

C and T Are Distinct Probes

Faruk Akkuş

1. Introduction

This paper deals with the *provenance* of ϕ -features on C and T heads, exemplified in (1). Various proposals have been put forth as to the locus of ϕ -features and how they result in multiple heads.

- (1) qul-tu [_{C⁰} le-(nen) zyār [_{T⁰} kan-o k1-y-ayl-o anzarut.
said-1SG that-3PL children aux.PST-3PL PST-3-eat-PL corn
'I said that the children were eating the corn.'

It is possible to classify the proposals into three categories. The first approach argues that Agree (ϕ -) features associated with the inflectional system are not an inherent property of T; T *inherits* these features from the phase head C (Chomsky 2007, 2008, 2013).¹ This view is a straightforward implementation of the idea that phase heads are the driving force behind each derivation, as such only phase heads are the locus of uninterpretable features. Essentially, the opposite of Feature Inheritance can also be found, mainly on the basis of West Germanic (e.g., Watanabe 2000, Zwart 1993, 1997, 2001). In this approach, the ϕ -set on C is simply a duplication of T's valued ϕ -set. C⁰ acquires its agreement features during the derivation by movement of T⁰ (AgrS⁰) to C⁰ (also Hoekstra & Marác 1989). A third proposal argues that C and T are distinct probes, each with its own ϕ -features (Haegeman & Van Koppen 2012, Van Koppen 2005). This paper examines three configurations in Arabic varieties in light of these three approaches, and provides support for the view that C⁰ and T⁰ are distinct probes.

The paper is organized as follows: §2 demonstrate that C and T can agree with the same goal, but bear different values (cf. Haegeman & Van Koppen 2012). §3 show that C and T can agree with different goals – they do not necessarily agree with the same goal. §4 investigates an ECM-like construction with a finite T that shows agreement, and crucially lacks higher projections, i.e., Neg and C. These configurations converge on the view that C and T are independent probes.

2. One goal, multiple probes

Complementizer agreement (CA) in the context of coordinated targets indicates that complementizer does not necessarily realize the same feature set as the auxiliary or the lexical verb.

Conjunct agreement in most Arabic varieties (including Sason Arabic, SA) follow the generalization in (2), in that only full/resolved agreement (RA) is allowed in the SVO order, but First Conjunct Agreement (FCA) as well as RA is possible in the VSO order.²

- (2) a. **Generalization:** a conjoined target preceding the agreement controller triggers resolved agreement (RA); whereas the target following the controller can trigger first conjunct agreement (FCA) or RA.
b. X⁰_{FCA/RA} » coordinated target » Y⁰_{RA}

* Faruk Akkuş, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, fakkus@umass.edu. Thanks to Julie Anne Legate, Hamid Ouali, Barbara Citko for their helpful comments and suggestions.

¹ See Richards (2007) for conceptual arguments for *Feature Inheritance*. Also Miyagawa 2010, and Ouali 2008, 2011.

² This is not the only pattern, but suffices for our purposes.

The generalization in (2) holds both for simplex and complex tenses (sentences with the auxiliary KWN and the main verb).

(3) *Complex tenses*

a. *ConjS-Aux-V-(O)*

[bint-ma u sabi-ma] {kan-o / *kan / *kan-e} {k1-y-ayl-o /
[girl.F-a and boy.M-a]3PL {aux.PST-3PL / aux.PST.3M / aux.PST-3F} {PST-3-eat-PL /
*k1-y-ayel / *k1-ta-yel} anzarut.
*PST-3SG.M-eat / *PST-3SG.F-eat} corn
'A girl and a boy were eating corn.'

b. *Aux-ConjS-V-(O)*

{kan-o / *kan / kan-e} [bint-ma u sabi-ma] {k1-y-ayl-o /
{aux.PST-3PL / aux.PST.3M / aux.PST-3F} [girl.F-a and boy.M-a]3PL {PST-3-eat-PL /
*k1-y-ayel / *k1-ta-yel} anzarut.
*PST-3SG.M-eat / *PST-3SG.F-eat} corn
'A girl and a boy were eating corn.'

Furthermore, in SA (similar to some other varieties), an agreement morpheme may be optionally attached to the complementizer *le* 'that' for some speakers, in both SVO and VSO orders. (4) is an illustration of embedded SVO order, in which the coordinated subject follows the complementizer, but precedes the lexical verb. As background, I make the following assumptions regarding the clause structure (with Akkuş & Benmamoun 2018, Benmamoun 2000, Soltan 2007, Tucker 2011): In simplex tenses, the lexical verb raises to T. The preverbal subject is in Spec,TP and the postverbal subject is in Spec,AspP. In complex tenses, an auxiliary appears in T and the lexical verb is in Asp.

In line with (2), the lexical verb in (4) shows RA, whereas the complementizer can show either RA or FCA.³

- (4) qul-tu {le / le-na / le-nen} [bint-ma u sabi-ma] {ayal-o / *ayal / *ayal-e}
said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3SG.F / that-3PL} [girl.F-a and boy-a]PL {ate-3PL / *ate.3SG.M / *ate-3SG.F}
anzarut.
corn
'I said that a girl and a boy ate the corn.'

Strikingly, the agreement values of C and T vary independently, even when the subject (in AspP) follows both. Thus, when T shows RA, C can show default or FCA or RA, (5a); when T shows FCA, C can show default or FCA or RA, (5b).

(5) *C-V-ConjS-O*

- a. qul-tu {le / le-na / le-nen} ayal-o [bint-ma u sabi-ma].
said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3SG.F / that-3PL} ate-3PL [girl.F-a and boy-a]PL
'I said that a girl and a boy ate (the corn).'
- b. qul-tu {le / le-na / le-nen} ayal-e [bint-ma u sabi-ma].
said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3SG.F / that-3PL} ate-3SG.F [girl.F-a and boy-a]PL
'I said that a girl and a boy ate (the corn).'

³ Lebanese Arabic exhibits the same pattern (The 3sg masculine is the default realization in LA).

(i) Lebanese Arabic (Youssef Haddad, Zahra Ayoub, p.c.)

fakkar {?inn-un / ??inn-a / ?inn-o} [hiyye w huwwe] raah-o.
thought.3SG.M {that-PL / ?that-3SG.F / that-3SG.M} [she.F and he]PL went-3PL
'He thought that she and he left.'

Same pattern is observed with complex tenses, as shown in (6).

(6) *C-Aux-ConjS-V-O*

- a. qul-tu {le / le-na / le-nen} kan-o [bint-ma u sabi-ma] k1-y-ayl-o
 said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3SG.F / that-3PL} aux.PST-3PL [girl.F-a and boy-a]PL PST-3-eat-PL
 anzarut.
 corn
 ‘I said that a girl and a boy were eating the corn.’
- b. qul-tu {le / le-na / le-nen} kan-e [bint-ma u sabi-ma] k1-y-ayl-o
 said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3SG.F / that-3PL} aux.PST-3SG.F [girl.F-a and boy-a]PL PST-3-eat-PL
 anzarut.
 corn
 ‘I said that a girl and a boy were eating the corn.’

This state of affairs is compatible with a configuration in which C^0 and T^0 each are independently endowed with ϕ -features. Before moving onto the next section, I briefly show that the ϕ -feature-checking relation in question takes place in syntax, and not at PF via either string/linear adjacency (Miyagawa 2010) or prosodic phrasing (Ackema & Neeleman 2003, 2004, 2012). The availability of *intervening phrases* shows that such accounts do not extend to these configurations.

- (7) qul-tu {le / le-na / le-nen} *ams sari* kan-e *fi nahar* [bint-ma u
 said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3SG.F / that-3PL} *yesterday morning* aux.PST-3SG.F *in heat* [girl.F-a and
 sabi-ma] k1-y-ayl-o anzarut.
 boy-a]PL PST-3-eat-PL corn
 ‘I said that yesterday morning a girl and a boy were eating the corn in the heat.’

