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1. Root and Pattern Morphology and the Syntax-Morphology Interface

El-Abbas BenMaamoun, University of Illinois

The goal of this paper is to explore how the root-and-pattern morphological system of Arabic, and other Semitic languages, interacts with syntax and the morpho-phonological interface. Though there is robust morphological evidence for small units of word formation such as consonantal roots, volcanic melodies, feet, and “words” reflecting what is traditionally referred to as concatenative and non-concatenative systems of word formation, it remains open whether there are principled restrictions that preclude or limit access to some units. For example, one question is whether roots are available at all levels or to all components. An analysis and empirical arguments will be advanced to show that such principled restrictions exist and that they track neatly with recent developments in syntactic theory and particularly the relation between the syntactic component and the morpho-phonological interface.
2. Predication, Equation, and the Copula in Arabic

Lina Choueiri, American University of Beirut

In Arabic sentences with non-verbal predicates, the copula can sometimes take the form of third person strong pronouns (PRON); otherwise, it is verbal (KN) (or phonetically null (¢)). In this talk, I examine the typology of copular constructions in Arabic. Evidence from Lebanese Arabic is brought to bear on two important issues: the distribution of PRON and KN in relation to the predicational/equative dimension in the interpretation of copular constructions, and the structure and derivation of those constructions.

A consensus position has emerged in the syntactic literature on copular constructions that discounts the ‘lexical ambiguity’ of the copula, even in languages like Arabic that make use of two different copula elements (see, e.g. Adger and Ramchand 2003, Citko 2008, and den Dikken 2006). Within Semitic languages, two lines of argument have been put forward. Building on Doron (1986), Shlonsky (1997) argues for two different structures underlying copular sentences in Modern Hebrew (MH): A ‘small clause analysis’ underlies a sentence like (1a), whereas (1b), which differs minimally from (1a) in the presence of PRON, nevertheless derives from a full IP structure.

Evidence for the two-structure analysis comes from the contrast in (2).

(2) a. 'eyn Rina zameret rok Neg. R singer Rock
   b. *'eyn Rina hi gveret Levi Neg. R she Mrs. L
   ‘Rina is not a Rock singer.’

Whereas (1a) can be embedded under ‘eyn, that is not the case with (1b). Under the assumption that MH makes available one subject position below negation, the contrast in (2) shows that equative sentences (1b) require more structure than predicational sentences (1a), and that the subject in (1b) must be higher than the one in (1a). A confirmation of this comes from the acceptability of (3).

(3) Rina ‘eyn-a gveret Levi neg-3fs Mrs. L
   ‘Rina is not Mrs. Levi.’

One underlying assumption here is that the predicational/equative dimension determines the choice between the small clause and the full IP structure. On the other hand, in a study of agreement in Arabic, Ouhalla (2013) unifies copular sentences with sentences involving lexical verbs. The main objective of this study is to show that all manifestations of agreement in Arabic can be unified under an AGREE approach to the phenomenon (Chomsky 2000). The assumption made about PRON is that it is the manifestation of the agreement features of T, when T corresponds to the present tense. Otherwise, T is realized as the verbal copula, KN. According to Ouhalla (2013), copular sentences in Arabic correspond to one underlying structure, and the observed differences between PRON, KN (or even ¢) (e.g. the case features of the non-verbal predicate) result from the differences in the feature makeup of the copular elements themselves.

Revisiting data on copular sentences in Lebanese Arabic, I will first show that the pattern of distribution of PRON and KN does not only map onto the present/non-present tense dimension. Interpretive differences between copular sentences with PRON and those with KN indicate that the two copular elements can also be distinguished along the predicational/equative dimension. Of the sentences in (4), only (4a) has a specificational reading. (4b) is unambiguously predicational.
Given the reversibility of specificational sentences, it does not come as a surprise that copular sentences involving PRON are reversible, whereas those that involve KN are not (5-6).

