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Abstract

This thesis provides a general descriptive account of the morpho-syntactic expression of negation in fifteen Modern Arabic varieties and investigates three of these varieties in more depth. The thesis contributes to the typological literature on negation through a survey of the negation patterns in a number of related and geographically close varieties. It sheds light on the most influential factors that unify the negation patterns found in these varieties, which are predicate type and form. It is found that the type of the predicate, such as verbal and non-verbal predicates, as well as the form of the verbal predicate, such as active participle as opposed to other verbal forms, play an essential role in determining the negation markers used. In addition, this thesis gives a comprehensive account of a number of negative elements in Libyan Arabic, namely the negative auxiliary, negative particle mišš, and miš as a metalinguistic marker, and establishes the morpho-syntactic properties and pragmatic functions of these elements. It concludes that the negative auxiliary is used for a specific pragmatic function, which is to deny assumed background information. It also finds that even though miš is not a negation marker exclusive for metalinguistic negation, it is a special metalinguistic marker that signals the metalinguistic reading of verbal sentences.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1. Thesis outline

This thesis investigates negation and the different patterns it takes in Modern Arabic varieties in general, and in Libyan Arabic spoken in the city of Tripoli in particular. The aims of this thesis are: first, to provide a descriptive account of the expression of negation on the morpho-syntactic level in fifteen Modern Arabic varieties, and determine the main factors and linguistic categories that play a role in determining these negation patterns. Second, to explore three of these varieties in more depth with regard to particular negation patterns that are chosen through the use of a questionnaire, and shed light on the elements and functions that are taken into consideration when producing these patterns. Third, to give a comprehensive account of a number of negative elements in Libyan Arabic, and establish the morpho-syntactic properties and pragmatic functions of these elements.

The current thesis contributes to the typological literature on negation through a survey of negation patterns in a number of related and geographically close varieties. This thesis sheds light on the properties and characteristics of a number of negation phenomena in these varieties, some of which have received little attention in the literature. It also offers insights on the pragmatic functions of specific negation elements and constructions, and highlights some negation patterns that are in need of further investigation.

The investigation is conducted on the basis of data collected from two different questionnaires aimed at eliciting negation patterns in a number of Arabic varieties, as well as the researcher’s own native examples and judgements of Libyan Arabic. The data from the questionnaires are compared against data collected from grammatical descriptions of the investigated fifteen Modern Arabic varieties. This is done to avoid using out-dated data in the analysis of the negation patterns. The first questionnaire is aimed at eliciting general negation patterns from fifteen Modern Arabic varieties for a general survey. The data obtained from the first questionnaire are used as a basis for choosing three specific Modern Arabic varieties for further investigation. The second questionnaire is aimed at eliciting specific negation
phenomena that emerged as interesting points of variation from the initial survey in the three chosen varieties.

The other source of data for this research is the researcher’s own native examples of Libyan Arabic, plus a number of examples from Syrian, Palestinian and Kuwaiti Arabic. The latter set of data from Syrian, Palestinian and Kuwaiti Arabic represents a small portion of the examples provided in this thesis and it was obtained by listening to natural conversations by native speakers of these varieties or through follow up questions after listening to natural conversations. The majority of these examples are introduced in Chapters Two and Three.¹

Chapter One of this thesis discusses negation as a linguistic category and the different forms in which it can be expressed, in different languages of the world, in order to assess the linguistic terminology used to describe similar forms in Modern Arabic varieties. This includes describing negation patterns on both semantic and syntactic levels. While some negation phenomena are reviewed for the sake of having a thorough discussion of the patterns through which negation is expressed in the languages of the world, this chapter also highlights the relevant terminology for the description of negation patterns in Modern Arabic varieties, as will be noted in each section.

Chapter Two discusses Arabic verbs with a focus on Libyan Arabic in order to set the scene for the different categories and notions that are used to describe the verbal elements in the rest of the thesis. This is done with a special focus on the distinctions within the class of verbs that are relevant to negation. Chapter Three explores the different negation patterns found in Modern Arabic varieties through the most cited accounts of negation in the literature. This chapter sets the scene for the elements and constructions within the environment of negation that interact with or have an impact on the expression of negation, and these are targeted for investigation in the general survey of Modern Arabic varieties. The data in this chapter also represents the basis against which the new data from the questionnaires will be compared in order to arrive at the most up-to-date results for the analysis.

¹ Examples that are not from the questionnaire will be marked by NQ at the end of each example.
Chapter Four discusses the methodology used to collect data for this thesis and describes the design of the two questionnaires. Two samples of the questionnaires are included in the appendices.

Chapters Five to Eight represent the main findings of this thesis. Chapter Five presents and discusses the data obtained from the general survey of negation patterns in Modern Arabic varieties. Moreover, it summarises the distribution of the general patterns found and highlights the negation patterns that are in need of more investigation and that are focused on for the second questionnaire.

Chapter Six introduces the data from the three varieties chosen on the basis of intriguing negation patterns emerging from the initial survey, namely Sudanese, Lebanese, and Libyan Arabic, and summarises the negation patterns found in the data. Chapter Seven focuses on specific negative elements, some of which were used by participants in both stages of the research. These elements are negative auxiliaries, negative particle mʕəš, and miš as a metalinguistic marker. This chapter investigates the morpho-syntactic properties of negative auxiliaries and negative particle mʕəš and the pragmatic functions of both negative auxiliaries and miš as a metalinguistic marker. Chapter Eight concludes with a summary of the negation patterns highlighted throughout this thesis and issues that are in need of further investigation.

1.2. Negation as a linguistic category

The basic meaning of negation is based on the intuition that a certain proposition is not true. From a logical perspective, negation is an operator that reverses the truth value of a proposition from \( p \) is true to \( p \) is not true or it is not the case that \( p \) is true. However, the picture is not as simple as this. Semantics, morphology and syntax interact to express negation on various levels, and pragmatics can also play a role in the expression of negation, specifically in producing negation that is not based on the logical notion that \( p \) is not true, i.e. non-truth conditional negation. The latter is referred to as metalinguistic negation and I will elaborate on this subject in Chapter Seven (7.3).
In this chapter I review the terminology used in modern literature to describe negation on the syntactic and semantic levels, in order to determine whether the different terms might be of use in later sections and chapters, and where they meet or contrast. In section (1.2.1), I briefly explore negation as a semantic notion and discuss the different concepts associated with the semantic application of negation. In section (1.2.2), I shed light on the morpho-syntactic expression of negation and highlight the different distinctions that can be made under this division.

### 1.2.1. Negation as a semantic notion

The semantic understanding of negation comes from the notion that a specific proposition is not true, and thus negation as a semantic notion is characterised as truth-conditional. For the purposes of this thesis, I will not go into details about the logical and philosophical understanding of negation (for a comprehensive semantic and logical account of negation see Horn 2001), but will focus on the application of negation as a semantic category under which a number of semantic concepts can be expressed.

When discussing negation from a semantic point of view, there are a number of semantic concepts that are associated with the understanding of negation as a linguistic category. Some of these are propositional negation, the scope of negation, the focus of negation, and antonymic negation. While negation as a semantic notion is relevant to all languages, the manifestation of these concepts varies across languages. These concepts are discussed in Chapter Three (3.1) with regard to Arabic. Moreover, these concepts sometimes overlap and the next few paragraphs briefly explore them separately and with relation to each other.

The basic intuition behind truth-conditional negation, i.e. a certain proposition is not true, is referred to as propositional negation. This basic intuitive meaning can be conveyed in various ways. For example, this could be expressed using the English negative particle *not* as in (1).

1. Mary is not happy.
The proposition *Mary is happy* can be negated as *Mary is not happy*. The interpreted meaning is *it is not the case that Mary is happy*. Propositional negation can be expressed in various ways and it, in fact, covers a wide variety of constructions employed by different languages. Propositional negation for example can be expressed on the morphological or the syntactic level, which I will revisit in section (1.2.2) of this chapter.

Another semantic concept that is of interest to the study of negation patterns is the scope of negation. The scope of negation is the part of the meaning of the clause that is being negated. Linguistic elements that are referred to as being under the scope of negation are those that contribute to the truth conditions of the negated clause, i.e. the falsity of one condition means the falsity of the clause.

2. a. I ate the apple.
   b. I did not eat the apple.

In the example (2a), the truth conditions of the clause are:

3. a. An action of eating occurred.
    b. The action was carried out by the speaker.
    c. The action was carried out on the apple.

The violation of any of these conditions means the falsity of (2a), and thus all these elements are under the scope of negation that is expressed in (2b). The scope of negation is a semantic concept that is associated with the elements in the clause that contribute to the truth conditions of the clause and not those that do not.

There are several accounts in the literature that aim to define the concept of scope of negation. Pullum & Huddleston’s (2002) definition of scope corresponds to the truth conditions presented above, while Horn & Kato (2000: 8) define scope as “a semantic relation that holds between two or more logical operators in a sentence”.
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The concept of scope of negation is not without problems, the most cited of which is the negation of modal auxiliaries. Quirk et al. (1985: 787) define scope as “the general term used to describe the semantic influence which certain words have on neighbouring parts of a sentence.”. In syntactic terms and with respect to the scope of negation, Quirk argues that the position of the negative element determines what falls under the scope of negation. He claims that the scope of negation includes everything that follows the negative element (including any auxiliary that it may combine with), unless it is an end-place adverbial, which does not necessarily need to be under the scope of negation. This is illustrated in example (4) in which the adverbial is either under the scope of negation (4a), or not (4b).

4. a. He [was not listening all the time.] (He was listening but not all the time)
   b. He [was not listening] all the time. (He was not listening for the whole time) (Quirk et al. 1985: 788)

Example (5) illustrates the problem with Quirk et al.’s definition. As illustrated in (5), there is a difference in the meaning of the negation of modal auxiliaries can and must. The whole proposition is negated in (5a) in the sense that he is not allowed to go with them check throughout; it is only the modality that is negated in (5b) where the interpreted meaning is that it is necessary he does not go with them. In other words, the negative marker has scope over can but not over must despite the fact that it combines with both elements. I will return to this in Chapter Three (3.1) with regard to Libyan Arabic.

5. a. He cannot go with them.
   b. He must not go with them. (Van der Auwera 2001: 24)

Focus of negation is the part of the meaning that is emphatically negated. It is associated with which of the truth conditions listed in (3), i.e. the conditions under the scope of negation, the speaker intends to draw the attention of the listener to as the emphasised or most important condition. In English, for example, Pullum & Huddleston (2002) state that this can be achieved prosodically by stressing the element that marks the most important condition from the point of view of the speaker. Larrivée (2001) refers to the focus of negation as the domain, defined through the scope of negation, on which one can select an item to focus on.
For instance, in example (6), the speaker stresses the word *apple* to make it clear to the listener that it is the apple, i.e. truth condition C, that he/she did not eat, as opposed to other things.

6. I did not eat the *apple*.

While the scope of negation is concerned with all conditions, i.e. with a wide semantic scope, the focus of negation is concerned with the most important one, i.e. a narrower scope.

Antonymic negation is another concept that is associated with negation on the semantic level. Certain linguistic elements can express negation on the word level. In English for example the prefixes *un*- and *in*- can be added to adjectives to express opposite meanings. This is a distinction that operates on the morphological level. *Unhappy* and *insecure* carry opposite meanings to their positive counterparts *happy* and *secure*. While this means that both *happy* and *unhappy* cannot be true at the same time, it does not mean that they cannot be false at the same time. *Mary is happy* and *Mary is unhappy* cannot be true at the same time. *Mary is not happy nor unhappy* is fine.

This means that antonymic negation is different from negation expressed by negation operators like *not*. It has been suggested that this difference is attributed to the gradability of adjectives like *happy* (De Soto & Trillas 1999, Penka 2015). Happiness is of degrees and that is why there could be a place on the scale of happiness or unhappiness where somebody is in the middle. In the case of non-gradable adjectives, the use of the negative marker *not* or an antonymic morphological marker gives the same result, as in *incomplete* and *not complete*.

Pullum & Huddleston (2002) report on the same phenomenon and refer to it as increased specificity of negation. They give an example from English where a negated clause is used instead of its affirmative counterpart, which contains an antonym, to convey meanings that the latter cannot. In the following example (7), the negative sentence in (7a) can be interpreted in more than one way. It could mean that *John dislikes scallops*, or that *John has never eaten scallops* and that is why we cannot say that he likes them.
7. a. John does not like scallops.
   b. John dislikes scallops.

The sentence in (7b), which has *dislike*, cannot be used to express the latter meaning. (7a) could also be interpreted to mean that *he does not like them but he does not dislike them either*. Again, this interpretation cannot be maintained by (7b).

However, not all languages have means of expressing antonymic negation morphologically and have this difference in meaning between morphological and syntactic negation markers. Arabic varieties, for example, do not have suffixes equivalent to *un-*, *dis-* and *in-* but use a different strategy to express the difference in meaning, which is a subject I will return to in Chapter Three (3.1).

1.2.2. **Negation as a morpho-syntactic notion**

Negation can be expressed on the morphological and syntactic levels in languages of the world. The next sub-sections distinguish between different types of morpho-syntactic negation, and explore the different linguistic elements and grammatical notions involved in the expression of negation or interacting with the environment of negation.

Some of the main distinctions that I am going to discuss are sentential vs. non-sentential negation, standard vs. non-standard negation, morphological vs. syntactic negation, negative categories, and the interaction of negation with other lexical and grammatical elements.

1.2.2.1. **Sentential vs. non-sentential negation**

Negation can combine with different linguistic categories, such as clauses, or verb, noun and preposition phrases. In these contexts negation is classified into sentential negation and non-sentential and constituent negation. The former is negation of main clauses while the latter involves the negation of subordinate clauses or smaller constituents within the clause.
Sentential vs. non-sentential negation is investigated in three Modern Arabic varieties: Sudanese, Lebanese and Libyan Arabic in Chapter Six (6.1, 6.2).

Some of the most common diagnostic tests for identifying sentential negation in English, originally introduced by Klima (1964), are the ability of the negated sentence to be followed by a positive rather than a negative tag, *neither, or not even*, as in examples (8-10).

8. Mary is not happy, is she?
9. Mary is not happy, and neither is John.
10. Mary is not happy, not even a little.

In non-sentential negation, negation combines with smaller constituents, not the whole sentence or clause, as in (11, 12).

11. #Mary is unhappy, is she?
12. #Mary wanted [not to be involved], did she?

Examples (11) and (12) are infelicitous rather than ungrammatical. There are contexts in which these two examples can be used, but I cite them here in comparison to the use of tag questions in examples (8-10). The main clauses preceding the tag questions in (11) and (12) are both affirmative and therefore the tag questions are supposed to be negative rather than positive.

One form of non-sentential negation is where negative elements occur in subordinate clauses, as in (12), where the negative particle *not* occurs in the subordinate clause. In example (13), the negation is also non-sentential as the interpretation is *it is possible that she will not like it*, since the negation does not have scope over the modal verb *could*.

13. She could [not like it].

It can be observed in examples (8-10, 12, 13) that the same negation particle *not* is used in both sentential and non-sentential negation in English. However, some languages use
different negation markers for sentential vs. non-sentential negation. In Yoruba, for example, there are two distinct negation markers (Payne 1985: 241). The negation markers, kò and má, are used in examples (14) and (15) respectively.

14. Ade kò lè korin
   Ade NEG may/can sing
   ‘Ade cannot sing.’

15. Ade lè má korin
   Ade may/can NEG sing
   ‘Ade may not sing.’ (It is possible he will not) (Yoruba, Payne 1985: 241)

In example (14), which is an example of sentential negation, the negative particle kò is used, while in (15), which is an example of non-sentential negation or negation of a subordinate clause, it is má that is used. The same phenomenon is attested in Welsh, French and Russian (Payne 1985: 241).

**1.2.2.2. Standard vs. non-standard negation**

The distinction between standard and non-standard negation was first introduced by Payne (1985: 198). Standard negation is negation that is applied to the most basic main clause in a language, with one predicate and as few noun phrases and adjuncts as possible. Non-standard negation is all the other means that are used to express negation in that language. Standard negation and sentential negation do not necessarily correspond. This means that if a certain sentence involves sentential negation, it is not necessarily standard negation.

The idea behind the distinction between standard and non-standard negation is that some languages have several means of expressing negation depending on different elements while others have only one. In the former, standard negation is the most basic means, and in the latter the basic means, i.e. standard negation, is the only means.
In English, the most basic means of negating a sentence is using the negation particle *not* immediately following the auxiliary, and thus the auxiliary plus *not* is the means for expressing standard negation. The examples (8-10) from English from the previous section (1.2.2.1) illustrate the use of the auxiliary followed by *not* to express standard negation. It is also the case that these sentences are examples of sentential negation.

Example (16) illustrates the use of standard negation in a non-sentential context. This is illustrated by the inapplicability of the positive tag, as *not* is negating the constituent *like it* and not the whole clause.

16. She could [not like it]\#could she?

Non-standard negation can involve negative quantifiers and negative adverbials, as in (17, 18).

17. Nobody is happy (are they?)
18. Never did she like it (did she?)

Both (17) and (18) are also cases of sentential negation, as they can be followed by positive tags.

Some negative elements that express non-standard negation are investigated in the questionnaires used to obtain data for this thesis and detailed in Chapters Five (5.6) and Chapter Seven (7.1, 7.2). Standard and non-standard negation is discussed in (3.2.1) to give a general view of these negation strategies in the literature on Modern Arabic varieties.

1.2.2.3. **Syntactic vs. morphological negation**

The morpho-syntactic status of negation markers can differ between languages. Some languages express negation morphologically, others express it syntactically, and some express it on both levels. In morphological negation, negation markers are attached to linguistic elements, as in the Turkish example in (19).
In (19) the negation affix -me- is used with the verbal element in a case of sentential negation.

In syntactic negation, on the other hand, negation elements are independent words that are introduced into the clause as in the English examples above (8-10) where not, an independent word, is used to express sentential negation.

1.2.2.4. Negative categories

Languages encode negation in the form of different categories. In this section I discuss negative particles, negative verbs and negative quantifiers.

1.2.2.4.1. Negative particles

Particles are function words that are not inflected for agreement. An example of a negative particle in English is not, as it cannot be inflected for person, number or gender. This is demonstrated in (20, 21) and all the English examples that have not in this chapter.

20. He does not see the problem.
21. Not many students showed up.

In example (20), not follows the auxiliary does and precedes the verb see and negates the whole clause. In (21), not is combined with the quantifier many and it is used to negate the quantifier itself.
With regard to Arabic varieties, Chapter Three (3.3) investigates the morpho-syntactic properties of the negative markers used in Modern Arabic varieties, and Chapter Seven (7.2) investigates the negative particle ِمَسُؤُولَ in Libyan Arabic.

1.2.2.4.2. Negative verbs

Negative verbs are verbal elements that are inherently negative and share some properties with standard verbs, such as inflection for a grammatical category: tense, mood, person, etc. (Payne 1985). Many languages of the world make use of negative verbs. An example of this can be found in Turkish, where nominal and adjectival predicates are negated with değil, a negative verb, as in (22), while verbal predicates are generally negated with -me-, as in (19).

\[
\text{22. mutlu değil-im} \\
\text{happy NEG-PST-1SG} \\
'\text{I was not happy.' (Turkish)}
\]

In (22) the negative verb değil is used to negate the adjectival predicate mutlu ‘happy’. Değil takes a verbal inflection -mek, değilmek ‘to not’, as opposed to a nominal inflection -luk, as in mutluluk ‘happiness’. In example (19), the verbal predicate bilmek ‘to know’ is negated with the affix -me-.

Another example of a negative verb in Turkish is yok. Yok is used to negate existential predicates, as in example (23)

\[
\text{23. para yok} \\
\text{money exist.NEG} \\
'\text{There is not money.' (Turkish)}
\]

The example in (23) illustrates the overlap between some of the proposed categories in this chapter, as yok is another example of a negative element that is used as a non-standard negative marker.
Some languages employ negative auxiliaries as part of their negation strategies. In Finnish, negation is expressed by inserting a negative auxiliary in negative clauses alongside the lexical verb, as in (24) (Miestamo 2007). The negative auxiliary is marked for person and number, which are marked on the lexical verb in the affirmative sentence.

24. a. koira-t hauku-vat
dog-PL bark-3PL
‘Dogs bark.’ (Finnish, Miestamo 2007: 554)

b. koira-t ei-vät hauku
dog-PL NEG-3PL bark.CNG
‘Dogs do not bark.’ (Finnish, Miestamo 2007: 554)

Negative auxiliaries are highlighted in the general survey of Modern Arabic varieties in Chapter Five (5.6), and explored in Sudanese, Lebanese and Libyan Arabic in Chapter Seven (7.1) of this thesis. Their function and diachronic development are investigated in Chapter Seven (7.1.4, 7.1.5).

1.2.2.4.3. Negative quantifiers

In addition to negative particles and negative verbs, languages can have indefinites that can be used in negation contexts and these are referred to as negative quantifiers. In English, for example, negative quantifiers like nobody and nothing take scope over the predicate to induce sentential negation, as in (25, 26)

25. Nobody saw me.

Negative quantifiers do not co-occur with standard negation, as in (27, 28)

27. #Nobody did not see me.
28. #Nothing did not happen.
While this is true of Standard English, in other non-standard varieties negative quantifiers co-
occur with standard negation and the result is a single negation of the clause. In addition,
there could be specific contexts in which (27) and (28) can be uttered but these would be
marked, i.e. when the quantifiers are outside the scope of negation.

In some languages, the co-occurrence of negative markers and negative indefinites does not
contribute multiple instances of semantic negation to the clause but only one. Willis et al.
(2013) refer to these indefinites as n-words instead of negative quantifiers, following Laka
(1990). In Polish, for example, the negation marker nie can co-occur with the negative
element nikt ‘nobody’ without one of them cancelling the other, as in (29a). However, nikt
does not generally occur without a negative particle in the clause (Penka 2015).

29. a. Nikt nie przyszeda.
nobody NEG came
   ‘Nobody came.’ not: ‘Nobody did not come.’

   b. Kto przyszeda? Nikt
    Who came? Nobody (=‘Nobody came.’) (Polish, Penka 2015: 6)

N-words display a set of properties that are seemingly contradictory. As seen in (29a), nikt
cannot occur without the negative marker, unlike nobody in (25). However, it can be
interpreted as a negative in a fragment answer in (29b). N-words can also occur in
comparative contexts, as illustrated by Spanish nunca (Willis et al. 2013), in example (30).

30. Juan ha llegado más tarde que nunca
    Juan have.PRS.3SG arrive.PP more late than n.ever
   ‘Juan has arrived later than ever.’ (Spanish, Herburger 2001: 298)

In fact, this phenomenon is found in many languages across the world (Haspelmath 2005).
However, this phenomenon poses a problem to the analysis of negation in the sense that if
nikt ‘nobody’ is inherently negative, why is it that only one instance of semantic negation is
contributed to the clause in (29a)? Moreover, if *nunca* is inherently negative, how can its occurrence in a comparative context be accounted for?

Willis et al. (2013) cite a widely accepted definition of n-words that takes into consideration their ability to occur in negative concord contexts, as well as their interpretability as negative in fragment answers.

31. **N-word**

An expression $\alpha$ is an n-word iff:

(a) $\alpha$ can be used in structures containing sentential negation or another $\alpha$-expression yielding a reading equivalent to one logical negation; and

(b) $\alpha$ can provide a negative fragment answer. (Giannakidou 2006: 328)

Other analyses have been proposed in the literature to deal with the problem of the seemingly contradictory properties of n-words. Some authors propose that these items are semantically ambiguous between negative quantifiers and negative indefinites (Herburger 2001) and refer to them as n-words, while others claim that n-words are negative polarity items (Laka 1990 and Giannakidou 1998, 2000). I return to these elements in Chapter Three (3.2.4.5), and in Chapter Five (5.7.1), as they are briefly investigated in the broad questionnaire.

### 1.2.2.5. Interaction of negation with environment

When negation is introduced to the clause, it can interact with the elements within the clause and sometimes it is the categories of these elements that determine the specific patterns negation can take. In the next sub-sections I discuss the interaction of negation with predicate type, clause type, verbal functional marking, and a more general distinction that is based on all these factors combined, referred to as symmetric vs. asymmetric negation. I finish by discussing the interaction of negation with positive and negative indefinites.

---

2 For more on negative polarity items, see (1.2.2.5.4). Also, for a comprehensive account see (Penka 2015).
1.2.2.5.1. **Predicate type**

Predicate type can play a role in determining negation patterns cross-linguistically. Some languages across the world use different strategies to express negation of verbal predicates as opposed to non-verbal predicates (Eriksen 2011). For example, in Kahrel’s (1996) sample of forty languages, he finds that eight languages had different negation strategies for non-verbal clauses and predicates as opposed to verbal ones.

Turkish, as outlined in the previous section (1.2.2.4.2), is an example of such a language. Turkish makes a distinction between verbal and non-verbal predicates in that verbal predicates are negated with *-me* as in example (19), while non-verbal predicates are negated with the negative verb *değil*, as in example (22).

This distinction based on predicate type is of utmost importance in the discussion of negation in Modern Arabic varieties and is revisited in Chapters Three (3.2.4.1), Five (5.1), and Six (6.1.3) of this thesis.

1.2.2.5.2. **Clause type**

Expressing negation can differ according to clause type. Some languages distinguish between negation strategies used in declarative clauses as opposed to ones used in imperative clauses (Van der Auwera & Lejeune 2005, Kayne 2000, 2013, Zanuttini 1997, Bošković 2012, Han 1999, Villa-García 2018). Koasati is an example of a language that makes a distinction between the negation marker used in negative imperatives and that used in negative second person declarative clauses (32-34) (Kimball 1991: 58, 270). Example (32) illustrates the positive imperative, while (33) illustrates the negative imperative.

32. ip
   eat
   ‘Eat!’

3 It could be argued that negation of imperatives is not truth-conditional in the sense that it does not reverse the truth conditions of the clause, however, this is not an issue I will be discussing in this thesis.
In example (34), which is a different clause type i.e. a declarative clause, a different negation marker is used: cīk-o.

This is a subject I return to in Chapter Three (3.2.4.2) where, I review the literature on the differences Arabic varieties make between negative and affirmative imperative clauses, and Five (5.5) where I investigate these differences in the fifteen investigated varieties.

1.2.2.5.3. Verbal functional marking

This section investigates the interaction between negation and verbal grammatical features and how this interaction affects negation and the marking of these features. Some of these verbal grammatical features are finiteness, mood, tense and aspect, and person, number and gender. Not all these features will be of relevance to the discussion of negation in Modern Arabic varieties. Mood, for example, is not going to be explored in later chapters, and finiteness will be briefly discussed in (2.1.6.) This is because Arabic varieties hardly show distinctions based on either of these notions, and thus show no difference in negation marking. Tense and aspect, on the other hand, are claimed to have an effect on negation patterns, which is discussed in Chapter Three (3.2.4.3) and investigated in Chapters Five (5.2) and Six (6.1.1, 6.1.2). The marking of person, number and gender is of relevance to the interaction between the auxiliary verb and pseudo-verbs, which is an issue I discuss in Chapter Six (6.1.5.2, 6.1.5.3).
With regard to finiteness, distinctions can be made on the basis of the finiteness of the negated element in affirmative vs. negative clauses. Sometimes the negative element is inserted without affecting the predicate it negates, i.e. the predicate is still marked for finiteness. However; this is not always the case as languages employ different strategies to mark the finiteness of clauses in negative contexts.

In Finnish in example (35), the verb *haukku* ‘bark’ is marked for third person plural, being the finite element of the affirmative clause (Miestamo 2007).

35. koira-t haukku-vat  
   dog-PL bark-3PL  
   ‘Dogs bark.’ (Finnish, Miestamo 2007: 554)

In (36), it is the negative auxiliary that takes the place of the lexical verb in denoting the finiteness of the clause.

36. koira-t ei-vät hauku  
   dog-PL NEG-3PL bark.CNG  
   ‘Dogs do not bark.’ (Finnish, Miestamo 2007: 554)

In (36), the negative auxiliary *ei* is marked for third person plural instead of *hauku*.

In addition to finiteness, the introduction of negation into the clause can affect the choice of mood. Maung is a language in which affirmative clauses have realis or irrealis mood (Capell & Hinch 1970). The introduction of negation means that only the irrealis mood is permitted in the clause. Examples (37) and (38) are affirmative sentences and display this distinction between realis mood, which is not overtly marked and is interpreted as ‘I put’, and irrealis mood, which is marked by -*ji*, and interpreted as ‘I can put’.
37. ni-udba
   1SG>3-put\(^4\)
   ‘I put.’

38. ni-udba-ji
   1SG>3-put-IRR.NPST
   ‘I can put.’ (Maung, Capell & Hinch 1970: 67)

In (39), which is the negative version, when the negative marker marig is introduced, the irrealis marker has to be present.

39. marig      ni-udba-ji
   NEG     1SG>3-put-IRR.NPST

In (39) the distinction between realis and irrealis cannot be maintained and the marker is interpreted in more than one way.

The introduction of negation can affect the marking of aspect and tense as well as person, number, and gender agreement. In Diola-Fogny, for example, the future tense marker that is used in negative sentences is different from that used in affirmative sentences (Sapir 1965). In (40), which is the affirmative sentence, the future marker used is pan-.

40. pan-i-manj
   FUT-1SG-want
   ‘I will want.’ (Diola-Fogny, Sapir 1965: 33)

This changes in (41) where an alternative future marker, let-, is used to mark the negative interpretation of the sentence.

\(^4\) 1SG>3 refers to first person singular subject acting on an third person object.
Differences in marking negation on linguistic elements are seen on the paradigmatic level as well. Harar Oromo is an example of a language that marks its verbal predicates for person, number and gender in affirmative sentences (Owens 1985). However, the same form *hin-deem-n-e* is used for all persons, in negative sentences, as in (42).

In (42), the affirmative version of the verb ‘go’ has a full paradigm of different persons and numbers. The negative version lacks all distinctions and the same form is used in all contexts.

A more general distinction is made on the basis of the differences between affirmative and negative sentences with regard to all the verbal functional categories discussed above. While the previous distinctions based on the marking of verbal functional categories deal with each of them individually, Miestamo (2000, 2003, 2005a) proposes a distinction that combines all categories under one collective term. This is the distinction between symmetric and asymmetric negation.

This distinction is based on all the differences between negative and affirmative clauses, besides the occurrence of the negative marker. In other words, if there are differences between negative and affirmative clauses, besides the existence of the negative marker, i.e. a change in the morpho-syntactic status of any of the elements in the clause, then it is a case of asymmetric negation. If there are no differences between the negative and the affirmative clauses, apart from the existence of the negative marker, then it is a case of symmetric negation.
The following examples from Latvian illustrate symmetric negation (Lazdina 1966). Example (43) represents the affirmative clause, and (44) represents the negative version. It can be observed that the only difference between (43) and (44) is the existence of the negative marker ne-. All the other elements of the clause remain unchanged, which indicates it is a case of symmetric negation.

43. tēv-s strādā  
father-NOM work.3  
‘Father is working.’

44. tēv-s ne-strādā  
father-NOM NEG-work.3  
‘Father is not working.’ (Latvian, Lazdina 1966: 24, 25, 303)

In asymmetric negation, other differences can be observed, besides the introduction of the negative element. An example of an asymmetric negative construction comes from Apalaí (Koehn & Koehn 1986). In (45), the affirmative clause, the lexical verb ‘see’ is the finite element of the clause.

45. isapokara [Ø]-ene-no  
jakuruaru.lizard [1>3]-see-IMPST  
‘I saw a jakuruaru lizard.’ (Apalaí, Koehn & Koehn 1986: 64)

In example (46), which is the negative clause, the lexical verb -ene- ‘see’ is deverbalised and the copula a-ken is introduced as the finite verb of the clause, in addition to the introduction of the negative element.

46. isapokara on-ene-pyra a-ken  
jakuruaru.lizard 3-see-NEG 1-be.IMPST  
‘I did not see a jakuruaru lizard.’ (Apalaí, Koehn & Koehn 1986: 64)
The distinction between symmetric and asymmetric negation can further be divided into two types where the difference between affirmatives and negatives is found on the level of constructions or on the level of paradigms. Symmetric and asymmetric negative constructions have been illustrated in examples (43, 44) and (45, 46) from Latvian and Apalaí respectively.

The other sub-type of the distinction between symmetric and asymmetric negation is on the level of paradigms. In symmetric paradigms, there is a one-to-one relationship between paradigm members that occur in affirmative and negative sentences.

In asymmetric paradigms, members make distinctions in the affirmative that are not used in the negative, or vice versa. This is illustrated in Harar Oromo in example (44) and Meithei in examples (47-49) (Chelliah 1997). The verb forms in (47) and (48) are two different members of the verbal paradigm of the verb ṭaw ‘to do’ in Meithei. These two forms are only part of the affirmative side of the paradigm and cannot be used in negative clauses.

47. ṭaw-i
   do-NHYP
   ‘(She) does.’

48. ṭaw-e
   do-ASS
   ‘(Yes, she) has.’

49. ay fotostat ṭaw-ṭa-e
    I Photostat do-NEG-ASS
    ‘I have not made copies.’ (Meithei, Chelliah 1997: 133, 228)

In the negative version (49), the verb form can only be that in (48) and not in (47), as that one is exclusive to the affirmative side of the paradigm.
An example of symmetric negation on the paradigmatic level is from English, where there are no paradigmatic distinctions that are used in the affirmative but cannot be used in negatives. In fact, the same verb forms are used in both clauses.

Modern Arabic varieties illustrate instances of symmetric and asymmetric negation patterns, which are explored in Chapter Three (3.2.4.2, 3.2.4.7), and commented on in Chapter Five (5.5).

1.2.2.5.4. Negative and positive indefinites

In addition to negative quantifiers discussed in (1.2.2.4.3), there are other indefinites that are associated with the environment within which negation is found. Positive indefinites like somebody and something do not generally co-occur with standard negation, as in (50-53).

50. I saw something.
51. #I did not see something.
52. I saw somebody.
53. #I did not see somebody.

However, that is not to say that examples (51) and (53) are ungrammatical. There are contexts in which these sentences can be used and these are where the negation is inside the scope of the indefinites. For example, one can imagine a context in which the speaker is negating that he saw something or somebody, in reference to the words themselves i.e. the intended meaning is there is something I did not see and there is someone I did not see.

Negative indefinites, such as anybody and anything, can be used with standard negation, as in (54, 55).

54. I did not see anybody.
55. I did not see anything.
Anybody and anything are also referred to in the literature as negative polarity items (NPIs), as they mainly occur in the scope of negation and expressions associated with negation (Klima 1964, Penka 2015, Progovac 1994, Hoeksema 2000, Baker 1970, Linebarger 1980, 1987).

Although negative indefinites or negative polarity items such as anybody and anything are referred to as negative, their distribution extends to non-assertive contexts such as interrogatives and conditionals in addition to negative ones. The same is true of the English NPI ever, as in examples (56a-d)

56. a. John does not ever arrive on time.
   b. Does John ever arrive on time?
   c. If John ever arrives on time, I’ll eat my hat.
   d. *John ever arrives on time (Willis et al. 2013: 28)

Some negative polarity items can only occur in the presence of another negative element in the clause, and these are referred to by Zwarts (1998) as strong NPIs. An example of these is the NPI one bit in English, as in (57), which can only occur in the context of negation. NPIs that do not require the presence of negation are referred to as weak NPIs, such as ever in (56).

57. a. John did not enjoy the concert one bit.
   b. *Did John enjoy the concert one bit?
   c. *If John enjoyed the concert one bit, I’ll take him again.
   d. *John enjoyed the concert one bit.

Modern Arabic varieties have items that behave similarly to negative indefinites and these are discussed in Chapter Three (3.2.4.5) and encountered in Chapter Five (5.7.1).

1.2.3. **Summary**

In this chapter I have reviewed the most commonly cited negation patterns in the linguistic literature. I highlighted the terminology used to describe these patterns and classified them
according to semantic and morpho-syntactic features. While not all the negation-related terminology reviewed here is used to describe negation patterns investigated in Modern Arabic varieties investigated in this thesis, this chapter offers a general account of how negation is expressed and described across languages and in modern literature, with a focus on negation concepts that become relevant in later chapters.

On the semantic level, I discussed propositional negation, the scope and focus of negation, as well as antonymic negation. On the morpho-syntactic level, I made the distinction between sentential negation and standard negation as two different manifestations of negation that sometimes overlap but do not have to. In addition, I explored other morpho-syntactic distinctions between negative and affirmative clauses that concern the environment of negation. Now that I have established the negation-related terminology that I will use for this thesis, I turn to describe the basic syntactic features of verbs in Libyan Arabic in order to establish the Arabic-related terminology that will be used for the rest of this thesis.
Chapter Two: Preliminaries about Arabic verbs

In this chapter I examine a number of issues that arise when discussing the morpho-syntactic behaviour of Arabic verbs. I review the properties of Arabic verbs and a number of grammatical and distributional features associated with verbal elements, with a focus on Libyan Arabic.\(^5\) I do this in order to set the scene for the reference to these elements before I explore their interaction with negation in later chapters.

In the first section of this chapter (2.1) I explore verb-form distinctions of standard verbs, investigate their functions and the functions of their different combinations, and establish the terminology I will use to refer to verbal forms in the rest of this thesis. I also discuss the notions of aspect in (2.1.5) and finiteness in (2.1.6) with regard to Libyan Arabic, as well as two properties that are prototypical of standard verbs in (2.1.7) and these are their ability to occur in ellipsis constructions and take scope over \(fi\) (an aspectual object marker). In the second section (2.2) I discuss a set of verbs that I refer to as non-standard verbs, and compare their properties to those of standard verbs in order to establish whether or not they are sufficiently distinct from standard verbs, in morpho-syntactic terms, to justify a separate category.

2.1. Standard verbs: Four verbal stems

The Arabic verbal paradigm is traditionally divided into three distinct forms, referred to in Arabic traditional grammar as \(al\-mādí\) ‘the past’, \(al\-muḍāriť\) ‘the present’, and \(al\-ʔamr\) ‘the imperative’. This distinction is mainly form-based and does not fully take functional criteria into consideration. More modern classifications of Arabic verbs argue that Arabic verb forms are specified for aspect (Travis 1979, Jelinek 1981, Bahloul 1994), tense (Fassi Fehri 2012), or both tense and aspect (Eisele 1990). Modern authors generally classify them into perfective and imperfective verb forms (Travis 1979, Bahloul 1994, and Al-Aqarbeh 2011). However, this classification has been a controversial issue in the literature on Modern Arabic (for a comprehensive account see Eisele 1999).

---

\(^5\) Even though I incorporate examples from other Modern Arabic varieties, the reader should assume it is Libyan Arabic unless it is specified otherwise.
There are, in fact, four distinct verbal forms in Modern Arabic varieties. In the Tripoli variety of Libyan Arabic, for example, ḏrab, yūḍrub, oḍrob, ḏārib ‘hit’ represent these four verbal forms. Anticipating my conclusion, I refer to these forms as past for ḏrab, non-tensed for yūḍrob, the imperative for oḍrob, and the active participle for ḏārib.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Non-tensed</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Active participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḏ-r-b</td>
<td>ḏrab</td>
<td>yūḍrub</td>
<td>ḩuḍrub</td>
<td>ḏārib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍ-ʔ-k-l</td>
<td>klē</td>
<td>yākil</td>
<td>kūl</td>
<td>wākil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-š-i</td>
<td>mšē</td>
<td>yimši</td>
<td>ḩimši</td>
<td>māši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h-b-b</td>
<td>ḥābb</td>
<td>yḥibb</td>
<td>hibb</td>
<td>ḥābb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (1): Verbal paradigm of a number of standard verbs in Libyan Arabic.

Table (1) illustrates a number of Libyan Arabic verbs in their four forms. Of the forms shown in the table, it is the first two that have full verbal agreement paradigms with all combinations of person, gender, and number. The imperative form is exclusive to the second person but with different combinations of gender and number. The active participle maintains adjectival gender and number agreement markers, which makes it different from the three other forms, and more controversial in terms of verbal identity. Examples (1-4) illustrate these four verbal forms.

1. Ahmid ḏrab xū-h
   Ahmid hit.PST.3MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘Ahmid hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

2. huwwə yuḍrub fi xū-h
   3MSG.SUB hit.NONT.3MSG FI brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘He hits/is hitting his brother.’ (LY-NQ)
3. ḥuḍrub
   hit.IMP.2MSG
   ‘Hit!’ (LY-NQ)

4. huwwə ḏārib xū-h
   3MSG.SUB hit.AP.MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘He has hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

In the next few sections I investigate the grammatical notions associated with each of these forms and their functions. I evaluate the validity of the traditional Arabic grammar distinction, compare it to the modern classification, and justify the terminology I use to refer to these forms.

2.1.1. The past form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>ḏrab.PST ‘hit’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ḏrəbt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2M</td>
<td>ḏrəbt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>ḏrəbtī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>ḏrəb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>ḏurbit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (2): Agreement table for past stem ḏrab.PST in Libyan Arabic.

The past form has prototypical morphological properties of standard verbs in Libyan Arabic; it is marked for person, number, and gender. Table (2) shows the different combinations of person, number, and gender with the past form ḏrab. Note that in most forms in Table (2), the form changes to indicate the different features. This can be seen in the first and second person singular and plural, where vowels and consonants are added. In the third person feminine and
third person plural, a vowel is inserted into the stem. Also notice that the first person singular form is the same as the second person masculine singular form, which is a prototypical property of these forms in Modern Arabic. In (5.2) and (6.1.1.1), I discuss the interaction between the past form and negation and show that different verb forms have an effect on the negation markers used.

It has been suggested in the traditional literature on Arabic that the past form is specified for past tense, while modern authors claim that it is perfectivity that is encoded. However, there are authors who disagree with the notion behind the terminology. Henkin (1992: 434) claims that Semitic verbs have been described in terms of relative tense and aspect in a very misleading way. He states in one of his footnotes that he puts the traditional terms “perfective” and “imperfective” between quotation marks as they completely differ from his own definition of perfective vs. imperfective aspect, which he believes is irrelevant outside Slavic languages. Comrie (1981: 78-81) claims that there is a difficulty in deciding whether the two Arabic paradigms encode tense with some aspectual meaning, or a primarily aspectual distinction.

According to Comrie & Corbett (1993: 10), aspect: “is concerned with the temporal internal structure of situations”, as apposed to tense which is concerned with determining the place of the situation in time in relation to other time points. Comrie (1976: 16) states that perfectivity means the view of a situation as a single whole without paying attention to the different stages that constitute the situation. He emphasizes the importance of using the words “complete action” as opposed to “completed action” when describing the perfective. He explains this by indicating that “completed” focuses too much on the termination of the action while perfectivity views it as a single whole and is not supposed to emphasize the end of the situation or any other part of it.

Slavic languages, especially Russian, are cited in the linguistic literature as the most prototypical examples of languages that display aspectual oppositions. Most Russian verbs occur in pairs, one in the perfective and the other in the imperfective form. The essential opposition between the two verb forms can be described in terms of boundedness, with perfective forms being bounded and imperfective being unbounded. This is illustrated in the
examples: *Kolja napisal (PERF) pis’ mo* ‘Kolja wrote a letter’ and *Kolja písal (IMPERF) pis’ mo* ‘Kolja was writing the letter’. In the first example the writing is represented as a complete bounded event, while in the latter there is no reference to completion for it could be the case that Kolja did not finish writing the letter (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 10, 11). Perfective verbs in Russian have both past and future forms, as they refer to complete actions whether in the past or future (for more on tense and aspect see Dahl 1985 and Comrie 1976 and for more on Russian see Jung & Migdalski 2014, Bošković 2012a, Jung 2014).

With regard to Arabic past forms, and taking into account the notion of completion encoded in perfective forms in Russian, it could be said that it is not the most appropriate description to claim that perfective aspect is encoded in a verb form such as *ḍrəb*. In Libyan Arabic, an adverb that indicates past time reference could be inserted with the past form *ḍrəb* ‘hit’, as in example (5). In this example the adverbial āmis ‘yesterday’ co-occurs with *ḍrəb* which suggests that it is aligned with past time reference.

5. ḏrəb.xū-h.āmis
   hit.PST.3MSG.brother-3MSG.PSS.yesterday
   ‘He hit his brother yesterday.’ (LY-NQ)

The notion of completion is naturally connected with the past tense and, therefore, it is not enough evidence to suggest that a verbal form encodes perfectivity just because it is hard to separate completion from past tense. In addition, the distinction between perfective and imperfective forms that are both in the past tense, which is characteristic of Russian verbs, is lacking in Libyan Arabic.

When *ḍrəb* is tested for perfectivity, by inserting a phrase that indicates that the event is not complete, such as *gāsid* ‘sit/remain’ in example (6), we find that there is no indication that the action of hitting is complete when the sentence in example (6) is uttered.
6. ḍrəb xū-h w gāʿid yuḍrub
   hit.PST.3MSG brother-3MSG.PSS and remain.AP hit.NONT.3MSG
   fī-h
   FI-3MSG.OBL
   ‘He hit his brother and he is still hitting him.’ (LY-NQ)

It could be the case that the person is still hitting his brother, i.e. there is no indication that the action is complete, as the notion of completion is cancelled by the presence of gāʿid. The interpretation we get from the verb form is that the event of hitting started in the past.

When the past form occurs with other verbs, other patterns emerge. First, the past form ḍrəb cannot occur with the past form of auxiliary verb kān ‘be.PST.3MSG’ to indicate the past perfect, as seen in example (7).

7. *kān ḍrəb xū-h
   be.PST.3MSG hit.PST.3MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘He had hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

However, the combination can occur in conditional clauses, which results in a counterfactual reading.

8. lōw gāl kālmā zyādā kān ḍur-b-āḥ
   if say.PST.3MSG word additional be.PST.3MSG hit.PST.3MSG-3MSG.OBJ
   ‘If he said another word, he would have hit him.’ (LY-NQ)

Second, example (9) shows that the past form can co-occur with the non-tensed form of the auxiliary ykān ‘be.NONT.3MSG’ and the future marker hā-. The reading that results from this indicates the future perfect tense. This perfect tense reading comes from the auxiliary, which becomes clearer as we encounter the auxiliary and its function in further examples.
In example (10), the interpretation we get from combining the active participle and ṣkūn with the past form of ḍrəb is the present perfect tense. This shows that the auxiliary is used to indicate the perfect tense.

> 10. ḥābb  ṣkūn  ḍrəb  xū-h
>   like.AP.MSG  be.NONT.3MSG hit.PST.3MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
>   ‘He would like to have hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

However, the existence of the active participle form in Libyan Arabic, which expresses the perfect tense too, blocks the auxiliary from expressing the perfect tense when combined with past forms in Libyan Arabic. This results in the ungrammaticality of ṣkūn on its own and thus we need the future marker ḥə- in (9) and the active participle ḥābb in (10) to co-occur with ṣkūn. In fact, the auxiliary ṣkūn mainly occurs in subordinate clauses in Libyan Arabic as will be shown in (2.2.2) and (6.2.1).

Third, the past form ḍrəb cannot be the complement of standard verbs in a catenative construction in any form as shown in (11, 12, 13). In these examples, the verb yḥibb ‘want/like’ is in the past, non-tensed and active participle forms respectively, and the past form ḍrəb cannot be the complement of any of these in a catenative construction.

> 11. *ḥəbb  ḍrəb  xū-h
>   like.PST.3MSG  hit.PST.3MSG  brother-3MSG.PSS
>   ‘He wanted to hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)
The examples in (8-10) further confirm that this form is not specified for perfectivity. In these examples the past form is not used to indicate the completion of the events denoted by the verb. On the contrary, it is used to refer to hypothetical and predicted events where the completion of the action is not asserted. In fact, the implicature of completion that comes with the past time reference can be cancelled by the insertion of the adverbial gāṣīd ‘sit/remain’, as in examples (14, 15).

14.  lōw  gāl  kālmə  zyādə  kān
    if  say.PST.3MSG  word  additional  be.PST.3MSG
  ḏurb-əh  w  gāṣīd  yuḍrub  fi-h
  hit.PST.3MSG-3MSG.OBJ  and  remain.AP  hit.NONT.3MSG  FI-3MSG.OBL
   ‘If he said another word, he would have hit and still be hitting him.’ (LY-NQ)

15.  ḥā-ykūn  ḏrab  xū-h  təwwə
    FUT-be.NONT.3MSG  hit.PST.3MSG  brother-3MSG.PSS  now
   w  gāṣīd  yuḍrub  fi-h
   and  remain.AP  hit.NONT.3MSG  FI-3MSG.OBL
   ‘He will have hit his brother by now and is still hitting him.’ (LY-NQ)

To sum up, the past form is used to indicate past time reference when on its own and it has a limited distribution. The past form can be the complement of the non-tensed form of the auxiliary, ykūn, but not of standard verbs or the past form of the auxiliary, kān, unless it
occurs in the consequent part of a conditional clause. This indicates its specific distribution, as opposed to the non-tensed form, which I will elaborate on in the next section.

2.1.2. The non-tensed form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>yoḍrub.NONT ‘hit’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>nuḍrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tuḍrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>tuḍrbi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>yuḍrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>tuḍrub</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3): Agreement table for non-tensed stem *yuḍrub*.NONT in Libyan Arabic.

The non-tensed form shows agreement for person, number, and gender with its subject. Table (2) shows the different combinations of person, number, and gender with the non-tensed form *yuḍrub*. Note that in Table (3), forms change to indicate the different features, as in the first and second person masculine singular forms where *n-* and *t-* replace *y-*.. In the rest, the stem is shortened as well. The interaction between negation and the non-tensed form is discussed in (5.2) and (6.1.1.1) where it is shown that verb forms have an effect on the negation markers used.

The non-tensed form is generally referred to as the imperfective in the literature on Modern Arabic (Travis 1979, Fassi Fehri 1993, Bahloul 1994 and Eisele 1999). Imperfectivity is concerned with the internal structure of the situation and focuses on the continuity of the action (Comrie 1976: 19). It can be subdivided into different categories, some of which are the continuous and the habitual (Comrie 1976: 25).

In this thesis, I refer to this form as the non-tensed form. It is important here to note what I mean by non-tensed. This form gives a generic meaning when it occurs on its own which is not associated with a specific time reference, as shown in (16).
When it occurs with aspectual marker \(fi\)^8, as in example (17), it gives a habitual or a continuous reading, or that which Stassen refers to as an interior aspect reading. Interior aspect is an aspectual notion proposed by Stassen (1997: 252) and combines the habitual and continuous aspect.\(^9\) However, this form occurs in diverse types of contexts, which I will show further in the next few paragraphs. Moreover, when I label this form as non-tensed, I do not mean that it is non-finite, as it does not occur in a non-finite clause. I elaborate on finiteness in section (2.1.6) of this chapter.

As shown in example (17), the habitual or continuous reading comes from the aspectual marker \(fi\) and not from the verb form. Thus, referring to this form as imperfective is not the most appropriate description. As a matter of fact, this form can be used when giving a future reading as well, which can be seen in example (18). In this example, the non-tensed form \(y\text{\textacute{s}\text{\textacute{u}}f}\) ‘see’ is consistent with the future timetabled event denoted by the adverbial.

The non-tensed form occurs in various types of contexts either on its own, with tense/aspect markers, or with other verbal forms. In example (17), the verbal form \(yu\text{\textacute{d}\text{\textacute{r}}u\text{\textacute{b}}}\) can be used in the context where the reading is either a habitual or a continuous one in the presence of \(fi\). In

\[^{8}\text{fi} \text{ is an aspectual marker that induces a habitual or a continuous reading, for more see (Börjars et al. 2016).}\]

\[^{9}\text{For more on interior aspect see (Stassen 1997).}\]
fact, the only way of distinguishing these two readings is by inserting an adverbial to specify
the time reference, as in (19), where it is continuous, and (20), where it is habitual.

19. huwwə yudrub fi xū-h təwwə
   3MSG.SUB hit.NONT.3MSG FI brother-3MSG.PSS now
   ‘He is hitting his brother now.’ (LY-NQ)

20. huwwə yudrub fi xū-h kull yōm
    3MSG.SUB hit.NONT.3MSG FI brother-3MSG.PSS every day
    ‘He hits his brother every day.’ (LY-NQ)

Example (21) shows that the non-tensed form is incompatible with past time reference in the
absence of another verbal form.

21. *huwwə yudrub fi xū-h āmis
    3MSG.SUB hit.NONT.3MSG FI brother-3MSG.PSS yesterday
    ‘He hit his brother yesterday.’ (LY-NQ)

The non-tensed form is consistent with the future interpretation brought about by the use of
an adverbial. This is shown in example (18) where the bare non-tensed form is used with the
adverbial in a future timetabled context. In examples (22) and (23), the non-tensed form
occurs with the future tense markers bi- and hā, and the events denoted are interpreted to
occur in the near and more distant future, respectively.10

22. bi-yudrub xū-h
    FUT-hit.NONT.3MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
    ‘He will hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

---

10 For the purpose of this thesis, I use the future marker ‘will’ to translate any future reading from Arabic. I do this to avoid
discussing the different ways future tense is expressed in English, which are irrelevant to this thesis.
23. ha-yuḍrub xū-h
   FUT-hit.NONT.3MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘He will hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

This form is also used in negative imperatives, as in (24).

24. ma toḍrob-iš xū-k
   NEG hit.NONT.2MSG-NEG brother-2MSG.PSS
   ‘Do not hit your brother!’ (LY-NQ)

Examples (16-24) show that the non-tensed form is consistent with both present and future readings depending on the context. This suggests that this form could be referred to as non-past, as it is consistent with both present and future readings, but not past. However, the next few sections further illustrate the diversity of the contexts in which this verb form can occur, including past time reference, and that is why I cannot refer to it as non-past.

Examples (25a) and (25b) show the non-tensed form as a complement of the auxiliary kān. In these examples the combination of the form and the auxiliary denotes an event that occurred in the past. Fī, the interior aspectual marker, indicates that it is either the past habitual in (25a) or the past continuous in (25b), depending on the adverbial.

25. a. kān yuḍrub fi xū-h
   be.PST.3MSG hit.NONT.3MSG fi brother-3MSG.PSS
   kull yōm
every day
   ‘He used to hit his brother everyday.’ (LY-NQ)

25. b. kān yuḍrub fi xū-h
   be.PST.3MSG hit.NONT.3MSG fi brother-3MSG.PSS
   ləmmə xaššēt ʕl-ēh
   when enter.PST.1SG on-3MSG.OBL
   ‘He was hitting his brother when I entered.’ (LY-NQ)
When the verb is stative, the reading can be either habitual or simple past, as in (26).

26. kān yəʕ rif l-qiṣṣa  
be.PST.MSG know.NONT.MSG DEF-story  
‘He used to know the story/He was aware of the story.’ (LY-NQ)

This verbal form can be taken as a complement by the auxiliary ykūn with the future marker in (27), and the active participle form in (28), and the combinations are used to indicate continuity in the presence of fī, as in (27) and (28).

27. ḥā-ykūn yuḍrub fī xū-h fī  
FUT-be.NONT.MSG hit.NONT.MSG fī brother-3MSG.PSS in  
l-wəgt hādə  
DEF-time this  
‘He will be hitting his brother at this time.’ (LY-NQ)

28. ḥābb ykūn yuḍrub fī xū-h  
like.AP.MSG be.NONT.MSG hit.NONT.MSG fī brother-3MSG.PSS  
fī l-wəgt hādə  
in DEF-time this  
‘He would like to be hitting his brother at this time.’ (LY-NQ)

In addition, it may occur as the complement of both the past and non-tensed forms of standard verbs.

29. ḥābb yuḍrub xū-h  
like.PST.MSG hit.NONT.MSG brother-3MSG.PSS  
‘He wanted to hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)
The fact that this form occurs in diverse types of contexts, whether present or future, main or as the complement of the auxiliary or a catenative verb, to induce a number of different time references including past tense, suggests that this form is not specified for tense. To reiterate, this does not mean it is non-finite, which is a topic I return to in (2.1.6). Therefore, I refer to it as non-tensed for the rest of this thesis.

2.1.3. The imperative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>oḍrob.IMP ‘hit’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ʔuḍrob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>ʔuḍrbī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4): Agreement table for imperative stem oḍrob.IMP in Libyan Arabic.

The contexts in which the imperative form is used in Libyan Arabic are quite restricted. The imperative can only be used with the second person, as shown in Table (4). In addition, it can only be used in positive imperatives, as in (31a). In negative imperatives what is used is the non-tensed form shown in (24) and repeated in (31b), as opposed to (32). I investigate the different negation strategies used in Modern Arabic varieties for negative imperatives in (5.5).

31. a. ʔuḍrub xū-k
        hit.IMP.2MSG brother-2MSG.PSS
        ‘Hit your brother!’ (LY-NQ)
b. ma tadrub-iš xü-k
   NEG hit.NONT.2MSG-NEG brother-2MSG.PSS
   ‘Do not hit your brother!’ (LY-NQ)

32. *ma ?udrub-iš xü-k
   NEG hit.IMP.2MSG-NEG brother-2MSG.PSS
   ‘Do not hit your brother!’ (LY-NQ)

The imperative form cannot be used as the complement of any other verb. It cannot be the complement of the auxiliary in any form (33-35).11

33. *kün ?udrob xü-k
   be.IMP.2MSG hit.IMP.2MSG brother-2MSG.PSS
   ‘Hit your brother!’ (LY-NQ)

34. *kän ?udrub xü-k
   be.PST.3MSG hit.IMP.2MSG brother-2MSG.PSS
   ‘Hit your brother!’ (LY-NQ)

35. *hà-ykün ?udrob xü-k
   FUT-be.NONT.3MSG hit.IMP.2MSG brother-2MSG.PSS

11 This stands in contrast to active participles and pseudo-verbs occurring after the auxiliary kün in its imperative form:

I. kün fi̇rīf sin b-dfr
   be.IMP.2MSG know.AP.MSG what FUT-do.2MSG
   ‘(You should) know what you’re going to do!’ (LY-NQ)

II. kün fi̇nd-ik mabdaʔ
    be.IMP.2MSG have-2MSG.OBL principle
    ‘(You should) have principles!’ (LY-NQ)
‘Hit your brother!’ (LY-NQ)

The imperative form cannot be the complement of a catenative in any form (36, 37).

36. *həbb ?udrob xū-h
   like.PST.3MSG hit.IMP.2MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘He wanted you to hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

37. *yhibb ?udrub xū-h
   like.NONT.3MSG hit.IMP.2MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘He likes you to hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

The imperative form in Libyan Arabic is restricted in both its syntactic distribution and semantic interpretation as it is used to serve one function, which is positive commands.12

2.1.4. Active participles

The present participle or the active participle form has received a reasonable amount of attention in the literature on Arabic (Watson 1993, Cowell 1964, Brustad 2000). However, there is not a clear consensus among authors about its verbal status. Watson (1993: 35) states that active participles show tense and aspect that are not morphological but semantic, as they are not inflected for either. She proposes that their function is to describe the result of a dynamic verb or the continuation of state in a stative verb and she comments on their ability to take a subject and complements. Cowell (1964) claims they function as additional tense, and Brustad (2000: 289) argues for their partial verbal nature. In this section, I explore the properties of active participles in detail and compare them to properties of other categories. This section discusses the temporal interpretations of active participles in light of the responses obtained from Libyan, Lebanese, and Sudanese speakers from the narrow questionnaire on the difference in meaning between active participles and other verbal forms.

12 This includes conditionals where the interpretation is “do this or…”.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ḍārib.AP ‘hit’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ḍārib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ḍārbə</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (5): Agreement table for active participle stem ḍārib.AP in Libyan Arabic.

In Libyan Arabic, active participles are like nouns and adjectives in the sense that they inflect for gender and number, but unlike verbs, in that they do not inflect for person (as shown in Table 5). Unlike non-tensed forms, active participles cannot take future tense markers, as in (38).

38. *bi-ḍārib  xū-h
       FUT-hit.AP.MSG  brother-3MSG.PSS
       ‘He will hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

Active participles are negated differently from other verb forms. Other verb forms are negated discontinuously, as in example (39), while active participles are negated with the negation marker miš, as in example (41), the same way as adjectives and nouns, as opposed to (40). I return to this in Chapter Three (3.2.4.1) and Six (6.1.4)

39. huwwə ma yudrub/ḍəb-iš  xū-h
       3MSG.SUB  NEG  hit.NONT/PST.3MSG-NEG  brother-3MSG.PSS
       ‘He does not/did not hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

40. *huwwə ma ḍārib-iš  xū-h
       3MSG.SUB  NEG  hit.AP.MSG-NEG  brother-3MSG.PSS
       ‘He has not hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

41. huwwə miš ḍārib  xū-h
       3MSG.SUB  NEG  hit.AP.MSG  brother-3MSG.PSS
       ‘He has not hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)
However, active participles have verbal features. For example, just like verbs, they take noun phrase complements\(^{13}\), which are marked in the same way (42a). In this example, there is no difference between the noun phrase object of the past form ְרָב in (1) or (42b) and the noun phrase object of the active participle ְרֹב in (42a).

42. a. l-wild ḏārib xū-h
   DEF-boy hit.AP.MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘The boy has hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

   b. l-wild llī ḏrab/ḏārib xū-h
   DEF-boy who hit.PST.3MSG/AP.MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘The boy who hit/has hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

This stands in opposition to the complement of an adjective such as ḥו in (43). The complement of ḥו is marked by a preposition in (43a). Moreover, adjectives can occur attributively, as in (43b), while active participles, like verbs have to be introduced by a relative pronoun as in example (42b).

43. a. ḥo bi-wild-əh
   proud of-son-3MSG.PSS
   ‘Proud of his son.’ (LY-NQ)

   b. l-bū l-ḥo
   DEF-father DEF-proud
   ‘The proud father.’ (LY-NQ)

Moreover, active participles maintain the same argument structure as other verb forms, represented in the ditransitive verb in (44, 45).

---

\(^{13}\) As opposed to passive participles, which correspond to the object of a verb and do not take complements.
I now turn to the functions of active participles. As illustrated in examples (44, 45), the meaning interpreted from active participles is different from the meaning denoted by past forms. In example (44), where the past form is used, the interpreted meaning indicates a simple past tense reference. However, in example (45), where the active participle form is used, the interpreted meaning is a perfect tense reading, which suggests that this form indicates perfect tense.

In addition to perfect tense readings, active participles can induce other tenses and aspects when combined with other elements or on their own. For example, like non-tensed forms they are compatible with future readings, like in (46).

The example in (46) resembles the present participle form in English, which can be used to denote both continuous and future readings. In fact, in the absence of the adverbial ꙛ⼼w⃱ ‘tomorrow’, the interpreted reading is a continuous meaning, as in (47) and (48).

46. huwwə jāy ꙛ⼼w⃱
    3MSG.SUB come.AP.MSG tomorrow
    ‘He is coming tomorrow.’ (LY-NQ)

47. huwwə jāy
    3MSG.SUB come.AP.MSG
    ‘He is coming.’ (LY-NQ)
It is worth mentioning that this is not the case with all verbs, but mainly with motion verbs, as opposed to dynamic non-motion and stative verbs. With ḏārib, which is a non-motion dynamic verb from, future and continuous readings are not possible (49).

49. *huwwə ḏārib xū-h (ḡudwə)
   3MSG.SUB hit.AP.MSG brother-3MSG.PSS tomorrow
   ‘He is hitting his brother (tomorrow).’ (LY-NQ)

With stative verbs on the other hand, there is no change in meaning and the non-tensed form and the active participle are interchangeable, as in (50).

50. huwwə ūrīf/yərīf
   3MSG.SUB know.AP.MSG/NONT.3MSG
   ‘He knows.’ (LY-NQ)

To sum up, when occurring as the main predicate of the clause, active participles give perfect, continuous and future readings, or neither, depending on their semantic interpretations. Active participles of non-motion dynamic nature like ḏārib give a perfect tense reading while active participles of motion verbs like jāy give future and continuous readings depending on context and accompanying adverbials.

In order to test the aforementioned observations about the functions of active participles stated above, I decided to dedicate a small section of the narrow questionnaire to exploring their semantic interpretations. While I discuss their semantic interpretation here, I return to their interaction with negation in (6.1.4). With regard to the difference in meaning between active participles and other verbal forms, some of the participants reported a difference
related to tense and aspect. They reported differences in meaning between the past and non-tensed verbal forms of ʕaṭa ‘give’, labas ‘wear’, and nām ‘sleep’ and their active participle counterparts, but not ʕaraf ‘know’. However, it is important to note here that these participants are not linguists and that the interpretations were elicited through careful and lengthy lines of questioning.

Some speakers (seven speakers) reported that the use of the past form ʕaṭa ‘give.PST’ in (51), means that the action was performed in the past but does not necessarily still hold, i.e. it may not be the case any more. When the active participle was used in (52), the speakers stated that the meaning intended includes a reference to the current relevance of the action.

51. hyya ʕt ʔxū-ha l-krt
3FSG.SUB give.PST.3FSG brother-3FSG.PSS DEF-card
‘She gave her brother the card.’ (LY, LE, SUA)

52. hyya ʕya ʔxū-ha al-krt
3FSG.SUB give.AP.FSG brother-3FSG.PSS DEF-card
‘She has given her brother the card.’ (LY, LE, SUA)

With regard to examples (53) and (54) and forms yilbis ‘wear.NONT’, which is the non-tensed form, and lābis ‘wear.AP’, which is the active participle form, the speakers who commented on this (nine speakers) described the sentence where the non-tensed form was used as denoting a context where the person is actively putting on his shoes. The use of the active

---

14 These are Libyan, Sudanese, and Lebanese speakers, more details about this can be found in (4.3).
15 I use PST and NONT to refer to verb forms in other Modern Arabic varieties, as well as Libyan Arabic, throughout this thesis. Even though I do not test other varieties for this distinction, there is no general consensus in the literature about their perfective vs. imperfective classification and thus I follow the authors that argue that they are specified for tense more than aspect, such as (Fassi Fehri 2012).
16 The sentences used in this thesis are not phonologically representative of the corresponding Arabic varieties, but are only representative of morpho-syntactic patterns.
17 I use a near-straight transliteration of the Arabic script (mostly with consonants only) for examples which are not intended to represent a specific variety.
participle on the other hand meant that he is wearing them at the moment, or that he has put them on recently.

53. hwwa ylbs (fi) hdʔ/kndrt-u
3MSG.SUB wear.NONT.3MSG fi shoe-3MSG.PSS
‘He is putting on his shoes.’ ((LY), LE, SUA)

54. hwwa lbs hdʔ/kndrt-u
3MSG.SUB wear.AP.MSG shoe-3MSG.PSS
‘He is wearing/has worn his shoes.’ (LY, LE, SUA)

With the active participles ʕāṭya and lābis, even though there are limitations with the responses given by the participants in terms of the functions of these particular active participle forms, they offer interesting insights into their temporal contents. The fact that they were described to include a sense of current relevance or a recent occurrence interpretation of the event suggests that the active participle forms denote a perfect tense interpretation.

With regard to the difference between ynām ‘sleep.NONT’, which is the non-tensed form in example (55), and nāyim ‘sleep.AP’ the active participle in example (56), the use of the active participle was described as denoting the current status of the subject by twelve speakers.

55. hwwa ynm bi/fi h-l-wʔ/gt
3MSG.SUB sleep.NONT.3MSG in this-DEF-time
‘He sleeps at this time.’ (LY, LE, SUA)

56. hawwa nym bi/fi h-l-wʔ/gt
3MSG.SUB sleep.AP.MSG in this-DEF-time
‘He is asleep at this time.’ (LY, LE, SUA)

With ʕaraf ‘know’ all speakers stated that they do not see a difference in meaning between the non-tensed form in (57-59) and the active participle in (60).
57. ?ana ma b-əřrif l-şiṇwān
1SG.SUB NEG IND-know.NONT.1SG DEF-address
‘I do not know the address.’ (SUA)

58. ?ane ma nəřrif-iš l-şiṇwān
1SG.SUB NEG know.NONT.1SG-NEG DEF-address
‘I do not know the address.’ (LY)

59. ?ana ma b-əřrif l-şiṇwān
1SG.SUB NEG IND-know.NONT.1SG DEF-address
‘I do not know the address.’ (LE)

60. ?ane/a miš/ma/mū ʃārif l-şiṇwān
1SG.SUB NEG know.AP.MSG DEF-address
‘I do not know the address.’ (LY, LE, SUA)

In conclusion, the examples in (51-56) confirm my initial observations about the different functions of active participles derived from non-stative verbs as opposed to those derived from stative verbs. Active participles derived from dynamic non-motion verbs give a perfect tense reading and those derived from motion verbs can give a present continuous tense reading. Active participles derived from stative verbs do not give a different reading from their non-tensed counterparts. This was confirmed in the participants’ responses with regard to nəřrif and ʃārif in examples (57-60) as no difference in meaning was reported.

However, it could be argued that the denotation of know in itself includes a current relevance notion in the sense that I have come to know and, therefore, now I know. This could be the reason why no participants commented on the difference between the non-tensed form and the active participle. This is in a way similar to Latin defective verbs like meminī ‘I remember’ where the perfect form is translated with a present meaning (Mondon 2014, Gwynne 2014).
When occurring as the complement of auxiliary kān and ykūn, the active participle form gives different readings depending on their semantic interpretations, i.e. whether they denote dynamic motion or dynamic non-motion events, or states. With active participles with non-motion dynamic meaning like ḍārib ‘hit.AP’, we get past and future perfect readings. Example (61) illustrates the combination of the past form of the auxiliary kān and the active participle ḍārib and the interpretation is a past perfect reading.

61. kān ḍārib xū-h
   be.PST.3MSG hit.AP.MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘He had hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

In example (62), ḍārib follows the non-tensed form of the auxiliary combined with the future marker ḥə- and the interpretation is the future perfect.

62. ḥə-ykūn ḍārib xū-h ṭəwəwə
   FUT-be.NONT.3MSG hit.AP.MSG brother-3MSG.PSS now
   ‘He will have hit his brother by now.’ (LY-NQ)

Examples (63-65) show that active participles, such as ḍārib, cannot be the complement of standard verbs whether they are in the past form (63), the non-tensed form (64), or the non-tensed form combined with the future marker (65).

63. *ḥabb ḍārib xū-h
   like.PST.3MSG hit.AP.MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘He wanted/would’ve liked to have hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

64. *yḥībb ḍārib xū-h
   like.NONT.3MSG hit.AP.MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘*He likes to have hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)
65. *ḥa-ḥibb  ḏārib  xū-h
   FUT-like.NONT.3MSG  hit.AP.MSG  brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘He would like to have hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

When the active participle is derived from motion verbs like ḥāy ‘come.AP’ and is the complement of the past form of the auxiliary, the interpretation is past continuous or past continuous with a future reading, as in (66) and (67).

66. kān  ḥāy
   be.PST.3MSG  come.AP.MSG
   ‘He was coming.’ (LY-NQ)

67. kān  ḥāy  ḡuḍwə
   be.PST.3MSG  come.AP.MSG  tomorrow
   ‘He was coming tomorrow.’ (LY-NQ)

When ḥāy is the complement of ḥa-ḥkūn, the reading is the future present continuous tense (68, 69).

68. ḥa-ḥkūn  ḥāy
   FUT-be.NONT.3MSG  come.AP.MSG
   ‘He will be coming.’ (LY-NQ)

69. ḥa-ḥkūn  ḥāy  ḡuḍwə
   FUT-be.NONT.3MSG  come.AP.MSG  tomorrow
   ‘He will be coming tomorrow.’ (LY-NQ)

When stative active participles are the complements of the auxiliary kān, the sentence could mean that ‘he used to know’ or that ‘he knew’, as in (70). When they are the complement of ḥkūn with the future marker, the meaning could be that ‘he will know’ or ‘he will have known’, as in (71). Note that these are not different whether the non-tensed form or the active participle is used.
To sum up, when dynamic active participles are the complements of the auxiliary kān, the resulting reading is either the past perfect or the past continuous, and when they are the complements of ykūn plus the future marker the reading is the future perfect or the future present continuous, depending on whether the active participle has a non-motion dynamic or a motion dynamic meaning respectively.

In conclusion, the examination of the functions of active participles suggests a split in these functions depending on the semantics of the verb. I conclude that stative active participles, such as ṭārif, do not have a different interpretation from their non-tensed forms, active participles that have non-motion dynamic meaning, such as ḍārib, indicate the completion and current relevance (perfect reading) of the event, and those that have a dynamic motion meaning, such as jāy, denote a continuous or a future reading.

2.1.5. Aspect

In the previous few sections I investigated the semantic notions associated with the four verbal forms and established that it is not aspect that is denoted in Libyan Arabic verbal forms. However, while aspect is not directly indicated in Libyan Arabic verbal forms, there are other ways of signalling aspecual notions such as habitual and continuous aspect. Therefore, in the next sections I look at ways in which aspect can be signalled in Libyan Arabic, whether synthetically by using aspecual markers or analytically by using different combinations of forms, to wrap up my investigation of aspecual expression in Libyan
Arabic. I will also comment on aspect marking in two other Modern Arabic varieties, namely Syrian and Palestinian Arabic.

2.1.5.1. Synthetic aspect in Arabic

As mentioned in (2.1.2), the non-tensed form of transitive non-stative verbs in Libyan Arabic is accompanied by *fi*, the aspectual object marker, to give a continuous or habitual reading, which can be referred to as interior aspect, as illustrated in example (72). This marker *fi* cannot occur with past forms but only with non-tensed forms of non-stative verbs, as in (73).

72. huwwə yuḍrub *fi* xū-h
    3MSG.SUB hit.NONT.3MSG *fi* brother-3MSG.PSS
    ‘He hits/is hitting his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

73. huwwə ʒrəb (*fi*) xū-h
    3MSG.SUB hit.PST.3MSG *fi* brother-3MSG.PSS
    ‘He hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

Other Modern Arabic varieties have a number of markers carrying continuous aspect. In Syrian Arabic ʕam, as in (74), gives a continuous or habitual reading. This marker occurs with all person and number combinations. ʕam is referred to by Cowell (1964: 320) as “the particle of actuality” and reported to give a progressive reading. ʕam is derived from the active participle ʕammāl ‘do.AP.MSG’ (Agius & Harrak 1987).

74. ʕam  yiktib
    ʕAM   write.NONT.3MSG
    ‘He is writing.’ (SYA, Ebert 2000: 776)

In Syrian Arabic ʕam can co-occur with what is referred to in the literature as the indicative marker *bi-. In example (75), *bi- is used to signal the indicative mood (Murphy 2014). In (76), ʕam has an ambiguous reading where the action could be either habitual or continuous, i.e.
has interior aspect reading, but not necessarily indicative. Their combination in (77) shows the indicative mode with interior aspect.

75. bi-yešṭīġel
   IND-work.NONT.3MSG
   ‘He works.’ (SYA-NQ)

76. ʕam yešṭīġel
   ʕAM work.NONT.3MSG
   ‘He is working.’ (SYA-NQ)

77. ʕam bi-yešṭīġel
   ʕAM IND-work.NONT.3MSG
   ‘He is working.’ (SYA-NQ)

The aspect marker ʕam is similar to fi in that it cannot combine with past tense or stative verbs, which indicates a similarity in their distribution.

78. *ʕam katab
   ʕAM write.PST.3MSG
   ‘He was writing.’ (SYA-NQ)

79. *ʕam yhibb ʔəxū-h
   ʕAM love.NONT.3MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
   ‘*He is loving his brother.’ (SYA-NQ)

Palestinian Arabic makes use of the full form of ʕam, ʕammal ‘do.AP.MSG’, and its full agreement paradigm in marking the continuous aspect, as in (80) and (81).

80. ʕammāl ʔaktub
    do.AP.MSG write.NONT.1SG
    ‘I am writing.’
2.1.5.2. **Analytic aspect**

Combinations of the auxiliary and different verbal forms, as will be illustrated in (2.2.2), can be used to indicate aspeclual meanings. As shown in section (2.1.2), combining the auxiliary kān with the non-tensed form of a dynamic verb and fi results in a past continuous or habitual tense, as in (82).

82. kān yuḍrub fi xū-h
be.PST.3MSG hit.NONT.3MSG FI brother-3MSG.PSS
‘He was hitting/used to hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

When the complement of the non-tensed form of auxiliary with the future marker hə- is a non-tensed dynamic verb form, the reading is the future continuous tense.

83. hə-ykūn yuḍrub fi xū-h fi
FUT-be.NONT.3MSG hit.NONT.3MSG FI brother-3MSG.PSS in
l-waqt hādə
def-time this
‘He will be hitting his brother at this time.’ (LY-NQ)

When an active participle form of a motion verb is the complement of the past form of the auxiliary, we get the past continuous tense, as in (84), and when it is the non-tensed form of auxiliary with the future marker hə-, the reading is the future continuous tense (85).

84. huwwə kān jāy
3MSG.SUB be.PST.3MSG come.AP.MSG
‘He was coming.’ (LY-NQ)
85. ha-ykūn jāy
FUT-be.NONT.3MSG come.AP.MSG
‘He will be coming.’ (LY-NQ)

To sum up, although aspect is not directly encoded in Libyan Arabic verb forms, it can be expressed using aspect markers and combination of the auxiliary and different forms, as will be summarised in Table (10) in section (2.2.2) of this chapter.

2.1.6. Finiteness

There is a general consensus among Arabic authors that verb forms in Arabic are exclusively finite. For the purposes of this thesis, I briefly discuss finiteness in Libyan Arabic here, for the sake of having a comprehensive account of the grammatical features of verbs, but do not mention it beyond this section.

Finiteness is best described in terms of finite vs. non-finite clauses, rather than finite vs. non-finite verbs, as it is types of clauses that are described to be finite or non-finite rather than verb forms, which can occur in both in some languages. Non-finite clauses are characteristically subordinate and are associated with the lack of properties of clauses that stand on their own as full sentences (Nikolaeva 2007, Trask 1993, Huddleston 1988). Properties of finite clauses include the ability of the verb to assign nominative case to its subject, in languages that have this case, and the possibility of the presence of agreement markers on the verb.

There are reasons to assume that there are no non-finite forms of Arabic verbs. This is based on the fact that all verb forms are inflected for agreement in all contexts, and all have the ability to assign nominative case to their subjects even in a subordinate position. The most cited and influential work on finiteness in Arabic is that of Fassi Fehri (1993), in which he concludes that Standard Arabic does not have non-finite verbs. His analysis has been adopted by Mohammad (2000) for Palestinian Arabic and Al-Zahre and Boneh (1999) for Syrian Arabic.
Following the analysis of Fassi Fehri, I argue that there are no non-finite verb forms in Libyan Arabic. Although I refer to the verb form \( yuḍrub \) in example (86) as non-tensed, I do not equate that with non-finite. This is based on the fact that this verb form can occur as the only verbal predicate of the clause, as in example (2) repeated in (86a), and has the ability to assign nominative case to its subject even when it occurs as a complement of a higher verb, as in (86b), which is a subordinate position. The same goes for both the past form in (1), repeated in (87a), and example (87b), and the active participle in (4), repeated in (88a), and example (88).

86. a. \( huwwə \ yuḍrub \ fi \ xū-h \)
    \[ \text{3MSG.SUB hit.NONT.3MSG \ fi \ brother-3MSG.PSS} \]
    ‘He hits/is hitting his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

b. \( yibbi \ (huwwə) \ yuḍrub \ xū-h \)
    \[ \text{want.NONT.3MSG \ 3MSG.SUB \ hit.NONT.3MSG \ brother-3MSG.PSS} \]
    ‘He wants to hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

87. a. \( Ahmid \ ḩrəb \ xū-h \)
    \[ \text{Ahmid \ hit.PST.3MSG \ brother-3MSG.PSS} \]
    ‘Ahmid hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

b. \( yibbi \ ykūn \ (huwwə) \ ḩrəb \)
    \[ \text{want.NONT.3MSG \ be.NONT.3MSG \ 3MSG.SUB \ hit.PST.3MSG} \]
    \[ \text{xū-h \ brother-3MSG.PSS} \]
    ‘He wants to have hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

88. a. \( huwwə \ ḍārib \ xū-h \)
    \[ \text{3MSG.SUB hit.AP.MSG \ brother-3MSG.PSS} \]
    ‘He has hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)
However, in addition to finite verb forms which head clauses, Arabic varieties have non-finite elements referred to as *maṣdar* ‘source’ forms (McCarthy and Prince 1990) or verbal nouns (Ryding 2005). These are not verbal elements and they are used in nominalisations, as in (89).

89. ħa-ykūn (*huwwa*) ḍārub xū-h ṣəfīb ʕlē-h
   FUT-be.NONT.3MSG 3MSG.SUB hit.MS brother-3MSG.PSS hard on-3MSG.OBL
   ‘It will be hard for him to hit his brother/Hitting his brother will be hard for him.’
   (LY-NQ)

These forms cannot assign nominative case nor do they show agreement, as shown in example (89).

2.1.7. Other properties of standard verbs

I now turn to two properties of verbs in Libyan Arabic to investigate if they can be used to distinguish standard from non-standard verbs. These are the ability to occur in elliptic constructions and take scope over the aspectual object marker *fī*. I investigate these properties and compare them to those of non-standard verbs in (2.2) in order to determine whether or not there is justification for having two separate classes. I also discuss the behaviour of standard vs non-standard verbs with regard to negation in (6.1.1), (6.1.2) and (6.1.5).
2.1.7.1. Ellipsis

Standard verbs taking verbal complements can introduce verbal ellipsis. Verbs like yhiba‘want/like’, yhāwil ‘try’ and yīthāššim ‘become shy’ can represent the missing verbal phrase in an elliptic construction, but only in some forms. This is shown in example (90, 91) where the past form of yhiba cannot occur without its complement in an elliptic construction, as in (90), but the active participle form can, as in (91).\(^\text{18}\)

90. A:\(^\text{19}\) huwwə həbb yiktib
    3MSG.SUB like.PST.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG
    ‘He wanted to write’

    B: *hatta hiyyə həbbə
    even 3FSG.SUB like.PST.3FSG
    ‘She wanted to as well.’ (LY-NQ)

91. A: huwwə hābb yiktib
    3MSG.SUB like.AP.MSG write.NONT.3MSG
    ‘He wants to write’

    B: hattə hiyyə hābbə
    even 3FSG.SUB like.AP.FSG
    ‘She wants to as well.’ (LY-NQ)

The standard verb yhāwil ‘try’ can substitute the verbal phrase, as shown in example (92) with the past form, and (93) with the non-tensed form.

92. A: huwwə hāwil yiktib
    3MSG.SUB try.PST.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG
    ‘He tried to write’

\(^{18}\) I do not discuss the non-tensed form because it has a different interpretation of ‘like’ not ‘want’ and it behaves differently.

\(^{19}\) Capital letters and a colon will be used to indicate dialogue examples.
B:  hattə hiyyə hāwlit
even  3FSG.SUB try.PST.3FSG
‘She tried to as well.’ (LY-NQ)

93. A:  huwwə yhāwil yiktib
3MSG.SUB try.NONT.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG
‘He tries to write’

B:  hattə hiyyə thāwil
even  3FSG.SUB try.NONT.3FSG
‘She tries as well.’ (LY-NQ)

Yithaššim ‘become.shy’ shows the same behaviour in examples (94, 95).

94. A:  huwwə thəššim yiktib
3MSG.SUB become.shy.PST.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG
‘He was shy to write’

B:  hattə hiyyə thəššmit
even  3FSG.SUB become.shy.PST.3FSG
‘She was as well.’ (LY-NQ)

95. A:  huwwə yithaššim yiktib
3MSG.SUB become.shy.NONT.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG
‘He is shy to write’

B:  hattə hiyyə tithaššim
even  3FSG.SUB become.shy.NONT.3FSG
‘She is as well.’ (LY-NQ)
To sum up, some forms of the standard verbs *yhibb* ‘want/like’, *yhāwil* ‘try’ and *yithaššim* ‘become.shy’ can take scope over elliptic constructions. This, however, is not a predictable and regular process as it can vary between verbs.

### 2.1.7.2. Scope over *fi*

Standard verbs in a subordinating position dominate the aspectual reading of the whole clause. In Libyan Arabic, the two verbal forms, past and non-tensed, are also distinguished by the possibility of the presence of *fi*, which is an object aspectual marker that denotes interior aspect. This particle *fi* cannot occur with past forms but only with non-tensed forms of non-stative verbs. This is shown in examples (96-98). In example (96), *yuḍrub* allows the presence of *fi*, as it is a dynamic verb and the result is an interior reading of the clause.

96. *yuḍrub*  
   *fi*  
   *xū-h*  
   hit.NONT.3MSG  
   *fi*  
   brother-3MSG.PSS  
   ‘He hits/is hitting his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

In examples (97) and (98), *yhibb* ‘want/like’ and *yakraḥ* ‘hate’, which are stative verbs, cannot co-occur with *fi*.

97. *yhibb*  
   (*fi*)  
   *xū-h*  
   like.NONT.3MSG  
   *fi*  
   brother-3MSG.PSS  
   ‘He likes his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

98. *yakraḥ*  
   (*fi*)  
   *xū-h*  
   hate.NONT.3MSG  
   *fi*  
   brother-3MSG.PSS  
   ‘He hates his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

When stative verbs, such as *yhib* and *yithaššim*, take dynamic verbs, such as *yuḍrub*, as their complements, they block the ability of the subordinate dynamic verbs to allow the occurrence of *fi*. This is shown in examples (99, 100) where *fi* is not permitted.
In other words, standard verbs dominate the aspectual reading of their verbal complements and do not allow their independence.

### 2.1.8. Summary

I have now investigated the different verbal forms of the Libyan Arabic verbal paradigm and established the semantic notions associated with these forms. I conclude that there is not enough evidence to argue that the distinction between Arabic verbal forms is one of aspect in that the forms represent perfective vs. imperfective aspect, as suggested by modern approaches. In case of the past stem, the form does not indicate the completion of the event as the completion entailment can be cancelled. In fact, the traditional Arabic grammar label of *al-māḍi* ‘the past’ is more reflective of the semantic notion denoted by this verbal form. In case of the non-tensed, the form can occur in different types of contexts with different time references and thus *al-mudārīṭ* ‘the present’ is not an informative label either.

Therefore I am not following the traditional or the modern approach of distinguishing Arabic verbs in this thesis. Instead, for the purposes of the current research, distinctions between Arabic verb forms will be form and function-based, and I refer to them as past, non-tensed, imperative, and active participle forms. Nevertheless, interior aspect can still be signalled in Arabic clauses synthetically or analytically using aspectual markers or combinations of different forms.
In addition to the properties of the four verbal stems, standard verbs share two characteristics. Some forms can occur in verbal elliptic constructions and non-tensed forms of dynamic verbs can take scope over the aspectual reading of the whole clause.

The following tables summarise what has been discussed in this section regarding standard verbs. Table (6) highlights the main features of standard verbs. Table (7) highlights the main functions of Libyan Arabic standard verbal forms and the tenses that result from the combinations of different verbal forms and tense markers or the auxiliary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of Standard verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four distinct forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject agreement markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense/aspect markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negation with <em>ma -(iš)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope over <em>fi</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (6): Features of Standard verbs in Libyan Arabic.
2.2. Non-standard verbs

There are a number of Arabic verbs that are claimed to be different from standard verbs in the literature on Modern Arabic. Different authors refer to them by different labels but the most important of these are auxiliaries (Brustad 2000, Ingham 1994, Eisele 1988, 1992, Jelinek 1981, Vanhove et al. 2009) and pseudo-verbs (Brustad 2000, Lucas 2010, Qafisheh 1992, Yoda 2005). Kān ‘be’, yigdir ‘can’ and lāzim ‘must’ are some of the most cited among the former category, while fi ‘exist’, badd- ‘want’ and ʕind- ‘have’ are often mentioned as pseudo-verbs. In this section, I apply the criteria summarised in Table (6) to investigate the properties of non-standard verbs, and check if they can be used to distinguish them from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal form (+)</th>
<th>Tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONT</td>
<td>Generic/future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONT + fi</td>
<td>Present continuous/habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI/ĦΘ + NONT</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP (NON-MOTION DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Present perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP (MOTION DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Present continuous/future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP (STATIVE)</td>
<td>Generic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX.PST + PST</td>
<td>Counterfactual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX.PST + NONT (DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Past continuous/habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX.PST + NONT/AP (STATIVE)</td>
<td>Past/habitual past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX.PST +AP (NON-MOTION DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Past perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX.PST +AP (MOTION DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Past continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT-AUX.NONT + PST</td>
<td>Future perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT-AUX.NONT + NONT (DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Future continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT-AUX.NONT + NONT/AP (STATIVE)</td>
<td>Future/future perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT-AUX.NONT +AP (NON-MOTION DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Future perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT-AUX.NONT +AP (MOTION DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Future continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (7): Functions of Libyan Arabic verbal forms.
standard verbs. Moreover, I discuss the behaviour of standard vs non-standard verbs with regard to negation in a number of Modern Arabic varieties in (6.1.1), (6.1.2) and (6.1.5).

2.2.1. Modals

A number of Arabic authors claim that both *yigdir* and *lāzim* are auxiliary verbs due to their modal-like meaning (Vanhove et al. 2009, Eisele 1992). In this section, I explore the morpho-syntactic properties of *yigdir* and *lāzim*, in comparison to standard verbs.

*Yigdir* ‘can’ has four verbal forms and a full verbal paradigm that includes subject agreement markers with all persons and numbers, such as that associated with a standard verb. This is shown in Table (8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>gdār.PST</th>
<th>yigdir.NONT</th>
<th>?egdir.IMP</th>
<th>gādir.AP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>gdārt</td>
<td>gdārnā</td>
<td>nīgdir</td>
<td>negdrū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>gdārt</td>
<td>gdārtū</td>
<td>tīgdir</td>
<td>tegdrū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>gdārtī</td>
<td>tegdrī</td>
<td>tegdrū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>gdār</td>
<td>gīdrū</td>
<td>yīgdir</td>
<td>yīgdrū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>gidrīt</td>
<td>tīgdir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (8): Verbal paradigm of *yigdir* ‘can’ in Libyan Arabic.

*Yigdir* expresses dynamic modality when combined with standard verbs in its past form and both dynamic and deontic modality in its non-tensed form, as in examples (101, 102). Example (102) shows that *yigdir* blocks the aspectual marker *fi* from occurring with the dynamic verb *yodrob*, which means it cannot co-occur with *fi*. 
101. gdår yudrub xū-h
can.PST.3MSG hit.NONT.3MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
‘He was able to hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

102. yigdir yudrub (*fi) xū-h
can.NONT.3MSG hit.NONT.3MSG fi brother-3MSG.PSS
‘He can/is able to hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

Yigdir can take future markers, as in example (103), and is negated just like standard verbs, as in (104).

103. bi/ḥa-yigdir yudrub xū-h
FUT-can.NONT.3MSG hit.NONT.3MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
‘He will be able to hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

104. ma yigdir-iš yudrub xū-h
NEG can.NONT.3MSG-NEG hit.NONT.3MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
‘He cannot hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

With regard to ellipsis, yigdir can substitute the verb phrase. This is shown in examples (105) and (106) with both the past and non-tensed forms of yigdir.

105. A: huwwə gdår yudrub xū-h
3MSG.SUB can.PST.3MSG hit.NONT.3MSG brother-3MSG.PSS
‘He was able to hit his brother’

B: ḥattə hiyyə gidrit
even 3FSG.SUB can.PST.3FSG
‘She was as well.’ (LY-NQ)
Lāzim is invariable and can express both deontic and epistemic modality, as in examples (107) and (108). The auxiliary kān has to be inserted to express past time reference, as in (109).

107. lāzim yiktib
    must write.NONT.3MSG
    ‘He must write/he must be writing.’ (LY-NQ)

108. lāzim niktib
    must write.NONT.1SG
    ‘I must write.’ (LY-NQ)

109. kān lāzim yiktib
    be.PST.3MSG must write.NONT.3MSG
    ‘He had to write.’ (LY-NQ)

Lāzim cannot take future markers, as in (110), and cannot be negated discontinuously, but with the negation marker miš, as in (111).

110. *bi/ha-lāzim yiktib
    FUT-must write. NONT.3MSG
    ‘He will have to write.’ (LY-NQ)
111. miš lāzim yiktīb
   NEG must write. NONT.3MSG
   ‘He does not have to write/to be writing.’ (LY-NQ)

*Lāzim* cannot substitute the verb phrase in elliptic constructions, as in (112).

112. A: huwwə lāzim yiktīb
    3MSG.SUB must write. NONT.3MSG
    ‘He must write/be writing.’

    B: *ḥattə hiyyə lāzim
    even 3FSG.SUB must
    ‘She must as well.’ (LY-NQ)

*Lāzim* can co-occur with *fi*. However, the reading we get from this combination can only be epistemic.

113. lāzim yuḍrub fi xū-h
    must hit. NONT.3MSG FI brother-3MSG.PSS
    ‘He must be hitting his brother ≠ He must hit his brother.’ (LY-NQ)

To sum up, *yigdir* has a full verbal paradigm while *lāzim* is invariable. *Yigdir* can occur in elliptic constructions while *lāzim* cannot, *yigdir* cannot take scope over *fi* while *lāzim* can in epistemic readings but not in deontic ones, and *yigdir* can take future markers while *lāzim* cannot. Moreover, both can have deontic and dynamic interpretations depending on context. In this sense, the properties of *yigdir* suggest that it behaves more like standard verbs while the properties of *lāzim* suggest it stands out.

Furthermore, neither *lāzim* nor *yigdir* has the ability to form synthetic tense combinations with standard verbs the way the auxiliary can, which makes them different from the auxiliary and similar to standard verbs. In fact, the auxiliary can combine with both of them to form
complex combinations, as in (114, 115). In the next section I will elaborate on the auxiliary and its properties.

114. ḥa-ykūn  gdār  yiktib  
   FUT-be.NONT.3MSG  can.PST.3MSG  write.NONT.3MSG  
   ‘He would have been able to write.’ (LY-NQ)

115. ḥa-ykūn  lāzim  yiktib  
   FUT-be.NONT.3MSG  must  write.NONT.3MSG  
   ‘He would have to write.’ (LY-NQ)

2.2.2. The auxiliary verb

In this section, I investigate the characteristics of the auxiliary, establish its properties, and anticipating my conclusion, I refer to it as the only real auxiliary in Libyan Arabic.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>kān.PST</th>
<th>ykūn.NONT</th>
<th>kūn.IMP</th>
<th>kāyin.AP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>kunt</td>
<td>kunnā</td>
<td>nkūn</td>
<td>nkūnū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>kunt</td>
<td>kuntū</td>
<td>tkūn</td>
<td>tkūnū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>kuntī</td>
<td>tkūnī</td>
<td>kūnī</td>
<td>kūnū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>kān</td>
<td>kānū</td>
<td>ykūn</td>
<td>ykūnū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>kānit</td>
<td>tkūn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (9): Verbal paradigm of auxiliary kān ‘be’ in Libyan Arabic.

---

20 tamāl in Palestinian Arabic expresses continuous aspect and has a full verbal paradigm with all persons, numbers and genders, as was shown in examples (73) and (74).
The auxiliary verb in Libyan Arabic shares certain characteristics with standard verbs and differs from them in some. As shown in the table above, the auxiliary has a full verbal paradigm with all combinations of person, number, and gender agreement markers, just like standard verbs.

The auxiliary *kān/ykūn* ‘be.PST/NONT’ is found in all Modern Arabic varieties. It can be the lexical verb of the clause as a copula, as in (116), or it can occur with other verbs, which it takes as complements, as in (117, 118). It also shares the argument structure and temporal reading of the main verb in the latter examples.

116. kān/hā-ykūn  
    saṣīd  
    be.PST.3MSG/FUT-be.NONT.3MSG happy  
    ‘He was/will be happy.’ (LY-NQ)

117. kān  
    yiktib  
    be.PST.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG  
    ‘He was writing/he used to write.’ (LY-NQ)

118. hā-ykūn  
    yiktib  
    FUT-be.NONT.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG  
    ‘He will be writing.’ (LY-NQ)

As shown in (116) and (118), the auxiliary *ykūn* does not occur on its own in the matrix clause, but only in the presence of another element, in these examples, the future marker. In fact, the auxiliary *ykūn* occurs on its own mainly in subordinate clauses as will be shown in Chapter Six (6.2.1).

In Modern Arabic varieties, non-verbal predicates occur on their own without a copula in sentences with a present time reading, as in example (119). *Kān* and *ykūn* are used with non-verbal predicates to indicate past and future time reference, as in (120, 121).
In this case, kān and ykūn behave similarly to standard verbs that take adjectival complements like wāllə ‘become’ and gʕəd ‘remain’. The past forms kān, wāllə, and gʕəd occur as the lexical verb, as in (120, 122, 123).

The non-tensed forms ykūn, ywalli, and yogʕod are combined with the future marker ḥə- to indicate future tense as in (121, 124, 125).
‘The house will remain white.’ (LY-NQ)

When kān is used as the lexical verb, it has an imperative form kūn ‘be.IMP’, as in example (126). Kūn cannot combine with past, non-tensed or imperative forms of standard verbs, but only with active participles or pseudo-verbs (see section 2.1.3).

‘Be happy!’ (LY-NQ)

Kān has an active participle form kāyin. As seen in example (127), it is used to give a perfect tense meaning in southern Libyan Arabic. This is not different from the active participle forms of standard verbs being used to indicate perfect tense.

‘The house has been white.’ (LY-NQ)

With regard to the combination of the auxiliary with other verb forms to form complex tenses, these have been discussed in section (2.1) of this chapter. Examples (8-10, 14, 15), (25-28) and (61, 62, 66-71) show that the combinations of the auxiliary and the past, non-tensed, and active participle forms respectively, result in different tenses. These are summarised in Table (10).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal form + Auxiliary</th>
<th>Tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUX.PST + PST</td>
<td>Counterfactual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX.PST + NONT (DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Past continuous/habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX.PST + NONT/AP (STATIVE)</td>
<td>Past/habitual past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX.PST +AP (NON-MOTION DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Past perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX.PST +AP (MOTION DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Past continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT-AUX.NONT + PST</td>
<td>Future perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT-AUX.NONT + NONT (DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Future continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT-AUX.NONT + NONT/AP (STATIVE)</td>
<td>Future/future perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT-AUX.NONT +AP (NON-MOTION DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Future perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT-AUX.NONT +AP (MOTION DYNAMIC)</td>
<td>Future continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (10): Functions of verbal forms + the auxiliary.

With regard to the other properties of standard verbs, the auxiliary is negated in the same way as standard verbs, as in (128, 129).

128. ma kān-iš yiktib
    NEG be.PST.3MSG-NEG write.NONT.3MSG

    ‘He was not writing.’ (LY-NQ)

129. ħābb ma ykūn-iš yuḍrub fi
    like.AP.MSG NEG be.NONT.3MSG hit.NONT.3MSG FI
    xū-h fi l-wəgt hādə
    brother-3MSG.PSS in DEF-time this

    ‘He would like to not be hitting his brother at this time.’ (LY-NQ)

While kān can occur in elliptic constructions where it substitutes the whole verb phrase, ykūn cannot do that.
130. A: huwwə kān yiktib
3MSG.SUB be.PST.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG
‘He was writing/used to write’

B: ḥəttə hiyyə kānit
even 3FSG.SUB be.PST.3FSG
‘She was as well.’ (LY-NQ)

131. A: huwwə ḥə-ykūn yiktib
3MSG.SUB FUT-be.NONT.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG
‘He will be writing’

B: *ḥəttə hiyyə ḥə-tkūn
even 3FSG.SUB be.NONT.3FSG
‘She will be as well.’ (LY-NQ)

The auxiliary verb in (132, 133) does not have scope over fi, i.e. it does not block the subordinate verb from licensing fi.

132. kān yiktib fi r-risālə
be.PST.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG fi DEF-letter
‘He was writing the letter.’ (LY-NQ)

133. ḥə-ykūn yiktib fi r-risālə
FUT-be.NONT.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG fi DEF-letter
‘He will be writing the letter.’ (LY-NQ)

In conclusion, yigdir and lāzim express dynamic, deontic and epistemic modality and share some properties with the auxiliary. However, they are quite different from it in that the auxiliary has the ability to form complex tenses with different forms of standard verbs and modals, and yigdir and lāzim do not. Thus, I refer to it as the only auxiliary in Libyan Arabic.
In the next section, I discuss the properties of another subset of non-standard verbs referred to as pseudo-verbs.

### 2.2.3. Pseudo-verbs

There is another class of elements that are common across Modern Arabic varieties that share verb-like features with the class of verbs. These are usually referred to in the literature as pseudo-verbs (Brustad 2000, Lucas 2010). Lucas (2010: 167) describes pseudo-verbs as a closed set of irregular verbs that are mainly derived from prepositional phrases and that are marked for person agreement. Some of the most frequently mentioned pseudo-verbs are: ʕind-/ʕand- ‘to have’ (134), lī- ‘to have’, maʕ- ‘to have (on one’s person)’, bədd- ‘to want’ (135), fi ‘there is/exist’ (136), fi ‘can/be.able’ and bī ‘there is’.

