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On the quantified determiner phrase and quantifier float in Modern Standard Arabic

Khalid Lahbibi and Mohamed Yeou

Abstract: This article provides a minimalist account to the morpho-syntax of the quantified D(eterminer) P(hrase) and quantifier float in Modern Standard Arabic. Having surveyed previous accounts, it proves that the prenominal structure is unmarked from which the postnominal is derived, and that the quantifier float is derived subsequently from the latter. The patterns are semantically similar. The pronominal clitic on the postnominal and floating quantifiers is a minimal copy left in the original merge position of the moved DP in the postnominal structure. The floating quantifier occupies the spec/vP position. When the subject DP undergoes movement to a preverbal position, the quantifier is left floating. When it is used with a transitive verb, the quantifier can occur after the object because the latter moves to an outer specifier of vP, across the quantifier position in spec/vP, to satisfy an EPP feature of the Light v.

Subjects: Grammar, Syntax & Linguistic Structure; Linguistic Theory
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1. Introduction

The main problem that this article deals with is the relationship between two patterns displayed by determiner phrases (hence DP) containing quantifiers in Modern Standard Arabic (hence MSA). The problem is a classic one, namely whether one form, the postnominal structure, is derived from another form, the pronominal structure, or whether they are independent of each other and have different derivational histories, given that the structures are semantically similar.

Some approaches in the literature address the problem raised in this article. The first approach is adopted by Shlonsky (1991a, 1991b). He proposes that the postnominal use of the quantifiers in the postnominal structure is derived from their pronominal use in the pronominal structure. The second approach dissociates between the derivation of the pronominal and postnominal structures (Benmamoun, 1999, Al Khalaf, 2019). As for the floating quantifier, the stranding analysis argues for leftward movement of the associate out of the structure within which both the associate and the floating quantifier are contained (Shlonsky 1991a & 1991b). A second analysis considers the floating quantifier as an adjunct or adverb that modifies a predicate.
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(Benmamoun, 1999). A third analysis proposes a movement dependency to be held between the floating quantifier and its associate. They are said to be two autonomous phrases (DP; QP) that are symmetrically merged (Al Khalaf, 2019).

MSA is a descendant of Classical Arabic (hence CL), and structurally they are very identical. The major differences between the two varieties are mainly lexical (Albirni, 2016). MSA is the standard variety that is used in most of the Arab world. The choice of this variety stems out from its prestigious status and the fact that most of the Arabic speakers regard it as the Arabic language (Albirni, 2016). By studying the behavior of quantified DP and quantifier float in MSA, we hope to gain deep insight into their structures.

The objective of this article is to provide a unified minimalist account to the morpho-syntax of the quantified Determiner DP and quantifier float in MSA. Having surveyed previous accounts to the morpho-syntax of the target structures, it shows that the prenominal use of quantifiers in MSA is the unmarked structure from which the postnominal use is derived, and that the quantifier float is derived subsequently from the latter. Also, an alternative account is provided to the pronominal clitic that occurs on the postnominal and floating quantifiers. It is a minimal copy left in the original merge position of the moved DP in the postnominal structure.

This article is organized as follows: section two presents the research questions. Section three describes the properties of the quantified DP and quantifier float in MSA. Section four surveys the previous studies and approaches to the morpho-syntax of the quantified DP and quantifier float, and so it provides a background to the questions under study. Section five proposes a minimalist analysis to the morpho-syntax of the quantified DP and quantifier float in MSA, and it provides an alternative account to the pronominal clitic that occurs both on the postnominal and floating quantifiers. Section six concludes the findings of the study.

2. Research questions
The article addresses the following research questions:

(1) Are the prenominal, postnominal and floating quantifier structures derivationally related in MSA?
(2) What is the nature of the pronominal clitic used on the postnominal and the floating quantifiers?
(3) How can the presence of the pronominal clitic in the postnominal and quantifier float structures, and its absence in the prenominal structure be accounted for?

3. Description of the properties of the quantified DP and quantifier float in MSA
There are three common quantifiers in MSA: kull “all” or kull wa:ḥid “each”, ʔa:ʔ “any” and baːr “some”. Also, the quantifier kull “all” has its dual variants kila “both.MASC” and kilta “both.FEM”. While ʔa:ʔ “any” can only be used prenominally, and baːr “some” can be used prenominally (1a) and postnominally (1b), the universal quantifier kull “all” and its dual variants kila “both.MASC” and kilta “both.FEM” display four patterns of use in MSA. They can be used (1c) alone, (1d) prenominally, (1e) postnominally, or (1f) floating.

(1) a. baːr u ʔa:ʔ kiltaːli
   some the-men.MASC.PL
   “Some men”

b. ʔa:ʔ waːriːqal u baːr u-ʔum
   the-men.MASC.PL some.NOM-them
   “Some men”
c. ʔal-kullu
the-all.NOM
“All”

d. kullu l-kutubi
all.NOM the-books.PLGEN
“All the books”

e. ʔal-bana:tu kullu-hunna
the-girls.FEM.PLNOM all.NOM-them
“All the girls”

f. ʔal-ʔawla:du ḥa:ʔu: kullu-hum
the-boys.MASC.PLNOM came.PST.3PL all.NOM-them
“All the boys came”

The quantifier in (1d) occurs prenominally. It is the head of the Quantifier Phrase (hence QP) in the prenominal structure, and the DP al-kutubi following the quantifier is marked for genitive case. When the quantifier occurs postnominally as in (1e) or when it is floating (1f), it carries a pronominal clitic/resumptive pronoun (hence RP). The latter agrees with the DP in gender and number.

Moreover, in their prenominal use, quantifiers are marked for structural case. The quantifier kullu “all” in (2a) is marked for nominative case because it is the subject of the verb ḥaːḥaba “went”.

In (2b), the quantifier kulla “all” is marked for accusative case because it is the object of the verb-subject raʔajtu “I saw”.

When they are used prenominally, the dual variants kila “both.MASC” and kilta “both.FEM” end in vowels, and so they cannot be marked for structural case because they are phonologically incompatible with case unless they are used postnominally as in (3f) and (3g), and they carry the pronominal clitic. When the quantifier kull is used to mean “all”, it can select either a definite plural (3a) or definite mass (3b). Its dual variants kila “both.MASC” and kilta “both. FEM” select definite dual DPs, and they agree with them in gender as shown in (3c) and (3d), respectively. When kull is used to mean kull waːḥid “each”, it selects an indefinite singular DP, and so the genitive DP following the quantifier kull has to be nunated (it has to carry the indefiniteness suffix -n) as in (3e).

(3) a. kullu l-ʔawlaːdi
all.NOM the-boy.MASC.PLGEN
“All the boys”

b. kullu l-mijaːhi
all.NOM the-water.PLGEN
“All the waters”
c. kila r-raḍulajni
   both the-men.MASC.D.GEN
   “Both of the men”

d. kilta: l-marʔatajni
   both the-women.FEM.PL.GEN
   “Both of the women”

e. kullu waladi-n
   each.NOM boy.MASC.SG.GEN-INDEF
   “Each/Every boy”

f. ṭar-raḍulajni kilajhima
   the-men.MASC.D.GEN both.MASC.D.GEN
   “Both of the men”

g. ṭal-marʔatajni kiltajhima
   the-women.FEM.PL.GEN both.FEM.PL.GEN
   “Both of the women”

While the quantifier ṭej “any” selects only an indefinite DP (4a), the quantifier baďu “some” can only be followed by a definite plural DP (9b).

(4) a. ṭeju dʒiha:zi-n
   any.NOM device.MASC.SG.GEN-INDEF
   “Any device”

b. baďu l-kutubi
   some.NOM the-books.MASC.PL.GEN
   “Some of the books”

While quantifiers in MSA cannot be modified by degree adverbs immediately following the quantifier (5a), the genitive DP can be modified (5b).

(5) a. *kullu taqri:ban r-rida:li
    all.NOM almost the-men.MASC.PL.GEN
    “Almost all men”

b. kullu l-kutubi l-ʔadidi:dati
    all.NOM the-books.FEM.PL.GEN the-new.FEM.PL.GEN
    “all the new books”

The quantifier kull “all” and its dual variants kila “both.MASC” and kiita “both.FEM” “both” can float. That is, the subject occupies a preverbal position, and the quantifiers are left stranded. Also, with transitive verbs, the quantifiers can occur before the object (6a) or after it (6b), carrying an obligatory pronominal clitic that agrees with the subject in gender and number.

(6) a. ṭal-ʔawla:du ṭakalu: kullu-*(ʔum) t-tuffa:ħata
    the-boys.MASC.PL.NOM ate.3MASC.PL all.NOM-(them) the-apple.FEM.SG.ACC
    “All the boys ate the apple”

b. ṭal-ʔawla:du ṭakalu: t-tuffa:ħata kullu-*(ʔum)
    the-boys.MASC.PL.NOM ate.3MASC.PL the-apple.FEM.SG.ACC all.NOM-(them)
“All the boys ate the apple”

To sum up, the quantifiers in MSA can be used alone, prenominally, postnominally, or floating. When the quantifiers are used prenominally, they are marked for structural case. Each quantifier type selects specific definiteness and number values on the genitive DP following them. The quantifiers cannot be modified, but the genitive DP can be modified. When the floating quantifiers are used with a transitive verb, they can occur before or after the object.

4. Literature review

Some approaches in the literature attempt to answer the questions asked above. The first approach is adopted by Shlonsky (1991a, 1991b). He proposes that the postnominal use of the quantifiers is derived from their prenominal use. He considers the latter to be a Construct State (hence CS). In this use, the quantifier is the head (Q), and the genitive DP is its complement. Shlonsky does not propose any movement to derive the prenominal structure, and he does not postulate any D projection above Q. Therefore, Shlonsky (1991b, p. 163) analyses the Hebrew Quantifier Construct State in (7a) as in (7b).

(7) a. kol ha-paxim (Modern Hebrew MH)
   all the flowers.MASC.PL
   “All the flowers”

   b. 
   QP
      Q
      Q
      DP
      kol ha-paxim

To derive postnominal structure, Shlonsky (1991b) proposes the movement of the DP complement of Q to spec/Q. He argues that the pronominal clitic on the postnominal quantifier is an agreement feature holding between the quantifier and the DP in its specifier position. He does not explain the difference in the case pattern marked on the prenominal and postnominal structures. Therefore, Shlonsky (1991b, p. 165) proposes the analysis in (8) for the derivation of the postnominal quantifier in (7a) above.

(8) 
   DPi
   Q
   ha-paxim Q DP
   kol t

The second approach is adopted by Benmamoun (1999). Contra Shlonsky’s approach, Benmamoun dissociates between the derivation of the prenominal and postnominal structures. Furthermore, he postulates head movement to be part of the derivation of the prenominal use of the quantifier in
MSA. He argues that the quantifier Q moves to D because a D is projected in Benmamoun’s analysis. Therefore, the examples in (9b) and (9c) are drawn from (Benmamoun, 1999, p. 625), as an analysis of (9a).

(9) a. kullu tʃ-ʃulla:bi
   all the-students.MASC.PL.GEN.
   “All the (male) students”

b.

As for the derivation of the postnominal quantifier, Benmamoun (1999) believes that to be independent from the derivation of the prenominal structure. To support this claim, he argues that, on the one hand, movement out of Construct States is not allowed in Arabic, and so he considers movement out of the Arabic Quantifier Construct State not permissible. On the other hand, he claims that in the postnominal quantifier structure, NP is the head and not Q because structural case is marked on the NP, and Q agrees with it in case and phi-features. This is different from the prenominal use of the quantifier where the structural case is marked on the quantifier, and the NP following it is marked for genitive case. Instead, he views Q as an adjunct to NP in the postnominal quantifier structure. Moreover, he argues that in the latter, the postnominal quantifier agrees with a pronominal clitic pro, and the latter agrees with the noun preceding the quantifier. Thus, the postnominal quantifier indirectly agrees with the noun it follows as shown in (10), from (Benmamoun, 1999, p. 636).

c.
Contra Benmamoun (1999) and in line with Shlonsky (1991a, 1991b), we argue that the postnominal use of the quantifier in MSA is derived from the prenominal structure. It is argued that the derivation of the former involves DP movement to spec/D. Shlonsky’s proposal of DP movement is not motivated, and he does not project a D to explain the genitive case marked on the complement DP. Also, the pronominal clitic is considered an agreement feature by Benmamoun and Shlonsky. The present article questions the lack of explanation of the presence of the agreement feature in the postnominal structure and its absence in the prenominal structure in the literature.

The approaches (Shlonsky 1991a, 1991b & Benmamoun, 1999) assume that the floating quantifiers are derived from their postnominal use. They claim that the subject in a sentence is raised to a preverbal position, and the quantifier is left stranded or floating. Shlonsky (1991b) argues that the postnominal structure is derived first from the prenominal structure through the movement of DP to spec/Q. Then, the DP in spec/Q undergoes movement to spec/I as in (11), from Shlonsky (1991b, p. 169).

Contra Benmamoun (1999) and in line with Shlonsky (1991a, 1991b), we argue that the postnominal use of the quantifier in MSA is derived from the prenominal structure. It is argued that the derivation of the former involves DP movement to spec/D. Shlonsky’s proposal of DP movement is not motivated, and he does not project a D to explain the genitive case marked on the complement DP. Also, the pronominal clitic is considered an agreement feature by Benmamoun and Shlonsky. The present article questions the lack of explanation of the presence of the agreement feature in the postnominal structure and its absence in the prenominal structure in the literature.

The approaches (Shlonsky 1991a, 1991b & Benmamoun, 1999) assume that the floating quantifiers are derived from their postnominal use. They claim that the subject in a sentence is raised to a preverbal position, and the quantifier is left stranded or floating. Shlonsky (1991b) argues that the postnominal structure is derived first from the prenominal structure through the movement of DP to spec/Q. Then, the DP in spec/Q undergoes movement to spec/I as in (11), from Shlonsky (1991b, p. 169).

The present article converges with Shlonsky’s proposal in assuming that the prenominal structure is derived first; the postnominal is derived second; and the floating quantifier is derived last. It differs from the approaches (Shlonsky 1991a, 1991b & Benmamoun, 1999) in accounting for the nature of the pronominal clitic on the postnominal quantifier. The pronominal clitic is not an agreement feature but a minimal copy of the moved DP. Furthermore, contra Benmamoun (1999) who argues that when the floating quantifier occurs after the object, it is best analyzed as VP adjunct, we argue that the floating quantifier remains in-situ, and the object moves across the subject position to an outer specifier of vP. What is more, the analysis of floating quantifier involving movement of the direct object past the quantifier has already been proposed by Stowell (2013) for English and Lacerda (2016) for Brazilian Portuguese.
One of the reasons why we reject Benmamoun’s approach is because he considers the prenominal and postnominal uses of quantifiers in MSA as derivationally unrelated. He considers the prenominal use of the quantifiers as a Construct State, and thus movement out of the Construct State is impossible. Moreover, he explains that the postnominal quantifier indirectly agrees with the noun it follows. He argues that the quantifier Q agrees with a null pronominal pro, which agrees with the noun. As a result, Q agrees with the noun indirectly. We regard this indirect agreement unnecessary. Finally, Benmamoun analyses the floating quantifier as VP adjunct. We argue that the floating quantifier remains in-situ, and the object moves across the subject position to an outer specifier of vP.

Al Khalaf (2019) investigates the phenomenon of floating quantifiers in MSA. Having surveyed the major approaches to floating quantifiers, she claims that they are both unsatisfactory. The first approach is the stranding analysis which argues for leftward movement of the associate out of the structure within which both it and the floating quantifier are contained (Shlonsky 1991a & b). The second approach considers the floating quantifier as an adjunct or adverb that modifies a predicate (Benmamoun, 1999).

The starting point of Alkhalaf’s analysis is the dissociation between derivation of the prenominal, postnominal, and floating quantifiers. The prenominal quantifier is considered a Construct State (in line with Shlonsky 1991a, 1991b & Benmamoun, 1999). In the postnominal quantifier, the quantifier and its argument are merged to form a continuous constituent.

Alkhalaf argues for the movement analysis posited by Ott (2011, 2012, 2015). She claims a movement dependency to be held between the floating quantifier and its associate. She confirms that at no stage in the derivation should they have formed a continuous constituent. That is, they are said to be two autonomous phrases (DP; QP) that are symmetrically merged. At some point, the derivation should be asymmetrically for the labeling to take place. As for the nature of the pronominal clinic that the postnominal and floating quantifier carries, Alkhalaf considers it an agreement marker that is held between the quantifier and its associate. We argue that it is not an agreement marker; it is a pronominal clitic. The stranding analysis of the floating quantifier is adopted in this article to justify the occurrence of the pronominal clitic on the postnominal and floating quantifier.

In this section, we highlighted shortcomings of the proposed approaches in the literature. Some of the approaches consider the derivation of the prenominal, postnominal, and floating quantifiers derivationally unrelated (Benmamoun, 1999, Al Khalaf, 2019). Others associate between the derivation of the three structures (Shlonsky 1991a, 1991b). Moreover, the pronominal clitic that is present in the postnominal and floating quantifiers and absent in the prenominal structure is analyzed as an agreement feature that holds between the quantifier and its associate. We consider the three structures derivationally related. We prove that the pronominal clitic on the postnominal and floating quantifiers is a RP. Finally, we adopt the stranding analysis to approach the floating quantifier in MSA and to argue for the resumptive nature of the pronominal clitic.

5. Proposal: a minimalist account to the morpho-syntax of the quantified DP and quantifier float in MSA
The approaches presented in the literature do not seem to agree on a particular pattern of derivation of the prenominal and the postnominal structures. Benmamoun (1999) and Al Khalaf (2019) claim that the two structures are derivationally different, while Shlonsky (1991a, 1991b) argues that they are derivationally related. We argue in line with Shlonsky, that the postnominal structure is derived from the prenominal structure through DP movement. We differ from Shlonsky by justifying this movement and by proposing an alternative analysis to the pronominal clitic on the postnominal and the floating quantifiers. Moreover, we assume that the floating quantifier is derived from the postnominal structure.
5.1. The prenominal quantifier

In this article, we consider the prenominal structure the unmarked structure in MSA. The prenominal quantifier is the head of the QP structure, and so it selects a genitive DP as its complement. The genitive DP is merged to the left of the quantifier Q; the result is a QP. We project a D in the prenominal structure. This D has an unvalued definiteness feature referred to as [αDef]. The latter is valued through an Agree relation that holds between D and the genitive DP under a c-command relation, leading the whole prenominal structure to have the same definiteness value as the genitive DP (i.e., definiteness spread). Moreover, D has a genitive case feature to check through Agree, and it checks its case on the DP following the quantifier. Therefore, derivation of (3a) (repeated here as 12a) is represented in (12b).

(12) a. kullu lʔawla:di
   all.NOM the-boys.MASC.PL.GEN
   “All the boys”

b. 

   DP
   Spec
   D
   [gen, aDef unwind]
   Q
   kullu
   lʔawla:di
   DP [gen, +Def unwind]

DPAfter all interpretable features are checked and the unvalued features are valued, the derivation of the quantified DP kullu lʔawla:di “all the kids” terminates and converges. It is worth mentioning that the structural case responsible for the case checked on the head Q (in QP) is assumed to be part of the representation of the projected D (but it does not concern us here). The genitive case on D is different from the structural case checked on Q in the prenominal structure. What is more, the analysis provided for the quantifier kull “all” in this section and the next section (cf. 5.2) is used to illustrate the same facts that apply to its dual variants kila “both.MASC” and kilta “both.FEM”.

5.2. The postnominal and the floating quantifier

The derivation of the postnominal structure is applied to the output of the prenominal structure. That is, it is applied after the genitive case is valued and the definiteness feature is valued. We project the same D projected in the prenominal structure. Moreover, the D projected in postnominal structure has two more features: an EPP feature and c-selectional features [aN], and we argue that D in the postnominal structure selects only definite DPs. We assume that D drives the movement of DP to spec/D to satisfy the edge feature (EPP, using the old term) and the c-selection of D. Also, we argue that the quantifiers kull wə:nid “each” (3e) and ʔe:j “any” (4a) cannot be used postnominally because they select an indefinite DP and the latter does not satisfy the c-selections of D.

When D is merged, it checks its c-selectional feature for a definite DP. Also, the definite DP undergoes movement to spec/D to check D’s EPP feature, and thus D project once more, resulting in the postnominal structure.

Under the Agree Theory assumption (Chomsky, 2001) adopted here, the features of the DP in the prenominal structure are valued while in-situ. The issue that is raised here relates to the validity of the DP as an active goal which can be marked for case. Apparently, the DP is not an
active goal by virtue of having its case already valued. In other words, how is the inactive goal DP activated so that it can enter a new Agree relation with a higher probe and receive case? This question is better answered under the assumption of the Copy Theory of Movement (Chomsky, 1995, Pesetsky 1997, 1998).

Under the Copy Theory of Movement, the operation Move (or Internal Merge) is argued to be a process of copying and deletion. The moved element is a copy of the lexical item. The original copy is deleted, and its phonetic features are deleted. Contra Chomsky, Pesetsky (1997, 1998) argues that the original copy of the moved lexical item is to be spelt out in the minimal way possible under certain circumstances. He assumes that “pronouncing a category as a pronoun means giving phonological shape to one of its properties” (Pesetsky 1997, p. 164). Also, Pesetsky (1998, p. 366) puts it clearly that “a pronoun is a pronunciation of phi-features like number, person, gender, but not notional features”. In that capacity, pronominal clitics are spellout of original copies.

Kayne (1981) posits that RPs are spellouts of traces. They occur in positions that are said to be gaps. The properties of the RP, which occurs as a clitic on the postnominal and floating quantifiers, resemble those of clitics in Romance languages reported by Kayne (1975, 1989). Kayne (1975) explains that clitics are not modified or coordinated. To show that the RP on the postnominal and floating quantifier is a clitic, we explain that it cannot be coordinated (13a). It can coordinate with a free (non-clitic) pronominal form (13b) and a full DP (13c). The coordination test confirms that the RP cannot be treated as an agreement marker since it can be coordinated with free (non-clitic) pronominal form as well as a full DP.

(13) a. *ʔakal-na wa *-u:
   Ate.3FEM-they and -they
   “they (girls) ate and they”

b. ʔakal-na wa hum
   Ate.3FEM-they and -they
   “they (girls) ate and they”

c. ʔal-bana:tu kullu-hunna wa l-waladu
   the-girls.FEM.PL.NOM all.NOM-them and the boy
   “All the girls and the boy”

In the case of the postnominal structure, the moved DP leaves behind a pronounceable copy that is realized as an RP. It occurs as a clitic on the postnominal and floating quantifier. We argue that to preserve the Agree relation established in the pronominal structure, a resumptive pronoun (copy) is needed in the original merge position of the moved DP. Furthermore, the moved copy to spec/D is now fresh and can be marked for structural case (which does not concern us here). Therefore, the postnominal structure of (14a) is shown in (14b).

(14) a. ʔal-ʔawla:du kullu-hum
   the-boys.MASC.PL.GEN all.NOM-them
   “All the boys”
Moreover, as argued in the literature, Benmamoun (1999) considers the prenominal structure a Construct State, and he argues that movement out of the Construct State is not allowed. Our analysis proposes an RP in the postnominal structure, and this RP is argued to be a last resort strategy when extraction out of a structure is not allowed (Shlonsky 1992, Hornstein, 2001). To exemplify more, the sentences below are taken from Mckee and McDaniel (2001, p. 115). (15a) and (15b) show that when extraction out of a wh-island is not allowed, a resumptive pronoun is to be used as in (15b).

(15) a. *That’s the girl that I don’t know [what t did].
    b. That’s the girl that I don’t know [what she did].

Floating quantifiers are derived from the postnominal structure. The same postnominal quantifiers kull “all”, kila “both.MASC” and kilta “both.FEM” can float. The floating quantifiers also carry an obligatory pronominal clitic as in (16a) and (16b).

Assuming Sportiche’s (1988) claim that quantifiers are VP-internal residue left after the movement of the subject, and Koopman and Sportiche’s (1991) VP-internal subject hypothesis,6 we argue that the subject is base generated in the specifier position of vP. Also, in the case of the quantifier float, the quantifier is left in the spec/vP while the subject DP undergoes movement to a preverbal position without the quantifier. Therefore, (16a) above is derived in two phases: (1) derivation of the postnominal structure in which the DP moves to spec/D to satisfy the EPP and c-selectional features of D, leaving an RP copy in its original merge position; (2) Derivation of the floating quantifier in which the same DP undergoes further movement to a preverbal position. The derivation of (6a), repeated here as (16a), is represented in (16b).

    the-boys.MASC.PL.NOM ate.3MASC.PL all.NOM-them the-
    apple.FEM.SG.ACC
    “All the boys ate the apple”
The floating quantifier can be used with a transitive verb as in (6a) and (6b), and so they can be used before the object (6a) or after it (6b). When they occur before the object (6a), they are derived as in (16b). When they are used after the object (6b), we assume, building on Chomsky (2005), that the floating quantifier remains in its base position (spec/vP) while the object undergoes movement to an outer specifier of vP to satisfy an EPP feature on the light v,7 resulting in a structure where the floating quantifier occurs after the object. The analysis of floating quantifier involving movement of the direct object past the quantifier is proposed by Stowell (2013) for English and Lacerda (2016) for Brazilian Portuguese. Therefore, the example in (6b) (repeated here as 17a) is derived as in (17b).

    the-boys.MASC.PL.NOM ate.PAST.3MASC.PL the-apple.FEM.SG.ACC
    all.NOM-them
    “All the boys ate the apple”

b.
The preceding analysis and discussion reveal that the postnominal structure is derived from the prenominal structure through DP movement. This movement is motivated by the EPP feature and c-selections on D. Also, an alternative analysis is proposed to the prenominal clitic on the postnominal and the floating quantifiers. Moreover, it is assumed that the floating quantifier is derived after the derivation of the postnominal structure.

6. Conclusion
This article has shown that earlier approaches to the morpho-syntact of the quantified DP and quantifier float do not provide sufficient account to the target structures. It has provided a unified minimalist account to the morpho-syntact of the quantified DP and quantifier float in MSA. Also, the derivation of the postnominal structure is shown to apply on the output of the prenominal structure, and floating quantifiers are derived from the former. A D system is projected in all structures. This D has an unvalued definiteness feature and genitive case in the prenominal structure [gen, αDef:], in addition to an EPP feature with c-selections in the postnominal structure and quantifier float [EPP, uN, gen, αDef:]. The EPP feature and the c-selections of D drive the movement of the definite DP from within the complement of D, which is the QP. Moreover, the RP that occurs as a clitic on the postnominal and floating quantifiers is a spell out of the original copy of the moved DP. It is argued that to preserve the Agree relation established in the prenominal structure, the RP (copy), which agrees with the moved item in number and gender, is needed in the original merge position of the moved DP. Finally, the floating quantifier is shown to occupy the spec/VP positions. After the subject DP moves to a preverbal position, the quantifier is left stranded or floating. When it is used with a transitive verb, the quantifier can occur after the object because the latter moves to an outer specifier of vP, across the quantifier position in spec/vP, to satisfy an EPP feature of the Light v.
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Notes
1. We assume, following Chomsky’s (2001, 2005) phase-based theory and feature inheritance, that Case on the subject is valued as nominative as a result of the Agree relation between C and the subject (Musabhien, 2008).
2. According to Musabhien (2008), object shift and scrambling in German is different from object movement in MSA in that the latter is not affected by definiteness, and both definite and indefinite objects undergo movement. Moreover, while shifting and scrambling affect unfocused objects, movement affects focused objects.
3. Unlike the wh-elements and the focused DPs which preserve their original (i.e., internally valued) case, and are not associated with a resumptive pronoun (Musabhien, 2008).
4. This phenomenon is also attested in MSA in the derivation of VSO word order (see Musabhien, 2008).
5. We assume, following Chomsky’s (2001, 2005) phase-based theory and feature inheritance, that Case on the subject is valued as nominative because of the Agree relation between C-T and the subject (Musabhien, 2008).
6. The VP-internal Subject Hypothesis of Koopman and Sportiche (1991) states that the subject originates within VP. The resulting VP is combined with a functional light head, which is merged with the external argument, resulting in a vP projection.
7. Our analysis assumes Chomsky’s (2001, 2005) work, and it assumes that object movement in MSA is an instance of A’ movement which is triggered by the edge feature on the head of the vP phase, i.e., v. The landing site of the moved object is the outer specifier of vP.
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