

## Control in Lebanese Arabic

Youssef A. Haddad  
University of Florida

*Lebanese Arabic (apc), Afro-Asiatic  
also known as Levantine Arabic, North Levantine Arabic, Lebanese-Syrian Arabic,  
Syro-Lebanese Arabic  
spoken in Lebanon (Asia)*

### 1 Grammar Profile\*

#### 1.1 Morpho-Syntax

##### 1.1.1 Head position

Mainly head-initial. In a VP, the word order is Verb-Object. In an NP, the word order is Noun-Adjective.

##### 1.1.2 Morphological type

Inflectional/Concatenative. Typically, a word is made up of “discontinuous morphemes”: a consonantal, three-segmental root (e.g. f-h-m ‘undersand’) and a vocalic melody imposed as a prosodic template (e.g. i-i). The result is fihim.

##### 1.1.3 Case system

No case-marking. Nouns are inflected for GENDER – DUAL (m/f) – PLURAL (m/f).

Verbs are inflected for:

Tense: perfect – imperfect

Person: first – second – third

Number: plural (no dual inflection on verbs)

Gender: masculine – feminine (Feminine Inflections show when the noun is singular only)

Mode: indicative – subjunctive - imperative

##### 1.1.4 Verbal Agreement

Subject agreement:

Gender and number: singular feminine / singular masculine / plural masculine

Person: 1 s – 1p – 2 s m – 2 s f – 2 p m – 3 s m – 3 s f – 3 p m  
(When gender is not mentioned, this means that the same form is used for both masculine and feminine. 2 p m and 3 p m are used as a default plural form for both genders.)

No object agreement.

### 1.1.5 Transitivity Patterns

a- True Passive: The object of the active verb becomes the subject of the passive verb. The verb doesn't take a passive form as it does in Standard Arabic; instead, it changes its Stem. To illustrate, a simple tri-radical Stem-I verb (katab 'he wrote'; nisi 'he forgot') is formed as a Stem-VII verb (nkatab 'was written') or Stem-VIII (nṭasa 'was forgotten'), with the derivational affix underlined.

b- Impersonal (or Subject-less) Passive: If the verb has no object but has a prepositional complement, an impersonal passive is formed which is unlike the English Passive where the object of preposition becomes the subject of the passive verb. E.g.,

(1) maa nsakan bi-hal-beet  
not be lived.PER.3s m in this house

or

hal-beet maa nsakan fi-i  
this house not be lived.PER.3s m in-3s

'This house hasn't been lived in.'

(In the second sentence, hal-beet has undergone left-dislocation; note that a resumptive pronominal appears inside PP.)

c- Mediopassive: This is a passive form that doesn't imply an external agent. E.g.

(2) nkasar-it l-ṭanniine  
be broken.PER-3s f the-bottle  
'The bottle was broken./The bottle broke.'

This sentence doesn't assume that somebody broke the bottle.

d- Causative: This is usually expressed through Stem-II verbs, meaning 'to make happen'. If the verb is intransitive, it becomes transitive (e.g. d'ahar 'he went out'; d'ahhar 'he took someone/something out'). If it is transitive, it becomes di-transitive (e.g. daras 'he studied'; darras 'he taught').

### 1.1.6 Null Arguments

Arabic is a subject pro-drop language. If the noun reference is understood in context, the agreement on the verb is enough indication of the person (1s, 2s m, etc.). Pronouns are used only to establish contrast. E.g.,

(3) Samiir man-o hoon; dahar maṣ asḥaab-o  
Samiir not-him here; go out.3s m with friends-his  
'Samiir isn't here; he went out with his friends.'

But if the subject is Samiir and Jane, and the speaker wants to say that Samiir went out with his friends, whereas Jane is in the library, then the second half of the sentence will be:

(4) huwwe d'ahar maṣ asḥaab-o w-hiyye bi-l-maktabe  
he go out.PER.3s m with friends-his and-she in-the-library  
'He went out with his friends and she is in the library.'

Otherwise, the use of the pronoun will be unnatural.

### 1.1.7 Non-Finite Categories

Non-finite categories include:

Gerunds or verbal nouns; e.g.,

- (5)    b-ji-krah                      l-safar                      bi-l-beexra  
           IND-IMP.3m-hate.s        the-travelling            in-the-ship  
           ‘He hates traveling by ship.’

