

Modality and the Evaluative Schema

Dr. Mohammad Ali Al Zahrani

*Associate Professor, Fellow of HEA, United Kingdom
Foreign Languages Department (FLD), College of Arts, Taif University*

m.zah@tu.edu.sa

Modality and the Evaluative Schema

Dr. Mohammad Ali Al Zahrani

(Received 09/04/2020; accepted 05/05/2020; Published 14/02/2021)

Abstract: Linguistic investigations on Hijazi Arabic modal elements have only considered a small class of modals classified under the three domains of modality, and consequently assigned different places in the hierarchy within the Principles and Parameters syntactic approach (P&P) (Chomsky, 1981, 1986) along with insights of Chomsky's Minimalist Program (MP) (Chomsky, 1995, 1999, 2000). The current paper investigates some other HA expressions that evaluate the speaker's attitudes, opinions and judgments from another perspective. It adopts the *evaluative schema* suggested by Heine (1993) and characterized by the form "*it is X to/that Y*" where X stands for the evaluative component expressing the speaker's judgement, and Y is the main prediction occurring in the complement selected by X. The purpose of the study is twofold. First, it presents the most common HA expressions that convey the speaker's evaluation towards a proposition using Heine's *evaluative schema* structure "*it is X to/that Y*". Second, since Heine's (1993) purpose does not explore the syntax of the evaluative structure, the paper explicates the components of Heine's structure in light of the syntactic studies on HA clauses within the generative syntax theory. The findings show that the evaluative components in the present study belong to different classes occurring in a CP clause. They may be preceded by a realized expletive subject, or by its phonetically null equivalent, and select for CP complements. This work should contribute to the field of HA modality in particular and enhance the discussion of the evaluative schema, in general.

Key words: modality, generative syntax, evaluation, subjectivity, judgement, Hijazi Arabic, CP complements.



الموقفية والصيغة التقديرية

د. محمد بن علي الزهراني

(قدم للنشر في 16/08/1441هـ؛ وقبل للنشر في 12/09/1441هـ؛ ونشر في 02/07/1442هـ)

المستخلص: تطرقت الدراسات الحجازية إلى عدد بسيط من أدوات الموقفية والتي صُنفت الأدوات فيها بناء على الأقسام الثلاثة الشهيرة للموقفية، وفحصت أماكنها البنائية بحسب معانيها البيانية في أطر المبادئ والوسائط (تشومسكي-1981) وبرنامج نظرية الحد الأدنى (تشومسكي-1995)، فكانت هذه الدراسة الحالية والتي تفحص أدوات موقفية أخرى تعبر عن موقف المتحدث وأراءه وتقديراته وذاتيته. تتبنى الدراسة إطار هين Heine (1993) والذي يعتمد على الصيغة (إنه من «س» أن «ص») حيث إن «س» متغير لأداة الموقفية و«ص» متغير لتتمتها. وبذلك فالغاية من هذه الورقة ثنائية. أولاً: النظر إلى أدوات موقفية أخرى لم يتم فحصها نحويًا في ضوء النظريات الحديثة. ثانياً: فحص الخصائص النحوصرفية لتلك الأدوات الموقفية في ضوء ما توصلت إليه نتائج الفحص النحوية في أطر نظريات النحو التوليدية. وتبين النتائج أن الأدوات الموقفية متنوعة ما بين صفات وأسماء وأفعال وتولد في جملة CP، وقد تكون الأداة الذاتية مسبقة بضمير الشأن المرفوع الظاهر/ الغائب (هو) - أو بنظيره المنصوب (-ه) عند دخول (إن). وللورقة إسهامات في تقديم دراسات للحجازية لما تتم دراستها، كما أنها تعزز الكمّ المعرفي الذي يصف الخصائص النحوية في ضوء إطار هين Heine (1993).

الكلمات المفتاحية: الموقفية، الذاتية، النحو التوليدي، العربية، الحجازية.

1. Introduction⁽¹⁾

The literature on HA modality presents two studies in which some modal forms have been derived from verbal roots. These studies have adopted the Principles and Parameters syntactic approach (P&P) (Chomsky, 1981, 1986) along with insights of Chomsky's Minimalist Program (MP) (Chomsky, 1995) and its latest advancements (Chomsky, 1999, 2000) to argue for three hierarchical projections on the basis of the morphosyntactic-semantic interface of the modals. The present study fills a gap in the literature by exploring some more HA modal forms/phrases in terms of Heine's (1993) evaluative schema that is marked by the structure "*it is X to/that Y*". It should be, however, noted that Heine's (1993) purpose of the suggested schema is to trace the grammaticalization of the elements used in its structure. This is beyond the scope of the present paper that only adopts Heine's evaluative schema to explore more HA forms that fit to its structure, on the one hand, and evaluate speakers' attitudes and opinions, on the other. In addition, Heine's (1993) schema does not provide syntactic analysis, so such a gap will be filled by investigating the syntactic properties of the structure "*it is X to/that Y*" within the generative framework within which other HA studies have been conducted.

2. Modality

Scholars of linguistics and logic have been investigating modality since the work of von Wright (1951). Nevertheless, modality still shows many problematic and controversial issues (Nuyts, 2005a: 5). Such issues arise when looking at the different definitions of modality. Originally, the term *modality* is derived from the post-classical Latin *modalitas* that is linguistically related to the uses that concern "the qualification of a proposition as necessary or possible" (Nordström, 2010: 11). However, linguists have not confined themselves to its post-classical Latin sense, which is purely semantic. This, in turn, shows a reason behind some of its problematic and controversial issues

⁽¹⁾ I am very thankful to the anonymous reviewers for their insightful feedback, valuable comments and useful suggestions that have improved the manuscript; all remaining errors and typos are mine.



where some linguists treat modality more broadly to include not only semantic senses, but also grammatical senses, as well. Under such a view, modality includes some grammatical notions (moods) such as indicative, declarative, subjunctive, hortative, optative, *et cetera*, and semantic notions (modal markers) such as epistemic, deontic, dynamic, and evidential. What emphasizes the complexity of this broad scope of modality is Nordström's (2010: 16) argument that these terms (of moods and modal markers) are hard to define because they show fuzzy boundaries; besides, some of the grammatical markers are multifunctional. Hence, the complexity of the broad sense of modality shows a clear overlap between the grammatical moods and the semantic notions within which modality covers "any kind of speaker modification or qualifications of a state of affairs including the grammatical dimensions of tense and aspect (Nuyts, 2016: 32). This latter definition, by Nuyts, is used in philosophy, but as evidence for complexity, it is also used in linguistics to correspond to either the grammatical categories of TAM (tense-Aspect-Modality) (see Bybee, Perkins, & Pagliuca, 1994) or qualifications of state of affairs (see Nuyts, 2001; Nuyts, 2005a, 2005b). Therefore, Nuyts (2016: 32) combines the "TAM categories" and "the qualifications" in one expression: "qualificational categories", so it covers the semantic dimensions of time, aspect and different types of modality, on the one hand, and the TAM markers, on the other. The resulting combination of semantic and grammatical notions refers to the linguistic devices used for expressing these semantic dimensions (Nuyts, 2016: 32).

This brief overview of the overlap between the categories of mood and modality shows that the term "mood" is used in the sense of "modality" under this view to conclude that mood is a set of distinctive forms signaling modality (Zhang, 2019: 879). This also shows that modality can be coded grammatically in its broad sense due to the overlap with mood.

Contrary to modality in its broad sense where it can be coded by grammatical means, modality in its narrowed sense is expressed by lexical means, and is purely considered a semantic category referring to

the semantic notions of necessity, possibility, and ability (Racy, 2008: 16-17 & Zhang, 2019: 879). These semantic notions are characterized by the subjectivity of the speaker, i.e., the speaker's evaluation and judgement, which according to Herslund (2005: 46) is the unmarked feature of modality. This is on a par with Palmer's (1986: 16) definition of modality as markers expressing the "... speaker's (subjective) attitudes and opinion". Palmer uses *subjectivity* to refer to attitudes and opinions, and he claims that subjectivity is an "essential feature of modality" (Palmer, 2001: 102).

This view of modality proposes that speakers' attitudes and subjectivity are basic ingredients in defining modality, which is what the current paper considers for the investigation of the HA modal expressions in terms of the evaluative schema suggested by Heine's (1993) study on grammaticalization and auxiliaries. However, the present paper does not explore grammaticalization or auxiliaries, but it uses the schema to account for the HA structure that employs some modal expressions that have not been explored yet. Hence, the broad sense of modality is not adopted in the present paper because the paper does not investigate the grammatical moods or the grammatical categories of tense and aspect.

