Conditional Clauses in BHA

Abstract:

This study delves into conditional structures within the BHA dialect, particularly in the Wadi Alfurra region. Six particles are identified for introducing conditional sentences, with distinct functions for expressing real and unreal conditions. The research unveils nuances in the usage of these particles, highlighting their roles in introducing clauses containing specific verb forms and nonverbal predicates. Comparative analysis with the Taif dialect underscores differences in conjunction usage and the allowance of verb forms within conditional clauses. Overall, the study offers insights into dialectal variations and syntactic patterns within Arabic linguistics.

(BHA, protasis, apodosis, verb from, conjunction, complementizer)

§1 Introduction

Conditional structures constitute an important element in a language's grammar, representing a common phenomenon shared across different linguistic systems (Traugott, 1986). The expression of conditionals differs from one language to another, and in some cases, it is mainly affected by the items used to introduce the condition, which may involve different constraints and may as a result yield different structures in the same language. The aim of this study is to discuss the different items that are used to express conditional meaning in Bedouin Hijazi Arabic (henceforth BHA), investigating the different meaning that result and the varied structures involved.

Hijaz is a region situated in the western part of Saudi Arabia and includes several cities, namely Makkah, Madinah, Jeddah, and Taif, (Alzaidi, 2014). This location gives Hijaz and hence the Hijazi dialects a distinctive significance because it is an area of the Arab world where the two most holy mosques, visited by millions of Muslims every year, are located. Omar (1975) considers Hijazi Arabic to be one of the most widely understood dialects among the different Arabic varieties spoken in the Arabian Peninsula.

Hijaz has two primary dialects: Bedouin and Urban. Bedouin Hijazi is spoken by the rural population, while Urban Hijazi is spoken by those who live in the cities (Alzaidi, 2014; Ladefoged & Johnson 2010). Hijazi dialects are one of four primary dialects spoken in Saudi Arabia. These include Najdi dialects, southwestern dialects and eastern dialects (Palva 2006; Prochazka 1988; Versteegh 2014). However, the sub-dialects within these main dialects exhibit variations based on a number of sociodemographic variables, including region, tribe, and the difference between Bedouin and urban (Altalhi, 2014).

The paper will proceed as follows: The next section examines the definition of conditionals in literature. Subsequently, the discussion will shift to conditionals in Arabic, accompanied by illustrative examples. This will be followed by a brief review of what studies have investigated conditionals in different dialects. Section four will analyse the conditionals in the BHA dialect, exploring the irrealis conditional introduced by *law*, which will be compared to the corresponding *law* in another Hijazi dialect, particularly the Taif dialect. The subsequent section will explore real conditional structures, and a comparative analysis between these structures in BHA and the Taif dialect will be provided. Finally, the paper will conclude by summarizing the main findings and implications.

§2 Conditionals

In the literature, conditionals have been defined differently by several grammarians. These definitions vary on the basis of the perspective from which the researchers approach such structures. Some researchers focus on the conjunctions that introduce the conditions, as is for example *if*, in English. These are referred to in different ways, in the literature, including the notions: conjunction and complementiser. Oher accounts define the conditional structure by focussing upon the basis of the relationship between the two clauses that form the condition. Dancygier (1998) and Bennett (2003) define the conditional as a complex sentence that consists of two clauses: main (also known as apodosis) and subordinate (also known as protasis). Crystal (2008) takes a semantic understanding and defines conditionals as clauses whose semantic

function is to express hypotheses or conditionals. Hacking (1998), in contrast, focuses upon the relationship between the two clauses that display a conditional relationship between two events, where one event relies on, or is influenced by the other event. Similarly, Bhatt and Pancheva (2007) refer to the fact that 'conditional structures are interpreted, in general terms, with the proposition expressed by the antecedent clause specifying the (modal) circumstances in which the proposition expressed by the main clause is true'. Likewise, Quirk et al., (1985) focus on the relationship between the protasis and the apodosis and refer to how the truth of the statement within the main clause (the apodosis) is determined by the fulfilment of the condition in the protasis.

In English, a conditional introduced by *if* or *unless* can be used. The varied choice yields a difference in the semantic interpretation of the clause. In turn, the same marker can be used, and we can there still have reference to different conditional meanings. There exist three types of conditional sentences: real, hypothetical and unreal conditionals (Azar (1981), Carter and McCarthy (2006), Murphy (2012), and others). The following examples illustrate these three types of conditionals, respectively.

> 1. If it rains heavily, some roads will be closed.

> 2. If it rained heavily, some roads would be closed.

> 3. If it had rained heavily, some roads would have been closed.

The above examples illustrate different types of conditionals, but which share a common feature: the protasis is introduced by the conjunction 'if'. A fundamental difference between conditionals in English and Arabic exists in this respect, as Arabic employs varied conjunctions that introduce specific conditional types, as we will discuss in the upcoming sections.

§3 Conditionals in Arabic

This section starts off by first exploring the morphosyntax of conditionals in Classical Arabic (CA). It also examines and provides examples of the two types of conditional conjunctions in CA: jussive and non-jussive. Additionally, it presents a compilation of the relevant studies that discuss conditionals in various Arabic dialects.

§3.1 The morphosyntax of Arabic Conditionals in CA

Traditional-oriented Arabic grammars analyse sentences using a Government-inspired framework. According to this theory, a word influences the inflection of other words in the sentence in particular ways. The governing words can include verbs, prepositions, and particles (Ryding, 2005). For example, in (4) below, the verb *shariba* 'drink' governs the subject *al-walad-u* 'the boy', marked with nominative case, and the object *al-haliba* 'the milk', marked as accusative.

> 4. shariba   al-walad-u   al-ḥaliba
>
>   drink.PFV.3SGM   DEF-boy-NOM   DEF-milk-ACC
>
>   'The boy drank the milk.'

The Arabic conditional clause consists of three components: *jumlat al-shart* (conditional clause), *jawab al-shart* (main clause) and an *adat al-shart* (conditional conjunction), which is what links the former two to each other (Alrajhi, 1998). These three components can be observed in (5), where the conditional conjunction *en* introduces the protasis *a-hsant-u-m* and is followed by the main clause *ahsan-tum li-anfus-i-kum*.

> 5. en   ahsan-tum   ahsan-tum   li-anfus-i-kum   (Sûrat Al-Isra, verse: 7)
>
>   If   do good.PFV-2PL   do good.PFV-2PL   for-self.PL-GEN-2PL.GEN
>
>   'If you do good, you do good for yourselves.'

Within a Government-inspired framework, conditional conjunctions or complementisers within the realm of Standard Arabic are categorised into two groups: jussive and non-jussive conjunctions. This division, as described by Alotaibi (2014), is determined by the conjunction's influence on the conditional sentence and the resulting inflection it causes on verbs in both the conditional and main clauses, as the examples in (6) and (7) are meant to illustrate. Consequently, conjunctions that induce certain verb inflections are referred to as jussive, whereas the remaining conjunctions fall into the non-jussive category. In (6), we can demonstrate that the complementiser *man* `whoever' functions as a jussive type of conjunction because of how it requires the embedded verb within the protasis and that in the main clause to display a jussive modal inflection.

> 6. man   y-thaker   y-njah
>
>   whoever   3M-study.IPFV.SG.JUSS   3M-suceed.IPFV.SG.JUSS
>
>   'Whoever studies will succeed.'

In the following example, (7), the non-jussive conjunction *law* affects neither the mood of the verb *jaa* `come' in the protasis, nor the verb *raa* `see' in the apodosis. In other words, the mood remains unchanged.

7.   law   jaa   al-wald-u   l-raay-t-hu

            if   come.PFV.3SGM   DEF-boy.SGM-NOM   FUT-see.PFV-1SG-3SGM.ACC

            'If the boy came, I would have seen him.'

Below in Table 1 is a list of complementisers as made use of in the Standard/Classical variety. Some of the conditional conjunctions in Classical Arabic are attached by an extra *-ma.* This extension does not affect the category. It seems to either add more emphasis to the meaning or it generalizes or hides it (Alsameraei, 2000). The different conjunctions are represented on a morphosyntactic basis, i.e., on whether they have an influence on the verb's modal inflection or not.

Conjunction	Type		Attached to extra ma
	Jussive	Non-Jussive	
in 'if'	✓		✓
man 'whoever'	✓		
ma 'whatever'	✓		
mahma 'whatever'	✓		
anna 'however, wherever'	✓		
ayyan 'whenever'	✓		✓
ayn 'where'	✓		✓
mata 'when'	✓		✓
haythuma 'wherever'	✓		
ay 'whoever, whatever'	✓		✓
ethma 'if'	✓		
kolama 'however'		✓	✓
law 'if'		✓	
etha 'if'		✓	
lamma 'when'		✓	✓

Table 1. Conditional conjunctions in Classical Arabic (cf. Ibn Aqeel (1980), Eid (2009))

With the above, a morphosyntactic dimension to conditional clauses has been introduced. In what follows, a brief overview of what studies exist, discussing conditionals, is provided.

§3.2 Conditionals in the dialects

The study of conditionals across the different Arabic varieties is thriving, and a number of studies have provided numerous descriptions of the phenomena within the individual dialects. A list of comprehensive works that discuss conditional clauses within Arabic dialects is provided below:

- Moroccan - Marçais (1977), Caubet (2005), Agaudé (2003), Boubekri (2019)

- Tunisian – Kumakiri (2013), Dallaji et al. (2018)

- Libyan – Pereira (2019), D'Anna (2017)

- Syrian – Jalonen (2017)

- Anatolian – Grigore (2008), Bițună (2015)

- Iraqi – Grigore (2005)

- Najdi – Ingham (1991), Alshammari (2018)

- Taif – Alotaibi (2014)

These studies include reference to the strategies employed within the individual varieties they describe. The strategies associate with and depend upon the semantics of the conditional that is being expressed. This choice in turn has an effect upon the relationship between the verbal morphological realization and the semantics of the conditional expressed. Brustad's (2000) study is the only one that discusses conditionals across a number of different Arabic dialects, namely Moroccan, Kuwaiti, Syrian and Egyptian. As is the case in a number of the abovementioned studies, Brustad's (2000) study makes reference to the distribution of the particles as used in the protasis along with the varied morphosyntax that correlates with that. It additionally focuses upon the grammaticalization that associates with *kān* lit. `be' in its use as a complementizer within counterfactuals.

Following this brief overview, we move on to the zoom in an discuss the subject proper of this study, namely the BHA conditionals.

§4. BHA Conditionals

This section discusses the conditional conjunctions that introduce conditional clauses in Bedouin Hijazi dialect, mainly that spoken in the area called *Wadi Alfuraa* 'Alfuraa Valley'. The discussion will here be dividing these particles into two different groups. The divide, as we will see, is essentially between *law* vs. the rest of the forms. This split is built upon these complementisers' distribution and is based on the primary split between real vs. unreal conditionals. As we engage in this divide, the complementiser choice will be followed by a discussion that covers the permissible verb-forms in both the protasis and apodosis, while providing a comparison between the BHA dialect and the Taif dialect, another Hijazi dialect. This comparison is the first of its type, demonstrating that variation exists internal to the different dialects within the larger regional dialect. The aim of this study is inspired by previous literature on other dialects, which has concentrated on the description of conditional clauses in several individual dialects. What follows will be a first, and is meant to particularly focus upon an in-depth initial description of BHA. BHA employs up to six conditional particles, namely; *law, en, etha, kān[1], madam* and *la.* Their individual discussion will be based upon the broader classification between irrealis and realis conditional structures.

§4.1 Irrealis Conditionals: *law*

This section discusses the use of the conditional conjunction *law* in BHA and accounts for the morphosyntactic-conditioning that the use of these complementisers have upon the verb forms that are allowed in both protasis and apodosis. The common use of the conjunction *law* in Classical Arabic and in the different Arabic varieties is its ability to express unreal conditionals. Dialects that use this strategy to introduce the protasis to express unreal conditionals include Najdi (Ingham, 1991), Taif (Alotaibi, 2014), Kuwaiti (Brustad, 2000), Syrian (Cowell, 1964), and Tripolitanian and Eastern Libyan Arabic ((Pereira (2008), Owens (1984), respectively).

law allows for different verb forms in both the protasis and apodosis. The protasis introduced by *law* allows four different verb forms and nonverbal predicates. The verb forms permitted in the protasis are PFV, FUT, IPFV and ACT.PASS. Allowing for the complementiser *en* 'that' after *law* or the inclusion of an adverbial clause introduced by *yawm* 'when' within the protasis differs on the basis of the verb form used. The PFV verb form can appear in the protasis introduced by *law* in two different structures. Firstly, *law* can be optionally followed by the complementizer *en* 'that', and the apodosis can be optionally introduced by *kān* lit. `be', but which here functions as an invariant complementiser form which grammaticalises the PFV.3SGM form, or *emdi* 'should have', followed by the PFV verb form, as illustrated in example (8).

---

[1] Due to their identical functions, *kān* and *en kān* can be interchanged in all situations. Therefore, in this paper, the exclusive use of *kān* implies that it also refers to *en kān*.

8. law (en-ni)   dari-t   (kān/emdi-ni)   jee-t

   if   that-1SG.ACC   know.PFV-1SG   (be.PFV.3SGM/should have.1SG.ACC)   come.PFV-1SG

   'If I had known, it would have been possible for me to come.'

The second use of the PFV in the protasis is in a context in which a temporal adverb *yawm* 'when' is also available within the clause. In such a structure, the use of the complementizer *en* after *law* is mandatory. The main verb within the protasis in the context of a `when' clause introduced by *yawm* can be either a PFV form or an ACT.PTCP as is the use in (9). Within the adverbial clause, however, a PFV form is necessary. It is additionally required for the adjunct clause to precede the main verb within the protasis.

9. law enn-h   {yawm jaa}   moalem-ni   / alam-ni

   if   that-3SGM.ACC when   come.PFV-3SGM tell.ACT.PASS.SGM-1SG.ACC / tell.PFV.2SGM-1SG.ACC

   kān/emdi-ni   gabal-te-h

   be.PFV.3SGM/should have-1SG.ACC   meet.PFV-1SG-3SGM.ACC

   'If he told me when he came, I would have met him.'

In this particular situation, the main clause is required to be introduced by *kān* or *emdi*, and the form of the main verb should obligatorily be a perfective form.

The imperfective aspect is also employed after the conditional conjunction *law* in two distinct structures. In the first structure, the complementizer *en* may be optionally used after *law*, and the apodosis is also introduced by the IPFV form, as shown in example (10).

10. law (enn-h)   y-dri   an-kom   y-ji

    if   that-3SGM.ACC 3M-know.IPFV.SG about-2PLM.GEN   3M-come.IPFV.SG

    'If he knows about you, he comes.'

The second use of the IPFV verb form in the context of *law* is allowed where the complementizer *en* is obligatory and which additionally involves the presence of a FUT verb-form within the same protasis, as in (11). The main clause in this instance takes an IPFV verb form.

11. law enn-h   y-dri   en-kom   b-t-joo-n   y-ji

    if   that-3SGM.ACC   3M-know.IPFV.SG   that-2PLM.GEN   FUT-2-come.IPFV-PLM   3M-come.IPFV.SG

    'If he knows that you are going to come, he will come.'

In a context where IPFV forms are available in a protasis introduced by *law*, it is still possible to have a PFV verb form within the apodosis. In this instance, the apodosis, i.e., the main clause which takes place a PFV verb-form must be introduced by *kān* or *emdi*.

12. law enn-h   y-dri   en-kom   b-t-joo-n

    if   that-3SGM.ACC   3M-know.IPFV.SG that-2PLM.GEN   FUT-2-come.IPFV-PLM

    kān/emdi-h   jaa

    be.PFV.3SGM/should have-3SGM.ACC   come.PFV.3SGM

    'If he knows that you are going to come, he would have come.'

It is also possible to have a future form within the protasis introduced by *law.* In this case, the complementizer *en* must obligatorily follow *law*. In such a context there is an obligatory requirement that the main clause is introduced by a perfective verb form. Once again, this should be preceded by either *kān* or *emdi*, as shown in example (13).

13. law enn-h   b-y-ji   kān/emdi-h   jaa

  If   that-3SGM.ACC FUT-3M-come.IPFV.SG   be.PFV.3SGM/should have.3SGM.ACC   come.PFV.3SGM

  'If he is going to come, he would have come.'

It is possible for the protasis to take an ACT.PTCP form of the verb. When this is the case, the main clause must take on a PFV form of the verb. In this instance, the presence of either *kān* or *emdi* is optional. This structure is shown through (14).

14. law   enn-h   moalemn-i   (kān/emdi-ni)   gabal-te-h

  if   that-3SGM   tell.ACT.PASS-1SG.ACC   (be.PFV.3SGM/should have-1SG.ACC) meet.PFV-1SG-3SGM.ACC

  'If he told me when he came, I would have met him.'

In the context of *law* conditionals, it is possible for the clause to take a non-verbal structure. In BHA, this can be in the form of PPs, APs or NPs. In this case, *law* is mandatorily followed by the complementizer *en.* In such cases, the matrix only permits a PFV verb form. This can in turn be optionally preceded by *kān* or *emdi*, as the following example show respectively.

15a. law   enn-ak   sadeg   (*kān*/emdi-k)   etsal-t

  if   that-2SGM.ACC   truthful.SGM (be.PFV.SGM/should have-2SGM.ACC)   call.PFV-2SGM

  'If you are being truthful, you would have called.'

b. law en   al-bait   rakhis   (kān/emdi-k)   eshtari-ta-h

  if   that DEF-house.SGM cheap.SGM (be.PFV.SGM/should have-1SG.ACC) buy.PFV-2SGM-1SG.ACC

  'If the house was cheap, I would have bought it.'

16. law enn-h   fa al-bait   (kān/emdi-k)   shif-t-h

  if   that-3SGM.ACC   in DEF-house (be.PFV.SGM/should have-2SGM.ACC) see.PFV-2SGM-3SGM.ACC

    'If he was in the house, you would have seen him.'

17. law *(en) al-talib   thaki,

  If   that DEF-student.3SGM   clever.SGM

  (*kān*/emd-h)   nijah

  (be.PFV.SGM/should have-3SGM.ACC)   succeed.PFV-3SGM.ACC

  'If the student was clever, he would have succeeded.'

The following table summarises the use of *law* in BHA.

Protasis				Apodosis		
law	en+ pron.	*Yawm* 'when'	verb from	*kān*	emdi +pron.	verb form
Law	optional		PFV		optional	PFV
Law	Mandatory	(oblig PFV)	PFV (NO EXAMPLE)/ ACT.PTCP / IMP	optional	optional	PFV
Law	optional		IPFV	? (not allowed)	? (not allowed)	IPFV
Law	Mandatory		IPFV (+FUT)	? (not allowed)	? (not allowed)	IPFV
Law	Mandatory		IPFV (+ FUT)	mandatory	mandatory	PFV
Law	Mandatory		FUT	mandatory	mandatory	PFV
Law	mandatory - optional with PFV		ACT.PTCP/ PFV	optional	optional	PFV
Law	Mandatory		Non-verbal	optional	optional	PFV

Table 2. The variation use of the conditional conjunction *law* in BHA

§4.1.1 *law* in TD vs. BHA:

law is also used in other Hijazi dialects; namely the Taif dialect. Although *law* is used in BHA and TD to express unreal conditionals, there are some differences in the structure in terms of the verb forms that are allowed in the protasis and the apodosis and the sort of correlations across the verb forms in the two structures. For example, in BHA, a non-verbal context is allowed when *law* introduces the condition, provided that a perfective verb form is used in the apodosis. Furthermore, *kān* 'be' and *emdi* 'should have' can also be used optionally to introduce the main clause, as shown in (15). However, this structure is not allowed in TD. In TD, non-verbal predicates are only allowed in the apodosis, and in such cases, the apodosis must be introduced by *fa-* 'then' to link it to the protasis, as (18) shows. It is therefore clear that TD allows for non-matched clauses when the protasis involves a PFV form.

    18. law naǧaḥ   ḥāmid,   fa-ḥāmid   ḏakī   Taif dialect (Alotaibi, 2014)

      If   succeed.PFV.3SGM Hamid,   then-Hamid   clever.SGM

      'If Hamed succeeds, then he is clever.'

Furthermore, in TD, the future marker *bi-* 'will' can be used in the apodosis, as shown in (19). In the context of BHA with *law*, the use of *bi-* is not allowed. Again, this is suggestive of the fact that PFV in the protasis in BHA obligatorily requires a certain matching of sorts, at least in the absence of certain embeddings.

19. law   jaa   salim,   bi-yi-gi   ali   Taif dialect (Alotaibi, 2014)

    if   come.PFV.3SGM   Salim   FUT-3M-come.IPFV.SG   Ali

    'If Salem comes, Ali will come.'

TD employs *kān* in the apodosis when this involves PFV (20) or IPFV (21) forms which is not allowed in BHA; the only verb form of *kān* that permitted in BHA is PFV. However, although both dialects allow for *kān* introducing the apodosis, BHA, unlike TD displays some restrictions related with the argument structure of the verb kind allowed, i.e., whether they are transitive or intransitive. For instance, the following example shows that while TD allows for a transitive verb to follow *kān* in the apodosis, this is not a possibility in BHA.

20. law ǧā   Ɂaḥmad, kān   qābal   ḫālid   Taif dialect (Alotaibi, 2014)

    if   come.PFV.3SGM Ahmad   be.PFV.3SGM meet.PFV.3SGM Khaled

    'If Ahmad had come, he would have met Khaled.'

21. law ǧā   ʿalī,   yikūn   wafī   Taif dialect (Alotaibi, 2014)

    if   come.PFV.3SGM Ali   be.IPFV.3SGM   honest.3SGM

    'If Ali comes, he is honest'

In BHA a contrast can be observed, whereby, using *kān* alone with transitive verb in the apodosis results in an ungrammatical structure (22). This contrasts with the availability of an intransitive verb, as in (23), repeated from (8) above.

22. *law   jaa   Ahmad,   *kān*   qabal   Khaled   BHA

    if   come.PFV.3SGM   Ahmad   be.PFV.3SGM meet.PFV.3SGM Khaled

    'If Ahmad had come, he would have met Khaled.'

23. law (en-ni)   dari-t   (kān/emdi-ni)   jee-t

    if   that-1SG.ACC   know.PFV-1SG   (be.PFV.3SGM/should have-1SG.ACC)   come.PFV-1SG

    'If I had known, it would have been possible for me to come.'

It is nevertheless possible to have a transitive PFV verb form in the matrix. For (22) to become a grammatical structure, we however require the obligatory presence of *emdi*. *kān* may optionally be used in this instance (24).

24. law jaa   Ahmad,   (*kān*)   emdi-h

    if   come.PFV.3SGM   Ahmad   be.PFV.3SGM should have-3SGM.ACC

    qabal   Khaled

    meet.PFV.3SGM   Khaled

    'If Ahmad had come, he would have met Khaled.'

(25) presents yet another minimal pair of BHA data demonstrating the difference in the sentence's acceptability. It is here argued that although this has not been previously discussed, some sort of condition exists whereby *kān* in the apodosis cannot co-occur with transitive verbs in BHA. This rule only applies when the protasis contains one verb, i.e., excluding other adverbial clauses and/or another verbs form. *kān* can only be used to introduce the apodosis when combined with *emdi* 'should have', or if *emdi* is used on its own without *kān*, and in which case, the meaning of *emdi* in this context is 'could/able'.

25a. *law   shaf   al-lawhah   *kān*   rsam-ha

    if   see.PFV.3SGM   DEF-artwork   be.PFV.3SGM should have-3SGM.ACC   paint.PFV.3SGM-3SGF.ACC

    'If he had seen the artwork, he would have drawn it.'

25b. law en-h   shaf   al-lawhah   (*kān*)   emdi-h

    if   that-3SGM.ACC see.PFV.3SGM DEF-artwork be.PFV.3SGM should have-3SGM.ACC

    rsam-ha

    paint.PFV.3SGM-3SGF.ACC

    `If he had seen the artwork, he would have drawn it.'

The following table shows the structures that are allowed in the context of *law* for BHA and TD (based on Alotaibi, 2014) along with the varied internal morphosyntax.

	Protasis	Apodosis
BHA	PFV, IPFV, FUT, ACT.PTCP and non-verbal	IPFV, PFV
TD	IPFV, PFV	non-verbal predicate, *bi-* 'will' + IPFV, *PFV* OR *IPFV* form

Table 3. The varied morphosyntax that conditions the structures allowed in the context of *law* when BHA and TD (based on Alotaibi, 2014) are compared.

§4.2 Real conditional structures

BHA employs *etha, kān, en, la* and *madam* to express real conditionals. The verb forms that are allowed when these introduce the protasis include a set of constraints based on the type of verb form available, whether PFV, IPFV and FUT-marked forms as well as non-verbal predicates. In some cases, some of these complementiser forms are mandatorily followed by other sorts of complementisers depending on the nature of the structure involved. In what follows below, a description is provided that considers the different associations between the complementiser used in the protasis and the form present in both the conditional clause and the matrix. Additionally, reference will be made to the interplay between the different complementisers and how these combine together when the conditional clause includes other types of (temporal) adjunct clauses within it.

In conditional clauses introduced by *etha* and *kān*, an IPFV form is allowed in the protasis. When this is the case, the use of the complementiser *en*+pronoun `that' is optional, as illustrated in (26). More specifically, correlated with this verb form in the protasis, FUT-marked or imperative verbal-forms only are allowed in the matrix.

    26. **etha/*kān*** (enn-ik)   t-abi-h   b-a-shtri-h

      if   that-2SGM.ACC   2-want.IPFV.SG-3SGM.ACC   FUT-1SG-buy.IPFV-3SGM.ACC

    allem-ni

    tell.IMP.2SGM-1SG.ACC

    `If you want it, I will buy it / tell me.'

The presence of non-verbal predicates, on the other hand, are not permissible in this context. Consequently, the given example below is considered grammatically incorrect.

27. ***etha/kān** (enn-ik)   t-abi-h   fa   al-bait

     if   that-2SGM.ACC   2-want.IPFV.SG-3SGM.ACC   in   DEF-house

     Intended: `If you want it, it's in the house.'

If we consider the distribution of the PFV verb form, we find that this can be used in the protasis of clauses introduced by a wider array of complementiser forms, namely, *etha, kān, la,* and *en.* In such instances, the presence of generic clausal complementisers such as *en* (which follows *etha* and *kān*) and *min* (which follows *la*) are only optionally required. The conditional conjunction *en*, on the other hand, does not permit the addition of any complementizer immediately after it, such as *en* or *min*.

28a. **etha/kān** (en-k)   jee-t   jee-t   / allem-ni

     if   that-2SGM.ACC come.PFV-2SGM come.PFV-1SG / tell.IMP.2SGM-1SG.ACC

                                          `If you came, {I would have come/tell me}.'

b. **la** (min)   jee-t   jee-t   / allem-ni

     if   COMP   come.PFV-2SGM come.PFV-1SG / tell.IMP.2SGM-1SG.ACC

     `If you came, {I would have come/tell me}.'

c. **en**   jee-t   jee-t   / allem-ni

     if   come.PFV-2SGM come.PFV-1SG / tell.IMP.2SGM-1SG.ACC

     `If you came, {I would have come/tell me}.'

la also allows a FUT form in the main clause when the protasis contains a PFV verb form, as the following example demonstrates. What this illustrates, particularly, in the context of (29) is that we are dealing with structures where the choice of complementiser has an effect not solely upon the immediate clause, but also a dependency upon the main clause. *la* therefore allows for the presence of a PFV in its clause without requiring a matching form in the main clause. This contrasts with what we had in the context of structures with *law.* Through the contrast between (29) and (30) we find that a FUT form in the matrix is only possible in the context of *kān* introducing the apodosis.

29. **la**   (min-k)   jee-t   b-a-j-i

     if   that-2SGM.ACC   come.PFV-2SGM   FUT-1SG-come.IPFV

     `If you came, I will come.'

30. *la (min-k)   jee-t   kān   b-a-ji

      if   that-2SGM.ACC   come.PFV-2SGM be.PFV.3SGM   FUT-1SG-come.IPFV

      `If you will come, I will come.'

When it comes to *b*-marked IPFV forms expressing a FUT reading, hence functioning as morphological FUT forms, these are restrained to conditional clauses introduced by *etha, kān* and *madam*. When such a form is present in the protasis, the use of the complementiser *en* `that' following the other set of conjunctions becomes mandatory. Moreover, in the context of a FUT form in the protasis, the matrix allows for either a FUT or an IMP form.

31. **etha/kān** *(en-k)   b-t-ji   b-a-ji   / allem-ni

     if   that-2SGM.ACC   FUT-2-come.IPFV.SGM FUT-1SG-come.IPFV / tell.IMP.2SGM-1SG.ACC

     `If you are going to come, I will come / tell me.'

As shown in (31), there is a correlation between the presence of a FUT form in the protasis and an equivalent form in the apodosis. However, an IMP verb-form is not allowed when the conditional clause is introduced by *madam* as example (32) shows. This once again reflects the relation between the complementiser type, i.e., the form with which the clause is introduced and the verb form allowed.

32. ***madam*** (enn-k)   b-t-ji   allem-ni

    if   that-2SGM.ACC   FUT-2-come.IPFV.SGM   tell.IMP.2SGM-1SG.ACC

    `If you are going to come, tell me.'

To finalise our description of plain conditional clauses, before heading on to consider ones that involve further adjunction within them, is to consider the presence of non-verbal predications within the conditional. The presence of non-verbal predicates such as NPs, PPs and APs are only allowed when the protasis is introduced by the conditional complementisers: *etha* and *kān.* Once again, here too, the complementiser *en* must be obligatorily employed as the following examples show.

33. **etha/kān** *(enn-h)   fa al-bait,   b-a-ji   / allem-ni

    If   that-3SGM.ACC   in DEF-house FUT-1SG-come.IPFV /   tell-IMP.2SGM-1SG.ACC

    `If he is in the house, I will come / tell me.'

34. **etha/kān** *(enn)   al-bait   kabeer,   b-a-shtri-h   / allem-ni

    If   that-3SGM.ACC   DEF-house big   FUT-1SG-come.IPFV / tell-IMP.2SGM-1SG.ACC

    `If he the house is big, I will buy it / tell me.'

35. (etha/ kān *(en-k)   sadeg,   taal   /   allem-ni

    if   that-2SGM.ACC truthful,   come. PFV-3SGM   /   tell-IMP.2SGM-1SG.ACC

    'If you are truthful, come / tell me.')

The conditional clause can become further complex internally, with the subordination of additional adjunct clauses within it. When this is the case, the presence of an additional clausal conjunction often overrides the morphological and syntactic constraints otherwise displayed in the context of the plain protasis counterpart introduced by the same complementiser form. If we first consider the complementiser forms *etha* and *kān* in the context of a *when* adjunct clause introduced by *yawm* lit. `day', meaning `when', we find that other forms such as ACT.PTCP forms are allowed in the embeddings of the protasis which otherwise would not be available in the plain protasis context. What remains constant, on the other hand, is the presence of a FUT or IMP form in the matrix.

36. **etha/kān** *(enn-h)   **yawm** y-ji   wa-enn-k   mawjood

    if   that-3SGM.ACC   when   3-come.IPFV.SGM and-that-2SGM.ACC exist.ACT.PASS.SGM

    b-a-jlas   /   ejles

    FUT-1SG-stay.IPFV   /   stay.IMP.2SGM

    `If you're there when he comes, I will stay/stay.'

37. *etha/kān yawm   y-mshi   b-a-mshi   / emsh

    if   when   3-leave.IPFV.SGM   FUT-1SG-leave.IPFV /   leave.IMP.2SGM

    `If you're there when he leaves, I will leave/leave.'

Another possible type of embedding within the conditional clause concerns the availability of an embedded conditional introduced by *law*, expressing the meaning `even if'. In this instance, in the context of a PFV verb within the higher conditional clause, no parallel morphological constraint applies in the matrix structure. As observed through (38) below, in contrast with (28) above, the presence of a PFV (or IMP) in the higher conditional protasis introduced by *etha, kān, la,* and *en* does not result in a PFV form in the matrix. Rather, the presence of further embedding within the conditional clause allows for this matching constraint to be withheld. The conditional clause introduced by *law* takes its own complementiser obligatorily, and in (36), in particular, it happens to involve an adjectival non-verbal predicate.

38a. **etha/kān**   (enn-h)   jaa   law   enn-h

   if   that-3SGM.ACC   come.PFV-3SGM   even if   that-3SGM.ACC

   lehal-h   y-kf-i

   alone-3SGM.GEN   3-enough.IPFV.SGM

   'If he came, even if alone, it would be enough.'

b. **la**   (min-h)   jaa   law   en-h

   if   that-3SGM.ACC   come.PFV-3SGM   even if   that-3SGM.ACC

   lehal-h   y-kf-i

   alone-3SGM.GEN   3-enough.IPFV.SGM

   'If he came, even if alone, it would be enough.'

c. en   jaa   law   en-h

   if   come.PFV-3SGM   even if   that-3SGM.ACC

   lehal-h   y-kf-i

   alone-3SGM.GEN   3-enough.IPFV.SGM

   'If he came, even if alone, it would be enough.'

In what follows in (39), the situation is not quite the same. What we have is maintenance of a pattern otherwise observed in (31). In the presence of a protasis introduced by *etha and kān* that takes a FUT verb form, we first observe that once again, the complementiser *en* is obligatory; secondly, in the context of a FUT form we find an imperative form in the matrix. Within the conditional clause, however, a clausal adjunction can be embedded and is introduced by *la* `when'. This allows for the presence of a PFV form functioning as an auxiliary of sorts in the combination with the FUT-form of the lexical (vs. functional) use of 'come', yielding the meaning `decided'. This is here all taken as evidence for the further embedding of the PFV form in the conditional clause, since the presence of a PFV form would have led to the presence of a PFV form in the matrix, whereas we here find a IMP form.

39. **etha/kān**   *(enn-h)   la   jaa   b-y-ji   b-t-amshi

   if   that-3SGM.ACC   when   come.IPFV.3SGM   FUT-3-come.IPFV.SGM   FUT-2-leave.IPFV.SGM

   allem-ni

   tell.IMP.2SGM-1SG.ACC

   'If you will leave when he decided to come, tell me.'

The table provided below presents a summary of the permissible verb forms within both the conditional clause and the main clause.

	Protasis							Apodosis
Conditional conjunction	**Complementizer *en/min***	**Verb form**	**Further conjunction**	**Verb form**	**Complementizer en/min**	**Verb form**	**Verb form**	**Verb form**
1. etha/kān	Optional	IPFV						FUT/IMP
2. etha/kān/en/la	optional 'no complementizer with en'	PFV						PFV/IMP
3. la	Optional	PFV						FUT
4. etha/madam/kān	mandatory	FUT						FUT / (IMP not with madam)
5. etha/kān	mandatory	Nonverbal predicate						FUT/IMP
6. etha/kān	mandatory		*yawm* 'when'	IPFV	*wa* 'and' + *en*		ACT.PASS	FUT/IMP
7. etha/kān/en/la	Optional 'no complementizer with en'	PFV	*law*		mandatory	Nonverbal predicates		IPFV
8. etha/kān	mandatory		*la*	PFV		FUT		FUT/IMP

Table 4. Various structures expressing real conditions in BHA.

§4.2.1 Realis in TD vs. BHA:

TD only employs *en* to introduce the protasis that expresses a real condition. In such case, according to Alotaibi (2014), the protasis should contain a lexical verb in the perfective form or the copula *kān*. Furthermore, when the PFV verb-form is employed in the protasis, the matrix is introduced by the future marker *-bi* 'will' as the following example shows.

40. en   dakar   faris,   bi-y-ngah   Taif dialect (Alotaibi, 2014)

    if   study.PFV.3SGM   Faris   FUT-3M-succeed.IPFV.SG

    'If Faris studies, he will succeed.'

In BHA, however, the use of the perfective form in the conditional clause and the future marker *-bi* in the main clause is only permitted when the conditional conjunction *la* introduces the condition, as shown above in example (29).

TD also allows for the presence of *kān* in the protasis when *en* introduces the condition. In this context, *kān* allows for a non-verbal structure with a PP, while the verb form in the apodosis is FUT as demonstrated in example (41). Of course, the breadth of the comparison here is limited, considering that we can only make do with the data available to us for comparison.

41. en   kān   ahmad fi al-bayt,   a-ba-gi-h   Taif dialect (Alotaibi, 2014)

    if   be.PFV.3SGM Ahmad in DEF-house   1SGM-FUT-go.IPFV-3SGM.ACC

    'If Ahmad is in the house, I will go to him.'

In BHA, the presence of a nonverbal predicate in the protasis is also allowed when the condition is introduced by the conjunctions *etha* or *kān* on its own, as shown in examples (33), (34) and (35). However, it is important to note that the complementizer *en*, which is not used in TD, must be used immediately after these conjunctions in BHA. Additionally, besides the PPs, BHA allows the inclusion of predicative NPs and APs in the protasis.

Alotaibi (2014) additionally mentions that the conditional conjunction *en* in its co-occurrence with *kān* is also used in Taif dialect to express unreal conditional. In this case, the protasis contains non-verbal predicates, while the matrix must be introduced by *kān* and is followed by a PFV verb form, as in example (42).

42. en   kān   ahmad fi al-bayt,   kān   qabal-ni   Taif Dialect (Alotaibi, 2014)

    if   be.PFV.3SGM Ahmad in DEF-house be.PFV.3SGM meet.PFV.3SGM-1SG.ACC

    ''If Ahmad had been in the house, he would have met me.''

This specific use is not allowed in BHA. However, a parallel structure is allowed, but whereas *law* is the complementiser introducing the condition, as shown through examples (15, 16, 17) where the protasis contains non-verbal predicates and the matrix is introduced by *kān*/*emdi* and followed by the perfective verb form. Table 5. accounts for a comparative assessment of the differences between BHA and TD.

	Protasis	Apodosis
BHA	PFV, IPFV, FUT, Nonverbal	FUT, IMP, IPFV, PFV
TD	PFV verb-form OR *kān* followed by PPs	*bi-* 'will' + IPFV, *kān* followed by PFV

Table 5. The different permissible structures for expressing real conditions in BHA and TD (based on Alotaibi, 2014)

§5 Conclusion

This study examines conditional structures in BHA, focusing on those used in Wadi Alfurra, Alfuraa valley. It begins with an overview of condition clauses in Classical Arabic and relevant literature on various Arabic varieties. The analysis of BHA conditional categorizes the discussion according to the conditional complementizer's usage, distinguishing between real and unreal conditions. The study identifies six particles in BHA that are used to introduce conditional sentences, including *law*, *etha*, *kān*, *en*, *la*, and *madam*. The analysis additionally offers a comparison of the usage of the conditional complementizers in another Hijazi dialect, specifically the Taif dialect.

 The particle *law* is primarily used to introduce clauses that express unreal conditions, while the remaining conjunctions are employed to introduce real conditions. Regarding the use of the complementizer *law*, it has been found that it introduces the protasis that contains PFV, IPFV, FUT, ACT.PASS verb forms and nonverbal predicates. Furthermore, the adverbial clause introduced by *yawm* 'when' is allowed within the conditional clause. This inclusion is permitted when the complementizer *en* immediately follows *law*, and *yawm* precedes the PFV verb form, which is then followed by the ACT.PASS or PFV verb form. The apodosis of the conditional clause introduced by *law* contains two verb forms: perfective and imperfective. The main clause can be introduced optionally or mandatorily by *emdi*/*kān* when followed by a PFV verb form. The mandatory use of them occurs when the conditional clause includes an imperfective verb form followed by a future verb form or a standalone future verb form.

Regarding real conditional, in BHA, the complementizers *etha*, *kān*, *en*, *la*, and *madam* are utilized to introduce the real conditionals. A variety of verb forms are used in the conditional clause, including PFV, IPFV, FUT and nonverbal predicates. The conditional conjunctions *etha* and *kān* introduce the protasis that contains all these verb forms. Moreover, the conjunctions *etha* and *kān* allow for the inclusion of additional adverbial clause introduced by *yawm* 'when' or conditional clauses introduced by *la* or *law* within the conditional clause. In such case, the use of the complementizer *en* is mandatory. The conditional conjunctions *la* and *en*, on the other hand, are only employed when the protasis contains a PFV verb form. Additionally, they permit the incorporation of another conditional clause introduced by *law* within the main conditional clause. The complementizer *madam* introduces the protasis that includes a future verb form and must be preceded by the complementizer *en*.

The apodosis, introduced by real condition conjunctions, allows for four verb forms: FUT, IMP, PFV, and IPFV. In the main clause, all these forms are permitted when the protasis is introduced by the conjunctions *etha*, *kān*, and *la*. However,

when the protasis is introduced by the conjunction *madam*, the apodosis only allows for one verb form: the future form. Lastly, in the main clause, perfective, imperative, and imperfective verb forms are permitted when the conditional conjunction *en* introduces the protasis.

The complementizer *en* must be used immediately after the conditional conjunction that introduces the protasis in several cases. This requirement applies regardless of whether the conditional conjunction is real or unreal. These cases involve the inclusion of an adverbial clause introduced by *yawm* 'when' within the protasis or the presence of another conditional clause in the main conditional clause. However, in the case of incorporating an additional conditional clause within the main conditional clause, the utilization of the complementizer *en* becomes obligatory solely when the conditional conjunction that introduces the embedded conditional clause precedes the main verb. Furthermore, the presence of the complementizer *en* is obligatory for a protasis that includes nonverbal predicates and future verb forms. The last two cases that require the inclusion of the complementizer *en* are specifically related to the conditional clause introduced by the conjunction *law*. The first case occurs when the conditional clause includes the verb form IPFV followed by the future verb form. The second case arises when the conditional clause contains the ACT.PASS verb form.

The comparison between the conditional clauses in BHA and Taif dialects reveals several differences related to the number of conditional conjunctions used and the allowance of verb forms within the protasis and apodosis. One such distinction is that in BHA, the apodosis does not allow for nonverbal predicates. However, in Taif dialects, nonverbal predicates are permissible in the apodosis. In contrast to BHA, which allows for the use of nonverbal predicates in the protasis, Taif dialect does not permit the inclusion of nonverbal predicates in conditional clauses. Additionally, in BHA, the use of *emdi/kān* to introduce the apodosis is optional or mandatory when the protasis is introduced by *law*. However, in Taif dialect, such usage is not permitted. Instead, Taif dialect employs *kān* in both the protasis introduced by *en* and the apodosis, which is not allowed in BHA.

References

AGUADÉ, Jordi. "Estudio descriptivo y comparative de los fonemas del árabe dialectal marroquí." EDNA 7 (2003): 59-109.

Alotaibi, Y. 2014. *Conditional Sentences in Modern Standard Arabic and the Taif Dialect.* Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Essex.

Al-Rajhi, A. 1998. *Al-Tatabiq Al-Nahawi.* Cairo: Dar Al-Marefah Al-Jameeah.

Alsameraei, F. 2000. *Maani Al-Naho.* Jordan: Dar Al-Fikr.

Alshammari, Ahmad Radi H. 2018. *The Syntax of Temporal and Conditional Adverbial Clauses in Najdi Arabic.* Ph.D. Dissertation, Newcastle University.

Altalhi, H. 2014. *Speech Acts of Thanking and Thanking Responses by Hijazi Females.* Ball State University.

Alzaidi, M. 2014. *Information Structure and Intonation in Hijazi Arabic.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Essex.

Azar, B. S. 1981. *Understanding & Using English Grammar.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bennett, J. F. 2003. *A Philosophical Guide to Conditionals.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bhatt, R., and R. Pancheva. 2007. "Conditionals." *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax,* 638–687.

Biţună, G. 2015. "The Conditional Clause in the Spoken Arabic of Siirt." *Folia Orientalia* 63: 63–74.

Boubekri, A. 2019. "Conditionals in Moroccan Arabic." *Journal of Universal Language* 20 (1): 1-38.

Brustad, K. 2000. *The Syntax of Spoken Arabic: A Comparative Study of Moroccan, Egyptian, Syrian, and Kuwaiti Dialects.* Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Carter, R., and M. McCarthy. 2006. *Cambridge Grammar of English: A Comprehensive Guide. Spoken and Written English. Grammar and Usage.* Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Caubet, D. 2005. "Generation darija!" EDNA 9: 233-243.

Cowell, M. 1964. *A Reference Grammar of Syrian Arabic.* Reprinted 2005. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Crystal, D. 2008. *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics,* Volume 30. Wiley-Blackwell.

Dallaji, Ines, Gabsi, Ines, and Stephan Procházka. 2018. "Conditional Clauses in the Arabic Dialect of Tunis." https://vicav.acdh.oeaw.ac.at/docs/TUNICO-conditionals-11–9-2018.pdf. Last accessed: 29.07.2019.

Dancygier, B. 1998. *Conditionals and Prediction: Time, Knowledge, and Causation in Conditional Constructions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

D'Anna, L. 2017. "On the Development of Conditional Particles in the Arabic Dialects of the Fezzān." In: V. Ritt-Benmimoun, ed. *Tunisian and Libyan Arabic Dialects: Common Trends – Recent Developments – Diachronic Aspects.* Zaragoza: Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza, 351–370.

Eid, M. 2009. *Al-Naho Al-Musafa.* Cairo: Alam Al-Kutub.

Grigore, George. 2005. "Conditional Structures in Baghdadi Arabic." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* L/3–4: 273–281.

Grigore, George. 2008. "Conditional Structures in Mardini Arabic." *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 49: 63–78.

Hacking, J. F. 1998. *Coding the Hypothetical: A Comparative Typology of Russian and Macedonian Conditionals,* Volume 38. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ibn Aqeel, A. 1980. *Sharh ibn Aqeel ala alfyat ibn malik* (20th ed.). Cairo, Egypt: Dar Al-Torath.

Ingham, B. 1991. "Subordinate Clauses of Time and Condition in Bedouin Dialects." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 54: 42-62.

Jalonen, J. 2017. *Conditional Constructions in Damascus Arabic: Form and Meaning.* MA Thesis. University of Uppsala.

Kumakiri, T. 2013. "Epistemic Modality and Conditional Sentence: On the Presentative Particle of an Arabic Dialect of Tunis (Tunisia)" 34: 155–173.

Ladefoged, P., and K. Johnson. 2010. *A Course in Phonetics* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth.

Marçais, Philippe. 1977. *Esquisse Grammaticale de l'Arabe Maghrébin.* Paris: Maisonneuve.

Murphy, R. 2012. *English Grammar in Use* (Fourth Edition). Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Omar, M. 1975. *Saudi Arabic, Urban Hijazi Dialect: Basic Course.* Washington: Foreign Service Institute.

Owens, Jonathan. 1984. *A Short Reference Grammar of Eastern Libyan Arabic.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Palva, H. 2006. "Dialects: Classification." In K. Versteegh, M. Woidich, M. Eid, A. Elgibali, and Z. Andrzej (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics,* Vol. 1, 604-613. Leiden: Brill.

Pereira, C. 2019, June. "Le Système Hypothétique de l'Arabe de Tripoli (Libye)." In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference of AIDA.*

Pereira, C. 2008. "Aperçu du Système Aspecto-Temporel du Parler Arabe de Tripoli (Libye)." In: Stephan Procházka and Veronika Ritt-Benmimoun (eds), *Between the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. Studies on Contemporary Arabic Dialects. Proceedings of the 7th AIDA Conference,* held in Vienna from 5-9 September 2006. Wien / Berlin: LIT, 329-348.

Prochazka, T. 1988. *Saudi Arabian Dialects.* London: Kegan Paul International.

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* Pearson Education India.

Qurancomplex.org. 2018. King Fahd Glorious Quran Printing Complex. Retrieved from http://qurancomplex.org/.

Ryding, K. 2005. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, et al. 1986a. "Overview." In: Traugott et al. (eds) *On Conditionals.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Versteegh, Kees. 2014. *Arabic Language.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.