Subjunctive

Hypotactic; e.g.

- (6)    xaaf                      ʔinno                      ji-s<sup>o</sup>t<sup>o</sup>  
           fear.PER.3s m        that                      SUB.IMP. 3m-fail.s  
           ‘He was worried that he might fail (a test).’

Paratactic; e.g.

- (7)    xaaf                      ji-s<sup>o</sup>t<sup>o</sup>  
           fear.PER.3s m        SUB.IMP. 3m-fail.s  
           ‘He was worried that he might fail (a test).’

## 1.2 Matrix Clause

### 1.2.1 Basic word order

Sentences with verbal predicates can be SVO/VSO; the first is more common due to loss of case-marking.

### 1.2.2 Alternate word orders

Sentences with non-verbal predicates, as well as sentences with simple imperfect verbal predicates with adjectival/descriptive meaning, are usually realized as Subject-Predicate. E.g.,

- (8)    ʃiʔl-o                      mniih                      /                      ʃiʔl-o                      b-j-taʔʔib (bitaʔʔib)<sup>1</sup>  
           work-his                      good                      /                      work-hisIND-IMP.3m-tire.s  
           ‘His job is good.’                      /                      ‘His job is tiring.’

Sentences with a prepositional predicate and an indefinite noun as a subject are normally realized as [Existential *fii* – Subject – Predicate] or [Predicate – Existential *fii* – Subject]. E.g.,

- (9)    fii            isteez    bi-l-maʔʔab                      or            bi-l-maʔʔab    fii    isteez  
           exist    teacher    in-the-playground  
           ‘There is a teacher in the playground.’

### 1.2.3 Ordering of nominal and pronominal arguments

Basically the ordering is the same, though subject pronouns are not used unless the predicate is a prepositional phrase, which shows no inflection for person or number or gender; pronouns are also used to avoid ambiguity or to show contrastive emphasis.

## 1.3 Embedded Clause

### 1.3.1 Basic word order

If a pronominal subject is used, it will be in the form of a clitic in a subjunctive, hypotactic form. E.g.,

---

<sup>1</sup> /b j C/ --> [biC]; /b j V/ --> [bjV]

- (10) bint-o                zakijje.                ma                b-j-xaaf  
 daughter-his        smart.                not                IND-IMP.3m-fear.s

ʔinn-a                ti-s<sup>o</sup>t<sup>o</sup>  
 that-she                SUB.IMP.3f-fail.s  
 ‘His daughter is smart. He isn’t worried that she might fail (a test).’

N.B. *ʔinno* (with the masculine singular clitic *-o*) can be used by default with all persons. My intuition is that the clitic *-o* lost its semantic value and that *ʔinno* is used as a complementizer-only word.

If a paratactic form is used, no clitic, apart from the agreement on the verb, is used.

- (11) bint-o                zakijje. ma                b-j-xaaf                ti-s<sup>o</sup>t<sup>o</sup>  
 daughter-his        smart. not                IND-IMP.3m-fear.s        SUB.IMP.3f-fail.s  
 ‘His daughter is smart. He isn’t worried that she might fail (a test).’

If a referential subject is used, the word order can be SV or VS

Hypotactic; e.g.

- (12) ma                b-j-xaaf                ʔinno                bint-o                ti-s<sup>o</sup>t<sup>o</sup>  
 not                IND-IMP.3m-fear.s        that                daughter-his        SUB.IMP.3f-fail.s
- (13) ma                b-j-xaaf                ʔinno                ti-s<sup>o</sup>t<sup>o</sup>                bint-o  
 not                IND-IMP.3m-fear.s        that                SUB.IMP.3f-fail.s        daughter-his  
 ‘He is not worried that his daughter might fail (a test).’

Paratactic; e.g.

- (14) ma                b-j-xaaf                bint-o                ti-s<sup>o</sup>t<sup>o</sup>  
 not                IND-IMP.3m-fear.s        daughter-his        SUB.IMP.3f-fail.s
- (15) ma                b-j-xaaf                ti-s<sup>o</sup>t<sup>o</sup>                bint-o  
 not                IND-IMP.3m-fear.s        SUB.IMP.3f-fail.s        daughter-his  
 ‘He is not worried that his daughter might fail (a test).’

Some verbs prefer a hypotactic embedded clause. E.g., the verb *bja ʃrif* ‘he knows’:

- (16) b-j-aʃrif                ʔinno                li-wleed                bi-l-maʃab  
 IND-IMP.3m-know.s        that                the-children        in-the-playground
- (17) ? b-j-aʃrif                ----                li-wleed                bi-l-maʃab  
 ‘He knows that the children are in the playground.’

The word order in non-verbal embedded clauses is normally Subject-Predicate. If the subject is indefinite, then existential *fii* is used.

- (18) b-j-aʃrif                ʔinno                fii                wleed                bi-l-maʃab  
 IND-IMP.3m-know.s        that                exist                children in-the-playground

### 1.3.2 Verbal agreement

Agreement is the same in both matrix and embedded clauses.

### 1.3.3 Restrictions on tense, aspect, mood

Tense, aspect, and mood in embedded clauses depend on the meaning of the sentence. It also depends on selectional restrictions by the matrix verb; for example, if the verb in the matrix clause is the desiderative verb *baddo* ‘he wants’ or the implicative verb *heewal* ‘he tried’ and the embedded clause is verbal, the embedded verb takes on the subjunctive mood regardless of the tense, aspect, or mood of the matrix verb.

### 1.3.4 Possible morphological categories of the embedded clause

Embedded clauses can be (at least) one of the following:

#### Finite

- (19)     $\int$ ef-t-o                    lamma    fall  
           see-PER.1s-him    when    left.PER.3s m  
           ‘I saw him when he left.’

#### Participial

- (20)     $\int$ ef-t-o                    feelil  
           see-PER.1s-him    leaving  
           I saw him leaving.

#### Subjunctive (the closest to the English infinitival)

- (21)    fad<sup>ɕ</sup>d<sup>ɕ</sup>al                    ji-mfi  
           prefer PER.3s m    SUB.IMP.3m-walk.s  
            $\int$ ala     $\int$ inno    ji-rkud<sup>ɕ</sup>  
           on        that    SUB.IMP.3m-run.s  
           ‘He preferred walking to running.’

#### Gerund

- (22)    fad<sup>ɕ</sup>d<sup>ɕ</sup>al                                    l-mafi                     $\int$ ala    l<sup>2</sup>-rakid<sup>ɕ</sup>  
           prefer.PER.3s m                    the-walking            on        the-running  
           ‘He preferred walking to running.’

### 1.3.5 Non-control complements

Some verbs are catenative verbs; these are verbs that take a verbal or nominal complement.

#### Verbal Phrases as complements:

- (23)    b-j-fad<sup>ɕ</sup>d<sup>ɕ</sup>il                                    (inno)    ji- $\int$ ti $\chi$ il                                    bi-l-leel  
           IND-IMP.3m-prefer.s                    that    SUB.IMP.3m – work.s                    in-the-night  
           ‘He prefers to work at night.’

#### Verbal Nouns as complements - Nominalization:

- (24)    b-j-faddil                                    l- $\int$ i $\chi$ il                                    bi-l-leel  
           IND-IMP.3m-prefer.s                    the-work(ing)                    in-the-night  
           ‘He prefers working at night.’

Complementation can take the form of multiple embeddings. E.g.,

- (25)    wa $\int$ ad-ni                                    (inno)    rah  
           promise.PER.3s m-me                    (that)    going.to  
           j-d<sup>ɕ</sup>all                                    j-heewil                                    j-see $\int$ id-ni  
           SUB.IMP.3m-keep.s                    SUB.IMP.3m-try.s                    SUB.IMP.3m-help.s-me  
           ‘He promised that he will keep on trying to help me.’

---

<sup>2</sup> The definite marker /l/ surfaces identical to a following coronal segment. In this case, /l/ should be transcribed as [r], but I did not transcribe as such so as to keep the marker more noticeable.

Raising:

- (26) maa xat<sup>ʕ</sup>ar ʕa(la) beel-i  
 not cross.PER.3s m on mind-me
- ʔinno Lajla rah t-ʕuuf-ak  
 that Leila going.to SUB.IMP.3f-see.s-you  
 ‘It didn’t cross my mind that Leila would see you.’

