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Goals

• **First**, provide a descriptive account of the distribution of two Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) in Egyptian Arabic (EA): \( \text{\textdagger} \)ayy and \( \text{\textdagger} \)alaa.

• **Second**, compare two approaches to the licensing conditions for these two NPIs, concluding that an approach to NPI-licensing in terms of nonveridicality fares better than a monotonicity-based approach in accounting for the EA facts.
Negative Polarity Items in Egyptian Arabic

- NPIs refer to lexical items that have restricted distribution in a language because their occurrence is tied to the presence of a “licenser” in the structure, typically one with negative or negative-like properties, hence the name NPIs (Klima 1964; Baker 1970).

- In this presentation, I discuss the behavior of two NPIs in EA: ِحَبِّي (any) and ِعَالَة (the polarity-sensitive item typically used in negative concord contexts).
؟اي (≠any)

- ？اي functions as a determiner that combines with indefinite nouns as in the examples below:

1. ？اي واهيد/؟اي هاد “anyone”
   ？اي هاغاه “anything”
   ？اي هتت “any place”
   ？اي راگيل “any man”
   ？اي كتaab “any book”
?ayy (any)

2a. ?anaa  maa-šuf-t-i-š  ?ayy  had
   I  NEG-SAW-1SG-EV-NEG  any  one
   ‘I didn’t see anybody.’

b. *?anaa  šuf-t  ?ayy  had
   I  saw-1SG  any  one
   *أنا شفت أي حد.
Similarly, *walaa* combines with indefinite nouns:

3. *walaa waatheid/walaa ⁷ had*  
   “no one”

   *walaa ṭhaagah*  
   “nothing”

   *walaa ṭittah*  
   “no place”

   *walaa raagil*  
   “no man”

   *walaa kitaab*  
   “no book”
4a.  ʔanaa  maa-šuf-t-i-š  walaa  waahid
    I  NEG-saw-1SG-EV-NEG  no  one
    ‘I didn’t see anybody.’

4b.  *ʔanaa  šuf-t  walaa  waahid
    I  saw-1SG  no  one
    *أنا شفت ولا واحد.
In the first half of the presentation, I provide a descriptive account of the grammatical distribution of ʔayy and walaʔa.

In the second half of the presentation, I compare two different analyses of NPI-licensing to determine which analysis is more adequate in accounting for the distribution ʔayy and walaʔa.
There are two types of grammatical contexts to consider with regard to the distribution of the NPIs ḳayy and walaa:

5a. Contexts in which both ḳayy and walaa occur, and

b. Contexts where ḳayy, but not walaa, may occur.
contexts where both ʔayy and walaa occur: clausemate sentential negation

6a. maa-šuf-t-i-š  ʔayy/walaa waahid
    NEG-saw-1SG-EV-NEG any/no one
    ‘I didn’t see anybody.’

6b. maa-šuf-t-i-š  ʔayy/walaa ḥaagah
    NEG-saw-1SG-EV-NEG any/no thing
    ‘I didn’t see anything.’
Contexts where both ʔayy and walaa occur: min-ʔeir (=without) clauses

7. ʕalii mišii min-ʔeir maa
Ali left.3sSGM without COMP
yi-tkallim maʕa ʔayy/walaa waaḥid
IPFV-talk.3SGM with any/no one
‘Ali left without talking to anyone.’
علي مشي من غير ما يتكلم مع أي/ولا واحد.
Contexts where both ʔayy and walaq occur: 
min-ʔeir (=without) clauses

8. Mona laff-it kitiir fii-ʔil-mool
Mona shopped.3SGF much in-the-mall
min-ʔeir maa ti-štirii ʔayy/walaq ʔaagah
without COMP IPFV-buy.3SGF any/no thing
‘Mona shopped around at the mall for a long time
without buying anything.’

منى لفت كتير في المول من غير ما تشترى أي/ولا حاجة.
Contexts where both ʔayy and walaa occur: ʔabl (=before) clauses

9. ʔabuu-haa maat ʔabl maa yi-šoof ʕayy/walaa waahid min ʕahfaad-u-h ʕabuu-haa maat ʔabl maa yi-šoof ʕayy/walaa waahid min ʕahfaad-u-h

father-her died.3SGM before COMP see.3SGM any/no one from grandchildren-EV-his

‘Her father died without seeing any of his grandchildren.’

أبوها مات قبل ما يشوف أي ولا واحد من أحفاده.
Contexts where both ʔayy and walaa occur:
ʔabl (=before) clauses

10. Mona laff-it kitiir fii-ʔil-mool
   Mona shopped.3SGF much in-the-mall
   ʔabl maa ti-štirii ʔayy/*walaa ḫaagah
   before COMP IPFV-buy.3SGF any/no thing
   ‘Mona shopped around at the mall for a long time
   before buying anything.’
   منى لفت كثير في المول قبل ما تشتري أي/ِولا حاجة.
So,

- ḥayy and waļaa may occur interchangeably in the contexts of
  
  (i) clausemate sentential negation,
  (ii) without-clauses, and
  (iii) some before-clauses.
Contexts where ʔayy, but not walaa, occurs: Distant Negation

11. ʔāḥmad maa-ʔaal-š ʔin Mona

Ahmad NEG-said.3SGM-NEG COMP Mona
fihm-it ʔayy/*walaa ūaagah
understood-3SGF any/no thing
‘Ahmad didn’t say that Mona understood anything.’

أحمد ما قالش إن منى فهمت أي/ولا حاجة.
Contexts where ʔayy, but not *walaa, occurs:

Polar Questions (non-rhetorical)

12a. ʔinta šuf-t ʔayy/*walaa waahid?
you saw-2SGM any/no one
‘Did you see anybody?’

12b. ʔinta akal-t ʔayy/*walaa haagah?
you ate-2SGM any/no thing
‘Did you eat anything?’
Contexts where *ayy, but not *walaa, occurs:

Polar Questions (rhetorical)

13. *Huwwa ʿAhmad ʿumr-uh ʿaraa
   Q Ahmad ever-his read.3SGM
   *ayy/*walaa kitaab?
   any/no book
   ‘Did Ahmad ever read a book?’

هوا أحمد عمره قرأ أي/ولا كتاب؟
Contexts where ؟ayy, but not waalaa, occurs: Wh-questions (non-rhetorical)

14. miin fii-kum yi-ʔraf ؟ayy/*walaa

who in-you IPFV-know.3SGM any/no

haagah yan ?il-lingwistiks?

ting about the-linguistics

‘Who among you knows anything about linguistics?’

مین فیکم يعرف أي/ولا حاجة عن الالینجویستکس؟
Contexts where `ayy, but not walaa, occurs: Wh-questions (rhetorical)

15. huwwa min `ayy/imtaa Aḥmad Q from when Ahmad bi-yi-fham `ayy/*walaa ASP-IPFV-understand.3SGM any/no ḫaagah fii `il-iqtiSaad? thing in the-economics ‘Since when does Ahmad understand anything about economics?’

ềuا من امتى أحمد بيفهم أي/ولا حاجة في الاقتصاد؟
Contexts where ʔayy, but not walaa, occurs:
The protasis of a conditional (non-counterfactual)

16. law šuft ʔayy/*walaa ḥaagah
   if saw.2SG any/no thing
   ballaʔ ʔil-boliis
tell.IMP the-police
‘If you see anything, call the police!’

لو شفت أي/ولا حاجة بلغ البوليس.
Contexts where ʔayy, but not walaːɡ, occurs:
The protasis of a conditional (counterfactual)

17. law kunt šuft ʔayy/*walaːɡ haagah
   if was.1SG saw.1SG any/no thing
   kunt ballaːx-t ʔil-boliis
   was.1SG tell.IMP-1SG the-police
   ‘If I had seen anything, I would have called the
   police.’

لو كنت شفت أي/ولا حاجة كنت بلغت البوليس.
Contexts where ˈayy, but not ˈalaa, occurs:

As-if clauses

18. ˈinta bi-ti-tkallim wi-kaˈina-k
    you ASP-IPFV-talk.2SGM and-as-you

faahim ˈayy/*ˈalaa ḥaagah
understanding.PTCP any/no thing

fii ˈil-lingwistiks
in the-linguistics

‘You talk as if you understand anything in linguistics.’

إنت بنتتكلم وكأنك فاهم أي حاجة/ولا حاجة في اللينجوستكس.
Contexts where ʔayy, but not walaa, occurs:
The restriction of a universal quantifier

19. kul waahid ʔand-u-h ʔayy/*walaa
   every one at-EV-him any/no
   suʔaal yi-kallim-ni baʕd
   question IPFV-talk.3SGM-me after
   ?il-muʔaaDrah
   the-lecture
   ‘Everyone who has a question should talk to me after the lecture.’
   كل واحد عنده أي سؤال/ولا سؤال يكلمني بعد المحاضرة.
Contexts where ʔayy, but not walaa, occurs:
The nuclear scope of ʔulayyiliin (=few)

20. naas ʔulayyil-iin fii ʔil-γarb
   people few-PL in the-West
   bi-γi-ʕraf-uu ʔayy/*walaa ʔaagah
   ASP-IPFV-know-3PL any/no thing
   ʕan ʔil-islaam
   about the-Islam

   ‘Few people in the West know anything about Islam.’

ناس قليلين في الغرب يعرفوا أي حاجة/ولا حاجة عن الإسلام.
Contexts where \( \text{\textipa{ayy}}, \) but not \( \text{\textipa{walaa}}, \) occurs: Comparative too-clauses

21. \( \text{\textipa{Ahmad \textipa{aDaf} min \textipa{inn-u-h}}} \)
Ahmad weaker than COMP-EV-him
\( \text{\textipa{yi-\textipa{uul} \text{\textipa{ayy}/\textipa{walaa} \textipa{haagah}}} \)
IPFV-say.3SGM any/no thing
\( \text{\textipa{li-l-mudiir} to-the-manager} \)
‘Ahmad is too weak to say anything to the manager.’

أحمد أضعف من إنه يقول أي حاجة/ولا حاجة للمدير.
Contexts where *ayy, but not walaâ, occurs:
Direct object of adversative predicates

22. Ahmad *ankar *ayy/ walaâ
Ahmad denied.3SG any/no
*îlîaaqah lii-h bi-l-mawduûf
relation to-him with-the-subject
‘Ahmad denied having anything to do with this
issue.’

 أحمد أنكر أي علاقة/ولا علاقة له بالموضوع.
Contexts where *ayy, but not walaa, occurs:
Embedded clause of adversative predicates

23. *ašukk ?în Aḥmad bi-yi-tkallim
doubt.1SG COMP Ahmad ASP-IPFV-talk.2SGM
maʕa *ayy/*walaa bint fī il-gaamīyah
with any/no girl in the-university
‘I doubt that Ahmad talks to any girl at the university.’

أشك إن أحمد بيتكلم مع أي بنت/ولا بنت في الجامعة.
Contexts where ʔayy, but not walaa, occurs:
Free choice contexts (Generics)

24. ’il-ḥukoomaat  ʔil-ʕarabiyyah
the-governments  the-Arab
bi-ti-Daayiʔ  ʔayy/*walaa  Saḥafii
ASP-IPFV-harass.3SGF  any/no  journalist
ya-ntaqid-haa
IPFV-criticize.3SGM-them

‘Arab governments harass any journalist that criticizes them.’

الحكومات العربية بتضايق أي صحفي*/ولا صحفي ينتقدها.
Contexts where ًayy, but not walaa, occurs:

Free choice contexts (Future)

25. ًanaa ha-dawwar ًalaa ًayy/*walaa

I FUT-look.1SG for any/no

waaহid yi-saaسىd-nii

one IPFV-help.3SGM-me

‘I will look for anyone to help me.’

أنا هادور على أي واحد/ولا واحد يساعدني.
Contexts where ðayy, but not walaa, occurs:
Free choice contexts (Modals)

26. mumkin ni-tðaabil fii ðayy/*walaa
possible IPFV-meet.1PL at any/no
wan't bukrarah
time tomorrow
‘We may meet any time tomorrow.’

27. laazim ti-šuuf ðayy/*walaa doktoor
must.PTCP IPFV-see.1PL any/no doctor
‘You must see a doctor.’
Contexts where ّayy, but not walaā, occurs:
Free choice contexts (complement of intensional verbs)

28. ّatmannaɭ ّinn-ɬ-k ti-saafir
IPFV.hope.1SG COMP-EV-YOU IPFV-travel.3SGM
li-ّayy/*li-walaa balad ّarabii
to-any/to-no country Arab
‘I hope you would travel to any Arab country.’

اتمنى إنك تسافر لأي بلد/ًولا بلد عربي.
Contexts where ʔayy, but not walaa, occurs:

Free choice contexts (Habituals)

29. dayman ʔabl ʔil-noom ba-ʔhib
   always before the-sleep ASP.IPFV-like.1 SG
   ʔa-tfarrag ʔalaa ʔayy/*walaa
   IPFV-watch.1 SG on any/no
   barnaamig fii ʔil-tilifizyoon
   program in the-television
   ‘I always like to watch any program on TV before I
go to bed.’

دائمًا قبل النوم بحب اتفرج على أي برنامج/*ولا برنامج في التليفزيون.
Contexts where ʔayy, but not walaa, occurs: Imperatives

30. ʔanni-l-naa ʔayy/*walaa ʔuʔniyyah
     sing.IMP-to-us any/no song
     yaa Wahiid!
     VOC Wahiid

‘Wahiid, sing us any song!’

غنينا أي أغنية/ولا أغنية يا وحيد.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical context</th>
<th>An languages-phrase</th>
<th>A wālaa-phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clausemate Negation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without-clauses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before-clauses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant Negation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar questions (rhetorical or non-rhetorical)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-questions (rhetorical or non-rhetorical)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protasis of conditionals (counterfactual or non-counterfactual)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-if clauses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The restriction of ∀</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nuclear scope of languages (few) and languages (very few)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparatives too-clauses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As direct objects or in the complement clause of adversative predicates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the complement clause of intensional verbs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habituals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperatives</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Contrastive distribution of languages and wālaa in EA
Two questions:

31a. First, what grammatical property licenses the occurrence of ʔayy and walaːa in the contexts in Table 1? Let’s call that the licensing question.

b. Second, why does ʔayy have a wider distribution than walaːa in EA? Let’s call that the contrastive distribution question.
Two approaches to questions (31a,b):

- The monotonicity-based approach (Ladusaw 1979)
The monotonicity-based approach (MBA) to NPI-licensing

32. \( \delta \) is a trigger for NPIs if and only if \( \delta \) is **downward-entailing**. (Ladusaw 1979:113)

where downward entailment is defined as follows:

33. A function \( f \) is **downward-entailing** iff for arbitrary elements \( X, Y \) it holds that: \( X \subseteq Y \rightarrow f(Y) \subseteq f(X) \).

- Downward-entailing (DE) functions are order reversing and allow inferences from sets to subsets.
34. Ahmad does not own a house.
   \[ \models \text{a big house} \subseteq \models \text{house} \]
   \[ \therefore \text{Ahmad does not own a big house.} \]

35. Few Arabs eat vegetables.
   \[ \models \text{spinach} \subseteq \models \text{vegetable} \]
   \[ \therefore \text{Few Arabs eat spinach.} \]

36. Arabs seldom eat vegetables.
   \[ \models \text{spinach} \subseteq \models \text{vegetable} \]
   \[ \therefore \text{Arabs seldom eat spinach.} \]
37a. Ahmad did not understand anything.
   b. Few students understood anything.
   c. These students seldom understand anything.
Non-DE operators: Affirmation, many, and often

38. Ahmad owns a house.
   \[\|a \text{ big house}\| \subseteq \|\text{house}\|\]
   \[\neq \text{Ahmad owns a big house.}\]

   \[\|\text{spinach}\| \subseteq \|\text{vegetable}\|\]
   \[\neq \text{Many Arabs eat spinach.}\]

40. Arabs often eat vegetables.
   \[\|\text{spinach}\| \subseteq \|\text{vegetable}\|\]
   \[\neq \text{Arabs often eat spinach.}\]
Non-DE operators do not license any in English

41a. *Ahmad understood anything.
   b. *Many students understood anything.
   c. *These students often understand anything.
But why do some NPIs have a wider distribution than others?

- Because not all DE functions are created equal.
- Zwarts (1995, 1996) and van der Wouden (1997) propose a more fine-grained system of downward entailment, where three types of DE functions are identified:

  * **monotone decreasing** (e.g., few, seldom);
  * **anti-additive** (e.g., nobody, no student); and
  * **antimorphic** (e.g., sentential negation, without).
So, how does the MBA explain the distribution of ḫayy and walaa in EA?

Under the MBA, we have the following answers to the licensing and contrastive distribution questions in (31a,b):

42a. Both ḫayy and walaa occur in contexts that include a DE operator.

b. ḫayy is licensed in the context of a monotone decreasing operator, whereas walaa is licensed in the context of an antimorphic operator.
Problems for the MBA analysis: Not general enough

- Do all the grammatical contexts in Table 1 contain a DE operator?
- Some of them indeed do: negation, without, before, restrictor of $\forall$, nuclear scope of $\text{?ulayyiliin}$.
- But some are not as clearly DE: questions, the protasis of conditionals, comparatives, and imperatives.
- And some are typically characterized as nonmonotone: generics, future, and modals.
- Downward entailment thus does not seem to be a general enough notion to account for all contexts of NPI licensing (Giannkidou 1998, 2009).
Problems for the MBA analysis: Antimorphicity is too restrictive for EA

- Recall the behavior of *walaa* in *before*-contexts: sometimes it is allowed, and sometimes not (cf. 9-10).

- If *before* were antimorphic, then we would predict *walaa* to occur in all *before*-clauses, contrary to fact.

- If *before* were anti-additive, then we would predict that other anti-additive operators such as adversative predicates would license *walaa*, again contrary to fact (cf. 22-23).
DE is not a general enough notion to account for all contexts of NPI licensing in EA, nor is it able to account for the contrast in distribution between Payy and walaa in the language, particularly in before-contexts.
The veridicality-based approach (VBA) to NPI-licensing


- The **veridicality** of a proposition has to do with certainty and an individual’s commitment to the truth of a proposition.

- **Nonveridicality** characterizes those contexts where no such commitment is made.

- Nonveridical contexts in which a commitment is made to the falsity of a proposition are said to be **antiveridical**.
43a. A propositional operator $F$ is veridical iff $Fp$ entails or presupposes that $p$ is true in some individual’s epistemic model $M_{E}(x)$; otherwise $F$ is nonveridical.

b. A nonveridical operator $F$ is antiveridical iff $Fp$ entails that not $p$ in some individual’s epistemic model: $Fp \rightarrow \neg p$ in some $M_{E}(x)$. 
The VBA: Examples

- “Yesterday” is a veridical operator:
  44. John left yesterday. → [John left] is true.

- “Perhaps” is a nonveridical operator:
  45. Perhaps John left. → [John left] may not be true.

- Negation is an antiveridical operator:
  46. John didn’t leave. → [John left] is false.
So, what’s the answer to the licensing question under the VBA?

- Giannakidou argues that the grammatical contexts in Table 1 are all nonveridical, and, therefore, concludes that NPIs are licensed only when in the scope of a nonveridical operator.

- For example, interrogatives and imperatives are argued not to have truth values, and in that sense are nonveridical.
So, what’s the answer to the licensing question under the VBA?

- The protasis of a noncounterfactual conditional is also nonveridical, since, in some intuitive sense, it may or may not be met.
- The same applies to future events, and those introduced by modals.
- The restriction of a universal quantifier is also nonveridical; “every student who has any question,” does not entail that “every student has a question.” In fact, it is compatible with a context in which no student has any question.
So, what’s the answer to the contrastive distribution question under the VBA?

47. Ḥayy is licensed in nonveridical contexts. whereas wala’a is licensed in antiveridical contexts.

- We have already shown that clausemate sentential negation is antiveridical. How about without and before?
Without is veridical with regard to its \( p \) argument, but antiveridical with respect to its \( q \) argument:

48. John left without talking to Mary. \( \rightarrow \) 
   
   [John left] is true.
   
