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Abstract

This thesis considers negation in 54 modern Arabic varieties from a typological point of view (as in Song 2001, Croft 2003 and Miestamo 2005). The types of negation investigated here are: standard negation, non-verbal negation, negative imperatives, negative existential clauses, negation with pseudo-verbs, negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord constructions. This approach results in 30 generalizations capturing different ways of expressing different types of negation among the contemporary varieties of Arabic; for example: the construction for standard negation in modern Arabic varieties is almost always symmetric (done by the addition of the negative morpheme to the affirmative clause only) and very rarely asymmetric (an example is the dialect of ʔAbha); there is no š-variety (a variety that uses ...-š negatively in standard negation) where ...-š is not, at least optionally, omitted in emphatic negation; the negator mā can commonly negate imperatives in every Arabic region, except in the Arabian Peninsula where this is extremely rare. One of the most interesting results the study reveals is that negation in Arabic is going through a cycle additional to the Jespersen’s cycle which is already identified by several studies (e.g., Lucas, 2009 and Diem, 2014). In the first stage of this additional cycle, a single negator is used to negate both verbal and non-verbal clauses. In the second stage, this negator is attached to a personal pronoun to negate non-verbal clauses only. In the third stage, a new single morpheme is coined and generalized to negate any non-verbal clause. In the fourth stage, this new morpheme is used to negate certain types of verbal clauses. In the last stage, verbal and non-verbal clauses return to be negated similarly, in that this new coined morpheme can negate both of them. In the study, this cycle is referred to as the Arabic negative cycle.
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<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First person</th>
<th>INF</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Second person</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third person</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Absolutive</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Non-hypothetical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASER</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>NSI</td>
<td>Negative-sensitive item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>NSP</td>
<td>Non-specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>Complementizer</td>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Copula</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Definite article</td>
<td>PTCP</td>
<td>Participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>Emphatic</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>PRG</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>PST</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>Habitual</td>
<td>SBJV</td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSS</td>
<td>Jussive</td>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>Vocative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEF</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

This thesis is a typological study of the way negation is expressed across modern Arabic varieties. Under this theme, different types of negation are considered in 54 documented Arabic varieties across the Arabic-speaking world. These types are standard negation, non-verbal negation, negative imperatives, negative existential clauses, negation with pseudo-verbs, negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord constructions.

In this introductory chapter, I first give an overview of the different types of Arabic and discuss the fact that Standard Arabic cannot be considered as the origin for all modern Arabic varieties; yet, it is justifiable to compare Standard Arabic to the modern varieties in order to understand some of the modern negative structures (section 1.1). In section 1.2, I provide information on the broad transcription system used in the present study. In doing so, I touch upon some of the phonological variations between modern Arabic varieties in both consonants (section 1.2.1) and vowels (section 1.2.2). Then, I discuss certain syntactic and morphological characteristics of Arabic, especially those which interact with negation (section 1.3). In this vein, the different types of Arabic sentences and basic word order are first explained because different sentence structures may require different negative strategies (1.3.1). Second, I shed light on the tense and case marking systems of Arabic, as both may interact with negation as well (section 1.3.2). An overview of previous works on Arabic is given in section 1.4, especially on the ones done on the history of Arabic negation. The aims and the structure of the thesis are explained in 1.5. Finally, section 1.6, on the significance of the present thesis, concludes this chapter.

1.1 Standard Arabic

Arabic is a member of the Semitic branch of the Afro-Asiatic language family. The language (arguably a language family in its own right) is primarily spoken in the Middle
East, north Africa, and some of the surrounding areas such as Malta and parts of sub-Saharan Africa, by more than 300 million people.

In the literature, Classical Arabic, Standard Arabic and *fuṣḥā* are occasionally used to refer to the same thing (the literary Arabic of the first few centuries of the Islamic era). Modern Standard Arabic, in contrast, is used to refer to the contemporary written language, which is phonologically, syntactically and morphologically very close to Classical Arabic. The only significant differences between the two are perhaps lexical. That is, a number of Classical Arabic expressions and lexical items are not used in Modern Standard Arabic. In this thesis, however, the term Standard Arabic is used as an umbrella term for both Classical and Modern Standard Arabic.

It is important, at the beginning of this study, to emphasize on the fact that Standard Arabic is not the mother of all modern Arabic varieties. This fact has been discussed in several studies (e.g. Al-Jallad, 2017; Lucas, 2018; Obler, 1975; Owens, 2005; Watson, 2011). Nevertheless, it is justified to refer to negation in Standard Arabic in order to explain some of the negative phenomena found in some modern Arabic varieties. In fact, in the upcoming chapters, before any negative structure is compared among the modern varieties of Arabic, it is first explained how such a structure is expressed in Standard Arabic if Standard Arabic has it. For one thing, some of the modern negative phenomena are best understood historically. For another, some of the proposed generalizations make reference to the way negation is rendered in Standard Arabic.

The justification of referring to Standard Arabic is based on two reasons. First, it seems, as there is no evidence suggests otherwise, Standard Arabic as found in Qur’an and other early Arabic texts is more similar to the early varieties of Arabic than the modern Arabic varieties, “and this is especially likely to be true of features such as exclusively preverbal negation, concerning which Classical Arabic, other ancient Semitic languages, and contemporary Bedouin dialects of the Arabian Peninsula are all in
agreement” (Lucas, 2018: 9). Therefore, if the Standard Arabic we know is not the mother of the modern Arabic varieties, it is, at least, relatively similar to their mothers.

The other reason concerns the diglossia present in the Arabic world, but before we proceed, a few words on diglossia are in order. Diglossia means a situation where two distinct forms of a single language are used simultaneously in one place, often by the same speakers, with each form having a distinct social function (Ferguson, 1959). This phenomenon can be observed almost in every Arabic-speaking region as both Standard Arabic and the local dialect of that region are spoken under different conditions within the same community. Standard Arabic in these cases would be the formal variety that is used in education and formal occasions, and moreover it would be the written variety in most, if not all, printed materials such as newspapers, magazines, books, etc. On the other hand, the colloquial variety would be used on a daily basis in informal situations. Unlike Standard Arabic, the colloquial variety in a region is mostly considered to be unwritten, although many songs and conversations on social media are written in colloquial varieties.

With this in mind on diglossia, the reference to Standard Arabic looks to be compelling. First, many native Arabic speakers end up being exposed to almost the same amount of Standard Arabic and the local Arabic dialect spoken in their areas which makes them bidialectal. Second, Arabic speakers find themselves in many situations forced to refer to Standard Arabic as the origin of their Arabic. In writing, for instance, because there are no conventional alphabetical symbols for any of the modern Arabic varieties, speakers who desire to write in their own varieties are forced to use the alphabetical symbols of Standard Arabic. And because there are some phonological differences between Standard Arabic and modern Arabic varieties as will be shown in section 1.2, one may cope with these phonological differences in two ways. First, if the different phoneme already has a representative symbol in the Standard alphabetical system, this
symbol is chosen. For example, the item for ‘three’ takes the form $\theta\lambda\breve{\alpha}h$ in Standard Arabic, whereas in Urban Hijazi Arabic it takes the form $tal\breve{a}h$.\(^1\) As can be noted here, the reflex of the Standard phoneme /$\theta$/ is [t] in this dialect. And because in the Standard Arabic alphabet, both /$\theta$/ and /t/ have specific symbols for them, Urban Hijazi speakers would choose the Standard symbol /t/ <ت>, when writing the word for ‘three’. Second, if the different phoneme has no representative symbol in Standard Arabic, speakers render such a phoneme by using analogy. That is to say, they make reference to how the item they wish to present in their own varieties is written in Standard Arabic. For example, /g/ is a phoneme used in Madinah Arabic, but not in Standard Arabic. Consequently, the Madinah Arabic morpheme $g\breve{\alpha}l$ ‘said’ would be rendered in writing as $q\breve{\alpha}l$ <قَال>.

Bearing in mind this diglossia situation, one can say that if the phenomenon of language contact is rightly taken into consideration to explain the evolution of many linguistic phenomena found in human languages, this long and massive contact between Standard Arabic and modern Arabic varieties should definitely be taken into consideration as well. Not to mention that the contact between Standard Arabic and modern Arabic varieties does not occur at the physical level only, but also at the intellectual level. In other words, the two varieties are not spoken by two different types of people who happen to be in contact (physical contact); they are spoken by the same people who think of them analogically all the time (intellectual contact).\(^2\)\(^\text{2}\) In short, then, we can say referring to Standard Arabic in order to understand some of the modern Arabic structures is justified either from a diachronic point of view, as Standard Arabic could be the mother of modern Arabic varieties or, at least, very similar in relevant respects to their mothers, or from a synchronic viewpoint since these varieties are in intensive contact with Standard Arabic.

\(^1\) Throughout this section, many names such as Urban Hijazi Arabic are proposed. See section 2.5 for information on where each Arabic variety considered in this study is spoken.

\(^2\) Perhaps also what is known as “code-switching” in linguistics is a result of an intellectual contact between two languages.
1.2 Phonology

1.2.1 Consonants

Standard Arabic has 29 consonant phonemes, presented in Table 1. The rows in this table show the place of articulation, whereas the columns show the manner. Note also that in the cells, symbols appear either to the left or to the right. Left symbols are voiceless, where the right ones are voiced. In a few cells, one can see some symbols appear to be above each other, indicating they have the same place of articulation. In these cases, the lower symbols are emphatic, meaning that they have a secondary uvular or pharyngeal articulation not shared by the sounds presented by the symbols above.
Table 1: Consonants in Standard Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labiodental</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palato-alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Uvular</th>
<th>Pharyngeal</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plosive</strong></td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nasal</strong></td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tap</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fricative</strong></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ſ</td>
<td>χ</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affricate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glide</strong></td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Approximate)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lateral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 This /r/ is trill in some cases.
All of the above consonants can be found in modern Arabic varieties. This is not to say they are used identically in every dialect; in fact, such a case does not exist. It means one might find some of these consonants used in one dialect, whereas the others are used in another one.\(^4\) In addition to these consonants, the following are used:

Table 2: Some consonants in contemporary Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Place and manner of articulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ﺯ</td>
<td>Emphatic voiced alveolar fricative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻖ</td>
<td>Voiceless alveolar affricate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺯ</td>
<td>Voiced palato-alveolar fricative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺼ</td>
<td>Voiceless palato-alveolar affricate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻟ</td>
<td>Voiced velar stop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above consonants are not used in Standard Arabic.\(^5\) Yet, they can be observed in different modern Arabic varieties. /\(z\)/, for example, can be found in Cairene and Damascus Arabic. It is used in certain lexical items where Standard Arabic has /\(d\)/ or /\(t\)/.

For example, the Standard Arabic morpheme \(\emptyset\)ann ‘surmise’ is realized as ẓann. /\(c\)/ can be found in some varieties of central Saudi Arabia. It may occur in place of the Standard Arabic /\(k\)/. For example, ka\(d\)d\(a\)b ‘liar’ in Standard Arabic is pronounced as ca\(d\)d\(a\)b. /\(z\)/

---

\(^4\) Perhaps a separate study is needed to capture all of the phonological variations between modern Arabic varieties. Thus, I only discuss here the major ones, especially those I encounter in the data I collected for the purpose of this study.

\(^5\) Some of them are used in some regional pronunciations of Standard Arabic, e.g., /\(g\)/ in Egypt and Yemen and /\(z\)/ in Levant and Maghreb.
can be observed in most Levantine and North African varieties. It is used in place of the Standard Arabic /ḡ/. For example, in Damascus Arabic, the Standard Arabic morpheme ḥaḡar ‘stone’ is pronounced as ḥaẓar. /ç/ can be heard sometimes in place of the Standard Arabic /k/ in the Gulf region, as well as in rural Palestine. For instance, the Standard Arabic morpheme ḥalb ‘dog’ is pronounced as ẓalb. The last consonant in Table 2 is /g/. It is found in many Arabic varieties in place of the standard /q/ as in gālb ‘heart’ rather than the Standard Arabic form qalb. In Egypt, on the other hand, /g/ is used in place of the Standard Arabic /ḡ/ as in gāmal ‘camel’ rather than ḡamal.

The phonological differences between Standard Arabic and modern Arabic varieties do not always involve use of a new consonant as explained above. In some cases, the reflex of a particular Standard Arabic consonant itself exists as a distinct consonant phoneme in Standard Arabic. For example, in Cairene Arabic, /ʔ/ is used in place of the Standard Arabic /q/. In this vein, for example, the Standard Arabic item qahwah ‘coffee’ appears as ʔahwah in Cairo. Another example can be observed in much of the Gulf. In this region, the traditional realization of the Standard Arabic /ḡ/ is /y/, for example, ḡumāḥa‘Friday’ becomes yimāḥa.

Finally, examples in Standard Maltese in this thesis are transcribed differently to examples from other Arabic varieties. Standard Maltese has its own Latin-script orthography, which is used conventionally in transcribing examples of this dialect. Thus, this convention is followed here as well. In this vein, Table 3 below shows the relevant symbols in the Maltese orthography, which are used in presenting examples of Standard Maltese only, in the left-hand column and their values in the right-hand one.
Table 3: Standard Maltese consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols in the Maltese orthography</th>
<th>Their phonetic values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ċ</td>
<td>č</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ġ</td>
<td>ģ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ž</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Silent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.2 Vowels

Standard Arabic has three vowel qualities only, with a short-long length distinction for each one of them. All of these vowels are listed below in Table 4.
Table 4: Vowels in Standard Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Open front unrounded vowel</td>
<td>ḡabal ‘mountain’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ā</td>
<td>The long version of /a/</td>
<td>bāb ‘door’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Close front unrounded vowel</td>
<td>min ‘from’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ī</td>
<td>The long version of /i/</td>
<td>ṭabīb ‘doctor’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>Close back rounded vowel</td>
<td>kutub ‘books’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ū</td>
<td>The long version of /u/</td>
<td>ḥurūf ‘letters’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three Standard Arabic long vowels (/ā/, /ī/ and /ū/) can be observed in most, if not all, modern Arabic varieties. In addition, the long vowels /ō/ and /ē/ can be found in many modern varieties only. These /ō/ and /ē/ vowels are monophthongised reflexes of what can be transcribed in Standard Arabic as /aw/ and /ay/, respectively. For example, the Standard Arabic morphemes yawm ‘day’ and bayt ‘house’ are realized as yōm and bēt in Madinah Arabic.

The short vowels (/a/, /i/ and /u/) are used in a very similar way to Standard Arabic in some modern Arabic varieties such as Cairene Arabic. Generally speaking, however, a number of other varieties collapse the phonemic distinction between /i/ and /u/, or even the phonemic distinction between /i/, /u/ and /a/ into a single phonemic short vowel schwa /ə/. Consider the following examples, and note that in Western Libyan Arabic /a/ is used in kṭobt ‘wrote’ and in Dellys Arabic used in ṣāyyad ‘fisherman’:
(1) Western Libyan Arabic

\[ \text{ma} - \text{k̠t̠b̠t} \quad \text{ḥatta} \quad \text{ḥaža} \]
\[ \text{NEG-write.PRF.1SG} \quad \text{any} \quad \text{thing} \]

‘I did not write anything.’

(Krer, 2013: 86)

(2) Dellys Arabic

\[ \text{huwa} \quad \text{maši} \quad \text{ṣāyyad} \]
\[ \text{he} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{fisherman} \]

‘He is not a fisherman.’

(Souag, 2005: 167)

Some varieties distinguish more vowels than the aforementioned. For example, in a number of varieties, the short vowels /o/ and /e/ can be observed. However, such vowels are typically not phonemic; they are used as allophones of other vowels, e.g., in many varieties [o] is used as an allophone of /u/ and [e] as an allophone of /i/. An example of this phenomenon can be found in Sousse Arabic, where the vowel [ɛ] as in (3) below is an allophone of /a/ and the choice between them depends on the surrounding consonants (Talmoudi, 1980: 17).

(3) Sousse Arabic

\[ \text{ʕ̱mur-hum} \quad \text{mɛ} \quad \text{y̱ɛk̠lu} \]
\[ \text{never-they} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{eat.IMPF.3PL} \]

‘They never eat.’

(Talmoudi, 1980: 166)

Talmoudi (1980) makes explicit which vowel symbols in his transcription represent underlying phonemes and which represent allophones. In many works consulted for the present thesis, however, such information is neither explained nor is there enough accessible data to infer it. For this reason, vowels in examples collected for the present
work will be copied faithfully from the original source. Due to this approach and the other cases discussed above, the following table summarizes all the vowels used in the present thesis in addition to those given in Table 4.

**Table 5: Additional vowels used in the study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Close-mid front unrounded vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Close-mid back rounded vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>Open-mid front unrounded vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ə</td>
<td>Mid central vowel (schwa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɛ̄</td>
<td>The long version of /ɛ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɔ̄</td>
<td>The long version of /o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɛ̆</td>
<td>The long version of /ɛ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.3 Syntax and morphology of Arabic**

**1.3.1 Syntax**

Arabic clauses may be divided into two major types: verbal and non-verbal. The verbal ones are those which contain an overt verb. In transitive clauses, the dominant basic word order in Standard Arabic is either VSO or SVO. Both are exemplified in the following, respectively:
However, Alsalem (2012) and Krer (2013), among others, claim that all of the six possible orders of subject, object and verb (VSO, VOS, SVO, SOV, OVS and OSV) can be found in Standard Arabic. This claim might be due to the fact that Standard Arabic has a case marking system, a point that will be discussed later in section 1.3.2.2. In other words, since the core arguments (subjects and objects) in Standard Arabic carry inflectional suffixes (case endings), their syntactic function in the clause can be determined by these inflections rather than by their order in the clause. In (4) above, for example, the subject ʔahmad ‘Ahmad’ carries the nominative case -u, and the object t-tuffāḥat ‘the apple’ carries the accusative one -a; therefore, regardless of their order in the clause, one can still identify them based on the case markers they carry.

The previous claim suggests that Standard Arabic is a free word order language. However, this is not the case. We must draw a clear line between what is possible in theory and what is actually attested in the writing and speech of Arabic speakers. We must also draw another line between what is considered as a dominant basic word order and more marked word orders that are rarely used for particular information-structural effects. In theory, a language, like Arabic, that has a case marking system might be eligible to be a free word order language, but what is found in practice in the vast majority of sentences in canonical texts are mostly two orders, either VSO or SVO. However,
VOS (5)(a) and OVS (5)(b) might be found in Standard Arabic as illustrated by the following examples from Qur’an: 6

(5) Standard Arabic

a. ʔinamā yāχšā l|āh-a min ʕibādih-i lʕulamāʔ-u

EMPH fear.IMPF.3MSG God-ACC from slave.PL-GEN DEF-scholar.PL-NOM

‘Scholars fear God.’ (Lit. ‘Among God’s servants, only scholars truly fear him’) (Qur’an 35: 28)

b. kull-an waʕada l-|āh-u l-ḥusnā

both-ACC.INDEF promise.PRF.3MSG God-NOM DEF-welfare

‘God promised both the welfare.’ (Qur’an 57: 10)

In the previous examples, allāh ‘God’ in (5)(a) and kull ‘both’ in (5)(b) are the objects and have the accusative case -a and -an (the indefinite form of -a), respectively. In contrast, al-ʕulamāʔ ‘scholars’ in (5)(a) and allāh ‘God’ in (5)(b) are the subjects and have the nominative case -u. These orders, however, cannot be used in all cases. In fact, there is what is known among Arabic grammarians as wuġūb taqdīm al-fāṣil ʕalā al-mafṣūl ‘the obligation of placing the subject before the object’. That is to say, if the overt case marking suffixes cannot be used, the subject must precede the object in the clause. This is the case, for example, when the stems of the core arguments end in vowels. That is, case marking inflections are mostly vowels in Arabic, and clusters of vowels do not occur in Arabic. In the following, mūsā ‘Musa’ and ʕīsā ‘Isa’ are both names that end in vowels. Thus, it is impossible to add another vowel at the end of them. As a result, the subject and the object is determined by their order in the clause only; whichever noun

---

6 To my knowledge, VOS and OVS are the only orders that can be used on very rare occasions as explained in (5), whereas the other two (SOV and OSV) are not used.
comes first is perceived as the subject of the clause, while the other is considered as the object.

(6) Standard Arabic

ḍaraba mūsā ʕīsā
hit.PRF.3MSG Musa Isa

‘Musa hit Isa.’  (Personal knowledge)

Similarly to Standard Arabic, in modern Arabic varieties both VSO and SVO are possible. The following are representative examples from Madinah and Cairene Arabic. Note that the same clause can be either SVO or VSO:

(7) Madinah Arabic

a. katab ʔaḥmad risālah
write.PRF.3MSG Ahmad letter

‘Ahmad wrote a letter.’

b. ʔaḥmad katab risālah
Ahmad write.PRF.3MSG letter

‘Ahmad wrote a letter.’  (Personal knowledge)

(8) Cairene Arabic

a. ʔakal ʔaḥmad kēka
eat.PRF.3MSG Ahmad cake

‘Ahmad ate a cake.’

b. ʔaḥmad ʔakal kēka
Ahmad eat.PRF.3MSG cake

‘Ahmad ate a cake.’  (Personal knowledge)
It is worth mentioning here that, as noted by Brustad (2000), SVO might be more common in modern Arabic varieties than VSO. She also notes that, in modern Arabic varieties, verb-initial clauses mostly lack an independent subject; it is marked on the verb (Brustad, 2000: 317–318). This is also noticed in the data I gathered in my fieldwork (see section 2.6) and the data found in the sources I consulted for the purpose of this study, for instance:

(9) Annaba Arabic

χαdamn fi ʂbîtər
work.PRF.1SG in hospital

‘I worked in a hospital.’ (Meftouh, Bouchemal, & Smaïli, 2012: 130)

(10) Muslim Baghdadi Arabic

yıği
come.IMPF.3MSG

‘He comes.’ (Erwin, 2004: 141)

Another case in my data that might support the assumption of the preference of SVO over VSO when there is an independent subject is that the following clauses that were included in the questionnaire designed for the present study (see section 2.6 for more details on the fieldwork):

(11) Yanbuʿ Arabic

a. mḥammad yašrab l-ḥalîb
Mohammed drink.IMPF.3MSG DEF-milk

‘Mohammed drinks the milk.’
The previous are two versions of the same clause. They differ in word order only, one SVO and one is VSO. Participants were asked to negate these clauses. The aim was to determine if basic word order affects the placement of the negator in the clause. Interestingly, participants, in all cases, added only the verbal negator mā for the SVO clause. For the VSO clause, in contrast, many participants not only added the negator mā but also reorganised the clause to make it SVO. In other words, the following clause was the negative form of both clauses in (11):

(12) Yanbuʿ Arabic

mḥammad  mā  yašrab  l-ḥalīb
Mohammed  NEG  drink.IMPF.3MSG  DEF-milk

‘Mohammed drinks the milk.’  

(Fieldwork data)

Based on this, one might conclude that both VSO and SVO are used in modern Arabic varieties; however, VSO seems to be used commonly when there is no independent subject in the clause, and if there is one, SVO seems to be preferable.

The second type of Arabic clause is non-verbal. These do not contain an overt verb; they are formed by juxtaposing a nominal and its predicate, e.g.:

---

7 They are also called verbless or nominal sentences.
As can be noticed in the English translation of the above examples, non-verbal sentences in Arabic are copular clauses in the present tense. Copular verbs in Arabic are omitted in the present and appear if the clause is changed to the past or the future. The following correspond to the above examples respectively. Note the Arabic copular verb َكَانَ ‘was’ is used as these clauses occur in the past tense.
(17) Madinah Arabic
kān ẓalīd ẓāki
was Khaled smart
‘Khaled was smart.’  
(Personal knowledge)

(18) Cairene Arabic
tamīm kān mudarris
Tameem was teacher
‘Tameem was a teacher.’  
(Personal knowledge)

It is important to mention here that clauses such as the ones in (17) and (18) are not considered to be non-verbal clauses in the present thesis as they contain an overt verb, namely kān in this case. That is, verbal clauses, even if the verb is the copular kān, are negated by a different strategy. Compare the following clauses from Madinah Arabic:

(19) Madinah Arabic

a. ẓalīd mu ẓāki
Khaled NEG smart
‘Khaled is not smart.’

b. ma kān ẓalīd ẓāki
NEG was Khaled smart
‘Khaled was not smart.’  
(Personal knowledge)

In (19)(a), the clause is non-verbal (no overt verb is used); thus, the non-verbal negator mu is used. In (19)(b), on the other hand, the verbal negator ma is used as the clause contains verb, despite the fact this clause is just the past tense version of the previous one.
Finally, the verbal negative strategy is mostly used to negate so-called pseudo-verb clauses. However, they are considered in the present work as a separate category because in some modern Arabic varieties certain types of them tend to be negated by particular negative strategies. This is not to say they are negated differently; it is just that in some varieties there is more than one negative strategy possible with ordinary verbs, and in these varieties certain pseudo-verbs tend to be negated by some of these strategies only (see section 6.2 for more details).

As Brustad puts it “a pseudo-verb can be a nominal or prepositional phrase that is used semantically to convey a verbal meaning, often but not necessarily possessive or existential in nature.” (Brustad, 2000: 153). In section 6.2, more detail is given on this, but for now, consider the examples below. Note that ŋind- functions in (20)(a) as a pseudo-verb meaning ‘have’, but in (20)(b) functions as a preposition meaning ‘by’.

(20) Madinah Arabic

a. ŋind-sayyārah

have-1SG car

‘I have a car.’

b. sayyārt-i ŋind il-bēt

car-my LOC DEF-house

‘My car is by the house.’

(Personal knowledge)

Madinah Arabic is one of the varieties in which pseudo-verbs and ordinary verbs are negated in the same fashion. Thus, the clause in (20)(a) above is negated by placing the verbal negator ma before ŋind as in:
In contrast, the clause in (20)(b) is negated by using the non-verbal negator *mu* as in (22) since *ʕind* here is perceived as a preposition not a pseudo-verb, which makes this clause non-verbal.

```
(22) Madinah Arabic
sayyārt-i muʕind il-bēt
car-my NEG LOC DEF-house
‘My car is not outside of the house.’ (Personal knowledge)
```

### 1.3.2 Morphology

#### 1.3.2.1 Tense

In Standard Arabic, also in modern Arabic varieties, the verbal system is neither a completely tense-marking nor a totally aspect-marking system (Lucas, 2009: 20). Typically, verbs in Arabic are typically divided into two categories, which we label here perfect and imperfect. Perfect verbs refer to past time with perfective aspect (23)(a), whereas imperfect verbs refer to non-past time and habitual or progressive aspect (23)(b).

```
(23) Standard Arabic
a. ?akala ?ahmad-u t-tuffāḥat-a
    eat.PRF.3MSG Ahmad-NOM DEF-apple-ACC
    ‘Ahmad ate the apple.’
```
b. yaʔkul-u ʔahlмad-u t-tuffāḥat-a  

eat.IMPF.3MSG-NOM Ahmad-NOM DEF-apple-ACC  

‘Ahmad eats the apple.’  

(Personal Knowledge)

Future tense clauses in Standard Arabic are expressed by prefixing *sa*- or inserting the particle *sawfa* before an imperfect verb.

(24) Standard Arabic

a. sa-yaʔkul-u ʔahlмad-u t-tuffāḥat-a  

FUT-eat.IMPF.3MSG-IND Ahmad-NOM DEF-apple-ACC  

‘Ahmad will eat the apple.’

b. sawfa yaʔkul-u ʔahlмad-u t-tuffāḥat-a  

FUT eat.IMPF.3MSG-IND Ahmad-NOM DEF-apple-ACC  

‘Ahmad will eat the apple.’  

(Personal Knowledge)

In modern Arabic varieties, mostly different morphemes are used instead of *sa*- and *sawfa* to express future tense. In Madinah Arabic, for instance, the future morphemes are *b*- and *rāḥ* (25), in Cairene Arabic, the morpheme is *ḥa*- (26), and in Malian Ḥassāniyya, it is *lāhi* (27).  

(25) Madinah Arabic

a. b-yākul ruzz  

FUT-eat.IMPF.3MSG rice  

‘He will eat rice.’

---

8. *b*- is derived from *yabyī* ‘want’, *rāḥ* and *ḥa*- are derived from *rāyiḥ* ‘going’, see Stewart (1998) for more information on this and similar morphemes in the modern varieties of Arabic.
b. ṭāḥ yākul ruzz
FUT-eat.IMPF.3MSG rice

‘He will eat rice.’  (Personal knowledge)

(26) Cairene Arabic

ḥa-yākul ruzz
FUT-eat.IMPF.3MSG rice

‘He will eat rice.’  (Personal knowledge)

(27) Malian Ḥassāniyya

mā-hu lāhi yṭīḥ
NEG-he FUT fall.IMPF.3MSG

‘He will not fall.’  (Heath, 2003: 114)

Tense plays a role in negation. In a number of modern Arabic varieties, future tense clauses, for example, are negated differently. In Cairene Arabic, for instance, with perfect verbs, negation can be realized by the bipartite construction ma……-š, but with future tense clauses negation must be single and expressed by miš.

(28) Cairene Arabic

a. ma gā-š imbāriḥ
NEG come.PFR.3MSG-NEG yesterday

‘He did not come yesterday.’

b. miš ḡa-tūgi bukra
NEG FUT-come.IMPF.3FSG tomorrow

‘She is not going to come tomorrow.’  (Gary & Gamal-Eldin, 1982 39)
It is worth noting here that verbs (only imperfect verbs) can carry mood affixes in Standard Arabic. These affixes are as follows: -u (for the indicative) -a (for the subjunctive) and $\emptyset$ (for the jussive mood). In (29), the verb $ya\dot{kul}$ ‘eat’ has the indicative mood suffix case -u:

(29) Standard Arabic

$ya\dot{kul}$-u $\dot{a}\dot{h}$am-ad-u t-tuffāḥat-a

$eat$.IMPF.$3MSG$-$IND$ Ahmad-NOM DEF-apple-ACC

‘Ahmad eats the apple.’ (Personal Knowledge)

Note here mood markers on verbs might be affected by negation (see section 3.3 for more details). For example, imperfect verbs following the Standard Arabic negator $lan$ must have the subjunctive mood -a:

(30) Standard Arabic

$lan$ $ya\dot{kul}$-a $\dot{a}\dot{h}$am-ad-u t-tuffāḥat-a

NEG $eat$.IMPF.$3MSG$-$SBJV$ Ahmad-NOM DEF-apple-ACC

‘Ahmad eats the apple.’ (Personal Knowledge)

Modern Arabic varieties have no overt case or mood suffixes as can be seen in (31) and (32).

---

9 All of these affixes have different allomorphs in Arabic. Note also that the indicative and the subjunctive makers are identical to the nominative and the accusative makers, respectively. Thus, they are labelled identically in the Arabic tradition, as $maf\check{s}\check{u}l$ and $mans\check{u}b$, respectively.
This absence of case markers in modern Arabic varieties might, in fact, explain why SVO tends to be more common in transitive clauses if subjects are independent. That is, with VSO word order, both the A and the P are adjacent to each other, but with SVO, they are separated by the verb which make them more identifiable.

### 1.3.2.2 Case marking system

Case marking (or case affixation) is a system that is used for indicating the grammatical relationship to the head of the clause or phrase of the case-marked word. Perhaps the best way to approach this phenomenon in Arabic is by briefly discussing first how it is done cross-linguistically. From a typological point of view, languages can be divided into three types based on the way they mark core arguments: nominative/accusative, ergative/absolutive and tripartite (Comrie, 2013; Tallerman, 2005). Before we examine each one of them in order to determine the type used in Arabic, we must define the term core argument. This term refers to three types of noun phrases: subject (S), Agent (A)

---

10 There is also a neutral system, in which core arguments are marked in the same way or equally unmarked, and there is a split case marking system, in which two of these three systems are used within the same language, see for more details Tallerman (2005: 164).
and patient (P). The subject (S) is the subject of intransitive clauses, the agent (A) is the subject of transitive clauses, and the patient (P) is the object of transitive clauses.

In the nominative/accusative system, S and A are marked in the same way, but P is marked differently. This is the case in Latin.

(33) Latin (Italic, Indo-European)

a. puella veni-t
   girl.NOM come.PRES.3SG
   ‘The girl(s) comes.’

b. puella puer-um audi-t
   girl.NOM boy-ACC hear.PRES.3SG
   ‘The girl hears the boy.’

(Tallerman, 2005: 162)

Note here that the S and the A in the previous is *puella* ‘girl’. It has the nominative case in both examples which means both S and A are marked in the same way. The P *puer-um* ‘boy’, in contrast, has the accusative case.

In the ergative/absolutive system, S and P are marked in one way, and A is marked in another. Consider the following from Lezgian:

(34) Lezgian (Northeast Caucasian)

a. zun ata-na
   I.ABS come.PRF
   ‘I came.’

b. aburu zun ajib-da
   they.ERG I.ABS shame-FUT
   ‘They will shame me.’

(Tallerman, 2005: 163)
As can be seen in the above, the S in (34)(a) zum ‘I’ has the absolutive case. In (34)(b), zum ‘I’ occurs in the P position and also has the absolutive case. The A aburu ‘they’, on the other hand, has the ergative case. This puts S and P in one side and A in another.

Finally, in the tripartite system, each argument (S, A and P) is marked differently. This is found in Hindi.

(35) Hindi (Indo-Iranian, Indo-European)

a. laRkā kal āy-ā
   boy yesterday come.AOR-MSG
   ‘The boy came yesterday.’

b. laRke ne laRkī ko dekh-ā
   boy.OBL ERG girl ACC see-MSG
   ‘The boy saw the girl.’

   (McGregor, 1977 as cited by Comrie, 2013)

In (35)(a), there is no overt case mark assigned to the S laRkā ‘boy’, whereas in (35)(b), the ergative postposition ne is assigned to the A laRke ‘boy’, and the accusative postposition ko is assigned to the P laRkī ‘girl’.11

Turning to Arabic, Standard Arabic has the nominative/accusative system in which S and A are marked in one way, and P is marked in another. In (36) below, ?ahmad ‘Ahmad’ functions as the S and the A, and in both cases has the nominative case -u. t-tuffāhat ‘the apple’, in contrast, functions as the P and has the accusative case -a:

---

11 According to Comrie (2013), the noun preceding the ergative case ne in this language must be in the oblique case.
1.4 Previous studies on Arabic

Arabic has been the topic of numerous previous studies. Many of these focus on a single dialect aiming to write a reference grammar of that dialect (e.g., de Jong, 2000; Erwin, 2004; Khalafallah, 1969; Owens, 1984; Qafisheh, 1992). Other studies investigate a single phenomenon such as negation in a specific Arabic dialect, e.g., Krer (2013) on Western Libyan Arabic; Chatar-Moumni (2012) on Moroccan Arabic; and Murphy (2014) on Damascus Arabic.

In several studies an attempt to compare negation in some Arabic varieties has been made (Diem, 2014; Hoyt, 2005; Lucas, 2009; Wilmsen, 2014). However, this thesis differs from all of these in important respects. In these studies, not only are a relatively small number of Arabic varieties discussed, but also only certain types of negation are investigated. For instance, Hoyt (2005) only considers the similarities and differences in standard negation between Moroccan and Palestinian Arabic. Diem (2014) also discusses the same aspect but between Cairene and Moroccan. Negative imperatives, for example, are not investigated in detail in any previous work. That is simply because, unlike this thesis, a systematic comparison of the different types of negation in most, if not all, modern Arabic varieties has not been the focus of previous works (see section 1.5 for more details on the aims of the present thesis).
The history of negation in Arabic has been also discussed in several works, (e.g. Diem, 2014; Lucas, 2009; Wilmsen, 2014). It seems appropriate to summarize this issue further here, since, although the present work is synchronic, an understanding of the historical background will result in a better understanding of some of the modern negative phenomena.

Arabic has gone through what has been known since Dahl (1979) as Jespersen’s cycle. In his study of negation in various Indo-European languages, Jespersen notes that:

The history of negative expressions in various languages makes us witness the following curious fluctuation: the original negative adverb is first weakened, then found insufficient and therefore strengthened, generally through some additional word, and this in its turn may be felt as the negative proper and may then in course of time be subject to the same development as the original word (Jespersen, 1917: 4).

The cycle can be summarized by the following three stages: in stage I, negation is expressed by a pre-verbal negative marker that gets weakened over time, in stage II, the original negator is supported by another morpheme placed post-verbally in order to strengthen the notion of negation, and in stage III, the original negator is omitted and negation is achieved through the use of the new morpheme only, which presumably will go through the same cycle again. The three stages are typically illustrated by the following examples from old (Stage I), contemporary standard (Stage II) and contemporary colloquial French (Stage III):
(37) French (Italic / Indo-European family)

a. Old French

jeo ne dis
1SG NEG say

‘I do not say.’

b. Contemporary standard French

je ne dis pas
1SG NEG say NEG

‘I do not say.’

c. Contemporary colloquial French

je dis pas
1SG say NEG

‘I do not say.’

Similarly to French, the cycle can be observed in Arabic (Diem, 2014; Lucas, 2009):

(38) Arabic

a. Standard Arabic

mā ?akala ?aḥmad-u ʻt-ʕašām-a
NEG eat.PRF.3MSG Ahmed-NOM DEF-food-ACC

‘Ahmad did not eat the food.’ (Personal Knowledge)

b. Palestinian Arabic

(ana) mā-akalt-š il-fūl
I NEG-eat.PRF.1SG-NEG DEF-fava beans

‘I did not eat fava beans.’ (Lucas, 2010: 173)
c. Palestinian Arabic

(ana) baḥibb\(^1\)-š il-fūl

I like.IMPF.1SG-NEG DEF-fava beans

‘I do not like fava beans.’ (Lucas, 2010: 173)

The origin of the negative …-š in Arabic is šayʔ ‘thing’, which functions as an accusative adverb as in the following Quranic passage (3: 120) (Diem, 2014; Lucas, forthcoming):

(39) lā yaḍurru-kum kaydu-hum šayʔ an

NEG harm.IMPF.3MSG-you.PL cunning-their thing.ACC

‘Their cunning will not harm you at all.’ (Lucas, 2009: 256)

Although the development of negation in Palestinian Arabic presents a good example of Jespersen’s cycle in the way Dahl (1979) explains it (preverbal > bipartite > post-verbal), the development in Cairene Arabic may be more cyclic in the strict sense of the word, because negation in Cairene Arabic is not only undergoing the third of three stages consisting of one particle > two particles > one particle, but will perhaps some time in the future end with exactly the same preverbal position which it had when the development started: 1. ma verb. 2. ma-verb-š. 3. miš verb. (Diem, 2014: 99–100).

An example of negation with miš placed pre-verbally in Cairene Arabic can be seen in the following clause:
An alternative analysis is offered by Wilmsen (2014). In this vein, Wilmsen argues that the use of the negative morpheme …-š in Arabic, is a result of Croft’s cycle, not Jespersen’s cycle. In section 6.1.2, this issue is discussed further as we will be explaining then the cycle proposed by Croft (1991) as well as Wilmsen’s alternative proposal.

1.5 Aims and structure

The main goal in this thesis is to determine to what extent modern Arabic varieties are alike and to what extent they differ in terms of negation. The significance of this goal is discussed further in the next section (1.6).

To answer this question, this thesis is divided into eight chapters: one is introductory; one is on the methodology; five are on the results; and the last one is the conclusion. As we have already seen, the introductory chapter gives an overview of the Arabic language in general. Under this theme, we have discussed several points: why it is reasonable to refer to Standard Arabic to understand some of the contemporary negative aspects found among the modern Arabic varieties (section 1.1); exploring some of the phonological variations between modern Arabic varieties to outline the broad transcription system used in the present study (section 1.2); illustration of some of the Arabic syntactic and morphological characteristics that interact with negation (section 1.3); previous works done on Arabic with particular attention to those done on
the history of negation in Arabic (section 1.4); this section (1.5) on the aims and the structure of this study: and finally, section 1.6 on the significance of the present project.

The methodology chapter (2) explains the method adopted in this research. Under this theme, essential background information on typology is provided in 2.1 to differentiate between this study and typical typological studies; the four necessary steps that should be followed in any typological study, including this one, is explained in 2.2; the various types of typological generalizations that can be proposed to capture how a phenomenon is expressed across the investigated sample are outlined in 2.3, a list of the modern Arabic varieties included in this study and their consulted sources are given in section 2.4, and finally, section 2.5 gives details of the fieldwork trip conducted to collect data for the purpose of this study.

Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 present the results of this study. In each chapter, a different type of negation is considered: chapter 3 is on standard negation, chapter 4 is on non-verbal negation, chapter 5 is on negative imperatives, chapter 6 is on negative existential clauses and negation with pseudo-verbs, and chapter 7 is on negative-sensitive items.

In each chapter, before we illustrate how any of these types of negation is expressed among the modern varieties of Arabic, we first define it, explain how it is expressed cross-linguistically, and how it is rendered in Standard Arabic as reference may be made occasionally to this when it is needed. In some cases, however, there might not be any typological framework that illustrates how the negative type in question is expressed cross-linguistically. In other cases, also, the investigated negative type may not be observed in Standard Arabic. Therefore, these two sections may not always be included in every chapter, and when they are not, an explicit statement is made to this effect.
The number of the modern Arabic varieties considered in each chapter varies significantly based on the availability of data. For instance, in chapter 3, standard negation is considered in 53 modern varieties out of the 54 included in this study. That is, no information regarding standard negation is found in Abeche Arabic, which is, though, included in other chapters where the relevant information is found. Accordingly, before any negative type is discussed among the modern varieties, an explicit statement is also made regarding the number of the varieties included in that chapter.

After defining the considered negative type, explaining how it is expressed cross-linguistically if possible, and explaining how it is expressed in Standard Arabic if applicable, the negative type is examined among modern Arabic varieties. In this regard, the modern varieties are categorized and, based on this categorization, generalizations are proposed and explained where possible. The categorization differs from one chapter to another. In some chapters, two different categorizations are proposed: one based on typological feature values and the other based on geography. In the first one, varieties that tend to behave in the same manner regarding the considered negative type are grouped under one category, whereas in the second, a geographically-based overview regarding the same negative type is given to show the variations found among varieties of the same region. In some chapters, both types of categorizations are conducted as each one of them seems to reveal different interesting results. In others, only one of them is done as the other might seem to be less interesting. For instance, regardless of their regions, the majority of modern Arabic varieties tend to negate existential clauses by using the verbal negator (section 6.1); therefore, it would be pointless to explain how such a construction is expressed on a region-by-region basis.

In a small number of cases, no categorization, either based on similarities and differences or based on geography, is proposed. For example, pseudo-verbs (section 6.2) in a given variety always seem to be negated similarly to ordinary verbs. In a few varieties
only, further data collected shows that speakers can choose from different accessible negative strategies used in their variety to negate certain types of pseudo-verbs, while their choice is limited with other types of pseudo-verbs. In this case, therefore, no categorization is proposed. Instead, facts are stated as found in the majority of the modern varieties in which negation with pseudo-verbs is no different from negation with ordinary verbs, then the extra available information on the limited speakers’ choice found in a very small number of varieties is discussed.

Finally, each of the five results chapters includes a summary where every generalization proposed in that chapter is repeated, and all of these generalizations together are repeated in the conclusion chapter (8) where a summary of the whole thesis is given.

1.6 The significance of the study

The significance of this study can be summarized in two points. First, there is a great wealth of studies on negation in individual Arabic varieties, and “it is time to draw up an interim balance in the form of comparative studies, so that we may see what our achievements [in Arabic dialectology] are, where we have to indicate serious lacunae, and what our attention should be focused on” (Woidich, 1999: 355). Second, the synchronic variations among varieties may represent language change in progress (Croft, 2003: 232). If this is the case in Arabic, the present study should, then, help us to understand the way Arabic evolves over time, since capturing these synchronic variations is one of the aims in this project. This, in turn, should help in reconstructing the development of negative constructions in Arabic. For example, “when one of two related languages has an asymmetrical paradigm and the other language a symmetrical one, the asymmetrical paradigm is, ceteris paribus, the more archaic one, from which, by the way of generalization of one of the variants, the symmetrical paradigm developed” (Diem,
In other words, speakers of the symmetrical dialect have generalized the new construction whereas speakers of the other one have not yet. Consider the following:

(41) Moroccan Arabic (Semitic, Afro-Asiatic)
    a. ma-żbaʁt flus
        NEG-find.PERF.1SG money
        ‘I did not find money.’
    b. ma-żbaʁt-š li-flus
        NEG-find.PERF.1SG-NEG DEF-money
        ‘I did not find the money.’
        (Diem, 2014: 76)

(42) Cairene Arabic
    a. ma-χadt-i-š filūs
        NEG-take.PRF.1SG-NEG money
        ‘I did not take money’
    b. ma-χadt-i-š il-filūs
        NEG-take.PRF.1SG-NEG DEF-money
        ‘I did not take the money.’
        (Personal knowledge)

In standard negation, Moroccan Arabic speakers use the bipartite negative strategy only when the direct object is definite. Cairene Arabic speakers, in contrast, use the same strategy whether the direct object is definite or not. Thus, the negation patterns found in Moroccan should be, then, perceived as the more archaic. In this vein, when the present study sheds the light on such variations and points out which Arabic dialect has a symmetrical negative paradigm and which has not, it will help to have a better understanding of the history of negation in Arabic which will lead to a better understanding of the history of negation in Semitic languages in general.
2. The present study

This chapter is devoted to explaining the present thesis. Because this study is typological, in section 2.1, essential background information on typology is given first in order to show in which respects the present work is similar and in which it differs from typical typological studies. Then, in section 2.2, I outline the necessary steps in any typological study, which are also followed in the present one. In 2.3, I illustrate the various types of typological generalizations as any generalization proposed here falls into one of these types. Data and varieties included in the study are given in section 2.4. And finally, fieldwork methodology is given in section 2.5.

2.1 Typology

The term *typology* refers to feature-based classification. Similarly to many linguistic terms, it is borrowed from another field of study. According to Croft (2003: 1) the term is adapted from its use in biology in the nineteenth century, a field that inspired many linguists during that time. Greenberg (1974: 13), by contrast, claims that the term is borrowed from psychology around 1928.\(^\text{12}\)

Initially, linguistic typology was connected with morphology only; in fact, the term typological morphology was used to refer to morphological classification as opposed to genealogical classification (Greenberg, 1974: 13). It aimed at categorizing languages into three groups: fusional, where a word consists of several morphemes and boundaries between them are not clear; agglutinative, where a word also consists of more than one morpheme but the boundaries between them are clear; or isolating, where each word represents one morpheme only (Shopen, 2007). The technique used in the Arabic word *katabnā* (43), for example, is fusional since it is impossible to draw a line between the

---

\(^{12}\) Perhaps, though, Croft is referring to the first typological study conducted by Schlegel (1808), whereas Greenberg is reporting the first use of the word *typology* itself since Greenberg cites Schlegel’s work in his book, indicating familiarity with it.
verb *write*, the perfect tense marker, the marker of first person, and the marker of plural; they are fused together. In contrast, when words are built by agglutination, the morphemes which they consist of are recognizable, and there is a one-to-one relationship between morphemes and grammatical functions. This is the case in the Turkish (44), as the three morphemes *gel-me-yecek* are identifiable as ‘come’, then a negative marker, then a future tense marker. In the isolating language Tetun Dili (45), however, the task is straightforward as each word encodes one meaning only.

(43) Standard Arabic

katabnā
come.PR.F.1.PL

‘We wrote.’ *(Personal Knowledge)*

(44) Turkish (Turkic)

gel-me-yecek
come-NEG-FUT

‘(S)he will not come.’ *(Schaik, 1996: 22)*

(45) Tetun Dili (Austronesian)

nia la ba
3SG NEG go

‘He did not go.’ *(Klinken, Hajek, & Nordlinger, 2002: 56)*

Currently, typology is used in a wider sense. It is a field of study that investigates similarities as well as differences among languages, and classifies them accordingly in order to come up with a generalization that captures what is either possible or impossible in human languages (Croft, 2003; Song, 2001; Velupillai, 2012). Typologists do not examine whole languages, rather they investigate a specific phenomenon, or perhaps
phenomena, across languages. In this vein, any linguistic aspect could be subject to study, for example: whether the existence of a voiceless nasal consonant in the sound system of a language implies the occurrence of a voiced one (phonology); whether there is a cross-linguistic preference for suffixation over prefixation (morphology); whether SOV is the most common basic word order universally (syntax); and so on. In addition, a typological study can be either synchronic– an investigation of a specific linguistic feature across a number of contemporary languages or dialects as in Mörh's (1997) study of the numeral system in modern Arabic varieties– or diachronic– an investigation of the development of a linguistic feature in different languages over time as in McGregor's (2013) work on the origin of tense, aspect and mood markers in Australian languages. The present thesis is synchronic focusing on negation (primarily the syntax of negation) in modern Arabic varieties.

Like any field, typology faces various challenges. First, typological studies are limited since not all languages are available to study. In this study, the aim is to investigate the system of negation in all modern Arabic varieties; in practice, we are limited to those for which it is possible to obtain the relevant information.

The second challenge might be the more critical one in this field, although it does not present a problem for the present study, due to a key difference between this study and a more typical typological investigation. In typology, languages are sorted based on their similarities and difference regarding the phenomenon in question. Accordingly, to the extent that some of the languages in a typologist’s sample are alike due to their genetic relationships or due to contact, that sample will present a skewed picture of the overall global situation. Such a risk is typically reduced by considering, as much as possible, languages from different language families and different geographical areas. Dryer (1989) innovates a new method to control for the two effects. In his methodology, languages are grouped into genera based on their genetic relationships. He refers to each
group as a *genus* which is, approximately, comparable to an Indo-European subfamily such as Germanic, Romance, etc. Then, genera are divided into the following five linguistic areas: Africa, Eurasia, Australia–New Guinea, North America and South America. Dryer (1989), though, uses the term *linguistic area* differently. Conventionally, the term is used to describe an area where many typological characteristics are shared by genetically unrelated languages. Dryer, on the other hand, uses the term for “an area in which at least one linguistic property is shared more often than elsewhere in the world to an extent which is unlikely to be due to chance, but which is probably due to either contact or remote genetic relationships” (Dryer, 1989: 266). This explains why the five linguistic areas in his study are approximately the size of a continent, and since the size of the areas is maximized, the areal effect is reduced. That is, it might be possible to borrow a feature from a language spoken within the same continent but not from another continent. Finally, to control genetic relationships, only genera, not languages, are counted in the study. In other words, a pattern that occurs in many languages within the same genus is counted as 1. Dryer (1989) illustrates the new method by testing the widely spread hypothesis of the preference of SOV basic word order over SVO. The result confirms the hypothesis as shown in the following (Dryer 1989: 271):\(^{13}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Afr</th>
<th>Eura</th>
<th>A-NG</th>
<th>Nam</th>
<th>Sam</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6: SOV and SVO preference*

\(^{13}\) Afr=Africa, Eura=Eurasia, A-NG=Australia-New Guinea, Nam=North America and Sam=South America
The data reveals that there are 111 genera in the sample containing SOV languages but only 57 of them contain SVO languages. Hence, the cross-linguistic preference of SOV over SVO is confirmed.

For the purpose of this study, however, the considered varieties do not belong to different language families or separate geographical areas; instead, they belong to a single language, namely Arabic, and all of them are spoken in relatively adjacent areas. In this study, the steps of typical typological studies are almost always followed as this approach seems to be a useful framework for approaching the variation in the expression of negation among varieties of Arabic. The most important respect in which this study departs from typical typological studies is way considered sample is constructed. That is, unlike with typical worldwide typological studies, the sample here is, in fact, a reasonable approximation of varieties of a single language (Arabic). In this vein, there is no need to control for relatedness and contact because the aim is not to shed light on what is or isn’t universal in human language, it is instead to give as comprehensive a picture as possible of the ways in which the expression of negation varies in different Arabic varieties, see section 1.6 for further discussion on the rationale behind this.

2.2 Steps of typological studies

Croft (2003) differentiates between three types of typological studies. The first is typological classification, in which languages are classified based on their structural differences. Another type is typological generalization, which refers to the study of a recurring pattern across languages– Croft also refers to this as the study of language universals, which will be discussed further in section 2.3. The last type of study Croft identifies is functional–typological explanation which essentially consists of offering an explanation of findings from the first and the second type of typological studies.
A slightly different perspective is offered by Song (2001). He proposes the following four stages as fundamental steps in any typological investigation: (I) identify which phenomenon (or phenomena) is being studied; (II) classify languages into groups based on the different strategies they use to express the phenomenon in question; (III) rely on the proposed classification in order to formulate a proper generalization; and finally, (IV) explain the result(s) where possible.

In the first stage, the studied phenomenon is identified. There is no restriction on which linguistic aspect should be investigated, nor how many linguistic properties should be examined simultaneously. In stage II, languages are classified based on the differences among them with regard to the chosen property. For example, based on the order of subject, object and verb in declarative clauses, languages are categorized into the following six types: SOV, SVO, VSO, VOS, OSV, OVS. However, a study of 1377 languages shows that SOV and SVO are overwhelmingly common cross-linguistically; 565 languages are SOV and 488 languages are SVO (Dryer, 2013). Consequently, in stage III, the following generalization can be formulated: the vast majority of the world’s languages tend to have either SOV or SVO as a basic word order. Such a tendency would impose the question why (Stage IV). At this stage, linguistic typologists are expected to make every effort to explain the result.

Note that the three definitions suggested by Croft (2003) are already implied in Song’s four stages. What Croft calls typological classification is, in fact, Song’s stage II, where languages are categorized into groups. And typological generalization represents stage III where a generalization is made in the light of the result of stage II. Finally, functional–typological explanation is what one does in stage IV to explain the conclusion.

In this thesis, I follow these four steps outlined by Song (2001). First, I demonstrate in detail the phenomenon I investigate and the approach to it adopted here. Second, I classify Arabic varieties on the basis of the similarities and the differences they
exhibit. Then, I rely on the proposed classification to formulate generalizations. Finally, I explain the conclusions reached where possible.

2.3 Generalizations

There is a strong relationship between generalizations and universals, but before we explain this relationship, we must first define the term *universal*. The relationship between universals and typology is extremely strong to the point that frequently they are mentioned in the same publication title (Comrie, 1981; Croft, 2003; Haspelmath, 2001). Simply, universals are properties that can be seen in all, or in most, human languages (Song, 2001; Velupillai, 2012). Logically speaking, then, a universal statement can also be made to describe a pattern that never, or rarely, occurs among languages. Accordingly, studies concerned with language universals are almost, if not always, statistical (Comrie, 1981; Dryer, 1991; Greenberg, 1963). That is to say, a pattern is identified as a universal if it is attested in a large number of languages, or not universal when there are no, or only a few languages, that have it. By definition then, language universals is a subfield of typology as in typology one investigates similarities and differences simultaneously whereas in language universals the aim is to determine shared properties only. Ramat (1987), however, views language universals as being in opposition to typology. As he puts it “…typological research and research into universals are, in principle, diametrically opposed …” (Ramat, 1987: 41). Typology is the study of language differences whereas universals is about similarities (ibid). However, such a claim may not be accurate. That is, it might be plausible to look at similarities without paying much attention to differences, but not vice versa. If typology aims at classifying languages based on the different properties they have, how can someone, then, accomplish such a task without being aware of the similarities among them? Similarities must be sorted out first in order to exclude them in any meaningful classification. For example, there is no way to make
an attempt to differentiate between languages on the basis of their ability to express negation without first establishing the fact that negation is universal. Once the four steps (outlined in 2.2 above) are followed in any typological study, the researcher must end up announcing the investigated pattern as either universal or not. Let us take the case of a language’s ability to express negation, for example. Negation (the studied phenomenon) is defined in Stage I. Then, in Stage II, languages are classified based on their ability to express it. In this stage, all languages will be grouped into one category as all of them are able to express negation. As a result, one can conclude that negation is universal. Thus, indeed, any study into universals is a typological research one way or another.

Universals are divided into two types: implicational and non-implicational (Song, 2001; Velupillai, 2012). Both can be divided further as absolute and non-absolute (ibid).\(^\text{14}\) In other words, implicational universals can be either absolute or non-absolute; similarly, non-implicational universals can be absolute or non-absolute. Velupillai (2012: 34) also notes that implicational universals can be bidirectional or unidirectional. The division is illustrated in the following figure:

\(^{14}\) Velupillai (2012) uses different terminology; he refers to implicational vs. non-implicational as restricted vs. unrestricted and for absolute vs. non-absolute as absolute vs. statistical.
In non-implicational universals, an unconditional statement is made, along the lines of X happens in all or most languages. If the statement holds true with no exceptions cross-linguistically, the non-implicational universal is absolute. If the statement, however, holds true in most languages, the non-implicational universal is non-absolute. On the other hand, in implicational universals, the statement is conditional and may take the following form: if X is found, then Y is observed. Similarly to non-implicational universals, if the statement is always true, the implicational universal is absolute; if it is mostly true, the universal is non-absolute. In implicational universals, however, a new parameter can be added: bidirectional vs. unidirectional. That is, if the relationship between X and Y is symmetrical, the implicational universal is bidirectional, meaning as X imposes Y, Y also imposes X. In contrast, if the relationship is asymmetrical, the universal is unidirectional, meaning X imposes Y, but not vice versa.
The four types of universals can be identified in the work of Greenberg (1963), for example:\footnote{In his study, Greenberg considers 30 languages and classifies them on the basis of basic word order. Only three, though, out of the six logically possible orders are considered in his paper (SOV, SVO and VSO) since the others are cross-linguistically rare. Perhaps it is worth noting in this context that basic word order used to be perceived in the light of the order of verb, subject and object; however, it has been argued in several studies that subject is less relevant and only verb and object should be taken into consideration. For more details, see Dryer (1991) and Lehmann (1973).}

A. \textit{Universal 42.} All languages have pronominal categories involving at least three persons and two numbers.”

\footnote{Greenberg, 1963: 60}

B. \textit{Universal 1.} In declarative sentences with nominal subject and object, the dominant order is almost always one in which the subject precedes the object.” (Universal 1)

\footnote{Greenberg, 1963: 43}

C. \textit{Universal 26.} If a language has discontinuous affixes, it always has either prefixing or suffixing or both.”

\footnote{Greenberg, 1963: 56}

D. \textit{Universal 41.} If in a language the verb follows both the nominal subject and nominal object as the dominant order, the language almost always has a case system.”

