

## The Impact of SAPs on Categorization: Evidence from Ostensible Lexical Categories in Arabic

**Introduction.** Standard Arabic has 30 lexical items that are exceptionally categorized as nouns-verbs-interjections, referred to as *Names of Verbs* (NoVs). NoVs show patterns that hinder their categorisation; they display nominal features, code epistemic stances of their speakers, and select arguments. These properties, among others, make NoVs look like verbs, nouns, and interjections without fully behaving like any fixed category.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. <i>hak</i>            <i>ʔal-kitab-a.</i><br/>take.OC:2SG    DEF-book-ACC<br/>'take the book.'</p> | <p>3. <i>hayhaat</i>        <i>ʔal-ʕawd-u ʔila ʔaḏ-ḏul-i.</i><br/>impossible.OC.PL DEF-back-NOM to DEF-disgrace-GEN<br/>'Going back to disgrace is impossible.'</p> |
| <p>2. <i>ʔaax-in</i>         mm-ka.<br/>hurt.OC:1SG-NUN from-you<br/>'I am in pain because of you.'</p>  | <p>4. <i>hayyaa</i>        <i>ʔila ʔal-ʕamal.</i><br/>go.OC.2SG to DEF-work<br/>'Let us go to work.'</p>  |

In this paper, we show how head-movement to a Speech Act Projection (SAP) (Haegeman & Hill, 2013; Hill, 2007, 2013) produces such ostensible categories. NoVs are associated with the type of derivation which enables such movement.

**Problem.** Traditional attempts at categorization of NoVs accentuate their verbal character (Owens, 1989) or nominal properties (Dawood, 1980), while more recent efforts list them as interjections (Lutz & Jong, 2011). But this literature is inconsistent with recent conclusions about the nature of verbs, nouns (Baker, 2003), and interjections (Hill 2013). For example, in Arabic, it is ungrammatical to mark a verb with addressee (c.f., \**xuḏk* 'take:2SG'). But such morphological agreement is acceptable in (1). In addition, while regular lexical verbs appear in both SVO and VSO patterns, constructions created by NoVs accept only affirmative VSO order (cf., (3) & (6)). NoVs are also incompatible with negation (5). And NoVs impose restrictions on peripheral movements (Rizzi, 1997); their arguments cannot be topicalized or put in focus. Finally, NoVs do not allow adverbial modification.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>5. *<i>la</i>        <i>t-hak</i>        <i>ʔal-kitab-a.</i><br/>NEG.PRT t-take.OC:2SG DEF-book-ACC<br/>Intended: 'Do not take the book.'</p> | <p>6. *<i>ʔal-ʕawd-u hayhaat</i>        <i>ʔila ʔaḏ-ḏul-i.</i><br/>DEF-back-NOM impossible.OC.PL to DEF-disgrace-GEN<br/>'Going back to disgrace is impossible.'</p> |
|--|--|

NoVs display some properties of nouns. Like construct state (7), NoVs select only definite nominals as their arguments (cf. (1) with (8)). And NoVs can be suffixed by nunation (2). Their nominal character is also seen in pluralia tantum forms (3), which are reliable indicators of feature valuation for number in nominal heads (Pesetsky and Torrego 2007). But unlike nouns, NoVs do not select nominals with genitive case (cf., (3) with (7)). Instead, their arguments are spelled out with nominative or accusative case, depending on their grammatical role.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>7. <i>dar</i>        <i>ʔal-radʕul-i.</i><br/>house DEF-man-GEN<br/>'the house of the man.'</p> | <p>8. *<i>hak</i>        <i>kitab-an.</i><br/>take.OC:2SG book-NUN<br/>'take a book.'</p> |
|--|---|

NoV data also stands in sharp contrast with interjections. Cross-linguistically, interjections do not assign case (e.g., 1-4), nor can they have arguments (1-4). According to Hill (2013), among others, interjections are optional; nevertheless, the bolded items are required for the grammaticality of the examples above.

NoVs display other characteristics features that set them apart from other categories. Conjunction with an NoV phrase creates *unbalanced conjuncts*, analogous to asymmetrical embedded conjuncts in Dutch (Hoekstra, 2009) (c.f.,(10) with (13)); unlike phrasal conjuncts with verbs (11-12), NoVs phrases must always appear as the left-most part of a phrasal conjunct (c.f., (9) and (10)).

9. \* *ʔiftari datfar-an w **dunka** ʔal-waraq.* 10. ***dunka** ʔal-qalam w ʔuktub ...*  
 buy notebook-NUN and take.OC:2SG DEF-paper take.OC:2SG DEF-Pen and write  
 ‘buy a notebook and take the paper.’ ‘take the pen and write ...’

11. *xuḏ ʔal-qalam w ʔiqraʔ ʔad-dars.* 12. *ʔiqraʔ ʔad-dars w xuḏ ʔal-qalam.*  
 take DEF-pen and read DEF-lesson read DEF-lesson and take DEF-pen  
 ‘Take the pen and read the first lesson.’ ‘Read the first lesson and take the pen.’

13. *Het irriteert ons dat je te laat thuiskomt en je hebt geen sleutel bij je.*  
 it irritates us that you too late home-come and you have no key with you  
 ‘It annoys us that you come home late and you do not have a key with you.’ (Dutch)

**Analysis and Predictions.** The data requires that NoVs originate in a position appropriate for verbal roots, but that they move to a higher position where a suppletive form is licensed. In their original position, they ensure verb-like case assignment and selection properties. In the derived position, they adjoin to higher expressive discursual functional heads, specified by speech act participants - speakers and addressees. The high landing site accounts for word order, and their higher participant specifiers accounts for the “agreement beyond phi” effect [ $\phi$ ] (Miyagawa, 2017). Moreover, external specifiers block movement of internal ones, ensuring the impossibility of topicalisation, etc. with NoV structures. These results are summed up in the simplified movement illustration (14).

14. [SAP DP {external} SA [CP [TP DP {internal} T [VP DP {internal} V [xp { $V_{\text{expressive}}$ }]]]]]
- 

The necessity for syntactic movement is seen directly in the unbalanced conjunctions. Movement of NoV to the SAP head is possible only from within the left conjunct, a pattern seen in Arabic and other languages (Aoun, Benmamoun, and Sportiche 1994) where an external probe is able to interact with the leftmost conjunct without engaging with the contents of the one of the right.

The analysis has implications for understanding other cases of ostensible ceteris whose functions cannot be determined from their surface forms. These range from mixed feature cases (nouns-verbs) to unexpected landing forms associated with unexpected landing sites, such as verbs topicalization structures (Borsley & Roberts, 2006; Carnie, 2006; Li, 2004; Zaretski 1929; Waletzky 1980). The proposed model also advances our understanding of (non)imperative structures; it establishes the significance of speech act specifiers on agreement not only with addressees (1) (e.g., Kaur, 2018; Alcazar & Saltarelie, 2014) but also with speakers (2).