The question to be asked at this juncture is why the narrow sense of modality is preferred for this study. Straightforwardly, the narrow sense of modality directly relates to the evaluative schema adopted in this paper. In HA, the evaluative schema employs lexical items that express the subjective evaluation of the proposition (Section 3). Second, in some Germanic and Romance languages *modality* is clearly related to *mood* (Nordström, 2010: 11) where verb moods and modality can be simultaneously expressed by the same form as is the case in the Latin subjunctive mood, which may also express prohibition, wishes, obligation, and ability (de Haan, 2012: 8-9), and the West Greenlandic verb ending *-ssa* that can mark past tense, future and obligation (de Haan, 2012: 25). Also, in Classical/Standard Arabic verb moods are indicated by verbal inflections whose endings can also be affected by the modal forms (Alotaibi, 2019: 38), or by the presence of some future



and negative particles (Mousa, 2019: 47; Ryding, 2005: 422). Besides, CA and SA can express modality grammatically by morphological-syntactic elements (Andriy, 2016: 61). Contrary, Arabic dialects, including HA, have almost lost the mood marking system on verb endings: a case which suggests that verb moods and modality are not clearly related. In addition, while some implicit modal meanings in these dialects are conveyed by negation, tense expressions, interrogative structures (Alotaibi, 2019: 38) or by counterfactuality and hypotheticality (Al Zahrani, 2020), the present paper only focuses on the explicit use of modality as a pure semantic category that is expressed by some verbal and non-verbal forms, which have not been explored in any HA work. Therefore, the overlap between moods and modality in HA is not addressed and the broad sense of modality is not favored.

To summarize the main objectives of this paper, it firstly seeks to address one type of HA modal expressions, i.e., evaluative components, within the evaluative schema; these HA modal expressions have not been addressed in the growing literature of HA. It, secondly, provides the syntactic analysis of these evaluative components and their complements.

The subsequent sections of this paper are organized as follows. Section 3 briefly presents the literature on HA modals and modality. Section 4 presents an overview of Heine's (1993) schemas. Sections 5 and 6 present the HA modal expressions in terms of Heine's evaluative schema, and analyze the clausal structure of such expressions. Section 7 briefly explores the syntactic properties of the complement structures selected by the modal expressions, and Section 8 concludes the paper and presents some recommendations for future studies. Following the conclusions, Appendix (1) and Appendix (2) are provided for the transliteration and abbreviation symbols.

3. HA modals and modality

Before exploring some HA modal forms in terms of Heine's (1993) evaluative schema, the present section sheds light on the HA modality

literature and summarizes the basic findings that relate to the investigation of the evaluative schema of the present study. The work in HA has been attracting the interests of a number of HA linguists since the last decade. The literature shows that studies on HA have started since 1970s. Early studies were traditional. These traditional studies include Bakalla (1973) Ingham (1971) and Sieny (1978). Other works on HA include a reader textbook like Feghali's (1991) work, and a basic course textbook like Margaret's (1975) work. Notably, the latter work was prepared by the Foreign Service Institute in Washington, which shows the global significance of the dialect under study. Furthermore, generative linguists have been exploring different linguistic issues in HA (see for example, Kheshaifaty, 1996; Bardeas, 2005; Al Barrag, 2007, 2014; Al Zahrani, 2008, 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2016, 2018, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c; Al Barrag & Al Zahrani, 2017; Eifan, 2017; and Al Zahrani & Alzahrani, 2019, amongst others).

Amongst the aforementioned generative studies, there are two studies that have explored HA modality, namely Al Zahrani (2013) and (2018) (Al Zahrani's studies, henceforth). Because the current paper explores some HA modal forms, it mainly depends on these two studies, which, to the best of the author's knowledge, are the only studies that have deeply investigated HA modals and modality from morphological, syntactic and semantic perspectives. Al Zahrani's studies have adopted the Principles and Parameters syntactic approach (P&P) (Chomsky, 1981, 1986) along with insights of Chomsky's Minimalist Program (MP) (Chomsky, 1995) and its latest advancements (Chomsky, 1999, 2000). Al Zahrani's studies consider the main three domains of modality, vis. epistemic, deontic and dynamic, to investigate the morphosyntactic and semantic interface of the HA modals.

Apart from the dynamic modal form *laabudd*, Al Zahrani's studies show that the modals have been derived from verbal roots indicating necessity, possibility and ability notions. For instance, the verbal roots \sqrt{LZM} , \sqrt{MKN} and \sqrt{GDR} derive modal forms indicating necessity, possibility and ability notions respectively. Verbal roots of these



notions, according to the templatic morphology of Arabic, can derive a variety of modal forms including active and passive perfective forms, active and passive imperfective forms, active and passive participial forms, and gerund forms. The modal derivatives are mapped on some of the ten templatic forms of the trilateral verbal root as represented in the following table, adopted from Al Zahrani (2013: 39) (IPA symbols have been used for consistency).

Table 1: Modal Forms in HA

Type of Modality	Modal forms
Epistemic & Deontic	<i>laazim, yufītarāʔ^ʕ, waadʒib, mafruuʔ^ʕ, muftarāʔ^ʕ, laabudd, ʔ^ʕaruuri, yimkin, yuhtamal, muhtamal, ihtimaal, mustahiil, dʒaayiz, mumkin</i>
Dynamic (ability)	<i>laabudd, laazim, yigdar, gidir, gaadir</i>

These modals have been classified according to their semantic notions covering the main domains of modality. The studies use this semantic classification to argue for different hierarchical placement of each domain within the P&P (Chomsky, 1981, 1986) approach and the minimalist program (Chomsky, 1995, 1999, 2000). Epistemic modal forms are base-generated in the Epistemic Modal Projection that is higher than the tense phrase (TP) while deontic and dynamic modal forms are respectively base-generated in the Deontic Modal Projection (DModP) and Dynamic Modal Projection (DyModP) located between TP and VP: verb phrase.

It follows from this brief overview that Al Zahrani's studies adopt a morphosyntactic-semantic approach. The morphological and semantic interface shows that the notion of the verbal root derives the modal form; the semantic-syntactic interface shows that the semantic interpretation of the modal determines its hierarchy along the spine. The conclusion that can be drawn from Al Zahrani's studies is that the semantic scope mirrors the syntactic scope.

The present study depends on Al Zahrani's studies not only to explore some more HA modal forms that have not been investigated, but also to explore them from another perspective. Not to mention that,

to the best of the author's knowledge, they are the only available modality studies in the literature. To fill some gap in the HA literature, while Al Zahrani's studies have adopted the Principles and Parameters syntactic approach (P&P) (Chomsky, 1981, 1986) along with insights of Chomsky's Minimalist Program (MP) (Chomsky, 1995) and its latest advancements (Chomsky, 1999, 2000) to argue for different modal projections, vis. epistemic (EModP), deontic, (DModP), and dynamic (DyModP), the current paper uses Heine's (1993) evaluative schema to explore some other modal forms, phrases and expressions that have not been explored in Al Zahrani's studies, with the hope that Al Zahrani's studies and the current paper present different syntactic analyses for the HA modal forms, and this all contributes to the HA linguistic studies. Heine's (1993) *Evaluative Schema* is introduced in the next section.

4. An Overview of Heine's Schemas

Heine (1993: 27 - 43) claims that grammatical concepts are reasonably abstract in that they do not refer to "physical objects or kinetic processes" but are defined according to their functions. However, the literature shows that the origins of the grammatical elements do not emerge *ex nihilo*, but are derived from concrete concepts. For instance, the grammatical concepts of tense, aspect and modality are interpreted by some expressions derived from concrete entities conveying the general notions of: Location, Motion, Activity, Desire, Posture, Relation and Possession. These notions are linguistically expressed by verbal forms as shown in *Table 2*.

Table 2: Notions and their Indicative Verbs

Notions	Location	Motion	Activity	Desire	Posture	Relation	Possession
Verbs	<i>be at</i> <i>stay at</i>	<i>go</i> <i>come</i>	<i>do</i> <i>start</i>	<i>want</i> <i>wish</i>	<i>sit stand</i>	<i>be with</i> <i>be part of</i>	<i>Get</i> <i>have</i>

Heine claims that these verbal forms constitute only a small part of very complex concepts called *basic event schemas*: *Location, Motion, Action, Volition, Change-of-state, Equation, Accompaniment, Possession, and Manner*. An *event schema* refers to the "notion of proposition" that Langacker (1978: 857, cited in Heine 1993:31) defines as "a simple semantic unit consisting of a predicate and



associated variables, e.g., $x \text{ SEE } y$ ". Heine divides the schemas into basic (simple) and complex (see below) and argues that they provide a richer source for the grammaticalization of elements expressing the four categories of tense, aspect, mood and modality.

What Heine labels as simple basic event schemas are those requiring basic propositional contents of subject-predicate clauses. According to Heine, the cross-linguistic research reveals that the simple schemas have provided strong evidence for the grammaticalization of elements used to express the two categories of tense and aspect where some elements may become fully grammaticalized while others may show some degrees of grammaticalization. For instance, the Motion Schema has shown the grammaticalization of the English verb *go* (*be going to*) (Heine, 1993; Hopper & Traugott, 1993, 2003), the French *venir de*-past (Heine, 1993; Heine, Claudi, & Hunnemeyer, 1991; Heine & Reh, 1984) and the Arabic dialectal verb *rah* (go) (Jarad, 2014; Stewart, 1998; Vanhove, Miller, & Caubet, 2009); the Volition Schema has shown the grammaticalization of the English future element *will*, and the Arabic volition verbs *yabya* (Hopper & Traugott, 2003; Jarad, 2017; Persson, 2008), *yafa?* (Versteegh, 2014), *widd* (Mitchell & Al-Hassan, 1994).

Heine has also presented three complex schemas. These complex schemas are *the Serial Schema*, *the Purpose Schema*, and *the Evaluative Schema*. They are complex as they give rise to elements expressing mood and modality categories. What is important to the current paper is *the Evaluative Schema*.

The above brief overview of Heine's basic event schemas and complex schemas has shown that the aim of Heine's work (1993) is to present the schemas as a source for grammaticalization. Therefore, Heine's discussion has shown some grammaticalized elements where mood and modality are clearly related in some languages such as Telugu, Turkana and Swahili (see the examples in (2) below). However, exploring these schemas and how they relate to grammaticalization is beyond the scope of this paper. What this paper adopts from Heine's

(1993: 39-41) is only the evaluative schema, not as a source to trace the grammaticalization of HA modal forms, but as a structure that best accounts for some HA modal clauses that have not been investigated in Al Zahrani's studies (2013, 2018). Therefore, I confine the discussion of this schema to what is related to the purpose of this paper: the syntactic analysis of this evaluative schema structure and how it employs HA modals.

The evaluative schema is only presented in less than two pages in Heine's work (1993: 39-41) where Heine cites examples and arguments from Palmer (1986), but when possible, I refer to Palmer's arguments from the work published in (2001). This explains why the paper cites other references. More importantly, Heine has not detailed the syntactic analysis of the evaluative schema, which this paper aims to do with reference to some syntactic assumptions from other linguistic studies.

The evaluative schema refers to the speaker's judgement towards the proposition. Heine (1993: 39-40) states that this schema is based on judgements "introducing a modal notion" whose "main prediction" is introduced in a clausal complement of that notion". Heine's evaluative schema is used to express the epistemic/deontic notions of necessity and possibility where it reflects the speaker's evaluation of the utterance. This evaluation is expressed by evaluatives that belong to different categories including (mostly) adjectives as well as verbals and pronominals. Gryzhak (2018: 85) claims that these evaluatives give subjective characterization of the qualities of the referent, revealing the speaker's peculiar attitude towards the proposition; evaluatives convey "the speaker's attitude to the referent" (Kochetova & Volodchenkova, 2015: 293). Because evaluatives express "attitudes towards known facts", they must be included within modal systems (Palmer, 2001: 119).

Thus, Heine's (1993) evaluative schema belongs to modal systems and its structure can employ HA evaluative components as shown below. According to Heine, the evaluative schema is characterized by the structure "*it is X to/that Y*" where "X" can be a verb form, an adjectival form, or a nominal form introducing the evaluative concept.



Notably, Palmer (1986) explored the structure under study when exploring "complement clauses" before Heine's (1993) evaluative schema, but he has not labelled it as a modal structure; Palmer states "there are, however, some clauses that typically, but not exclusively, occur with adjectives and where the sentence is usually introduced by *it*" and he exemplified this by the examples I presented in (1a) adopted from Palmer (2002: 129). Note that Palmer's statement includes the adjective forms as typical forms because English mostly uses them as "a predicate nucleus, e.g., *essential, necessary, likely*" (Heine, 1993: 40). Other forms are also witnessed in Heine's (1993) evaluative schema as I show below.

The main syntactic properties of the evaluative schema structure, as presented by Heine (1993: 40) are the following. The evaluative concept introduced by the matrix clause (It is X) contains an impersonal expression. To clarify this, Heine (1993:40) has cited Palmer's (1986: 127) example presented in (1a) below, but he has not explored its syntactic structure in detail due to the fact that his purpose is to trace the grammaticalization of those elements used in the schema. Because the syntactic properties of Heine's (1993) evaluative schema are important to the analysis of HA modal forms, I shall detail some properties of the form "*it is X to/that Y*" before moving to Palmer's example in (1a), cited by Heine (1993:40).

To provide the syntactic analysis of Heine's (1993) evaluative schema clauses, the paper assumes the three basic hierarchical projections for any clause in the syntactic theory: the complementiser phrase (CP), the tense phrase (TP) and the verb phrase (VP) (see Chomsky, 1995; Ouhalla & Shlonsky, 2002; Radford 2009a, 2009b). Syntactically, the form "*it is X to/that Y*" shows two clauses: higher and lower. The higher clause (matrix clause) contains the structure "*it is X*" that expresses the modal notion and contains either a dummy subject with third person singular features or a null/expletive subject. This proposes that this structure lacks animate subjects that can indicate whose attitude or opinion is being reported (Palmer, 2001: 127). The dummy subject position is the specifier of the TP that is theoretically

dominated by a CP indicting the force and case-assigning properties (see, for example, Radford, 2009a). The head of the higher CP can be null or occupied (as I show in Arabic examples in Section 6). The lower clause containing the main prediction is the CP complement selected by X. To make this more practical, consider the examples in (1), adopted from Palmer (2001: 127), (Heine, 1993 cited (1a) only).

- (1) a. "It is essential that they should come".
 b. "It is likely that they will come".

Palmer (2001: 127) states that the modality notions in (1b) are deontic and epistemic respectively. Example (1b) cannot be deontic. What has made (1a) deontic is the infinitival verb following *should*. Again, the modality notions are retrieved from the evaluative concepts expressed via the higher clauses "It is essential" and "It is likely" that show the impersonal dummy subject *it* carrying third person singular features. This construction does not have a thematic referential subject in the main clause (higher clause), and this shows a crucial difference with those types of modality that have animate subjects as in "he must go".

Expressing modality through the evaluative schema is also witnessed in some languages including Telugu (Dravidian), and Swahili (Bantu, Niger-Congo), adopted from Heine (1993: 40) and presented in 0(2a-b) respectively, and Icelandic, adopted from Sigurðsson (2008: 14, cited in Nordström 2010: 43), and presented in (2c).

(2)	a.	<i>Neen</i>	<i>ii</i>	<i>sagati</i>	<i>mii</i>	<i>too</i>	<i>maatlaada</i>	<i>guuda</i>	<i>du</i>
		I	D	matter	2.pl	C	talk.Inf	be.suitable	Neg.3sg.M
		"I shouldn't talk to you about this matter."							
	b.	<i>Ni</i>	<i>heri</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>end-e</i>				
		be	luck	2sg	go-subj				
		"You'd better go."							
	c.	<i>Pað</i>	<i>Er</i>	<i>gaman</i>	<i>að</i>	<i>tunglið</i>	<i>skuli</i>	<i>brosa</i>	
		it	Is	fun	that	moon.the	shall.subj	smile	
		"It is fun that the moon smiles."							

According to Heine, while English mostly uses adjectivals to express modality in this schema, some other languages may employ adjectives (2a) or nouns (2b). Example (2a) can be interpreted as "it is



not suitable to talk to you about this matter" where the adjectival form *guuda* "suitable" occurs following the infinitival verb *maatlaada* "talk" whose mood is subjunctive. Both the mood of the verb and the evaluative component make the modality deontic (obligation) as can be seen in the translation. In (2b) the noun *heri* "luck" occurs before the subjunctive verb "go" to express the modal necessity. The complements in (2) are clausal as indicated by the CP layer headed by *too* "that" in (2a) and by the subjunctive verb with its argument in (2b). Similarly, (2c) employs the adjectival form *gaman* "fun" preceding the CP that contains the subjunctive verb. These three examples in (2) show some languages where mood and modality are clearly related, for more on moods indicating modality the reader is advised to see (de Haan, 2005, 2012; Vanhove *et al.*, 2009). However, this is not the case in HA as explained above.