\footnote{Greenberg, 1963: 59}

An example of a non-implicational absolute universal is (A), whereas (B) is an example of a non-implicational non-absolute universal. In contrast, (C) is an implicational absolute universal and finally (D) is an implicational non-absolute universal.
With this in mind about universals, one can conclude that not every generalization is necessarily a universal, but every universal is by default a generalization. That is, a universal statement is meant to capture a cross-linguistic pattern, whereas a generalization might be either a statement that describes a cross-linguistic one, in this case it can be called a universal, or a one that occurs among a certain group of languages only. For instance, the fact that all languages are capable of expressing negation can be called a cross-linguistic generalization or, simply, a universal. Although the latter would be the most accurate term to use, the term generalization is sufficiently usable in this case. In contrast, the fact that there is a preference among Modern Arabic varieties for SVO word order over VSO must be perceived a generalization only because it is made to describe a pattern that found among a specific group of languages or, in this case, dialects.

Despite the differences between the two terms (universals and generalizations), it is plausible to say that the division used in universals can be applied identically to generalizations. That is to say, generalizations can be either implicational or non-implicational, which, in turn, can be divided further as absolute and non-absolute. Therefore, typological generalizations given in the present work fall into one of these types. See chapter 8 for the type of every generalization proposed in this study.

2.4 Data collection

In this thesis, negation in 54 Arabic varieties is considered. The data in the study are collected from published sources, except for negation in Saudi Arabia where fieldwork is conducted, a point which I will return to later in section 2.6 below. I tried to include every source available to me that has sufficient information on negation. Mainly, the considered sources are either English or Arabic sources because I do not have reading ability in any other language. However, an attempt has been made to consult several sources from other
languages such as Reinhardt (1894) and Seeger (1996; 2013). Nevertheless, my reading ability presents one of the limitations in this study.

The 54 considered Arabic varieties are listed with their sources below in Table 7. In this table, varieties are represented by countries, and these countries are organized alphabetically, except for Ḥassāniyya. This representation is used only for the sake of simplification and to give an approximate impression of where each variety may be found, since political borders between two countries do not necessarily present a division between the language(s), or the dialect(s), spoken in each of them. Also, it does not mean the whole country speaks one form of a language either. In Egypt, for example, it is possible to distinguish in Sinai alone seven varieties spoken in this relatively small area, namely Biyyāḏī and Ḥayrasī Arabic, Muzēnah and Baṯī Wāṣil Arabic, Northwestern Sinai Arabic, Smēnī and ŠGēlī Arabic, Southern Sinai Arabic and Ṭuwara Arabic (de Jong, 2000; de Jong, 2011). While these varieties are very similar in many respects, major differences in the way negation is expressed can be observed between them. In Smēnī and ŠGēlī Arabic, for example, standard negation is bipartite rendered by ma....-š, whereas in Muzēnah and Baṯī Wāṣil Arabic, standard negation is single rendered by mā alone. The following represent each variety, respectively:

(46) Smēnī and ŠGēlī Arabic

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ma} & \quad \text{šuft-š} \\
\text{NEG} & \quad \text{see.PRF.1SG-NEG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I did not see.’

(de Jong, 2000: 317)

---

16 This name refers to a dialect, not a country. That is, this dialect is spoken across a few countries as will be illustrated in section 2.5.
In Ḥassāniyya Arabic, on the other hand, the case is the opposite as this variety is spoken not only in Mauritania, but also in Western Sahara and part of Algeria. Therefore, in section 2.5 the place of where each Arabic variety can be found is noted.

Table 7: List of varieties and their sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Annaba Arabic</td>
<td>(Meftouh et al., 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dellys Arabic</td>
<td>(Souag, 2005, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Abeche Arabic</td>
<td>(Kaye, 1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Largeau Arabic</td>
<td>(Abu Absi, 1966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>al-ʕArīš Arabic</td>
<td>(de Jong, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Egyptian western desert Arabic</td>
<td>(Maṭar, 1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Biyyāḏī and ʕAxraṣī Arabic</td>
<td>(de Jong, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td>(Brustad, 2000; Diem, 2014; Doss, 2008; Gary &amp; Gamal-Eldin, 1982; Woidich, 1968, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Muzēnah and Banī Wāṣīl Arabic</td>
<td>(de Jong, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>ʕṢāfīdī Arabic</td>
<td>(Khalafallah, 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Smēṣnī and ʕGēlī Arabic</td>
<td>(de Jong, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Southern Sinai Arabic</td>
<td>(de Jong, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassāniyya Region</td>
<td>Ṭuwara Arabic (de Jong, 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malīan Ḥassāniyya Arabic (Heath, 2003, 2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Christian Baghdadi Arabic (Abu-Haidar, 1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim Baghdadi Arabic (Al-Khalesi, 2006; Erwin, 2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Širqāṭ (Assur) Arabic (Salonen, 1980)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>al-Karak Arabic (Alsarayreh, 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as-Salṭ Arabic (Herin, 2011; Palva, 2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Kuwaiti Arabic (Alsalem, 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Aley Arabic (Bishr, 1956)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baskinta Arabic (Abu-Haidar, 1979)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ʕAtīz Arabic (Younes &amp; Herin, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Eastern Libyan Arabic (Owens, 1984)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Libyan Arabic (Algryani, 2015; Borsley &amp; Krer, 2012; Krer, 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Eastern Nigeria Arabic (Owens, 1993)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Nigeria Arabic (Owens, 1993)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>Coastal Dhofār Arabic (Davey, 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Arabic Varieties</td>
<td>Sources/Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td>(Hoyt, 2005b, 2005a; Lucas, 2009, 2010; Rosenhouse, 2011; Seeger, 1996, 2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>al-Baḥa Arabic</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-ʔAhsāʔ Arabic</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ḥagil Arabic</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madinah Arabic</td>
<td>Personal knowledge(^{17})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Hijazi Arabic</td>
<td>(Siény, 1978)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yanbuʿ Arabic</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ʔAbha Arabic</td>
<td>(Al-Azraqi, 1998)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ʕUnayzah Arabic</td>
<td>(Ingham, 1994) and Fieldwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Sudanese Arabic</td>
<td>(Bergman, 2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Damascus Arabic</td>
<td>(Cowell, 2005; Murphy, 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi Arabic</td>
<td>(Qafisheh, 1977)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dubai Arabic</td>
<td>(Hoffiz, 1995)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Sahel/Tunis Arabic</td>
<td>(Halila, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sfax Arabic</td>
<td>(Bahloul, 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sousse Arabic</td>
<td>(Talmoudi, 1980)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Adeni Arabic</td>
<td>(Ahmed, 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hadhrami Arabic</td>
<td>(Ahmed, 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Șana’a Arabic</td>
<td>(Qafisheh, 1992; Watson, 1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taiz Arabic</td>
<td>(Ahmed, 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zinḡibār Arabic</td>
<td>(Ahmed, 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, the 54 varieties are divided into seven categories based on their geographical areas: Maghrebi, Egyptian, Sudanic, Levantine, Mesopotamian, Arabian Peninsula and Yemeni. The Maghrebi area includes the Arabic varieties found in

\(^{17}\) I am native speaker of this dialect.
Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Malta and the Ḥassāniyya region. The Egyptian area includes the varieties of Egypt only. The Sudanic area includes Sudan, Chad and Nigeria. The Levantine area includes Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Palestine. The Mesopotamian area includes Iraq only. The Arabian Peninsula area, for the purposes of this study, includes Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates and Oman, but not Yemen. That is, the way negation is expressed in Yemen is significantly different from the way it is expressed in the other parts of the Arabian Peninsula. Finally, the Yemeni area includes Yemen only.

There are a few points that should be noted before we proceed. First, in this thesis many Arabic varieties are included, and yet I have made no attempt to give an independent definition of the term variety. In this study, the condition for a variety to be included separately from others is just that if the original source treats it separately from others. For one thing, in order to classify two forms of speech as a single or different varieties, they should be compared at many levels, i.e., phonologically, syntactically, morphologically, etc. However, in this study, only one linguistic feature is considered (negation); therefore, the similarities between two varieties in the way negation is formed are not enough to view them as a single variety. For another, this is a typological study, and from a typological point of view, to say negation is expressed in region X and in region Y in the same fashion is important as much as to say it is expressed differently. As a result, whether region X and region Y have similar or different varieties has only secondary relevance for the present study. This approach seems to be a practical way of separating varieties for present purposes. However, sometimes further investigation is needed. Al-Khalesi (2006), as an example, states that he is describing Baghdadi Arabic, but we know from Erwin (2004) and Abu-Haidar (1991) that there are two different varieties of Arabic spoken in Baghdad: one by the Christian people and one by the Muslims. Consequently, more investigation is made to determine whether Al-Khalesi is
meant to describe the Christian or the Muslim one – see section 2.5 for more information about this and other similar investigations.

Another point worth mentioning in this context is that, for some varieties, such as Cairene Arabic, more than one source is available. Thus, all of them are considered and data are compared among them to confirm the reached result. Sometimes further investigation is made. This has been the case in Sfax Arabic, Palestinian Arabic and northern Jordanian Arabic. In Sfax Arabic, no affirmative clause in the consulted source is available. Thus, a personal communication with the author has been made to get more information in this regard. Such a clause is important to see whether standard negation in this variety is symmetric or asymmetric and the only possible way to find out this is by comparing negative clauses to affirmative ones.

In Palestinian Arabic, the case is that both mā and mā-š can be found in almost every negative verbal clause as shown by the following:

(48) Palestinian Arabic
a. mā akalt-iš
   NEG eat.PR.1SG-NEG
   ‘I did not eat.’
   (Lucas, 2010: 173)

b. mā riḍi yuskut
   NEG agree.PR.3MSG shut up.IMPF.3MSG
   ‘He refused to shut up.’ (Lit. ‘He did not agree to shut up.’)
   (Seeger, 1996: 36)

However, all of the accessible examples for y-imperfect verbs show that these verbs are negated by mā only, for example:
Ahmad does not know how to eat." (Seeger, 1996: 30)

As none of the available sources provide any example of a y-imperfect verb negated by mā……-š, nor does any of them deny its occurrence, confirmation from a native speaker of the dialect has been sought. The reached conclusion shows that y-imperfect verbs can be negated by mā……-š as well, for example:

(50) Palestinian Arabic

imisk-o Şašăn mā yitḥarrak-iš
hold.IMPF.2MSG-him so NEG move.PRF.3MSG-NEG

‘Hold him so he does not move.’

In northern Jordanian Arabic, Alqassas states that “the form of negation used in negative imperatives is [la…-š] rather than [ma……-š]” (Alqassas, 2012: 14). In Haija (1985), on the other hand, the following example where ma……-š is used as a negator in negative imperatives is found:

(51) Northern Jordanian Arabic

ma tsarriχ-iš
NEG shout.IMP.2MSG-NEG

‘Do not cry (shout)!’ (Haija, 1985: 13)
Because of this explicit contradiction between the two sources, an expert, who happens to be a native speaker of the variety, is consulted, and he confirms that negative imperatives can be done by *ma*-........*-š* as well.\textsuperscript{18}

Another contradictory set of data found about Northern Jordanian Arabic is that, according to Alqassas (2015), the negative polarity item *ʕumr* is mostly pre-verbal in this variety, but it can also be post-verbal. Both are exemplified below, respectively:

\begin{displaymath}
\text{Northern Jordanian Arabic}
\end{displaymath}

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. *ʕumr*-o mā zār el-batra  
\hspace{1cm} ever-him NEG visit.PRF.3MSG DEF-Petra  
\hspace{1cm} ‘He has never visited Petra.’ \hspace{1cm} (Alqassas, 2015: 102)
\item b. mā zār *ʕumr*-o el-batra  
\hspace{1cm} NEG visit.PRF.3MSG ever-him DEF-Petra  
\hspace{1cm} ‘He has never visited Petra.’ \hspace{1cm} (Alqassas, 2015: 102)
\end{enumerate}

When *ʕumr* is post-verbal, however, negation can be either single as in the previous example or bipartite as in the following:

\begin{displaymath}
\text{Northern Jordanian Arabic}
\end{displaymath}

\begin{enumerate}
\item ma-zār-iš *ʕumr*-o el-batra  
\hspace{1cm} NEG-visit.PRF.3MSG-NEG ever-him DEF-Petra  
\hspace{1cm} ‘He never visited Petra.’ \hspace{1cm} (Alqassas, 2015: 107)
\end{enumerate}

In Haija's book (1985), in contrast, the following example is observed where *ʕumr* is pre-verbal and the bipartite negation is used:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[18] This is obtained via personal communication with Mutasim Al-Deaibes.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
(54) Northern Jordanian Arabic

ʕumr-i ma šuft-iš wāḥad miṭl-u
(n) ever-I NEG see.PRФ.3MSG-NEG one like-him

‘I have never seen anyone like him.’ (Haija, 1985: 15)

Accordingly, a confirmation from the same expert is sought, and this time, Alqassas’s analysis seems to be the most accurate one as Al-Deaibes confirms that bipartite negation is not possible when the item ʕumr occurs pre-verbally in the clause.¹⁹

Finally, I reproduce every example faithfully from its original source, but the gloss and the transcription symbols are changed where necessary for the sake of consistency. I have also, on very rare occasions, changed the English translation of some examples. That is, sometimes a source may add extra information in the translation line that helps the point the author is trying to explain. For example, in her book of Baskinta Arabic, Abu-Haidar (1979) provides the following example:

(55) Baskinta Arabic

ʔana b-asāḥid ʔimm-i b-šiyl il-bayt
I HAB-help.IMPF.1SG mother-me with-work DEF-house

‘I am (in the habit of) helping my mother with the housework’

(Abu-Haidar, 1979: 86)

In the English translation line of this example, the phrase “in the habit of” is extra information used because Abu-Haidar is trying to explain the use of the habitual marker

¹⁹It is possible here that the differences between the two sources are due to the idiolectal variation. Further research would be needed to determine whether the structure in (54) is grammatical for speakers of Northern Jordanian Arabic other than Haija.
with imperfect verbs. In my paper, however, the English translation for the same example is ‘I help my mother with the housework’.

In the following section, I discuss the names and the places of where each modern Arabic variety included in the study is spoken. I also explain any investigation made or any assumption proposed to determine the place of where a variety can be found.

2.5 Modern Arabic varieties, names and places

Generally speaking, I tried to name every variety after the place where it is spoken. In certain cases, however, a different name is proposed, as the variety might be spoken by specific group of people or in more than one place within the same region. Below, varieties are discussed on a country by country basis, and these countries are organized alphabetically.

From Algeria, two varieties are considered: Annaba Arabic (Meftouh et al., 2012) and Dellys Arabic (Souag, 2005, 2016). Annaba is spoken in the city of Annaba, a coastal city located in the north-eastern corner of Algeria. Dellys is also a coastal city located in the northern part of Algeria between Algiers and Bejaia. It is about 80 kilometers east of Algiers.

From Chad, also another two varieties are investigated: Abeche Arabic (Kaye, 1976) and Largeau Arabic (Abu Absi, 1966). Abeche Arabic is spoken in Abeche, one of the Chadian major cities located in the eastern part of Chad. In contrast, Largeau Arabic is spoken in the north of Chad, more specifically in Largeau (also known as Faya), which is the largest city in northern Chad (Abu Absi, 1995).

Northwestern Sinai Arabic (de Jong, 2000), Ṣaʿīdī Arabic (Khalafallah, 1969), Smēṣnī and ʕGēlī Arabic (de Jong, 2000), Southern Sinai Arabic (de Jong, 2011) and Ṭuwara Arabic (de Jong, 2011). al-ʕArīš Arabic is the variety of Alʕarīš, a city in the northeast of Sinai. Egyptian western desert Arabic is the variety of the Bedouins in the Western Desert of Egypt (Maṭar, 1981). Ḥiyyāḏī and Aẓrāṣī Arabic is spoken by Biyyāḏiyyah and Aẓārsah, both are Bedouin Arabic tribes in the northwest of Sinai (de Jong, 2000). Cairene Arabic is spoken in Cairo, the capital city of Egypt. Muzēnah and Banī Wāṣil Arabic is the variety of Muzēnah and Banī Wāṣil tribes (de Jong, 2011). Muzēnah is a large tribe in the center of, south and southeast Sinai, whereas Banī Wāṣil, in contrast, is a small tribe lives “near the town of At-ṭūr and towards the east of it and in the western part of the massif of the central south of Sinai” (de Jong, 2011:115). Northwestern Sinai Arabic is the variety of several Arabic tribes in the northern part of Sinai. These tribes are Rmēlī, Swērkī, ʕAyyāḏī, Turbānī, Masʕūdī, Balawī and Aḥaywī (de Jong, 2000). Ṣaʿīdī Arabic can be found in in Upper Egypt, specifically, in the strip of Nile that extends between Cairo and Aswan. Smēṣnī and ʕGēlī Arabic is the variety of Smēṣnah, an Arabic tribe settled in the northwest of Sinai, and ʕAḡālah, another Arabic tribe in the north of Sinai (de Jong, 2000). Southern Sinai Arabic, like Northwestern Sinai Arabic, is a variety of several Arabic tribes in Sinai. These tribes are called Tarāḇīn, Ḥwēṯīt, ǧarāǧrah, Tayāḥa, badarah, Dbūr and Malalḥah (de Jong, 2011).

Two types of Ḥassāniyya are included in the study: Ḥassāniyya Arabic (Al-Any, 1969; Francis, 1979; Heath, 2003, 2004; Taine-Cheikh, 2007) and Malian Ḥassāniyya (Heath, 2003, 2004). Ḥassāniyya Arabic is mainly, but not exclusively, spoken in Mauritania and Malian Ḥassāniyya is spoken only in Mali. The name Ḥassāniyya is derived from “Bani Hassan”, Arabic tribes who speak the variety (Al-Any, 1969: 15). Approximately, the borders of this variety are “Goulimine in the north, Tindouf in the

---

20 This source is written in Arabic, so I had to transcribe the examples myself.
northeast, Tombouctou in the southeast and the Senegal River in the south” (Taine-Cheikh, 2007: 1) As can be seen on the map below (Map 1), the variety is spoken in the south of Morocco, Western Sahara, Mauritania, small part of Algeria and the northwestern part of Mali. In this very large area, there are four main varieties of Ḥassāniyya: Ahl s-sāhil (West), Ahl š-šarq (East), Ahl il-tel (North) and Ahl il-qibla (South) (Al-Any, 1969: 15). However, “the differences between these varieties appear to be mainly in vocabulary and usage, rather than morphology and syntax” (ibid: 15). Al-Any summarizes the differences between these varieties in the following three aspects: meaning (the meaning of a word may differ from one area to another), vocabulary (some words maybe heard in certain varieties only but not in others, which may suggest these words have been borrowed from neighbouring languages), and intensity (words or expressions may have different degree of intensity) (Al-Any, 1969: 16). Heath also supports this claim, according to him “except for the inevitable lexical variation, there seems to be little difference in grammar (including phonology) in Ḥassāniyya varieties of Mauritania, the Western Sahara, and the more purely Ḥassāniyya-type varieties of the Moroccan oases” (Heath, 2004: ix). However, Heath notes that there are some phonological as well as grammatical differences between the Mauritanian Ḥassāniyya and the Malian Ḥassāniyya (spoken in the Timbuktu area northern Mali) (Heath, 2003: 7–8). Based on this, Ḥassāniyya in this paper is considered as a single variety, despite the fact that it is spoken in a relatively large area, except the one spoken in Mali which is classified separately as Malian Ḥassāniyya.
Christian Baghdadi Arabic (Abu-Haidar, 1991), Muslim Baghdadi Arabic (Al-Khalesi, 2006; Erwin, 2004) and Širqāṭ (Assur) Arabic (Salonen, 1980) are all Iraqi varieties. Širqāṭ Arabic is found in the city of Širqāṭ in the governorate of Nineveh in the north of Iraq. The city is about 100 km south of Mosul, the capital city of Nineveh. Both Christian Baghdadi and Muslim Baghdadi are spoken in Bagdad, the capital city of Iraq. Clearly, Christian Baghdadi is spoken by the Christian population of the city (Abu-Haidar, 1991), and Muslim Baghdadi Arabic is the variety of the Muslim population (Al-Khalesi, 2006; Erwin, 2004). It should be noted, however, Erwin (2004) confirms that he is describing the variety of Baghdadi Muslims (Erwin, 2004: 1). Al-Khales (2006), in contrast, states that the described variety in his study is the variety spoken in Baghdad only (Al-Khales, 2006: xvi). Thus, it is not clear whether Al-Khales is investigating the Muslim or the Christian variety. It seems, however, Al-Khales’s book is about the Muslim variety only. That is, according to Abu-Haidar (1991) who describes the Christian Baghdadi Arabic, one of the main differences between Christian Baghdadi and Muslim Baghdadi is that Muslim speakers have the consonant [r] in their variety whereas the
Christian speakers replace this consonant with [ɣ]. And based on the data provided by Al-Khaies (2006), one can see that [r] is present everywhere in his book.

From Jordan comes al-Karak Arabic (Al-sarayeh, 2012), Northern Jordanian Arabic (Al-Deaibes, 2016; Alqassas, 2012, 2015; Haija, 1985) and as-Salṭ Arabic (Herin, 2011; Palva, 2004). Al-Karak Arabic is spoken in the province of al-Karak, about 140 km south of Amman, the capital city of Jordan. as-Salṭ Arabic is spoken in as-Salṭ, a city approximately 25 kilometers northwest of Amman. Northern Jordanian Arabic is the variety found in Horan areas of Jordan. It is worth noting in this context that both Alqassas (2012) and Al-Deaibes (2016; 2019) note that three types of Arabic varieties can be observed in Jordan: Urban Jordanian Arabic, Rural Jordanian Arabic and Bedouin Jordanian Arabic. And both Alqassas and Al-Deaibes explicitly state that the differences between these Arabic varieties are primarily phonetic. Although Alqassas claims that “this classification [urban, rural and Bedouin], to a large extent, does not make reference to a certain lifestyle or geographic region”, he declares that the rural dialect is spoken in the suburbs of Irbid and can also be found in the city of Irbid (Alqassas, 2012: 2). In contrast, Al-Deaibes proposes the following geographical distribution: the urban dialect is the one used in big cities (Amman, Zarqa, and Irbid); the rural dialect is the dialect of the villagers living in the countryside and the suburbs in northern Jordan; and the Bedouin dialect is spoken by desert inhabitants who lives in different part of Jordan (Al-Deaibes, 2016: 22–23). Thus, in this study, the name of the Arabic variety spoken in the north of Jordan, more specifically in Horan areas, is called Northern Jordanian Arabic. Note this name implies only the urban and the rural, not the Bedouin dialect.

Only one variety comes from Kuwait, Kuwaiti Arabic (Alsalem, 2012). According to Alsalem (2012), “when linguists refer to KA [Kuwaiti Arabic] they mean one particular urban dialect. This study provides a description of the morpho-syntax of negation patterns in all the varieties of KA and SA [Standard Arabic]. Thus, data in this
study is meant to represent all the varieties of KA” (Alsalem, 2012: 4). This statement implies that there is more than one variety of Arabic spoken in Kuwait. However, when the author gives examples in her study, she does not assign any of these examples to any specific Kuwaiti variety. This suggests one the following two scenarios: either negation is expressed in the same way in every Kuwaiti variety, or the author is describing any negative construction that can be heard in Kuwait. It is not clear which one of these scenarios is the case here.

Aley Arabic (Bishr, 1956), Baskinta Arabic (Abu-Haidar, 1979) and ʕAtīţ Arabic (Younes & Herin, 2016) are all spoken within Lebanon. Aley Arabic is spoken by Druze population of Aley. The city of Aley is about 15 km east Beirut. Baskinta Arabic is the variety of Baskinta, a town located in northern Lebanon. ʕAtīţ Arabic is spoken by the ʕAtīţ people, a clan of the Nēēm tribe in Wadi Khaled in Akkar, north of Lebanon.

Two varieties in the study are from Libya: Eastern Libya Arabic (Owens, 1984) and Western Libya Arabic (Algryani, 2015; Borsley & Krer, 2012; Krer, 2013). Eastern Libya is the variety spoken in Banghazi, a coastal city on the Mediterranean Sea. Western Libya, on the other hand, is the variety spoken in the west of Libya, including Tripoli (the capital city of Libya).

From Malta, only one variety is considered, Standard Maltese (Borg & Azzopardi-Alexander, 1997; Lucas, 2009, 2014; Mifsud, 2011). It is the written variety and the variety spoken in major towns such as Valetta and Sliema.

Similarly to Kuwait and Malta, only one variety included in the study is from Morocco, Moroccan Arabic (Benmamoun, 1997; Chatar-Moumni, 2012; Harrell, 1962, 2004; Heath, 2002; Hoyt, 2005b, 2005a; Lucas, 2009). It is the urban koine variety spoken in major cities in Morocco such as Casablanca, Fez, Rabat and Meknes.

In Nigeria, according to Owens (1993), two varieties can be found in this region: one in the east and one in the west and both are included here. As Owens puts it:
Very roughly, there exist two main Arabic varieties in Nigeria, an eastern one and a western one. Allowing for a certain fuzziness in the clustering of dialect isoglosses, the dividing line between the two areas runs along a line south from Lake Chad mid-way between Ngala (eastern area) town and Kirenawa (western) directly southwards towards Gulumba, then south and slightly east towards Bama (Owens, 1993: 13–14).

From Oman, only one variety is included, the coastal Dhofārī Arabic (Davey, 2013). It is the variety of Dhofār, a governorate located in the south of the Sultanate of Oman.

Also, another one variety comes from Palestine, Palestinian Arabic (Hoyt, 2005b, 2005a; Lucas, 2009, 2010; Rosenhouse, 2011; Seeger, 1996, 2013). According to Lucas (2010), who has done fieldwork in this area, there are no significant differences in the syntax of negation in varieties spoken by non-Bedouins in Palestine. Thus, Palestinian Arabic here refers to the non-Bedouin variety spoken in Palestine.

From Saudi Arabia, eight varieties are included: al-Bāḥa Arabic, al-ʔAḥsāʾ Arabic, Ḥagil Arabic, Madinah Arabic, Urban Hijazi Arabic (Sieny, 1978), Yanbuʾ Arabic, ʔAbha Arabic (Al-Azraqi, 1998) and ʕUnayzah Arabic. All of them are named after specific cities in Saudi Arabia, except Urban Hijazi Arabic. Both al-Baḥa and ʔAbha are small cities located in the south of Saudi Arabia; Al-ʔAḥsāʾ is a city in the east; Ḥagil is a city in the north; Madinah and Yanbuʾ are cities in the west; and finally, ʕUnayzah is a city in the center. In contrast, the Urban Hijazi Arabic is named after Al-Hijaz. Technically, Al-Hijaz is the western part of Saudi which extends from Jordan in the north to ʕAṣir in the south. Conventionally, however, the name is used to refer to Makkah, Madinah and Jeddah only, which are the biggest cities in the west of Saudi. And according
to Siemy (1978), the variety he is describing is the one spoken in these cities only. However, this variety is different from the one named Madinah Arabic in this paper. That is, Madinah Arabic is the variety spoken by the Bedouin population in Madinah while Hijazi Arabic is spoken by the urban population of the city. Mainly, the two varieties differ from each other in two aspects: lexicon and phonology. In lexicon, one may find some Arabic words are used in one variety whereas their synonyms are used in the other. In phonology, speakers of the Bedouin variety have preserved the Classical Arabic phonemes [θ] and [ð], but the urban variety speakers use, instead, [t] and [d], respectively. It should be borne in mind; however, the term Bedouin in Saudi Arabia is not used to refer to a nomadic person of the desert only. It is used to refer to those who descend from Bedouin Arabic tribes. Accordingly, a Saudi person may have lived his or her whole life in one of the major cities in Saudi, and yet, he or she is still classified as Bedouin. On the other hand, the term Urban is used to refer to those who their ancestors have become Saudi by the process of naturalisation. However, the division of Bedouin/Urban might be observed only in Al-Hijaz major cities. That is, perhaps most immigrants to Saudi Arabia are found in this region and this is for two reasons. First, the majority of immigrants might be Muslims and because of this they may prefer this region in order to be close to Makkah and Madinah, the two holy cities in Islam. Second, this immigration phenomenon took place a while ago and during that time Al-Hijaz was the only urbanized area in Saudi.

One variety only in this study comes from Sudan, Sudanese Arabic. It is spoken in Khartoum, the capital city of Sudan.

---

21 According to the locals, the phonological differences between the Bedouin variety and the Urban variety in Madinah are because most of the immigrants are originally from India, Pakistan and Turkey, and in their languages, there is no [θ] or [ð]. Consequently, they had to substitute these sounds with [t] and [d]. This story needs further investigation to be taken as a fact. Interestingly, however, nowadays descendants of those immigrants are perfectly capable to pronounce [θ] and [ð] as they are born and raised in Saudi Arabia; yet, they do not. For some reasons, they intentionally want to be distinguished from Bedouins, a topic that could be interesting from a sociolinguistic perspective.
Also, one variety comes from Syria (Damascus Arabic), spoken in Damascus, the capital city of Syria (Cowell, 2005; Murphy, 2014).

From the United Arab Emirates, Abu Dhabi Arabic (Qafisheh, 1977) and Dubai Arabic (Hoffiz, 1995) are included. Abu Dhabi is the capital city of the country, whereas Dubai is one of the main and the largest city there.

From Tunisia, Sahel/Tunis Arabic (Halila, 1992), Sfax Arabic (Bahloul, 1996) and Sousse Arabic (Talmoudi, 1980) are considered. The name Sahel/Tunis Arabic is proposed because this is a mixed variety. As Halila puts, “the data used in this dissertation is drawn primarily from the dialect of the author, a mixed dialect between that of the general area of the central coastal region known as the Sahel and the dialect of the city of Tunis” (Halila, 1992: 27–28). In contrast, Sfax Arabic and Sousse Arabic are non-mixed which are named after specific cities. Sfax is the capital city of the Sfax governorate, located in the east of Tunisia.²² Sousse is also a capital city but for Sousse governorate. It is also located in the east but more toward the north.

Finally, Adeni Arabic (Ahmed, 2012), Hadhrami Arabic (Ahmed, 2012), Ṣana’a Arabic (Qafisheh, 1992; Watson, 1993), Taiz Arabic (Ahmed, 2012) and Zināḡībār Arabic (Ahmed, 2012) are all from Yemen. Adeni Arabic is the Arabic variety spoken in the city of Aden in the south of Yemen. Ṣana’a Arabic is the variety of Ṣana’a, the capital city of Yemen. Taiz Arabic is the variety of Taiz, a city in southwest of Yemen. Zināḡībār Arabic is the variety of Zināḡībār, the capital city of Abyan Governorate. Hadhrami Arabic is observed in the Hadhramaut Governorate. However, according to Ahmed (2012), there are two different varieties spoken in this region: Hadhramaut assahel ‘the coastal area’ and Hadhramout alwadi ‘the valley area’. These two varieties differ from each other in lexicon and perhaps morphology but not in syntax (ibid).²³

²² Through personal communication with Bahloul, I found that this is the dialect of Sfax as the author does not provide this information in her paper.
²³ Ahmed (2012) does not state whether the two dialects are identical with respect to negation or not. I assume; however, they are alike in this regard because the aim of Ahmed’s fieldwork was
2.6 Fieldwork

Saudi Arabia is a relatively large country, approximately 2,150,000 km$^2$. In this area, many forms of Arabic can be found. However, we do not have a great deal of information about the Arabic dialectological situation, especially regarding negation in this region. Therefore, fieldwork was conducted in this area in several trips in 2017 and 2018. In these trips, five areas were visited: north, south, east, west and the center. In each area, one city only was considered. However, big cities were avoided because of the problem of *koineization* whereby a new dialect of a language may arise due to the mix of many other dialects. In contrast, extremely isolated settlements would be ideal, but these were difficult to find or hard to reach. A good compromise, then, seemed to be medium-sized cities for which there is little inward migration from other parts of the country; thus, speakers in these places are not expected to be too influenced by other varieties of the region due to contact. In this vein, the following cities have been chosen: Ḥagil in the north, al-Bāḥa in the south, al-ʔAḥṣā? in the east, Yanbu‘ in the west and ʕUnayzah in the center (see map 2 below).

to investigate negation only. Therefore, any difference between the two dialects in negation would be expected to be mentioned in her thesis.
All participants were males only and over 18 years old. That is, it is culturally inappropriate for a woman to sit with a male stranger and discuss anything except in extraordinary circumstances. It might be possible, though, to collect data from female subjects accompanied by male chaperones, or by recruiting female assistants to collect data. However, since it is not anticipated that there will be major differences between males and females in the use of the negative structures to be investigated here, it is judged preferable to collect more data in less time from a narrower range of subjects (males only), than less data in more time from a wider range of subjects (both males and females).

In Yanbuʕ, ʕUnayzah and al-Bāḥa, I was able to contact a friend who helped me to find participants. In al-ʔAḥsāʔ and Ḥagil, on the other hand, I had to visit many coffee shops and the university campus looking for individuals to help. However, in order for a person to be included in the study, he must have not lived for more than six months in any place other than the city in question. Moreover, his parents must be from the same city. This is to make sure as much as possible this person does not have a mixed variety.
Data was collected in the fieldwork by two main direct methods, as well as informal observations. First, a recording session was held once in each city where at least three participants were asked to discuss inoffensive topics such as the different cultural traditions in Saudi Arabia, whether smartphones have positive or negative impact on our lives, whether education is essential to be successful in life, and so on. Each session took about 30 minutes. To be more specific, the recording took in Ḥagīl 35 min; in al-Bāḥa 27 min; in al-ʔAḥsāʾ 30 min; in Yanbu' 31 min; and in ṢUnayzah 30 min. This method was used, not only to record as much as possible natural speech, but also to make it possible to discover any unanticipated local particularities in the expression of negation in the variety under investigation.

The second method involved a questionnaire. In each city, at least ten speakers were asked to fill out a questionnaire (see Appendix B). This is to make sure the needed information regarding negation is captured. The questionnaire consisted of four parts. In the first part, a situation is set and informants were asked to react accordingly. For example, the following question was asked: if someone was invited to attend an event but that person missed it, how would you describe his being absent? This is to elicit how negation is formed with perfect tense, with an expected answer along the lines of ‘he didn’t attend’. As might be noticed, I tried here not to use negation when I described such situations. This technique was used in order to make participants unaware at this stage of the main purpose of the questionnaire (i.e. negation). After every response, a follow up question was asked to see if there is any other way to express the same notion of negation. For example, after recording the answer of a participant on how to ask someone not to do something, I asked him if there is any other way to say the same thing. If there was any,

---

24 Getting participants to agree to be recorded for this long was not an easy task to achieve. For various reasons, several participants were initially reluctant to be recorded. Thus, I had to assure them that the data will not be made public and it will be used for the purpose of this study only, see the consent form in appendix A.
I recorded his answer and checked it with other participants. In other words, I asked other participants if they would say this or not.

In the second part of the questionnaire, I gave participants affirmative sentences and asked them for their negative counterparts. For example, if the given sentence is *He is tall*, the expected answer is *He is not tall*. This might be more straightforward way to ask about negation than the one used in the first part. The reason is sometimes the situation technique did not always result in a negative construction. Participants sometimes repeated the same information in the question. For instance, a respond to “how would you describe Mohammed’s absence?” is sometimes “Mohammed is absent”.

In the third part, informants were given some negative Arabic sentences and they were asked to reproduce them in their local variety. In this part, participants were almost fully aware of the main purpose of the study (i.e. negation). Yet, this part was important as it operated as a backup plan. If the necessary information about the different types of negative constructions was not obtained in the first and the second part, it is always obtained in the third one.

All of these three parts were identical for each city, and they were organized based on their directness of revealing their main purpose (negation), from least direct (the situation technique) to the most direct (the repetition of some negative sentences). The fourth part of the questionnaire, however, was different in each city. That is, this part is an acceptability judgment, and it was constructed during the process of collecting data. At the beginning of each trip, the recording session was done first, followed by doing the three previously mentioned parts of the questionnaire with four people only. Then, based on the gathered information, the acceptability judgement part was constructed, and the other six participants were asked to do this fourth part, in addition to the other three (see Appendix C for ʕUnayzah; Appendix D for Yanbuʕ; Appendix E for al-Bāha; Appendix F for al-ʔAḥsāʔ; and Appendix G Ḥagil). Mainly, this part was to collect data about the
behaviour of negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord constructions, in which two negative elements are present in the same clause and they fail to cancel each other out (see section 7.1 for more detail about this phenomenon). In this part also, responses to the follow up questions were included. That is to say, as mentioned above, each question in part one of the questionnaire was followed by another one to see whether the phenomenon in question can be expressed in any other way, and when a response to any of these questions was recorded, it was included in this part to double check their acceptability. For example, in al-Bāḥa Arabic, ḥiṣhak is another morpheme that can be used in negative imperatives as in the following:

(56) al-Bāḥa Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ḥiṣhak</th>
<th>tifliḥ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEG.IMP</td>
<td>go.IMP.3MSG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Do not go!’ *(Fieldwork data)*

Therefore, the following clause ḥiṣhak tifliḥ ‘Do not go’ was used and informants in this city were asked whether this is an acceptable clause or not.

After the first introductory chapter and this second one on the methodology, we move now to the analytical part of the thesis. This consists of five chapters. In each one of them, different type, or sometimes types, of negation is considered. The first chapter of these five (chapter three) is on standard negation; the second is on non-verbal negation; the third is on negative imperatives; the fourth is on negative existential clauses and negation with pseudo-verbs; and finally, the fifth is on negative indefinites and negative concord constructions.
3. Standard negation

This chapter is on standard negation in modern Arabic varieties. In this chapter and the upcoming ones, the four steps outlined in section 2.2 for typological studies are performed. First, I explain the phenomenon in question (step I). In this vein, I define the term *standard negation* in 3.1. I discuss the way it is expressed cross-linguistically in order to show where Arabic varieties fit into the cross-linguistic map (3.2). Then, I demonstrate how standard negation is rendered in Standard Arabic (section 3.3) as reference to this will be made occasionally. In step II, I categorize Arabic varieties based on their similarities and differences with respect to standard negation (3.4). Under this section also, step III, where generalizations are proposed, and step IV, where an explanation is given when it is possible, are performed.

3.1 What is standard negation?

Negation is universal; every language in the world, with no known exceptions, is capable of expressing the notion of negation (Dahl, 1979; Song, 2001). In logic, negation serves to invert the truth value of the proposition in which it occurs. In natural language, it serves a similar function, but can operate either at the sentential level or at the level of smaller constituents. In sentential negation, the entire clause is within the scope of negation as in *John did not come*, whereas in constituent negation, only a particular constituent in the clause is negated as in *John wants milk not water*, where the notion of negation is applied to the word *water* only.

Sentential negation can be divided further into two different types: standard negation and non-standard negation (Miestamo, 2007). The division is made based on the type of the negated clause. If the negated clause is a declarative verbal main clause (*He did not go to school*), the sentential negation is standard; otherwise, it is identified as a non-standard negation such as negation of embedded or imperative clauses.
Accordingly, by standard negation in this study, we refer to the negation of Arabic verbal sentences. This excludes non-verbal and pseudo-verb clauses, see section 1.3.1 for types of Arabic sentences.

### 3.2 Typology of standard negation

Strategies used cross-linguistically to express standard negation have been classified in accordance with two frameworks: one considers the nature of the negator itself, and the other considers the structural differences between negative clauses and their affirmative counterparts.\(^{25}\) The first one is proposed by Dahl (1979). In Dahl’s study, 247 languages are considered and two different types of standard negation are distinguished: morphological (108 languages) and syntactic (139 languages). If the negative morpheme is a prefix, a suffix or a circumfix, the negative strategy is morphological.\(^{26}\) The following are representative examples: in Persian the negative marker is the prefix *na* attached to the verb stem (57); in Turkish it is the suffix *me* also attached to the verb (58); and in Amharic it is the circumfix *al…əmm* affixed to the verb as well (59):

\[(57)\]  
Persian (Iranian, Indo-European)  
diruz na-raft-am madrese  
yesterday NEG-went-1SG school  
‘I did not go to school yesterday.’ \(\text{(Kwak, 2010: 623)}\)

\[(58)\]  
Turkish  
gel-me-yecek  

come-NEG-FUT  
‘(S)he will not come.’ \(\text{(Schaaik, 1996:22)}\)

---

\(^{25}\) To my knowledge, these are the only frameworks in the literature for standard negation.  
\(^{26}\) Two matters to be noted here: negative infixes have not been attested yet, and negative circumfixes may also be called double, bipartite or discontinuous.
(59) Amharic (Semitic, Afro-Asiatic)

al-säbbär-äčč-əmm

NEG-break.PST-3FSG-NEG

‘She did not break.’  

(Leslau, 1995: 292)

In syntactic negation, in contrast, negation is expressed by an uninflected particle, an auxiliary verb or a dummy auxiliary construction (negative marker(s) + dummy auxiliary verb). Negation in English can be done by the use of an uninflected particle as in *John is writing* / *John is not writing* or the use of the dummy auxiliary construction as in *John writes* / *John does not write*. An example of a negative auxiliary verb can be found in Dupaningan Agta:

(60) Dupaningan Agta (Philippine, Austronesian)

awan=ko  katandi

NEG=1SG.GEN  know

‘I don’t know/understand.’  

(Robinson, 2012: 187)

Perhaps it is worth noting in this context that bipartite negation does not automatically mean morphological negation with circumfixes; syntactic negation can be bipartite as well. In Hdi, for example, negation is achieved by the use of two uninflected particles: *a* occurs immediately after the verb and *wa* occurs clause-finally:

(61) Hdi (Chadic, Afro-Asiatic)

za a ta hlu’wi wa

eat NEG OBJ meat NEG

‘He does not eat meat.’  

(Frajzyngier & Shay, 2002: 383)
In the same vein as Dahl (1979) but not using the same terminology, Dryer (2013) examines the nature of the negative morpheme in 1157 languages. The results are as follows: 395 languages with negative affixes, 502 with negative particles, 47 with negative auxiliaries, 73 where the case is not clear whether the negative word is a verb or a particle, 21 languages with variation between negative words and affixes, and 119 with bipartite negation, in which negation is expressed by two simultaneous morphemes. In both Dahl’s and Dryer’s studies, no language in which negation is achieved by a change such as word order or intonation is attested. In other words, the presence of one or more negative morphemes is mandatory.  

Despite the similarities between the two studies, there are some differences among them. While Dahl considers the dummy auxiliary construction (negative marker(s) + dummy auxiliary verb), Dryer does not. Dryer classifies constructions like John does not eat apples based on the nature of the negative morpheme— in this case we have a negative particle. Second, in Dahl’s study, uninflected free morphemes are considered to be particles, but in Dryer’s this is not always the case. In his sample, Dryer finds languages where verbs have little or no morphology. Thus, it is hard to determine whether the free negative morpheme is a particle or an auxiliary verb. It could be a particle since it is not inflected, or it might be an auxiliary but with no inflections because verbs do not inflect in these languages. Dryer puts such languages in a separate category, namely languages where it is not clear whether negators are particles or verbs. For instance, in Maori both the negator and the verb appear uninflected; thus, the negator could be a particle or an uninflected auxiliary verb:

---

27 The fact that this phenomenon is not observed in their data may suggest its infrequency but does not deny its existence. In some Dravidian languages, negation is expressed by the omission of tense markers only (Miestamo, 2010).
The last difference between the two studies concerns bipartite negation. Dahl identifies this based on the type of the negators themselves. That is, if they are independent words, negation is syntactic, but if they are affixes, negation is morphological. It is not clear how a bipartite negative construction is classified if one of the morphemes is, for example, an affix and the other is a particle. Perhaps, though, such an instance is not observed in Dahl’s sample. Dryer, in contrast, treats bipartite negation as a separate category. He classifies any negation involving two different morphemes under this type. The two morphemes could be both particles or both affixes, or even one is a particle and the other is an affix.

The second classification of standard negation is proposed by Miestamo (2005). He considers a sample of 297 languages and, upon a comparison between affirmative clauses and their negative counterparts, suggests two different negative strategies: symmetric vs asymmetric. The distinction between them can be observed from the constructional point of view and the paradigmatic one. In other words, the negative construction can be symmetric or asymmetric and the negative paradigm can also be either symmetric or asymmetric. In the symmetric negative construction, there is no structural difference between negative clauses and their corresponding affirmatives aside from the presence of the negative marker(s). This is the case in Kham (63), there is no structural difference between the clause in (63)(a) and the one in (63)(b) other than the negative marker *ma*; thus, the construction is symmetric.
(63)  Kham (Tibeto-Burman, Sino-Tibetan)

a. ba-ke
go-PERF

‘He went.’ or ‘He left.’  (Watters, 2002: 258)

b. ma-ba-ke
NEG-go-PRF

‘He did not go.’  (Watters, 2002: 264)

If, however, further differences between the two constructions are observed, the construction is asymmetric. This is the case in Japanese (64) where tense is encoded by different morphology in negatives. The past tense suffix in affirmatives is ta as in the affirmative clause in (64)(a), whereas in negatives it is katta as in the negative clause in (64)(b).

(64)  Japanese (Japonic)

a. kodomo  ga  ringo  o  tabe-te  i-ta
    child NOM apple ACC eat-PRG AUX-PST

‘The child was eating an apple.’

b. kodomo  ga  ringo  o  tabe-te  i-na-katta
    child NOM apple ACC eat-PRG AUX-NEG-PST

‘The child was not eating an apple.’  (Nyberg, 2012: 18-19)

Some languages, though, have both a symmetric and an asymmetric negative construction simultaneously. In English, for example, between he is tall and he is not tall, the negator not is the only difference; therefore, the construction is symmetric in this
example. On the other hand, between *he came* and *he did not come*, further differences are observed, namely the auxiliary verb *did*, so in this case the construction is asymmetric.

As for the paradigm, if there is a one-to-one correspondence between affirmatives and negatives, the negative paradigm is symmetric; otherwise, it is asymmetric. To put it differently, in symmetric negative paradigms, every notion expressed in affirmatives can be negated but in asymmetric paradigm, not every notion can be negated. In the Dutch example in (65), for instance, the negative paradigm is symmetric, whereas in Meithei (66) it is asymmetric. That is, in Dutch, all types of affirmatives can be negated, but in Meithei this is not the case. Affirmative clauses in Meithei can be either non-hypothetical to convey “mild assertion; the speaker does not support the statement by providing evidence for it, but simply presents it as fact”, or assertive to indicate strong assertion (Chelliah, 1997: 132). Negative clauses, on the other hand, must be assertive only. As a result, speakers’ choices are reduced in negation, and this is what makes the paradigm asymmetric in Meithei (Miestamo, 2007).

(65) Dutch (Germanic, Indo-European)

*Present*

a. ik zing
   1SG sing.PRES
   ‘I sing.’

b. ik zing niet
   1SG sing.PRES NEG
   ‘I do not sing.’
Past

a. ik zong
   1SG sing.PST
   ‘I sang.’

b. ik zong niet
   1SG sing.PST NEG
   ‘I did not sing.’

Perfect

a. ik heb gezongen
   1SG PERF sing
   ‘I had sung.’

b. ik heb niet gezongen
   1SG PERF NEG sing
   ‘I had not sung.’

   (Miestamo, 2007: 557)

(66) Meithei (Sino-Tibetan)

Affirmative: non-hypothetical

a. təw-i
   do-NH
   ‘(She) does.’

Affirmative: assertive

b. təw-e
   do-ASER
   ‘(Yes, she) has.’
Negative: assertive

c. əy fotostat təw-tə-e
    1SG photocopy do-NEG-ASER

‘I have not made copies.’  (Miestamo, 2007: 557)

It is important to note here that only Miestamo’s framework will be considered in this project. The one proposed by Dahl is not applied. That is, Dahl uses certain criteria to distinguish between syntactic and morphological negation, and some of them might be impossible to adopt here. In his work, the distinction between particles and auxiliaries seems to be reasonably straightforward. If the independent negative morpheme is inflected for categories such as tense and person, which typically tend to appear on verbs, the negator is classified as an auxiliary (Dahl, 1979: 85). If it is not inflected, it is classified as a particle. The distinction gets more complicated when it comes to separating affixes from independent words. This difficulty is admitted by Dahl himself; nevertheless, he follows certain criteria to favour one treatment over another. In his study, a negator is probably an affix if it is a portmanteau morpheme, shares a single stress with the verb, is placed between the verb and other inflections, or if there is a morphophonemic alternation in the negator itself (Dahl, 1979: 83). A portmanteau morpheme is a single morpheme that realizes two grammatical categories (Givón, 1984: 72). This is the case in Finnish, as en realizes negation and person:

(67) Finnish (Finnic, Uralic)
  a. Luen
     read.PRES.1SG
  ‘I read.’
b. en
  NEG.1SG  read.PRES

‘I do not read.’  (Dahl, 1979: 84)

On the other hand, the negator is probably an independent morpheme if it is movable in the clause, carries its own stress, carries an inflectional affix, or is written separately in the orthographic system (Dahl, 1979: 83–84). It is not clear whether the previous factors must be applied all together or whether only one of them is enough to draw a conclusion. However, as Dahl puts it, “In most cases, we have chosen the orthographic factor as decisive……it probably tends to reflect the gut feelings of the users of the language” (Dahl, 1979: 84). This may imply that only one factor is sufficient to reach a conclusion, and in most cases this factor is the orthographic one.

It is going to be very difficult to apply Dahl’s framework in the present study. In some Arabic varieties, there are some negators which one can, with great confidence, classify as independent words, namely negative verbs, since these can be inflected for gender and number. This is the case with the negative copula laysa in Standard Arabic:

(68)  Standard Arabic
a. ʔal-mudīr-u  laysa  ġayyid-an
      DEF-manager-NOM  NEG.COP.3MSG good-ACC

‘The manager is not good.’

b. ʔal-mudīr-at-u  laysat  ġayyid-at-an
      DEF-manager-F-NOM  NEG.COP.3FSG  good-F-ACC

‘The manager(♀) is not good(♀).’  (Personal Knowledge)
Matters become less straightforward, however, with other Arabic negators like \( mā \). In some varieties, this item is pronounced with a long vowel (\( mā \)) and has its own stress which may suggest its independence. Not to mention the fact that it is written separately as a word in Standard Arabic, for example:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Standard Arabic} & \text{mā} & \chiarağa & ?aḥmad-u & \text{mina} & \text{l-bayt-i} \\
\text{NEG} & \text{get.out.PRФ.3MSG} & \text{Ahmad-NOM} & \text{from} & \text{DEF-house-GEN} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘\( \text{Ahmad did not leave the house.} \)’

\[(\text{Personal Knowledge})\]

In contrast, in a number of modern Arabic varieties, which are largely unwritten, the vowel is pronounced short (\( ma \)). Additionally, it is combined in many Arabic varieties with the post-verbal morpheme \( ...-š \), for example:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Cairene Arabic} & \text{?aḥmad} & \text{ma-raḥ-š} & \text{il-bēt} \\
\text{Ahmad} & \text{NEG-go.PRФ.3MSG-NEG} & \text{DEF-house} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘\( \text{Ahmad did not go home.} \)’

\[(\text{Personal Knowledge})\]

Hoyt (2007) investigates the status of \( ma \) and \( ...-š \) in Palestinian Arabic and comes to the conclusion that both negators should be characterized as special clitics according to the criteria proposed by Zwicky and Pullum (1983). A morpheme is classified as a special clitic if it forms a prosodic word with its hosts, can be attached to words from different classes, can be attached to words that already hosting other clitics, and its syntactic distribution is different from other free morphemes in the language (Hoyt, 2007: 120). This analysis makes negation in Palestinian somewhere between
morphological and syntactic. That is, clitics are not completely affixes nor totally independent words. Negative clitics are not considered in Dahl’s study. However, one might argue that negation effected by means of clitics should be classified as morphological, since, for one thing, clitics are bound morphemes in the same way as affixes. For another, they would appear to be moving toward becoming affixes, based on the notion of grammaticalization where independent morphemes become clitics then become affixes overtime (Hopper & Traugott, 2003). The notion of grammaticalization may support this analysis of negative clitics. However, the same notion may put the entire framework into question. That is, a classification based on the nature of the negative morpheme may change overtime when, as a result of grammaticalization, free morphemes become clitics and then end up as affixes after a certain period of time. In other words, negation in a language might change from being syntactic (accomplished by an independent morpheme) at a certain point, to become morphological at a later point if that negative marker loses its phonological independence. Finally, there is insufficient accessible data from every Arabic variety to examine, for example, their phonological systems to determine the rules that govern stress in order to find out whether negative markers are independent morphemes or not. All of this makes Dahl’s insights very hard to consider in this project, and, as we will see after demonstrating standard negation in Standard Arabic below, categorizing the strategies used to express standard negation among Arabic varieties based on, for example, features (e.g. single or bipartite negation) could be more productive way than categorizing them with this distinction.

3.3 Standard negation in Standard Arabic

In Standard Arabic, standard negation is always single and can be expressed by seven different morphemes: lam, lammā, lan, lā, ?in, mā and laysa. The negative construction is symmetric in some cases and asymmetric in others as follows:
The first negator is lam, which can only be used to negate perfect aspect.

(71) Standard Arabic

a. ʔakalaʔaḥmad-u t-tuffāḥat-a
    eat.PRF.3MSG Ahmad-NOM DEF-apple-ACC
    ‘Ahmad ate the apple.’

b. lam yaʔkulʔaḥmad-u t-tuffāḥat-a
    NEG.PST eat.IMPF.JUSS.3MSG Ahmad-NOM DEF-apple-ACC
    ‘Ahmad did not eat the apple.’ (Personal Knowledge)

Note here two structural differences can be noted between the above examples: the verb in (71)(a) is perfect and tense is encoded by the verb, but in (71)(b) the verb is imperfect in the jussive mood and tense is encoded by the negator lam. Because of the different verbal construction and because of the different way of marking past tense, the negative construction is asymmetric in this case.

The second negator is lammā. It is similar to lam in that it negates perfect aspect only, the negator realizes negation and past aspect, and must be followed by an imperfect verb in the jussive mood. Accordingly, negation in this case is asymmetric as well. Compare the following and note in the affirmative clause the verb is perfect, but when the clause is negated the verb is imperfect. Also, note aspect is marked by the negator lammā.

(72) Standard Arabic

a. qaḍāmāʔamara-h
    do.PRF.3MSG what command.PRF.3MSG-him
    ‘He did what [God] commanded him.’
b. lammā yaqdi mā ?amara-h
   NEG.PST do.IMPF.JUSS.3MSG what command.PRF.3MSG-him
   ‘He did not do what [God] commanded him.’ (Qur’an 80: 23)

It is worth noting that there is a functional difference between lam and lammā. Both negate the proposition of the clause, but only lammā implies that the negated proposition is expected to occur in the future. Thus, a more suitable English translation to the clause in (72)(b) would be ‘He did not do what [God] commanded him yet.’.

The third negator is lan. It can be only used to negate future clauses.

(73) Standard Arabic

a. sa-yaktub-u ?ahmad-u r-risālat-a
   FUT-write.IMPF.3MSG-IND Ahmad-NOM DEF-letter-ACC
   ‘Ahmad will write the letter’

b. lan yaktub-a ?ahmad-u r-risālat-a
   NEG.FUT write.IMPF.3MSG-SBJV Ahmad-NOM DEF-letter-ACC
   ‘Ahmad will not write the letter’ (Personal Knowledge)

Note here that negation is asymmetric as well. For one thing, the verb in the affirmative clause is in the indicative mood (signaled by the suffix -u), but in the negative one, the verb is in the subjunctive mood (signalized by the suffix -a). For another, the future marker sa- is omitted in negation and lan realizes both the negation and the future aspect.

The fourth negator is lā. It is typically used with imperfect verbs only. Unlike the previous cases, negation here is symmetric. Consider the following and note that the presence of lā is the only structural difference between the two clauses:
(74) Standard Arabic

a. yasʔal-u ʔahmad-u χālid-an

ask.IMPF.3MSG-IND Ahmad-NOM Khaled-ACC

‘Ahmad asked Khaled’

b. lā yasʔal-u ʔahmad-u χālid-an

NEG ask.IMPF.3MSG-IND Ahmad-NOM Khaled-ACC

‘Ahmad does not ask Khaled’  (Personal Knowledge)

The fifth negator is ʔin. It can be used with both perfect and imperfect aspect, for example:

(75) Standard Arabic

Perfect

a. saʔala ʔahmad-u χālid-an

ask.PRF.3MSG Ahmad-NOM Khaled-ACC

‘Ahmad asked Khaled’

b. ʔin saʔala ʔahmad-u χālid-an

NEG ask.PRF.3MSG Ahmad-NOM Khaled-ACC

‘Ahmad did not ask Khaled’

Imperfect

a. yasʔal-u ʔahmad-u χālid-an

ask.IMPF.3MSG-IND Ahmad-NOM Khaled-ACC

‘Ahmad asked Khaled’

b. ʔin yasʔal-u ʔahmad-u χālid-an

NEG ask.IMPF.3MSG-IND Ahmad-NOM Khaled-ACC

‘Ahmad does not ask Khaled’  (Personal Knowledge)
As can be observed negation is symmetric in this case since it is expressed by the addition of ʔin only.

The sixth negator is mā. Similarly to ʔin, it can be used with both perfect and imperfect verbs, and negation with mā is always symmetric.

(76)  

**Standard Arabic**

**Perfect**

a. saʔala ʔahmad-u ʔālid-an  
as.k.3MSG Ahmad-NOM Khaled-ACC  
‘Ahmad asked Khaled’

b. mā saʔala ʔahmad-u ʔālid-an  
NEG as.k.3MSG Ahmad-NOM Khaled-ACC  
‘Ahmad did not ask Khaled’

**Imperfect**

a. yasʔal-u ʔahmad-u ʔālid-an  
as.k.IMP.3MSG Ahmad-NOM Khaled-ACC  
‘Ahmad asked Khaled’

b. mā yasʔal-u ʔahmad-u ʔāled-an  
NEG as.k.IMP.3MSG Ahmad-NOM Khaled-ACC  
‘Ahmad does not ask Khaled’ (Personal Knowledge)

Finally, laysa is a negator used in Standard Arabic mostly with non-verbal clauses (see section 4.2). It can also be used rarely to negate imperfect clauses only as in (77).
(77) Standard Arabic

a. ʔadrī
   know.IMPF.1SG
   ‘I know.’

b. lastu ʔadrī
   AUX.NEG.1SG know.IMPF.1SG
   ‘I do not know.’ (Personal Knowledge)

Note in the previous example, *laysa* is inflected for person. However, if the subject is a third singular masculine, *laysa* is not inflected. That is, this person is unmarked in Arabic, e.g.:

(78) Standard Arabic

a. yadrī
   know.IMPF.1SG
   ‘He knows.’

b. laysa yadrī
   NEG.3MSG know.IMPF.1SG
   ‘He does not know.’ (Personal Knowledge)

The following table summarizes negators and their functions in Standard Arabic. Note, however, that as explained above and summarized below in the table, in some cases, there are more than one negator is possible. For example, perfect aspect clauses can be negated by *lam* and *mā*. In these cases, the choice between them seem to be due to stylistic considerations.
### Table 8: Negators and their functions in Standard Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Negators</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Type of the negative strategy</th>
<th>Type of the negative construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>lam</td>
<td>Negate perfect aspect only, and encode past</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Asymmetric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>lammā</td>
<td>Negate perfect aspect only (with an expectation to occur in the future) and encode past</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Asymmetric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>lan</td>
<td>Negate future clauses and encode future</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Asymmetric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>lä</td>
<td>Negate imperfect aspect only</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Symmetric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>?in</td>
<td>Negate both perfect and imperfect aspect</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Symmetric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>Negate both perfect and imperfect aspect</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Symmetric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>laysa</td>
<td>Rarely negate imperfect aspect only</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Symmetric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note in the table three negative morphemes result in asymmetric negation, namely lam, lammā and lan. All of them have another grammatical function (encoding tense). The negators lä, ?in, and mā render negation only. This fact may suggest lam, lammā and lan are negative auxiliaries, but lä, ?in and mā are negative particles. That is, particles are typically uninflected, whereas auxiliaries are usually inflected for categories, which typically appear on finite verbs such as tense in this case. laysa is a non-verbal negator that might be used with imperfect verbs only. This negator is inflected for person unless the subject is a third masculine singular. The use of this negator results in symmetric negation as well. After this, we turn now to standard negation in modern Arabic varieties.
3.4 Standard negation in Modern Arabic varieties

In this section, step II, step III and step IV of the steps identified by Song (2001) for typological studies are performed. That is, Arabic varieties are categorized into groups in accordance to their similarities and differences (step II). In this vein, generalizations are proposed where it is appropriate (step III) and the result is explained where possible (step IV). The categorization, however, is divided into two sub-sections: categorization based on features and categorization based on geographical areas. Both sub-sections are divided further as we will see. Then, a summary of this chapter is given. Note, however, as mentioned previously, in this thesis 54 Arabic varieties are considered, but this section is based on 53 of them only. Abeche Arabic is excluded in this chapter but included in others. There are no available data on how standard negation is expressed in Abeche Arabic. In fact, Abeche Arabic is the only Arabic variety in the present thesis where information on non-verbal negation and negative imperatives is found, but not on standard negation. Usually, the case is the opposite; data on standard negation is mostly the first to find, where the other types of negation may not be discussed in the consulted source. Similar exclusion will occur occasionally in the study. Another point that should be emphasized here is that the result reached in this chapter, and in the others, is that while the vast majority of data presented here is based on explicit information contained in published sources, in some cases reasonable assumptions have been made even though there is a lack of data. Assumptions of this sort can cautiously be made, for example, when speculating about the behaviour of a negative morpheme in an under-described variety surrounded by better-described varieties with uniformly similar negation systems. In any case, when such assumptions are proposed, explicit statements are made to highlight them.
3.4.1 Categorization by features

The first feature is regarding the type of the negative strategy used in standard negation. This strategy can be single, bipartite or single–bipartite. The second feature is regarding the use of ...-š in negation. The last one is regarding the negative construction (symmetric vs. asymmetric). After categorizing the modern Arabic varieties based on each feature, a general result based on this categorization is given and explained.

3.4.1.1 Negative strategies

3.4.1.1.1 Single negation

Single negation refers to a negative strategy in which negation is rendered by the use of a single negative morpheme only. As in 3.3, Standard Arabic makes a use of the single negative strategy only. And the same strategy can be observed in many modern Arabic varieties, for example:

(79) Largeau Arabic
rağg-na  mā  ?akal  halāwa
friend-our  NEG  eat.PRF.3MSG  candy
‘Our friend did not eat candy.’ (Abu Absi, 1995: 33)

(80) al-Karak Arabic
yazan  ma-laʃib  faṭbōl
Yazan  NEG-play.PRF.3MSG.  soccer
‘Yazan did not play soccer.’ (Alsarayreh, 2012: 42)

(81) Hadhrami Arabic
ma  namit  samḥ  al-bariḥ
NEG  sleep.PRF.1SG  early  DEF-last.night
‘I did not sleep early last night.’ (Ahmed, 2012: 48)
Single negation is observed in 29 out of the 53 varieties considered in this section. It is common across all of the seven geographical areas (Maghrebi, Egyptian, Sudanic, Levantine, Mesopotamian, Arabian Peninsula and Yemeni). However, among the modern Arabic varieties, some single negators must be placed pre-verbally and others must occur post-verbally as we will see in 3.4.1.1.3. Only the pre-verbal ones can occur among the single negation varieties. This takes us to the first generalization:

*Generalization 1: In standard negation, the pre-verbal single negative strategy is the most common one observed among the modern Arabic varieties.*

The following table summarizes the 29 Arabic varieties. Where the first column states the name of the region, the second one is for numbering, the third is to state the name of the modern Arabic variety, and the last column is for the negative morpheme(s) used in each variety.

**Table 9: Modern Arabic varieties where standard negation is single**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The negative morpheme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maghrebi</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ḫassāniyya Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em> and <em>ma</em> + PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Malian Ḫassāniyya Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> and <em>ma</em> + PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Muzēnah and Banī Wāṣil Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Northwestern Sinai Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> (or <em>ma</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Southern Sinai Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanic</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Eastern Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> (or <em>ma</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Western Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> (or <em>ma</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic Form</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sudanese Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Largeau Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>al-Karak Arabic</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>ʿAtīţ Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Damascus Arabic</td>
<td>mā and mū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Christian Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Muslim Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>ʿIrqāṭ (Assur) Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Kuwaiti Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Coastal Dhofārī Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>al-Bāḥa Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>al-ʿAḥsāʾ Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Ḥagil Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Madinah Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Urban Hijazi Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Yanbuʿ Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>ʿAbha Arabic</td>
<td>mā, mā+PRO, lim, lis and lis+PRO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>ʿUnayzah Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi Arabic</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Dubai Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Hadhrami Arabic</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Zināgibār Arabic</td>
<td>miš (or miši and māši)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this table, the negator mā is the most common negator, found in 28 out of the 29 varieties. In 24 out of these 28, mā is used as the only negator, whereas in the other four (Ḥassāniyya Arabic, Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic, Damascus Arabic and ṬAbha Arabic), mā is used but beside other negative morphemes. This imposes our next generalization:

*Generalization 2: In modern Arabic varieties where the negative strategy is single, the negator used is almost always mā.*

In Ḥassāniyya Arabic, Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic, Damascus Arabic and ṬAbha Arabic, mā is found as well as other negators. In Ḥassāniyya and Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic, mā negates non-future clauses only.28

(82) Ḥassāniyya Arabic

| ma tkallamt |
| --- | --- |
| NEG speak.PRF.1SG |

‘I did not speak.’ (Francis, 1979: 111)

(83) Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic

| mā žayt lə-r-rāẓəl hāḍa |
| --- | --- | --- |
| NEG come.PRF.1SG to-DEF-man this |

‘I did not come to this man.’ (Heath, 2003: 20)

When the negated clause is future, mā is affixed to the appropriate personal pronoun, a pronoun that agrees with the subject of the clause in person number and gender.

---

28 It is *ma*, with a short vowel, in Ḥassāniyya and *mā*, with the long vowel, in Malian Ḥassāniyya
In (84), the subject of the clause is first singular; thus, the pronoun suffix -ni is attached to the negator mā, whereas in (85) the subject is third singular masculine; thus, the suffixed attached here is -hu. This attachment of the personal pronoun to the negative morpheme, or morphemes when the attachment occurs with ma……-š as in ma-nī-š ‘I am not’, is very common, especially in non-verbal negation as will be seen in section 4.4.2. Henceforth, this strategy is referred to as \( \textit{NEG+PRO} \).

In Damascus Arabic, the verbal negator is mostly mā.

(86) Damascus Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
1-wāḥed & mā & bilāʔi & mətəl & balad-o \\
\text{DEF-one} & \text{NEG} & \text{find.IMPF.3MSG} & \text{like} & \text{country-his}
\end{array}
\]

‘There is no place like home.’ (Lit. ‘One does not find the like of his community.’)

(Cowell, 2005: 383)

However, similarly to many modern Arabic varieties (see section 3.4.1.1.3), when verbs are affixed to \( \textit{sam-} \) (the progressive aspect maker) or to \( \textit{raḥa-} \) (the future tense marker), they can be negated by the non-verbal negator in the variety. In Damascus, this negator
is mū which can be used optionally instead of mā in these cases. In (87)(a) and (87)(b) below, the ʕam-verb is negated by mā and mū, respectively. The same can be noted with the raḥa-verb in (87)(c) and (87)(d).

(87) Damascus Arabic

a. ʔabū-k mā ʕam-yākol
father-your NEG PRG-eat.IMPF.3MSG

‘Your father is not eating.’ (Cowell, 2005: 384)

b. mū ʕam-yəštḅoḥ hallaʔ
NEG PRG-work.IMPF.3MSG now

‘He is not working now.’ (Cowell, 2005: 387)

c. lʔaylab mā laḥa-yəḥṣal ʕa-ṣ-ṣayle
DEF-most.likely NEG FUT-get.IMPF.3MSG on-DEF-job

‘Chances are, he will not get the job.’ (Cowell, 2005: 387)

d. mū raḥa-tkūn əmṣībe ʔiṣa mā ḥṣālt ʕalē
NEG be.IMPF.3FMSG misfortunate big if neg get.PRF.1SG on.it

‘I will not be a great misfortunate if I did not get it.’ (Cowell, 2005: 387)

This mū is an advanced stage of the attachment between the third singular masculine pronoun and the negative morpheme which can be realized as follows: mā+hu > māhu > mū. This advanced stage can be noted in many modern Arabic varieties, but the resulting morpheme differs considerably depending on the verbal negator in the variety in question. For example, when the verbal negator is mā....-š, the fusion between this negator and hu may result in muš. All the varieties where this fusion is observed will be discussed further in 3.4.2.2. For now, when the attachment results in a single form, the resulting
form is labeled as a negator. In this regard, *mā-ni* in Ḥassāniyya Arabic (84) is called
\textit{NEG+PRO}, but *mā* in Damascus Arabic will be referred to as another negator.\footnote{As mentioned previously, the use of the non-verbal negator to negate future clauses is very common among the modern varieties of Arabic. However, unlike Damascus Arabic, negation in these varieties is single in some cases and bipartite in others; thus, they are discussed in a separate section (3.4.1.1.3). The question, however, is what about the situation in single negation varieties which are spoken in areas adjacent to Damascus Arabic such as the ones in Iraq? In other words, in varieties where negation is single like Damascus Arabic are future clauses negated by *mā*? Based on the available data, it seems that although the non-verbal negator is *mā* in some of these varieties adjacent to Damascus Arabic, such as Christian Baghdadi Arabic and Muslim Baghdadi Arabic, it is not used with future clauses. Consider the following from Muslim Baghdadi Arabic and note that the verbal negator *mā* seems the only possibility to negate future clauses:

\begin{verbatim}
ma-raḥ-yiği
NEG-FUT-come.IMPF.3MSG
‘He is not going to come.’
\end{verbatim} \hfill (Erwin, 2004: 141)}

In Ḍabha Arabic, the negators are *mā, mā+PRO, lim, lis* and *lis+PRO*. First, *mā* can be used with past and present clauses, both exemplified respectively below.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(88)] Ḍabha Arabic
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. huwwah mā šaddag-hā yōm gālat la-h
\begin{tabular}{llll}
he & NEG & believe.PR.F.3MSG-her & day & tell.PR.F.3SG to-him
\end{tabular}
\begin{verbatim}
‘He did not believe her when she told him.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 116)
\end{verbatim}
\item b. mā tišrif ḥatta tuslug bēḍah
\begin{tabular}{llll}
NEG & know.IMPF.3SG even & boil.IMPF.3SG & egg
\end{tabular}
\begin{verbatim}
‘She does not even know how to boil an egg.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 123)
\end{verbatim}
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

Second, *mā+PRO* is used to negate present clauses. In (89)(a), the subject is third singular masculine; thus, the pronoun *-hū* ‘he’ is used, but in (89)(a), the subject is third singular feminine; this, the pronoun *-hi* ‘she’ is used.
This \textit{mā}+PRO strategy can also negate future clauses, but note unlike present clauses \textit{mā} alone is not another option here to negate such clauses.

\textit{lim} is another verbal negator in ?Abha Arabic. Recalling standard negation in Standard Arabic from 3.3, one can see that this \textit{lim} is etymologically related from \textit{lam}.

Moreover, similarly to \textit{lam}, \textit{lim} can be used with past tense meaning only, and past tense in affirmatives is marked on the verb, but when verbs are negated by \textit{lim}, the verb takes the imperfect form. Compare the following and note that in (91)(a) the verb is inflected for the past, but (91)(b) past tense is conveyed by \textit{lim}. 

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{(89) ?Abha Arabic}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item a. mā hū yẓalli ḥadinn yḥākī-h
        \text{NEG he let.IMPF.3MSG anyone talk.IMPF.3MSG-him}
        \text{‘He does not let anyone talk to him.’} \hspace{1cm} (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 73)
      \item b. mā hi tišrab iš-šāhī bi s-sukkar
        \text{NEG she drink.IMPF.3FSG DEF-tea with DEF-sugar}
        \text{‘She does not drink tea with sugar.’} \hspace{1cm} (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 73)
    \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{(90) ?Abha Arabic}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item mā hū b-ygˇud
        \text{NEG he FUT-stay.IMPF.3MSG}
        \text{‘He will not stay.’} \hspace{1cm} (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 140)
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
(91) ʔAbha Arabic

a. gāmatt umm-ī

wake.PRF.3FSG mother-me

‘My mother woke up.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 84)

b. lim agūl la-h

NEG.PST tell.IMPF.1SG to-him

‘I did not tell him.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 141)

lis is also an ʔAbha Arabic negator. It is etymologically related to laysa, a negator used in Standard Arabic, mostly, with non-verbal clauses (see section 4.2). lis can be used with either present or future clauses. However, with present clauses, lis must be accompanied by the appropriate personal pronoun (lis+PRO).

(92) ʔAbha Arabic

lis-nī aʕrif dōlā l-banāt

NEG-me know.IMPF.1SG these DEF-girls

‘I do not know these girls.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 56)

With future clauses, the accompaniment of the personal pronoun is optional. However, when lis is used alone with future clauses, the future marker b- must be omitted, but when lis+PRO is used, the b- marker is not omitted. Both cases are exemplified respectively in the following:
(93) Abha Arabic

a. lis yiswī-h
   \text{NEG.FUT fix.IMPF.3MSG-it}
   ‘He will not fix it.’
   (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 142)

b. lis-nī b-sāfir δā l-yōm
   \text{NEG-me FUT-travel.IMPF.1SG this DEF-day}
   ‘I am not going to travel today.’
   (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 142)

In the previous, example (93)(a) shows that \textit{lis} is inflected for future tense, but example (93)(b) shows future tense is encoded by \textit{b-} (the future tense marker in this variety). Perhaps this is to avoid confusion. That is to say, \textit{lis+PRO} can negate present (92) and future clauses (93)(b). Therefore, when \textit{lis+PRO} is used the only difference between the negative present clause and the negative future clause would be the presence of \textit{b-}. In contrast, when \textit{lis} alone is used, there is no need for \textit{b-} to differentiate between the two types of clauses as the use of \textit{lis} alone is permitted with negative future clauses only.

Finally, Table 9 shows that Zinābār Arabic is the only one where the single verbal negator is \textit{miš}, which has two allomorphs (\textit{miši} and \textit{māši}), for example:

(94) Zinābār Arabic

a. miš idina-hum as-siyārah ḥaqqa-na
   \text{NEG give.PRF.1PL -them DEF-car POSS-our}
   ‘We did not give them our car.’
As Ahmed puts it, “this dialect employs a single negative marker miš [miš] to negate all types of constructions. The negative marker is composed of ma and sh [...-š] but it is never expressed as a two-part marker” (Ahmed, 2012: 33). This is, however, does not mean mā is completely absent in this variety. The case is that miš is the ordinary verbal negator and mā is used in certain cases only. For example, when negation is emphasized, …-š is omitted and the used negator is mā alone, for example:

(95) Zinḡibār Arabic

\[
\text{wallah ma qūm men maḥall-in}
\]

\[
\text{by-God NEG stand.IMPF.1SG from place-my}
\]

‘I swear By God that I will not leave my place.’ (Ahmed, 2012: 45)

Such an omission is very common among the modern Arabic varieties, see section 3.4.1.2 for more details on this phenomenon.

3.4.1.2 Bipartite negation

The bipartite negative strategy means standard negation is rendered by the use of two negative morphemes simultaneously. This strategy is not found in Standard Arabic (see section 3.3), only in modern Arabic varieties. It is found as the only possible way to perform negation in 11 out of the 53 Arabic varieties, consider here:

b. miš ba-nandi-hum as-siyārah ḥaqqa-na

\[
\text{NEG FUT-give.IMPF.1PL-them DEF-car POSS-our}
\]

‘We will not give them our car.’ (Ahmed, 2012: 34)
Unlike the single strategy which can be found across the Arabic world, the bipartite strategy seems to be a characteristic found in some regions only, Maghrebi, Egyptian and Yemeni. Table 10 outlines the 11 bipartite negation varieties in which single negation (whether pre-verbal or post-verbal) is impossible in unmarked standard negation contexts. Similarly to the previous table, the modern Arabic varieties are represented by regions, followed by the name of the Arabic variety and finally the negative morpheme(s).
Table 10: Modern Arabic varieties where standard negation is bipartite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The negative morpheme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maghrebi</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Annaba Arabic</td>
<td>mā……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Dellys Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sfax Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sousse Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Eastern Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Biyyāḏī and Aḫrasī Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>SmēṢnī and Ǧēlī Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Ṭuwara Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Adeni Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Taiz Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the previous table demonstrates, in Moroccan Arabic and Dellys Arabic the second part of the verbal negator (...-š) may be pronounced as ...-ši.30 However, it is worth noting that, according to Souag, the vowel /i/ in Dellys Arabic is rarely pronounced by younger generations (Souag, 2005: 166), for example:

---

30 Note that in Moroccan Arabic, ma……-šay is also possible but with emphatic negation only. This section, however, focuses on non-emphatic negation, and emphatic negation will shortly be discussed in section 3.4.1.2.
It should be borne in mind that the second element ...-š may be omitted in certain cases. This phenomenon is common wherever this ...-š is found. For example, in Moroccan Arabic, the presence of the item ʕəmmər ‘never’ entails the omission of ...-š, compare the following clauses:

(99)  

Moroccan Arabic

a.  ma-nemšiwi-$š$

    NEG-come.IMPF.1PL-NEG

    ‘We will not go.’  

    (Harrell, 2004: 152)

b.  ʕəmmər-hum  ma-šaףu-h

    never-they  see.PRF.3PL-him

    ‘They have never seen him.’ or ‘They never saw him.’  

    (Harrell, 2004: 154)

Despite this omission, which results in single negation, the negative strategy in Moroccan Arabic is classified as always bipartite, see section 3.4.1.2 for more information on this omission across the modern Arabic varieties. In order for standard negation in a variety to be classified as single–bipartite, both the single and the bipartite negative strategies have to be frequent as we will see in the following section, not as in Moroccan Arabic where bipartite negation is used and the single one is possible under certain restricted circumstances. It should also be noted that, as we will see in the following section, some modern varieties negate certain clauses such as future clauses by the use of a single
morpheme. In the varieties listed in Table 10 above, however, no available data shows
the use of such a morpheme, and negation in these varieties seems to be always bipartite
in non-emphatic negation.

3.4.1.1.3 Single–bipartite negation

Single–bipartite negation means both the single as well as the bipartite negative strategy
are frequently found within the same variety. This is the case in 13 out of the 53 Arabic
varieties, all of which are listed in the following table:

Table 11: Modern Arabic varieties where standard negation is Single–Bipartite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The negative morpheme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maghrebi</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Standard Maltese</td>
<td>ma……-x and mhx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Western Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š and miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sahel/Tunis Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š, miš and ma-PRO-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>al-ŠArīš Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š (i) and miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Egyptian western desert Arabic</td>
<td>mā and mā……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š and miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ṣaṣīdī Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-šey and ...-šey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levantine</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Northern Jordanian Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š and miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>as-Salṭ Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š, ...-š and mā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Aley Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š, ...-š, miš and ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Baskinta Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š, ...-š and miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td>mā……-š, ...-š, mā and muš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Ṣana’a Arabic</td>
<td>mā……-š and mā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 13 varieties can be divided further into three sub-categories: varieties where the choice between the single and the bipartite strategy seems to be optional (Group A); varieties where future clauses are negated by the single strategy and non-future clauses are negated by the bipartite one (Group B); and finally varieties where there is an overlap between the two strategies (Group C).

In group (A), the speaker here seems to have an option of using either single or bipartite negation. There seems to be no constraints on which one should be used. This is the case in four varieties: Egyptian western desert Arabic, Saṣīdī Arabic, Şana’a Arabic and as-Saţ Arabic. In the following, for example, in Egyptian western desert Arabic (100) and in Saṣīdī Arabic (101), a perfect clause is once negated by the single strategy and once by the bipartite one.

(100)  Egyptian western desert Arabic

a. mā gā-š

   NEG come.PR.F.3.SG-NEG

   ‘He did not come.’ (Maţar, 1981: 183)

b. ir-rāgil mā _Printf.3.SG
c. ŋatā

   DEF-man NEG give.PR.F.3.SG from new.PL

   ‘The man did not report any news.’ (Lit. ‘The man did not give any news.’) (Maţar, 1981: 183)

(101)  Şaṣīdī Arabic

a. l-kalb ma _Printf.3.SG

   DEF-dog NEG reach.PR.F.3.SG-NEG

   ‘The dog did not reach the bone.’ (Khalafallah, 1969: 101-102)

31 Note Maţar (1981) is written in Arabic; thus, the examples here are my own transcription.
b. l-kalb ḥaṣṣal-ši l-ʕaḍma

DEF-dog reach.PRF.3MSG-NEG DEF-bone

‘The dog did not reach the bone.’ (Khalafallah, 1969: 101-102)

as-Salṭ Arabic differs slightly from the rest of group (A) varieties. Here, the same
optionality is almost found between ma……-š and mā.

(102) as-Salṭ Arabic

a. ṭabḥan ma ylägī-š ḡawāb

of course NEG get.IMPF.3MSG answer

‘Of course, he does not get answer.’

b. ẓiḥna mā bintīḥ ẓa-l-ġor

we NEG go.down.IMPF.1PL to-DEF-Jordan.valley

‘We do not go [down] to the Jordan valley.’ (Palva, 2004: 229)

However, with b-imperfect verbs only in addition to ma……-š and mā, the negator …-š
can be used. The following is an example of a b-imperfect verb negated by each one of
the three negators.

(103) as-Salṭ Arabic

a. ma baʃrif-š inklīzi

NEG know.IMPF.1SG English

‘I do not know English.’ (Palva, 2004: 229)

b. ẓiḥna mā bintīḥ ẓa-l-ɣor

we NEG go.down.IMPF.3MPL to-DEF-Jordan.valley

‘We do not go [down] to the Jordan valley.’ (Palva, 2004: 229)
Based on negation in group (A), the following can be formulated:

**Generalization 3:** The optionality between using single and bipartite negation is rarely found in modern Arabic varieties.

In group (B), there is a split between negation of future clauses and negation of non-future clauses. The bipartite negation is used only with non-future clauses (past or present), whereas the single one is preserved with future clauses only.\(^{32}\) This is the case is four varieties: Standard Maltese, Western Libyan Arabic, al-ʿArīš Arabic and Northern Jordanian Arabic. The following are from Western Libyan Arabic and Northern Jordanian. Note the first clause of each example is non-future; thus, negation is bipartite, and the second one is future; thus, negation is single.

---

\(^{32}\) A logical question would be here that how future clauses are negated in group (A). This is to make sure they do not belong to group (B). In other words, can the optionality of using single or bipartite negation be found with future clauses in group (A) varieties as well? The result shows that Ṣanaʿa Arabic definitely belongs to group (A) since the optionality does occur even with future clauses. On the other hand, data on negation of future clauses in Egyptian western desert Arabic, Saṭīdī Arabic and as-Salṭ Arabic is not found. Therefore, a sensible step here could be classifying these three varieties under a different category in which the motivation is the ambiguity of negation with future clauses. However, since the consulted sources of these three varieties are either a descriptive grammar book or a journal article written specifically on negation, any difference in negation with future clauses would highly be expected to be mentioned. The lack of this mention could be because there is nothing to mention. That is, negating future clauses is similar to negating any other type of clause.
(104) Western Libyan Arabic

a. l-awlād ma-mšū-š li-l-madrsa
   DEF-boy.PL NEG-go.PRF.3PL-NEG to-DEF-school
   ‘The boys did not go to the school.’  (Krer, 2013: 75)

b. l-awlād miš ḫa-yemšū li-l-mad rsa
   DEF-boy.PL NEG FUT-go.IMPF.3PL. to-DEF-school
   ‘The boys do not go to the school.’  (Krer, 2013: 97)

(105) Northern Jordanian Arabic

a. ma-zār-iš el-batra
   NEG-visit.PRF.3MSG-NEG DEF-Petra
   ‘He did not visit Petra.’  (Alqassas, 2015: 102)

b. miš ḫa-yisāfir
   NEG FUT-travel.IMPF.3MSG
   ‘He will not making the journey.’  (Haija, 1985: 10)

In group (C), there is an overlap between the two strategies. This is the case in five varieties: Cairene Arabic, Sahel/Tunis Arabic, Aley Arabic, Baskinta Arabic and Palestinian Arabic. The overlap here differs considerably from one variety to another. Accordingly, it seems reasonable to demonstrate how this overlap occurs on a case-by-case basis.
The first case is Cairene Arabic. Here, *ma*-š and *miš* can be used with non-future clauses, for example:  

(106) Cairene Arabic

a. ma-biyḥibb-iš il-ḥaflāt
   NEG-like.IMPF.3MSG-NEG DEF-party.PL
   ‘He does not like parties.’

b. miš biyḥibb il-ḥaflāt
   NEG like.IMPF.3MSG DEF-party.PL
   ‘He does not like parties.’ (Gary & Gamal-Eldin, 1982: 39)

However, when the clause is future, only *miš* is possible.

(107) Cairene Arabic

miš ḥa-tīği bukra
   NEG FUT-come.IMPF.3FSG tomorrow
   “She is not going to come tomorrow” (Gary & Gamal-Eldin, 1982: 39)

The second case is Sahel/Tunis Arabic. In this variety, standard negation can be expressed by three morphemes: *ma*-š, *miš* and the use of the NEG+PRO construction. *ma*-š is used with non-future and non-progressive aspect clauses.

---

33 Brustad investigates the use of *ma*-š and *miš* with non-future clauses with an Egyptian linguist and concludes that in such cases *miš* is used to indicate “a kind of categorical negation, a marked (but not emphatic) form of verbal negation” (Brustad, 2000: 302). Mughazy (2003), in contrast, argues that *miš* is used to express metalinguistic negation, not descriptive negation. The difference between these two types of negation is that the descriptive negation concerns with the truth-conditions of the proposition in the clause, whereas the metalinguistic negation concerns with the assertability of that proposition (Mughazy, 2003). However, whichever analysis is more accurate, it is clear that in Cairene Arabic *miš* is possible in standard negation with non-future clauses.
(108) Sahel/Tunis Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{nawāl} & \text{ma-žāt-š} & \text{l-bārḥ} \\
\text{Nawal} & \text{NEG-come.PRF.3FSG-NEG} & \text{DEF-yesterday}
\end{array}
\]

‘Nawal did not come yesterday.’

(Halila, 1992: 30)

If the negated clause is future or has a progressive aspect interpretation, either miš or ma-PRO-š are used. In the following, (109)(a) and (109)(b) are future clauses, whereas (109)(c) and (109)(d) are progressive clauses, each one of these types is once negated by miš and once by ma-PRO-š:

(109) Sahel/Tunis Arabic

a. \[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{nawāl} & \text{miš} & \text{bāš} & \text{tžī} \\
\text{Nawal} & \text{NEG} & \text{FUT} & \text{come.IMPF.3FSG}
\end{array}
\]

‘Nawal is not coming.’

b. \[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{nawāl} & \text{ma-hyā-š} & \text{bāš} & \text{tžī} \\
\text{Nawal} & \text{NEG-she-NEG} & \text{FUT} & \text{come.IMPF.3FSG}
\end{array}
\]

‘Nawal is not coming.’

c. \[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{nawāl} & \text{miš} & \text{taqra} & \text{fi} & \text{ktāb} \\
\text{Nawal} & \text{NEG} & \text{read.IMPF.3FSG} & \text{in} & \text{book}
\end{array}
\]

‘Nawal is not reading a book.’

d. \[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{nawāl} & \text{ma-hyā-š} & \text{taqra} & \text{fi} & \text{ktāb} \\
\text{Nawal} & \text{NEG-she-NEG} & \text{read.IMPF.3FSG} & \text{in} & \text{book}
\end{array}
\]

‘Nawal is not reading a book.’

(Halila, 1992: 31)

The third case is Aley Arabic. Here, the negators are ma……-š, ...-š, miš and ma.

If the negated verb is perfect, the used negator can be either ma……-š or ma alone.
(110) Aley Arabic

a. ma ʔayad-ā-š maʕ-u
   NEG take.PR.3MSG-her-NEG with-him
   ‘He did not take her with him.’

b. ma ʔayad-a maʕ-u
   NEG take.PR.3MSG-her with-him
   ‘He did not take her with him,’
   (Bishr, 1956: 46)

If the negated verb is b-imperfect, the used negators are ma……-š, …-š alone or rarely ma alone, e.g.:

(111) Aley Arabic

a. ma baʕrif-š bayy-ak
   NEG know.PR.1SG-NEG father-your
   ‘I do not know your father.’

b. baʕrif-š bayy-ak
   know.PR.1SG-NEG father-your
   ‘I do not know your father.’

c. ma baʕrif bayy-ak
   NEG know.PR.1SG father-your
   ‘I do not know your father.’
   (Bishr, 1956: 46)

If the negated verb is ϣab-imperfect, the negator used is miʕ. 34

---

34 ϣab- seems to be the progressive aspect marker in this dialect.
(112) Aley Arabic

\[ \text{miš Šabiktub maktūb} \]
\[ \text{NEG write.IMPF.1SG letter} \]

‘I am not writing a letter.’ (Bishr, 1956: 46)

The fourth case is Baskinta Arabic. Here, negators are \( ma \ldots ...-\š \), \( ...-\š \) and \( miš \).

With perfect verbs, \( ma \ldots ...-\š \) is used.

(113) Baskinta Arabic

\[ \text{ʔimm-i ma Šallamit-nī-š šīl is-sinnāra} \]
\[ \text{mother-me NEG teach.PRF.3FSG-me-NEG work DEF-crochet} \]

‘My mother did not teach me how to crochet.’ (Abu-Haidar, 1979: 109)

With \( b \)-imperfect verbs, the negator is either \( ma \ldots ...-\š \) or \( ...-\š \) alone.\(^{35}\)

(114) Baskinta Arabic

a. \[ \text{hal-mutār ma byiflah-š imlīḥ} \]
\[ \text{this-tractor NEG plough.IMPF.3MSG-NEG well} \]

‘This tractor does not plough well.’

b. \[ \text{byismaš-š il-kilmi} \]
\[ \text{heed.IMPF.3MSG-NEG DEF-word} \]

‘He does not heed (my) advice.’ (Abu-Haidar, 1979: 109)

\(^{35}\) In this case only (\( b \)-imperfect verbs), \( ma \) in \( ma \ldots ...-\š \) may become \( ʔa \) as in \( ʔa \ldots ...-\š \). As Abu-Haidar puts it “the particle \( ʔa \) is, in fact, \( ma \), but \( m \) is elided where it is followed by a word beginning with \( b \)-.” (Abu-Haidar, 1979: 110).
With ʕan-imperfect verbs and future clause, the negator is miš.\(^{36}\)

(115) Baskinta Arabic

a. miš ʕan-yiḥki maʃ-i baʔa
   NEG PRGTalk.IMPF.3MSG with-me anymore

   ‘He is not talking to me anymore.’

b. miš raḥ nizraʃ ilʔās is-sini
   NEG FUT plant.IMPF.1PL potatoes DEF-year

   ‘We shall not plant potatoes this year.’ (Abu-Haidar, 1979: 109)

The last case is Palestinian Arabic. The negators here are mā……-š, ...-š, mā and
mus. mā……-š and mā can be used with non-future clauses.

(116) Palestinian Arabic

a. mā akalt-iš
   NEG eat.PRF.1SG-NEG

   ‘I did not eat.’ (Lucas, 2010: 173)

b. mā riḍi yuskut
   NEG agree.PRF.3MSG shut up.IMPF.3MSG

   ‘He refused to shut up.’ (Lit. ‘He did not agree to shut up.’) (Seeger, 1996: 36)

Beside the above two negators, the post-verbal ...-š can be used with b-imperfect verbs.

\(^{36}\)ʕan- seems to function as the progressive aspect marker in this dialect.
(117) Palestinian Arabic

(ana) baḥībb-iš il-фūl

I like.IMPF.1SG-NEG DEF-fava beans

‘I do not like fava beans.’ (Lucas, 2009: 244)

The last negator is muš. It is used with future clauses only.

(118) Palestinian Arabic

muš rāḥ yuktob

NEG FUT write.IMPF.3MSG

‘He is not going to write.’ (Rosenhouse, 2011)

Table 12 below summarizes how standard negation is expressed in group (C) varieties.
Table 12: Standard negation in group (C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The negative morpheme(s) and their functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td>Both <em>ma</em>……<em>-š</em> and <em>miš</em> can be used with non-future clauses, but only <em>miš</em> can be used with future clauses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sahel/Tunis Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em>……<em>-š</em> is used with non-future and non-progressive clauses, and <em>miš</em> and <em>ma</em>-PRO*-š* are used with futures and progressive clauses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Aley Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em>……<em>-š</em> and <em>ma</em> are optionally used with prefect verbs; <em>ma</em>……<em>-š</em>, ...<em>-š</em> and <em>ma</em> are optionally used with b + imperfect verbs; and <em>miš</em> is used with <em>ʕab</em> + imperfect verbs only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Baskinta Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em>……<em>-š</em> and ...<em>-š</em> can be used with b-imperfect verbs, but with perfect verbs only <em>ma</em>……<em>-š</em> is possible and with <em>ʕab</em> + imperfect verbs only <em>miš</em> is possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em>……<em>-š</em> and <em>mā</em> can be used with perfect and non-b-imperfect verbs; <em>mā</em>……<em>-š</em>, ...<em>-š</em> and <em>mā</em> can be sued with b-imperfect; and only <em>muš</em> is possible with future clauses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have seen in the previous a categorization of the modern Arabic varieties based on the type of the negative strategy. In the following section, however, a different feature is considered, the use of ...*-š* in negation. As we will see, varieties in this regard are divided into two groups: varieties where this ...*-š* is found and varieties where this ...*-š* is not found. The focus in this section will be on the common omission of this ...*-š* among varieties that have it.
3.4.1.2 The negative …-š

Based on the use of …-š as a negative morpheme, or at least as part of it, Arabic varieties can be divided into two categories: š-varieties, where the negative …-š is observed, and non-š-varieties, where this …-š is not observed at all. By default, then, the š-group includes all Arabic varieties where negation is classified as bipartite (Table 10) and where negation is classified as single~bipartite (Table 11). That is, …-š is always present as the second element in any bipartite negation. Based on this, one can say bipartite negation always entails the use of …-š (or its variants such as …-šey or …-ši) as the second element. The same is true about mā; bipartite negation, almost always entails the presence of mā (or its variant ma) as the first element; thus.37

Generalization 4: In standard negation, bipartite negation almost always entails the use of is ma……-š.

This is not to be confused with the Arabic negator lā. In some modern Arabic varieties, lā may co-occur with …-š to express negative imperatives, but not standard negation, see section 5.4.

On the other hand, not all modern Arabic varieties where negation is single belong automatically to the non-š-group. In Zinḡibār Arabic, negation is single; yet, it belongs to the š-group as the single negator here is miš which contains /š/. The geographical distribution of these š-varieties and non-š-varieties is explained in detail in section 3.4.4, and the fact that not all š-varieties have this …-š as a result of going through Jespersen’s cycle as some of them may just have borrowed it from other adjacent varieties is

37 As far as the available data shows, the only exception to this is found in Baskinta Arabic where ma……-š may become ʔa……-š with b-imperfect verbs.
explained in section 4.4.3. Here, we will focus on the phenomenon of omitting this …š in certain constructions.

Commonly, this omission occurs mostly when negation is emphasized (the omission is also found in other cases as will be explained). In modern Arabic varieties, emphasis seems to be commonly expressed by use of an oath, the use of a negative-sensitive item, or by stress. The latter can be called wordless; in fact, this may be a better term for this way of emphasizing as we will see shortly.

The first strategy is oath which mostly involves the use of َللَّي ‘by-God’.

(119) ِTuwwara Arabic

\[
\text{wallāh mā ġā-ni}
\]

by-God NEG come.PRF.3MSG-us

‘By God, he did not come to us.’

(120) Northern Jordanian Arabic

\[
\text{wallah mā b-йōm bassāmḥ-k}
\]

by-God NEG in-day forgive.IMPF.1SG-you

‘I will not forgive you in any day = I will never forgive you.’

(Alqassas, 2015: 114)

(121) Adeni Arabic

\[
\text{wallah ma-aqūm men maḥl-i}
\]

by-God NEG-stand.IMPF.1SG from place-my

‘By God, I will not leave my place.’

(Ahmed, 2012: 66)

The second case for this omission is in the presence of a negative-sensitive items (NSIs). These items can be divided further into negative polarity items, negative concord items and negative indefinite pronouns. All of these types will be addressed in chapter 7.
For now, it is sufficient to say that NSIs are items which tend to occur in certain non-affirmative clauses such as negation, interrogatives and conditionals. In the following, the item ʕumr- ‘never’ is an example of an NSI (it is a negative polarity item).

(122) Moroccan Arabic

ʕəmmər-hum ma-ʔafu-h
never-they see.PRF.3PL-him
‘They have never seen him.’ or ‘They never saw him.’ (Harrell, 2004: 154)

(123) Sousse Arabic

ʕəm-r-o mɛ yɛdfax
never-he NEG pay.IMPF.3MSG
‘He never pays.’ (Talmoudi, 1980: 166)

(124) Cairene Arabic

ʕumr-u mā ḥass innu huwwa ṣagnabi
never-he NEG feel.PRF.3MSG that he foreign
‘Never has he felt that he was foreign’ (Brustad, 2000: 307)

The last relevant emphasis type is stress (or wordless). The reason this could be called wordless is that the consulted sources usually provide an example of this way of emphasizing negation without explaining how the emphasis is marked. The author would just give a statement similar to: the second element …-š is omitted when extra emphasis is intended, for example:
(125) Smēʔniy and ʕGēliy Arabic

mā ha-zʕal
NEG FUT-get.angry.IMPF.1SG

‘I shall not be angry.’ (de Jong, 2000: 318)

(126) Biyyāḏī and ʕAxrasī Arabic

mā kammalin gōlīt-hin
NEG finish.PRF.3FPL talk-their(F)

‘They had not even finished.’ (de Jong, 2000: 393)

However, in Zinġibār Arabic only, the author reports that emphasis may be expressed by a focal stress. Then, she puts the stressed items in bold as in:

(127) Zinġibār Arabic

kanēn ma yatšeršafain ammāt awwal
be.PRF.3FPL NEG wear.veils.IMPF.3FPL woman.PL old

‘Women in the old days were not wearing veils.’ (Ahmed, 2012: 45-46)

However, if we know that the focal stress has been used in Zinġibār Arabic, we do not know if the same has been used in others. All we know is that the clause is emphasized. Thus, the wordless label seems to be more suitable here, and is the only one that will be used from now on.

The amount of the available data on the three cases (oath, the use of an NSI and wordless) varies considerably from a variety to another. In some Arabic varieties, there is no information found on any of them. In others, some or a little data can be found. In

---

38 Note here in Zinġibār Arabic, negation is single rendered by miš, and when …-š is omitted the resulting negator is ma.
Table 13 below, all the Arabic varieties where \(-\š\) is used as a negator or part of it are listed. In this table, varieties are organized according to the type of their negative strategy. The (\(\sqrt{\text{.}}\)) and (X) symbols do not mean \(-\š\) is omitted or not; they are just to indicate whether data on oath, the use of NSIs and the wordless method is available or not. The same table can be viewed, however, as a list of the Arabic \(\š\)-varieties.

**Table 13:** \(\š\)-varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Negative strategy</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Oath</th>
<th>Wordless</th>
<th>NSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Single negation</td>
<td>Zin(\text{'}g)ib(\text{'})r Arabic</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annaba Arabic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dellys Arabic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sfax Arabic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sousse Arabic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Bipartite negation</td>
<td>Eastern Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Biyy(\text{`})(\text{`})î and Ay(\text{`})rasî Arabic</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sm(\text{`})(\text{`})nî and ʕG(\text{`})lî Arabic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ʕTu(\text{`})wara Arabic</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adeni Arabic</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taiz Arabic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Maltese</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(\sqrt{\text{.}})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As demonstrated by the previous table, data on all of the three cases is available in Zinġībār Arabic only, whereas in Annaba Arabic, Egyptian western desert Arabic, Saṣīdī Arabic, Aley Arabic and Baskinta Arabic, there is no available data at all. The other varieties are somewhere between; data might be found on …-š with oath but not on …-š with NSIs, for example, or found on …-š with wordless emphasis but not on the other cases. Another important point that can be noticed in this table is that information on emphasis by oath or by NSIs are significantly more available than information on emphasis by the wordless strategy. Yet, this is not a surprise. That is, the oath and the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Western Libyan Arabic</th>
<th>Sahel/Tunis Arabic</th>
<th>al-Ṣarīṣ Arabic</th>
<th>Egyptian western desert Arabic</th>
<th>Cairene Arabic</th>
<th>Saṣīdī Arabic</th>
<th>Northern Jordanian Arabic</th>
<th>as-Salṭ Arabic</th>
<th>Aley Arabic</th>
<th>Baskinta Arabic</th>
<th>Palestinian Arabic</th>
<th>Şana’a Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>X X √</td>
<td>X X √</td>
<td>X √ X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>√ X √</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>√ X √</td>
<td>√ X √</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>√ X √</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NSIs strategies are done by the addition of a separate morpheme to the clause, whereas no such addition is found with the wordless strategy. This makes the latter strategy less conspicuous than the others. Accordingly, an investigator of a specific variety, may exclude, intentionally or unintentionally, wordless emphatic negation. The intentional exclusion could be because such strategy has no impact on the way negation is expressed in the variety in question. In other words, negation in a clause that is emphasized wordlessly is identical to a clause that is not emphasized wordlessly; thus, there is no need to differentiate between these two types of clauses in term of negation. In contrast, the unintentional exclusion could be because this way of emphasizing a clause is not observed in the investigated variety. In other words, we cannot know if wordless emphasis is found in every modern Arabic variety or not.

Bearing in mind the various ways to express emphatic negation and the amount of the available data on this, we now turn to the question of whether this emphasis always entails the omission of the negative ...-š or not. The answer is not always but mostly; thus,

*Generalization 5: In the š-varieties, ...-š is mostly omitted in emphatic negation.*

This is based on data from 20 out of the 25 š-varieties in Table 13 above since in 5 of them no data is available (Annaba Arabic, Egyptian western desert Arabic, Saṭīdī Arabic, Aley Arabic and Baskinta Arabic). In 13 out of these 20, the omission of ...-š seems to be mandatory as demonstrated by the examples (119) - (127) above. The exempt 7 from these 20 are Palestinian Arabic, as-Salṭ Arabic, Moroccan Arabic, Sfax Arabic, Eastern Libyan Arabic, Ṣana’a Arabic and Northern Jordanian Arabic. In these 7, the situation is different; in some of them the omission is optional while in others it is applied in some
cases only. The differences are best explained on a case-by-case basis, followed by a summary and overall discussion on this omission phenomenon.

The first case is Moroccan Arabic. This variety could be classified with the above 13 varieties where ...-$š$ is always omitted in emphatic negation. However, there is one exception here. In the above 13, an assumption has been made on the omission of ...-$š$ in the wordlessly emphasized negation, but here the long version of this ...-$š$ is used instead, namely $šay$: 39

(128) Moroccan Arabic

\[
\text{ma-$ža$-$šay$} \\
\text{NEG-come.PRF.3MSG-NEG} \\
\text{‘He certainly did not come.’} \quad \text{(Harrell, 2004: 152)}
\]

The second case is Palestinian Arabic and as-Salṭ Arabic. Two matters are to be noted here. The first one is that both $ma$......-$š$ and $mā$ are possible in standard negation

39 There is available data that shows the omission of ...-$š$ in this dialect occurs also in other cases. First, when the direct object of the clause or the complement of the negative verb is an indefinite noun. Compare the following:

\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ma-$žbort$-$š$} \quad \text{flus} \\
& \text{NEG-find.PRF.1SG} \quad \text{DEF-money} \\
& \text{‘I did not find the money.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{ma-$žbort$} \quad \text{flus} \\
& \text{NEG-find.PRF.1SG-NEG} \quad \text{money} \\
& \text{‘I did not find (any) money.’} \quad \text{(Harrell, 2004: 154)}
\end{align*}

Second, when the clause contains an adverbial phrase of duration such as $hadi$ šahrin ‘these two months’ and *telti šur* ‘three months’. However, in order for the omission to be applied here, these phrases must not occur finally in the clause. Compare the following:

\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{hadi šahrin} \quad \text{ma-$ža$} \quad \text{l-d-dar} \\
& \text{these two.months} \quad \text{NEG-come.PRF.3MSG} \quad \text{at-DEF-house} \\
& \text{‘Since two months, he has not come to the house.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{ma-$ža$-$š$} \quad \text{l-d-dar} \quad \text{hadi šahrin} \\
& \text{NEG-come.PRF.3MSG-NEG} \quad \text{at-DEF-house} \quad \text{these two.months} \\
& \text{‘He has not come to the house since two months.’} \quad \text{(Chatar-Moumni, 2012: 7)}
\end{align*}
in these varieties (cf. section 3.4.1.1.3); therefore, one might say that in cases where ...-š is not used, mā is the only possible negator rather than saying ...-š is omitted. In other words, the speakers’ choice between ma......-š and mā has been reduced here to mā only. Data is found on this use of mā only with oath and with NSIs as demonstrated by the following:

(129) Palestinian Arabic
a. waḷḷāhi mā ɬuft-u
   by-God NEG see.PRF.1SG –him
   ‘By God, I did not see him.’ (Hoyt, 2007: 4)

b. ūmr-ī ma-ɬuft-u
   never-me NEG-see.PRF.1SG-him
   ‘I never saw him.’ (Hoyt, 2005b: 17)

(130) as-Salṭ Arabic
a. waļla ma btaṣrif wēn-o
   by-God NEG know.IMPF.2MSG where-him
   ‘Do not you know where he is?’ (Lit. You swear you do not know where he is)

b. ūmr-i ma ruḥt ʕa-maṣ(i)r
   never NEG go.PRF.1SG to-Egypt
   ‘I have never been to Egypt.’ (Palva, 2004: 230)

The second matter is that, as far as can be found, ...-š is possible with one type of NSIs, namely wala-items. A wala-item is a negative concord item because it may co-occur with the ordinary negator and yet, this co-occurrence does not result in a double negative construction where the result is an affirmative reading (this will be discussed further in 7.1). For now, it is sufficient to say that in Palestinian Arabic and as-Salṭ Arabic,
...-š is possible with negative concord items (a sub-category of NSIs). The possibility, however, occurs if, and only if, these wala-items are placed post-verbally as when they are used pre-verbally, predicate negation is not used in the first place (See section 7.1).

(131) Palestinian Arabic

\[
\text{ma-šāf-nī-š} \quad \text{wala} \quad \text{ḥada}
\]

\[
\text{NEG-see.PRF.3MSG-me-NEG} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{one}
\]

‘No one saw me. \hfill \text{(Hoyt, 2005: 1)}

(132) as-Salṭ Arabic

\[
\text{maš-hummu-šš} \quad \text{walā} \quad \text{giřš}
\]

\[
\text{with-they-NEG} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{piaster}
\]

‘They did not have a piaster [in their pockets].’ \hfill \text{(Palva, 2004: 232)}

The third case is found in Eastern Libyan Arabic and Sfax Arabic where the omission is optional. In Eastern Libyan Arabic, data is available on emphatic negation with oath and with NSIs, and with both the omission seems to be optional. In the following, (133)(a) and (133)(b) show the optionality of the omission with an NSI item, whereas (133)(c) shows the optionality of the same omission with oath.\(^{40}\)

(133) Eastern Libyan Arabic

a. \[
gabul \quad ūmr-a \quad \text{ma} \quad ġa-š
\]

\[
\text{before} \quad \text{never-he} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{come.PRF.3MSG-NEG}
\]

‘Before he never came.’ \hfill \text{(Owens, 1984: 200)}

\(^{40}\) In both of these cases (with oath and with NSIs), Owens explicitly reports that ...-š is optional, but in explaining this optionality, he provides several examples with NSIs (some with ...-š and some without ...-š) and one example only with oath (with ...-š). Therefore, I was able to choose two examples with NSI (a and b) to show how ...-š is optionally used, but with oath I had to use the only provided example and indicate the optionality of omitting ...-š by using two brackets around it as in (c).
b. ʕamr-a  ma  ġa
never-he  NEG  come.PRF.3MSG

‘He never came at all.’  (Owens, 1984: 162)

c.  wallāhi  ma  nagdar (-š)
By.God  NEG  can.PRF.1SG (-NEG)

‘Really I cannot.’  (Owens, 1984: 204)

On the other hand, in Sfax Arabic, data is available on emphatic negation with NSIs only, and the optionality of omitting …-š in their presence can be seen with the NSI "hatta ḥad ‘anybody’ below:

(134)  Sfax Arabic

ma-qābiltī(-š)  ḥatta  ḥad  l-yūm
NEG-meet.PRF.1SG(-NEG)  any  body  DEF-today

‘I did not meet anybody today.’  (Bahloul, 1996: 79)

With one NSI, however, the omission is still required, namely šay ‘anything’ as in:41

(135)  Sfax Arabic

ma-šuft  šay
NEG-see.PRF.1SG  anything

‘I did not see anything.’  (Bahloul, 1996: 79)

41 Perhaps the fact that šay is the long version of …-š makes it difficult to have the two morphemes following each other in the same clause.
The fourth case is Ṣana’a Arabic. Here data is available on oaths and on NSIs, and as far as the data shows …-š is possible with oaths but impossible with NSIs, ahad ‘one’ is the NSI in the following example.42

(136) Ṣana’a Arabic

a. wa’llāhi mā fihimt-š

By.God NEG understand.PRF.1SG-NEG

‘Honestly, I did not understand.’ (Qafisheh, 1992: 271)

b. mā yiṣraf ahad Šann-ih

NEG know.IMPF.3MSG one about-it

‘No one knows about it’ (Watson, 1993: 262)

Lastly, in Northern Jordanian Arabic, …-š is omitted in oaths (137)(a), but not with NSIs (137)(b) (ḥada ‘one’ is the NSI in this example).

(137) Northern Jordanian Arabic

a. wallah mā b-yōm bassāmh-k

buy-God NEG in-day forgive.IMPF.1SG-you

‘I will not forgive you in any day = I will never forgive you.’

(Alqassas, 2015: 114)

b. ma-ṣuft-iš ḡada

NEG-see.PRF.1SG-NEG one

‘I did not see anyone.’ (Alqassas, 2015: 103)

42 Note similarly to Palestinian Arabic and as-Salṭ Arabic, both in mā ……-š and mā are possible in Ṣana’a Arabic; thus, the case here is more of a choice reduction rather than an omission.
However, according to Alqassas, the NSI ʕumr- can occur pre-verbally and post-verbally, and when it is pre-verbal, the omission is required (138)(a), but when it is post-verbal, the omission of ....-š is optional (138)(b) and (138)(c).

(138) Northern Jordanian Arabic

a. ʕumr-o mā zār el-batra
   never-him NEG visit.PRF.3MSG DEF-Petra
   ‘He has never visited Petra.’ (Alqassas, 2015: 102)

b. mā zār ʕumr-o el-batra
   NEG visit.PRF.3MSG never-him DEF-Petra
   ‘He has never visited Petra.’ (Alqassas, 2015: 102)

c. ma-zār-iš ʕumr-o el-batra
   NEG-visit.PRF.3MSG-NEG never-him DEF-Petra
   ‘He never visited Petra.’ (Alqassas, 2015: 107)

Interestingly enough, the negator ma-……-š can be attached directly to the item ʕumr-.

(139) Northern Jordanian Arabic

ma ʕumr-t-š šuft wāḥad miθl-u
   NEG (n) ever-I-NEG see.PRF.3MSG. one like-him
   ‘I have never seen anyone like him.’ (Haija, 1985: 15)

The following table summarizes, the omission of ....-š in the 7 exempt Arabic varieties where the omission is not always required in every emphasized negative construction. The symbol (+) is when the omission must be applied; (−) is when the omission is not
applied; (±) is when the omission is optional; (+/−) is when the omission is possible but with some exceptions; and finally (X) is used where information is not available.

Table 14: The variation of omitting ...š

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Oath</th>
<th>Wordless</th>
<th>NSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>as-Salṭ Arabic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sfax Arabic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Eastern Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ṣana’a Arabic</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Northern Jordanian Arabic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quick glance at the previous table shows that no information is found with the wordless strategy except in Moroccan Arabic. And as mentioned above this may due to the fact that this strategy is not common in all modern Arabic varieties, or may occur but has no effect on negation and thus not mentioned in published sources. Data on the oath strategy is not found in Moroccan Arabic and Sfax Arabic but found in the rest. Omission with this strategy is required in Palestinian Arabic, as-Salṭ Arabic and Northern Jordanian Arabic, and optional with Eastern Libyan Arabic and Ṣana’a Arabic. Data on the NSI strategy is found in all of them. In Moroccan Arabic and Ṣana’a Arabic, the omission seems to be required with NSIs. In Palestinian Arabic, as-Salṭ Arabic, Sfax Arabic and Northern Jordanian Arabic, such omission is also required but with some exceptions. In
Eastern Libyan Arabic only, by contrast, the omission is optional. This takes us to another
generalization regarding the use of ...-š:

**Generalization 6: There is no š-variety where ...-š is not, at least optionally, omitted in emphatic negation.**

In conclusion, then, we know so far that the negative ...-š is a result of going
through Jespersen’s cycle (cf. section 1.4). We also know that ...-š cannot be used to
negate every affirmative clause. However, since ...-š is a result of a new development,
the absence of ...-š in some construction should be considered as the incomplete
generalization of the new negative construction rather than an omission in part of it
(Diem, 2014: 77). In other words, ...-š is not omitted in emphatic negation, the original
pattern is simply maintained in this context. This is justified from a theoretical point of
view. In stage II of Jespersen’s cycle, the original negator is supported by another
morpheme to strengthen the notion of negation; thus, the original function of the new
morpheme is to emphasize. In emphatic negation, the negative notion is already
strengthened by emphasizing the clause; therefore, there is no need for double emphasis.
Accordingly, applying ...-š in emphatic negation could be viewed as one of the late steps,
if not the last one, in Stage II of the cycle (cf. Lucas, 2007). In this sense, Eastern Libyan
Arabic is the most advanced Arabic variety, as in this variety only the use of ...-š seems
to be completely optional in emphatic negation, while in the other varieties the case
differs from being impossible to possible with some exceptions.

### 3.4.1.3 Symmetric vs. Asymmetric negative construction

In 3.2, we have seen that when negation is formed by the addition of a negative marker(s)
only to an affirmative clause, the negative construction is symmetric. When negation
involves any change other than this addition, the negative construction is asymmetric. We have also seen, in Standard Arabic 3.3, that there are seven negators (\textit{lam}, \textit{lammā}, \textit{lan}, \textit{lā}, \textit{ʔin}, \textit{mā} and \textit{l}y\textit{sa}). The use of \textit{lam}, \textit{lammā} and \textit{lan} results always in asymmetric negation and the use of \textit{lā}, \textit{ʔin}, \textit{mā} and \textit{l}y\textit{sa} results always in symmetric negation. Thus, the negative construction in Standard Arabic could be classified as symmetric~asymmetric since both (the symmetry and the asymmetry) are observed.

