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Abstract

The main aim of the thesis is to analyze the syntactic features of “raising and passive structures.” This thesis presents an overview of some of the essential analyses of raising and passive in Standard Arabic. The dissertation not only discusses the two central analyses of argument movement in Standard Arabic but also provides key modifications of Soltan’s (2007) analysis of raising and passive structures, with data that Soltan did not consider and with certain new theoretical proposals involving the inventory of functional projections available in Arabic.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, and 3</td>
<td>first, second, and third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ-role</td>
<td>theta role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-movement</td>
<td>argument movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>complementizer phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>extended projection principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>determiner phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTP</td>
<td>determiner topic phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Iraqi Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCL</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>subject verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>verb subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1: Introduction

The study of Argument movement (A-movement) has been ongoing for several years, and it continues to grow as one of the most important topics in many languages. A number of studies have presented important discussions about A-movement in Standard Arabic (SA) (Abdul-Hafiz, 2003; Mohammed, 2000; Salih, 1986; Soltan, 2006-2007). However, certain relevant phenomena have not been fully investigated, and there are remaining questions concerning some essential issues that face A-movement in SA that the current study tries to address.

The thesis investigates different analyses of raising and passive constructions. According to one dissection, there is A-movement, while another study argues that there is no A-movement. Chapter 2 will provide a full examination about these two approaches.

The issue of Arabic raising structures, specifically with the raising predicate “yabduu/seems,” plays a central role in syntactic theory and has been a recurrent topic of debate over the past 20-30 years.

The thesis includes consideration of both SA and one dialect of SA, namely, Iraqi Arabic (IA). In the thesis I present data from IA, in addition to SA, to support a new hypothesis for raising and passive structures. To illustrate certain of the central themes of this thesis, consider the following examples:

1) Raising to subject in Standard Arabic
      seem-3MS that the-student-NOM read-3MS the-book-ACC
      “It seems that the student read the book.”

seem-3MS the-student-NOM that-he read-3MS the-book-ACC

“The student seems that he read the book.”

2) Raising to subject in IA


∅ seem 3MS that- the-student read the book

“It seems that the student read the book.”

b) ?ala-ma yabduu ?al-talib bi-?anna qara ?al-kitab

∅ seem 3sgmas the-student that read the book

“The student seems that he read the book.”

Clearly, the surface structure in example (1.b) and (2.b) are virtually¹ identical; each sentence has the following word order: VS order. However, some scholars (Mohammed, 2000; Soltan, 2007) have disagreed with the argument that sentence (1.b) is the result of A-movement. According to Mohammed and Soltan, example (1.b) is not the result of DP movement from the embedded clause to the matrix clause to give us the surface structure of (1.b).

---

¹ Generally speaking, most of the Iraqi speakers use the expression “ʔala-ma” before the verb “yabduu/seems,” but some prefer to drop the “ʔala-ma” and start the sentence with the verb immediately, as in the following examples:

1) Raising to Subject in IA


seem 3MS that- the-student read the book

“It seems that the student read the book.”


seem 3sgmas the-student that read the book

“The student seems that he read the book.”
Other researchers (Abdul-Hafiz, 2003; Salih, 1986), on the other hand, propose that SA has the same structure as English regarding A-movement; they claim that (1.b) is the result of A-movement. The discussion of raising structures will be presented in detail in the next chapter.

1.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate a number of important syntactic properties of Arabic—specifically, subject-to-subject raising and passive structures both in SA and IA—by carefully analyzing key examples from both languages.

“Raising structures” are standardly considered to be a type of A-movement. However, there is disagreement about A-movement in SA. It has been argued that in SA, neither passive nor raising structures involve any A-movement at all.

The status of raising verbs in SA is controversial and important for a better understanding of the nature of empty categories in syntactic theory. Although there is some literature on this topic in SA, there are issues that are still not well understood; hence, this study attempts to fill these gaps.

It is worth mentioning that rather little research on IA has been published. Wahba (1991) has presented wh-movement in IA, and Jassim (2011) has discussed relative clauses in IA. Other scholars (Abu-Haidar, 1989; Al-Bazi, 2006) have presented general information about IA, but none of these studies has ever discussed raising and passive structures in this language. This study is an attempt to shed light on an important topic regarding raising and passive structures in Arabic.

In the thesis, I argue that Soltan (2007) provides the best overall analysis of raising and passive structures in SA; however, there are various potential problems that Soltan does not address. The thesis attempts to find possible solutions for these problems. Ultimately, we
introduce and explore a new hypothesis, which can be called the “Functional Projection Hypothesis.” This theory will be applied to raising and passive structures in both languages, SA and IA, in Chapter 3.

In the thesis, I will adopt Soltan’s analysis that SA does not have raising structures. However, we will present a range of new data, not considered in the literature before, which raises interesting issues for Soltan’s proposal.

It can be suggested from the result of this study that there is a type of A-movement in SA and IA. It should be noted from the data presented in Chapter 3 that A-movement only appears with any functional head that has a periphery feature (i.e., the DP can raise to the highest projection in the case of having modal or negation). The study concludes that the verb “yabduu/seems” can raise up and precede the determiner phrase (DP) “?al-talib-u/the student” to give us the word order of examples (1.b) and (2.b). In these two examples, we suggest that the word order can be derived by raising the verb to F; the details of raising and passive structures are presented in Chapter 3.

1.2 Research Questions

The main goal of this thesis is to explain and analyze questions about raising and passive structures in Arabic and to compare two arguments about raising structures in SA from a theoretical perspective. More specifically, I would like to raise and answer a number of important questions:

1) Does Arabic have A-Movement with raising and passive structures?

2) Does Arabic have V to C raising with “yabduu/seems” clause?

3) If the DP is base-generated in Spec-TP in the passive structures, then what occupies VP?

4) Why does IA allow wh-movement in raising and passive structures?
5) What is the role of the functional projection hypothesis?

The question we ask is whether Arabic involves A-movement in raising and passive structures or whether the DP in the examples above base-generates and does not arrive to its final position via movement. To provide a passable answer to this problem and to answer the questions above, the study must go beyond SA to see how the dialects (i.e., IA) deal with these problems. The data that will be presented and discussed in Chapter 3 suggest that the verb “yabduu/seems” in Arabic has the option to move and precede the DP. This in turn raises the question of whether the verb is allowed to raise from its position to T then to C in the Arabic clauses in raising or passive structures. Evidence from using modal verbs and negation particles with raising and passive structures provides syntactic support for such a projection. That is, Arabic does not allow V to C raising. This issue plays an important role in the current discussions. The study will provide the new hypothesis, the functional projection hypothesis, to solve this problem.

Moreover, it would be interesting to examine the functional projection hypothesis with Soltan’s analysis, which nicely accounts for the topic properties of the “yabduu/seem” clause, but it does not account for a certain range of cases: specifically, those where the verb “yabduu/seems” precedes the higher subject, which the present study attempts to answer.

1.3 Scope and Organization

The concentration of this dissertation is a range of morpho-syntactic phenomena (i.e., raising and passive structures) in Arabic. The main goal is to provide the detailed analysis of these structures. The proposed investigation presents two basic theoretical considerations (discussed in Chapter 2), providing better understanding to the concept of A-movement in Arabic.
The organization of the thesis is as follows: in the introductory chapter, I have provided general background information about the topic, the purpose of the study, and the research questions.

Chapter 2, “Literature Review,” focuses on works that concern A-movement in SA. I provide an overview of previous research in the field of raising and passive structures. It is clear from the discussion presented in Chapter 2 that there are two disagreements about A-movement analyses in SA. Some scholars, such as Mohammed (2000) and Soltan (2007), claim that SA is a language that does not make use of A-movement operations at all. Other scholars, such as Abdul-Hafiz (2003) and Salih (1986), assert that SA allows A-movement in raising and passive structures. The chapter discusses the two different analyses of raising and passive structures in detail and concludes with important questions that Soltan’s analysis does not provide.

In Chapter 3, I present new data demonstrating that it is possible to have an A-movement in both languages, SA and IA, after providing general background information about IA and how IA differs from SA. The chapter challenges Soltan’s analysis and introduces the new hypothesis, the functional project hypothesis. In this chapter, I argue that IA allows the wh-movement to precede the topic and assume that the DP in IA occupies an A-position rather than A’-position.

The chapter also provides some evidence that allows the verb to raise to F in the passive structures if we have negation particles or quantifiers. The quantifiers are not the main concern of this study. Therefore, little attention will be drawn to this matter.

In the concluding chapter, I sum up the analyses made in the previous chapters, providing the results of this study. The chapter concludes that the verb move to F is optional to give us the word order “VS” in both structures, raising and passive. The chapter also points to areas of future research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter, I will present an overview of raising and passive structures. First, I will give the definition of raising; then I will briefly review the research that has contributed to the study of raising and passive structures in both languages, English and Arabic. Finally, I will provide two different arguments about raising and passive structures in SA after giving background information about certain key syntactic properties of Arabic, such as word order and subject-verb agreement, which play an important role in understanding raising and passive constructions in this language.

2.1 Raising and Passive Structures in Generative Grammar

Raising structures have been one of the most important topics of continued theoretical study within the Minimalist framework ever since Chomsky (Chomsky, 1995; Boskovic, 2002; Haddad, 2012; Radford, 2009), which is not surprising given that raising plays a central role in the theory.

“Raising structure” is a term developed from the fact that the DP, which is the subject of the sentence, starts in a lower part of the sentence and moves to the subject position of the higher clause, as examples (1) and (2) show. In other words, the subject of the embedded clause should raise and become the surface subject of the matrix clause. Therefore, the subject of the sentence is semantically related to the verb of the lower infinitive clause but not to the verb of the matrix clause (Baker, 2005).

In English, verbs like *seem, appear, likely*, and others are considered a special type of verb, called raising verbs, which participate in a unique set of morpho-syntactic behaviors and which play a central role in evaluating competing syntactic theories.
In general, raising verbs are of at least two types: raising-to-subject and raising-to-object. The two types are illustrated in examples (1-5). In this study, I will deal with both raising to subject and with passive structures. However, it is useful to give a very brief review of raising to object.

Raising to subject:

1) The man seems [__ to like books].
2) Bill is likely [__ to leave].
3) *Susan seems that [__ is sick].

Raising to object:

4) Mary wants John [__ to leave].
5) I wanted the cat to be let out of the bag.

According to Carnie (2013), the DP movement in the examples above is called raising because the DP raised from the lower to the higher clause. The reason behind the DPs movement from their original position to their final position is to get a nominative case and to satisfy the EPP. The relevant derivation is illustrated in (6).

---

1 Raising to object cases are usually referred to as “Exceptional Case Marking,” or ECM, verbs.

2 Example (5) adopted from Carnie, 2013, p. 440.
In this derivation, the DP “the man” starts out in the specifier of the embedded VP where it gets its theta-role. Then, it moves to spec T of the embedded clause to satisfy its EPP requirements (i.e., every sentence must contain a DP in the subject position). The case feature of the DP “the man” in the embedded spec T is still unchecked because the infinitival T in the embedded clause is unable to check case in this position; then the DP raises up to the specifier of the higher T, where it receives case because only the specifier-TP of the higher clause can assign case to its DP. The other reason for the DP movement to the specifier of the matrix T is to satisfy the EPP requirements.\(^3\)

\(^3\) Extended projection principle (EPP) is a hypothesis proposed by Chomsky, which states that each sentence should have a subject. The subject must be presented syntactically even if the verb assigns theta-role to its subject. Thus, verbs that cannot assign external theta-role to their subjects, such as seems and appears, will appear with a subject that has been raised from the embedded clause, or with the pronoun “it” (Chomsky, 1982).
The DP movement in raising structures is not limited only to the specifier of TP; there are other positions that the DP can end up in, as can be seen in raising to object examples. The DP “John” in (7) appears as the surface object of the matrix verb *wants*. This verb is a special verb that can be used with both raising and control. Raising to object can come with verbs of intention, cognition verbs, and verbs of discovery (see Abdel-Hafiz, 2003; Carnie 2013 for further discussion of this phenomenon).

