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In this paper, I document a parallel between genitive interrogatives and D-linked content questions in Iraqi Arabic. In particular, I argue that genitive interrogatives are inherently D-linked and I explore the nature of this D-linking property. I first introduce the problem, the proposed analysis and its consequences (§1). I then consider in greater detail how genitive interrogatives differ from bare interrogatives and instead parallel D-linked content questions (§2). I argue that the property that ties together genitive and D-linked interrogatives is the fact that they both have an overt domain restriction (§3).

1. The problem, the analysis and the consequences

1.1 The problem: the contrast between genitive and bare interrogatives

Consider the following context: a class of students is defending their theses; they all have different supervisors and the secretary of the board has to talk to each student’s supervisor. In Iraqi Arabic a content question with a bare interrogative pronoun is not felicitous (1a). In contrast, a content question with a construct state genitive is felicitous (1b), as is a D-linked content question (1c).

(1) a. content question with bare interrogative pronoun
   ويا منو حاکت السکریتیر؟
   wu:ya: minnu: Haːʃit is-sikriti ra
   with who spoke.3FS the-secretary.F
   # ’Whom did the secretary talk to ?’

   b. content question with genitive interrogative construction
   السکریتیر ویا آستاد منو حاکت
   is-sikriti ra wu:ya: ʔustaːð minnu: Haːʃit
   the-secretary.F with professor who spoke.3FS
   ’With whose professor did the secretary talk ?’

   c. content question with D-linked interrogative
   السکریتیر ویا آستاد حاکت؟
   is-sikriti ra wu:ya ya: ʔustaːð Haːʃit
   the-secretary with which professor talk.3FS
   ’With which professor did the secretary talk ?’
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The pattern contrasts in (1) are a first indication that bare and genitive interrogatives don't pattern in the same way; they also indicate that there is a parallel between genitive and D-linked interrogatives. The question that I address is the following:

(2) What accounts for the contrast between bare interrogatives and genitive interrogatives on the one hand, and the parallel between genitive interrogatives and D-linked interrogatives on the other hand?

1.2 The analysis: genitive interrogatives are inherently D-linked

The core of my analysis is that genitive interrogatives are inherently D-linked (Pesetsky 1987; 2000). Specifically, I argue that what defines D-linking is the presence of an overt domain restriction in the form of an overt noun. Consider Table 1. Bare interrogatives such as minnu: 'who' lack an overt domain restriction. In contrast, both genitive interrogatives and D-linked content questions have an overt domain restriction. With genitive interrogatives such as orted minnu: 'whose professor', the domain restriction is supplied by the head noun. With D-linked interrogatives such as ya orted 'which professor', the overt domain restriction is supplied by the noun that follows the interrogative operator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>minnu:</td>
<td>'who'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orted minnu:</td>
<td>'whose professor'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ya: orted</td>
<td>'which professor'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Internal structure of bare, genitive and D-linked interrogatives

1.3 D-linking arises whenever there is an overt domain restriction

I take the syntactic parallel between genitive and D-linked interrogatives to indicate that D-linking arises whenever there is an overt domain restriction. On the one hand, domain restriction is purely semantic and arises when a quantifier has an overt restriction on its domain of application. Quantifiers with no overt restriction — such as each, who and what in (3) — are generally taken to have a contextually defined domain restriction.

(3) a. They each attended the lecture.
    b. Who attended the lecture?
    c. What did they attend?

Of course, it’s always possible to introduce an overt restriction: these are the underlined nouns in (4). It’s the presence of an overt domain restriction that distinguishes D-linked interrogatives (e.g. which student, which lecture) from bare interrogatives (e.g. who, what).
(4) a. Each student attended the lecture.
b. Which student attended the lecture?
c. Which lecture did they attend?

2. Comparing bare, genitive and D-linked interrogatives

The behavior of the genitive interrogatives parallels D-linked content questions with respect to resumption (§2.1 – §2.2) and with respect to superiority effects (§2.3).

2.1 The resumptive strategy and the gap strategy: local extraction

Now let us look at extraction in interrogatives in more detail, in particular considering extraction with and without resumption. Resumption refers to the syntactic strategy of inserting a pronoun in the extraction site where other languages such as English leave a gap (5).

(5) سهی يا مغني شافته بالمطعم؟
Suha which singer saw in-the-restaurant
"Which singer did Suha see [him] in the restaurant?"

2.1.1 Local extraction with bare interrogatives

First consider local extraction. Here bare interrogatives allow only the gap strategy with extracted subjects and objects, as in (6) and (7). As for extracted prepositional objects (8), they permit neither the gap strategy (this reflects the general prohibition against P-stranding in Arabic), nor the resumptive strategy. PP-fronting allows only the gap strategy, because Arabic does not have resumptives for entire prepositional phrases (9).

(6) Subject extraction
منو هو اشترى الجريدة البارحة؟
minnu: ___/ h: wu ij:ra: il- d:garida il- ba:riha?
who ___/ [he] bought.3MS the-newspaper yesterday
"Who ___/ [he] bought the newspaper yesterday?"

(7) Direct object extraction
إيمنا منو شافته في بيتي عواتف؟
Iman minnu: fa: fah: ___/ h: bi- beyt Awatif
Iman who saw.3SF ___/ 3MS in-house Awatif
"Whom did Iman see ___/[him] at Awatif's house?"

1 It is not the object of the current paper to investigate why subject extraction always prohibits resumption in Arabic. For a possible solution, see Sterian (2011).
2.1.2 Local extraction with genitive interrogatives

The overall pattern with genitive interrogatives differs from that of bare interrogatives. As before, with extraction from subject position, the gap strategy but not resumption is possible, as in (10). In this respect, a genitive interrogative is like a bare interrogative. But local extraction from the direct object position, as in (11), differs from bare interrogatives in allowing not only the gap strategy, but also the resumptive strategy. As for extraction from a prepositional object position, the gap strategy is predictably prohibited because of the impossibility of P-stranding, as in (12). Finally, with PP-fronting, the gap strategy but not resumption is possible (13).

(10) subject extraction

رجال منو *هو شاف نجوى بالحفلة؟

rida:1 minnu: fa:f__/=hwu Najwa bi-l-Hafla husband who saw.3MS he Najwa at-the-party

‘Whose husband ___/[he] saw Najwa at the party ?’

(11) object extraction

نجوى رجال منو شافت *هو بالحفلة؟

Najwa rida:1 minnu: fa:fat__/=hwu bi-l-maktaba Najwa man who saw.3SF/=/3MS in-the-library

‘Whose husband did Najwa see [him] at the library ?’

(12) prepositional object extraction

نجوى صديق منو النطق وية *بالحفلة؟

Najwa Sadi:g minnu: iltagat wu:ya: */=hu bi-l-Hafla Najwa friend who met.3FS with__/=3MS at-the-party

‘Whose friend did Najwa meet with__/[him] at the party ?’

(13) PP-fronting with genitive interrogative

نجوى وية صديق منو النطق بالحفلة؟

Najwa wu:ya: Sadi:g minnu: iltagat bi-l-Hafla Najwa with friend who met.3FS at-the-party

‘With whose friend did Najwa meet at the party ?’
2.1.3 Local extraction with D-linked interrogatives

Now consider local extraction with D-linked interrogatives. With a D-linked interrogative, subject extraction is possible only with gap (14); direct object extraction permits gap and resumption (15), prepositional object extraction permits only resumption (16) and PP-fronting permits only the gap strategy (17).

(14) **subject extraction**

يا صديقة هن اشترت شقة ببغداد؟

ya: Sadi:ga iftarat /hi: jiga bi-Baghdad which friend.F bought.3FS /she flat in-Baghdad

‘Which friend [she] bought a flat in Baghdad?’

(15) **object extraction**

ايمان يا رجال شافت هالحفلة؟

Iman ya: ridj:a fit /=hu bi-l-hafla Iman which man saw.3FS /=3MS at-the-party

‘Which man did Iman see [him] at the party?’

(16) **prepositional object extraction**

سهى يا معلم اللغة بالكلية؟

Suha ya: mu:fallim iltagat wu:ya:/=hu bi-l-kulli:a Suha which professor met.3FS with /=3MS at-the-faculty

‘Which professor did Suha meet with [him] at the faculty?’

(17) **PP-fronting with d-linked interrogative**

سهى وية يا استاذ اللغة بالكلية؟

Suha wu:ya: ya ustasa:ð iltagat bi-l-kullyia Suha with which professor met.3FS at-the-faculty

‘With which professor did Suha meet at the faculty?’

2.1.4 Summary of the local extraction data

Table 2 summarizes the patterning of the gap and resumptive strategies in the context of local extraction with bare, genitive interrogatives and D-linked interrogatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interrogative Type</th>
<th>Gap Strategy</th>
<th>Resumptive Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bare</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object of V</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object of P</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-fronting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Local extraction of bare, genitive and D-linked interrogatives

Table 2 indicates the following. The resumptive strategy is always prohibited with bare interrogatives. But with genitive and D-linked interrogatives, it is
permitted with direct objects and prepositional objects. More generally, we observe that, with respect to local extraction, genitive and D-linked interrogatives pattern in the same way. In the next section I turn to long-distance extraction.

2.2 The resumptive and gap strategy: long-distance extraction

2.2.1 Long-distance extraction with bare interrogatives

With bare interrogatives, long-distance extraction from subject position only allows the gap strategy, as in (18). Long-distance extraction from the object position permits both gap and resumption, as in (19). Long-distance extraction of the prepositional object is ruled out: neither gap nor resumption are possible, as in (20). PP-fronting is also possible with long-distance extraction (21).

(18) \textit{Subject extraction}

\begin{verbatim}
Iman minnu: tašataqid ___/*hwu fa:f Ahmad bi-l-Hafla
Iman who think:3FS ___/ he saw:3MS Ahmad at-the-party
'Who does Iman think ___/[he] saw Ahmad at the party ?'
\end{verbatim}

(19) \textit{Direct object extraction}

\begin{verbatim}
Suha minnu: tašatagid ra:H ya’zim ___/=hu Ahmad ?
Suha who think:3FS will invite:3MS ___/=3MS Ahmad
'Whom does Suha think that Ahmad will invite ___/[him] ?'
\end{verbatim}

(20) \textit{Prepositional Object}

\begin{verbatim}
Iman minnu: tašarif ennu iltaga Bahjat wuya: *___/*/h
Iman who know:3FS that met:3MS Bahjat with ___/=3MS
'Whom does Iman know that Bahjat met with ___/[him] ?'
\end{verbatim}

(21) \textit{PP-fronting}

\begin{verbatim}
Iman wuya: minnu: tašarif ennu: iltaga Bahjat
Iman with who know:3FS that met Bahjat
'With whom does Iman know that Bahjat met ?'
\end{verbatim}

To summarize extraction with bare interrogatives, the direct object allows both gap and resumption with long distance extraction, while with local extraction it only allows gap\(^2\). All the other arguments pattern in the same way with local and long-distance extraction.

\(^2\) It is not the object of this paper to investigate why direct object extraction with bare interrogatives allows resumption only in embedded questions.
2.2.2 Long-distance extraction with genitive interrogatives

Now consider long-distance extraction with genitive interrogatives. As before, with subject extraction, only the gap strategy is possible (22). With object extraction, both gap and resumption are allowed (23). The same holds of long-distance extraction of a prepositional object: both gap and resumption are allowed (24). And with PP-fronting, only the gap strategy is possible (25).

(22) subject extraction

سَهِي رَجَالَ مَنِّو تَعْتُقَدَ آنُو شَافِ ّبُو هَوِّ نَجْوَٰی؟

Suha ridжал минну: таъатагид энну: жа:ф__=hwu Najwa

Suha husband who think.3FS that saw.3MS__he Najwa

‘Whose husband does Suha think that__/[he] saw Najwa?’

(23) object extraction

سَهِي رَجَالَ مَنِّو تَعْتُقَدَ آنُو نِجْوَٰی شَافِت؟

Suha ridжал минну: таъатагид энну: Нажва жа:ф__=hu

Suha man who think.3FS that Najwa saw.3SF__=3MS

‘Whose husband does Suha think that Najwa saw__/him]?’

(24) prepositional object extraction

سَهِي صَدِیقِ مَنَوَ تُدْرِی اَنُو ایمَّانَ الْقَتْلِ وِیَةٌ؟

Suha Sadi:г минну: тдри энну: Iman iltagat wu:ya:*__/hu

Suha friend who think.3FS that Iman met.3FS with__=3MS

‘Whose friend does Suha think that Iman met with__/[him]?’

(25) PP-fronting with genitive interrogative

سَهِي وَیَهُ صَدِیقِ مَنَوَ تَعْتُقَدَ آنُو نِجْوَٰی الْقَتْلِ؟

Suha wu:ya: Sadi:г минну: таъатагид энну: Нажва iltagat

Suha with friend who think.3FS that Najwa met.3FS

‘With whose friend does Suha think that Najwa met?’

2.2.3 Long-distance extraction with D-linked interrogatives

Finally, consider long-distance extraction of D-linked interrogatives. With subject extraction, only the gap strategy is possible (26). With object extraction, both gap and resumption are possible (27). With long-distance extraction of a prepositional object, only resumption is possible (28). And with PP-fronting, only the gap strategy is possible (29).

(26) subject extraction

راَغِبَ بِیَ صَدِیقَةٍ یَدْرِی اَنُو اَشَتَرَتْ__بُو هَیْ شَقَةٌ؟

Ragheb ya: Sadi:ga ydry энну: жтарат__=bi: figga

Ragheb which friend.F think.3MS that bought.3FS__she flat

‘Which friend does Ragheb think that__/[she] bought a flat?’
(object extraction

(27) 

Ragheb ya: ridga:1 ydry ennu: Iman ja:fit___/=hu
‘Which man does Ragheb think that Iman saw___/[him]?’

(28) 

Ahmad ya: ridga:1 ydry ennu: Suha iltagat wu:ya:*__/hu
‘Which man does Ragheb think that Suha met___/[him]?’

(29) 

PP- fronting with d-linked interrogative

Ragheb wu:ya ya: mu'allim ya:fatagid ennu: Suha iltagat
‘With which professor does Ragheb think that Suha met?’

2.2.4 Summary of the long-distance extraction data

Table 3 summarizes the patterning of the gap and resumptive strategy in the context of long-distance extraction with bare, genitive interrogatives and D-linked interrogatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interrogative type</th>
<th>Gap strategy</th>
<th>Resumptive strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bare</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object of V</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object of P</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-fronting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Comparison of bare, genitive and D-linked interrogatives with respect to long-distance extraction (extraction from an embedded clause)

As with local extraction, with long-distance extraction we observe that genitive and D-linked interrogatives pattern in the same way with respect to whether they use the gap or the resumptive strategy. And as before, bare interrogatives are distinct from genitive/D-linked interrogatives.

2.3 Superiority effects

Superiority effects arise in contexts where two interrogative expressions are contained in the same clause. In Iraqi Arabic bare interrogatives show superiority effects, while genitive and D-linked interrogatives do not. The superiority condition (Chomsky 1973), as stated in (30) is an attempt to account for the contrast between the well-formed (31) and ill-formed (32).
(30) **Superiority Condition**

No rule can involve X and Y in the structure \( \ldots X \ldots \) \( \ldots Z \ldots Y \ldots \) \( \ldots \) where the rule could also apply to X and Z, and Z is superior to Y (Z is superior to Y if Z c-commands Y).

(31) a. Who saw what?
   b. I wonder who saw what.

(32) a. *What did who see?
   b. *I wonder what who saw.

The superiority condition derives the fact that in sentences where both the subject and object are interrogative expressions, only the subject (Z) can undergo movement; i.e. the movement rule involves X and Z. It correctly prohibits movement of the object over the subject, as this would be an instance of a rule involving X (the object position) and Y (the A’ landing site), with Z (the subject) superior to Y (the object). As shown in (33), Iraqi Arabic bare interrogatives obey the superiority condition:

(33) a. **superiority effect observed**
   
   منو شنود قال لسام؟
   minnu: fenu: ga:l li-Samer
   who what said.3MS to=Samer
   Who said what to Samer?

   b. **superiority effect violated**
     
   شنود قال منو لسام؟
   * fenu: ga:l minnu: li-Samer
     what said.3MS who to=Samer
   * 'What did who say to Samer?'

With genitive interrogative constructions however, the superiority effect disappears. This is illustrated by the grammaticality of both multiple questions in (34), where (34a) shows SVO word order and (34b) shows OVS word order.

(34) a. **SVO word order**

   رجال منو شاف ولد منو؟
   ridg:a:l minnu: fa:f walad minnu:
   man who saw.3MS boy who
   'Whose husband saw whose son?'

   b. **OVS word order**

   ولد منو شافه رجال منو؟
   walad minnu: fa=f hu ridg:a:l minnu:
   boy who saw.3MS=3MS husband who
   'Whose son did whose husband see?'

With D-linked interrogatives superiority effects also disappear. This is illustrated in the grammaticality of the D-linked questions in (35), where (35a) shows SVO
word order and (35b) shows OVS word order.

(35)  a.  SVO word order
      يا طالبة اشترت يا كتاب؟
      ya: Ta:liba ijtarat ya: kita:b
      which student.F bought.3FS which book
      'Which student bought which book ?'

      OVS word order
      يا كتاب اشترت يا طالبة؟
      ya: kita:b ijtarat ya: Ta:liba
      which book bought.3FS which student.F
      'Which book did which student buy ?'

3  Why genitive interrogatives are inherently D-linked

I propose that it is the syntactic structure which causes genitive and D-linked interrogatives to pattern in the same way with respect to local extraction, long-distance extraction and superiority. In particular, I suggest that the structural parallel between genitive and D-linked interrogatives lies in the fact that they both contain an overt domain restriction (§3.1). I then show how the derivation of the gap and resumptive strategy proceeds with genitive interrogatives (§3.2).

3.1  D-linking arises if there is an overt domain restriction

In (Sterian 2011) it is argued that the D-linked interrogative in the gap strategy has a D-N structure as in (36a) and the D-linked interrogative expression of the resumptive strategy has a D-φ-N structure as in (36b).

(36)  a.  the gap structure
      [D D [N N]]

      b.  the resumptive structure
      [D D [φ [N N]]]

A comparison of the syntax of bare interrogatives, D-linked interrogatives and genitive interrogatives is given in (37).

(37)  a.  syntax of bare interrogatives
      [D wh [sØ]]  the gap strategy
      [D wh [φ hu [NØ]]]  the resumptive strategy (only long-distance)

      b.  syntax of D-linked interrogatives
      [D wh [N N]]  the gap strategy
      [D wh [φ hu [N N]]]  resumption (local & long-distance)

      c.  syntax of genitive interrogatives
      [D [s N [D wh]]]  the gap strategy
      [D [N [D wh] [φ hu [N]]] resumption (local & long-distance)
There are two observations to note here. First, the structure of the genitive in Arabic and Hebrew is known as the construct state, where the head noun is left-adjacent to a noun phrase or interrogative pronoun (Borer 1999; Fehri 1988; Ritter 1988; Shlonksy 2004). Second, with both genitive and D-linked interrogatives there is an overt noun which specifies a domain restriction. It seems that the D-linked interrogative expressions and the genitive interrogative expressions are domain restricted because of the overt noun, whereas the bare interrogative expressions do not have this restriction since they do not have an overt noun. I speculate that the domain restriction is supplied by the overt noun that allows the resumption strategy to be used in a wider range of contexts that is possible with bare interrogatives. This suggests that there is a close connection between domain restriction and the presence of a resumptive pronoun, because resumption selects an element from a domain. The bare interrogative expressions do not have any such domain restriction and therefore resumption is not allowed. The claim made here is that genitive interrogatives are inherently D-linked. Therefore, they should have a D-N structure in content questions which employ the gap strategy and a D-Ø-N structure in content questions which employ the resumptive strategy (Sterian 2011). With this in mind I now look at the derivation of content questions with genitive constructions in more detail.

### 3.2 Derivation of the genitive interrogative with the gap strategy

Consider (38a) which is a genitive interrogative employing the gap strategy. The numeration is given in (38b).

(38) a. *Genitive interrogative with gap*

جوئی رجال منو شافت؟
Najwa ridgal minnu: fa:fit
Najwa husband who saw:3SF
‘Whose husband did Najwa see?’


Consider (39) which shows the derivation of (38a). At the VP phase (39b), the DP is built by (39bI) merging the interrogative pronoun *minnu:* ‘who’ with the noun *ridgal* ‘husband’; in accordance with Ritter’s (1991) N-to-D raising in construct states, N raises to SpecD via a successive application of Copy and Delete (39bII-III). Then the verb *fa:fit* ‘she saw’ merges with the DP *ridga:l minnu:* ‘whose husband’ (39bIV). The subject DP *Najwa* merges with the V at SpecVP (39bV). At the IP phase (39c), the inflectional head merges with the VP (39cI), then the subject DP *Najwa* is moved to SpecIP via successive application of Copy and Delete (39cII-III). At the CP phase (39d), the DP *ridga:l minnu:* ‘whose husband’ is moved to SpecCP via successive application of Copy and Delete (39dI-II). At the TopP phase (39e), the topical head Top merges with the CP (39eI) and the subject DP *Najwa* is moved to SpecTopP via successive application of Copy and Delete (39eII-III).

b. VP phase
   I. Merge <D, N>
      \[ [\text{minnu}_D] [\text{ridża}_N] \]
   II. Copy \text{ridża}_N and Merge <N, D>
      \[ [\text{minnu}_D] [\text{ridža}_N] \]
   III. Delete \text{ridža}_N
      \[ [\text{minnu}_D] [\text{ridža}_N] \]
   IV. Merge <V, D>
      \[ [\text{Sa:fit}_N] [\text{minnu}_D] [\text{ridža}_N] \]
   V. Merge <D, V>
      \[ [\text{Najwa}_O] [\text{Sa:fit}_N] \]

   c. IP phase
   I. Merge <L, V>
      \[ [\text{Najwa}_O] [\text{Sa:fit}_N] [\text{minnu}_D] \]
   II. Copy \text{Najwa}_O & Merge <D, L>
      \[ [\text{Najwa}_O] [\text{Sa:fit}_N] [\text{minnu}_D] \]
   III. Delete \text{Najwa}_O
      \[ [\text{Sa:fit}_N] \]

   d. CP phase
   I. Copy \[ [\text{minnu}_D] [\text{ridža}_N] [\text{Sa:fit}_N] \] & Merge <C, L>
      \[ [\text{minnu}_D] [\text{ridža}_N] [\text{Sa:fit}_N] \]
   II. Delete \[ [\text{minnu}_D] [\text{ridža}_N] \]
      \[ [\text{Sa:fit}_N] \]
   III. Delete \[ [\text{minnu}_D] [\text{ridža}_N] \]
      \[ [\text{Sa:fit}_N] \]