The clausal structure "*it is X*" appears in HA with and without the morphological realization of the dummy subject, and it expresses the evaluative concepts as shown in (3).

(3)	<i>(hu:) muhim</i>	<i>j-dzu</i>
	(expl.nom) <i>important</i>	Impf.3pl-come
	<i>"It is important that they come."</i> Lit: "(it) important they-come"	

Example (3) shows the adjectival evaluative component *muhim* and its complement. The set of the round brackets indicates the optional presence of the dummy subject. The deep analysis of this HA structure is presented in Sections 4-7 that investigate the evaluative components belonging to the different nominal, adjectival and prepositional categories in HA, their different superficial clausal structures and their clausal complements within Heine's framework outlined in this section. Once again, it is important to mention that Heine's (1993) evaluative schema does not provide the detailed syntactic analysis needed for the current study; it only suggests the modal structure "*it is X to/that Y*" that the paper adopts to account for their modal notions. Yet, the paper uses the syntactic analyses of HA to provide a description of such modal expressions.

5. HA Evaluative Components

As is explained in Section 3, current HA modality literature has so far investigated some forms that belong to different grammatical categories including active and passive perfective forms, active and passive imperfective forms, active and passive participial forms, and gerund forms. This section and its subsequent sections constitute the main part of this paper. They explore the verbal, nominal, adjectival and prepositional modal forms/phrases, which are absent from the modality literature of HA. The author of this paper has collected those forms from written and spoken language posted on the social platforms including: Facebook, Twitter, WhatsApp, Instagram, and YouTube.

While the majority of these modal expressions are mainly adjectives, HA also employs some verbal and indefinite noun expressions (Ind.N, henceforth), which also evaluate the speaker's attitude. The adjectival and indefinite noun expressions can also appear in the scope of definiteness by virtue of the determinative *al-* 'the' prefixed to them to create the combination of *al+*Adjectival and *al+*Ind.N respectively. The resulting structures (*al+*Adjectival) and (*al+*Ind.N) can also appear in the scope of the preposition *min* deriving the structure of (*min al+*Adjectival) and (*min al+*Ind.N) which can be interpreted as "it is part of" (see the tables below).

The prepositional and definite nominal modals have been basically created from adjective forms (see Table 6). This is on a par with Heine (1993: 40), Palmer (2001: 129) and Gryzhak (2018: 85) who claim that the evaluatives are mostly adjectives. This fact is accounted for by Gryzhak (2018: 87) who holds that while other categories such as nouns, adverbs and modal verbs can evaluate the speaker's attitude, "adjectives are traditionally considered as the most obvious means of communicating this concept" because adjectives are mostly used as "a predicate nucleus" (Heine, 1993: 40) and "most typically, adjectives describe qualities of people, things, and states of affairs" (Biber *et al.*, 2007: 64). This is the case in HA as shown below.

According to this brief morphological analysis, the modal forms



under study can be classified into four categories: verbal, adjectivals, nominals, and prepositionals, listed in the tables below. Worthy of notice here is that the forms in the following tables (*Table 3* through *Table 6*) share one basic semantic property. They are impersonal expressions that reflect the subjectivity of the speaker towards the proposition. Note that while the tables provide the translation of the HA evaluatives, it is important to mention that some evaluatives may also carry other related or unrelated senses. For example, the literal meaning of the evaluative *hīlu* is 'beautiful', but it can also be used in a range of other senses such as "good, great, perfect, and ideal ...etc.", to mention a few. The purpose of the translation is to provide the general common meaning.

Table 3: Verbal Modal Expressions

Verbals
<i>yis'luh</i> 'become good'
<i>yinfaf</i> 'benefit'
<i>yidʒu:z</i> 'permitted/allowed'

Table 4: Adjectival Modal Expressions

Adjectivals
<i>γari:b</i> 'strange'
<i>ʃadʒi:b</i> 'wonderful'
<i>muhim</i> 'important/necessary'
<i>aki:d</i> 'sure/certain'
<i>muakkad</i> 'sure/certain'
<i>hīlu</i> 'good/beautiful'
<i>zain</i> 'good/beautiful'
<i>muḍhil</i> 'astonishing'
<i>ʔʔayyib</i> 'good'
<i>ʃa:di</i> 'good/fine/normal'
<i>ʔʔabi:ʃi</i> 'fine/normal'
<i>wa:qʔih</i> 'clear/apparent'
<i>afqʔal</i> 'better'
<i>aḥsan</i> 'better'
<i>adʒmal</i> 'more beautiful/better'

Table 5: Indefinite-Noun Modal Expressions

<i>Indefinite Nouns</i>
<i>xaba:lah</i> 'stupidity'
<i>hama:gah</i> 'stupidity'
<i>γaba:</i> 'stupidity'

Table 6: Nominal and Prepositional Modal Expressions Derived from Adjectivals and Indefinite Nouns

Nominals = adjectival + al-	Prepositionals= adjectival + min + al-
<i>alyari:b</i> 'the strange'	<i>min alyar:ib</i> 'it is part of the strange'
<i>alṣaḍi:b</i> 'the wonder'	<i>min alṣaḍ:ib</i> 'it is part of the wonder'
<i>almuhim</i> 'the important'	<i>min almuhim</i> 'it is part of the important'
<i>alaki:d</i> 'the certain/certainty'	<i>min alaki:d</i> 'it is part of the certain/certainty'
<i>almuakkad</i> 'the certain/certainty'	<i>min almuakkad</i> 'it is part of the certainty/ certainty'
<i>alhilu</i> 'the good/beautiful'	-
<i>almuḍhil</i> 'the astonishing'	<i>min almuḍhil</i> 'it is part of the astonishing'
<i>alṭʿayyib</i> 'the good/better'	<i>min alṭʿayyib</i> 'it is part of the good/better'
<i>alṭʿabiṣi</i> 'the normal'	<i>min alṭʿabiṣi</i> 'it is part of the normal'
<i>alwa:dih</i> 'the clear/apparent'	<i>min alw:adih</i> 'it is part of the clear/apparent'
<i>alafḍʿal</i> 'the better'	<i>min alafḍʿal</i> 'it is part of the better'
<i>alahsan</i> 'the better/good'	<i>min alahsan</i> 'it is part of the better/good'
<i>aladḡmal</i> 'the more beautiful/ the better'	<i>min aladḡmal</i> 'it is part of the more beautiful'
<i>alxaba:lah</i> 'the stupidity'	<i>min alxaba:lah</i> 'it is part of the stupidity'
<i>alhama:gah</i> 'the stupidity'	<i>min alhama:gah</i> 'it is part of the stupidity'
<i>alyaba:</i> 'the stupidity'	<i>min alyaba:</i> 'it is part of the stupidity'
<i>alḍʿa:hir</i> 'the apparent'	<i>alḍʿa:hir</i> 'it is part of the apparent'

Table 3 shows three verbal forms and Table 4 and Table 5 show 15 adjective forms and 3 indefinite noun forms respectively. This shows that the majority of the forms are adjectives, which is in line with argument, provided above, where Heine (1193: 40), Palmer (2001: 129) and Gryzhak (2018: 85) hold that evaluatives are mostly adjectivals. The adjective forms in Table 4 may derive other evaluatives as shown in Table 6. Almost all the adjective forms (in Table 4) have been



suffixed into the determinative *al-* 'the' as shown in the first column of *Table 6*. Almost all the resulting structures in the first column of *Table 6* have been combined with the preposition *min* in the second column of *Table 6*.

These impersonal expressions in *Table 3* through *Table 6* are not the only ones indicating the subjectivity of the speaker in HA, but they are the most common ones. The tables show some lexical gaps where some forms appear as adjectivals, but their derivative structures are absent from other tables. This, however, does not mean the absent forms cannot evaluate the speaker's attitude, but they might be uncommon.

The next section explores the modal expressions listed in the tables of this section in terms of Heine's evaluative schema. Once again, since all these modal forms share one common sense of modality in that they all indicate the subjectivity of the speaker; I use only some of them in my examples. All the other expressions, however, are almost interchangeable.