As can be seen in (7), the DP “John” first moves to the specifier of TP to satisfy EPP requirements; then it raises up to the specifier AgrOP to check accusative case. As has been mentioned above, the spec-TP of the lower clause cannot assign accusative case because it is a
non-finite clause; only the T of a finite clause is not assigned case to the DP, and for that reason the DP “John” moves to spec-AgrOP to check accusative case.

The syntactic analysis of raising verbs in English is that finite T, in the higher clause, licenses a subject. In addition, the Spec-TP of the matrix clause is a non-theta position. If a lower clause is non-finite, its subject must move to the TP of the higher clause, which is a non-theta position, to be licensed by the matrix finite T of higher TP. This explains why the embedded subject appears in the matrix clause in examples (1-2). Once the DP has been assigned a case and has satisfied the EPP, it cannot move further as shown by the ungrammaticality of example (3).

Another construction that involves A-movement is passive, as illustrated in (8). Radford (2004) states that the subject, in the passive form, moves from V-complement position into the specifier of TP position to check case.

8) Susan was kissed [___by Bill].

The derivation in example (9) will be as follows: the DP “Susan” moves from the VP to the specifier of TP to satisfy the EPP requirements and to satisfy the case filter after it gets its θ-role from the verb kissed.

Carnie (2013) implies that since the verb kissed in example (8) is [-accusative] and the DP cannot have a case in the VP position; the DP must move to the specifier of the finite T, as there is no DP in this position. As has been noted earlier, the specifier of the finite T is the only place that can assign case to its DP. The reason behind the inability to get a case in the VP position is that the passive morpheme takes away the verb’s ability to assign case to its DP complement.
It is clear that the verb in the example above, which is in the passive form, cannot assign accusative case to its DP because only the active transitive verb can assign accusative case to the DP, as in (11). Burzio (1986) proposes an analysis to explain accusative case in passive. The analysis is called “Burzio's generalization.”

10) Burzio’s Generalization: An accusative case can be assigned to an object if and only if the verb can assign θ-role to the subject.

In other words, a verb that does not have an agent argument in its specifier cannot check accusative case.

11)

a) She invited him. (Active)

b) He was invited. (Passive)

c) *He was invited her.
Example (11.a) is a grammatical sentence in English because the verb *invited* is in active voice that can assign θ-role to its subject and then assign an accusative case to its object. Example (11.c) is an ungrammatical sentence because the verb is in the passive form that does not have a θ-role, so it cannot assign accusative case to its complement. Hence, it violates the Case Filter.

From the data presented above, it should be noted that the passive structure is similar to subject raising structure in the following respects: first, in both cases, the DP starts in a position where case cannot be assigned. For this reason, the DP has to move to the closest position where case can be checked. Second, the DP, in both structures, moves from a theta to a non-theta position. It has to be mentioned that passive and subject raising structures are not similar in every feature. An essential difference is that the DP in subject raising structure moves from a subject position to another subject position (i.e., the subject of the embedded clause moves to the subject of the matrix clause). In contrast, the DP in the passive structures moves from an object position to a subject position (Santorini, 2012).

To conclude this section, we can summarize the properties of raising structure as the following:

a) The DP is the element that has to move.

b) The DP movement is obligatory when the DP is in a position to which no case can be assigned.

c) The DP movement ends in a position where case is assigned and the EPP is satisfied.

d) Raising allows idiomatic readings both in subject-to-subject and subject-to-object raising in addition to passive structure.
From the discussion above, it is clear that raising is important for the theory because it helps linguists to determine the interaction of different components of the theory, such as Theta vs. case Theory, case filter, and EPP, as shown in the examples above.

2.2 The Syntactic Features of Arabic

In the previous section, I gave a brief review of raising and outlined why it is important to syntactic theory. In the following two sections (2.2.1) and (2.2.2), I will present a brief introduction to relevant Arabic structures, specifically, word order and subject-verb agreement.

2.2.1 Word Order

Arabic is a verb initial “VSO” and pro-drop language. Sentences in Arabic can be nominal or verbal sentences. Nominal sentences usually have a topic and a predicate. The topic of the nominal sentence can be a noun or a pronoun, while the predicate can be a noun, preposition, or verb. This is shown in the following examples:

12) ?al-bayt-u jadiid-un
   The house-NOM new-NOM         SV Order
   “The house is new.”

13) ?al-walad-u rahal-a
   the boy-NOM left-3MS          SV Order
   “The boy left.”

The topic of a nominal sentence is usually definite; however, Arabic grammarians indicate that an indefinite subject is allowed in some types of sentences that express possession.

---

Semantically speaking, nominal sentences traditionally have been considered as a topic (mubtada)-comment (xabar) structure. Scholars illustrate that nominal sentences can come with no verb or copula realized at surface structure.
or existence, and in this case, the subject comes after the predicate. This can be shown in the following examples.

14) hunalik-Ɂa ?awlad-un fi ?al-hadiqa-ti
   there boys-NOM in the park-DAT Nominal Sentence
   “There are boys in the park.”

15) li ?akh-un
   I/have-1S brother Nominal Sentence
   “I have a brother”

16) ?andi sayara
   I/have-1S car-F Nominal Sentence
   “I have a car.”

Arabic grammarians differ as to the analysis of the sentences in SA. According to Abdel-Hafiz (2005), two hypotheses have been proposed to analyze the preverbal DP in the nominal sentences in SA: the topic hypothesis and the subject hypothesis. Fareh (1995) argues that the DP “?al-walad-u/the boy” in (18) is a topic rather than a subject because it is the logical agent that occupies the A'-position and it is no longer the grammatical subject of the sentence. The author claims that the NP is considered a topic, but he does not provide any reasons why the DP should be treated as a topic rather than a subject.

According to Wright (1995), on the other hand, the DP “?al-walad-u/the boys” is the subject of the sentence in both (17) and (18). Wright states that both sentences in the examples below are considered verbal sentences, even when the DP is pre-verbal or post-verbal (as cited in Abdel-Hafiz, 2005, p. 108).
17) qara Ɂ al-walad-u Ɂ al-kitab-a
read/past the-boy-NOM the-book-ACC VS Order
“The boy read the book.”

18) Ɂ al-walad-u qara Ɂ al-kitab-a
the-boy-NOM read-past the-book-ACC SV Order
“The boy read the book.”

On the other hand, for some scholars, verbal sentences include any sentence that starts with a verb. A sentence like example (19) is considered a verbal sentence.

19) rahal-Ɂ al-awlad-u
left-3MS the boys- NOM VS Order
“The boys left.”

In addition to VSO and SVO order, Arabic also allows different patterns of word order, which are OSV, OVS, SOV, and VOS. Mohammed (2000) states that if the subjects are definite, and there is no ambiguity in understanding the meaning of the sentence, word order is free as in (20).^5

20) a) qabala zayd-un Ɂ amr-an VSO Order
met 3MS Zayd-NOM Amr-ACC
“Zayd met Amr.”

b) zayd-un qabala Ɂ amr-an SVO Order
Zayd-NOM met-3MS Amr-ACC
“Zayd met Amr.”

^5 Examples adopted from Mohammed (2000), p. 3.
c) qabala ʔamr-an zayd-un  VOS Order  
met-3MS  Amr-ACC  Zayd-NOM  
“Zayd met Amr.”  
d) zayd-un ʔamr-an qabala  SOV Order  
Zayd-NOM  Amr-ACC  met-3MS  
“Zayd met Amr.”  
e) ʔamr-un qabala zayd-un  OVS Order  
Amr-ACC  met-3MS  Zayd-NOM  
“Zayd met Amr.”  
f) ʔamr-un zayd-un qabala  OSV Order  
Amr-ACC  Zayd-NOM  met-3MS  
“Zayd met Amr.”  

The word order will be restricted if case marking is unable to differentiate between the subject and the object. Example (21) shows that only sentences (21.a) and (21.c) clearly distinguish between the subject and the object, while sentences (21.b), (21.d), (21.e), and (21.f) are ambiguous because the subject and the object failed to show case marking as they end in long vowels. However, according to Mohammed, if the subject or the object is different in gender (i.e., Muna- F and Yhyia-M), then all six word orders will be acceptable (for further discussion, see Mohammed, 2000, pp. 4-7).

21)  
a) raʔa-t layla najwa  VSO Order  
met-3FS Layla Najwa  
“Layla met Najwa.”
The most common patterns in Arabic are VS and SV. According to Arabic grammarians, the basic word order is VS, and SV is derived via subject movement, as illustrated in the following examples:

22) VS order

a) daras-a  ?al-tulab-u  ?al-darsa
   studied-3MS  the-students-NOM  the-lesson-ACC
   “The students studied the lesson.”
b) Daras-at  ?al-talibt-u  ?al-darsa
studied-3FS  the-students-NOM  the-lesson-ACC

“The students studied the lesson.”

23) SV order

a)  ?al-tulab-u  daras-u  ?al-darsa
the-students-NOM  studied-3MP  the-lesson-ACC

“The students studied the lesson.”

b)  ?al-talibat-u  daras-na  ?al-darsa
the-students-NOM  studied-3FP  the-lesson-ACC

“The students studied the lesson.”

Mohammed (2000) indicates that VS and SV word order can be derived as follows: VS order is derived by moving the verb from its base position to T while the subject remains in situ (i.e., Spec-VP). To derive the SV order, on the other hand, the subject raises to Spec-TP after moving the verb to T.

Ouhalla (1994) asserts that in order to derive the VS word order from the underlying SV structure, not only can the subject move to precede the verb as in (24), but it can be derived by moving the verb to precede the subject as in (25).

24) ?al-awlad-u  wasal-u
the-boys-NOM  arrived-3MP  SV Order

“The boys have arrived.”

25) wasal-a  ?al-awlad-u
arrived-3MS  the-boys-NOM  VS Order

“The boys have arrived.”
Arabic grammarians indicate that the SV pattern is used to put the emphasis on the subject, while the VS structure is used to put the emphasis on the verb. This implies that Arabic is unlike English; the subject-verb pattern in Arabic is a free variant of regular patterns. The choice between VS and SV in Arabic is related to the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic features.

2.2.2 Subject-Verb Agreement

Arabic is a language that has a complicated agreement structure. Subject-verb agreement can be affected by the word order. The forms of agreement in Arabic differ from other patterns of agreement in other languages. As a result, the attested agreement patterns challenge existing syntactic analyses of agreement.

In a VS structure as in (22), repeated here for convenience as (26), the verb agrees with the subject in gender and person only, while in SV order, the verb agrees in person, number, and gender with the subject, as in (27).

26) VS order—Partial agreement

a) daras-a ?al-tulab-u ?al-darsa

studied-3MS the-students-NOM the-lesson-ACC

“The students studied the lesson.”


studied-3FS the-students-NOM the-lesson-ACC

“The students studied the lesson.”

27) SV order—Full agreement

a) ?al-tulab-u daras-u ?al-darsa

the-students-NOM studied-3MP the-lesson-ACC
“The students studied the lesson.”

b) ئال-تالبات-ع دارس-ن ئال-دارس
the-students-NOM studied-3FP the-lesson-ACC

“The students studied the lesson.”

It has to be mentioned that if the sentence starts with a pronominal subject, full agreement is required in both orders, whether they come before or after the verb as in (28) and (29).

28)
   a) قرأ-عهم ئال-كتاب-ا
read-3MP they the-book-ACC VS Order
   “They read the book.”
   b) *قرأهم ئال-كتاب-ا
read-3MS they the-book-ACC VS Order
   “They read the book.”

29) هم قرأ-ع ئال-كتاب-ا
they read-3MP the-book-ACC SV Order
   “They read the book.”

The full agreement in SV and the partial agreement in VS have been one of the most recognized topics in numerous studies. Ouhalla (1994) and Mohammed (2000) suggest that full agreement in SV order is a specifier-head relationship between the subject and the tense head in the sentence, while partial agreement is the relation between the tense head and a null expletive in its specifier (Al-Shorafat, 2012).
In contrast, Aoun et al. (1994) claim that both orders have full agreement; however, the agreement gets “lost” due to further verb raising in VS order. The full agreement is obtained in a Spec-head agreement between I and Spec-IP in both orders (as cited in Soltan, 2007, p. 37).

Soltan (2007) argues that SV is not derived from subject raising. The DP in the VS order did not arrive via movement to give us the SV order. The SV orders are different from the VS orders in several respects, such as semantic, and case properties. Semantically, the SV orders are always treated as topic-comment structures. VS orders, on the other hand, are treated as unmarked structures. In addition, both structures have different case properties: the DP in the SV structures appear with nominative case, while the DP in the VS structures shows nominative case only if it is not preceded by the complementizer “?inna/that.” In other words, the VS and SV structures are transformationally unrelated. Rather, Soltan argues that the two hypotheses proposed by Ouhalla (1994), Mohammed (2000), and Aoun et al. (1994) are unacceptable to describe subject-verb agreement in SA.

Soltan (2006) presents a hypothesis that full agreement in SV order is required in order to satisfy the pro identification requirements. The pro is located in v*p, as in (30). While in VS order, such a pro does not exist, and then full agreement between the verb and the subject is not obligatory an in (31).

30) VS: \([_{TP T_{DEFAULT/CLASS}}][v^*+V] [v^*_p DP tv^* [v^*_p tv^* YP]]\]

31) SV: \([_{TP DP T_{EPP/Φ/CLASS}}][v^*+V] [v^*_p pro tv^* [v^*_p tv^* YP]]\]

He indicates that the operation agree will not take place in a Spec-head configuration; instead it will take place at a distance, within a local search domain. Moreover, Soltan assumes that T has three uninterpretable features. First, T may appear with a person and number feature. Second, T should have a separate CLASS feature. Finally, T may appear with a peripheral
feature, which is the EPP feature. In other words, for Soltan, T in Arabic is always valued for gender, but it does not need to be valued for person and number or have a specifier.

Soltan (2007) provides evidence for his analysis of word order in SA. He indicates that the preverbal DP in the SV order did not arrive by movement to this position, but it is base-generated in the specifier-TP. The evidence for his analysis is that the DP prohibits wh-movement, idiom chunks, case properties of preverbal and postverbal DPs, and finally the occurrence of overt resumptive pronouns. I will not dwell on this issue here (but see Soltan 2007 for further discussion). Rather, I will focus on one of the arguments (i.e., wh-movement), which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

To sum up this section, there are different analyses about word order in SA. Some scholars, such as Mohammed (2000) and Ouhalla (1994), propose that SV is a derivation of VS word order. Either the subject or the verb moves to a specific position to give us the SV orders. In contrast, Soltan argues that the subject in both orders is base-generated in Spec-TP and does not arrive to this position via movement. He also argues that the agreement in SA is obtained in the following way: the full agreement for SV order is the result of the agreement between T and pro in the v*P, while the partial agreement is due to default agreement. In the next section, I will investigate raising and passive structures in Arabic language by providing two different arguments.

2.3 Raising Structures in Standard Arabic

The analysis of raising structures in Arabic within the framework of Minimalism has been the topic of many studies. Raising structures, as mentioned before, are standardly considered to be a type of A-movement. However, there is disagreement about A-movement in
SA. It has been argued that in SA, neither passive nor raising structures involves any A-
movement at all.

As mentioned in the previous sections, raising verbs are of at least two types: raising-to-
subject and raising-to-object. Abdel-Hafiz (2003) points out that in SA, not only can the subject
of the complement clause be raised to be the subject of a matrix-clause, but even a direct and
indirect object of the lower clause can be raised directly to be the subject of the matrix-clause.
This is shown in the following sentences:⁶

32) Subject Raising:

a) yabduu ?anna l-mu9allim-a Šaraha 1-qasiidat-a
   seem that the-teacher-ACC explained the-poem-ACC
   “It seems that the teacher explained the poem”

b) yabduu l-mu9allim-u ?anna-hu Šaraha 1-qasiidat -a
   seem the-teacher-NOM that-he explained the poem-ACC
   “The teacher seems to have explained the poem.”

33) Direct Object Raising:

a) yabduu ?anna as-sayyaara-ta daraba-t al-walad-a
   seem that the-car-ACC hit-F the-boy-ACC
   “It seems that the car hit the boy.”

b) yabduu 1-walad-u ?anna as-sayyaara-ta daraba-t-hu
   seem the-boy-NOM that the-car-ACC hit-F-him
   The boy seems to have been hit by the car.
   Lit. “The boy seems that the car hit him.”

34) Indirect Object Raising:

a) yabduu ?anna l-walada-a ?a9taa kitaab-an li-l-bint-i

seem that the-boy-ACC gave the-book-ACC to-the-girl

“It seems that the boy gave the book to the girl.”

b) tabduu 1-bint-u ?anna l-walad-a ?a9taa kitaab-an la-haa

seem the-girl-NOM that the-boy-ACC gave book-ACC to-her

“The girl seems to have been given a book.”

Lit. “The girl seems the boy gave a book to her.”

The next section reviews previous work done on raising structures in SA. Scholars differ as to the analysis of raising structures in SA. Abdel-Hafiz (2003) and Salih (1986) argue that Arabic does have A-movement. Yet other scholars, such as Mohammed (2000) and Soltan (2007), argue that SA does not allow A-movement at all. The first section (2.3.1) looks at the analysis of the scholars who argue that there is raising structures in Arabic, while the second section (2.2.2) looks at the analysis of why Arabic does not have raising structures.

2.3.1 Raising in Standard Arabic

Abdel-Hafiz (2003) and Salih (1986) argue that SA has A-movement. Abdel-Hafiz criticizes Mohammed’s analysis, which deals with raising structure in SA. He claims that verbs like “yabduu/seem” involve raising, such as raising the subject, object, or indirect object of the embedded clause to the subject position of the matrix-clause. The author follows Salih’s analysis of raising structures in Arabic as shown in examples (32-34), which represent raising structures in SA.
Accordingly, example (32.b) looks, on the surface at least, very similar to English raising structures. In fact, Abdel-hafiz (2003) and Salih (1986) argue that example (32.b), repeated here as (35), is the result of the DP movement.

35)

a) yabduu ṭanna l-mu9allim-a Ṣarahā 1-qasiidat-a

seem that the-teacher-Acc explained the-poem-Acc

“It seems that the teacher explained the poem.”

b) yabduu l-mu9allim-u ṭanna-hu Ṣarahā 1-qasiidat-a

seem the-teacher-Nom that-he explained the poem-Acc

“The teacher seems to have explained the poem.”

The derivation according to them will be as follows: the DP “l-mu9allim-u/the teacher” starts in the Spec-VP of the embedded clause; then it is raised up to Spec-TP in the embedded clause. It is then moved to Spec-VP of the matrix-clause before raising up to SpecTP of the “yabduu/seem” clause and becoming the subject of the matrix-clause.

Salih (1986) provides some evidence for raising in SA, including the following: First, the DP always leaves a pronominal copy behind it in the lower clause. The copy will be attached either to the complementizer if the DP is the subject, to a predicate if it is the direct object, or to a preposition if it is the indirect object. Second, the embedded clause will remain finite, which is introduced by the complementizer “ṭanna/that.” The structure of (35) can be given as the following:

36) [TP [VP yabdu al-mu9allimu [CP ṭanna COPY/hu [ TP ṣ ẛaraḥa ṣ ad- darsa]]]]
It should be noted that Salih’s argument is not clear; that is, it is not entirely clear why example (35.b) is considered an example that involves DP movement. He only asserts that because we have a pronominal copy in the embedded clause we can have raising structure, but it is not clear what hypothesized connection is between the pronominal copy and the DP movement. It could be assumed that the overt pronoun exists for other reasons (i.e., the complementizer “ʔanna/that” never allows an empty subject to follow it).

Abdel-Hafiz (2003) argues against Mohammed’s analysis in the case of subject-verb agreement: in SA, as has been mentioned earlier, if the verb precedes the subject, the verb must agree with the subject in gender and person (i.e., partial agreement).

37)  

a) *yabduu l-bint-u ?anna-ha fahima-t ad-dars-a  
   M-seem the-girl-NOM that-she understood-F the.lesson-ACC  
   “The girl seems to have understood the lesson.”

b) ta-bduu l-bint-u ?anna-ha fahima-t ad-dars-a  
   F-seem the-girl-NOM that-he understood-F the.lesson-ACC  
   “The girl seems to have understood the lesson.”

Abdel-Hafiz introduces two problems with Mohammed’s analysis of “yabduu/seems” verb. According to Muhammad (2000) the “yabduu/seems” verb always has default features (i.e., third, masculine, singular). It is clear from example (37.b) that if the verb has a default feature, then it would be assumed that example (37.b) should be grammatical, but according to Abdel-Hafiz, “yabduu/seems” must change its gender to have a grammatical sentence like (37.b).\(^7\)

\(^7\) Mohammed’s analysis of seem-raising structure will be discussed in detail in the next section.
Another problem with Mohammed’s analysis, according to Abdel-Hafiz, is the case of left dislocation. Mohammed (1990) deals with sentences containing a verb like “yabduu/seems” as examples involving left-dislocation rather than raising (as cited in Abdel-Hafiz, 2003, p. 84).

38) Haoaan ?ar-rajulaan ?al-9ajiibaan la yabduu

these the-two-men the-strange not seems

?ana-humaa ya- tagyyaraani maa ?azaman

that-they change with the-time

Lit. “These two strange men don’t seem that-they change with the time.”

Abdel-Hafiz (2003) claims that the raising sentence in (32.b) is different from example (38) in that raising sentences begin with the verb “yabdu/seems,” which is followed by the raised DP. The raising verbs agree only in person and gender with the DP. In contrast, the example with left dislocation starts with the DP, and there is full agreement between the subject and the verb.

As has been mentioned above, example (32.b) has the same properties of English raising structures, but if we looked more closely at Salih’s and Abdel-Hafiz’s analyses of raising structures we can see that the authors just asserted that there is raising in SA. However, they did not provide a strong analysis to support their hypotheses, and they adopted only the null hypothesis, which indicates that SA has the same structure as English structure and both languages follow the same rule.

In addition, the authors do not explain why the subject raises to Spec-VP of the lower clause before raising to Spec-TP of the matrix-clause. Furthermore, there is a problem with Abdel-Hafiz’s analysis of left-dislocation. The verb “yabduu/seems” in example (38) is in the singular form and not in the plural form, so there is no full agreement between the subject and the verb in (38). Abdel-Hafiz does not provide another example for yabduu-clause where the
verb “yabduu/seems” is in a plural form. He only provides an example with a subject in a plural form but the verb is still in a singular form.

However, if we tried to add a plural affix “wan/2P” to the verb to have full agreement with the subject in the example (38), to examine Abdel-Hafiz’s analysis, the verb will no longer be considered a raising verb but instead would be considered a linking predicate as in (39).\(^8\)

39) Hathaan al-rajulaan al-‘ajiibaan la yabduu-wan

these the-two-men the-strange not seem-DULMP

ana-humaa ya-tagyyaraani maa’ al-zaman

that-they change with the-time

“These two strange men don't seem that-they change with the time.”

2.3.2 No Raising in Standard Arabic

Mohammed (2000) and Soltan (2007) argue that SA does not allow A-movement at all. In this section, I will present Mohammed’s and Soltan’s analyses and I will review their arguments against raising in SA.