N.B. The 3sm in *xat<sup>ʕ</sup>ar* has no reference in the sentence. Notice how it doesn’t agree with the raised subject in the following sentence.

- (27) Lajla maa xat<sup>ʕ</sup>ar ʕa(la) beel-i  
 Leila not cross.PER.3s m on mind-me
- ʔinno rah t-ʕuuf-ak  
 that going.to SUB.IMP.3f-see.s-you  
 ‘It didn’t cross my mind that Leila would see you.’
- (28) d<sup>ʕ</sup>aruuri (ʔinno) Lajla t-eekol mneeh  
 essential (that) Leila SUB.IMP.3f-eat.s well  
 ‘It is important that Leila eats well.’
- (29) Lajla d<sup>ʕ</sup>aruuri (ʔinno) t-eekol mneeh  
 Leila essential (that) SUB.IMP.3f-eat.s well  
 ‘It is important that Leila eats well.’

N.B. My intuition about the raising versions is that they are more topicalization than anything.

On the same note, Mohammad (2000) holds that there is no raising in Arabic because fronting the subject does not result with subject-verb agreement, which is further supported in the example with the verb *xat<sup>ʕ</sup>ar* above.

## 2 Control Profile

It is worth noting here that the following cases might not be control at all, as argued below. We consider below whether the structures instantiate control (PRO in the embedded subject position) or null subject phenomena (*pro* in the embedded subject position). The question is relevant because the particular structures are not particularly control-like. Arabic is a subject *pro*-drop language, it has no infinitives, and the embedded clauses all allow an overt subject DP that is not coreferential with a matrix DP. If the examples are not control, they are clearly not relevant to theorizing about control or formulating cross-linguistic generalizations about control.

Most of the diagnostics point to the conclusion that there actually is no control in Arabic and that the embedded subject in the above data is always *pro*. The diagnostics that we use to distinguish PRO vs. *pro* come largely from Hornstein 1999. They are as follows:

DIAGNOSTIC	PRO	<i>pro</i>
non-sentence-internal antecedent	no	yes
antecedent choice subject to MDP	yes	no
non-c-commanding antecedent	no	yes
strict reading under ellipsis allowed	yes	no
split antecedent allowed	no	yes
object antecedent in adjuncts	no	yes
alternates with an overt DP	no?	yes

2.1 forward subject control into subjunctive complement

2.1.1 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, desiderative: *rafad* ‘refuse’

verb, implicative: *heewal* ‘try’

verb, aspectual: *ballaf* ‘begin’

2.1.2 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

bi-clausal structure

- (30) Samiir rafad<sup>ϕ</sup> (ʔinno) ji-ħki maɣ-na  
 Samiir refuse.PER.3s m (that) SUB.IMP.3m-talk.s with-us
- (31) \*Samiir<sub>i</sub> rafad<sup>ϕ</sup> (ʔinno) Samiir<sub>i</sub> ji-ħki maɣ-na  
 ‘Samiir refused to talk to us.’
- (32) Lajla heewal-it (ʔinno/ʔinn-a) ti-ktub l-riseele  
 Leila try.PER-3s f (that/that-she) SUB.IMP.3f-write.s the-letter
- (33) \*Lajla<sub>i</sub> heewal-it (ʔinno/ʔinn-a) Lajla<sub>i</sub> ti-ktub l-riseele  
 ‘Leila tried to write the letter.’

Tri-clausal structure

- (34) Samiir heewal (ʔinno) ji-rfad<sup>ϕ</sup> ji-ftiyil  
 Samiir try.PER.3s m (that) SUB.IMP.3m-refuse.s SUB.IMP.3m-work.s  
 ‘Samiir tried to refuse to work.’

2.1.3 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

- (35) li-tlemiiz heewal-o ʔinno kill-on ji-nɣah-o  
 the-students try.PER-3p m that all-them SUB.IMP.3m-succeed-p  
 ‘All the students tried to succeed./The students tried to all succeed.’