The parallel behavior of specificational copular sentences and equatives is well-documented (see, e.g. Heycock and Kroch 1999, den Dikken 2006, etc.). What the observations in (4-6) indicate then is that PRON and KN give rise to different interpretations along the predicational/equative dimension. Second, I show the differential behavior of copular sentences involving PRON and those involving KN with respect to extraction. Specifically, whereas copular sentences involving KN allow A’-extraction of their predicate, this is not acceptable in copular sentences involving PRON (7).

I account for the observations in (4-7) by assuming two underlying structures for copular sentences, which differ in whether FP is projected (8). The latter is headed by PRON. Sentences without a copula or with KN do not project FP, and KN, when present, realizes T[AGR].
3. The Arabic Feminine in Gender Typology and Poly-valued Agreement

Abdelkader Fassi Fehri, Mohammed V University

Arabic grammar varieties instantiate rather original patterns of what surfaces as feminine. While the sex-based distinction is relevant for some ‘lexical’ (or root) correlates, in addition to morphologically regular derived animate nouns (through the affix –at typically), feminine affixes are used productively to produce compositional meanings of individuation, quantification, size decrease or increase, evaluation, abstracts, intensives, plurals, double plurals, etc. This highly gendered meaning diversity, if ever mentioned in the typological literature (of various frameworks), in addition to formal (or claimed ‘arbitrary’) gender, has not been acknowledged as essential to an adequate treatment of Gender, at both descriptive and theoretical levels (despite many unresolved issues about origins of gender or its evolution). Clearly, intra-linguistic and inter-linguistic variation cannot be limited to a semantic sex-based (and/or animacy, humanness) vs. formal choice, and must involve more features and diversity of architecture.

My purpose is to explore an enriched system of features and architecture to describe (and theorize) interrelations of gender forms and meanings in a minimalist distributed morphology model of grammar. I will typically investigate gender behaviors in some contexts of so-called ‘mixed agreement’, which I rename as ‘poly-valued agreement’ (to avoid disputed typological assumptions associated with the former terminology). I will argue in particular for the relevance and motivation of four ‘heights’ in gender syntax and interpretation: (a) conceptual root gender, (b) categorizing n (and/or classifying) gender, (c) Num (number) pluralizing gender, and (d) D (referential, discursive) gender.
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4. Possessive Dative Constructions in Lebanese Arabic

Youssef A. Haddad, University of Florida

Many languages license structures known as Possessive Dative Constructions (PDCs). The sentences in (1) through (3) are examples from French (Guéron, 1985: 59, (69b)), Hebrew (Landau, 1999: 3, (3a)), and Lebanese Arabic respectively. They contain a dative nominal – in boldface – that functions semantically as a possessor of another DP (e.g., a direct object, object of preposition) and syntactically as a complement to the verb. Because the possessor is external to the possessum DP, PDCs are also known as External Possessive Constructions.

(1) J’ai coupé les cheveux à Pierre
I have cut the hair to Pierre.DAT
‘I cut Pierre’s hair.’

(2) ha-yalda kilkela le-Dan et ha-radio.
the-girl spoiled to-Dan.DAT ACC the-radio
‘The girl broke Dan’s radio.’

(3) a. Raamii kawee-laa l-tannuura la-Aaya
Ramy ironed-her.DAT the-skirt for-Aaya
‘Ramy ironed Aaya’s skirt.’

   b. Raamii naʔʔatˁ-laa zeet ʕa-l-tannuura la-Aaya
Ramy dropped-her.DAT oil on-the-skirt for-Aaya
‘Ramy dropped oil on Aaya’s skirt.’

This paper has two goals. It provides a descriptive overview of PDCs in Lebanese Arabic from a cross-linguistic perspective, focusing on both their distribution and their interpretation and function. In terms of their distribution, PDs are spuriously similar to other datives (e.g., argument datives and ethical datives); the paper shows the resemblance and highlights the differences. It also delineates the types of predicates (e.g., transitive, unaccusative), complements (e.g., themes, instruments), and possessums (e.g., alienable, inalienable) that PDs may occur with. In all this, the paper also shows how PDCs in Lebanese Arabic are different from PDCs in other languages. Concerning their interpretation and function, the paper focuses on the pragmatic meaning that PDs express as conventional implicature contributors. For example, PDs may express the speaker’s empathy toward the possessor or depict that person as an affectee (see O’Connor 2007).

