

Univerzita Karlova

Filozofická fakulta

Katedra Blízkého východu

Bakalářská práce

Mariam Srire

Přípustkové, korelativní a relativní konstrukce v libyjské arabštině

Unconditionals, Correlatives and Relatives in Libyan Arabic

Praha 2023

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Adam Pospíšil

Acknowledgement

I express my sincere gratitude to my thesis supervisor Mgr. Adam Pospíšil, for his guidance, patience and valuable advice in conducting my thesis, as well as for the provided materials. I would like to thank doc. Mgr. Radek Šimík, Ph.D. for providing the conceptual framework for this thesis. I am very thankful to my consultants for their cooperation and willingness to participate in my fieldwork.

Declaration

I declare that I have prepared my bachelor thesis independently, that I have properly cited all sources and literature used, and that the thesis has not been used in the context of another university study or to obtain another or the same degree.

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně, že jsem řádně citovala všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze, dne 11. května 2023

.....

Mariam Srire

Abstrakt (česky)

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá popisem a analýzou gramatických prostředků, kterými je v libyjské arabštině vyjádřeno spektrum syntaktických konstrukcí zahrnující základní otázky, přípustkové konstrukce, korelativní konstrukce, volná relativa a relativa s hlavou (headed relatives). Přípustkovým konstrukcím a jejich různým variantám je věnována nejrozsáhlejší část práce. Téma bylo inspirováno projektem "Od interogativ k relativům" pod vedením Radka Šimíka, který se zabývá těmito gramatickými konstrukcemi z různých perspektiv a také je zkoumá v různých variantách hovorové arabštiny. Hlavním cílem byl sběr dat a poskytnutí adekvátního popisu těchto konstrukcí v libyjské arabštině, neboť tato oblast gramatiky není v arabské dialektologii dostatečně prozkoumána. Popsané konstrukce jsou také částečně konfrontovány se dvěma existujícími hypotézami ohledně struktury těchto konstrukcí.

Klíčová slova (česky)

libyjská arabština, nekondicionál, přípustkové konstrukce, korelativ, syntax arabštiny, volná relativa, lingvistika arabštiny, dialektologie arabštiny

Abstract (in English):

This bachelor thesis deals with the description and analysis of the grammatical means used in Libyan Arabic for the formation of a range of syntactic constructions, namely basic questions, unconditional constructions, correlatives, free relatives and headed relatives. Unconditionals and their various variants represent the most extensive part of the thesis. The topic was inspired by the project "From Interrogatives to Relatives" led by Radek Šimík, which deals with these grammatical constructions from different perspectives and also studies them in different varieties of colloquial Arabic. The main goal was to collect data and provide an adequate description of these constructions in Libyan Arabic, as this area of grammar is not sufficiently explored in Arabic dialectology. The thesis also attempts to confront the described constructions with two existing hypotheses about the structure of these constructions.

Key words (in English):

Libyan Arabic, unconditional, correlative, free relative, Arabic syntax, Arabic linguistics, Arabic dialectology

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	12
1.1	CURRENT STATE OF RESEARCH	13
1.2	CONSTRUCTIONS UNDER STUDY	14
2	METHODOLOGY	21
2.1	ELICITATION VIA QUESTIONNAIRE.....	21
2.2	DATA COLLECTION AND FREQUENT ISSUES.....	22
2.3	BACKGROUND OF CONSULTANTS.....	23
3	DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	25
3.1	WH-QUESTIONS	25
3.2	UNCONDITIONALS	27
3.2.1	<i>Wh-word based</i>	27
3.2.2	<i>Nominal based</i>	29
3.2.3	<i>Periphrasis</i>	32
3.2.4	<i>Doubling unconditionals</i>	37
3.3	CORRELATIVES	42
3.4	FREE RELATIVES	44
3.4.1	<i>Plain free relatives</i>	44
3.4.2	<i>Ever free relatives</i>	46
3.5	HEADED RELATIVES.....	48
4	DISCUSSION	50
4.1	DISTRIBUTION WH-WORDS ACROSS THE CONSTRUCTION AND ACROSS THE PARADIGM	51
4.2	ANOMALOUS FORMS	52
4.3	TAM RESTRICTIONS AND NEUTRALIZATION	53
4.4	DOUBLING UNCONDITIONALS	54
4.5	OPEN ISSUES	56
5	CONCLUSION	58
6	REFERENCES:	60

Abbreviations and notation conventions

Examples are glossed based on the Leipzig glossing rules.

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ACC	accusative
AUX	auxiliary
CON	conjugation
DET	determinant
F	feminine
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
IPF	imperfect
LOC	locative
M	masculine
NEG	negation
NOM	nominative
OBJ	direct object
PAS	passive
PST	past
PF	perfect
PL	plural
PREP	preposition
PRES	present
PTP	participle
REL	relativizer
REFL	reflexive pronoun
SG	singular

Additional abbreviations

DUnc Doubling unconditionals

FITR From interrogatives to relative (project of the Research Group for the Empirical Study of Formal Syntax and Semantic led by Radek Šimík)

NP noun phrase

LA Libyan Arabic

TAM Tense Aspect Modus

Transcription of Arabic

The transcription of the Arabic data is based on the DMG transcription. Due to the phonology of Libyan Arabic, I use ʒ for ج and g for ق.

ء	ʔ	voiceless glottal stop
ج	ʒ	voiced palato-alveolar fricative
ح	ħ	voiceless pharyngeal fricative
خ	ħ	voiceless velar fricative
ش	ʃ	voiceless palato-alveolar fricative
ص	ṣ	emphatic voiceless dental fricative
ض	ḍ	emphatic voiced dental fricative
ط	ṭ	emphatic voiceless dental stop
ظ	ẓ	emphatic voiced interdental fricative
ع	ʕ	voiced pharyngeal fricative
غ	ġ	voiced pharyngeal fricative
ق	g	voiceless velar stop
	ā	long vowel [a]
	ī	long vowel [i]
	ū	long vowel [u]
	ē	long vowel [e]
	ō	long vowel [o]

1 Introduction

This study deals with the use of *wh*-words within five specific types of syntactic constructions in Libyan Arabic (further LA). The examined constructions are *wh*-questions, unconditionals, correlatives, free relatives and headed relatives. The free relatives section also includes subsections devoted to plain relatives and ever free relatives.

Given that these syntactic constructions have not been described in the literature for LA so far, the main task was to collect authentic and relevant data from native speakers of the LA. For each of the categories I will provide examples acquired from my fieldwork, with a detailed characterization of the given structures, which will be the core of this study.

The main inspiration for this thesis was the research project *From interrogatives to relatives*¹ (further FITR) conducted by the Research Group for the Empirical Study of Formal Syntax and Semantics led by Radek Šimík. I was invited to join this research by my thesis supervisor Adam Pospíšil, who is in charge of collecting and analyzing data of Arabic varieties for FITR, as I contributed with some data from the Libyan dialect, which were presented in (Šimík et. al 2023). The questionnaire used in this thesis was based on the questionnaire developed by Radek Šimík for the purpose of the project and with his permission I include its adapted version in the attachment. Thanks to the project I had access to Syrian, Algerian and Egyptian Arabic data, from which I will occasionally give examples for the sake of comparison with my LA data.

In the next two subsections I will mention the current state of research on this topic and provide a general description of the examined constructions. In § 2 I provide more detailed information on the data collection itself and the issues that arose throughout the process and some background information about the consultants that participated in my fieldwork. § 3 represents the core of this study as it contains the data and their analysis. It is divided into sections, where I describe the strategies used to form the desired constructions, and occasionally provide examples from other Arabic varieties for comparison. In § 4 I provide a table with the obtained results and discuss my findings and comment on the hypothesis established by Radek Šimík (2023: 5–7) regarding the distribution of *wh*-words in the proposed hierarchy of constructions and another one

¹ Further information available at <https://www.radeksimik.eu/>

regarding the internal structure of the so called doubling unconditionals (Šimík 2022: 5–9). Lastly in § 5 I summarize my findings.

1.1 Current state of research

There has naturally been research on Libyan Arabic and descriptions of some Libyan varieties are provided for example in *Descriptive grammar of Libyan Arabic* by Abubaker A. Elfitoury (1976), or *The Arabic Dialect of the Jews in Tripoli (Libya)* by Sumikazu Yoda (2005). Besides that, individual treatises of particular grammatical phenomena exist, but the constructions under study in this thesis have not been addressed so far. This is naturally due to the fact that they represent rather peripheral part of grammar.

As for the research on the syntactic constructions across Arabic varieties, it is being carried out within the project *From interrogatives to relatives* (further FITR) by the Research Group for the Empirical Study of Formal Syntax and Semantics led by Radek Šimík, which provides the framework for this thesis. Some of the results of the research by FITR are presented in the article *Doubling unconditionals in Arabic* (Šimík et. al 2023), which treats for doubling unconditional structures in colloquial Arabic varieties and tests the hypothesis of their internal structure, which was formed in the article *Doubling unconditionals and relative sluicing* (Šimík 2020: 7–11). Another article related to FITR is *From interrogatives to relatives: A comprehensive account of wh-constructions* (Šimík 2023 5–7), where Šimík presents a hypothesis about the distribution of wh-words in the proposed hierarchy of constructions.

Unconditionals are cross-linguistically discussed in *Concessive conditionals in the languages of Europe* (Haspelmath & König 1998). As unconditionals are semantically very similar to conditionals, the article *Conditionals: A Typology* (Comrie 1986) is also relevant for my discussion of the behavior of the constructions appearing in the data. Correlatives, free relatives and headed relatives are discussed in the dissertation *The Syntax of Relativization* (de Vries 2002). Free relatives are also discussed in detail in *Free relatives* (Šimík 2021) and *Ever free relatives crosslinguistically* (Šimík 2018), as well as in *Free relatives in Maltese* (Sadler & Camilleri 2018).

1.2 Constructions under study

Here I list each type of the syntactic constructions under study with a basic characterization and examples from Slovak and some colloquial varieties of Arabic. I will examine individual types of constructions within the following part of the interrogative paradigm - WHO, WHAT, WHERE and WHEN. In addition to the basic paradigm, I also obtained data for HOW, WHY, WHAT NP AND WHICH NP, but due to the possible scope of the thesis I did not include them. It would indeed be interesting to see how the distribution of wh-words would develop. General descriptions of these structures are provided by Šimík in the form of notes in the questionnaire (Attachment 1), so unless stated otherwise I base my descriptions on those notes, (additional literature on this is provided in 1.1.). My main task was the collection and analyzing of the data itself, as I adopted the theoretical framework from FITR.

Wh-questions

They are simple questions containing wh-words as seen in (1). The purpose of investigating them is to introduce the basic interrogative pronouns for LA, which will be listed in Table 1 (in 3.1). One of the main goals of this study is to track the appearance of these interrogatives throughout the other examined constructions. Another matter under study is, whether the wh-words are placed in-situ or ex-situ.

- | | | | | |
|----|----------|------------|----------------|---------------|
| 1. | <i>O</i> | <i>čom</i> | <i>hovoril</i> | <i>Jozef?</i> |
| | about | what.LOC | talk.PST.3SG.M | Jozef.NOM |
- “What did Jozef talk about??”

Unconditionals

Unconditionals are conditional-like structures that consist of two compound clauses, the antecedent and the consequent. Their main characteristic is that the consequent is always true regardless of the value of the antecedent (Šimík et al. 2023: 3–4). For example, in (2), the fact that Jane stays in Prague is always true and it does not matter where Jozef lives. Therefore “*No matter where Jozef lives*” is the antecedent and “*Jane stays in Prague*” is the consequent. Another of the important characteristics is that the consequent

does not have to reference back to the antecedent, like it is in correlatives (see correlatives below).

2. *Bez ohľad-u na to, kde Jozef býva*
 Without regard-GEN on it.ACC where Peter.NOM live.PRES.3SG.M
Jana zostane v Prahe.
 Jana.NOM stay.FUT.3SG.F in Prague-LOC.
 “Regardless where Peter lives, Jana will stay in Prague.”

The formal structure of unconditional constructions can be very diverse, they belong to a broader group of constructions, which has been variously labeled by different authors in literature. Some of the labels are “concessives”, “hypothetical concessives”, “irrelevance conditionals”, “concessive relative clauses”, or the term “unconditionals” which I am using in line with the FITR. Alternatively, the antecedent can be referred to by the term protasis and the consequent by the term apodosis (Haspelmath & König 1998: 563).

Šimík focuses in his article (Šimík et. al 2023) on a specific type of unconditionals called clausal headless wh-based unconditionals (3). These are structures, where the antecedent clause is not headed by any overt expression, unlike it is in (2), but it is introduced by a wh-word with an -ever meaning, which is the place where the semantic variation takes place (Šimík et. al 2023: 4). In other words, in (3) the wh-expression *kdekoľvek* meaning “wherever” represents all the possibilities where Peter can live.

3. *Kde-koľvek Jozef býva,*
 where-ever Jozef.NOM live.PRES.3SG.M
Jana zostane v Prahe.
 Jana.NOM stay.FUT.3SG.F in Prague-LOC
 “Wherever Jozef lives, Jana stays in Prague.”

Cross-linguistically the mentioned structures can be expressed by different strategies. My goal was to find out what strategies are used in LA, but most importantly discover whether LA uses clausal headless wh-based unconditionals as they do occur in other colloquial Arabic varieties. Example (4) illustrates such constructions in Syrian (4a) and Palestinian (4b) Arabic, which use a wh-expression with an -ever morpheme.

4. a) Syrian Arabic (Šimík et. al 2023: 6)

<i>Wēn</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>ʕāš</i>		<i>Yūsuf</i>
where	MA	live.PF.3.SG.M		Yūsuf
<i>Rahaf</i>	<i>rah</i>	<i>ət-ḍall</i>	<i>əb</i>	<i>Berlīn.</i>
Rahaf	FUT	3.SG.F-remain.IPF	in	Berlin

“Wherever Yūsuf lives Rahaf will stay in Berlin.”

b) Palestinian Arabic (Šimík et. al 2023: 6)

<i>Wēn</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>b-yə-skun</i>		<i>Yūsuf</i>
where	MA	PRES-3.SG.M.live.IPF		Yūsuf
<i>Rahaf</i>	<i>rah</i>	<i>ət-ḍall</i>	<i>bi</i>	<i>Berlīn.</i>
Rahaf	FUT	3.SG.F-remain.IPF	in	Berlin

“Wherever Yūsuf lives Rahaf will stay in Berlin.”

Examples (3) and (4) illustrate canonical wh-based unconditionals. A special type of clausal headless wh-based unconditionals, which also play an important role in LA, are Doubling unconditionals (5) (further DUnc) in which the verb appears twice within the antecedent. They are discussed by Šimík (2020).

5.

<i>Nech</i>	<i>prīde</i>	<i>kto</i>	<i>prīde,</i>
let.OPT	come.FUT.3SG.M	who	come.FUT.3SG.M
<i>ja</i>	<i>zostanem</i>	<i>v</i>	<i>izb-e.</i>
I	stay.FUT.1SG	in	room-LOC.

“Whoever comes, I will stay in the room.”

Correlatives

Correlatives are similar constructions to unconditionals, also formed by two compound clauses, but the crucial difference is, that the consequent must obligatorily refer to the antecedent. Here applies the same as with unconditionals, correlative constructions can be expressed by different strategies. For example (6) illustrates a clause headed by the relativizer *illi* in Algerian Arabic (6a) and Egyptian Arabic (6b).

6. a) Algerian Arabic (Data collected by FITR)

<i>Elli</i>	<i>y-ʕard-o</i>	<i>Yūsef,</i>
-------------	-----------------	---------------

REL 3SG.M-invite.IPF-3SG.M.OBJ Youssef,
Rahaf rah t-tlaga-h
 Rahaf FUT 3SG.M-meet.IPF-3SG.M.OBJ
 “Who Youssef invited, that Rahaf will meet.”

b) Egyptian Arabic

Illi Yūsif kal-u,
 REL Youssef ate-3SG.M.OBJ
Rahaf ḥatta ma-lamas-it-ūš
 Rahaf even NEG-touch.PF.-3SG.F-3SG.M.OBJ
 “What Youssef ate, that/it Rahaf didn’t even touch”

The main intention is to find out whether LA has productive correlatives headed by a wh-word, as illustrated in Slovak (7). The wh-expression typically lacks the -ever meaning, as correlatives tend to have a generic flavor. English does not have very productive correlatives using this strategy, therefore some of the English translations in examples, either in this section or further in the study, may not be correct in English, but serve rather as literal equivalents of the constructions.

7. a) *Kto príde, ten dostane kávu.*
 who come.FUT.3SG.M that get.FUT.3SG.M coffee.
 “Who(ever) comes gets coffee.”

b) *Kde Peter býva,*
 where Peter.NOM live.PRES.3SG.M
tam Jana pôjde.
 there Jane.NOM go.FUT.3SG.F
 “Where(ever) Peter lives, there Jane goes.”

Plain and ever free relatives

Free relatives are clauses that function as nominal, prepositional, adverbial or attributive phrases within their host clauses (Šimík 2018: 1). They can be expressed through various strategies. Typically they are introduced by a wh-expression as illustrated in (8), but that doesn't have to be the case, i.e. the free relative may not be derived from an

interrogative. Depending on whether the -ever meaning is present, they are classified as either plain or ever free relatives.

8. *Jana sa objaví tam,*
 Jane.NOM REFL show_up.FUT.3SG.F there
kde Peter býva
 where Peter.NOM live.PRES.3SG.M
 “Jane will show up where Peter lives.”

Free relatives are characterized by the fact, that the wh-expression can be replaced by a paraphrase with definite noun or participle phrases (Sadler & Camilleri 2017: 7). For example, (8) may be paraphrased as *Jana sa objaví na mieste, kde Peter býva* “Jane will show up at the place where Youssef lives.”

Headed relatives

Headed relatives are constructions where a relative clause is headed by a noun. Typically, the clause is introduced by a relative pronoun (9a), but it can also be introduced by a wh-word as in (9b). For example, in Slovak the strategy of using a relative pronoun is universal, i.e. can be used throughout the paradigm, unlike headed relatives introduced by a wh-word. This is illustrated in (9b) and (9c), where both options are possible, unlike in (9a).

9. a) *Muž, ktorý/ *kto vošiel do izb-y.*
 man.NOM which enter.PST.3SG.M IN room-GEN
 “(The) Man, which entered the room.”
- b) *Mesto, kde som sa narodila.*
 city.NOM where AUX.1SG PAS give_birth.PTP.1SG.F.
 “(The) city where I was born.”
- c) *Mesto, v ktorom som sa narodila.*
 city.NOM in which.LOC AUX.1SG PAS give_birth.PTP.1SG.F.
 “(The) city where I was born.”

Tense restrictions and neutralization

The constructions examined in this study can potentially show specific phenomena concerning their morphosyntactic and semantic behavior. I will examine two main points, namely the neutralization of tenses and restrictions in terms of TAM² used in the antecedent. In this section I illustrate these phenomena in general terms, further in § 3 I will address this matter for each construction type in LA individually.

Tense neutralization (i.e. loss of tense distinctions expressed in a construction) occurs in similar constructions also in English (10). According to Comrie (1986: 93), the loss of tense distinctions is frequent in conditionals with high hypotheticality. For example, in (10a) and (10b) in English, the present/future opposition is neutralized.

10. English tense neutralization (Comrie 1986: 94)

- a) If he comes (regularly), I run away / If he comes (tomorrow), I'll run away.
- b) If (ever) he came, I would run away / If he came (tomorrow), I would run away

Since unconditionals are syntactically related to conditionals, it can be assumed that they will behave similarly. Example (11) illustrates this phenomenon in Syrian Arabic. The *wh*-expression (*mīn ma*) can be followed by a verb in the perfect (*ʔiža*), but it still has a present / future time reference.

11. Syrian Arabic (Šimik et. al 2023: 27)

- | | | | |
|----|---------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) | <i>mīn ma</i> | <i>ʔiža</i> | { <i>ʔimbārəḥ / halla / bukra</i> } |
| | who MA | come.PF.3SG.M | {yesterday / now / tomorrow} |
| | <i>lāzim</i> | <i>t-rahhib</i> | <i>fī-h.</i> |
| | necessary | 2SG.M-welcome.IPF | PREP-3SG.M |
- “Whoever came yesterday / comes now / will come tomorrow,
you have to welcome him.’you have to welcome him.”

Related to this is another phenomenon, namely the restrictions in terms of TAM within the antecedent. In (10) the example illustrates such a restriction in English, where

² I use the term TAM as the categories of tense aspect and modus are often interconnected, but in fact, I mostly dealt with tense distinctions empirically.

expressing the future through “will” is not possible in case of using “if”. To determine whether LA has any restrictions, all of the mentioned constructions were examined in various tenses. Each sentence of the questionnaire was listed in perfect (past), imperfect (present) and future tense, as the restrictions may occur only in some structures³.

³ The perfect form represents the past, the imperfect represents the present and the future is marked by the prefix b(i)-.

2 Methodology

In this chapter I discuss the data collection process and the issues I encountered. Additionally, I provide basic sociolinguistic characteristics of the consultants.

2.1 Elicitation via questionnaire

The chosen elicitation method was based on a questionnaire consisting of various examples representing the constructions in each of the required categories. As mentioned, the questionnaire used in this thesis is an adapted version (see Attachment 1) of the one used in FITR. The original examples were provided in English, and the consultants were asked to provide an alternative in LA. This type of translation, from the contact language (English) into the target language (LA) is called Reverse Translation Elicitation (Chelliah & de Reuse 2001: 377). In one case, the elicitation was based on contextualization, as one consultant does not speak English.

In general, this research was a form-to-function type of investigation, as the consultants were asked to choose a strategy to express the given structures based on what was most natural for them. So even though the research was motivated by some specific strategies which have been addressed by FITR (see 1.2), some other strategies also appeared as a side result. In total I acquired three samples of the questionnaire from three different native Libyans. Another sample is the one I filled in through introspection, as I am a native speaker of the Libyan dialect myself. This sample is not included in the final results used in this study, it only served as a guide, since I believe that linguistic research should not be based on introspection.

Since I gathered data from only 3 consultants, the research is not statistically valid in any way. Although I tried to find and provide various types of examples for each of the examined constructions, given the extent of the research and the character of this thesis, it is important to state that I may not have covered all the existing structures. In other words, it is not excluded that other versions of the examined constructions exist but have not occurred in my data.

The greater part of the data collection took place remotely via online platforms, due to distance, since two of the three participants live in other countries. Therefore, we used

shared online documents for the questionnaire itself and online calls for additional explanatory discussions when needed.

2.2 Data collection and frequent issues

Throughout the elicitation process I encountered various issues, some of which were expected, others arose only at later stages. Here my introspection sample served me well, as I could mark some constructions in advance as harder to interpret correctly and prepare a suitable situation to outline the desired context.

Overall, the main complication was that neither of the consultants is a linguist nor has any training in a similar field. Hence a misinterpretation of the intended meaning was likely to occur with some of the constructions, as the constructions under study are semantically rather complex. So, my task was to analyze and re-check the data to produce the most relevant results, which I then consulted with my thesis supervisor.

The elicitation took place in several phases and lasted for several weeks. Firstly, I acquired a sample of data, which I then analyzed. This was followed by another elicitation session with the consultants, where we discussed possible mistakes and I tried to interpret a better context to obtain the desired meaning of the constructions. This method of checking previous materials is called Review elicitation (Chelliah & de Reuse 2011: 378). This was essential to determine whether the structures really exist with the desired function.

Initially I strictly followed the sentences from the mentioned questionnaire, but eventually I started to develop my own examples. Here I used my own knowledge of the dialect to outline the semantic context through standard everyday situations. I provided customized examples for each consultant, to help them understand the context of each situation accurately, which was important for me in order to achieve the desired structure.

After repeating the process described above several times and completing the whole questionnaire, more extensive data analysis took place, where I started to fill in the table of used wh-words, which is listed in the final discussion, see (Table 2). In this part of the process, I created an additional questionnaire, with examples targeted at particular forms, the existence of which I needed to verify.

Two of the three consultants speak advanced English, so I asked them to translate the individual sentences in the questionnaire, but despite their knowledge of English it was necessary for me to assist them and provide the contextualization as described above. Explanatory discussions were held mostly in English, to avoid influence by my versions of the constructions. The problematic elements were mostly inaccurate translations or attempts for a literal word for word translation, where the English sentence structure influenced the speaker. This is a frequent problem of elicitation by translation from the contact language to the target language, described in (Chelliah & de Reuse 2011: 377)

One of the consultants does not speak English at all, therefore in this instance I assisted throughout the whole process and the contact language was Libyan Arabic itself. Instead of the method described earlier, i.e. translation of English sentences I had to take a different approach. Firstly, I tried using Modern Standard Arabic while asking for the possible equivalents in the dialect, but this was not an ideal solution, as the consultant could be influenced by those constructions. The second approach, which proved to be more useful, was elicitation through contextualization, where I outlined an exemplary situation in detail to achieve the desired meaning, which I then noted in the questionnaire.

2.3 Background of consultants

In the following lines I address the background of the participants such as their origin, age and time spent abroad, since two of them do not live nor visit Libya anymore. These factors may help us understand the source of possible variations and even represent a possible influence on the collected data.

Regarding the area and origin, as mentioned, all three consultants have lived most of their lives in the capital city of Libya, Tripoli. Two of them are close relatives of mine, my father and brother. Although their family origins are in Surman, a city situated 60 km to the west of Tripoli, only my father lived there for several years. Eventually we came across some situations, where my father and brother used very different expressions, which I partially attribute to the generational difference, but also to the fact that his dialect might be influenced by living in Surman for several years.

One of the consultants is in his twenties, who studies abroad, but still often returns to Tripoli. The second consultant, my father, is a seventy-year-old, who has been living abroad the last 10 years, but he still uses Arabic as his main language of communication. The third consultant, my brother, is in his mid-thirties and has been living abroad roughly 8 years, although he speaks other languages in his day-to-day life, he still uses Arabic daily. Any possible impact on the authenticity of their Arabic is very low to none, since they are all native speakers who still actively use the language on a daily basis. Therefore, I believe their questionnaires are a relevant source of data to be used as fieldwork for this study.

3 Description and analysis of data

This chapter represents the core of the study providing the description of the data and their analysis. I will focus on each of the mentioned constructions individually in a separate section. The examined pronouns in each construction type are WHO, WHAT, WHERE and WHEN. For a general explanation of the individual syntactic constructions see chapter 1.2 *Constructions under study*.

3.1 Wh-questions

The interrogative pronouns (wh-words) are listed in Table 1 below, as well as examples of LA using these pronouns.

<i>Interrogatives ENG</i>	<i>Interrogatives LA</i>
Who	<i>Min(u)</i> ⁴
What	<i>Šin(u)</i>
Where	<i>Wēn</i>
When	<i>Amta</i>

Table 1. Interrogative pronouns

In questions the interrogative words are usually placed ex-situ, i.e. initially and not in-situ. Interrogatives *minu* and *šinu* can stand both for the subject and direct object of the question, which can lead to the ambiguity illustrated in (12a). To emphasize that the pronoun stands for the object, it can be placed after the subject as in (12b), but of those two the wh-word initial option (12a) is preferred and more natural for the speakers.

12. a) *Minu* *šazam* *Yūsuf?*
 who invite.PF.3SG.M Youssuf?
 “Who invited Youssuf? / Who did Youssuf invite?”

- b) *Yūsuf* *min* *šazam?*
 Youssuf who invite.PF.3SG.M

⁴ Interrogatives *minu* and *šinu* have a reduced version *min* and *šin*, this does not impact on the meaning.

“Who did Youssuf invite?”

The question word can follow a preposition as illustrated in (13a) and (13b). Additional examples where *šinu* stands for a subject (13c) and for an object (13d). The interrogative *wēn* can be used in both, directional (13e) and locative (13f) questions. The interrogative *amta* is used in (13g).

13. a) *ʕalē min Yūsuf tkallim?*
PREP who Youssuf talk.PF.3SG.M

“About whom did Youssuf talk?”

- b) *ʕalē šin tkallim Yūsuf?*
PREP what talk.PF.3SG.M Youssuf?

“What did Youssuf talk about?”

- c) *Šinu ʕaflig Yūsuf?*
what annoy.PF.3SG.M Youssuf?

“What annoyed Youssuf?”

- d) *Šin klē Yūsuf?*
what eat.PF.3SG.M Youssuf?

“What did Youssuf eat?”

- e) *Wēn yi-mši Yūsuf?*
where 3SG.M-go.IPF Yosusef?

“Where does Youssuf go?”

- f) *Wēn yu-skun Yūsuf?*
where 3SG.M-live.IPF Youssuf?

“Where does Youssuf live?”

- g) *Amta nāḍ Yūsuf?*
when wake.PF.3SG.M Youssuf?

“When did Youssuf wake up?”

All above mentioned questions can be created by using a cleft construction with the relativizer *illi* (14) and a resumptive pronoun. The resumptive pronoun is absent when it

stands for a subject (14a) and optional for a direct object, as in (14c) it is present, but in (14b) not. The resumptive is otherwise obligatory, as seen in (14d) where it follows a preposition.

14. a) *Min illi ʕazam Yūsuf.*
 who REL invite.PF.3SG.M Youssuf.
 “Who invited Youssuf?”
- b) *Šinu illi kān yi-gūl Yūsuf?*
 what REL be.PF.3SG.M 3SG.M-say.IPF Youssuf?
 “What was Youssuf saying?”
- c) *Šinu illi gāl-ah Yūsuf?*
 what REL say.PF.3SG.M-3SG.M.OBJ Youssuf
 “What was Youssuf saying?”
- d) *Šinu illi tkallim ʕalē-h Yūsuf?*
 who REL talk.PF.3SG.M about-3SG.M.OBJ Youssuf?
 “What did Youssuf talk about?”

3.2 Unconditionals

According to my data there are several strategies of forming unconditional structures in LA. They differ in the ways of expressing the -ever meaning. As this is the most extensive part of my research, I divided the individual strategies into separate sections consisting of Wh-word-based, Nominal-based and Periphrasis followed by the last section, Doubling unconditionals.

3.2.1 Wh-word based

This strategy uses an interrogative pronoun combined with the *ma* morpheme⁵, which is formally and functionally the closest equivalent to the English -ever morpheme. Based on my research, I conclude that this strategy does not cover the whole paradigm, as it was used only with *wēn*, as in (15a-b) and *amta*, as in (15c).

⁵ I do not deal with the issue whether *ma* is a separate particle or an affix.

15. a) *Wēn ma yi-mši Yūsuf,*
 where MA 3SG.M-go.IPF Youssuf
Fāṭma gaṣda fī Berlīn.
 Fatima stay.IPF.3SG.F in Berlin.

“Wherever Youssuf goes, Fatima stays in Berlin.”

c) *Wēn ma bi-y-ḥīš Yūsuf,*
 where MA FUT-3SG.M-live Youssuf,
Fāṭma b-tu-gṣad fī Berlīn
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-stay in Berlin.

“Wherever Youssuf will live, Fatima will stay in Berlin.”

c) *Amta ma bi-y-nūḍ Yūsuf,*
 when MA FUT-3SG.M-wake Youssuf,
Fāṭma bi-t-kūn ṭālṣ-a.
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-will leave.IPF-3SG.F

“Whenever Youssef will wake up, Fatima will be already gone.”

The expressions *minma* and *šinma* were rejected by my consultants, but despite that *šinma* appeared in one case of doubling unconditionals listed in (34). For comparison, the WHO and WHAT wh-words do exist in other dialects, as listed in example (16) from Syrian Arabic.

16. Syrian Arabic (Data collected by FITR)

a) *min ma ḥižā,*
 who MA come.IPF.3SG.M
Rahaf rah b-ta-kfī aš-šugl
 Rahaf FUT PRES-3SG.F-continue DEF-work

“Whoever arrived, Rahaf will keep on working.”

b) *ṣalā šū ma ḥaftamad Yūssef,*
 about what MA rely.PF.3SG.M Youssef
Rahaf rah b-t-kaffī aš-šugl
 Rahaf FUT PRES-3SG.F-continue DEF-work

“On whatever Youssef relies, Rahaf will keep on working.”

The antecedent clause in wh-based unconditionals in LA have no restrictions regarding TAM, the antecedent can be freely in the past (habitual past) (16a), present (imperfect) (16b) or future tense (16c).

17. a) *Wēn ma kān* *ʕāješ* *Yūsuf,*
 where MA be.3SG.M live.PTP.3SG.M Youssuf
Fāṭma *gaʕd-et* *fī* *Berlīn.*
 Fatima stay.PF-3SG.F in Berlin.
 “Wherever Youssuf lived, Fatima stayed in Berlin.”

b) *Amta ma y-nūḍ* *Yūsuf,*
 when MA 3SG.M-wake.IPF Youssuf
Fāṭma *bi-t-kūn* *ṭālʕ-a.*
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-be leave.IPF-3SG.F
 „Whenever Youssuf wakes up, Fatima will be already gone.“

c) *Wēn ma b-yi-mši* *Yūsuf,*
 where MA FUT-3SG.M-go Youssuf,
Fāṭma b-tu-gʕad *fī* *Berlīn.*
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-stay.ipf in Berlin.
 “Wherever Youssef will go, Fatima will stay in Berlin.”

Example (18) illustrates a case of tense neutralization, where the verb *mšē* in its perfect form has a time reference to the future.

18. *Wēn ma mšē* *Yūsuf,*
 where MA FUT-3SG.M-go Youssuf,
b-ni-mši *mʕa-h.*
 FUT-1SG-go with-3SG.M.OBJ
 “Wherever Youssef goes, I will go with him.”

3.2.2 Nominal based

Instead of the proper wh-words, this strategy relies on expressions formed by *ʔayya*, a question word in the meaning of “which”, followed by a nominal analogue of the given question word. The nominal analogues used in this strategy are indefinite pronouns *ḥad* “someone” (19a–b) and *šay* “something” (19c–e). In (19a) and (19d) the expression

stands for the subject, in (19b–c) and (19e) for an object. The expression follows a preposition in (19b) and (19e).

19. a) *ʔayya had ya-ʕzim Yūsuf,*
any somebody 3SG.M-invite.IPF Youssuf,
Fāṭma gaʕd-a ti-ḥdim.
Fatima stay.IPF-3SG.F 3SG.F-work.IPF
“Whoever invites Youssef, Fatima keeps on working.”
- b) *ʕalē ʔayya had b-yi-tkallim Yūsuf,*
about any somebody FUT-3SG.M-talk Youssuf,
Fāṭma b-tu-gʕad ti-ḥdim
Fatima FUT-3SG.F-stay 3SG.F-work.IPF
“Whoever will Youssef talk about, Fatima will keep on working”
- c) *ʔayy šay gaššiš Yūsuf,*
any something annoy.PF.3SG.M Youssuf,
Fāṭma kān-at gaʕd-a ti-ḥdim.
Fatima be.PF-3SG.F keep.IPF-3SG.F 3SG.F-work.IPF
“Whatever annoyed Youssuf, Fatima kept on working.”
- d) *ʔayy šay bi-y-žī,*
any something FUT-3SG.M-come
Fāṭma b-tu-gʕad ti-ḥdim.
Fatima FUT-3SG.F-stay 3SG.F-work.IPF
“Whatever will arrive, Fatime will keep on working.”
- e) *ʕAlē ʔayy šay yi-tkallim Yūsuf,*
PREP any something 3SG.M-talk.IPF Youssuf,
Fāṭma gaʕd-a ti-ḥdim.
Fatima stay.IPF-3SG.F 3SG.F-work.IPF
“Whatever Youssef talks about, Fatima keeps on working.”

Secondly the nominal analogue is the noun *mkān* “place”, illustrated in (20a) in a locative usage and in (20b) in a directional one. Theoretically this strategy could also be

used for expressing “whenever” (i.e. *ʔayya* + *wagt*), but none of the consultants used the form, therefore I assume it is at least not preferred, if it exists at all.

20. a) *ʔayya mkān Yūsuf y-ʔiʃ,*
 any place Youssuf 3SG.M-live.IPF
Fāṭma gaʕd-a fī Berlīn.
 Fatima stay.IPF-3SG.F in Berlin.
 “Wherever Youssuf lives, Fatima stays in Berlin.”

- b) *ʔayya mkān mšē Yūsuf,*
 any place go.PF.3SG.M Youssuf,
Fāṭma gaʕd-et fī Berlīn.
 Fatima stay.PF-3SG.F in Berlin.
 “Wherever Youssef went, Fatima stayed in Berlin.”

There are no restrictions in the terms of TAM in the antecedent of nominal-based unconditionals, as illustrated in example (21), where (21a) is in perfect, (21b) in imperfect and (21c) in future tense.

21. a) *ʔayya ḥad žā,*
 any somebody arrive.PF.3SG.M
Fāṭma gaʕd-et ti-ḥdim.
 Fatima keep.PF-3SG.F 3SG.F-work.IPF
 “Whoever arrived, Fatima kept on working.”

- b) *ʔayy šay yá-kil Yūsuf,*
 any something 3SG.M-eat.IPF Youssuf,
Fāṭma gaʕd-a ti-ḥdim.
 Fatima keep.IPF-3SG.F 3SG.F-work.IPF
 “Whatever Youssuf eats, Fatima keeps on working.”

- c) *ʔayya ḥad b-yā-kil al-kusksī,*
 any somebody FUT-3SG.M-eat DEF-couscous,
Fāṭma b-tu-gʕad ti-ḥdim.
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-keep 3SG.F-work.IPF
 “Whoever will eat the kus kus, Fatima will keep on working.”

Theoretically, this type could be interpreted as a subtype of the above mentioned wh-based clauses, if one assumed that the ever-meaning is expressed periphrastically through the combination of *ʔayya* “which” with a noun corresponding to the given question word, i.e. person, place, time. But I believe that such analysis is not totally appropriate. The construction is indeed partially periphrastic, but I believe that it represents an individual category for two reasons. Firstly, the nominal base in case of WHO is not a noun, but an indefinite pronoun (*had*). This holds also for WHAT (*šay*), even though *šay* can be considered both a noun and an indefinite pronoun (synonymous to *hāža*).

Secondly, although the word *mkān* is a noun, in this instance it does not behave as one. If it was just a periphrasis with *ʔayya* + place, the structure would have to include a preposition (i.e. *fī ʔayya mkān*), which it does not. From a diachronic point of view, *ʔayya* originated from an interrogative pronoun. On the other hand, from a synchronic perspective it can be considered as a separate type of an -ever morpheme.

A similar occurrence can be seen in Syrian Arabic, with the word *maḥall ma*, in (21). Like with *ʔayya mkān*, it has a nominal based unconditional word, except instead of using *ʔayya*, the -ever meaning is expressed by the *ma* morpheme, which has a wider distribution in Syrian than in LA.

22. Syrian Arabic (Data collected by FITR)

<i>Raḥ</i>	<i>a-drus</i>	<i>maḥall</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>daras-ət.</i>
FUT	1SG-study.IPF	place	MA	study.PF-2SG.M
“I will study where you studied.”				

3.2.3 Periphrasis

In this section I will present two additional strategies which occurred in the data, both of which are periphrastic, but differ in their versatility. In the first type the antecedent is introduced by the expression *mahma kān* followed by the relativizer *illi* and in the second one it is introduced by the expression *muš muhimm* followed by an embedded clause beginning with a wh-word.

Mahma kān

The word *mahma*, meaning “whatever” is borrowed from Standard Arabic (Šimík et. al 2023: 38). In these structures, *mahma* is always used with the auxiliary verb *kān* “be” in 3rd person singular. The expression *mahma kān* is followed by the relativizer *illi* which introduces a relative clause. *Kān* always appeared in the perfect in my data, regardless of the tense of the following clause. For example, in (23a) the verb is in future tense and in (23b) a verb is in the perfect.

23. a) *Mahma kān illi b-ya-ʕzm-a Yūsuf,*
 mahma be.PF.3SG.M REL FUT-3.SG.M-invite-3SG.M.OBJ Youssuf,
Fāṭma bi-t-wāṣil fī šuġl-hā.
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-keep.IPF in work-3SG.F.OBJ
 “Whoever Youssuf will invite, Fatima will keep on working.”

b) *Mahma kān illi klē-h Yūsuf,*
 mahma be.PF.3SG.M REL eat.PF.3SG.M-3SG.M.OBJ Youssuf
Fāṭma gaʕd-et ti-ḥdim.
 Fatima keep.PF-3SG.F 3SG.F-work.IPF
 “Whatever Youssef ate, Fatima kept on working.”

This strategy does not cover the whole paradigm, as it seems to be only used for question words WHO in (23a,b) or WHAT in (23c). The relative clause requires a resumptive pronoun unless *illi* stands for its subject (just like the resumptive in cleft questions (see 4.1)). Example (23) also illustrates the use of the a resumptive pronoun with *illi*, which stands for the object. Although the resumptive is optional in these cases, it appears that it is preferred.

In (24a–c) the wh-word stands for a subject, therefore the resumptive is not present. Examples (24d) and (24e) illustrate structures with prepositions, where the resumptive is obligatory.

24. a) *Mahma kān illi y-ākil l-kusksī,*
 mahma be.PF.3SG.M REL 3SG.M-eat.IPF DEF-couscous
Fāṭma t-wāṣil fī šuġl-hā.
 Fatima 3SG.F-keep.IPF in work-3SG.F.OBJ

“Whoever is eating the kus kus, Fatima keeps on working.”

b)	<i>Mahma</i>	<i>kān</i>		<i>illi</i>	<i>ʕazam</i>	<i>Yūsuf,</i>
	mahma	be.PF.3SG.M		REL	invite.PF.3SG.M	Youssuf
	<i>Fāṭma</i>		<i>gaʕd-et</i>		<i>ti-ḥdim.</i>	
	Fatima		keep.PF-3SG.F		3SG.F-work.IPF	

“Whoever invited Youssuf, Fatima kept on working.”

c)	<i>Mahma</i>	<i>kān</i>		<i>illi</i>	<i>ʕaflig</i>	<i>Yūsuf,</i>
	mahma	be.PF.3SG.M		REL	annoy.3SG.M	Youssuf
	<i>Fāṭma</i>		<i>gaʕd-et</i>		<i>ti-ḥdim.</i>	
	Fatima		keep.PF-3SG.F		3SG.F-work.IPF	

“Whatever annoyed Youssef, Fatima kept on working.”

d)	<i>Mahma</i>	<i>kān</i>		<i>illi</i>	<i>yi-tkallim</i>	<i>ʕalē-h</i>	<i>Yūsuf,</i>
	mahma	be.PF.3SG.M		REL	3SG.M-talk.IPF	about-3SG.M.OBJ	Youssuf
	<i>Fāṭma</i>		<i>t-wāṣil</i>		<i>fī</i>	<i>ʕuḡl-hā.</i>	
	Fatima		3SG.F-keep.IPF		in	work-3SG.F.OBJ	

“Whatever Youssef talks about, Fatima keeps on working.”

Only in one instance (25) this strategy appeared for WHERE in the directional sense. In this case the resumptive follows the directional preposition *li-*. Since it appeared only once, it cannot be claimed that it is a standard way of expressing the structure and I list it rather to illustrate the variability appearing in the data.

25.	<i>Mahma</i>	<i>kān</i>		<i>illi</i>	<i>mšē</i>	<i>l-ah</i>	<i>Yūsuf,</i>
	mahma	be.PF.3SG.M		REL	go.PF.3SG.M	to-3SG.M.OBJ	Youssuf
	<i>Fāṭma</i>		<i>gaʕd-et</i>		<i>fī</i>	<i>Berlīn</i>	
	Fatima		stay.PF-3SG.F		in	Berlin.	

“Wherever Youssef went, Fatima stayed in Berlin.”

Example (26b) illustrates the case, in which the antecedent clause is the same for both who and what.

26.	<i>Mahma</i>	<i>kān</i>		<i>illi</i>	<i>wʕal,</i>	
	mahma	be.PF.3SG.M		REL	arrive.PF. 3SG.M	

<i>Fāṭma</i>	<i>gaʕd-et</i>	<i>ti-ḥdim.</i>
Fatima	keep.PF-3SG.F	3SG.F-work.IPF

“Whoever / whatever arrived, Fatima kept on working.”

In comparison, in Algerian Arabic *mahma* can be followed by any interrogative pronoun, as in (27), where *mahma* is followed by *škun* “who”. According to my fieldwork, this is impossible in LA, as it is always used with *illi* and a relative clause.

27. Algerian Arabic (Data collected by FITR)

<i>Mahma</i>	<i>škun</i>	<i>ža</i>	
mahma	who	come.PF.3SG.M	
<i>Rahaf</i>	<i>raḥ</i>	<i>tə-bqa</i>	<i>tə-ḥdām.</i>
Rahaf	FUT	3SG.F-remain.IPF	3SG.F-work.IPF

‘Whoever came, Rahaf will keep on working.’

Muš muhimm

In this strategy the antecedent begins with the phrase *muš muhimm*, meaning “not important” followed by an embedded clause, introduced by a question word. Based on my research, I believe that this is the most universal strategy for unconditionals, as it can be used throughout the whole paradigm. Examples in different tenses with WHO are in (28a-c) and with WHAT in (28d-f)

28. a) *Muš muhimm minu ʕazam Yūsuf,*
 NEG important who invite.PF.3SG.M Youssuf
Fāṭma gaʕd-et ti-ḥdim.
 Fatima keep.PF-3SG.F 3SG.F-work.IPF
 “Whoever invited Youssuf, Fatima kept on working.”

b) *Muš muhimm minu y-ākil fi l-kusksī,*
 NEG important who 3SG.F-eat.IPF in DEF-couscous
Fāṭma b-tu-gʕad ti-ḥdim.
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-keep 3SG.F-work.IPF
 “Whoever will eat the kus kus, Fatima will keep on working.”

c) *Muš muhimm minu bi-y-žī,*
 NEG important who FUT-3SG.M-arrive
Fāṭma b-tu-gṣad ti-ḥdim.
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-keep 3SG.F-work.IPF

“Whoever will arrive, Fatima will keep on working.”

d) *Muš muhimm šinu ṣaflig Yūsuf,*
 NEG important what annoy.PF3.SG.M Youssef,
Fāṭma gaṣd-et ti-ḥdim.
 Fatima keep.PF-3SG.F 3SG.F-work.IPF

“Whatever annoyed Youssef, Fatima kept on working.”

Interestingly, the interrogative *šinu* can be replaced by the relativizer *illi*, as illustrated in (29a). Additionally listed examples use the interrogative where in (29b-c) and when in (29d). There are no TAM restrictions in the antecedent clause, as shown across the examples in (28) and (29), which illustrate different tenses.

29. a) *Muš muhimm illi y-ākla-h Yūsuf,*
 NEG important REL 3SG.M-eat.IPF-3SG.M.OBJ Youssef
Fāṭma gaṣd-a ti-ḥdim.
 Fatima keep.IPF-3SG.F 3SG.F-work.IPF

“Whatever Youssef eats, Fatima keeps on working.”

b) *Muš muhimm wēn y-ḥīš Yūsuf,*
 NEG important where 3SG.M-live.IPF Youssef,
Fāṭma gaṣd-a fī Berlīn.
 Fatima keep.IPF-3SG.F in Berlin.

“Wherever Youssef lives, Fatima stays in Berlin.”

c) *Muš muhimm amta y-nūḍ Yūsuf,*
 NEG important when 3SG.M-wake.IPF Youssef,
Fāṭma t-kūn ṭālṣ-a.
 Fatima 3SG.F-be.IPF leave.PF-3SG.F

“Whenever Youssef wakes up, Fatima will be already gone.”

3.2.4 Doubling unconditionals

The last mentioned strategy used for unconditional structures in LA are so-called doubling unconditionals. These are clauses in which the predicate is doubled and they are considered a type of clausal headless wh-based unconditionals (Šimík et. al 2023). According to my fieldwork, LA prefers doubled unconditionals where the wh-expression is antecedent-initial. This strategy covers the whole paradigm, as will be illustrated in the examples below.

Example (30) shows cases of doubled verbs with a wh-word in between them representing the subject. In (30) both verbs are in the imperfect form, which typically occurs in doubled unconditionals also in other colloquial Arabic varieties (see 33).

30. *y-žī* *min* *y-žī*,
 3.SG.M-come.IPF who 3.SG.M-come.IPF
Fāṭma *gaṣd-a* *ti-ḥdim*.
 Fatima stay.IPF-3.SG.F 3.SG.F-work.IPF
 “Whoever arrives, Fatima keeps on working.”

In contrast to that, an important observation, on which I will comment later (see chapter 4. Discussion) is the structure of (31), where both verbs are in the perfect form.

31. *Žē* *min* *žē*,
 come.PF.3SG.M who come.PF.3.SG.M
ma-ṭlaṣt-eš *min* *d-dār*.
 NEG-leave-1.SG PREP DEF-room
 “Whoever arrived, I did not leave the room.”

The DUnc expressing the future tense is shown in (32), where the first verb is obligatorily in the imperfect and the second verb in future tense. This must be preserved in structures using interrogatives in the middle. In (32a) *min* stands for the subject, as in (32b) *šinu* stands for the object.

32. a) *Y-ží* *min* *bi-y-ží*,
 3SG.M-come.IPF who FUT-3SG.M-come

ana *ma-yhim-niš*
 I NEG-interest-1SG
 “Whoever will arrive, I do not care.”

b) *Yā-kil* *šinu* *b-yā-kil*,
 3SG.M-eat.IPF what FUT-3SG.M-eat
ana *muš* *žaʕán*
 I NEG hungry.IPF.3SG.M
 “Whatever he will eat, I am not hungry.”

In (33) we see a different word order, as the subject can be expressed at the beginning of the clause, in which the interrogative stands for the object. I believe this option is not very preferred, as this is the only case it appeared.

33. *Yūsuf* *klē* *šin klē*,
 Youssuf eat.PF.3SG.M what eat.PF.3SG.M
Fāṭma *gaʕd-et* *ti-ḥdim*.
 Fatima keep.PF-3SG.F 3SG.F-work.IPF
 “Whatever Youssef ate, Fatima kept on working.”

The following example (34a) illustrates the occurrence of *šin* combined with the morpheme *ma*, although this possibility did not appear in canonical wh-based unconditionals.

34. *Ṭayyib-t* *šin ma ṭayyib-t*,
 cook.PF-2SG.M what MA cook.PF-2SG.M
ana *ma-niš* *wākl-a*.
 I NEG-1SG eat.PTP-1SG.F
 “Whatever you cooked, I will not eat.”

The wh-words commonly used with the *ma* morpheme, i.e. *wēn* and *amta*, can be used in this strategy in two ways, either between the doubled verbs (35b) and (35c), or at the beginning of the clause (35d) and (35e).

35. a) *Nāḍ* *amta ma nāḍ*,
 wake.PF.3SG.M when MA wake.PF.3SG.M

Fāṭma kān-at tālī-a
 Fatima be.PF-3SG.F leave.IPF-3SG.F
 “Whenever he woke up, Fatima already left.”

b) *Mšē wēn ma mšē,*
 go.PF.3SG.M where MA go.PF.3SG.M
Fāṭma gaḥd-et fī l- ḥōš.
 Fatima stay.PF-3SG.F in DEF-house
 “Wherever he went, Fatima stayed at home.”

c) *Amta ma nāḍ nāḍ,*
 when MA wake.PF.3SG.M wake.PF.3SG.M
Fatima kān-at tālī-a.
 Fatima be.PF-3SG.F leave.IPF-3SG.F
 “Whenever he woke up, Fatima already left.”

d) *Wēn ma mšē mšē,*
 Where MA go.PF.3SG.M go.PF.3SG.M
b-ni-mšī m'a-h.
 FUT-1SG-go with-3SG.M.OBJ
 “Where ever he goes, I will go with him”

It seems that the expression of tenses is flexible, but example (35d) represents tense neutralization, as the doubled verb *mšē* is in the perfect but it has future reference, which is confirmed by the future tense used in the consequent. This is not a unique thing, as we see this cross-dialectally, e.g. in Syrian Arabic (36).

36. Syrian Arabic (Šimik et. al 2023: 2)
- | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
| <i>Wēn</i> | <i>ma</i> | <i>raḥ</i> | <i>y-ākul</i> | <i>Yūsif</i> | <i>y-ākul</i> |
| Where | MA | FUT | 3SG.M-eat.IPF | Yūsif | 3SG.M-eat.IPF |
| <i>Rahaf</i> | | <i>raḥ</i> | <i>tə-dfaḥ.</i> | | |
| Rahaf | | FUT | 3SG.F-eat.IPF | | |
- “Wherever Youssef will eat, Rahaf will pay.”

An alternative version of the doubling unconditional is that in which the antecedent clause begins with the optative particle *ḥallī-* with a suffixed pronoun referring to the subject, as

illustrated in (33). This occurs also in other variants of colloquial Arabic, as shows the example of Iraqi Arabic in (34).

37. *Ḥall-ī-ha* *ti-šri* *šin* *b-ti-šri*,
 let.IPF-2SG.M-3SG.F.OBJ 3SG.F-buy.IPF what FUT-3SG.F-buy
ana *muš* *ṭālġ-a* *min* *l-hōš*.
 I NEG leave.IPF-1SG.F from DEF-house
 “Let her buy whatever she wants, I won’t leave the house“

38. Iraqi Arabic (Šimík et. al 2023: 7)
ḥalli *Yūsuf* *yu-štugul* *wēn* *ma* *yu-štugul*
 let.2SG.IMP Yūsuf 3SG.M-work.IPF where MA 3SG.M-work.IPF
Rahaf *ha-tu-ntuẓr-ah*.
 Rahaf FUT-3SG.F-wait.IPF-OBJ3.SG.M
 “Wherever Youssef works, Rahaf will wait for him.”

In a variant of the doubling unconditional there is the option, that the interrogative can be replaced by the relativizer *illi* with a resumptive pronoun, (which occurred also with the periphrasis by *muš muhimm* above). Both examples (39a) and (39b) have a resumptive, although it is typically optional when standing for the direct object, in the case of these doubled unconditionals it seems to be preferred. In (39c) the resumptive is absent, as *illi* stands for the subject. Similarly, to the placement of interrogatives mentioned above, *illi* can be placed in the middle (39a) or at the beginning (39b–c) of the clause. In that case, as seen in (39b), both verbs have a resumptive.

39. a) *gāl* *illi* *gāl-ah*,
 say.PF.3SG.M REL say.PF.3SG.M-3SG.M.OBJ
ma-fīš *ḥad* *šadg-ah*
 NEG-is.IPF somebody believe.PF.3SG.M-3SG.M.OBJ
 “Whatever he said, nobody believed him.”

- b) *Illi* *gāl-ah* *gāl-ah*,
 REL say.PF.3SG.M-3SG.M.OBJ say.PF.3SG.M-3SG.M.OBJ
ma-fīš *ḥad* *šadg-ah*
 NEG-is.IPF someone believe.PF.3SG.M-3SG.M.OBJ
 “Whatever he said, nobody believed him.”

c)	<i>Illi</i>	<i>žē</i>	<i>žē,</i>
	REL	come.PF.3SG.M	come.PF.3SG.M
	<i>Fāṭma</i>	<i>tkallm-it</i>	<i>mʕa-h.</i>
	Fatima	talk.PF-3SG.F	PREP-3SG.M.OBJ

“Whoever arrived, Fatima talked to him.”

Another option of the doubling strategy is illustrated in (40), where the doubled form is a participle, which here has a present tense meaning.

40. b)	<i>Illi</i>	<i>žāy</i>	<i>žāy,</i>
	REL	come.PTP.3SG.M	come.PTP.3SG.M
	<i>l-ḥōš</i>	<i>nḍīf</i>	
	DEF-house	clean	

“Whoever comes, the house is clean.”

Lastly, I will illustrate the possibility of expressing a future antecedent while using *illi*. Example (41a) illustrates the same structure as seen with wh-words i.e. [verb in imperfect – *illi* – verb in future tense]. The second option is displayed in (41b), where *illi* is at the beginning of the clause, followed by the two-verb form, the first of which is in future and the second in the imperfect. According to my data the order of the forms cannot be interchanged.

41. a)	<i>y-žī</i>	<i>illi</i>	<i>bi-y-žī,</i>
	3SG.M-come.IPF	REL	FUT-3SG.M-come
	<i>Fāṭma</i>	<i>b-tu-gʕad</i>	<i>ti-ḥdim.</i>
	Fatima	FUT-3SG.F-keep	3SG.F-work.IPF

“Whoever will arrive, Fatima will keep on working.”

b)	<i>Illi</i>	<i>bi-y-žī</i>	<i>y-žī,</i>
	REL	FUT-3SG.M-come	3SG.M-come.IPF
	<i>l-ḥōš</i>	<i>nḍīf.</i>	
	DEF-house	clean	

“Whoever comes, the house is clean.”

3.3 Correlatives

Two main strategies for forming correlatives appeared in my fieldwork, either using wh-words or the relativizer *illi*. As can be seen in the examples listed throughout this section, correlatives in LA are totally flexible in regards of TAM restrictions for the antecedent.

Firstly, I will describe constructions introduced by wh-words. This strategy covers the whole paradigm. In (42a) *min* stands for the subject, in (42b) it follows a preposition. In some cases of the object use of the interrogative *šinu*, it can be used with or without a resumptive, as illustrated in (42c).

42. a) *Min* *wṣal*,
 who 3SG.M-arrive.PF
 Fāṭma *ti-tkallim* *m'a-h*.
 Fatima 3SG.F-talk.IPF with-3SG.M.OBJ
 “Who arrived, that Fatima talked to”

- b) *Mša min mšē* *Yūsuf li lmadrsa*,
 with who go.PF.3SG.M Youssuf to DEF-school
 huwa lāzim y-kūn *fī ʕīd milād-a*.
 he necessary 3SG.M-be.IPF in feast birth-3SG.M.OBJ
 “With whom Youssef went to school, he should be present at his
 (Yousseffs) birthday party.”

- c) *Šinu (ṭayyib / ṭayyb-a) Yūsuf*,
 What (cook.PF.3SG.M / cook.PF.3SG.M-3SG.M.OBJ) Youssuf
 Fāṭma kl-it.
 Fatima eat.PF-3SG.F
 “What Youssuf cooked, Fatima ate”

As mentioned earlier, correlative constructions are not supposed to have an -ever meaning, yet the *ma* morpheme appeared in examples with *amta* (43a) and *wēn* (43b–c). Although the *ma* expression is known to be used in colloquial Arabic as an expression of the -ever meaning, it is not always the case. Therefore, I cannot determine to what extent it

really contributes the ever-meaning in the individual cases. Its presence is optional, as all the clauses in (43) can be formed only with the wh-word itself.

43. a) (*Amta* / *Amta ma*) *Yūsuf* *nāḏ*,
 (When / When MA) Youssuf wake.PF.3SG.M
Fāṭma dār-at *gahwa*.
 Fatima do.PF-3SG.F coffee
 “When Youssef woke up, then Fatima made coffee.”

- b) (*Wēn* / *Wēn ma*) *yu-skun* *Yūsuf*,
 (Where / Where MA) 3SG.M-live.IPF Youssuf
Fāṭma ti-mši.
 Fatima 3SG.F-go.IPF
 “Where Youssuf lives, (there) Fatima goes”

- c) (*Wēn* / *Wēn ma*) *Yūsuf* *mšē*,
 (where / Where MA) Youssuf go.PF.3SG.M
ḡādi Fāṭma mš-it.
 there Fatima go.PF-3SG.F
 “Where Youssef went, there Fatima went.”

The second strategy of forming correlative constructions, i.e. that using *illi* with a resumptive pronoun, does not cover the whole paradigm, as it works for interrogatives WHO and WHAT, but not for WHEN and WHERE. The resumptive is absent in (44a) as *illi* stands for a subject, but it is present in (44b–d), which indicates that it might be preferred when standing for an object. A possible change of the word order is illustrated in (44b) and (44c).

44. a) *Illi* *žē*,
 REL come.PF.3SG.M
Fāṭma tkallm-it *mṣa-h*.
 Fatima talk.PF-3SG.F PREP-3SG.M.OBJ
 “Whoever arrived, Fatima talked to him.”

- b) *Illi* *ṭayyb-a* *Yūsuf*,
 REL cook.PF.3SG.M-3SG.M.OBJ Youssuf

Fāṭma klā-t-ah.
 Fatima eat.PF-3SG.F-3SG.M.OBJ
 “What Youssuf cooked, that Fatima ate.”

c) *Illi Yūsuf ṭayyb-a,*
 REL Youssuf COOK.PF.3SG.M-3SG.M.OBJ
Fāṭma klā-t-a.
 Fatima eat.PF-3SG.F-3SG.M.OBJ
 “What Youssuf cooked, that Fatima ate.”

d) *Illi Yūsuf bi-ṭayyb-a,*
 REL Youssuf FUT-cook.3SG.M-3SG.M.OBJ
Fāṭma b-ta-kla-h.
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-eat-3SG.M.OBJ
 “What Youssef will cook, that Fatima will eat.”

A morphologically unique form *ṭayyumin* appeared in a sentence used by one of the consultants, shown in (44). It stands for “who(ever)” and seems to be a combination of *ṭayya* “which” with *minu*, but its precise morphological segmentation is unclear.

45. *ṭayy-u-min y-žī,*
 which?-who 3SG.M-come.IPF
Fāṭma ti-tkallim mʕa-h.
 Fatima 3SG.F-talk.IPF with-3SG.M.OBJ
 “Who arrives, Fatima talks to him.”

3.4 Free relatives

3.4.1 Plain free relatives

Libyan Arabic has plain relative clauses introduced by *wh*-words, because all the examined *wh*-words can be as free relatives, as illustrated in (46). These constructions are rather unproblematic and flexible in the terms of TAM, as the examples below are in different tenses. Example (46a–b) uses *min* standing for an object with a preposition. In

(46c) *šinu* stands for a subject and (46d) for an object. Example (46e) illustrates the usage of *wēn*.

46. a) *Fāṭma b-ti-tlāga mša min šazam Yūsuf.*
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-meet with who invite.PF.3SG.M Youssuf
 “Fatima will meet who Youssef invited.”
- b) *Fāṭma tšarrf-it šala min Yūsuf šazam.*
 Fatima meet.PF-3SG.F about who Youssuf invite.PF.3SG.M
 “Fatima met, who Youssef invited.”
- c) *Šinu šār āmis šaflig-nī.*
 what happen.PF.3SG.M yesterday annoy.PF-1SG
 “What happened yesterday annoyed me.”
- d) *Yūsuf grē šinu Fāṭma kitb-it.*
 Yousef read.PF.3SG.M what Fatima write.PF.-3SG.F
 “Youssef read what Fatima wrote.”
- e) *Fāṭma t-žī wēn y-šīš Yūsuf.*
 Fatima 3SG.F-come.IPF where 3SG.M-live.IPF Youssuf
 “Fatima will show up where Youssef lives”

In the case of the interrogative pronoun WHEN, two possibilities appeared, *amta* and *lamma*, as illustrated in (47). *Lamma* is a temporal conjunction, which in this case can be used interchangeably with *amta*.

47. a) *Fāṭma kallm-it l-mumarrīḍa*
 Fatima call.PF-3SG.F DEF-nurse
 (*amta* / *lamma*) *Yūsuf nāḍ.*
 (when / when.CON) Youssuf wake.PF3.SG.M
 “Fatima called the nurse when Youssef woke up.”
- b) *Bi-n-kallm-ik (amta / lamma) n-nūḍ.*
 FUT-1SG-call-2.SG (when / when.CON) 1SG-wake.IPF
 “I will call you when I wake up.”

- c) *Dār-at* *ftūr* (*amta / lamma*) *nāḍ*.
 Do.PF-3SG.F breakfast (when / when) wake.PF.3SG.M

Example (48) illustrates a strategy using *illi*, which again does not cover the whole paradigm, but can stand for WHO and WHAT. In the cases of WHO (48a) and WHAT (48b–d), *illi* competes with the interrogatives and both can be used in most cases. In (48a) and (48d) *illi* is used with a resumptive pronoun, as it stands for an object, although it is not obligatory, as shown in (48c). In (48b) it stands for a subject.

48. a) *Fāṭma* *b-ti-tlāga* *mʕa illi*
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-meet with REL
ʕazam-hum *Yūsuf*.
 invite.PF.3SG.M-3PL.M Youssuf
 “Fatima will meet who (pl.) Youssef invited.”
- b) *Illi* *šār* *āmis* *ʕaflig-nī*.
 REL happen.PF.3SG.M yesterday annoy.PF-1SG
 “What happened yesterday annoyed me.”
- c) *Yūsuf* *dār* *illi* *Fāṭma* *gālit* *l-u*.
 Youssuf do.PF.3SG.M REL Fatima tell.PF.3SG.F to-3SG.M.OBJ
 “Youssef did what Fatima told him.”
- d) *Fāṭma* *ma-miss-itš* *illi* *Yūsuf* *klē-h*.
 Fatima NEG-touch-3SG.F REL Youssuf eat.PF.3SG.M-3SG.M.OBJ
 “Fatima didn’t touch what Youssef ate.”

3.4.2 Ever free relatives

LA uses two main strategies for ever free relatives, which differ by the way of expressing the -ever meaning. Both already occurred above (see section 3.2 unconditionals) as wh-based and nominal-based ever expressions.

Example (49) illustrates nominal-based expressions consisting of *ʔayya had* for WHOEVER (49a), *ʔayya hāža* for WHATEVER (49b) and *ʔayya mkān* for WHEREVER (49c). A resumptive is used in (49b) for an object and in (49c) after a preposition.

49. a) *Fāṭma b-ti-tlāga mʕa ʔayy had*
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-meet with any somebody
Yūsuf b-ya-ʕzm-a.
 Youssef FUT-3SG.M-invite-3SG.OBJ
 “Fatima will meet whoever Youssef invited.”

b) *Fāṭma muš ha-t-miss ʔayy hāža*
 Fatima NEG FUT-3SG.F-touch any something
Yūsuf klē-ha.
 Youssef eat.PF.3SG.M-3SG.F.OBJ
 “Fatima didn’t touch whatever Youssef ate.”

c) *Fāṭma b-ti-mšī ʔayy mkān*
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-go any place
ʕājiš ft-h Yūsuf
 live.PTP.3SG.M in-3SG.F.OBJ Youssef
 “Fatima will show up wherever Youssef lives.”

The second possible strategy is the use of a wh-word with the *ma* morpheme. But same as with the wh-based unconditional, only forms *wēn ma* (50a) and *amta ma* (50b) are used.

50. a) *Fāṭma b-ti-mši wēn ma Yūsuf ʕājiš.*
 Fatima FUT-3SG.F-GO where MA Youssef live.PTP.3SG.M
 “Fatima will show up wherever Youssef lives.”

b) *Fāṭma kallm-it l-mumarrīða.*
 Fatima call.PF-3SG.M DEF-nurse
amta ma Yūsuf nāḍ
 when MA Youssef wake.PF.3SG.M
 “Fatima called the nurse whenever Youssef woke up.”

3.5 Headed relatives

Libyan Arabic clearly prefers the strategy using *illi* with a resumptive pronoun for forming headed relative clauses. As illustrated in (51), it works throughout the whole paradigm. In (51a) it is used for WHO, in (51b) for WHAT, in (51) for WHEN and in (51d) for WHERE.

51. a) *r-rāzil illi šāf-at-a Fāṭma*
 DEFman REL see.PF-3SG.F-3SG.M.OBJ Fatima
tawa yu-skun fī Berlin.
 now 3SG.M-live.IPF in Berlin.
 “The man who Fatima saw now lives in Berlin.”

- b) *l-ḥāž-āt illi ṭulb-it-hum*
 DEF-thing-PL REL order.PF-3SG.F-3PL.M.OBJ
Fāṭma wuṣl-u.
 Fatima arrive.PF-3PL.M
 “The things which Fatima ordered arrived.”

- c) *l-yōm illi šrēt fī-h s-siyyāra.*
 DEF-day REL buy.PF.1SG in-3SG.M.OBJ DEF-car
 “The day when I bought the car.”

- d) *l-mdīna illi wlid-et fī-ha.*
 DEF-city REL born.PF-1SG in-3SG.F.OBJ
 “The city where I was born.”

I obtained two examples that use a wh-word (52). However, the consultants claimed it to be possible, but strongly disfavored. Therefore, it seems that LA does not prefer interrogatives in headed relatives.

52. a) *l-yōm amta šrēt s-siyyāra.*
 DEF-day when buy.PF.1SG DEF-car
 “The day when I bought the car.”

b) *l-mdīna* *wēn* *ʕiṣ-na*.
DEF-city where live.PF-1PL
“The city where we lived.”

4 Discussion

In this chapter I will summarize the information and interesting findings from Chapter 3 and possibly confront them with two hypotheses about the distribution and structure of the constructions under study. I will also point out some issues and questions that remain open and deserve to be investigated in further research.

In Table 2 I list an overview of the used strategies for each of the examined syntactic constructions. Some expressions listed in unconditionals occurred only in the special type of doubling unconditionals, which is why the abbreviation *DUnc* is given in brackets. Periphrastic strategies (*see 3.2.3 Periphrasis*) are not included in the table, as they were not the primary focus of my research.

	<i>Interrogative</i>	<i>Unconditional</i>	<i>Correlative</i>	<i>Plain FR</i>	<i>Ever FR</i>	<i>Head. R.</i>
<i>WHO</i>	<i>minu</i>	<i>minu (DUnc)</i> <i>illi (DUnc)</i> <i>ʔayya ʔad</i>	<i>minu</i> <i>illi</i>	<i>minu</i> <i>illi</i>	<i>ʔayya ʔad</i>	<i>illi</i>
<i>WHAT</i>	<i>šinu</i>	<i>šinu (DUnc)</i> <i>šin ma (DUnc)</i> <i>illi (DUnc)</i> <i>ʔayya šay</i>	<i>šinu</i> <i>illi</i>	<i>šinu</i> <i>illi</i>	<i>ʔayya</i> <i>hāža</i>	<i>illi</i>
<i>WHERE</i>	<i>wēn</i>	<i>wēn ma</i> <i>ʔayya mkān</i>	<i>wēn</i> <i>wēn ma</i>	<i>wēn</i>	<i>wēn ma</i> <i>ʔayya</i> <i>mkān</i>	<i>illi</i> <i>wēn</i>
<i>WHEN</i>	<i>amta</i>	<i>amta ma</i>	<i>amta</i> <i>amta ma</i>	<i>amta</i> <i>lamma</i>	<i>amta ma</i>	<i>illi</i> <i>amta</i>

Table 2. Overview of used strategies.

4.1 Distribution wh-words across the construction and across the paradigm

As mentioned earlier, the main goal of my research was to determine, if LA allows the formation of the constructions under study using wh-words and if yes, what part of the interrogative paradigm is covered by this strategy. As seen in Table 2, wh-words indeed appear with an interesting distribution across the constructions and across the paradigm.

In **unconditionals**, the wh-based strategy competes with the nominal-based, but neither of them covers the whole paradigm. The overall answer to the question, whether LA has clausal headless wh-based unconditionals is yes, as I verified the existence of structures using *wēn ma* and *amta ma*.

However, it seems that unlike other dialects of Arabic, LA does not use the interrogatives *minu* and *šinu* with the *ma* morpheme, when forming the ever expressions in canonical (non-doubling) unconditionals. This part of the paradigm is covered by the nominal-based strategy, which is used also for WHERE, resulting in the overlap of both strategies. Nevertheless, the interrogatives *minu* and *šinu* appear only in the specific subtype of doubling unconditionals. Additionally, there are two periphrastic strategies, one using *mahma + kān + illi*, which covers WHO a WHAT, the second *muš muhim*, that covers the whole paradigm.

In **correlatives**, the wh-words cover the whole paradigm, with the possible occurrence of the *ma* morpheme for WHERE and WHEN. Structures formed with the relativizer *illi* can be used for who and what.

A similar situation occurred in **plain free relatives**, where the wh-words cover the whole paradigm, while the strategy using *illi* competes with the for WHO and WHAT and the temporal conjunction *lamma* for WHEN.

On the other hand, in **ever free relatives**, similar to unconditionals, the nominal-based strategy covers the paradigm except for WHEN. Wh-words with the *ma* morpheme are used for WHERE (in competition to nominal-based) and WHEN.

Lastly **headed relatives**, where as expected, the structures using *illi* were strongly preferred, but structures using wh-words *wēn* and *amta* exist as well.

Across the paradigm of the wh-words it seems that the adverbial interrogatives WHERE and WHEN, cover the whole range of the constructions, unlike WHO and WHAT. They cover even headed relatives, where they compete with the relativizer *illi*. In WHERE the wh-word *wēn* competes with the nominal form *ʔayya mkān* in unconditionals and in WHEN the wh-word *amta* competes with the temporal conjunction *lamma* in plain free relatives.

Wh-words in WHO and WHAT cover the range of the constructions only to the plain free relatives and always compete with another strategy (either nominal based forms or the relativizer *illi*). Furthermore, in unconditionals, they only seem to appear in the doubling type.

Hypothesis about using wh-words in the proposed hierarchy

The hypothesis formed by Šimík (2023: 5–7) suggests, that if a wh-word is used higher in the proposed hierarchy (towards the right in Table 2), it must also be used lower in the hierarchy (toward the left side in Table 2). In other words, if a wh-word is used in headed relatives, it can be used in free relatives; if it is used in free relatives, it can be used in correlatives and/or unconditionals.

When the hypothesis is confronted with my data (as listed in Table 2), they do not contradict it, as the wh-words used in constructions higher in the proposed hierarchy, are also used lower. However the wh-words *minu* and *šinu*, are used in unconditionals only in the doubling type, which is a rather specific strategy, while they are not used in canonical wh-based unconditionals (not DUnc). Therefore, it can be argued that the hypothesis is weakened.

4.2 Anomalous forms

During my research one case of an anomalous form appeared, namely *ʔayyumin* corresponding to “whoever” (see example 45). It seems to be formed from the wh-word *ʔayy* “which” and *minu* “who”, but an analogical expression did not appear with *šinu* or other wh-words. This form occurs only with one speaker and when I attempted to verify it

with the other consultants it was rejected. Nevertheless, the form deserves to be listed, even though it may be very marginal.

4.3 TAM restrictions and neutralization

In most of the examined constructions LA does not have any TAM restrictions in the antecedent. The only exceptions were the restrictions appeared are doubling unconditionals (see Chapter 3.2.4). In DUnc with a past or present time reference, both verbs are always in the same form, i.e. with a past antecedent, both verbs are in the perfect form (31), similarly to the present antecedent, where both verbs are in their imperfect form (30).

The only case, when the doubled verbs are in different tenses are antecedents with a future time reference. They differ in their order. In structures where the interrogative is in the middle (wh-medial), the first verb is in imperfect and the second in future form (32). The same applies when *illi* is in the middle (41a). However, when *illi* is at the beginning of the clause, the first verb is in the future and the second is in the imperfect form (41b). I believe the same would apply if the wh-word was at the beginning, but such a structure in future tense did not occur in my fieldwork data.

Regarding the tense neutralization, it exists in LA, as two examples such examples appeared in my research. The first one is a canonical wh-based unconditional (18), where a wh-expression with a verb in the perfect form (*wēn ma mšē*) has a future time reference. The second is a case of a DUnc, which I list again in (53), where the wh-expression at the beginning is followed by two verbs, which are both in perfect form, but have a future time reference. This phenomenon is also seen in a DUnc in Syrian Arabic (54), where a verb in any form, even in perfect, can be used to express a future meaning.

53. *Wēn ma mšē mšē,*
 where MA go.PF.3SG.M go.PF.3SG.M
b-ni-mšī mša-h.
 FUT-1SG-go with-3SG.M.OBJ
 “Where ever he goes, I will go with him”

4.4 Doubling unconditionals

DUnc are a specific subtype of wh-based unconditionals, with a doubled predicate, or a whole clause in the antecedent, and they are productive across Arabic varieties (Šimik et. al 2023: 3). These structures also exist cross-linguistically, for example in Slovak (5). In LA they are most commonly introduced by a wh-word, often with the *ma* morpheme (53). Based on the placement of the wh-expression they can be wh-initial, as (35c–d), or wh-medial, as in (35a–b). The wh-expression can be replaced by the relativizer *illi*, as in (39), but this covers the paradigm only partially, i.e. it stands for WHO and WHAT, unlike structures with wh-words, which cover the whole paradigm.

Based on my research, DUnc in LA behave slightly different than it is described in the article (Šimik et. al 2023). The doubled verb is always in a complete form with a time reference, i.e. the ever meaning is not expressed by any special form. In comparison to that, for example, in Syrian Arabic (54), the ever meaning is expressed by the bare imperfect form *yiži* (together with the *ma* morpheme) which has no time reference and functions as a subjunctive/optative form, unlike in LA, where it codes the present tense.

54. Syrian Arabic (Šimik et. al 2023: 28)
- | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| <i>mīn ma</i> | { <i>iža</i> | / <i>b-yi-ži</i> | / |
| who MA | {come.PF.3.SG.M | / PRES-3.SG.M-come.IPF / | |
| <i>rah yi-ži</i> | | <i>bukra</i> | <i>yiži</i> |
| FUT 3.SG.M-come.IPF} | | tomorrow | 3.SG.M-come.IPF |
| <i>lāzim</i> | <i>t-rahhib</i> | | <i>fī-h.</i> |
| necessary | 2.SG.M-welcome.IPF | | PREP-3.SG.M |
- “Whoever comes tomorrow, you have to welcome him.”

Hypothesis about the internal structure of doubling unconditionals

According to the hypothesis about the internal structure of doubling unconditionals formed in (Šimik 2020: 7–11), what is expressed by the wh-word (wherever) in canonical wh-based unconditionals is expressed by a focused free relative clause in DUnc. This means, that the part “*wēn ma mšē*” (wherever he went) is considered a free relative, that

corresponds to the *wh*-expression “wherever” in canonical unconditionals. The *ma* morpheme does not hold the *-ever* meaning, as it is generally not necessary in doubling conditionals, as seen in (32).

55. *Mšē* *wēn* *ma* *mšē*,
 go.PF.3SG.M where MA go.PF.3SG.M
Fāṭma *gaʕd-et* *fī* *l- ḥōš*.
 Fatima stay.PF-3SG.F in DEF-house
 “Wherever he went, Fatima stayed at home.”

The hypothesis requires the free relative to be contrastively focused (for further information see Šimík et. al 2023: 9–13). Contrastive focus in LA has not been studied, nor have I studied it empirically in my enquiry. In order to test the hypothesis, at least tentatively, I tried to explore the focus in LA very basically through introspection. It seems that the adequate options of focus placement exist (corresponding to the placement of the FR in DUnc) which is illustrated in the examples in (56).

56. a) *Yūsuf* *mšē* *wēn* *ma* *mšē* ...
 Youssuf go.PF.3.SG.M where MA go.PF.3.SG.M
 “Wherever Youssuf went, ...”
- b) *Yūsuf* *mšē* *li* *lmadrsa*,
 Youssuf go.PF.3.SG.M to DEF-school
Fāṭma *mš-it* *li* *d-dukān*
 Fatima go.PF-3SG.F to DEF-shop
 “Youssuf went to school, Fatima went to the store.”
- c) *Wēn* *ma* *mšē* *mšē* *Yūsuf* ...
 where MA go.PF.3.SG.M go.PF.3.SG.M Youssuf
- d) *Li* *lmadrsa* *mšē* *Yūsuf*,
 to DEF-school go.PF.3.SG.M Youssuf
Fāṭma *mš-it* *li* *d-dukān*
 Fatima go.PF-3SG.F to DEF-shop
 “Youssuf went to school, Fatima went to the store.”

The relative clause (*wēn ma mšē*) in (56a) and (56c) occupies the same position as the contrastively focused object in (56b) and in (56d), which means that the free relative clause in LA can be assumed to be contrastively focused, whether it is in a wh-initial (56c) or wh-medial (56a) position. Therefore, it could be stated that the hypothesis is corroborated by my data.

4.5 Open issues

The findings presented above provided answers to the basic questions raised at the beginning of my research, but also lead to many questions which still remain open for further research, some of which I will discuss in this section. As mentioned earlier, this research has no statistical value as it is based only on three questionnaires from consultants and although they are native speakers there is a need to verify these data at a higher scale.

In **unconditionals**, a question that deserves further research is that of the existence of canonical wh-based unconditionals for WHO and WHAT (i.e. using wh-words *minu*, possibly with the *ma* morpheme as *minu ma* and *šinu ma*), since they exist for WHERE and WHEN (*wēn ma / amta ma*). The wh-words *šinu* and *minu* were used regularly in doubling unconditionals, but not in the canonical ones. The expression *šin ma* occurred only in one example of DUnc (34), therefore it can be argued that it exists, but *min ma* did not appear at all.

According to my research, LA has productive DUnc constructions with both verbs in their perfect form, which is interesting, as such structures did not appear in (Šimík et. al 2023). It seems that they mostly convey a past meaning, except for two cases of tense neutralization (see 4.3). I believe it would be beneficial to examine them in more detail.

In regards to nominal-based unconditionals, it would be beneficial to verify if they exist also for WHEN, i.e. whether the expression *ʔayya + wagt* exists, as they cover the rest of the paradigm (WHO, WHAT, WHERE). It would also be interesting to find out, whether they can be used in DUnc, i.e. replacing the wh-expression (e.g., *yžī ʔayya ḥad yžī; jsīr ʔayya šay jsīr, yʕīš ʔayya mkān yʕ īš*), because assuming they are a separate category (for explanation see 3.2.2), they should show similar characteristics to wh-based structures.

Another question is whether tense neutralization can occur in nominal-based unconditionals.

In **correlatives** the forms *wēn ma* and *amta ma* are used (43), but it is questionable whether they bear the -ever meaning or not (which is not supposed to be present with correlatives).

In **free relatives** in the paradigm of WHO and WHAT the clauses are introduced either by a wh-word or by the relativizer *illi*. As they compete each other in my data, it would be worth investigating whether there is a preference for each of them based on some factors. For example, it could be possible that *min* would appear in more generic and *illi* in more episodic contexts.

5 Conclusion

In this thesis I discussed strategies used in Libyan Arabic for the formation of a set of syntactic constructions, namely wh-questions, unconditionals, correlatives, free relatives and headed relatives. In each section I presented examples obtained from my fieldwork with a detailed description and occasional comparisons to other varieties of colloquial Arabic. Although I obtained data for a wider part of the paradigm (HOW, WHY, WHAT NP, WHICH NP), due to the size of this thesis I have restricted the paradigm to WHO, WHAT, WHERE and WHEN.

The main descriptive goal was to determine whether LA uses wh-words in the constructions under study and if yes, which parts of the paradigm do they cover. The overall answer is yes, as in all of the constructions at least a part of the paradigm can be introduced by wh-words. Another major strategy was presented by nominal-based forms, which was used in the parts of the paradigm that were not covered by wh-words, but in some cases the two strategies compete with each other. Some headed relatives do not allow either of these strategies and require the relativizer *illi*. A detailed distribution of the forms is shown in Table 2. The discussion above revealed that adverbial interrogatives WHERE and WHEN behave differently from WHO and WHAT, as they allow the use of wh-words in all construction types. Since my research was based on the function-to-form investigation, also two types of a periphrastic strategy occurred.

I was also able to test two hypotheses concerning the behavior of these constructions. Firstly, the hypothesis proposed about using wh-words in the proposed hierarchy (Šimík 2023: 5–7) is not contradicted by my data, but it seems weakened, as the wh-words do not cover the paradigm of WHO and WHAT in canonical wh-based unconditionals (they only occur in the doubling type). Secondly, the hypothesis formed by Šimík (2020: 7–11) about the internal structure of the doubling unconditionals (DUnc) seems to be corroborated by my data and I also discovered a new type of DUnc, which has both verbs in the doubling in the perfect form, which has not been encountered within FITR in other Arabic varieties. Nevertheless, due to the limited possibilities of the research done for this thesis, it is not possible for me to make definite conclusions at this level, so these results may only be considered as tendencies that need further verification.

I hope that my data and their analysis provided in this thesis have contributed to the description of this peripheral part of grammar within Arabic dialectology and in particular to the research of Libyan Arabic.

6 References:

- Chelliah, Shobhana L. & de Reuse, Willem J. 2011. *Handbook of Descriptive Linguistic Fieldwork*. Dordrecht : Springer.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1986. Conditionals: A Typology. In Traugott, Closs, Elizabeth & Ter Meulen, Alice & Reilly, Snitzer, Judy & Ferguson A. Charles, *On Conditionals*, 77-100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elfitoury, Abdalla, Abubaker. 1976. *A descriptive grammar of Libyan Arabic*. Georgetown: Georgetown University (Doctoral dissertation)
- De Vries, Mark. 2002. *The Syntax of Relativization*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam. (Doctoral dissertation)
- Haspelmath, Martin & Ekkehard König. 1998. 9 Concessive conditionals in the languages of Europe. In van der Auwera, Johan (ed), *3 Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*, 563-640. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110802610.563>
- Sadler, Louisa & Camilleri, Maris. 2018. Free relatives in Maltese. *Brill's Journal of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics* 10, 115-159.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/18766633-00901001>
- Šimík, Radek. 2018. Ever free relatives crosslinguistically. In Sauerland, Uli & Solt, Stephanie (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 22, Vol. 2. 375-392. Berlin: Leibniz-ZAS. <https://ojs.ub.uni-konstanz.de/sub/index.php/sub/article/view/112>
- Šimík, Radek. 2020. On doubling unconditionals and relative sluicing. *Natural Language Semantic*. 28. 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-019-09157-4>
- Šimík, Radek. 2021. *Free relatives*. In Gutzmann, Daniel & Matthewson, Lisa & Meier , Cécile & Rullmann, Hotze & Zimmermann, E. Thomas (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to semantics*. Wiley-Blackwell.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118788516.sem093>

Šimík, Radek. 2023. From interrogatives to relatives: A comprehensive account of wh-constructions, submitted to *The Cambridge Handbook of Comparative Syntax*.

Šimík, Radek & Pospíšil, Adam & Aljani, Ouras. 2023. Doubling unconditionals, submitted to the *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics*.

Yoda, Sumikazu. 2005. *The Arabic Dialect of the Jews in Tripoli (Libya): Grammar, Text and Glossary*. Weibaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.