   e. TopP phase
   I. Merge <Top, C>
      \[ [\text{Top}_C] [\text{Sa:fit}_N] [\text{minnu}_D] \]
   II. Copy \text{Najwa}_O & Merge <Top, C>
      \[ [\text{Top}_C] [\text{Sa:fit}_N] [\text{minnu}_D] \]
   III. Delete \text{Najwa}_O
      \[ [\text{Top}_C] [\text{Sa:fit}_N] [\text{minnu}_D] \]
In this section I have shown that the derivation of the Iraqi Arabic genitive interrogatives employing the gap strategy parallels the derivation of Iraqi Arabic D-linked content questions employing the gap strategy (Sterian 2011), in that both have a D-N structure.

### 3.3 Derivation of the genitive interrogative with the resumptive strategy

Let us now look at the derivation of a genitive interrogative employing the resumptive strategy (40a). The numeration is given in (40b); notice that it contains the φ-element ‘him’.

(40) a.  
Genitive interrogative with resumption

 أيمان رجل منو شافته؟
Iman  ridja:l  minnu:  ja:fat=hu
Iman husband who saw:3SF.3MS  
‘Whose husband did Najwa see [him]?’

b.  Numeration: {TOPØ, CPØ, NajwaØ, Sa:fitv, minnu:Ø, ridja:Ø, huφ}

Consider (41) which gives the derivation of (40a). At the VP phase (41b), the DP is built by: (41bI) merging the pronoun hu ‘him’ with the noun ridja: ‘husband’ and (41bII) merging this complex syntactic object with the interrogative pronoun minnu: ‘who’. In keeping with the N-to-D raising of the construct state, N raises to SpecD via a successive application of Copy and Delete (41bIII-IV). Then the verb ja:fit ‘she saw’ merges with the DP ridja:l  hu minnu: ‘whose him husband’ (41bV) and cliticization of the pronoun hu ‘him’ immediately takes place via successive application of Copy and Delete (41bVI-VII). The subject DP Najwa merges with the V at SpecVP (41bVIII). At the IP phase (41c), the inflectional head merges with the VP (41cI), then the subject DP Najwa is moved to SpecIP via successive application of Copy and Delete (41cII-III). At the CP phase (41d), the DP ridja:l  him minnu: ‘whose husband’ is moved to SpecCP via successive application of Copy and Delete (41dII-III). At the TopP phase (41e), the topical head Top merges with the CP (41eI) and the subject DP Najwa is moved to SpecTopP via successive application of Copy and Delete (41eII-III).

(41) a.  
Numeration: {TOPØ, CPØ, NajwaØ, Sa:fitv, minnu:Ø, ridja:Ø, huφ}

b.  VP phase

I.  Merge <φ, N>
   [φ [huφ] [ridja:1N]]

II.  Merge <D, φ>
    [0 [minnuD] [huφ, ridja:1N]]

III. Copy ridja:1N and Merge <N, D>
     [D [ridja:1N] [0 [minnuD] [huφ, ridja:1N]]]

IV. Delete ridja:1N
    [D [ridja:1N] [D [minnuD] [huφ, ridja:1N]]]
In this section I have shown that the derivation of the Iraqi Arabic genitive
interrogatives employing the resumptive strategy parallels the derivation of Iraqi Arabic D-linked content questions employing the resumptive strategy (Sterian 2011), in that both have a D-φ-N structure.

4. Conclusions

In this paper I presented a parallel between genitive interrogatives and D-linked content questions in Iraqi Arabic. I argued that genitive interrogatives are inherently D-linked and that it is the syntactic structure which causes genitive interrogatives and D-linked interrogatives to pattern in the same way with respect to local extraction, long-distance extraction and superiority and that this D-linking nature arises whenever there is an overt domain restriction. Thus, genitive interrogatives have a D-N structure in content questions which employ the gap strategy and a D-φ-N structure in content questions which employ the resumptive strategy. This has consequences for our understanding of how D-linking interacts with the resumptive strategy.
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