134. ʕind-i šudāʕ
     have-1SG.OBL headache
   ‘I have a headache.’ (LY-NQ)

135. bidd-i māy
     want-1SG.OBL water
   ‘I want water.’ (SYA-NQ)

136. fi ʕaṣḥār fi 0-əllājāọ
     exist juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There is juice in the fridge.’ (LY-NQ)

These elements show diverse properties and varying morpho-syntactic behaviour, which have received the attention of many authors, such as Comrie (1982, 1991, 2008), Haspelmath & Caruana (2000) and Lucas (2010). In this section, I establish the key properties of this set of elements by investigating their morphological and syntactic behaviour with a special focus on Libyan Arabic.
Table (11): Verbal paradigm of pseudo-verb ʕind- ‘have’ in Libyan Arabic.

Table (11) illustrates the combination of pseudo-verbs with agreement markers in the form of oblique pronouns. This is attributed to the fact that they are originally derived from prepositional phrases. Moreover, pseudo-verbs do not show tense distinctions the way standard and some non-standard verbs do.

Pseudo-verbs cannot take the tense/aspect prefixes bi-, hə- and ʕam (137, 138), which verbs take in some Modern Arabic varieties.

137. *bi/hə-ʕind-i  šudāʕ

FUT-have-1SG.OBL headache
‘I will have a headache.’ (LY-NQ)

138. *ʕam  ʕand-i  šudāʕ

ʕAM have-1SG.OBL headache
‘I am having a headache.’ (SYA-NQ)

They require the auxiliary kān/γkūn ‘be.PST/NONT’ in order to express past and future tense (139, 140). In the future tense, the future markers bi-/hə are attached to ɣkūn as in (140), instead of the pseudo-verb.
139. kān  fī  ʕāṣīr  fī  0-ʔällājō
be.PST.3MSG  exist  juice  in  DEF-fridge
‘There was juice in the fridge.’ (LY-NQ)

140. bi/ḥa-ykūn  fī  ʕāṣīr  fī  0-ʔällājō
FUT-be.NONT.3MSG  exist  juice  in  DEF-fridge
‘There will be juice in the fridge.’ (LY-NQ)

Pseudo-verbs are negated in the same way as standard verbs and the auxiliary, as in example (141). Prepositional phrases, from which pseudo-verbs developed, are negated like non-verbal predicates, as in (142).

141. ma  ʕind-ī-š  ṣudāš
NEG  have-1SG.OBL-NEG  headache
‘I do not have a headache.’ (LY-NQ)

142. l-ʕāṣīr  miš  fī  0-ʔällājō
DEF-juice  NEG  in  DEF-fridge
‘The juice is not in the fridge.’ (LY-NQ)

Pseudo-verbs do not have imperative forms. Instead, the closest way to ask someone to ‘have’ or ‘want’ something is to construct a sentence in which you tell the person that he should be in the state expressed by the pseudo-verb, as in examples (143) and (144), where the auxiliary or the modal lāzim are used.

143. kūn  ʕind-ik  mābdā?
be.IMP.2MSG  have-2MSG.OBL  principle
‘(You should) have principles!’ (LY-NQ)

144. lāzim  ykūn  ʕind-ik  flūs
must  be.NONT.3MSG  have-2SG.OBL  money
‘You should make/have money.’ (LY-NQ)
As mentioned above, pseudo-verbs have bound oblique pronouns. These oblique pronouns seem to function as the subject of the pseudo-verb\textsuperscript{21}, such as with $\textit{sind}$- and $\textit{bød}$- in (145a) and (146a).

145. A: l-walad bidd-ū lešbe
DEF-boy want-3MSG.OBL toy
‘The boy wants a toy.’

B: hiyye kamān bidd-hə
3FSG.SUB too want-3FSG.OBL
‘She wants it too’ (SYA-NQ)

146. A: l-wild $\textit{ṣind}$-ə $\textit{ṣudā}$
DEF-boy have-3MSG.OBL headache
‘The boy has a headache.’

B: hattə hiyyə $\textit{ṣind}$-ə
even 3FSG.SUB have-3FSG.OBL
‘She has it as well.’ (LY-NQ)

Another property of pseudo-verbs is that they can substitute the verbal phrase in an elliptic construction, as shown in (145b) and (146b).

\textit{Fi} ‘exist’, which is used in almost every Modern Arabic variety including Libyan Arabic, can optionally take an oblique pronoun, as in (147) and (148). However, even though it seems to behave like a preposition when it takes an oblique pronoun, it is till negated discontinuously like a pseudo-verb. In fact, \textit{fi} ‘exist’ is negated discontinuously like standard verbs, whether or not it takes an oblique pronoun, as in (147, 149).

\textsuperscript{21} This is investigated further in the next section (2.2.3).
There is no juice.’ (LY-NQ)

‘The bag has juice in it.’ (LY-NQ)

‘The bag has no juice in it.’ (LY-NQ)

The pseudo-verbs *bədd-* and *ṣind-* can take overt arguments that correspond to the oblique pronouns, in addition to them, as in (145, 146). *Fi-‘exist’* in (147) does not have a separate argument and cannot occur on its own without an overt argument that follows it. *Fi-‘exist’* that has an oblique pronoun can have an overt argument that corresponds to the oblique pronoun, as in (148).

*Fi- ‘can/be.able’, on the other hand, combines with another verb instead of an NP argument, as in (150). It can combine with a prepositional phrase as well, as in (151) and (152).

‘I am not able to go with you.’ (SYA, Brustad 2000: 156)

‘I can do/live without her.’ (SYA-NQ)

‘I can do it.’ (SYA-NQ)
This highlights the differences in morpho-syntactic behaviour among the different members of the set of elements referred to as pseudo-verbs.

In sum, pseudo-verbs behave like standard verbs in that they seem to take overt arguments and that they are negated in the same way. They differ from them in that they are invariable, cannot take aspect/tense markers and need the presence of the auxiliary to express past and future tense. Pseudo-verbs differ from prepositional phrases in terms of negation. There are divisions within the category of pseudo-verbs manifested in their argument structure, which is another feature that distinguishes them from prepositional phrases. This is investigated further in the next section.

2.2.3.1. The argument structure of pseudo-verbs

Now that I have established the main properties of the category of pseudo-verbs, I move on to discuss the functions of the elements that precede and immediately follow pseudo-verbs that might be considered arguments. As mentioned above, pseudo-verbs take oblique pronouns in subject-like roles that can have their referents in separate NPs, and they combine with NPs (or VPs and PPs in the case of fi- ‘can/be.able’). While I referred to both elements earlier as arguments, the question that arises here is whether or not these elements are indeed the subjects and objects of the pseudo-verbs.

With regard to the elements that immediately follow pseudo-verbs, I am going to investigate their status as objects. One property of the objects of standard verbs is that they can be fronted, as in example (153). When this happens, a resumptive pronoun that agrees with the object is attached to the verb to indicate the changed position of the object. In this case, it is -əh, the third person masculine singular object pronoun.

153.  l-bēt ane šuft-əh
    DEF-house.MSG 1SG.SUB see.PST.1SG-3MSG.OBJ
    ‘The house, I saw it.’ (LY-NQ)
A similar pattern can be observed with the elements immediately following some pseudo-verbs, as in (154) and (155) with *bədd*- and *ʕind*- . Both these examples illustrate the fronting of *l-lešbe* and *s-sayyāra* , which results in making them the focus of the clauses, in order to determine whether or not they behave like objects.

154. *l-lešbe l-walad bidd-ū yā-hə*

   DEF-toy.FSG DEF-boy.MSG want-3MSG.OBL OBJM-3FSG.OBJ

   ‘It is the toy the boy wants.’ (SYA-NQ)

155. *s-sayyāra l-wild ʕind-əh min-hə*

   DEF-car.FSG DEF-boy.MSG have-3MSG.OBL from-3FSG.OBL

   ‘It is the car the boy has.’ (LY-NQ)

However, with pseudo-verbs, resumptive pronouns are attached to a preposition or a pronominal object marker *ya*- that follows the verb. This is also the case with the objects of ditransitive verbs in Syrian and Libyan Arabic as in (156, 157). As can be seen in examples (156, 157), *ʕata ‘give’* from both Libyan and Syrian Arabic requires two objects, which is quite similar to *bədd*- and *ʕind*- , in the sense that the pseudo-verbs take agreement markers -ū and -əh and object-like elements *l-lešbe* and *s-sayyāra* . Even though I am not suggesting that the agreement marker on the pseudo-verb is an object, it is still the case that the resumptive pronoun needs a preposition or a pronominal object marker to attach to when there is another element attached to the pseudo-verb. This attached element prohibits the pseudo-verbs from having a resumptive pronoun that corresponds to the element that follows it. In both cases, the resumptive pronoun is attached to *ya*- and *l*- . Therefore, this suggests that the elements following pseudo-verbs *bədd*- and *ʕind*- , at least, behave like objects.

156. *l-lešbe l-walad ʕaṭā-ni yā-hə*

   DEF-toy.FSG DEF-boy.MSG give.PST.3MSG-1SG.OBJ OBJM-3FSG.OBJ

   ‘It’s the toy the boy gave to me.’ (SYA-NQ)
The difference between the Syrian and Libyan examples is the treatment of the direct and indirect objects. While the direct object is attached to the pronominal object marker, and the indirect object is attached to the verb, the direct object is attached to the verb in the Libyan example and the indirect object is attached to the preposition.

The pseudo-verb *fi* ‘exist’ is different. As mentioned above, *fi* ‘exist’ does not have to take an agreement marker. When the following element is fronted, as in example (158), the changed position of the element is not marked by any pronouns that follow *fi* to signal the role of the element. When *fi* has an agreement marker, the pronoun still agrees with the element preceding *fi*, *š-šanṭa*, even when *ṣasīr* is fronted, as in (159).

158.  *ṣasīr*  *fi*
    juice  exist
    ‘There is juice.’ (LY-NQ)

159.  *ṣasīr*  (*š-šanṭa*)  *fi*-ha  (*š-šanṭa*)
    juice.MSG  DEF-bag.FSG  exist/in-3FSG.OBL  DEF-bag.FSG
    ‘Juice, there is in the bag/ The bag has juice in it.’ (LY-NQ)

The pattern in (158) could be attributed to the fact that *fi* ‘exist’ does not have another argument and therefore there is no need to distinguish elements in the sentence, as there is only one. This suggests that *fi* could be interpreted as an impersonal verb. Example (159), on the other hand, suggests that this *fi* still maintains some of its original properties as a preposition that takes an NP complement (*š-šanṭa*) and refers to it regardless of its position in the clause.

With regard to subjects, Arabic verbs agree in terms of person, number and gender with their subjects, which is a test Comrie (1991) cites for determining the subjects of pseudo-verbs in
Arabic. Examples (160, 161) illustrate the agreement of the oblique pronouns attached to the pseudo-verbs with the element preceding the pseudo-verbs, which represent the possessor/experiencer in (160) and the wisher/experiencer in (161).

160. l-bint ʕind-hə șudāʃ
   DEF-girl,FSG have-3FSG.OBL headache.MSG
   ‘The girl has a headache.’ (LY-NQ)

161. l-benet bidd-hə may
   DEF-girl,FSG want-3FSG.OBL water.MSG
   ‘The girl wants water.’ (SYA-NQ)

Furthermore, according to Keenan (1987: 99, 100), subjects generally control reflexive pronouns and co-referential deletions. The wisher/experiencer of ḥadd- controls the reflexive pronoun nafsū ‘himself’ in (162), and the possessor/experiencer of ʕind- controls it too in (163).

162. l-walad bidd-ū l-leʃbe la-nafsū
   DEF-boy want-3MSG.OBL DEF-toy for-himself
   ‘The boy wants the toy for himself.’ (SYA-NQ)

163. l-wild ʕind-əh s-sɔyɔrə li-rūhəh
   DEF-boy have-3MSG.OBL DEF-car for-himself
   bəs l-yōm
   only DEF-day
   ‘The boy has the car all for himself only for today.’ (LY-NQ)

The wisher/experiencer and possessor/experiencer of pseudo-verbs ḥadd- and ʕind- can be co-referential in coordination contexts. However, this test is not the best diagnostic for subjecthood in Arabic since it is a pro-drop language and therefore subjects can be omitted anyway even if they are not co-referential.
Another diagnostic that could be used here is the ability of the wisher/experiencer and possessor/experiencer of pseudo-verbs $bədd$- and $ṣind$- to be controlled by a control verb like $ʔəqnə$ ‘persuade’. In example (164), the fact that the object pronoun $-ni$, which corresponds to the possessor/experiencer of $ṣind$-, is controlled by $ʔəqnə$ ‘persuade’, to which it is attached, as its object, is further evidence that it is the subject of $ṣind$-. In similar contexts, the subject of the embedded verb corresponds to the object of the control verb, which is evidence that the possessor/experiencer of $ṣind$- is indeed its subject.

164. $ʔumm$-i $ʔəqnə$it-ni $ykūn$
   mother-1SG.PSS persuade.PST.3FSG-1SG.OBJ be.NONT.3MSG
   $ṣind$-i $nəḍrə$ $muhāyda$
   have-1SG.OBL look.FSG neutral
   ‘My mother persuaded me to have a neutral perspective.’ (LY-NQ)

Haspelmath & Caruana (2000) propose another test for subjecthood, which is raising to object. The verb of an embedded clause sometimes has the ability to raise its subject to be the object of the matrix clause, such as the English verb want in (165).

165. John wants Mary to leave.

In fact, Haspelmath & Caruana use this test to show that oblique pronouns of pseudo-verbs in Maltese lack some subject properties, as they cannot do that, as in (166a), as opposed to a standard verb in (166b).

166. a. *$Irrid$-ek ikollok il-ktieb
   want.IMPERF.1SG-2SG have.SBJV.2SG DEF-book
   ‘I want you to have the book’

   b. $Irrid$-ek thobb l-ghalliem il-gdid
   want.IMPERF.1SG-2SG love.IMPERF.2SG DEF-teacher DEF-new
   'I want you to love the new teacher.’ (Maltese, Haspelmath & Caruana 2000: 250)
The verb *yibbi* ‘want’ in Libyan Arabic also shows this raising effect in which the subject of its complement is raised to be its object, as in (167).

167. ʔumm-i  
     tibbī-ni  
     nimšī  
     mother-1SG.PSS  
     want.NONT.3FSG-1SG.OBJ  
     walk.NONT.1SG  
     li-s-sūg  
     to-DEF-market  
     ‘My mother wants me to go to the market.’ (LY-NQ)

When we apply this test to the pseudo-verb *ʕind*- in Libyan Arabic, we find that it is possible that it is the construction that Haspelmath & Caruana use that prevents the pseudo-verb from illustrating this property. In Libyan Arabic, inserting the auxiliary *ykūn* allows the possessor argument of the lower clause, i.e. the oblique pronoun, to be raised as the object of the matrix clause, which suggests that it is a subject.

168. ʔumm-i  
     tibbī-ni  
     ykūn  
     mother-1SG.PSS  
     want.NONT.3FSG-1SG.OBJ  
     be.NONT.3MSG  
     ʕind-i  
     nādrā  
     muḥāydā  
     have-1SG.OBL  
     look.FSSG  
     neutral  
     ‘My mother wants me to have a neutral perspective.’ (LY-NQ)

The aforementioned suggests that the agreement marker of the pseudo-verb *ʕind*-, represented in the oblique pronoun, is its subject, even though it appears as an oblique pronoun instead of a subject pronoun. This phenomenon is not unheard of cross-linguistically, and, in fact, referred to as non-canonical subject marking.

Moreover, when combined with the auxiliary, a more complicated picture is observed. When the auxiliary is inserted with pseudo-verbs, it does not necessarily agree with the oblique pronoun, as more than one option is available. The auxiliary can either agree with the oblique pronoun (and therefore the possessor, experiencer or the wisher), as in (169), or the object, as
in (170), or be in the default third person masculine singular form, which does not agree with either, as in (171).

169. l-wild kān ʕind-əh səyyārə
   DEF-boy be.PST.3MSG have-3MSG.OBL car.FSG
   ‘The boy had a car.’ (LY-NQ)

170. l-wild kānit ʕind-əh səyyārə
   DEF-boy be.PST.3FSG have-3MSG.OBL car.FSG
   ‘The boy had a car.’ (LY-NQ)

171. l-bint kān ʕind-hə səyyārə
   DEF-girl be.PST.3MSG have-3MSG.OBL car.FSG
   ‘The girl had a car.’ (LY-NQ)

In fact, this is observed in (164) and (168) too, where ykān is in the third person masculine singular form, and can optionally be in the third person feminine singular or first person singular forms in (172) and (173), corresponding to nədhə ‘look.FSG’ or -i ‘1SG.OBL’, respectively.

172. ʔumm-i tibbīʔəqnašit-ni
   mother-1SG.PSS want.NONT.3FSG/persuade.PST.3FSG-1SG.OBJ
   tkūn ʕind-i nədrə muhāydə
   be.NONT.3FSG have-1SG.OBL look.FSG neutral
   ‘My mother wants/persuaded me to have a neutral perspective.’ (LY-NQ)

173. ʔumm-i tibbīʔəqnašit-ni
   mother-1SG.PSS want.NONT.3FSG/persuade.PST.3FSG-1SG.OBJ
   nkūn ʕind-i nədrə muhāydə
   be.NONT.1SG have-1SG.OBL look.FSG neutral
   ‘My mother wants/persuaded me to have a neutral perspective.’ (LY-NQ)
While three options are possible in Libyan Arabic, Syrian Arabic allows this alternation with *bed-*, as in (174), but only allows the default form of the auxiliary with *ṭan-*(ṭind) ‘have’, as in (175) from (Cowell 1964).

174. kān/ken-na bedd-na
   be.PST.3MSG/be.PST-1PL require/want-1PL.OBL
   ‘We wanted.’ (SYA, Cowell 1964: 414)

175. *ken-na ṣan-na
   be.PST-1PL at/have-1PL.OBL
   ‘We had.’ (SYA, Cowell 1964: 414)

Based on this variation in the agreement of the auxiliary with the possessum, the possessor, or neither, with the pseudo-verb ṣind-, which is also found in the Tunis variety of Tunisian Arabic and the Meknés variety of Moroccan Arabic, Comrie (1991: 25) concludes that it is possible that the pseudo-verb treats neither as a subject. It follows from this that the default agreement of the auxiliary is a result of the conflict between two potential subjects competing for the subject function.

However, I maintain that the oblique pronoun of ṣind-, at least in Libyan Arabic, is a non-canonical subject based on the tests cited above. With regard to the behaviour of the auxiliary, it might be suggested that this is a result of the non-canonical marking of the subject.

2.2.4. Summary

This section explored non-standard verbs in Libyan Arabic, namely: modals, the auxiliary and pseudo-verbs. While modals express dynamic, deontic and epistemic modality, they cannot form complex tenses like the auxiliary. Pseudo-verbs are different from standard verbs, modals and auxiliaries in their morphological properties, but they are negated in the same way as other verbs and at least one pseudo-verb has a similar argument structure. However, the properties of the auxiliary, ḥāṣīm and pseudo-verbs justify their classification as
non-standard, while those of *yigdir* suggest it behaves more like a standard verb. A summary of the properties of standard and non-standard verbs is provided in Table (12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Standard verbs</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Modal: <em>yigdir</em></th>
<th>Modal: <em>lāzim</em></th>
<th>Pseudo-verbs$^{22}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four distinct forms</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject agreement markers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense/aspect markers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation with <em>ma -iš</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms analytic tense</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipsis</td>
<td>✓ ✗</td>
<td>✓ ✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope over <em>fi</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (12): Properties of different verb types in Libyan Arabic.

---

$^{22}$ Even though the agreement markers of pseudo-verbs are in oblique pronoun forms, they still agree with their subjects.
Chapter Three: Negation in Modern Arabic Varieties

Negation in Modern Arabic varieties is expressed in different ways according to many interrelated factors and this has received a substantial amount of attention in the literature. This thesis seeks to investigate the expression of negation in these varieties through a comparison of the reported negation patterns in the grammatical descriptions of these varieties with more recent data collected using questionnaires. This approach aims to report on the most up-to-date data and negation patterns in order to arrive at more reliable results and analyses. In this chapter, I explore the negation patterns and distinctions found within Modern Arabic varieties, as well as highlight some of the most cited accounts of negation patterns and functions in the literature on Modern Arabic. I do this in order to provide the data set against which the collected data from the questionnaires will be compared. I discuss the differences and similarities between the two data sets and highlight the emerging patterns from the new data set in Chapter Five and Six.

The first section, (3.1), explores negation in Libyan Arabic on the semantic level while the second section, (3.2), explores Libyan Arabic, and other Modern Arabic varieties, on the morpho-syntactic level. The two sections highlight the distinctions that are observed with regard to these two levels, and make use of the distinctions made and terminology used in Chapter One about the negation patterns reported in the typological literature. The third section, (3.3), discusses the morpho-syntactic properties of the negation markers used in Libyan Arabic, ma and -iš, in order to arrive at a satisfactory description of their status, which serves as a basis for their glossing and labelling.

3.1. Negation as a semantic notion

The basic intuition behind the concept of negation is that a certain proposition is not true. This basic intuition can be expressed in various ways, and manifested in a number of semantic concepts. The first chapter of this thesis gave a brief exploration of these concepts. This section investigates the scope and focus of negation and antonymic negation in Libyan Arabic.
It can be said that the truth conditions of the clause in example (1) are under the scope of negation, and these truth conditions are detailed in (2). The violation of any of these conditions means the falsity of the clause in (1a).

1. a. klēt et-tuffāḥə
   eat.PST.1SG DEF-apple
   ‘I ate the apple.’ (LY-NQ)

   b. ma klēt-iš et-tuffāḥə
      NEG eat.PST.1SG-NEG DEF-apple
      ‘I did not eat the apple.’ (LY-NQ)

2. a. An action of eating occurred.
   b. The action was carried out by the speaker.
   c. The action was carried out on the apple.

As mentioned in Chapter One (1.2.1), the concept of the scope of negation is problematic in the sense that it is sometimes difficult to specify which elements of the clause are under the scope of negation. The examples cited in Chapter One (1.2.1) illustrated the interaction between the negative marker *not* and modal auxiliaries *can* and *must*. In spite of the fact that the position of the negative marker was the same with both modal auxiliaries, negation had scope over *can* but not over *must*.

In the Libyan Arabic examples in (3) and (4), the position of the negative markers determines which elements are under the scope of negation and which are not. The elements that are surrounded by the negative markers in (3) and (4a), and the element that follows the negative marker in (4b), are the ones that are under the scope of negation.

3. a. ma yigdir-iš yimši mšā-hum
   NEG can.NONT.3MSG-NEG go.NONT.3MSG with-3PL.OBL
   ‘He cannot go with them.’ (LY-NQ)
Examples (3) and (4) show that the modal that is surrounded by the negative markers or the one that immediately follows the negative marker, depending on the modal, is under the scope of negation, and that the scope can be manipulated by changing the position of the negative marker.

With regard to the concept of focus of negation, Arabic varieties do not behave differently from English in terms of expressing this concept. For example, just like in English, the focus of negation in Libyan Arabic is expressed prosodically through stressing the element under the scope of negation, which marks the most important truth condition from the point of view of the speaker.

Example (5) shows the word *et-tuffāḥa* being stressed to show that it represents the most important truth condition, i.e. “the action was carried out on the apple”, which is the focus of negation.
Another related negation phenomenon that is found in Modern Arabic varieties is what is referred to in the literature as emphatic negation (Abulhaija 1989, Al-Momani 2011). Emphatic negation is characterised by the dropping of one of the negation markers in the varieties that make use of both a preverbal and a postverbal marker. I return to this subject in section (3.2.4.4) of this chapter.

With regard to antonymic negation, Libyan Arabic does not have affixes equivalent to un-, dis- and in- as in unhappy, dislike and insecure, which serve the purpose of expressing antonymic negation in English. Instead, it uses the negation marker miš to express this notion, as in (6). The fact that miš is also used to mean not makes the sentence in (6) ambiguous, as it can mean either he is not happy or he is unhappy.

6. miš səʕīd
   NEG happy
   ‘He is not happy/He is unhappy.’ (LY-NQ)

This ambiguity is clear when we define miš in terms of semantic entailment. Entailments follow directly from the truth conditions of the clause and, therefore, cannot be cancelled. In English, not and un- do not mean the same thing and that is why we cannot cancel the entailment from un- but we can it with not, as in (7) and (8) respectively. In (7) where un- is used, you cannot cancel the entailment that he is not happy, while in (8), when not is used, this can be done.

7. #He is unhappy, he is ecstatic!
8. He is not happy, he is ecstatic!

In Libyan Arabic, miš is used to express both these notions induced by not and un-. This results in the ability to cancel the entailment induced by the use of miš, as in (9).
While example (9) clearly illustrates the use of *miš* to mean *not*, it does not show how it can unambiguously be used to express the antonymic negation expressed by *un-*.

As discussed in Chapter One (1.2.1), *unhappy* and *not happy* do not have the same meaning, due to the gradability of concepts such as happiness. This gradability is clear when using morphologically marked antonymic negation as opposed to the negative marker *not* (De Soto & Trillas 1999, Penka 2015). In Libyan Arabic, while *miš* standing alone results in ambiguity, repeating *miš*, as in example (10), makes the distinction between the different meanings clearer.

10. ḥuwwə miš səšid w miš miš səšid
   3MSG.SUB NEG happy and NEG NEG happy
   ‘He is not happy and not unhappy.’ (LY-NQ)

The repetition of the negative marker in the Libyan Arabic sentence does not cancel the negation but while one *miš* is interpreted the same as the negative marker *not* in English, the other *miš* expresses the antonymic negation expressed by *un-*. This highlights the diverse nature and functions of *miš*, which will be revisited in Chapter Seven (7.3).

3.2. Negation as a morpho-syntactic notion

Negation in Modern Arabic is largely expressed morpho-syntactically using a number of negative elements. This section explores the distinctions that can be observed in Modern Arabic varieties on the morpho-syntactic level, such as standard vs. non-standard negation, sentential vs. non-sentential negation, preverbal vs. postverbal negation and symmetric vs. asymmetric negation. In addition, it explores a number of negative categories and the interaction of negation with its environment.
3.2.1. Standard vs. non-standard negation

Standard negation in Arabic varieties is expressed with the combined negation marker *ma-*(iš). In example (11) and (12), *ma-(iš)* is used to negate the verbal predicates *yhibb* ‘love’ and *šuft* ‘see’.

11. *hu ma yhibb-hə*  
   3MSG.SUB NEG love.NONT.3MSG-3SG.OBJ  
   ‘He does not love her.’ (KA, Brustad 2000: 280)

12. *ma šuft-hā-š*  
   NEG see.PST.1SG-3SG.OBJ-NEG  
   ‘I did not see her.’ (LY-NQ)

Non-standard negation is expressed by a number of inherently negative elements. Some of these are: *miš*, *mʕəš*23 and *lā* depending on the predicate type, as well as negative auxiliaries, and the negative quantifier *məhədd(iš)*. In example (13), *miš* is used to negate the adjectival predicate *ʔbyid*.

13. *miš ʔbyid*  
   NEG white  
   ‘It’s not white.’ (LY)

*Mʕəš* is an inherently negative element that is used in Libyan Arabic to express negation plus the notion of discontinuity, as in (14) and (15).

14. *Ahmid mʕəš šgəyyir*  
   Ahmid no.more young  
   ‘Ahmid is not young any more.’ (LY-NQ)

---

23 *mʕəš* is explored further in (7.2).
15. mʕəš  mʔēt  li-n-nādi
   no.more    walk.PST.1SG  to-DEF-club
   ‘I stopped going to the club.’ (LY-NQ)

Lā is used for negative commands in imperative clauses in Syrian, Sanʕani\textsuperscript{24}, Jordanian, and Palestinian Arabic.

16. lā  tatʔaxxar
   NEG  be.late.NONT.2MSG
   ‘Do not be late!’ (SYA, Cowell 1964: 389)

The element that is referred to in the literature as a negative pronoun (Eid 1991), or a negative copula (Brustad 2000, Cowell 1964), will be labelled the negative auxiliary. The negative auxiliary mahūš, illustrated in example (17), carries an additional pragmatic notion that cannot be expressed by miš in Libyan Arabic. I return to this in (7.1).

17. Ahmid  mahūš  Šārīf
   Ahmid  NEG.3MSG  know.AP.MSG
   ‘Ahmid does not know.’ (LY-NQ)

*Mahədd(iš)* is a negative quantifier that can serve as the subject of the clause.

18. məḥədd(iš)  Šāf  s-sayyāra
   No.one  see.PST.3MSG  DEF-car
   ‘No-one saw the car.’ (LY-NQ)

It is important to note here the difference between standard negation and sentential negation (for more details on the distinction see 1.2.2.1 and 1.2.2.2). The negative elements used to express standard negation and non-standard negation can be used to express either sentential negation or non-sentential negation. This will be illustrated in the next sub-section.

\textsuperscript{24} A variety of Yemeni Arabic.
3.2.2. Sentential vs. non-sentential negation

Some of the diagnostics that were used to identify sentential negation in English in Chapter One (1.2.2.1) can be reapplied to Libyan Arabic. For example, *wala* ‘neither’ can only be used after clauses that contain sentential negation as in (19), and not those that have non-sentential negation, as in (20).

19. A: Ahmid ma šāf-iš s-sāyyārə
   Ahmid NEG see.PST.3MSG-NEG DEF-car
   ‘Ahmid did not see the car.’

   B: wala Məḥəmmid
      neither Mohammad
      ‘Neither did Mohammad.’ (LY-NQ)

20. A: Ahmid yibbi ma ykūn-iš
   Ahmid want.NONT.3MSG NEG be.NONT.3MSG-NEG
   l-axīr fī es-sībāq
   DEF-last in DEF-race
   ‘Ahmid wants not to be the last in the race.’

   B: *wala Məḥəmmid
      neither Mohammad
      ‘Neither does Mohammad.’ (LY-NQ)

In example (20), it is the standard negation marker *ma -iš* that is used to express non-sentential negation. In example (21), the non-standard negative marker *mʃəš* is used to express sentential negation.
21. A: Ahmid mʕəš ʂgəyyir
    Ahmid no.more young
    ‘Ahmid is not young any more.’

B: wala Ṭāriq
    neither Tariq
    ‘Neither is Tariq.’ (LY-NQ)

Non-sentential negation can be expressed using negative marker miš, or the negative auxiliary. In example (22), the non-standard negative markers miš and manīš are used to express it.

22. kunt miš/manīš ʕārif
    be.PST.1SG NEG/NEG.1SG know.AM.1SG
    ‘I did [not know].’ (LY-NQ)

However, there have not been any reports, as far as I am aware, of any Arabic variety that makes a distinction between negation markers used in sentential vs. non-sentential negation.

3.2.3. Negative categories

This section highlights the main negative elements used to express negation in Modern Arabic varieties and these are negative particles and clitics, negative auxiliaries and the negative quantifier.

3.2.3.1. Negative particles and elements

Arabic varieties make use of negation particles and elements ma (-iš), mū, miš, and mʕəš, some of which are invariant and are not inflected for person, number or gender. There have been claims in the literature that eastern and western varieties of colloquial Arabic are differentiated by the negation markers they use (Brustad 2000). These claims propose that there is an isogloss separating the western and the eastern varieties and that is the use of -iš as
a negative marker. This is based on the observation that western varieties like Egyptian and Moroccan Arabic use the combined marker *ma -iš* in negation, as in example (23-25) from Egyptian Arabic.\(^{25}\)

23. ma šuft-iš il-mödēl da ?abl kida  
   NEG see.PST.1SG-NEG DEF-style that before thus  
   ‘I did not see that style before.’ (EA, Brustad 2000: 279)

24. ma yiḍrab-ū-š  
   NEG hit.NONT.3MSG-3MSG-NEG  
   ‘He does not hit him.’ (EA, Willmore 1905: 131-132)

25. ma ẓarabū-š  
   NEG hit.PST.3MSG-NEG  
   ‘He did not hit him.’ (EA, Willmore 1905: 131-132)

Eastern varieties like Syrian Arabic and varieties from the Gulf do not use *-iš* but only *ma* as in (11) and (26-34), which include Qatari, Kuwaiti, Saudi and Iraqi Arabic.

26. ma kisart l-jām  
   NEG break.PST.1SG DEF-window-pane  
   ‘I did not break the window-pane.’ (Gulf Arabic, Holes 1990: 71-73)

27. ma tišrab halīb  
   NEG drink.NONT.2MSG milk  
   ‘You do not drink milk.’ (Gulf Arabic, Holes 1990: 71-73)

28. mā kaleto šei  
   NEG eat.PST.2PL thing  
   ‘You did not eat anything.’ (QA, Al-Buainain 2002:14-15)

---

\(^{25}\) This is similar to French where *ne... pas* are used in sententioanl negation, as in *Il peut pas venir ce soir* (Van der Auwera 2010: 79)
29. salet-eh mā eyrf
   ask.PST.1SG-3MSG.OBJ NEG know.NONT.3MSG
   ‘I asked him, he does not know.’ (QA, Al-Buainain 2002:14-15)

30. ?ana m-adhar
   1MSG.SUB NEG-come.out
   ‘I shall not come out.’ (QA, Johnstone 1967: 166-167)

31. ma rāḥ
   NEG go.PST.3MSG
   ‘He did not go.’ (KA, Johnstone 1967: 147-148)

32. ma jā-na muṭar
   NEG come.PST.3MSG-1PL.OBJ rain
   ‘No rain came to us.’ (Najdi Arabic, Ingham 1994: 44)

33. ma agdar aji s-sāxa xamsa
   NEG can.NONT.1SG come.NONT.1SG DEF-hour five
   ‘I cannot come at five.’ (IA, Erwin 1963: 328-329)

34. ma rihna li-s-sūg l-yōm
   NEG go.PST.1PL to-DEF-market DEF-day
   ‘We did not go to the market today.’ (IA, Erwin 1963: 328-329)

However, the situation is not as simple as this, Brustad herself acknowledges this as she states that isoglosses are hard to locate. Furthermore, even in eastern varieties like Lebanese (35), Jordanian (Aoun et al. 2010: 106), and Palestinian Arabic (36) (Lucas 2013: 405), -iš is commonly used in isolation as a postverbal negator.

35. bi-thib-š šīgl l-bayt
   IND-like.NONT.3FSG-NEG work DEF-house
   ‘She does not like housework.’ (LE, Abu-Haidar 1979: 110)
36. (ma) bidd-1-š mašāri
   (NEG) want-1SG.OBL-NEG money
   ‘I do not want money.’ (PA, Lucas 2013: 415)

In addition, in Sudanese Arabic, only *ma* is used negation, and in Yemeni Arabic *ma*-iš is used, as in examples (37, 38) and (39-41) respectively.

37. inta ma b-tafham ʕarabi
   2MSG.SUB NEG IND-understand.NONT.2MSG Arabic
   ‘You do not understand Arabic.’ (SUA, Dickins 2007: 570-571)

38. mā maraqna sawa
   NEG go.out.PST.3PL together
   ‘We did not go out together.’ (SUA, Trimingham 1946: 61)

39. ŋamma š-šabāb ma yišrabū-š
   as DEF-young.men NEG drink.NONT.3PL-NEG

40. ma guilt-l-ak-š turgud
    NEG say.PST.1SG-to-2SG-NEG sleep.NONT.2MSG
    ‘I did not tell you to sleep.’ (YAS, Watson 1993: 261)

41. es-sayyārih ma kan-š la-ha brayk
    DEF-car NEG be.PST.3MSG to-3FSG.OBL brake
    ‘The car had no brake.’ (YAS, Watson 1993: 156)

Discontinuous negation, i.e. with both *ma* and -iš, is in fact the standard way of negation in the varieties of Tunisia (42, 43) Algeria (44, 45), Morocco (46, 47), Libya (48, 49), Egypt, much of Yemen, and the interior and south of Oman (Lucas 2013), and these are eastern and western varieties. This indicates that the use of negation markers in Modern Arabic varieties varies across the Arabic speaking world and that isogloss boundaries are hard to draw.
42. ma naʃraf-ši
   NEG know.NONT.1SG-NEG
   ‘I do not know.’ (TA, Foreign Service Institute (U.S.) 1961: 4-10)

43. ma šəft-ak-š
   NEG see.PST.1SG-2MSG.OBJ-NEG
   ‘I did not see you.’ (TA, Cohen 1975: 268)

44. ma qrit-š hāda l-ktāb
   NEG read.PST.1SG-NEG this DEF-book
   ‘I did not read this book.’ (AA, Souag 2005: 166-167)

45. ma yoaktəb-š mliḥ
   NEG write-NONT.3MSG-NEG good
   ‘He does not write well.’ (AA, Laraba 1981: 147)

46. ma jā-š
   NEG come.PST.3MSG-NEG
   ‘He did not come.’ (MA, Harrell 1962: 152-156)

47. ma ka-yakol-š
   NEG IND-eat.NONT.3MSG-NEG
   ‘He does not eat.’ (MA, Harrell 1962: 152-156)

48. ma šifnā-k-š
   NEG see.PST.1SG-2SG.OBJ-NEG
   ‘We did not see you.’ (LY, Owens 1984: 157)

49. ma ndīr-l-ak-š
   NEG do.NONT.1SG-for-2SG.OBL-NEG
   ‘I will not do it for you.’ (LY, Owens 1984: 157)
Many Modern Arabic varieties use the negation particle \( lā \) in imperative clauses. In Syrian Arabic, as in example (16) (Cowell 1964), and San\( ṭ \)ani Arabic, as in (50) (Qafisheh 1992), it is used to express negative commands.

50. \( lā \) \( tgūli \) ma bi-\( š \)
\[
\text{NEG say.NONT.2FSG NEG exist-NEG}
\]
‘Do not say there is not!’ (YAS, Qafisheh 1992: 274)

In Jordanian Arabic, \( lā \) is used in negative commands and these allow either \( lā \) or \( ma \) (Al-Momani 2011). Nonetheless, \(-iš\) can still be used either in combination with \( ma \) or \( lā \), or on its own, as in (51).

51. \( lā/ma \) \( tgušš-(iš) \)
\[
\text{NEG cheat.NONT.2MSG-NEG}
\]
‘Do not cheat.’ (JA, Al-Momani 2011: 489)

In Palestinian Arabic, \( ma \) becomes optional in imperatives with the second person prefix \( t-\), as in (52) (Lucas 2013).

52. (\( ma \)) txaf-iš
\[
\text{NEG fear.NONT.2MSG-NEG}
\]
‘Do not be afraid.’ (PA, Lucas 2013: 415)

Finally, Libyan Arabic makes use of the negative particle \( m\( ū \)š\), which I investigate in Chapter Seven (7.2).

3.2.3.2. **Negative auxiliaries**

Modern Arabic varieties make use of negative auxiliaries and these are marked for person, number and gender, just like verbs, as in (53).
Negative auxiliaries are found in many Arabic varieties across North Africa and the Middle East, for example, Cohen (1975) reports on the use of *mānīš* and *mākəš* in Tunisian Arabic. Harrell (1962) and Benmamoun (2000) cite their use in Moroccan and Egyptian Arabic, Souag in Algerian Arabic, as in (52), Brustad (2000) in Syrian and Lebanese Arabic, Al-Momani (2011) in Jordanian Arabic, and Owens (1984) in Libyan Arabic.

These auxiliaries are found in many varieties across the Arab world and even varieties that do not use *-iš*. Johnstone reports on the use of negative auxiliaries in Qatari and Kuwaiti Arabic, as in examples (55-58), Prochazka (1988) and Ingham (1994) in Saudi Arabic, as in (59), and Holes in Omani Arabic, as in (60, 61).

53. Ahmid mahūš ʕārif
   Ahmid NEG.3MSG know.AP.MSG
   ‘Ahmid does not know.’ (LY-NQ)

54. Hməd marahuš/mahuš mṛīḍ
   Ahmed NEG.3MSG sick
   ‘Ahmed is not sick.’ (AA, Souag 2005: 166)

55. mantab kufūh
   NEG.2MSG equal
   ‘You’re not up to it.’ (QA, Johnstone 1967: 166-167)

56. mahū/mahūb zēn
   NEG.3MSG good
   ‘It is not good.’ (KA, Johnstone 1967: 147-148)

57. mintə yāyy
   NEG.2MSG come.AP.MSG
   ‘You are not coming.’ (KA, Johnstone 1967: 147-148)
58. māni zēn l-yōm
   NEG.1SG good DEF-day
   ‘I am not good today.’ (KA, Johnstone 1967: 147-148)

59. Hasan ma-hub jāy
   Hasan NEG-3MSG come.AP.MSG
   ‘Hasan s not coming.’ (Najdi Arabic, Ingham 1994: 45)

60. Šādan māb zēna l-hīn
   Aden NEG.3FSG good DEF-now
   ‘Aden is no good now.’ (OA, Holes 2007: 220)

61. inta mintab rayyāl/raggāl
   2MSG.SUB NEG man
   ‘You are not a man.’ (OA, Holes 2007: 220)

I discuss the nature of these elements in Chapter Seven (7.1).

### 3.2.3.3. The negative quantifier

In Libyan Arabic, məhədd(iš), as in example (18), is a negative quantifier that evolved from
the combination of hədd ‘anyone’ and the negative markers ma and -iš. Hədd is an indefinite
that cannot stand on its own as the subject of the clause, as in (28), suggesting that
məhədd(iš) is not a synchronic combination of the indefinite and the negation markers.

62. *hədd šāf s-səyyārə
   anyone/one see.PST.3MSG DEF-car
   ‘Someone saw the car.’ (LY-NQ)

Moreover, the co-occurrence of məhədd(iš) with the negative marker ma -iš produces a
double negative that cancels the negation in example (29).
This confirms that Libyan Arabic has a negative quantifier *məhədd(iš)* and it is used in the variety to express sentential negation.

### 3.2.4. Interaction of negation with environment

#### 3.2.4.1. Predicate type

Some Arabic varieties use different negation markers on the basis of predicate type. This can be observed in clauses that have verbal predicates as opposed to clauses that have non-verbal ones. Libyan Arabic, for example, uses the combined marker *ma*-iš with verbal predicates (12), and the negative marker *miš* with non-verbal ones, illustrated in the adjectival predicate in (62), the prepositional phrase in (63) and the nominal predicate in (64).

64. ?ane miš mirtāh
   1.SG.SUB NEG comfortable
   ‘I am not comfortable.’ (LY-NQ)

65. ?ane miš fī l-hōš
   1.SG.SUB NEG in DEF-house
   ‘I am not home.’ (LY-NQ)

66. ?ane miš ṭālib
   1SG.SUB NEG student
   ‘I am not a student.’ (LY-NQ)

Eastern Libyan Arabic use masculine and feminine versions of this negation marker, as in (67, 68).
67. ʔana  meyš  kibīra
   1SG.SUB NEG.FSG  big.F
   ‘I am not old.’ (LY, Owens 1984: 159)

68. ʔana  moš  kibīr
   1SG.SUB NEG  big.M
   ‘I am not old.’ (LY, Owens 1984: 159)

North African Arabic varieties like Egyptian and Tunisian Arabic use muš to negate non-verbal predicates, as in (69, 70), while Algerian and Moroccan Arabic use māši, as in (71, 72).

69. muš  hina
   NEG  here
   ‘Not here.’ (EA, Willmore 1905: 131-132)

70. muš  mnīḥ
   NEG  good
   ‘It is not good.’ (TA, Cohen 1975: 268)

71. hāda  māši  mlīḥ
   this  NEG  good
   ‘This is not good.’ (AA, Souag 2005: 166-167)

72. māši  mezyān
   NEG  good
   ‘It is not good.’ (MA, Harrell 1962: 152-156)

Yemeni and Levantine Arabic varieties also use miš for non-verbal predicates, as in (73-76).

73. 1-jumlih  hādā  miš  šāhh
   DEF-sentence this  NEG  right
   ‘This is sentence is not right.’ (YAS, Watson 1993: 254)
74. Ahmad miš našīţ
    Ahmad NEG active
    ‘Ahmad is not active.’ (JA, Al-Momani 2011: 488)

75. muš mabṣūṭ
    NEG pleased
    ‘He is not pleased.’ (PA, Piamenta 1966: 61)

76. huwwe miš hōn
    3MSG.SUB NEG here
    ‘He is not here.’ (LE, Aoun et al. 2010: 97)

Furthermore, Arabic varieties spoken in the Arab gulf use a variety of negation markers for non-verbal predicates. These are mub/mob, mi and mū, as in examples (77-84).

77. huwa mub zēn
    3MSG.SUB NEG good
    ‘He is not good.’ (Gulf Arabic, Holes 1990: 71-73)

78. hāđi mi zōjti
    this NEG wife.1SG.PSS
    ‘This is not my wife.’ (Gulf Arabic, Holes 1990: 71-73)

79. mob Sara ali fāzet be-l-jāyzeh
    NEG Sara who win.PST.3SG with-DEF-prize
    ‘It was not Sara who won the prize.’ (QA, Al-Buainain 2002:14-15)

80. mū min-k
    NEG from-2SG.OBL
    ‘It is not from you.’ (QA, Johnstone 1967: 166-167)
81. mū/mub zēn
   NEG good
   ‘It is not good.’ (QA, Johnstone 1967: 166-167)

82. mū zēn
   NEG good
   ‘It is not good.’ (KA, Johnstone 1967: 147-148)

83. inta mu/mub rayyāl/raggāl
   2MSG.SUB NEG man
   ‘You are not a man.’ (OA, Holes 2007: 220)

84. hāḍa mū ṣuḡl-i
   this NEG work-1SG.PSS
   ‘That is not my affair.’ (IA, Erwin 1963: 328-329)

Sudanese Arabic, on the other hand, uses the same negation marker for both verbal and non-verbal predicates, which is ma, as seen in (37, 38) and (85).

85. inta ma kwēyis fi-l-bēt
   2MSG.SUB NEG good in-DEF-house
   ‘You are not good in the house.’ (SUA, Dickins 2007: 570-571)

The distinction between verbal and non-verbal predicates, however, is not clear-cut. Active participles, which I investigated in Chapter Two (2.1.4), are verbal forms that pattern with nominals and adjectives in that they are negated using the negative marker miš, as in (86).

86. ʔane miš Šārif
   1SG.SUB NEG know.AP.MSG
   ‘I do not know.’ (LY-NQ)

Brustad (2000: 289) claims that the way in which active participles are negated reflects their partial verbal nature. In cases where the active participle indicates states, they are negated
with *miš*, *māši*, or *mu*, depending on the variety, as in (84). However, in cases where they have more verb-like features, such as when they take objects, they may be negated with *ma* in some varieties, such as in Syrian and Kuwaiti Arabic, or *ma -š* in Moroccan and much of rural Egyptian Arabic.

Active participles are negated with *ma* in Sudanese Arabic, as in (87), and with *mub/mob* and *ma-hub* in Qatari and Saudi Arabic, as in (88, 89), just like non-verbal predicates.

87. mā wāqfīn
   NEG stand.AP.MPL
   ‘Not standing.’ (SUA, Trimingham 1946: 29)

88. mob rāyh š-šgel bukreḥ
   NEG go.AP.MSG DEF-work tomorrow
   ‘I am not going to work tomorrow.’ (QA, Al-Buainain 2002:14-15)

89. Hasan ma-hub/mub jāy
    Hasan NEG-3MSG/NEG come.AP.MSG
    ‘Hasan s not coming.’ (Najdi Arabic, Ingham 1994: 45)

In Moroccan Arabic, while verbal negation is expressed with the combined marker *ma -š*, as in (46, 47), and non-verbal negation is expressed with *māši*, as in (72), non-verbal predicate negation can also be expressed discontinuously (Brustad 2000), even though it is not the preferred pattern (Comrie 1991: 18). This is illustrated in example (90), in which the non-verbal predicate is negated with the combined marker *ma -š*.

90. ħtta fi l-māğrib ma mašrūf-š
    even in Morocco NEG known-NEG
    ‘He is even in Morocco unknown.’ (MA, Brustad 2000: 291)

A similar phenomenon has been attested in Libyan Arabic (Lafkioui 2013), as in example (38).
91. āna mo tālib-š
1SG.SUB NEG student-NEG
‘I am not a student.’ (LY, Lafkioui 2013: 58)

In addition, Moroccan Arabic offers an interesting development in its negation system, presented in the negation marker ma -bu26 (Lafkioui 2013). In the Moroccan Arabic variety of Oujda, there is a split in the variety’s negation system. While ma (-š) is also used in this variety, ma -bu occurs in contexts where there is a determined (most likely definite) object, as in example (39). Ma -bu has to be followed by an object, whereas ma (-š) does not, which means they are in complementary distribution. This is not to say that ma -bu cannot be substituted by ma (-š) in contexts where an object is present, but this is not preferred where the object is referentially fixed. Consequently, the use of the combined marker ma -š is associated with contexts where the object is undetermined.

92. ma liqāt bu l-hāl lī-hā
NEG find.PST.3FSG NEG DEF-solution for-3FSG.OBL
‘She did not find the solution for her (problem)/she did not find a way to deal with her.’ (MAO, Lafkioui 2013: 82)

In addition, in Sanṣani Arabic, Watson (1993: 258) claims that the combined marker is used to negate prepositional phrases, as in (42).

93. ma bī-š ġadā
NEG exist-NEG lunch
‘There is no lunch.’ (YAS, Watson 1993: 258)

However, it is important to note that while Watson refers to bī- in (93) as a preposition, it rather patterns with pseudo-verbs in its morpho-syntactic behaviour. Pseudo-verbs are discussed in Chapter Two (2.2.3) and the next section (3.2.4.1.1).

26 The second part of the negation marker most likely comes from Berber (Lafkioui 2013: 84).
3.2.4.1.1. Pseudo-verbs

Pseudo-verbs interact with negation in interesting ways in Modern Arabic varieties. The negation marker *ma* becomes optional in the negation of pseudo-verbs in several Arabic varieties. This is the case in both Jordanian and Palestinian Arabic, as in examples (94-98).