It is worth noting that although *rafad* ‘refuse’ is a subject-control verb, it is not an object control verb, and it doesn’t even induce object raising – no ECM

- (36) Samiir<sub>i</sub> rafad<sup>ϕ</sup> ʔinno t<sup>ϕ</sup>oni<sub>k</sub> ji-ħki maɣ-na  
 Samiir refuse.PER.3s m that Toni SUB.IMP.3m-talk.s with-us
- (37) \*Samiir<sub>i</sub> rafad<sup>ϕ</sup> t<sup>ϕ</sup>oni<sub>k</sub> ʔinno ji-ħki maɣ-na  
 ‘Samiir refused that Toni talk to us.’

2.1.4 Control type: Not Control

Evidence suggests that the structure in question is not in fact control. When we consider antecedent options for zero embedded subjects, we find that the choice is rather free. Compare *zakkar* ‘remind’ with *twaʔaʔa* ‘expect’ in the following sentences.

- (38) zamaal kteer b-ji-nsa.  
 Jamaal very IND-IMP.3m.forget.s.
- mbeerih Samiir zakkar-o (ʔinno) j-fill  
 yesterday Samiir remind.PER.3s m-him (that) SUB.IMP.3m-leave.s  
 ‘Jamaal is very forgetful. Yesterday Samiir reminded him that he should leave.’

- (39) *ʒamaal kteer xaduum.*  
 Jamaal very helpful.
- kil-naa twaʔʔaʕ-na (?inno) j-seeʕid-na  
 all-us expect.PER-1p (that) SUB.IMP.3m-help.s-us  
 ‘Jamaal is very helpful. We all expected him to help us.’

Whereas the null subject of the embedded clause requires an antecedent with the verb *zakkar* ‘remind’, it does not need to have an antecedent when the matrix verb is *twaʔʔaʕ* ‘expect’ – although an antecedent is also possible:

- (40) *ʒamaal kteer xaduum.*  
 Jamaal very helpful.
- kil-naa twaʔʔaʕ-na minn-o (?inno) j-seeʕid-na  
 all-us expect.PER-1p from-him (that) SUB.IMP.3m-help.s-us  
 ‘Jamaal is very helpful. We all expected him to help us.’

The examples below show that the antecedent choice for the embedded subject need not obey the Minimal Distance Principle. With what would be a canonical object control verb, the embedded subject can be interpreted as coindexed with the matrix subject or object:

- (41) *Samiir<sub>i</sub> ttafaʔ maʕ ʒamaal<sub>k</sub> ʔinno ji-resm-o<sub>i/k</sub>*  
 Samiir agree.PER.3s m with Jamaal that SUB.IMP.3m-draw.s-him  
 ‘Samiir made a deal with Jamaal that he (Samiir or Jamaal) draw him.’

The sentence is ambiguous even when the object of the embedded verb is an anaphor:

- (42) *Samiir<sub>i</sub> ttafaʔ maʕ ʒamaal<sub>k</sub> ʔinno*  
 Samiir agree.PER.3s m with Jamaal that
- ji-rsum haal-o<sub>i/k</sub>  
 SUB.IMP.3m-draw.s self-him  
 ‘Samiir made a deal with Jamaal for him (Samiir, Jamaal) to draw himself.’
- (43) *Samiir<sub>i</sub> zakkar ʒamaal<sub>k</sub>*  
 Samiir remind.PER.3s m Jamaal
- ʔinno rah ji-rsum haal-o<sub>i</sub>  
 that going.to SUB.IMP.3m-draw.s self-him  
 ‘Samiir reminded Jamaal that he (Samiir, Jamaal, someone else) will draw himself.’
- (44) *Samiir<sub>i</sub> xabbar ʒamaal<sub>k</sub> ʔinno*  
 Samiir tell.PER.3s m Jamaal that
- rah ji-rsum haal-o<sub>i</sub>  
 going.to SUB.IMP.3m-draw.s self-him  
 ‘Samiir told Jamaal that he (Samiir, Jamaal) will draw himself.’

Notice that *ʔinno* is not optional in this last sentence.

The sentence becomes unambiguous if the matrix verb ‘order’ is used; however, this seems to be a semantic consequence of the matrix verb.