In addition, the paper puts forth a syntactic analysis of PDCs. Two analyses of PDCs within the generative tradition are raising/movement and control/binding (see Deal 2013 for an overview). The former holds that the possessor starts out in the possessum DP before it undergoes A-movement to a higher position. The latter maintains that a PD undergoes first merge external to the possessum DP and binds it from that position. In this paper, I show that the possessor and possessum do not form a constituent at any level in the derivation, and that PDs are instances of clitic doubling.
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In this talk, I argue that two constructions both expressed with “have+en” in English are expressed distinctly in modern Syrian Arabic, suggesting that the “perfect” is not a homogeneous construction, but a cluster of constructions that are morphologically conflated in English but not Arabic.

The “existential” perfect is based on an eventive predicate and asserts that such an event took place in the near past (1). The “universal” perfect is based on a stative predicate and asserts that such a state holds up to the reference time, and is most natural in combination with a time interval specification (2) (McCawley 1971).

(1) John has watered the plants. [existential]
(2) The window has been dirty? (for two weeks) [universal]

I argue that the universal perfect is expressed in Syrian Arabic by the auxiliary verb Saar (become) as illustrated in (3). (3) is an impersonal construction in which the subject of the underlying stative predicate bears dative case and the time interval specification is obligatory.

(3) sh-shibbaak Sar-lo usbuu3-een wasix. The-window became-it_DAT week-dual dirty ‘The window has been dirty for two weeks.’

I further argue (mirroring what Fassi Fehri 2004 says about Standard Arabic) that the existential perfect is expressed in Syrian Arabic by the perfective verb form (4), which also expresses the simple past. That is, the perfective is ambiguous between the simple past and the existential perfect.

(4) xaalid saqa z-zaraayi3. Xalid watered the-plants ‘Xalid watered / has watered the plants.’

I add, though, that (4) isn’t used very much on the perfect reading in Syrian Arabic because another construction comes very close to that meaning and is semantically unambiguous, namely the “active participle” construction, which is sometimes described as a perfect construction (Boneh 2010).

(5) xaalid saaqi z-zaraayi3. Xalid water.ACT.PART the-plants ‘Xalid has watered the plants.’

However, I argue that (5) is actually an active counterpart to the resultative passive participles seen in Indo-European in sentences like “The plants are watered”. These are similar in meaning to the perfect, but differ from it morphosyntactically in systematic ways that I will describe in detail. English does not have a counterpart to the construction in (5).
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6. Stochastic Grammar and Grammatical Variation in Arabic

Frederick M. Hoyt, University of New England

I discuss several kinds of variation in acceptability judgements that have been documented in spoken Arabic syntax and how they complicate analyses with binary grammars (i.e., grammars that produce output that are either "grammatical" or "ungrammatical"). These areas of variation include:

1. Variation in the acceptability of unlicensed n-words in certain positions within negative concord sentences in Jordanian, Syrian and Moroccan Arabic (Hoyt 2010, 2014);

2. Variation in copular agreement marking in Palestinian Arabic existential sentences (Hoyt 2000, 2002);

3. Variation in complementizer agreement in Palestinian and Jordanian Arabic (Mohammad 2000);


I then introduce Stochastic Optimality Theory (ST-OT: Boersma and Hayes 2001) for syntax. ST-OT differs from standard optimality theory in positing constraints ranked in terms of ranges along a scale. Where ranking ranges for two constraints overlap, variation in acceptability is predicted. I show how ST-OT can account for these points of variation elegantly, using a variety of constraints proposed elsewhere for syntactic, pragmatic and prosodic (Helmuth 2006, Felhausen 2008, Destruel 2013) analyses.