6. HA Modal expressions within Heine's Evaluative Schema

Heine's (1993: 39) evaluative schema is characterized by the structure of "it is X to/that Y" where X is the variant that reflects the judgement of the speaker towards the proposition. Consider the dialogue in (4) and the scenario below.

(4)	a.	<i>xuð-ha</i>		<i>b-θama:n-miyah</i>	
		<i>take-it</i>		P-eight-hundreds	
	"Take it for 800 hundred (Saudi Riyals)."				
b.	<i>min-alyaba:</i>	<i>inn-na:</i>	<i>na:-xuð-ha:</i>	<i>b-θama:n-miyah</i>	
	P-D.stupidity	C-1pl.acc	<i>we-take-3sg.F.acc</i>	P-eight-hundreds	
	"It is stupidity that we take it with 800 (Saudi Riyals)" Lit: from-the-stupidity that we-take-it with-800				
c.	<i>ihhtarim</i>		<i>al-fa:ð^s-ak</i>		
	respect		D-words-2sg.M.gen		
	"Watch your words!" Lit: respect your words!				

The examples in (4a) and (4c) are for the same speaker (Speaker A). The utterance in (4b) is for another speaker (Speaker B); it clearly

indicates the attitude of its speaker (Speaker B) by virtue of the evaluative component *min alyaba*: towards the utterance in (4a); i.e., towards the main prediction, which is buying the sheep with that price. Speaker A got upset from the reaction in (4b) as indicated by his reaction in (4c) where he requested Speaker B to watch his words!

This communication was between some friends planning for a picnic. One person said that he went to the sheep market and found one (sheep) for SR800. The response in (4a) shows an agreement on the price. Example (4b) shows a negative response towards the utterance in (4a); it uses the impersonal expression *min alyaba*: "it is part of stupidity", so it can be interpreted as "it is a stupid suggestion that we take it with SR800". This, in turn, has made Speaker A (4a) upset as indicated by his request in (4c). Notice that in (4b) the impersonal expression *min alyaba*: does not contain a thematic subject, so the speaker does not directly say "I claim/admit that your suggestion to take it with this price is stupid" nor does he say "you are stupid as you have suggested that". Nevertheless, the impersonal expression conveys this implied subjective interpretation so the speaker of (4a) felt some insult by this response in (4b). The conclusion that can be drawn from this analysis is that the statement headed by *min alyaba*: in (4b) clearly shows the attitude/judgment of its speaker towards the utterance in (4a) and this is evidenced by the request in (4c) "watch your words!" What this communication suggests is that the impersonal expressions listed in *Table 3* through *Table 6* convey speaker's evaluation towards the referent.

Having shown that the HA structure in (4b) expresses an attitude, the discussion now shifts to the syntactic analysis of such a structure. Recall that the paper assumes the fundamental hierarchical projections for any clause in the syntactic theory: the complementiser phrase (CP), the tense phrase (TP) and the verb phrase (VP) (see Chomsky, 1995; Ouhalla and Shlonsky, 2002; Radford 2009a, 2009b). Recalling Radford's (2009a: 134; 2009b: 105) claim that complete clauses are CP clauses, the utterance in (4b) contains two CP clauses. The higher clause is a CP containing the PP *min alyaba*: 'it is part of stupidity' and the lower clause is the CP *inn-na: na:-xuð-ha: b-θama:n-miyah* 'that we take it with



SR800'. In the higher CP of (4b), I argue that the heads of CP and TP do not have any morphological content but they have morphosyntactic features as shown in the discussion of (6) below. In the lower CP of (4b), the complementizer *inn* occupies the head of CP and the accusative *-na*: occupies Spec, TP; T is also empty in this clause. The verb *na:-xuḏ-ha*: has moved from the head of VP to the Taxis-Aspect projection (Tax-AspP) where it inflects for the subject-verb agreement and the taxis-aspect features (for a deep analysis of HA verbal structures, see Al Zahrani, 2013, 2014, 2016, 2018).

The discussion now shifts to the syntactic properties of the two CP clauses: the matrix clause containing the evaluative component and its selected complement, which is the lower CP. The higher CP contains the impersonal modal expression as presented in (5).

(5)	a.	<i>afḏʿal</i>		<i>t-ḏa:kr-i</i>	<i>badri</i>
		better		Impf-study-2sg.F	early
	"It is better you study early."				
	b.	<i>ka:n</i>	<i>afḏʿal</i>	<i>t-ḏa:kr-i</i>	<i>badri</i>
		aux	better	Impf-study-2sg.F	early
	"It was better you studied early."				

The evaluative component *afḏʿal* 'better' in (5a) expresses the speaker judgment towards the main prediction of the complement: studying early. Notice that the evaluative component is the only morphological form occurring in the higher CP. According to Al Zahrani (2013, 2016, 2018), the head of TP always requires a perfective form if the tense is past, but not if the tense is non-past. Hence, the time reference in (5a) is present. Evidence for this claim can be drawn from (5b) where the evaluative component *afḏʿal* is preceded by the auxiliary *ka:n* that is base-generated in T that requires a perfective form since the time reference is past. Notice that the auxiliary *ka:n* does not agree with the feminine thematic subject of the lower TP, but it shows the default agreement with the empty pronoun *pro* (the null version of the expletive subject *hu:*) that occupies the specifier position of TP and always carries third person singular masculine features. Evidence for this claim is obtained from the

following examples in (6).

(6)	a.	<i>hu:</i>	<i>afḏʿal</i>	<i>t-ḏa:kr-i</i>	<i>badri</i>	
		expl.nom	better	Impf-study-2sg.F	early	
	"It is better (that) you study early".					
	b.	<i>hu:</i>	<i>ka:n</i>	<i>afḏʿal</i>	<i>t-ḏa:kr-i</i>	<i>badri</i>
		expl.nom	aux	better	Impf-study-2sg.F	early
	"It was better (that) you studied early".					
c.	<i>*ka:n</i>	<i>hu:</i>	<i>afḏʿal</i>	<i>t-ḏa:kr-i</i>	<i>badri</i>	
	aux	expl.nom	better	Impf-study-2sg.F	early	
Intended reading: "It was better (that) you study early".						

In (6a-b), both the auxiliary and the expletive subject exhibit the default unmarked agreement: third person singular masculine agreement features. The expletive subject is base-generated in Spec,TP and this unveils the following. The expletive subject occurs before the auxiliary *ka:n* (Spec, TP) but it cannot precede the auxiliary as shown by the ungrammaticality of (6c). Also, the expletive subject *hu:* is in the default third person singular masculine pronoun form *hu:* 'he' (*huwah*-vocalic variation) and it is always not referential. Furthermore, its occurrence is not obligatory as shown in (4) and (5). When *hu:* is not phonetically present in Spec, TP, according to Mohammad (2000), this position is filled by the phonetically null version of the expletive *hu:*, namely– *pro* (see (4) and (5) above). Recalling the Case Condition "A pronoun or noun expression is assigned case by the closest case-assigning head which c-commands it" (Radford, 2009b: 101), and following Fassi Fehri (1993: 33) and Al Zahrani (2013: 114), if the CP layer is not occupied by a complementizer as in (4) to (6), the expletive subject is assigned nominative case. This suggests that both the expletive *hu:* and its phonetically null version are nominative in examples (4) to (6). This is not the case when the clause containing the evaluative component is embedded under *inn* as show in (7).

(7)	a.	<i>adri</i>	<i>inn</i>	<i>-uh</i>	<i>afḏʿal</i>	<i>(inn-ik)</i>	<i>t-ḏa:kr-i</i>	
		I.know	C	expl.acc	better	C-2sg.F.acc	Impf-study-2sg.F	
	"I know that it is better that you study".							
	b.	<i>adri</i>	<i>inn</i>	<i>-uh</i>	<i>ka:n</i>	<i>afḏʿal</i>	<i>(inn-ik)</i>	<i>t-ḏa:kr-i</i>
		I.know	C	expl.acc	aux	better	C-2sg.F.acc	Impf-study-2sg.F
	"I know that it was better that you study."							



In (7a-b), the evaluative components are governed by the complementizer *inn*. Each example in (7a-b) exhibits three CP clauses. The clause [*adri*] 'I know', the modal clause containing the evaluative component [*inn-uh* (*ka:n*) *afɖʕal*] 'that it is/(was) better', and the lower CP clause [*inn-ik t-ɔa:kr-i badri*] 'that you study early'. Notice that the presence of the complementizer structure (*inn-ik*) in the lower CP is optional as indicated by the round brackets (see the discussion about examples (9) and (10)).