3. C and T agree with different goals

This section demonstrates that the C and T may agree with different goals. C and T may also differ in their requirements for agreement, i.e., what features they are probing for (closest goal vs. Case-discriminating).

In embedded structures (both in SVO and VSO orders), C^0 agrees with the fronted object (be it a CLLD-ed object, (8b), or a focused object, (8c)) rather than the subject.^{4,5}

- (8) a. qul-tu {le / le-nen} qaraf-o [calabma zyār] mase.
 said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3PL} broke-3PL [some children]PL table.F
 ‘I said that some children broke the table.’
- b. *C agreement with CLLDed object*
 qul-tu {le / le-na} *mase qaraf-u-a* [calabma zyār].
 said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3SG.F} table.F broke-3PL-it.F [some children]PL
 ‘I said that *the table*, some children broke *it*.’
- c. *C agreement with focus-fronted object*
 qul-tu {le / le-na} MASE qaraf-o [calabma zyār] (qursi lā).
 said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3SG.F} table.F broke-3PL [some children]PL (chair no)
 ‘I said that THE TABLE, some children broke (not the chair).’

⁴ CLLD-ed object and the resumptive pronoun associated with it are italicized, and the focussed element is indicated via small caps. CLLDed objects are base-generated in the left periphery, whereas focussed objects undergo movement (e.g., Akkuş 2021, Aoun et al. 2010, Benmamoun 2000).

⁵ Jarrah (2019a) looks at a similar pattern in JA, but in JA this is limited to embedded OVS clauses. Ouali (2014) also has a similar idea, but his analysis is based on the claim that Arabic complex tenses are bi-clausal.

Note that C can exhibit FCA with a fronted, coordinated object.

- (9) a. qul-tu {le / le-nu} qaraf zyer-ma [mase u bābe].
said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3SG.M} broke.3SG.M child.M-a [table.F and door.M]
'I said that some child broke the table and the door.'
- b. *FCA by C with CLLDed object*
qul-tu {le / le-na / le-nen} [mase u bābe] qaraf-en zyer-ma.
said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3SG.F / that-3PL} [table.F and door.M]PL broke.3SG.M-them child.M-a
'I said that *the table and the door*, some child broke *them*.'
- c. *FCA by C with focus-fronted object*
qul-tu {le / le-na / le-nen} [MASE U BĀBE] qaraf zyer-ma.
said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3SG.F / that-3PL} [table.F and door.M]PL broke.3SG.M child.M-a
'I said that THE TABLE AND THE DOOR, some child broke (not the chair and the TV).'

In SA, C⁰ agrees with the closest goal in its c-command domain. C cannot skip over a high object and agree with the subject, (10a). Similarly, C cannot skip over the subject and agree with the low-focussed object, (10b).

- (10) a. qul-tu {le / le-na / *le-nen} MASE [calabma zyār] qaraf-o (qursi lā).
said-1SG {that.Ø / that-3SG.F / *that-3SG.PL} table.F [some children]PL broke-3PL (chair no)
'I said that some children broke the table (not the chair).'
- b. qul-tu [C⁰ {le / *le-na / le-nen} [calabma zyār] [T⁰ kan-o MASE
said-1SG {that.Ø / *that-3SG.F / that-3SG.PL} [some children]PL aux.PST-3PL table.F
[A_{sp}⁰ kī-i-qīrf-o (qursi lā).
PST-3-break-3PL (chair no)
'I said that some children were breaking the table (not the chair).'

On the other hand, T agrees with only the grammatical subject in SA, skipping over any intervening object (this contrast between C and T is also observed in Hijazi Arabic).

- (11) a. kan-o [calabma zyār] kī-i-qīrf-o mase.
aux.PST-3PL [some children]PL PST-3-break-PL table.F
'Some children were breaking the table.'
- b. {kan-o / *kan-e } MASE [calabma zyār] kī-i-qīrf-o.
{aux.PST-3PL / *aux.PST-3SG.F } table.F [some children]PL PST-3-break-PL
'Some children were breaking the table (not the chair).'