Lastly, I discuss what OT constraints "mean": A OT-based theory (stochastic or otherwise) has to have an account for what kind of constraints are possible. I briefly introduce work showing that ST-OT has been shown to be a form of maximum entropy grammar (Jäger 2007), suggesting that constraints in an ST-OT grammar can be viewed as probabilities assigned to input-output pairs. I conclude by noting how using stochastic grammar for theoretical purposes offers a way to unite existing theoretical work on Arabic with developments in areas on the computer science side of linguistics.
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7. Weak Resumptive Elements in Jordanian Arabic Relative Clauses

Nouman Malkawi, Al-Hussein Bin Talal University

In Jordanian Arabic (JA), we distinguish strong resumption (strong pronouns and epithets) from weak resumption (clitics and doubled clitics). In this paper, I study the interpretation of weak resumption in JA relative clauses (and interrogatives). I show that, whereas clitics give rise, in the one hand, to \textit{de re} and \textit{de dicto} readings, and in the other hand, to natural function and pair list readings, doubled clitics only give rise to \textit{de re} and natural function readings.

To account for this asymmetry, we have to consider the notion of competition between the different morphological realisations of a variable. I propose the following morphological scale of economy: ‘\textit{gap} \emptyset > \textit{clitic} (-uh) > \textit{doubled clitic} (-uh hu)’. The less marked morphologically variable on this scale gives rise to an interpretive ambiguity in an appropriate context. For instance, in a relative clause (context of obligatory resumption), ambiguity appears with the clitic and not with the doubled clitic since clitic has a morphological form less specified than the doubled clitic.
Form II (FaʕʕaL) of Classical Arabic verbs can denote causativisation or verbal plural (intensive or pluriactionality in Newman's 1990 termonology) (Greenberg 1991, Fassi Fehri 2012). It denotes causativisation in verbs with a non-causative Form I variant (e.g. ʔalim ‘know’/ʔallam ‘teach’), and verbal plural in transitive verbs with a causative Form I variant (e.g. kasar ‘cause break’/kassar ‘shatter’) as well as unaccusative/non-causative verbs with a plural argument (e.g. barak ‘singular kneel’/ barrak ‘plural kneel’ cited in Greenberg 1991). Moreover, the ability of Form II to denote verbal plural does not depend on the perfect-imperfect distinction. These properties are consistent with an analysis whereby the head of the Form II template is specified for CAUSE, NUM_pl and its corresponding node in the structure excludes from its scope both the causer argument, which does not participate in verbal plural, and the node that encodes the perfect-imperfect distinction.

In Moroccan Arabic, Form II also denotes causativisation in transitive verbs with a non-causative Form I variant (e.g. dḥak ‘laugh’/daḥḥak ‘cause laugh’). However, Moroccan Arabic has numerous transitive Form II verbs that lack a Form I variant (e.g. harrs ‘cause break’) as well intransitive, non-causative Form II verbs (e.g. naqqaz ‘jump’). It also has agent nominals based on Form II but have a non-causative meaning (e.g. xaddam ‘employee/*employer’). The partial similarity with Classical Arabic appears to be limited to verbs and forms inherited from Classical Arabic, and the departure is characteristic of neologisms. This indicates a move towards a situation where Form II becomes the default verb form, where median gemination can take place for the purpose of template saturation and is not necessarily associated with CAUSE. This trend towards a bigger template, form arguably started in Classical Arabic bearing in mind archaic pairs where the causative/non-causative distinction is exclusively encoded in the vocalism of Form I verbs: [i]/[a] (e.g. ḥaz antuhu fa ḥazi ‘I caused him to become sad and therefore he became sad’).