What is important to our argument is that (7a-b) show the accusative version of the expletive subject *-uh*, which must always be present if the complementizer *inn* occupies C. In other words, *inn* cannot be followed by the nominative version of the expletive subject *hu:* or the empty pronoun *pro* as indicated by the ill-formed structures in (8a-b) respectively.

(8)	a.	<i>*adri</i>	<i>inn</i>	<i>hu:</i>	<i>afɖʕal</i>	<i>t-ɔa:kr-i</i>	<i>badri</i>
		I.know	C	expl.nom	better	Impf-study-2sg.F	early
	b.	<i>*adri</i>	<i>inn</i>	<i>pro</i>	<i>afɖʕal</i>	<i>t-ɔa:kr-i</i>	<i>badri</i>
		I.know	C	expl.nom	better	Impf-study-2sg.F	early
	c.	<i>*adri</i>	Ø	<i>-uh</i>	<i>afɖʕal</i>	<i>t-ɔa:kr-i</i>	<i>badri</i>
		I.know	Ø	expl.acc	better	Impf-study-2sg.F	early

Examples (8a-b) show ungrammatical clauses that provide evidence that the accusative expletive subject *-uh* can never occur in its nominative version when embedded under *inn* (8a), and that *pro* cannot occur under *inn* (8b) since *pro* is an empty pronoun that must not occur in a non-nominative environment (see, Benmamoun, 1993; Tavangar & Amouzadeh, 2009). Furthermore, (8c) shows that the bound accusative morpheme *-uh* cannot occur independently as the sign Ø indicates the absence of *inn*.

So far, we have seen in the examples presented in (4) through (8) that the evaluative components evaluate the speakers' judgement on the uttered propositions and that they fit to Heine's (1993) evaluative schema characterized by the form (It is X that/to Y). Also, the HA evaluative components exemplified above are on a par with Heine's (1993) and Palmer's (1986, 2002) claim that they are impersonal

expressions that do not have referential subjects. These HA evaluative components may be preceded by the nominative non-referential expletive subject *hu:* or by its null version (the empty pronoun) *pro*. If the evaluative component is governed by the complementizer *inn*, the presence of the accusative expletive subject is obligatory. These different possibilities are represented in the following paradigm (*Table 7*) where Y stands for the complement selected by the evaluative component *afḍal*.

Table 7: Possible Evaluative Component Clausal Structures

evaluative component	Literal translation
<i>afḍal</i> Y	'better'
<i>hu: afḍal</i> Y	'it better'
<i>ka:n afḍal</i> Y	'was better'
<i>hu: ka:n afḍal</i> Y	'it was better'
<i>inn-uh afḍal</i> Y	'that it better'
<i>inn-uh ka:n afḍal</i> Y	'that it was better'

This paradigm in *Table 7* summarizes the possible structures of the CP clauses in which HA evaluative components occur. In other words, it shows that the structure of Heine's evaluative schema is employed by HA where evaluative components express modality. In such a structure, the entire CP may only contain one morphologically realized form, which is an evaluative component such as *afḍal* 'better'.

To sum, the previous semantic analysis of the HA evaluative components has shown that the evaluatives fit to the definitions provided by Heine (1993: 40) Gryzhak (2018: 85), Palmer (2001: 119), and Kochetova & Volodchenkova (2015: 293) in that they indicate subjective characterization of the qualities of the referent, and reveal the speaker's peculiar attitude towards the proposition, so they must be considered modal forms.

Also, this section has shown that the analysis of the HA evaluative components is in line with Heine's (1993) clausal structure "It is X" that consists of an impersonal expression that may have no subject in the superficial structure, or have a nominative or accusative dummy subject presenting third person singular features. One remaining issue is the



status of the complements that can be selected by these evaluative components, which is briefly discussed in the next section.

7. Complements of evaluative components

The previous discussion of the syntactic properties of the adjectival modal elements within the evaluative schema, suggested by Heine (1993) as detailed in Section 4, has shown that they occur in a CP clause that may or may not have its C, Spec TP and T positions occupied by a complementizer, an expletive subject or a tense marker respectively. These CP structures have been summarized in *Table 7* and exemplified in Section 6. We have noticed that they can select for CP clausal complements whose C and T may or may not be overtly occupied by a complementizer in C and/or a tense marker in T. This section investigates the status of such clausal complements. Consider the following complements of the evaluative component *afḍʿal* in (9).

(9)	a.	<i>afḍʿal</i>	<i>(inti)</i>	<i>t-ḍa:kr-i</i>	<i>b-nafsik</i>
		better	you.nom-2sg.F	Impf-study-2sg.F	P-yourself.F
	"It is better you study in your own". Lit: better (you.F) study by-yourself				
	b.	<i>*afḍʿal</i>	<i>kunt-i</i>	<i>t-ḍa:kr-i</i>	<i>b-nafsik</i>
		better	aux-2sg.F	Impf-study-2sg.F	P-yourself.F
	Intended reading: "It is better that you studied in your own."				
	c.	<i>*afḍʿal</i>	<i>ḍa:kart-i</i>		<i>b-nafsik</i>
		better	Pf-study-2sg.F		P-yourself.F
	Intended reading: "It is better that you studied in your own".				

In (9a) the evaluative component *afḍʿal* has elected for a CP complement that exhibits the following. The presence of the nominative pronoun *inti* (you.F) is optional as indicated by the round brackets. In (9a), *inti* has moved from Spec, VP to Spec, TP preceding the imperfective verb *t-ḍa:kr-i* that has moved from V to Tax-AspP for the inflectional features. Since the time reference is present, T does not trigger the imperfective verb form *t-ḍa:kr-i* to move to it.

In evaluative complements, past time interpretations cannot be obtained via the auxiliary *ka:n* (base-generated in T) or a perfective form (moving to T); this accounts for the ungrammaticality of (9b-c).

The question raises at this point is how we can obtain past time interpretations if a perfective form, be it a lexical or an auxiliary, is banned from occurring in evaluative complements as shown in (9b-c). Following Al Zahrani (2013: 177), some past time interpretations in HA require a licenser. Adopting his theory, I argue that the presence of a perfective form in a complement structure selected by an evaluative component requires a licenser that creates a phase or a domain between the evaluative component and the perfective verb form. Following this line of argument, HA has two licensers: the CP layer with the complementizer *inn* overtly occupying C, and the aspectual imperfective auxiliary form *y-ku:n*. These two licensers provide two different interpretations. Consider the examples in (9) repeated in (10) with these licensers.

(10)	a.	<i>afd'al</i>	<i>inn-ik</i>	<i>t-da:kr-i</i>	<i>b-nafsik</i>					
		better	C-2sg.F.acc	Impf-study-2sg.F	P-yourself.F					
		"It is better that you study in your own."								
b.	<i>afd'al</i>	<i>inn-ik</i>	<i>da:kart-i</i>	<i>b-nafsik</i>						
					better	C-2sg.F.acc	Pf-study-2sg.F	P-yourself		
					"It is better that you studied in your own."					
c.	<i>afd'al</i>	<i>inn-ik</i>	<i>kunt-i</i>	<i>da:kart-i</i>	<i>b-nafsik</i>					
						better	C-2sg.F.acc	Pf.aux-2sg.F	Pf-study-2sg.F	P-yourself.F
						"It is better that you had studied in your own."				
d.	<i>afd'al</i>	<i>t-ku:n-i</i>	<i>da:kart-i</i>	<i>b-nafsik</i>						
					better	Impf-aux-2sg.F	Pf-study-2sg.F	P-yourself.F		
					"It is better that you will have studied in your own."					
e.	<i>afd'al</i>	<i>inn-ik</i>	<i>t-ku:n-i</i>	<i>da:kart-i</i>	<i>b-nafsik</i>					
						better	C-2sg.F.acc	Impf-aux-2sg.F	Pf-study-2sg.F	P-yourself.F
						"It is better that you will have studied in your own."				