- (45) Samiir<sub>i</sub> ʔamar                      ʒamaal<sub>k</sub>                      (ʔinno)  
 Samiir    order.PER.3s m    Jamaal                      that
- ji-rsum                                      haal-o<sub>k</sub>  
 SUB.IMP.3m-draw.s                      self-him  
 ‘Samiir ordered Jamaal to draw himself.’

All that the above examples amount to is a Minimal Distance Principle (MDP) violation since subject control is possible even in the presence of a c-commanding object.

The examples below illustrate that the antecedent of the embedded subject need not c-command it. The antecedent can be the possessor of the subject.

- (46) bajj/abu<sub>i</sub>                      Lajla<sub>k</sub>                      rafad<sup>c</sup>  
 father.of                      Leila                      refuse.PER.3s m
- (ʔinno) ji-rsum                                      haal-o<sub>i</sub>  
 (that) SUB.IMP.3m-draw.s                      self-him  
 ‘Leila’s father refused to draw himself.’

- (47) bajj/abu<sub>i</sub>                      Lajla<sub>k</sub>                      rafad<sup>c</sup>  
 father.of                      Leila                      refuse.PER.3s m
- (ʔinno/ʔinn-a)    ti-rsum                                      haal-a<sub>k</sub>  
 (that/that-she) SUB.IMP.3f-draw.s                      self-her  
 ‘Leila’s father refused that she draw herself.’

- (48) bajj/abu<sub>i</sub>                      Lajla<sub>k</sub>                      rafad<sup>c</sup>                      (ʔinno)  
 father.of                      Leila                      refuse.PER.3s m                      (that)
- ji-rsim-a<sub>k</sub>  
 SUB.IMP.3m-draw.s-her  
 ‘Leila’s father refused to draw her.’

- (49) bajj/abu<sub>i</sub>                      Lajla<sub>k</sub>                      rafad<sup>c</sup>                      (ʔinno)                      ti-rism-o<sub>i</sub>  
 father.of                      Leila                      refuse.PER.3s m                      (that)                      SUB.IMP.3f-draw.s-him  
 ‘Leila’s father refused that she draw him.’

These last four sentences seem to abide by Landau’s (2004) definition of F-subjunctive (free subjunctives) whereby “no constraint applies to the embedded subject” (p. 827).

In conclusion, the antecedent for the missing subject of the embedded clause in control-like sentences can be in a variety of syntactic positions, not all of which are compatible with what is known about canonical controller-controllee relations.

Further, we note that, in general, the embedded subject position of clausal-complement taking verbs can be realized with a full DP that is not controlled. This is possible even in the case of verbs which are cross-linguistically restricted to control interpretations such as *heewal* ‘try’.

- (50) ʔ Samiir                      heewal                      ʔinno    l-ʔad<sup>c</sup>ijje                      ti-nhall  
 Samiir                      try.PER.3s m                      that                      the-case                      SUB.IMP.3f-solved.s
- bas    ma    ʔidir  
 but    not    be.able. PER.3s m  
 ‘Samiir tried that the case get solved but he didn’t succeed.’

The meaning here is that he didn’t try to solve the problem himself; he tried to get it solved. This, however, can be the result of a lazy tongue; the sentence will certainly sound better if said in this way:

- (51) Samiir heewal ʔinno j-xalli l-ʔad<sup>ʕ</sup>ijje  
 Samiir try.PER.3s m that SUB.IMP.3m-make.s the-case
- ti-nhall bas ma ʔidir  
 SUB.IMP.3f-solved.s but not be.able. PER.3s m  
 ‘Samiir tried that the case get solved but he didn’t succeed.’

Such examples cast further doubt on the existence of true control structures in Lebanese Arabic. We propose that there is in fact no control. Null embedded subjects are never PRO.

## 2.2 forward subject control into finite complement

### 2.2.1 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, implicative: *nisi* ‘forget’

verb, perception: *hass / ʃa ʃar* ‘feel’

### 2.2.2 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

bi-clausal structure

- (52) ʒamiil nisi ʔinno ʃtara xibiz  
 Jamiil forget.PER.3s m that buy.PER.3s m bread  
 ‘Jamiil forgot buying bread.’
- (53) l-raʔiis hass ʔinno ʔilit<sup>ʕ</sup>  
 the-president feel.PER.3s m that mistake.PER.3s m  
 ‘The president felt that he made a mistake.’
- (54) l-raʔiis hass ʔinno raħ ji-ʔlat<sup>ʕ</sup>  
 the-president feel.PER.3s m that going to SUB.IMP.3m mistake.s  
 ‘The president felt that he was going to make a mistake.’

tri-clausal structure

- (55) l-malik hass ʔinno ballaʃ ji-kbar  
 the-king feel.PER.3s m that begin.PER.3s m SUB.IMP.3m-age.s  
 ‘The king felt that he started growing old.’

### 2.2.3 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

- (56) l-ʔaheeli hass-o ʔinno kill-on ʔilt<sup>ʕ</sup>-o  
 the-parents feel.PER-3p m that all-them mistake.PER-3p m  
 ‘The parents felt that they all have made a mistake.’

## 2.3 forward oblique control into subjunctive complement

### 2.3.1 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, manipulative: *tʕalab* ‘ask/request’

verb, desiderative: *twaʔʔa ʃ* ‘expect’

### 2.3.2 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

bi-clausal structure

- (57) l-walad tʕalab/twaʔʔa ʃ min bajj-o (ʔinno) j-seeʃd-o  
 the-child ask/expect.PER.3s m from dad-his (that) SUB.IMP.3m-help.s-him  
 ‘The child asked/expected his dad to help him.’

also

- (58) l-walad tʿalab min bajj-o ʔinno imm-o  
the-child ask.PER.3s m from dad-his that mother-his  
t-seeʔd-o  
SUB.IMP.3m-help.s-him  
'The child asked his dad that his mother help him.'

### 2.3.3 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

- (59) l-walad tʿalab min bajj-o w-xajj-o  
the-child ask.PER.3s m from dad-his and-brother-his  
ʔinno tnajn-eeton j-seeʔd-u-u  
(that) two-them SUB.IMP.3m-help-p-him  
'The child asked both his dad and brother to help him.'

### 2.3.4 Control Type

Ellipsis data seem to show that embedded clauses allow only a sloppy reading under ellipsis. This is the expected result if the construction is control but it is perhaps unexpected if the embedded subject is pro. The other diagnostics point away from control and we have no account of these restricted interpretations under ellipsis.

- (60) Samiir tʿalab min xajj-o (ʔinno)  
Samiir ask.PER.3s m from brother-his (that)  
j-seeʔd-o. w-ʒamaal kameen  
SUB.IMP.3m-help.s-him. and-Jamaal too  
'Samiir asked his brother to help him, and Jamaal did too.'

OBLIQUE CONTROL – Meaning that 'Jamaal asked his own brother to help him.' - SLOPPY

## 2.4 forward object control into subjunctive complement

### 2.4.1 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, manipulative: *xalla* 'allow'

verb, implicative: *zakkar* 'remind'

### 2.4.2 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

bi-clausal structure

- (61) Samiir xalla/zakkar ʒamaal j-fill  
Samiir allow/remind.PER.3s m Jamaal SUB.IMP.3m-leave.s  
'Samiir allowed Jamaal to leave/Samiir reminded Jamaal that he should leave.'

Observe the following sentences:

- (62) Samiir<sub>i</sub> xalla ʒamaal<sub>k</sub> ji-resm-o<sub>i/\*k</sub>  
Samiir allow.PER.3s m Jamaal SUB.IMP.3m-draw.s-him  
'Samiir allowed Jamaal to draw him.' UNAMBIGUOUS
- (63) Samiir<sub>i</sub> xalla ʒamaal<sub>k</sub> ji-resm haal-o<sub>\*i/k</sub>  
Samiir allow.PER.3s m Jamaal SUB.IMP.3m-draw.s self-him  
'Samiir allowed Jamaal to draw himself.' UNAMBIGUOUS

In these last sentences, it is clear that the verbs are exclusively Object Control.

2.4.3 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

- (64) Samiir<sub>i</sub> xalla li-wleed kill-on ji-resm-o  
 Samiir allow.PER.3s m the-children all-them SUB.IMP.3m-draw-p  
 ‘Samiir allowed the children to all draw.’

2.4.4 Control type

Again, ellipsis data show that sloppy readings are allowed.