In the 53 Arabic varieties considered here, the negative construction in standard negation is almost always symmetric. There is no Arabic variety where the construction is always asymmetric only, and there are four varieties where the construction is symmetric in some cases and asymmetric in others (symmetric~asymmetric). The fact that symmetry is the only possibility in 49 Arabic varieties leads to the following generalization:

\textit{Generalization 7: In modern Arabic varieties, the negative construction in standard negation is almost always symmetric.}

An example of this symmetry can be seen from comparing the following affirmatives to the negatives that follow them. Note that the only structural difference between affirmatives and negatives in the exemplified Arabic variety below is the presence of the negative marker(s).

\begin{equation}
\text{(140)} \quad \text{Muslim Baghdadi Arabic}
\end{equation}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. \textit{yiği}
\begin{verbatim}
come.IMPF.3MSG
\end{verbatim}
\end{itemize}

‘He comes.’
b. ma-yśūf

\texttt{NEG-see.IMPF.3MSG}

‘He does not see.’ \hfill (Erwin, 2004: 141)

\begin{align*}
(141) & \quad \text{Standard Maltese} \\
\text{a. smajt} & \quad \text{l-istorja} \quad \text{kollha} \\
\text{hear.PR.F.1SG} & \quad \text{DEF-story} \quad \text{whole} \\
& \quad \text{‘I heard the whole story.’} \\
\text{b. ma \, smajt-x} & \quad \text{l-istorja} \quad \text{kollha} \\
\text{NEG \, hear.PR.F.1SG-NEG.} & \quad \text{DEF-story} \quad \text{whole} \\
& \quad \text{‘I did not hear the whole story.’} \quad (\text{Borg \& Azzopardi-Alexander, 1997: 88})
\end{align*}

The only four Arabic varieties where the negative construction is symmetric–asymmetric are: Ḥassāniyya Arabic, Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic, Sahel/Tunis Arabic and ḌAbha Arabic. In Ḥassāniyya Arabic and Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic, asymmetric negation occurs with negative future clauses only because in negating these clauses the negator \textit{mā} must be accompanied by the relevant personal pronoun (NEG+PRO construction). This mandatory accompaniment presents another structural difference between future affirmatives and future negatives aside from the presence of the negative marker. As an example, compare the following affirmative future clauses to the negative future clauses:

\begin{align*}
(142) & \quad \text{Ḥassāniyya Arabic} \\
\text{a. lāhi} & \quad \text{nšuf-ak} \quad \text{iš-ṣubḥ} \\
\text{FUT} & \quad \text{go.IMPF.1SG-you.SG} \quad \text{DEF-morning} \\
& \quad \text{‘I will see you in the morning.’} \quad (\text{Francis, 1979: 100})
\end{align*}
In Sahel/Tunis Arabic, the asymmetry occurs with progressive and future clauses only. And similarly to the previous case, negation of these clauses entails an accompaniment between the relevant personal pronoun and the negative morpheme(s).

As an example, compare the following:

(144) Sahel/Tunis Arabic

a. nawāl (bāš) tṛī yudwa
   Nawal FUT come.IMPF.3FSG tomorrow
   ‘Nawal will not come tomorrow.’ (Halila, 1992: 37)

b. nawāl ma-hyā-š bāš tṛī
   Nawal NEG-she-NEG FUT come.IMPF.3FSG
   ‘Nawal is not coming.’ (Halila, 1992: 31)

Note, however, in Sahel/Tunis Arabic, there is an option to negate these clauses with miš which would result in symmetric negation as in the following:
(145) Sahel/Tunis Arabic

\[
\text{nawāl} \quad \text{miš} \quad \text{bāš} \quad \text{tžī}
\]
Nawal NEG FUT come.IMPF.3FSG

‘Nawal is not coming.’ (Halila, 1992: 31)

In ?Abha Arabic, when perfect clauses are negated by \textit{lim}, the negative construction is asymmetric as tense in affirmatives is marked on the verb but in negatives marked on this \textit{lim}. This different placement of the tense marker presents another structural difference between past affirmatives and past negatives, for example:

(146) ?Abha Arabic

a. \text{gāmatt} \quad \text{umm-ī}

\text{wake.PRF.3FSG} \quad \text{mother-me}

‘My mother woke up.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 84)

b. \text{lim} \quad \text{agūl} \quad \text{la-h}

\text{NEG.PST} \quad \text{tell.IMPF.1SG} \quad \text{to-him}

‘I did not tell him.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 141)

When present clauses are negated by the \textit{NEG+PRO} construction, the result is asymmetric negation as the pronoun is not used in affirmatives. Note, however, that two verbal negators in this variety can accompany the personal pronoun: \textit{mā} and \textit{lis}. In the following, (147)(a) is an affirmative clause to show the absence of the personal pronoun, where (147)(b) and (147)(c) are to exemplify the presence of the personal pronoun with both \textit{mā} and \textit{lis} respectively:
(147) ŠAbha Arabic

a. aʕrif ḥārat dirah
   know.IMPF.1SG area Dirah
   ‘I know the Dirah area.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 226)

b. mā hū yʕallī ḥadinn yḥākī-h
   NEG he let.IMPF.3MSG anyone talk.IMPF.3MSG-him
   ‘He does not let anyone talk to him.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 73)

c. lis-nī aʕrif dōlā l-banāt
   NEG-me know.IMPF.1SG these DEF-girls
   ‘I do not know these girls.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 56)

Finally, future clauses in ŠAbha Arabic are always negated asymmetrically. They can be negated by either lis+PRO or by lis alone. Both are exemplified below after the future affirmative clause in (148)(a).

(148) ŠAbha Arabic

a. bi-tṣāfir baʕdēn
   FUT-travel.IMPF.3FSG later
   ‘She will travel later.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 86)

b. lis-nī b-sāfir ða l-yōm
   NEG-me FUT-travel.IMPF.1SG this DEF-day
   ‘I am not going to travel today.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 142)

c. lis yiswī-h
   NEG.FUT fix.IMPF.3MSG-it
   ‘He will not fix it.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 142)
While in the first case, the accompaniment of the personal pronoun with *lis* is the structural difference, in the second case, the structural difference is the omission of the future marker *b*.

To summarize, then, the asymmetry in Standard Arabic occurs with *lam*, *lammā* and *lan*, and the reason is because these items not only negate the clause, but also indicate its aspect which is used to be inflected on the verb. In modern Arabic varieties, the asymmetry is either because of the use of the NEG+PRO construction or because of the use of *lim* and *lis*. The latter ones are observed in ʔAbha Arabic only as *lim* and *lis* are only used in this variety. *lim*, as mentioned before, is related to the Standard Arabic negator *lam* (see section 3.3), which can negate perfect aspect only.

(149) Standard Arabic

a. ʔakala ?aḥmad-u t-tuffāḥat-a
   eat.PRF.3MSG Ahmad-NOM DEF-apple-ACC
   ‘Ahmad ate the apple.’

b. lam yaʔkul ?aḥmad-u t-tuffāḥat-a
   NEG.PRF eat.IMPF.JUSS.3MSG Ahmad-NOM DEF-apple-ACC
   ‘Ahmad did not eat the apple.’

(Personal Knowledge)

Note here that in the negative clause *lam* encodes past tense instead of the verb doing so in the affirmative clause. This is similar to the use of *lim* in ʔAbha Arabic; *lim* is only compatible with a past interpretation and requires the verb to be imperfect rather than perfect. Therefore, it is not only this negator that is preserved in ʔAbha Arabic but also its grammatical function.

The second negator is *lis* which is also related to the Standard Arabic negator *laysa*. Similarly to *laysa* in Standard Arabic, it could negate imperfect verbs and be
inflected for person in this case. The question, however, is that if *lis* is etymologically related to *laysa* which is rarely used to negate imperfect verbs, how did it become capable of negating future clauses in ʔAbha Arabic. Part of the answer could be that in Arabic, the participial form of verbs may be used to refer to a future action or entails a progressive aspect interpretation. For example, in the following, *dāhib* is the participial form of the verb *dahab* ‘went’, and the clause in this example is non-verbal. Yet, as can be seen in the English translation, the clause can either be understood as occurring in the future or has progressive aspect interpretation.

(150) Standard Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>?anā</th>
<th>dāhib-un</th>
<th>ʔilā</th>
<th>al-madrasat-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>go.PTCP-NOM</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>DEF-school-GEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I will go to the school.’ Or ‘I am going to the school.’ *(Personal Knowledge)*

The above clause can be negated by *laysa; lastu* in this example since it has to be inflected for the first singular person. Note the future and the progressive interpretation are still in place.

(151) Standard Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lastu</th>
<th>dāhib-an</th>
<th>ʔilā</th>
<th>al-madrasat-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEG.1SG</td>
<td>go.PTCP-ACC</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>DEF-school-GEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I will not go to the school.’ Or ‘I am not going to the school.’ *(Personal Knowledge)*
This semantic ambiguity does not occur if the clause contains a time phrase item such as \( yad \) ‘tomorrow’ or \( l-\text{ʔān} \) ‘now’ as in (152); otherwise the semantic meaning can be determined from the context.

(152) Standard Arabic

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \quad \text{ʔanā} & \quad \text{dāhib-un} & \quad ?ilá & \quad \text{al-madrasat-i} & \quad \text{yad-an} \\
& \quad \text{I go.PTCP-NOM to} & \quad \text{DEF-school-GEN} & \quad \text{tomorrow-ACC} \\
& \quad \text{‘I will go to the school tomorrow.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
b. \quad \text{ʔanā} & \quad \text{dāhib-un} & \quad ?ilá & \quad \text{al-madrasat-i} & \quad \text{1-ʔān} \\
& \quad \text{I go.PTCP-NOM to} & \quad \text{DEF-school-GEN} & \quad \text{DEF-now} \\
& \quad \text{‘I am going to the school now.’} \quad \text{(Personal Knowledge)}
\end{align*}
\]

This future interpretation of a non-verbal clause that is negated by \( \text{laysa} \) could be the origin of the use of \( \text{lis} \) with future clauses in ?Abha Arabic. That is to say, \( \text{laysa} \) in Standard Arabic is mostly used with non-verbal clauses. Certain types of these clauses can refer to the future. Because of these non-verbal future clauses which can be negated by \( \text{laysa} \) in Standard Arabic, ?Abha Arabic speakers get the use of \( \text{lis} \) with verbal future clauses.

Finally, the reason which results in asymmetric negation in Ħassāniyya Arabic, Malian Ħassāniyya Arabic and Sahel/Tunis Arabic is that the verbal negator in these varieties could be accompanied by a personal pronoun in some cases as in (153) below.

(153) Malian Ħassāniyya Arabic

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NEG-he} & \quad \text{FUT} & \quad \text{fall} \\
\text{mā-hu} & \quad \text{lāhi} & \quad \text{yṭīh} \\
& \quad \text{He will not fall.’} \quad \text{(Heath, 2003: 114)}
\end{align*}
\]
However, this reason could be considered as a more temporary reason. It should disappear once the merger of the pronoun and the negative morpheme is completed. This expected merger is based on the similar cases found in many modern Arabic varieties. For instance, in Damascus Arabic (section 3.4.1.1.1), the merger of the negator ṣād and the pronoun hu results in ṣād. This, in turn, is viewed as a single negative morpheme that expresses negation symmetrically. Therefore, in Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic, for example, when ṣād-hu becomes, mu (or an item that is relatively similar), there will be no reason to classify negation of future tense clauses as asymmetric in this variety.

3.4.2 General remarks on the feature categorizations

Several overall points can be drawn from the feature categorizations. These points will be explained in two sections. In the first one, we discuss the type of negators and their placement in the clause. In the second one, we return to the use of ...-š in some modern Arabic varieties. We have already established that this ...-š is a result of going through Jespersen’s cycle; thus, here we discuss the progression of these modern Arabic varieties in this cycle.

3.4.2.1 Negators and their placement in the clause

As we have seen in section 3.3, negators used to express standard negation in Standard Arabic are: lam, lammā, lan, lā, ḍīn, mā and laysa. And we have seen that negators that are used for the same purpose in modern Arabic varieties are: mā, mā ...-š (or other variants such as ma ...-š or ma ...-šey), muš (or other variants such as miš), ...-š (or other variants such as ...-šey), lim, lis and the NEG+PRO construction. Accordingly, we can formulate the following generalization:
Generalization 8: The use of lammā, lan, lā and ṭin in standard negation is unattested in modern Arabic varieties.

Reflexes of lam and laysa are only attested in one variety only, ṭAbha Arabic. Therefore, we can also formulate the following:

Generalization 9: Reflexes of lam and laysa in standard negation is extremely rare in modern Arabic varieties.

Accordingly, mā, which could be paired with ...-š, seems to be the most Arabic negator that has survived in the modern varieties. One question could be asked here, why has this reduction in the number of negators occurred in Arabic in the first place? The answer could be for the sake of economy. Simply speaking, having one negative marker to express standard negation would be more economical than having seven markers for the same purpose. The question, then, is why is the chosen negator mā, not any other one? It could be because when speakers have a choice between seven items which express the same notion (standard negation), they might prefer choosing the most active one. In this sense, mā is the most active negator. That is to say, in Table 8 above, lam and lammā negate perfect clauses only; lā negates imperfect clauses only; lan negates future clauses only; laysa rarely negates imperfect clauses; and finally, ṭin and mā negate both perfect and imperfect clauses. Thus, unlike the others, ṭin and mā may be more practical as they can negate more than one type of clauses. However, ṭin is already rarely used in Standard Arabic. This makes mā the most eligible tool to be chosen if speakers are being economical.
Perhaps it is worth noting in this context that the vowel in \( mā \) may be shortened in the modern varieties. In fact, this seems to be very common in rapid speech, compare the following:

(154) Ḥagil Arabic

a. \( mā \)  ydāwim

\( \text{NEG} \) attend.work.IMPF.3MSG

‘He does not go to work.’

b. \( mā \)  ydāwim

\( \text{NEG} \) attend.work.IMPF.3MSG

‘He does not go to work.’ (Fieldwork data)

The placement of the negative morpheme is another point to be noticed. In Standard Arabic, whether the negative morpheme is \( mā \) or any other one, it is always placed immediately before the verb.

(155) Standard Arabic

\( mā \)  saʔala ʔahmad-u χālid-an

\( \text{NEG} \) ask.PRF.3MSG Ahmad-NOM Khaled-ACC

‘Ahmad did not ask Khaled’ (Personal Knowledge)

In modern Arabic varieties, the case is different since negation here could be single, bipartite or single~bipartite. If the negator is a single morpheme, other than ...-š
and its variants, then it is mostly placed before the verb or prefixed to it if this negator has become an affix.\textsuperscript{43}

(156) Christian Baghdadi Arabic

\begin{tabular}{lll}
\text{mā} & tʕallamtu & mōšēqa \\
\text{NEG} & learn.PRF.1SG & music \\
\end{tabular}

‘I did not learn music.’ \textsuperscript{(Abu-Haidar, 1991: 129)}

(157) Aley Arabic

\begin{tabular}{lll}
\text{miš} & ʕabiktub & maktūb \\
\text{NEG} & write.IMPF.1SG & letter \\
\end{tabular}

‘I am not writing a letter.’ \textsuperscript{(Bishr, 1956: 46)}

Note that in the Aley Arabic example, the negator is \textit{miš}, not \textit{mā}. This is to assert the fact that any single negator, other than …-š, is mostly placed pre-verbally.

In contrast, when the single morpheme is …-š (or its variants), it is always, without exception, suffixed to the verb (post-verbal).

(158) Palestinian Arabic

\begin{tabular}{lll}
\text{(ana)} & baḥibb-iš & il-fūl \\
I & like.IMPF.1SG-NEG & DEF-fava beans \\
\end{tabular}

‘I do not like fava beans.’ \textsuperscript{(Lucas, 2009: 244)}

\textsuperscript{43} The exception to this is when the NEG+PRO construction is used as in Ḥassāniyya and Malian Ḥassāniyya.

\begin{tabular}{lll}
\text{mā-hu} & lāhi & yṯiḥ \\
\text{NEG-he} & FUT & fall \\
\end{tabular}

‘He will not fall.’ \textsuperscript{(Heath, 2003: 114)}
When the negation is bipartite, usually the two parts sandwich the verb.

(160) Northern Jordanian Arabic

ma-zār-iš el-batra
NEG-visit.PRF.3MSG-NEG DEF-Petra

‘He did not visit Petra.’ (Alqassas, 2015: 102)

Note, however, that the suffixation of...-š to the verb follows any direct or indirect object clitics that might be attached to the verb as in:

(161) Baskinta Arabic

ʔimm-i ma ūallamit-nī-š šīyl is-sinnāra
mother-me NEG teach.PRF.3FSG-me-NEG work DEF-crochet

‘My mother did not teach me how to crochet.’ (Abu-Haidar, 1979: 109)

Also note that, in some varieties such as in Sahel/Tunis Arabic below ma-.......-š can sandwich the personal pronoun, but this is very common in non-verbal negation as we will see in section 4.3.
(162) Sahel/Tunis Arabic

\[ \text{nawāl} \quad \text{ma-hyā-š} \quad \text{taqra} \quad \text{fi} \quad \text{ktāb} \]

Nawal \quad \text{NEG-she-NEG} \quad \text{read. IMPF.3SG} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{book}

‘Nawal is not reading a book.’ \quad \text{(Halila, 1992: 31)}

With this in mind on the placement of the negator(s), the following may be proposed:

*Generalization 10: In standard negation, the negative morpheme(s) mostly occur(s) adjacent to the verb.*

The previous generalization holds true unless the clause contains an auxiliary verb. In Standard Arabic, \text{mā} comes before the auxiliary verb instead of being coming before the main verb.

(163) Standard Arabic

\[ \text{mā} \quad \text{kān} \quad \text{yasʔal-u} \quad \text{?ʔahmad-u} \quad \text{ʔālid-an} \]

NEG \quad \text{was} \quad \text{ask.IMPF.3MSG-IND} \quad \text{Ahmad-NOM} \quad \text{Khaled-ACC}

‘Ahmad was not asking Khaled’ \quad \text{(Personal Knowledge)}

In the modern varieties of Arabic, mostly when negation is single, the negator comes before the auxiliary, and when negation is bipartite the negators sandwich this auxiliary. This is based on data from 10 varieties only as data on negative clauses
containing an auxiliary verb is not found in the others.\textsuperscript{44} The following represent the phenomenon in single and bipartite negation, respectively:

(164) Madinah Arabic

\begin{tabular}{llllll}
mā & kān & yaktub & ?ahmād & risālah \\
NEG & was.PRF.3MSG & write.IMPF.3MSG & Ahmad & letter \\
\end{tabular}

‘Ahmad was not writing a letter.’ \textit{(Personal knowledge)}

(165) Western Libyan Arabic

\begin{tabular}{llllll}
l-awlād & ma-kanū-š & yālšbū & fi & l-madrsa \\
DEF-boy.PL & NEG-be.PRF.3PL-NEG & play.IMPF.3PL & in & DEF-school \\
\end{tabular}

‘The boys were not playing the school.’ \textit{(Krer, 2013: 76)}

In al-ʔAḥsā' Arabic and in Northern Jordanian Arabic, the case is slightly different. In al-ʔAḥsā' Arabic, negation is single and the negative morpheme can either be placed before or after the auxiliary verb; however, this different placement seems to have no semantic implications.

(166) al-ʔAḥsā' Arabic

\begin{description}
\item[a.] \begin{tabular}{llllll}
?ahmād & mā & kān & yākil \\
Ahmad & NEG & was & eat.IMPF.3MSG \\
\end{tabular}

‘Ahmad was not eating.’

\item[b.] \begin{tabular}{llllll}
?ahmād & kān & mā & yākil \\
Ahmad & was & NEG & eat.IMPF.3MSG \\
\end{tabular}

‘Ahmad was not eating.’ \textit{(Fieldwork data)}
\end{description}

\textsuperscript{44} These ten varieties are Northern Jordanian Arabic, Western Libyan Arabic, Standard Maltese, Moroccan Arabic, al-Bāḥa Arabic, al-ʔAḥsā' Arabic, Ḥagil Arabic, Madinah Arabic, Yanbu' Arabic and ʕUnayzah Arabic.
In Northern Jordanian Arabic, on the other hand, the bipartite negator can either sandwich the auxiliary or the main verb. Unlike al-ʔAḥsāʾ Arabic, the different placement may have some impact of the meaning of the clause as suggested by Alqassas (2015). The different meaning can be seen in the English translation of the following:

(167) Northern Jordanian Arabic

a. ma-kunt-iš albas badleḥ
   NEG-was.1SG-NEG wear.IMPF.1SG suit
   ‘I used not to wear a suit.’ (Although I was supposed to do so)

b. kunt ma-albas-iš badleḥ
   NEG-was.1SG-NEG wear.IMPF.1SG suit
   ‘I did not use to wear a suit.’ (Alqassas, 2015: 114)

After these remarks on negators and their placement in the clause, we now turn to the progression of the š-varieties in Jespersen’s cycle.

3.4.2.2 The progression of the modern Arabic varieties in Jespersen’s cycle

The final point that needs to be made regarding the feature categorizations concerns the progression of some modern Arabic varieties through Jespersen’s cycle. But first we should recall Diem’s analysis outlined in section 1.4, on the relatively advanced position of Cairene Arabic in the cycle. According to Diem, negation in Palestinian Arabic is a good example of Jespersen’s cycle as explained by Dahl (1979) (pre-verbal > bipartite > post-verbal), whereas negation in Cairene Arabic may be “more cyclic in the strict sense of the word….” (Diem, 2014: 99–100). That is, in Cairene Arabic, the cycle results in a new negator (miš), which is used pre-verbally. According to Diem then, stage II in the cycle can go in two directions: to strictly pre-verbal negation, or to strictly post-verbal
negation. However, in some varieties such as Palestinian Arabic, we can find both: the post-verbal negation and the pre-verbal \textit{miš}. Therefore, the pre-verbal negation (\textit{miš}) could be considered as a further development in Palestinian Arabic. Let us call it for now stage IV. In other words, the cycle would be pre-verbal > bipartite > post-verbal > pre-verbal. In this sense, the negator in stage I would be the pre-verbal \textit{mā}; in stage II the bipartite \textit{mā.....-š}; in stage III the post-verbal \textit{.....-š}; and finally in stage IV the pre-verbal \textit{miš}. Note that the negators in stage I and stage IV are different, but their place is the same (pre-verbal). In stage I, the negator is the original Arabic negator \textit{mā}, but in stage IV it is \textit{miš}.\(^45\) In this paper, however, we adopt different analysis from this one to explain the use of \textit{miš}, but let us first explore which Arabic varieties use it. In Table 15, all the \textit{š}-varieties are listed and the stage which they have reached in the cycle is given. This is based on the four stages analysis.

\textbf{Table 15:} The progress of modern Arabic varieties in Jespersen’s cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The stage in Jespersen’s cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annaba Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dellys Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Maghrebi</td>
<td>Sfax Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sousse Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Maltese</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{45}\) As will be explained shortly, the phonological shape of this \textit{miš} could be different depending on the variety.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sahel/Tunis Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Biyyāḏī and Axrasī Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Smēšnī and ǦGēlī Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.TRUE Ara Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Egyptian western desert Ara</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Şafīḍī Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>al-ČArīš Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>as-Salṭ Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Northern Jordanian Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Aley Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Baskinta Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sana’a Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Adeni Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Taiz Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Zinġibār Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this table, a variety is considered to be stage II if *mā ... -š* can, at least, be used with some clauses in standard negation; considered to be stage III if ...-š can, at least, be used with some clauses in standard negation; and finally considered to be stage IV if *mīš*
can, at least, be used with some clauses in standard negation. There are many varieties where more than one stage can be found. In Palestinian Arabic, for instance, all the negative strategies of the four stages can be observed simultaneously (the pre-verbal mā, the bipartite mā-...-š, the post-verbal -...-š and the pre-verbal muš). In (168), each one of them is exemplified, respectively:

(168) Palestinian Arabic

a. mā  riḏi  yuskut

\[\text{NEG agree.PRF.3MSG shut up.IMPF.3MSG}\]

‘He refused to shut up.’ (Lit. ‘He did not agree to shut up.’) (Seeger, 1996: 36)

b. mā  akalt-iš

\[\text{NEG eat.PRF.1SG-NEG}\]

‘I did not eat.’ (Lucas, 2010: 173)

c. (ana)  baḥibb-iš  il-fūl

\[\text{I like.IMPF.1SG-NEG DEF-fava beans}\]

‘I do not like fava beans.’ (Lucas, 2009: 244)

d. muš  rāḥ  yuktob

\[\text{NEG FUT write.IMPF.3MSG}\]

‘He is not going to write.’ (Rosenhouse, 2011)

We have seen the progression of every š-variety in the cycle, and now let us determine which one of them is the most advanced one in this regard. Logically speaking, it is going to be one of the stage IV varieties. In Table 16 below, all of the Arabic varieties where stage IV seems to be reached are listed. As mentioned above, the phonological shape of the negator used in stage IV differs from one variety to another; thus, the negator used in each variety is given as well as the type of clauses this negator can operate with.
However, the available data for Northern Jordanian Arabic shows the use of *miš* with future clauses only but not with progressive aspect clauses. In contrast, the available data for Aley Arabic and Baskinta Arabic shows the use of the same negator with progressive aspect clauses but not with future clauses. However, these three varieties are spoken in relatively adjacent areas and their negative patterns seem to be similar. Thus, it is assumed that progressive aspect and future clauses in these three varieties are negated by *miš*, even though there is no available data to show the use of *miš* with progressive aspect clauses in Northern Jordanian Arabic nor there is available data to show the use of this negator with future clauses in Aley Arabic and Baskinta Arabic,
Table 16: Stage IV varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Stage IV negator</th>
<th>Type of the negated clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Zinġibār Arabic</td>
<td>miš (or mišā and māšā)</td>
<td>The only morpheme to negate for all type of clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>al-ＳArīš Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>Negates future clauses only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>Always negates future clauses and optionally may be used instead of ma........-š to negate non-future clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Northern Jordanian Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>Negates future and progressive clauses only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Aley Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>Negates future and progressive clauses only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Baskinta Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>Negates future and progressive clauses only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Western Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>Negates future clauses only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Standard Maltese</td>
<td>mhux</td>
<td>Negates future clauses only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td>muš</td>
<td>Negates future and progressive clauses only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sahel/Tunis Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>Negates future and progressive clauses only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this table, the stage IV negator seems to be able to negate all types of clauses in Zinġibār Arabic and in Cairene Arabic only. However, while in Zinġibār Arabic, this negator is the only one used for all types of clauses, in Cairene Arabic, it is used beside
In the latter, future clauses are only negated by this stage IV negator whereas other types of clauses can be negated either by this negator or by *ma.....-š*. Accordingly, Cairene Arabic may not have reached stage IV completely, whereas Zinjibār Arabic has. This means Zinjibār Arabic is more advanced than Cairene Arabic. In fact, it is more advanced than any documented Arabic variety in this regard. Among the other stage IV varieties, the negator in question is not even used with every clause, only with future or progressive aspect clauses.

However, the advancement of Zinjibār Arabic here should not be perceived as a contradiction to the advancement of Eastern Libyan Arabic discussed in 3.4.1.2 where the bipartite negative strategy has been generalized to negate every clause including the emphasized ones. Eastern Libyan Arabic is still considered more advanced than Zinjibār Arabic in this regard. In Zinjibār Arabic, even when negation seems to be reaching stage IV, *...-š* is omitted in emphatic negation as in (169).

(169) Zinjibār Arabic

a. wallah ma qūm men maḥall-in
   by-God NEG stand.IMPF.1SG from place-my
   ‘I swear By God that I will not leave my place.’

b. ʕumr-h ma zār qaryat-na
   ever-him NEG visit.PRF.3MSG village-our
   ‘He has never visited our village.’ (Ahmed, 2012: 45)

The previous analysis is one way of approaching this topic. Another way, which could be more accurate, is to view what has been called stage IV negator as a result of a separate development in negation. That is to say, as we will see in section 4.3, modern Arabic varieties tend overwhelmingly to express non-verbal negation by the use of a
NEG+PRO construction. This seems to be the case whether the Arabic variety is affected by Jespersen’s cycle or not. Consider the following non-verbal clauses from Yanbuʕ Arabic, where Jespersen’s cycle is not observed, and Sahel/Tunis Arabic, where the cycle is observed:

(170) Yanbuʕ Arabic

mā-hu  ċakki

NEG.3MSG  smart.MSG

‘He is not smart.’  (Fieldwork data)

(171) Sahel/Tunis Arabic

nawāl  ma-hyā-š  firhāna

Nawal  NEG-she-NEG  happy

‘Nawal is not happy.’  (Halila, 1992: 42)

In many cases, as well, the third singular masculine personal pronoun hu ‘he’ is chosen and fused with the verbal negator in the variety in question, which in turn, comes to be generalized to negate any non-verbal clause. However, as can be expected, the morpheme that results from this fusion differs considerably depending on whether the variety is going through Jespersen’s cycle or not. In Yanbuʕ Arabic, for example, Jespersen’s cycle is not observed; thus, when the verbal negator mā is fused with hu ‘he’, the result is mū. On the other hand, in Sahel/Tunis Arabic, Jespersen’s cycle is observed; thus, when the verbal negator mā......-š is fused with hu, the result is miš. Both cases are exemplified below, respectively:
(172) Yanbu' Arabic

mu  δaki
NEG  smart.MSG

‘He is not smart.’  
(Fieldwork data)

(173) Sahel/Tunis Arabic

nawāl  miš  fīrḥāna
Nawal  NEG  happy

‘Nawal is not happy.’  
(Halila, 1992: 42)

In many modern Arabic varieties, the new morpheme of this fusion spreads into standard negation. Damascus Arabic below is an example of a variety where Jespersen’s cycle is not observed; hence, the new coined morpheme is mū which can negate future or progressive aspect clauses. In contrast, Northern Jordanian Arabic is a variety where Jespersen’s cycle has occurred; therefore, the coined morpheme is miš which can also negate future clauses. In the following, the use of this new morpheme in each variety is exemplified, once with a non-verbal clause and once with a verbal one.

(174) Damascus Arabic

a. hal  ḥaki  ḥāda  mū  ḥalu
that  talk  this  NEG  nice

‘That (kind of) talk is not nice.’  
(Cowell, 2005: 386)

b. mū  ʕam-yāštāl  halla?
NEG  PRG-work.IMPF.3MSG  now

‘He is not working now.’  
(Cowell, 2005: 387)
(175) Northern Jordanian Arabic

a. ʔana miš χaddām-ak
I NEG servant-your

‘I am not your servant.’

b. miš ḫa-yisāfīr
NEG FUT-travel.IMPF.3MSG

‘He will not make the journey.’

(Haija, 1985: 10)

The extension of the use of this new morpheme into standard negation may start with future or progressive aspect clauses. In other words, when this new morpheme is used in standard negation, it is probably first used to negate future or progressive aspect clauses. To explain this, let us first recall the stage IV varieties in Table 16 where this new morpheme is found. From this table, we see that in 8 out of these 10 stage IV varieties, the new morpheme is only used with future or progressive aspect clauses.\(^{46}\) In Zinğıbār Arabic and Cairene Arabic only, the new morpheme can negate any type of clause. However, in Zinğıbār Arabic, this new negator is the only one used, but in Cairene Arabic it is the only possible one to negate future clauses while other types of clauses can be negated by either this new morpheme or by ma……-š. Therefore, because of the tendency in the use of this new morpheme in negating future and progressive clauses only in 8 out of the 10 varieties, it is assumed that this morpheme tends to be used with such clauses first, and because of the case in Cairene Arabic where future clauses are only negated by this morpheme while other clauses are possibly negated in the same way, it is assumed that this morpheme is gradually generalized in standard negation. Finally, because this new morpheme is used to negate all types of clauses in Zinğıbār Arabic, it is

\(^{46}\) These 8 varieties are al-ʕArīš Arabic, Northern Jordanian Arabic, Aley Arabic, Baskinta Arabic, Western Libyan Arabic, Standard Maltese, Palestinian Arabic and Sahel/Tunis Arabic.
assumed that the generalization of the use of this morpheme in standard negation is a point modern Arabic varieties are potentially heading to. Note that this analysis is based on 10 varieties only, the varieties we use to consider above as varieties of stage IV in Jespersen’s cycle. However, if we consider other varieties where Jespersen’s cycle is not observed, we find the same tendency of using the new negative morpheme with future or progressive clauses only. In Damascus Arabic, for example, the new morpheme resulting from the fusion of the personal pronoun and the verbal negator is mū. This morpheme is used with non-verbal clauses in Damascus, for example:

\[(176)\] Damascus Arabic

```
hal ḥaki hāda mū ḥolu
that talk this NEG nice
```

‘That (kind of) talk is not nice.’

(Cowell, 2005: 386)

In standard negation, this mū is used optionally in place of mā to negate future and progressive aspect clauses as in (177), the first two clauses are progressive and the other two are future.

\[(177)\] Damascus Arabic

a. ḥaḇū-k mā ḥam-yākol

father-your NEG PRG-eat.IMPF.3MSG

‘Your father is not eating.’

(Cowell, 2005: 384)

b. mū ḥam-yāšṯəl halla?

NEG PRG-work.IMPF.3MSG now

‘He is not working now.’

(Cowell, 2005: 387)
The question, then, is why there is a tendency of using the new morpheme with future and progressive aspect clauses first. The rationale could be similar to the aforementioned one for the use of lis+PRO in ?Abha Arabic in section 3.4.1.3. That is to say, certain non-verbal clauses (containing the participial form of the verb) in Arabic may be interpreted as future tense or as progressive aspect clauses. This relationship between the participial non-verbal clauses and future/progressive aspect clauses could be the reason why both clauses tend to be negated in the same fashion. Another factor could be that in many modern Arabic varieties, the progressive aspect marker ʕam- and the future tense marker rah/ha, etc., are derived, respectively, from the participle ʕammāl ‘doing’ and the participle rāyiḥ ‘going’. This may give some non-verbal properties to these clauses. Therefore, they tend to be the first clauses negated by the non-verbal negative strategy.

If this is true, then one can propose the following stages to capture this development of negation in modern Arabic varieties. For ease of reference, this development will be called the Arabic negative cycle in which the new morpheme resulting from the fusion is called a mū~miš morpheme because commonly the phonological shape of this new morpheme is found to be either mū or miš.47

47 Note that this proposed cycle is not the same as Croft's cycle, which Wilmsen (2014) claims to identify in the historical developments of Arabic negation, because the cycle proposed here makes no reference to (negated) existential verbs—a crucial element of Croft's cycle. For more information on problems with Wilmsen's (2014) proposals, see Lucas (forthcoming).
Figure 2: The Arabic negative cycle

In the first stage, an Arabic negator, mostly $mā$, is used to negate both verbal and non-verbal clauses. This is the case in some of the Sudanic varieties as we will see in 4.3.1.3. In the second stage, the verbal negator is attached to a personal pronoun that agrees with the subject of the non-verbal clause in person, number and gender (NEG+PRO construction) to express non-verbal negation. In the third stage, a new single morpheme is coined mostly, but not necessarily always as we will see with some varieties in 4.3, as a result of fusing the verbal negator with the third singular masculine pronoun resulting in what we will refer to in this thesis as $mū~miš$ morpheme. This $mū~miš$ morpheme is in turn generalized to negate any non-verbal clause. In the fourth stage, this $mū~miš$ morpheme negates future and progressive aspect clauses. Finally, the $mū~miš$ morpheme can negate both verbal and non-verbal clauses of all kinds. Note that this
development is called a cycle because, in the final stage, verbal and non-verbal clauses return to a point similar to the one they have started from, which is being negated in the same fashion.

Viewing the evolution of Arabic negation in this way resolves a problem that arises from viewing Jespersen’s cycle as four rather than three stages. In Table 16 above, we have seen the stage that every Arabic variety seems to have reached in Jespersen’s cycle based on the four stages proposal. We have also seen that in many Arabic varieties where the cycle has occurred, there is an overlap between these four stages as in Palestinian Arabic. In this variety, the pre-verbal mā (stage I), the bipartite mā⋯⋯-š (stage II), the post-verbal ...
...-š (stage III) and the pre-verbal muš (stage IV) are all attested. In other Arabic varieties, however, one might find the pre-verbal mā (stage I), the bipartite mā⋯⋯-š (stage II) and the pre-verbal muš (stage IV) only, with stage III (negation with the post-verbal ...
...-š only) not being observed. This is the case, for example, in Standard Maltese, Western Libyan Arabic, Cairene Arabic and others. In these cases, the third stage is skipped. If we adopt, however, the Arabic negative cycle illustrated in Figure 2, there will be no skipping. Varieties such as Standard Maltese, Western Libyan Arabic and Cairene Arabic are still at stage II, as the use of miš in these varieties is a result of another development in negation, namely what we call here the Arabic negative cycle.

In section 4.3, the stage of every modern Arabic variety considered in this study regarding this Arabic negative cycle will be given. That is, there are some stages in this cycle concerned with non-verbal negation; thus, the placement of the modern Arabic varieties cannot be determined until we examine how non-verbal negation in these varieties is done.

In the following section, a different categorization of modern Arabic varieties is proposed. This categorization is geographical. The reason for this is to explain the variations in the way standard negation is expressed among varieties of the same region.
3.4.3 Geographical Categorization

As mentioned in various places above, the modern Arabic varieties can be divided into seven categories based on their geographical areas: Maghrebi, Egyptian, Sudanic, Levantine, Mesopotamian, Arabian Peninsula and Yemeni. Varieties of each area are discussed below. After showing the variations in negation between varieties of the same region, general remarks based on this categorization are discussed.

3.4.3.1 Maghrebi

In the Maghrebi region, all of the previously mentioned negative strategies (single, bipartite and single~bipartite) can be found. This is based on the 11 Maghrebi varieties included in the study as shown in Table 17 below.
Table 17: Standard negation in the Maghrebi varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The negative strategy</th>
<th>The negative morpheme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ḥassāniyya Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>ma and ma + PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>mā and ma + PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Annaba Arabic</td>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>mā……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Dellys Arabic</td>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Sfax Arabic</td>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sousse Arabic</td>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Eastern Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Standard Maltese</td>
<td>Single~bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-x and mhx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Western Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>Single~bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š and miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Sahel/Tunis Arabic</td>
<td>Single~bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š, miš and ma-PRO-š</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The single negation is found in the south, more specifically in Ḥassāniyya Arabic and Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic, and can done either by mā or mā+PRO, e.g.:

(178) Ḥassāniyya Arabic
a. ma tkallamt
   NEG speak.PRF.1SG
   ‘I did not speak.’ (Francis, 1979: 111)
b. mā-ni lāhi nimši

NEG-me FUT go.IMPF.1SG

‘I will not go.’  (Francis, 1979: 99)

In the north of this region, the negative ...-š appears and here both strategies bipartite and single–bipartite are found. In Moroccan Arabic, Annaba Arabic, Dellys Arabic, Sfax Arabic, Sousse Arabic and Eastern Libyan Arabic, the observed strategy is the bipartite strategy only as in:

(179) Sfax Arabic

ma-kammilt-š

NEG-finish.PRF.1SG-NEG

‘I have not finished.’  (Bahloul, 1996: 74)

In Standard Maltese, Western Libyan Arabic and Sahel/Tunis Arabic, the observed strategy is single–bipartite. In Standard Maltese and Western Libyan Arabic, the situation is identical; the bipartite morpheme negates non-future clauses as in (180) and the single one negates future clauses as in (181).

(180) Western Libyan Arabic

l-awlād ma-mšū-š lī-l-madrsa

DEF-boy.PL NEG-go.PRF.3PL-NEG to-DEF-school

‘The boys did not go to the school.’  (Krer, 2013: 75)
In Sahel/Tunis Arabic, the situation is almost similar to the previous one. The future/non-future division is observed, and negation is expressed in the same fashion (bipartite with non-future clauses and single with future clauses). However, more data in Sahel/Tunis Arabic is found which shows that the division also applies to progressive and non-progressive clauses. That is to say, non-future and non-progressive clauses in this variety are negated by *ma*...-š, but future and progressive clauses are negated by either *miš* or by the NEG+PRO construction as in (182).

(182) Sahel/Tunis Arabic

a. nawāl  miš  bāš  tžī

Nawal  NEG  FUT  come.IMPF.3FSG

‘Nawal is not coming.’

b. nawāl  ma-hyā-š  bāš  tžī

Nawal  NEG-she-NEG  FUT  come.IMPF.3FSG

‘Nawal is not coming.’  (Halila, 1992: 31)

3.4.3.2 Egyptian

From this region, 10 varieties are considered. Similarly to the case in the Maghrebi region, all three negatives strategies can also be found in Egypt, as in Table 18.
Table 18: Standard negation in the Egyptian varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The negative strategy</th>
<th>The negative morpheme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Muzēnah and Banī Wāṣil Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>mā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southern Sinai Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>mā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northwestern Sinai Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>mā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Biyyāḏī and Aḥrasī Arabic</td>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>ma……..š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Smēnīi and ʿGēlī Arabic</td>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>ma……..š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ṭuwara Arabic</td>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>ma……..š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ṣaṣīdī Arabic</td>
<td>Single~bipartite</td>
<td>ma……..šey and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>….-šey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Egyptian western desert Arabic</td>
<td>Single~bipartite</td>
<td>mā…….. š and mā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td>Single~bipartite</td>
<td>ma……..š and miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>al-ʿArīš Arabic</td>
<td>Single~bipartite</td>
<td>ma…….-š(i) and miš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The single strategy is a characteristic of three Egyptian varieties: Muzēnah and Banī Wāṣil Arabic, Southern Sinai Arabic and Northwestern Sinai Arabic. All of them are spoken in Sinai, and mā is the only possible negator in all of them, for example:

(183) Northwestern Sinai Arabic

mā šift-ih

NEG see.PRF.1SG-him

‘I did not see him.’

(de Jong, 2000: 244)
Bipartite negation is a characteristic of another three varieties: Biyyādī and Aχrasī Arabic, Smēnī and ʿGēlī Arabic and Ṭuwara Arabic. This is based on the available data for these three varieties. All of them are spoken in Sinai as well, and the negator used here is ma……-š (184).

(184) Ṭuwara Arabic

ma naṣraf-ha-š
NEG know.IMPF.1.PL-her-NEG

‘We do not know her.’ (de Jong, 2011: 101)

The single–bipartite negation is characteristic of four varieties: Saʿidī Arabic, Egyptian western desert Arabic, Cairene Arabic and al-ʿArīš Arabic. In Egyptian western desert Arabic and in Saʿidī Arabic, it seems that speakers can freely choose between using the single or the bipartite negative strategy, e.g.:

(185) Egyptian western desert Arabic

a. mā gā-š
NEG come.PRF.3MSG-NEG

‘He did not come.’ (Maṭar, 1981: 183)

b. ir-rāgil mā ẓaṭā min ẓabar
DEF-man NEG give.PRF.3MSG from new.PL

‘The man did not report any news.’ (Lit. ‘The man did not give any news.’) (Maṭar, 1981: 183)

---

48 Note Maṭar (1981) is written in Arabic; thus, the examples here are my own transcription.
(186) Ṣaṣīdī Arabic

a. l-kalb ma ḥaṣṣal-šī l-ṣaḍma
   DEF-dog NEG reach.PRF.3MSG-NEG DEF-bone
   ‘The dog did not reach the bone.’ (Khalafallah, 1969: 101-102)

b. l-kalb ḥaṣṣal-šī l-ṣaḍma
   DEF-dog reach.PRF.3MSG-NEG DEF-bone
   ‘The dog did not reach the bone.’ (Khalafallah, 1969: 101-102)

In al-ṢArīš Arabic, the single strategy seems to be used with future clauses only, while the bipartite one is used with non-future clauses as in:

(187) al-ṢArīš Arabic

a. ma ġat-š
   NEG come.PRF.3FSG-NEG
   ‘She did not come.’

b. miš ha-tnām
   NEG FUT-sleep.IMPF.2SG
   ‘You will not sleep.’ (de Jong, 2000: 526)

Finally, in Cairene Arabic, both the bipartite strategy and the single one can occur with non-future clauses, for example:

(188) Cairene Arabic

a. ma-biḥhibb-iš il-ḥaflāt
   NEG-like.IMPF.3MSG-NEG DEF-party.PL
   ‘He does not like parties.’
b. miš biyḥibb il-ḥaflāt

\begin{align*}
\text{NEG} & \quad \text{like.IMPF.3MSG} & \quad \text{DEF-party.PL} \\
\text{‘He does not like parties.’} & \quad (\text{Gary & Gamal-Eldin, 1982: 39})
\end{align*}

However, with future clauses, only miš is possible, e.g.:

(189) Cairene Arabic

\begin{align*}
\text{miš} & \quad ḥa-ṭigi & \quad \text{bukra} \\
\text{NEG} & \quad \text{FUT-come.IMPF.3FSG} & \quad \text{tomorrow} \\
\text{‘She is not going to come tomorrow’} & \quad (\text{Gary & Gamal-Eldin, 1982: 39})
\end{align*}

3.4.3.3 Sudanic

In this region, only single negation is found, and the negator used is always mā. This is according to four varieties form this region: Eastern Nigeria Arabic, Western Nigeria Arabic, Sudanese Arabic and Largeau Arabic (Table 19).

Table 19: Standard negation in the Sudanic varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The negative strategy</th>
<th>The negative morpheme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Eastern Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Western Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sudanese Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>mā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Largeau Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>mā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following exemplify the way negation is rendered in the Sudanic region.
(190) Eastern Nigeria Arabic

ana ma šift ar-rāḡl da

I NEG see.PRF.1SG DEF-man this

‘I did not see the man.’ (Owens, 1993: 173)

3.4.3.4 Levantine

In this region, negation is either single or single–bipartite. This is based on the 8 Levantine Arabic varieties considered in the study (Table 20).

Table 20: Standard negation in the Levantine varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The negative strategy</th>
<th>The negative morpheme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>al-Karak Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ʕAtīż Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>mā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Damascus Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>mā and mū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Northern Jordanian Arabic</td>
<td>Single–bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š, ...-š and miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>as-Salṭ Arabic</td>
<td>Single–bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š, ...-š and mā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Aley Arabic</td>
<td>Single–bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š, ...-š, miš and ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Baskinta Arabic</td>
<td>Single–bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š, ...-š and miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td>Single–bipartite</td>
<td>mā……-š, ...-š, mā and muš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In al-Karak Arabic, ʕAtīż Arabic and Damascus Arabic, negation is single. The negative morpheme here is mā. However, unlike the case in al-Karak Arabic and ʕAtīż
Arabic where no data is available on how future and progressive aspect clauses are negated, in Damascus Arabic, such clauses can be negated by either \( mā \) or \( mū \). (191) below is to exemplify the use of \( mā \) and (192) is to exemplify \( mū \) in Damascus Arabic.

(191) ʕAṭfž Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{l}
gabl & \text{al-badu} & mā & \text{tsāwi} & ċišič \\
\text{before} & \text{DEF-Bedouins} & \text{NEG} & \text{do.IMPF.3MPL} & ċišič \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Before, the Bedouins did not do ċišič.’  
(Younes & Herin, 2016)

(192) Damascus Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{l}
mū & \text{ʕam-yəštæl} & \text{halla?} \\
\text{NEG} & \text{PRG-work.IMPF.3MSG} & \text{now} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘He is not working now.’  
(Cowell, 2005: 387)

In Northern Jordanian Arabic, as-Salṭ Arabic, Aley Arabic, Baskinta Arabic and Palestinian Arabic, negation is single–bipartite. The bipartite negator in all of them, as well as in any Arabic variety where bipartite negation is found, is \( ma------\-š \).

(193) Palestinian Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{l}
mā & \text{akalt-īš} \\
\text{NEG} & \text{eat.PRF.1SG-NEG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I did not eat.’  
(Lucas, 2010: 173)

The single negator, however, differs considerably. It is \( miš \) in Northern Jordanian Arabic; \( ...\-š \) and \( mā \) in as-Salṭ Arabic; \( ...\-š, miš \) and \( ma \) in Aley Arabic; \( ...\-š \) and \( miš \) in Baskinta Arabic; and finally \( ...\-š, mā \) and \( muš \) in Palestinian Arabic. Wherever, the \( miš \) (or \( muš \) as
in Palestine) is found in this region, it is only used with either future or progressive aspect clauses, for example:

(194) Northern Jordanian Arabic

\[
\text{miš ū-\text{yisāfīr}}
\]

NEG FUT-travel.IMPF.3MSG

‘He will not making the journey.’

(Haija, 1985: 10)

(195) Baskinta Arabic

\[
\text{miš ū-an-\text{yiḥki maṣ-i baʔa}}
\]

NEG PRG-talk.IMPF.3MSG with-me anymore

‘He is not talking to me anymore.’

(Abu-Haidar, 1979: 109)

Wherever the ...-\text{s} is found, it is used optionally with the other verbal negators in the variety to negate \text{b}-imperfect verbs only, for example:

(196) Aley Arabic

\[
\text{baṣrif-\text{s bayy-ak}}
\]

know.PRF.1SG-NEG father-your

‘I do not know your father.’

(Bishr, 1956: 46)

Finally, wherever \text{mā} is found in this region, it is mostly used optionally with the other verbal negators in the variety to negate non-future clauses as in the following:
as-Salṭ Arabic

\[\text{tab\'an ma ylāgī-š ǧawāb}\]

of course NEG get.IMPF.3MSG answer

‘Of course, he does not get answer.’ (Palva, 2004: 229)

3.4.3.5 Mesopotamian

Identically to the Sudanic region, only single negation is found in this region, and the negator used is always \( mā \). This is based on three varieties, all are listed in Table 21 below.

**Table 21:** Standard negation in the Mesopotamian varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The negative strategy</th>
<th>The negative morpheme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Christian Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>( mā ) (or ( ma ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Muslim Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>( mā ) (or ( ma ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Širqāṭ (Assur) Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>( mā )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider the following from Muslim Baghdadi Arabic as an example:

(198) Muslim Baghdadi Arabic

a. \( \text{ma-yšūf} \)

NEG-see.IMPF.3MSG

‘He does not see.’
b. ma-raḥ-yiği

\texttt{NEG-FUT\text{-}come.IMPF.3MSG}

‘He is not going to come.’

(Erwin, 2004: 141)

3.4.3.6 Arabian Peninsula

The Arabian Peninsula (excluding Yemen) is another region where negation is always single. This comes from the consideration of 12 Arabic varieties in this region (Table 22).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
No. & Arabic variety & The negative strategy & The negative morpheme(s) \\
\hline
1. & Kuwaiti Arabic & Single & mā \\
\hline
2. & Coastal Dhofārī Arabic & Single & mā (or ma) \\
\hline
3. & al-Bāḥa Arabic & Single & mā (or ma) \\
\hline
4. & al- Fetish Arabic & Single & mā (or ma) \\
\hline
5. & Ḥagil Arabic & Single & mā (or ma) \\
\hline
6. & Madinah Arabic & Single & mā \\
\hline
7. & Urban Hijazi Arabic & Single & mā (or ma) \\
\hline
8. & Yanbuẓ Arabic & Single & mā (or ma) \\
\hline
9. & ?Abha Arabic & Single & mā, lis and lim \\
\hline
10. & ṢUnayzah Arabic & Single & ma \\
\hline
11. & Abu Dhabi Arabic & Single & mā \\
\hline
12. & Dubai Arabic & Single & mā \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Standard negation in the Arabian Peninsula varieties}
\end{table}
In all of the varieties here, the negator is *mā* as in (199), except in ?Abha Arabic where *lis* and *lim* are also found.

(199) Abu Dhabi Arabic

```
ma rāḥ
NEG go.PRF.3.SG
```

‘He did not go.’ 

(Qafisheh, 1977: 238)

Beside *mā*, *lim* in ?Abha Arabic is used with perfect aspect only and *lis* with either imperfect or future clauses 3.4.1.1.1. In (200), the use of the *lim* as well as the two cases where *lis* is used are exemplified.

(200) ?Abha Arabic

a. `lim agūl la-h

   NEG.PST tell.IMPF.1.SG to-him

   ‘I did not tell him.’ 

   (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 141)

b. `lis-nī aṣrif ḏūlā l-banāt

   NEG-me know.IMPF.1.SG these DEF-girls

   ‘I do not know these girls.’ 

   (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 56)

c. `lis-nī b-sāfīr ḏa l-yūm

   NEG-me FUT-travel.IMPF.1.SG this DEF-day

   ‘I am not going to travel today.’ 

   (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 142)

3.4.3.7 Yemeni

The last region is the Yemeni region, and here all of the three negative strategies are observed. This is according to five varieties considered from this area (Table 23).
Table 23: Standard negation in the Yemeni varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The negative strategy</th>
<th>The negative morpheme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Hadhrami Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Zinğıbār Arabic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>miš (or miši and māši)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Adeni Arabic</td>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Taiz Arabic</td>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ṣana’a Arabic</td>
<td>Single–bipartite</td>
<td>mā……-š and mā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The single strategy is a characteristic of Hadhrami Arabic and Zinğıbār Arabic. In the first one, the negator is *ma* and in the second one it is *miš*. The use of both is illustrated respectively by the following:

(201) Hadhrami Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{ma} & \text{nāmit} & \text{samḥ} & \text{al-bariḥ} \\
\text{NEG} & \text{sleep.PRF.1SG} & \text{early} & \text{DEF-last.night}
\end{array}
\]

‘I did not sleep early last night.’

(Ahmed, 2012: 48)

(202) Zinğıbār Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{miš} & \text{idina-hum} & \text{as-siyārah} & \text{ḥaqqa-na} \\
\text{NEG} & \text{give.PRF.1PL} & \text{-them} & \text{DEF-car} & \text{POSS-our}
\end{array}
\]

‘We did not give them our car.’

(Ahmed, 2012: 34)

In Adeni Arabic and Taiz Arabic, negation is bipartite and, of course, this makes the negator in both of them *ma……-š*, for instance:
(203) Adeni Arabic

ma-ṣatīna-hum-š haqqa-na as-siyārah
NEG-give.PRF.1PL-them-NEG POSS.us DEF-car

‘We did not give them our car.’ (Ahmed, 2012: 55)

In Ṣana’a Arabic, negation is single–bipartite. The single negator is mā and the bipartite one is mā.......-š, and they seem to be used optionally in negation. Consider, for example:

(204) Ṣana’a Arabic

a. ẓalā sibb mā yuḥruḡ allī dāḫil-hā
so NEG come.out.IMPF.3MSG what inside-it

‘So that what is inside it does not come out’ (Watson, 1993: 204)

b. mā yiṣṭi-š

NEG want.IMPF.3MSG-NEG

‘He does not want.’ (Ahmed, 2012: 271)

3.4.4 General remarks on the geographical categorization

The geographical categorization answers two significant questions. The first is: what are the variations in the expression of negation between varieties of the same region. This was answered in the previous section. The second question, which we turn to now, is: in which areas is the negative ...-š present and in which is it absent? In Table 24, all of the seven regions are listed, followed by the negative strategies found in each one of them. The symbol (+) is to indicate ...-š is attested, and the symbol (−) is to indicate otherwise.
### Table 24: Standard negation in the seven regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The name of the region</th>
<th>The negative strategy</th>
<th>( \ldots-\ddot{\text{s}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Maghrebi</td>
<td>Single, bipartite and single~bipartite</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Single, bipartite and single~bipartite</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sudanic</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Levantine</td>
<td>Single and single~bipartite</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mesopotamian</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Arabian Peninsula</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>Single, bipartite and single~bipartite</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note as in this table, \( \ldots-\ddot{\text{s}} \) is observed wherever the bipartite negation is found. This is the case in the Maghrebi, Egyptian, Levantine and Yemeni regions, and since the use of \( \ldots-\ddot{\text{s}} \) in negation is a result of being affected by Jespersen’s cycle, one can say:

*Generalization 11: Jespersen’s cycle is observed in the Maghrebi, Egyptian, Levantine and Yemeni regions only.*

On the other hand, where negation is single only, the negative \( \ldots-\ddot{\text{s}} \) is not observed. This is case in the Sudanic, Mesopotamian and Arabian Peninsula regions; therefore:

*Generalization 12: Jespersen’s cycle is not observed in the Sudanic, Mesopotamian and Arabian Peninsula regions.*
3.5 Summary

In this chapter, we have defined the term *standard negation*, and we have seen the way it is expressed cross-linguistically. We then saw how standard negation is expressed in modern Arabic varieties.

Based on 53 Arabic varieties, complementary categorizations have been offered: feature categorization and geographical categorization. The first one is based on the negative strategy, the use of the negative morpheme ...-š and the type of the negative construction (symmetric vs. asymmetric). The negative strategy feature distinguishes three types of varieties: single, where negation is expressed by the use of a single morpheme only, bipartite, where negation is expressed by the use of two morphemes simultaneously, or single~bipartite, where both the single and the bipartite strategy are found in the same variety.

The negative ...-š feature distinguishes two groups: š-varieties and non-š-varieties. And since ...-š is a result of a variety having gone through Jespersen’s cycle, this feature shows which varieties have been affected by this cycle and which have not. Under this categorization, we have also examined cases where this ...-š is omitted, which is mostly in emphatic negation. The available data also shows that there is no modern Arabic variety where ...-š obligatorily occurs in all contexts.

The type of negative construction feature results in two groups as well: symmetric and symmetric~asymmetric. Symmetric negation, however, is significantly more common than asymmetric negation. The data collected here shows that there is no modern Arabic variety where negation is asymmetric only.