Contrary to the examples in (9b-c) where past time interpretations cannot be obtained by a perfective auxiliary or a perfective verb form in T, the examples in (10a-c) provide evidence that the complementizer *inn* licenses for obtaining past time interpretations. In such a case, the complementizer *inn* heading the CP layer obligatorily triggers the subject to move from Spec, VP to Spec, TP and assigns it accusative case (10a-c&e). The permission of the presence of perfective forms in evaluative complements is due to the fact that the complementizer has created a phase between the evaluative component and the different

lexical and auxiliary verbal forms occurring in the complements. Hence, beside the presence of the imperfective *t-ḍa:kr-i* in Tax-Asp in (10a), one can notice that this phase has allowed for the presence of the perfective *ḍa:kart-i* in T (10b), and for the perfective auxiliary *kunt-i* in T so that the perfective verb *ḍa:kart-i* stays in Tax-Asp in (10c). This occurrence yields different interpretations. The perfective auxiliary in (10b) indicates the past time reference while the combination of the perfective auxiliary and the perfective verb in (10c) indicates the past perfect time reference.

The second licenser is the imperfective auxiliary *t-ku:n-i*, which is base-generated in AspP (dominated by T and dominating Tax-Asp) as indicated by example (10d). In this latter example the auxiliary has allowed for the presence of the perfective form *ḍa:kart-i* in Tax-Asp and the combination of both the imperfective auxiliary and the perfective form derives the future perfect time reference.

In summary, HA has two licensers that create a phase between an evaluative component and its perfective-form complements. The first licenser is the complementizer *inn* that allows for perfective forms to occupy T and consequently derive either past or past perfect time interpretations. The second licenser is the imperfective auxiliary *y-ku:n*, projected in AspP, where it allows for the presence of a perfective form in Tax-Asp, so the future perfect interpretation is obtained. Notice that both licensers can co-occur in a clause as in (10d) but only the future perfect reading can be obtained due to the fact that the imperfective auxiliary occupies Asp that is dominated by T; consequently the imperfective auxiliary in the head of AspP blocks any verb form to move to T, hence, past time reading is blocked.

8. Conclusions and recommendations

This paper has explored some HA modal constructions that, to the best of the author's knowledge, have not been investigated. These modal constructions evaluate the attitude of the speaker by virtue of some verbal, adjectival, nominal and prepositional forms. Being evaluative in nature, the paper adopts Heine's (1993: 39) evaluative

schema, not to trace the grammaticalization of the HA evaluative components, but basically to show that such components fit into the evaluative schema "*it is X to/that Y*" to express some judgements that are "interpreted as introducing a modal notion".

Due to the fact that Heine's (1993) evaluative schema does not detail the syntactic properties of the schema structure, the present paper follows the assumptions and findings of the HA syntactic studies, which have been conducted within the Principles and Parameters syntactic approach (P&P) (Chomsky, 1981, 1986) along with insights of the Minimalist Program (MP) (Chomsky, 1995, 1999, 2000).

The HA examples discussed in terms of the structure "*it is X to/that Y*", where X stands for the evaluative component and Y stands for its verbal complement, have clarified the following. The structure "*it is X to/that Y*" presents two clauses: a higher CP clause (matrix clause) and a lower CP clause (complement). The variant X is an evaluative component occurring in the matrix CP clause ("*it is X*") and selects for the CP complement "*to/that Y*".

The matrix clause shows the following properties. It may have the non-referential dummy/expletive subject *hu*: that carries third person singular masculine features: default unmarked agreement. The presence of the expletive subject, however, is optional and when it occurs it is base-generated in the specifier position of TP and it is in the nominative case. If it is absent, the position is occupied by the phonetically null nominative expletive subject *pro*. Evidence for this claim comes from the fact that the evaluative component can be embedded under the complementizer *inn* that obligatorily requires the presence of the expletive subject in accusative case. According to Al Zahrani (2013: 114) and Fassi Fehri (1993: 33) subjects occupying Spec TP are nominative unless they are governed by an overt case-assigning element such as the complementizer *inn*. The study has also shown some structures where both the expletive subject and the complementizer may or may not be morphologically realized. In such a case, if the tense is present T is phonetically null, so the matrix clause



may only show the evaluative component with its CP complement (see *Table 7*).

The CP complements of an evaluative component are all verbal complements that may interpret present time reading and future perfect reading when T is null, or past time reading and past perfect time reading when T is overtly occupied by a perfective form.

The discussion in this paper has also shown some future research points and some related issues that should be taken into consideration. First, Heine's (1993) evaluative schema presents some forms that have been fully grammaticalized or shown some degrees of grammaticalization. This gives a rise to the question of whether or not (some of) the HA forms listed in *Table 3* through *Table 6* have been fully/partially grammaticalized. The answer to such a question requires a heavy linguistic corpus for an individual investigation of each element within a grammaticalization framework. For instance, one may explore them according to the seven stages (*stages A-G*) suggested by Heine (1993: 53-66).

Second, the evaluative components listed in *Table 3* through *Table 6* belong to different grammatical categories: verbs, pronominals and prepositionals. This, in turn, suggests that they may exhibit different selectional properties and syntactic behavior. Thus, an individual investigation of the syntactic properties of each evaluative component should enrich the literature not only on HA modal expressions, but also on the field of modality in general.

Third, a study of a challenging morphosyntactic and semantic investigation may be conducted. That is, one may consider a way to unite the findings of this paper and the findings of Al Zahrani's (2013) and (2018) studies. On the one hand, the study may explore the position(s) of the evaluative components listed in *Table 3* through *Table 6* in light of the three hierarchical positions (epistemic, deontic and dynamic) suggested in Al Zahrani's studies. Then, it may also explore how the modals investigated by Al Zahrani (2013), reproduced

in *Table 1*, can fit within the evaluative schema suggested by Heine's (1993). Such a study would show some interesting findings of a massive number of HA modal forms and modal phrases expressing evaluative concepts and classified according to the main modality domains (epistemic, deontic and dynamic) with their different placements in the hierarchy.

9. Appendix 1: Consonants and Vowels

Consonants

IPA Equivalent	Description
[ʔ]	Glottal stop
[b]	Bilabial stop
[t]	Voiceless dental stop
[θ]	Voiceless emphatic dental fricative
[ɖ]	Voiceless retroflex fricative
[ħ]	Voiceless pharyngeal fricative
[x]	Voiceless velar fricative
[d]	Voiced dental fricative
[ð]	Voiced emphatic dental fricative
[r]	Dental trill
[z]	Voiced dental fricative
[s]	Voiceless dental fricative
[ʃ]	Voiceless palatal fricative
[sʕ]	Voiceless emphatic dental fricative
[ɖʕ]	Voiced emphatic stop
[tʕ]	Voiceless emphatic dental stop
[ðʕ]	Voiced emphatic interdental fricative
[ʕ]	Voiced pharyngeal fricative
[ɣ]	Voiced velar fricative
[f]	Voiceless labiodental fricative
[q]	Voiceless uvular stop
[k]	Voiceless velar stop
[l]	Lateral dental
[m]	Bilabial nasal
[n]	Dental nasal
[h]	Voiceless laryngeal fricative
[w]	Bilabial glide
[j]	Palatal glide



Vowels

IPA Equivalent	Description
[a]	Short low front
[a:]	Long low front
[i]	Short high front
[i:]	Long high front
[u]	Short high back
[u:]	Long high back

10. Appendix 2: Abbreviations

∅	absence of element	HA	Hijazi Arabic
1	First person	Impf	Imperfective verb form
2	Second person	Inf	Infinitive
3	Third person	Neg	Negative
acc	Accusative case	M	Masculine
AspP	Aspect Phrase (Projection)	nom	Nominative case
aux	auxiliary	P	Preposition
C	Complementizer	Pf	Perfective verb form
CA	Classical Arabic	pl	Plural
CP	Complementizer Phrase (Projection)	<i>pro</i>	empty nominative pronoun position (expletive)
D	Determinative	sg	Singular
DModP	Deontic Modal Phrase (Projection)	Spec	Specifier of XP
DyModP	Dynamic Modal Phrase (Projection)	subj	Subjunctive Mood
EModP	Epistemic Modal Phrase (Projection)	T	The head position of the TP
expl.acc	Expletive Accusative Subject	Tax-AspP	Taxis-Aspect Phrase (Projection)
expl.nom	Expletive Nominative Subject	TP	Tense Phrase (Projection)
F	Feminine	VP	Verb Phrase (Projection)
gen	Genitive case	SA	Standard Arabic