   [John talked to Mary] is false.

Prediction: \textit{walaq} may always occur in the \( q \) argument of \textit{without}, which is indeed the case (cf. the examples in (7-8)).
Before is veridical with respect to its $p$ argument, but its veridicality status with respect to the $q$ argument is context-sensitive.

In some contexts, $before$ is nonveridical with respect to the $q$ argument, as in (51):

49. John resigned before talking to his boss. →

[John resigned] is true.

[John talked to his boss] may not be true.
In other contexts, the \( q \) argument of \( \text{before} \) can indeed be antiveridical:

50. John died before seeing his grandchildren. \( \rightarrow \)

\([\text{John died}] \) is true.

\([\text{John saw his grandchildren}] \) is false.

Prediction: \textit{walaal} will occur in the \( q \) argument of \( \text{before} \), but only when it is antiveridical, which is indeed the case (cf. the examples in (9-10), repeated on the next two slides).
Now, reconsider the EA facts:

51. Ꝩabuu-haa maat Ꝩabl maa yi-šooffather-her died.3SGM before COMP see.3SGM
 Ꝩayyy/walaa waāḥid min Ꝩahfaad-u-hany/no one from grandchildren-EV-his
‘Her father died without seeing any of his grandchildren.’
أبوها مات قبل ما شوّف أي/ولا واحد من أحفاده.
Now, reconsider the EA facts:

52. Mona laff-it kitiir fii-ʔil-mool

Mona shopped.3SGF much in-the-mall

ʔabl maa ti-štirii ʔayy/*walaa ʔaagah

before COMP IPFV-buy.3SGF any/no thing

‘Mona shopped around at the mall for a long time
before buying anything.’

منى لفت كتير في المول قبل ما تشتري أي/ولا حاجة.
Summary 2

- The VBA fares better than the MBA in its account for the occurrence of ²ayy and walaː in EA as well as the contrast in distribution between them.

- As it turns out, the VBA also has further empirical consequences for licensing of ²ayy (or lack thereof) in other grammatical contexts. I discuss one such case next.
Licensing ²ayy with propositional attitude predicates (PAPs) of the directive type

- PAPs of the directive-type such as ²aayiz (≡want), šaayif (≡suggest, be of the opinion of), and ²aSarr (≡insist), allow the occurrence of ²ayy in their complement domains, where the embedded verb typically appears in the imperfective.
53. ِناَنا ِاِایَیز-ِاک ِتی-یِأرَرَف-ِعی
    I ِوْانِت.پِتْکِپ-ِیِو۷-ِسِی‌گِی ِیِپِف-ِمِئِت-ِ۳ِبِی‌گِی
    ِیِاَلِا ِیِاَیِی ِمِعَمَّسِیِل
    on ِوْنَی ِاکْتُرَع
    ‘I would like you to meet any actor.’

أنا عايزك تتعرف على أي ممثل.
šaayif (=suggest, be of the opinion of)

54. ʔanaa šaayif ʔinn-ik
I see.PTCP.SGM COMP-you.SGF
ti-tʕarraf-ʔi ʔalaa ʔayy mumassil
IPFV-meet-3SGF on any actor
‘I suggest that you meet any actor.’

أنا شايف إنك تتعرف على أي ممثل.
55. Ahmad  qaSarr  qiinn-i-naa
 Ahnmd  insisted.3SGM  COMP-EV-we
 ni-daxKal  qayy Taalib
 IPFV-let.in.1PL  any  student
 qil-muyaaDrah
 the-lecture
 ‘Ahmad insisted that we let in any student to the
 lecture.’

 أحمد أصر إننا ندخل أي طالب المحاضرة.
Non-licensing of ʔayy with epistemic and factive predicates

By contrast, PAPs of the epistemic and factive type such as Ẓanān (=believe), ʕaarif (=know), and ḥilim (=dream), which allow the verb to appear in the perfective form, typically do not license ʔayy in their complement domains.
Zann (believe)

56.  *ʔaZunn ʔinn Mona ʔitarrafa-ıt
believe.1SG COMP Mona met-3SGF
ʔalaa ʔayy mumassil
on any actor

*I believe that Mona met any actor.’

أظن إن منى اتعرفت على أي ممثل.
laarif (know.ptcp)

57. *ʔanaa laarif ʔinn-ik
I know.PTCP.1SG COMP-you.SGF
ʔitʔarraf-tii ʔalaa ʔayy mumassil
met-3SGF on any actor
‘*I know that you met any actor.’

أنا عارف إنك اتعرفتى على أي ممثل.
58. *?anaa ḥilim-t ḥumm-ik
I dreamed.1SG COMP-you.SGF
?itarraf-tii ?aalaay ?ayy mumassil
met-3SGF on any actor
‘*I dreamed that you met any actor.’

*أنا حلمت انك اتعرفتي على أي ممثل.
PAPs and (non)veridicality

- Under the VBA, the contrast between both types of PAPs follows from (non)veridicality: Whereas the complements of directive PAPs are nonveridical, those of epistemic and factive PAPs are veridical.
PAPs and (non)veridicality: 

**Believe vs. want**

59a. \[\text{[Jacob believes that Sue loves Paul]} \]_c = 1 \text{ iff } \\
\forall w [w \in M_E(Jacob) \rightarrow w \in \lambda w'. \text{ Sue loves Paul in } w']

b. \[\text{[Jacob wants that Sue leave]} \]_c = 1 \text{ if } \\
\exists w [w \in M_E(Jacob) \land w \in \lambda w'. \text{ Sue leave in } w']
A note on locality for walaa

If antiveridicality is the licencing condition on walaa, then why can’t it be licensed long-distance?

11. ʿAhmad maa-ʔaal-š ʔin Mona

Ahmad NEG-said.3SGM-NEG COMP Mona

fihm-it ʔayy/*walaa ʔaagah

understood-3SGF any/no thing

‘Ahmad didn’t say that Mona understood anything.’

أحمد ما قالش إن منى فهمت أي/ولا حاجة.
A note on locality for *walaa*

- The locality constraint on *walaa* licensing is not tied to the semantics of antiveridicality. Rather, locality of grammatical dependencies is better accounted for in syntactic terms.

- One possible explanation, suggested by Giannakidou (1998) for Modern Greek, is to assume, that *walaa*-phrases are quantifiers, hence undergo QR. Since QR is clause-bound, *walaa*’s licenser has to be clausemate.

- Another approach is to assume that *walaa* has a formal feature that requires licensing via a syntactic operation, say Agree (Chomsky 2001). Since Agree is subject to a locality condition (the so-called *Phase Impenetrability Condition*), the clausemateness condition follows.
Conclusions

- The grammatical distribution of the two NPIs ʔayy and walaa in EA provides empirical evidence in support of the VBA account of NPI-licensing, and against the MBA analysis.

- For one thing, the MBA is unable to explain the difference in behavior between ʔayy and walaa, particularly with regard to the occurrence of walaa in before-clauses.

- More generally, the MBA fails to explain why ʔayy can still occur in non-downward-entailing contexts such as interrogatives or modals.
Conclusions

- The VBA, by contrast, can readily explain the difference in behavior between 払い and おそらく by imposing an antiveridicality restriction on the licensing of おそらく, which also has the advantage of explaining the variable behavior of おそらく in before-clauses.

- The VBA also offers a unified account for all contexts of 払い licensing, including free choice environments, by appealing to the notion of nonveridicality.

- Furthermore, the VBA is shown to account for the variable behavior of 払い with propositional attitude predicates.
Conclusions

- I conclude that the VBA is empirically superior to the MBA when it comes to NPI licensing in EA.
Abbreviations in glosses

The following abbreviations are used in the glosses of the Egyptian Arabic data in the paper: 1, 2, 3 for first, second, and third person, respectively; SG = singular; PL = plural; DU = dual; M = masculine; F = feminine; NEG = negation marker; FUT = future; COMP = complementizer; IPFV = imperfective; PTCP = participial; Q = question-particle; IMP = imperative; VOC = vocative particle; EV = epenthetic vowel.
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شكراً لحسن استماعكم!