The change in the meaning properties of Form II is already completed as far verbal plural (intensive) is concerned. Form II does not denote verbal plural with any type of verb in Moroccan Arabic. Instead, verbal plural is independently denoted by the preposition f’in’ associated with the direct object in a PP-complement structure (e.g. (ţbar-u) kayşrab l-xmar ‘(I found him) drinking alcohol’ vs. kayşrab f l-xmar ‘abusing alcohol’). The plural preposition is obligatory with transitive verbs with an inherent plural meaning such as barqəq/balət ‘stare/eye-ball’ (e.g. kaybarqəq *(fi) n-nas ‘he stares at people’). Moreover, the expression of verbal plural with the preposition is permissible within the scope of the imperfect form of verbs but not the perfect form (e.g. *šrab (*f-) l-xmar l-barah ‘he drank/*abused alcohol yesterday’). The change relating to verbal plural can be shown to be connected to the change relating to causativisation and the difference between Classical Arabic and Moroccan Arabic can be reduced to well-defined differences and related processes independently suggested in the literature.
9. Where Are the Perfective Epistemic Modals in Arabic?  

Actuality Entailment did it

Sarah Ouwayda, Université de Genève/Google

Summary: I provide novel data showing that perfective, which results in actuality entailment for root modals, also affects epistemic modality: It bars epistemic modals from occurring altogether. I propose a novel account of actuality entailment for root modals in the perfective, and show it also accounts for the infelicity of epistemic modals in the perfective.

Background: Normally, a modal’s complement is not necessarily true in the actual world (1a: Lebanese Arabic). But when a modal occurs in the perfective (PFV), its complement must be true in the actual world (1b). This is actuality entailment (AE). Previous accounts of AE either ignore epistemic modals (Bhatt 1999, Piñon 2003, Mari & Martin 2008, Homer 2010), or predict perfective does not affect them (Hacquard 2009, Borgonovo & Cummins 2008).

1. a. Imperfective
   saami keen yeʔder yesbaH (bass ma sebeH)
   Sami was can-ipfv swim (but not swam)
   Sami could swim (but never did)

   b. Perfective → Actuality Entailment
   saami ?eder yesbaH (#bass ma sebeH)
   Sami could-pfv swim (#but not swam)
   Sami could swim (#but never did)

Data: Modal verbs that can otherwise be interpreted as either epistemic or as root modals, like (2a), lose their epistemic reading when they occur in the perfective (2b).

2. a. yumkin an yakuun saami fi l-beit
   can-ipfv to be.ipfv S. in the-home
   OK John was allowed to be at home (ability)
   OK John might have been at home (epist.)

   b. amkan an yakuun saami fi l-beit
   can-pfv to be.ipfv S. in the-home
   OK John could be at home (ability)
   #John might have been at home (epist.)

In fact, unambiguously epistemic modals cannot occur in the perfective. This is shown for the exclusively epistemic modal verb yemken in Lebanese Arabic (3a), barred in the pfv (3b).

3. a. sami yemken ykoun bi-l-beit
   BePossible.ipfv be.ipfv at-the-house
   Sami might be at home (only epistemic)

   b. *sami amkan ykoun bi-l-beit
   BePossible.pfv be.ipfv at-the-house

Proposal: Semantically, I assume that root and epistemic modals are quantifiers over worlds (Kratzer 1991), differing only in their ordering source and modal base, and that both compose with <e,t>-type predicates (4). Syntactically, I assume they both merge below the perfective (5).

4. a. \[\text{must}_d = \lambda P. \lambda x. \forall w \in W_D: P(x) \in w\]
   \[\text{may}_d = \lambda P. \lambda x. \forall w \in W_D: P(x) \in w\]

   b. \[\text{must}_e = \lambda P. \lambda x. \forall w \in W_E: P(x) \in w\]
   \[\text{may}_e = \lambda P. \lambda x. \forall w \in W_E: P(x) \in w\]

   \[W_D= \text{the worlds most compatible with the \ laws/circumstances of the actual world}\]
   \[W_E= \text{the worlds compatible with our \ epistemic state in the actual world}\]