11. References:

- (1) Al Barrag, T. (2007). *Relative clauses in Hijazi Arabic*. (MA thesis), University of Queensland, Brisbane.
- (2) Al Barrag, T. (2014). *Noun Phrases in Urban Hijazi Arabic: A Distributed Morphology Approach*. (PhD thesis), University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.
- (3) Al Barrag, T., & Al Zahrani, M. (2017). Free State Construction. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 14(2), 104 - 115.
- (4) Alotaibi, B. (2019). *Event Phrase and the Syntax of TAM Verbs in Kuwaiti Arabic*. (thesis), Newcastle University, Newcastle, United Kingdom.
- (5) Al Zahrani, M. (2008). *Morphology of negation in Modern Standard Arabic and spoken Hijazi Arabic*. (MA thesis), University of Queensland, Brisbane.
- (6) Al Zahrani, M. (2013). *Morphosyntactic and Semantic Properties of Hijazi Arabic Modals*. (PhD Theoretical Linguistics: Morpho-Syntax and Semantic Interface), University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland.
- (7) Al Zahrani, M. (2014a). Negation in non-verbal clauses: Modern Standard Arabic and Spoken Hijazi Arabic. *Pakistan Journal of Languages and Translation Studies*, 2, 31- 49.
- (8) Al Zahrani, M. (2014b). The Syntactic Properties of Negatives. *US-China Foreign Language*, (1), 1-17.
- (9) Al Zahrani, M. (2016). Aktionsarten Projection and Subcategorization. *The Internaional Journal of Arabic Linguistics (IJAL)*, 2(1), 46-69.
- (10) Al Zahrani, M. (2018). Morphosyntactic and Semantic Properties of Epistemic Modals Modifying Verbal Clauses. In P. G. Medina, R. T. Alonso & R. V. Escarza (Eds.), *Verbs, Clauses and Constructions: Functional and Typological Approaches*, 149-166. Newcastle, United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- (11) Al Zahrani, M., & Alzahrani, S. (2019). Negatives scoping over verbal clauses in some Arabic varieties. *US-China Foreign Language*, 17(7), 332 - 344.
- (12) Al Zahrani, M. (2020a). Hypothetical and Counterfactual Mood Markers: Hierarchical Placement. *The Internaional Journal of Arabic Linguistics (IJAL)*, 6(1 & 2), 167-191.
- (13) Al Zahrani, M., & Al Thagafi, K. (2020b). The Structural PF Deletion Approach to Sluicing Investigation. *Advances in Languages and Literary Studies (ALLS)*, 11(4).
- (14) Al Zahrani, M. (2020c). Focus Position Hosting the Stripping Remnant. *Jurnal Arbitrer*, 7(2).
- (15) Andriy, M. (2016). The Notion of Modality in Arabic Linguistics: the Origin and Development. In G. George & S. Laura (Eds.), *Modalities in Arabic* (Vol. XVI). Bucharest, Romania: Center for Arab Studies.
- (16) Bardeas, S. (2005). *The Pronominal Forms in Questions in Makkan Arabic*. (MA thesis), The University of York.



- (17) Benmamoun, E. (1993). Null pronominals in the context of NP and QP. *The Twelfth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*.
- (18) Biber, D., Stig, J., Geoffrey, L., Susan, C., & Edward, F. (2007). *The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (Vol. 6th impression). London: Pearson Education Limited.
- (19) Bybee, J. L., Perkins, R. D., & Pagliuca, W. (1994). *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (20) Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht, Holland; Cinnaminson, [N.J.]: Foris Publications.
- (21) Chomsky, N. (1986). Barriers. *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press
- (22) Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- (23) Chomsky, N. (1999). Derivaion by Phase. *MITOPL 18*.
- (24) Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist Inquiries. In R. M. e. al (Ed.), *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, 53-87. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press.
- (25) de Haan, F. (2005). Typological Approaches to Modality. In W. Frawley (Ed.), *The Expression of Modality*, 27-69. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (26) de Haan, F. (2012). Irrealis: Fact or Fiction? *Language Sciences*, 34, 107-130.
- (27) Eifan, E. (2017). *Grammaticalization in Urban Hijazi Arabic*. (thesis), Manchester University.
- (28) Fassi Fehri, A. (1993). *Issues in the Structure of Arabic Clauses and Words*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- (29) Gryzhak, L. (2018). Evaluative Adjectives in the Portrayal of Victorian Women. *Linguaculture*, 9(1), 85-97.
- (30) Heine, B. (1993). *Auxiliaries: Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (31) Heine, B., Claudi, U., & Hunnemeyer, F. (1991). *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- (32) Heine, B., & Reh, M. (1984). *Grammaticalization and Reanalysis in African Languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- (33) Herslund, M. (2005). *Subjective and Objective Modality*. London; Oakville, CT: Equinox.
- (34) Hopper, P. J., & Traugott, E. C. (1993). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (35) Hopper, P. J., & Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (36) Jarad, N. I. (2014). The Grammaticalization of the Motion Verb “Raḥ” as a Prospective Aspect Marker in Syrian Arabic. *Al-‘Arabiyya*, 47, 101–118.
- (37) Jarad, N. I. (2017). Grammaticalization in Emirati Arabic. *Arabica*, 64, 742-760.

- (38) Kheshaifaty, H. (1996). Numerals: A comparative Study between Classical and Hijazi Arabic. *King Saud University*, 9(1), 19-36.
- (39) Kochetova, L. A., & Volodchenkova, O. I. (2015). Evaluative Language in English Job Advertisements in Diachronic Perspective. *Review of European Studies*, 7(11), 292-302.
- (40) Langacker, R. W. (1978). The Form and Meaning of the English Auxiliary. *Language*, 54(4), 853-884.
- (41) Mitchell, T., & Al-Hassan, S. (1994). *Modality, Mood and Aspect in Spoken Arabic: with Special Reference to Egypt and the Levant*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- (42) Mohammad, A. (2000). *Word Order, Agreement, and Pronominalisation in Standard and Palestinian Arabic* (Vol. 181). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- (43) Mousa, N. (2019). *Grammatical Aspects of Rural Palestinian Arabic*. (PhD), Arizona State.
- (44) Nordström, J. (2010). *Modality and Subordinators* (Vol. 116). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- (45) Nuyts, J. (2001). *Epistemic Modality, Language and Conceptualization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- (46) Nuyts, J. (2005a). The Modal Confusion on Terminology and Concepts behind it. In A. Klinge & H. H. Müller (Eds.), *Modality: Studies in Form and Function*, 5-38. London; Oakville, CT: Equinox.
- (47) Nuyts, J. (2005b). Modality: Overview and Linguistic Issues. In W. Frawley, E. Eschenroeder, S. Mills & T. Nguyen (Eds.), *The Expression of Modality*, 1-26. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (48) Nuyts, J. (2016). Analyses of the Modal Meanings. In J. Nuyts & J. v. d. Auwera (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modality and Mood*, 31-49.
- (49) Ouhalla, J., & Shlonsky, U. (Eds.). (2002). *Themes in Arabic and Hebrew Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- (50) Palmer, F. (1986). *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (51) Palmer, F. (2001). *Mood and Modality*. (Second ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (52) Persson, M. (2008). The Role of the *b*-prefix in Gulf Arabic Dialects as a Marker of Future, Intent and/or Irrealis. *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies*, 8, 26-52.
- (53) Racy, S. K. (2008). *Towards a Unified Treatment of Modality*. (PhD), The University of Arizona, 2008., Ann Arbor.
- (54) Radford, A. (2009a). *Analysing English Sentences: A Minimalist Approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- (55) Radford, A. (2009b). *An Introduction to English Sentence Structure*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.



- (56) Ryding, K. C. (2005). *A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (57) Sigurðsson, H. (2008). Mood in Icelandic. *lingBuzz*.
- (58) Stewart, D. J. (1998). Clitic Reduction in the Formation of Modal Prefixes in the Post-Classical Arabic Dialects and Classical Arabic *Sa-/Sawfa*. *Arabica*, 45, 104-128.
- (59) Tavangar, M., & Amouzadeh, M. (2009). Subjective Modality and Tense in Persian. *Language Sciences*, 31(6), 853-873.
- (60) Vanhove, M., Miller, C., & Caubet, D. (2009). The Grammaticalisation of Modal Auxiliaries in Maltese and Arabic Vernaculars of the Mediterranean Area. In B. Hansen & F. d. Haan (Eds.), *Modals in the Language of Europe: A Reference Work*, 325-362. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- (61) Versteegh, C. H. M. (2014). *The Arabic Language* (Second edition. ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- (62) von Wright, G. H. (1951). *An Essay in Modal Logic*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Pub. Co.
- (63) Zhang, J. (2019). A Semantic Approach to the English Modality. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 10(4), 879-885.

* * *