94. (ma) bād-hā-š xubiz
   (NEG) want-3FSG.OBL-NEG bread
   ‘She does not want bread.’ (JA, Al-Momani 2011: 484)

95. badd-i-š
    want-1SG.OBL-NEG
    ‘I do not want.’ (JA, Palva 1972: 42)

96. (ma) bidd-i-š maṣāri
    (NEG) want-1SG.OBL-NEG money
    ‘I do not want money.’ (PA, Lucas 2013: 415)

97. fi-š samak kol fahm
    exist-NEG fish eat.IMP.2MSG coal
    ‘If there is no fish, eat coal.’ (PA, Lucas 2010: 166)

98. bidd-ō-š yihki la-hadd abadan
    want-3MSG.OBL-NEG tell.NONT.3MSG to-one ever
    ‘He will not tell anybody at all.’ (PA, Piamenta 1966: 31)

In these examples, the use of the preverbal marker *ma* is optional and -š on its own can contribute negation to the clause. However, in Lebanese Arabic, *ma* -š is used to negate the pseudo-verb *fi* in (99).
Lucas (2013: 414) reports that the optionality of *ma* is the case with all pseudo-verbs in Palestinian Arabic with the exception of the pseudo-verb *ʕind* ‘to have’, as in example (100, 101).

100. ?ana ma ūend-ī-š banāt la-ja-jīze
1SG.SUB NEG have-1SG.OBL-NEG girl.PL for-DEF-marriage
‘I have no daughters to marry off.’ (PA, Piamenta 1966: 31)

101.*ʕind-ī-š maṣāri
have-1SG.OBL-NEG money
‘I do not have money.’ (PA, Lucas 2013: 415)

A possible explanation for this variation is that all pseudo-verbs in Palestinian Arabic, except *ʕind*-, begin with labial consonants, which have the same place of articulation as *ma* (Lucas 2013). This could have motivated the dropping of *ma* in the pseudo-verbs that start with labial consonants, but not with *ʕind*-, which starts with a pharyngeal fricative.

Pseudo-verbs are also found in other Arabic varieties and they are mostly negated with the same negation markers used for verbal predicates. For example, *ma* is used to negate pseudo-verbs in Sudanese, Gulf and Yemeni varieties, as in (102-110).

102.mā fī ʔawāya
NEG exist trouble
‘There is no problem.’ (SUA, Manfredi 2013: 27)

103.lā mā maʕā-y
NEG NEG have-1SG.OBL
‘No I do not have it.’ (SUA, Trimingham 1946: 53)
104. ma fīh dāšī
   NEG exist need
   ‘There is no need.’ (Gulf Arabic, Holes 1990: 71-73)

105. ma ġind-k flus
   NEG have-2MSG.OBL money
   ‘You do not have money’ (Gulf Arabic, Holes 1990: 71-73)

106. ma mašā-y šay fi-l-bēt
   NEG have-1SG.OBL thing in-DEF-house
   ‘I have nothing at home.’ (OA, Holes 2007: 220)

107. ma fī hīwánāt katīr
   NEG exist animal.PL many
   ‘There are not many animals.’ (OA, Holes 2007: 220)

108. ma ġind-ī flus
   NEG have-1SG.OBL money
   ‘I do not have money.’ (IA, Erwin 1963: 328-329)

109. ma-aku hāja txaabr-a
   NEG-exist need phone.NONT.2MSG-3MSG.OBJ
   ‘There is no need for you to phone him.’ (IA, Erwin 1963: 328-329)

110. ma mašī zalaṭ
   NEG have-1SG.OBL money
   ‘I have no money.’ (YAS, Watson 1993: 258)

Ma -iš is used to negate pseudo-verbs in Egyptian, Tunisian, Algerian, Moroccan and Libyan Arabic, as in (111-116). It is also worth noting that Sudanese Arabic uses ma fī-š, even though it does not have -iš, probably borrowed from neighbouring Egypt (Trimingham 1946).
The interaction of pseudo-verbs with negation in other varieties is revisited in the Chapters Five (5.3) and Six (6.1.5).

### 3.2.4.2. Clause type

Furthermore, Modern Arabic varieties demonstrate distinctions based on clause type. An example of this can be found in declarative and imperative clauses. While the negation markers remain the same, verbal forms used in declarative and imperative clauses in the
presence of negation are different. Declarative clauses use the same verbal forms in affirmative sentences and their negative counterparts. Imperatives, on the other hand, make distinctions between negative and affirmative sentences, which is a case of asymmetrical negation. Positive imperatives use the imperative form while negative imperatives use a surrogate form which is the second person form, as in (46).\textsuperscript{27}

\begin{verbatim}
117. ma tšūf-iq
    NEG see.2MSG-NEG
    ‘Do not look!’ (LY-NQ)
\end{verbatim}

Positive imperatives use a different form that is not used anywhere else, and is exclusive to positive imperative clauses, as in (47).

\begin{verbatim}
118. šūf
    see.IMP.2MSG
    ‘Look!’ (LY-NQ)
\end{verbatim}

Different negation markers can be used in different Modern Arabic varieties in negative imperatives. Varieties spoken in Sudan and the Arab gulf use \textit{ma} and \textit{lā}, as in examples (119-124).

\begin{verbatim}
119. lā tākul
    NEG eat.NONT.2MSG
    ‘Do not eat!’ (SUA, Tringham 1946: 58)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
120. ma tamšī henāk
    NEG go.NONT.2MSG there
    ‘Do not go there!’ (SUA, Manfredi 2013: 28)
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{27} For more on negative imperatives see (1.2.2.5.2).
121. lā tišrab halīb
   NEG drink.NONT.2MSG milk
   ‘Do not drink milk!’ (Gulf Arabic, Holes 1990: 71-73)

122. lā telṣbūn fi-š-šārʕ
   NEG play.NONT.2PL in-DEF-street
   ‘Do not play in the street!’ (QA, Al-Buainain 2002:14-15)

123. lā tašrābēen-iḥ
   NEG drink.NONT.2FSG-3MSG.OBJ
   ‘Do not drink it.’ (QA, Johnstone 1967: 166-167)

124. lā tišrabūn
   NEG drink.NONT.2PL
   ‘Do not drink.’ (KA, Johnstone 1967: 147-148)

Ma -iš is used in Egyptian, Tunisian and Moroccan Arabic, as in (125-127)

125. ma tiḥrab-ū-š
   NEG hit.NONT.2MSG-3MSG-NEG
   ‘Do not hit him.’ (EA, Willmore 1905: 131-132)

126. ma tiktbū-ši
   NEG write.NONT.2SG-NEG
   ‘Do not write.’ (TA, Foreign Service Institute (U.S.)1961: 4-10)

127. ma temši-š
   NEG go.NONT.2SG-NEG
   ‘Do not go!’ (MA, Harrell 1962: 152-156)

Harrell (1962) reports that the combination of lā and -š can be used in negative imperatives as well in Moroccan Arabic, as in (128).
Yemeni Arabic patterns with Gulf varieties in the use of *la*, as in (129, 130), and Lebanese Arabic is reported to use both *ma* and *la*, as in (131, 132).

128. lā temši-š  
NEG go.NONT.2SG-NEG  
‘Do not go!’ (MA, Harrell 1962: 152-156)

129. la txāff-iš  
NEG fear.NONT.2MSG-NEG  
‘Do not be afraid!’ (YAS, Watson 1993: 263)

130. infī lā tkūnī-š tithākay bi-hāda  
2FSG.SUB NEG be.NONT.2SFG-NEG talk.NONT.2FSG with-this  
l-kalām  
DEF-speech  
‘You should not talk in this way.’ (YAS, Watson 1993: 88)

131. ma taktob  
NEG write.NONT.2MSG  
‘Do not write!’ (LE, Aoun et al. 2010: 121)

132. la trūh  
NEG go.NONT.2MSG  
‘Do not go!’ (LE, El-Hajje 1954: 170)

Jordanian Arabic allows both markers as well and either can combine with optional –iš, as in (133).

133. lā/ma tgušš-(iš)  
NEG cheat.NONT.2MSG-NEG  
‘Do not cheat.’ (JA, Al-Momani 2011: 489)
Finally, as mentioned in (3.2.3.1), in Palestinian Arabic, ma is optional in imperatives with the second person prefix t-, as in (134).

134. (ma) txaf-š
    (NEG) fear.NONT.2MSG-NEG
    ‘Do not be afraid.’ (PA, Lucas 2013: 415)

Cairene Arabic does not allow the postverbal negator -š to occur on its own in declarative clauses, but allows that in conditional clauses, as in (135), and interrogative clauses, as in (136) (Woidich 2006).

135. law kunti-š šuft-ak…….
    if be.PST.1SG-NEG see.PST.1SG-2MSG.OBJ
    ‘If I had not seen you…’ (EAC, Woidich 2006: 336)

136. bēt abūya huwwa fēn walla akun-š
    house father.1SG.PSS 3MSG.SUB where or be.NONT.1SG-QU
    ġliṭt fi š-šāriʿ
    err.PST.1SG in the-street
    ‘Where’s my father’s house? Or have I got the wrong street?’ (EAC, Woidich 2006: 358)

However, in the latter case, it does not necessarily express a negative meaning but sometimes functions as a device for casting doubt (Lucas 2013: 417).

3.2.4.3. Verbal functional marking

It is claimed that the marking of negation in some Arabic varieties is determined by the aspect and tense of the verb. In Jordanian Arabic, Al-Momani (2011) states that ma -iš can be used with both the past and non-tensed forms of the verb, as in (137, 138) and (139)
respectively. He reports that with the past form, *ma* is always obligatory, while *-iš* is optional, as in (137, 138).

\[137\text{-}1\text{-} \text{walad} \quad \text{ma} \quad \text{nam-(iš)} \]
\[\text{DEF-boy} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{sleep.PST.3MSG-(NEG)} \]

‘The boy did not sleep.’ (JA, Al-Momani 2011: 484)

\[138\text{-}1\text{-} \text{taqs} \quad \text{ma} \quad \text{kān-(iš)} \quad \text{kwayis} \]
\[\text{DEF-weather} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{be.PST.3MSG-NEG} \quad \text{good} \]

‘The weather was not beautiful.’ (JA, Al-Momani 2011: 484)

With the non-tensed form, either *ma* or *-iš* can be used separately or together, as in (139).

\[139\text{-}1\text{-} \text{walad} \quad (\text{ma}) \quad \text{b-ynam-(iš)} \]
\[\text{DEF-boy} \quad (\text{NEG}) \quad \text{IND-sleep.NONT.3MSG-(NEG)} \]

‘The boy does not sleep.’ (JA, Al-Momani 2011: 484)

Al-Momani (2011) states that *yenām* is in the infinitive form when the indicative prefix *bi-* is absent. He claims that *ma -iš* cannot be used with the form that he refers to as the infinitive form to express future tense, as in (140), and that only the single *ma* can be used, as in (141).

\[140\text{-}1\text{-} \text{walad} \quad \text{ma} \quad \text{rah} \quad \text{yenam-iš} \]
\[\text{DEF-boy} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{FUT} \quad \text{sleep.NONT.3MSG-NEG} \]

‘The boy will not sleep.’ (JA, Al-Momani 2011: 484)

\[141\text{-}1\text{-} \text{walad} \quad \text{ma} \quad \text{rah} \quad \text{yenām} \]
\[\text{DEF-boy} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{FUT} \quad \text{sleep.NONT.3MSG} \]

‘The boy will not sleep.’ (JA, Al-Momani 2011: 484)

---

28 Al-Momani (2011) refers to these verbal forms as perfective and imperfective respectively.

29 Although Al-Momani refers to these verb forms as infinitives, there is no actual consensus about their status as non-finite forms in Jordanian Arabic. For a full discussion of finiteness in Jordanian Arabic see (Al-Aqarbeh 2011).
Similarly, in Palestinian Arabic, the postverbal negation marker -iš can be used either with 
ma or on its own with verbs that contain the indicative prefix b-, as in (142) (Lucas 2013).

142.(ma) b-aḥḥibbi-š il-fūl  
(NEG) IND-like.NONT.1SG-NEG DEF-beans  
‘I do not like beans.’ (PA, Lucas 2013: 414)

However, this cannot happen with past forms of standard verbs, as in (143).

143.*aḥḥalti-š il-fūl  
eat.PST.1SG-NEG DEF-beans  
‘I did not eat the beans.’ (PA, Lucas 2013: 415)

While the variation reported in the use of the negative markers ma and -iš seems to align with 
verb form distinctions, it is in fact partially phonologically motivated just like that with 
pseudo-verbs in Palestinian and Jordanian Arabic (Lucas 2013). In examples (139) and (142), 
the non-tensed forms co-occur with the indicative prefix b-, which starts with a labial 
consonant and, thus, has the same place of articulation as the negative marker ma. Just like 
with pseudo-verbs, this could have triggered the dropping of ma. This is confirmed by the 
optional dropping of ma in lexical verbs starting with labial consonants, as in (144), even 
though the lexical verb is in the past tense and therefore cannot be combined with the 
indicative prefix bi-.

144.(ma) ballaš-iš il-film  
NEG start.PST.3MSG-NEG DEF-film  
‘The film did not start.’ (PA-NQ)

This is not the case where the lexical verb starts with a non-labial consonant. This is shown in 
example (147) where ma cannot be dropped.
However, Lucas (2013) only reports on the dropping of *ma* with pseudo-verbs starting with labial consonants and non-tensed forms starting with the indicative prefix *b*- and not with past forms starting with labials, suggesting that this might be in need of further investigation.

When examining grammatical descriptions of Palestinian and Lebanese Arabic, it seems that the variation in the use of the single or discontinuous negation marker is similar to that reported in Jordanian Arabic. For example, when non-tensed forms have the indicative marker *b*-, they are more likely to have the single negation marker –*iš*, as in (146, 147).

However, this is not always the case, as seen in (146-159), where sometimes *ma* is used and sometimes *ma -iš* is used in both varieties. However, it seems that the discontinuous marker *ma -iš* occurs more frequently in Palestinian than in Lebanese Arabic in grammatical descriptions of both varieties.

---

145. ma ʕrift(-iš)  l-walad  lamma  Ꙁift-ū
   NEG  know.PST.1SG-NEG  DEF-boy  when  see.PST.1SG-3MSG-OBJ
   ‘I did not recognise the boy when I saw him.’ (PA-NQ)

146. illi  bi-ʕraf-š  bidd-o
   who  IND-know.NONT.3MSG-NEG  want-3MSG.OBL
   yentezer  t-tarjame
   wait.NONT.3MSG  DEF-translation
   ‘Whoever does not know [the language] must wait for the interpretation.’ (PA, Piamenta 1966: 21)

147. bi-thib-š  šiğl  l-bayt
   IND-like.NONT.3FSG-NEG  work  DEF-house
   ‘She does not like housework.’ (LE, Abu-Haidar 1979: 110)
148. mā b-inhibis illa iza xālaf
   NEG IND-be.imprisoned.NONT.3MSG except if break.PST.3MS
   l-qānūn
   DEF-law
   ‘He will not be imprisoned except if he breaks the law.’ (PA, Piamenta 1966: 26)

149. ma ġidri-l-hā-š
   NEG can.PST.3MSG-to-3SG.OBL-NEG
   ‘He could not control her.’ (PA, Piamenta 1966: 99)

150. ma ništārīḥ(-š)
   NEG sit.down.NONT.1SG-NEG
   ‘We will not sit down.’ (PA, Driver 1925: 96)

151.1-walad ma ʔara-(š) l-kāb
   DEF-boy NEG read.PST.3MSG-NEG DEF-book
   ‘The boy did not read the book.’ (LE, Aoun et al. 2010: 96)

152. ma be-šrab duxxān
   NEG IND-drink.NONT.1SG smoke
   ‘I do not smoke.’ (LE, d’Alverny 1970: 2)

153. ma ʃufnā-k
   NEG see.PST.1PL-2MSG.OBJ
   ‘We did not see you.’ (LE, d’Alverny 1970: 1)

154. ʔana ma b-hobb-īš l-mūsīqa l-ʕarabiyye
   1SG.SUB NEG IND-like.NONT.1SG-NEG DEF-music DEF-Arab
   ‘I do not like Arabic music.’ (LE, d’Alverny 1970: 19)

The more frequent occurrence of ma -iš in Palestinian Arabic, rather than Lebanese Arabic, seems to be the case with the auxiliary as well, as in examples (155-159). This
variation in the distribution of negation markers with different verb forms shall be investigated in (5.2), (6.1.1.) and (6.1.2) to determine if there is an underlying rule governing this distribution.

155. mā kunt iṭlēt nḏīf
   NEG be.PST.1SG stay.PST.1SG clean
   ‘I would not have stayed clean.’ (PA, Piamenta 1966: 7)

156. mā kunt-ēš saddaʔt-ak
   NEG be.PST.1SG-NEG believe.PST.1SG-2MSG
   ‘I would not have believed you.’ (PA, Piamenta 1966: 7)

157. ma kān fīh frūḍ
   NEG be.PST.3MSG exist homework.PL
   ‘There was no homework.’ (LE, d’Alverny 1970: 17)

158. ma kunna našref
   NEG be.PST.1PL know.NONT.1PL
   ‘We did not know.’ (LE, d’Alverny 1970: 17)

159. ma kunna nestašmel kūfr š-ṣuwak
   NEG be.PST.1PL use.NONT.1PL much DEF-fork.PL
   ‘We did not use forks much.’ (LE, d’Alverny 1970: 17)

The inability of having ma -iš in example (140) is revisited in Chapter Five (5.2).

3.2.4.4. **Emphatic negation**

One factor that has an impact on the choice of negative markers in Modern Arabic varieties is the speaker’s intention to emphasise negation. In certain contexts, the post-verbal negative marker -iš is dropped. These contexts are found across Arabic varieties and are referred to by
Arabic authors by different terms. These contexts are clauses that contain oaths (160), the words for *anyone* (161) and *anything* (162) (Lucas 2007).

160. wallāh ma ʕamalīt ḥāda
   by.GodNEG do.PST.1SG this
   ‘I swear (by God) I did not do this.’ (PA, Lucas 2007: 406)

161. ma ʃāf ḥādd
   NEG see.PST.3MSG anyone
   ‘He did not see anyone.’ (LY-NQ)

162. ma ʃāf ʃoy
   NEG see.PST.3MSG anything
   ‘He did not see anything.’ (LY-NQ)

The effect of emphasising the negation by using the oath particle *wallāhi* can also be seen in Egyptian and Eastern Libyan Arabic in the dropping of -iš, as in (157-158).

163. wallāhi ana ma ʔafraf
   by.God 1SG.SUB NEG know.NONT.1SG
   ‘I swear I do not know.’ (EA, Willmore 1905: 283)

164. wallāhi hu mo rāgud
   by.God 3MSG.SUB NEG asleep
   ‘I swear he is not asleep.’ (LY, Owens 1984: 162)

However, when someone is less sure and thus the negation is not emphatic, -š is not dropped in Eastern Libyan Arabic, as in (165).

165. wallāhi hu moš rāgud
   by.God 3MSG.SUB NEG asleep
   ‘I swear he is not asleep.’ (LY, Owens 1984: 162)
Emphatic negation contexts include clauses that contain `umr-`, as in (166-170), which, in fact, is a nominal suffixed by agreement markers and is equivalent to *ever.*\(^3^0\) Varieties that show this include Moroccan (166), Tunisian (167), Egyptian (168), Libyan (169) and Palestinian Arabic (170).

166.\(\text{ma } \text{ʕammar-hə}\) mšāt l-həmmām
   \(\text{NEG } \text{ever-3FSG go.PST.3FSG DEF-hammām}\)
   ‘She never went to the hammam!’ (MA, Lafkioui 2013: 64)

167.\(\text{ʕumr-u ma ja}\)
   \(\text{ever-3MSG NEG come.PST.3MSG}\)
   ‘He never came.’ (TA, Chaâbane 1996: 122)

168.\(\text{ʕumr-i ma šufts-u}\)
   \(\text{ever-1SG NEG see.PST.1SG-3MSG.OBJ}\)
   ‘I never saw him.’ (EA, Willmore 1905: 283)

169.\(\text{ʕamr-a ma ja}\)
   \(\text{ever-3MSG NEG come.PST.3MSG}\)
   ‘He never came at all.’ (LY, Owens 1984: 157-162)

170.\(\text{ʔana } \text{ʕumr-i ma rafaṭṭ inni } \text{ʔasāʕed}\)
   \(\text{1SG.SUB ever.1SG NEG refuse.PST.3MSG that help.NONT.1SG}\)
   \(\text{insān}\)
   human
   ‘I never refused to help any person.’ (PA, Piamenta 1966: 79)

\(^3^0\) Note that the negative marker *ma* can occur before or after `umr- 'ever’, as in (166) and (167) respectively.
However, Willmore (1905) and Owens (1984) cite the use of -š with šumr- in Egyptian and Eastern Libyan Arabic in (171, 172).

171. ma šumr-ī-š šuft-u
   NEG ever-1SG-NEG see.PST.1SG-3MSG.OBJ
   ‘I never saw him in my life.’ (EA, Willmore 1905: 283)

172. šamr-a ma idīr-īš hiki
   ever-3MSG NEG do.NONT.3MSG-NEG like.that
   ‘He never does that.’ (LY, Owens 1984: 160)

Coordinate structures, as in (173-179), are contexts that allow the dropping of -iš as well in many Modern Arabic varieties.

173. ma kla ma šrāb
   NEG eat.PST.3MSG NEG drink.PST.3MSG
   ‘He neither ate nor drank.’ (MAC, Adila 1996: 108)

174. ma kalliimt-u wala šuft-u
   NEG speak.PST.1SG-3MSG.OBJ neither see.PST.1SG-3MSG.OBJ
   ‘I did not speak to him nor see him.’ (EA, Willmore 1905: 283)

175. lā yārtāh u lā yxalli škūn
   NEG rest.NONT.3MSG and NEG let.NONT.3MSG who
   yārtāh
   rest.NONT.3MSG
   ‘He does not rest nor let anyone rest.’ (TA, Cohen 1975: 267)

176. ma ixāf ma ifjaš
   NEG fear.NONT.3MSG NEG be.alarmed.NONT.3MSG
   ‘He is never afraid or alarmed.’ (AA, Cohen 1912: 379)
177. ma tikallam ula ismiʕ
NEG speak.PST.3MSG neither hear.PST.3MSG.’
‘He never spoke nor heard.’ (LY, Owens 1984: 162)

178. ma hakā ula tanahhad
NEG speak.PST.3MSG neither moan.PST.3MSG
‘He neither spoke nor moaned.’ (PA, Driver 1925: 200)

179. la akalt wla šrebт
NEG eat.PST.1SG neither drink.PST.1SG
‘I neither ate nor drank’ (LE, Nakhla 1937: 248)

These contexts where -iš is dropped are referred to by different terms in the literature on Arabic. Brustad (2000: 306) classifies the cases where -iš is dropped as a separate class that she refers to as categorical or absolute negation, following Harrell (1962: 154). She describes this phenomenon, exemplified in (180), as the cases where the negated complement refers to a whole category not a single or a number of members of that category. She reports that this only applies to ma -iš, as miš and māši are morphologically fixed. However, notice that this is not the case in Eastern Libyan Arabic, as in (164).

180.mā šābат wālu gīr l-hyūт
NEG find.PST.3FSG anything but DEF-walls
‘She did not find anything but the walls.’ (MA, Brustad 2000: 308)

Abulhaija (1989) and Al-Momani (2011) report on the same phenomenon in Jordanian Arabic and refer to it as emphatic negation. However, while Abulhaija claims that it expresses the mood of the speaker, Al-Momani proposes that categorical negation differs from emphatic negation in that the latter expresses the mood of the speaker, while the former is less personal. Both types are expressed by dropping -iš in Jordanian Arabic, as in (181).
Emphatic negation that is reflective of the speaker’s mood is also found in Moroccan and Eastern Libyan Arabic, where -š is dropped, as in (179, 180).

What is interesting about this phenomenon in Modern Arabic varieties is that while different authors refer to it by different names it is essentially the same contexts or conditions that everybody cites. Whether it is referred to as negation of the whole category, or emphatic negation, the dropping of -š occurs in the presence of elements that express emphasis of the negation by using ʕumr- and oath words (163, 164, 166-170) or when the speaker intentionally emphasises the negation or refers to the whole category (160-162, 173-183). Therefore, I refer to this phenomenon, where -š is dropped, as emphatic negation in this thesis.

3.2.4.5. Negative indefinites

Other linguistic elements that are associated with negation are negative indefinites. Modern Arabic varieties have items such as ʔodd ‘anyone’ (184, 187, 189, 190), ʔay ‘anything’ (185, 187), wālu ‘anything’ (186) and ḥotta ʔaja ‘anything’ (188), examples being from Libyan, Moroccan, Tunisian and Algerian Arabic.
‘He did not see anyone.’ (LY-NQ)

‘He did not see anything.’ (LY-NQ)

‘She did not find anything but the walls.’ (MA, Brustad 2000: 308)

‘He did not see anyone.’ (TA, Cohen 1975: 268)

‘I do not have anything.’ (AA, Souag 2005: 166-167)

‘We did not see anyone.’ (MA, Harrell 1962: 152-156)

‘I did not see anyone.’ (LY, Owens 1984: 157-162)

Benmamoun (1996) refers to them as negative polarity items because he claims they require a negative element to be available in the clause and do not produce a double negative.
Lucas (2013) surveys a number of indefinites in both Standard and Modern Arabic varieties and divides them into three categories, namely rigid negative indefinites, which include negative quantifiers like *mahədd(ʾiš)*, n-words, for which he adopts Giannakidou’s (2006) definition (see 1.2.2.4.3), and items that do not contribute negation to the clause. Negative polarity items are included in the latter category and he divides them into weak and strong NPIs. Some negative polarity items can only occur in the presence of another negative element in the clause and these are referred to by Zwarts (1998) as strong NPIs. Others can occur without it and are referred to weak NPIs (see 1.2.2.5.4).

191. N-word

An expression α is an n-word iff:

(a) α can be used in structures containing sentential negation or another α-expression yielding a reading equivalent to one logical negation; and

(b) α can provide a negative fragment answer. (Giannakidou 2006: 328)

Indefinites like *ṭabadan* ‘ever’ and *baʕd/lissa* ‘still’ are categorised as n-words due to their distribution that allows them to occur in both negative and non-negative contexts and their ability to contribute logical negation to the clause (in fragment answers). This is illustrated in examples (192-194) from Palestinian and Egyptian Arabic.

192.a. hiyya lissa/baʕd-hə txîna
3FSG.SUB still/still.3FSG.OBL fat
‘She’s still fat’

192.b. ṭayyib bass ana lissa/(baʕd-ni) ma
ok but 1MSG.SUB still/(still-1SG) NEG
šuʕt-š il-ʕarūsa
see.PST.1SG-NEG DEF-bride
‘OK, but I have not seen the bride yet.’ (CA, (PA), Woidich 2006: 167: 349)
193. A: huwwa mayyit
3MSG.SUB dead
‘Is he dead?’

B: lissa/bašd-u
still/still-3MSG.OBL
‘Not yet.’ (CA, PA, Lucas 2013: 432)

194. a. inni sahbit-na tiskut ṭabadan
COMP friend-3PL.OBJ be.silent.NONT.3FSG ever
‘That our friend would keep quiet? Never!’

b. di masʔala miš sahla ṭabadan
this.F issue NEG easy ever
‘This is an issue which is not at all easy’

c. huwwa-nta maʃā-na ṭabadan
QU-2MSG.SUB with-1PL.OBL ever
‘Do you ever agree with us?! (CA, Woidich 2006: 162. 349)

Moroccan Arabic has indefinites wālu ‘anything’ and ʕammər- ‘ever’, which Lucas classifies into an n-word with a strong NPI distribution, and a weak NPI respectively. This is due to the distribution of wālu, as it occurs as a negative element in fragment answers, as in (195), and the fact that it occurs with negation, and the ability of ʕammər- to occur without negation.

195. A: mā-l-ək
what-to-2MSG
‘What’s the matter?’

B: wālu wālu
anything
‘Nothing, nothing.’ (MA, Durand 2004: 111)
Libyan Arabic has a number of negative indefinites and these can be divided into inherently negative items, n-words and negative polarity items. These are šə́y ‘anything’, ḥə́dd ‘anyone’, ṭə́badā́n ‘never’, šumr- ‘ever’ and bukkul ‘at all’.

Šə́y and ḥə́dd are used with standard negation as in the examples (184, 185). However, they are not inherently negative and cannot be used on their own in declarative clauses, as in (196, 197).

196. *šə́f ḥə́dd
   see.PST.3MSG anyone
   ‘He did not see anyone.’ (LY-NQ)

197. *šə́f šə́y
   see.PST.3MSG anything
   ‘He did not see anything.’ (LY-NQ)

They can be used on their own in interrogative clauses as in (198, 199).

198. šuft ḥə́dd
   see.PST.2MSG anyone
   ‘Did you see anyone?’ (LY-NQ)

199. šuft šə́y
   see. PST.2MSG anything
   ‘Did you see anything?’ (LY-NQ)

They can be used as negative replies in fragmented answers to interrogative clauses, as shown in (200, 201). This poses a problem to Benmamoun’s analysis as negative polarity items are associated with negation but cannot contribute it themselves. The same is true of ṭə́badā́n, as in (202).
200. A: min šuft
who see.PST.2MSG
‘Who did you see?’

B: hɔdd
anyone
‘Nobody!’ (LY-NQ)

201. A: šin šuft
what see.PST.2MSG
‘What did you see?’

B: šay
anything
‘Nothing!’ (LY-NQ)

202. A: šuft šay?
see.PST.2MSG anything
‘Did you see anything?’

B: ḥəbadən
never
‘Never!’ (LY-NQ)

This suggests that šay and hɔdd are n-words with a weak NPI distribution as they can contribute negation in fragmented answers and occur in non-assertive contexts. ḥəbadən is an inherently negative item as it contributes negation in fragmented answers, but is replaced by negative polarity items šumr- ‘ever’ and bukkul ‘at all’ in other contexts, as in examples (204a) and (205a) below.

šumr- ‘ever’ and bukkul ‘at all’ do not contribute negation to the clause. šumr- ‘ever’, as in (203), can occur with or without the presence of another negative element. This suggests that
like in Moroccan Arabic, it is a weak NPI too. This is illustrated in example (204b) and (204c) where it occurs in an interrogative and a conditional clause respectively.

203. A:  
\[\text{huwwā} \ ťāf-hə]\
3MSG.SUB see.PST.3MSG-3FSG.OBJ 
‘Did he see her?’ (LY-NQ)

B:  
\[\text{*ʕumr-əh}\
ever-3MSG 
‘Never!’ (LY-NQ)

204. a.  
\[\text{ma} \ ťumr-əh \ ťāf-hə]\
NEG ever-3MSG see.PST.3MSG-3FSG.OBJ 
‘He never saw her.’ (LY-NQ)

b.  
\[\text{šumr-əh} \ ťāf-hə]\
ever-3MSG see.PST.3MSG-3FSG.OBJ 
‘Did he ever see her?’ (LY-NQ)

c.  
\[\text{luw} \ ťumr-əh \ ťāf-hə]\
if ever-3MSG see.PST.3MSG-3FSG.OBJ be.PST.3MSG ťraf-hə 
know.PST.3MSG-3MSG.OBJ 
‘If he ever saw her, he would’ve recognised her.’ (LY-NQ)

\textit{Bukkul} ‘at all’ can occur with or without the presence of another negative element in the clause, as in (205a) and (205b), which suggests that it is a weak NPI. However, it cannot occur in interrogative and conditional clauses, as in (205c) and (205d), or stand alone as a fragmented answer, as in (206).
‘He did not like it at all.’

‘That’s really good!’ (LY-NQ)

‘Did he like it at all?’ (LY-NQ)

‘If he liked it at all, he would’ve bought it.’ (LY-NQ)

‘Did he like it?’

‘Not at all!’ (LY-NQ)

For the purposes of this thesis, I adopt Lucas’s classification of indefinites as it fits the properties of the indefinites cited here, and I return to this in Chapter Five (5.7.1).
3.2.4.6. Preverbal vs. postverbal negation

The main characteristic of emphatic negation is the dropping of the postverbal negative marker -iš, which is found in specific contexts that signal the speaker’s intention to emphasise the negation. Section (3.2.4.3) of this chapter contained sentences where it is the preverbal negative marker ma that is dropped, mainly in Palestinian and Jordanian Arabic.

While the dropping in preverbal negation is pragmatically governed, the dropping of ma in postverbal negation is subject to another condition. This is illustrated in example (207) where ma becomes optional in imperatives with the second person prefix t-. This is also the case with pseudo-verbs beginning with labial consonants (208-212) and non-tensed forms starting with the indicative prefix b- (213, 214). Finally, -iš can appear on its own in conditional clauses, as in (215), or as a device for casting doubt instead of functioning as a negative marker as in (216).

207. (ma) txaf-iš
    (NEG) fear.NONT.2MSG-NEG
    ‘Do not be afraid.’ (PA, Lucas 2013: 415)

208. (ma) bəd-hā-š xubiz
    (NEG) want-3FSG.OBL-NEG bread
    ‘She does not want bread.’ (JA, Al-Momani 2011: 484)

209. bədd-i-š
    want-1SG.OBL-NEG
    ‘I do not want.’ (JA, Palva 1972: 42)

210. (ma) bidd-t-š mašāri
    (NEG) want-1SG.OBL-NEG money
    ‘I do not want money.’ (PA, Lucas 2013: 415)
211. fi-š samak kol fahm exist-NEG fish eat.IMP.2MSG coal
   ‘If there is no fish, eat coal.’ (PA, Lucas 2010: 166)

212. bidd-ō-š yihki la-hadd abadan want-3MSG.OBL-NEG tell.NONT.3MSG to-one ever
   ‘He will not tell anybody at all.’ (PA, Piamenta 1966: 31)

213. l-walad (ma) b-ynam-(iš) DEF-boy (NEG) IND-sleep.NONT.3MSG-(NEG)
   ‘The boy does not sleep.’ (JA, Al-Momani 2011: 484)

214. (ma) b-ahibbi-š il-fūl (NEG) IND-like.NONT.1SG-NEG DEF-beans
   ‘I do not like beans.’ (PA, Lucas 2013: 414)

215. law kunti-š ūsuft-ak….. if be.PST.1SG-NEG see.PST.1SG-2MSG.OBJ
   ‘If I had not seen you…’ (EAC, Woidich 2006: 336)

216. bēt abūya huwwa fēn walla akun-š house father.1SG.PSS 3MSG.SUB where or be.NONT.1SG-QU
    ġliṭṭ fi ś-šāriš err.PST.1SG in the-street
   ‘Where’s my father’s house? Or have I got the wrong street?’ (EAC, Woidich 2006: 358)

If we omit the cases in which the clause type has an effect on the expression of negation, or where -iš is not really a negative marker, the other cases can be unified under one condition, a phonological one. It can be observed that in cases where ma is dropped, it is followed by a labial consonant b-. Therefore, it can be concluded that while the dropping of -iš is subject to pragmatic conditioning, the dropping of ma is phonologically-conditioned. The case where
ma is dropped and the verb starts with t- is found in Palestinian Arabic and maybe subject to other conditions.

3.2.4.7. Symmetric vs. asymmetric negation

Symmetric negation refers to the cases of negation where there are no differences between affirmative and negative clauses, aside from the existence of the negation marker itself. Asymmetric negation is where there are differences between affirmative and negative clauses in addition to the existence of the negation marker, while symmetric negation is where the addition of the negation marker is the only difference. Symmetric and asymmetric negation can be divided further into symmetric and asymmetric negation on the construction or the paradigm level (see 1.2.2.5.3).

With regard to this distinction, several elements in Modern Arabic varieties indicate that negation can be constructionally and paradigmatically asymmetric. This is illustrated in the difference between positive and negative imperatives, as it is not only the presence of the negative marker that is different between negative and positive clauses, but the verbal forms as well. As seen in examples (217) and (218), the verbal form used in the negative imperative is the second person form, while the one used in the positive imperative is a special form that is exclusively imperative.

217. ma tšūf-iš
    NEG see.2MSG-NEG
    ‘Do not look!’ (LY-NQ)

218. šūf
    see.IMP.2MSG
    ‘Look!’ (LY-NQ)

In addition, in some Arabic varieties negative non-verbal sentences and negative sentences that have active participles as their predicates make distinctions that affirmative sentences do not. As can be seen in the following examples, in negative clauses where the predicate is non-
verbal or an active participle, you can either use the negative elements *miš* (219) or *mahūš* (220), subject to pragmatic conditions.

219.1-bēt  
miš  ?əbyið
DEF-house  NEG  white
‘The house is not white.’ (LY-NQ)

220.1-bēt  
mahūš  ?əbyið
DEF-house  NEG.3MSG  white
‘The house is not white.’ (LY-NQ)

Note that the use of these negative markers is subject to pragmatic conditions, which will be explored in Chapter Seven (7.1). The use of *mahūš* is restricted to contexts where there is mutual assumed background information between the speaker and listener. In the affirmative in (221), however, the pragmatic distinction cannot be maintained without the presence of negation.

221.1-bēt  
?əbyið
DEF-house  white
‘The house is white.’ (LY-NQ)

Negative imperatives and the pragmatically-conditioned alternation between *miš* in (219) and *mahūš* in (220) confirms that negation in Arabic can be asymmetric on both the construction and paradigm levels.

I have explored the most common negation patterns found in Modern Arabic varieties and established the terminology I use to refer to them throughout this thesis. I now turn to the morpho-syntactic properties of the negation markers *ma* and *-iš*. I do this in order to offer a justification for my decision to gloss *ma* as a separate word and *-iš* attached to the predicate it negates, throughout this thesis.
3.3. **The morpho-syntactic status of negation markers in Modern Arabic varieties**

It is easy to mistake linguistic tests and diagnostics for sufficient definitions for particular linguistic elements. However, tests and diagnostics are generally intended to be characteristic symptoms rather than necessary conditions (Zwicky 1985: 285). In this section, I investigate the morpho-syntactic statuses of the negation markers *ma* and -*iš*, with a focus on Libyan Arabic, and check whether their properties are similar to affixes, clitics or independent words. I do this with reference to general diagnostics proposed in Zwicky & Pullum (1983) and Zwicky (1985) for distinguishing these three linguistic elements. The aim of this section is to explore the properties of *ma* and -*iš* and decide on their labelling and glossing but not necessarily to classify them under any of these terms if they show diverse properties.

### 3.3.1. Preverbal negation marker *ma*

#### 3.3.1.1. Phonological tests

Some of the most cited tests for distinguishing words from affixes and clitics are phonological tests. First of all, *ma* can only occur with other elements; it cannot occur in isolation (222), which is typical of bound elements (Zwicky 1985).

222. *ma

    NEG

    ‘not.’ (LY-NQ)

Second, another test is the ability to be stressed, as an element that can be stressed is generally considered an independent word. With regard to the negation marker *ma*, it can bear stress in Modern Arabic varieties, as in (223).

223. *mā ṣufts-hā

    NEG see.PST.1SG-3SG.OBJ

    ‘I did not see her.’ (LY-NQ)
As a matter of fact, when *ma* is stressed, -*iš* is dropped altogether. This is one way to express emphatic negation, referred to in section (3.2.4.4) of this chapter.

While this may suggest that *ma* is an independent word, at least when it is used emphatically, it could be argued that some languages stress clitics and others never stress some independent words (Zwicky 1985: 287), which renders this test unreliable on its own.

### 3.3.1.2. Selection

*Ma* has a wider selection of elements it can negate. For example, it can occur before NPIs and future grammatical markers, as in (224-226)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>224. Ahmid</th>
<th>ma</th>
<th>rah/hā-yāšūf</th>
<th>l-mudīr</th>
<th>l-isbūš</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmid</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>FUT-see.NONT.3MSG</td>
<td>DEF-manager</td>
<td>DEF-week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l-jāy</td>
<td>DEF-next</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (LY)

In fact, *ma* can precede or follow *ʕumr*-‘ever’, as in (225) and (226).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>225. ma</th>
<th>ʕumr-əh</th>
<th>šāf-hə</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>ever-3MSG</td>
<td>see.PST.3MSG-3FSG.OBJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘He never saw her.’ (LY-NQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>226. ʕumr-əh</th>
<th>ma</th>
<th>šāf-hə</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ever-3MSG</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>see.PST.3MSG-3FSG.OBJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘He never saw her.’ (LY-NQ)

This can be interpreted in favour of the case that *ma* is likely to be an independent word. However, the distribution of *ma* is not as wide as that of an independent word as it is generally used with verbs, and is fairly restricted when compared to independent words, which is a property typical of clitics.
With regard to the possibility of *ma* being an affix or a clitic, *ma* does not show a high degree of selection with respect to the elements it negates, as it can combine with verbs (223), future markers (224) and NPIs (225). Moreover, there are no arbitrary gaps or morpho-phonological idiosyncrasies that result from its combination with the following elements. Both these features have been proposed by Zwicky & Pullum as characteristics of affixes, which distinguish them from clitics, and *ma* does not show either.

3.3.1.3. **Syntactic deletions**

In syntactic deletions in coordinate structures with the conjunction *aw* ‘or’, both *ma* and -*iš* can be deleted, as can be seen in example (227).

```
227. ma šāf-iš  aw  smāš
    NEG  see.PST.MSG-NEG or  hear.PST.MSG

‘He neither saw nor heard.’ (LY-NQ)
```

It is also the case that both negative markers have to be deleted, as in (228).

```
228. *ma šāf-iš  aw  smāš-iš
    NEG  see.PST.MSG-NEG or  hear.PST.MSG-NEG

‘He neither saw nor heard.’ (LY-NQ)
```

Alternatively, if the negation markers combine with the second part of the coordinate structure, an entirely new meaning appears. The sentence would be interpreted to mean ‘he either did not see or did not hear’, as in (226).

```
229. ma šāf-iš  aw  ma  smāš-iš
    NEG  see.PST.MSG-NEG or  NEG  hear.PST.MSG-NEG

‘He either did not see or did not hear.’ (LY-NQ)
```

However, when the connecting element is *wa* ‘and’, *ma* cannot occur as a gap, as it needs to be either repeated or substituted by *la* as in examples (230) from Libyan Arabic.
The examples in (231-236) show that *ma cannot occur as a gap in coordinate structures. Instead, it has to be repeated, as in (231) and (232).

This is the case whether it occurs on its own (233) or with -iš (234-236).
In contexts where -iš is generally dropped, such as the introduction of šumr- ‘ever’ into coordinate structures, similar results are found. In (237-239), where šumr- is introduced, -iš has to be dropped and ma has to be repeated.

237. šumr-əh ma šāf w ma sməʕ-iš
ever-3MSG NEG see.PST.3MSG and NEG hear.PST.3MSG
‘He never saw nor heard.’ (LY-NQ)

238. *šumr-əh ma šāf-iš w ma sməʕ-
ever-3MSG NEG see.PST.3MSG-NEG and NEG hear.PST.3MSG
‘He never saw nor heard.’ (LY-NQ)

239. *šumr-əh ma šāf w sməʕ-
ever-3MSG NEG see.PST.3MSG and hear.PST.3MSG
‘He never saw nor heard.’ (LY-NQ)

While example (240) shows that ma cannot occur as a gap with wa, ma can occur as a gap in the presence of aw with šumr-‘ever’.

240. šumr-əh ma šāf aw sməʕ-
ever-3MSG NEG see.PST.3MSG or hear.PST.3MSG
‘He never saw nor heard.’ (LY-NQ)

To recap, while ma shows properties of being an independent word as it can bear stress and occur in syntactic deletions, it shows properties of being a clitic as well, as it does not have a high degree of selection or show morpho-phonological idiosyncrasies when combining with other elements, and cannot occur in isolation.
3.3.2. Postverbal negation marker -iš

3.3.2.1. Phonological tests

I now turn to the morpho-syntactic properties of the postverbal negation marker -iš. -iš cannot bear stress or occur without ma outside of specific contexts, discussed in section (3.2.4.6) of this chapter. This is illustrated in (241).

241. *šāf-iš
    
    see.PST.3MSG-NEG
    ‘He did not see.’ (LY-NQ)

3.3.2.2. Selection

The negation marker -iš occurs after other affixes and clitics attached to the word as in (242, 243). In both these examples, -iš occurs after the third person feminine object pronoun -hə, which is also a clitic (Atawneh 1992, Jelinek 2002, Albuhayri 2013).

242. ma šāf-hā-š
    NEG see.PST.3MSG-3FSG.OBJ-NEG
    ‘He did not see her.’ (LY-NQ)

243. ma šafū-hā-š
    NEG see.PST.3PL.SUB-3FSG.OBJ-NEG
    ‘They did not see her.’ (LY-NQ)

Zwicky (1985) states that an element that closes off word boundary to further affixation or cliticisation is generally a clitic. Zwicky & Pullum (1983: 504) suggest that one of the tests for differentiating affixes from clitics is that “clitics can attach to material already containing clitics, but affixes cannot”, which describes the behaviour of -iš in (242, 243).
However, when the object is the third person masculine singular pronoun, -ā(h), the negation marker -š can become -ši to signal the presence of the object pronoun when the pronoun has a similar form to another part of the verb and only -h is present. An example of this is when the verb is in the plural form\(^{31}\), as in (244-246).

244. a. ma šāfu-ši  
    NEG see.PST.3PL.SUB-NEG.3MSG.OBJ  
    ‘They did not see him.’ (LY-NQ)  

    b. šāfu-h  
    see.PST.3PL.SUB-3MSG.OBJ  
    ‘They saw him.’ (LY-NQ)  

245. a. ma šufū-ši  
    NEG see.PST.2PL.SUB-NEG.3MSG.OBJ  
    ‘You did not see him.’ (LY-NQ)  

    b. šufū-h  
    see.PST.2PL.SUB-3MSG.OBJ  
    ‘You saw him.’ (LY-NQ)  

246. a. ma šufn-ā-ši  
    NEG see.PST.1PL.SUB-NEG.3MSG.OBJ  
    ‘We did not see him.’ (LY-NQ)  

    b. šufnā-h  
    see.PST.1PL.SUB-3MSG.OBJ  
    ‘We saw him.’ (LY-NQ)  

\(^{31}\) This is also the case with verbs that end in –ā even if they are not in the plural form.
This change in the form of the negation marker is associated with the third person masculine singular object pronoun and can be realised optionally with other verb forms. Examples (247, 248) illustrate this with the third person masculine singular and the first and second person singular verb forms.

247. a. ma šaf-ā-š(i)
   NEG see.PST.3MSG-3MSG.OBJ-NEG.3MSG.OBJ
   ‘He did not see him.’ (LY-NQ)

   b. šāf-ə(h)
   see.PST.3MSG-3MSG.OBJ
   ‘He saw him.’ (LY-NQ)

248. a. ma šuṭf-ā-š(i)
   NEG see.PST.1SG/2SG-3MSG.OBJ-NEG.3MSG.OBJ
   ‘I/you did not see him.’ (LY-NQ)

   b. šuṭf-ə(h)
   see.PST.1SG/2SG-3MSG.OBJ
   ‘I/you saw him.’ (LY-NQ)

Notice that that the addition of the -i to the negation marker in examples (247a, 248a) is optional as the third person masculine singular object pronoun is already present -a. The addition of -i is only obligatory with the plural verb forms in (244a-246a), which are marked by the presence of -ū and -ā, the latter being part of the verb form and not the object pronoun. Moreover, note that -ə is dropped in the affirmative sentences in (244b, 245b) and only -h is present. -h is actually part of the original object marker from Standard Arabic but it is dropped in (244a, 245a), which makes the signalling of the third person masculine singular object impossible unless -i is added to the negation marker. In (246a), -ā is part of the verb form and thus it cannot be the object pronoun so -i is added to the negation marker.
Therefore, it could be argued that the extra -\( \text{\textit{i}} \) is part of the negation marker rather than a separate morpheme that represents the third person masculine singular object. Its presence is obligatory because of the difficulty in pronunciation when incorporating the third person masculine singular object pronoun -\( \text{\textit{a}}(h) \) after -\( \text{\textit{a}} \) of the second and third person plural verb forms. This suggests that the negative marker -\( \text{\textit{i\text{\textit{s}}}}(i) \) is the last element closing off the word boundary.

Having no arbitrary gaps in the elements they combine with and not triggering morpho-phonological idiosyncrasies in their hosts are both characteristic of clitics. The negation marker -\( \text{\textit{i\text{\textit{s}}}} \) follows verbs, which suggests that it is a verbal clitic. In addition, there are no arbitrary gaps in the verbs that it can follow as it can follow all verbs in Libyan Arabic. Furthermore, the combinations of the negation marker -\( \text{\textit{i\text{\textit{s}}}} \) with verbs do not trigger any morpho-phonological idiosyncrasies, i.e. the hosts are rarely affected by -\( \text{\textit{i\text{\textit{s}}}} \), except in (244a, 245a, 246a) above where the motivation is clearly to do with difficulty in pronunciation.

It is worth mentioning that the vowels -\( \text{\textit{i}} \) before and after -\( \text{\textit{s}} \) are optional when its host ends with other vowels. As can be seen in examples (242, 243), the vowel the host ends in is -\( \text{\textit{a}} \), and therefore, -\( \text{\textit{i}} \) is dropped. Alternatively, it could be proposed that -\( \text{\textit{i}} \) is an epenthetic vowel that is inserted to make the pronunciation easier, and therefore, it is not present when it is not needed. The same vowel is inserted between word boundaries in words that end in consonants and start with -\( \text{\textit{s}} \), \( \text{\textit{b\text{\textit{e}}\text{\textit{t}-i\text{\textit{s}}\text{\textit{e}}\text{\textit{b}}} ‘\text{\textit{s\text{\textit{e}}\text{\textit{b}}}’s house} ‘.\)

3.3.2.3. Syntactic deletions

Like \( \text{\textit{ma}} \), -\( \text{\textit{i\text{\textit{s}}}} \) cannot occur as a gap in syntactic deletions in coordinate structures where the verb is repeated when the conjunction word is \( \text{\textit{wa}} \) ‘and’, as it needs to be repeated too, as shown in example (249).

249. *\( \text{\textit{ma}} \) \( \text{\textit{š\text{\textit{āf}}}}\text{\textit{-i\text{\textit{s}}}} \) \( \text{\textit{w}} \) \( \text{\textit{ma}} \) \( \text{\textit{sm\text{\textit{āf}}} \) \( \text{\text{\textit{NEG}} \text{\textit{see.PST.3MSG-NEG}}} \) \( \text{\textit{and}} \) \( \text{\textit{NEG}} \) \( \text{\textit{hear.PST.3MSG}} \)

‘He neither saw nor heard.’ (LY-NQ)
Nevertheless, just like *ma*, it can be deleted in coordinate structures in the presence of *əw* ‘or’, as can be seen in example (227).

To conclude, while *ma* shows properties of both independent words and clitics, *-iš* behaves more like clitics. Based on this and for the purposes of this thesis, I gloss *ma* as a separate word and *-iš* as attached to the verb and will continue to do so in the rest of this thesis.\(^\text{32}\)

### 3.3.3. Alternative functions for single *ma*

The fact that both *ma* and *-iš* have to be dropped together as a gap in coordinate structures suggests that they form one unit. However, *ma* can occur on its own, mainly in emphatic negation, which suggests that this *ma* may be a different negation marker than the one occurring with *-iš*. The question that arises here is whether or not this *ma* is different from the one that has to be dropped with *-iš* and forms a unit with it, in the sense that it can be used for certain functions. In order to investigate this, this section looks at potential functions that *ma* on its own can be used for. Some of the possibilities that could be tested for the functions of single *ma* are metalinguistic negation and verum focus.

Horn (1989) defines metalinguistic negation as a marked use of the negation marker where it is used to object to a previous utterance on any grounds other than its truth value, and that is normally followed by a rectification that explains the objection, as in the following examples (250) and (251). The speaker uses the negation marker to cancel the presupposition that *he used to smoke* which results in a metalinguistic reading of the clause.\(^\text{33}\)

\[\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{250. } & \text{?ane} & \text{miš} & \text{wāqīfī} & \text{tādānī} & \text{?ane} & \text{ma} \\
& 1\text{SG.SUB} & \text{NEG} & \text{stop.PST.1SG} & \text{smoking} & 1\text{SG.SUB} & \text{NEG} \\
& \text{dāxxint-iš} & \text{fī} & \text{hyāt-tī} \\
& \text{smoke.PST.1SG-NEG} & \text{in} & \text{life-1SG.PSS} \\
\end{array}\]

\(^{32}\) Although I only investigate the morpho-syntactic properties of *ma-*iš* in Libyan Arabic, I use the same glossing arrangements for other varieties as well. While I am aware that the status of these markers might be different in other varieties, the investigation of these properties is beyond the scope of this thesis.

\(^{33}\) Metalinguistic negation is investigated further in (7.3).
‘I did not stop smoking, I never smoked in my life.’ (LY-NQ)

251. ʔane ma waggfi-iš tadxin ʔane
1SG.SUB NEG stop.PST.1SG-NEG smoking 1SG.SUB
ma daxxint-iš fī ḥyāt-I
NEG smoke.PST.1SG-NEG in life-1SG.PSS
‘I did not stop smoking, I never smoked in my life.’ (LY-NQ)

In this case it is either miš or the combined marker ma -iš that is used to express metalinguistic negation rather than ma on its own.

Mughazy (2003: 1151) claims that one of the diagnostics for identifying metalinguistic negation in Egyptian Arabic is that it cannot be used with emphatic negation, and hence, the negation marker cannot be stressed in metalinguistic negation. He elaborates on the matter by stating that metalinguistic negation is used to object to an utterance on any ground other than its truth conditional value, while emphatic negation is where the speaker is emphasising the truth conditional value of the utterance, and therefore, they are incompatible. This eliminates the possibility of single ma being especially used for metalinguistic negation.

With regard to verum focus, Gutzmann & Miró (2011: 1) state that verum focus, which realises the operator VERUM, is the non-contrastive focus on the verb or the complementiser. Höhle (1992: 114) states that this VERUM operator emphasises the truth of the proposition it takes scope over. In the following examples, the speaker in (120b, 121b) uses focal stress on the auxiliary has or the negated auxiliary did not to realise VERUM and, therefore, emphasises the proposition that Carl has finished his book in (252) or that Carl did not finish his book in (253).

       B: Carl HAS finished his book.

       B: Carl DID NOT finish his book. (Höhle 1992: 114)
Coming back to negation in Arabic varieties, a negative counterpart could be tested to see if \textit{ma} is a special operator for this function. As can be seen in example (254), \textit{ma -iš} is used in addition to \textit{la ‘no’} to realise VERUM. This rules out the possibility of using single \textit{ma} for verum focus.

\begin{align*}
254. \ A & : \quad \text{Ahmid} \quad \text{kəmmil} \quad \text{ktāb-əh} \\
& \quad \text{Ahmid finish.PST.3MSG book-3MSG.PSS} \\
& \quad \text{‘Ahmid finished his book’} \\
B & : \quad \text{lā} \quad \text{lā} \quad \text{ma} \quad \text{kəmmil-iš} \\
& \quad \text{No no NEG finish.PST.3MSG-NEG} \\
& \quad \text{‘No, he did not.’ (LY-NQ)}
\end{align*}

I conclude that the tests above do not support the notion that the negation marker \textit{ma} used in emphatic negation is a different negative marker than the one found in other contexts. However, as stated in section (3.2.4.6), the dropping of -\textit{iš} is subject to pragmatic conditions.

3.4. Summary

This chapter explored negation patterns in Libyan Arabic in particular and Modern Arabic varieties in general, on the semantic and morpho-syntactic levels. The most cited accounts of negation in the literature were visited in order to arrive at a comprehensive review of the patterns, and the terminology used to describe them, which is utilised in later chapters in the thesis. The morpho-syntactic statuses of the negative markers \textit{ma} and -\textit{iš} were discussed. I conclude that their morpho-syntactic behaviour justifies glossing \textit{ma} separately from the verb while glossing -\textit{iš} attached to it throughout this thesis.
Chapter Four: Methodology

The majority of the data used in this thesis was obtained through the use of two questionnaires, a broad questionnaire and a narrow one. The purpose of the questionnaires was to investigate the different ways in which Modern Arabic varieties employ negation strategies in different types of contexts and identify the main factors that affect the negation patterns. Data was collected through questionnaires and not from grammatical descriptions of Modern Arabic varieties in order to compare the more recent data collected from the questionnaire with the older data found in grammatical descriptions and reported on in Chapter Three. This approach ensures that the data used in this thesis is up-to-date and the results and analysis are more accurate and reliable.

The first section of this chapter discusses the advantages and disadvantages of using questionnaires to collect linguistic data and the motivations for using them to obtain data for this research. The second and third sections describe the two questionnaires in terms of their design and specific targets.

4.1. The use of questionnaires to collect linguistic data

The main advantages of using questionnaires are that they can be tailored to the particular needs of a specific research question, they are cost effective, and they can be used to obtain a wide variety of information from diverse groups of people in different situations (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010, Gillham 2000).

However, some drawbacks to using questionnaires include the tendency to make them as simple as possible so the participants would understand what is asked from them. This corresponds to the limited amount of time participants are willing to spend filling in a questionnaire (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010). Moreover, the researcher does not have the chance to correct the participants if they misunderstood any of the questions or if they are biased or tend to agree with things they are not sure about.
While I am aware of the disadvantages of using questionnaires, I have decided to use them because of their advantages. The fact that questionnaires save time and effort and can be used to obtain data from diverse groups of people is ideal for this research. Investigating several varieties at the same time requires data from a number of participants from different backgrounds, which can be achieved more straightforwardly when asking participants to fill in a questionnaire. In addition, recorded natural speech, which is generally cited as the ideal means of obtaining linguistic data, has many distractors from the investigated phenomenon, unlike questionnaires, which are targeted and precise. Therefore, I decided that using a questionnaire would be a more practical option in order to obtain the data required for this research.

To deal with the drawbacks of using questionnaires, I decided to use more than one format for the questions in both my questionnaires, which will be detailed in the next sections. This is to ensure that the participants do not feel the tasks they were presented with were too long and tedious and stop focusing on the questions they were being asked. The variation in question types and strategies also enabled me to further investigate the issues if radically different responses were obtained and ensure the responses were as controlled as possible.

The ten speakers recruited for the narrow questionnaire were offered a small financial reward to ensure their willingness to answer detailed questions. In case any of the responses were not clear, or I believed that the participant did not understand any of the tasks, the participant was contacted again to obtain more accurate responses. Samples from the broad and narrow questionnaires are attached in the appendices of this thesis.

4.2. The broad questionnaire

The aim of the broad questionnaire was to conduct a general survey of negation patterns in Modern Arabic varieties in order to choose three varieties that would be somewhat geographically representative for further investigation (for the broad questionnaire see appendix 1).
Participants were recruited from all over the Arab world; there were three participants from fifteen countries. Methods of recruitment varied from spreading word through friends and university connections to social media advertisement. Some questionnaires were sent to the participants electronically while others were delivered by hand, and contact was maintained with the participants for follow-up questions about their responses throughout the analysis stage of the research. The countries included Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Oman, Qatar, Kuwait, Jordan, Morocco, Yemen, Libya, Tunisia, Lebanon, Palestine, Egypt, Algeria and Sudan (see Map 1). Appendix (3) shows the cities from which each of the participants comes. Different versions of the questionnaire were given to the participants but all aimed at eliciting the same sentences. The results from this questionnaire are discussed in Chapter Five.

![Map of the targeted Arab countries](image)

**Map (1): Map of the targeted Arab countries.**

### 4.2.1. The design of the questionnaire

Firstly, Modern Arabic varieties are vernacular spoken every-day varieties that are rarely used in writing, except in informal texting and Internet and social media contexts. Standard

---

34 All maps in this thesis were created using QGIS software.
Arabic is used in official correspondence and academic education throughout the Arab world. Therefore, in order to avoid potential confusion about using a modern vernacular variety in written form, the aim of the questionnaire in targeting the spoken vernacular was specified at the beginning of the questionnaire. I made it clear at the beginning of the questionnaires that the participants should not use Standard Arabic in answering the questions but their own colloquial varieties. I picked sentences and vocabulary that were familiar with most Arabic varieties and which most Arabic speakers would find little difficulty understanding or naturally producing, as far as possible. However, because of the diverse lexical nature of Modern Arabic varieties, I included both Arabic sentences and their English equivalents. This was to ensure that participants understood the meanings of sentences in case they have difficulty understanding some Arabic words that were not part of their own variety. Nevertheless, participants commented that some of the sentences did not reflect their respective varieties and modifications were made after the first questionnaires were distributed in order to reflect this variation.

Secondly, with regard to obtaining controlled responses in relation to negation, several strategies were employed. The questionnaire was designed to cover a broad range of factors that may affect the way in which the example sentences were negated. This was based on previous literature (see Chapter Three), which suggested that these certain grammatical categories, distinctions and functions affect or interact with negation patterns. These were predicate type, tense, verb type, clause type and type of negation.

Thirdly, the questionnaires were designed in a way in which tasks were randomised in more than one way. In the questionnaires, the participants were given two types of tasks in three sections. In the first section they were given affirmative sentences and asked to give their negated equivalents. In the second section, participants were given a list of possible negated versions of sentences and asked to give their judgements. The participants were given questionnaires in which the investigated sentences were randomised and put in different order. This applied to both the tasks and the listed example sentences. This was put in place to make sure that the participants were not influenced by any ordering conventions or biased by the examples that occurred first.
With regard to the listed negated sentences, I decided to use a judgement system in which participants chose from three options: Acceptable (A), Unacceptable (U), or Odd but acceptable (O). The third option was to ensure that the participants would not exclude any sentence that they themselves may not use but other people who spoke the same variety may do. The participants were asked in all questions to provide their versions of the negated sentences in the event that they did not find any of the listed sentences acceptable or if they thought there was more than one way to negate the sentence and they were not mentioned.

The third section included different types of sentences from the ones included in the first two sections. I decided not to include affirmative sentences but only negated versions of the example sentences for these specific sentences. This is because it would have been difficult to extract the desired negated version in some complicated cases. These included conditional and interrogative clauses and sentences that had negative indefinites. For the sake of making the questionnaire as simple and easy as possible for the participants, lists of negated versions were given and participants were asked to give their judgements. In addition, the participants were asked to add their own versions if required.

4.3. The narrow questionnaire

A second questionnaire was designed to investigate specific negation patterns within the three varieties that were chosen on the basis of the broad questionnaire, namely, Libyan, Lebanese, and Sudanese Arabic. Thirty participants were recruited for this stage of the research, ten speakers from each variety, most of which lived in Manchester at the time while others were contacted electronically. The main purpose of the questionnaire was to further investigate the interaction between predicate type, tense, the negative auxiliary, and pseudo-verbs with negation in these three varieties, which showed variation in the results of the broad questionnaire. The narrow questionnaire was designed to cover the different negation patterns that the initial survey covered, in addition to a detailed investigation of intriguing patterns found within the latter and the pragmatic application of some negative constructions. Other patterns emerged within the data, which are discussed in Chapter Six (for the narrow questionnaire see appendix 2, and for a list of the cities each of participant comes from see appendix 3).
4.3.1. The design of the questionnaire

With regard to the format of the questionnaire, firstly, just like with the broad questionnaire, I made it clear at the beginning of the questionnaires that the participants should not use Standard Arabic in answering the different questions but their own colloquial varieties. Moreover, I picked sentences and vocabulary that were familiar with these three Arabic varieties so speakers would not have difficulty in understanding them or naturally producing negated versions of them. Unlike in the first questionnaire, I omitted English translations of the example sentences, which might have biased the participants or affected their choices. This was due to the more detailed nature of the questions asked in this questionnaire, especially the investigation of the difference in meaning between active participles and other verb forms, which could have potentially been affected by English translations.

Secondly, with regard to obtaining the most controlled responses in relation to negation, several strategies were employed. As can be seen in appendix 2, the first section asked the participants to imagine certain contexts and choose the most appropriate responses or produce their own. This task was targeted at eliciting sentences with the negative auxiliary and investigate what contexts it can be used in, as opposed to regular negation markers. In addition, the task investigated the use of the preverbal negation marker ma on its own in emphatic negation, and the difference between truth-conditional and metalinguistic negation. The use of background scenarios ensured that the participants could relate to the different contexts in which the varied elements and constructions were used.

In the second section, the participants were given affirmative sentences and asked to give their negated equivalents. In the third section, participants were given a list of possible negated versions of sentences and asked to give their judgements on them. With regard to the judgement questions, I used the same judgement system I used for the broad questionnaire where participants chose from three options: Acceptable (A), Unacceptable (U), or Odd but acceptable (O).
The second and third sections focused on different predicate types, different tenses and time references, clause types and sentence types these predicates were in, as well as type of negation. Predicate types included verbal, nominal, adjectival, and prepositional predicates. Verbal predicates included standard and pseudo-verbs, intransitive, transitive and ditransitive verbs, verbs in compound tenses, and active participles. The initial survey suggested some of these categories were especially sensitive to negation.

The fourth section was devoted to exploring the similarities and differences between active participles and other verbal forms. In this task, the participants were asked whether or not active participles and specific verbal forms had similar meaning, and if not, they were asked to identify these meanings and explain the different contexts in which they would be used.

Finally, just like with the broad questionnaire, the participants were asked in all questions to provide their versions of the negated sentences if they did not find any of the listed sentences acceptable or there was more than one way to negate the sentence. In addition, the investigated sentences were randomised and put in different order.
Chapter Five: Initial survey of negation in Modern Arabic Varieties

This chapter presents the results of the general survey of negation patterns in a number of Modern Arabic varieties. These varieties are spoken in Saudi Arabia (SA), Iraq (IA), Oman (OA), Qatar (QA), Kuwait (KA), Jordan (JA), Lebanon (LE), Palestine (PA), Yemen (YA), Morocco (MA), Algeria (AA), Libya (LY), Tunisia (TA), Egypt (EA), and Sudan (SUA). This chapter summarises these general patterns of negation, compares them to those reported in Chapter Three, and highlights the main factors and grammatical categories that interact with negation and affect its expression. This chapter identifies the three Modern Arabic varieties that are chosen for further investigation and analysis.

On a general note, the data obtained from the initial questionnaire showed, to some extent, a degree of consistency with regard to sentences produced by speakers of the same variety. With a few exceptions, mostly in Lebanese Arabic, speakers of the same variety produced similar sentences. The fact that the format of the questions given to them was different did not seem to affect the speakers’ choices. The differences in responses that were found could be attributed to personal preferences or the different varieties within each country the speakers come from.35

It is important to note here that the sentences used in this thesis are not phonologically representative of the corresponding Arabic varieties, but that they are only representative of the morpho-syntactic patterns. This is because written responses to questionnaire questions and tasks cannot capture the accurate phonological behaviour of speakers from different varieties, but only their morpho-syntactic choices. Some morpho-syntactic patterns are representative of more than one variety and, thus, these are grouped and referred to together in the glosses and a near-straight transliteration of the Arabic script (mostly with consonants only) are used for them as they are not intended to represent a specific variety. Saudi, Iraqi, Omani, Qatari and Kuwaiti Arabic are referred to as Gulf Arabic (GA). Egyptian, Libyan,

35 I am not suggesting that participants who come from the same country should have the same negation strategies or that they should speak the same variety as different countries will have their own different varieties. However, the purpose of this chapter is to provide a general survey of negation patterns in Modern Arabic varieties and classifying the varieties according to the countries they come from is a practical way for achieving this.
Tunisian, Algerian and Moroccan Arabic are referred to as North African Arabic (NA). Jordanian, Palestinian and Lebanese Arabic are referred to as Levantine Arabic (LVA). I refer to each variety on its own when there are differences in morpho-syntactic patterns. In addition, when participants show divergent negation strategies from other speakers in their respective varieties, I refer to them by numbers: 1,2,3, which represent the cities they come from.\footnote{The cities/towns of origins for each of the participants are listed in appendix (3).}

The next few sections review a number of morpho-syntactic categories that represent the main points of investigation in the broad questionnaire. These are: predicate type in (5.1), tense in (5.2), pseudo-verbs in (5.3), the use of the auxiliary in (5.4), clause type in (5.5), the use of the negative auxiliary in (5.6), and emphatic negation in (5.7). The last section, (5.8), discusses the motivations for further research.

### 5.1. Predicate type

One of the main factors that the questionnaire aimed to investigate was the role of predicate type in determining negation markers used in different contexts. The distinction between verbal and non-verbal predicates was observed in the sentences produced by the speakers of most varieties, as they used different markers according to the predicate type.

For example, speakers of Gulf Arabic, in addition to Sudanese speakers, used *ma* with verbal predicates, as in examples (1), which illustrates the use of *ma* with a standard verb. This confirms the data cited in (3.2.31) with regard to the use of *ma* with verbal predicates in these varieties.

1.  l-wld  ma  šāf  l-bnt  
   DEF-boy  NEG  see.PST.MSG  DEF-girl  
   ‘The boy did not see the girl.’ (GA, SUA, LVA, YA)
Speakers from Morocco, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Egypt (North African Arabic), used the combined marker *ma-*iš with verbal predicates, as in examples (2, 3), just as reported in (3.2.3.1). Speakers from Jordan, Lebanon, and Palestine (Levantine Arabic), in addition to Yemen, used the single marker *ma* with verbal predicates, as in (1), and the combined marker *ma-*iš, as in example (3). In example (2), *ma-*iš is used with a standard verb, while in example (3), it is used with the past form of the auxiliary.

2. l-wld ma šāf-š l-bnt  
   DEF-boy NEG see.PST.MSG-NEG DEF-girl  
   ‘The boy did not see the girl.’ (NA)

3. l-bt ma kān-š ʔbyḍ  
   DEF-house NEG be.PST.MSG-NEG white  
   ‘The house was not white.’ (NA, YA, LVA)

However, while speakers of North African Arabic used *ma-*iš consistently with verbal predicates, speakers of Levantine and Yemeni Arabic showed more variation in the use of the combined marker. They used the combined marker in some contexts, as in (3), but opted for the preverbal marker *ma* on its own, as in examples (1, 4, 5), in others. This variation is explored further in (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4).

4. l-walad ma ʕām yšūf l-bent kill  
   DEF-boy NEG ʕAM see.NONT.MSG DEF-girl every  
   yawm day  
   ‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (LE)

5. l-wld ma b-yšūf l-bnt kll ym  
   DEF-boy NEG IND-see.NONT.MSG DEF-girl every day  
   ‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (YA, LVA)
With regard to non-verbal predicates, just as reported in (3.2.4.1), speakers from Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Kuwait used the marker *mū* in negating them. In example (6), *mū* is used to negate an adjective, and in (7), it is used with an adverb.

6. l-bt mū ?byy드
   DEF-house NEG white
   ‘The house is not white.’ (SA, IA, KA)

7. hwwa mū hna
   3MSG.SUB NEG here
   ‘He is not here.’ (SA, IA, KA)

Speakers from Qatar and Oman used *mub* with the same non-verbal predicates, as in examples (8, 9):

8. l-bt mub ?byy드
   DEF-house NEG white
   ‘The house is not white.’ (OA, QA)

9. hwwa mub hna
   3MSG.SUB NEG here
   ‘He is not here.’ (OA, QA)

Sudanese speakers, on the other hand, used *ma* with non-verbal predicates, as in examples (10) and (11), as well as with the verbal predicate in (1), which makes it a variety that uses an invariable negation particle in all contexts, substantiating the generalisation cited in (3.2.4.1) that *ma* is used in all contexts.

10. l-bēt ma ʔbyaʔ đ
    DEF-house NEG white
    ‘The house is not white.’ (SUA)
11. huwwə ma hena
   3MSG.SUB NEG here
   ‘He is not here.’ (SUA)

Speakers from Saudi Arabia also used *ma* and *mub* as alternatives to *mū* with non-verbal predicates, as in examples (12-14). It is noted that *ma* can be used for the negation of both verbal and non-verbal predication in Saudi Arabic.

12. l-bēt ma ʔəbyað
   DEF-house NEG white
   ‘The house is not white.’ (SA)

13. huwwə ma hena
   3MSG.SUB NEG here
   ‘He is not here.’ (SA)

14. huwwə mub hena
   3MSG.SUB NEG here
   ‘He is not here.’ (SA)

Speakers from Libya, Tunisia, Jordan, Palestine and Yemen used *miš* when negating non-verbal predicates, as in examples (15, 16), confirming the patterns shown in (3.2.4.1)

15. l-bt miš ʔbyd
   DEF-house NEG white
   ‘The house is not white.’ (LY, TA, EA, LVA, YA)

16. hww miš hn/hōn
   3MSG.SUB NEG here
   ‘He is not here.’ (LY, TA, EA, LVA, YA)
Speakers from Egypt also used *muš* with the same predicates, as in (17, 18).

17. l-bēt ṭuš ʔbyaḍ
   DEF-house NEG white
   ‘The house is not white.’ (EA).

18. huwwə ṭuš hena
   3MSG.SUB NEG here
   ‘He is not here.’ (EA)

Speakers from Morocco and Algeria used *māši*, as in example (19, 20).

19. l-bt māši ʔbyaḍ
   DEF-house NEG white
   ‘The house is not white.’ (MA, AA)

20. huwwa māši hna
   3MSG.SUB NEG here
   ‘He is not here.’ (MA, AA)

Speakers from Lebanon used either *mū* or *miš* as in examples (21, 22).

21. l-bēt mū/miš ʔbyaḍ
   DEF-house NEG white
   ‘The house is not white.’ (LE)

22. huwwe mū/miš hōn
   3MSG.SUB NEG here
   ‘He is not here.’ (LE)

One speaker from Morocco used the combined marker *ma*-iš with the non-verbal predicate *hne/a* ‘here’, resulting in the form *ma-hnā-š* ‘not here’, as can be seen in example (23). This
confirms the use of the combined marker *ma -iš*, reported in Chapter Three (3.2.4.1.), with non-verbal predicates. However, the same form is attested in Libyan Arabic as a lexicalised form meaning ‘absent’, as in (24), rather than a productive construction.

23. huwwə ma-hnā-š
   3MSG.SUB NEG-here-NEG
   ‘He is not here.’ (MA2)

24. huwwə mahnāš
   3MSG.SUB absent
   ‘He is absent.’ (LY).

Even though it is not the case in Libyan Arabic, other examples from other Moroccan speakers suggest that it is indeed a productive construction. This is illustrated in other non-verbal predicates being negated with the combined marker *ma -iš* as in example (25).

25. l-bēt ma ʔəbyiḍ-š
   DEF-house NEG white-NEG
   ‘The house is not white.’ (MA)

Note that *ma -(iš)* is used in standard negation, while *miš/muš*, and *mū/mub* are all used in non-standard negation in Modern Arabic varieties.

The findings of this sub-section confirm the findings of (3.2.4.1) and table (13) summarises the main findings of this section. The table demonstrates the negation markers used by each investigated variety according to predicate type.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Verbal predicates</th>
<th>Non-verbal predicates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>ma -iš</td>
<td>māši/ma -iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algerian</td>
<td>ma -iš</td>
<td>māši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisian</td>
<td>ma -iš</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libyan</td>
<td>ma -iš</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>ma -iš</td>
<td>miš/muš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>ma -(iš)</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian</td>
<td>ma -(iš)</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>ma -(iš)</td>
<td>miš/mû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>mû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwaiti</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>mû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma/mû/mub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatari</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>mub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omani</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>mub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>ma -(iš)</td>
<td>miš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (13): The distribution of negation markers used in verbal vs. non-verbal predicates in Modern Arabic varieties.
Map (2): The geographical distribution of the negation markers used with verbal predicates in the investigated Modern Arabic varieties.

Map (2) illustrates the geographical distribution of the negation markers used with verbal predicates, while Map (3) illustrates the geographical distribution of the negation markers used with non-verbal predicates in the investigated Arabic varieties.

Map (3): The geographical distribution of the negation markers used with non-verbal predicates in the investigated Arabic varieties.
Map (4) illustrates the contrast between varieties that use the same negation marker in verbal and non-verbal predicates, as opposed to those that do not.

Map (4): The geographical distribution of the negation markers used with verbal vs. non-verbal predicates in the investigated Modern Arabic varieties.

5.2. Tense

Previous literature on negation in Modern Arabic varieties suggests that tense affects the choice of negation markers, with regard to Jordanian Arabic in particular (see 3.2.4.3), and thus tense was targeted by the general questionnaire as a factor that could affect negation patterns. In varieties that used the preverbal negative marker *ma* with verbal predicates, namely Levantine, Gulf, Sudanese, and Yemeni Arabic, *ma* combined with the verb regardless of the tense, as in (1), (4), (5), (26) and (31).

26. l-wld ma yšūf l-bnt kll yūm
   DEF-boy NEG see.NONT.3MSG DEF-girl every day
   ‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (GA)
Example (1) illustrates the use of *ma* with a standard verb in its past form, while examples (4, 5, 26) illustrate the use of *ma* with a standard verb in its non-tensed form to denote a habitual reading.

In varieties that use the combined marker with verbal predicates, which are the North African varieties, speakers used it with past tense forms, as in (2), and with non-tensed forms in sentences with a habitual reading, as in (27) and (28).

27. l-wld ma yšūf-š (fī) l-bnt kull
   DEF-boy NEG see.NONT.3MSG FI DEF-girl every
   ym
   day
   ‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (LY, TA, AA, MA)

28. l-walad ma bi-yšūf-š l-bent kull
   DEF-boy NEG IND-see.NONT.3MSG NEG DEF-girl every
   yōm
day
   ‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (EA)

In addition, it was observed that in Levantine and Yemeni Arabic, the combined marker *ma* - *iš* was used in sentences with auxiliaries and pseudo-verbs, but not as often with standard verbs. Note that the Levantine and Yemeni data from (3.2.3.1) (3.2.4.3) does not suggest this patterned use of the discontinuous marker with different verb forms.

The majority of speakers of Levantine and Yemeni Arabic preferred to have *ma* on its own in sentences with the past form of a standard verb, as in (29).

29. l-wld ma šāf-(š) l-bnt
   DEF-boy NEG see.NONT.3MSG-(NEG) DEF-girl
   ‘The boy did not see the girl.’ (YA, LVA)
All speakers of Levantine and Yemeni Arabic chose to use *ma* on its own with non-tensed forms, as in examples (30, 31). This suggests that there is a restriction on the interaction between negative markers and non-tensed forms preceded by another element that comes between the negative marker and the verb form.

30. l-walad ma ʕam yšūf l-bent kill yawm 3  
DEF-boy NEG ʕAM see.NONT.3MSG DEF-girl every day  
‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (LE)

31. l-wld ma b-yšūf l-bnt kll ym  
DEF-boy NEG IND-see.NONT.3MSG DEF-girl every day  
‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (SUA, LVA, YA)

One of the elements that come between the negative marker and the verb is ʕām, as in (30), which is derived from the active participle ʕammal ‘do.AP.MSG’ (Agius & Harrak 1987). It was noted in (2.1.4) that the adjectival origins of active participles trigger the use of the negative marker used for non-verbal predicates in Modern Arabic varieties. However, this is not the case here, as the existence of ʕām does not trigger the use of the negative marker of non-verbal predicates. Despite the active participle origin of ʕām, what is used with it is *ma*, as in (30). It is worth noting that ʕām is used in Syrian Arabic too, which uses *ma* and *mū* to negate non-verbal predicates. The use of *ma* in (30) suggests that perhaps ʕām is starting to lose its status as an originally active participle form in Lebanese Arabic.

Moreover, for one Lebanese speaker, three alternatives were allowed with standard verbs in the past form, either *ma* (32), *ma* -iš (33) or -iš (34).

32. l-walad ma šāf l-bent  
DEF-boy NEG see.PST.3MSG DEF-girl  
‘The boy did not see the girl.’ (LE2)
33. l-walad ma šāf-iš l-bent
   DEF-boy NEG see.PST.3MSG-NEG DEF-girl
   ‘The boy did not see the girl.’ (LE2)

34. l-walad šāf-iš l-bent
   DEF-boy see.PST.3MSG-NEG DEF-girl
   ‘The boy did not see the girl.’ (LE2)

For this particular speaker, he only used *ma* on its own with the non-tensed form with a habitual reading, (35), which confirms the restriction on the interaction between the negative markers and non-tensed forms, observed above. However, this type of data reflects the drawbacks of using questionnaires to collect data about negation patterns. While this speaker insists that he would use these three patterns, it is unlikely to be the case if their natural speech is recorded. Thus, while I report on this variation, I believe this should be regarded carefully and further explored to avoid hasty generalisations.

35. l-walad ma ʕam yšūf l-bent kill
   DEF-boy NEG ʕAM see.NONT.3MSG DEF-girl every
   yawm
day
   ‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (LE2)

In all of the investigated varieties, a future marker is inserted to express the future tense, and it always precedes the non-tensed form of the verb. In sentences produced by speakers who used *ma* with verbal predicates, *ma* always came before the future marker and the non-tensed form. This was attested in sentences produced by speakers of Yemeni, Sudanese, Gulf and Levantine Arabic, as in (36).
In North African varieties, which use the combined marker, more variation was found. For example, Algerian and Moroccan speakers combined *ma-šūf* with the future tense markers *rah* and *gādi* respectively, as in examples (37) and (38).

37. Ahmad ma rah-šūf yशūf l-mdīr
Ahmid NEG FUT-NEG see.NONT.3MSG DEF-manager
l-šūf l-jāy
DEF-week DEF-next
‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (AA)

38. Ahmad ma gād-šūf yशūf l-mdīr
Ahmid NEG FUT-NEG see.NONT.3MSG DEF-manager
l-šūf l-jāy
DEF-week DEF-next
‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (MA)

Libyan, Tunisian and Egyptian speakers, on the other hand, used the marker *miš*, in the future tense, as in examples (39) and (40). In these examples, *miš* precedes both the future marker and the verb.

39. Ahmad miš h-yশūf l-mdīr l-sbūf
Ahmid NEG FUT-see.NONT.3MSG DEF-manager DEF-week
l-jy
DEF-next
‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (LY, EA, LVA, YA)
40. Ahmad miš beš yšūf l-mudīr l-islūf

Ahmid NEG FUT see.NONT.3MSG DEF-manager DEF-week

l-jāy
DEF-next

‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (TA)

The use of miš can be explained in terms of the role of predicate type. This is because the future marker, which immediately follows the negation marker, is originally an active participle form, i.e. rāyih/ḥa ‘go.AP.MS’, ḡādi ‘go.AP.MS’ (Comrie 1991: 19). This form is used as a future marker and sometimes shortened. Active participles, as detailed in (2.1.4), align with non-verbal predicates in terms of negation and so does the future marker which comes before the verbal predicate and, therefore, calls for the presence of miš instead of ma-iš, which is reserved for prototypical verbal predicates.

Further evidence for the central role of the originally active participle form is the use of ma-(iš) when the future marker bi- from Libyan Arabic, and the indicative marker bi- from a number of varieties, are present, as shown in examples (41a,b) and (42).

41. a. l-wild bi-yšūf l-bint ġuḍwa
DEF-boy FUT-see.NONT.3MSG DEF-girl tomorrow

‘The boy will see the girl tomorrow.’ (LY-NQ)

b. l-wild ma yibīš yšūf l-bint
DEF-boy NEG FUT-NEG see.NONT.3MSG DEF-girl

ġuḍwa tomorrow

‘The boy will not see the girl tomorrow.’ (LY-NQ)

42. l-wld ma b-yšūf l-bnt kll ym
DEF-boy NEG IND-see.NONT.3MSG DEF-girl every day

‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (SUA, LVA, YA)
*Bi-* ‘future’ and *bi-* ‘indicative’ are not derived from active participles and therefore do not call for the use of *miš*, instead of *ma- (iš)*, to negate the verbal predicate. In fact, *bi-* ‘future’ appears in its original form in the presence of negation, as in (41b), which is a non-tensed form, and is negated by the combined marker *ma -iš*.

Moroccan Arabic allows the use of the combined marker *ma -iš* with non-verbal predicates and thus allows it with the future markers as well, as in example (38). Algerian Arabic seems to allow this with active participles, as in (37), even though it was not reported in (5.1) with regard to non-verbal predicates.

 Speakers of Levantine and Yemeni Arabic used *miš* in the future tense too, as in (39), as an alternative to *ma* in (36). However, one Lebanese speaker found the use of the combined marker with non-tensed forms in the future tense odd but acceptable, as in (43).

43. ?Ahmid ma ḥa-yšūf-š l-mudīr l-isbūš
    Ahmed NEG FUT-see.NONT.3MSG-NEG DEF-manager DEF-week
    l-jāy
    DEF-next
   ‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (LE2)

Table (14) summarises the patterns resulting from the interaction between negation markers and different verbal forms to express events happening in the past, present and future in the investigated Arabic varieties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present/ habitual reading</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>ma V-š</td>
<td>ma V-š</td>
<td>ma FUT-š V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algerian</td>
<td>ma V-š</td>
<td>ma V-š</td>
<td>ma FUT-š V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisian</td>
<td>ma V-š</td>
<td>ma V-š</td>
<td>miš FUT V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libyan</td>
<td>ma V-š</td>
<td>ma V-š</td>
<td>miš FUT-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>ma V-š</td>
<td>ma IND V-š</td>
<td>miš FUT-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese</td>
<td>ma V</td>
<td>ma IND V</td>
<td>ma FUT-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>ma V-(iš)</td>
<td>ma IND V</td>
<td>miš FUT-V/ ma FUT-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian</td>
<td>ma V-(iš)</td>
<td>ma IND V</td>
<td>miš FUT-V/ ma FUT-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>(ma) V-(iš)</td>
<td>ma šAM/IND V</td>
<td>miš FUT-V/ ma FUT-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>ma V</td>
<td>ma V</td>
<td>ma FUT-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwaiti</td>
<td>ma V</td>
<td>ma V</td>
<td>ma FUT-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>ma V</td>
<td>ma V</td>
<td>ma FUT-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatari</td>
<td>ma V</td>
<td>ma V</td>
<td>ma FUT-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omani</td>
<td>ma V</td>
<td>ma V</td>
<td>ma FUT-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>ma V-(iš)</td>
<td>ma IND V</td>
<td>miš FUT-V/ ma FUT-V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (14): The distribution of negation markers according to tense in Modern Arabic varieties.

Map (5) illustrates the geographical distribution of negation markers used in the future tense in the investigated Modern Arabic varieties.
Map (5): The geographical distribution of negation markers used in the future tense in the investigated Modern Arabic varieties.

5.3. Pseudo-verbs

Data from the broad questionnaire shows that pseudo-verbs and negation interact in interesting ways. First, speakers from varieties that used *ma* consistently with verbal predicates treated pseudo-verbs the same way as standard verbs, by inserting *ma* before the pseudo-verb. Example (44) illustrates the use of *ma* with the pseudo-verb *fī* in Gulf and Sudanese Arabic.

44. ma  fī  ُṣīr  fī  0-0llaja
   NEG  exist  juice in  DEF-fridge
   ‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (GA, SUA, LE)

In varieties that used the combined marker consistently, i.e. speakers of North African Arabic, the speakers used it with all pseudo-verbs, as in (45) and (46), and as reported in (3.2.4.1.1).
45. ma fī-š ʕṣīr fī 0-0llaja
   NEG exist-NEG juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (NA)

46. ma thammā-š ʕəṣīr fī 0-øllājə
   NEG exist-NEG juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (TA)

Speakers of Egyptian Arabic used the combined marker with all pseudo-verbs, but allowed
the single postverbal marker with the pseudo-verb məʕ-, as in example (47). The motivation
for dropping ma in this context is phonological as discussed in (3.2.4.6).

47. məʕ-ī-š flūs
   have-1SG.OBL-NEG money
   ‘I do not have money.’ (EA)

In the presence of pseudo-verbs, the use of ma -iš was found to be more common, as opposed
to with standard verbs, among speakers of Yemeni and Levantine Arabic, as in (48-53),
which is not a pattern found in the data cited in (3.2.4.1.1).

48. ma fī-š ʕəṣīr fī 0-øllājə
   NEG exist-NEG juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (YA)

49. (ma) fī-(š) ʕṣīr fī 0-0llajə
   NEG exist-NEG juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (LVA)

50. ma məʕi-š flūs
   NEG have-1SG.OBL-NEG money
   ‘I do not have money.’ (YA)
51. (ma) mʕī-($) flūs
   NEG have-1SG.OBL-NEG money
   ‘I do not have money.’ (LVA)

52. ma ʕnd-($) syyārtn
   NEG have-1SG.OBL-NEG car.DU
   ‘I do not have two cars.’ (LVA, YA)

53. (ma) bdd-($) nām
   NEG want-1SG.OBL-NEG sleep.NONT.1SG
   ‘I do not want to sleep.’ (LVA)

However, the variation was determined by the pseudo-verb itself in these varieties. Speakers of Palestinian Arabic, for example, treated each pseudo-verb in a different way. Palestinian speakers allowed three alternatives with bdd- ‘want’, fī ‘exist’ and mʕī- ‘have’, as in (49, 51, 53), but only discontinuous and preverbal negation with ʕnd- ‘have’, as in (52). They used only the preverbal negation marker with fī- ‘can/be.able’, as in (54).

54. ma fī-nī ?ansā-hə
   NEG can-1SG.OBL forget.NONT.1SG-3SG.OBJ
   ‘I cannot forget her.’ (PA)

Similarly, speakers of Jordanian Arabic allowed the three alternatives with three pseudo-verbs only, mainly mʕī-, bdd-, and fī ‘exist’ (49, 51, 53). The others, i.e. ʕnd- (52) and fī- ‘can/be.able’ (55), can only have preverbal or discontinuous negation, in sentences produced by Jordanian speakers.

55. ma fī-nī($) ?ansā-hə
   NEG can-1SG.OBL forget.NONT.1SG-3SG.OBJ
   ‘I cannot forget her.’ (JA)
Speakers of Lebanese Arabic showed great variation with regard to pseudo-verbs. One speaker allowed alternative constructions with every pseudo-verb. This was the same speaker (LE2) who allowed three alternatives with standard verbs in (5.2), which casts doubt on the validity of this finding. For another speaker, the variation seemed to be determined by which pseudo-verb is used. For example, he did not use the combined marker with bədd- and preferred the preverbal marker, as in (56).

56. ma bədd-ī nām
   NEG want-1SG.OBL sleep.NONT.1SG
   ‘I do not want to sleep.’ (LE)

With maʕ- he used the three alternatives, as in (51), but with fī ‘exist’, and ʕand- he allowed either the preverbal or the combined marker (44, 48, 52).

In general, the variation reported in (3.2.4.1.1) with regard to the interaction between negation markers and pseudo-verbs is confirmed by the data in this sub-section. However, the likelihood of the discontinuous marker to co-occur with pseudo-verbs and the auxiliary, also shown in the next section (5.4), more than its co-occurrence with standard verbs is not. However, the small size of the sample used for this analysis prevents me from making this generalisation as a larger sample is needed for more reliable analyses.

Table (15) presents a summary of the behaviour of pseudo-verbs in the presence of negation in each investigated variety and according to each pseudo-verb. Map (6) summarises the variation in the use of negation markers with pseudo-verbs in the investigated varieties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>fi ‘exist’</th>
<th>fi ‘can/be.able’</th>
<th>bbdd-</th>
<th>mɔš-</th>
<th>ʕand-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algerian</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisian</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libyan</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwaiti</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatari</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omani</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV-iš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (15): The distribution of negation markers and pseudo-verbs in Modern Arabic varieties.
The auxiliary

First of all, as noted in (2.2.2), the auxiliary kān and its non-tensed version ykūn are inserted to express past and future tenses with non-verbal predicates. The auxiliary was generally treated like standard verbs in terms of negation in the investigated Arabic varieties, with a few exceptions.

As shown in examples (57-60), speakers of the varieties that used the preverbal marker with verbal predicates, Gulf, Levantine, Sudanese and Yemeni speakers, also used it with the auxiliary whether in the past or future tense.

57. 1-bt     ma    kān    ʔbyd
     DEF-house  NEG  be.PST.3MSG  white
     ‘The house was not white.’ (SUA, GA, LVA, YA)
58. hwwa ma kān hna/hōn
3MSG.SUB NEG be.PST.3MSG here

‘He was not here.’ (SUA, GA, LVA, YA)

59. l-bt ma h-ykūn ʔbyḍ
DEF-house NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG white

‘The house will not be white.’ (SUA, GA, LVA, YA)

60. hwwa ma h-ykūn hna/hōn
3MSG.SUB NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG here

‘He will not be here.’ (SUA, GA, LVA, YA)

Speakers who used the combined marker with verbal predicates, i.e. North African speakers, used it with kān, as in examples (61, 62).

61. l-bt ma kān-iš ʔbyḍ
DEF-house NEG be.PST.3MSG-NEG white

‘The house was not white.’ (NA, LVA, YA)

62. hwwa ma kān-iš hna/hōn
3MSG.SUB NEG be.PST.3MSG-NEG here

‘He was not here.’ (NA, LVA, YA)

Moreover, it was noted that speakers from the Levant and Yemen used either ma on its own (57, 58) or the combined marker (61, 62) with kān, even though they preferred the single marker ma with standard verbs, as shown in (5.1) and (5.2), highlighting a pattern that has not been reported on before and not observed in the data in (3.2.3.1), (3.2.4.2) or (3.2.4.3) especially with regard to Yemeni Arabic.

Those who used either miš or ma in the future tense also used them with ykūn. Examples (63, 64) illustrate the use of miš by Levantine, Yemeni, and North African Arabic speakers, while examples (59, 60) illustrate the use of ma.
63. l-bt  miš  h-ykūn  ʔbyḍ
def-house  neg  fut-be.nont.3msg  white
‘The house will not be white.’ (NA, LVA, YA)

64. hwwa  miš  h-ykūn  hna/hōn
3msg.sub  neg  fut-be.nont.3msg  here
‘He will not be here.’ (NA, LVA, YA)

One interesting phenomenon within the data obtained from the questionnaire comes from Sudanese Arabic. One Sudanese speaker put the negation marker after the auxiliary, as in example (65), unlike speakers of other varieties of Arabic who inserted it before the auxiliary, as in examples (57, 58).

65. jowwa kān  ma  ʔobyāḍ	house  be.pst.3msg  neg  white
‘The house was not white.’ (SUA3)

Second, as mentioned in (2.2.3), pseudo-verbs do not have past forms the way standard verbs do. Instead, the auxiliary kān and its non-tensed form ykūn, along with the future marker, are inserted to express past and future tenses respectively. Just like with non-verbal predicates, it was found that there is variation in the position of the negation marker between Sudanese and other varieties of Modern Arabic when negating pseudo-verbs. The same Sudanese speaker that produced example (65), inserted the negation marker ma after the auxiliary negating the pseudo-verb, as can be seen in example (66).

66. kān  ma  fī  ʃarabāt  fī  ʔ-ʔallājā
be.pst.3msg  neg  exist  juice  in  def-fridge
‘There was not juice in the fridge.’ (SUA3)
Participants that used the preverbal marker with verbal predicates, i.e. Sudanese and Gulf Arabic speakers, used it with the auxiliary with pseudo-verbs as well, whether in the past or future tense, as in examples (67, 68).

67. ma kān fi ʿṣār fi ʿlāja
   NEG be.PST.MSG exist juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There was not juice in the fridge.’ (SUA, GA, LVA, YA)

68. ma ḥ-ykūn fi ʿṣār fi ʿlāja
   NEG FUT-be.NONT.MSG exist juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There will not be juice in the fridge.’ (SUA, GA, LVA, YA)

The same was found for speakers of North African Arabic with the combined marker and miš, as in (69-74).

69. ma kān-š fi ʿṣār fi ʿlāja
   NEG be.PST.MSG-NEG exist juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There was not juice in the fridge.’ (NA, LVA, YA)

70. ma kān-iš əmmə ʿṣār fi ʿlājə
   NEG be.PST.MSG-NEG exist juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There was not juice in the fridge.’ (TA)

71. miš h-ykūn fi ʿṣār fi ʿlāja
   NEG FUT-be.NONT.MSG exist juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There will not be juice in the fridge.’ (EA, LY, LVA, YA)

72. ma ḡād-š ḡyκūn fi ʿṣār fi ʿlājə
   NEG FUT-NEG be.NONT.MSG exist juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There will not be juice in the fridge.’ (MA)
Speakers of Levantine and Yemeni Arabic, again, used alternatives between the *ma* and the combined marker in the past tense, as in examples (67, 70), and *ma* and *miš* in the future, as in examples (68, 71).

Moreover, sentences produced by one Lebanese speaker offered more options. For example, this speaker allowed three alternatives, *ma, ma -iš* or, *-iš*, in past and future tense, as in (75-80), as well as *miš* in the future tense (71), when an auxiliary is inserted with every pseudo-verb. As noted in (5.2), this should be carefully considered and further investigated before making any generalisations about this possibility in Lebanese Arabic.

73. *ma rah-iš ykūn fi ʕəṣūr fi 0-ʔallājā*
    NEG FUT-NEG be.NONT.3MSG exist juice in DEF-fridge
    ‘There will not be juice in the fridge.’ (AA)

74. *miš beš ykūn ʔəmma ʕəṣūr fi 0-ʔallājā*
    NEG FUT be.NONT.3MSG exist juice in DEF-fridge
    ‘There will not be juice in the fridge.’ (TA)

75. *ma kān fi ʕəṣūr fi 0-ʔallājā*
    NEG be.PST.3MSG exist juice in DEF-fridge
    ‘There was not juice in the fridge.’ (LE)

76. *ma kān-iš fi ʕəṣūr fi 0-ʔallājā*
    NEG be.PST.3MSG-NEG exist juice in DEF-fridge
    ‘There was not juice in the fridge.’ (LE)

77. *kān-iš fi ʕəṣūr fi 0-ʔallājā*
    be.PST.3MSG-NEG exist juice in DEF-fridge
    ‘There was not juice in the fridge.’ (LE)
78. ma ha-ykūn fi ṣaṣīr fi 0-0llājə
    NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG exist juice in DEF-fridge
    ‘There will not be juice in the fridge.’ (LE)

79. ma ha-ykūn-iš fi ṣaṣīr fi 0-0llājə
    NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG-NEG exist juice in DEF-fridge
    ‘There will not be juice in the fridge.’ (LE)

80. ha-ykūn-iš fi ṣaṣīr fi 0-0llājə
    FUT-be.NONT.3MSG-NEG exist juice in DEF-fridge
    ‘There will not be juice in the fridge.’ (LE)

Table (16) illustrates the use of the auxiliary in the past and future tense in the investigated Arabic varieties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>ma AUX-iš</td>
<td>ma FUT-iš AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algerian</td>
<td>ma AUX-iš</td>
<td>ma FUT-iš AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisian</td>
<td>ma AUX-iš</td>
<td>miš FUT AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libyan</td>
<td>ma AUX-iš</td>
<td>miš FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>ma AUX-iš</td>
<td>miš FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese</td>
<td>ma AUX</td>
<td>ma FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>ma AUX-(iš)</td>
<td>miš FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ma FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian</td>
<td>ma AUX-(iš)</td>
<td>miš FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ma FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>(ma) AUX-(iš)</td>
<td>miš FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ma) FUT-AUX-(iš)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>ma AUX</td>
<td>ma FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwaiti</td>
<td>ma AUX</td>
<td>ma FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>ma AUX</td>
<td>ma FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatari</td>
<td>ma AUX</td>
<td>ma FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omani</td>
<td>ma AUX</td>
<td>ma FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>ma AUX-(iš)</td>
<td>miš FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ma FUT-AUX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (16): The distribution of negation markers and the auxiliary in Modern Arabic varieties.

Maps (7) and (8) show the geographical distribution of the negation markers used with the auxiliary in the future and past tense in Modern Arabic varieties.
Map (7): The geographical distribution of the negation markers used with the auxiliary in the future tense in the investigated Modern Arabic varieties.

Map (8): The geographical distribution of the negation markers used with the auxiliary in the past tense in the investigated Modern Arabic varieties.
5.5. Clause type

Asymmetrical negation in declarative and imperative clauses was discussed in (3.2.4.2) and (3.2.4.7). The participants were presented with positive imperative clauses and asked to reverse the directives denoted in them. The change in the verb form was observed in the sentences produced in all varieties spoken by all the participants. Moreover, the negative markers used to negate the verbal predicate showed variation. Speakers of North African Arabic used the combined marker *ma-*iš, as in (81).

81. ma tmš-iš
   NEG  walk.NONT.2SG-NEG
   ‘Do not go!’ (NA, JA, PA, YA)

Speakers of Sudanese Arabic used *ma*, as in (82). Speakers of Gulf Arabic showed a preference for *lā*, as in (83), but used *ma* too, as in (82).

82. ma tmši
   NEG  walk.NONT.2SG
   ‘Do not go!’ (SUA, GA, LVA, YA)

83. la tmši
   NEG  walk.NONT.2SG
   ‘Do not go!’ (GA, LVA, YA)

Speakers of Levantine and Yemeni Arabic showed the most variation in their responses. While most speakers from these varieties used either the single negation markers *ma* or *lā*, as in examples (82) and (83), some Jordanian, Palestinian and Yemeni speakers found the combined marker *ma-*iš acceptable as well, as in (81). A Jordanian and a Yemeni speaker combined the postverbal marker *-iš* with *lā*, as in (84). One Palestinian speaker used the postverbal marker *-iš* on its own as in (85). As a general trend, these patterns substantiate the findings of (3.2.4.2).
84. la tmš-īš
   NEG walk.NONT.2SG-NEG
   ‘Do not go!’ (JA, YA)

85. temš-īš
   walk.NONT.2SG-NEG
   ‘Do not go!’ (PA)

It was reported in (3.2.4.2) that negation in conditional clauses could be expressed with the postverbal marker -īš in Egyptian Arabic. The participants were given this choice in a multiple-choice question to check the possibility of this phenomenon in other Modern Arabic varieties. However, none of the speakers found it acceptable, including Egyptian speakers. The participants opted for either the single ma or the combined marker instead, as in (86) and (87).

86. lw ma knť šft-k
   if NEG be.PST.1SG see.PST.1SG-2MSG.OBJ
   knť mšēt
   be.PST.1SG walk.PST.1SG
   ‘If I had not seen you I would’ve left’ (SUA, LVA, YA, GA)

87. lw ma knť-š šft-k
   if NEG be.PST.1SG-NEG see.PST.1SG-2MSG.OBJ
   knť mšēt
   be.PST.1SG walk.PST.1SG
   ‘If I had not seen you I would’ve left’ (NA, LVA, YA)

This suggests that the occurrence of -īš in conditional clauses in Egyptian Arabic is in need of further investigation with a wider sample, which is beyond the scope of this thesis.
Table (17) illustrates the different negative markers used in negative imperative clauses in Modern Arabic varieties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Negative marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>ma V-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algerian</td>
<td>ma V-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisian</td>
<td>ma V-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libyan</td>
<td>ma V-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>ma V-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese</td>
<td>ma V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>ma V(-iš)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>læ V(-iš)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian</td>
<td>(ma) V(-iš)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>læ V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>ma V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>læ V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>ma V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>læ V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwaiti</td>
<td>ma V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>læ V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>ma V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>læ V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatari</td>
<td>ma V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>læ V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omani</td>
<td>ma V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>læ V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>ma V(-iš)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>læ V(-iš)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (17): The distribution of negation markers used in negative imperative clauses in Modern Arabic varieties.
Map (9) shows the geographical distribution of the negation markers used in negative imperative clauses in Modern Arabic varieties.

![Map of the geographical distribution of negation markers in Modern Arabic varieties](image)

Map (9): The geographical distribution of the negation markers used in negative imperative clauses in the investigated Modern Arabic varieties.

### 5.6. The negative auxiliary

Another phenomenon that was observed in the data collected was the use of the negative auxiliary. Benmamoun (2000: 78, 79), Caubet (1996: 83) and Eid (1991: 50) report on the occurrence of these constructions in Egyptian and Moroccan Arabic.

The negative auxiliary looks like a merger between the combined negation marker *ma -iš* and personal pronouns. However, it must be noted here that these constructions function as negators of the predicate, not the pronoun. The negative auxiliary is investigated further with regard to Libyan Arabic in Chapter Seven (7.1).
This phenomenon was mostly found in sentences produced by speakers from varieties that are spoken in North Africa. It was observed that the negative auxiliary was generally followed by non-verbal predicates, as in (88, 89).

88. mhūš hna
    NEG.3MSG here
    ‘He is not here.’ (MA, AA, LY)

89. l-bt mhūš ?byḍ
    DEF-house NEG.3MSG white
    ‘The house is not white.’ (MA, AA, LY)

Some speakers indicated that the negative auxiliary was interchangeable with the negative marker miš, as in (90, 91).

90. l-bt miš/māši/mhūš ?byḍ
    DEF-house NEG/NEG.3MSG white
    ‘The house is not white.’ (MA, AA, LY)

91. hwwa miš/māši/mhūš hna
    3MSG.SUB NEG/NEG.3MSG here
    ‘He is not here.’ (MA, AA, LY)

The use of the negative auxiliary is not exclusive to varieties of North Africa, as shown in examples (92) and (93) from Saudi Arabic. These examples confirm that Saudi Arabic has the negative auxiliary as well, as reported in (3.2.3.2), and in various forms.

92. mahū hino
    NEG.3MSG here
    ‘He is not here.’ (SA)
The house is not white.' (SA)

Tunisian Arabic speakers used the negative auxiliary to negate sentences in the future tense, as in (94). This was used as an alternative to miš, which was the other option that one particular speaker gave for the negation of the same sentence, as in (95).

There will not be juice in the fridge.’ (TA)

The negative auxiliary was used in example (97) from Tunisian Arabic as an alternative to ma -iš with the non-tensed form of the verb with a habitual reading.

‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (TA)
Note that negative auxiliaries are non-standard negative markers in Modern Arabic varieties, as they could replace the negative marker miš/mū/ma. Non-standard negation markers are revisited in Chapter Seven (7.1) and (7.2).

5.7. **Emphatic negation**

As discussed in (3.2.4.4), emphatic negation is characterised by the dropping of the postverbal negative marker -iš. Several contexts that are claimed to clearly illustrate the dropping of -iš in emphatic negation, as detailed in Chapter Three (3.2.4.4), were investigated. The participants were asked to judge the occurrence of the combined marker ma -iš in these contexts and mixed results were found.37

With regard to oaths, which are generally considered an exception to discontinuous negation, many speakers did not conform to this generalisation. Speakers of Libyan and Tunisian Arabic used discontinuous negation in this context, as in (98). This is consistent with the use of -š with oath words reported in (3.2.4.4) in Libyan Arabic when no emphasis on negation is intended.

98. wallāhi ma šāf-hā-š
   by.God NEG see.PST.3MSG-3FSG.OBJ-NEG
   ‘I swear he did not see her.’ (LY, TA)

Another context that was characterised by the absence of -iš is coordinate structures, as in (99) and (100). The absence, however, is motivated by the use of the negation marker lā, which forms a different construction that is less likely to include -iš, and is not necessarily a case of emphatic negation.

99. la šaf la smš
    NEG see.PST.3MSG NEG hear.PST.3MSG
    ‘He neither saw nor heard.’ (All)

37 The results are exclusive to varieties that use the combined marker.
5.7.1. Negative indefinites

The interaction between negation markers and negative indefinites was discussed in (3.2.4.5). In the broad questionnaire, the participants were asked to judge the co-occurrence of negative indefinites with the single negative marker *ma* and the combined marker *ma-*šū as part of the investigation of emphatic negation in the varieties that use the combined marker. While some speakers preferred to use *ma* on its own in the presence of negative indefinites *ḥadd* ‘anyone’ and *šay* ‘anything’, this behaviour was not consistent as the combined marker was acceptable as well, as shown in (101-104).

101. ma šaf-(š) hdd/hda
   NEG see.PST.3MSG anyone
   ‘He did not see anyone.’ (NA, LVA, YA)

102. ma šaf-(š) šy
    NEG see.PST.3MSG anything
    ‘He did not see anything.’ (NA, LVA)

103. (ma)/miš h-yšūf hdd/hda
    NEG see.NONT.3MSG anyone
    ‘He will not see anyone.’ (NA, (LVA, YA))

104. (ma)/miš h-yšūf šy
    NEG see.NONT.3MSG anything
    ‘He will not see anything.’ (NA, LVA, YA)
However, the only context that was considered an exception to discontinuous negation by all speakers involved sentences with `umr-‘ever’, as in (105), even though this was not the case in (3.2.4.4). The use of `umr- perhaps marked emphasis on the negation that was more explicit that the speakers felt it must surely indicate emphatic negation.

105. `umr-ah ma şaf-ha
      ever-3MSG NEG see.PST.3MSG-3SG.OBJ
      ‘He never saw her.’ (NA, LVA, YA)

In sum, the variation seen above suggests that emphatic negation reflects the personal preferences of speakers and is determined by the speaker’s intention rather than by the existence of certain elements. In addition, this personal nature of emphatic negation suggests that it is better studied analysing naturally-occurring speech rather than elicited examples.

5.8. Motivations for the second stage of the research

The collected data from the broad questionnaire offered many interesting insights into the nature of sentential negation in different Modern Arabic varieties. It was on the basis of the data collected that three Arabic varieties were chosen for further investigation. However, it is important to note here that some divergent patterns reported by some of the participants should be viewed suspiciously and further investigated in order to arrive at more reliable results.

Some of the most interesting negation patterns that were found were the variation in the use of negative markers according to predicate type and verbal form, the use of the negative auxiliary, and the interaction between negative markers and pseudo-verbs. The variation in the use of negative markers according to predicate type and verbal form was attested in most varieties, even though some varieties, like Gulf and Sudanese Arabic, did not make use of the combined negation marker ma -iš altogether. The use of negative auxiliary was attested in many Arabic varieties including Libyan Arabic. The variation in the use of the negation markers with pseudo-verbs was attested in Jordanian, Palestinian, Yemeni, and Lebanese
Arabic. It was shown that different pseudo-verbs differ from standard verbs and from each other with regard to negation patterns.

It is based on the above results that I chose the three varieties that were investigated further and these were Libyan Arabic, Lebanese Arabic, and Sudanese Arabic. These varieties were found to be representative of the most interesting negation patterns in the data and also fit with the geographical distribution of Arabic varieties as they represented different parts of the Arab world.
Chapter Six: Negation in Sudanese, Libyan and Lebanese Arabic

This chapter discusses the results of the second stage of the research represented in the data obtained from the narrow questionnaire investigating Sudanese, Libyan and Lebanese Arabic. This chapter describes and analyses the different patterns of negation found in the data obtained from the participants with regard to national varieties, but does not address the individual distinct varieties within each country.

As noted in Chapter Five, the sentences used in this chapter are not accurate phonological representations of the corresponding Arabic varieties investigated, but are rather representative of the morpho-syntactic patterns found in the data. Thus, a near-straight transliteration of the Arabic script (mostly with consonants only) are used for examples that are not intended to represent a specific variety. In addition, when participants show divergent negation strategies from other speakers in their respective varieties, I refer to them by numbers: 4, 5, 6, etc., which represent the cities they come from. Note that the numbering starts from 4 to avoid duplication with data from Chapter Five.38

I start with sentential negation in section (6.1). This section discusses sentential negation through the interaction of negation with standard verbs in (6.1.1), the auxiliary (kān and ykūn) in (6.1.2), non-verbal predicates in (6.1.3), active participles in (6.1.4), and pseudo-verbs in (6.1.5). Non-sentential negation is explored in section (6.2), while section (6.3) deals with emphatic negation. This chapter discusses the results of the narrow questionnaire that involve standard and non-standard negation. More negative markers associated with non-standard negation are discussed in Chapter Seven.

6.1. Sentential negation

This section deals with the data from the narrow questionnaire that shows sentential negation and it includes the negation wof standard verbs in (6.1.1), the auxiliary (kān and ykūn) in

38 The cities/towns of origins for each of the participants are listed in appendix (3).
(6.1.2), non-verbal predicates in (6.1.3), active participles in (6.1.4), and pseudo-verbs in (6.1.5). For a discussion of sentential negation see Chapter One (1.2.2.1) and Three (3.2.2).

6.1.1. Standard verbs

Among the linguistic categories investigated for the purposes of this research are standard verbs. The results of the narrow questionnaire showed that this category offered variation in terms of the negation markers used by the speakers of the different varieties. Speakers of Sudanese Arabic showed consistency in their choice of negation markers throughout the questionnaire and the different patterns with which they were presented (see Map 4 in 5.1). They all used the preverbal negation marker ma with standard transitive verb šāf ‘see’ and ditransitive and intransitive verbs ʔaṣṭa ‘give’ and ydxxin ‘smoke’, as illustrated in examples (1), (2) and (3) respectively. All Lebanese speakers used ma with standard verbs, as in (1-3), which again confirms the findings of (5.1) that Lebanese speakers use the combined marker less often with standard verbs, which is not found in the literature reported on in (3.2.4.3).

1. l-wld ma šāf l-bnt
   DEF-boy NEG see.PST.MSG DEF-girl
   ‘The boy did not see the girl’ (SUA, LE)

2. hwwa ma ʔaṣṭa l-bnt hdyyat-ha
   3MSG.SUB NEG give.PST.MSG DEF-girl gift-3SG.MSG.PSS
   ‘He did not give the girl her present.’ (SUA, LE)

3. Ahmid ma ydxxn ʔšlan
   Ahmid NEG smoke.NONT.MSG originally
   ‘Ahmid does not smoke in the first place.’ (SUA, LE)

Speakers of Libyan Arabic, on the other hand, used the combined negation marker. As illustrated in examples (4-6), ma -iš was used with standard verbs šāf ‘see’, ʔaṣṭa ‘give’ and ydxxin ‘smoke’ by all Libyan participants
4. l-wild ma šāf-iš l-bent
   DEF-boy NEG see.PST.MSG-NEG DEF-girl
   ‘The boy did not see the girl.’ (LY)

5. huwwə ma šītā-š l-bent hadiyyət-ħə
   3MSG.SUB NEG give.PST.MSG-NEG DEF-girl gift-3FSG.PSS
   ‘He did not give the girl her present.’ (LY)

6. Ahmid ma ɣdɔxxin-iš ʔaʃlan
   Ahmid NEG smoke.NONT.MSG-NEG originally
   ‘Ahmid does not smoke in the first place.’ (LY)

This shows that all standard verbs are treated in the same way when combined with negation regardless of their status as transitive, ditransitive or intransitive verbs in each variety.

6.1.1.1. Tense and verbal forms

The data collected showed that the interaction between different verbal forms and tense markers played an important role in determining speakers’ choices of negation markers. However, this was not the case with the Sudanese speakers as they only used one negation marker in all contexts, illustrated in example (7) with the non-tensed form ɣšūf ‘see.NONT’, and example (1) with the past form šāf ‘see.PST’.

7. l-walad ma bi-yšūf l-bent kull yōm
   DEF-boy NEG IND-see.NONT.MSG DEF-girl every day
   ‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (SUA)

Lebanese and Libyan speakers made the distinction between past forms and non-tensed forms used on their own, as opposed to non-tensed forms occurring with the future marker.
Libyan speakers used the combined markers *ma-*iš when standard verbs were in their past form (4, 5), and in their non-tensed forms, as in example (8).

8. l-wild ma yšūf-iš fi l-bint kull
   DEF-boy NEG see.NONT.3MSG-NEG FI DEF-girl every
   yōm
day
   ‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (LY)

When the future marker *rah/ho* was present with non-tensed forms, Libyan speakers used either *ma* or *miš*, as in examples (9) and (10) respectively, but not *ma-*iš.

9. Ahmid ma ḥ/h-yšūf l-mdīr l-sbūš
   Ahmid NEG FUT-see.NONT.3MSG DEF-manager DEF-week
   l-jy
   DEF-next
   ‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (SUA, LE4,5, LY)

10. Ahmid miš rah/ha-yšūf l-mudīr l-isbūš
    Ahmid NEG FUT-see.NONT.3MSG DEF-manager DEF-week
    l-jāy
    DEF-next
    ‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (LY)

As shown in (5.2), the explanation for this divergence in negation forms is attributed to the predicate type of the element immediately following the negation marker. The future marker *rah/ho* is derived from *rāyiḥ ‘go.AP.MS’*, which is an active participle form (see 5.2 for more details). However, the use of *ma* in (9) is perhaps indicative of an on-going change where the future marker is losing its original identity as an active participle form.

---

39 The investigated example in (8) has a habitual reading, but there is no evidence that the negation pattern changes if the form is used to indicate future time reference.
Lebanese speakers used *ma* with past forms, as in example (1), and non-tensed forms without the future marker, as in example (11). With non-tensed forms with the future marker they used either *ma* or *miš* (eight speakers), or just *ma* (two speakers), as in examples (12) and (9).

11. l-walad ma ʕam/bi- yšūf l-bent
   DEF-boy NEG ʕAM/IND see. NONT.3MSG DEF-girl
   kill yawm
every day
‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (LE)

12. Ahmid ma/miš rah/hə-yšūf l-mudīr l-isbūʕ
   Ahmid NEG FUT-see.ΝΟΝT.3MSG DEF-manager DEF-week
   l-jāy
   DEF-next
‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (LE6-13)

This suggests that the negation pattern employed in the sentences obtained from Libyan and Lebanese speakers is determined by grammatical tense that is based on form rather than time reference. The variation of negation markers is determined by the predicate type, or more specifically the verbal form, of the element immediately following the negation marker. This is confirmed by the data obtained from North African, Levantine and Yemeni Arabic varieties in (5.2) as well.

However, one particular Libyan speaker, who was the youngest of the participants, gave more than one alternative in his responses. It was observed that in his sentences two patterns emerged. The first pattern was where the past form and non-tensed form, without the future marker, were both marked by the combined negation marker. In addition, the non-tensed form was marked by *ma* or *miš* in the future tense, i.e. when the future marker was present. This was the general pattern found with other Libyan speakers, as illustrated in the previous examples (4, 5, 8-10).
The second pattern observed in the young Libyan speaker’s responses was where the non-tensed form, whether with or without the future marker, was marked with -iš only, as in examples (13) and (14), while the past form was marked by the combined marker, as in examples (4, 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. l-wild</th>
<th>yšūf-iš</th>
<th>fi</th>
<th>l-bint</th>
<th>kull</th>
<th>yōm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEF-boy</td>
<td>see.NONT.3MSG-NEG</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>DEF-girl</td>
<td>every day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (LY7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Ahmid</th>
<th>hā-yšūf-iš</th>
<th>l-mudīr</th>
<th>l-isbūš</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmid</td>
<td>FUT-see.NONT.3MSG-NEG</td>
<td>DEF-manager</td>
<td>DEF-week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l-jāy</td>
<td>DEF-next</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (LY7)

In examples (4, 5) and (13, 14), the distinction was made between the past form and non-tensed form in terms of negation marking, regardless of the presence or absence of the future marker with the non-tensed form. In this case, it is also the form of the verbal predicate that determines the negative marker used. However, it is not the form of the element immediately following ma, i.e. the future marker, but the form of the verb. This could be an indicator of change in progress in Libyan Arabic, in which the future marker is no longer perceived as an active participle form, but as a grammatical marker that does not affect the negation pattern. However, this issue is in need of more investigation and the data at hand is not enough to make this claim.

To sum up, while Sudanese Arabic speakers used ma to negate standard verbs in all cases, Libyan and Lebanese speakers’ responses were conditioned by verb-form and the presence of the future marker. Libyan and Lebanese Arabic treated past and non-tensed forms, in the absence the future marker, the same, as they used ma -iš or ma respectively with them. With non-tensed forms in the presence of the future marker, they used ma or miš. In addition, one

---

40 The use of -iš on its own with standard verbs was only found in the responses of this particular speaker and will be shown in other examples throughout this chapter.
Libyan Arabic speaker differentiated between past forms, which he negated with *ma –iš*, and non-tensed forms with which he used single *-iš*.

6.1.2. *Kān* and *ykān*

With regard to the interaction between the auxiliary and negation, the following patterns emerged. Sudanese participants used the preverbal marker *ma* with the lexical *kān* ‘be.PST’ when combined with a non-verbal predicate, as in example (15), and with the auxiliary *kān* taking a verbal complement, as in example (16).

15. *ma*  
   *kān*  
   *l-mdīr*

   **NEG**  
   be.PST.3MSG  
   DEF-manager

   ‘He was not the manager.’ (SUA, LE4,5,9-13)

16. *l-walad*  
   *ma*  
   *kān*  
   *yiktib*  
   *r-risālə*

   **DEF-boy**  
   **NEG**  
   be.PST.3MSG  
   write.NONT.3MSG  
   DEF-letter

   ‘The boy was not writing the letter.’ (SUA)

Libyan speakers treated both lexical and auxiliary *kān* the same way as standard verbs, i.e. they consistently used the combined marker with both standard verbs and *kān*, whether it was a lexical verb or an auxiliary, as in (17) and (18).

17. *hwwa*  
   *ma*  
   *kān-š*  
   *l-mdīr*

   **3MSG.SUB**  
   **NEG**  
   be.PST.3MSG-NEG  
   DEF-manager

   ‘He was not the manager.’ (LY, LE6-8)

18. *l-wild*  
   *ma*  
   *kān-iš*  
   *yiktib*  
   *fī*  
   *r-risālə*  
   DEF-letter

   **DEF-boy**  
   **NEG**  
   be.PST.3MSG-NEG  
   write.NONT.3MSG  
   FI  
   DEF-letter

   ‘The boy was not writing the letter.’ (LY)
However, with Lebanese speakers, it was observed that there were three out of ten speakers who used the combined marker consistently in their responses with \(kān\), as in example (19), even though they did not use the combined marker anywhere else. This substantiates the findings of (5.1) and (5.4) that Lebanese speakers use the combined marker more with the auxiliary than with standard verbs, which is not found in the literature reported on in (3.2.4.3). The remaining seven speakers used \(ma\) on its own, as in example (20).

19. l-walad ma kān-š yiktib r-risāle
   DEF-boy NEG be.PST.3MSG-NEG write.NONT.3MSG DEF-letter ‘The boy was not writing the letter.’ (LE6-8)

20. l-walad ma kān yiktib r-risāle
   DEF-boy NEG be.PST.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG DEF-letter
   ‘The boy was not writing the letter.’ (LE4,5,9-13)

The same three speakers used the combined marker when \(kān\) was used on its own as a lexical verb, as in (17), and the remaining seven speakers used \(ma\), as in (15).

The use of \(ykūn\) ‘be.NONT.3MSG’ was investigated in the presence of the future marker as it occurs on its own only in subordinate contexts. With \(ykūn\), the participants showed no deviations from the patterns found with standard verbs. The Sudanese speakers used single \(ma\) with \(ykūn\) as a lexical and auxiliary verb, as in examples (21) and (22).

21. hwwa ma h-ykūn l-mdīr
   3MSG.SUB NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG DEF-manager
   ‘He will not be the manager.’ (LE, SUA, LY)

22. l-walad ma hā-ykūn yiktib r-risālāh
   DEF-boy NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG DEF-letter hassa now
   ‘The boy will not be writing the letter now.’ (SUA)
The Lebanese and Libyan speakers consistently used either the single *ma* or *miš*, as in examples (21, 23-27). In examples (21) and (23), Libyan and Lebanese speakers used *ma* and *miš* with *ykūn* as the lexical verb.

23. hwawa ma h-ykūn l-mdīr
   3MSG.SUB NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG DEF-manager
   ‘He will not be the manager.’ (LY, LE6-13)

In examples (24-27), Libyan and Lebanese speakers used *ma* and *miš* with auxiliary *ykūn* as a part of a compound verbal predicate.

24. l-wild ma hā-ykūn yiktib fi
   DEF-boy NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG FI
   r-risālā təwwə DEF-letter now
   ‘The boy will not be writing the letter now.’ (LY)

25. l-wild miš hā-ykūn yiktib fi
   DEF-boy NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG FI
   r-risālā təwwə DEF-letter now
   ‘The boy will not be writing the letter now.’ (LY)

26. l-walad ma hā-ykūn yiktib r-risālə
def-boy NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG DEF-letter halla? now
   ‘The boy will not be writing the letter now.’ (LE)

27. l-walad miš hā-ykūn yiktib r-risālə
def-boy NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG DEF-letter halla? now
   ‘The boy will not be writing the letter now.’ (LE6-13)
In examples (28) and (29), the youngest Libyan speaker used -iš with lexical and auxiliary ykūn, as it is the non-tensed form of kān.

28. huwwə ḥə-ykūn-iš l-mudīr
   3MSG.SUB FUT-be.NONT.3MSG-NEG DEF-manager
   ‘He will not be the manager.’ (LY7)

29. l-walad ḥə-ykūn-iš yiktib fi
   DEF-boy FUT-be.NONT.3MSG-NEG write.NONT.3MSG FI
   r-risālə ṭəwwə
   DEF-letter now
   ‘The boy will not be writing the letter now.’ (LY7)

In conclusion, the negation of kān and ykūn is not different from the negation of standard verbs in both Sudanese and Libyan Arabic, whether they were used as a lexical or an auxiliary verb. Lebanese speakers were divided in negating the past form kān in that some speakers used the combined marker ma -iš, while others used the single marker ma.

6.1.3. Non-verbal predicates

With regard to non-verbal predicates, nominal, adjectival and prepositional predicates were investigated in the narrow questionnaire. Sudanese participants used ma with all non-verbal predicates, just like with verbal ones. This is illustrated in the nominal predicate l-mudīr ‘the manager’ in (30), the adjectives ḥbyad ‘white’ and baṣīd ‘far’ in (31) and (32), and the prepositional phrase fi l-madrasa ‘at school’ in (33). As noted in (2.2.2), non-verbal predicates occur without a copula in sentences with present time reading.

30. huwwə ma l-mudīr
    3MSG.SUB NEG DEF-manager
    ‘He is not the manager.’ (SUA)
Libyan and Lebanese speakers, on the other hand, made distinctions based on predicate type. While *ma-iš* was used with verbal predicates, *miš* and *mū* were used with non-verbal predicates. As seen in the following examples, speakers of Libyan Arabic used *miš* with nominal (34), adjectival (35, 36), and prepositional phrases (37).

31. l-bēt ma ʔɔbyaɗ
   DEF-house NEG white
   ‘The house is not white.’ (SUA)

32. li maktab l-barīd lī ma baʃīd min hina
to office DEF-post that NEG far from here
   ‘To the post office that’s not far from here.’ (SUA)

33. huwwə ma fī l-madrasa
   3MSG.SUB NEG in DEF-school
   ‘He is not at school.’ (SUA)

34. huwwə miš l-mudīr
   3MSG.SUB NEG DEF-manager
   ‘He is not the manager.’ (LY)

35. l-bēt miš ʔɔbyiŋ
   DEF-house NEG white
   ‘The house is not white.’ (LY)

36. li maktib l-baʃīd lī miš bŋiŋ min hne
to office DEF-post that NEG far from here
   ‘To the post office that’s not far from here.’ (LY)

37. huwwə miš fī l-madirsə
   3MSG.SUB NEG in DEF-school
   ‘He is not at school.’ (LY)
Speakers of Lebanese Arabic used \( m\u (\text{five speakers}) \) and \( mi\u (\text{five speakers}) \), with nominal (38), adjectival (39, 40) and prepositional predicates (41).

38. huwwe \( m\u (mi\u) \) l-mud\( \u \)
\( 3\text{MSG.SUB} \) \( \text{NEG} \) \( \text{DEF-manager} \)
‘He is not the manager.’ (LE4-8,(9-13)

39. l-b\( \u \)\( t \) \( m\u (mi\u) \) \( ?\u bya\u \)
\( \text{DEF-house} \) \( \text{NEG} \) \( \text{white} \)
‘The house is not white.’ (LE4-8,(9-13)

40. li maktab l-bar\( \u \)\( d \) l\( \u \) li \( m\u (mi\u) \) b\( \u \)\( \u \)\( d \) min
\( \text{to office} \) \( \text{DEF-post} \) \( \text{that NEG far from} \)
\( h\u \)\( \u \)\( n \) \( \text{here} \)
‘To the post office that’s not far from here.’ (LE4-8,(9-13)

41. huwwe \( m\u (mi\u) \) f\( \u \) l-madr\( \u \)
\( 3\text{MSG.SUB} \) \( \text{NEG} \) \( \text{in DEF-school} \)
‘He is not at school.’ (LE4-8,(9-13)

To sum up, various negation markers are involved in the negation of non-verbal predicates. The distribution of negation markers with non-verbal predicates in Sudanese, Libyan and Lebanese Arabic, which was shown in Map 3 in (5.1), was confirmed by the findings of the narrow questionnaire. It was also confirmed that in contrast to all Arabic varieties, Sudanese Arabic uses the same negation marker in both verbal and non-verbal predicates, as was shown in Map 4 in (5.1).
6.1.4. Active participles

Both the semantic interpretations of active participles and their interaction with negation was investigated in the narrow questionnaire. In (2.1.4) of this thesis, I discussed the semantic interpretation of active participle in Libyan, Lebanese and Sudanese Arabic and concluded that they have a diverse semantic nature and that their functions depend on their semantic interpretation. However, this diversity of semantic interpretation is not related to negation as the interpretations hold for affirmative sentences as well. The next few sub-sections report on the results of the narrow questionnaire in terms of their negation and how the negation patterns confirm the semantic interpretation.

6.1.4.1. Negation of active participles

When the participants were asked to negate active participles, Sudanese speakers used the preverbal marker *ma*, as in (42).

42. ʔana ma ʕārif l-ʕinwān
    1SG.SUB NEG know.AP.MSG DEF-address
    ‘I do not know the address.’ (SUA)

Libyan speakers used *miš* in contexts where the active participle form occurred on its own as the only verb in the clause (43), *ma -iš* when it occurred with the auxiliary *kān* in the past tense (44), and *miš* or *-iš* when it occurred with *ykūn* in the future tense (45, 46), as expected.

43. ʔane miš ʕārif l-ʕinwān
    1SG.SUB NEG know.AP.MSG DEF-address
    ‘I do not know the address.’ (LY)

44. ʔane ma kunt-iš ʕārif l-ʕinwān
    1SG.SUB NEG be.PST.1SG-NEG know.AP.MSG DEF-address
    ‘I did not know the address.’ (LY)
Lebanese speakers used ma, mū (five speakers), and miš (five speakers) with active participles on their own as in (47, 48).

47. ?ana mū/ma ūrif l-nwān
1SG.SUB NEG know.AP.MSG DEF-address
‘I do not know the address.’ (LE4-8)

48. ?ana miš ūrif l-nwān
1SG.SUB NEG know.AP.MSG DEF-address
‘I do not know the address.’ (LE9-13)

Their occurrence with kān and ykūn did not trigger any different patterns than those associated with the auxiliaries reported in (6.1.2), where the combined marker was used with the past form of the auxiliary by some speakers, as in (49) and (50).

49. ?ana ma kent-iš ūrif l-nwān
1SG.SUB NEG be.PST.1SG-NEG know.AP.MSG DEF-address
‘I did not know the address.’ (LE6-8)

50. ?ana ma kenit ūrif l-nwān
1SG.SUB NEG be.PST.1SG know.AP.MSG DEF-address
‘I did not know the address.’ (LE4,5,9-13)
An interesting observation in example (47) is that Lebanese speakers used *ma* with active participles as well, treating it the same as past and non-tensed forms. This comes in contrast to non-verbal predicates where speakers used *miš* and *mū*, but not *ma*.

With regard to the semantic interpretation of active participle forms of stative verbs, the results of this questionnaire confirmed the initial conclusion about the similarity in function between active participle and non-tensed forms. When participants from all varieties were asked to negate active participles, the majority gave two negated sentences when presented with an active participle derived from the stative verb ʕaraf ‘know’, one with the active participle, and one with the non-tensed form of the stative verb (51-56), confirming that they used them interchangeably.

51. ʔana     ma  ʕārif     1-ʕinwān
   1SG.SUB   NEG  know.AP.MSG  DEF-address
   ‘I do not know the address.’ (SUA)

52. ʔana     ma  b-ʕārif    1-ʕinwān
   1SG.SUB   NEG  IND-know.NONT.1SG  DEF-address
   ‘I do not know the address.’ (SUA)

53. ʔane     miš  ʕārif    1-ʕinwān
   1SG.SUB   NEG  know.AP.MSG  DEF-address
   ‘I do not know the address.’ (LY)

54. ʔane     ma  nʕārif-iš  1-ʕinwān
   1SG.SUB   NEG  know.NONT.1SG-NEG  DEF-address
   ‘I do not know the address.’ (LY)

55. ʔana     (miš)/ma/mū  ʕārif    1-ʕinwān
   1SG.SUB   NEG  know.AP.MSG  DEF-address
   ‘I do not know the address.’ (LE4-8,(9-13))
56. ?ana       ma       b-əʕrif          l-ʕinwān
1SG.SUB     NEG     IND-know.NONT.1SG  DEF-address
‘I do not know the address.’ (LE)

This was also illustrated in the stative non-tensed/active participle pair gādir/nigdir ‘can’ in examples (57-62) in all three varieties. In these examples, the participants gave two responses when asked to negate the active participle gādir ‘can.AP’, one with an active participle form, as in (57-59) and one with the non-tensed form, as in (60-62).

57. ?ana       ma       gādir          ?əʕmil-hə
1SG.SUB     NEG     can.AP.MSG  do.NONT.1SG-3SG.OBJ
‘I cannot do it/I am not capable of doing it.’ (SUA)

58. ?anẹ       miš       gādir       ndīr-hə
1SG.SUB     NEG     can.AP.MSG  do.NONT.1SG-3SG.OBJ
‘I cannot do it/I am not capable of doing it.’ (LY)

59. ?ana       (miš)/ma/mū  ?ādir        ?əʕmil-hə
1SG.SUB     NEG     can.AP.MSG  do.NONT.1SG-3SG.OBJ
‘I cannot do it/I am not capable of doing it.’ (LE4-8,(9-13))

60. ?ana       ma       b-əgdar        ?əʕmil-hə
1SG.SUB     NEG     IND-can.NONT.1SG  do.NONT.1SG-3SG.OBJ
‘I cannot do it/I am not capable of doing it.’ (SUA)

61. ?anẹ       ma       nigdir-iš       ndīr-hə
1SG.SUB     NEG     can.NONT.1SG-NEG  do.NONT.1SG-3SG.OBJ
‘I cannot do it/I am not capable of doing it.’ (LY)

62. ?ana       ma       b-əʔdar        ?əʕmil-hə
1SG.SUB     NEG     IND-can.NONT.1SG  do.NONT.1SG-3SG.OBJ
‘I cannot do it/I am not capable of doing it.’ (LE)
This was not the case with active participle forms ġāy ‘come.AP’ and māši ‘go.AP’ of motion verbs yjī ‘come’ and yimši ‘go’, as in examples (63-68). Participants did not offer more than one negated version, but only sentences where negation markers are used with the active participle form.

63. hiyyə ma gāyya b-surʕə
3FSG.SUB NEG come.AP.FSG with-speed
‘She is not coming fast.’ (SUA)

64. ʔana ma māši li-l-madrasa
1SG.SUB NEG go.AP.MSG to-DEF-school
‘I am not going to school.’ (SUA)

65. hiyyə miš jāyya b-surʕə
3FSG.SUB NEG come.AP.FSG with-speed
‘She is not coming fast.’ (LY)

66. ʔane miš māši li-l-madirsə
1SG.SUB NEG go.AP.MSG to-DEF-school
‘I am not going to school.’ (LY)

67. hiyye (miš)/ma/mū jāye b-surʕə
3FSG.SUB NEG come.AP.FSG with-speed
‘She is not coming fast.’ (LE4-8,(9-13))

68. ʔana (miš)/ma/mū māši li-l-madrase
1SG.SUB NEG go.AP.MSG to-DEF-school
‘I am not going to school.’ (LE4-8,(9-13))

To sum up, in Libyan Arabic, active participles generally pattern with non-verbal predicates in terms of negation and not with other verbal predicates. Lebanese speakers, on the other
hand, show more variety in that they allow their negation to be expressed with miš, mū, or ma, the latter being used with verbal forms too.

6.1.5. Pseudo-verbs

The initial survey, as shown in (5.3), showed that pseudo-verbs behave differently with respect to negation compared to standard verbs in some Modern Arabic varieties. This section reports on variation in the three chosen varieties, Sudanese, Libyan and Lebanese Arabic.

6.1.5.1. Interaction with negation

As previously discussed in (2.2.3), pseudo-verbs have only one stem, and the auxiliary is inserted to express past and future tenses. The narrow questionnaire investigated the interaction of pseudo-verbs with negation in their present time reading and when the auxiliary was inserted to indicate the past and future tenses.

In the case of pseudo-verbs occurring on their own as the lexical verb of the clause, Sudanese speakers used the preverbal negation marker ma with pseudo-verbs fī (69), məʕ-, (70) ẓend- (71). These are the only pseudo-verbs used in this variety.

69. ma Ỉ fī ʕəṣīr fī 0-tallājə
   NEG exist juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (SUA)

70. ma məʕ-ı flūs
   NEG have-1SG.OBL money
   ‘I do not have money.’ (SUA)

71. ma ẓend-ı sayyārtēn
   NEG have-1SG.OBL car.DU
   ‘I do not have two cars.’ (SUA)
Libyan speakers consistently use ma -iš with the two pseudo-verbs used in this variety, fi (72) and sind- (73).

72. ma fi-š ʒəšir fi 0-0allājə
   NEG exist-NEG juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (LY)

73. ma sind-ı-š səyyārtein
   NEG have-1SG.OBL-NEG car.DU
   ‘I do not have two cars.’ (LY)

Lebanese speakers used either the combined markers ma -iš or the postverbal marker -iš on its own. This variation was determined by the pseudo-verb itself. For example, the three speakers mentioned in (6.1.2) that used the combined marker ma -iš with the past form of the auxiliary kān, used it with the pseudo-verbs bədd- ‘want’ (74), məʃ- ‘have’ (75), fi ‘exist’ (76) and fi- ‘can/be.able’ (77). This confirms the findings of (5.1) and (5.3) that Lebanese speakers use the combined marker more with pseudo-verbs than with standard verbs, which is not found in the literature reported on in (3.2.4.3).

74. ma bədd-ı-š nām
   NEG want-1SG.OBL-NEG sleep.NONT.1SG
   ‘I do not want to sleep.’ (LE6-8)

75. ma məʃ-ı-š flūs
   NEG have-1SG.OBL-NEG money
   ‘I do not have money.’ (LE6-8)

76. ma fi-š ʒəšir fi 0-0allājə
   NEG exist-NEG juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (LE6-8)
However, the three speakers only used the preverbal marker *ma* with *ʕand-* ‘have’, as in (78).

78. ma ʕand-i səyyārtain
NEG have-1SG.OBL car.DU
‘I do not have two cars.’ (LE)

The same three speakers allowed the postverbal marker -iʃ to occur on its own with the same pseudo-verbs, as in (79-82), but again not with *ʕand-* ‘have’.

79. məʕ-ʃ-ʃ flūs
have-1SG.OBL-NEG money
‘I do not have money.’ (LE-8)

80. fi-ʃ ʃasīr fi 0-0əllājə
exist-NEG juice in DEF-fridge
‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (LE-8)

81. bədd-ʔ-ʃ nām
want-1SG.OBL-NEG sleep.NONT.1SG
‘I do not want to sleep.’ (LE-8)

82. fi-nī-ʃ ʔansā-hə
can-1SG.OBL-NEG forget.NONT.1SG-3SG.OBJ
‘I cannot forget her.’ (LE6-8)

The remaining seven speakers used the preverbal marker *ma* with all pseudo-verbs, as in (78) and (83-86).
83. ma fi ʕəṣīr fi θ-θəllājə
   NEG exist juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (LE)

84. ma bədd-ī nām
   NEG want-1SG.OBL sleep.NONT.1SG
   ‘I do not want to sleep.’ (LE)

85. ma məʕ-ī flūs
   NEG have-1SG.OBL money
   ‘I do not have money.’ (LE)

86. ma fī-nī ?ensā-hə
   NEG can-1SG.OBL forget.NONT.1SG-3SG.OBJ
   ‘I cannot forget her.’ (LE)

Overall, while the behaviour of pseudo-verbs with regard to negation is consistent in the sentences obtained from Sudanese and Libyan Arabic, it is determined by each pseudo-verb for some speakers of Lebanese Arabic. This confirms the results of the initial questionnaire reported in Table (15) and Map 6 in (5.3).

6.1.5.2. Pseudo-verbs and the auxiliary

As mentioned in (2.2.3), the co-occurrence of the auxiliary forms kān and ykūn with pseudo-verbs is associated with past and future tenses. The co-occurrence of the auxiliary with pseudo-verbs did not trigger different patterns than those found with standard verbs in terms of the choice of the negation markers. Speakers from all three varieties were not affected by the existence of the pseudo-verbs, and used the same negation marker with kān, whether it was used as a lexical verb or as an auxiliary with a standard verb or with a pseudo-verb. This is illustrated in example (87) by Sudanese speakers, example (88) by Libyan speakers, and examples (88-90) by Lebanese speakers.
87. ma kān ʃend-ī sayyārtēn
   NEG be.PST.3MSG have-1SG.OBL car.DU
   ‘I did not have two cars.’ (SUA)

88. ma kan-iš ʃnd-ī syyārtn
   NEG be.PST.3MSG-NEG have-1SG.OBL car.DU
   ‘I did not have two cars.’ (LY, LE6-8)

89. ma kān-iš bədd-ī nām
   NEG be.PST.3MSG-NEG want-1SG.OBL sleep.NONT.1SG
   ‘I did not want to sleep.’ (LE6-8)

90. ma kān bədd-ī nām
   NEG be.PST.3MSG want-1SG.OBL sleep.NONT.1SG
   ‘I did not want to sleep.’ (LE4,5,9-13)

In the future tense where ḥə-ykūn was present, speakers used the same patterns as those found with standard verbs, i.e. either ma or miš or just -iš. Sudanese speakers used ma as in (91).

91. ma h-ykūn ʃnd-ī syyārtn
   NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG have-1SG.OBL car.DU
   ‘I will not have two cars.’ (SUA LE)

Libyan speakers used miš (92), ma (93) and -iš (94)

92. miš h-ykūn ʃnd-ī syyārtn
   NEG FUT-be.NONT-3MSG have-1SG.OBL car.DU
   ‘I will not have two cars.’ (LY, LE6-13)

93. ma ḥə-ykūn ʃind-ī sayyārtēn
   NEG FUT-be.NONT-3MSG have-1SG.OBL car.DU
   ‘I will not have two cars.’ (LY)
The Lebanese speakers used *ma* as in (91) and (95), and *miš*, as in (92) and (96).

95. *ma ḥa-ykūn bōdd-ī nām*  
NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG want-1SG.OBL sleep.NONT.1SG  
‘I would not want to sleep.’ (LE)

96. *miš ḥa-ykūn bōdd-i nām*  
NEG FUT-be.NONT.3MSG want-1SG.OBL sleep.NONT.1SG  
‘I would not want to sleep.’ (LE6-13)

To recap, Sudanese speakers used *ma*, Libyan speakers used *ma-iš, ma, miš* and *-iš*, and Lebanese speakers used *ma-iš, ma* and *miš* in the negation of the auxiliary with pseudo-verbs.

### 6.1.5.3. The auxiliary with standard verbs vs. with pseudo-verbs

One of the interesting observations in the responses obtained from the questionnaires was the invariability of the forms of the auxiliary when combined with pseudo-verbs. This stands in contrast to when it occurred as the lexical verb or combined with other types of verbs. This variation was discussed in (2.2.3.1). This also stands in contrast to Trimingham’s (1946) claims that in Sudanese Arabic the auxiliary has to agree with the predicate, as in (97, 98).

97. *kānat ṣīnd-ak sānā*  
be.PST.3FSG have-2SG.OBL watch.F  
“You had a watch.’ (SUA, Trimingham 1946: 58)
In responses from all the speakers of the different varieties, the auxiliary illustrated an invariable form in terms of person, number and gender when combining with pseudo-verbs. This stands in opposition to the variable forms of the auxiliary found with standard verbs, which agree with the subjects of lexical verbs in person, number and gender. In fact, even though in some varieties, including Libyan Arabic, the form of the auxiliary that combines with pseudo-verbs can be variable and can agree with the oblique pronoun of the pseudo-verb, as shown in (2.2.3.1), the more common form is actually the invariable form. However, it is important to note that this invariability is not exclusive to negated sentences, as these invariable forms are used in affirmative sentences as well.

With non-verbal predicates, the auxiliary/copula agrees with the subject of the clause in person, number and gender. The examples in (99-101), show the auxiliary and the subject pronouns in the first person plural form in Sudanese, Libyan and Lebanese Arabic respectively.

98. mā kān/kānat ʕinda-na illa xaddām/a wāhid
   NEG be.PST.3MSG/3FSG have-1PL.OBL except servant.M/F one
   ‘We had only one servant.’ (SUA, Trimingham 1946: 57)

In responses from all the speakers of the different varieties, the auxiliary illustrated an invariable form in terms of person, number and gender when combining with pseudo-verbs. This stands in opposition to the variable forms of the auxiliary found with standard verbs, which agree with the subjects of lexical verbs in person, number and gender. In fact, even though in some varieties, including Libyan Arabic, the form of the auxiliary that combines with pseudo-verbs can be variable and can agree with the oblique pronoun of the pseudo-verb, as shown in (2.2.3.1), the more common form is actually the invariable form. However, it is important to note that this invariability is not exclusive to negated sentences, as these invariable forms are used in affirmative sentences as well.

99. eħna ma kunnā ?ašhāb l-bēt
     1PL.SUB NEG be.PST.1PL owner.PL DEF-house
     ‘We were not the owners of the house.’ (SUA)

100. eħne ma kunnā-š ?ašhāb l-bēt
     1PL.SUB NEG be.PST.1PL-NEG owner.PL DEF-house
     ‘We were not the owners of the house.’ (LY)

101. eħna ma kunnā-(š) ?ašhāb l-bayt
     1PL.SUB NEG be.PST.1PL-NEG owner.PL DEF-house
     ‘We were not the owners of the house.’ (LE(6-8))
In examples (102-104), both the auxiliary and the standard verb are in the first person singular form.

102. ma kunt b-aktib r-risālə
   NEG be.PST.1SG IND-write.NONT.1SG DEF-letter
   ‘I was not writing the letter.’ (SUA)

103. ma kunt-iš niktib fi r-risālə
   NEG be.PST.1SG-NEG write.NONT.1SG FI DEF-letter
   ‘I was not writing the letter.’ (LY)

104. ma kenit bi-ktib r-risāle
   NEG be.PST.1SG IND-write.NONT.1SG DEF-letter
   ‘I was not writing the letter.’ (LE4,5,9-13)

In the following examples, pseudo-verbs are the complements of the auxiliary kān and ykūn, which are in the third person masculine singular past and non-tensed forms respectively. The two forms of the auxiliary were used invariably with all combinations of different persons, numbers and genders of the oblique pronouns attached to the pseudo-verbs. The information about the person, number and gender of the subjects of the pseudo-verbs were indicated solely through the oblique pronouns.

In example (105) from Sudanese Arabic, the oblique pronoun attached to the pseudo-verb ʕend- is in the third person plural form, and in (106) it is in the first person singular form, while the auxiliary is in the third person masculine singular past form in both examples.

105. ma kān ʕend-hum bēt
   NEG be.PST.3MSG have-3PL.OBL house
   ‘They did not have a house.’ (SUA)
A similar pattern was found in examples (107, 108) from Libyan Arabic, and examples (109, 110) from Lebanese Arabic. In these four examples, the form of the auxiliary does not agree with the oblique pronouns attached to the pseudo-verbs in number or person.

In examples (111-116), the auxiliary is in the third person masculine singular non-tensed form, while the oblique pronouns of the pseudo-verbs are in the third person plural form in (111-113), and the first person singular form in (114-116).
112. miš/ma ḥa-ykūn ẓind-hum sāyyārtēn
   NEG    FUT-be.NONT.3MSG have-3PL.OBL car.DU
   ‘They will not have two cars.’ (LY)

113. (miš)/ma ḥa-ykūn ẓand-hum sāyyārtain
   NEG    FUT-be.NONT.3MSG have-3PL.OBL car.DU
   ‘They will not have two cars.’ (LE4,5,(6-13))

114. ma ḥa-ykūn ẓend-i sāyyārtēn
   NEG    FUT-be.NONT.3MSG have-1SG.OBL car.DU
   ‘I will not have two cars.’ (SUA)

115. miš/ma ḥa-ykūn ẓind-i sāyyārtēn
   NEG    FUT-be.NONT.3MSG have-1SG.OBL car.DU
   ‘I will not have two cars.’ (LY)

116. (miš)/ma ḥa-ykūn ẓand-i sāyyārtain
   NEG    FUT-be.NONT.3MSG have-1SG.OBL car.DU
   ‘I will not have two cars.’ (LE4,5,(6-13))

To sum up, while kān and ykūn agree with the person, number and gender of the subject of the clause when they occur as the lexical verbs, or as the auxiliary verb that takes standard verbs as complements, they do not do so when combined with pseudo-verbs. Instead, the most common form of the auxiliary in this context is the invariable form, at least in Libyan Arabic, represented in the third person masculine singular form. This was shown in examples in (105-116), which showed disagreement between the auxiliary and the pseudo-verbs in person and number.

6.1.5.4. Dropping of negative marker ma

The data presented in this section (6.1.5) confirms my previous observations about the dropping of the preverbal negative marker ma discussed in (3.2.4.6). I concluded that the
dropping of *ma* is phonologically-conditioned by the presence of a labial as the first consonant of a verb. The attested dropping of *ma*, in the sentences produced by Lebanese speakers, with the pseudo-verbs *bədd*-, *məʕ*-, *fi* ‘exist’ and *fi*- ‘can/be.able’, but not with *ṣand*-, offers further evidence supporting this conclusion. This was attested in examples (117-120).

117. *məʕ-ī-š flūs*
   have-1SG.OBL-NEG money
   ‘I do not have money.’ (LE6-8)

118. *fī-š ʕasīr fī 0-0aŀlājə*
   exist-NEG juice in DEF-fridge
   ‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (LE6-8)

119. *bədd-ī-š nām*
   want-1SG.OBL-NEG sleep.NONT.1SG
   ‘I do not want to sleep.’ (LE6-8)

120. *fī-nī-š ʔansā-hə*
   can-1SG.OBL-NEG forget.NONT.1SG-3FSG.OBJ
   ‘I cannot forget her.’ (LE6-8)

To sum up, while the interaction between pseudo-verbs and negation in Sudanese and Libyan Arabic does not trigger any special patterns, it does so in Lebanese Arabic. Pseudo-verbs in Lebanese Arabic show interesting interaction with negation in that negation can be expressed solely by the postverbal negation marker *-iš*, when the suitable phonological environment is available.
6.2. Non-sentential negation

Non-sentential negation was investigated in the narrow questionnaire and the participants were asked to negate subordinate clauses and constituents. This was done in order to find out if these contexts demonstrate different negation patterns to those found in sentential negation.

6.2.1. Subordinate clauses

Negation of subordinate clauses was not found to be different from that of main clauses. It was found that the same factors and grammatical categories that interacted with negation and influenced negation patterns in main clauses, did so in subordinate clauses as well. The example in (121) illustrates the use of *ma* by Sudanese and Lebanese speakers, while examples (122) and (123) illustrate the use of *ma -iš* by Libyan and Lebanese speakers, with the auxiliary *kān* in a subordinate clause.

121. ḥbbt        ennu       ma    kān        kbīr
    like.PST.1SG that.3MSG  NEG  be.PST.1SG  big
    ‘I liked that it was not big.’ (SUA, LE)

122. ḥabbēt      ennah      ma    kān-iš    kbīr
    like.PST.1SG that.3MSG  NEG  be.PST.1SG-NEG  big
    ‘I liked that it was not big.’ (LY)

123. ḥabbayt     ennu       ma    kān-iš    kbīr
    like.PST.1SG that.3MSG  NEG  be.PST.1SG-NEG  big
    ‘I liked that it was not big.’ (LE6-8)

The non-tensed form of the auxiliary, *ykūn*, was negated with *ma* by Sudanese speakers, as in (124), and some Lebanese speakers, as in (125). *Ykūn* was negated with *ma -iš* by Libyan speakers, as in (126), and three Lebanese speakers, as in (127), when it occurred in a subordinate clause. Subordinate clauses are the only contexts in which auxiliary *ykūn* can
appear without another element. The same patterns held whether or not a complementiser was present in the subordinate clause.

124. b-faḍīl (ennəh) ma ykūn jīdīd
   IND-prefer.NONT.1SG that.3MSG NEG be.NONT.1SG new
   ‘I prefer it not to be new.’ (SUA)

125. b-faḍīl (ennu) ma ykūn jīdīd
   IND-prefer.NONT.1SG that.3MSG NEG be.NONT.1SG new
   ‘I prefer it not to be new.’ (LE)

126. nfaḍīl (ennəh) ma ykūn-iʃ jīdīd
   prefer.NONT.1SG that.3MSG NEG be.NONT.1SG-NEG new
   ‘I prefer it not to be new.’ (LY)

127. b-faḍīl (ennu) ma ykūn-iʃ jīdīd
   IND-prefer.NONT.1SG that.3MSG NEG be.NONT.1SG-NEG new
   ‘I prefer it not to be new.’ (LE6-8)

The non-tensed form of the standard verb yākil ‘eat’ was negated with ma in Sudanese and Lebanese Arabic, as in (128) and (129), and ma -iʃ in Libyan Arabic in (139), in a subordinate position. This was the case when the matrix verb yfaḍīl ‘prefer’ was in the non-tensed form.

128. b-faḍīl ma ?ākul hassa
   IND-prefer.NONT.1SG NEG eat.NONT.1SG now
   ‘I prefer not to eat now.’ (SUA)

129. b-faḍīl ma ?ākul halla?
   IND-prefer.NONT.1SG NEG eat.NONT.1SG now
   ‘I prefer not to eat now.’ (LE)
‘I prefer not to eat now.’ (LY)

The same was attested for the non-tensed verbal form *ydayig* ‘bother’ in all three varieties, when the matrix verb *həbb* ‘want/like’ is in the past form.

131. *həbb* ma *ydayig-ni*
    like.PST.3MSG NEG bother.NONT.3MSG-1SG.OBJ
    ‘He wanted not to bother me.’ (SUA)

132. *həbb* ma *ydayig-nī-š*
    like.PST.3MSG NEG bother.NONT.3MSG-1SG.OBJ-NEG
    ‘He wanted not to bother me.’ (LY)

133. *həbb* ma *ydayīʔ-ni*
    like.PST.3MSG NEG bother.NONT.3MSG-1SG.OBJ
    ‘He wanted not to bother me.’ (LE)

In (134) and (135), the active participle *gāšid* ‘sit.AP’ is in the subordinate clause and is negated with *ma* by Sudanese speakers in (134), and with *mū* and *miš* by Libyan and Lebanese speakers in (135, 136).

134. *šāf* walad ma *gāšid* fi-l-hādiqa
    see.PST.3MSG boy NEG sit.AP.MSG in-DEF-garden
    ‘He saw a boy who’s not sitting, in the garden.’ (SUA)

135. *šāf* wild miš *gāšid* fi-l-hādiqa
    see.PST.3MSG boy NEG sit.AP.MSG in-DEF-garden
    ‘He saw a boy who’s not sitting, in the garden.’ (LY)
136. šāf wallad mū/(miš) ʔāfīd bi-l-hadīʔa
see.PST.3MSG boy NEG sit.AP.MSG in-DEF-garden
‘He saw a boy who’s not sitting, in the garden.’ (LE(9-13))

Similar results were obtained when the complementiser enn ‘that’ was present in the subordinate clause, as in (137-139). The active participle forms were negated with the same markers attested for the three varieties and mentioned above.

137. ma ḥajab-ni ennāh ma
NEG please.PST.3MSG-1SG.OBJ that.3MSG NEG
fāhim l-mawḍūf
understand.AP.MSG DEF-subject
‘I did not like that he does not understand the subject.’ (SUA)

138. ma ḥajab-nī-š ennāh miš
NEG please.PST.3MSG-1SG.OBJ-NEG that.3MSG NEG
fāhim l-mawḍūf
understand.AP.MSG DEF-subject
‘I did not like that he does not understand the subject.’ (LY)

139. ma ḥajab-ni ennū mū/(miš)
NEG please.PST.3MSG-1SG.OBJ that.3MSG NEG
fāhim l-mawḍūf
understand.AP.MSG DEF-subject
‘I did not like that he does not understand the subject.’ (LE(9-13))

The presence of the relative pronoun ḥātī ‘who’ in the subordinate clause did not trigger any differences either, as shown in (140-142). In these examples, ḥātī is followed by an active participle form, which is negated with the same negation markers attested for Sudanese, Lebanese and Libyan Arabic.
When non-verbal predicates were in the subordinate clause, no special negation patterns were triggered. The Sudanese speakers used *ma* with the adjectival predicate in (143).

143. ḥabbēt ennə ma kbīr
    like.PST.1SG that.3MSG NEG big
    ‘I liked that it was not big.’ (SUA)

The Libyans used *miš* in (144), and the Lebanese used *mū* or *miš*, as in (145).

144. ḥabbēt ennəh miš kbīr
    like.PST.1SG that.3MSG NEG big
    ‘I liked that it was not big.’ (LY)

145. ḥabbayt ennu (miš)/mū kbīr
    like.PST.1SG that.3MSG NEG big
    ‘I liked that it was not big.’ (LE(9-13))

Overall, the occurrence of negation in subordinate clauses did not show any diverging patterns in terms of negation strategies.
6.2.2. Constituent negation

Only one type of constituent negation was investigated in the narrow questionnaire and that is the negation of quantifier phrases. None of the participants showed any different strategies of negation when asked to negate quantifier phrases, i.e. they used the same negation markers with non-verbal predicates regardless of their position in the clause. Example (146) shows *ma* being used by the Sudanese speakers to negate the quantifier phrase *halba/ktīr/ktār nās* ‘many people’.

146. ma nās katīra/ktār kānū hina
   NEG people many be.PST.3PL here
   ‘Not many people were here.’ (SUA)

Libyan and Lebanese speakers used *miš* and *miš/mū* in (147) and (148) respectively.

147. miš halba nās kānū hne
   NEG many people be.PST.3PL here
   ‘Not many people were here.’ (LY)

148. (miš)/muš ktīr nās kānū hōn
   NEG many people be.PST.3PL here
   ‘Not many people were here.’ (LE(9-13))

To conclude, none of the three Arabic varieties were found to make any distinctions in terms of negation patterns based on clause type or position within the clause.

6.3. Emphatic negation

As discussed in (3.2.4.4), emphatic negation is the type of negation that is characterised by the use of the preverbal negation marker *ma* on its own and the dropping of the postverbal marker -*iš*. This does not apply to speakers of Sudanese Arabic, as they do not make use of -
*iš* in the first place. While emphasising negation can be expressed prosodically by stressing the negation marker, this section focuses on the dropping of the postverbal negation marker.

This phenomenon was investigated and mixed results were found. For instance, the example in (149) is a response to a context where the participants were asked to imagine a situation where they had to leave the office immediately because of an emergency but they were not allowed to do so by their boss. In their response, they were asked to emphatically tell the boss that they could not stop them from leaving.

Libyan speakers gave mixed responses as some of them used *ma* on its own (149), and some used it with -*iš* (150).

149. ma tigdir timnəš-ni

\[
\text{NEG} \quad \text{can.NONT.2MSG} \quad \text{stop.NONT.2MSG-1SG.OBJ}
\]

‘You cannot stop me!’ (LY)

150. ma tigdir-iš timnəš-ni

\[
\text{NEG} \quad \text{can.NONT.2MSG} \quad \text{stop.NONT.2MSG-1SG.OBJ}
\]

‘You cannot stop me!’ (LY)

Another context that is associated with emphatic negation is where an oath word like *wallāhi* ‘by.God’ is used. Interestingly, the dropping of -*iš* in emphatic negation with *wallāhi* was also realised with the negative auxiliary *māhu* in example (151).

151. wallāhi māhu jdīd

\[
\text{by.God} \quad \text{NEG.3MSG} \quad \text{new}
\]

‘I swear it’s not new.’ (LY)

Lebanese speakers did not use -*iš* with *ma* in the emphatic negation context in (152). However, they hardly used it outside the context of pseudo-verbs and auxiliary *kān*, so their responses cannot be used in favour of claiming that -*iš* is dropped for the effect of empathic negation.
Emphatic negation is a linguistic category that is hard to investigate using a questionnaire. The reason behind this is that in addition to its personal nature that is associated with the speaker’s intention to emphasise negation, it is also hard to elicit. Therefore, I conclude that this issue is in need of further investigation.

6.4. Summary

The responses received from the participants recruited for this stage of the research showed variation in negation patterns. This reflects the diverse nature of the selected Arabic varieties investigated in terms of the many linguistic elements and constructions associated with negation. This diversity was not only perceptible in the different varieties but occasionally within speakers from the same country. This could be attributed to the different varieties within these three countries.

Sudanese speakers used ma invariably throughout the different tasks of the narrow questionnaire, which reflects the consistent manner in which this variety uses the same negation marker in both verb and non-verb predicates, as illustrated in Map (4) in (5.1). This was the case in both sentential and non-sentential negation.

Libyan speakers used ma -iš in the negation of standard verbs and the auxiliary in their past forms, non-tensed forms in the absence of the future marker, and with pseudo-verbs. They used miš in the negation of non-verb predicates, active participles, and with non-tensed forms in the presence of the future marker. Moreover, they used ma with non-tensed forms in the presence of the future marker and in empathic negation. One young Libyan speaker used single -iš with non-tensed forms in all contexts. The fact that the variation between the negation of past forms and non-tensed forms was determined by the presence or absence of
the future marker, which is originally an active participle form, suggests that predicate type and form are the most important factors in determining negation patterns in Libyan Arabic.

With regard to Lebanese Arabic, the data collected from Lebanese speakers showed a great deal of variation. Lebanese speakers used *ma* with past and non-tensed forms of standard verbs, and *miš* or *mū* for non-verbal predicates and active participles. Furthermore, they used *ma* or *miš* with non-tensed forms in the presence of the future marker. The data indicated three levels in the use of -iš as a negative marker in Lebanese Arabic. The first was the prohibition of -iš regardless of predicate type and in all contexts (two speakers). The second was the use of *miš* with the future tense with non-tensed verbal forms, which was done by every speaker who allowed the use of -iš (eight speakers). The third was represented in the division between the speakers who used *ma* -iš with *kān* (three speakers), and the speakers who did not use *ma* -iš with *kān* but with non-verbal predicates and active participles (five speakers). The group that consisted of three speakers seemed to align the use of the combined marker with the auxiliary, pseudo-verbs (non-standard verbs), and the grammaticalised future marker, even though they did not use it with active participles. The group of five, on the other hand, patterned verbal predicates together in contrast to non-verbal predicates and active participles.

The patterns observed in the sentences produced by Lebanese speakers suggest that predicate type and form play an important role in determining the negation pattern, whether it was verbal vs. non-verbal predicate, or the form and type of the verbal predicate. In addition, these are patterns that have not been observed or commented on in the literature on negation in Lebanese Arabic nor were they found in the data cited in (3.2.4.3).

The negation patterns followed by Libyan and Lebanese speakers were consistent across sentential and non-sentential negation contexts.
Chapter Seven: Negative elements

This chapter discusses two special inherently negative elements found in Libyan Arabic and some other Modern Arabic varieties. These are what I refer to as negative auxiliaries and the negative particle \( m\text{ʕəš} \) ‘no more’. Both these negative elements are non-standard negative markers (see 1.2.2.2 and 3.2.1 for more on standard vs. non-standard negation). In addition, this chapter explores metalinguistic negation and the possibility of the existence of a dedicated metalinguistic negation marker in Libyan Arabic. The chapter focuses on Libyan Arabic but contains data from Sudanese and Lebanese Arabic, obtained through the narrow questionnaire, where relevant.

In section (7.1), I investigate negative auxiliaries in terms of their morpho-syntactic properties, distribution, and function and establish that they can no longer be identified as synchronic combinations of pronouns and negative markers. I conclude that they can be used in place of \( miš \) to serve a special pragmatic function and I conjecture a potential historical path for their development. In section (7.2), I investigate the morpho-syntactic properties and distribution of \( m\text{ʕəš} \) and conclude that \( m\text{ʕəš} \) is a negative particle that can combine with nominal, adjectival, and prepositional phrases, as well as verbs. Section (7.3) explores the behaviour of the negative marker \( miš \) as a potential metalinguistic negation marker.

7.1. Negative auxiliaries

In this section, I discuss a limited set of negative elements that are historically formed from the merger between negation markers and what looks like personal pronouns. These negative constructions are found in many Modern Arabic varieties including Libyan Arabic, and are referred to as negative pronouns by Eid (1991: 50), and negative copulas by Brustad (2000: 297-8), Lucas (2013) and Cowell (1964: 387). They function as negators of the predicate of the clause, as in example (1), and have a similar function and distribution to the negation marker \( miš \), as in example (2).
1. huwwə ma-hū-š hne
   3MSG.SUB NEG-3MSG-NEG here
   ‘He is not here.’ (LY)

2. huwwə miš hne
   3MSG.SUB NEG here
   ‘He is not here.’ (LY)

These negative elements are not especially used to contrast pronouns despite their pronominal origins, as shown in (1). In fact, either negative auxiliaries or the negative marker miš can be used in example (3) to contrast the two pronouns ?ane ‘1SG.SUB, and huwwə ‘3MSG.SUB’.

3. miš/mahūš ?ane huwwə
   NEG/NEG.3MSG 1SG.SUB 3MSG.SUB
   ‘Not me, him!’ (LY-NQ)

I establish that these constructions are not synchronic combinations of negation markers and personal pronouns, but that they have developed a unique morpho-syntactic identity and function, and can no longer be referred to as pronouns. In the next few sections I first present the data from the narrow questionnaire that illustrates the use of negative auxiliaries in Sudanese, Lebanese and Libyan Arabic in (7.1.1). Following this, I investigate their morphological properties and syntactic distribution in (7.1.2) and (7.1.3), as well as their function in (7.1.4), with a focus on Libyan Arabic. I also refer to a few accounts in the literature, which label them as negative pronouns or copulas. Finally, I conjecture a historical path through which negative auxiliaries could have come about in (7.1.5).

7.1.1. Negative auxiliaries in Sudanese, Lebanese and Libyan Arabic

Speakers of the investigated three varieties made use of these auxiliaries, as shown in the following examples. Sudanese Arabic is shown in example (4), Libyan in (5) and Lebanese in (6). All these are negative auxiliaries in the third person masculine singular form.
The following examples show the first person singular negative auxiliary in Sudanese Arabic in (7) and Libyan Arabic in (8).

4. li maktab l-barīd llī māhu baḡīd
to office DEF-post that NEG.3MSG far
min hena
from here
‘To the post office that’s not far from here.’ (SUA)

5. li maktib l-baɾīd llī mahuwāš/mahūš bṣīd
to office DEF-post that NEG.3MSG far
min hne
from here
‘To the post office that’s not far from here.’ (LY)

6. huwwe māνnu l-mudīr
3MSG.SUB NEG.3MSG DEF-manager
‘He is not the manager.’ (LE)

The following examples show the first person singular negative auxiliary in Sudanese Arabic in (7) and Libyan Arabic in (8).

7. zay maʔakūn ?ana mānī ?ana llī
like that be.NONT.1SG 1SG.SUB NEG.1SG 1SG.SUB that
kunt zamān
be.PST.1SG past
‘It’s like I am not the old me.’ (SUA)

8. maniš ?aŋe llī kunt zmān
NEG.1SG 1SG.SUB that be.PST.1SG past
‘I am not the old me.’ (LY)
7.1.2. Morphological properties

Negative auxiliaries in Modern Arabic varieties are inflected for person, number and gender, similar to the declension of personal pronouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>OBJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>?ane</td>
<td>-nî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>inta</td>
<td>-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>inti</td>
<td>-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>huwwə</td>
<td>-h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>hiyyə</td>
<td>-hə</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (17): Personal pronouns and negative auxiliaries in Libyan Arabic.

Table (17) shows the paradigm of personal pronouns and negative auxiliaries in Libyan Arabic. With regard to the origins of the pronoun-like part of the auxiliaries, several observations can be made about the type of pronoun they seem to have originated from. It can be seen that there is a variation in the form of pronouns that provide the original part of the negative auxiliary, i.e. the agreement marker. In the singular and plural forms of the second person and the plural forms of the third person negative auxiliaries, the agreement markers take the forms of object/oblique pronouns. Singular forms of the third person auxiliaries, on the other hand, show divergence in the origins of the agreement markers. Subject pronouns are the closest to these but they are by no means identical. The agreement markers of
negative auxiliary in the first person forms resemble object pronouns in the singular and either subject or object pronouns in the plural forms.

Other Modern Arabic varieties have negative auxiliaries too, and the connections between one type of personal pronouns and the negative auxiliaries are sometimes even more obscure in some of these varieties. Palestinian Arabic, for example, allows two alternatives in which auxiliaries can be connected to either subject or object pronouns (Wilmsen 2014: 101).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB OBJ</td>
<td>PSS/ OBL NEG AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>?ana -ni -i mā-ni ēhna -na -na ma-hna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>enta -k -k ma-nṭa entu -kum -kum ma-ntu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>enti -k -k ma-nti entu -kum -kum ma-ntu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>huwwū -u -u ma-hū humma -hum -hum ma-humma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>hiyyū -hū -hū ma-hī humma -hum -hum ma-humma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (18): Personal pronouns and negative auxiliaries in Sudanese Arabic.
Table (19): Personal pronouns and negative auxiliaries in Egyptian Arabic.

Varieties like Sudanese and Egyptian Arabic show consistency in that the origins of the negative auxiliaries are always connected with subject pronouns. For example, the second person negative auxiliary form is *ma-nťā-* in Egyptian and Sudanese Arabic as illustrated in the Tables (18) and (19), the latter from Benmamoun (2000: 78, 79). While *-ntā-* looks more like the subject pronoun than other pronoun forms, it is still the case that it is not identical and that the auxiliary has developed its own representation with a monosyllabic version of the pronoun.
Table (20): Personal pronouns and negative auxiliaries in Syrian and Lebanese Arabic.

In Syrian and Lebanese Arabic on the other hand, the consistent pattern is the connection between auxiliaries and object/oblique pronouns instead of subject pronouns, as can be seen in Table (20) from Brustad (2000: 296). Negative auxiliaries are reported to not be interchangeable with the negative markers *mū* in Syrian Arabic, but show complementary distribution (Brustad 2000: 299).

The divergent patterns of the agreement markers of negative auxiliaries from the different forms of personal pronouns are evidence for the independent identity of these elements. This contrasts with Eid’s (1991) reference to them as pronouns. These auxiliaries are not synchronically derived from the pronouns but have developed their own identity and phonetic representations, which will be further substantiated in the following section.
7.1.3. Syntactic distribution

With regard to the syntactic distribution of negative auxiliaries, they can co-occur with personal pronouns, which is illustrated in examples (9, 10) from Libyan Arabic.

9. (huwwə) mahūš ʕārif
   3MSG.SUB NEG.3MSG know.AP.MSG
   ‘He does not know.’ (LY-NQ)

10. (ʔane) manīš ʕārif
    1SG.SUB NEG.1SG know.AP.MSG
    ‘I do not know.’ (LY-NQ)

They can co-occur with full noun phrases as subjects, as in (11). Note that these auxiliaries always agree with the subject of the clause, as in (9-11). The negative auxiliary is marked for the third person masculine singular, in (9, 11) and for the first person singular in (10), both agreeing with the subject.

11. Ahmid mahūš ʕārif
    Ahmid NEG.3MSG know.AP.MSG
    ‘Ahmid does not know.’ (LY-NQ)

This further suggests that they are not negated versions of personal pronouns but have their own syntactic distribution and function. If they had been pronouns, they would not co-occur with the pronouns or noun phrases they refer to.

When non-verbal predicates are negated, either the negative marker miš or negative auxiliaries are used.

12. huwwə miš/mahūš səʕād
    3MSG.SUB NEG/NEG.3MSG happy
    ‘He is not happy.’ (LY-NQ)
As noted in (2.2.2), in Libyan Arabic, sentences with non-verbal predicates do not require the existence of a copula in present time reference. When the time reference is in the past, *kān* is used to indicate past tense, as in (14) with the adjectival predicate *səʕīd* ‘happy’, and in (15) with the active participle *ʕārif* ‘know.AP’.

13. huwwə səʕīd
   3MSG.SUB happy
   ‘He is happy.’ (LY-NQ)

14. huwwə kān səʕīd
   3MSG.SUB be.PST.3MSG happy
   ‘He was happy.’ (LY-NQ)

15. huwwə kān ʕārif
   3MSG.SUB be.PST.3MSG know.AP.MSG
   ‘He knew.’ (LY-NQ)

Negative auxiliaries can combine with the active participle verbal form *ʕārif* as in examples (9-11). This could be attributed to the nature of active participles and their adjectival origins (see 2.1.4). Active participles still retain some aspects of their non-verbal behaviour and are still treated as non-verbal predicates by *kān*, negative particles and negative auxiliaries, as in examples (15) and (16).

16. huwwə miš/mahūš ʕārif
   3MSG.SUB NEG/NEG.3MSG know.AP.MSG
   ‘He does not know.’ (LY-NQ)

The fact that negative auxiliaries have agreement markers and can combine with verbal forms i.e. active participles, suggests that they are better referred to as auxiliaries instead of negative particles or negative copulas.
Note that in the past tense, negative auxiliaries co-occur with the auxiliary َكان, as in example (17). This can be treated as a sequence of auxiliaries occurring after each other. َميش can also occur after َكان, as in (18).

17. **huwwə َكان mahūš َسەئید**
   3MSG.SUB be.PST.3MSG NEG.3MSG happy
   ‘He was not happy/was unhappy.’ (LY-NQ)

18. **huwwə َكان َميش َسەئید**
   3MSG.SUB be.PST.3MSG NEG happy
   ‘He was not happy/was unhappy.’ (LY-NQ)

I have shown that the agreement markers of negative auxiliaries take the forms of subject, object and oblique pronouns and diverge from the original forms of these pronouns. I have also shown that negative auxiliaries can co-occur with personal pronouns or noun phrases, and co-occur with the auxiliary َكان. Thus, I conclude that these negative elements are not synchronic combinations of negation markers and pronouns, but that they have their own independent identity and functions. In addition, the fact that negative auxiliaries have agreement markers and combine with active participles justifies my decision to refer to them as negative auxiliaries instead of negative particles or copulas. I now turn to an investigation of their function and how it differs from that of the negative marker َميش.

### 7.1.4. Function of the negative auxiliary

The fact that the negative auxiliary carries the same semantic information as the negation marker َميش is evidence that they have similar functions. However, it is not clear what is their specific function or what are the contexts in which they occur instead of the negation marker. In this section, I investigate a number of potential functions for these auxiliaries using examples from my own introspective judgements and some from the narrow questionnaire. I start by comparing the syntactic distribution of negative auxiliaries to that of negative marker َميش in Libyan Arabic.
7.1.4.1.  Negative auxiliaries vs. miš

Miš is used as a negation marker in a number of contexts. These are the negation of non-verbal predicates (19), active participles (20), and with the future marker to negate verbal predicates in the future tense (21).

19. l-bēt    miš   ʔəbiyid
   DEF-house  NEG  white
   ‘The house is not white.’ (LY)

20. ʔane    miš   māši   li-l-madīrsa
   1SG.SUB   NEG  go.AP.MSG  to-DEF-school
   ‘I am not going to school.’ (LY)

21. Ahmad  miš   hə-yšūf   l-mudīr  l-isbūʃ
   Ahmad   NEG  FUT-see.NONT.3MSG  DEF-manager  DEF-week
   l-jāy
   DEF-next
   ‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (LY)

Negative auxiliaries can be used in the negation of non-verbal predicates (22), active participles (23), but not with future marker to negate verbal predicates (24).41

41 This is not the case in Algerian and Tunisian Arabic where negative auxiliaries have a wider distribution. They combine with the future marker in Algerian Arabic in (1), and with either the future marker or the non-tensed form in Tunisian Arabic in (2) and (3).

I. mahūš   rāyeh  ykūn   fi   ʔəsār   fi  ʔ-ʔəllājə
   NEG.3MSG  FUT  be.NORT.3MSG  exist  juice  in  DEF-fridge
   ‘There will not be juice in the fridge.’ (AA)

II. mahūš   beš   ykūn   ʔəmmə   ʔəsār   fi  ʔ-ʔəllājə
   NEG.3MSG  FUT  be.NORT.3MSG  exist  juice  in  DEF-fridge
   ‘There will not be juice in the fridge.’ (TA)
22. l-bēt mahūš ʔabyið
DEF-house NEG.3MSG white
‘The house is not white.’ (LY)

23. ?ane manīš māši li-l-madīrsə
1SG.SUB NEG.1SG go.AP.MSG to-DEF-school
‘I am not going to school.’ (LY-NQ)

24. *Ahmid mahūš hā-yšūf l-mudīr l-isbūʃ
Ahmid NEG.3MSG FUT-see.NONT.3MSG DEF-manager DEF-week
l-jāy
DEF-next
‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (LY)

The observation that miš is interchangeable with negative auxiliaries in certain contexts, but not all, suggests that there is a restriction on the contexts that allow negative auxiliaries. From the patterns observed in examples (22, 23), they negate non-verbal predicates, and active participles, which are verbal forms that maintain adjectival inflections.

In spite of the fact that the future marker is originally an active participle form, it cannot be negated with negative auxiliaries in Libyan Arabic, as in (24). The future marker is a grammaticalised active participle, which perhaps hinders negative auxiliaries from recognising it as an active participle form. Note that this is not the case in Algerian and Tunisian Arabic as shown in (5.6) and footnote (30). Miš in Libyan Arabic, on the other
hand, has a wider distribution and can negate several types of elements and constructions, one of which is the originally active participle future marker.

7.1.4.2. Function

In order to test for the function of negative auxiliaries in the narrow questionnaire, participants were given certain contexts, and then presented with possible sentences or replies that included the use of negative auxiliaries as opposed to that of the negative marker miš. These examples were used as a basis for the investigation of the function of the negative auxiliaries, along with some examples from the researcher’s native Libyan Arabic.

The fact that negative auxiliaries, as opposed to the negative marker miš, have agreement markers that are developed from personal pronouns suggests that they are negating information about the noun phrases or pronouns, to which they refer, in an emphatic or a contrastive way. However, in example (1), the speaker is not using the negative auxiliary to emphasise the inapplicability of the predicate hne ‘here’ to the subject huwwə ‘3MSG.SUB’, or at least the participants were not asked to do that in the questionnaire with regard to this particular example. The negative auxiliary is not used in a manner where there is a contrast with another pronoun either, nor was this suggested in the task in the questionnaire. As a matter of fact, the function of contrasting two pronouns can be done using either miš or the negative auxiliary, as in example (3), which suggests that negative auxiliaries are not used especially for that.

While it is not possible to determine the difference in use between miš and negative auxiliaries from the above, the responses to tasks in the questionnaire offer a few suggestions. For instance, the examples in (25) and (26) show a context in which the participants were told to imagine that they were arguing with a friend about whether the post office is close to or far from their house and that the friend believed it to be far. On the next day, the participant prepares himself/herself to go to the post office when the same friend asks where they are going, and so they reply with the examples in (25-27) in Sudanese, Libyan and Lebanese Arabic respectively. The examples illustrate a context in which the speaker is denying the
friend’s claims from the previous day and asserting their own, using the negative auxiliary to do so. It was found that most speakers actually used the negative auxiliary in this context.

25. li maktab l-barīd lī mahū baṭīd
to office DEF-post that NEG.MSG far
min hena
from here

‘To the post office that’s not far from here.’ (SUA)

26. li maktib l-barīd lī mahūš bṣīd
to office DEF-post that NEG.MSG far
min hne
from here

‘To the post office that’s not far from here.’ (LY)

27. li maktab l-barīd lī mānu baṭīd
to office DEF-post that NEG.MSG far
min hōn
from here

‘To the post office that’s not far from here.’ (LE)

The participants were also presented with a task in which they were told to imagine a situation where they got a new job along with a friend of theirs, after a successful interview with someone they both thought was their manager. On their first day at work, the participant found out that that person was not the manager but their friend did not. The friend told the participant that he was going to ask the person, i.e. the assumed manager, for time off work for an emergency. The participant then has to reply with one of two sentences where they use either the negative auxiliary or the negative marker miš. In this context, the speaker and listener share mutual awareness of old information where it is assumed that the person referred to by hāda ‘this.MSG’ is the manager, and the participant is negating this. The sentence in (28) illustrates the participants’ reply and eight out of ten Libyan Arabic speakers reacted by using the negative auxiliary to deny this information.
Furthermore, in one of the tasks of the narrow questionnaire, a new referent is introduced into the sentence and a relative clause is used to negate information about this referent. In this context, the participant is telling a group of children the story of Little Red Riding Hood. In the middle of the narrative, they reach the part where he/she introduces the wolf’s character. It is found that in this context no participant from the three varieties used the negative auxiliary. Instead, all participants used the negation marker for non-verbal predicates in their respective varieties.

28. hādə mahūš l-mudīr
   this.3MSG NEG.3MSG DEF-manager
   ‘This is not the manager.’ (LY)

29. kān fī ḏīb fī l-gābə ma ʕārif
   be.PST.3MSG exist wolf in DEF-woods NEG know.AP.MSG
   ennə Laila jāyya
   that Laila come.AP.FSG
   ‘There was a wolf in the woods who does not know that Red Riding Hood is coming.’
   (SUA)

30. kān fī ḏīb fī l-gābə miš ʕārif
   be.PST.3MSG exist wolf in DEF-woods NEG know.AP.MSG
   ennə Laila jāyya
   that Laila come.AP.FSG
   ‘There was a wolf in the woods who does not know that Red Riding Hood is coming.’
   (LY)
31. kān fi ʿārab fi l-ḡābe miš/mū
   be.PST.3MSG exist wolf in DEF-woods NEG
   ṣārif ennū Laila jāye
   know.AP.MSG that Laila come.AP.FSG
   ‘There was a wolf in the woods who does not know that Red Riding Hood is coming.’
   (LE)

This unavailability of the use of the negative auxiliary in the context where information about a new referent is negated is not to do with the nature of relative or subordinate clauses. This is because when there is a relative clause with an old referent and information, the negative auxiliary can be used, as in (32).

32. ḏ-ʿārab lī mahūš ṣārif ennū Laila
   DEF-wolf that NEG.3MSG know.AP.MSG that Laila
   jāyya
   come.AP.FSG
   ‘The wolf who does not know that Red Riding Hood is coming.’ (LY-NQ)

This suggests that negative auxiliaries are not used to deny new information being introduced into the clause or the context. The main factor that is involved in the determination of their distribution can be related to the context background and information structure. In other words, negative auxiliaries are only used to deny information that is already part of the background information structure shared between the speakers before the sentence in which they are used is uttered.

The data obtained from the questionnaires suggest that negative auxiliaries are used when there is an assumption that the listener has a contrastive opinion or view about the reality of the situation. For instance, in example (32), the use of the negative auxiliary mahūš signals the existence of an assumption or view in the discourse background where the wolf does know that Red Riding Hood is coming and, therefore, the negative auxiliary is used to deny that misguided view.
The use of miš is also possible in this context, as in example (33). However, the speaker is not trying to signal the denial of any existent background information.

33. ðībb lît miš ġārif ennə Laila jāyya  
DEF-wolf that NEG know.AP.MSG that Laila come.AP.FSG  
‘The wolf who does not know that Red Riding Hood is coming.’ (LY-NQ)

It is important to note here that while negative auxiliaries are interchangeable with miš in this context, as the choice between them is pragmatic and does not result in ungrammaticality, the substitution of miš with a negative auxiliary in other contexts is not as unrestrictive as this, at least not in Libyan Arabic, as shown in example (34).

34. *kān fî ðīb fî l-ḡābə mahūš  
be.PST.3MSG exist wolf in DEF-woods NEG.3MSG  
ḡārif ennə Laila jāyya  
know.AP.MSG that Laila come.AP.FSG  
‘There was a wolf in the woods who does not know that Red Riding Hood is coming.’ (LY-NQ)

Negative auxiliaries are not used in contexts where a new referent or new information is introduced and do indeed result in ungrammaticality, as in (34).

Finally, one of the contexts that gave participants the choice between miš and the negative auxiliary is one that involved unambiguous identity reading. Eid (1991) claims that negative auxiliaries in Egyptian Arabic cannot be used in sentences with unambiguous identity reading. The context she gives for example (35) is one where the speaker sees himself/herself in a dream where there is a noticeable difference in their physical appearance and they are telling their psychiatrist about it. She claims that negative auxiliaries cannot be used in this context where the identity reading is clear, as in (36).
35. ṭana miš ṭana
1SG.SUB NEG 1SG.SUB
‘I am not me.’

36. *ṭana maniš ṭana
1SG.SUB NEG.1SG 1SG.SUB
‘I am not I.’ (Eid 1991: 50)

The context that the participants were presented with in the questionnaire was not identical to Eid’s context but similar. In this context, the speaker, which is the participant, started telling his/her friends about an incident that he/she encountered the night before, in which he/she was acting unlike himself/herself. As a consequence, one of the friends asked what he/she meant by that, which resulted in a sentence with an unambiguous identity reading. Some speakers provided the following examples in which the negative auxiliary maniš/mani occurred in contexts where the identity reading was unambiguous and clear-cut, as in (37, 38).

37. zay ma akūn ṭana māni ṭana
like that be.NONT.1SG 1SG.SUB NEG.1SG 1SG.SUB
lī kunt zamān
that be.PST.1SG past
‘It’s like I am not the old me.’ (SUA)

38. maniš ṭane lī kunt zmān
NEG.1SG 1SG.SUB that be.PST.1SG past
‘I am not the old me.’ (LY)

The data collected suggests that negative auxiliaries are compatible with unambiguous identity readings, at least in Libyan and Sudanese Arabic, unlike what Eid (1991) suggests for Egyptian Arabic.
Mughazy (2008: 71-4) discusses negative auxiliaries in Egyptian Arabic. He refers to the negative auxiliary as *ma-pro-š* and claims that it is a truth-functional negation operator that has the same semantic function of sentential negation. Mughazy claims that the use of *ma-pro-š* is a mechanism of denial. He states that negation is a semantic operator that reverses the truth-values of propositions, while denial is “a speech act of objecting to the truthfulness of a proposition that is assumed to be part of the addressee’s background knowledge, whether this proposition is asserted in previous discourse or implicated”. He claims that this means that every negation is ambiguous between an assertive illocutionary force and a denying one.

To illustrate this, he proposes a scenario in which two friends leave work together when one of them receives a text from her husband saying he is not home. Knowing that her husband is not home, she invites her friend over. Her friend who does not get along with her husband says: ‘but your husband is at home’ so she says *goozy meš fe-l-beet*, as in (39), in which meš is used for an assertive or denial function.

39. goozy          meš          fe-l-beet  
    husband.1SG.PSS  NEG   in-DEF-house  
    ‘My husband is not home.’ (EA, Mughazy 2008: 75)

However, according to Mughazy, if the speaker wanted to be cooperative in the sense of Grice’s Cooperative Principle (Grice 1975), she would have used *ma-pro-š*, as in (40). The use of the negative auxiliary in (40) signals the denial of assumed information on the part of the speaker’s friend.

40. goozy          mahūš        fe-l-beet  
    husband.1SG.PSS  NEG.3MSG  in-DEF-house  
    ‘My husband is not home.’ (EA, Mughazy 2008: 75)

This makes Mughazy’s analysis of the function of negative auxiliaries the closest to the one proposed in this chapter, as it is consistent with both the examples provided and the observations made with regard to negative auxiliaries in Libyan Arabic.
I conclude that while the negative marker *miš* and negative auxiliaries are interchangeable in semantic terms, the latter has its own pragmatic use. While the negative marker *miš* is used in general contexts in Libyan Arabic, negative auxiliaries are reserved for those in which contrastive background information is assumed on the part of both the speaker and the listener and, therefore, the speaker signals both his/her awareness and his/her denial of this shared information using negative auxiliaries. It is also the case that the use of *miš* in these contexts is not ungrammatical, but it is rather the case that negative auxiliaries are preferred for pragmatic effects.

### 7.1.5. The development of negative auxiliaries

The earliest evidence of the existence of constructions that might resemble negative auxiliaries is found in Andalusian folk proverbs from the time of the Arab conquest of Spain, cited by Wilmsen (2014: 69-70) and shown in (41). Wilmsen comments on this evidence which shows what is now the negation clitic *-iš* being used in folk proverbs, with a pronoun, but without *ma*. It is not obvious in the proverb if *-iš* is being used as a negator or an interrogative marker. However, he argues that the historical path of the negation marker *-iš* is one where it was an interrogative particle that has developed into an indefinite determiner and then a negator. This contrasts with Lucas (2007) and Ouhalla (2002), who state that *-iš* originated from the Arabic word *šayy* ‘thing’, which was reduced and then grammaticalised and used as a negation marker.

41. ism-ū Šaly-ya wa huw-āš yiğatti
   name-3MSG.PSS on-1SG.OBL and it-NEG cover.NONT.3MSG
   rğlay-ya
   legs.PL-1SG.PSS
   ‘His name is on me and it does not cover my legs.’ (Andalusi Arabic, al-Ahwānī 1962: 314, cited by Wilmsen 2014: 70)

While the example in (41) does not offer great insight into the development of these auxiliaries, Lucas (2013) proposes that they developed from a construction involving a
negated resumptive pronoun that follows the subject of the clause, as in (42). He proposes that they came about through a reanalysis of the whole construction as a negative auxiliary.

42. Ahmad mā-hū-š ġabi
    Ahmad NEG-3MSG-NEG stupid
    Conservative interpretation: ‘Ahmad, he’s not stupid.’
    Innovative interpretation: ‘Ahmad is not stupid.’ (Lucas 2013: 406)

Lucas (2013) proposes that the negative marker miš/muš is a reduced form of the negative auxiliary. He further supports this theory by citing Arabic varieties that do not make use of the postverbal marker -iš. Some of these varieties have mū instead of muš, which confirms his hypothesis. If we assume that miš/muš developed from the negative auxiliary, it follows from this that varieties that do not use the postverbal marker -iš would have mū and not muš.

For the purposes of this section, I focus on the first part of Lucas’s analysis about the development of negative auxiliaries from negated resumptive pronoun constructions. While this analysis is quite reasonable, it does not account for the use of the combined marker ma-iš to negate a non-verbal element represented in the pronoun in the conservative interpretation, or, at least, it misses a bridging stage where negative -š does not exist.

Van der Auwera (2010) proposes three types of diachronic development patterns for negation markers. The second type is compatible with the development of the combined negation marker in Modern Arabic varieties42, and the third of which represents the proposed path for the development of negative auxiliaries. These are:

A. X → NEG
B. NEG1 X → NEG1 NEG2 → NEG2
C. NEG1 X → [NEG1-X]NEG2

---

42 For more see (Lucas 2007).
A is the case where a certain element that is not negative in itself becomes negative because it has a close meaning to negation. Van der Auwera provides an example of the development of the negative prohibitive *toko* in Lewo. While there is a verbal element *toko* ‘desist’ that takes a nominalized complement, there is also a recently developed *toko* element that is used in prohibitive constructions (Early 1994: 77). This negative prohibitive is shown in example (43) where it occurs with other negative markers *ve...re*.

43. Ve a-kan re toko!

\[\text{NEG.IRR 2SG-eat} \quad \text{NEG PROH}\]

‘Do not eat it!’ (Lewo, Early 1994a: 76)

In (43), *toko* is not a verb taking a nominal complement, because if it was, it would cancel the other negative marker meaning ‘desist from not eating=eat’ instead of ‘do eat’. The reported lack of intonation break between *toko* and the preceding elements also confirms this (Early 1994a: 77).

Type B represents the development of negation markers found in Jespersen’s cycle (1917) and Croft’s cycle (1991). An example of a negative marker that developed through Jespersen’s cycle is that of *pas* in French. In example (44a), the first stage is where *ne* is the negative marker, followed by the second stage in (44b) in which the combination of *ne* and *pas* acts as the negative marker. In (44c), representing the third stage, *pas* becomes a negative marker in its own account.

44. a. Il ne peut venir ce soir
    b. Il ne peut pas venir ce soir
    c. Il peut pas venir ce soir
    \[\text{He NEG can NEG come this evening}\]

‘He cannot come tonight.’ (French, Van der Auwera 2010: 79)

Type C is where a negative marker develops from the univerbation of a non-negative element with a negative one, and the reanalysis of the construction as a new negative marker. Van der Auwera provides an example from Baghdad Arabic, (45), where a negative quantifier *ma-*


45. Ma-hadd  
kisār  il-šibbač  
No.one  broke  DEF-window  
‘No-one broke the window.’ (Baghdad Arabic, Haspelmath 1997: 206, based on Ali 1972: 48, 53)

With regard to negative auxiliaries, I follow Lucas’s account of the reanalysis of the negated resumptive pronoun construction as the diachronic origin for the development of negative auxiliaries, but I elaborate on the missing stage that is left out of his analysis. This missing stage accounts for the unusual manner in which ma -iš combines with the resumptive pronoun. The development of negative auxiliaries could have gone through three conjectural stages represented below. The scarcity of historical evidence to support this conjectural development prevents me from referring to these stages with more certainty.

I.  NEG1 X.  
II.  NEG1 X → [NEG1-X]NEG2.  
III.  NEG2 NEG3 → [NEG2 -NEG3].

The example in (46) represents stage I of this development, as ma is used to negate the pronominal element huwwā.

46. Ahmid  ma  huwwā  hne  
Ahmid  NEG  3MSG.SUB  here  
‘Ahmid, he is not here.’ (LY-NQ)

Example (46) is actually a use of the negation particle ma that is attested in Classical Arabic. In Classical Arabic, negative ma can occur before pronouns and sometimes nouns, not just verbs, as in example (47) from the Quran. However, this is not the case in Libyan Arabic, except in some proverbial expressions.
In the next step, I conjecture that example (48) emerged as a result of the reanalysis of a negated resumptive pronoun construction as a negative auxiliary. Ma and huwwā would have been merged together, through univerbation, and were perceived as one negative element, which represents the second stage of the development of negative auxiliaries, II. NEG1 X → [NEG1-X]NEG2, and Type C of Van der Auwera’s types of diachronic negation development.

48. Ahmid  mahuwwā  hne
Ahmid  NEG.3MSG  here
‘Ahmid is not here.’ (LY-NQ)\textsuperscript{43}

In the varieties that make use of the postverbal negative marker -iš, when this marker -iš was introduced as a negative marker with ma in the variety, negative ma would have been merged with –iš, as in (49, 50), giving us the third stage of the development (Lucas 2007), III. NEG2 NEG3 → [NEG2 -NEG3]. In the varieties that do not make use of -iš, stage II is the last stage.

49. Ahmid  mahuwwā-š  hne
Ahmid  NEG.3MSG-NEG  here
‘Ahmid is not here.’ (LY-NQ)

50. Ahmid  mahūš  hne
Ahmid  NEG.3MSG  here
‘Ahmid is not here.’ (LY-NQ)

\textsuperscript{43} In Libyan Arabic, example (48) dropped out of the language (except as a back-formation from the negative marker in some contexts where -iš is dropped as in (52).
Notice that in stage III, I do not classify the new construction as one element in which a new NEG4 emerges, unlike the case in Type C of Van der Auwera’s types of diachronic negation development. Instead, I keep NEG3 separate from NEG2, which is the newly reanalysed negative auxiliary in its initial form. The explanation for this is that while *ma cannot be separated from the negative auxiliary, as in (51), there are contexts in which -*iš* can.

51. *huwwā/hū-š hne
    NEG-3MSG here
    ‘He is not here.’ (LY-NQ)

In emphatic negation, -*iš* can be dropped from negative auxiliaries just like it is dropped in the negation of verbal predicates.

52. wallāhi māhū hne
    by.God NEG.3MSG here
    ‘I swear he is not here.’ (LY-NQ)

To conclude, the combination of the negation markers and the originally pronominal elements survived in the language as negation markers with a specific function.

A similar phenomenon is the emergence of the negative polarity marker *lāw* in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic (Bar-Asher Siegal & De Clercq 2016). *Lāw* started as a combination of two elements: a negative marker *lā* + a copular element *hu*. Through phonological univerbation, the construction was reanalysed as a new single negative marker *lāw*, which exists alongside the original negative marker *lā*.

53. lāw Ḥim ’ītawy wa
    NEG Ḥam exist be.PST.3MSG
    ‘It was not Ham (lit. it was not the case that it was Ham)’ (Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, Bar-Asher Siegal & De Clercq 2016: 3)
There are functional and distributional differences and similarities between *lāw* and negative auxiliaries. For example, *lāw* is used in rhetorical questions, to cancel presuppositions, and it takes scope over the whole clause (it is interpreted to mean *it is not the case*) as it denotes wide scope negation, as in (53). In Libyan Arabic it is the negation marker *miš* that is used in this context and not negative auxiliaries, as in (54).

54. miš/*mahūš  Ahmid  xde  ḥabbit  rāṣ
   NEG/NEG.3MSG Ahmid  take.PST.3MSG  pill  head
   ‘It’s not the case that Ahmid took a painkiller.’ (LY-NQ)

However, similarly to the negative auxiliaries in (55), *lāw* can co-occur with other negation markers, as in (56), and can be used to negate previously affirmed information, as in (57).

55. miš  mahīš  jdīda  xurda
   NEG  NEG.3FSG  new  rubbish
   ‘It’s not not modern, it’s rubbish.’ (LY-NQ)

56. lāw  lā  šnā
   NEG  NEG  different.MSG
   ‘Isn't it the case that it doesn't matter?!’

57. d-mar  sābar  k-karmelit  dāmy-ā
   REL-master  think.PTCP.3MSG  like-karmelit  similar-FSG
   w-mar  sābar  lāw  k-karmelit  dāmy-ā
   and-master  think.PTCP.3MSG  NEG  like-karmelit  similar-FSG
   ‘As the one thought it is like a karmelit; and the other thought it is not like a karmelit.’
   (Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, Bar-Asher Siegal & De Clercq 2016: 3, 5)

7.1.6. Conclusion

I have shown that negative auxiliaries are not synchronic formations of negation markers and personal pronouns, but independent negative elements with a specific pragmatic function.
While they are interchangeable with the negation particle *miš* in semantic terms, their function is reserved for contexts where the speaker intends to deny shared background information. I have suggested a historical path in which their development could have come about through the reanalysis of negated resumptive pronouns as negative elements, and conjectured that this combination survived in Arabic varieties as negative auxiliaries with a specific pragmatic function.

7.2. **On the morpho-syntactic properties of *mʕəš*, a negative particle**

Libyan Arabic has a linguistic element that is inherently negative and is used in various linguistic constructions. *Mʕəš* is originally derived from *ʕād* ‘return’ and the combined negative marker *ma*-*iš*. This becomes clear when *mʕəš* is stressed, as it consequently retrieves its original form, as in example (58).

58. \[ \text{mʕəš/mʕādiš} \quad \text{b-nimši} \quad \text{mʕā-k} \]
\[
\text{no.more} \quad \text{FUT-walk.NONT.1SG} \quad \text{with-2SG.OBL}
\]

‘I will not go with you any more.’ (LY-NQ)

*Mʕəš* can be roughly translated into ‘no more’, or ‘will not do any more’. It is also found in other Modern Arabic varieties in different forms. Brustad (2000) reports on *maʕād* ‘no longer’ in Syrian Arabic and refers to it as a temporal verb. She states that temporal verbs are a unique class of verbs that embed other verbs temporally but not modally. Comrie (2008) refers to *maʕād* as a pseudo-verb.

In Libyan Arabic, *mʕəš* can combine with different word classes in different constructions. However, the morpho-syntactic status of this element is not clear. Therefore, I start by establishing its morpho-syntactic properties and refer to it as a negative particle in anticipation of my conclusion.
7.2.1 Morphological properties

Although mʕəš is originally derived from the verb ʕad, it is invariable in Libyan Arabic, as it does not inflect for tense, person, number, or gender, like standard verbs. This is not the case in some varieties of Syrian Arabic where it still agrees with the grammatical subject of the clause, as in example (59). In this example, it is inflected for the third person feminine singular, in agreement with the subject of the clause indicated on the standard verb tjawwaret ‘develop’ (Brustad 2000).

59. țabʕan laʔannu tjawwaret il-ʕālam
   of.course because develop.PST.3FSG DEF-world
   ma ʕādit mitilʔawwal
   NEG remain.PST.3FSG like first
   ‘Of course, because people have changed, they’re no longer like before.’ (SYA, Brustad 2000: 224)

Mʕəš cannot take the future markers bi- and hə-, which standard verbs take in Libyan Arabic (60). It can combine with a verb that is combined with the future marker giving a future reading, as in example (61).

60. *bi/hə-mʕəš nimši mʕā-k
    FUT-no.more walk.NONT.1SG with-2SG.OBL
    ‘I will not go with you any more.’ (LY-NQ)

61. mʕəš b/hə-nimši mʕā-k
    no.more FUT-walk.NONT.1SG with-2SG.OBL
    ‘I will not go with you any more.’ (LY-NQ)
7.2.2. Syntactic distribution

Mʕəš can combine with both past and non-tensed verbal forms as in examples (62) and (63) respectively.

62. mʕəš mšēt li-n-nādi
   no.more walk.PST.1SG to-DEF-club
   ‘I stopped going to the club.’ (LY-NQ)

63. mʕəš nimši li-n-nādi
   no.more walk.NONT.1SG to-DEF-club
   ‘I do not go to the club any more.’ (LY-NQ)

It can be used as a negative prohibitive particle, as an alternative to ma, as in examples (64) and (65), where the latter has the added meaning of ‘any more’.