5. \[\text{TP John } [\text{AspPerf } [\text{Epistemic-Mod must}/may_e ] [\text{Root-Mod must}/may_d ] [\text{VP swim}]]]\]

I propose that besides its temporal function, perfective involves an actualizing component:

6. a. \[
\text{PFV}w, B, \leq, c = \lambda P_{\leq e,t}. \lambda t_i. \lambda x. \exists e. \forall w \in W_2: \tau(e) \in t \& \text{Agent}(e) = x \& Ev(P)(e) \in w\]

where \[W_2 = \text{All worlds compatible with what is true in the actual world at utterance time}\]

and \[Ev = \lambda P \in D_{\leq e,t}. \lambda e \in D_c. \forall x \in D_e: x \in Agents(e) \rightarrow e \text{ is such that } P(x)\]
b. **Paraphrase:** Given a predicate P, an utterance time, and an individual x there is an event characterized by P, completed before utterance time, whose agent is x, in all the worlds compatible with what is true in the actual world at utterance time.

Since modals are quantifiers over worlds, regardless of the relative scope between modal and PFV, function application always results in the modal marginalizing PFV’s actualizing effect.

As (7) illustrates for **root modals**, I propose actuality entailment occurs because like in non-modal utterances, the main verb in modalized sentences moves (in LF) to ASP, and both copies of the verb are interpreted, and compose with their respective sisters, as in (8).

7. \[ TP \quad \text{Juan} \quad [\text{Asp} \quad \text{PFV}+\text{nadar} \quad [\text{Mod} \quad \text{poder}_d \quad \text{[VP}\text{nadar}]])]]

8. a. \[ [\text{ye’der}_d]\{[\text{yesbaH}]=\lambda x. \ w \ W_D : \text{swims}(x) \in w \]
   b. \[ \text{PFV} , \{[\text{yesbaH}]=\lambda x. \ e. \ w \ W_2 : [\tau(e) \subseteq t \& \text{Agent}(e) = x \& x \text{swims} \in w] \]

Both compositions in (8) yield predicates of type \(<e,t>\), which subsequently compose with each other through Predicate Modification (Heim and Kratzer 1998), resulting in (9).

9. a. \[ [[\text{ye’der}_d \text{yesbaH}]] = \lambda x. [\lambda y. \exists w \in W_D : y \text{swims in } w](x) \text{ and } [\lambda y. \exists e. \forall w \in W_2 : [\tau(e) \subseteq t \& \text{Agent}(e) = y \& [e \text{ is s.t. } y \text{ swims} \text{ in } w]](x) \]
   b. After composition with Juan \(\rightarrow\) ‘**John swam and he had permission to swim’**

Independent motivation for V-to-Asp movement: In Lebanese Arabic, both modal verb and lexical verb can appear in perfective form (10), and be interpreted identically to (1b).

10. \(\text{sami ’eder sabaH mbeereH}\)
    Sami can.pfv swim.pfv yesterday (Actuality Entailment)

I propose all is identical for **epistemic modals** except the modal base and ordering source (11).

11. a. \[ [[\text{‘eder}_e \text{yesbaH}]] = \lambda x. [\lambda y. \exists w \in W_E : y \text{swims in } w](x) \text{ and } [\lambda y. \exists e. \forall w \in W_2 : [\tau(e) \subseteq t \& \text{Agent}(e) = y \& [e \text{ is s.t. } y \text{ swims} \text{ in } w]](x) \]
   b. After composition with Juan \(\rightarrow\) ‘**John swam and he might have swam’**

This causes infelicity for perfective epistemic modals: (11b) is a conjunction of an indicative proposition and an epistemic proposition that it entails, and conjoining a proposition and its entailment is infelicitous (Hudford 1974, Schlenker 2008, Katzir & Singh 2014).

As (12) illustrates ‘John swam’ entails ‘John might have swam’, but not vice versa, making their conjunction infelicitous. In contrast ‘John swam’ does not entail ‘John had the permission to swim’, nor vice-versa (13). So their conjunction is felicitous.

12. ‘John swam’ \(\rightarrow\) John swam in the actual world \(\rightarrow\) There are worlds compatible with what the speaker saying “John swam” knows, where John swims \(\rightarrow\) ‘John possibly swam’
    \(\Rightarrow\) “John swam and he possibly swam” is infelicitous

13. ‘John swam’ \(\rightarrow\) John swam in the actual world \(\rightarrow\) There are worlds compatible with the rules of the actual world where John swam \(\rightarrow\) ‘John was allowed to swim’
    \(\Rightarrow\) “John swam and he was allowed to swim” is felicitous

Crucially, replacing permission with ability in (9) (and (13)) would not result in entailment either: As
Thalberg 1972 and Piñon 2003 argue, (14a) does not necessarily entail (14b). If John was a terrible bowler who was lucky once, only (14a) is true, while (14b) is false.

14. a. John bowled three strikes  b. John had the ability to bowl three strikes

I assume **imperfective**, unlike perfective, merges below all modals (15), like the frequentative and repetitive aspects in Cinque (2000). When the verb moves to Asp\_IPFV (16), Predicate Modification of the verb’s two copies occurs prior to composing with the modal. So the modalized predicate does not get conjoined with an implicative one. So root modals do not have actuality entailment, and epistemic modals are felicitous in imperfective.

15. TP > …> Asp\_perfective > … > ModP\_epistemic > … > ModP\_root > … > (Asp\_imperfective >) …

16. [TP Sami [Mod yemken\_d [Asp\_IPFV IPFV+nadar IPFV+nadar]]]

**Independent evidence:** In Standard and Lebanese Arabic, imperfectives require tense affixes, perfectives do not, suggesting perfectives are higher than imperfective (Benmamoun 2000).

**Comparison to other proposals:** I show that my proposal predicts actuality entailment more directly than other proposals, and that these proposals cannot be extended to account for the new facts from epistemics: Hacquard (2009) and Borgonovo & Cummins (2008) explicitly exclude effects on epistemic modals. Bhatt (1999) and Homer (2010) rely on the semantics of root modals in a way that cannot be extended to derive non-identical effects on epistemic modals. And Piñon (2003), which is based on scope, would -if extended to epistemics- predict they either have AE (removing the modality), or they remain unaffected. Crucially, it does not derive their infelicity.
Lebanese Arabic presents a puzzling order in non-finite subordination contexts: The subject of the matrix clause comes sandwiched between the embedded verb and its complement, as noted and discussed in detail in Hallman (2011). We present new facts and argue for phrasal (TP) movement carrying both the matrix and embedded verbs as well as intervening material above the subject, along the lines of Kayne (2005). Importantly, while this may appear to be a complex rightward movement of the subject, we propose the subject itself only undergoes one simple movement (as a topic), and the puzzling order follows from the movement of phrases containing it.
Tunisian Arabic (TA) differs from other dialectal varieties (e.g. Moroccan, Egyptian and Lebanese) in that it does not have a prefix introducing the imperfective verbs in the present tense. It has a prefix to form the future, but imperfective forms appear bare in present tense contexts.

With respect to transitive dynamic predicates, TA has a strategy to differentiate generic ad progressive sentences: in order to assign a progressive interpretation, in fact, the direct object must be introduced by the preposition “fi”, as in (1); in the absence of “fi” the sentence is interpreted as generic (2) with the direct object position restricted to bare (plural) noun phrases.

1)  Sɛmi yekl fi-(l)-sandwich/kosksi
   Semi eats fi-(the)-sandwich/couscous
   'Semi is eating a/the sandwich/couscous'

2)  Sɛmi yekl sandwichet/kosksi
   Semi eats sandwiches/couscous
   'Semi eats sandwiches/couscous'   (as in: Semi generally eats/likes to eat sandwiches/couscous)

Perfective predicates, on the other hand, do not select the prepositional object. When “fi” co-occurs with a perfective form, it can only be interpreted as a locative preposition, compare (3) and (4).