Mohammed (2000) claims that SA does not allow DP movement from the embedded clause to the matrix clause with *seems*-type verbs; thus for Mohammed, (40.c) is ungrammatical since movement of the DP from the lower to the higher clause is disallowed.

40)

a) *pro* yabduu ?anna al-tulab-a qad qara-u al-kitab-a

*pro* seem.3MS that-the-students-M-ACC PCL read.3MP the-book-ACC

“It seems that the students have read the book.”

\(^8\) Soltan considers “yabduu/seem” in (39) as a linking verb which selects a small clause, rather than a base-generated left-dislocation. I will not dwell on this issue here (see Benmamoun (2000) and Soltan (2007) for further discussion).

"It seems that the students have read the book."

c) * the-students-NOM seem.3MP that read.3MP the-book-ACC

"The students seem that they have read the book."

Mohammed determines that the verb “yabduu/seems” is always marked third person singular masculine with an empty subject in the matrix clause, while the subject of the lower clause may have different features. However, if it were assumed that the DP is raised from the embedded clause to the subject position, full agreement would be required in the higher clause, but such full agreement is in fact not allowed, as the ungrammaticality of (40.c) shows. The author argues that the DP “?al-tulab-a/the students” does not arrive to this position via movement. That is, if there is raising, we would expect to have full agreement; but with “yabduu/seems” there is in fact only partial agreement.

41)

a) * the-students-F-NOM seem.3FP that-They have read.3FP the-book-ACC

"The students seem that they have read the book."

b) * the-student-F-NOM seem.3FS that-she has read.3FS the-book-ACC

"The student seem that she has read the book."

Mohammed states that the ungrammaticality of (40.c) is the result of the inability of the DP to occupy the subject position of a “raising” verb, and an overt pronoun or subject should
occupy the complementizer “ʔanna/that.” He proposes that only an expletive pronoun can meet the requirements of such a verb, and that the expletive is a subject that has “third person singular masculine” features, and it does not require a θ-role. Another reason for the ungrammatically of (40.b) is the fact that the complementizer “ʔanna/that” must be followed by an overt pronoun or an overt full subject.

Mohammed (2000) argues that the examples above are different from left-dislocation structures as in (42). The DP “ʔal-talibat-u/the students” in the example below is in an A’ and a θ’-position. The difference between the raising and left-dislocation structures is that “the NP in the left-dislocation construction must be coindexed with a pronominal in an A- and a theta-position, whereas such a coindexation is barred in raising structures” (p. 98).

42) ʔal-talibat-u pro yabdu ʔanna-hunna haDar-na

the-students-F-NOM pro seem.3MS that-them came.3FP

“The students, it seems that they came.”

Soltan (2007) argues that neither passive nor raising structures involve A-movement; the DP in both structures is base-generated in Spec-TP. He claims that the DP “ʔl-awlaad-a/the boys” in example (44) is not the result of A-movement, and it is transformationally unrelated to example (43).

43) yabduu ʔanna ʔl-awlaad-a qad haDar-uu

seem.3sgmas C the-boys-ACC PCL came-3plmas

“It seems that the boys have come.”

44) ʔal-awlaad-u yabduu ʔanna-hum qad haDar-uu

the-boys-NOM seem.3sgmas C they PCL come/PF-3plmas

“The boys, it seems that they have come.”
He alleges that the DP “ʔal-awlāad-a/the boys” in (43) is base-generated in the specifier of TP of the embedded clause as in (45).

45)

On the other hand, the DP “ʔal-awlāad-u/the boys” in example (44) is base-generated in the specifier of TP of the “yabduu/seems” clause and did not arrive to this position via movement. In other words, the DP did not start as the Spec-TP of the embedded clause, and then raise up to Spec-TP of the matrix-clause to become the subject of the matrix-clause. Rather, example (44) will have the derivation in (46).
Soltan’s analysis of the subject-verb agreement, as has been stated before, occurs as follows: the T in the SV order has complete φ features with an EPP property. Soltan explains that in order to get full agreement there must be a pro, which occupies Spec-VP, and this pro triggers full agreement with the verb. Otherwise, the pro identification will be violated if there is not full agreement. After getting full agreement, the verb raises to T of the embedded clause. In contrast, the T in the SV order has no φ features and no EPP requirements; therefore, such pro is not needed and full agreement is not allowed because the T has default agreement.

In a “yabduu/seems” clause, on the other hand, the verb always appears with third singular masculine. The reason behind the inability of the verb “yabduu/seems” to change its feature according to Soltan is that the verb “yabduu/seems” “does not select an external argument; however, the possibility of merging a pro in Spec-v*P does not arise, and full agreement is in turn impossible to obtain” (p. 113).
Soltan (2007) supports his argument about raising structures in SA with the following evidence:

a) The preverbal DP cannot be indefinite.

b) The preverbal DP blocks wh-movement.

Soltan (2007), among others, indicates that the DP in the preverbal order cannot be indefinite as the ungrammatically of (47.b) shows.9

47) a) yabduu ?anna ?awlaad-an kasar-uu ?al-nafiďat-a

seem.3sgmas that-C boys-ACC stole 3plmas the- window-ACC

“It seems that some boys broke the window.”

b) *?awlaad-un yabduu ?anna-hum kasar-uu ?al-nafiďat-a

boys-NOM seem.3sgmas thatC-they broke 3plmas the-window

“Some boys, it seems that they broke the window.”

The reason behind the ungrammaticality of (47.b), according to Soltan, is that the DP occupies an A'-position. One property of the A'-position is that it is reserved for topics and thus it disallows an indefinite, nonspecific NP. The second property of an A'-position is that it blocks wh-movement. In SA, wh-movement cannot cross the topic, as the ungrammatically of (48.b) indicates:

48) a) ??man yabduu ?anna ?al-rajal-uu ra?a-uu?

who seem.3MS C- the-men-NOM saw 3MP

9 Traditional Arabic grammarians, however, provided some exceptions to start the SV structures with indefinite nonspecific NPs. I will not dwell on this issue here.
“Who does it seem that the men saw?”

b) *man ?al-rajal-u yabduu ?anna-hum ra?a-uu?

who the-men-NOM seem.3MS C-they saw 3MP

“Who does it seem that the men saw?”

Soltan states that (48.b) is ungrammatical because the wh-phrase crosses the DP “?al-rajal-u/the men,” which occupies an A'-position. However, Soltan does not discuss how it is that (48.a) is grammatical; in fact, wh-phrase “man/who” crosses the DP “?al-rajal-u/the men,” which occupies a topic/A'-position in the lower clause. In relevant respects, (48.a) is parallel to (49). Soltan points out that example (49) is ungrammatical since the preverbal DP, which is assumed to occupy an A'-position, blocks wh-movement.

49) *man ?al-rajul-u ra?a-a

who the-man-NOM saw-3MS

“Who did the man see?”

The ungrammaticality of example (49) is the result of wh-extraction. Soltan (2007) states that because the DP “?al-rajul-u/the man” is a topic, it means that it occupies an A'-position and thus does not allow wh-phrase to cross it. Thus, it is not clear why (48.a) is grammatical for Soltan (we will discuss this matter further in Chapter 3).

Moreover, Soltan does not provide any examples where the DP comes after the verb “yabduu/seems” in his studies. However, his analysis of raising structures has been supported by Al-Balushi (2011), who claims that example (50) is ungrammatical in SA. In fact, we will see later in Chapter 3 that it is possible to consider example (50) as a grammatical sentence in SA, and will provide a different analysis.

   seem.3MS the-man-NOM C-that-he PCL attended-3MS- the-meeting-ACC

   “It seems that the man has attended the meeting.”

   Al-Balushi argues that the ungrammaticality of the example above is the result of a prohibition against having an overt DP in the postverbal position in the “yabduu/seems” clause, since there is no pro in the Spec-v*P of the matrix-clause. Another reason for the ungrammaticality of (50) is the result of the inability to have a post verbal empty subject in the “yabduu/seems” clause because the subject fails to agree with the verb because of the absence of φ content (p. 228).

   To summarize this section, I have presented an argument against raising with “yabduu/seems” verb in SA. Mohammed (2000) has argued that the result of raising the DP is having full agreement between the topic and “yabduu/seems” verb, but the data show that “yabduu/seems” never changes its features; otherwise, the result is an ungrammatical sentences as shown in (40.c) and (41). Soltan (2007), on the other hand, claims that the DP, in the SV order, cannot be the result of A-movement as it is related to the fact that the DP cannot be indefinite and it will prohibit wh-extraction. We have seen that the reason for the verb “yabduu/seems” to have default agreement is the result of the inability to have a pro in the specifier of the v*P because the verb cannot select an external argument.

2.4 Passive in Standard Arabic

   Soltan (2007) argues that passive in Arabic also does not involve A-movement. As in the raising structures, the DP in the passive structures is base-generated in Spec-TP. He indicates that passive structures in SA do not need to relocate the internal argument, and only gender agreement shows on the verb, besides the nominative case, as is illustrated in (51.b) and (51.c).
51) a) kaser-a ?al-walad-u ?al-nafiðat-a

   broke-3MS the-boy NOM the-window-ACC Active Voice

   “The boy broke the window.”

b) kusir-at ?al-nafiðat-u

   broken-PASS-3FS the-window-NOM VS Order—Passive

   “The window was broken.”

c) ?al-nafiðat-u kusir-at

   the-window-NOM broken-PASS-3FS SV Order—Passive

   “The window was broken.”

Soltan (2007) states that the DP in SV order is always nominative, while the DP in VS order is only nominative by default (i.e., the DP will appear in accusative case if it is preceded by the complementizer ?inna). The author argues that the DP of the passive verb in SV structures is similar to the DP in the subject position of raising structures. In both cases, the DP is in a topic position; i.e., raising and passive are left-dislocation structures (i.e., SV structures cannot start with indefinite DP, and wh-phrases cannot cross the DP). Therefore, the DP in the passive structure must be treated as left-dislocation since it is base-generated in Spec-TP.

Once again, Soltan claims that the DP in the passive structure occupies an A’-position. This means that the DP cannot be indefinite, as the ungrammaticality of example (52) shows. Moreover, the DP will block wh-movement as illustrated in (53).

52) *nafithat-un kusir-at

   a-window-NOM broken-PASS-3FS

   “A window was broken.”
53) *mata ?al-nafiāt-u kusir-at?

when the-window-NOM broken-PASS-3FS

“When was the window broken?”

Critically, Soltan’s analysis of active voice is that there must be a pro which occupies the Spec-VP to get its semantic properties and its meaning. However, if the DP in the passive structure is bass-generated in Spec-TP and it does not involve A-movement, then it would seem that there must be a pro in object position. This can be shown in (54). ¹⁰

54)

On the other hand, a study by Ayyat, Sultan, and Yasin (2013) argues against Soltan’s analysis of passive structures. The authors indicate that SA has A-movement for short passive, as in (51) above. According to them, in the VS structure, the verb “kasar-a/broke” enters the derivation with an unvalued voice feature, and the DP “?al-nafiāt-u/the window” has an unvalued case feature. The verb “kasar-a/broke” moves to Spec-Voice to value its unvalued voice feature and to satisfy the EPP requirements. The DP “?al-nafiāt-u/the window” remains in Spec-VP and gets its case checked from T, which carries φ features.

¹⁰ More detail will be presented in the next chapter regarding this problem.
On the other hand, in SV order, the DP starts in the Spec-VP with an unvalued case feature, and then it is raised up to Spec-T to satisfy the EPP requirements and to check the nominative case. The verb raises up from V to Spec-Voice to value its voice features.

2.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have presented different arguments about raising structures in both languages, English and Arabic. First, I have given a short introduction about raising and passive structures in English. Second, I have provided a brief review on word order and subject-verb agreement in SA, which shows an important effect in subject-verb agreement. It is clear from the data presented above that full agreement is required between the subject and the verb in the SV structures. Partial agreement, on the other hand, is required between the subject and the verb in the VS order. However, a sentence that has pronominal subject full agreement is obligatory in both orders.

In addition, I have provided two different analyses about raising structures in SA. The first analysis argues that Arabic is similar to English raising structures. The DP moves from the embedded clause to the subject position of the matrix-clause to give us the surface structure of examples (32-34).

Earlier studies, however, have taken a different method analyzing raising structure in SA. Mohammed (2000) and Soltan (2007) argue that SA does not make use of A-movement operation. The verb “yabduu/seem” never changes its gender, person, or number with raising structure in both orders. The authors conclude that the DP in SV order in raising and passive structures should be treated as the left-dislocation structure.

It is clear from the data presented above that the subject of the embedded clause, in the English structure, has to move from its deep structure position in order to satisfy case
requirements and the EPP. On the other hand, the subject in SA can satisfy case requirements without moving because SA does not have infinitives. Soltan (2007) indicates that SA has subjunctives instead of infinitives, which occur with control and some raising-to-object structures. The subject in raising structure is (by Soltan’s hypothesis) based-generated in the spec-TP, and it did not arrive to this position via movement as in example (43). Otherwise, if the subject arrived to the specifier of higher TP by movement, it will violate the case filter.

I have also presented Soltan’s analysis of passive structure, which indicates that passive structures like raising structures do not make use of A-movement in SA. The subject in the passive constructions in SA can agree with the verb and get case-assigned in situ. According to his analysis, it can be assumed that there might be a pro, which occupies the VP in order to explain why the DP, in the passive structure, is considered the subject rather than the object that is base-generated in the Spec-TP and did not arrive to this position via movement. On the other hand, Ayyat, Sultan, and Yasin (2013) indicate that A-movement is an essential feature in the derivation of passive structures in SA.

Soltan has a very interesting argument about raising structures, but there are a set of questions and consequences that his own analysis does not deal with (i.e., the cases where the verb “yabduu/seems” precedes the higher subject). I will provide more detail about this issue in the next chapter.
Chapter 3: New Analysis

3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, I looked at raising and passive structures in English and SA. Two different analyses of A-movement in Arabic were presented.

In this chapter, new data that present certain challenges to Soltan’s analysis of raising and passive structures will be introduced. However, before I start analyzing the new data, it is helpful to give background information about IA and how it is different from SA, as I will examine the new data on IA in addition to SA.

The chapter will be outlined as follows: the current section (3.1) is a short introduction about what the chapter will present and a brief review of what has been presented in the previous chapter. The second section (3.2) presents general background information about IA. The following section (3.3) analyzes Soltan’s analysis with respect to the situation where the verb “yabduu/seems” precedes the topic in raising structures. Soltan’s analysis of raising structures will be examined with modal and negation, since this plays a crucial role in understanding just how raising works in Arabic. Moreover, modal and negation help to determine the accurate word order of the sentences not only in raising structures but also in passive structures, as I will discuss later in the chapter. Then, I will present an argument that shows the possibilities of having raising structures in SA and IA to give us the surface structure of (9.b) and (17.a) by introducing a new hypothesis, which is called “the functional projection hypothesis.” In the next section (3.4), the functional projection hypothesis will be applied to passive structures in SA and IA. Finally, there is a summary of the major developments of this chapter.
3.2 Background

Iraqi Arabic, or what is known as “Mesopotamian Arabic,” is a dialect of Arabic and a subgroup of the Afro-Asiatic language family. IA includes three distinguished sub-dialects within the country: Baghdadi, Southern, and Maslawi dialect (Abu-Haidar, 1989; Kessler, 2003).

Aramaic was the lingua franca in Iraq for many years, and, as may be expected, IA shows signs of an Aramaic substrate until Iraq was affected by the Mongol occupation in 1258. In this era, many things changed, including the language (Kessler, 2003). Furthermore, due to Iraq’s inherent multiculturalism, IA demonstrates extensive borrowing in its lexicon from Aramaic, Akkadian, Kurdish, and Turkish.

According to Al-Bazi (2006), “IA, unlike SA, which is not a native language of any Arab countries but is the language of education across the Arab world, is the spoken language of everyday activities at home, at work, on the street, and on social occasions” (p. 22). IA is spoken in Iraq as well as in Syria, Southeastern Turkey, and part of Persia.

IA differs from SA phonologically, morphologically, and syntactically. It is worth mentioning that the current study is focused on syntax; we will not go into detail with phonology and morphology, but we note in passing that phonologically, IA has 3 consonants more than SA, and 3 additional long vowels.

Morphologically, IA is different from SA in the present progressive tense. In IA, the present progressive tense is formed by adding the prefix [da-] to the conjugated stem of the verb, which cannot be found in SA, as in (2).

1) ?an-a ?drus-u ?al?an
I am studing-1S now 
SV Order—Standard Arabic

“I am studying now.”
2) ?ani da-?drus.

I am studying

“\textbf{I am studying.}”

Syntactically, IA differs from SA in case marking; IA does not end words with vowels, and it does not show overt cases. Therefore, words end with consonants rather than vowels, as illustrated in (4):

3) qara-tu \(\text{?al-kitaab-a}\)

read-1S the-book-ACC

\textbf{VS Order—Standard Arabic}

“\textbf{I read the book.”}

4) qri:t \(\text{?al-kitaab}\)

read the book

\textbf{VS Order—Iraqi Arabic}

“\textbf{I read the book.”}

Finally, agreement in IA, like other dialects, does not always follow the structure of VS order in SA. The verb usually has full agreement with the subject in both orders, SV and VS, as shown in (6).

5) Standard Arabic

a) naam-a \(\text{?al-atfal-uu}\)

slept-3MS the-children-NOM

\textbf{VS Order—Partial Agreement}

“The children slept.”

b) \(\text{?al-atfal-uu naam-uu}\)

the children-NOM slept-3MP

\textbf{SV Order—Full Agreement}

“The children slept.”
6) Iraqi Arabic
   a) naam-wo (*naam-a) ?al-atfal
      slept-3MP the-children VS Order—Full Agreement
      “The children slept.”
   b) ?al-awlad naam-wo
      the children slept-3MP SV Order—Full Agreement
      “The children slept.”

   However, there are some exceptions where the verb agrees partially with the subject in VS order, as illustrated below.

7) Standard Arabic
   a) qara-a ?al-tulab-uu ?al-kitab-a
      read-3MS the-students-NOM the-book ACC VS Order—Partial Agreement
      “The students read the book.”
   b) ?al-tulab-uu qara-uu ?al-kitab-a
      the-students-NOM read-3MP the-book ACC SV Order—Full Agreement
      “The students read the book.”

8) Iraqi Arabic
   a) qara ?al-tulab ?al-kitab
      read-3MS the-students the-book VS Order—Partial Agreement
      “The student read the book.”
   b) ?al-tulab qara-wo ?al-kitab
      the-students read-3MP the-book SV Order—Full Agreement
      “The student read the book.”
In this section, I have discussed some important issues regarding IA. I have presented the most important differences between IA and SA. The main purpose of this section is to review the syntactic differences between the two languages. From the discussion above, it is clear that IA does not have overt cases, and the verb shows full agreement instead of partial agreement in the VS structures. In the next section, I discuss raising structures in SA and IA and provide the new data that challenge Soltan’s analysis.

3.3 Raising Structures in Arabic - New Analysis

This section discusses certain structures that Soltan did not consider. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Soltan (2007) argues that SA does not allow A-movement because the DP (in the case of SVO order) is in a topic position, which is an A-bar position. Consequently, it does not allow wh-extraction and does not allow the sentence to start with an indefinite nonspecific DPs in the SV structure.

It is clear from the discussion in Chapter 2 that Soltan’s analysis of raising structures with seems in SA dealt with only certain word orders: namely, where the DP precedes the verb “yabduu/seems” in the matrix clause, or where the DP follows the complementizer “?anna/that” in the embedded clause. However, his analysis does not address other cases, such as the case where the verb “yabduu/seems” precedes the higher subject, as in (9.b) below.

9) Raising to subject in Standard Arabic

a) yabduu ?anna ?al-talib-u qara-a ?al-kitab-a

seem-3MS that the-student-NOM read-3MS the-book-ACC

“It seems that the student read the book.”

b) yabduu ?al-talib-u ?anna-hu qara-a ?al-kitab-a

seem-3MS the-student-NOM that-he read-3MS the-book-ACC
“The student seems that he read the book.”

In this study, I will adopt Soltan’s general analysis of raising structures, according to which the DP “?al-talib-u/the student” is base-generated in Spec-TP of the higher clause in SV order, and thus it did not raise from the lower Spec-TP of the embedded clause. However, as mentioned in the previous chapter, other scholars, such as Abdel-Hafiz (2003) and Salih (1986), argue that the DP “?al-talib-u/the student” in (9.b) is raised from the lower clause to the Spec-TP of the matrix clause and becomes the subject of the “yabduu/seems” clause. Thus, example (9.b) is grammatical in SA, but we have suggested that the evidence favors Soltan’s analysis.

The question that can be raised at this point is “How can we account for the case where the matrix verb ‘yabduu/seems’ precedes the matrix subject?”

One possibility is by raising the verb “yabduu/seems” to C to have the word order in (9.b); i.e., the subject DP “?al-talib-u/the student” is base-generated in Spec of matrix TP, and then the verb seems raises to C, yielding (9.b). However, this option is problematic because the result of moving “yabduu/seems” to C will give us an ungrammatical sentence in cases having modal and negation. In short, the analysis would over-generate. See illustration (10.b).

10) Modal and Negation in Standard Arabic

a) qad la-yabduu ?al-talib-u anna-hu qara-a ?al-kitab-a
   may not seem-3MS the-student-NOM that-he read the book-ACC
   “The student does not seem that he read the book.”

b) *yabduu qad la ?al-talib-u anna-hu qara-a ?al-kitab-a
   seem-3MS may not the-student-NOM that-he read the-book-ACC
   “The student does not seem that he read the book.”
If we account for the word order of (9.b) as suggested, we cannot account for (10.b); in fact, it should also be allowed.

Critically, it has been argued that there is no V to C movement in Arabic. According to Fassi-Fehri (1993), Arabic does not allow V to C raising. In brief, the verb in Arabic cannot raise and precede the modal “qad/may” or the negation “la/not” in order to get the word order in example (10.b), as the data in (11) below illustrate:


That is, in order to explain the ungrammaticality of cases like (11), it is proposed that there is no V to C raising.

It should be noted that the inability to raise the verb to C is not limited to “yabduu/seems” clause but is also true for basic clauses, as example (12) shows.

12)

a) ?al-talib-u lam yaqara ?al-kitab-a

the-student-NOM read the book-ACC SV Order

“The student read the book.”

b) * yaqara ?al-talib-u lam ?al-kitab-a

read the-student-NOM not the-book-ACC VS Order

“The student did not read the book.”

The ungrammaticality of example (12.b) is the result of raising the verb to C to get the word order of VS, but according to Fassi-Fehri (1999), it is impossible to raise the verb to C in Arabic.
To conclude this section, it is clear from the discussion above that in SA, we cannot raise the verb to C to get the word order of (9.b) since that would fail to account for (10.b) and (12.b). This fact can also be true if we adopt an alternative analysis of negation, as the next section shows.

3.3.1 An Alternative Analysis of Negation in Standard Arabic

In the previous sections, it has been argued that modal and negation are generated between CP and TP. Some scholars, on the other hand, provide a different analysis of negation in SA. Aoun, Benmamoun, and Choueiri (2010) state that negation is generated between TP and VP. Soltan (2007) argues against Benmamoun’s analysis, which indicates that the negation particle is lower than T. According to Benmamoun (1991), the verb should raise to Spec-T if the T is [Past, Future] which have a [+V] feature that needs to be checked. However, the verb remains in its position if the T is [Present] because it does not have the [+V] feature. Finally, “Neg has a [+N] feature that requires checking by a nominal” (as cited in Soltan, 2007, p. 182).

If we adopt Benmamoun’s analysis of negation to get the word order VSO, then we will have to raise the verb to C, but we still get the wrong result because there is no V to C raising in Arabic. This can be illustrated in the following example.


seem-3MS the-student-NOM not that-he read the book-ACC

“The student does not seem that he read the book.”

The purpose of presenting this analysis is to see if we can solve the problem with the

---

11 In Arabic, there are five different particles: ma, la, lam, lan, and laysa/not. la, lam, and lan occur in sentences that have a verb, which is considered the main predicate. Ma and laysa, on the other hand, are used with nouns and required for subject agreement.
word order in (13). Thus, if we assume that the alternative analysis is correct, then there should not be any problem for raising the verb to C, and it will solve this problem, but as mentioned earlier, Arabic does not allow V to C raising. In addition, Soltan argues against Benmamoun’s analysis. Soltan provides some details about Benmamoun’s analysis and concludes that negation should be located higher than TP and lower than CP. In this study, I will present one problem that Soltan’s analysis addresses about Benmamoun’s analysis.

According to Soltan (2007), if we assume that the negation is lower than T, then the verb will merge with negation when it raises to T in past tense, but not in present tense, as it is assumed that there is no verb raising in the present tense. According to Benmamoun (2000) and others, the tense properties will show on the negation rather than on the verb after it is raised to T in the past and future. While in the present tense, the verb and negation will have default forms. This can be illustrated in (14).  

14)  

\[ \text{a) \ lam ya-qra\? Zayd-un ?al-kitaab-a} \]  
\[ \text{Neg}_{\text{past}} \text{ IMPER-read 3sgmas-JUS Zayd-NOM the-book-ACC} \]  
\[ \text{“Zayd did not read the book.”} \]  

\[ \text{b) \ laa ya-qra\?-u Zayd-un ?al-kitaab-a} \]  
\[ \text{Neg}_{\text{present}} \text{ read 3sgmas-IND Zayd-NOM the-book-ACC} \]  
\[ \text{“Zayd is not reading the book.”} \]  

Soltan (2007) states that Benmamoun’s analysis cannot account for all Arabic dialects. Some dialects, such as Egyptian Arabic (EA), show that the negation “miš/not” should precede the future verb form, which is the opposite of what Benmamoun’s analysis predicts. In addition, the tense will not appear on the negation article but rather it will appear on the verb (pp. 181-4).

---

12 Example (14; 15) adopted from Soltan (2007).
This can be seen in the following examples:

15)  
   a) xalid miš (fi al-ghaalib) ha-ye-?ra l-kitaab  
      Khalid Neg (probably) FUT-IMPER-read 3sgmas the-book  
      “Khalid won’t probably read the book.”  
   b) xalid miš aaraa-š Ɂl-kitaab  
      Khalid Neg-read-Past-3sgmas-Neg the-book  
      “Khalid did not read the book.”  
      “Khalid won’t probably read the book.”  

Soltan concludes that example (15) shows that negation must be higher than T in such clause structure.

In this section, I have presented an alternative analysis of negation and I have argued that even if we adopted this analysis, which indicates that negation is located between the TP and VP, the result of the word order in the VS structure is still ungrammatical because we will end up raising the verb to C, and as mentioned in the previous sections, there is no V to C raising in Standard Arabic. I have also presented Soltan’s argument against Benmamoun’s analysis and discussed the problem for the alternative analysis. Hence, I will adopt Fassi-Fehri’s and Soltan’s analysis of modal and negation, which indicates that modal and negation are located between CP and TP. In the next section, I present the new hypothesis and show that there is important evidence that this hypothesis is correct.

3.3.2 Functional Projection Hypothesis

In this section I propose a new hypothesis, which is called the “functional projection hypothesis.” In order to get the word order of example (9.b), I argue that there is a functional
projection F to which the verb “yabduu/seems” raises to F to precede the DP. It should be noted that we could still have a grammatical sentence with the word order in (9.b) even with modal and negation, as example (10.a) shows. The relevant derivation is illustrated in (16).

In this derivation, the DP is base-generated in Spec-TP of the matrix clause, following Soltan’s analysis, and the verb “yabduu/seems” raises from VP to T and then raises up to F to give us the final surface structure of example (9.b).
The previous discussion of raising structures in SA also accounts for IA even in the case of having modal or negation in “yabduu/seems” clause. The verb “yabduu/seems,” in IA, cannot move from V to C, as the ungrammaticality of (17.b) illustrates.

17) Raising and Negation in Iraqi Arabic

a) ?ala-ma yabduu ?al-talib bi-anna- qara ?al-kitab

∅ seem 3MS the-student that read the book

“The student seems that he read the book”

b) *yabduu me ?al-walad bi-anna qira ?al-kitab

seem-3MS not the-boy ∅-that- read the book

“The boy does not seem that he read the book.”

I argue, however, that IA allows the word order in (17.a), which can be considered a result of V raising in IA. As has been stated above, it is possible for the verb “yabduu/seems” in example (9.b) to move higher than TP of the matrix clause if we have the functional projection hypothesis, where the functional projection F is located between complementizer phrase and TP of the matrix clause. For this reason, example (9.b) and (17.a) can be considered grammatical sentences in both SA and IA. The derivation of the clause in (9.b) is as follows:
To conclude this section, I have proposed and discussed a new hypothesis, and I have also presented some data from IA to support our proposal. The data presented in this section show that it is possible to get the word order in (9.b) and (17.a), where the verb “yabduu/seems” precedes the DP in both languages, SA and IA, if we have the functional projection. The argument of raising “yabduu/seems” verb to F to get the VS order can be used to support our hypothesis against Soltan claims. In the next section, further evidence is presented, which indicates that this proposal is correct.
3.3.3 Wh-movement in Iraqi Arabic

In this section, I discuss wh-movement in IA and present an argument that shows that it is possible for the wh-phrases to precede the DP in IA.

As discussed in Chapter 2, Soltan argues that SA does not allow an indefinite DP in the topic position with a “yabduu/seems” clause; Soltan’s arguments can also account for IA, as the following examples show:13

19) *walad-un yabduu ?anna-hu naam-a
   a boy-NOM seem-3MS that-he slept-ACC Standard Arabic
   “A boy seems that he slept.”

20) *wald ?ala ma yabduu bi-?anna nam
   a boy ∅ seem-3MS that slept Iraqi Arabic
   “A boy seems that he slept.”

However, IA differs from SA in the case of wh-movement. Soltan claims that SA does not allow wh-movement across a DP in Spec of TP because it occupies an A’-position, as the ungrammaticality of (21.a) shows. As mentioned in the previous chapter, one property of the

а


13 As in SA, there are some exceptions where it is acceptable to start the SV structure with indefinite non-specified DP. The following sentences are acceptable for some speaker in IA.

1) rijal bi-albab.
   A man at the-door.
   “A man at the door.”

2) rijal iuri:d ikalm-ek.
   a-man wants talk-you
   “A man wants to talk to you.”

However, it is rare for an Iraqi speaker to start with indefinite nonspecific NP.
topic is that it blocks the wh-movement. However, such does not seem to be the case in IA, as example (21.b) illustrates:

21)

who the-students-NOM seem-3MS that-they saw 3MP Standard Arabic

“Who does it seem that the students saw?”

b) mino ?al-tulab yabduu bi-?ann-hum shaf-wo?
who the-students seem-3MS that-they saw 3MP Iraqi Arabic

“Who does it seem that the students saw?”

Soltan did not provide much detail about the wh-operation in his study, only mentioning wh-movement when he discussed the properties of the topic. In the current study, I will adopt Alotaibi’s analysis as background information for the wh-operation in SA. Alotaibi (2013) investigates wh-movement in SA, in both VS and SV structures. In this section, I will present the analysis of only SV order because this word order poses a problem with wh-extraction, and it is specifically relevant to Soltan’s analysis as he claims that SV order does not allow the wh-phrases to precede the topic.

Alotaibi indicates that if the DP in (22) is assumed to be a subject rather than a topic, then it is predicted to have a grammatical sentence like (22.b). However, example (22.b) is considered to be an ungrammatical sentence in SA.

22) Standard Arabic

The-student-NOM read 3MS the-book-ACC SV Order

“The student read the book.”
b) *maaða ?al-talib-u qara-a?
   what the-student-NOM read3MS
   “What did the student read?”

c) ?al-talib-u maaða qara-a?
   the-student-NOM what read3MS
   “What did the student read?”

Wh-movement, according to Alotaibi, will be derived as follows: the subject “?al-talib-u/the student” should raise from VP to TP in order to satisfy the EPP requirements. “The wh-phrase ‘maaða/what’ moves to Spec-CP to satisfy the edge feature on the interrogative phase head C.” The result of the subject and wh-movement is ungrammatical because in SA it is impossible for the wh-word to move over preverbal DP. The author adopts Fassi-Fehri’s (1981, 1993) and Rizzi’s (1997) analyses, which illustrate that the DP “?al-talib-u/the student” is a topic because it cannot be indefinite and no elements can move over the topic (i.e., wh-phrases).14

Thus, the wh-phrase is placed below the topic position. The final word order in (22.c) will have the following structure.

\[
23) \left[ \text{TopP} \ ?al-talib-u \left[ \text{FocP} \ maaða \left[ \text{TP} \ qara-a \left[ \text{vP} \ maaða \left[ \text{v} \ 'pro \ \text{qara-a} \left[ \text{vP} \ qara \ maaða] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right]
\]

A study by Wahba (1994), on the other hand, points out that wh-operation is flexible in IA. The wh-words can appear in the Spec-CP or in situ.15 See illustration (24).16

---

14 It should be noted that the topic properties (i.e., the DP cannot be indefinite and it will block wh-movement) has also been proposed by Soltan, but Soltan did not provide any detail about where the wh-phrases should be placed in the SV structures.

15 In IA, it is optional for the wh-phrases to occur in situ.

16 Examples (24-26) are taken from Wahba (1994).
a) meno, Mona shaafat e,?
   who Mona saw
   “Who did Mona see?”

b) Mona shaafat meno?
   Mona saw whom?
   “Whom did Mona see?”

In IA, the wh-phrase can remain in situ because the complementizer is not required to be occupied by wh-element, but the wh-phrase can only appear in their base position when the embedded is a non-finite clause (Simpson, 2000).

Wahba (1994) and Simpson (2000) assert that the wh-in situ cannot be separated from the complementizer with more than one tense clause. This can be shown in (25).

25) *Mona tsawwarat Ali ishtara sheno?
   Mona thought Ali bought what
   “What did Mona think Ali bought?”

The ungrammaticality of the example above is related to the fact that the embedded clause is tensed; thus the wh-phrase should appear in a tensed domain of “+Q” complementizer in order to be licensed. The wh-phrase should raise from the tensed CP of the embedded clause to the Spec-CP of the matrix clause, as illustrated in (26).

26) sheno, tsawwarat Mona Ali ishtara e,?
   what thought Mona Ali bought
   “What did Mona think Ali bought?”

Following Wahba’s analysis, I argue that wh-phrases, in IA, can move to Spec-CP and can cross the DP even when the verb “yabduu/seems” precedes the topic to give us the surface
structure of example (24.b). The reason behind the ability to move wh-pharases to precede the DP of the “yabduu/seems” clause is that the tensed CP does not block the wh-movement in IA and the wh-element should be licensed.

It is worth mentioning that the wh-phrase in example (24.b) can also appear in different positions, such as the Spec-CP of the embedded clause as in (27.a), and in its base position as in (27.b), which is expected to be a grammatical sentence in IA.