Based on this feature categorization, a new development in negation in Arabic is recognized (the Arabic negative cycle in Figure 2). According to this cycle, verbal clauses and non-verbal clauses are negated in stage I by the same morpheme. In stage II, non-verbal clauses are negated differently by attaching a personal pronoun to this negator. In
stage III, a mū-miš morpheme is coined to negate any non-verbal clause. In stage IV, this mū-miš morpheme is used with future and progressive aspect clauses. In stage V, the mū-miš morpheme is used to negate any verbal clause.

The second categorization is geographical. Modern Arabic varieties can be divided geographically into seven regions: Maghrebi, Egyptian, Sudanic, Levantine, Mesopotamian, Arabian Peninsula and Yemeni. In some regions, varieties tend to behave in an internally homogeneous way, as is the case in the Sudanic and the Mesopotamian regions, where negation in these areas is always single, and there is no instance of the negative ...-š. In others, the variations among varieties are considerable, as is the case in the Egyptian region. For example, in the Egyptian area, one can find a variety where negation is always single and the negative ...-š is not attested at all and a variety where negation is single–bipartite where this ...-š is used commonly. As well as explaining these variations within each region, we have also presented the geographical distribution of ...-š under this categorization.

Finally, the result of this chapter is a formulation of 12 generalizations. These are repeated below.

**Generalization 1:** In standard negation, the pre-verbal single negative strategy is the most common one observed among the modern Arabic varieties.

**Generalization 2:** In modern Arabic varieties where the negative strategy is single, the negator used is almost always mā.

**Generalization 3:** Optionality between using single and bipartite negation is rarely found in modern Arabic varieties.

**Generalization 4:** In standard negation, bipartite negation almost always entails the use of ma.......-š.

**Generalization 5:** In the š-varieties, ...-š is mostly omitted in emphatic negation.
Generalization 6: There is no š-variety where …-š is not, at least optionally, omitted in emphatic negation.

Generalization 7: In modern Arabic varieties, the negative construction in standard negation is almost always symmetric.

Generalization 8: The use of lammā, lan, lā and ?in in standard negation is unattested in modern Arabic varieties.

Generalization 9: Reflexes of lam and laysa in standard negation is extremely rare in modern Arabic varieties.

Generalization 10: In standard negation, the negative morpheme(s) mostly occur(s) adjacent to the verb.

Generalization 11: Jespersen’s cycle is observed in the Maghrebi, Egyptian, Levantine and Yemeni regions only.

Generalization 12: Jespersen’s cycle is not observed in the Sudanic, Mesopotamian and Arabian Peninsula regions.

The following chapter is on non-verbal negation. Under this theme, non-verbal clauses are defined and the way they are expressed in Standard Arabic is explained, followed by an explanation of the way they are rendered in the modern varieties of Arabic.
4. Non-verbal negation

This chapter is on non-verbal negation. In this chapter, the four steps (or stages) in any typological study introduced in section 2.2 are performed as follows: in 4.1 non-verbal negation is defined and in 4.2 how it is expressed in Standard Arabic is explained (step I), in 4.3 the modern Arabic varieties are categorized according to their expression of non-verbal negation (step II), in 4.4 generalizations are proposed based on the reached conclusion as well as explained where possible (step III and step IV). Note, however, unlike the standard negation chapter, there is no section regarding how non-verbal negation is expressed cross-linguistically. That is, as far as can be seen, no typological framework on this phenomenon is proposed in the literature. It is worth noting, however, that Veselinova (2006) has made an attempt in this regard. In her study, she categorizes languages into six types based on the way they express standard negation, non-verbal negation and existential negation. In type (A), negation in all of the three types of clauses is rendered in the same way. In type (B), standard negation and non-verbal negation are expressed in a way that is different from existential negation. In type (C), standard negation and existential negation are expressed in a way that is different from non-verbal negation. In type (D), standard negation is expressed in one way and non-verbal negation and existential negation are expressed in another. In type (E), the case is not clear. Finally, in type (F), each type of these clauses is expressed differently from the others.

4.1 What is non-verbal negation?

Unlike standard negation, which refers to negating declarative verbal main clauses, non-verbal negation refers to negating declarative non-verbal main clauses. As explained in 1.3.1, these clauses are formed by juxtaposing a nominal and its predicate as in:
The predicate in non-verbal negation, however, does not have to be a single morpheme; it could be a noun phrase or a prepositional phrase as in the following:

(206) Standard Arabic

?aḥmad-u fī al-bayt-i
Ahmad-NOM in DEF-house-GEN

‘Ahmad is in the house.’  
(Personal Knowledge)

Therefore, in this study, a main clause is considered to be non-verbal as long as it has no overt verb.

4.2 Non-verbal negation in Standard Arabic

Non-verbal clauses in Standard Arabic are negated by *laysa*, *mā*, *fī* and *ɣayr*. The most common negator with such clauses is *laysa*. With this negator, the predicate in the clause must be in the accusative case. Consider the following and note that the first clause is affirmative, and that the predicate here is in the nominative case, whereas the second one is negated by *laysa* and, thus, the predicate is in the accusative case.
Standard Arabic

a. ʔal-mudīr-u  ṣayyid-un
   DEF-manager-NOM  good-NOM
   ‘The manager is good.’

b. ʔal-mudīr-u  laysa  ṣayyid-an
   DEF-manager-NOM  NEG.3MSG  good-ACC
   ‘The manager is not good.’  (Personal Knowledge)

laysa can be inflected for person, number and gender, for example:

Standard Arabic

a. ʔal-mudīr-at-u  laysat  ṣayyid-at-an
   DEF-manager-F-NOM  NEG.3FSG  good-F-ACC
   ‘The manager(F) is not good(F).’

b. ʔal-mudarāʔ-u  laysū  ṣayyidīn
   DEF-manager.MPL-NOM  NEG.3MPL  good.MPL.ACC
   ‘The managers are not good.’  (Personal Knowledge)

Finally, laysa can either precede the predicate as in the previous examples or occur initially in the clause as in the following:

Standard Arabic

laysa  l-mudīr-u  ṣayyid-an
   NEG.3MSG  DEF-manager-NOM  good-ACC
   ‘The manager is not good.’  (Personal Knowledge)
The second non-verbal negator is mā. Unlike laysa, this negator is uninflected, must occur initially in the clause and has no effect on the case ending of the predicate. Consider the following affirmative and its corresponding negative:

(210) Standard Arabic

a. ʔal-mudīr-u ̣ḡayyid-un

DEF-manager-NOM  good-NOM

‘The manager is good.’

b. mā l-mudīr-u ̣ḡayyid-un

NEG  DEF-manager-NOM  good-NOM

‘The manager is not good.’ (Personal Knowledge)

However, it is worth noting here that there are two types of this mā according to the Arabic grammarians: mā ʔal-ḥiḡāziyyah ‘the Hijazi mā’ and mā ʔat-tamīmiyyah ‘the Tamimi mā’. It was reported that in the early Islamic era the Hijazi mā used to be used in the Hijazi region and the Tamimi mā in the Najdi region. The only difference between the two is that the Tamimi mā has no effect on the case ending of the predicate as explained above, while the Hijazi mā makes the case ending of the predicate accusative as in the following:

(211) Standard Arabic (early Islamic Hijazi variety)

mā l-mudīr-u ̣ḡayyid-an

NEG  DEF-manager-NOM  good-ACC

‘The manager is not good.’ (Personal Knowledge)
The third non-verbal negator is ʔîn. Similarly to the Tamimi mā, it is uninflected, has to be initial and has no impact on the case ending of the predicate, for example:

(212) **Standard Arabic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ʔîn</th>
<th>il-mudîr-u</th>
<th>ǧayyid-un</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>DEF-manager-NOM</td>
<td>good-NOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The manager is not good.’ *(Personal Knowledge)*

The last non-verbal negator in Standard Arabic is yayr. This negator has to precede the predicate which must then have the genitive case. As an example, consider:

(213) **Standard Arabic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ʔal-mudîr-u</th>
<th>yayr-u</th>
<th>ǧayyid-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEF-manager-NOM</td>
<td>NEG-NOM</td>
<td>good-GEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The manager is not good.’ *(Personal Knowledge)*

Note that yayr can carry case ending suffixes; it is the nominative case in the above example. This is probably why it is considered to be a noun by the Arabic grammarians, since carrying case endings in Arabic is a characteristic of nouns and nominal elements only such as adjectives.

To sum up, then, laysa, mā, ʔîn and yayr are non-verbal negators in Standard Arabic. laysa can be inflected for person, it can either be initial or immediately precede the predicate and it makes the case ending of the predicate accusative. mā ʔat-tamîmiyyah and ʔîn are not inflected, they must be initial and have no impact on the case ending of the predicate. mā ʔal-ḥiḡāziyyah is similar, except the predicate here must have the
accusative case. Finally, ayr takes a case ending, and must precede the predicate, which must then be in the genitive case.

4.3 Non-verbal negation in modern Arabic varieties

In this section, step II, step III and step IV of the steps outlined by Song (2001) for typological studies are conducted. In step II, varieties are categorized. However, unlike the case in standard negation, only the geographical categorization is adopted here. Categorization by features reveals fewer interesting generalizations for non-verbal negation. That is, the negative strategy (the first feature in the previous chapter) in non-verbal negation is mostly single. The negative ...-š (the second feature) which is used to differentiate between š-varieties and non-š-varieties is problematic when it comes to non-verbal negation. As we will shortly see, some of the non-š-varieties have borrowed miš in non-verbal negation; thus, categorizing these varieties as š-varieties could be misleading. For the purposes of this study, š-varieties are those which use ...-š as a negative morpheme, or at least as part of it, in standard negation only. The symmetric vs. asymmetric framework (the last feature) is proposed by Miestamo (2005) to capture the cross-linguistic mechanisms of standard negation only, and negation of non-verbal clauses is different from standard negation according to our definition of these terms. We must also note here that, out of the 54 Arabic varieties included in the study, this chapter is based on 48 varieties only, as detailed information on the negation of non-verbal clauses was not available to me for Sfax Arabic, Muzēnah and Banī Waṣil Arabic, Southern Sinai Arabic, Biyyāṭī and Axraṣī Arabic, Ṭuwarda Arabic and ʕAtījī Arabic.

Finally, two points are worth noting before we start look at non-verbal negation in modern Arabic varieties: (a) clarifying the meaning of NEG+PRO constructions and mū̄-miš morphemes and (b) giving an impression of the organization of this section. First, the NEG+PRO construction refers to the attachment of a verbal negator in a variety to a
personal pronoun, whereas the $mū̸-mīs$ morpheme refers to the form resulting from the fusion between a verbal negator and mostly the third singular masculine pronoun. As we will see, both strategies are very common across the Arabic-speaking world. However, in some varieties, the available data shows the use of only one of them. This, in turn, does not automatically deny the existence of the other. Such a fact will be discussed after representing the found data in section 4.4.1, a matter that takes us to the next point to be mentioned before we start (the organization of this section). In this section, data is presented on a region-by-region basis such that the way that non-verbal clauses are negated in each region is described with brief discussion. The main discussion will be provided in the general remarks section which follows this regional data representation.

4.3.1 Geographical categorization

4.3.1.1 Maghrebi

11 Maghrebi varieties are included in the study, but information on non-verbal negation in Sfax Arabic is not available. Thus, only 10 of these varieties are considered here (Table 25). In this table, after the name of the Arabic variety, the negative morpheme(s) used in standard negation and the negative morpheme(s) used in non-verbal negation are given.
Table 25: Non-verbal negation in the Maghrebi varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The verbal negator(s)</th>
<th>The non-verbal negator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Hassâniyya Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em> and <em>ma + PRO</em></td>
<td><em>mā</em>+PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Malian Hassâniyya Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> and <em>ma + PRO</em></td>
<td><em>mā</em>+PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma....-š(i)</em></td>
<td><em>maši, ma+PRO+š</em> and <em>ma+Predicate+š</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Annaba Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā......-š</em></td>
<td><em>maš</em> and <em>maš+PRO</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Dellys Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma......-š(i)</em></td>
<td><em>maši</em> and <em>ma+PRO+š</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Sousse Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma......-š</em></td>
<td><em>miš, miš+PRO</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sahel/Tunis Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma......-š, miš</em></td>
<td><em>miš and ma+PRO+š</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Eastern Libyan Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma......-š</em></td>
<td><em>moš, ma+PRO+š</em> and <em>mo+Predicate+š</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Western Libyan Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma......-š</em> and <em>miš</em></td>
<td><em>miš</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Standard Maltese</td>
<td><em>ma......-x</em> and <em>mhux</em></td>
<td><em>mhux and ma+PRO+x</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from this table, the addition of the verbal negator to a personal pronoun is very common (NEG+PRO); it can be seen in 9 of them. The following are examples of this phenomenon. Note here that the personal pronoun that is attached to the verbal negator agrees with the subject of the clause in person, number and gender.

(214)  Hassâniyya Arabic

*mā-hi* fitrāna

NEG-3FSG   tired.FSG

‘She is not tired.’  (Francis, 1979: 18)
‘We are not going on foot.’ (Borg & Azzopardi-Alexander, 1997: 89)

Note also that Ḩassāniyya Arabic is a non-š-variety and the verbal negator is mā; thus, no ...-š is attached to the personal pronoun, whereas Standard Maltese is a š-variety and the verbal negator is mā-...-x; thus, ...-š (...-x in the Maltese orthography) is suffixed to the pronoun. In 3.4.2.1, we have seen that the suffixation of ...-š follows any other direct or indirect object clitics that can be attached to the negated verb, but in non-verbal negation the final suffixation of ...-š is not always the case. In other words, in the š-varieties where the NEG+PRO strategy is used, the personal pronoun is mostly intercalated between the pre-verbal mā and the post-verbal ...-š which makes ...-š the final suffix in the resulting morpheme (mā+PRO+...-š). In Annaba Arabic and in Sousse Arabic, in contrast, ...-š is not final as the personal pronoun occurs after it (mā+...-š+PRO), for example:

(216) Annaba Arabic

maš-nī matfakar

NEG-1SG remember.PTCP


In Moroccan Arabic and Eastern Libyan Arabic, the bipartite negators mā-...-š may sandwich the predicate if this predicate is a single morpheme only, for example:
(217) Moroccan Arabic

ma-kbir-šī

NEG-big-NEG

‘It is not big’ (Harrell, 2004: 155)

(218) Eastern Libyan Arabic

ana mo ṭālib-š

I NEG student-NEG

‘I am not a student.’ (Owens, 1984: 158)

Finally, the ṣū–miš morpheme, which was introduced in the Arabic negative cycle in Figure 2 as a new coined morpheme resulting, probably, from fusing the verbal negator to the third singular masculine pronoun, is used in most of the Maghrebi varieties as in Table 25. In fact, it is found in all of them, except in Ḥassāniyya Arabic and Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic where the NEG+PRO construction seems to be more common, if not the only way, to express non-verbal negation. This puts Ḥassāniyya Arabic and Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic at a different stage from the others in the Arabic negative cycle. In the general remarks section (4.4) below where some overall points on non-verbal negation are discussed, the stage of every modern Arabic variety regarding this cycle will be given. There will also be a discussion on the quality of the ṣū–miš morpheme. That is, in the Arabic negative cycle, we assumed that this morpheme is probably a result of a fusion between the verbal negator and the third singular masculine pronoun. In some varieties, however, it seems to be a result of a direct attachment of the two negative bipartite elements (mā and ...-š). This seems to be the case in Dellys Arabic, for example. In this variety, the bipartite negative morpheme used in standard negation is ma......-š(i), and the ṣū–miš morpheme used in non-verbal negation is maši. For now, it is sufficient to say that this ṣū–miš morpheme seems to be the most common way to render non-verbal
negation in Western Libyan Arabic, whereas in the other varieties this morpheme is used beside other ways such as the NEG+PRO construction. The following exemplify the use of this *miš* morpheme:

(219)  Sousse Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{miš} & \text{bēhi} \\
\text{NEG} & \text{good}
\end{array}
\]

‘It is not good.’  (Talmoudi, 1980: 166)

(220)  Western Libyan Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{l-ktāb} & \text{miš} & \text{zdīd} \\
\text{DEF-book} & \text{NEG} & \text{new}
\end{array}
\]

‘The book is not new.’  (Krer, 2013: 99)

4.3.1.2 Egyptian

Ten Egyptian varieties are included in the study, but only 6 of them are included in this section. All of these are listed in Table 26 with their verbal and non-verbal negators.
Table 26: Non-verbal negation in the Egyptian varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The verbal negator(s)</th>
<th>The non-verbal negator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Northwestern Sinai Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Smēnī and ŠGēlī Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Ṣaṭīdī Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-šey and</td>
<td>miš and ma-predicate-şey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…-şey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Egyptian western desert Arabic</td>
<td>mā……-š and mā</td>
<td>mā+predicate+š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mā+PRO predicate+š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mu+PRO predicate+š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š and miš</td>
<td>miš and ma+PRO+š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>al-ʕArīš Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š(i) and miš</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the table, the mū~miš morpheme, which is miš in this region, seems to be the most common non-verbal strategy among the Egyptian varieties, for example:

(221) al-ʕArīš Arabic

miš        mawğūd-ah
NEG        present-FSG

‘She is not present.’ (de Jong, 2000: 527)

(222) Smēnī and ŠGēlī Arabic

al-ʕağwah   miš   wāḥid w  ašāb-ak  miš   wāḥid
DEF-pressed dates  NEG  one and fingers-your  NEG  one

‘Pressed dates are not alike, and your fingers are not alike.’ (de Jong, 2000: 318)
Note here that Northwestern Sinai Arabic is a non-š-variety (...-š is not observed in standard negation); yet, ...-š is part of the non-verbal negator (miš). Compare the following negative clauses and note that the first one is an example of standard negation and the second one is an example of non-verbal negation:

(223) Northwestern Sinai Arabic

a. mā šift-ih
   NEG see.PRF.1SG-him
   ‘I did not see him.’
   (de Jong, 2000: 244)

b. miš ʕayb
   NEG disgrace
   ‘It is not disgrace.’
   (de Jong, 2000: 224)

This, and other similar instances, will be discussed in the general remarks section (4.4.3).

The NEG+PRO construction is also found in this region. Consider the following from Cairene Arabic:

(224) Cairene Arabic

ma-nī-š gayy
NEG-1SG-NEG come.PTCP
‘I am not coming.’
(Gary & Gamal-Eldin, 1982: 39)

In Egyptian western desert Arabic only, this NEG+PRO strategy is used in a different fashion. Usually, mā......-š is affixed to the pronoun in which mā is prefixed and ...-š is suffixed. In this variety, however, mā is also prefixed to the pronoun, but the post-
verbal …-š is suffixed to the predicate. Consider the following and note that mű may optionally be used instead of ma.\footnote{No data is found where the predicate is more than one word (e.g., prepositional phrase).}

(225) Egyptian western desert Arabic

a. mā-nī fāditī-š

\[\text{NEG-ISG empty}_{{\text{PTCP.F-NEG}}}\]

‘I am not available(f).’ (Lit. ‘I am not empty’)

b. ḥāḏā mū girīqī-š

\[\text{this NEG Greek}_{{\text{NEG}}}\]

‘This [person] is not Greek.’

(Maṭar, 1981: 184)

Finally, beside the two common strategies used in non-verbal negation (NEG+PRO and mű–miš morpheme), a less common strategy to express the same notion is found in the region. In Ṣaṭṭī Arabic and in Egyptian western desert Arabic, the single predicate can be sandwiched by ma-……-šey as in:

(226) Ṣaṭṭī Arabic

li-ktāb ma ġadīd-šey

\[\text{DEF-book NEG new}_{{\text{NEG}}}\]

‘The book is not new.’

(Khalafallah, 1969: 101)

4.3.1.3 Sudanic

Five Sudanic varieties are considered in this study, and information on non-verbal negation is available in all of them (Table 27).
Table 27: Non-verbal negation in the Sudanic varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The verbal negator(s)</th>
<th>The non-verbal negator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Eastern Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td>$mā$ (or $ma$)</td>
<td>$mā$, $mā$+PRO and $mi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Western Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td>$mā$ (or $ma$)</td>
<td>$mā$, $mā$+PRO and $mi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sudanese Arabic</td>
<td>$mā$</td>
<td>$mā$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Largeau Arabic</td>
<td>$mā$</td>
<td>$mā$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Abeche Arabic</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>$mā$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this table shows, the verbal negator in Abeche Arabic is unknown as this is the only variety in the study where information on standard negation is not found. However, it could be assumed, with some confidence, that the verbal negator in Abeche Arabic is $mā$ since this morpheme is the only verbal negator found in every considered variety from this region. If this is correct, then one can say that among the Sudanic varieties, $mā$ is capable of expressing both standard negation and non-verbal negation, for example:

(227) Sudanese Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dā</th>
<th>šakl-ū</th>
<th>$mā$</th>
<th>zarīf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that.MSG</td>
<td>appearance-his</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>nice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘That one, his appearance is not nice.’

(Bergman, 2002: 59)

(228) Abeche Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hu</th>
<th>$mā$</th>
<th>kabīr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>great</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘He is not great.’

(Kaye, 1976: 100)
In addition to this similar way of expressing standard negation and non-verbal negation, the *mū-*miš and NEG+PRO strategies can be used in this region as found in Eastern Nigeria Arabic and Western Nigeria Arabic. As an example, consider the following and note that the *mū-*miš morpheme here is the negator *mi*:

(229) Eastern Nigeria Arabic

\[\text{jīkka} \quad \text{ḥamsa} \quad \text{da} \quad \text{mi} \quad \text{katīr}\]

\[\text{jīkka} \quad \text{five} \quad \text{this} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{big}\]

‘The five jīkka are not much.’  

(Owens, 1993: 170)

(230) Western Nigeria Arabic

\[\text{hi} \quad \text{mā-ha} \quad \text{kabīre}\]

\[\text{she} \quad \text{NEG-3SG} \quad \text{big.F}\]

‘She is not big.’  

(Owens, 1993: 170)

### 4.3.1.4 Levantine

In this study, eight Levantine varieties are considered. Seven of them are included in this section as in Table 28. The excluded variety is ḫArāf Arabic because of the shortage of data on non-verbal negation in this variety.
**Table 28**: Non-verbal negation in the Levantine varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The verbal negator(s)</th>
<th>The non-verbal negator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>al-Karak Arabic</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma+PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Northern Jordanian Arabic</td>
<td>ma…….-š and miš</td>
<td>miš and ma+PRO+š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>as-Salṭ Arabic</td>
<td>ma…….-š, ...-š and mā</td>
<td>miš and ma+PRO+š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Damascus Arabic</td>
<td>mā and mū</td>
<td>mū and mā+PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td>mā…….-š, ...-š, mā and muš</td>
<td>miš, muš, mā+PRO and mā+PRO+š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Aley Arabic</td>
<td>ma…….-š, ...-š, miš and ma</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Baskinta Arabic</td>
<td>ma…….-š, ...-š and miš</td>
<td>miš and miš+PRO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the table, the mū~miš strategies are very common among the Levantine varieties, for example:

(231) Palestinian Arabic

hāḏa miš mumkin

this NEG possible

‘This is not possible.’ (Hoyt, 2005: 6)

(232) Aley Arabic

bayy-u miš ḥakīm

father-his NEG doctor

‘His father is not a doctor.’ (Bishr, 1956: 39)
The NEG+PRO construction is also very common. Consider the following and note that Northern Jordanian Arabic is a š-variety; thus, ...-š is attached to the pronoun, and al-Karak Arabic is a non-š-variety; thus, there is no ...-š attached here.

(233) Northern Jordanian Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{ma-ni-š} & \text{žāy} & \text{bašd} & \text{iḏ-ḏuḥur} \\
\text{NEG-1SG-NEG} & \text{come.PTCP} & \text{after} & \text{DEF-afternoon} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

‘I am not coming in the afternoon.’

(Haija, 1985: 9)

(234) al-Karak Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{l-awlād} & \text{mumah} & \text{fī-d-dār} \\
\text{DEF-boy.PL} & \text{NEG.3PL} & \text{in-DEF-house} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

‘The boys are not in the house.’

(Alsarayreh, 2012: 43)

However, similarly to Annaba Arabic from the Maghrebi region, in Baskinta Arabic only, the personal pronoun in the NEG+PRO construction occurs after the negative ...-š as in:

(235) Baskinta Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{mišš-u} & \text{fāḍi} & \text{yḥakkī-k} \\
\text{NEG-3MSG} & \text{available} & \text{talk.IMPF.3MSG-you} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

‘He has no time to speak to you.’ (Lit. ‘He is not available to talk to you.’)

(Abu-Haidar, 1979: 109)

4.3.1.5 Mesopotamian

Three varieties are included in the study from this region and all of them are included here, as in Table 29 below.
Table 29: Non-verbal negation in the Mesopotamian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The verbal negator(s)</th>
<th>The non-verbal negator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Christian Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>mū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Muslim Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>mū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Širqāṭ (Assur) Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>mū</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*mū*, which is the *mū*–*miš* morpheme, seems to be very common strategy to express non-verbal negation in this region, whereas data on the use of the NEG+PRO strategy is not found. As mention above in 4.3 and will be discussed further in detail in section 4.4.1 below, the lack of data for the use of the NEG+PRO strategy does not mean it is absent in this region; it may just mean it is rarely used. The following are representative examples for the use of *mū* in this region:

(236) Muslim Baghdadi Arabic

inta       mū       Širāqi
you.MSG    NEG      Iraqi
‘You are not an Iraqi.’  (Al-Khalesi, 2006: 36)

(237) Širqāṭ (Assur) Arabic

el-balad    mū       balad-hum
DEF-land    NEG      land-them
‘The land is not their land.’  (Salonen, 1980: 115)

(238) Christian Baghdadi Arabic

hal-akli    mū       ṭaybi       yā-ha
this-food   NEG      tasty       EMPH–FSG
‘This food is not tasty.’  (Abu-Haidar, 1991: 128)
Note in the Christian Baghdadi Arabic example in (238), the prefix $yā-$ is used to emphasize the clause. This is the case in every non-verbal negative example found in the consulted source. Therefore, a further investigation has been made to see if this morpheme is meant to strengthen the notion of negation or not. The investigation shows that the prefix $yā-$ does not occur with negative non-verbal clauses only, it is possible with the affirmative ones as well. The following show the optionality of this prefix in affirmatives:

(239)  Christian Baghdadi Arabic

a. $ḥāyī $ḥəlwi

she pretty

‘She is pretty.’

b. $ḥāyī $ḥəlwi $yā-ha

she pretty EMPH-her

‘She is pretty.’ or ‘She is indeed pretty.’ (Abu-Haidar, 1991: 122)

Blanc (1964) reports that, according to his informants, the presence or the absence of the prefix $yā-$ has no semantic effect, and is felt to be old-fashioned when included (Blanc, 1964: 125). Consequently, the reached conclusion is that although there is no negative non-verbal clause, among the handful examples provided by the consulted source, where the prefix $yā-$ is not used, it could be assumed that negative non-verbal clauses without this prefix are possible. That is to say, the prefix $yā-$ can be used with any clause, either negative or affirmative.
4.3.1.6 Arabian Peninsula

From this region, 12 Arabic varieties are considered in this study and all of them are considered here as well. In Table 30, these varieties are listed with their verbal and non-verbal negators.

Table 30: Non-verbal negation in the Arabian Peninsula varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The verbal negator(s)</th>
<th>The non-verbal negator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Kuwaiti Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>mā+PRO, ma+PRO+-b, mū and rarely γayr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Coastal Dhofārī Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>mā+PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>al-Bāḥa Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>mā+PRO+-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>al-ʔAḥsāʿ Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>mā+PRO, mu, mub and muš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ḥagil Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>mā+PRO and mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Madinah Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>mā+PRO and mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Urban Hijazi Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>mā+PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Yanbuʕ Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>mā+PRO and mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>ʔAbha Arabic</td>
<td>mā, lis and lim</td>
<td>lis and mā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ʕUnayzah Arabic</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>mā+PRO+-b and mūb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>mā+PRO, mū, mub or mūb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Dubai Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>mū and mūb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table, there are several points which can be considered as peculiarities of this region. Perhaps the first two of these points are the use of the Standard
Arabic non-verbal negators (section 4.2) ɣayr and lis. ɣayr is used rarely in Kuwaiti Arabic to negate adjectives only, for example.\(^{50}\)

(240) Kuwaiti Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{؟یل-والد} & ɣayr & ʃādeg & fī mašā finer-
\\
\text{DEF-boy} & \text{NEG} & \text{honest} & \text{in feeling-his}
\end{array}
\]

‘The boy is not honest.’ \((\text{Alsalem, 2012: 40–41})\)

lis (etymologically related to laysa) is used in ʔAbha Arabic only as illustrated by the following:

(241) ʔAbha Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
lis & ɣālid & hinah
\\
\text{NEG} & \text{Khaled} & \text{here}
\end{array}
\]

‘Khaled is not here.’ \((\text{Al-Azraqi, 1998: 142})\)

Similarly to varieties of other regions, both the \(mū-miš\) and the NEG+PRO strategy are very common in this region. Consider the following and note, in Ḥagil Arabic, \(mū\) is the \(mū-miš\) morpheme:

---

\(^{50}\) This is what is reported by the consulted source (Alsalem, 2012). However, in many modern Arabic varieties, ɣayr can be used in non-verbal negation, not as part of the grammar of these varieties, but as an instance of code-switching into Standard Arabic. Therefore, there is no reason that makes us to expect that the case in Kuwaiti Arabic here is different from the similar cases found in other varieties. In other words, ɣayr in Kuwaiti Arabic is an instance of code-switching into Standard Arabic.
(242) Coastal Dhofārī Arabic

mā-hum mašyūlīn
NEG-3MPL busy.PL

‘They are not busy.’  
(Davey, 2013: 208)

(243) Ḥagil Arabic

mū ṭālib
NEG student

‘I am not a student.’  
(Fieldwork data)

However, what seems to be a unique feature in this region is that in al-Bāḥa Arabic, ʕUnayzah Arabic and Kuwaiti Arabic when the NEG+PRO strategy is used, -b is suffixed to the pronoun. These varieties will be referred to as b-varieties to differentiate them from the non-b-varieties where this -b is not found at all. The following are representative examples, but note here that this -b is glossed as -b for now. In this section, we focus on where this -b is exactly found and how it is precisely used, whereas in the general remarks section (4.4), a sub-section is devoted to address the origin of this -b and its grammatical function in detail.

(244) al-Bāḥa Arabic

mḥammad ma-hu-b muhandis
Mohammed NEG-3MSG-b engineer

‘He is not an engineer.’  
(Fieldwork data)

(245) ʕUnayzah Arabic

ma-hu-b ṭālib
NEG-3MSG-b student

‘He is not a student.’  
(Fieldwork data)
Because of the presence of this -b, the fusion between the verbal negator and the third singular masculine pronoun hu ‘he’ to coin a mū-.miš morpheme results in mūb among the b-varieties, whereas the result of the same fusion is mū (or mu) among the non-b-varieties. Consider, for example:

(246) ʕUnayzah Arabic

hind mūb ţālbah

Hind NEG student.F

‘Hind is not a student.’ (Fieldwork data)

(247) Yanbuʕ Arabic

al-bint mu ādakiyya

DEF-gril NEG smart.FSG

‘The girl is not smart.’ (Fieldwork data)

As in Table 30 above, one can see that in some varieties both mū and mūb are used. More specifically, both mū and mūb are capable of expressing non-verbal negation in al-ʔAḥsāʔ Arabic, Abu Dhabi Arabic and Dubai Arabic. However, whereas in al-ʔAḥsāʔ Arabic and Dubai Arabic, mū and mūb seem to be optionally used in non-verbal negation, in Abu Dhabi Arabic mū tends to negate predicates which start with geminate consonants or start with two consonants only (Qafisheh, 1977: 242). Both cases are exemplified respectively below:

(248) Abu Dhabi Arabic

a. huwa mū d-drēwil

he NEG DEF-driver

‘He is not the driver.’
b. ʔāna  mū  myabbal
   I   NEG   crazy

‘I am not crazy.’  
(Qafisheh, 1977: 242)

The question then is: in which varieties is ʿmūb a result of further development as explained in the Arabic negative cycle (Figure 2) where the verbal negator is fused with a personal pronoun, and in which varieties is this morpheme borrowed from another adjacent variety in the region (dialect contact; see the discussion of ʿmiš in Northwestern Sinai Arabic in section 4.4.3). Perhaps this could be answered if we determine first which one of the Arabian Peninsula varieties are what we might call “true” b-varieties and which are not. To answer this, let us consider the negative personal pronoun paradigm (the phonological form of every personal pronoun after being attached to the verbal negator) of any variety that makes use of -b in non-verbal negation. This is to see whether this -b is systematically attached to every negated personal pronoun or not. According to Table 30 above, varieties where -b is found in non-verbal negation are al-Bāḥa Arabic, al-ʔAḥṣāʾ Arabic, ʕUnayzah Arabic, Kuwaiti Arabic, Abu Dhabi Arabic and Dubai Arabic. The negative personal pronoun paradigms in these varieties are given in Table 31 below. Note in this table, the symbol (−) is to indicate unknown information. Note also that in some cells, more than one morpheme is given. This is because in some cases more than one allomorph is possible. Moreover, in some varieties such as al-Bāḥa Arabic, the form for the third plural masculine and the third feminine masculine are identical; thus, the relevant two cells are merged, whereas in others such as ʕUnayzah Arabic, these forms are different; thus, the relevant two cells are kept separate.
Table 31: The negative personal pronoun paradigm of some of the Arabian Peninsula varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEG+PRO</th>
<th>al-Bāḥa</th>
<th>al-ʔAḥsāʔ</th>
<th>ṢUnayzah</th>
<th>Kuwaiti</th>
<th>Abu Dhabi</th>
<th>Dubai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEG.1SG</td>
<td>mānib</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>mānib</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.1PL</td>
<td>mānhin</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>māḥināb</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>miḥna</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.2MSG</td>
<td>māntab</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>mantāb</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>minta</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.2FSG</td>
<td>māntib</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>mantib</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>minti</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.2MPL</td>
<td>māntum</td>
<td>māntub</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>mintu</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.2FPL</td>
<td>māntub</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>māntin</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>mintin</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.3MSG</td>
<td>māḥab</td>
<td>māḥub</td>
<td>māḥub</td>
<td>māḥub</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.3FSG</td>
<td>māḥib</td>
<td>māḥīb</td>
<td>māḥīb</td>
<td>māḥīb</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.3MPL</td>
<td>māḥum</td>
<td>māḥum</td>
<td>māḥub</td>
<td>māḥumb</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.3FPL</td>
<td>māḥub</td>
<td>māḥub</td>
<td>māhin</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table, -b is systematically suffixed to the negated personal pronoun in al-Bāḥa Arabic and ṢUnayzah Arabic. However, there are some exceptions to this suffixation. In al-Bāḥa Arabic, -b is not used with the first plural mānhin ‘We are not’ and optionally used with the second plural māntum/māntub ‘You (PL) are not’ and with the third plural māhum/māhub ‘They are not’. Note that the optionality here refers to the mandatory omission of either the final /m/ or the final /b/. Consequently, one can conclude that in al-Bāḥa Arabic, -b is not possible after the final /n/ and can optionally replace the final /m/.

In ṢUnayzah Arabic, the exceptions are found with the second feminine plural mantin ‘You (FPL) are not’ and the third feminine plural mahin ‘They (F) are not’. In one
respect, the situation is similar to al-Bāḥa Arabic in which -b is impossible after the final /n/. In another respect, it is different, as unlike the case in al-Bāḥa Arabic, in ʕUnayzah Arabic, -b always replaces the final /m/ as can be seen with the second masculine plural mantub ‘You (MPL) are not’ and with the third masculine plural mahub ‘They (MPL) are not’. Therefore, the omission of -b after the consonant /n/ in al-Bāḥa Arabic and ʕUnayzah Arabic can be captured by the following phonological rule:

\[ b \rightarrow \emptyset \begin{array}{c}
\text{+nasal} \\
\text{+alveolar}
\end{array} \#
\]

In contrast, the obligatory omission of /m/ in ʕUnayzah Arabic (which is optional in al-Bāḥa Arabic) can be captured by the following rule:\(^{51}\)

\[ m \rightarrow \emptyset \begin{array}{c}
/ \\
\text{Vowel}
\end{array} b \]

Also, according to Table 31, -b is found in the only two available negative pronouns in Kuwaiti Arabic. Thus, Kuwaiti Arabic might be considered as a variety with a systematic -b. On the other hand, -b is not used in the negative personal pronoun

---

\(^{51}\) The case could be that, similarly to ʕUnayzah Arabic speakers, al-Bāḥa Arabic speakers do not allow a final /b/ after a nasal (or perhaps any other consonant). This is settled in both varieties after the alveolar nasal /n/, as explained by the first rule. It is also settled in ʕUnayzah Arabic after the bilabial nasal /m/ in which /b/ is chosen over the presence of /m/, as explained by the second rule. In al-Bāḥa Arabic, in contrast, /b/ is also impossible after /m/, but it has not been settled yet which one of them should be chosen over the other. That is, /m/ and /b/ are still competing with each other; once /b/ is omitted and once /m/ is omitted. The competition here could be motivated by the fact that both /b/ and /m/ have the same place of articulation, namely bilabial. In any case, it should be noted that this phenomenon is not general, such that all al-Bāḥa Arabic speakers choose to omit sometimes /m/ and sometimes /b/. It seems to be an individual characteristic in which some speakers always omit /m/ and others would always omit /b/.
paradigm of al-ʔAḥsāʾ Arabic and Abu Dhabi Arabic.\textsuperscript{52} And such information is not found in Dubai Arabic.

As a result, al-Bāḥa Arabic, ʕUnayzah Arabic and Kuwaiti Arabic may be classified as $b$-varieties since the occurrence of -$b$ in these varieties seems to be systematic. Therefore, the use of $mūb$ in these varieties is probably a further development in non-verbal negation. On the other hand, al-ʔAḥsāʾ Arabic and Abu Dhabi Arabic may be classified as non-$b$-varieties because the occurrence of -$b$ in these varieties is not systematic. Thus, the use of $mūb$ in these two varieties is probably a result of dialect contact. In Dubai Arabic, the case is not clear due to the lack of data; we do not know if this -$b$ is systematic or not.

Finally, similarly to the borrowing of $mūb$, $muš$ seems to be borrowed as well in al-ʔAḥsāʾ Arabic, possibly from Yemen or Oman, from where many of the Shia inhabitants of the Gulf region are known to have migrated, as some dialects in this region use $\ldots-\check{s}$ as part of the negative morpheme. al-ʔAḥsāʾ Arabic is a non-$\check{s}$-variety because $\ldots-\check{s}$ is not observed here in standard negation; thus, $muš$ cannot be considered as a result of attaching the verbal negator to a personal pronoun. Compare the following verbal and non-verbal clauses from al-ʔAḥsāʾ Arabic:

(249) al-ʔAḥsāʾ Arabic

a. ʔaḥmad mā ǧa

Ahmad  NEG come.PRF.3MSG

‘Ahmad did not come.’

\textsuperscript{52} al-ʔAḥsāʾ Arabic is one of the varieties where data is collected through fieldwork; yet, the negative personal pronoun paradigm of this variety is not completed in the table. That is, the NEG+PRO strategy is rarely used among speakers of this variety and when it is used, it seems to occur only in the three cases mentioned in the table.
b. al-bēt muš zēn

DEF-house NEG nice

‘The house is not nice.’ (Fieldwork data)

4.3.1.7 Yemeni

Five modern Arabic varieties come from Yemen in the study, and all of them are considered in this section as in Table 32.

Table 32: Non-verbal negation in the Yemeni varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The verbal negator(s)</th>
<th>The non-verbal negator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Hadhrami Arabic</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma+PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Zinḡibār Arabic</td>
<td>miš (or miši and māši)</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Adeni Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
<td>muš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Taiz Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
<td>ma+PRO+-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ṣana’a Arabic</td>
<td>mā……-š and mā</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the NEG+PRO construction and the mū–miš morpheme, are used in this region to express non-verbal negation. The following are representative examples:
(250) Hadhrami Arabic\(^{53}\)

ad-dār  \(\text{ma-hi} \)  kabēr  
\(\text{DEF-house} \) \(\text{NEG-3FSG} \) \(\text{big} \)

‘The house is not big.’  
(Ahmed, 2012: 50)

(251) Taiz Arabic

ma-na-š  \(\text{rāyiḥ} \)  al-yūm  
\(\text{NEG-1SG-NEG} \) \(\text{go.PTCP} \) \(\text{DEF-today} \)

‘I am not going today.’  
(Ahmed, 2012: 61)

(252) Zinābīr Arabic

al-bait  \(\text{miš} \)  kabēr  
\(\text{DEF-house} \) \(\text{NEG} \) \(\text{big} \)

‘The house is not big.’  

(253) Adeni Arabic

al-gaw  \(\text{muš} \)  ḥama  
\(\text{DEF-air} \) \(\text{NEG} \) \(\text{hot} \)

‘The air is not hot.’  
(Ahmed, 2012: 60)

4.4 General remarks on non-verbal negation in modern Arabic varieties

Several overall points can be drawn from the aforementioned demonstration of non-verbal negation in modern Arabic varieties. These points will be explained in the following five sub-sections. In 4.4.1, we outline every possible way found in the modern Arabic varieties to express non-verbal negation, including the use of the NEG+PRO and the \(\text{mū} \sim \text{miš} \) strategies. In 4.4.2, the type of the pronoun attached to the verb when the NEG+PRO construction is used will be examined. In 4.4.3, the phonological shapes of

\(^{53}\) dār ‘house’ in Arabic is feminine. This is why the pronoun attached to the negator \(\text{ma} \) is \(\text{hi} \) ‘she’, the third singular feminine pronoun.
the \textit{mū\textendash}miš morpheme in the modern Arabic varieties is discussed. In 4.4.4, the origin of \(-b\), which is observed in some Arabian Peninsula varieties, is discussed. Finally, in 4.4.5, the development of negation in modern Arabic varieties is examined in the light of the Arabic negative cycle proposed in Figure 2.

4.4.1 Non-verbal negation strategies

We have seen in 4.2 that non-verbal negation in Standard Arabic can be rendered by the use of \textit{laysa}, \textit{mā}, \textit{ʔin} and \textit{y ayr}. We have also seen that in modern Arabic varieties, the same notion is commonly rendered by: a) attaching a variety’s verbal negator to one of the personal pronouns in that variety (NEG+PRO); or b) by the use of a \textit{mū\textendash}miš morpheme; or rarely c) by adopting the strategy used in standard negation. However, before going further, two points should be noted. First, the Standard Arabic non-verbal negator \textit{y ayr} may be used in a modern variety as an instance of code-switching into Standard Arabic. This is as the case in Kuwaiti Arabic in (254). Second, \textit{lis} (related to the Standard Arabic \textit{laysa}) is found in ?Abha Arabic only as in (255).

(254) Kuwaiti Arabic

\begin{verbatim}
ʔil-walad ɣ ayr śādeg fī mašār-ah
DEF-boy NEG honest in feeling-his
‘The boy is not honest.’
\end{verbatim}

(Alsalem, 2012: 40–41)

(255) ?Abha Arabic

\begin{verbatim}
lis ẓālīd hinah
NEG Khaled here
‘Khaled is not here.’
\end{verbatim}

(Al-Azraqi, 1998: 142)

The previous facts impose the following two generalizations:
Generalization 13: The use of ئ in non-verbal negation is unattested in modern Arabic varieties.

Generalization 14: The use of a reflex of laysa and ۳ayr in non-verbal negation is rarely attested in modern Arabic varieties.

We turn now to the other strategies in non-verbal negation. First, the use of the NEG+PRO construction and the mū~mīš morpheme is found in every region, except in the Mesopotamian one where data is found on the use of the mū~mīš approach only. Similar cases are found in some varieties of other regions in which data may be found on the use of the NEG+PRO construction but not on the use of the mū~mīš morpheme, or vice versa. However, the lack of data for the use of one of these two strategies cannot be taken as evidence that this strategy is not used. It can only be considered as an indication for the common use of the attested strategy and the less, or perhaps rare, use of the absent one. To explain this, let us consider, as an example, the case in al-Karak Arabic and the case in Muslim Baghdadi Arabic.

In al-Karak Arabic, the available data shows that only the NEG+PRO construction is used in non-verbal negation as demonstrated by the following:

(256)  al-Karak Arabic

l-awlād    mumah    fi-d-dār
DEF-boy.PL  NEG.3PL  in-DEF-house

‘The boys are not in the house.’  
(Alsarayreh, 2012: 43)
Data also shows that, in al-Karak Arabic, a *mū–miš* morpheme has been already coined but has not been generalized yet to negate every non-verbal clause. It is used with third singular subjects only, for example:

(257) al-Karak Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{haḍa} & \text{mū} & \text{ktāb-i} \\
\text{NEG} & \text{book-my} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘This is not my book.’ 

(Alsarayreh, 2012: 44)

In Muslim Baghdadi Arabic, the case is the opposite; the available data shows the use of the *mū–miš* morpheme only, but there is no available data to show the use of the NEG+PRO construction. The following exemplifies the use of *mū* in this variety:

(258) Muslim Baghdadi Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{inta} & \text{mū} & \text{Ṣirāqi} \\
\text{you.MSG} & \text{NEG} & \text{Iraqi} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘You are not an Iraqi.’

(Al-Khalesi, 2006: 36)

Therefore, bearing in mind the fact that *mū* in many modern Arabic varieties has been generalized in non-verbal negation, there will be no reason to anticipate that varieties such as al-Karak Arabic would be different from these varieties. In other words, it would be risky to assume that *mū* has never been used to negate any non-verbal clause where the subject is something other than a third singular masculine. In contrast, considering the fact that *mū* is the short version of the NEG+PRO construction *mā-hu*, it would be also difficult to state here that no Muslim Baghdadi Arabic speaker would ever use *mā-hu*, or similar, in non-verbal negation. The appropriate analysis in such cases seems to be that
when either the use of the NEG+PRO construction or the use of the \( m\text{"}\text{\~m}i\text{\~s} \) morpheme is not reported in a variety, it should be considered as an indication that the unreported phenomenon is less commonly used. Note, however, this is one of the a few places in this study where even when there is no available data, the situation can be, with some confidence, assumed. As a result, the following is proposed:

*Generalization 15:* In modern Arabic varieties, non-verbal negation is commonly expressed by either the use of the NEG+PRO construction or the \( m\text{"}\text{\~m}i\text{\~s} \) morpheme.

As a strict rule, however, whether the non-verbal clause is negated by the NEG+PRO construction or by the \( m\text{"}\text{\~m}i\text{\~s} \) morpheme, the negative item always precedes the predicate. Therefore,

*Generalization 16:* In non-verbal negation, the NEG+PRO and the \( m\text{"}\text{\~m}i\text{\~s} \) morpheme are always placed before the negated predicate.

Finally, in a few varieties, the standard negation strategy is used in non-verbal negation as well. This seems to be a characteristic of the Sudanic varieties only as in this region \( m\text{"} \) is able to negate verbal and non-verbal clauses, compare the following:

(259) Sudanese Arabic

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a. } & m\text{"} \text{\~g}" \\
& \text{NEG} \text{ come.PRF.3PL} \\
\end{array}\]

‘They did not come.’ (Bergman, 2002: 194)
The same is found in four non-Sudanic varieties (Moroccan Arabic, Eastern Libyan Arabic, Ṣaṣīdī Arabic and Egyptian western desert Arabic). All of which are š-varieties and spoken in the north of Africa. This, however, seems to occur only when the predicate is a single word, which, in turn, is intercalated between mā……-š, for example:

(260) Moroccan Arabic

ma-kbir-ši

NEG-big-NEG

‘It is not big’ (Harrell, 2004: 155)

The intercalating of pronouns between mā… …-š in such varieties is illustrated in the next sub-section.

4.4.2 The NEG+PRO construction

The morpheme resulting from the interaction between the verbal negator and the personal pronoun (NEG+PRO) differs considerably from one variety to another. This is based on the following two factors: (1) the type of the variety (e.g., š-variety, b-variety) and (2) the type of the personal pronoun attached to the verbal negator.

Regarding the first factor, in the non-š-varieties, when this NEG+PRO construction is used, mā is always attached to the personal pronoun as in:
(261) Yanbu' Arabic

\[ \text{mā-hum aðkya} \]
\[ \text{NEG-3PL smart.MPL} \]

‘They are not smart.’ \((\text{Fieldwork data})\)

(262) Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic

\[ \text{ntāma galb-u mā-hu hawn} \]
\[ \text{Ntama heart-his NEG-3MSG here} \]

‘Ntama’s heart is not here.’ \((\text{Heath, 2003: 68})\)

In only three non-š-varieties (al-Bāḥa Arabic, ʕUnayzah Arabic and Kuwaiti Arabic), which might be identified as \(b\)-varieties, \(-b\) is suffixed to the negated personal pronoun and the resulting morpheme here would be \(mā+\text{PRO}+\)\(-b\), for instance:

(263) al-Bāḥa Arabic

\[ \text{mḥammad ma-hu-b muhandis} \]
\[ \text{Mohammed NEG-3MSG-b engineer} \]

‘He is not an engineer.’ \((\text{Fieldwork data})\)

The fact that all of these varieties are from the same region imposes the following generalization:

\textit{Generalization 17}: \(b\)-varieties seem to be found in the Arabian Peninsula region \textit{only}. 
On the other hand, in the š-varieties, when the NEG+PRO strategy is used, the personal pronoun is mostly intercalated between mā... ...-š in which the morpheme ...-š appears as the final suffix in the resulting item, for example:

(264) Taiz Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{ma-na-š} & \text{rāyiḥ} & \text{al-yūm} \\
\text{NEG-1SG-NEG} & \text{go.PTCP} & \text{DEF-today}
\end{array}
\]

‘I am not going today.’  
(Ahmed, 2012: 61)

However, in three š-varieties only (Annaba Arabic, Sousse Arabic and Baskinta Arabic), ...-š is not final since the attached personal pronoun occurs after ...-š as in (265).

(265) Annaba Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{maš-nī} & \text{matfakar} \\
\text{NEG-1SG} & \text{remember.PTCP}
\end{array}
\]

‘I do not remember.’  
(Meftouh, Bouchemal, & Smaïli, 2012: 128)

Accordingly, the following can be formulated:

\textit{Generalization 18: In the š-varieties, ...-š is mostly the final suffix when the NEG+PRO strategy is used.}

This could mean that the attachment between the negator ma and the personal pronoun to express non-verbal negation became a strategy before the use of ...-š.

The second factor concerns the type of the personal pronoun that is attached to the verbal negator. In Arabic, the pronoun paradigm can be divided into two categories:
dependent and independent. It would be very difficult to identify the phonological shape of every pronoun in every modern Arabic variety; thus, the phonological shapes of these pronouns in Standard Arabic are taken as representative examples as in the table below:

Table 33: The dependent and independent pronouns in Standard Arabic\(^{54}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Dependent form</th>
<th>Translations</th>
<th>Independent form</th>
<th>Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-ī -nī</td>
<td>me/my</td>
<td>ʔanā</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>-nā</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>nāḥnu</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2MSG</td>
<td>-ka</td>
<td>you(r) (2MSG)</td>
<td>ʔanta</td>
<td>you (2MSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2FSG</td>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>you(r) (2FSG)</td>
<td>ʔanti</td>
<td>you (2FSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2MPL</td>
<td>-kum</td>
<td>your (2MPL)</td>
<td>ʔantum</td>
<td>you (2MPL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2FPL</td>
<td>-kunna</td>
<td>you(r) (2FPL)</td>
<td>ʔantunna</td>
<td>you (2FPL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3MSG</td>
<td>-hu</td>
<td>him/his</td>
<td>huwa</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3FSG</td>
<td>-hi</td>
<td>her</td>
<td>hiya</td>
<td>she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>3MPL</td>
<td>-hum</td>
<td>them/their (3MPL)</td>
<td>hum</td>
<td>they (3MPL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3FPL</td>
<td>-hunna</td>
<td>them/their (3FPL)</td>
<td>hunna</td>
<td>they (3FPL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now let us consider Table 34 below. This table outlines the phonological forms resulting from the attachment between personal pronouns and verbal negators. Note that not all varieties are listed in this table, as information on the NEG+PRO constructions is not always available.\(^{55}\) Note also that, unlike other tables in this study, data in this table

---

\(^{54}\) In Standard Arabic, there are three grammatical numbers: singular, plural and dual. However, the dual number is ignored in this table as it is not observed in any modern Arabic variety.

\(^{55}\) To make the information fit in the table, some varieties’ names have been shortened as follows: M.Ḥassān= Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic, E.Libyan= Eastern Libyan Arabic, W.Libyan= Western Libyan Arabic, S/T= Sahel/Tunis Arabic, E-Nigeria= Eastern Nigeria Arabic, W-Nigeria= 
is best to be read vertically rather than horizontally. That is, the purpose of this table is to compare the type of the pronoun attached to the verbal negator in every Arabic variety; thus, it seems appropriate to present the relevant items in the same column, e.g., the resulting form when the verbal negator is attached to the first singular pronoun. In this table, the first column, which contains letters, is for regions. The meaning of these letters is as follows: (R) to mean region, (M) to mean Maghrebi, (E) to mean Egyptian, (S) to mean Sudanic, (L) to mean Levantine and (A) to mean Arabian Peninsula. In the table also, the symbol (–) is to indicate unknown information; more than one item in the cell indicates different allomorphs; and the merger of two cells means the same morpheme is used in these cases.  

Western Nigeria Arabic, N.Jordan= Northern Jordanian Arabic, C.Dhofārī= Coastal Dhofārī Arabic and U.Hijazi= Urban Hijazi Arabic.

56 Note that not all varieties distinguish between 2MPL and 2FPL, for example. In such varieties, the correct term in this case would be 2PL.
Table 34: The negative personal pronoun paradigm of some modern Arabic varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>1PL</th>
<th>2MSG</th>
<th>2FSG</th>
<th>2MPL</th>
<th>2FPL</th>
<th>3MSG</th>
<th>3FSG</th>
<th>3MPL</th>
<th>3FPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Cairene</td>
<td>maḥīš</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Nigeria</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>māna</td>
<td>māk</td>
<td>māki</td>
<td>māku</td>
<td>mākan</td>
<td>mī</td>
<td>māha</td>
<td>māhum</td>
<td>māhin</td>
<td>māhum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-Nigeria</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>māna</td>
<td>māk</td>
<td>māki</td>
<td>māku</td>
<td>mākan</td>
<td>mī</td>
<td>māha</td>
<td>māhum</td>
<td>māhin</td>
<td>māhum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>al-Karak</td>
<td>mana</td>
<td>maḥna</td>
<td>mīnit</td>
<td>mīntī</td>
<td>mīntu</td>
<td>mū</td>
<td>mī</td>
<td>mumah</td>
<td>mumma</td>
<td>māhin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Jordan</td>
<td>manīš</td>
<td>maḥnāš</td>
<td>mantāš</td>
<td>mantīš</td>
<td>mantūš</td>
<td>mahuš</td>
<td>mahuš</td>
<td>mahīyyāš</td>
<td>mahīš</td>
<td>mahumāš</td>
<td>mahumīš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as-Salṭ</td>
<td>manīš</td>
<td>maḥnāš</td>
<td>mantīš</td>
<td>mantūš</td>
<td>mantinniš</td>
<td>mahūš</td>
<td>mahūš</td>
<td>mahumūš</td>
<td>mahummuš</td>
<td>mahinniš</td>
<td>mahinniš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>C. Dhofarî</td>
<td>al-Baḥa</td>
<td>al-ʔAḥṣā?</td>
<td>Hagil</td>
<td>Madinah</td>
<td>U.Hijazi</td>
<td>Yanbuʕ</td>
<td>ʕUnayza</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>Kuwaiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td>māni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manī</td>
<td>manī</td>
<td>manī</td>
<td>manī</td>
<td>manī</td>
<td>manī</td>
<td>manī</td>
<td>manī</td>
<td>manī</td>
<td>manī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
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<td>mānī</td>
<td>mānī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td></td>
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<td>mānı</td>
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<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td>mānı</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The aim here is to find out the type of the personal pronoun (dependent or independent) attached to the verbal negator. However, the dependent and independent forms for 3MSG, 3FSG, 3MPL and 3FPL are not sufficiently phonologically distinct. In fact, in most varieties they are too similar which makes it difficult to identify which form is being attached to the negator. Therefore, these pronouns (3MSG, 3FSG, 3MPL and 3FPL) are excluded in this investigation. However, in a few cases only it might be clear which form is used. For example, in both m’huwiex he is not in Maltese and mahuāš he is not in Northern Jordanian Arabic, it seems clear that the independent 3MSG form, not the dependent one, is attached to the verbal negator here.

For the 1SG, the dependent pronoun -nī ‘me’ seems to be the one attached to the verbal negator in all Arabic varieties, except in al-Karak Arabic where the independent ġanā ‘I’ is the one used in such a case. Therefore,

*Generalization 19: The use of the NEG+PRO construction for ISG subject almost always means the dependent pronoun -nī is attached to the verbal negator.*

For 1PL, 2MSG, 2FSG, 2MPL and 2FPL, the pronouns are different. With the exception of Standard Maltese, the dependent pronouns are chosen to be the attached set among the Maghrebi and the Sudanic varieties. That is to say, when the NEG+PRO construction is used in these regions with, for example, 1PL, the dependent form -nā ‘us’ (not the independent one nahmu ‘we’) will be attached to the verbal negator. In contrast, with the exception of Damascus Arabic, in the Levantine and the Arabian Peninsula regions, the independent pronouns are chosen to be attached in such cases. Urban Hijazi Arabic (an Arabian Peninsula variety) is unique. That is, both options are available in this variety; it can behave as the Levantine and the Arabian Peninsula varieties as well as the Maghrebi and the Sudanic varieties. Note also that in Coastal Dhofārī Arabic, the same
optionality is found but with the first plural only. That is to say, the negated first plural pronoun in this variety could be -nā ‘us’ as in mānā ‘we are not’ or nahnu ‘we’ as in mānahana ‘we are not’. Despite these exceptions, the following can be proposed:

*Generalization 20: The use of the NEG+PRO construction for 1PL, 2MSG, 2FSG, 2MPL and 2FPL subjects mostly means the relevant dependent pronoun, not the independent one, is attached to the verbal negators in the Maghrebi and the Sudanic region and the relevant independent one is attached instead in the Levantine and the Arabian Peninsula region.*

In the following section, we explore the phonological shapes of the mū–miš morphemes, a strategy that is common as much as the NEG+PRO construction in non-verbal negation.