3)  #Sɛmi kle fi-(l)-sandwich/kosksi
    Semi ate in-(the)-sandwich/couscous

4)  Sɛmi kle fi-škala
    Semi ate in-bowl
    'Semi ate in a bowl'

In this paper I claim that the facts illustrated by the examples above are the result of two interrelated factors. First: TA imperfective forms, similarly to the imperfective forms found in other dialectal varieties, are defective (see also Aoun et al. 2010) and due to this condition they require an additional layer to mediate the mapping relation between a Theme and the event (Krifka, 1992). This extra-layer is headed by “fi” and it anchors the event to the reference time.

Second, defective predicates in the absence of “fi” are unable to select entity-denoting internal arguments. Consequently, their selection is restricted to property denoting nominal phrases (bare plurals) that operate as predicate restrictors (Chung & Ladusaw 2004, Belletti & Bianchi 2015). I propose that predicate modifiers of this type do not provide a relevant scale for temporal mapping with the result that the sentence is interpreted by default as generic (Cinque 1999).

Finally, I will illustrate how the relation between the generic reading and entity denoting complements (<e,t>) also holds in Italian suggesting a possible an alternative analysis to the phenomenon of Genericity that prescinds the introduction of ad hoc semantic operators.
12. The landscape of exceptive constructions in Egyptian Arabic

Usama Soltan, Middlebury College

This paper provides a descriptive account of exceptive constructions in Egyptian Arabic (EA) as well as an analysis of their syntactic properties in light of proposals made in the literature regarding the typology of exceptives in human language. In particular, I first discuss the syntactic distribution of EA exceptive phrases headed by the particle Ɂillaa, arguing for an analysis of their syntactic properties in terms of Hoeksema’s (1987) seminal distinction between connected exceptives (CEs) and free exceptives (FEs), where CEs are argued to be coordinated DPs within a mono-clausal structure, whereas FEs are argued to be coordinated CPs which undergo ellipsis. I then discuss other types of exceptive structures in the language in light of that analysis. In particular, I discuss exceptive structures headed by the following markers: yeir, ma-ʕadaa, bixlaaf, and the occasionally used Standard Arabic bi-stisnaaɁ, all of which have the meaning ‘except/other than.’ The analysis proposed is shown to account for the syntactic distribution of exceptive phrases in the language, and is supported by a number of empirical facts related to ellipsis phenomena, the occurrence of speaker-oriented adverbials, scope ambiguity, among others.
In this talk we set out to explore the landscape of pronominal non-core datives in Syrian Arabic. We show that in order to reach an adequate classification, constructions containing non-core dative should be considered in their context of use and not in isolation. This methodological move will enable us to make the claim that the main classification distinguishes between non-core datives that are truth conditional, conceived as additional event participants, and non-truth conditional datives, which make a pragmatic and discursive contribution to the clause’s meaning (cf. Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh 2015).

With respect to the former, we will show that all truth conditional non-core datives should be collapsed together, namely that there is no grammatical distinction between the so called possessor dative and the beneficiary/maleficiary dative, rejecting a possessor raising analysis of the former (see Al-Zahre 2003).

Concerning non-truth conditional non-core datives, two sub-types of non-core datives will be considered: (i) the co-referential dative described in Al-Zahre & Boneh (2010), which will be characterized as an anti-exclamative of sorts and (ii) a dative operating at the discourse level restricted to 2nd person, hitherto undescribed in Syrian Arabic. Equipped with a clearer understanding of the different interpretative characteristics of these non-core datives, we will consider their syntactic placement in the clausal skeleton.

Time permitting, we will compare the two sub-types of non-truth conditional non-core datives in Syrian Arabic to parallel ones in Lebanese Arabic (see Haddad 2013, 2014), Modern Hebrew (Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh 2015) and French (e.g. Leclère 1976, Jouitteau & Rezac 2007, Boneh & Nash 2011).

References:


