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Ellipsis in Iraqi Arabic: An Analysis of Gapping, Sluicing, and Stripping

Saja Albuarabi

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to explore the syntax of ellipsis in Iraqi Arabic. The paper sheds light on three types of ellipsis in Arabic and English, namely: sluicing, gapping, and stripping and puts each of them in a comparison between Iraqi Arabic and English languages in addition to Arabic dialects. To the best of my knowledge, these elliptical structures have not been studied in Iraqi Arabic before. Therefore, this study offers the first description of these phenomena from a generative standpoint.

The paper argues that the three types of ellipsis mentioned above can be the result of Phonological Form (PF)-deletion and not Logic Form (LF) copying. For example, sluicing exists in Iraqi Arabic which is derived by wh-movement followed by Tense Phrase (TP) deletion at PF. Moreover, pseudosluicing exhibits a challenge to the preposition stranding generalization. Data show that pseudosluicing is allowed even when preposition in Iraqi Arabic cannot be stranded in regular wh-questions. Moreover, gapping occurs through Across-The-Board (ATB) movement to low-coordination construction of two vPs. The data of this study also shows that gapping in Iraqi Arabic has the three properties proposed by Johnson (2009). Finally, stripping can be derived by the movement of the remnant out of TP plus deletion of that TP at the PF boundary similar to Depiante (2000), Merchant (2003) and Kolokonte (2008) proposals. Based on facts of binding and p-stranding properties, stripping can be derived by the movement of the remnant to the left periphery followed by TP deletion.

Keywords: ellipsis, Iraqi Arabic, gapping, sluicing, stripping, and TP deletion
1. Introduction

The study of Ellipsis has been one of the important topics in linguistics for centuries, and it continues to grow as one of the most important topics in many languages. Several studies have presented important discussions about ellipsis in English: Sag (1976), Chomsky & Lasnik (1993), Chomsky (1995), Lobeck (1995), Merchant (2001), van Craenenbroeck (2010). Lobeck (1995) divides ellipsis into two categories: the first category contains gapping, pseudogapping, and stripping which share the same properties. The second category includes Verb Phrase (VP)-ellipsis, sluicing, and Noun Phrase (NP)-ellipsis which also share certain features that differentiate them from the first category. The syntax of Arabic elliptical constructions, on the other hand, have few studies that provide descriptive literature. Based on my knowledge this study is the first attempt to study elliptical constructions in Iraqi Arabic (henceforth, IA). Therefore, this paper investigates the elliptical constructions in IA and provides the analysis of these constructions. In this paper, I present data from Iraqi Arabic to support my proposed analysis for the elliptical constructions. To illustrate certain central themes of this paper, consider the following examples:

1. ءلي ءکل تفاح، و المرم [VP _____] موز. (Gapping)

   Ali ate.3MS apple.FS and Mary banana.FS

   ‘Ali ate an apple, and Mary a banana.’

2. سوزان تدكر ءتسو و كيكاه، و المرم [TP_____] حامتيين. (Stripping)

   Suzan F.can.3S F.make.3S cake and Mary too

   ‘Suzan can make a cake, and Mary too.’

3. ساره فافت وااحد بس مارّرف مينو [TP_______] (Sluicing)

   Sarah saw.3FS someone but not 1-know who
‘Sarah saw someone, but I don’t know who.’

4. ʔəħməd jikdər jihʃiiʔəħbəʕ luɣaat, ʔw mərim tikdər tihʃii ɣəmsəh [NP_].  (NP-ellipsis)  
Ahmed  M.can.3S  M.speak.3S  four  languages,  and  Mary  F.can.3S  five  
‘Ahmed  can  speak  four  languages,  and  Mary  can  five.’

The purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to investigate a number of important syntactic properties of ellipsis in Iraqi Arabic (IA) focusing on sluicing, pseudogapping, and stripping. “Ellipsis” refers to the omission of elements which can be regained from the context. Moreover, it presents different analyses of the elliptical constructions in Arabic dialects. According to one discussion, the Preposition Stranding Generalization (PSG) can be falsified in some dialects such as Emirate Arabic. Moreover, P-stranding is forbidden in wh-questions while sluicing is possible even when the underlying construction would include a stranded preposition (Kortobi, 2002; Leung 2014). While other scholars such as (Algryani, 2011; Al Bukhari, 2016) argue that other dialects such as Jordanian Arabic (JA) and Libyan Arabic (LA) allow gapping but not VP-ellipsis which is allowed in JA and LA where T is occupied by a modal or auxiliary. JA and LA only have gapping, and it does not have pseudogapping cases

It is worth mentioning that little research on Iraqi Arabic, in general, has been published. Bruce (1998), Abu-Haidar (2002), and Hassan (2015) have presented general information about Iraqi Arabic, but none of these studies have ever discussed the syntactic feature of ellipsis structures in this dialect. This study is an attempt to shed light on an important topic regarding elliptical constructions in Iraqi Arabic which I argue that they can be the result of Phonological Form (PF)-deletion and not Logic Form (LF) copying. For example, locality, identity form, and p-stranding effects show that stripping can be derived by the focus movement of the remnant to
the left periphery followed by Tense Phrase (TP) deletion at PF. Furthermore, as far as information structure is concerned, it is argued that the remnant, which occupies a Specifier (Spec) position in the left periphery, is interpreted as a new information focus. As section (3.2.3) shows that stripping can be derived by the movement of the remnant to the left periphery followed by TP deletion at PF.

**Research Questions**

The main goal of this paper is to explain and analyze questions about elliptical constructions in IA and to compare them to English language focusing on a theoretical perspective. More specifically, three questions are addressed:

1. What is the syntax of elliptical constructions in IA?
2. What syntactic conditions allow for the presence of the gap?
3. Do the elliptical constructions approach by PF-deletion or LF-copying?

**Organization of the study**

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents previous studies about ellipsis in both English and Arabic. Section 3 focuses on ellipsis in IA. Then it provides an introduction about IA word order and agreement. There are three subsections (i.e., Sluicing, Gapping, & Stripping) that discuss the types of ellipsis in IA. The concluding section sums up the analyses made in the previous (sub)sections, providing the results of this study. The section concludes that elliptical constructions are a result of PF-deletion and not LF-copying. The verb or other components move before PF-deletion process.
2. Literature Review

2.1 Ellipsis in English

According to Smith (2001), “the phenomenon of missing phrasal constituents’, that is, “ellipsis” is difficult to be classified as it involves ‘phonology (due to its similarity to deaccenting), syntax (by virtue of its distribution), semantics (evidenced by its apparent licensing conditions), and pragmatics (because of the cognitive load it imposes’.”

The linguistic representation of ellipsis falls into two schools of through: theories of deletion and non-deletion (Sag 1976; Chomsky & Lasnik 1993; Chomsky 1995; Merchant 2001; Aelbrecht 2010; van Craenenbroeck 2010). The latter considers ellipsis as a null category (devoid of syntactic structure) which can be understood either by copying the semantic constituent of the antecedent into the ellipsis position (Chung et al. 1995; Fortin 2007) or as a regular pronoun (Hardt 1993; Lobeck 1995). This can be seen in (5).

The former, on the other hand, proposes that ellipsis is deleted at the PF interface but syntactically represented which means it has syntax but not a phonological representation (6).

5. John made cookies, and Mary did [make cookies] too. (non-deletion)

1) Also known as structural or non-structural. The latter refers to the absence of (pronounceable) material to pronounce, whereas the former refers to the existence of material that becomes unpronounced at later stages in the derivation either at PF or LF.

| Is there unpronounced syntactic structure in ellipsis sites? |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| a. Nonstructural | b. Structural      |
| approaches        | approaches        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there unpronounced syntactic structure in ellipsis sites throughout the entire derivation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. LF-copy, null anaphora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adopted from Merchant, 2003)
6. John made cookies, and Mary did e too.  

Before analyzing the elliptical structures of IA, recent studies on both languages, Arabic and English are reviewed. Furthermore, I will show some examples from other languages to show how other types of relative ellipsis work.

Lobeck (1995) divides ellipsis into two categories: the first category contains gapping (7), pseudogapping (8), and stripping (9). The second category includes VP-ellipsis (10), sluicing (11), and Noun Phrase (NP)-ellipsis (12).

7. John ate rice, and Mary [VP _____] a hamburger.  
8. Suzan can make cakes, and Mary can [VP ____] brownies.  
9. Suzan can make cakes, and Mary [TP_____] too.  
10. John bought a new car, and Mary did [VP ______], too.  
11. Sarah met someone, but I do not know who [TP_________]  
12. John can speak four languages, and Mary can speak five [NP__].

Examples (7-12) show the possible types of ellipsis in English which will be examined in IA and see which types are possible in this dialect. The common property of all elliptical structures, in the examples above, is that some parts of the sentence are not present; they have been omitted. For example, in (10), the entire verb phrase in the second conjunct is omitted. Clearly, the sentence is: "John bought a new car, and Mary bought a new car", even though the second verb phrase is not pronounced. In gapping structures, like (7), the verb is omitted. The meaning of the sentence is John ate rice, and Mary ate a hamburger. Sentence (8) is an example of pseudogapping, where only the main verb “make” is omitted, the auxiliary “can” is not.

Agbayani and Zoerner (2014) argue that there are some similarities between pseudogapping and gapping. The first similarity is that there is a deletion of the main verb in
both cases. The second similarity is that both pseudogapping and gapping involve remnants on both sides of the apparent deletion. On the other hand, pseudogapping shares a property with Verb Phrase Ellipsis (VPE) that is absent in gapping. Both pseudogapping and VPE have a tensed auxiliary as a left-side remnant. In contrast, Levin (1986) states that pseudogapping is unrelated to both gapping and VPE. This paper shows that the former conclusion is only partially correct. I follow Levin’s argument which states that gapping and pseudogapping are transformationally unrelated. Moreover, as the data shows, IA does not allow pseudogapping.

2.2 Ellipsis in Arabic

The syntax of Arabic elliptical constructions is still debatable. There are few studies (i.e., Kortobi, 2002; Algryani, 2011; Al Bukhari, 2016) that have discussed this in Arabic literature, as well as in IA explicitly. Hence, this paper will study some types of elliptical constructions in IA to understand the analysis of these constructions. In order to carry out this study, it is important to find out how elliptical facts behave by providing some examples that are analyzed as sluicing structures, while others are gapping or stripping constructions.

Kortobi (2002) examines the VP-ellipsis in Moroccan Arabic (henceforth, MA). The author discusses some issues regarding the MA auxiliary kan and its English equivalent was. In addition to the future particle ɣadi “will”. Kotobi illustrates that VP-deletion is always allowed when no auxiliaries are used, despite the tense of the sentence. This is shown in the following examples:


Yasin was Prt-M.playing-3S football and Yousre was [ ____ ] too he

“Yasin was playing football and Yousre was too.”

Yasin was \( \text{Prt-M.} \text{playing.3S} \) football and Yousre was \( \text{Prt-M.} \text{playing.3S} \) football too:

“Yasin was playing football and Yousre was too.”

The author proposes that both MA and English resort to deletion of an Aspect Phrase (AspP) when the presence of the aspechural marker ka-I-ing disallows VP-deletion. Kotobi concludes that gapping can be handled as a case of VP-deletion. The subject can raise to the specifier of AgrS, while the object can raise to the Spec of AgrO, and V to Inft of the first clause. Then the VP gets deleted, as it is an empty shell now. Finally, kan “was” allows its complement to delete, but the complement is actually AspP and not VP. ɣadi “will”, on the other hand, does not allow its complement to delete “because the latter is a propositional argument that needs to be present to assume its θ-role” (Kotobi, 2002). See example (15):

   Nour will 3P-sleep and Bader will also he
   ‘Nour will sleep and Bader will too.’

b. Nour ɣadi y-əns w Badr hetta huwa.
   Nour will 3P-sleep and Bader also he
   ‘Nour will sleep and Bader will too.’

16. [MP M \([C?P/ C/?]\) TP T [AgrSP AgrS [AgrOP AgrO [vp V ...

   (Adopted from Kotobi, 2002: 235)

Algryani (2011) investigates ellipsis in Libyan Arabic (LA). He argues that there is modal ellipsis and verb-stranding Verb Phrase (VP) ellipsis. The former is a case of VP-ellipsis, while the latter is not. In the modal ellipsis, the main verb is deleted which is a type of VP-ellipsis since it displays qualities of VP-ellipsis, which features contain sloppy/strict reading. Sloppy reading means that the elided VP is not identical to the antecedent VP while strict reading
means that the elided VP is identical to the antecedent VP. This is shown in the following example:

17. Sarah reslet flus el-χu-h, w Ahmed hamate:n.
Sarah sent.3FS money to-brother-her and Ahmed too

‘Sarah sent money to her brother, and Ahmed too.’

Furthermore, backward anaphora is allowed in modal ellipsis because they do not violate island effects (Sag, 1976; Merchant, 2008). Modal ellipsis allows both antecedent and/or the ellipsis site to be embedded. The author states that if the complements of the main verb and all vP-correlated substance are deleted, it is not a case of VP-ellipsis, but rather a null object construction in LA constructions, as shown in (18):

18. ana fret siyyara li?ena Dimitri fre
  I bought.1MS car,FS because Dimitri bought.3MS

  “I bought a car because Dimitri did.”

  (Adopted from Algryani, 2012: 119)

The author states that such constructions are analyzed as a null object argument as in (19.b), and not as Verb Stranding VP-ellipsis (19.a).

Leung (2014) investigates Emirati Arabic (EA) and argues that the Preposition Stranding Generalization (PSG) can be falsified in EA. Moreover, P-stranding is forbidden in wh-questions while sluicing is possible even when the underlying construction would include a stranded preposition. This is shown in the following example:

20. John ʃərab gahwa [wɪjja wahəd], bəs ma ʕrf [minu John ʃərab gahwa [wɪjja t]].

John drank coffee with someone but not 1-know who John drank coffee with

“John drank coffee with someone, but I don’t know who.”

The example above shows that the indirect interrogative clause ‘ minu John ʃərab gahwa wɪjja’ is deleted except for the wh-phrase ‘minu.’ In EA, there are two sources to derive a bare wh-word in a sluicing clause: wh-fronting and wh-clefts. “The bare wh-words are called the wh-sluice which can be used freely for any type of wh-expression, and regardless of the syntactic projection of the antecedent correlate” (Leung, 2014). P-stranding is allowed under sluicing, even if it is strictly prohibited in the case of wh-movement. The author concludes that P-stranding can be defined as a PF condition in languages such as EA. Such a move depends on the PF deletion approach to sluicing which is a result of PF deletion which can save P-stranding violations as stated at the level of PF.

Finally, Al Bukhari (2016), studies elliptical construction in Jordanian Arabic (JA) focusing on gapping and sluicing. The author states that JA allows gapping but not VP-ellipsis which is allowed in LA where T is occupied by a modal or auxiliary. JA only has gapping, and it does not have pseudogapping cases. JA shows the three properties of gapping which are essential to differentiate between gapping and pseudogapping. The author concludes that “JA data show that wh-fronting is the only available derivation with like wh-adjuncts and wh-PP which means that pseudosluicing cannot work for the full range of data.” To conclude, in this section I have
shown previous studies discuss ellipsis in Arabic dialects. The following table summarizes their arguments.

Table 1: A summary of the previous claims:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>languages</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Their claims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic (MA)</td>
<td>Kortobi (2002)</td>
<td>MA like English resorts to a deletion of an Aspect Phrase (AspP) when the aspectual marker ka-I-ing of the disallows VP-deletion is present. Therefore, gapping can be handled as a case of VP-deletion in MA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Libyan Arabic (LA)</td>
<td>Algryani (2011)</td>
<td>LA has a modal ellipsis and verb-stranding Verb Phrase (VP) ellipsis. The former is a case of VP-ellipsis, while the latter is not. In the modal ellipsis, the main verb is deleted which is a type of VP-ellipsis since it displays qualities of VP-ellipsis, which features contain sloppy/strict reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Emirati Arabic (EA)</td>
<td>Leung (2014)</td>
<td>In EA, P-stranding is forbidden in wh-questions while sluicing is possible even when the underlying construction would include a stranded preposition. However, P-stranding is allowed under sluicing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jordanian Arabic (JA)</td>
<td>Al Bukhari (2016)</td>
<td>JA allows gapping but not VP-ellipsis, it does not have pseudogapping cases and wh-fronting is the only available derivation with like wh-adjuncts and wh-PP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Ellipsis in Iraqi Arabic**

This section examines the status of ellipsis in IA. The main issue discussed here focuses on whether or not IA allows the three types of ellipsis mentioned above. The questions discussed in this section are: what is the main word order of IA and how does the deleted constituent acquire its meaning in the ellipsis constructions?

3.1 **Word Order and Agreement in Iraqi Arabic**

Iraqi Arabic allows different word order, such as SVO, VSO, VOS, SOV, etc. The main word order is SVO; VSO is also acceptable. IA does not show overt cases or partial agreement between the subject and the verb. In IA, like other dialects, the verb usually has full agreement with the subject in both orders, SV and VS, as the following examples show:
21. a. VS-Order ‘Iraqi Arabic’

\[ \text{qiru} \quad \text{ʔ al-tʕulab} \quad \text{ʔ al-kitaab} \]
\[ \text{read.₀₃₇₅} \quad \text{the students.₀₃₇₅} \quad \text{the-book.₀₃₉₄} \]

“The students read the book.”

b. SV-Order ‘Standard Arabic’

\[ \text{ʔ al-tʕulab} \quad \text{qir-u} \quad \text{ʔ al-kitaab} \]
\[ \text{the students.₀₃₇₅} \quad \text{read.₀₃₇₅} \quad \text{the-book} \]

“The students read the book.”

3.2 Ellipsis Types in Iraqi Arabic: Sluicing, Gapping, & Stripping

3.2.1 Sluicing

This section examines if IA shows sluicing and/or pseudosluicing constructions and if there is any violation of Preposition Stranding Generalization (PSG). PSG refers to the deletion of the TP, leaving only a wh-phrase remnant behind, as the following example of English shows:

22. Jack bought something, but I don’t know what \[ Jack \text{ bought } \]

(Adopted from Merchant, 2003)

Some languages allow P-stranding under regular overt wh-movement, but others do not. Merchant (2001) illustrates that there is a correlation between p-stranding and wh-movement in full and elliptical wh-questions and argues that such results are similar in sluicing.

Preposition Stranding Generalization

A language L will allow preposition stranding under sluicing iff L allows preposition stranding under regular wh-movement.

(merchant, 2001)
The author examines this theory in several languages to support the PSG hypothesis. These languages are English, Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, and Icelandic. For example, p-stranding is allowed in English and Swedish under regular wh-movement; hence, p-stranding in sluicing is permitted. See example (23):

23. a. John was talking with someone, but I don’t know (with) who.
   b. Who was he talking with?

In contrast, other languages, such as Greek, Moroccan Arabic, Dutch, Italian, Russian, Czech, Hebrew, French, Yiddish, and German, do not allow p-stranding under regular wh-movement; therefore, it would be predicted that p-stranding in sluicing is disallowed. Such prediction is not true as we can see in (24) that Moroccan Arabic allows p-stranding in sluicing.

24. a. Driss talkəlm mʃə jī waḥəd, walakin ma ʕraft-ʃ *(mʃə) mən
   Driss talked.3MS with someone but not 1.know-neg with who
   b. * mən tkəllem Driss mʃə?
   who talked Driss with?

There are two approaches for sluicing in the literature. The first approach is PF-deletion which is proposed by Ross (1969) and illustrates that sluicing involves some movement of the wh-phrase out of the sentential constituent, such as TP, and then a deletion of that node applies at PF, as shown in (25):

25. John bought something, but I don’t know [CP whati C [TP he bought ti]].
   (Adopted from Merchant, 2003: 2)

The second approach is LF-copying which is proposed by Lobeck, (1995); Chung et al., (1995). This approach consists of a designated null category from the lexicon that is replaced after Spell-Out by copying the semantics from the antecedent at LF, as shown in (26):
26. a. At Spell-Out

Jack bought something, but I don’t know [CP what C [TP e]]

b. At LF

Jack bought something, but I don’t know [CP what C [TP Jack bought something]].

(Adopted from Merchant, 2003: 5)

It is clear from the data presented above that languages which allow p-stranding under regular wh-movement also allow p-stranding in sluicing. While other languages do not follow the same rule as has been seen with Moroccan Arabic. This fact is also true in IA. IA, like other Arabic dialects, is a non-p-stranding language as in (27) which indicates that the preposition cannot be stranded in regular wh-questions, and so it is expected that p-stranding is not allowed in the wh-sluice according to PSG.

27. a. Ahmed tkelm wejja wahd, bas ma aNraf (wejja) minu [Ahmed tkelm]

Ahemd talk.3MS with someone, but not 1s-know.IMP who [ Ahmed talk.3MS.PER]

‘Ahmed talked with someone, but I don’t know who.’

b. *mino tkelm Ahmed wejja?

who talk.3MS.PER Ahmed with?

‘who did Ahmed talk with?’

Considering the data in (27), it can be argued that IA is another language that shows PSG violation at PF since it is a non-preposition stranding language (27.b), yet p- stranding in wh-sluice in (27.a) is allowed.

In this study, I will follow Ross’ hypothesis and argue that sluicing in IA happens by PF-deletion. The wh-phrase moves out of TP, and a deletion of that node applies at PF. See (28) and (29):
28. a. Ali ʕiʃtara fi:, bas ma ʔə-ʕraf juno
   Ali bought 3MS.PER something MS, but not 1s-know.IMP what
   ‘Ali bought something, but I do not know what.’

b. Ali ʕiʃtara fi:, bas ma ʔə-ʕraf juno hwei
   Ali buy 3MS.PER something MS, but not 1s-know.IMP what it
   ‘Ali bought something, but I do not know what (it is).’

29. a. Ahmed ʃa:f wa:had, bas ma aʕraf minu
   Ahmed saw 3MS someone MS, but not 1s-know.IMP who
   ‘Ahmed saw someone, but I do not know who.’

b. Ahmed ʃa:f wa:had, bas ma aʕraf minu hwa
   Ahmed saw 3MS someone MS, but not 1s-know.IMP who he
   ‘Ahmed saw someone, but I do not know who (he is).’

The examples above support Ross’ hypothesis because the wh-phrase ‘ʃuno’ first moves out of TP, then the complete TP is deleted at the PF. Example (28-29) indicate that sluicing is derived via wh-fronting (30.a) and pseudosluicing via wh-clefting (30.b):

30. a. minuʃ pro ʃa:f ti
   who pro saw 3MS
   (Sluicing)

b. minuʃ ti (hu) illi Ahmed ʃa:f ah
   who (PRON) that Ahmed saw 3MS-him
   (Pseudosluicing)
The structure of (30.b) is shown in (31):

31. [CP [Spec minu] [C' [TP [Spec minu] [T' [T [^DP illi Ahmed ʃa:fah]]]]]

Sluicing in IA can also appear in main and embedded situations. In the former, sluicing happens as mere wh-phrases in situations where the antecedent is a main wh-question, as in (27) above. In the embedded clause, sluicing occurs in the omitted conjoined constructions, as in (32).

Both constructions are preceded by verbs that select CP complements such as jʕarf ‘know’, jətəðəkə ‘remember’, jəqul ‘say’, jənsə ‘forget’, etc.

32. a. Sarah ʕrədət waħəd min ʔuləb-hə elbarhə.

Sarah dismissed 3MS one of students-her yesterday

‘Sarah dismissed one of her students yesterday.’

b. minu / ?ayya tʕāləb?

who /which student

‘Who? / which student?’

33. Sarah ʔrəd-ət waħəd min ʕuləb-hə elbarhə, bas ma-gəl-ət minu
Sarah dismissed 3MS one of students-her 3FS yesterday but NEG-said 3MS who

‘Sarah dismissed one of her students today, but she didn’t say who.’
In sluicing, p-stranding is only permitted when the wh-remnant has an overt antecedent sharing the same index. See example (34):

34. a. el-waled ʤan xayəf min wahad, bas ma ʤruf. (min) menu.
   the boy was.3MS scared of someone but NEG 1.known of who
   ‘The boy was scared of someone, but it’s not known (of) who(m).’

   b. el-waled ẓaan xayəf, bas ma ẓruf. min menu
   the boy was.3MS scared.3MS but not known of who
   ‘The boy was scared, but it’s not known of whom.’

   c. *el-waled ẓaan xayəf, bas ma ẓruf menu
   the boy was.3MS scared.3MS but not known who
   *‘The boy was scared, but it’s not known who(m).’

To conclude, as the data above shows, this section showed that IA allows both sluicing (wh-fronting), as has been shown in example (30.a) repeated here as (35.a) and pseudosluicing (wh-cleft) as example (30.b) repeated here as (35.b) shows.

35. a. minuʃ pro faʃ ti
   who pro saw.3MS

   b. minuʃ ti (hu) illi Ahmed faʃ ah
   who (PRON) that Ahmed saw.3MS-him

36. The underlying source for example (35):

   a. ...bas ma ẓraf minu faʃ
      but not know1s.IMP who see.3MS.
      ‘...but I do not know who he is that Ahmed saw.’
b. ...bas ma ʕraf minu illi ʃa:f-e
   but not know.IMP who that see.3MS-him
   ‘...but I do not know who he is that Ahmed saw.’

c. ...bas ma ʕraf minu hijej illi ʃa:f-ha
   but not know.IMP who she.SF that see.3MS-him
   ‘...but I do not know who she is that Ahmed saw.’

3.2.2 Gapping:

Gapping refers to the deletion of a finite verb from the VP construction without any remnant auxiliaries (37-38).

   Ahmed M-play.3S football and Ali tennis

   Ahmed M.study.3S music but Ali English
   ‘Ahmed studies music, and Ali [studies] English.’

   Ali went.3MS to-the university and 1S-think.S Sarah to-the house.
   ‘Ali went to the university, and I think Sarah [went] home.’

To decide which analysis is the best for IA I have examined some data of gapping. I have also investigated if IA has the properties of gapping and whether it is similar to English. Gengel (2013) states that gapping and pseudogapping are very similar structures. However, gapping, as in (39-40) has a contrastive remnant, like pseudogapping, without having the finite auxiliary in front of the ellipsis site.

40. a. Vivek might like Chinese action films, but Nishi doesn’t _ sci-fi movies.
   
   b. Some will eat nattoo TODAY, because others had _ YESTERDAY.

   (Adopted from Lobeck, 1995)

   However, gapping seems to be more restricted than pseudogapping, as we will see in the comparison of the two constructions later in this section.

   According to Al Bukhari (2016), there have been two analyses for gapping which are

   1) low coordination of two vPs, “conjunction analysis” and ATB movement of the verb

   (Johnson, 2009).

   2) coordination of two vPs with VP-Ellipsis from which the gap arises (Toosarvandani, 2013).

   Johnson (2009) claims that gapping requires a low coordination construction and ATB verb movement to a position he refers to as the Predicate Projection (PredP), which is higher than the vP but lower than TP. This is supported by the first analysis. See example (41):

41. a. Some will eat beans and others rice.

   b. 

   (Adapted from Al Bukhari, 2016, p 51)
In IA, gapping can occur with coordinating conjunctions such as ‘and’ and ‘or’ while pseudogapping cannot. As the latter only occurs with the subordination conjunctions like ‘because/if/after,’ as shown in the following examples:

42. Ahmed j-lšeb kura, {w /ʔaw} Ali [ _____ ] tenis.  
Ahmed M-play.3S football {and /or} Ali tennis  
‘Ahmed plays football, and/or Ali [plays] tennis.’

43. * Ahmed j-lšeb kura, {laʔen/eða /baʕd} Ali [ _____ ] tenis  
Ahmed M-play.3S football {because/if /after} Ali tennis  
Ahmed plays football, because/if / after Ali [plays] tennis.’

According to Johnson, (2009), there are three properties to distinguish gapping from pseudogapping:

1. Gapping can occur in coordinate structures as in (42), but not in subordination which shows pseudogapping structure (43) above.

Example (42) above shows that T is shared between the two conjuncts, as there is no T in the second conjunct in the first place, and the subject of the first conjunct c-commands the subject of the second conjunct in coordination. The configuration of example (42) is shown in (44.a & 44.b):

44. a. [TP [DP Ahmed] [T' [T ] [VP [vP [t ] [vP [ ] [VP [v j-lšeb ] [DP kura]]]] [w ][vP Ali [vP 
[ ] [VP [v j-lšeb ] [DP tenis]]]]]
b.

2. An antecedent cannot occur with an embedded clause as in:

45. *gal-et b-ʔn Ali ekel pizza, w axo-h [ ___ ] sendwi:ʧ

Say-3FS that Ali eat-3MS pizza, and brother- his sandwich

‘She said that Ali ate pizz, and his brother [ate] sandwich.’

3. The subject of the first conjunct is able to bind the pronoun in the second conjunct as in (46), but this is impossible in pseudogapping case.

46. kul wəlad rah (?ə)-safər el-turkiya, w ?buu-ʔəh [ ___ ] el-Iran

every boy will travel-3MS to-Turkey, and father-his to-Iran

‘Every boy will travel to Turkey and his father to Iran.’

From the data presented in this section, I can conclude that gapping constructions in IA have the following properties:

1) Gapping constructions only occur in coordination cases which is similar to English.

2) The antecedent cannot occur within an embedded clause, which is a feature of gapping, while it can for English pseudogapping.
3) In gapping structure, the subject of the first conjunct binds the pronoun in the second conjunct. Pseudogapping constructions, on the other hand, cannot bind the pronoun because a VP cannot elide leaving T (VP-ellipsis), which is the core of pseudo-gapping constructions. Therefore, IA cannot exhibit pseudogapping cases.

### 3.2.3 Stripping

Stripping refers to “a rule that deletes everything in a clause under identity with corresponding parts of the preceding clause, except for one constituent” (Hankamer and Sag, 1976). In the stripping structure, an entire clause except for one constituent (the remnant) is elided. The remnant is typically preceded by a sentential modal adverb such as ‘probably’, ‘possibly’, or ‘maybe’ and the focusing adverb hamati:n ‘too’, as shown in the following examples:

47. Abby speaks passable Dutch, and Ben, [speaks passable Dutch] too.

(Adopted from Merchant, 2003)


Ahmed speak.3MS Farsi and father-his too

‘Ahmed speaks Farsi, and his father too’.

49. Ahmed (e)ʃtera bi:t, w sajareh hamati:n.

Ahmed bought.3MS house and car too

‘Ahmed bought a house, and a car too.’

Lobeck (1995) argues that ellipsis differs from stripping in several ways. First, similar to gapping, stripping cannot occur in subordinate clauses, and the empty constituent cannot precede its antecedent. Stripping hence does not conform to the Backwards Anaphora Constraint.

50. a. John studied rocks but not Jane [e].
b. *John studied rocks even though not Jane [e].

51. a. Jane gave presents to John, but seldom [e] to Geoff.
   
   b. *Jane gave presents to John, even though seldom [e] to Geoff.

52. a. Jane loves to study rocks, and [e] geography too.
   
   b. *Jane loves to study rocks, and John says that [e] geography too.

53. a. *Although not Jane [e], John studied rocks.
   
   b. *Even though seldom [e] to Geoff, Jane often gave presents to John.
   
   c. *Even though [e] geography too, Jane really loves to study rocks.

   Second, unlike ellipsis, stripping does not always contain a full phrasal constituent. The
   author states that “one element of the 'stripped' sentence must remain, as seen in (54) typically a
   negative or sentence adverbial.”

54. a. Jane knows lots of people who play the piano, a. but not very well.
   
   b. *but I know a man who not very well.

   Stripping can occur in IA, and it occurs in coordinated clauses, as in (48) and (49) above.
   In such constructions, an entire clause except for the remnant will be elided. In stripping, the
   focusing adverb ‘hamati:n/too’ and adverbs such as ‘probably,’ ‘possibly,’ or ‘maybe’ can
   precede the remnant. Only the focusing adverb is obligatory. See the following example:

55. Sarah  safər-et  elbarheh,  w  mumkin Layla hamati:n.
   Sarah  left.3MS  yesterday  and  probably Layla  too

   ‘Sarah left yesterday, and probably Layla too.’

   There is evidence which shows that an entire structure can be elided, such as p-stranding,
   islands effect, and sloppy identity readings. Example (56) can have strict and sloppy identity
   readings, showing that there is a pronoun in the ellipsis site.
56. Sarah reslet flus el-χu-h, w Ahmed hamate:n.
Sarah sent.3FS money to-brother-her and Ahmed too

‘Sarah sent money to her brother, and Ahmed too.’

*Sloppy reading:* ‘Ahmed sent money to his brother.’

*Strict reading:* ‘Ahmed sent money to Sarah’s brother.’

It is clear that on the strict reading, the pronoun is identical to the pronoun in the antecedent clause whereas, on the sloppy reading, the pronoun is bound by the subject of the second conjunct, which is the stripped clause.

The second evidence is the locality effect which means that movement must obey island constraints. The remnant in stripping is sensitive to islands, as in (57):

57. *Sarah etšsb-et liʔan (ʔa)takallemt wejja Ahmed w wejja Ali hamatεn
Sarah got mad.3FS because I-talked.MS with Ahmed and with Ali too

‘Sarah got mad because I talked with Ahmed, and with Ali too.’

The ungrammaticality of (57) is because the remnant has moved from an island domain. Another evidence is the presence of p-stranding which is not allowed in stripping, as in (58) and (59). The ungrammaticality of (58) can be attributed to the prohibition on p-stranding in the language. The structure in (59) is acceptable because the prepositional phrase moves to the left periphery.

Ali talked.3MS with Layla and Sarah too

‘Ali talked with Layla, and Sarah too.’

Ali talked.3MS with Sarah and with Ahmed too
‘Ali talked with Omar, and probably with Asma too.’

To sum, the data in this section shows that stripping can occur in IA and is derived by the PF- deletion approach after the remnant moves to the left periphery.

4. Conclusion:

The paper has discussed three types of ellipsis: sluicing, gapping and stripping in IA. Section one is an introduction of the study which provides a literature review, the purpose of the study and the questions that need to be answered. In section two, I have discussed the word order of IA then discussed the three types of ellipsis that can occur in this language. Based on data presented in this section and the subsection I conclude that sluicing is derived by wh-movement then TP gets deleted at PF. Moreover, data shows that pseudosluicing is allowed even when preposition in IA cannot be stranded in regular wh-questions, and so it is expected that p-stranding is not allowed in the wh-sluice according to PSG. Sluicing is derived by wh-fronting while pseudosluicing is derived by wh-clefting. I then examined the properties of gapping in IA. After an examination of these properties, I concluded that IA allows gapping which occurs through ATB movement to low- coordination construction of two vPs.

Evidence such as locality, identity form and p-stranding effects, show that stripping can be derived by focus movement of the remnant to the left periphery followed by TP deletion at PF. Furthermore, as far as information structure is concerned, it is argued that the remnant, which occupies a spec position in the left periphery, is interpreted as a new information focus. Section (3.2.3) shows that stripping can be derived by the movement of the remnant to the left periphery followed by TP deletion at PF. Finally, I have argued that sluicing, gapping and stripping can be the result of PF-deletion and not LF copying.
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List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>First person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATB</td>
<td>Across-the-Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Emirati Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Iraqi Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Jordanian Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Libyan Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Logic Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Masculine Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Phonological Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prt</td>
<td>Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSG</td>
<td>Preposition Stranding Generalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Tense Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec</td>
<td>Specifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPE</td>
<td>Verb Phrase Ellipsis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>