In Jordanian Arabic (JA), both C and T agree with the closest goal: (12) shows that C agrees with a CLLDed or focussed object.

- (12) *Jordanian Arabic*
- a. C agreement with a CLLDed object
mustāhiil ?inn-ha ?at^ʕ-t^ʕaalibih ?at^ʕaa-ha ?il-markaz musaaʕadih.
impossible that-3SG.F the-student.F gave.3SG.M-her the-center help
'It is impossible that *the student*.(f), the centre gave *her* help.' (Jarrah 2019b:19b)
- b. C agreement with a focussed object (Marwan Jarrah, Issa Al-Wer, p.c.)
?il-fab ?iʕtaraf {?inn-uh / *?inn-ha } WALAD z^harab-t ?il-binit.
the-young.man confessed.3SG.M {that-3G.M / that-3G.F } boy.M hit.PST-3SG.F the-girl.F
'The young man confessed that it was a boy that the girl hit.'

The auxiliary (i.e., T⁰) which otherwise agrees with the subject in (13a), agrees with the CLLDed object, or a focused object, (13b) in the low discourse area.⁶

(13) JA (Marwan Jarrah, Issa Al-Wer, Mahmoud Al-Sharafat, p.c.)

- a. kaan-t ʔil-binit ʔitlaagi l-wlaad.
aux.PST-3SG.F the-girl.F meet-3SG.F the-boys
'The girl was meeting the boys.'
- b. focused object between T and Asp
kaan-u L-WLAAD ʔitlaagi ʔil-binit.
aux.PST-3PL the-boys meet-3SG.F the-girl.F
'THE BOYS, the girl was meeting (not the parents).'

The variation across dialects seems more like a *Case-discriminating* agreement effect (e.g., Akkuş 2020, Bobaljik 2008, Deal 2017, Preminger 2014): T⁰ in SA can only agree with DPs bearing certain cases, presumably Nominative. On the other hand, C⁰ in JA and SA, as well as T⁰ in JA impose no restriction in terms of Case-sensitivity.

4. ϕ -features on T that are independent of C

A third configuration that support the view that C and T are distinct probes comes from embedded constructions that lack C, but have only finite T that agrees; this indicates that T's ϕ -features are not inherited from C, but are part of T.

The clause structure in SA consists of C > Neg > T (See Benmamoun et al. 2013, Soltan 2007 for MSA and several Arabic varieties).

The structure embedded under the verbal root *HPS* 'expect (lit: wait)' exhibits ECM-like properties. However, the embedded structure manifests subject agreement, as shown for auxiliary and modal, (14).

- (14) ab-i i-hapes Leyla {t_i-tix / ki} t_i-fqez.
father-my 3SG.M-wait Leyla.F 3F-be.able.to / aux.PRS.3F 3SG.F-run
'My father expects Leyla {to be able to run / to be running}.'

The ECM in (14) has a counterpart in which the complementizer is possible, (15).

- (15) ab-i i-hapes le Leyla {t_i-tix / ki} t_i-fqez.
father-my 3SG.M-wait that Leyla.F 3F-be.able.to / aux.PRS.3F 3SG.F-run
'My father expects that Leyla {is able to run / is running}.'

The question is whether we are dealing with an optional complementizer of the English sort, in which a complementizer is optionally not pronounced, as shown in (16)?

- (16) a. My father believes [_{C⁰} that [_{T⁰} Leyla is running]].
b. My father believes [_{C⁰} \emptyset [_{T⁰} Leyla is running]].

However, the two constructions in SA differ in several significant respects, leading to the conclusion that the complementizer version embeds a full finite C, Neg and T; whereas the ECM one embeds a T that agrees, but no higher projections.

⁶ The low discourse-related area between TP and AspP in JA includes FocusP and TopicP (Jarrah & Abusalim 2020), whereas SA allows focus, but not topic phrases in the low position (Akkuş 2021).

4.1. Passivization asymmetries

Passivization of the matrix verb leads to different patterns. The embedded subject becomes the matrix subject without the complementizer, (17a), but not with it, (17b).