27)  
a) ?al-tulab yabduu bi-?ann-hum ?al-man shaf-wo?
   the-students seems.3MS  that-they to-who saw 3MP
   “Who does it seem that the students saw?”

b) ?al-tulab yabduu bi-?ann-hum shaf-wo mino?
   the-students seems.3MS  that-they saw 3MP who
   “Who does it seem that the students saw?”

To sum up the section, it should be clear that SA does not allow wh-movement because the topic occupies an A-bar position. However, we can assume that the DP in IA occupies an A-position rather than an A’-position. In this case, the DP can allow the wh-phrase to cross it. In addition, in IA, the tensed CP does not block the wh-phrase to move from its position to the higher CP.

Another structure that can be used to examine the functional projection hypothesis is the passive structure. I do that in the next section.

3.4 Passive Structures in Arabic – New Analysis

In the previous chapter, I presented Soltan’s analysis of passive structures. However, one problem with his analysis has been presented. Soltan states that the DP “?al-nafi?at-u/the
window” in example (49.c), repeated here as (28), is base-generated in Spec-TP in SV structures, but Soltan did not provide more detail about passive structures in SA. He focused only on certain issues, such as the facts that passive structures do not allow an indefinite nonspecific DP to start the sentence and the DP in the passive structure blocks wh-movement in SV order.

28) ?al-nafiðat-u kusir-at

the-window-NOM broken-PASS-3FS

SV Order—Passive

“The window was broken.”

An interesting question that can be raised about Soltan’s analysis is as follows: “If the DP is base-generated in Spec-TP, in the passive structures, then what occupies the VP?”

A simple answer to this question is to assume that there must be a pro, which occupies the object position. However, such a possibility is not allowed in Arabic, because Arabic does not have a null object, as shown in (29).

29) *waðat-u pro fi al-maghsalat-i

put-I pro into the-sink-GEN

“I put pro into the sink.”

The ungrammaticality of (29) is the result of having the empty object pro. What the sentence literally means is as follows:

30) waðat-u al-suhun-a fi al-maghsalat-i

put-I the-dishes-MP-ACC into the-sink-GEN

“I put the dishes into the sink.”

It must be noted that in SA, it is acceptable to have a null subject but not a null object. This fact also accounts for passive. If we assume that there is a pro in the object position, then the result is an ambiguous sentence if not an ungrammatical sentence, as (31) illustrates.
31) ?*al-suhun-u wuði?at pro
   the-dishes-MP-NOM put-PASS pro
   “*The dishes were put.”

   The ambiguity of the example above is related to the fact that there should be an argument, which occupies the object position. This can be illustrated in the following example:

32) al-suhun-u waði?at fi al-maghsalat-i
   the-dishes-MP-NOM put-PASS in the-sink-DAT
   “The dishes were put in the sink.”

   From the discussion above, it should be noted that SA does not allow an empty object, either in simple or in passive sentences, as the ungrammaticality of examples (29) and (31) show.

   Another issue that is important to look at is the negation in the passive structures. The question that can be raised at this point is “Where does the DP raise to if we negate the passive structures?”

   As seen in raising structures, if modal verbs and negation particles are used, which are generated between CP and TP, the verb should raise to C to give us the word order of (10.a) repeated here as (33).

   may not seem-3MS the-student-NOM that-he read the book-ACC
   “The student does not seem that he read the book.”

   However, as mentioned in the second part of section (3.3), there is no V-to-C raising in Arabic. For this reason, I have argued that if we have a functional projection, which is located lower than CP and higher than TP, then the structure in (33) can be acceptable in Arabic because the verb is raised to F rather than to C.
If we want to negate the passive structures in the SV order, we will have to raise the DP, “ʔal-nafiðat-u/the window,” and not the verb, to C, to get the surface structure of (34.b), but according to Soltan (2007), the DP is base-generated in Spec-TP and cannot raise to C in order to give us the word order of (34.b).

34)

a) lam tu-kser ʔal-nafiðat-u
   not broken-PASS-3FS the-window-NOM       VS Order—Standard Arabic
   “The window was not broken.”

b) ʔal-nafiðat-u lam tu-kser
   the-window-NOM not broken-PASS-3FS       SV Order—Standard Arabic
   “The window was not broken.”

Therefore, one option to solve this problem is by raising the DP to Spec-NegP. Soltan (2007) assumes that the functional heads that are higher than T can have a peripheral feature; hence, the DP, which also has a peripheral feature, could raise to the specifier of any functional head that is lower than C (p. 76).

It should be noted here that Soltan (2007) states that the DP in the SV order has the same semantic features of left dislocation and because the DP of the left dislocation is always placed after C, the DP in the passive structures cannot raise higher than C.

In this study, I will adopt Soltan’s assumption that if the sentence has modal or negation particles, the DP should raise to the specifier of the highest functional projection, and in this case that projections is Spec-NegP. The relevant derivation is illustrated as follows:
However, Soltan’s analysis has provided some evidence showing that SA does not involve A-movement in the derivation of passive structures (i.e., wh-movement and indefinite nonspecific DP). Such analysis, however, ignores a theoretically important question that the current study tries to answer, which is “Does the DP in example (36.b) derive from (36.a) by raising the DP ‘?l-awlaid-i/the boys’ from its position Spec-TP, to the highest functional projection with quantifier ‘kul/all,’ or are examples (36.a) and (36.b) transformationally unrelated?”

36)

a) kul-u ?l-awlaid-i nuqid-u

all-NOM the-boys-GEN criticized
“All the boys were criticized.”

b) ?l-awlaad-u kulu-hum nuqid-u

The-boys-NOM all-them-NOM criticized

“All the boys were criticized.”

Marouani (2005) argues that example (36.a) and (36.b) are two different structures. The surface structure in (36.b) is not derived from (36.a). The DP “?l-awlaad-i/the boys” did not raise from V to the specifier of the quantifier phrase (QP) to give us the final structure of (36.b) because it does not follow movement constraints.\footnote{Marouani (2005) provides an argument against the DP movement. The author illustrates that the DP movement will violate the following principles: Case, initial NP and Barriers, and Casual Case. One of these principles is discussed in this section.}

Marouani claims that the DP “?l-awlaad-u/the boys” in (36) is a topic and it is base-generated in the specifier of the determiner topic phrase (DTP). The author provides some evidence to support his argument. One piece of evidence is that the DP “?l-awlaad-u/the boys” is supposed to keep its case if it has been raised from its original position to Spec-QP; but the DP “?l-awlaad-u/the boys” in the examples above shows different case marking. Marouani states that according to the checking theory, case cannot be checked more than once. However, the DP “?l-awlaad-u/the boys” is base-generated in Spec-DTP and did not arrive in this position by movement because the DP in the two examples has two different cases, and it violates the case theory if it is considered as movement rather than base-generated.

Moreover, a study by Benmamoun (1999) argues against Shlonsky’s analysis, which illustrates that example (36.b) is derived from example (36.a). According to Shlonsky (1991), to
get the word order of (36.b), the DP “?l-awlaad-u/the boys” must raise from its original position to Spec-QP.18

Benmamoun (1999) proposes another analysis, which illustrates that the DP “?l-awlaad-u/the boys” in (36.b) is a main phrase rather than a specifier of QP. Benmamoun provides an argument to support his analysis, which involves the case properties of NP and Q. As mentioned before, the DP “?l-awlaad-u/the boys” will change its case if the quantifier “kul/all” precedes or follows it. The reason behind changing the case marking, according to Benmamoun, is related to the fact that the quantifier “kul/all” is the modifier of the DP “?l-awlaad-u/the boys” in both structures, DP-Q and Q-DP.

The author states that the DP “?l-awlaad-u/the boys” in the DP-Q order is the main phrase, which is modified by a QP rather than the specifier of the QP, as shown in (37.a). Furthermore, the quantifier “kul/all” gets its case from the DP “?l-awlaad-u/the boys,” as shown in the following examples.

37) Quantifier in Standard Arabic

a) ?l-awlaad-u kulu-hum nuqid-u

The-boys-NOM all-NOM-them criticized-3PM SV Order

“All the boys were criticized.”

b) nuqid-u ?l-awlaad-a kula-hum

criticized-3PM The-boys-ACC all-ACC-them VS Order

“All the boys were criticized.”

18 In this study, I am not going to present any further detail for Shlonsky’s analysis. See Shlonsky (1997) for further discussion.
Benmamoun concludes that the structures in (36.a) and (36.b) are syntactically different and have different derivations, as shown in (38).

38)

a) Q-NP

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{QP} \\
\text{Q} \\
\text{kul-u} & \quad \text{?l-awlaad-i}
\end{align*}
\]

b) NP-Q+clitic

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NP}_1 \\
\text{NP}_1 \\
\text{?l-awlaad-u} & \quad \text{QP} \\
\text{Q+clitic} \quad \text{kulu-hum} & \quad \text{NP}_2 \\
& \quad \text{\textit{pro}}
\end{align*}
\]

If we agree with the analyses above, a question may arise at this point, which is “How can we account for the cases of having negation or any other projections that occur between CP and TP?” Can we have the same word order in (36.b) if we have the negation particle “lam/not”? This can be illustrated in (39).

39) *?l-awlaad-u lam kulu-hum ymqad-u

The-boys-NOM not all-them-NOM criticized-3PM

“The boys all were not criticized.”
The example above is considered an ungrammatical sentence in SA because the negation particle “lam/not” should precede the verb and should not be separated from the verb by any constituent, as shown in the following example.

40) ʔλ-awlaad-u lam ynaqed-u kulu-hum
    the-boys-NOM not criticized-3PM all-them-NOM
    “All the boys were not criticized.”

For the discussion here, I will make the assumption that in order to get the word order in (40), we should use the functional projection hypothesis. The DP “ʔλ-awlaad-u/the boys” can raise to Spec-NegP, and the verb “ynaqed-u/were criticized” can move to F. The derivation of the clause in (40) is as follows:

41)
To summarize the section, it is clear from the data presented above that negation and quantifiers play a central role in determining the word order of the passive structures. In order to have a well-formed sentence in the passive structures in case of having negation, the DP can raise to the specifier of NegP.

Benmamoun (1999) and Marouani (2005) claim that the structure of example (36.b) is not the result of the DP movement. Benmamoun asserts that the quantifier “kul/all” is a modifier that gets its case from the DP. Benmamoun’s and Marouani’s analysis have nicely provided some details of the quantifier “kul/all” in Arabic; however, their analyses did not consider the issues where the negation is presented with quantifiers. The section concludes that if there is a functional projection in a sentence that has quantifiers, the verb can raise to F and give us a well-formed sentence in Arabic.

In the next section, I argue that the aforementioned issues for passive structures in SA can also account for IA.

3.5 Passive Structures in Iraqi Arabic

The passive structures in IA are formed by adding the prefix [in-] to the conjugated stem of the verb, which cannot be found in SA. This can be illustrated in (42).

42) Active and Passive in Iraqi Arabic

a) kiser ?al-walad ?al-shubak

broke-3MS the-boy the-window

“The boy broke the window.”

b) in-kiser ?al-shubak

broken-PASS-3MS the-window

“The window was broken.”
c) ?al-shubak in-kiser

the-window broken-PASS-3MS  
SV Order—Passive

“The window was broken.”

As mentioned in the previous chapter, in SA, the DP in the passive structures is base-generated in Spec-TP and does not arrive to this position via movement. Evidence for this hypothesis is that the DP will block wh-movement. Soltan (2007) argues that example (2), repeated here as (43), is considered to be an ungrammatical sentence in SA because the wh-phrase crossed the DP “?al-naʃiðat-u/the window,” which is in a topic position.

43) *mata ?al-naʃiðat-u kusir-at?

when the-window-NOM broken-PASS-3FS

“When was the window broken?”

IA, on the other hand, allows wh-movement in passive structures. As shown in section (3.3), wh-phrases can cross the DP in raising structures and give us well-formed sentences.

In the passive structures, wh-phrases can also appear in different positions and still give us grammatical sentences with the same meaning, as illustrated in (44).

44)

a) shwaket in-kiser ?al-shubak?

when broken-PASS-3MS the-window  
VS Order—Passive

“When was the window broken?”

b) shwaket ?al-shubak in-kiser?

when the-window broken-PASS-3MS  
SV Order—Passive

“When was the window broken?”

c) ?al-shubak shwaket in-kiser?
the-window when broken-PASS-3MS  

“When was the window broken?”

In IA, it is acceptable for the wh-phrases to move from their base positions and precede the DP in the SV order. The structure in (44.b) is expected to be a grammatical sentence in IA. The relevant derivation is illustrated in (45).

![Diagram of sentence structure]

45) It is worth mentioning that the wh-phrases in passive structures can also appear in their base positions and still give us a grammatical sentence. The reason behind the ability for the wh-phrases to remain in situ, as mentioned earlier, is that the complementizer is not obligatorily filled by a wh-element (Simpson, 2000, p. 73). This can be illustrated in the following example:

46) ?al-shubak in-kiser shwaket?

the-window broken-PASS-3MS when  

“When was the window broken?”
Quantifiers, on the other hand, can appear in different positions. In IA, the quantifier “kull/all” can appear in many positions and still give us grammatical sentences, as example (47) illustrates.

47)

a) kul ʔ-l-awlaad intiqdu-hum
   all the-boys criticized
   “All the boys were criticized.”

b) ʔ-l-awlaad kul-hum intiqdu-hum
   The-boys all-them criticized-them
   “The boys all were criticized.”

c) ʔ-l-awlaad intiqdu-hum kul-hum
   the-boys criticized-them all-them
   “All the boys were criticized.”

One reason behind the ability of the quantifier “kul/all” to appear in more than one position in IA is case issue. As mentioned in section (3.2), IA does not show overt case. Therefore, it is acceptable for the quantifier “kul/all” to precede or follow either the DP or the verb. Another reason for the quantifier “kul/all” to appear in different positions is that the DP in IA occupies an A-position rather than A’-position.

Another bit of evidence to support our hypothesis can be found by using negation particles to check whether we still can get a grammatical sentence. This can be shown in the following examples:
48)

a) kul ?l-awlaad ma intiqdu-hum
    all the-boys not criticized-them
    “All the boys were not criticized.”

b) ?l-awlaad kul-hum ma intiqdu-hum
    The-boys all-them not criticized-them
    “The boys all were not criticized.”

c) ?l-awlaad ma- intiqdu-hum kul-hum
    the-boys not criticized-them all-them
    “All the boys were not criticized.”

As has been shown in the discussion of the passive structures in SA, in order to get the surface structure of (40), the verb could move to F. Therefore, in order to get the word order of example (48.c) in IA, the verb “intiqdu-hum/were criticized” can raise to F. The derivation of (48.c) is as follows:
In this derivation, the DP “ʔl-awlaad/the boys” starts out in the Spec-TP and then moves to Spec-NegP. The verb “intiqdu-hum /were criticized” is raised to T and then to F to give us the final structure of (48.c).

In summary, it is clear that the DP can move to Spec-NegP and the verb can raise to F to give us grammatical sentences in IA. From the data presented in this chapter, it can be assumed that the DP in IA occupies an A-position, which allows the wh-words to cross the DP and gives us the surface structures of (44.b).

**3.6 Summary**

In this chapter, I have provided background information about AI and a brief discussion about the differences between IA and SA. It is clear from the data presented in this chapter that IA has gone through many changes: phonologically, morphologically, and syntactically.
An important difference between IA and SA has been introduced, which is case marking. From the data presented in section (3.2), we can see that cases do not show at the end of the words in IA. Another difference is agreement. Partial agreement in some cases was lost, and full agreement is shown in both orders, VS and SV.

In section (3.3), I have presented new data that argue against Soltan’s analysis. The section first shows the consequences of Soltan’s analysis of raising structures with the “yabduu/seems” verb and provides a possible answer to the questions that have been raised in this section.

The chapter also has provided an alternative analysis of negation in SA. I have presented Soltan’s argument against Benmamoun’s analysis. I have pointed out that Soltan’s analysis of negation is preferable because if we adopted Aoun, Benmamoun, and Choueiri’s analyses, we would still get an ungrammatical sentence if we supposed that the negation particle were located between TP and VP.

In the second part of the chapter, I have argued against Soltan’s analysis of passive structures. Imperial evidence has been introduced regarding negation and quantifiers in the passive structures. The new hypothesis has been used with passive structures to show the possibilities of raising the verb to precede the subject to give us the VS order.

In this study I have agreed with Soltan’s assumption: if we have any functional projection that is higher than TP and lower than C, the DP can raise to the specifier of the highest functional projection. Therefore, in a case of having negation particles, the DP will raise to Spec-NegP and the verb will move to F to get the final structure of (33) and (48.c) in both languages.

I have supported the argument for A-movement by showing that IA allows A-movement in both structures: raising to subject and passive structures. The chapter has provided data that
illustrate that the wh-operation in IA differs from the wh-operation in SA. It is acceptable to find the wh-phrases in positions that are not found in SA, such as in situ or preceding the DP in the SV order.

Syntactically speaking, wh-phrases in situ show the same features of the wh-movement. According to Simpson (2000), the tensed CP does not block the wh-movement in IA. However, wh-movement is not free. For instance, if there are more than one-tensed clauses, the wh-phrases cannot cross them on their way to the complementizer.

The main goal of this chapter was to introduce the new analysis, the functional projection hypothesis, which presents certain challenges for Soltan’s analysis of raising and passive structures in SA. Moreover, I extended the study to include IA in the discussion for raising and passive structures.
Chapter 4: Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to analyze A-movement in Arabic. The study tries to reach possible answers for the questions that have been raised through this work. The result of the previous chapter was as follows: the verb can optionally raise to F to get the word order of VS in both raising and passive structures. We have adopted Soltan’s analysis, which indicates that the DP in raising and passive structures is base-generated in Spec-TP. Therefore, in order to get the structure of the examples in (1), we have proposed a new hypothesis, the functional projection hypothesis, which indicates that the verb has the option to raise to F to give us the SV structures in both languages, SA and IA.

1) Raising to Subject in Arabic

   seem-3MS the-teacher-NOM that-he explain-3MS the-lesson-ACC
   “The teacher seems that he explain the lesson.”

b) ala ma-yabduu ?al-mu?lm bi-?anna sharh ?al-dars Iraqi Arabic
   seem-3MS the-teacher that-he explain-3MS the-lesson
   “The teacher seems that he explain the lesson.”

In the thesis, I have presented two analyses of A-movement and illustrated that Soltan’s analysis comprises the best argument against A-movement in SA, as it presents some important details that other analyses did not. However, Soltan’s analysis did not consider some essential issues, such as the case where the verb “yabduu/seems” precedes the topic or the case where the modal, negation, and quantifier are presented in both raising and passive structures.
In Chapter 1, I presented a brief introduction about A-movement. In order to analyze raising and passive structures in Arabic, a number of questions were raised that other studies did not discuss. Chapter 1 can be considered as a short introduction to the study.

In Chapter 2, I provided background information about raising and passive structures. The purpose of this chapter was to provide the reader with general information about raising and passive structures in both languages, English and SA.

It is clear from the discussion in Chapter 2 that in English the subject must raise from its original position to Spec-TP of the higher clause to check case and to satisfy the EPP requirements. In the non-infinite clauses, the subject cannot check case because the Spec-TP of the embedded clauses cannot assign cases to its DP; therefore, the DP should raise to the specifier of the higher TP to check case requirements because Spec-TP of the matrix clause is the position where the DP can get its case. Arabic, on the other hand, for some scholars (i.e., Mohammed, 1999; Soltan, 2007) is different from English regarding raising and passive structures, as it does not involve any movement. The DP can satisfy the case requirements in its position.

In the same chapter, I explained the syntactic features of Arabic, such as word order and subject-verb agreement, as it plays an essential role in understanding A-movement in SA. The chapter provided some data that show that in SA, if the verb precedes the subject, partial agreement is required, whereas if the subject precedes the verb, full agreement is required. An exception for the subject-verb agreement was presented with pronominal subjects. It was determined that full agreement is obligatory in both orders, SV and VS order.

In the second half of Chapter 2, I presented two different analyses of A-movement in SA, reviewing the technical details of each analysis. The first analysis, presented by Abdel-Hafiz
(2003) and Salah (1986), argued that SA involves A-movement in both structures, raising and passive. I have illustrated that neither analysis provided strong evidence for its conclusion, and I also pointed out that there is no connection for the pronominal copy that attaches to the complementizer “?anna/that” to be considered as evidence for the movement of the DP. From the discussion in Chapter 2, it is clear that Abdel-Hafiz’s analysis has some problems regarding the agreement between the verb “yabduu/seems” and the DP, according to the data that he presented. An important problem with his analysis was that the verb “yabduu/seems” should show gender agreement, but I have demonstrated that if the verb shows gender agreement, the sentence will be ungrammatical.

Mohamed (1999) and Soltan (2007), on the other hand, have argued that SA does not make any use of A-movement, and the DP in the “yabduu/seems” clause in SV order did not arrive via movement. Soltan has provided some evidence to support his argument. First, in SA, to start the sentence with indefinite nonspecific DP in SV order is not allowed, as the ungrammaticality of example (2) illustrates.

2) *?awlaad-un yabduu ?anna-hum kasar-uu ?al-nafiðat-a

boys-NOM seem.3sgmas thatC-they broke 3plmas the-window

“Some boys, it seems that they broke the window.”

Second, the DP prevents the wh-movement in the SV order. The wh-phrases cannot cross the DP if the DP occupies a topic position. These facts provide important evidence that the DP in “yabduu/seems” or passive is base-generated in Spec-TP rather than arriving to this position by movement.
In Chapter 3, the new analysis was introduced. The study was extended to include one dialect of Arabic, which is IA. The main purpose of this chapter is to provide some evidence illustrating that it is possible to get the structures of (1.a) and (1.b) above.

The chapter also presented some information about the alternative analysis of negative in SA. However, I have not gone deep into this discussion, but I concluded that even if we adopt this analysis, we still have to raise the verb to C and the result will be an ungrammatical sentence.

In addition, I discussed the problems with Soltan’s analysis. It was shown that if the DP is base-generated in Spec-TP, the only way to derive the VS order in the present of modal or negation is by raising the verb to C, but the data show that the verb cannot raise to C in Arabic. Therefore, to solve this problem I have proposed the functional projection hypothesis to allow the verb to raise to its position to give us grammatical sentences in both languages, SA and IA.

I proposed, in agreement with Wahba (1991), that the wh-phrases can cross the DP or remain in situ in both structures, raising to subject with “yabduu/seems” clause and passive. The result of raising the wh-phrase to precede the DP is grammatical because the complementizer does not block wh-movement and wh-features should be checked.

In the second part of the chapter, I argued that A-movement can also be found with the passive structures. The DP can move to Spec-NegP and the verb can raise to F to get the word order of the example (43) repeated here as (3) for convenience.

3) Passive in Arabic

   a)  ?l-awlaad-u lam yned-u kulu-hum
       the-boys-NOM not criticized-3PM all-them-NOM       SV Order—Standard Arabic
       “All the boys were not criticized.”
b) ?l-awlaad ma- intiqdu-hum kul-hum

the-boys not criticized-them all-them SV Order—Iraqi Arabic

“All the boys were not criticized.”

I provided empirical evidence showing that the verb raising is optional in both structures, raising and passive, to get the VS order.

To summarize the study, it should be noted that this paper forms only a small part of other studies for A-movement theory of Arabic. The goal of this study was to add to the current understanding of how we can derive the VS order with “yabduu/seems” clause and passive structures. This work opens up numerous possibilities for future research, such as subject-verb agreement in IA and control verbs in Arabic.
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