### 4.4.3 The mū–miš morpheme

As we have seen, the use of a mū–miš morpheme is very common to negate non-verbal clauses. In the Arabic negative cycle introduced in Figure 2, we demonstrate that this form is mostly a result of a fusion between the verbal negator in a variety and the third singular masculine pronoun in that variety. Accordingly, the verbal negator in the š-varieties contains ...-š, and, therefore, when this verbal negator is fused to the third singular masculine pronoun, the resulting morpheme is muš or miš, for example:

(266) Palestinian Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hāda</th>
<th>miš</th>
<th>mumkin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘This is not possible.’ (Hoyt, 2005: 6)
In the non-š-varieties, on the other hand, the verbal negator has no ...-š; consequently, the resulting from does not contain such a sound, and it is mostly mū, for example:

(267) Muslim Baghdadi Arabic

inta mū Širāqi
you.MSG NEG Iraqi
‘You are not an Iraqi.’ (Al-Kholesi, 2006: 36)

In some of the non-š-varieties, however, the morpheme contains -b. This is a characteristic of some of the Arabian Peninsula varieties (see the following section for the origin and the function of this morpheme), for example:

(268) ʕUnayzah Arabic

hind mūb ṭāliba
Hind NEG student.F
‘Hind is not a student.’ (Fieldwork data)

In the following table, the phonological shapes of the mū~miš morphemes in the Arabic varieties are given. Note that the table only include varieties where data in this regard is found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The mū~miš</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maghrebi</strong></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
<td>maši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Annaba Arabic</td>
<td>maš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Dellys Arabic</td>
<td>maši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sousse Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sahel/Tunis Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Eastern Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>moš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Western Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Standard Maltese</td>
<td>mhux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egyptian</strong></td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Northwestern Sinai Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Smēšnī and ʩGēlī Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Şašidī Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>al-ʩArīš Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sudanic</strong></td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Eastern Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td>mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Western Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td>mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levantine</strong></td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Northern Jordanian Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>as-Salṭ Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Damascus Arabic</td>
<td>mū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td>miš and muš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Aley Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Baskinta Arabic</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mesopotamian</strong></td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Christian Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>mū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Muslim Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>mū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Širqāṭ (Assur) Arabic</td>
<td>mū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arabian Peninsula</strong></td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Kuwaitī Arabic</td>
<td>mū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>al-ʔAhsāʔ Arabic</td>
<td>mu, mub and muš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Ḥagil Arabic</td>
<td>mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Madinah Arabic</td>
<td>mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Yanbuʕ Arabic</td>
<td>mu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The \textit{mū~miṣ} morpheme in these varieties may not be always a result of a fusion. Simply, this morpheme could be borrowed from other varieties. This is the case, for example, in Northwestern Sinai Arabic. As in (269), the verbal negator in this variety has no \textit{-ṣ}, yet the non-verbal negator is \textit{miṣ}.

(269) \textit{Northwestern Sinai Arabic}

a. \text{mā} \text{ṣift-ih}  
\hspace{1em} \text{NEG} \text{	extit{see.PRF.1SG-him}}  
\hspace{1em} ‘I did not see him.’  
\hspace{1em} (de Jong, 2000: 244)

b. \text{miṣ} \text{ʕayb}  
\hspace{1em} \text{NEG} \text{disgrace}  
\hspace{1em} ‘It is not disgrace.’  
\hspace{1em} (de Jong, 2000: 224)

A reasonable explanation here is that \textit{miṣ} in Northwestern Sinai Arabic is a result of dialect contact, because this variety is surrounded by others such as Smēšnī and ʕGēlī Arabic where this \textit{miṣ} is used to negate non-verbal clauses. In fact, the spread through dialect contact is likely the most important driver not only of Arabic varieties gaining \textit{miṣ} as a non-verbal negator, but also of varieties gaining discontinuous negation with \textit{-ṣ} as a possible construction in standard negation. This is to acknowledge the likelihood that
in reality only a small minority of Arabic varieties (perhaps even just one) originally underwent Jespersen’s cycle internally, by grammaticalizing šī ‘thing’ as a negative particle (see section 1.4 above). The rest have presumably borrowed the sound ...-š as a negative suffix. Consider, for instance, the fact that in many Arabic varieties such as Delys Arabic, hāğa, not šī, is the ordinary word for ‘thing’ as in the example below; nevertheless, no Arabic variety has grammaticalized this item as a negator.

(270) Delys Arabic

ma-ṣand-i ḥāṭta ḥāğa

NEG-have-me even thing

‘I have nothing.’ or ‘I have not got a thing.’ (Souag, 2005: 166)

Another interesting point about the mū–miš morphemes is the presence of -b in some of them. This is a characteristic found among the Arabian Peninsula varieties only. Such a phenomenon may require further details and, thus, will be the focus of the next sub-section.

4.4.4 The use of -b in non-verbal negation

This sub-section is to discuss the origin as well as the function of the morpheme -b which we find in some of the Arabian Peninsula varieties. In his investigation of Najdi Arabic, Ingham states that “This [-b] is a peculiarity of Central Najdi and occurs also as an alternative structure in [Standard Arabic]” (Ingham, 1994: 44).57 In this study, we find that this -b is not only found in the Najdi variety included in this study (ʕUnayzah Arabic),

---

57 Najd is a name of the central region of Saudi Arabia where more than one Arabic variety can be found. Najd is one of the regions where the fieldwork of this study is conducted. ʕUnayzah Arabic is the Najdi variety that has been chosen to be investigated for the purpose of this study, see the reason behind this choice in 2.6 above.
but also found in other two non-Najdi varieties (al-Bāḥa Arabic and Kuwaiti Arabic). Ingham does not discuss the function of the alternative structure in Standard Arabic where -b is used, which will be explained here. In Standard Arabic -b is prefixed to the negated predicate, and in the examples provided by Ingham (1994) on Najdi Arabic as in (271) and the ones provided by Alsalem (2012) on Kuwaiti Arabic as in (272), -b is transcribed as a prefix attached to the negated predicate as well.

(271) Najdi Arabic

ḥasan ma hu b-ḡāy
Hāsan NEG he b-come.PTCP
‘Hasan is not coming.’ (Ingham, 1994: 45)

(272) Kuwaiti Arabic

ʔil-ʕarab mu-hum b-waḥid
DEF-Arab NEG-3PL b-one
‘The Arabs are not the same.’ (Alsalem, 2012: 39)

In contrast, I argue in this study that -b is no longer prefixed to the predicate; instead, it is suffixed to the negated personal pronoun. This is, at least, true in the two b-varieties (ʕUnayzah Arabic and al-Bāḥa Arabic) out of the three ones included in this study. That is because unlike the third b-variety in the study (Kuwaiti Arabic), data in ʕUnayzah Arabic and al-Bāḥa Arabic has been obtained through fieldwork in which extra information has been sought to determine the place and the function of -b.

In Standard Arabic, -b may occur with negative non-verbal clauses to emphasize the negative notion. This is possible with two non-verbal negators only (mā and laysa).

58 Although this point does not seem to have been argued for explicitly in the literature, it is clear that various authors assume the same thing, since they transcribe this form of negation as mub and not mu... b- (e.g. Holes 2015).
In (273) below, the use of these negators is exemplified once with -b and once without it. Note, however, in modern Arabic varieties this -b has undergone phonological reduction. It is originally bi as can be seen in the Standard Arabic examples below.

(273) Standard Arabic

a. mā ?anā qārī?-un
   NEG I read.PTCP-NOM
   ‘I am not a reader.’

b. mā ?anā bi-qārī?-in
   NEG I EMPH-read.PTCP-GEN
   ‘I am certainly not a reader.’

c. ?al-mudīr-u laysa ǧayyid-an
   DEF-manager-NOM NEG.3MSG good-ACC
   ‘The manager is not good.’

d. ?al-mudīr-u laysa bi-ǧayyid-in
   DEF-manager-NOM NEG.3MSG EMPH-good-GEN
   ‘The manager is not good.’ (Personal Knowledge)

Aside from the well-known Arabic rule which explains the prefixing of bi- to the predicate when extra emphasis is intended, and therefore, similarly to any other Standard Arabic preposition, the noun hosting this prefix must be in the genitive case, we can see that bi- in Standard Arabic cannot be separated from the predicate. For instance, when the negative non-verbal clause has extra information involving additional morpheme, or perhaps morphemes, this extra morpheme may occur between the subject and the predicate. In such cases, the emphatic bi- moves with the predicate (its host). Consider

(Personal Knowledge)
the following Quranic passage and note that the additional morphemes here are a prepositional phrase which occurs between the subject and the predicate:

(274) Standard Arabic

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wa-mā} & \quad ?\text{anta} & \quad ʕ\text{alay-him} & \quad \text{bi-wakīl-in} \\
\text{and-NEG} & \quad \text{you.MSG} & \quad \text{on-them} & \quad \text{EMPH-sponsor-GEN}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Certainly, you are not their sponsor.’ (Lit. ‘You are not a sponsor on them’)

(Qur’an 42:6)

As demonstrated by the above example, the fact that bi- moves with the predicate suggests that the predicate, not the personal pronoun ?anta ‘you.MSG’ (the subject), is the host of the affix bi-.

In the modern Arabic b-varieties, on the other hand, -b is not used to emphasize; it is part of the ordinary negative morpheme in non-verbal negation, for example:

(275) ʕUnayzah Arabic

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ma-nti-b} & \quad \text{wakīl} & \quad ʕ\text{alē-hum} \\
\text{NEG-you.MSG-b} & \quad \text{sponsor} & \quad \text{on-them}
\end{align*}
\]

‘You are not their sponsor.’

(Fieldwork data)

In this example, the prepositional phrase ʕalē-hum ‘on them’ can either follow the predicate wakīl ‘sponsor’ as in this example, or precede it as in the following one.
(276) ʕUnayzah Arabic

ma-nṭi-b ʕalē-hum  wakīl
NEG-you.MSG-b  on-them  sponsor

‘You are not their sponsor.’  
*(Fieldwork data)*

Note that unlike case in Standard Arabic, the affix -\(b\) does not move with the predicate. This is because it is not attached to it anymore; it is part of the negative morpheme (NEG+PRO).

As a result, it is assumed here that similarly to the analysis of the mandatory use of ...-\(š\) in the \(š\)-varieties, we could analyze the mandatory use of -\(b\) in the \(b\)-varieties (ʕUnayzah Arabic, al-Bāḥa Arabic and Kuwaiti Arabic). In other words, this mandatory use of -\(b\) in non-verbal negation is a result of being affected by Jespersen’s cycle. In this regard, non-verbal negation in these \(b\)-varieties can be classified as stage II in this cycle, where the ordinary negator is supported by another morpheme to strength the notion of negation. Therefore, -\(b\) in the upcoming examples will be glossed as a negative morpheme since its omission would render negative structures ungrammatical. In this context, it is worth noting, however, that while the origin of the negative ...-\(š\) in Arabic is \(šayʔ\) ‘thing’ as explained in 1.4 above, the origin of -\(b\) is the emphatic \(b\)-\(i\)-, which is already used in Standard Arabic for the same purpose (emphasizing the negative notion).

### 4.4.5 The Arabic negative cycle

In 3.4.2.2, we introduced the Arabic negative cycle. Under this theme, we outlined five stages in Figure 2. In stage I, one negator (mostly \(mā\)) negates both verbal and non-verbal clauses. In stage II, the verbal negator is attached to a personal pronoun that agrees with the subject of the non-verbal clause to express non-verbal negation (NEG+PRO strategy). In stage III, a single morpheme is formed (\(mū~miš\) morpheme) usually by fusing the
verbal negator to the third singular masculine pronoun, and this morpheme is generalized to negate any non-verbal clause. In stage IV, the mū–miš morpheme is used to negate future and progressive aspect clauses. In stage V, the mū–miš morpheme is generalized to negate both verbal and non-verbal clauses. In the same section, we mentioned that the placement of the modern Arabic varieties in their relevant stages regarding this cycle is postponed until we see how non-verbal negation is expressed in them. After seeing this now, we are going to determine their stages.

However, because the Arabic negative cycle concerns both verbal and non-verbal negation, the stage of a variety cannot be determined unless information is available on how verbal and non-verbal negation is expressed in that variety. Accordingly, the stage of the following six varieties cannot be determined as information on how non-verbal negation is expressed in these varieties is unknown: Sfax Arabic, Muzēnah and Banī Waṣil Arabic, Southern Sinai Arabic, Ṭuwarā Arabic, Biyyāḏi and Axraṣī Arabic and ɬAfīḏ Arabic. Abeche Arabic is similarly excluded since information is not available here on how verbal negation is done. Thus, the total number of varieties where data on both verbal and non-verbal negation is found is 47. All of them are listed in the following table and their stage in the Arabic negative cycle is given. Note, however, in many varieties, more than one stage can be observed. Therefore, the one given stage here is the most advanced stage only. For example, when both stage I and stage II can be found in a variety, the variety is classified, as stage II as this stage is the most advanced one.

Table 36: The progress of modern Arabic varieties in the Arabic negative cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The reached stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Maghrebi</td>
<td>Ħassāniyya Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Malian Ħassāniyya Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Annaba Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dellys Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sousse Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Eastern Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Standard Maltese</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Western Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sahel/Tunis Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Northwestern Sinai Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Smēṣnī and ℰGēlī Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ṣaṣīdī Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Egyptian western desert Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td>Stage V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>al-ʕArīš Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Eastern Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Western Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sudanese Arabic</td>
<td>Stage I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Largeau Arabic</td>
<td>Stage I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>al-Karak Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Damascus Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Northern Jordanian Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>as-Salṭ Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Aley Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Baskinta Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Christian Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Muslim Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Širqāṭ (Assur) Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Kuwaiti Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Coastal Dhofārī Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>al-Bāḥa Arabic</td>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>al-ʔAḥsā? Arabic</td>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic Variety</td>
<td>Stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Ḥagil Arabic</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Madinah Arabic</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Urban Hijazi Arabic</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Yanbu' Arabic</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>?Abha Arabic</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>ṬUnayzah Arabic</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi Arabic</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Dubai Arabic</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Hadhrami Arabic</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Zinjibār Arabic</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Adeni Arabic</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Taiz Arabic</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Sana’a Arabic</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table, the geographical place of a variety does not seem to have an influence on the progress of that variety in the cycle. As can be noticed, three Arabic varieties are in stage I as verbal and non-verbal clauses in them are negated by *mā*. Compare the following verbal and non-verbal clauses from Sudanese Arabic and from ?Abha Arabic:

(277) **Sudanese Arabic**

a. **mā ţō**

```
NEG come.PRF.3PL
```

‘They did not come.’ (Bergman, 2002: 194)

b. **dā Ŵakl-ū ţārīf**

```
that.MSG appearance-his NEG nice
```

‘That one, his appearance is not nice.’ (Bergman, 2002: 59)
(278)  ?Abha Arabic

a.  mā  tīṣrif  ḥatta  tuslug  bēḏah
   NEG  know.IMPF.3SG  even  boil.IMPF.3SG  egg
   ‘She does not even know how to boil an egg.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 123)

b.  mā  l-ŷurfā-k  l-ik  l-hāl-ik
   NEG  DEF-room-you  for-you  DEF-alone-you
   ‘The room is not for you alone.’ (Al-Azraqi, 1998: 140)

In the table also, seven of the modern Arabic varieties are in stage II. That is, non-verbal negation in these varieties is rendered by adding the verbal negator to a personal pronoun that agrees with the subject of the non-verbal clause. Consider the following and note that the verbal negator that is attached to the personal pronoun in the first example is mā and in the second one is mā…..-š:

(279)  Urban Hijazi Arabic

hada  al-bāb  ma-hu  xašab
this  DEF-door  NEG-3MSG  wood
   ‘This door is not made from wood’ (Lit. ‘This door is not wood.’)
   (Sieny, 1978: 168)

(280)  Taiz Arabic

ma-na-š  rāyīḥ  al-yūm
NEG-1SG-NEG  go.PTCP  DEF-today
   ‘I am not going today.’ (Ahmed, 2012: 61)

The table also shows that most of the varieties are in stage III; 24 of them are in this stage in which a newly coined morpheme (mū~miš) is generalized in non-verbal
negation. This number is based on the available data; however, as we explained in 4.4.1, even when there is no available data to show the use of a morpheme in a variety, it can be expected that morpheme exists but might be rarely used in that variety. Thus, the number of the varieties in this stage (III) is probably more than 24. In any case, this morpheme is mostly, but not always, among the non-Š-varieties and among the š-varieties. Both are exemplified below:

(281) Muslim Baghdadi Arabic

\[
\text{inta mū Širāqi} \\
\text{you.MSG NEG Iraqi}
\]

‘You are not an Iraqi.’ (Al-Khalessi, 2006: 36)

(282) Aley Arabic

\[
\text{bayy-u miš ḥakīm} \\
\text{father-his NEG doctor}
\]

‘His father is not a doctor.’ (Bishr, 1956: 39)

In the table as well, 11 varieties are at stage IV in which the negator can negate future and progressive aspect clauses, as in the following:\(^{59}\)

(283) Damascus Arabic

\[
\text{mū Šam-yəštə̱l halla?} \\
\text{NEG PRG-work.IMPF.3MSG now}
\]

‘He is not working now.’ (Cowell, 2005: 387)

\(^{59}\) Note in some varieties such as Cairene Arabic, the morpheme is the only possible negator with such clauses, whereas in others, such as Damascus, these clauses may optionally be negated by the verbal negator.
Standard Maltese

mhux se jmur id-dar
NEG FUT go.IMPF.3MSG DEF-home

‘He is not going to go home.’ (Borg & Azzopardi-Alexander, 1997: 88)

Only two varieties, according to the table, are in stage V (Cairene Arabic and Zināġibār Arabic). This is because the $mū$–$miš$ morpheme in both varieties can occur in standard negation (i.e., main declarative verbal clauses) with non-future as well as non-progressive clauses, for example:

(285) Cairene Arabic

miš biyḥibb il-ḥafīlāt
NEG like.IMPF.3MSG DEF-party.PL

‘He does not like parties.’ (Gary & Gamal-Eldin, 1982: 39)

(286) Zināġibār Arabic

miš idina-hum as-siyyārah ḥaqqa-na
NEG give.PRF.1PL-them DEF-car POSS-our

‘We did not give them our car.’ (Ahmed, 2012: 34)

It should be pointed out here that in section 3.4.2.2 we claimed that the viewing of Jespersen’s cycle as four rather than three stages would be problematic. That is, the four stages approach would entail considering the third stage as a stage that has been skipped in many Arabic varieties. The same skipping, however, can be found here. Ḥassāniyya Arabic and Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic are classified as stage IV in the Arabic negative cycle. This means the $mū$–$miš$ morpheme is used to negate future clauses. However, in these two varieties, there is no available data that indicates the existence of
a mū–miś morpheme, and future clauses are negated here by the NEG+PRO construction, for instance:

(287) Ḥassāniyya Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{mā-ni} & \text{lāhi} & \text{nimši} \\
\text{NEG-me} & \text{FUT} & \text{go.IMPF.1SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘I will not go.’ (Francis, 1979: 99)

This means that stage III in these varieties has been skipped where the mū–miš is coined and generalized in non-verbal negation. However, if we adopt the approach where Jespersen’s cycle is considered to be four stages, we find that the third stage of Jespersen’s cycle has been skipped in 6 out of the 10 considered varieties in Table 16. In contrast, if we adopt the Arabic negative cycle advocated here, the skipping of a stage is found in only two varieties out of 47, meaning this approach seems to capture this situation much more neatly. Another point that favours the adoption of the Arabic negative cycle rather than the four stages analysis of Jespersen’s cycle is that the latter would only explain the use of the new coined morpheme (miš or muš) in the š-varieties but not the use of the similar morpheme (mū or mūb) in the non-š-varieties. The Arabic negative cycle approach, thus, applies to more data, and captures it more neatly, than the four-stage Jespersen’s cycle approach.

4.5 Summary

In this chapter, we discussed non-verbal negation. Under this theme, we defined non-verbal clauses and we explained how they are negated in Standard Arabic as well as in modern Arabic varieties.
Based on 48 modern Arabic varieties, a geographical categorization is adopted to demonstrate the variations among varieties of each region regarding non-verbal negation. The result shows that there is a common tendency to negate non-verbal clauses by the use of a NEG+PRO strategy, in which the verbal negator is attached to a personal pronoun, or by the use of a mū–miš morpheme.

In the Arabian Peninsula region only, a use of -b in non-verbal negation is attested. We argued that in Standard Arabic this morpheme is to emphasize the negated clause, but in the modern Arabic varieties (b-varieties) it is part of the non-verbal negator. This, in turn, can be interpreted as an instance of Jespersen’s cycle in this region.

In this chapter also, we evoked the Arabic negative cycle introduced in the previous chapter. According to this cycle, verbal and non-verbal clauses start by being negated by the same morpheme and return to a similar stage after going through three other stages in which this morpheme is phonologically modified. The majority of the modern varieties, however, can be placed in stage III where a new morpheme is coined and generalized in non-verbal negation, and only two varieties seem to be reaching the final stage where this new morpheme is used in standard negation.

Finally, this chapter results in nine generalizations which are repeated below.

Generalization 13: The use of ʔ in non-verbal negation is unattested in modern Arabic varieties.

Generalization 14: The use of a reflex of laysa and ɣ ayr in non-verbal negation is rarely attested in modern Arabic varieties.

Generalization 15: In modern Arabic varieties, non-verbal negation is commonly expressed by either the use of the NEG+PRO construction or the mū–miš morpheme.
Generalization 16: In non-verbal negation, the NEG+PRO and the mū-miš morpheme are always placed before the negated predicate.

Generalization 17: b-varieties seem to be found in the Arabian Peninsula region only.

Generalization 18: In the š-varieties, …-š is mostly the final suffix when the NEG+PRO strategy is used.

Generalization 19: The use of the NEG+PRO construction for 1SG subject almost always means the dependent pronoun -nī is attached to the verbal negator.

Generalization 20: The use of the NEG+PRO construction for 1PL, 2MSG, 2FSG, 2MPL and 2FPL subjects mostly means the relevant dependent pronoun, not the independent one, is attached to the verbal negators in the Maghrebi and the Sudanic region and the relevant independent one is attached instead in the Levantine and the Arabian Peninsula region.

The next chapter is on negative imperatives. We explore how they are expressed cross-linguistically and then how they are rendered in the modern varieties of Arabic.
5. Negative imperatives

This chapter is on negative imperatives. In this chapter, the four steps (or stages) in any typological study introduced in section 2.2 are performed as follows: I first define the term negative imperatives in 5.1, and I investigate how they are expressed cross-linguistically in 5.2 (step I). In 5.3 and in 5.4, I demonstrate how negative imperatives are expressed in Arabic and categorize modern Arabic varieties according to their similarities and differences (step II). In these same sections, step III and step IV are also conducted. That is, generalizations are proposed where appropriate and explained where possible.

5.1 What are negative imperatives?

Simply speaking, an imperative sentence is a sentence that is used to issue a command or a request such as (go!). In this sense, it is different from the declarative sentence (he goes). While (go!) implies a command or a request, (he goes) is a statement. Negative imperatives are also used to issue a command or a request but in a different way. That is, affirmative imperative clauses convey the meaning of doing something, but negative imperative clauses convey the meaning of not doing it. For this reason, they might be called prohibitive clauses. In chapter 3, we saw that standard negation refers to negation of declarative verbal main clauses only. Therefore, negation of imperatives is a type of non-standard negation since the negated clause here is not declarative.

5.2 Typology of negative imperatives

Relatively less attention in the literature has been given to the way negation is expressed in imperatives (Miestamo, 2007). Based on 495 languages, van der Auwera, Lejeune and

---

60 Of course, various other forms of non-standard negation would be interesting to investigate here, for example clausal complements of adversative predicates such as ‘fear’, ‘doubt’, etc., but detailed information on the negation of such clauses is rarely available in grammatical descriptions, so we leave such investigations for future work.
Goussev (2013) note four different ways to form negative imperatives meant to address a single addressee. These ways are as follows:

I. Similar negative strategy to that used in standard negation and similar verbal construction found in affirmative imperatives – observed in 113 languages. English is an example of this type as in (288). In this example, one can see that the same strategy (*do not*) is used in both standard negation and the negative imperative, and verbs in affirmative and negative imperatives are alike.

(288) English (Germanic, Indo-European)

a. They do not come.

b. Come.

c. Do not come

II. Different negative strategy from that used in standard negation but similar verbal construction found in affirmative imperatives – observed in 182 languages. This is the case, for example, in Vietnamese (289). In this language, the verbal construction in the imperative clause (289)(a) is similar to the one found in the negative imperative clause (289)(b), but the negative marker used with imperatives is *cho*, which is different from the standard negation marker *khong* as in (289)(a).

(289) Vietnamese (Vietic, Austroasiatic)

a. khong uong ruou

   NEG drink alcoholic

   ‘I/you/he/etc are not drinking alcohol’

---

61 To my knowledge, this is the only major framework in the literature for negative imperatives.
b. uong ruou
   drink alcoholic
   ‘Drink alcohol!’

c. cho uong ruou
   NEG drink alcoholic
   ‘Do not drink alcohol!’ (van der Auwera et al., 2013)

III. Similar negative strategy to that used in standard negation but different verbal construction from affirmative imperatives – observed in 55 languages. Spanish is a language of this type, as the ways of forming standard negation and negative imperatives are identical, but verbal forms in affirmative and negative imperatives are different. In the Spanish example in (290), the negator no is used with standard negation and negative imperatives, but the verbal construction in the affirmative imperative (canta ‘sing’) is different from the verbal construction in the negative imperative (cantes ‘sing’).

(290) Spanish (Italic, Indo-European)

a. pedro no canta
   Pedro NEG sing.IND.PRES.3SG
   ‘Pedro does not sing.’

b. canta
   Sing.IMP.2SG
   ‘Sing!’

c. no cantes
   NEG sing.SBJV.PRES.2SG
   ‘Do not sing!’ (van der Auwera et al., 2013)
IV. Different negative strategy from that used in standard negation and different verbal construction from affirmative imperatives – observed in 145 languages. This is the case in Zulu. As can be seen in (291), the bipartite negative marker $a$-......$i$ is used with standard negation, whereas the negative auxiliary $m$us is used with negative imperatives. In addition, the verbal construction used in affirmative imperative is different from the one used in negative imperatives, as can be seen from comparing the clauses in (291)(b) and (291)(c).

(291) Zulu (Atlantic-Congo, Niger-Congo)

a. a-wu-shay-i inja
   \textsc{neg.ind.pres-2sg-hit-neg.ind.pres} dog
   ‘You do not hit the dog.’

b. shay-a inja
   \textsc{hit.imp.2sg} dog
   ‘Hit the dog!’

c. mus-a uku-shay-a inja
   \textsc{neg.imp.aux-2sg inf-hit-inf} dog
   ‘Do not hit the dog’ \hfill (van der Auwera et al., 2013)

In this study, negative imperatives in Arabic will be classified into different categories based on this typological framework. However, some modifications have been made here. While this framework is meant to classify negative imperatives where the addressee is a second singular person only, it is used here to classify negative imperatives whether the person of the addressee is a second singular or plural, masculine or feminine. That is, in Arabic, as we will see, the person and the number of the addressee seems to have no impact on the way negative imperatives are formed. In other words, the strategy
that negates imperatives in an Arabic variety is the same regardless of the gender and the number of the addressee, and if the verbal construction in affirmative imperatives is different with any addressee such as masculine singular, it will also be different with any other addressee.

5.3 Negative imperatives in Standard Arabic

In Standard Arabic, negative imperatives are expressed by placing the negator ḍā before a different form of the verb to the one used in affirmative imperatives, compare the following:

(292) Standard Arabic

a. ʔiḏhab
   go.IMP.2MSG
   ‘Go.MSG!’

b. ḍā taḏhab
   NEG go.IMPF.JUSS.2MSG
   ‘Do not go!’
   (Personal Knowledge)

The differences between the verbal construction in affirmative and negative imperatives can be observed by comparing the affirmative clause to its negative counterpart in (292) above; it is ḍiḏhab (in the special imperative form of the verb, lacking a person prefix) in the affirmative and taḏhab (the jussive form of the imperfect aspect) in the negative. In contrast, the negator ḍā is no different from the ḍā used in standard negation (cf. section 3.3), e.g.:


(293) Standard Arabic

\[ \text{lā} \ \text{yasʔal-u} \ \text{ʔahmad-u} \ \text{χālid-an} \]

\[ \text{NEG} \ \text{ask.IMPF.3MSG-IND} \ \text{Ahmad-NOM} \ \text{Khaled-ACC} \]

‘Ahmad does not ask Khaled’  

(Personal Knowledge)

It should be noted, however, that as explained in section 3.3, \( \text{lā} \) is not the only negator used to express standard negation in Standard Arabic; it is a possible negator used beside others for the same purpose. This case is common, as we will see, in many modern Arabic varieties where more than one negative marker can render standard negation and some of these markers can negate imperatives as well. In such cases, the negative strategy in negative imperatives and in standard negation is considered to be similar, in which ‘similar’ does not mean identical but means possible use of a particular strategy in the two types of negation. Accordingly, negative imperatives in Standard Arabic are type III. That is, the verbal construction in affirmative imperatives is different from the ones in negative imperatives, but the strategy that negates imperatives is similar to one of the strategies used in standard negation.

5.4 Negative imperatives in modern Arabic varieties

In this section, step II, step III and step IV of the steps outlined by Song (2001) for typological studies are conducted. For step II, modern Arabic varieties are categorized based on their similarities and differences with respect to negative imperatives. For step III, generalizations are proposed based on such categorization, and for IV, the proposed generalizations are explained where possible. Two types of categorizations are proposed here: one according to the negative imperative types explained in 5.2 and one geographical. While the first one reveals the variations among modern Arabic varieties in general, the second one aims to reveal the same variations but among varieties of the
same region. Finally, this section is based on 39 out of the 54 Arabic varieties included in the study, since information on the rest is not available. The excluded 15 varieties are: Annaba Arabic, Delliys Arabic, Sfax Arabic, Eastern Libyan Arabic, Sahel/Tunis Arabic, Muzēnah and Baṇī Waṣil Arabic, Southern Sinai Arabic, Northwestern Sinai Arabic, Biyyāḏī and Axraṣī Arabic, Smēṣnī and ǧGēlī Arabic, Ṭuwarā Arabic, Egyptian western desert Arabic, al-ṣArīš Arabic, Eastern Nigeria Arabic and ɣIrqāṭ (Assur) Arabic.

5.4.1 Categorization by types

The framework proposed by van der Auwera, Lejeune and Goussev (2013) reveals four types of negative imperatives (see section 5.2). These four types arose as a result of considering two factors: the verbal construction and the negator. In some languages, the verbal construction between affirmative and negative imperatives is found to be the same, in others found to be different. Similarly, in some languages, the negator used with negative imperatives is found to be similar to the one used in standard negation (negating verbal declarative main clauses), in others, found to be different. In type I and II, the verbal construction is always similar, but the case is not always the same with the negator. When the verbal construction is the same, the negator could be similar resulting in type I or could be different resulting in type II.

In types III and IV, on the other hand, the verbal construction is always different, and when the negator is similar, the type is III and when it is different, the type is IV. In modern Arabic varieties, type I and II are not observed at all. That is, the verbal construction in these varieties is always different. Similarly to standard Arabic, all varieties in the current sample use the special imperative form of the verb with a person prefix for affirmative imperatives, and the imperfect form of the verb (without any aspectual or mood prefixes such as b-) for negative imperatives. This means negative imperatives in modern Arabic varieties have to be either type III or type IV depending on
whether the negator is similar to the standard negation marker or different. If the negator used with imperatives is similar to the one used in standard negation, the type is III. If the negator used with imperatives is different from the one used in standard negation, the type is IV. In some varieties, however, there is a mix such that there is more than one possible negator with imperatives, and some of these negators are similar to the markers found used in standard negation and some are different. As we will see, in such cases, the type assigned is III–IV.

5.4.1.1 Type III

In this type (III), negative imperatives are expressed by the use of the same negator used in standard negation, but the verbal construction in negative imperatives is found to be different from the one observed in affirmative imperatives. Consider (294) and note that the first clause is an example of standard negation to illustrate the use of the negator mā, the second clause is an affirmative imperative clause to show the verbal construction in such clauses, and the last clause is the negative counterpart of the previous affirmative imperative to illustrate the use of mā (the standard negation marker) with negative imperatives and the different verbal construction between affirmative imperatives and their corresponding negatives:

(294) Sudanese Arabic

a. mā ġō
   NEG come.PRF.3PL
   ‘They did not come.’ (Bergman, 2002: 194)

b. itkallam
   speak.IMP.2MSG
   ‘Speak!’ (Bergman, 2002: 194)
c. mā titkallam

\text{NEG speak.IMPF.2MSG}

‘Do not speak!’ \quad \text{ (Bergman, 2002: 194)}

The type III is found in 8 varieties out of 39 varieties considered in this section. All of them are listed in Table 37 below. In this table, the region, the verbal negator (standard negation marker) and the negator used with imperatives are given for each variety.

\textbf{Table 37: Modern Arabic varieties of type III}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Verbal negator</th>
<th>Imperative negator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maghrebi</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Sousse Arabic</td>
<td>\textit{mē......-š}</td>
<td>\textit{mē......-š}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Western Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>\textit{ma......-š} and \textit{miš}</td>
<td>\textit{ma......-š}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Şa‘īdī Arabic</td>
<td>\textit{ma......-šey} and \textit{...-šey}</td>
<td>\textit{ma......-šey} and \textit{...-šey}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td>\textit{ma......-š} and \textit{miš}</td>
<td>\textit{ma......-š}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanic</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sudanese Arabic</td>
<td>\textit{mā}</td>
<td>\textit{mā}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Largeau Arabic</td>
<td>\textit{mā}</td>
<td>\textit{mā}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Abeche Arabic</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>\textit{mā}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levantine</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Aley Arabic</td>
<td>\textit{ma......-š}, \textit{...-š}, \textit{miš} and \textit{ma}</td>
<td>\textit{ma......-š} and \textit{...-š}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the classification of Abeche Arabic with this group is based on the assumption we made in 4.3.1.3, which is, in accordance with other Sudanic varieties, \textit{mā} is expected to be the verbal negator in this variety. If this expectation is correct, then the verbal and the imperative negator in Abeche Arabic are alike, and since
the verbal constructions in affirmative and negative imperatives are different as in (295) below; this variety is categorized as type III.

(295) Abeche Arabic
a. ʔaktib
write.IMP.2MSG
‘Write!’
b. mā taktib
NEG write.IMPF.2MSG
‘Do not write!’ (Kaye, 1976: 101)

Another point shown in the table is that the differences in the imperative negators between these varieties are relatively similar to the differences between them in the verbal negators. That is to say, when the verbal negator in a variety is mā, the imperative negator will be mā as well. And when there is more than one verbal negator, the imperative negator must be one of them. This is, in fact, the reason behind identifying these varieties as type III because this type entails a similarity between the way negation is expressed in standard negation and in negative imperatives. We have seen examples of the use of mā above, and below are examples of the use of ma......š.

(296) Cairene Arabic
ma-truḥ-ši ṭinnaharda
NEG-go.IMPF.2MSG-NEG today
‘Do not go today!’ (Gary & Gamal-Eldin, 1982: 39)
In two varieties only (Ṣaṣīdī Arabic and Aley Arabic), beside ma......-š, the post-verbal negator ...-š (or ...-šey in some varieties) is used in negative imperatives. Note that this post-verbal ...-š is one of the possible strategies in Ṣaṣīdī Arabic and Aley Arabic to form standard negation; otherwise, they would be classified in a different category where declarative verbal main clauses and imperatives are not negated in the same fashion. The following are representative examples for the use of ...-š:

(298) Aley Arabic

trih-š maš-un bukra

go.IMPF.2MSG-NEG with-them tomorrow

‘Do not go with them tomorrow!’ (Bishr, 1956: 47)

(299) Ṣaṣīdī Arabic

takil-ši dhân

eat.IMPF.2MSG-NEG fat

‘Do not eat fat!’ (Khalafallah, 1969: 102)

The geographical disruption of the different imperative negators is discussed in 5.4.4 after exploring all of the possible negators used for this purpose. In this vein, a different type from III of forming negative imperatives is demonstrated next.
5.4.1.2 Type IV

In this type (IV), negative imperatives are expressed by the use of a different negator from the one employed in standard negation. Also, similarly to the case in type III, the verbal constructions in affirmative and negative imperatives are different from each other. The following exemplify this type, note that the imperative negator in the exemplified varieties is \( \text{\textit{lā}} \), which is not possible in standard negation, note also the different verbal construction between affirmative imperatives and their negative counterparts:

(300) Muslim Baghdadi Arabic

a. \( \text{rūḥ} \)

\text{go.IMP.2MSG}

‘Go!’

b. \( \text{la-trūḥ} \)

\text{NEG-go.IMPF.2MSG}

‘Do not go!’ \hspace{1cm} (Erwin, 2004: 141)

(301) al-\(?\text{Aḥsā? Arabic}

a. \( \text{rəḥ} \)

\text{go.IMP.2MSG}

‘Go!’

b. \( \text{lā trūḥ} \)

\text{NEG go.IMPF.2MSG}

‘Do not go!’ \hspace{1cm} (Fieldwork data)

This type of negative imperative is the most common type in modern Arabic varieties, found in 20 out of the 39 varieties considered in this section as in Table 38.
Table 38: Modern Arabic varieties of type IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Verbal negator</th>
<th>Imperative negator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maghrebi</strong></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ḥassāniyya Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em> and <em>ma</em>+PRO</td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> and <em>mā</em>+PRO</td>
<td><em>lā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Standard Maltese</td>
<td><em>ma</em>…..-<em>x</em> and <em>mhux</em></td>
<td><em>la</em>….. <em>x</em> and ….<em>x</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sudanic</strong></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Western Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> (or <em>ma</em>)</td>
<td><em>yā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levantine</strong></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>al-Karak Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em></td>
<td><em>lā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mesopotamian</strong></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Muslim Baghdad Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> (or <em>ma</em>)</td>
<td><em>lā</em> or <em>la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arabian Peninsula</strong></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Kuwaiti Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em></td>
<td><em>lā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>al-Bāḥa Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> (or <em>ma</em>)</td>
<td><em>lā</em> or <em>la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>al-ʔAḥsāʔ Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> (or <em>ma</em>)</td>
<td><em>lā</em> or <em>la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ḥagil Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> (or <em>ma</em>)</td>
<td><em>lā</em> or <em>la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Madinah Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> (or <em>ma</em>)</td>
<td><em>lā</em> or <em>la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Urban Hijazi Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> (or <em>ma</em>)</td>
<td><em>lā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Yanbuʕ Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> (or <em>ma</em>)</td>
<td><em>lā</em> or <em>la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>?Abha Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em>, <em>lis</em> and <em>lim</em></td>
<td><em>lā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>ʕUnayzah Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em></td>
<td><em>lā</em> or <em>la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em></td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Dubai Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em></td>
<td><em>lā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yemeni</strong></td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Hadhrami Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em></td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Zīnğibār Arabic</td>
<td><em>miṣ</em> (or <em>miṣi</em> and <em>māṣi</em>)</td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Adeni Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em>…..-<em>š</em></td>
<td><em>la</em>…..-<em>š</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As in the table, the imperative negator among the IV varieties is mostly læ, found in 17 of them. In two varieties only (Standard Maltese and Adeni Arabic), læ co-occurs with the post-verbal ...-š, for instance:

(302) Adeni Arabic

la-tisharū-š al-līlah
NEG-stay.up.IMPF.2MPL-NEG DEF-tonight

‘Do not stay up late tonight!’  
(Ahmed, 2012: 67)

In Standard Maltese, however, beside læ....-š, the post-verbal ...-š alone is capable of expressing negative imperative, for example.⁶²

(303) Standard Maltese

tirkib-x

ride.IMPF.2PL-NEG

‘Do not ride!’  
(Mifsud, 2011)

Finally, unlike any other Arabic variety, negative imperatives in Western Nigeria Arabic are done by yā (304). The reason for this unique use of yā is not clear so far. An investigation was made to check how negation/negative imperatives are expressed in the major contact languages for Nigerian Arabic (Kanuri, Fulfulde, Kotoko and Bagirmi) and yā was not used, meaning that a contact-based explanation does not seem correct.

---

⁶² According to Mifsud (2011), læ....-x in Standard Maltese is used to signal extra emphasis on the command, for example:

la tirkib-x
NEG ride.IMPF.2SG-NEG

‘Do not ride!’  
(Mifsud, 2011)
(304) Western Nigeria Arabic

\[ \text{gada yā taḡ le bakā-ni} \]
\[ \text{again NEG come.IMPF.2MSG to place-my} \]

‘Do not come again to my place!’

(305) Moroccan Arabic

a. \[ \text{ma-nemši-w-š} \]
\[ \text{NEG-come.IMPF.1PL-NEG} \]

‘We will not go.’

b. \[ \text{ma-tomši-š} \]
\[ \text{NEG-go.IMPF.2MSG-NEG} \]

‘Do not go!’

5.4.1.3 Type III–IV

Negative imperatives in 11 modern Arabic varieties (Table 39) are classified as type III–IV. That is, the verbal constructions between affirmative and negative imperatives in these varieties are always different just like any other Arabic variety, but the imperative negator can be either similar or different to the verbal one. For example, in Moroccan Arabic, \( ma \ldots -š \) is used in standard negation, which can also be used, beside \( la \ldots -š \) in negative imperatives. Example (305) demonstrates the use of \( ma \ldots -š \) in standard negation as well as negative imperative and the use of \( la \ldots -š \) in negative imperatives only.

63 According to Harrell, in Moroccan Arabic, the use of \( la \ldots -š \) instead of \( ma \ldots -š \) may deliver a sense of advice rather than a command (Harrell, 2004: 153). In this regard, for example, the English translation of negative imperative \( la-tomši-š \) in (305) might be ‘You should not go or I advise you not to go.’
c. la-tamši-š

NEG-go.IMPF.2MSG-NEG

‘Do not go!’ (Harrell, 2004: 153)

Table 39: Modern Arabic varieties of type III~IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Verbal negator</th>
<th>Imperative negator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maghrebi</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š(i)</td>
<td>ma……-š and la……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ṢAfīż Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>mā and lā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Damascus Arabic</td>
<td>mā and mū</td>
<td>mā and lā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Northern Jordanian Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š and miš</td>
<td>ma……-š and la……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levantine</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>as-Salṭ Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š, ...-š and mā</td>
<td>lā, la……-š, ṭa……-š and ...-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Baskinta Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š, ...-š and miš</td>
<td>ma……-š and la……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td>mā……-š, ...-š, mā and muš</td>
<td>mā……-š, ...-š and la……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesopotamian</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Christian Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>mā and la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabian Peninsula</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Coastal Dhofārī Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>mā or lā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Taiz Arabic</td>
<td>ma……-š</td>
<td>ma……-š and la……-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Sana’a Arabic</td>
<td>mā……-š and mā</td>
<td>mā, mā……-š and lā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In five varieties of this type (ʿAtīṣ Arabic, Damascus Arabic, Christian Baghdad Arabi,
Coastal Dhofārī Arabic and Sanaʿa Arabic), the imperative negators can be either
mā or lā, for instance:

(306) Damascus Arabic

a. mā trūḥu
   NEG go.IMPF.2PL
   ‘Do not go!’ (Cowell, 2005: 359)

b. lā tēʔayyar
   NEG be.late.IMPF.2MSG
   ‘Do not be late!’ (Cowell, 2005: 389)

In addition to this alternation between mā and lā, mā…..-š is possible in Sanaʿa
Arabic, e.g.:

(307) Sanaʿa Arabic

mā tistahī-š
   NEG be.shy.IMPF.2MSG-NEG
   ‘Do not be shy!’ (Watson, 1993: 262)

In Moroccan Arabic, Northern Jordanian Arabic, Baskinta Arabic, Palestinian
Arabic and Taiz Arabic, the negators mā…..-š and lā…..-š can alternate as in:
Northern Jordanian Arabic

a. ma tsarriχ-iš

NEG shout.IMPF.2MSG-NEG

‘Do not cry (shout)!’  
(Haija, 1985: 13)

b. la-truh-iš

NEG-go.IMPF.2MSG-NEG

‘Do not go!’  
(Alqassas, 2012: 16)

In addition to this alternation between $mā……-š$ and $lā……-š$, $……-š$ alone can negate imperatives in Palestinian Arabic, for instance:

Palestinian Arabic

tcaf-iš

fear.IMPF.2MSG-NEG

‘Do not be afraid!’  
(Lucas, 2010: 175)

Finally, four imperative negators are observed in as-Salṭ Arabic. These are $lā$, $lā……-š$, $……-š$, and $ʔa……-š$. All of these negators are found in other varieties as well, except $ʔa……-š$, which seems to occur as an imperative negator in this variety only, for example:

64 This $ʔa……-š$ form is also found in some other Levantine varieties for standard negation, e.g. Baskinta Arabic.
In the following section, overall remarks based on the previous categorization of negative imperatives are outlined and discussed.

5.4.2 General remarks on the categorizations by types

In 5.3, we have seen that the type of negative imperatives in Standard Arabic is III. We have also seen that in modern Arabic varieties (section 5.4) the type is III, IV or III~IV. Thus, neither the type I nor II occurs in Arabic because in these two types the verbal construction in affirmative and negative imperatives is the same, a case not observed among the modern Arabic varieties. Thus:

*Generalization 21: In modern Arabic varieties, the verbal construction in affirmative imperatives is always different from the one used in negative imperatives.*

The imperative negator in Standard Arabic is *lā*, which is one of the possible morphemes to negate declarative verbal main clauses (standard negation); thus, Standard Arabic is type III. In modern Arabic varieties, the use of this *lā* is very common. In fact, it is found in 30 out of the 39 varieties considered in this section (see section 5.4.4 for the geographical distribution of this and other imperative negators). In *š*-varieties only, the morpheme *-š* mostly co-occurs with *lā* in negative imperatives. The following demonstrate the use of *lā* and *lā*-*-š*, respectively:
(311) Yanbu\textsuperscript{ā} Arabic

\begin{itemize}
  \item lā \text{trūḥ}
\end{itemize}

\text{NEG go.IMPF.2MSG}

\text{‘Do not go! (Fieldwork data)’}

(312) Adeni Arabic

\begin{itemize}
  \item la-tisharū-š
  \item al-līlah
\end{itemize}

\text{NEG-stay.up.IMPF.2MPL-NEG DEF-tonight}

\text{‘Do not stay up late tonight!’ (Ahmed, 2012: 67)}

The fact that …-š in negative imperatives may occur in š-varieties only means that unlike the case in non-verbal negation (cf. section 4.4), …-š is not borrowed in negative imperatives. In other words, the use of …-š in negative imperatives implies this variety is a š-variety in the first place, meaning this …-š is already used in standard negation. This imposes:

\textit{Generalization 22: Unlike the case with non-verbal negation, if the negative …-š occurs in negative imperatives in a variety, it always means this variety is a š-variety in the first place.}

There is no š-variety where …-š is possible in negative imperatives but not possible in standard negation. This is, however, not to be confused with the optional use of this …-š in negative imperatives. In other words, in many of the š-varieties, there is more than one strategy to render negative imperatives; some of which involve the use of …-š and some do not. For example, Sana’a Arabic is š-variety; thus, …-š can be used in negative imperatives, for instance:
(313) Sana’a Arabic

mā tistahī-š
NEG be.shy.IMPF.2MSG-NEG

‘Do not be shy!’ (Watson, 1993: 262)

These are also, however, other ways in Sana’a Arabic to negate imperatives where …-š is not used, for example:

(314) Sana’a Arabic

mā tilšab al-kurā hānā
NEG play.IMPF.2MSG DEF-ball here

‘Do not play ball here!’ (Watson, 1993: 262)

Note also that Generalization 22 is unidirectional, not bidirectional (see section 2.3 for the different types of generalizations). That is, the opposite is not necessarily true. In other words, the absence of …-š in negative imperatives does not mean the variety is a non-š-variety. Zinġibār Arabic, for example, is a š-variety; yet, the use of this …-š with negative imperatives is not found so far in the available data. Imperatives here seem to be negated by lā only here, e.g.:

(315) Zinġibār Arabic

la tasharu al-līlāh
NEG stay.up.IMPF.2MPL DEF-tonight

‘Do not stay up tonight!’ (Ahmed, 2012: 46)
The previous observation may indicate that between standard negation, non-verbal negation and negative imperatives, the latter seems to be the most conservative negative structure. It seems to be the last structure among them to be affected by any new strategy used in negation. This can be seen from three points of view. First, in many modern Arabic varieties the use of lā as in Standard Arabic has been maintained with negative imperatives. Second, in many modern Arabic varieties where ...š is used negatively, this use is common in standard negation as well as in non-verbal negation, but not necessarily in negative imperatives as in the case of Zinğibâr Arabic (315). This could mean that the spread of ...š into negation may start with standard negation and non-verbal negation but not with negative imperatives; imperatives are a late stage in this spread. Finally, ...š is borrowed and used in some non-š-varieties with non-verbal negation, not to mention the fact that in many š-varieties it has been probably borrowed and used with standard negation, but no such a borrowing is found with negative imperatives. That is, before ...š is used with negative imperatives, it has to be adopted first with other types of negation. However, this conservative status of negative imperatives may be expected. That is, under normal circumstances, standard negation and non-verbal negation might be more frequent than negative imperatives in natural speech. If this correct, then negative imperatives would be less exposed to any new negative strategy.

Another general point on negative imperatives in modern Arabic varieties can be made on type IV (the most common one). We have already established the fact that in both Standard Arabic and modern Arabic varieties, the verbal construction in imperatives changes when they are negated. And we have already explained that this is a characteristic of type III and IV only. Therefore, the classification of a variety as type III or as type IV depends on the type of the imperative negator. In Standard Arabic, the type is III because imperatives are negated by lā, which can be used with declarative verbal main clauses as
well. On the other hand, in modern Arabic varieties, the use of this $lā$, whether with or without $...-š$, is always the reason for classifying a modern Arabic variety as type IV. That is, unlike Standard Arabic, $lā$ is not attested in standard negation in any modern Arabic variety. In other words, the use of $lā$ in any modern variety means the negative strategy in standard negation and negative imperatives are not the same. It could be however, partially the same when this $lā$ is used beside other negators observed in standard negation such as $mā$ which would make the type III–IV. Therefore,

*Generalization 23: In modern Arabic varieties, the use of the negator $lā$ always entails classifying negative imperatives as type IV, either totally or partially.*

In one variety only (Western Nigeria Arabic), however, the classification of IV is a result of using $yā$ with negative imperatives as in the following example:

(316) Western Nigeria Arabic

```
gada yā taḡ le bakā-ni
again NEG come.IMPF.2MSG to place-my
```

‘Do not come again to my place!’ (Owens, 1993: 226)

Note that this use of $yā$ is a peculiarity of Western Nigeria Arabic. It is not observed in any other Arabic variety considered in this study, neither with negative imperatives nor with any other type of negation. Note also that this uniqueness is different from the unique use of $lis$ in ?Abha Arabic (cf. section 3.4.1.1.1). In the case of the latter, we have a reflex of a form that is used in Standard Arabic and it survives in this variety, but the Western

---

65 Totally when the type is IV only, and partially when the type is III–IV.
Nigeria Arabic ĥā is not found in Standard Arabic. As noted above, the origin of this element is unclear: it does not seem to be borrowed from a contact language.

The last general point here is that if the use of ĥā with negative imperatives is the reason for classifying Standard Arabic as type III, and the use of the same negator is the reason for classifying some of the modern varieties as type IV, what are the reasons, then, for classifying some of the modern varieties as type III? This takes us to the types of other imperative negators. In some varieties, the verbal negator mà, which may co-occur with or without ...-š depending on whether the variety is a š-variety or not, can be the only imperative negator (cf. 5.4.1.1) or a possible negator beside others (cf. 5.4.1.3). This use of mà in negative imperatives is as common as the use of ĥā (the geographical distribution of these negators is discussed in section 5.4.4 below). The following are representative examples for the use of mà with and without ...-š:

(317)  Christian Baghdadi Arabic

\[ \text{ma-tyōhēn wāyyā-nu} \]
\[ \text{NEG-go.IMPF.2FSG with-him} \]

‘Do not go with him!’  
(Abu-Haidar, 1991: 129)

(318)  Western Libyan Arabic

\[ \text{ma-talKāb-š l-barā} \]
\[ \text{NEG-play.IMPF.2MSG-NEG DEF-outside} \]

‘Do not play outside!’  
(Krer, 2013: 105)

In a few varieties, other imperative negators than mà and ĥā might be used. In Ṣaḥīḥ Arabic, Aley Arabic, Standard Maltese, as-Salṭ Arabic and Palestinian Arabic, the post-verbal ...-š can be used alone in negative imperatives, for example:
Another imperative negator is \( \text{ʔa} \ldots \text{-š} \) which is observed in as-Salṭ Arabic only, for example:

(320) as-Salṭ Arabic

\[
\text{ʔa}\text{tgūli-š}
\]

NEG say.IMPF.2MSG-NEG

‘Do not say!’ (Palva, 2004: 227)

In the following section, the variations regarding negative imperatives are explored on a region-by-region basis, followed by a general remarks section to explain the geographical distribution of the imperative negators.

5.4.3 **Geographical categorization**

5.4.3.1 **Maghrebi**

Negative imperatives in modern Arabic varieties can be III, IV or III–IV. All of these three types are found in this region as in table Table 40.
Table 40: Negative imperatives in the Maghrebi varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Verbal negator</th>
<th>Imperative negator</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ḥassāniyya Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em> and <em>ma</em> + PRO</td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic</td>
<td><em>mā</em> and <em>ma</em> + PRO</td>
<td><em>lā</em></td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em> ....-<em>š(i)</em></td>
<td><em>ma</em> ....-<em>š</em> and</td>
<td>III~IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>la</em> ....-<em>š</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sousse Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em> ....-<em>š</em></td>
<td><em>me</em> ....-<em>š</em></td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Standard Maltese</td>
<td><em>ma</em> ....-<em>x</em> and</td>
<td><em>la</em> ....-<em>x</em> and</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>mhux</em></td>
<td><em>…-x</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Western Libyan Arabic</td>
<td><em>ma</em> ....-<em>š</em> and</td>
<td><em>ma</em> ....-<em>š</em></td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>miš</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the non-*š*-varieties (Ḥassāniyya Arabic and Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic), the imperative negator is *lā*, e.g.:

(321) Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic

*lā* tamši

NEG go.IMPF.2SG

‘Do not go!’ (Heath, 2003: 112)

In two *š*-varieties (Moroccan Arabic and Standard Maltese), the imperative negator *lā* co-occurs with the post-verbal *…-š* as in the example below:
(322) Standard Maltese

```
la tirkib-x
NEG ride.IMPF.2MSG-NEG
```

‘Do not ride!’ (Mifsud, 2011)

However, in both varieties, $lā......-š$ is used beside another negator; $ma......-š$ in Moroccan Arabic and $...-x$ in Standard Maltese. Both are exemplified respectively below:

(323) Moroccan Arabic

```
ma-tomši-š
NEG-go.IMPF.2MSG-NEG
```

‘Do not go!’ (Harrell, 2004: 153)

(324) Standard Maltese

```
tirkib-x
ride.IMPF.2SG-NEG
```

‘Do not ride!’ (Mifsud, 2011)

Finally, in Sousse Arabic and Western Libyan Arabic, only $ma......-š$ seems to be the common negator with imperatives as in (325)

(325) Sousse Arabic

```
me tɛdɔʃə-š
NEG pay.IMPF.2MSG-NEG
```

‘Do not pay!’ (Talmoudi, 1980: 166)
5.4.3.2 Egyptian

Only two Egyptian varieties are considered in this section. This makes it difficult to draw any solid conclusion regarding negative imperatives in this region. The two varieties are Ṣaṣīdī Arabic and Cairene Arabic, and in both, the type of the negative imperative is III (see Table 41).

Table 41: Negative imperatives in the Egyptian varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Verbal negator</th>
<th>Imperative negator</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ṣaṣīdī Arabic</td>
<td>$ma\ldots\text{-}š$ and $\ldots\text{-}š$</td>
<td>$ma\ldots\text{-}š$ and $\ldots\text{-}š$</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td>$ma\ldots\text{-}š$ and $miš$</td>
<td>$ma\ldots\text{-}š$</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the two varieties, $ma\ldots\text{-}š$ is the imperative negator (326), and in addition to this, the post-verbal $\ldots\text{-}š$ seems possible in Ṣaṣīdī Arabic only (327).

(326) Cairene Arabic

$ma\text{-}tinziš$

NEG-go.down.IMPF.2MSG-NEG

‘Do not go down!’ (Woidich, 2011)

(327) Ṣaṣīdī Arabic

$takil\text{-}ši$ dhān

eat.IMPF.2MSG-NEG fat

‘Do not eat fat!’ (Khalafallah, 1969: 102)
5.4.3.3 Sudanic

The Sudanic varieties seem to behave in a similar way. The type of negative imperatives here is always III, except in Western Nigeria Arabic.\(^\text{66}\) Consider the following table:

**Table 42:** Negative imperatives in the Sudanic varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Verbal negator</th>
<th>Imperative negator</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Western Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>yā</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sudanese Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Largeau Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Abeche Arabic</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of Western Nigeria Arabic, the imperative negator in the Sudanic varieties seems to be always mā, for example:

(328) Largeau Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{mā} & \text{tašarbi} & \text{gahwa} \\
\text{NEG} & \text{drink.IMPF.2FSG} & \text{coffee} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Do not drink coffee!’ \[(Abu Absi, 1995: 33)\]

In Western Nigeria Arabic only, the type is IV. This is due to the use of yā as an imperative negator, which is not used in standard negation, for instance:

\(^{66}\) Note that the negator used in standard negation (declarative verbal main clauses) is unknown in Abeche. It is, however, assumed to be mā (cf. section 4.3.1.3).
Western Nigeria Arabic

gada yā tağ le bakā-ni

again NEG come.IMPF.2MSG to place-my

‘Do not come again to my place!’  
(Owens, 1993: 226)

5.4.3.4 Levantine

Similarly to the Maghrebi region, all of the three types of negative imperatives found in the modern varieties can be observed in this region. However, unlike the Maghrebi varieties where the type III–IV is attested in one variety only (Moroccan Arabic), this type seems to be the most common one in this region, found in 6 out of 8 varieties (see Table 43).

Table 43: Negative imperatives in the Levantine varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Verbal negator</th>
<th>Imperative negator</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>al-Karak Arabic</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>lā</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ṢAfīẓ Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>mā and lā</td>
<td>III–IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Damascus Arabic</td>
<td>mā and mū</td>
<td>mā and lā</td>
<td>III–IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Northern Jordanian Arabic</td>
<td>ma.....-š and miš</td>
<td>ma.....-š and la.....-š</td>
<td>III–IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.  | as-Salṭ Arabic          | ma.....-š, ...


ş, mā and ma la.....-š and ...-š

| 6.  | Aley Arabic             | ma.....-š, ...


ş, miš and ma ma.....-š or by ...-š | III |
| 7.  | Baskinta Arabic         | ma.....-š, ...


ş, miš ma.....-š, la.....-š | III–IV |
| 8.  | Palestinian Arabic      | mā.....-š, ...


ş, mā and muš mā.....-š or by ...-š and lā.....-š | III–IV |
Varieties in the table are identified as type III–IV because, in addition to ḫā, whether accompanied by ...-š or not, imperatives can potentially be negated by some of the standard negation markers. For instance, in Palestinian Arabic, ṭā ....-š and ...
-š are used, among others, in standard negation, and they can also be used in negative imperatives. In contrast, ḫā ....-š, in Palestinian Arabic, can only be used with negative imperatives as in (330) below.

(330) Palestinian Arabic

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ḥā} & \quad \text{tuk titob-š} \\
\text{NEG} & \quad \text{write.IMPF.2MSG-NEG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Do not write!’ (Rosenhouse, 2011)

The previous optionality is not attested in Aley Arabic; no example demonstrating the use of ḫā in this variety is found, and the available data shows negative imperatives here are either negated by ṭā ....-š or ...
-š. Both are already used to express standard negation in Aley Arabic. This similar use of negators in both types of negation (standard negation and negative imperatives) makes negative imperatives type III in this variety. The following is an example of the use of ṭā ....-š in standard negation and negative imperatives in this variety:

(331) Aley Arabic

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ṭā} & \quad \text{ṣaḥād-ā-š} & \quad \text{maṣ-u} \\
\text{NEG} & \quad \text{take.PRF.3MSG-her-NEG} & \quad \text{with-him}
\end{align*}
\]

‘He did not take her with him.’ (Bishr, 1956: 46)
b. ma.triḥ-š maš-un bukra
   NEG go.IMPF.2MSG-NEG with-them tomorrow
   ‘Do not go with them tomorrow!’ (Bishr, 1956: 47)

In al-Karak Arabic, the case is the opposite; there is no similarity between negators of standard negation and negators of negative imperatives. In this variety, ma is used with standard negation and lā with negative imperatives (332). Thus, the type here is IV.

(332) al-Karak Arabic
   lā təbkī
   NEG cry.IMPF.2FSG
   ‘Do not cry!’ (Alsarayreh, 2012: 66)

5.4.3.5 Mesopotamian

Similarly to the Egyptian region, information on negative imperatives is found in only two varieties in this region (Table 44). Therefore, it is difficult to draw a coherent conclusion here.

Table 44: Negative imperatives in the Mesopotamian varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Verbal negator</th>
<th>Imperative negator</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Christian Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>ma and lā</td>
<td>III–IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Muslim Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>lā or la</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As in the previous table, the optional use of *ma* and *la* with negative imperatives makes Christian Baghdadi Arabic type III–IV (333), whereas the exclusive use of *lā* with such constructions makes Muslim Baghdadi Arabic type IV (334).

(333) Christian Baghdadi Arabic

a. ma-tγūhēn  wɔyyā-nu
   NEG-go.IMPF.2FSG  with-him
   ‘Do not go with him!’

b. la-txallī  aḥad  yɔḍḥak  ʕalē-k
   NEG-let.IMPF.3FSG  anyone  laugh.IMPF.3MSG  on-you
   ‘Do not let anyone laugh at you!’ (Abu-Haidar, 1991: 129)

(334) Muslim Baghdadi Arabic

la-trūḥ
   NEG-go.IMPF.2MSG
   ‘Do not go!’ (Erwin, 2004: 141)

5.4.3.6 Arabian Peninsula

Among the Arabian Peninsula varieties, negative imperatives are almost always type IV in which the morpheme *lā* negates imperatives but not declarative verbal clauses (standard negation). As in Table 45 below, only Coastal Dhofārī Arabic is categorized as type III–IV because, beside *lā*, the standard negation marker *mā* can also negates imperatives.
Table 45: Negative imperatives in the Arabian Peninsula varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Verbal negator</th>
<th>Imperative negator</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Kuwaiti Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>lā</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Coastal Dhofārī Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>mā or lā</td>
<td>III–IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>al-Bāḥa Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>lā or la</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>al-ʔAḥsāʔ Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>lā or la</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>ʕHaḍil Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>lā or la</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Madinah Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>lā or la</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Urban Hijazi Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>lā</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Yanbuʕ Arabic</td>
<td>mā (or ma)</td>
<td>lā or la</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>ʔAbha Arabic</td>
<td>mā, lis and lim</td>
<td>lā</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ʕUnayzah Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>lā or la</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Dubai Arabic</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>lā</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following, the use of lā in Urban Hijazi Arabic is shown as a representative example of how it is used in this region.

(335) Urban Hijazi Arabic

lā  tāṣud  al-ʔaridah
NEG  take.IMPF.2MSG  DEF-newspaper

‘Do not take the newspaper!’ (Sieny, 1978: 168)

On the other hand, the following example shows the optional use of mā and lā in Coastal Dhofārī Arabic.
5.4.3.7 Yemeni

The Yemeni varieties are either type IV or III~IV. Like other modern Arabic varieties, when lā, whether co-occurring with ...-ş or not, is used, the variety is classified as type IV, and when it is used beside mā, also whether accompanied by ...-ş or not, the type is III~IV. See the table below for the list of the Yemeni varieties and their negative imperative types.

Table 46: Negative imperatives in the Yemeni varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>Verbal negator</th>
<th>Imperative negator</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Hadhrami Arabic</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Zinibar Arabic</td>
<td>miš (or miši and māši)</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Adeni Arabic</td>
<td>ma......-ş</td>
<td>la......-ş</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Taiz Arabic</td>
<td>ma......-ş</td>
<td>ma......-ş and la......-ş</td>
<td>III~IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Sana’a Arabic</td>
<td>mā......-ş and mā</td>
<td>mā, mā......-ş and lā......-ş</td>
<td>III~IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sole use of *lā* seems to be the case in Hadhrami Arabic and Zinğibār Arabic, e.g.:

(337) Zinğibār Arabic

```
la tasharu al-līlah
NEG stay.up.IMPF.2MPL DEF-tonight
```

‘Do not stay up tonight!’  (Ahmed, 2012: 46)

The same case applies to Adeni Arabic but here *lā* co-occurs with …-š, e.g.:

(338) Adeni Arabic

```
la-tishārū-š al-līlah
NEG-stay.up.IMPF.2MPL-NEG DEF-tonight
```

‘Do not stay up late tonight!’  (Ahmed, 2012: 67)

In contrast, *mā*……-š beside *lā*……-š can be used in Taiz Arabic and Sana’a Arabic. In addition, *mā* can also be used for the same purpose in Sana’a Arabic only. The following are examples of *mā*……-š and *mā*, respectively:

(339) Taiz Arabic

```
la-tismarun-š al-līlah
NEG-stay.up.IMPF.2MPL-NEG DEF-tonight
```

‘Do not stay up late tonight!’  (Ahmed, 2012: 67)
5.4.4 General remarks on the geographical categorization

In the previous sub-sections, we have seen the variations in negative imperatives among varieties of each region. In this sub-section, however, we explore the same variations but among regions. In terms of the type of negative imperatives, we find that all of the observed three types of negative imperatives can be found in the Maghrebi, Levantine and Mesopotamian regions. That is to say, in these regions, there is, at least, one modern Arabic variety where the type of negative imperatives is III, at least one where the type is IV, and at least, one where the type is III–IV. In the Arabian Peninsula and Yemeni regions, varieties are either type III or type III–IV. In the Sudanic region, varieties are either type III or type IV. And finally, in the Egyptian region, only type III is observed.

In terms of the type of the negator used with imperatives, we find more interesting variations. Although we can find that in modern Arabic varieties, imperatives can be negated by many negators (mā, lā, mā……-š, lā……-š, ʔa……-š, ...-š and yā), the variations can be explained based on two negators only (mā and lā). That is to say, for the negator ...-š, it seems sufficient to say that it occurs in as-Salṭ Arabic, Palestinian Arabic, Aley Arabic (Levantine varieties), Ṣaṣīdī Arabic (an Egyptian variety) and Standard Maltese (a Maghrebi variety). For ʔa……-š, it is sufficient to say that it is found in as-Salṭ Arabic only (Levantine variety). And for yā, it seems also sufficient to say that it is used in Western Nigeria Arabic only (a Sudanic variety). This leave us with mā, lā,

---

67 Bearing in mind, in the Mesopotamian and the Egyptian regions, this conclusion is based on data found from two varieties only in each region.
mā……-š and lā……-š. However, the presence or the absence of …-š, with mā or lā, seems to depend only on whether the variety is a Š-variety or not. In other words, in a Š-variety where mā or lā is used, …-š may co-occur with the used negator and the result would be mā……-š or lā……-š. Therefore, including mā……-š and lā……-š in our discussion here will only tell us which varieties are Š-varieties and which are not, a fact already established in section 3.4.1.2.68

With this in mind, we now turn to the geographical distribution of mā and lā. In Table 47 below, the seven Arabic regions in this study are listed. The symbols (+) and (−) are used to indicate the use of mā and lā, in which (+) means the negator is attested in the region, at least in one variety, and (−) means it is not attested.

Table 47: Negative imperatives in the seven regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The name of the region</th>
<th>mā</th>
<th>lā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Maghrebi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sudanic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Levantine</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mesopotamian</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Arabian Peninsula</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68 Nevertheless, it seems worth noting here that the Š-varieties included in this section (negative imperatives) are Moroccan Arabic, Sousse Arabic, Standard Maltese, Western Libyan Arabic, as-Salṭ Arabic, Ṣaḥīḥ Arabic, Cairene Arabic, Northern Jordanian Arabic, Aley Arabic, Baskinta Arabic, Palestinian Arabic, Adeni Arabic, Taiz Arabic and Sana’a Arabic. In all of them …-š seems to be mandatorily used with either mā or lā. In as-Salṭ Arabic only, beside this use of …-š with the negator lā as in lā……-š, lā alone is possible with negative imperatives, and in Sana’a Arabic only beside mā……-š, mā alone is also possible. It is also worth noting here that in both (as-Salṭ Arabic and Sana’a Arabic), …-š is also optionally used in standard negation (cf. 3.4.1.1.3).
As seen from the table, the use of \( m\ddot{a} \) with negative imperatives is attested in every region. However, in every region, the use of this \( m\ddot{a} \) seems to be reasonably common, except in the Arabian Peninsula region where this use seems to be very rare. Out of the 12 Arabian Peninsula varieties considered in this section, \( m\ddot{a} \) as an imperative negator is observed in one of them only, Coastal Dhofārī Arabic. Accordingly, the following can be proposed:

*Generalization 24:* \( m\ddot{a} \) can commonly negate imperatives in every Arabic region, except in the Arabian Peninsula where this is extremely rare.

The table also shows that \( l\ddot{a} \) appears to be common across the Arabic-speaking world, except among the Egyptian and the Sudanic varieties. Therefore,

*Generalization 25:* \( l\ddot{a} \) can commonly negate imperatives in every Arabic region, except in the Egyptian and the Sudanic ones.

Finally, it is worth noting in this context that in some modern Arabic varieties, negative imperatives can be expressed by other means. Data in this regard is available in five varieties: Baskinta Arabic, Damascus Arabic, Urban Hijazi Arabic, Madinah Arabic and al-Bāḥa Arabic. In Baskinta Arabic and Damascus Arabic (Levantine varieties), \( \ddot{a}\ddot{a}\ddot{a} \) can function as an imperative negator, whereas in Urban Hijazi Arabic, Madinah Arabic and al-Bāḥa Arabic (Arabian Peninsula varieties), \( \ddot{i}\ddot{a}\ddot{h} \) can be used. The following exemplify both, respectively:
Interestingly, however, both ʔūʕa and ʔiṣḥ- have a relatively similar meaning. They can be translated as ‘wake up’, ‘be conscious’, or ‘beware’. Similar items are doubtless found in other modern Arabic varieties; unfortunately, such items have received less attention in the literature.

5.5 Summary

In this chapter, we examined negative imperatives. We have seen how they are expressed cross-linguistically in order to approach how they are expressed in modern Arabic varieties. We have seen that cross-linguistically negative imperatives can be categorized into four types: I, II, III and IV. In modern Arabic varieties, only type III and IV are found. In some of them, both types are found which makes the type in such varieties III~IV.

In terms of the negators used with imperatives, we have seen that lā is commonly used as a negator that occurs with imperatives only. In some varieties, it is used as a sole negator, whereas in others as a possible one that used beside other standard negation markers in these varieties.

Finally, this chapter results in five generalizations which are repeated below.
Generalization 21: In modern Arabic varieties, the verbal construction in affirmative imperatives is always different from the one used in negative imperatives.

Generalization 22: Unlike the case with non-verbal negation, if the negative ...š occurs in negative imperatives in a variety, it always means this variety is a š-variety in the first place.

Generalization 23: In modern Arabic varieties, the use of the negator lā always entails classifying negative imperatives as type IV, either totally or partially.

Generalization 24: mā can commonly negate imperatives in every Arabic region, except in the Arabian Peninsula where this is extremely rare.

Generalization 25: lā can commonly negate imperatives in every Arabic region, except in the Egyptian and the Sudanic ones.

In the next chapter, two types of negative constructions are addressed: negative existential clauses and negation of pseudo-verb clauses. Each type is defined and the way it is expressed in modern Arabic varieties is explained.
6. Negative existential clauses and negation of pseudo-verbs

Two types of negation are discussed in this chapter: negative existential and negation of pseudo-verbs. The variations among modern Arabic varieties regarding the two types are not significant enough to treat them in separate chapters. Nevertheless, as with the other chapters, the four necessary steps (or stages) in any typological study are conducted. Section 6.1 is on negative existential clauses. Under this theme, the definition of these clauses is provided in 6.1.1, followed by section 6.1.2 on how such clauses are expressed in the world’s languages (step I). In 6.1.3, how this phenomenon manifests itself in Standard Arabic is illustrated, followed by how it is found in modern Arabic varieties (6.1.4). In the latter sub-section, step II, III and IV of typological studies are performed, varieties are categorized in order to propose generalizations, which are, in turn, explained where possible.

The second part of this chapter (6.2) is on negation of pseudo-verbs. They are defined in 6.2.1, negation of their corresponding clauses in Standard Arabic is discussed in 6.2.2, and finally section 6.2.3 is on the way they are negated in modern Arabic varieties. Unlike negative existential clauses, no typological framework on negation of pseudo-verbs is found in the literature. Thus, this section contains no such information.

6.1 Negative existentials

6.1.1 What are negative existentials?

Existential clauses are those which explicitly assert the existence of some entity. An English example of such clauses is There is a pen. By negative existential, then, we mean negation of these types of clauses (There is no pen). Note that the noun phrase, such as a pen, in existential clauses is mostly, if not always, indefinite. Consider, for example, the following existential clause from Madinah Arabic:
(343) Madinah Arabic

\[
\text{fī} \quad \text{biṭ} \\
\text{EX} \quad \text{house}
\]

‘There is a house.’ (Personal knowledge)

The existential item \text{fī} in the previous example should not be confused with the preposition \text{fī} ‘in’ in the same variety, e.g.:

(344) Madinah Arabic

\[
\text{ar-raḡḡāl} \quad \text{fī} \quad \text{l-bēṭ} \\
\text{DEF-man} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{DEF-house}
\]

‘The man is in the house.’ (Personal knowledge)

In addition to the semantic meaning and the phonological differences (the vowel in the existential \text{fī} is long but short in the prepositional \text{fī}), the existential \text{fī} clause and the prepositional \text{fī} clause are structurally different. In (343), the \text{fī} and the noun \text{bēṭ} ‘house’ together forms a clause (complete thought), the same combination of the morphemes \text{fī} and \text{l-bēṭ} in (344) do not as the omission of the subject \text{ar-raḡḡāl} ‘the man’ here would result in ungrammaticality.\(^{69}\) Therefore, by existential clauses in Arabic, we refer to clauses that can form a complete thought regarding the existence of an entity by means only of the use of the existential item and the entity referred to. This is, however, not to be confused with the possibility of adding extra information to the existential clause. For example, in the existential clause \text{there is a pen on the table}, the constituent

\(^{69}\) This noun phrase can function to express a complete thought, however, if the subject is understood from the context. For example, an answer to the question, ‘where is he?’ could be ‘in the house’, meaning ‘he is in the house’.
on the table is a piece extra information whose omission would not affect the grammaticality of this clause.

6.1.2 Typology of negative existentials

The major typological investigation of existential clauses is by Croft (1991). In his study, Croft found that languages negate existential clauses according to three different strategies:

Type (A): In the same way they form standard negation.

Type (B): By using a specific negative existential item.

Type (C): By using of a specific negative existential item that is identical to the ordinary verbal negator. In other words, the negator used in standard negation also functions as a negative existential item.

Eastern Libyan Arabic is an example of type (A), as the same negator mā......-š is used in standard negation (345)(a) and to negate existential clauses, compare (345)(b) and (345)(c).

(345) Eastern Libyan Arabic

a. ma šifna-k-š
   NEG see.PRF.1PL-2MSG-NEG
   ‘We did not see you.’ (Owens, 1984: 157)

b. fīh šubāya
   EX woman.PL
   ‘There are women.’ (Owens, 1984: 97)
c. ma fi-š sayyāra inrīd-ha yādi

NEG EX-NEG car want.PRF.1SG-3SG there

‘There is no car which I want there.’  
(Owens, 1984: 97)

Turkish (346), on the other hand, is a language of type (B) because here there is a special negative existential item yok (346)(c) which is different from the verbal negator -me (346)(a) and the positive existential item var (346)(b).

(346) Turkish (Turkic)

a. gel-me-yecek

come-NEG-FUT

‘(S)he will not come.’

b. su var

water EX

‘There is water’

c. su yok

water EX.NEG

‘There is no water.’  
(Schaaik, 1996: 22-25)

Finally, Tongan is an example of type (C); it has a special negative existential item (347)(c) that is identical to the ordinary negator (347)(a):  

(347) Tongan (Malayo-Polynesian, Austronesian)

a. na’e ’ikai ke kata ’a pita

PST NEG SUB laugh ABS Pita

‘Pita did not laugh.’
b. 'oku 'i ai ha me ’a

PRES LOC EX NSP thing

‘There is something/someone.’

c. 'oku 'ikai ha me ’a

PRES EX.NEG NSP thing

‘There is not anything.’ (Veselinova, 2014; 1342)

Some languages, however, have more than one type, e.g. A and B or B and C, etc. Croft (1991) explains such a phenomenon by proposing what he refers to as the *Negative existential cycle*. That is to say, negative existentials change over time from type A to type B, from B to C, from C to A and so on. During the changing process from A to B, a special negative existential form comes to light and is used alongside the ordinary negator. The new form mostly, but not always, arises as a result of a contraction or a fusion between the verbal negator and the positive existential morpheme (Croft, 1991). In Balinese (348), for example, the verbal negator is *tan* and can be used to negate the existential *hana* as in (348)(a). However, a contraction between the two forms results in *tanana*, the new negative existential item as in (348)(b).

(348) Balinese (Malayo-Polynesian, Austronesian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>asepi tan hana wong liwating awan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deserted NEG EX person pass.by street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘It was deserted and there was no one passing on the street.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. tanana seraya

NEG.EX substitute

‘There was no substitute’ (Croft, 1991:7)
From B to C, the negative existential predicate begins to be used in standard negation. This can occur as: (a) a form of competition wherein the negative existential competes with the original negator to the extent of being used sometimes alternatively; (b) reinforcement to support the verbal negator; or (c) gradual substitution for the ordinary negator in part of the verbal grammatical system (Croft, 1991: 9–10). The latter, for example, can be observed in Kanuri (349) as the negative existential *bâ* is used to negate imperfect verbs only:

(349) Kanuri (Saharan)
   a. cidâ bâ  
      work NEG.EX
      ‘There is no work.’
   b. bûkîn-bâ  
      eat.1SG.IMPF-NEG.EX
      ‘I do not eat.’  (Croft, 1991: 10–11)

Finally, from C to A, the negative existential starts to be reanalyzed as the only negator and a positive existential predicate begins to be optionally uttered (Croft, 1991). In Marathi (350), as an example, *nahi* can function as a negative existential or as a negator to negate a positives:

(350) Marathi (Indo-Iranian, Indo-European)
   tithā koni nahi (ahe)  
   there anyone NEG (OR NEG.EX) (EX)
   ‘There is not anyone there.’  (Croft, 1991: 12)
Croft’s cycle can be summarized as follows:

Type A: One marker negates both verbal (standard negation) and existential clauses
Type A-B: A negative existential item is created and used occasionally
Type B: The new negative existential item is used obligatorily with negative existentials
Type B-C: The new negative existential item is used to some extent in standard negation
Type C: The new negative existential item can be used to express standard negation
Type C-A: The new negative existential predicate starts to be reanalyzed as a negative marker and a positive existential comes to light

Wilmsen (2014, 2015) suggests that the aforementioned cycle can be observed in Arabic. That is, the verbal negator in most Arabic varieties is the marker ma which may negate existential clauses as in Omani Arabic (type A):

(351) Omani Arabic (Semitic, Afro-Asiatic)

a. lō šē šaḥḥa al-ḥamdu li-llāh
   if EX health DEF-praise to-God
   ‘If there is health, thank God.’

b. mā šē ḥmīr maš-nā
   NEG EX donkeys with-us
   ‘There are no donkeys with us.’ (Wilmsen, 2015: 1)

Wilmsen claims that evidence of Type B can be found in Arabic in the shape of miš, which he argues functions as a negative existential and whose form is a result of a contraction or a fusion of the verbal negator ma and the positive existential šē. Wilmsen, however, does not support his claim by any example.
In 1.4 above, we saw that the post-verbal negative morpheme ...-š is derived from šayʔ and occurs in Arabic as a result of Jespersen’s cycle. Wilmsen (2014), however, argues that, it is the morpheme šayʔ ‘thing’ that is derived from ...-š, not vice versa. That is, “grammatical ši has been always grammatical whereas the substantive šayʔ is a later development. Its original function as an existential particle, itself derived from a Proto-Semitic presentative/ demonstrative/ 3rd person pronoun, remains within the language, giving rise to its other functions” (Wilmsen, 2014: 209). Consequently, according to Wilmsen, the development in Arabic negation should not be explained by Jespersen’s cycle but by the one proposed by Croft. However, several studies have argued against Wilmsen’s proposal and favoured the commonly held analysis based on Jespersen’s cycle, see, for instance, Al-Jallad (2015), Lucas (2018) and Souag (2016). In addition, the synchronic point of view of this study, shows that what Wilmsen considers to be result of a contraction or a fusion of the verbal negator ma and the positive existential šē (miš) seems, in fact, to be the result of an attachment between the verbal negator and a personal pronoun. In this vein, miš, and similar items found among š-varieties such as muš, is probably a contraction of the NEG+PRO construction ma-hu-š ‘he is not’. As Diem puts it “a further development in Cairene Arabic and other dialects was the generalization of *māhūšī in certain functions, especially as the unmarked negation of nominal clauses, and its contraction to muš, which in modern Cairene Arabic developed to miš” (Diem, 2014: 67). This construction is parallel to one found among the non-š-varieties. As we saw in 4.4.3, in these varieties, mū corresponds to miš (or muš) in the š-varieties, and is also formed from a similar NEG+PRO construction, ma-hu ‘he is not’.
6.1.3 Negative existential in Standard Arabic

In Standard Arabic, the existence of an entity can be indicated by the item \( \theta \)amma(\( \tau \)) or the demonstratives \( hu\nu\)ā ‘here’ and \( hu\nu\)ākā ‘there’. All are exemplified respectively below:

(352) Standard Arabic

a. \( \theta \)amma(\( \tau \)) ra\u012b\-\u016eu

EX man.NOM

‘There is a man’

b. \( hu\nu\)ā ra\u012b\-\u016eu

EX man.NOM

‘There is a man’ (Lit. ‘here is a man.’)

c. \( hu\nu\)ākā ra\u012b\-\u016eu

EX man.NOM

‘There is a man’ (Personal Knowledge)

As can be noticed, these are non-verbal clauses as they contain no overt verb; thus, they are negated by the non-verbal negative strategies in Standard Arabic (cf. 4.2). And because the negator \( m\u016au \), for example, can negate verbal and non-verbal clauses in Standard Arabic, \( m\u016au \) can also negate existential clauses, which makes Standard Arabic type (A) in this regard. In the following, the first clause is to show the use of \( m\u016au \) in standard negation, and the rest are the negative counterparts of the affirmative existential clauses in (352).
6.1.4 Negative existentials in modern Arabic varieties

The information in this section is based on 31 modern Arabic varieties. 23 varieties are excluded due to the lack of data in this regard.\(^70\) The included varieties are categorized based on Croft’s framework only. No geographical categorization is proposed here since, as we will see, the modern varieties of Arabic mostly fall into one type. In contrast, the items used to express the existential notion are discussed from the geographical point of view since these items differ significantly based on the region of the variety.

\(^70\) The excluded varieties are Annaba Arabic, Sousse Arabic, Muzēnah and Banī Waṣīl Arabic, Southern Sinai Arabic, Northwestern Sinai Arabic, Biyyāḏi and Axsāṣi Arabic, Smēnī and SGēlī Arabic, Tuwarā Arabic, Saḥīḥ Arabic, Egyptian western desert Arabic, al-ʿArīf Arabic, Largeau Arabic, Abeche Arabic, al-Karak Arabic, Baskinta Arabic, Baskinta Arabic, Kuwaiti Arabic, Urban Hijazi Arabic, Dubai Arabic, Hadhrami Arabic, Zinḡībār Arabic, Adeni Arabic and Taiz Arabic.
6.1.4.1 Categorization by types

6.1.4.1.1 Type A

This type is found in 28 out of the 31 modern Arabic varieties considered in this section. That is, in these varieties, existential clauses and declarative verbal main clauses (standard negation) are negated in the same fashion. As an example, in each variety in the following, standard negation is exemplified first, followed by an affirmative existential clause and a negative existential one.

(354) Ḥassāniyya Arabic

a. ma tkallamt
   NEG speak.PRF.1SG
   ‘I did not speak.’ (Francis, 1979: 111)

b. ʕālig māru fi l-marṣa il-yawm
   EX rice in DEF-market DEF-today
   ‘There is rice in the market today.’ (Francis, 1979: 36)

c. ma ʕālig māru fi l-marṣa
   NEG EX rice in DEF-market
   ‘There is no rice in the market.’ (Francis, 1979: 36)

(355) Sahel/Tunis Arabic

a. nawāl ma-żāt-š l-bārḥ
   Nawal NEG-come.PRF.3FSG-NEG DEF-yesterday
   ‘Nawal did not come yesterday.’ (Halila, 1992: 30)

b. famma ktāb fūq ᵗ-ṭāwala
   EX book on DEF-table
   ‘There is a book on the table.’ (Halila, 1992: 265)
c. ma-famma-š ktāb fūq t-ṭāwala

NEG-EX-NEG book on DEF-table

‘There is no a book on the table.’

(Halila, 1992: 263)

(356) Yanbu‘ Arabic

a. mḥammad mā yašrab l-ḥalīb

Mohammed NEG drink.IMPF.3MSG DEF-milk

‘Mohammed drinks the milk.’

b. fīh muya

EX water

‘There is water.’

c. mā fīh muya

NEG EX water

‘There is no water.’

(Fieldwork data)

As can be noticed from the above examples, the existential item differs considerably from variety to another, a fact that will be addressed further in section 6.1.4.2. For now, consider the following table where all varieties of type A are listed with their existential item:

Table 48: Negative existential (type A varieties)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The existential item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Maghrebi</td>
<td>Hassāniyya Arabic</td>
<td>xālig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Malian Hassāniyya Arabic</td>
<td>xālg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
<td>kay(i)n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sfax Arabic</td>
<td>ŧamma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Eastern Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>fīh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Standard Maltese</td>
<td>hemm and hawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Western Libyan Arabic</td>
<td>fīh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sahel/Tunis Arabic</td>
<td>famma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td>fī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sudanic</td>
<td>Eastern Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td>fī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Western Nigeria Arabic</td>
<td>fī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sudanese Arabic</td>
<td>fī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Levantine</td>
<td>ŠAfīż Arabic</td>
<td>bū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Damascus Arabic</td>
<td>fī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Jordanian Arabic</td>
<td>fīh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td>as-Salṭ Arabic</td>
<td>bī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aley Arabic</td>
<td>fī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td>fī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Mesopotamian</td>
<td>Muslim Baghdadi Arabic</td>
<td>aku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Širqāṭ (Assur) Arabic</td>
<td>akū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Arabian Peninsula</td>
<td>al-Bāḥa Arabic</td>
<td>fīh and šī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td>al-ʔAlṣāʔ Arabic</td>
<td>fī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ḥagil Arabic</td>
<td>fī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yanbuʕ Arabic</td>
<td>fīh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ŠʔUnayzah Arabic</td>
<td>fī and buh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abu Dhabi Arabic</td>
<td>fī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>Sana’a Arabic</td>
<td>bih</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from the table, in some modern Arabic varieties, more than one existential item is found. These are Standard Maltese, al-Bāḥa Arabic and ʕUnayzah Arabic. Nevertheless, this has no impact on the type of their negative existential clauses (type A), nor on the way these clauses are negated. For instance, both fiḥ and šī are existential items in al-Bāḥa Arabic, e.g.:

(357)  al-Bāḥa Arabic

a. šī  muya  
EX  water
‘There is water.’

b. fiḥ  muya  
EX  water
‘There is water.’  
(Fieldwork data)

Both fiḥ and šī are negated by the standard negation strategy as in (358).

(358)  al-Bāḥa Arabic

a. mḥammad  mā  ḡa  
Mohammed  NEG  come.PRF.3MSG
‘Mohammed did not come.’

b. mā  šī  muya  
NEG  EX  water
‘There is no water.’

c. mā  fiḥ  muya  
NEG  EX  water
‘There is no water.’  
(Fieldwork data)
Finally, the fact that type A is extremely common among modern Arabic varieties imposes the following generalization:

*Generalization 26: In modern Arabic varieties, existential clauses in a variety are almost always negated by the same strategy used in standard negation in that variety.*

This is unlike the case in Standard Arabic, where such clauses are considered to be non-verbal and therefore the non-verbal negative strategies are used to negate them. In modern Arabic varieties, existential items could be considered pseudo-verbs; consequently, they are not negated by the non-verbal negative strategies but by the verbal ones (standard negation).

### 6.1.4.1.2 Type B

This type is observed in one Arabic variety only among those considered in this thesis, Coastal Dhofārī Arabic (an Arabian Peninsula variety). That is, in this variety the negative existential item is either *hinnāk* or *fī* as exemplified below:

(359) Coastal Dhofārī Arabic

a. hinnāk qarūra fī š-ṣanṭa

  `EX bottle in DEF-bag`

  ‘There is a bottle in the bag.’

b. fī šūra fōg il-kurfāya

  `EX picture above DEF-bed`

  ‘There is a picture above the bed.’

  (Davey, 2013: 170)
However, unlike most of the modern Arabic varieties where these items are negated by the standard negation strategy, this variety has a special negative existential morpheme to express such a notion, namely māšē as in (360):

(360) Coastal Dhofārī Arabic

māšē kirāšī biğinb-ak
NEG.EX chairs next to-you

‘There are no seats next to you.’ (Davey, 2013: 153)

Accordingly, negative existential clauses in Coastal Dhofārī Arabic are type (B), in which they are expressed by a specific morpheme that is different from the positive existential one.

It is worth noting in this context that in his study of the Arabic Omani dialects in the 19th century, Reinhardt (1894) reported the use of šiši as a negative existential marker in Oman, e.g.:

(361) Omani Arabic

hādi šiši byūt
these NEG.EX house.PL

'There were no houses at all.' (Holes, 2015: 28)

The ancient use of such a morpheme is discussed in several studies (e.g., Holes, 2015; Lucas, 2018; Wilmsen, 2014). However, the use of this morpheme is not observed in the modern Arabic varieties, neither in Coastal Dhofārī Arabic (an Arabic variety spoken in Oman) nor in any other modern Arabic variety. As Holes puts it, ‘šiši ‘nothing at all’, an emphatic form, is now an unusual usage in Oman, though it occurs in Reinhardt’s 19th
century material gathered in Zanzibar” (Holes, 2015: 28). And because the present study is synchronic, this old use of šiši is not investigated further here.

6.1.4.1.3 Type A–B

As explained in 6.1.2, this type arises when there is a mix between type (A) and type (B). In other words, negative existential clauses are expressed by the same negative strategy found in standard negation (type A); in addition, a specific morpheme can be used to express negative existential clauses. This is observed in two varieties only; one from the Arabian Peninsula region and the other from the Maghrebi region. The Arabian Peninsula variety is Madinah Arabic. In this variety, affirmative existential clauses are expressed by the item ⍨(h), for example:

(362) Madinah Arabic

\[ \text{fī}(h) \quad \text{muya} \]

\[ \text{EX} \quad \text{water} \]

‘There is water.’ \((Personal\, knowledge)\)

Such clauses can be negated by \(mā\) (the standard negation morpheme in this variety), for example:

(363) Madinah Arabic

\[ \text{mā} \quad \text{fī}(h) \quad \text{muya} \]

\[ \text{NEG} \quad \text{EX} \quad \text{water} \]

‘There is no water.’ \((Personal\, knowledge)\)
In addition to the previous mention method, negative existential clauses in Madinah Arabic can be expressed by the item *māš*, e.g.:

(364) Madinah Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
māš & \text{muya} \\
\text{NEG.EX} & \text{water}
\end{array}
\]

‘There is no water.’ *(Personal knowledge)*

This possibility of expressing negative existential by the standard negation strategy or by the use of the item *māš* is what makes Madinah Arabic type A~B.

The other variety is Delys Arabic (a Maghrebi variety). The affirmative existential item in this variety is *kayən*, e.g.:

(365) Delys Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
kayən & \text{ḥlib?} \\
\text{EX} & \text{milk?}
\end{array}
\]

‘Is there milk?’ *(Souag, 2016: 507)*

Note that *kayən* is found in another Maghrebi variety, namely Moroccan Arabic (one of the type A varieties). In Moroccan Arabic, the item is *kayen* and when it is negated by the verbal negator *ma*..., the result is *ma-kayen*-š. “The expected negative existential marker [in Delys Arabic] would therefore be *ma kayən*-ši, as attested in Morocco. What is actually used, however, is *ma ka(n)-ši, with the n almost always absent*” *(Souag, 2016: 508)*. Consider the following:
To analyse this situation in Dellys Arabic, let us first recall some of Croft’s observations from section 6.1.2. In Croft’s cycle, type (A) means negating the affirmative existential item by the ordinary verbal negator. Type (A~B) means a new morpheme is coined, mostly but not always, as a result of a contraction or a fusion between the verbal negator and the positive existential morpheme, which, in turn will be used occasionally with negative existential clauses. Type (B) means the new morpheme in type (A~B) becomes the only way to form negative existential clauses. In Madinah Arabic, we have seen that māš is a new negative existential item, but it is not a result of a contraction or a fusion between the verbal negator because in this variety the existential item is fī(h) and the verbal negator is mā. It could be, though, a result of dialect contact since in al-Bāḥa Arabic (one of the Arabian Peninsula varieties spoken relatively in an area close to Madinah Arabic) māši is an alternative way to express negative existentials (see 6.1.4.1.1 above).

Madinah Arabic, therefore, is clearly type (A~B); fī(h) can be negated by mā and the new morpheme māš is occasionally used. In Dellys Arabic, on the other hand, the case is not as straightforward as in Madinah Arabic. If makaš (366) in Dellys Arabic was used beside *ma kayon-ši to express negative existentials, one could clearly assumed that this is type (A~B) where a new negative existential morpheme is used occasionally. However, according to Souag, *ma kayon-ši is not used (Souag, 2016: 508). One could assume, then, that Dellys Arabic is type (B), in which only the new morpheme is used with negative existentials. I argue, however, otherwise. Dellys Arabic is type (A~B), despite the fact *ma kayon-ši is not observed.
Dellys Arabic is identified in this study as a š-variety. It is also listed among others where information on the omission of the post-verbal ...š is observed in the presence of NSIs (cf. section 3.4.1.2). With this in mind, we turn now to the new Dellys negative existential morpheme makaš. If the process of coining this morpheme was finalized as in Madinah Arabic where māš is inseparable, the morpheme ...š in makaš would no longer be perceived as a post-verbal negative morpheme. In other words, unlike māš in Madinah Arabic, makaš is in Dellys Arabic has not been consoidered as an item that can unconditionally express negative existentials. That is, in Dellys Arabic, when the negative existential clause contains an NSI item, ...š is omitted similarly to the case in standard negation. In such cases, the verbal negator mā......-š is no longer fused to the affirmative existential item kayən, or to be more specific, it is no longer fused to kan. kan is the alternative existential predicator used in non-positive contexts (Souag, 2016: 511).

Consider in the following:

(367) Dellys Arabic

ma-kan   walu  
NEG.EX    nothing

‘There is nothing.’   (Souag, 2016: 508)

Dellys Arabic, then, cannot be considered as type (A), where the affirmative existential item is negated by the addition of the verbal negator only, nor as type (B), where the new coined morpheme is unconditionally generalized. It is type (A~B), where a new negative existential morpheme is coined, but still used beside type (A) strategy, where the ordinary verbal negator is simply used to negate affirmative existential. This is despite the fact that the latter is used in certain cases only such as in the presence of an NSI item.
6.1.4.2 The positive existential items

In Table 48 above, we saw that in modern Arabic varieties, different items can be used to express the existential notion. These items are xālig-type (xālig and xālg), kayin-type (kay(i)n and kay(e)n), ḥamma-type (ḥamma, ṣamma), fī-type (fī(h) and fī), bū-type (bū/buh and bū/bih), aku-type (aku and ⟨ʔ⟩aku) and hemm, hawn and šī.\(^{71}\) The geographical distribution of these items reveals some interesting variations, but before this is discussed, let us exclude the ones that occur in specific varieties only. These are hemm, hawn and šī. The first two (hemm and hawn) occur in Standard Maltese only, and šī occurs in al-Bāḥa Arabic. This limits us to the six item-types only.

The geographical distribution of these six item-types will be addressed on a region-by-region. First, in the Maghrebi region, four types out of the six are found: the xālig-type, kayin-type, ḥamma-type and fī-type. In fact, three of these (xālig-type, kayin-type and ḥamma-type) are not found anywhere other than the Maghrebi region. The xālig-type is observed in the Ḥassāniyya region only, with Hassāniyya Arabic and Malian Ḥassāniyya Arabic. The kayin-type is found in Morocco and Algeria only, with Moroccan Arabic and Dellys Arabic. The ḥamma-type is found in Tunisia only with Sfax Arabic and Sahel/Tunis Arabic. Finally, the fī-type is found, within the Maghrebi region, in Libya only with Eastern Libyan Arabic and Western Libyan Arabic.

Second, in the Egyptian region and the Sudanic region, only the fī-type is found, and this is based on one Egyptian variety (Cairene Arabic) and three Sudanic varieties (Sudanese Arabic, Eastern Nigeria Arabic and Western Nigeria Arabic).

Third, in the Levantine region, the fī-type and the bū-type are observed. With ʕAtīṭ Arabic and as-Salṭ Arabic, the bū-type is used, and with the others (Damascus

\(^{71}\) Different classification is also possible based on the source meanings (e.g. locative adverb, prepositional phrase, participle, etc.). In this vein, for example, xālig-type and kayin-type can be grouped under participle; fī-type and bū-type grouped under preposition; and ḥamma-type, hemm and hawn grouped under locative adverb.
Arabic, Northern Jordanian Arabic, Aley Arabic and Palestinian Arabic), the ġī-type is used.

Fourth, in the Mesopotamian region, only the aku-type is found. This is according to the two Mesopotamian varieties considered in this section (Muslim Baghdadi Arabic and šīrqāṭ (Assur) Arabic). Note also that aku-type existentials are found nowhere outside of the Mesopotamian region.

Fifth, in the Arabian Peninsula region, the ġī-type and the bū-type are used. However, the latter is found in one variety only in this region (šīnayzah Arabic), while the ġī-type is found in the rest (al-Bāḥa Arabic, al-ʔAḥṣāʔ Arabic, Ḥagil Arabic, Yanbuʕ Arabic, ʔAbha Arabic and Abu Dhabi Arabic).

Finally, in the Yemeni region, based on one variety only (Sana’a Arabic), the bū-type is the only one used here.\textsuperscript{72}

The following table summarizes the previous geographical distribution of the six existential item-types and the individual use of the items hemm, hawn and šī. In this table, not only regions are specified but also countries, as they seem to play a significant role in this distribution, especially in the Maghrebi region. Note, however, that although Ḥassāniyya is not a name for a country, it is listed, exceptionally, as if it was one. That is, the name Ḥassāniyya is conventionally used to refer to a specific area (see Map 1).

\textsuperscript{72} According to Behnstedt, many other forms are used in Yemen such as ġī(ḥ) and šī (Behnstedt, 2016: 346).
**Table 49: Existential items arranged by countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>The existential item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maghrebi</td>
<td>Hassāniyya</td>
<td>xālig-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>kayin-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>θamma-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libyan</td>
<td>fī-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>hemm and hawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>fī-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanic</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>fī-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levantine</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>fī-type and bū-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>fī-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesopotamian</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>aku-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabian Peninsula</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>fī-type, bū-type and šī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>bū-type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same summary represented in Table 49 is given again in Table 50 below. In this table, however, data is looked at from a different perspective. That is, the existential items are listed first, followed by the countries where they can be found.
Table 50: Existential items arranged by items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The existential item</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xālig-type</td>
<td>Ḥassāniyya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kayin-type</td>
<td>Morocco and Algeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θamma-type</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fiī-type</td>
<td>Libyan, Egypt, Sudan, Nigeria, Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, Palestine and Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aku-type</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>būu-type</td>
<td>Lebanon, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ħemm and ħawn</td>
<td>Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ši</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next part of this chapter we explore pseudo-verb clauses. The term is first defined, followed by an explanation on how such clauses are negated in Arabic.

6.2 Negation with pseudo-verbs

This section is on the negation of pseudo-verbs. The phenomenon is defined in 6.2.1. The way it is done in Standard Arabic is explained in 6.2.2, and in 6.2.3, we explore the same thing but in the modern varieties of Arabic. No categorization is proposed here as most of the varieties tend to behave in the same way in this regard. The section, however, is
based on 33 varieties where information is available. The excluded ones are Malian Ḣassāniyya Arabic, Annaba Arabic, Sousse Arabic, Sahel/Tunis Arabic, Muzēnah and Baniy Waṣīl Arabic, Southern Sinai Arabic, Northwestern Sinai Arabic, Smēṣnē and ṢGēlī Arabic, Ṣuwarā Arabic, Ṣafīdī Arabic, Egyptian western desert Arabic, al-ṢArīš Arabic, Eastern Nigeria Arabic, Western Nigeria Arabic, Abeche Arabic, ṢAfīz Arabic, Christian Baghdadi Arabic, Kuwaiti Arabic, ṢAbha Arabic, Dubai Arabic and Hadhrami Arabic.

6.2.1 What does negation with pseudo-verbs mean?

In section 1.3.1, we introduced the term pseudo-verb. Pseudo-verbs are a small class of predicates in Arabic dialects whose morphosyntactic behaviour distinguishes them from the prepositional phrases from which they derive. In the following sub-section, we will introduce some of these criteria when we explain how Standard Arabic lacks them. For now, it is sufficient to say that in the majority of modern Arabic varieties negation with pseudo-verb is done by the same strategies used in standard negation. In a few varieties, however, negation with pseudo-verb clauses seems to require further details, and these details are the topic of this section.

6.2.2 Standard Arabic and pseudo-verbs

It may seem accurate to say that there are no pseudo-verbs in Standard Arabic, and what might appear as pseudo-verb clauses are, in fact, non-verbal clauses. The most important morphosyntactic criterion is lack of agreement of past auxiliary kān ‘was’ with what would have to be the subject if the pseudo-verb was a prepositional phrase. Let us apply this criterion on the item ṣīnd- ‘have’ in the following clauses from Standard Arabic and Madinah Arabic:
(368) Standard Arabic
a. ʕind-ī sayyārat-un
   have-1SG car-NOM
   ‘I have a car.’  (Personal Knowledge)

(369) Madinah Arabic
ʕind-i sayyārah
have-1sG car
‘I have a car.’ (Personal knowledge)

If we add the past auxiliary kān ‘was’ to the previous clauses, the result would be the following:

(370) Standard Arabic
a. kān-at ʕind-ī sayyārat-un
   was-3FSG have-3MSG car-NOM
   ‘I had a car.’ (Personal Knowledge)

(371) Madinah Arabic
kān ʕind-i sayyārah
was  have-1sG car
‘I had a car.’ (Personal knowledge)

Note that sayyārah ‘car’ in Arabic is feminine and the past auxiliary kān agrees with in Standard Arabic. In Madinah Arabic, in contrast, there is no such agreement. This shows that if the item ʕind in Madinah Arabic was a preposition, not a pseudo-verb, the past auxiliary kān would appear in the previous example as kān-at, similarly to the case in Standard Arabic. Items such as ʕind in Standard Arabic always appear as prepositions.
Thus, they are always negated by the non-verbal negative strategies (cf. section 4.2) as in the following:

(372) Standard Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ccl}
mā & ūnda-hu & qalam-un \\
\text{NEG} & \text{at-3MSG} & \text{pen-NOM}.
\end{array}
\]

‘He does not have a pen.’  
(Personal Knowledge)

In Madinah Arabic, on the other hand, ūnd can appear as preposition or as a pseudo-verb. In the first case, it is negated by the non-verbal negative strategy, whereas in the second one, it is negated by the verbal one. Consider the following and note that in the first example ūnd is a preposition; thus, the non-verbal negator mu is used, but in the second one, it is a pseudo-verb; thus, the verbal negator ma is used:

(373) Madinah Arabic

a. sayyārt-i  mu  ūnd  il-bēt  
   car-my  NEG  LOC  DEF-house

‘My car is not outside of the house.’

b. ma  ūnd-i  sayyārah  
   NEG  have-1SG  car

‘I do not have a car.’  
(Personal knowledge)

Accordingly, negation might be considered as one of the criteria that distinguish pseudo-verbs. That is to say, when the used negative strategy is the verbal one, the item is pseudo-verb, and when the used negative strategy is the non-verbal one, the item is preposition. In the following section, we explain that in some modern Arabic varieties
only certain types of the possible verbal negative strategies seem to be usable with certain
types of pseudo-verbs.

6.2.3 Negating pseudo-verbs in modern Arabic varieties

In modern Arabic varieties, pseudo-verb clauses in a variety are negated by the strategies
used with verbal clauses (standard negation strategies) in that variety. In each of the
following, an example of standard negation is given, followed by a negative pseudo-verb
clause.

(374) Moroccan Arabic
a. ma-nemšiwiš

NEG-go.IMPF.1PL-NEG

‘We will not go.’

(Harrell, 2004: 152)

b. ma-ʕend-iš

NEG-have-1SG-NEG

‘I do not have (it).’

(Harrell, 2004: 156)

(375) Largeau Arabic
a. rafīg-na mā ʔakal halāwa

friend-our NEG eat.PRF.3MSG candy

‘Our friend did not eat candy.’

b. fātimā mā ʕind-a kitāb

Fatimah NEG have-3FSG book

‘Fatima does not have a book.’

(Abu Absi, 1995: 33)

In a few varieties, more data on different types of pseudo-verbs is available, which
shows some variations in the way they are negated. This is not to say different types of
pseudo-verbs are negated in differently from standard negation, it is just that in some modern Arabic varieties, different strategies may be used in standard negation and not all of these strategies are possible with every pseudo-verb type. For example, in Palestinian Arabic, as-Salṭ Arabic and Baskinta Arabic (all are Levantine varieties), the use of the post-verbal negator ...-$š$ only is possible with $b$-imperfect verbs (cf. section 3.4.3.4), e.g.:

(376) Aley Arabic

\[
\text{baʃrif-$š$ bayy-ak} \quad \text{know.PRF.1SG-NEG father-your}
\]

‘I do not know your father.’  \hfill (Bishr,1956: 46)

In all of these varieties as well, this post-verbal negative morpheme can negate bilabial initial pseudo-verbs only; other pseudo-verbs cannot be negated this way. Consider the following from Palestinian Arabic and note that the bilabial pseudo-verb $maʃ$- ‘have’ or ‘with’ is once negated by $mā........-š$ and once by ....-$š$ alone, whereas the non-bilabial one ($ṣind$-) is negated by $mā........-š$ only.

(377) Palestinian Arabic

a. $\text{mā maʃ-ī-$š$}$

\[
\text{NEG have-1SG-NEG}
\]

‘I do not have.’

b. $\text{maʃ-ī-$š$}$

\[
\text{have-1SG-NEG}
\]

‘I do not have.’
c. mā ṣīnd-ī-š
   NEG have-1SG-NEG

   ‘I do not have.’ (Lucas, 2010: 174)

In Biyyāūtī and Aχrasī Arabic (an Egyptian variety), there is no example available to demonstrate the use of …-š alone in standard negation, nor there is any to demonstrate how non-bilabial pseudo-verbs are negated. However, data shows that bilabial pseudo-verbs can possibly be negated by either the bipartite ordinary verbal negator mā …-š or by …-š alone as in the following:

(378) Biyyāūtī and Aχrasī Arabic

a. ma bidd-ī-š
   NEG want-me-NEG

   ‘I do not want.’

b. bidd-ī-š
   want-me-NEG

   ‘I do not want.’ (de Jong, 2000: 393)

Note that all of the previous four varieties are š-varieties; information on bilabial pseudo-verbs in the other š-varieties is not available. Perhaps, bilabial initial pseudo-verbs in these varieties are negated similarly to any other pseudo-verb which makes their mentioning in the consulted sources not necessary. In the non-š-varieties, in contrast, …-š is not a possible negator in the first place, which makes the question, whether bilabial pseudo-verbs in these varieties are negated by …-š alone or not, invalid.

As a result, based on the previous data from the 33 varieties considered in this section, one can propose that:
Generalization 27: In modern Arabic varieties, negation of pseudo-verbs is similar to standard negation, but in varieties where …-š alone is a possible negator, only bilabial pseudo-verbs seem to be able to make use of this negator.

6.3 Summary

In this chapter, we discussed negation of existential clauses and pseudo-verbs. We have seen that most modern Arabic varieties implement the negative strategy they use in standard negation to negate existential clauses. Thus, most of them are classified as type (A) in Croft’s cycle. Type (B) and (A~B) are also found, but rarely. That is, (B) is observed in Coastal Dhofārī Arabic only, and (A~B) is observed in Madinah Arabic and Delys Arabic only.

As is the case with negative existentials, most modern Arabic varieties use the negative strategy, or one of a few possible strategies that they have in standard negation to negate pseudo-verb clauses. In four š-varieties (Palestinian Arabic, as-Salt Arabic, Baskinta Arabic and Biyyānī and Aṣrasī Arabic) data shows that bilabial initial pseudo-verbs only can potentially be negated by the post-verbal negative morpheme …-š.

This chapter results in two generalizations which are repeated below.

Generalization 26: In modern Arabic varieties, existential clauses in a variety are almost always negated by the same strategy used in standard negation in that variety.

Generalization 27: In modern Arabic varieties, negation of pseudo-verbs is similar to standard negation, but in varieties where …-š alone is a possible negator, only bilabial pseudo-verbs seem to be able to make use of this negator.
In the next chapter, we consider negative-sensitive items. We define each type of these items and then we focus more on two types of them only: negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord items.
7. Negative-sensitive items (NSIs)

This chapter is on negative-sensitive items. This term refers to three different types of items. In accordance with the first step of the four ones needed in any typological study, all of the three types of these items are defined in 7.1. However, only two of them (negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord items) are discussed further in this chapter. As we will shortly explain in detail, a discussion of negative polarity items (the third type) is less interesting in the context of the present investigation.

For the purpose of this chapter, the second step in the four steps of typological studies, where varieties are categorized, has been skipped, but the third one, where generalizations are proposed, and the fourth, where they are explained where possible, are conducted. That is, modern Arabic varieties in this chapter will not be categorized based on their similarities and differences regarding the phenomenon in question, but according to the amount of available data. That is, a discussion where more information is available would be more comprehensive than one where not the same amount of information is accessible. Varieties where more data is found are the Saudi Arabian varieties since special attention during the fieldwork trip to this region was given to negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord items. Therefore, negative indefinite pronouns among the Saudi Arabian varieties are discussed first (section 7.2.2), followed by a discussion on the same phenomenon in other modern Arabic varieties (section 7.2.3). In the same manner, negative concord items are considered first among the Saudi Arabian varieties (7.3.1), followed by a discussion on the same phenomenon in other modern Arabic varieties (section 7.3.2). Neither of the two sub-sections (negative indefinite
pronouns and negative concord items), however, includes a section on how they are found in Standard Arabic, as both seem not to be found in this variety.\(^3\)

### 7.1 What are negative-sensitive items?

In section 3.4.1.2, we introduced the term *negative-sensitive items* (NSIs). In the same section, we explained that these items tend to occur in certain non-affirmative contexts such as negation, interrogatives and conditionals. We also mentioned that NSIs can be divided further into three categories: negative polarity items, negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord items. In the literature, the definition of these items seems to be under debate (e.g., Alsarayreh, 2012; Giannakidou, 2007; Laka, 1990; Lucas, 2009; Szabolcsi, 2004). Perhaps, for one thing, this is due to the fact that these items do not necessarily occur in all human languages. For another, among languages that have them, the behaviour of these items seems to be different from one language to another. Because of this debatable situation, a few words on what we exactly mean by each term are in order.

The first term is *negative polarity items*. In his study, Lucas defines these as items which, “while not themselves negative, are restricted to appearing in certain non-affirmative contexts such as negation, interrogatives and conditionals. Clear examples of these are provided by standard English *anyone, anything*” (Lucas, 2009: 188). In this thesis, we adopt the same definition, which seems to already imply that these items cannot

---

\(3\) In Standard Arabic, notions like *I did not see anything* are expressed by simply negating the affirmative counterparts of these clauses. Compare the following and note that the only structural difference between the first and the second clause is the negative marker *mā*:

- raʔaytu šayʔ-an
  
  see.PRF.1SG thing-ACC
  
  ‘I saw something.’

- mā raʔaytu šayʔ-an
  
  NEG see.PRF.1SG thing-ACC
  
  ‘I did not see anything.’
occur as a grammatical fragment answer to a question such as *Who came* since the answer to this question cannot be *anyone*. This technique will be referred to as the grammatical fragment answer, and will be used as a diagnostic test to distinguish these items from the other NSIs (negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord items).

A typical example of a negative polarity item in the modern Arabic varieties is ʕumr- ‘(n)ever’. The occurrence of this item in questions, conditionals and negative clauses is exemplified, respectively below.

(379) Madinah Arabic

a. ʕumr-ak Šufta-ha
    ever-you.2MSG see.PRF.2MSG-it
    ‘Have you ever seen it?’

b. ʔiðā ʕumr-ak Šufta-ha gull-ī
    if ever-2MSG see.PRF.2MSG-3FSG tell.IMP-1SG
    ‘If you ever saw it, tell me.’

c. mā ʕumr-ī Šufta-ha
    NEG ever-1SG see.PRF.1SG-3FSG
    ‘I have never seen it.’ (Personal knowledge)

Items such as ʕumr- are not possible in affirmative declarative clauses and cannot be a grammatical fragment answer. The ungrammaticality of such uses is demonstrated by the ungrammatical examples below:
The second term is *negative indefinite pronouns*. Unlike negative polarity items, these items can occur as a grammatical fragment answer to a question like *Who came?* as the answer can be *nobody*. Note this answer is not only grammatical but also conveys a negative meaning. In fact, these items can be used in questions, without predicate negation, and yet those clauses are interpreted as negatives. Take English *nobody* as an example. This item not only can be used as a fragment answer conveying negative meaning, but also in a question like *did nobody come?* And in the latter, the question is interpreted negatively.

*maḥad* in Yanbuʕ Arabic, would be a clear example of this phenomenon as in the following:

(381) Yanbuʕ Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{maḥad} & \text{̣ga} \\
\text{noone} & \text{come.PR.F.3MSG} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
l-\text{yōm} & \\
\text{DEF-today} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘No one came today.’

*(Fieldwork data)*
This item can occur as a grammatical fragment answer. It can also be used in a question, without predicate negation, and results in negative interpretation. Both facts are exemplified below:

(382) Yanbu' Arabic

a. mīn ġa
   who come.PRF.3MSG
   maḥad
   no one
   ‘Who came?’
   ‘No one.’

b. maḥad ġa l-yōm
   no one come.PRF.3MSG DEF-today
   ‘Did nobody come today?’
   (Fieldwork data)

The last term is negative concord items. These items are named after the negative concord phenomenon, which means that two negative elements occur in the same clause and fail to cancel each other out. This is exactly the opposite of what is called double negation. In the latter, the presence of the two negative elements in the same clause results in an affirmative reading as they do cancel each other out.

An example of these items is what we will be referring to in this study as wala-items such as wala-ktāb ‘not (even) a book’. Shortly such phrases will be addressed in detail. For now, it is important to point out that a negative concord item is an item that can occur in a negative concord construction. For instance, wala-ktāb in al-?Aḥsā? Arabic can co-occur with the verbal negator mā in the same clause, and the resulting construction would be a negative concord structure (negative reading still in place), whereas the co-
occurrence of the negator $mā$ with the negative indefinite pronoun $mahād$ ‘no one’ would result in double negation (affirmative reading). The following clause illustrates the co-occurrence of $wala$-$ktāb$ and the negator $mā$ in the same clause:

(383) al-$ʔAḥsāʔ$ Arabic

$mā$ garēt wala-$ktāb$
NEG read.$PRF.1$SG NEG-book

‘I did not read any book.’ *(Fieldwork data)*

Similarly to negative indefinite pronouns, negative concord items can be used as a grammatical fragment answer conveying a negative meaning, e.g.:

(384) al-$ʔAḥsāʔ$ Arabic

$kam$ ktāb garēt
how.$many$ book read.$PRF.3$MSG

wala-$ktāb$
NEG.book

‘How many books did you read?’
‘Not (even) a book.’ *(Fieldwork data)*

---

74 This is not to say that negative indefinite pronouns can normally co-occur with predicate negation in modern Arabic varieties. In fact, this might not be the case. In Madinah Arabic, for example, the negative indefinite pronoun $mahād$ does not normally co-occur with the verbal negator $mā$ in the same clause. However, if someone is being sarcastic about an embarrassing situation he or she has faced in a formal occasion, then, if someone asked him or her did anyone notice that?, a sarcastic reply to such a question could be:

$mahād$ mā lāḥaḏ
noone NEG notice.$PRF.3$MSG
‘Everyone noticed.’ (Lit. ‘No one did not notice’)* (Personal knowledge)*

Note in this example, $mahād$ and $mā$ cancel each other out, and the result is an affirmative reading.
Unlike negative indefinite pronouns, however, negative concord items cannot occur in a question, without predicate negation.

To sum up, then, negative polarity items, negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord items can all be labeled as negative-sensitive items. Negative polarity items cannot be used as a grammatical fragment answer, while the other two can. Out of these two, however, only negative indefinite pronouns can be used in a question without predicate negation, while negative concord items cannot. On the other hand, only negative concord items can potentially occur with predicate negation in the same clause and not cancel the negative meaning out.

In this chapter, only negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord items are considered. That is, the available data on negative polarity items are, first, not sufficiently plentiful to be investigated from a comparative point of view. Second, in varieties where some data is available, often no information is found on whether what might appear to be a negative polarity item can occur as a fragment answer or not. Finally, the behaviour of what might look like items of this category seem not to reveal any interesting information about their interaction with negation other than the most likely omission of the post-verbal negative ...-§ from negative clauses they appear in, a fact already addressed in 3.4.1.2. Note that the same omission is also found with negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord items, but since data reveals more interesting information on these two types other than this omission, they will be discussed further here. Note, however, that unlike the case in the other chapters in this thesis where any negative phenomenon is first explained in Standard Arabic, this section does not include such a part. That is because Standard Arabic seems to lack both lexicalized negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord constructions.
7.2 Negative indefinite pronouns

Based on our definition of the term, an item is identified as a negative indefinite pronoun if it is restricted to occur in non-affirmative contexts, able to function as a grammatical fragment answer conveying a negative meaning, and results in negative interpretation when used in a question without predicate negation. However, in large-scale cross-linguistic studies, these narrow criteria may not be effective as there will always be some missing data. For instance, in some varieties, it might be possible to check if an item can occur as a grammatical fragment answer, but it might not be possible to check if the same item can be used in questions without predicate negation. Nevertheless, these narrow criteria were checked in six varieties in Saudi Arabia, the place where my fieldwork trip was conducted for the purpose of this study. Therefore, the behaviour of negative indefinite pronouns in these varieties will be discussed first, followed by a discussion on the behaviour of what appear to be similar items in other varieties. Both, discussions, however, will come after we briefly see in the following section how negative indefinite pronouns behave cross-linguistically. In total, though, this section is based on 21 modern Arabic varieties out of the 54 considered in this study. These varieties are al-Bāḥa Arabic, al-ʔAḥsāʾ Arabic, Ḥagīl Arabic, Yanbuʾi Arabic, ʕUmayzah Arabic, Madinah Arabic, Western Libyan Arabic, Cairene Arabic, Palestinian Arabic, Baskinta Arabic, Damascus Arabic, al-Karak Arabic, as-Salṭ Arabic, Northern Jordanian Arabic, Širqāṭ (Assur) Arabic, Abu Dhabi Arabic, Coastal Dhofārī Arabic, Zinḡibār Arabic, Adeni Arabic, Hadhrami Arabic and Şana’a Arabic.

7.2.1 Typology of negative indefinite pronouns

Before this framework is explained, it should be pointed out that the definition Haspelmath (2013) adopts for negative indefinites in his study discussed below is different from the one we adopt here and explained above. As he puts it, “all nominal
expressions that correspond to ‘nobody’ and ‘nothing’ are regarded as “negative indefinite pronouns”, even though in many or most languages the negative sense is contributed exclusively by the predicate negation” (Haspelmath, 2013). Nevertheless, a reference to his typological framework will be made occasionally.

Haspelmath (2013) investigates a 206-language pilot sample, and notes that in 170 languages negative indefinites may co-occur with the negator used in standard negation and the omission of the latter would result in an ungrammatical structure (Type A), for example:

(385) Russian (Slavic, Indo-European)

ja ne videla ničego

1SG NEG saw nothing

‘I saw nothing.’ (Haspelmath, 2013)

In 11 languages, the negator used in standard negation never occurs with negative indefinites (Type B):

(386) German (Germanic, Indo-European)

Niemand kam

Nobody come.pst.3sg

‘Nobody came.’ (Haspelmath, 2013)

13 languages, however, show an overlap between the two previous types (Type C); the ordinary negator may or may not co-occur with negative indefinites. This is the case in Spanish where the negative morpheme is required when the negative pronoun occurs after the verb and prevented when the negative pronoun occurs before the verb:
Finally, in 12 languages, the negative existential construction is used to express negative indefinite pronouns (Type D). Nelemwa is an example of this type as the following demonstrates:

(388) Nelemwa, also known as Kumak (Malayo-Polynesian, Austronesian)

\[
\text{kia} \quad \text{agu} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{uya}
\]

\text{NEG.EX} \quad \text{person} \quad \text{3SG} \quad \text{arrive}

‘Nobody came.’ (Lit. ‘There is not a person who came.’)  
(Haspelmath, 2013)

Arabic varieties actually resist straightforward classification as one or other of these varieties, but rather have items that behave like the items of type B languages, and other items that behave like the items of type C languages. As we will see below, what we define in this study as negative indefinite pronouns behave as items of type B languages, whereas what we define as negative concord items behave as items of type C languages.
7.2.2 Negative indefinite pronouns in Saudi Arabia

In this study, eight varieties from Saudi Arabia are considered, but only six are included in this section: al-Bāḥa Arabic, al-ʔAḥsāʾ Arabic, Ḥagil Arabic, Yanbuʾ Arabic, ʕUnayzah Arabic and Madinah Arabic. In all of these varieties, the criteria we have for negative indefinite pronouns are found to be met with one item only, *maḥad*. This item literally means ‘no one’, and its behaviour and its phonological shape are found to be identical in all of the considered varieties here.

*maḥad* in all of the six varieties in this section never co-occurs with predicate negation; thus, according to Haspelmath’s study (2013), these varieties are type (B).

Consider the following and note that *maḥad* must always be in the subject position:

(389) Ḥagil Arabic

```
maḥad ligā hadiyyah
no one get.PRF.3MSG gift

‘No one got a gift.’ (Fieldwork data)
```

(390) al-Bāḥa Arabic

```
maḥad ʔa
no one come.PRF.3MSG

‘No one came.’ (Fieldwork data)
```

*maḥad* in all of the six varieties can be used as a fragment answer to a question and conveys a negative meaning, e.g.:

---

75 Data in all of them are collected through fieldwork (cf. section 2.6), except in Madinah Arabic as data in this one is based on my personal knowledge of the variety (I speak it natively).
(391) Madinah Arabic

a. mīn ḅa
   who come.PRF.3MSG
maḥad
no one
‘Who came?’
‘No one.’

(Personal knowledge)

(392) al-ʔAḥsāʔ? Arabic

a. mīn šift
   who see.PRF.1SG
maḥad
no one
‘Who did you see?’
‘No one.’

(Fieldwork data)

In all of the six varieties also, maḥad can occur in a question, without predicate negation, and the question will have negative interpretation, e.g.:

(393) Yanbuʕ Arabic

maḥad ᵇazam-kum
no one invite.PRF.2PL
‘Did no one invite you?’
(Fieldwork data)

(394) ʕUnayzah Arabic

maḥad ḅa l-yōm
no one come.PRF.3MSG DEF-today
‘Did no one come today?’
(Fieldwork data)
maḥad in these varieties is a result of a lexicalization process, in which the negative polarity item ahad ‘one’ is fused to the verbal negator mā. A similar item, which presumably underwent the same process, is observed in other modern Arabic varieties. However, the shortage in the availability of data prevents us from checking whether these similar items meet all the criteria we adopt in this study for negative indefinite pronouns or not. Therefore, unlike the case with the six Saudi Arabian varieties where maḥad is referred to as a negative indefinite pronoun, these similar items will be referred to as maḥad-items, and their behaviours will be discussed in the next section.

7.2.3 maḥad-items in modern Arabic varieties

maḥad-items are those which look phonologically and semantically similar to the negative indefinite pronoun maḥad found in Saudi Arabia. From the semantic point of view, these items are all nominal expressions correspond to the meaning ‘no one’. From the phonological point of view, these items seem to be a result of a lexicalization process in which the verbal negator in a variety is fused to the item ahad ‘one’. In Table 51 below, all varieties where such items are found are listed with the phonological shapes of these items.
We have seen that among the Saudi Arabian varieties, the *maḥad*-item is *maḥad* in all of them, but here we find different phonological shapes of these items. Some are similar to the Saudi Arabian *maḥad*, some with a geminated [ḥ] as in *maḥḥad*, some with a geminated [d] as in *mahaddiš*, some with a final -a as in *maḥada*, and finally some contain the negative ...-š. First, *mahad* as observed in Saudi Arabia is found in Western Libyan Arabic, Širqāṭ (Assur) Arabic, Coastal Dhoʃārī Arabic and Șana’a Arabic. These four varieties are from different geographical areas (Western Libyan Arabic is from the

### Table 51: *maḥad*-items in modern Arabic varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Arabic variety</th>
<th>The <em>maḥad</em>-item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Western Libyan Arabic</td>
<td><em>maḥad</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cairene Arabic</td>
<td><em>mahaddiš</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
<td><em>maḥaddeš</em> (or <em>māḥadāš</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Baskinta Arabic</td>
<td><em>maḥada</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Damascus Arabic</td>
<td><em>māḥada</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>al-Karak Arabic</td>
<td><em>maḥada</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>as-Salṭ Arabic</td>
<td><em>māḥadāš</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Northern Jordanian Arabic</td>
<td><em>maḥadāš</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Širqāṭ (Assur) Arabic</td>
<td><em>mahad</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi Arabic</td>
<td><em>maḥḥad</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Coastal Dhoʃārī Arabic</td>
<td><em>māḥad</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Zinḡibār Arabic</td>
<td><em>maḥḥad</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Adeni Arabic</td>
<td><em>maḥḥad</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hadhrami Arabic</td>
<td><em>maḥḥad</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Șana’a Arabic</td>
<td><em>māḥad</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maghrebi region; Šīrqāṭ (Assur) Arabic is from the Mesopotamian region; Coastal Dhofārī Arabic is from the Arabian Peninsula region; and Ṣan’a Arabic is from the Yemeni region. Therefore, it seems that the phonological form *maḥad* has no specific region.

Second, the gemination of [ḥ] is found in Abu Dhabi Arabic, Zinġībār Arabic, Adeni Arabic and Hadhrami Arabic. All of them are Yemeni varieties, except Abu Dhabi Arabic is an Arabian Peninsula one. Thus, one might assume that the gemination of [ḥ] occurs in the Arabian Peninsula and the Yemeni region only, which are adjacent to each other. This is not to say, though, other forms where [ḥ] is not geminated is not found; it is just to say that when this gemination occurs, it is probably in these two regions.

Third, the gemination of [d] is found in Palestinian Arabic and Cairene Arabic. Although we have classified these two varieties as belonging to different areas for the purposes of this study (Egyptian and Levantine), the proximity of Palestine to Egypt results in a number of similarities between the two varieties in different areas of grammar and lexicon, and it is likely that the gemination of [d] in the *maḥad*-item in Palestinian Arabic is a borrowing from Cairene Arabic.

Fourth, the presence of the final -a is found in Baskinta Arabic, Damascus Arabic, al-Karak Arabic, as-Salṭ Arabic, Palestinian Arabic and Northern Jordanian Arabic. All of them are Levantine varieties. Note, however, that this final -a is followed in some varieties by the negative …-š as in *māḥadāš*, a fact that will be discussed in detail next. For now, it is important to note that unlike the gemination of [ḥ] in the Arabian Peninsula and the Yemeni region where it occurs beside other forms, all of the Levantine varieties seem to have always this final -a, except Palestinian Arabic where this form is found as in *māḥadāš* beside *maḥaddeš* with no final -a.76

---

76 This [a] could be a relic of the accusative case marker -a in Arabic. See section 1.3.2.2 for case marking system in Arabic.
Finally, the presence of \(-\hat{s}\) is found in Cairene Arabic, Palestinian Arabic, as-Salṭ Arabic and Northern Jordanian Arabic. All of them are Levantine varieties, except Cairene Arabic, which is an Egyptian one. Therefore, one might expect a mahad-item with a final [\(\hat{s}\)] to be found in the Levantine and the Egyptian region. This, however, must be restricted to the fact that whether the variety is a \(\hat{s}\)-variety or not. That is, Damascus Arabic, for example, is a Levantine non-\(\hat{s}\)-variety; thus, no final [\(\hat{s}\)] is found with the mahad-item in this variety. There is one exception found for this, however. Baskinta Arabic is \(\hat{s}\)-variety; yet, the mahad-item here is mahada with no [\(\hat{s}\)]. The question is why, but before we answer this, we should ask another question, namely does [\(\hat{s}\)] occur in mahad-items in \(\hat{s}\)-varieties of other regions? The answer to this question is no. The available data reveals that if the \(\hat{s}\)-variety is not spoken in the Levantine or the Egyptian regions, mahad-items do not contain [\(\hat{s}\)]. This is based on four \(\hat{s}\)-varieties spoken in other regions: Western Libyan Arabic, Zinğibār Arabic, Adeni Arabic and Ṣana’a Arabic. All of them are Yemeni varieties, except Western Libyan Arabic is a Maghrebi one. Having said that, we return now to the question of why Baskinta Arabic and other non-Levantine/non-Egyptian \(\hat{s}\)-varieties do not have final [\(\hat{s}\)]. In section 7.3.1, we explained that mahad-items appear to be a result of a lexicalization process, in which the negative polarity item aḥad ‘one’ is fused to the verbal negator. Therefore, in varieties where \(-\hat{s}\) is not part of the verbal negator, the resulting mahad-item is not expected to have [\(\hat{s}\)], but in varieties where \(-\hat{s}\) is part of the verbal negator, the resulting mahad-item should be expected to have [\(\hat{s}\)]. However, the reason why mahad-items do not have a final [\(\hat{s}\)] in some of the \(\hat{s}\)-varieties where \(-\hat{s}\) is part of the verbal negator could be that mahad-items in such varieties have been lexicalized before \(-\hat{s}\) became part of the verbal negator in these varieties. Accordingly, if we consider the fact that both having \(-\hat{s}\) as part of the negative morpheme and lexicalizing a mahad-item are innovations in the modern Arabic varieties, one can assume that having \(-\hat{s}\) is an older development than lexicalizing a
*maḥad*-item in the Levantine and the Egyptian region, whereas in other regions, in contrast, the lexicalization of a *maḥad*-item is the older one.

After this discussion on the different phonological shapes of the *maḥad*-items, we turn now to their behaviour in the clause. In all of the 15 varieties considered in this section, these items seem to behave similarly to the negative indefinite pronoun *maḥad* found in the Saudi Arabian varieties. That is, they always appear in the subject position and never co-occur with predicate negation in the same clause. Thus, if we classify these items as negative indefinite pronouns, these varieties will be categorized as type (B) according to the aforementioned framework proposed by Haspelmath (cf. 7.2.1). The following are representitive examples:

(395) Baskinta Arabic

\[
\text{maḥada} \quad \chi\text{abar-ni} \quad \text{ʔinn-ak} \quad \text{hawn} \\
\text{no one} \quad \text{tell.PRF.3MSG-me} \quad \text{that-2MSG} \quad \text{here}
\]

‘No one told me that you were here.’ (Abu-Haidar, 1979: 110)

(396) Palestinian Arabic

\[
\text{māḥaddeš} \quad \text{biʔdar} \quad \text{yisiriʔ-o} \\
\text{no one} \quad \text{can.IMPF.3MSG} \quad \text{steal.IMPF.3MSG-3MSG}
\]

‘No one can steal from him.’ (Seeger, 1996: 2)

(397) Abu Dhabi Arabic

\[
\text{maḥḥad} \quad \text{yidišš} \quad \text{hini} \\
\text{No one} \quad \text{enter.IMPF.3MSG} \quad \text{here}
\]

‘No one enters here.’ (Qafisheh, 1977: 243)

Accordingly, the following generalization is meant to capture not only the behaviour of the *maḥad*-items, but also the corresponding ones attested in Saudi Arabia:
Generalization 28: In a full sentence, maḥadd-items always occur in the subject position and never co-occur with predicate negation.

Finally, less data is found to show the expected double negation (as explained in 7.1) that results from the co-occurrence of a mahad-item with predicate negation in the same clause. Examples demonstrating this are found in Cairene Arabic and Damascus as in the following:

(398) Cairene Arabic
maḥaddiš min al-bašar ma-lū-š maḥāsin
no one from DEF-mankind NEG-have-NEG good.qualities
‘Everyone has some good qualities’ (Woidich, 1968: 73)

(399) Damascus Arabic
māḥada mā šāf-ni
no one NEG see.PRF.3MSG-1SG
‘Everyone saw me.’ (Murphy, 2014: 94)

In the next section, we explore another type of negative-sensitive items, negative concord items. As in this section, these items are first explored among the Saudi Arabian varieties, then we explore how what appear to be similar items behave in other modern Arabic varieties.

7.3 Negative concord items
Negative concord items are those which can be used with predicate negation in the same clause and yet the resulting clause would still be interpreted as negative. However, as we will shortly see, similarly to negative indefinite pronouns, in certain constructions, these
items cannot co-occur with predicate negation. Moreover, in some cases, their behaviour is different from negative indefinites. More data was collected during the fieldwork trip to Saudi Arabia to identify such differences, but the same amount of data is not accessible in other varieties to do the same. Therefore, these items among the Saudi Arabian varieties will be addressed in section 7.3.1, and the behaviour of what appear to be similar items in other varieties will be addressed in section 7.3.2. The total number of varieties included in these two sections is 15. These varieties are al-Bāḥa Arabic, al-ʔAḥsāʔ Arabic, Ḥagil Arabic, Yanbuʕ Arabic, ŦUnayzah Arabic, Madinah Arabic, Palestinian Arabic, Damascus Arabic, as-Salţ Arabic, al-Karak Arabic and Northern Jordanian Arabic, Moroccan Arabic and Western Libyan Arabic. Note, however, that unlike the previous section on negative indefinites, there is no typological framework found for these items in the literature; thus, no sub-section is included here for this purpose.

7.3.1 Negative concord items in Saudi Arabia

In the six Arabic varieties from Saudi Arabia (al-Bāḥa Arabic, al-ʔAḥsāʔ Arabic, Ḥagil Arabic, Yanbuʕ Arabic, ŦUnayzah Arabic and Madinah Arabic), there does not appear to be any lexicalized negative concord item. However, with the exception of ŦUnayzah Arabic and al-Bāḥa Arabic, such morphemes can be constructed by adding the emphatic morpheme wa- ‘and’ to the negator lā and following them by any indefinite noun as in walā-kitāb ‘not (even) a book’. There seem to be no restrictions on what noun can follow walā as long as this noun is indefinite and singular. In al-ʔAḥsāʔ Arabic, Ḥagil Arabic, Yanbuʕ Arabic and Madinah Arabic, when these items occur before the verb, predicate negation is not possible in the clause, but when they occur after the verb, predicate negation is required. Consider the following:
(400) Ḥagil Arabic

a. wala-wāḥad  ḡā
   NEG-one        come.PRF.3MSG
   ‘No one came.’ (Lit. ‘Not even one person came.’)

b. mā  ḡā      wala-wāḥad
   NEG    come.PRF.3MSG   NEG-one
   ‘No one came.’ (Lit. ‘Not even one person came.’)  (Fieldwork data)

(401) al-ʔAḥsāʔ Arabic

a. wala-šay    šift
   NEG-thing    see.PRF.1SG
   ‘I did not see anything.’ (Lit. ‘I did not even see one thing.’)

b. mā    šift       wala-šay
   NEG     see.PRF.1SG   NEG-thing
   ‘I did not see anything.’ (Lit. ‘I did not even see one thing.’) (Fieldwork data)

Note that in these examples the two indefinite nouns following wala are wāḥad as in wala-wāḥad and šay as in wala-šay. This is to illustrate that if we analyze these two items based on the criteria Haspelmath (2013) adopts in his typological study on negative indefinites, they would be considered as negative indefinite pronouns since both items correspond, respectively, to ‘no one’ and ‘nothing’. Accordingly, al-ʔAḥsāʔ Arabic, Ḥagil Arabic, Yanbuʕ Arabic and Madinah Arabic would be type (C) since the case in them is similar to Spanish where the verbal negator is used when wala-wāḥad and wala-šay occur after the verb and prevented when they occur before the verb (cf. section 7.2.1). It might, however, be worth noting here that the first assumption that was made about this phenomenon is that wala-items are not possible with the verbal negator if they occur in the subject position (before the verb), and they are possible if they occur in the object
position (after the verb). However, the following examples challenge such an assumption as in both clauses here the item *wala-ktāb* occurs in the object position. The grammatical function of these items therefore appears to be less important than their position relative to the verb.

(402) Madinah Arabic

a. *wala-ktāb* garēt
   
   NEG-book read.PR.F.1MSG
   
   ‘I did not read any book’

b. mā garēt *wala-ktāb*
   
   NEG read.PR.F.1MSG NEG-book
   
   ‘I did not read any book’  (Personal knowledge)

The fact that these *wala*-items can co-occur with predicate negation, even if this is restricted by having them after the verb only, make us classify the four varieties (al-?Aḥsāʾ Arabic, Ḥagil Arabic, Yanbuʿ Arabic and Madinah Arabic) as varieties where the negative concord phenomenon is possible.

Like the negative indefinite *maḥad*, *wala*-items can occur as a fragment answer, e.g.:
(403) Madinah Arabic

kam ktāb ārē
how many book read

wala-ktāb
NEG-book

‘How many books have you read?’

‘Not (even) one book.’ (Personal knowledge)

(404) Yanbu’i Arabic

ʔēš gāl
what say

wala-kilmah
NEG-word

‘What did he say?’

‘Not (even) a word’ (Fieldwork data)

Unlike the negative indefinite mahād, however, wala-items cannot occur in questions without predicate negation. Compare the following and note that, in the first question, the wala-item comes before the verb, and, as illustrated above, the verbal negator is not used; thus, the question is not grammatical, whereas, in the second question, the wala-item comes after the verb, and, as illustrated, the verbal negator is used; thus, the question is grammatical:

(405) al-ʔAḥsā’i Arabic

a. *wala-šay šīf

NEG-thing see

‘Did you see nothing?’
b. mā šift wala-šay
   NEG see.PRF.2MSG NEG-thing
   ‘Did you see nothing?’ (Fieldwork data)

In ʕUnayzah Arabic and al-Bāḥa Arabic, the case is different from the one explained above. First, in al-Bāḥa Arabic, *wala*-items are only possible after the verb and the verbal negator must be used. This indicates that negative concord constructions are also possible in this variety, e.g.:

(406) al-Bāḥa Arabic
   mā šār wala-šay
   NEG happen.PRF.3MSG NEG-thing
   ‘Nothing happened.’ (Lit. ‘Not even a thing happened’) (Fieldwork data)

In al-Bāḥa Arabic also, *wala*-items can occur as fragment answers to a question and convey negative meaning, for example:

(407) al-Bāḥa Arabic
   wiš šift
   what see.PRF.3MSG
   wala-šay
   NEG-thing
   ‘What did you see?’
   ‘Nothing.’ (Lit. ‘Not even a thing) (Fieldwork data)
Based on this al-Bāḥa Arabic is type A in Haspelmath’s typological study since predicate negation is always required with nouns corresponding to ‘no one’ and ‘nothing’ in this variety (cf. section 7.2.1).

Out of the six Saudi Arabian varieties, ʕUnayzah Arabic is the only variety where negative concord is not possible. This does not mean *wala*-items are not attested here; they are, but they never occur in a complete clause, whether they occur after or before the verb. The only possible context for these items is fragment answers, for example:

(408) ʕUnayzah Arabic

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{wiš} & \text{šift} \\
\text{what} & \text{see.PRF.3MSG} \\
\text{walā-šay} & \\
\text{NEG-thing} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘What did you see?’

‘Nothing.’ (Lit. ‘Not even a thing)  \hspace{1cm} \text{(Fieldwork data)}

Finally, in his description of Damascus Arabic, Cowell states that “lā is used with the “emphatic w-” in the sense ‘not even’” (Cowell, 2005: 390), e.g.:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
mā & \text{šay} \\
\text{NEG} & \text{see.PRF.1SG thing} \\
\text{‘I did not see anything.’} & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
mā & \text{ḡā} \text{ahād} \\
\text{NEG} & \text{come.PRF.3MSG one} \\
\text{‘No one came.’} & \text{(Fieldwork data)}
\end{array}
\]
‘Not even one of the doctors could diagnose the disease.’ (Cowell, 2005: 390)

This sense of the presence of ‘even’ with *wala*-items was tested in the six Saudi Arabian varieties by intercalating the morpheme *ḥattā* ‘even’ between *wala* and the indefinite noun. For instance, the item *walā-šay* ‘not a thing’ would appear after this intercalation as *walā-ḥatta-šay* ‘not even a thing’. Consider, as an example:

(410) **al-Bāḥa Arabic**

\[
\text{mā šift walā-ḥatta-šay}
\]

NEG see.PRF.1SG NEG-even-thing

‘I did not even see a thing.’ (Fieldwork data)

Participants in this study all agreed on that this construction is possible when extra emphasis is intended. As we will see in the next section, this sense of having ‘even’ with *wala*-items seems to play a significant role in the way such items appear in some modern Arabic varieties.

### 7.3.2 *wala*-items in modern Arabic varieties

By *wala*-items, we mean items that look similar to the ones discussed previously among the Saudi varieties in which *wala* is followed by an indefinite singular noun. Information on these items is available for Palestinian Arabic, Damascus Arabic, as-Salṭ Arabic, al-Karak Arabic and Northern Jordanian Arabic. In all of them, if the *wala*-item occurs before the verb, the verbal negator cannot be used, but if the item occurs after the verb,
the verbal negator seems required. Thus, based on the definition of the typological framework proposed by Haspelmath (2013), these five varieties are type (C) where the morphemes ‘no one’ and ‘nothing’ may or may not co-occur with the verbal negator. Consider, for example:

(411) Palestinian Arabic
a. wala-ḥada fī-hum šāf-ni
   NEG-one in-them see.PRF.3MSG-1SG
   ‘No one saw me.’

b. ma-šāf-nī-š wala-ḥada
   NEG-see.PRF.3MSG-1SG-NEG NEG-one
   ‘No one saw me.’ (Hoyt, 2005: 1)

(412) as-Salṭ Arabic
a. wala-wāḥad qaغا
   NEG-one come.PRF.3MSG
   ‘No one came.’ (Palva, 2004: 226)

b. maš-hummu-šš walā-girš
   with-they-NEG NEG-piaster
   ‘They did not have a piaster [in their pockets].’ (Palva, 2004: 232)

(413) Damascus Arabic
a. wū-wāḥed mn əd-dakātra ʔəder ʔay̱ršə əl-marad
   NEG-one from DEF-doctors could diagnose.IMPF.3MSG DEF-disease
   ‘No one from the doctors could diagnose the disease.’ (Cowell, 2005: 390)
b. būṣed-ek mā əḥki wala-kəlme barrāt ṭ-ṭarī?

promise.IMPF.1SG-2SG NEG say.IMPF.1SG NEG-word outside DEF-way

‘I promise you I will not say a single word outside the way [bounds of propriety]’

(Murphy, 2014: 69)

In al-Karak Arabic and Northern Jordanian Arabic only, further data also shows that wala-items in these varieties can also occur as fragment answers, e.g.:

(414) al-Karak Arabic

mīn ġa

who come.PRF.3MSG

wala-wāḥad

NEG-one

‘Who came?’

‘No one’

(Alsarayreh, 2012: 73)

(415) Northern Jordanian Arabic

mīn šuft

who see.PRF.2MSG

wala-ḥada

NEG-one

‘Who did you see?’

‘No one’

(Alqassas, 2015: 123)

Based on the previous, then, one can see that the negative concord phenomenon occurs in all of these five varieties. Note that all of these five varieties could be considered as Eastern Arabic varieties as they are spoken in the eastern part of the Arabic-world
(Egypt eastwards). A similar phenomenon, but with different morphemes, is observed in some of the Western Arabic varieties spoken in the west of the Arabic-speaking world (Libya westwards). Information on this is available in three Western Arabic varieties: Moroccan Arabic, Western Libyan Arabic and Standard Maltese.

In the previous section, we explained that *wala*-items deliver the sense of ‘not even’. In this vein, the item *wala-wāḥid* ‘not one’ may be realized, to add an extra emphasis, as *wala hattā wāḥid* ‘not even one’. This has been confirmed among the Saudi varieties by asking participants to judge the grammaticality of such phrases. Also, in the same section, we have seen that Cowell (2005) reports the same sense of *hattā* ‘even’ with *wala*-items in Damascus Arabic. With this in mind regarding some of the Eastern Arabic varieties, we turn now to the case in the Western Arabic ones.

In Moroccan Arabic, Western Libyan Arabic and Sfax Arabic, we find what we will refer to as *ḥattā*-items such as *ḥattā-wāḥid* ‘no one’. These items function similarly to the *wala*-items found in the Eastern varieties of Arabic. That is to say, the full phrase *wala + ḥattā +* an indefinite is usually shortened to *wala +* an indefinite noun in Eastern Arabic, and to *ḥattā +* an indefinite in Western Arabic. However, it seems that in the east *wala* can be followed by any indefinite singular noun, whereas in the west the available data shows that the item *ḥattā* is commonly followed by *wāḥid* ‘one’ as in *ḥattā-wāḥid* ‘no one’ (or *ḥad* as in *ḥattā-ḥad* ‘no one’) and *ḥaža* ‘thing’ as in *ḥattā-ḥaža* ‘nothing’. The latter (*ḥattā-ḥaža* ‘nothing’), however, is found to have an allomorph in Moroccan Arabic, namely *walu* ‘nothing’. Compare the following:

---

78 It can also be followed by any indefinite noun expressing a minimal quantity such ‘gram’, ‘centime’, etc. (Adila, 1996).
In addition to the sense of having *hattā* ‘even’, the above examples may provide another evidence that favours the assumption that *hattā*-items and *wala*-items are alike. In other words, this western item *walu* ‘nothing’ could be a trace of the eastern *wala* in which the realization of the phrase *wala hattā haža* results in two variants *ḥotta-ḥaža* and *walu*, a morpheme that would appear as *wala-ḥāğa* ‘nothing’ in the east.⁷⁹

The differences between *hattā*-items and *wala*-items go beyond the phonological form. In the eastern varieties of Arabic, we have seen that the verbal negator co-occurs with *wala*-items if they come after the verb, and it is omitted it when they come before the verb. We have also seen, based on the availability of data in some eastern varieties, that *wala*-items can occur as fragment answers to a question and convey a negative meaning. This is not always the case with *hattā*-items, at least, not based on the western Arabic varieties considered here.

In Western Libyan Arabic and Moroccan Arabic, the verbal negator with *hattā*-items seems to be required whether these items come before or after the verb, e.g.:

---

⁷⁹ Although *wala-šay* would be more common in Saudi Arabia, for example, to mean ‘nothing’, *wala-ḥāğa* can also be possibly used.
(417) Western Libyan Arabic

a. ḥatta-wəḥad ma-žā
   no one NEG-come.PRF.3MSG
   ‘No one came.’ (Krer, 2013: 91)

b. ma-žā ḥatta-wəḥad
   NEG-come.PRF.3MSG no one
   ‘No one came.’ (Krer, 2013: 90)

(418) Moroccan Arabic

a. ḥəttə-wəḥəd ma-ža
   no one NEG-come.PRF.3MSG
   ‘No one came.’ (Benmamoun, 1997: 272)

b. ma-iddiw ḥəttə-ḥəža
   NEG-take.PRF.3PL nothing
   ‘They are not going to take nothing.’ (Harrell, 2004: 154)

In Sfax Arabic, data is only available on the use of ḥattā-items after the verb only, e.g.:

(419) Sfax Arabic

ma-qābilti (-š) ḥatta ḥad l-yūm
   NEG-meet.PRF.1SG (-NEG) any body DEF-today
   ‘I did not meet anybody today.’ (Bahloul, 1996: 79)

In Western Libyan Arabic, the available data shows that ḥattā-items cannot occur as fragment answers to a question and in Sfax Arabic no data are found to either confirm or deny such a fact, but in Moroccan Arabic, ḥattā-items can be used as fragment answers, e.g.:
This means that, according to our definition of the two terms (section 7.1), ḥattā-items in Moroccan Arabic are negative concord items because they can occur as fragment answers and convey a negative meaning, but these items in Western Libyan Arabic are negative polarity items since they cannot be used as fragment answers. In Sfax Arabic, the case of ḥattā-items is not clear; no data are found to see whether ḥattā-items can occur as fragment answers or not.

In Western Libyan Arabic, negative concord items are found, but they are not ḥattā-items (expressed with an initial ḥattā). These items are had ‘no one’ and šay ‘nothing’. Both items are mostly found to function as negative polarity items in other modern Arabic varieties in which they cannot be used as fragment answer. Consider the following where the use of these two items are exemplified. Note here that the first two examples show the use of these two items in negative concord constructions, whereas the other examples show how these two items can occur as fragment answers:

---

80 This is the case in Standard Arabic, but there is no available data in every modern Arabic variety to confirm the this, except among the Saudi Arabian varieties. In these varieties, the similar items (ʔahad and šay) mean, respectively ‘one’ and ‘thing’, and they are negative polarity items as they cannot be fragment answers and tend to appear in non-affirmative contexts only.
(421) Western Libyan Arabic

a. ma-mšā ḥad li-lmadrsa

\[
\text{NEG-go.PRF.3MSG no one DEF-school}
\]

‘No one went to the school’

b. ma-šuft šay

\[
\text{NEG-see.PRF.1SG thing}
\]

‘I saw nothing’

c. min šuft

\[
\text{who see.PRF.2MSG}
\]

ḥad

no one

‘Who did you see?’

‘No one.’

d. šini dirit

\[
\text{what do.PRF.2MSG}
\]

šay

‘What did you do?’

‘Nothing.’ (Krer, 2013: 86)

Standard Maltese is another variety where the observed negative concord items are similar to the ones found in Western Libyan Arabic (Lucas, 2014). The morphemes in this variety are ḥadd ‘no one’ and xejn ‘nothing’. The following are representative examples for their use in negative concord clauses and their use as fragment answers.
The remaining question is that if the five considered eastern varieties in this section (Palestinian Arabic, Damascus Arabic, as-Salṭ Arabic, al-Karak Arabic and Northern Jordanian) are Type C based on the typological framework proposed by Haspelmath (2013) since in these five varieties the items correspond to ‘no one’ and ‘nothing’ may or may not co-occur with the verbal negator, what is then the type of the four considered western varieties (Moroccan Arabic, Western Libyan Arabic, Sfax Arabic and Standard Maltese) based on the same typological framework. The types of these four western varieties is (A) as the predicate negation seems to be required in these varieties with items that correspond to ‘no one’ and ‘nothing’.

To sum up, then, this section (negative concord items) answers two important questions. First, do negative concord constructions occur in modern Arabic varieties? The answer is they do occur, and this is based on 15 modern Arabic varieties. In 14 out of
these varieties, negative concord constructions are attested, only in one variety (Sunayzah Arabic, a Saudi Arabian variety) this phenomenon is not attested. Therefore,

*Generalization 29:* Unlike the case in Standard Arabic, negative concord constructions are observed in modern Arabic varieties.

The second question is what are the negative concord items in these 14 modern Arabic varieties? The answer is that among the eastern modern Arabic varieties (10 out of the 14), the items that seem to be functioning this way are what we referred to as *wala-*items. Thus,

*Generalization 30:* In the eastern modern Arabic varieties, negative concord constructions are mostly done by the use of *wala-*items.

In the western modern Arabic varieties (4 out of the 14), there seems to be no specific class of items functioning this way. In Moroccan Arabic, the negative concord items are what we referred to as *hatta-*items. In Western Libyan Arabic, these items are *had* ‘no one’ and *šay* ‘nothing’. In Standard Maltese, the items are *hadd* ‘no one’ and *xejn* ‘nothing’. In Sfax Arabic, the case is not clear due to the limitation of the available data. Because of this diversity between these types of items in western Arabic varieties, and because moreover the number of these varieties considered here is four only, no generalization regarding their negative concord items is proposed.

### 7.4 Summary

In this chapter, we considered negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord items. Due to some similar aspects between the two phenomena, more restricted definitions were
used to distinguish them from each other. As a result, the Saudi Arabian varieties, for which it was possible to apply these restricted definitions precisely, were discussed first. Then, we discussed the use of what appear to be similar items found in different modern Arabic varieties.

*maḥad* is the negative indefinite pronoun among the Saudi varieties. The same item is found in other varieties, which seems to be used in the same manner, i.e., it appears in the subject position only. *wala*-items can be used in negative concord constructions among the majority of the Saudi varieties (found in 5 out of 6 Saudi varieties). Similar items are found to function in the same fashion in other Arabic varieties. These items, however, appear to be constructed with *wala*, as in *wala*-wāḥid ‘no one’, in the eastern part of the Arabic world and with *hattā*, as in *hattā*-had ‘no one’, in the western part. Finally, this chapter results in three generalizations which are repeated below.

**Generalization 28:** In a full sentence, *maḥad*-items always occur in the subject position and never co-occur with predicate negation.

**Generalization 29:** Unlike the case in Standard Arabic, negative concord constructions are observed in modern Arabic varieties.

**Generalization 30:** In the eastern modern Arabic varieties, negative concord constructions are mostly done by the use of *wala*-items.

This is the last chapter where results of this study are presented. The next chapter is the conclusion, in which the results of the present study are summarized and possible avenues for future research are touched upon.
8. Conclusion

8.1 Summary

In this thesis, different types of negation are considered from 54 modern Arabic varieties. If we include Standard Arabic, the total number of the considered varieties in this study would be then 55, not 54. However, in this study, Standard Arabic has not been considered as a modern variety. It is perceived, instead, as a variety that is relatively similar to the mother of the considered modern varieties; thus, occasional reference to it has been made to explain some of the found negative phenomena among the contemporary varieties of Arabic.

The investigated negative types in this study are considered from a typological point of view. Thus, as explained by Song (2001), the four steps (or stages) that should be followed in any typological study are also followed here where possible. In this vein, any considered negative phenomenon is first defined (step I). Then, the considered sample of Arabic varieties is categorized (step II). Then, generalizations are proposed (step III) and explained where possible (step IV). These four steps have been followed in most cases. More specifically, they have been followed with standard negation, non-verbal negation, negative imperatives and negative existential clauses. In three cases only (negation of pseudo-verbs, negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord constructions), the steps have been modified such that no categorization has been proposed. In the negation of pseudo-verbs, varieties tend to behave in the same manner; thus, a categorization in this regard would not reveal any interesting information. In contrast, with negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord constructions, there was more data available for Saudi varieties than most others, thanks to the fieldwork I conducted on these varieties (e.g., unlike the other Saudi varieties, negative concord constructions are not possible in Unayzah Arabic). Thus, the Saudi varieties were investigated first, and then an investigation of other varieties where data is available on
what appear to be similar items to the Saudi negative indefinite pronouns and the Saudi negative concord items was conducted.

One of the most interesting results the study shows is that negation in Arabic is going through a cycle other than the one proposed by Jespersen (1917) and identified by several studies (e.g., Lucas, 2009 and Diem, 2014). In this Arabic negative cycle, negation goes through five different stages in which verbal negation (standard negation) and non-verbal negation start from being similarly expressed by the same morpheme and return to being also similarly expressed but by a morpheme that is different from the one they have started with. The change occurs first in non-verbal negation in which this type of negation would first entail an attachment of a personal pronoun to the verbal negator. The personal pronoun here must agree with the subject of the negated non-verbal clause in number, person and gender. Then, a new morpheme is coined, containing a frozen form of the 3MSG pronoun, and used to negate any non-verbal clause regardless of the type of the subject in that clause. This new coined morpheme will, in turn, be used in standard negation initially with future and progressive clauses only, and finally, generalized to negate any verbal clause.

The study also reveals other results, and these are captured by 30 generalizations. 27 of these generalizations are non-implicational. That is, the described phenomenon in the proposed generalization is not restricted (does not depend on the existence of another generalization). The remaining three generalizations are implicational. That is, the described phenomenon is restricted (depends on the existence of another one, e.g., X is only found in region Y).

10 out of the 27 non-implicational generalizations are absolute, i.e., the described phenomenon is always true, while the other 17 are non-absolute, i.e., the described phenomenon is mostly, but not always, true. On the other hand, two out of the three implicational generalizations are absolute, and only one is non-absolute. However,
because implicational generalizations may take the form X means Y, they can be either bidirectional or unidirectional. In the first one, the relationship between X and Y is symmetrical, meaning if X entails Y, Y also entails X. In the second one, the relationship is asymmetrical, meaning X entails Y but not vice versa. In this regard, two out of the three implicational generalizations are unidirectional, and one is bidirectional.

All of the 30 generalizations are repeated below and organized based on their types. Implicational generalizations are followed by an explanation to illustrate whether these generalizations are bidirectional or unidirectional. Such a characteristic is not applicable to non-implicational generalizations; thus, no such explanation follows them.

First, the non-implicational absolute generalizations are:

Generalization 6: There is no š-variety where …-š is not, at least optionally, omitted in emphatic negation.

Generalization 8: The use of lammā, lan, lā and ʔin in standard negation is unattested in modern Arabic varieties.

Generalization 11: Jespersen’s cycle is observed in the Maghrebi, Egyptian, Levantine and Yemeni regions only.

Generalization 12: Jespersen’s cycle is not observed in the Sudanic, Mesopotamian and Arabian Peninsula regions.

Generalization 13: The use of ʔin in non-verbal negation is unattested in modern Arabic varieties.

Generalization 16: In non-verbal negation, the NEG+PRO and the mū–miš morpheme are always placed before the negated predicate.

Generalization 17: b-varieties seem to be found in the Arabian Peninsula region only.
Generalization 21: In modern Arabic varieties, the verbal construction in affirmative imperatives is always different from the one used in negative imperatives.

Generalization 28: In a full sentence, maḥad-items always occur in the subject position and never co-occur with predicate negation.

Generalization 29: Unlike the case in Standard Arabic, negative concord constructions are observed in modern Arabic varieties.

Second, the non-implicational non-absolute generalizations are:

Generalization 1: In standard negation, the pre-verbal single negative strategy is the most common one observed among the modern Arabic varieties.

Generalization 3: The optionality between using single and bipartite negation is rarely found in modern Arabic varieties.

Generalization 4: In standard negation, bipartite negation almost always entails the use of ma……-š.

Generalization 5: In the š-varieties, …-š is mostly omitted in emphatic negation.

Generalization 7: In modern Arabic varieties, the negative construction in standard negation is almost always symmetric.

Generalization 9: Reflexes of ʿam and laysa in standard negation is extremely rare in modern Arabic varieties.

Generalization 10: In standard negation, the negative morpheme(s) mostly occur(s) adjacent to the verb.

Generalization 14: The use of a reflex of laysa and ɣayr in non-verbal negation is rarely attested in modern Arabic varieties.
Generalization 15: In modern Arabic varieties, non-verbal negation is commonly expressed by either the use of the NEG+PRO construction or the mūmiš morpheme.

Generalization 18: In the š-varieties, …-š is mostly the final suffix when the NEG+PRO strategy is used.

Generalization 19: The use of the NEG+PRO construction for 1SG subject almost always means the dependent pronoun -nā is attached to the verbal negator.

Generalization 20: The use of the NEG+PRO construction for 1PL, 2MSG, 2FSG, 2MPL and 2FPL subjects mostly means the relevant dependent pronoun, not the independent one, is attached to the verbal negators in the Maghrebi and the Sudanic region and the relevant independent one is attached instead in the Levantine and the Arabian Peninsula region.

Generalization 24: mā can commonly negate imperatives in every Arabic region, except in the Arabian Peninsula where this is extremely rare.

Generalization 25: lā can commonly negate imperatives in every Arabic region, except in the Egyptian and the Sudanic ones.

Generalization 26: In modern Arabic varieties, existential clauses in a variety are almost always negated by the same strategy used in standard negation in that variety.

Generalization 27: In modern Arabic varieties, negation of pseudo-verbs is similar to standard negation, but in varieties where …-š alone is a possible negator, only bilabial pseudo-verbs seem to be able to make use of this negator.

Generalization 30: In the eastern modern Arabic varieties, negative concord constructions are mostly done by the use of wala-items.
Third, the implicational absolute generalizations are (note that the unidirectional vs. bidirectional relationship is stated between two brackets at the end of each generalization):

*Generalization 22:* Unlike the case with non-verbal negation, if the negative ...-š occurs in negative imperatives in a variety, it always means this variety is a š-variety in the first place.

(Unidirectional)

*Generalization 23:* In modern Arabic varieties, the use of the negator lâ always entails classifying negative imperatives as type IV, either totally or partially.

(Bidirectional)

Generalization 22 is unidirectional. That is, the use of ...-š in negative imperatives always means this variety is a š-variety, but not every š-variety would necessarily use ...-š with negative imperatives; some of them, such as as-Salṭ Arabic for instance, would simply use lâ. Generalization 23, on the other hand, is bidirectional because the use of lâ in a variety with negative imperatives always entails that this variety is either totally or partially type IV (the negator of declarative verbal main clauses is different form the negator of negative imperatives). The opposite is also true: the classification, either totally or partially, of negative imperatives in a variety as type IV almost always means lâ is used with negative imperatives in this variety.

Fourth, the only implicational non-absolute generalization in this study is:

*Generalization 2:* In modern Arabic varieties where the negative strategy is single, the negator used is almost always mā.

(Unidirectional)
This generalization is unidirectional. That is, when the negative strategy in a variety is classified as single, it almost always means the negator used in this variety is \( m\ddot{a} \), but the use of the negator \( m\ddot{a} \) does not necessarily mean the negative strategy in this variety is single; it could be single~bipartite.

### 8.2 Limitations and potential for further research

There are some limitations in this study. First, the study relies on English and Arabic sources only; a consideration of sources written in other languages would definitely result in more extensive discussions. The second limitation concerns the lack of data. That is, data on the seven negative types included in this study (standard negation, non-verbal negation, negative imperatives, negative existential clauses, negation with pseudo-verbs, negative indefinite pronouns and negative concord constructions) is not available for every modern Arabic variety considered here. The analysis of negative concord constructions, for example, is based on 15 varieties out of the 54 ones considered in this study. Therefore, these two limitations could be viewed as potential research areas in the future. More sources and more data would definitely result in more solid investigation. In terms of the data, however, it should be pointed out that the amount of the available data on certain types of negation is significantly less than the available amount on others. For example, the available data on negative indefinite pronouns such as \textit{mahad}-items and negative concord items such as \textit{wala}-items are considerably less than the available data on standard negation. Thus, carrying future investigations in these two areas seems interesting. Future research could also be conducted in the same vein of this study. For example, other aspects such as the phonological variations in phonemic consonants in all the modern varieties of Arabic could be studied from a typological point of view.
Finally, typological studies conventionally imply a sample of languages from different language families and different geographical areas. In this study, the considered sample consists of varieties of the same language which are spoken in relatively adjacent areas. The implementation of the typological approach in this unconventional way shows that typology is a field of study that is not limited to explain cross-linguistic phenomena only. In this study, it is applied to varieties of the same language and reveals some interesting results in terms of how these varieties behave with respect to negation. In the same vein, the development of negation in languages should not be studied from a cross-linguistic perspective only. In this study, for example, we have seen negation in Arabic is going through a unique cycle that might not be observed elsewhere. All that we know then is that languages definitely evolve over time and typological studies could be an effective way to investigate their evolution. The evolution could be a cross-linguistic tendency among many human languages, or an individual aspect found only in a specific group of languages or language varieties.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Consent form

First, I would like to thank you for your help in this research.

This research is on the varieties of modern Arabic varieties and their peculiarities in Saudi Arabia which may help us to understand the way Arabic evolves over time. Accordingly, the purpose of this work is to learn how you express yourself in your own dialect, not in standard Arabic.

Every piece of information you give in this study, including your personal information such as your level of education and the city you live in, will be used in this research only.

I may use some part of your participation in this research, but I will not state your name; instead, I will refer to participants by numbers such as participant number one, two, three, etc. If you agree to be recorded to help me remember your participation, be sure your recording will never be public.

If you agree to participate in this study, please sign.

☐ I agree with recording ☐ I agree without recording

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>نموذج الموافقة</th>
<th>توقيع:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أولاً، أود أن أشكرك على مساعدتك لي في هذا البحث.</td>
<td>التاريخ:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هذا البحث يتعلق بتنوع اللهجات العربية في السعودية وخصمها، والذي قد يساعدنا على فهم تطور اللغة العربية عبر الزمن. وعليه فإن المقصود بهذا العمل هو معرفة الطريقة التي تعبير بها عن نفسك بلهجتك الخاصة وليس باللغة العربية الفصحى.</td>
<td>الاسم الأول:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إن كل معلومة تدلية بها في هذه الدراسة بما في ذلك معلوماتك الشخصية كالمستوى التعليمي والمدينة التي تسكن بها ستستخدم في هذا البحث فقط. قد يتم اقتباس أجزاء من مشاركتك في البحث ولكن لن يشار إلى اسمك أبدا بل سيرمز للمشاركين بأرقام مثل مشارك رقم واحد، اثنين، ثلاثة، إلخ. إذا كنت موافقًا على تسجيل مشارك صوتيا لمساعدتي على تذكر مشاركتك، فكن على يقين أن هذا التسجيل لن يظهر للعلن أبدا.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you agree to participate in this study, please sign.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ أوافق مع التسجيل ☐ أوافق بدون التسجيل</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ I agree with recording ☐ I agree without recording</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First name: Signature: Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أولاً، أود أن أشكرك على مساعدتك لي في هذا البحث.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Questionnaire

Preliminaries

This questionnaire consists of three parts: in the first one, a hypothetical situation is described. Please try to imagine how you would respond in such an event. In the second and the third one, you will be asked to reformulate affirmative sentences. Please remember to reply in your own dialect.

a) Name:

b) Age:

c) The city you currently live in:

d) Have you lived in any other place for more than six months?

e) The city your parents currently live in:

f) Has any of your parents lived in any other city for more than six months?
Questions (Part 1)

1- If you ask someone named Mohammed to attend an occasion, but he missed it, how would you describe his missing? Would you say it differently? (Perfect verbs, past)

2- If you plan to do an occasion and you asked Mohammed to come, but you know he is most likely will miss it, how would you describe his missing? Would you say it differently? (Imperfect verbs, future)

3- Mohammed works as a manager, but he always misses work. And if someone asked, is Mohammed coming to work, what would you say? Would you say it differently? (Imperfect verbs, present)
4- If someone said Mohammed is nice, but you disagree with this, what would you say? Would you say it differently? (Nominal sentence)

5- If you know Mohammed is working and someone thinks Mohammed is playing, how would you correct this? Would you say it differently?

6- If you want tea but someone gave you milk, what would you say to him? Would you say it differently? (Pseudo-verbs)

7- If you have a car only but someone thinks you have a car and a house, how do you correct this? Would you say it differently? (Pseudo-verbs)
8- If the water is cut off in your place, how would describe the nonexistence of the water? (Negative existential)
Would you say it differently?
Would you say māš mād “There is no water”

9- If many people were invited to attend an occasion, but all of them missed it, how would you tell someone about this? Would you say it differently? (Negative pronouns)

10- If your friend is smoking and you hate the smell, what would you say to him to stop? Would you say it differently?
(Imperatives)
Questions (Part 2)

In this part, you will be given sentences and you should reformulate them. For example, if the sentence is *I saw Mohammed*, the answer should be *I did not see Mohammed.*

- Mohammed came.

- Mohammed drinks milk every day.
- The house is nice.
- I am student.
- We are students.
- You (MSG) student.
- You (FSG) are student.
- You (MPL) are students.
- You (FPL) are students.
- Kaled is a student.
- He is a student.
- Hind is a student.
- She is a student.
- The boys are students.
- They (M) are students.
- The girls are students.
- They (F) are students.
- Go.

- Go (Plural)

- I have a car.

- I want coffee.

- Mohammed was eating.

- If you go, I will sleep.

- Why do you go?

- Everyone got a gift.

- Have you ever used š in negation?
Questions (Part 3)

In this part, you will be given sentences. Please reproduce them in your own dialect.

1- Who came?
- Nobody.
- Would you please use “use the answer above” in a sentence?

2- Nobody comes to visit us.

3- What did you see?
- Nothing.

4- Nothing happened.
Appendix C: Acceptability Judgement for ʕUnayzah

1- You (MSG) are not their sponsor.
2- You (MSG) are not their sponsor.
3- You (MSG) are not the same student.
4- We are not the same students.
5- It is not the same mobile.
6- Did nobody come today?
7- I saw nothing.
8- I did not even see anything.
### Appendix D: AcceptabilityJudgementforYanbuṣ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The girl is not smart.</td>
<td>ﻣﻲ ﺍﻟﺒﻨﺖ ﻣﻴﻦ ﺗﻠﻜﺒophobic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The students are not smart.</td>
<td>ﻣﻮ اﻟﺒﻠFromBody ﻣﻴﻦ ﺗﻠﻜﺒophobic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quit smoking!</td>
<td>ﺑﻄﻞ دﺧﺎن.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quit smoking!</td>
<td>ﺑﻄﻞ دﺧﺎن.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stop smoking!</td>
<td>ﺑﻄﻞ دﺧﺎن.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stop smoking!</td>
<td>ﺑﻄﻞ دﺧﺎن.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>There is no water.</td>
<td>ﻓﯿﮫ ﻣﺎ ﻣﻮﯾﮫ ﻣﺎ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We saw nothing today.</td>
<td>ﻓﯿﮫ ﻣﺎ ﻣﻮﯾﮫ ﻣﺎ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Acceptability Judgement for al-Bāḥa

1- You (MSG) are not the same student.
2- You (MPL) are not even students here.
3- You (MSG) are not the same student who is here.
4- You (MPL) are not the same students who are here.
5- We are not the same students.
6- I did not see anything.
7- I did not even see one.
8- I did not see anything.
9- No one came.
10- Do not go!
11- Did nobody come?
12- Did no body come?
Appendix F: Acceptability Judgement for al-?Ahsā?

1- The house is not nice.
2- The house is not nice.
3- The house is not nice.
4- I did not see anything.
5- I did not see anything.
6- I did not see anything.
7- I did not see anything.
8- He is not their sponsor.
9- He is not their sponsor
10- Did you (MSG) see nothing?
11- Did you (MSG) see nothing?
12- Did no body come?
13- I did not read any book.
14- He did not tell me any word.
15- How many books did you read?
   Not book
   Not even a book.
16- Mohammed was not eating.
17- Mohammed was not eating.
Appendix G: Acceptability Judgement for Ḥagil

1- We found nothing.
1 - ولا شيء لقيت.

2- I did not like anything.
2 - ما عجبني ولا شيء.

3- I did not say anything.
3 - ما هرجت (قلت) ولا كلمة.

4- How many books you read?
4 - كم كتاب قريت؟

Not a book
ولا كتاب.

Not even a book.
ولا حتى كتاب.

5- Did you see nothing?
5 - ولا شيء شفت؟

6- Did nobody come today?
6 - محمد جاكم اليوم؟

7- Did you like nothing?
7 - ما أعجبك ولا شيء؟