- (17) a. Leyla *tı-n-hapes* (*le) *ki* *tı-fqez* *sahane*.
 Leyla.F 3SG.F-PASS-wait that aux.PRS.3F 3SG.F-run now
 ‘Leyla is expected to be running.’ → not possible as impersonal passive
- b. *in-hapes* *(le) *Leyla* *ki* *tı-fqez* *sahane*.
 3SG.M.PASS-wait that Leyla.F aux.PRS.3F 3SG.F-run now
 ‘It is expected that Leyla is running at the moment.’ → not possible as personal passive

4.2. Realization of the embedded subject

In the ECM, the embedded subject can be realized as an object pronoun, which cliticizes onto the matrix verb, (18a).⁷ It fills the argument position, thus cannot have another argument.

The morpheme on the complementizer functions as an agreement morpheme, thus the argument it is associated with can be overtly realized, (18b).

- (18) a. *ab-i* *i-hapəs-u* (*Kemal / *iyu) *ku* *i-fqez* *sahane*.
 father-my 3SG.M-wait-him (*Kemal / *he) aux.PRS.3M 3SG.M-run now
 ‘My father expects him to be running at the moment.’
- b. *ab-i* *i-hapes* *le-nu* (Kemal / iyu) *ku* *i-fqez* *sahane*.
 father-my 3SG.M-wait.PRS that-3M (Kemal / he) aux.3M 3SG.M-run now
 ‘My father expects that *pro*/Kemal/he is running at the moment.’⁸

4.3. Focusing or CLitic Left Dislocation (CLLD)

In the ECM, the subject cannot be preceded by a CLLD-ed or focussed constituent.

- (19) a. **ab-i* *i-hapes* *potad* *Kemal* *ku* *i-xsıl-en*.
 father-my 3SG.M-wait.PRS clothes Kemal aux.PRS.3M 3SG.M-wash.IPFV-them
 ‘My father expects, clothes, Kemal to be washing them.’
- b. **ab-i* *i-hapes* *POTAD* *Kemal* *ku* *i-xsel*.
 father-my 3SG.M-wait.PRS clothes Kemal aux.PRS.3M 3SG.M-wash.IPFV
 ‘My father expects Kemal to be washing CLOTHES, (not the curtains).’

Its counterpart with the complementizer does not have such a restriction.

- (20) a. *ab-i* *i-hapes* *le* *potad* *Kemal* *ku* *i-xsıl-en*.
 father-my 3SG.M-wait that clothes Kemal aux.PRS.3M 3SG.M-wash.IPFV-them
 ‘My father expects that, clothes, Kemal is washing them.’
- b. *ab-i* *i-hapes* *le* *POTAD* *Kemal* *ku* *i-xsel*.
 father-my 3SG.M-wait that clothes Kemal aux.PRS.3M 3SG.M-wash.IPFV
 ‘My father expects that Kemal is washing CLOTHES, (not the curtains).’

⁷ Various arguments show that the embedded subject does not raise to the matrix object position in syntax; thus in (18a) it encliticizes onto the host at PF.

⁸ Note that (18b) is not an instance of a cleft. In order to form a cleft, a nonverbal copula is required, which would be *ye* ‘be.3sg’ in this case. Furthermore, another complementizer *le* would need to follow, which could optionally be preceded by the appropriate relativizer, e.g. *ande le* ‘who that’ in this configuration. Furthermore, clefts have a different intonational pattern, which places prosodic prominence on the pivot, which is not available here with *Kemal*.

Such constituents are expected to be possible in the presence of the left periphery in the context of the ECM construction.

4.4. Sentential negation

Sentential negation is not allowed in the ECM, whereas this is possible with the complementizer. Contrast (21) with (22).

