Name: Abdel-Rahman Abu Helal Affiliation: University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee

The main goal of this paper is to present and analyze a restricted set of dimensional nominal property concepts (DNPC) in Palestinian Arabic (PA) (e.g., *Tuul* "tallness", *ʕarD* "width") with a semantics that supports the syntactic analysis of property concepts under the uniformitarian view (Menon and Pancheva, 2014) and challenges the semantic analysis under the transparent view (Francez & Koontz-Garboden 2015). Unlike other quality-denoting property concepts, DNPCs in PA have the following properties: (i) DNPC sentences are context-independent, semantically transitive since they do not allow modification by POS operator and indeed they are not vague. They require overt degree modifiers such as measure phrases and equatives as in (1).

(1) a. *Ali (fiih) Tuul
Ali (FIIH) tallness
"Ali is tall"

b. Ali mitreen Tuul
Ali 2 meters tallness
"Ali is 2 meters tall"

c. Tuul Ali nafs Tuul Aħmad
Tallness Ali same tallness Aħmad
"Ali is as tall as Aħmad"

(ii) DNPCs are nominalized by the addition of the nominalizing head (CaCC) which is a semantically inert categorizing head. (iii) DNPCs exhibit the properties of part-whole existential-*have* sentences in PA (Hornstein et al, 1995). In this language, part-whole denoting possession is expressed by using a distinct syntactic structure marked by preposition *la* "to" (Boneh and Sichel 2010). The syntactic parallelism between *la*-possessive sentences and DNPC sentences lies in the incapability of the indefinite pivot to appear in the preverbal position as in (2.a) and their incompatibility with full agreement in the post copular PP-DP structure (2.b). The data suggest that the pivot comprising of the DNPC and its degree operator denotes a relation so that it can neither raise nor agree.

(2) a. *tlat-a miter Tuul (kaan-u) rajul l-talʒ
three meter tallness WERE-3PL the snowman
"The snowman (was) three meters tall"

b. (*kaan-u) tlat-a miter Tuul (la-)rajul l-talʒ
WERE.-3PL three-meter tallness to- the snowman
" The snowman was 3 meters tall"

We suggest that the DNPC sentence has the same underlying structure as relational have-sentence in English which trigger definiteness effects (Hornstein et al. 1995; Landman and Partee, 1987; Partee 1999). On the transparent analysis, the problem is crystal-clear. The non-vagueness of the structure cannot be explained without adopting the option of assigning an individual-characterizing denotation to DNPCs, leading to a non-possessive semantics for DNPCs in PA. A uniformitarian analysis, on the other hand, does not encounter this problem. It has the theoretical merit of reconciling the two facts of non-vagueness and the possessive semantics. This analysis would have the following assumptions: (i) The DNPC has a derived root with an underlyingly relational possessive structure (i.e., [[Ali] $_j$ [be + IN [[2 miter Tuul]$_i$ t$_{IN}$ [t$_j$ t$_i$]]]]). (ii) The root denotes a property of portions with an inherently degree function from portions to degrees (i.e., [[√*Twl*]] =: λpλd. p ∈ tallness & μ(p) ≤ d). (iii) It composes with the semantically inert nominalizer (CaCC) that denotes an identity function. (iv) The resulting object saturates a covert possessive operator [[IN]] represented as *la* in possessive *la*- sentences. As an existential relational structure with definiteness effects, it is standardly expected to be sensitive to the strong-weak DP distinction (Barwise and Cooper 1981). On the assumption that the POS degree operator is a universal quantifier over the contextually determined neutral set of degrees (i.e., ["λQ: ∀d ∈ g(N) (SA)) Q(d)] (von Stechow, 2009)), it makes a strong DP when it composes with the relational DNPC. This results into a tautologous statement (See Partee 1999) so (1.a) is odd. Other degree operators, when applied to relational DNPCs, (e.g., (1.b,c)) make weak DPs. This results into contingent statements that are felicitous. This explains the fact that DNPC modified by operators with lexically-specified standards are acceptable as exemplified in (1.b,c). On Dimensional Property Concepts in Palestinian Arabic: Evidence for Uniformitarianism

References:

Barwise, Jon, and Robin Cooper, 1981: Generalized quantifiers and natural language.

Linguistics and Philosophy, 4: 159–219.

Benmamoun, Elabbas. (1999). Arabic morphology: The central role of the imperfective. *Lingua* 108: 175-201.

Boneh, Nora and Ivy Sichel (2010) Deconstructing Possession. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28:1-40.

Grano, Thomas and Stuart Davis. 2017. Universal markedness in gradable adjectives revisited The morpho-semantics of the positive form in Arabic. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory.*

Francez, Itamar and Andrew Koontz-Garboden.(2015). Semantic variation and the grammar of property concepts. *Language* 93:533–563.Hornstein, Norbert S., Sara Rosen, and JuanUriagereka. 1995. *Integrals*.

Landman, Fred & Barbara H. Partee (1987) Weak NPs in HAVE sentences (unpublished abstract, UMass Amherst)

Menon, Mythili, and Roumyana Pancheva. (2014). *The grammatical life of property concept roots in Malayalam*. In Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 18, 289-302.

Partee, Barbara H. (1999) Weak NPs in HAVE Sentences. In J. Gerbrandy, M. Marx, M. de Rijke, and Y. Venema (eds.) *JFAK, a Liber Amicorum for Johan van Benthen on the occasion of his 50th Birthday* (pp.39-57) (University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam).