

HYPERRAISING IN JORDANIAN ARABIC

By

Tariq Mohammed Farghal

PREVIEW

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

Linguistics – Master of Arts

2020

ProQuest Number:28261406

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 28261406

Published by ProQuest LLC (2020). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All Rights Reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

## ABSTRACT

### HYPERRAISING IN JORDANIAN ARABIC

By

Tariq Mohammed Farghal

This thesis addresses the phenomenon of hyperraising (HR) in Jordanian Arabic where the embedded subject escapes its CP boundary by raising to the matrix subject position. Earlier proposals on Brazilian Portuguese (BP) (Fong, 2018, 2017; Martins and Nunes, 2010; Nunes, 2008) support the analysis of an A-movement of the subject NP to the matrix clause of the raising predicate *parecer* 'seem' crossing the head C *que* 'that'. Jordanian Arabic seems to adopt the same strategy by showing sensitivity to syntactic factors of intervention and islands that support an analysis of raising. Agreement plays a critical role in the analysis as different agreement patterns are useful cues for identifying distinct structures (unraised vs. raised or raised vs. left-dislocation). The targeted raising predicate is *shikil* and it seems to have a nominal value '+N', contrary to its usual verbal status in other languages. Hyper-raising of subject to subject (e.g. Brazilian Portuguese, Maithili) seems to be the counterpart of infinitival subject raising (e.g. English, Spanish) and its existence raises critical questions about the syntax of raising more generally.

PREVIEW

Copyright by  
TARIQ MOHAMMED FARGHAL  
2020

This thesis is dedicated to my father Professor Mohammed Farghal and my mother Eman Okour

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Professor Alan Munn who helped me greatly in making this thesis possible. He always guided me in building on my ideas and always showed admirable openness and professionalism in discussions. He is an example in mind and character.

I would also like to thank Professor Cristina Schmitt as a member of my committee and my professor who convincingly guided me to develop arguments in theory and always showed substantial support and unique open-mindedness when I asked questions. She is a great person to work with.

I am grateful to the the department of linguistics at MSU and its faculty members: Professor Suzanne Wagner, who always offered her full guidance and persistent advisory during the program; Professor Deogratias Ngonyani for being a vital member of my committee; and all the professors who taught me and assisted me during the program: namely Karthik Durvasula, Yen-Hwei Lin, Alan Beretta, and Brian Buccola.

Special thanks go to the Arabic program and its faculty members. In particular, I am indebted to Professor Camelia Suleiman who helped me from the beginning of the degree and assisted me in getting involved within the department.

Finally, I also want to thank Professor Saddam Issa and Professor Ayman Mohamed, from whom I learned a lot in Arabic teaching. They helped me in constructing ideas about Arabic and always offered their advice.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	vii
CHAPTER 1 HYPERRAISING IN JORDANIAN ARABIC . . . . .	1
1.1 Introduction . . . . .	1
1.1.1 What is hyperraising . . . . .	1
1.1.2 Theta Theory of HR . . . . .	4
1.2 The predicate <i>ʃikil</i> . . . . .	7
1.2.1 Agreement . . . . .	7
1.2.2 Construct Phrase . . . . .	10
1.3 The copula <i>jaku:n</i> . . . . .	15
1.4 The Structure of Arabic Hyperraising . . . . .	21
1.5 Syntactic Diagnoses of Hyperraising . . . . .	22
1.5.1 Intervention Effects . . . . .	23
1.5.2 Reconstruction . . . . .	26
1.5.3 Idiom Chunk Movement . . . . .	29
1.5.4 Hyperraising of expletives . . . . .	32
1.6 Hyperraising vs. Infinitival raising . . . . .	33
CHAPTER 2 HYPERRAISNG AND THEORY . . . . .	40
2.1 Arabic Literature of Raising . . . . .	40
2.2 Hyperraising Across Languages . . . . .	43
2.2.1 Nunes’s Inherent Case Licensing . . . . .	44
2.2.2 Composite Features of COMP . . . . .	47
2.2.3 CP-Deletion Rule . . . . .	49
2.3 The Puzzle behind HR . . . . .	52
CHAPTER 3 HYPERRAISING VS. COPY RAISING . . . . .	66
3.1 Copy raising and Perceptuality . . . . .	67
3.2 trace vs. <i>pro</i> . . . . .	69
3.3 Other SEEM-type Predicates in JA . . . . .	72
3.3.1 The comparison predicate <i>ka-COMP</i> . . . . .	72
3.3.2 The Puzzle of the Absent Cook in JA . . . . .	77
3.4 den Dikken’s Predicational Approach . . . . .	79
3.4.1 Against Hyperraising . . . . .	82
3.4.2 Against CR . . . . .	86
CHAPTER 4 CONCLUSION . . . . .	91
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	93

## KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

<b>AAE</b>	Anti-Agreement Effect
<b>ACC</b>	Accusative
<b>AP</b>	Adjective Phrase
<b>BP</b>	Brazilian Portuguese
<b>COMP</b>	Complementizer
<b>CR</b>	Copy Raising
<b>EA</b>	Egyptian Arabic
<b>ECM</b>	Exceptional Case Marking
<b>Gen</b>	Genitive
<b>HR</b>	Hyperraising
<b>INFN</b>	Infinitive
<b>JA</b>	Jordanian Arabic
<b>MA</b>	Maltese Arabic
<b>MSA</b>	Modern Standard Arabic
<b>NIC</b>	Nominative Island Condition
<b>Nom</b>	Nominative
<b>PART</b>	Participle
<b>Pres</b>	Present
<b>POSS</b>	Possessive
<b>PROG</b>	Progressive
<b>SUBJ</b>	Subjunctive
<b>1st</b>	First Singular
<b>1PL</b>	First Plural
<b>2SM</b>	Second Singular Masculine
<b>2SF</b>	Second Singular Feminine
<b>2MPL</b>	Second Masculine Plural
<b>2FPL</b>	Second Feminine Plural
<b>3SM</b>	Third Singular Masculine
<b>3SF</b>	Third Singular Feminine
<b>3MPL</b>	Third Masculine Plural
<b>3FPL</b>	Third Feminine Plural



## CHAPTER 1

### HYPERRAISING IN JORDANIAN ARABIC

#### 1.1 Introduction

##### 1.1.1 What is hyperraising

Hyperraising is a phenomenon in which an NP raises out of a finite clause. This type of raising escapes the CP domain that is known to constrain A-movement in English-type languages (Nunes, 2019; Fong, 2018, 2017; Ademola, 2011; Carstens and Diercks, 2009; Nunes, 2008; Yadava, 2007; Ura, 1994). For instance, we know that raising a subject NP out of a finite clause is impossible in English:

- (1) a. \* John seems that *t* likes ice-cream
- b. \* John is likely that *t* arrives early

In English, the complement of the raising predicate must be non-finite, so English in this sense appears as an infinitival raising language.

- (2) a. John seems to *t* like ice-cream
- b. John is likely to *t* arrive early

However, the case in Arabic seems to be the other way around. The target of *SEEM*-raising extracts the NP out of a tensed clause whereas raising out of a tenseless clause is disallowed.

- (3) Fatma fikil-ha (inn-u) biṭhib il-bu:za  
Fatma appearance-3SF (C-3SM) likes-3SF the-ice-cream  
'Fatma seems that likes the ice-cream'.

Int.: It seems that Fatma likes the ice-cream

(JA)

- (4) \* Fatma fikil-ha (inn-u) ṭhib il-bu:za  
Fatma appearance-3SF (C-3SM) like-SUBJ il-bu:za  
'Fatma seems to like the ice-cream'.

On the one hand, it would be intuitive to assume that there is some feature or principle in Arabic that makes its *SEEM*-type raising hyperraising ‘HR’ rather than English-type non-finite raising. On the other hand, it can be claimed that Arabic is not a raising language at all (Soltan, 2007; Mohammad, 2000) and that those structures can be explained by some principle of NP dislocation that associates the agreement features of the dislocated NP with whatever item (predicate, embedded verb, etc.) falls within its domain. Therefore, there is no active computation of syntactic raising. This theoretical opposition should lead us to investigate what the nature of the gap is that is left behind by hyperraised NP. Since Arabic is a *pro*-drop language and the verbal inflection is always associated with some *pro* that carries agreement, *pro* is a candidate for the gap as it agrees with the fronted NP. However, this thesis argues for raising and I will show that the gap is actually a trace not a *pro*. The analysis of the gap is significant as it plays a key role in understanding the nature of the structure we are dealing with. Consider the following underlying structures:

- (5) a. [Fatma *ʃikil*-ha            [ *t* *bithib*    *il-bu:za* ]]  
 [Fatma appearance-3SF [ *t* likes-3SF the-ice-cream ]]  
 ‘Fatma seems that *t* like the ice-cream’. (JA)
- b. [Fatma *ʃikil*-ha            [ *pro* *bithib*    *il-bu:za* ]]  
 [Fatma appearance-3SF [ *pro* likes-3SF the-ice-cream ]]  
 ‘Fatma seems that *pro* likes ice-cream’.

The theoretical consequence of each analysis is different. Our target is to motivate the trace analysis where the NP is assumed to hyperraise from its base position through some syntactic mechanism. First, the assumption that the NP has a base position in the embedded clause is partially motivated by the existence of an expletive structure that shows the position of an NP in a non-hyperraising structure. The agreement suffix of the raising predicate *ʃikil* shows default agreement features (3SM), which indicates the existence of a null expletive in the underlying structure whereas the NP lies in the base position:

- (6) *ʃikl*-u                      Fatma *bithib*    *il-bu:za*  
 appearance-3SM Fatma likes-3SF the-ice-cream  
 ‘It seems that Fatma likes the ice-cream’. (JA)

Once the NP is hyperraised as in (5a), it enters into full agreement with the raising predicate *shikil* implying intuitively that movement occurs from the base subject position to the matrix subject position of the clause resembling in some fashion infinitival raising of English. However, this movement out of a CP seems to violate Case theory on the one hand as the NP ends up being assigned case twice from the local T and the matrix T. On the other hand, it also seems to violate the Nominative Island Condition (NIC), Chomsky (1981), that constrains the NP-movement out of a tensed clause. Nonetheless, the literature on hyperraising has shown that this movement adheres to the different diagnoses of raising including reconstruction, locality, and movement of idiom chunks. Those diagnostic tests apply in the case of hyperraising in JA. Thus, (7a) shows that the intermediate CP violates the locality principle between the moved NP and the subject, (7b) shows that the NP can be reconstructed in the embedded clause (interpreted in the lower position), and (7c) is an example of an idiom chunk movement.

- (7) a. \* Fatma fikil-ha (inn-u) Mariam fakkart inn-ha bithib il-bu:za  
 Fatma appearance-3SF (C-3SM) Mariam think-3SF C-3SF likes-3SF the-ice-cream  
 ‘It seems that Mariam thought that Fatma likes ice-cream’.
- b. fi na:s<sub>i</sub> fikil-hum (inn-u) ma:t-u t<sub>i</sub>  
 In people<sub>i</sub> appearance-3MPL C-3SM died-3MPL t<sub>i</sub>  
 ‘There are people seem to have died’.
- c. i:d wahdi fikil-ha ma bts<sup>2</sup>affig  
 one hand appearance-3SF not clap  
 ‘One hand does not clap’.

If the gap were a *pro*, the diagnoses would appear contradictory to such an analysis. For instance, *pro* might not be so sensitive to locality as traces are and *pro* also shows a predicational relation with its antecedent without reconstruction effects. This non-raising behavior of *pro* could be recognized in the copy-raising (CR) construction (Asudeh and Toivonen, 2012; Landau, 2009; Rogers, 1972, 1971) where the subject appears to have a copy (e.g. *pro* in Arabic) in the embedded clause, and the structure does not show the effects of a trace analysis. For instance, (8a) is fine although there is an intervening intermediate CP because the CR construction allows mapping the subject to a deeply embedded *pro* (not adhering to A-movement locality). (8b) shows that the subject must be base-generated and cannot reconstruct in the embedded clause. Also, looking at

(8c), the idiom chunk movement fails with copy raising, and it distorts meaning. This is expected of a base-generated structure.

- (8) a. Fatma fikil-ha ka-inn-u Mariam fakkart inn-ha biṭḥib  
 Fatma appearance-3SF as-if-3SM Mariam thought-3SF C-3SF likes-3SF  
 il-bu:za  
 the-ice-cream  
 ‘Fatma seems like Mariam thought that she likes ice-cream’.
- b. fi na:s shikil-hum ka-in-hum ma:t-u  
 in people appearance-3MPL like-C-3MPL died-3MPL  
 ‘There are some people seem like they have died’.
- c. \*i:d waḥdi fikil-ha ka-inn-u ma bts<sup>?</sup>afig  
 one hand appearance-3SF like-C-3SM not clap  
 ‘One hand does not clap’.

This contrast of hyperraising (*shikil* ‘appearance’) vs. copy raising (*shikil ka-inn-u* ‘appearance like’) reminds us of the contrast found in English between infinitival raising (*seem*) and copy raising (*seem like*):

- (9) a. John seems to like ice-cream  
 b. John seems like that he likes ice-cream

Therefore, if we tease these two structures apart as well in Arabic, we could conceptualize the gap differently even though *pro* would carry the agreement of the embedded clause of both structures. If the structure is hyperraising, then we want to believe that the base position is a trace, and if the structure is a copy raising construction, then we end up with a base-generated DP that has a *pro* position in the embedded clause.

### 1.1.2 Theta Theory of HR

The core notion of syntactic raising is that the raising predicate (*seem*-type) does not assign a theta-role to the subject and the subject is raised from its base position in the embedded clause. In terms of theta-assignment, this applies to hyperraising in JA. There is sufficient evidence to propose that *shikil* behaves as a raising predicate. For example, this raising noun can host ex-

pletive subjects such as *fi* ‘in’ or *hunaak* ‘there’, while we know that control verbs fail to host non-thematic subjects.

- (10) *fi/huna:k fikl-u fayab bi-fa:ri?*  
 in/there appearance-3SM riot in-street  
 ‘There seems to be riot in the street’.
- (11) \* *fi/hunaak qarrar juku:n fi fayab bi-fa:ri?*  
 in/there decide-PAST-3SM be-/INF in riot in-street  
 ‘There decided to be a riot in the street’.

Also, *shikil* can appear with weather verbs, which is characteristic of raising verbs, but not control ones.

- (12) a. *fikil-ha bitfatti*  
 appearance-3SF rains-PRES-3SF  
 ‘It seems to rain’.
- b. \* *qarrar-at tfatti*  
 decided-3SF rains-IFN  
 ‘It decided to rain’.

Also, reconstruction is possible with *shikil*, which makes the structure ambiguous between the narrow scope reading and the wide scope reading of the subject NP. Control verbs only allow the wide scope interpretation. The DP *mara* ‘a woman’ can be interpreted within the embedded clause in (13a), which implicates the raising status of the structure:

- (13) a. *fi mara min Amman fikil-ha saww-at*  
 there woman from Amman appearance-3SF make-PAST-3SF  
*ihtifa:l bi l ha:ra*  
 celebration in the neighbourhood.  
 ‘there is a woman from Amman who seems to have made a celebration in the neighbourhood’
- i. Wide scope: DP *mara* has scope over the raising noun *fikil*
  - ii. Narrow scope: *fikil* has scope over *mara*. This interpretation solely applies to the expletive (non-raising structure in Arabic).
- b. *fikl-u fi mara min Amman saww-at*  
 appearance-3SF there woman from Amman make-PRES-3SF

ih̄tifa:l      bil ha:ra  
 celebration in the neighbourhood.  
 ‘It seems that there is a woman who seems to have made a celebration in the neighbourhood.’

(Only the narrow scope: *fikl-u* is over the DP *mara*).

- c. fi    mara    qarrar-at/h̄awal-at tsaww-i      ih̄itifal      bi l-h̄a:ra  
 there woman decide-3SF/try-3SF make-INF-3SF celebration in the-neighbourhood  
 ‘there is a woman who decided/tried to make a celebration in the neighbourhood’  
 (Only wide scope interpretation: the DP *mara* always has higher scope than the control verb.)

The above data shows that the Arabic raising noun *fikil* does not assign a thematic role to its subject just like raising verbs, which lines up with its compatibility with expletive subjects, weather subjects, and narrow scope readings.

Based on thematicity, agreement, and the syntax of hyperraising, it is legitimate to consider the phenomenon in Jordanian Arabic. However, there remains the puzzle of how the NP is moved out of a CP in JA and cross-linguistically (VanUrck, 2015; Nunes, 2008; Yadava, 2007; Ura, 1994; Jake and Odden, 1979). The intuition is that there may be some UG principle that licenses HR across those different languages.

This chapter looks into the main elements of the hyperraising structure: the actual nature of the raising predicate *fikil*, T’s carrier, and the diagnosis of the structure as a whole. The multiple syntactic diagnoses show that hyperraising involves a raising behavior between the raised DP and the trace. Chapter two has two parts: the first outlines the literature of hyperraising and its different types across languages and the other investigates hyperraising in JA under phase-based computations and concepts. Chapter three emphasizes the difference between the trace analysis of hyperraising and the copy analysis of copy raising constructions. It proceeds to show that copy raising is strictly perceptual in nature whereas hyperraising is eventual in the sense of infinitival raising. Finally, Chapter four aims at refuting den Dikken’s counterargument of hyperraising and copy raising and suggests parallel analysis of raising adjectives between JA and Hungarian.

## 1.2 The predicate *fikil*

### 1.2.1 Agreement

The raising predicate *fikil* ‘appearance’ seems to have nominal properties as it hosts possessive clitics and carries no tense at all. Also, the predicate is the same form of the lexical predicate *appearance*. Arabic nouns host possessive pronouns as clitic suffixes and this morphological paradigm also applies to the raising predicate:

(14)

Form	Features
<i>fikl-u</i>	3SM
<i>fikil-ha</i>	3SF
<i>fikil-hum</i>	3MPL
<i>fikil-hin</i>	3FPL
<i>fikl-ak</i>	2SM
<i>fikil-um</i>	2MP

Tense is carried by the copula *kaan* that links the subject with the raising predicate. The following structure shows a typical linear order where the subject precedes the copula and the copula precedes the raising predicate:

- (15) Eman ka:n-at fikil-ha (inn-u) ħabb-at il-bu:za  
Eman be-3SF appearance-3SF (C-3SM) like-3SF the-ice-cream  
‘Eman was appearance that liked ice-cream’.  
Int.: Eman seemed to like ice-cream.

The predicate *fikil* has two distinct meanings as a raising predicate and as a non-raising lexical predicate. The pattern of agreement can manifest this distinction in JA. To explain the pattern, we can manipulate the agreement of each: the copula, the raising predicate, and the embedded predicate (e.g. adjective). In examples (16a) and (16b), the embedded clause is the predicative adjective *mrattab* ‘nice’. Arabic predicative adjectives always agree with their subjects (or as modifiers with their modified noun phrases). The predicate *fikil* is primarily a masculine noun. The adjective has masculine features agreeing with the masculine features of the predicate *shikil* rather than with the feminine subject DP, thus (16a)’s interpretation must be addressing Fatma’s

actual physical appearance as being neat. Example (16b) shows the opposite: the adjective shows feminine agreement with the subject DP (Fatma) and (16b)'s interpretation must be the raising interpretation (*Eman seems neat*). This data shows there is an actual raising version of the predicate *fikil* as in (16b).

- (16) a. Eman *fikil-ha*                      *mrattab*  
           Eman appearance-3SM nice-3SM  
           ‘Eman, her appearance is neat’.
- b. Eman *fikil-ha*                      *mrattab-i*  
           Eman appearance-3SM nice-3SF  
           ‘Eman appears neat’.

However, this typical agreement can be manipulated by two factors: the lexical ambiguity of the raising noun and the flexible Arabic order. First, we see how the agreement pattern of the adjective can resolve the ambiguity of the raising predicate. Second, since the copula *jaku:n* can show agreement as well, we can have the same distinguishing pattern of agreement where the past *ka:n* either agrees with the adjective, which yields the lexical meaning as in (17a) or agrees with the hyperraised subject Eman, which yields the raising meaning as in (17b)

- (17) a. Eman *kaan fikil-ha*                      *ma?addab*  
           Eman was appearance-3SF polite-3SM  
           ‘Eman, her appearance was polite’.
- b. Eman *kan-at fikil-ha*                      *ma?addab-i*  
           Eman was-3SF appearance-3SF polite-3SF  
           ‘Eman seemed polite’.

Therefore, the pattern of agreement is systematic. Sometimes, agreement can be optional in certain contexts; yet, this optionality is predicted in light of some other factors. ElSadek et al. (2015) show that this optionality is found in agreement between the raising *fakl* (which has the same function of the Jordanian raising predicate *fikil*) and the copula in Egyptian Arabic, but they do not explain this optionality. This is the case where word order affects agreement. For instance, if the copula follows the subject, it must show only full agreement features as in (18a), which is typical of subject-verb agreement in general. If the copula is in initial position (meaning it precedes the raising noun and there is no overt subject), the agreement of this copula



could either be full or default as in (18b). The optionality of (18b) might shed some doubt on the consistency of the pattern of the agreement of an item such as the copula. However, the deviation in (18b) seems predictable if we consider the effect of word orders on Null-copula-predicate vs. Overt-copula-predicate.

- (18) a. Eman ka:n-at/\*ka:n      fikil-ha      ĥazi:n-i  
 Eman was-3SF/\*was-3SM appearance-3SF sad-3SF  
 ‘Eman seemed to be sad’.
- b. ka:n-at/ka:n      fikil-ha      ĥazi:n-i  
 was-3SF/was-3SM appearance-3SF sad-3SF  
 ‘she seemed to be sad’.

It cannot be that the masculine features of the copula agree with the lexical meaning of the raising noun because the embedded clause (the adjectival phrase) carries feminine features in (18b). Therefore, the structures in (18a) and (18b) are hyperraising whether the copula is masculine or feminine. This anti-agreement should be attributed to the anti-agreement effect (AAE) (Ouhalla, 1993) on the V-predicate word order (where the subject is not in initial position or is null). This non-agreement pattern obtains by moving the verb in initial position as V-predicate which might parallel the anti-agreement of VS word order in other contexts. Consider the following contrast where (19a) shows full agreement of SVO order and (19b) shows optionality of agreement (similar to what we have seen earlier with the copula):

- (19) a. il-bana:t fa:f-in      il-ĥara:mi  
 the-girls saw-3FPL the-thief  
 ‘the girls saw the thief’.
- b. fa:f/faf-in      il-ĥara:mi il-bana:t  
 saw-3SM/saw-3FPL the-thief the-girls  
 ‘saw the thief, the girls’.

Based on this agreement pattern, we end up with a copular verb in the matrix clause that adheres to the pattern of subject-verb agreement. If the copula appears after *fikil* and the subject is null, we end up with full agreement and if the copula appears before *fikil* and the subject is null, agreement becomes optional and the prediction about agreement is borne out. The case of anti-agreement we had above is triggered when the subject is null and the copula is in initial position.

However, when the copula is in initial position and the overt subject in a post-verbal position, full agreement obtains the same as it does with SVO word order. Contrary to what is known about Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) in the literature that VSO order triggers an anti-agreement effect (Ouhalla, 1993), JA and most Arabic dialects (Fehri, 2013) must show full agreement in SVO and VSO order as well.

- (20) \* ʃa:f/ʃa:f-u                    il-wla:d il-ḥara:m-i  
       saw-3SM/saw-3MPL the-boys the-thief  
       ‘the boys saw the thief’.

The same pattern applies to the copula with respect to the subject in a hyperraising structure. (and the subject is an overt DP in a post-verbal position). Thus, default agreement is ruled out.

- (21) \* ka:n/ka:n-u                    il-ʃaba:b ʃikil-hum                    ḥabb-u    il-bu:za  
       was-3SM/was-3MPL the-boys appearance-3MPL like-3MPL the-ice-cream  
       ‘the boys seemed that liked the ice-cream’.  
       Int.: it seemed that the boys liked the ice-cream.

So far, we have three patterns of agreement with respect to word order in a hyperriaisng structure:

(22)

Form	Agreement pattern
S-copula- <i>ʃikil</i>	full agreement
copula-S- <i>ʃikil</i>	full agreement
Null S-copula- <i>ʃikil</i>	optional

The alternation of the pattern of agreement mentioned so far manifests the distinction between the non-thematic raising meaning and the lexical meaning of the predicate *ʃikil*. We have also seen that the pattern of agreement can be consistent with respect to word order in a hyper-raising structure.

### 1.2.2 Construct Phrase

Before going into the mechanism of hyperraising, it is useful to recognize the syntactic category of the raising predicate *ʃikil* and the phrase it is contained within. Unlike English raising predicates, this Arabic predicate seems to be a noun and it constitutes a phrase with its clitic. Now,

the pattern of noun + possessive clitic is often associated with *construct* phrases as it is the case in Hebrew and most, if not all, varieties of Arabic. Primarily, the construct phrase consists of a DP phrase and a dependent noun. In the case of clitics, they appear inflectionally as dependent suffixes. Consider the parallel between the DP-noun phrase and the DP-clitic phrase:

- (23) a. *kita:b* Omar  
 book Omar  
 ‘Omar’s book’.
- b. *kita:b-u/kita:b-ha/kita:b-hum*  
 book-3SM/book-3SF/book-3MPL  
 ‘his book/her book/their book’.

It is plausible to assume that the raising predicate plus the clitic as *shikl-u* is actually a construct phrase. Research on construct phrases (Fehri, 2013; Benmamoun, 2000; Shlonsky, 2004) mainly theorize that the construct head (e.g. *kita:b* ‘book’ as in (23a)) has moved to a position higher than the dependent noun (e.g. *Omar*) and the dependent noun is the specifier of the phrase.

- (24) [DP [D D *kita:b<sub>i</sub>*] [DP [NP Omar] *t<sub>i</sub>*]]

This structural analysis can be applied to DP-clitic phrase where the underlying structure can be an overt pronoun, and then the predicate *shikil* is in its base position.

- (25) [NP [DP *huwwa*] *fikil*] (he appearance)

Now, the movement rule applies, the predicate incorporates the silent D and the overt pronoun ends up as a suffix on the moved NP, whose morphological character shows how the pronoun is positioned in the structure with respect to nouns in general.

- (26) [DP [D D *fikil<sub>i</sub>*] [NP [DP *-u-3SM*] *t<sub>i</sub>*]]

This seems to apply in the case of the phrase *shikl-u*. This movement analysis emphasizes that a key property of constructs, namely that the DP inherits definiteness from the dependent noun. Therefore, the DP must have a silent D, in other words, for it to have an overt D is actually illegal.

- (27) (\*il) kita:b il-walad  
 (the) book the-boy  
 'the boy's book'

This applies to the case of the DP-clitic phrase of *fikl-u*, which shows that the pronominal suffix seems to fill the position of a specifier that inherits definiteness to the nominal predicate.

- (28) (\*il)-fikl-u  
 the-appearance-3SM

The lexical version of the predicate *fikil* is also a constituent, which is characteristic of construct phrases in general. We can replace the lexical phrase *fikl-u* (his actual physical look) with a null pronoun or a wh-particle showing constituency.

- (29) a. fikl-u            ka:n            mkarkab  
 appearance-3SM be-3SM-PAST messy  
 'His look was messy'  
 b. ka:n            mkarakb-3SM  
 be-3SM-PAST  
 'was messy'  
 c. fu: ka:n        mkarkab?  
 what was-3SM messy?  
 'What was messy?'  
 Answer: *shikl-u* 'his appearance'

Therefore, we believe that the raising noun-clitic phrase is as the construct phrase in its morphological make-up (DP-clitic) and its DP inherits definiteness from the specifier as a construct. Yet, it behaves as a raising noun, so it will be different from ordinary noun-clitic phrases. A key distinguishing property is the fact that this raising noun *fikl-u* cannot form a constituent with the preceding NP as most lexical DPs do. If we assume that this nominal predicate is actually raising, it should not be able to form a constituent with a preceding NP, because it would be its subject and subjects and predicates (without a complement) cannot form a constituent. This difference can be observed more clearly if we compare hyperraising structures to what is called by Cinque (1999) as *broad subject constructions*. Broad subject constructions seem to have two subjects: broad and narrow. The broad subject lies in the left-periphery of the structure and follows the embedded clause containing the narrow subject with its predicate. The narrow subject

appears as a DP-clitic construct phrase where the clitic refers back to the preceding NP (the broad subject) and the predicate agrees with the narrow not the broad subject. The following example shows the clitic of the narrow subject *balcony-3SM* refers to the house and the adjective of the small clause agrees with its narrow subject *barande* ‘balcony’ and not *be:t* ‘the house’.

- (30) *il-be:t barandi-tu mrattab-i*  
 the-house balcony-3SM nice-3SF  
 ‘The house, its balcony is neat’.

This structure is much like the structure of hyperraising since they both begin with an initial DP, followed by a DP-clitic phrase that shows agreement and selects a complement. As mentioned earlier, constituency fails in a hyperraising structure between the DP and the raising noun. This applies in the case of the lexical DP in the structure of a Broad Subject Construction:

- (31) *barandit il-be:t mrattab-i*  
 balcony the-house nice-3SF  
 ‘The balcony of the house is nice’

Presumably, following the movement analysis, the DP *barandit* moves to a position higher than the specifier *be:t*. Note that the specifier does not need a clitic any longer.

If we apply this movement to the hyperraising structure, the sentence crashes. The only way for the construct phrase *fikl-u* to move to a DP position containing the specifier is to be lexical in meaning but not raising, which is incompatible with the hyperraising complement. Example (32a) is a legal raising structure, but the predicate in (32b) fails to move to a DP position to form a construct with *Eman*. The movement yields the phrasal meaning of *Eman*’s actual appearance as the subject, which cannot select the raising complement *fa:zat* because the interpretation will be that *Eman*’s (physical) appearance won, in other words, the lexical usage of *fikil* is contradictory with the finite complement and the meaning is distorted.

- (32) a. *Eman fikil-ha fa:z-at*  
 Eman appearance-3SF win-3SF-PAST  
 ‘Eman seems to have won’.
- b. \**fikil Eman fa:zat*  
 appearance Eman win-3SF-PAST  
 ‘\*Eman’s appearance won’.

The movement of the construct phrase applies if we employ the lexical meaning of *shikil* and choose the compatible complement. Example (33a) shows how the lexical version of the predicate appears in broad subject construction and looks parallel in surface to a raising structure as a DP<sub>1</sub>-DP<sub>2</sub>-clitic-complement. Example (33b) shows that unlike the raising meaning, the lexical *shikil* can form a construct phrase with the initial NP.

- (33) a. Eman *fikil*-ha                    mkarkab-3SM  
           Eman appearance-3SF messy  
           ‘Eman, her look is messy’.
- b. *fikil*                    Eman makrakb  
           appearance Eman messy-3SM  
           ‘Eman’s look is messy’.

The distinguishing behavior of the raising *fikil* from the ordinary nominal construct phrases including the lexical version of *fikil* itself is strong evidence that it is actually a non-thematic raising noun. The agreement shown by the clitic of the raising predicate *fikil* is a reflex of the subject-verb agreement whereas the agreement on the clitic of a non-raising lexical predicate is a reflex of dislocation agreement found in so-called Broad Subject Constructions. We can push this DP-clitic phrase to be clausal in the sense it can host a CP complement parallel to a hyper-raising structure. However, the distinction persists. The clausal construct predicate with its CP complement will constitute the subject phrase rather than T’ phrase as in the raising structure. For instance, factual nominal predicates such as *iddiṣa:ʔ* ‘the claim’ might show similarity with the usage of the raising predicate *shikil*; yet, they are different structures. The following example shows how the nominal predicate *iddiṣa:ʔ* can host a clitic suffix that shows agreement with the subject and host a complement.

- (34) Eman *iddiṣa:ʔ*-ha inn-u    fa:z-at                    mish mazbu:t<sup>2</sup>  
           Eman claim-3SF    C-3SM win-PAST-3SF not    right  
           ‘Eman, her claim that she won is false’.

This structure is different from hyperraising in two respects. First, unlike raising predicates, such factual nominal predicates cannot link syntactically a subject with the main complement. Instead, they constitute with their complement a narrow subject to the broad subject *Eman*. This explains

why the predicate *mazbu:ʔ* ‘right’ has masculine features, which indicates its agreement with the narrow subject *iddiʕa:ʔ* rather than the broad subject *Eman*. Therefore, the following sentence is not complete since the predicate is still missing:

- (35) \* *Eman iddiʕa:ʔ-ha inn-u fa:z-at bil mubara*  
 Eman claim-3SF C-3SF win-PAST-3SF in-the game  
 ‘Eman, her claim that she won the match’.

Second, the syntactic relation between the DP *Eman* and this nominal predicate is different from a raising structure. The broad subject DP can be the specifier of the factual predicate *iddiʕa:ʔ* by adopting a construct phrase, which is characteristic of lexical nouns as we have seen before.

- (36) *iddiʕa:ʔ Eman inn-u fa:z-at mish mazbu:ʔ*  
 claim Eman C-3SM win-PAST-3SF not right  
 ‘Eman’s claim that she won is not right’.

This shows that the hyperraising structure seems to look like a broad subject construction and the raising predicate *fikil* seems to behave as a construct phrase. However, this surface similarity weigh less in theory since the deep raising syntax of hyperraising shows distinguishing properties from ordinary lexical items (whether they select clauses or not). We can theorize that the agreement shown on the raising predicate is a reflex of the subject-predicate agreement resulting from the DP raising. While the agreement shown on non-raising clausal predicates such as the factual predicates is the actual thematic specifier that entails its construct relation with the subject constituting what is known as broad subject constructions. Thus, the predicate is *fikil* a genuine raising noun.

### 1.3 The copula *jaku:n*

As mentioned before, T is carried by the copula *jaku:n*. This copula is absent in present tensed clauses, but appears elsewhere (past, future, modality, conditionality. etc.). (Al-Balushi, 2012; Soltan, 2007; Henkin, 1993; Marshad and Suleiman, 1991; Farghal, 1988)

- (37) *Eman mabsu:tʔa*  
 Eman happy  
 ‘Eman is happy’.

- (38) Eman ka:n-at/ra:h̄ tku:n/mumkin tku:n mabsu:t<sup>2</sup>a  
 Eman was-3SF/will be-SUBJ/might be-SUBJ happy  
 ‘Eman was/will be/might be happy’.

Regardless of the many analyses about this absence of the copula in the present tense, the literature (Benmamoun, 2000; Al-Balushi, 2012; Soltan, 2007; Henkin, 1993) agrees that this copula appearing elsewhere is the element that carries T features including agreement. Furthermore, since the matrix T is carried by the copula *jaku:n*, we end up with two different Ts: the matrix T and the embedded T. The following examples shows the copula appearing in the matrix clause as well as in the embedded clause:

- (39) Eman ka:n-at       jikil-ha       (inn-u) ka:n-at       thib       il-bu:za  
 Eman be-3SF-PAST appearance-3SF (C-3SM) was-3SF-PAST like-INF-3SF the-ice-cream  
 ‘Eman seemed that she used to like the ice-cream’.

The embedded T of the hyperraising construction seems to show local behavior with respect to the matrix T. The matrix T always takes scope temporally over the embedded T in a sense that if the matrix T is past, the embedded T must be past. This temporal dependence of the embed T as a complement of a hyperraising construction can be a key property of the locality of the clause that contains the trace to the higher clause that contains the raised DP. Before going into the character of matrix T’s temporal dominance of the embed T, it is essential to recognize how different tenses are realized in JA. The following paradigm illustrate those differences. Morphology including prefixation, infixation, and vowel harmony indicate tense. Aspect is indicated by the copula *jku:n*. The simple present form acquires the prefix *b* with the vowel pattern and the past simple acquires a vowel pattern with no affixes. The past progressive consists of the past copula *ka:n* showing agreement and the verb in the infinitive form with the *ja*-prefixation. The simple future consists of the particle *rah* that shows no agreement, but indicates futurity and appears only before the verb