(21) ECM

- a. *ab-i i-hapes Kemal ma-ku i-fqez.
 father-my 3SG.M-wait.IPFV Kemal NEG-aux.PRS.3M 3SG.M-run.IPFV
 Intended: 'My father expects Kemal not to be running.'
- b. *ab-i i-hapes Kemal mi-i-tix i-fqez.
 father-my 3SG.M-wait.IPFV Kemal NEG-3SG.M-be.able.to.PRS 3SG.M-run.IPFV
 Intended: 'My father expects Kemal not to be able to run.'

(22) with complementizer

- a. ab-i i-hapes le Kemal ma-ku i-fqez.
 father-my 3SG.M-wait that Kemal NEG-aux.PRS.3M 3SG.M-run.IPFV
 'My father expects that Kemal is not running.'
- b. ab-i i-hapes le Kemal mi-i-tix i-fqez.
 father-my 3SG.M-wait that Kemal NEG-3SG.M-be.able.to 3SG.M-run.IPFV
 'My father expects that Kemal is not able to run in the game.'

A final piece of evidence for the absence of C comes from the so-called *scope enhancement*. Normally, movement of the focused modal from T to C leads to a strictly surface scope with quantificational adverb. This is in contrast to the non-movement configuration in which case both direct and inverse scope readings are available. However, in the ECM, whereas both scope readings are still possible when the modal is in T, an attempt to move the modal leads to ungrammaticality. I put the illustration of this pattern aside in this paper.

To summarize, the matrix verb embeds two structures: (i) a full CP including Neg and T, and (ii) an agreeing T, which lacks higher projections.

5. Conclusions

Arabic varieties provide a fruitful testing ground for the investigation of the potential relation between C^0 and T^0 from three different angles.

These are (i) multiple probes agreeing with the same goal, (ii) each probe agreeing with a distinct goal, (iii) a configuration which projects up to finite T that shows agreement, and no higher projections. The discussion leads to the conclusion that C^0 and T^0 are distinct probes.

6. Appendix: SA exhibits coordination of NPs, not clauses

Aoun et al. (1994) and Aoun & Benmamoun (1999) provide several diagnostics to determine whether coordination involves a conjunction of two NPs or the conjunction of clauses, each with a singular subject.

Number-sensitive items (NSIs) are allowed in the former case, but not the latter.⁹ This distinguishes Standard Arabic (MSA) from Lebanese Arabic (LA) and Moroccan Arabic (MA).¹⁰

(23) Modern Standard Arabic

- a. ?iztamaʕa Marwan w Karim.
met.3MS Marwan and Karim
'Marwan and Karim met.'
- b. Marwan w Karim ?iztamaʕaa.
Marwan and Karim met.3M.D
'Marwan and Karim met.'

(Aoun & Benmamoun 1999:179)

(24) Lebanese Arabic

- a. *Itaʔa Kariim w Marwaan.
met.3MS Kareem and Marwaan
'Kareem and Marwaan met.'
- b. Itaʔo Kariim w Marwaan.
met.3PL Kareem and Marwaan
'Kareem and Marwaan met.'

(Aoun et al. 1994:43)

Similar to MSA, SA and Jordanian Arabic (JA, Al Khalaf 2021: (14)) allow NSIs.

(25) a. SA

taffay Salim u Kemal fi maytaba.
met.3SG.M Salim and Kemal in school
'Salim and Kemal met at the school.'

b. JA

Idʒramaʕ Salim w ʕumar bi-l-maktabih.
met.3SG.M Salim and Omar at-the-library
'Salim and Omar met at the library.'

(Al Khalaf 2021:14)

Moreover, LA and MA do not show FCA (Aoun & Benmamoun 1999) in *Aux-ConjS-V* configuration. This is consistent with the view that in this configuration we are dealing with two clauses. Despite the apparent partial agreement between the auxiliary and the first conjunct in (26a), the absence of agreement with feminine subjects indicates that no FCA exists.

(26) Lebanese Arabic

- a. keen Kariim w Marwaan ʕam yilʕabo
met.3MS Karim and Marwan ASP play.3PL
'Karim and Marwan were playing.'

(Aoun & Benmamoun 1999:44)

- b. *keenet Nadia w Zayna ʕam yilʕabo
was.3FS Nadia and Zayna ASP play.3PL
'Nadia and Zayna were playing.'

(Aoun & Benmamoun 1999:45b)

⁹ NSIs include (i) collective/distributive predicates such as *gather, share, meet*, (ii) anaphors, (iii) obligatory control predicates that do not allow split antecedents (Aoun & Benmamoun 1999, Aoun et al. 1994, 1999).

¹⁰Aoun et al. (1994: 211): "If we are dealing with a conjunction of NPs, as superficially appears to be the case, then the subject of the clause should be able to behave like a plural subject semantically, even if it does not do so syntactically (i.e., by failing to require plural agreement). On the other hand, if we are dealing with a conjunction of clauses, then we are dealing with two clauses, each with a singular subject; in these examples, the subject should not be able to behave as if it denotes a plurality."

As such, Aoun & Benmamoun (1999) suggest that a better translation for (26a) and related sentences is *It is the case that Karim and Marwan were playing*. SA and JA pattern like MSA in exhibiting FCA in the sandwiched configurations.

(27) a. SA

kan-e [bɪnt-ma u sabi-ma] kɪ-y-ayl-o anzarut.
 aux.PST-3SG.F [girl.F-a and boy.M-a] PST-3-eat-PL corn
 ‘A boy and a girl were eating corn.’

b. JA

kaan-at [Nadia w Muhammad] yuktub-u shifir.
 aux.PST-3SG.F Nadia.F and Muhammad.M write-3M.PL poetry.
 ‘Nadia and Muhammad were writing poetry.’

(Al Khalaf 2021:16c)

In fact, Hijazi Arabic also behaves like SA and JA in allowing sandwiched agreement.

(28) Hijazi Arabic (HA)

kun-t [ʔana w hiyya] b-n-itsallag sullam
 aux.PST-1SG [I and she] PROG-1PL-climb ladder
 ‘I and she were climbing a ladder.’

(Hassan Munshi, p.c.)

These diagnostics demonstrate that at least in SA, JA and HA, we are dealing with the coordination of two NPs, rather than two clauses.

References

- Ackema, Peter & Ad Neeleman. 2003. Context-sensitive spell-out. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21. 681–735.
- Ackema, Peter & Ad Neeleman. 2004. *Beyond morphology: Interface conditions on word formation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ackema, Peter & Ad Neeleman. 2012. Agreement weakening at PF: A reply to Benmamoun and Lorimor. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(1). 75–96.
- Akkuş, Faruk. 2020. On Iranian case and agreement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 38(3). 671–727.
- Akkuş, Faruk. 2021. Evidence from Sason Arabic for \bar{A} -movement feeding Case-licensing relations. *Linguistic Inquiry* (To appear).
- Akkuş, Faruk & Elabbas Benmamoun. 2018. Syntactic outcomes of contact in Sason Arabic. In Stefano Manfredi, Mauro Tosco & Giorgio Banti (eds.), *Arabic in contact*, vol. 6, 37–52. John Benjamins.
- Al Khalaf, Eman. 2021. Furthest conjunct agreement in Jordanian Arabic: Evidence for multiple (non)simultaneous Agree. en. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-021-09515-0>.
- Aoun, Joseph & Elabbas Benmamoun. 1999. Gapping, PF Merger, and Patterns of Partial Agreement. In Shalom Lappin & Elabbas Benmamoun (eds.), *Fragments: Studies in ellipsis and gapping*, 175–192. Oxford University Press.
- Aoun, Joseph, Elabbas Benmamoun & Lina Choueiri. 2010. *The syntax of Arabic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Aoun, Joseph, Elabbas Benmamoun & Dominique Sportiche. 1994. Agreement, word order, and conjunction in some varieties of Arabic. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 195–220.
- Aoun, Joseph, Elabbas Benmamoun & Dominique Sportiche. 1999. Further remarks on first conjunct agreement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(4). 669–681.
- Benmamoun, Elabbas. 2000. *The feature structure of functional categories: A comparative study of Arabic dialects*. Oxford University Press.
- Benmamoun, Elabbas, Mahmoud Abunasser, Rania Al-Sabbagh, Abdelaadim Bidaoui & Dana Shalash. 2013. The location of sentential negation in Arabic varieties. *Brill's Journal of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics* 5(1). 83–116.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2008. Where's phi? agreement as a post-syntactic operation. In Daniel Harbour, David Adger & Susana Béjar (eds.), *Phi theory: phi-features across interfaces and modules*, 295–328. Oxford University Press.