- (65) Samiir twaʔʔaʃ (ʔinno) ji-rbaħ  
 Samiir expect.PER.3s m (that) SUB.IMP.3m-win.s  
 w-ʒamaal kameen  
 and-Jamaal too  
 ‘Samiir expected to win, and Jamaal did too.’ (meaning: *Jamaal expected to win.*)
- (66) Samiir xalla xajj-o (ʔinno) ji-dʕhar  
 Samiir allow.PER.3s m brother-his (that) SUB.IMP.3m-go out.s  
 w-ʒamaal kameen  
 and-Jamaal too  
 ‘Samiir allowed his brother to go out, and Jamaal did too.’

OBJECT CONTROL – Meaning that ‘Jamaal allowed his own brother to go out.’ – SLOPPY

The permissibility of split antecedents, however, points to a non-control analysis. Split antecedents are possible for the empty embedded subject position. Both the subject and the object (direct or oblique) of the matrix clause jointly control the subject of the embedded clause. Such interpretations are not usually thought to be possible (pace Landau) for PRO but are allowed for pro.

- (67) Samiir ʔamar ʒamaal (ʔinno) ji-ʃtiɣl-o  
 Samiir order.PER.3s m Jamaal that SUB.IMP.3m-work-p  
 sawa  
 together  
 ‘Samiir ordered Jamaal that they have to work together.’
- (68) Samiir tʕalab min ʒamaal (ʔinno)  
 Samiir asked.PER.3s m from Jamaal (that)  
 ji-ʃtiɣl-o sawa  
 SUB.IMP.3m-work-p together  
 ‘Samiir asked Jamaal if they (Samiir and Jamaal) would work together.’ (closest translation!)

The embedded verb may also be non-subjunctive:

- (69) Samiir zakkar ʒamaal ʔinno raħ  
 Samiir order.PER.3s m Jamaal that going.to  
 ji-ʃtiɣl-o sawa  
 IMP.3m-help-p together  
 ‘Samiir reminded Jamaal that they were going to work together.’

Further evidence against a control analysis comes from the behavior of adjuncts. According to Hornstein (1999: 76), “PRO-headed adjuncts do not permit object control” in a sentence like ‘*Sue helped Tom without knowing it*’, unless the adjunct includes a pronoun as in ‘*Sue helped Tom without his knowing it.*’ In Arabic however, a null subject in an adjunct can have subject orientation, (68), or object orientation, (69), as shown by the agreement on the verb:

- (70) Samiir seeʕad Lajla min-duun ma ja-ʕrif  
 Samiir help.PER.3s m Leila with-out not IMP.3m-know.s  
 ‘Samiir helped Leila without (him) knowing it.’
- (71) Samiir seeʕad Lajla min-duun ma ta-ʕrif  
 Samiir help.PER.3s m Leila with-out not IMP.3f-know.s  
 ‘Samiir helped Leila without (her) knowing it.’

## References

- Cowell, Mark W. 1964. *A Reference Grammar of Syrian Arabic (based on the dialect of Damascus)*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. “Movement and Control.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 69-96.
- Landau, Idan. 2004. “The Scale of Finiteness and the Calculus of Control.” *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22, 811-877.
- Mitchell, T.F. and S.A. al-Hassan. 1994. *Modality, Mood and Aspect in Spoken Arabic with special reference to Egypt and the Levant*. London and New York: Kegan Paul International. (A Grammar)
- Mohammad, Mohammad. 2000. *Word order, agreement, and pronominalization in standard and Palestinian Arabic*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

*Youssef A. Haddad*  
*Department of Linguistics*  
*University of Florida*  
*Gainesville, Florida, USA*  
*yah-ufl.edu*  
<http://plaza.ufl.edu/yah/>

---

\* Notes and abbreviations:

- IPA is used to transcribe the Arabic words and sentences.
- A dash (-) to mark morpheme boundaries if the morpheme is a suffix or a prefix.
- A dot (.) is used when the morpheme is a template/infix or a portmanteau (having more than one function).
- m = masculine
- f = feminine
- SUB = subjunctive
- IND = indicative
- PER = perfect
- IMP = imperfect
- s = singular
- p = plural
- 1 = 1st person
- 2 = 2nd person
- 3 = 3rd person