- Chomsky, Noam. 2007. Approaching UG from below. In Uli Sauerland & Hans Martin Gärtner (eds.), *Interfaces + recursion = language?*, 1–29. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On phases. In Robert Freidin, Carlos P Otero & Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational issues in linguistic theory. essays in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, 134–166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130. 33–49.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2017. Syntactic ergativity as case discrimination. In *Proceedings from wccfl*, vol. 34, 141–150.
- Haegeman, Liliane & Marjo Van Koppen. 2012. Complementizer agreement and the relation between C^0 and T^0 . *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(3). 441–454.
- Hoekstra, Jarich & László Marác. 1989. On the position of inflection in West Germanic. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 44. 75–88.
- Jarrah, Marwan. 2019a. Complementizer agreement and the T^0 - Φ parameter in Jordanian Arabic. *Studia Linguistica* 74(1). 139–164.
- Jarrah, Marwan. 2019b. Record your Agree: A case study of the Arabic complementizer *?inn*. *Journal of Linguistics* 55(1). 83–122.
- Jarrah, Marwan & Nimer Abusalim. 2020. In favour of the low IP area in the Arabic clause structure: Evidence from the VSO word order in Jordanian Arabic. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2010. *Why agree? Why move?: Unifying agreement-based and discourse-configurational languages*. MIT Press.
- Ouali, Hamid. 2008. On C-to-T-feature transfer: The nature of Agreement and Anti-Agreement in Berber. In R. D' Alessandro, G. H. Hrafnbjargarson & S. Fischer (eds.), *Agreement restrictions*, 159–180. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ouali, Hamid. 2011. *Agreement, pronominal clitics and negation in Tamazight Berber: A unified analysis*. NY: Continuum.
- Ouali, Hamid. 2014. Multiple agreement in Arabic. In Reem Khamis-Dakwar & Karen Froud (eds.), *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics XXVI: Papers from the annual symposium on Arabic*, 121–134.
- Preminger, Omer. 2014. *Agreement and its failures*. Vol. 68. MIT Press.
- Richards, Marc. 2007. On Feature Inheritance: An Argument from the Phase Impenetrability Condition. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38. 563–572.
- Soltan, Usama. 2007. *On formal feature licensing in minimalism: aspects of standard arabic morphosyntax*. University of Maryland dissertation.
- Tucker, Matthew A. 2011. The morphosyntax of the Arabic verb: Toward a unified syntax-prosody. In *Morphology at Santa Cruz: Papers in Honor of Jorge Hankamer*. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0wx0s7qw>.
- Van Koppen, Marjo. 2005. *One probe-two goals: Aspects of agreement in Dutch dialects*. Leiden University. Utrecht dissertation.
- Watanabe, Akira. 2000. Feature copying and binding: Evidence from Complementizer agreement and switch reference. *Syntax* 3(3). 159–181.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 1993. *Dutch syntax: A Minimalist approach*. University of Groningen dissertation.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 1997. *Morphosyntax of verb movement: A Minimalist approach to the syntax of Dutch*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2001. Syntactic and phonological verb movement. *Syntax* 4(1). 34–62.

Proceedings of the 39th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Robert Autry,
Gabriela de la Cruz Sanchez,
Luis A. Irizarry Figueroa,
Kristina Mihajlovic, Tianyi Ni,
Ryan Smith, and Heidi Harley

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2024

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 39th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2024 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-481-2 hardback

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the printed edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Akkuş, Faruk. 2024. C and T Are Distinct Probes. In *Proceedings of the 39th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Robert Autry et al., 42-51. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #3615.