64. ma timš-iš li-n-nādi
   NEG walk.NONT.2SG-NEG to-DEF-club
   ‘Do not go to the club!’ (LY-NQ)

65. mʕəš timši li-n-nādī
   no.more walk.NONT.2SG to-DEF-club
   ‘Do not go to the club any more!’ (LY-NQ)

Mʕəš can combine with different types of verbs, whether standard or non-standard. In example (66) and (67), it combines with the pseudo-verbs fi and ʕind-.

66. mʕəš fi min-hə
   no.more exist from-3SG.OBL
   ‘There’s none left from it any more.’ (LY-NQ)
67. mʕəš  śind-i  səyyāra
   no.more  have-1SG.OBL  car
   ‘I do not have a car any more.’ (LY-NQ)

In example (68), it combines with nigdir and lāzim, two modal verbs.

68. mʕəš  nigdir/lāzim  nšūf-hə
   no.more  can.NONT.1SG/must  see.NONT.1SG-3SG.OBJ
   ‘I cannot/do not have to see it any more.’ (LY-NQ)

Since mʕəš is invariable, the auxiliary combines with it in order to express past and future meanings, as in (69) and (70) respectively.

69. kān  mʕəš  b/hə-yimši  li-n-nādī
ebe.PST.3SG  no.more  FUT-walk.NONT.3SG  to-DEF-club
   ‘He was going to stop going to the club.’ (LY-NQ)

70. bi/hə-tkūn  mʕəš  fi-n-nādī
    FUT-be.NONT.2SG  no.more  in-DEF-club
   ‘You will not be at the club any more.’ (LY-NQ)

Mʕəš can occur before the auxiliary to express future meaning, as in (71). However, its occurrence before both forms of the auxiliary ykūn and kān in (71) and (72) is less common, due to its verbal origin, which makes it more natural following the auxiliary not preceding it. As shown in (2.2.2), the auxiliary can take verbal complements, and thus the verb follows it instead of preceding it.

71. mʕəš  bi/hə-tkūn  fi-n-nādī
   no.more  FUT-be.NONT.2MSG  in-DEF-club
   ‘You will not be at the club any more.’ (LY-NQ)
72. ?mʕaš kān b/ḥa-yimši li-n-nādī
   no.more be.PST.3MSG FUT-walk.NONT.3MSG to-DEF-club
   ‘He was going to stop going to the club.’ (LY-NQ)

Mʕaš can occur after the overt subject of the clause.

73. ?ane mʕaš nādir-ha
   1SG.SUB no.more do.NONT.1SG-3SG.OBJ
   ‘I will not do it any more.’ (LY-NQ)

It can combine with noun (74), adjectival (75), and prepositional phrases (76), in the same way as miš.

74. Ahmad mʕaš šāhib n-nādī
    Ahmad no.more owner DEF-club
    ‘Ahmid is not the club owner any more.’ (LY-NQ)

75. Ahmad mʕaš ʃg̓əyyir
    Ahmad no.more young
    ‘Ahmid is not young any more.’ (LY-NQ)

76. Ahmad mʕaš fi-n-nādī
    Ahmad no.more in-DEF-club
    ‘Ahmid is not at the club any more.’ (LY-NQ)

The syntactic distribution of mʕaš is similar to the auxiliary verb in Libyan Arabic as the auxiliary can occur on its own as a lexical verb, as shown in (77-79), and it can occur with other verbs, as in (80). Mʕaš can also occur before verbal and non-verbal predicates, as illustrated in the previous examples (62, 63, 74-76).
77. Ahmid kān šāhib n-nādhī
Ahmid be.PST.3MSG owner DEF-club
‘Ahmid was the club owner.’ (LY-NQ)

78. Ahmid kān fī-n-nādhī
Ahmid be.PST.3MSG in-DEF-club
‘Ahmid was at the club.’ (LY-NQ)

79. Ahmid kān ṣgāyyir
Ahmid be.PST.3MSG young
‘Ahmid was young.’ (LY-NQ)

80. kān yiktib
be.PST.3MSG write.NONT.3MSG
‘He was writing.’ (LY-NQ)

However, unlike the auxiliary, mʕaʃ does not have past and non-tensed forms and is not
inflected for person, gender or number.

To sum up, in Libyan Arabic, mʕaʃ has only one form, as it does not inflect for person,
number or gender, it can combine with all types of predicates, and it cannot take future
markers. It generally behaves as a negative modifier for the following element and cannot be
considered an auxiliary due to its invariable nature, unlike that of the auxiliary. This suggests
that mʕaʃ is no longer a verb in the sense that it does not pattern with verbs in terms of its
morpho-syntactic behaviour.

7.2.3. Mʕaʃ and adverbials

What can be observed from the aforementioned examples is that mʕaʃ is generally followed
by the predicate of the clause, suggesting that mʕaʃ itself is not the predicate but functions as
a negative modifier of the predicate. However, it does not follow from this that it is an
adverbial element. This is because unlike adverbials, \(mʕəš\) cannot occur freely within the clause or after verbs, as illustrated in examples (81-85).

Adverbials can occur at the beginning of the clause (81), at the end of the clause (82) or between the verb and its argument (83), as illustrated by the adverbial \(b-surʕə\) ‘quickly’.

81. \(b\)-surʕə mšēt li-n-nādī  
   with-speed walk.PST.1SG to-DEF-club  
   ‘I went to the club quickly.’ (LY-NQ)

82. mšēt li-n-nādī b-surʕə  
   walk.PST.1SG to-DEF-club with-speed  
   ‘I went to the club quickly.’ (LY-NQ)

83. mšēt b-surʕə li-n-nādī  
   walk.PST.1SG with-speed to-DEF-club  
   ‘I went to the club quickly.’ (LY-NQ)

\(Mʕəš\), on the other hand, has to occur before the predicate and does not enjoy the freer movement patterns adverbials have (84, 85).

84. *mšēt li-n-nādī mʕəš  
   walk.PST.1SG to-DEF-club no.more  
   ‘I stopped going to the club.’ (LY-NQ)

85. *mšēt mʕəš li-n-nādī  
   walk.PST.1SG no.more to-DEF-club  
   ‘I stopped going to the club.’ (LY-NQ)

The fact that \(mʕəš\) does not behave like verbs or adverbials in terms of its syntactic behaviour, suggests that it is neither. This leads us to conclude that \(mʕəš\) has lost its verbal status in Libyan Arabic and now functions as a negative particle.
7.2.4. Conclusion

To conclude, ṭəš, in Libyan Arabic, is an invariable negative particle that can combine with different types of predicates to express the notion of discontinuity, and is no longer a verbal element as is the case in some other Modern Arabic varieties.

7.3. Metalinguistic negation

Phonology, morphology and syntax can interact to produce negation that serves a specific pragmatic function, known as metalinguistic negation. Metalinguistic negation is not a negation of the truth-values of the utterance, and therefore not a semantic negation. Metalinguistic negation is a marked use of negation used to object to a previous utterance on any grounds except its truth-value, and is normally followed by a rectification that explains the objection. The grounds on which the objection to the utterance is made can be anything from its pronunciation and choice of words, to implicature or style.

In the sentence in (86), the interpreted meaning is not about the truth-value of Mary is unhappy. What is being objected to is not the proposition that Mary is not happy. On the contrary, the truth-value still holds.

86. Mary is not unhappy, she is miserable.

The objection is to the use of the word unhappy. The intended meaning is not to say that Mary is unhappy is not true, but to say that the lexical choice is not appropriate.

Metalinguistic negation was investigated in the narrow questionnaire using contexts in which the participants objected to utterances that require metalinguistic negation instead of truth-conditional negation. In section (7.3.1), I present the data obtained from the participants. In section (7.3.2), I briefly discuss metalinguistic negation as a pragmatic category through an exploration of different accounts of metalinguistic negation in the linguistic literature. In section (7.3.2.1), I investigate metalinguistic negation in Libyan Arabic, the different
strategies employed to express it, and determine whether or not Libyan Arabic has a special marker for metalinguistic negation

7.3.1. Sudanese, Libyan and Lebanese Data

Speakers from the three varieties gave mixed responses with regard to metalinguistic negation. Whether this was due to the difficulty of eliciting metalinguistic negation or if it is expressed differently among individuals is a matter that needs more research and clarification. Nevertheless, the examples provided illustrate metalinguistic negation in the three varieties.

Sudanese speakers were united in their responses as *ma* was the only negation marker used across different constructions and metalinguistic negation was not an exception to this, as in (87).

87. Ahmid ma baṭṭal tadxīn Ahmid ma

   Ahmid NEG stop.PST.3MSG smoking Ahmid NEG
   bi-ydəxxin ʔašlən
   IND-smoke.NONT.3MSG originally

   ‘Ahmid did not stop smoking, Ahmid does not smoke in the first place.’ (SUA)

The variation was found among Lebanese and Libyan speakers. Some Lebanese speakers used *mū* and *miš* as a means of indicating metalinguistic negation, as opposed to truth-conditional negation in (88, 89).

88. Ahmid miš baṭṭal tadxīn Ahmid ma

   Ahmid NEG stop.PST.3MSG smoking Ahmid NEG
   bi-ydəxxin ʔašlən
   IND-smoke.NONT.3MSG originally

   ‘Ahmid did not stop smoking, Ahmid does not smoke in the first place.’ (LE)
89. Ahmid mü bəṭṭal tadxǐn Ahmid ma
Ahmid NEG stop.PST.3MSG smoking Ahmid NEG
bi-yaḍəxən ?ašlon
IND-smoke.NONT.3MSG originally
‘Ahmid did not stop smoking, Ahmid does not smoke in the first place.’ (LE)

Some Libyan speakers used miš as a means of indicating metalinguistic negation as well, as in (90).

90. Ahmid miš bəṭṭil tadxǐn Ahmid
Ahmid NEG stop.PST.3MSG smoking Ahmid
ma yaḍəxən-iš ?ašlon
NEG smoke.NONT.3MSG-NEG originally
‘Ahmid did not stop smoking, Ahmid does not smoke in the first place.’ (LY)

Others used the standard negation pattern, i.e. ma for Lebanese participants, as in (91), and ma -iš for Libyan participants, as in (92).

91. Ahmid ma bəṭṭal tadxǐn Ahmid ma
Ahmid NEG stop.PST.3MSG smoking Ahmid NEG
bi-yaḍəxən ?ašlon
IND-smoke.NONT.3MSG originally
‘Ahmid did not stop smoking, Ahmid does not smoke in the first place.’ (LE)

92. Ahmid ma bəṭṭil-iš tadxǐn Ahmid
Ahmid NEG stop.PST.3MSG-NEG smoking Ahmid
ma yaḍəxən-iš ?ašlon
NEG smoke.NONT.3MSG-NEG originally
‘Ahmid did not stop smoking, Ahmid does not smoke in the first place.’ (LY)
In the case of non-verbal predicates, *miš* was also used to indicate the metalinguistic interpretation of the clause. Note here that the metalinguistic negation is used as an objection to the use of negation marker *miš*, in the following examples (93, 94).

93. **miš miš jīda ḥāja nizil fi-s-sūg**

   NEG NEG new last thing come.out.PST.3FSG in-DEF-market

   ‘It’s not not modern, it’s the latest thing there is.’ (LY-NQ)

94. **miš miš jīde ḥāja nizil bi-s-sū?**

   NEG NEG new last thing come.out.PST.3FSG in-DEF-market

   ‘It’s not not modern, it’s the latest thing there is.’ (LE-NQ)

The data presented illustrates the diverse nature of negation patterns of the different Arabic varieties and calls for further investigation of the nature of metalinguistic negation, which I do in section (7.3.3), regarding Libyan Arabic in particular.

### 7.3.2. Metalinguistic negation as a pragmatic category

Horn (1989) claims that there is a pragmatic ambiguity associated with negative utterances as they could have two readings, a descriptive truth conditional reading or a metalinguistic one. It follows from this that the rectification that follows looks like it is contradicting the negated sentence. This results in a double-processing effect that makes the hearer reinterpret the negative utterance as a metalinguistic one instead of a descriptive truth conditional interpretation. The verb phrase *stop smoking*, used by the speaker in example (95), presupposes that *Ahmid used to smoke at one point in time*. If the first part of the utterance were interpreted descriptively, the presupposition would not be cancelled and the second part would be inconsistent. However, the rectification violates the presupposition, which results in a double-processing effect where the negative marker is reinterpreted as a metalinguistic marker.

95. Ahmid did not stop smoking; Ahmid does not smoke in the first place.
Horn (1985) attempts to unify a number of cases where negation has an ambiguous reading and claims that in all these cases it is pragmatic ambiguity rather than semantic ambiguity that the negation imposes. He claims that the negative marker in these cases is metalinguistic rather than truth-functional. These cases include presuppositions, conventional and conversational implicatures, scalar predications, phonetic representation, style or register, difference in focus, and conditionals. He refers to the pragmatic ambiguity in all these cases as metalinguistic negation and claims that the speaker uses negation to express their objection to the assertability of the utterance and not to its truth-value.

Geurts (1998), on the other hand, adopts the term “denial” instead of metalinguistic negation for most of these cases, and argues against the unitarian approach of Horn (1985, 1989). He claims that the negative operator used in some of these cases is truth-conditional. He justifies his claim by suggesting that negation of implicatures and linguistic forms involves semantic transfer, proposed by Nunberg (1977). Nunberg proposes that a predicate gets a special interpretation that is related to the context but not present in the lexical content of the word itself. In the following example, he proposes that the adjectival predicate intelligent in (96), includes the sense of at least intelligent, and the context gives it the extra meaning of exactly intelligent but not more through semantic transfer. The negative marker not is negating the new meaning of exactly so she is not exactly intelligent but more, she’s brilliant. It is based on the notion of semantic transfer that Geurts claims that the negative operator is truth-functional.

96. She is not intelligent: she is brilliant

He claims that presupposition denials are explained by a presupposition theory proposed by Van der Sandt (1988). Van der Sandt’s binding theory argues that presuppositions break out of the scope of negation, whether or not they are locally or globally triggered. However, in certain circumstances, presuppositions remain in the position in which they were triggered, and this is what happens in presupposition denials (for more see Geurts 1998).

Mughazy (2003) argues that data from Egyptian Arabic that illustrates the use of miš for metalinguistic negation cannot be accounted for using Geurt’s (1998) truth-conditional
analysis. Mughazy criticises Geurts’s semantic transfer approach with regard to the negation of cardinal numbers. He argues that if the negation of cardinal numbers involves the acquisition of an exactly sense, and this sense is denied descriptively through truth-functional negation, there should be no problem when the truth-functional nature of negation is emphasised with an oath particle. However, this is not the case in Egyptian Arabic where the introduction of an oath particle is not possible if we assume that the negation marker is denying a contextually acquired exactly sense.

In example (97), the use of cardinal numbers invokes the notion of exactness. This exactness is either an implicature that is negated metalinguistically, as Horn (1985) suggests, or a non-lexical sense that is negated descriptively, as Geurts claims. In example (97a), the oath particle is used to negate the ‘at least’ sense, which is lexically encoded according to Geurts. The use of the oath particle wallāhi is grammatical and consistent with this sense as it emphasises the truth-conditional function of the negation marker. However, the example in (97b) is ungrammatical even though the negation marker is supposedly descriptively negating a sense rather than an implicature, i.e. the exactly sense. If Geurt’s claim of the truth-conditional function of the negation marker holds, the introduction of the oath particle should not have an effect on the grammaticality of the sentence. In fact, it should be emphasising the truth-conditional function of the negation marker, which Geurts claims is the case by citing the notion of semantic transfer.

97. a. wallāhi ma ?akalt-(eš) xamas
by.God NEG eat.PST.1SG-NEG five
sandawetšāt
sandwiches
‘I swear I did not eat five sandwiches.’

b. *wallāhi meš ?akalt xamas sandawetšāt
by.God NEG eat.PST.1SG five sandwiches
?ana ?akalt setta
1SG.SUB eat.PST.1SG six
‘I swear I did not eat five sandwiches, I ate six.’ (EA, Mughazy 2003: 1155)
The inability to introduce an oath particle to the negation of cardinal numbers in (97b) suggests that the *exactly* reading of cardinal numbers is an implicature that is negated metalinguistically rather than a sense that is negated descriptively. The oath particle *wallāhi* is inconsistent with metalinguistic negation as it directly emphasises the truth-conditional function of negation, which is the opposite of metalinguistic negation.

### 7.3.2.1. Metalinguistic negation in Libyan Arabic

The introduction of an oath particle is inconsistent with the metalinguistic reading of the negation marker in Libyan Arabic as well, as in example (98).

98. a. *wallāhi ma klēt-(iš) xəmsə sāndwišṯāt*
    
    by.God  NEG  eat.PST.1SG-NEG five sandwiches
    
    ‘I swear I did not eat five sandwiches.’

b. *wallāhi miš klēt xəmsə sāndwišṯāt*
    
    by.God  NEG  eat.PST.1SG five sandwiches
    klēt  setta
    eat.PST.1SG six
    
    ‘I swear I did not eat five sandwiches, I ate six.’ (LY-NQ)

Geurt’s analysis cannot explain the ungrammaticality of (98b) and, therefore, is inconsistent with the data from both Egyptian and Libyan Arabic. Horn’s analysis, on the other hand, accounts for the ungrammaticality of (98b) and is consistent with the data. Thus, I maintain Horn’s non-truth functional approach to metalinguistic negation for the rest of this section.

Metalinguistic negation has not received a great deal of attention in the linguistic literature on Modern Arabic varieties. Mughazy’s (2003) analysis of metalinguistic negation in Egyptian Arabic is one of the very few accounts of metalinguistic negation in Arabic varieties.
In this and the following sections, I adopt Horn’s analysis of metalinguistic negation and discuss it with regard to Libyan Arabic. I discuss the different strategies employed to express it, and determine whether or not Libyan Arabic has a special marker for metalinguistic negation. This is done on the basis of data collected from ten Libyan Arabic speakers from the city of Tripoli and my own examples, and with relation to the contexts of metalinguistic negation from Horn (1985).

The first context that Horn discusses is the use of metalinguistic negation to cancel presuppositions. A presupposition is a proposition that a certain utterance assumes is valid without directly asserting it. The example in (99) states that ‘Ahmid stopped smoking’, which presupposes that Ahmid used to smoke without directly stating so. Presuppositions cannot be cancelled using truth-conditional negation, as the negation will apply to the utterance and not to the presupposition. The example in (99) presupposes that ‘Ahmid used to smoke’ at some point. The example in (100) does not necessarily cancel the presupposition that ‘he used to smoke’ i.e. it could be the case that ‘he used to smoke and he still does’. The only way to cancel or deny a presupposition is by using metalinguistic negation to object to the presupposition itself. In English this is done by the same negation particle not giving us one sentence with two potential readings, a metalinguistic negation reading, and a truth-conditional negation reading.

99. Ahmid bati’al tadxin
    Ahmid stop.PST.3MSG smoking
    ‘Ahmid stopped smoking.’ (LY)

100. Ahmid ma bati’l-iš tadxin
     Ahmid NEG stop.PST.3MSG-NEG smoking
     ‘Ahmid did not stop smoking.’ (LY)

In Libyan Arabic, the negation marker used in sentential negation is ma -iš as in example (100). The denial of the presupposition can be expressed using miš as in example (101). In example (101), the objection is made to the presupposition denoted by the verb phrase ‘stopped smoking’, but unlike in the English example, there is no pragmatic ambiguity. The
utterance is immediately recognized as metalinguistic negation because of the use of\textit{ mi\text{"u}š}, as it would not have been used had the sentence been intended to denote a descriptive truth conditional negation.

101. Ahmid mi\text{"u}š ba\text{"u}t\text{"i}l t\text{"a}dx\text{"i}n Ahmid ma
Ahmid NEG stop.PST.3MSG smoking Ahmid NEG
yd\text{"a}xxin-i\text{"u}š ?a\text{"u}l\text{"o}n
smoke.NONT.3MSG-NEG originally

‘Ahmid did not stop smoking, Ahmid does not smoke in the first place.’ (LY)

With regard to conventional implicatures, these are implicatures associated with linguistic elements that are part of the meaning and cannot be cancelled. Horn provides an example where a conventional implicature triggered by the factive verb\textit{ forget} is denied through the use of the negation marker to enforce a metalinguistic reading on the clause. The conventional implicature denoted by\textit{ nse} ‘forget’ is that one must have known something at a certain time in order for him/her to forget it.

102. A: \text{"u}kl\text{"a}h Ahmid nse m\text{"a}w\text{"i}d-\text{"a}h
it.seems Ahmid forget.PST.3MSG appointment- 3MSG.PSS
m\text{"a}-\text{"i}
with-1SG.OBL

‘It seems Ahmid forgot his appointment with me.’

B: mi\text{"u}š ns-\text{"a}h ma yindr\text{"i}-\text{"u}š
NEG forget.PST.3MSG-3MSG.OBJ NEG know.NONT.3MSG-NEG
\text{"u}l\text{"e}-h
on-3MSG.OBL

‘He did not forget it, he does not know about it.’ (LY-NQ)

In Libyan Arabic, what we get is the negation marker\textit{ mi\text{"u}š} denying the conventional implicature associated with the factive verb\textit{ nse} ‘forget’ in (102).
The same marker is used to deny conversational implicatures triggered by scalar predications, as in (103). A conversational implicature is one that is not entailed by the proposition and can be cancelled but is generally assumed on the part of the listener based on the Maxims of the cooperative principle proposed by Grice (1975).

103. A: Ahmid nse bʿd məwāqīd-əh
Ahmid forget.PST.3MSG some appointment.PL-3MSG.PSS
‘Ahmid forgot some of his appointments.’

B: miš nse bʿd məwāqīd-əh
NEG forget.PST.3MSG some appointment.PL-3MSG.PSS
nsā-hum kull-hum
forget.PST.3MSG-3PL.OBJ all-3PL.OBL
‘He did not forget some of his appointments, he forgot them all.’ (LY-NQ)

In this example, the word bʿd ‘some’ gives rise to the implicature that it is a limited number of his appointments that Ahmid forgot. The response in (103b) uses miš to cancel this implicature.

Metalinguistic negation can be used to object to the phonetic representation of a certain utterance associated with a certain style or register. For example, the long vowel ī is associated with Berber speech in Libyan bilingual households. It is common for older speakers to use it instead of long ē. However, when it is spoken by the young, as in (104a), it is commonly stigmatised and corrected, as in (104b), using metalinguistic negation.

104. A: grīt-hə l-qıṣṣa
read.PST.1SG-3FSG.OBJ DEF-story
‘I read the story.’

B: miš grīt-hə grīt-hə
NEG read.PST.2MSG-3FSG.OBJ read.PST.2MSG-3FSG.OBJ
‘You did not read it, you read it.’ (LY-NQ)
Another context that Horn refers to is when negation is introduced to express objections to the focus of the clause and not its truth-value. In (105b), the speaker does not object to the fact that she and her father look alike, she objects to the focus on herself being the point of reference.

105. A: bū-k yišḅəh-l-ik
    father-2SG.PSS resemble-to-2SG.OBL
    ‘Your dad looks like you.’

    B: miš bū-y yišḅəh-l-i ?ane
    NEG father-1SG.PSS resemble-to-1SG.OBL 1SG.SUB
    nišḅəh-l-əh
    resemble-to-3MSG.OBL
    ‘My dad does not look like me, I look like him.’ (LY-NQ)

In this case, miš is used to express this objection in Libyan Arabic in example (105b).

Conditionals, Horn claims, are another case where negation is ambiguous because of the confusion between truth and assertability. In the following example (106), the speaker does not necessarily mean that ‘if Ahmid does take the pill then he will not get better’, and, therefore, the negation is not of the truth conditions of the conditional but of the assertability of his intention to confirm the proposition denoted by the conditional.

106. miš lōw Ahmid xde ḥəbbit rāš
    NEG if Ahmid take.PST.3MSG pill head
    ḥa-ywəlī ?əhsin
    FUT-become.NONT.3MSG better
    ‘It’s not the case that if Ahmid took a painkiller he’ll get better.’ (LY-NQ)

What the speaker means in example (106) is that ‘it is not the case that if Ahmid took a painkiller he’ll get better, it might be that he will not’. Therefore, this type of negation is
about the assertability of the clause and not its truth conditions and thus referred to in Horn’s terms as metalinguistic negation. Miš is also used in this sub-type of metalinguistic negation in Libyan Arabic.

7.3.2.1.1. Correlates of metalinguistic negation

Horn (1989) cites several diagnostics for identifying metalinguistic negation in English, but I refer to them as correlates instead of diagnostics, for Libyan Arabic. Some of these are that the negative marker cannot be bound as a suffix when used metalinguistically as in unhappy in example (107). Another is the use of concessive but in (108). The first is not relevant to Libyan Arabic, as negative markers cannot be incorporated as bound morphemes in the same sense that English prefixes un- and in- can. Lākin ‘but’ in Libyan Arabic does not have a concessive reading but only a contrastive one as in (109). Ti, on the other hand, has a concessive reading in Libyan Arabic and can be used as a diagnostic for metalinguistic negation, as in (110).

107. #He is unhappy, he is ecstatic!
108. He is not happy, but ecstatic!

109. #miš jdīda lākin ?āxir hāja nizlit  fi-s-sūg
    NEG new but last thing come.out.PST.3FSG in-DEF-market
    ‘It’s not modern, but the latest thing there is.’ (LY-NQ)

110. miš jdīda ti ?āxir hāja nizlit  fi-s-sūg
    NEG new CNS last thing come.out.PST.3FSG in-DEF-market
    ‘It’s not modern, but the latest thing there is.’ (LY-NQ)

A third correlate for metalinguistic negation is the incapability of metalinguistic negation to license negative polarity items. In example (111), bukkul ‘at all’ is licensed by the negative marker ma -iš, and therefore cannot occur without it in (112). In Libyan Arabic, metalinguistic negation cannot license negative polarity items, as in (113-118).
111. Ahmid ma bəṭṭil-iš tədəx․n bukkul Ahmid NEG stop.PST.3MSG-NEG smoking at.all
   ‘Ahmid did not stop smoking at all.’ (LY-NQ)

112. #Ahmid bəṭṭil tədəx․n bukkul Ahmid stop.PST.3MSG smoking at.all
   ‘#Ahmid stopped smoking at all.’ (LY-NQ)

113. #Ahmid miš bəṭṭil tədəx․n bukkul Ahmid Ahmid NEG stop.PST.3MSG smoking at.all Ahmid
    ma ydəxən-iš ʔəşlən
    NEG smoke.NONT.3MSG-NEG originally
   ‘Ahmid did not stop smoking at all, Ahmid does not smoke in the first place.’ (LY-NQ)

114. A: šəkləh Ahmid nse
    it.seems Ahmid forget.PST.3MSG
    məwšəd-əh mš-āi
    appointment-3MSG.PSS with-1SG.OBL
   ‘It seems Ahmid forgot his appointment with me.’

    B: #miš ns-əh bukkul ma yindrī-ʃ
    NEG forget.PST.3MSG-3MSG.OBJ at.all NEG know.NONT.3MSG-NEG
    ŋlə-h
    on-3MSG.OBL
   ‘He did not forget it at all, he does not know about it.’ (LY-NQ)

115. A: Ahmid nse bəɟ məwšədid-əh
    Ahmid forget.PST.3MSG some appointment.PL-3MSG.PSS
   ‘Ahmid forgot some of his appointments.’
116. A: grīt-hə l-qiṣṣa
read.PST.1SG-3FSG.OBJ DEF-story
‘I read the story.’

B: #miš grīt-hə bukkul grēt-hə
NEG read.PST.2MSG-3FSG.OBJ at.all read.PST.2MSG-3FSG.OBJ
‘You did not read it at all, you read it.’ (LY-NQ)

117. A: bū-k yišbəḥ-l-ik
father-2SG.PSS resemble-to-2SG.OBL
‘Your dad looks like you.’

B: #miš bū-y yišbəḥ-l-i bukkul ʔane
NEG father-1SG.PSS resemble-to-1SG.OBL at.all 1SG.SUB
nišbəḥ-l-əh
resemble-to-3MSG.OBL
‘My dad does not look like me at all, I look like him.’ (LY-NQ)

118. #miš ləw Ahmed xde ḥəbbit rāš
NEG if Ahmed take.PST.3MSG pill head
ḥa-yəwalli ʔəhsin bukkul
FUT-become.NONT.3MSG better at.all
‘It’s not the case that if Ahmad took a painkiller he’ll get better at all.’ (LY-NQ)
7.3.2.1.2. *Miš* as a metalinguistic marker

I have shown that Libyan Arabic data support Horn’s analysis of the non truth-conditional function of the negation markers in metalinguistic negation, as utterances that have a metalinguistic negation marker cannot have the oath particle *wallāhi*, as in (98). The oath particle emphasises the truth-conditional function of negation markers and, therefore, is inconsistent with metalinguistic negation.

Horn (1985) claims, based on Gazdar’s (1979) investigation of several languages, that no language employs a special negation marker that is specifically metalinguistic. There have been a number of claims in linguistic literature on metalinguistic negation that some languages have unambiguous means of expressing metalinguistic negation. Some of these are Carston & Noh (1996) for Korean and Martins (2014) for European Portuguese.

Martins (2014) claims that European Portuguese has special markers for metalinguistic negation that are unambiguous and cannot be used for truth-conditional negation, and these are *lá* and *agora*. While truth-conditional negation is compatible with negative and positive polarity items, metalinguistic negation is not, because of its non-truth conditional nature. The affirmative clause in (119) includes the phrase *do diabo* ‘with the devil’, which is a positive polarity item (PPI) in European Portuguese. Its co-occurrence with truth-conditional negation in (120) is ruled out.

119. Tiveste uma sorte do diabo
   had.2SG a good.luck of.the devil
   ‘So lucky you were!’

120. *Não tiveste uma sorte do diabo
    not had.2SG a good.luck of.the devil
    (Out-of-the-blue declarative)
    ‘You were not that lucky.’ (Portuguese, Martins 2014: 641)

The co-occurrence of the PPI with the metalinguistic markers *lá* or *agora* is permitted, as
shown in example (121).

121. Tive lá/agora uma sorte do diabo

had.1SG MN.marker a good.luck of.the devil

‘I was not so lucky.’ (Portuguese, Martins 2014: 641)

This suggests that lá and agora are unambiguous metalinguistic markers, unlike not, which is used in English for both truth-conditional and metalinguistic negation, as in (95).

The examples from Libyan Arabic also suggest that Libyan Arabic is an exception to Horn’s generalisation. This is due to the elimination of the pragmatic ambiguity by the use of miş, which marks the metalinguistic interpretation of the negative utterance.

Nonetheless, metalinguistic negation can be expressed by either miş or ma-iš, which gives an ambiguous reading that requires double processing. The difference is in the pragmatic use of each negative marker. For example, the sentence in (122) could be used to create a dramatic effect in which the speaker does not want the hearer to immediately grasp the metalinguistic interpretation of the negative marker but to induce a surprise element. In this case, the double processing effect suggested by Horn takes place in order to express metalinguistic negation.

122. Ahmad ma baṭṭil-iš tadxīn Ahmad

Ahmid NEG stop.PST.3MSG-NEG smoking Ahmid

ma ydɔxxin-iš ?ašlən

NEG smoke.NONT.3MSG-NEG originally

‘Ahmid did not stop smoking, Ahmad does not smoke in the first place.’ (LY)

This applies to some, but not all, of the types distinguished by Horn (1985) and investigated in this section. In the cases where the metalinguistic negation is used to object to conventional implicatures, conversational implicatures, phonetic representations, or differences in focus, there are two alternatives in which either miş or the standard negation marker ma-iš can express metalinguistic negation. This is shown in the following examples (123-126).
123. A: šəkləh Ahmid nse it.seems Ahmid forget.PST.3MSG məwəd-əh mə-əi appointment-3MSG.PSS with-1SG.OBL

‘It seems Ahmid forgot his appointment with me.’

B: ma nsā-ši\textsuperscript{44} ma yindrī-š NEG forget.PST.3MSG-NEG.3MSG NEG know.NONT.3MSG-NEG ʕlē-ŋ on-3MSG.OBL

‘He did not forget it, he does not know about it.’ (LY-NQ)

124. A: Ahmid nse bəd məwəšid-əh Ahmid forget.PST.3MSG some appointment.PL-3MSG.PSS

‘Ahmid forgot some of his appointments.’

B: ma nsā-š bəd məwəšid-əh NEG forget.PST.3MSG-NEG some appointment.PL-3MSG.PSS nsā-hum kull-hum forget.PST.3MSG-3PL.OBJ all-3PL.OBL

‘He did not forget some of his appointments, he forgot them all.’ (LY-NQ)

125. A: grīt-hə l-qίṣṣa read.PST.1SG-3FSG.OBJ DEF-story

‘I read the story.’

B: ma grīt-hā-š grīt-hə NEG read.PST.2MSG-3FSG.OBJ-NEG read.PST.2MSG-3FSG.OBJ

‘You did not read it, you read it.’ (LY-NQ)

\textsuperscript{44} Notice the addition of -i to the postverbal negation marker. This is due to the verb ending in -ā, similar to the object pronoun. For more on this see (3.3.2.2).
However, in the case of conditionals, only one strategy is accepted. In example (127) below, it is not possible to use the standard negation marker ma-iš to induce a metalinguistic reading, as the only possible strategy is the use of miš.

In example (127), the use of the standard marker ma-iš can only give a truth-conditional negation reading and, therefore, is inconsistent with metalinguistic negation. The use of ma-iš can only apply directly to the truth conditions of the predicate, while miš takes scope over the whole proposition, which is crucial for denying the assertability of the conditional (actually expressed through it is not the case that in English). Therefore, the fact that the use of miš is obligatory could suggest that miš is specifically marked for metalinguistic negation.

Does that mean that Libyan Arabic has a special marker that is exclusive to metalinguistic negation? If this is the case then this contrasts with Horn’s claim that no language does. In addition, miš is used as a negation marker in other contexts. Are there two instances of miš in Libyan Arabic? Is this miš used for metalinguistic negation different from the negative
marker \textit{miš}? This requires the investigation of the syntactic distribution of these two negation elements.

\textbf{7.3.2.1.3. Distribution of \textit{miš}}

\textit{Miš} is used as a negation marker in certain contexts. These are the negation of non-verbal predicates (128), active participles (129), and with the future marker to negate verbal predicates in the future tense (130).

128. \textit{miš jđīda}  
\hspace{1cm} \textit{NEG new}  
\hspace{1cm} ‘It’s not modern.’ (LY)

129. \textit{ʔane miš ūrīf l-ʕinwān}  
\hspace{1cm} \textit{1SG.SUB NEG know.AP.MSG DEF-address}  
\hspace{1cm} ‘I do not know the address.’ (LY)

130. \textit{Ahmid miš hā-yūf l-mudīr l-ỉsbus}  
\hspace{1cm} \textit{Ahmid NEG FUT-see.NONT.3MSG DEF-manager DEF-week}  
\hspace{1cm} \textit{1-jāy DEF-next}  
\hspace{1cm} ‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (LY)

\textit{Miš} can be interpreted in the above examples, (128-130), as a metalinguistic negative marker too. In these cases, like when \textit{ma -iš} is used in (123-126), the negation is ambiguous. In these contexts, the metalinguistic negation induces a double processing effect, i.e. an ambiguous negative reading that needs rectification, as in (131).

131. \textit{miš jđīda ʔāxir hāja nizlit fi-s-sūg}  
\hspace{1cm} \textit{NEG new last thing come.out.PST.3FSG in-DEF-market}  
\hspace{1cm} ‘It’s not modern, it’s the latest thing there is.’ (LY)
Metalinguistic negation can be applied on the negative marker itself. In this case, the metalinguistic interpretation of the utterance leads to double negation, as in examples (132-134). Note that in these cases, the metalinguistic negation is of the use of the negation marker miš and not directly of the predicate.

132. miš miš jādīda xurda
    NEG NEG new rubbish
    ‘It’s not not modern, it’s rubbish.’ (LY-NQ)

133. l-bēt miš miš ʔəbyid bizzabit ma-li-ši
    DEF-house NEG NEG white exactly NEG-have-NEG
    ʕalāqa b-l-bayād
    relation to-DEF-whiteness
    ‘The house is not not exactly white, it has nothing to do with whiteness.’ (LY-NQ)

134. ʔane miš miš ʕārif l-ʕinwān bizzabit
    1SG.SUB NEG NEG know.AP.MSG DEF-address exactly
    ʔane miš ʕārif-əh bukkul
    1SG.SUB NEG know.AP.MSG-3MSG.OBJ at.all
    ‘I do not not exactly know the address, I do not know it at all.’ (LY-NQ)

As mentioned in (7.1), negative auxiliaries in Libyan Arabic are semantically interchangeable with the negative marker miš in spite of the difference in their pragmatic distribution. Negative auxiliaries are interchangeable with both truth-conditional miš, as in (135-137), and metalinguistic miš, as in (138-140), depending on pragmatic use.

135. miš mahiš jādīda xurda
    NEG NEG.3FSG new rubbish
    ‘It’s not not modern, it’s rubbish.’ (LY-NQ)

45 Notice the addition of -i to the negation marker to mark the third person masculine object pronoun.
However, negative auxiliaries are not interchangeable with miš in the following metalinguistic context:
Negative auxiliaries can only combine with non-verbal predicates or active participles, as the latter still maintain their adjectival inflections. The inability of negative auxiliaries to be interchangeable with *miš in (141) is attributed to their morpho-syntactic properties. The metalinguistic negation of conditionals requires the negation marker to take scope over the whole proposition, and both *ma -iš in example (127) and the negative auxiliary in (141), are not capable of doing that due to their morpho-syntactic distribution.

Nevertheless, the fact that *miš is interchangeable with negative auxiliaries in (135-140) suggests that parallel contexts force a metalinguistic reading that could be realised by either *miš or negative auxiliaries. This in turn suggests that *miš is not a special marker that is exclusive for metalinguistic negation in Libyan Arabic.

I conclude that *miš is used for the negation of a variety of constructions in Libyan Arabic, including non-verbal predicates and active participles, and its use is not exclusive to metalinguistic negation. This is supported by the fact that it is interchangeable with negative auxiliaries, where these auxiliaries are allowed, and that it can be used outside the scope of metalinguistic negation. However, it is still the case that while Libyan Arabic does not have a marker that is exclusive to metalinguistic negation, the use of *miš is a special means of distinguishing metalinguistic negation from truth-conditional negation in verbal sentences in Libyan Arabic.

### 7.3.2. Conclusion

Libyan Arabic uses *miš as a metalinguistic negation marker; however, it is not a negative marker that is exclusive to metalinguistic negation. The fact that it is interchangeable with negative auxiliaries suggests that it is the same marker used with non-verbal predicates and...
active participles, but unlike negative auxiliaries, it can take scope over a wide variety of
constructions. Nonetheless, it is still the case that Libyan Arabic uses *miš* as an unambiguous
special marker for distinguishing metalinguistic negation from truth-conditional negation in
verbal sentences.
Chapter Eight: Summary of main findings

This chapter highlights the main findings of this thesis and summarises the general patterns of negation found in Modern Arabic varieties discussed in the previous chapters. Section (8.1) highlights the main forms of negation used in the investigated Modern Arabic varieties in this research. Section (8.2) highlights the most influential factors that unify the negation patterns found in these varieties, which are predicate type and form. Section (8.3) summarises the results on the pragmatic functions of emphatic negation, the negative auxiliary and miš as a metalinguistic marker. Section (8.4) sheds light on issues that are in need of further research and investigation.

8.1. Forms of negation

Negative elements used in Modern Arabic varieties in standard and non-standard negation are various. Standard negation, as detailed in (1.2.2.2) and (3.2.1), is the means used to negate the most basic clause in a language while non-standard negation is all the other means. The standard negative marker ma is used by every variety.\(^{46}\) In fact, it is the main negative element used by Sudanese speakers in all negative constructions, as shown in (1).

1. l-walad ma bi-yšūf l-bent kull yōm
   DEF-boy NEG IND-see.NONT.3MSG DEF-girl every day
   ‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (SUA)

The varieties of Gulf Arabic use ma for standard negation and mū and mub for non-standard negation. North African speakers use ma -iš in standard negation, as in (2), and muš, miš, māši for non-standard negation. Levantine and Yemeni Arabic use ma (-iš) and mū and miš for these two types of negation respectively. In addition, all varieties make use of the negative auxiliary.

\(^{46}\) In combination with -iš in some varieties.
2. l-wld ma šaf-š l-bnt
   DEF-boy NEG see.PST.3MSG-NEG DEF-girl
   ‘The boy did not see the girl.’ (NA, LVA, YA)

8.2. Predicate type/form

The collected data offered many interesting insights into the nature of sentential negation in different Modern Arabic varieties. The data showed variation in the use of negation markers according to the type of the negated predicate, in terms of verbal vs. non-verbal predicates, as well as the form and the type of the verbal predicate. The effect of the form of the verbal predicate was seen in the behaviour of active participles and elements related to them, and past vs. non-tensed forms. The effect of the type of the verbal predicate was also seen in the behaviour of the auxiliary and pseudo-verbs in certain varieties. This section highlights the role of type and form of the predicate as a factor that is found to affect most of the observed variation in consistent patterns.

The results of this research shed light on the geographical division of the Arab world according to the negation markers used in sentential negation. This is illustrated in the use of negation markers ma in Gulf Arabic and Arabic spoken in the Arab peninsula, as in example (1), with the exception of Yemen. It is also seen in the use of ma -iš in North African Arabic, as in example (2), with the exception of Sudan, and a mixture of both strategies in the Levant.

The above indicates that while there is diversity in the negation markers used, there are consistent patterns that unify varieties that are found within the same geographical location, as shown in Map (2) repeated from Chapter Five (5.1). The North African varieties use very similar markers and strategies. The same is found of the varieties of the Arab peninsula and gulf where neighbouring varieties make use of ma in most negation contexts. The varieties of the Levant also display the same consistency within themselves.
The Arabic varieties of Sudan and Yemen represent exceptions to these generalisations as they display different patterns to the varieties surrounding them. Sudanese Arabic speakers used single marker *ma*, as opposed to the combined negation marker *ma –iš*, used in the neighbouring varieties of Egypt and Libya. Yemeni Arabic showed similar patterns to those used in the Levant, as opposed to the neighbouring Saudi and Omani Arabic. In addition, it is interesting to note here that most of the variation reported in previous chapters is consistent with this geographical division.

8.2.1. **Verbal vs. non-verbal predicates**

The first distinction in the use of negation markers observed in the collected data according to predicate type is that of verbal vs. non-verbal predicates. Speakers from all varieties, except Sudanese Arabic, used at least two different negation markers for verbal and non-verbal predicates.
Speakers from the varieties of the Arab peninsula and gulf used *ma* with verbal predicates, as in example (3), and *mū* and *mub*, as in (4), for non-verbal predicates, but did not make use of the postverbal marker *-iš*.

3. l-wld ma šaf l-bnt
   DEF-boy NEG see.PST.3MSG DEF-girl
   ‘The boy did not see the girl.’ (GA, SUA, LVA, YA)

4. l-bt mū/mub ?byḍ
   DEF-house NEG white
   ‘The house is not white.’ (GA)

North African varieties showed a broader range in that they make use of the postverbal marker *-iš*. In Egyptian, Libyan, Tunisian, Moroccan, and Algerian Arabic, verbal predicates were negated with the negative combined marker *ma -iš*, as in (5), while non-verbal predicates were negated with *muš*, as in (6) *miš* and *māši*.

5. l-wld ma šaf-š l-bnt
   DEF-boy NEG see.PST.3MSG-NEG DEF-girl
   ‘The boy did not see the girl.’ (NA, YA, LVA)

6. l-bēt muš ?obyaḍ
   DEF-house NEG white
   ‘The house is not white.’ (EA)

Speakers of Moroccan Arabic used the combined marker *ma -iš* with non-verbal predicates as well as with verbal predicates, as in example (7).

7. l-bēt ma ?obyiḏ-š
   DEF-house NEG white-NEG
   ‘The house is not white.’ (MA)
Speakers of Levantine and Yemeni Arabic also made a distinction between verbal and non-verbal predicates in that they used *ma (-iš)* for verbal predicates and *mū* and *miš* for non-verbal predicates.

Map (3), repeated from Chapter Five (5.1), shows the geographical distribution of the negation markers used with non-verbal predicates in the investigated Arabic varieties.

Map (3): The geographical distribution of the negation markers used with non-verbal predicates in the investigated Arabic varieties.

### 8.2.2. Active participles

Furthermore on the range of variation shown in the data from the investigated varieties, active participles represent a verbal category that patterned with non-verbal predicates instead of verbal ones. This is illustrated in the fact that they were negated with negative markers associated with non-verbal predicates, as shown in example (8), and thus their behaviour is consistent with the distribution of negation markers used for non-verbal predicates shown in Map (3) in the previous sub-section. The adjectival origins of active participles are the reason behind this defection. Even though active participles share crucial properties with verbal elements, they still maintain their adjectival inflections, which make them pattern with non-
verbal predicates. This was illustrated not only in negation but also in their need of the presence of the auxiliary to express past and future tense, as discussed in (7.1.3).

8. ʔana (miš)/ma/mū ʕārif l-ʕānwān
1SG.SUB NEG know.AP.MSG DEF-address
‘I do not know the address.’ (LE4-8,(9-13))

8.2.2.1. Active participles as grammaticalised markers

Some elements that indicate the future tense developed from active participles and show the same defective behaviour of active participles discussed above with regard to negation. It was observed that in the future tense when the future marker was present, the negation marker used in some varieties was that used for non-verbal predicates, such as mū and miš, instead of ma-iš. This can be explained in terms of the role of verbal form, more specifically by the reported defectiveness of the active participle form. The future marker is originally an active participle form that developed into a future marker (see 5.2). Active participles, as detailed in the previous sub-section, aligned with non-verbal predicates in terms of negation and so did the future marker. The future marker comes before the verbal predicate and, therefore, calls for the presence of miš instead of ma-iš, which is reserved for prototypical verbal predicates.

Example (9) shows the use of miš instead of ma-iš to negate the verbal predicate, due to the presence of the future marker in a number of Modern Arabic varieties.

9. Ahmid miš h-yūf l-mdīr l-sbūf
Ahmid NEG FUT-see.NONT.3MSG DEF-manager DEF-week
l-jy
DEF-next
‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (LY, EA, LVA, YA)

Map (6), repeated from Chapter Five (5.2), shows the geographical distribution of the negation marker used in the future tense in Modern Arabic varieties.
Map (5): The geographical distribution of negation markers used in the future tense in the investigated Modern Arabic varieties.

8.2.3. Past vs. non-tensed forms

This distinction was found in Libyan Arabic only. The responses from the majority of Libyan speakers indicated that Libyan Arabic makes a distinction between past and non-tensed forms, as opposed to active participle forms in terms of negation. The exception to this was found in the one Libyan speaker who had an alternative pattern that distinguished past from non-tensed forms regardless of the presence of the future marker.47 In his sentences, demonstrated in (10-12) below, he used ma -iš with the past form and -iš with the non-tensed forms, regardless of the presence of the future marker, as in (12).

10. huwwə ma šiṭa-š l-bint hadiyyət-hə
   3MSG.SUB NEG give.PST.3MSG-NEG DEF-girl gift-3SG.PSS
   ‘He did not give the girl her present.’ (LY7)

47 It is worth noting that this tendency is common with young Libyan speakers even though there was only one participant in this research that shows this distinction.
11. l-wild yšūf-iš fī l-bent kull yōm
DEF-boy see.NONT.3MSG-NEG fī DEF-girl every day
‘The boy does not see the girl every day.’ (LY7)

12. Ahmid ħa-yšūf-iš l-mudīr l-īsbūš
Ahmid FUT-see.NONT.3MSG-NEG DEF-manager DEF-week
l-jāy DEF-next
‘Ahmid will not see the manager next week.’ (LY7)

8.2.4. The auxiliary and pseudo-verbs

As detailed in (2.2), the auxiliary and pseudo-verbs are two types of non-standard verbs. A type of variation in negation patterns found in the data from Yemeni and Levantine Arabic was in the use of negation markers with these two categories, which is a phenomenon that has not been reported on before.

Speakers of Yemeni Arabic used the combined marker ma -iš with the auxiliary and pseudo-verbs, as in example (13) and (14) respectively, as opposed to with standard verbs where the preferred pattern was the single marker ma, as in (3).

13. l-bt ma kan-š ?byḍ
DEF-house NEG be.PST.3MSG-NEG white
‘The house was not white.’ (YA, LVA)

14. ma fī-š ẓāsīr fī 0-0llājā
NEG exist-NEG juice in DEF-fridge
‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (YA)
Similarly, speakers of Levantine varieties used the combined marker *ma -iš* with the auxiliary in (13), and either *ma -iš* or the postverbal marker *-iš* with pseudo-verbs, as in (15), as opposed to with standard verbs, where the preferred choice was *ma*, as in (3).

15. (ma) ʕšr ʕṣr fl 0-Ωlaja  
        NEG exist-NEG juice in DEF-fridge  
        ‘There is not juice in the fridge.’ (LVA)

Furthermore, these varieties offered variation in negation patterns with pseudo-verbs. Example (15) shows that pseudo-verbs can be negated with either *ma, ma -iš* or *-iš* on its own. The exception to this was the pseudo-verb *ʕand-* as in (16), where *ma* could not be dropped due to phonological reasons (see 3.2.4.6).

16. ma ʕnd-ʕʕšrt ʕʕrtn  
        NEG have-1sg.oabl-NEG car.DU  
        ‘I do not have two cars.’ (LVA)

The variation attested in the presence of the auxiliary and pseudo-verbs is further evidence for the important role of the type of the predicate. The variation in Levantine varieties in the negation of pseudo-verbs represents a level of variation that was not found in Yemeni or North African varieties. In Levantine varieties, the negation markers varied according to the phonological characteristics of the pseudo-verb.

Map (6), (7) and (8), repeated from Chapter Five (5.3), show the geographical distribution of negation markers used with the auxiliary in the future and past tense, and with pseudo-verbs, respectively, in Modern Arabic varieties.
Map (6): The geographical distribution of the negation markers used with pseudo-verbs in the investigated varieties.

Map (7): The geographical distribution of the negation markers used with the auxiliary in the future tense in the investigated Modern Arabic varieties.
Map (8): The geographical distribution of the negation markers used with the auxiliary in the past tense in the investigated Modern Arabic varieties.

Lebanese speakers showed more variation with respect to negation in combination with the auxiliary. The data showed that the same speakers, who used the combined marker with the auxiliary and pseudo-verbs, did not use *miš* with non-verbal predicates or active participles. Another group of speakers who used *miš* with the future marker, non-verbal predicates, and active participles did not use it with the auxiliary or pseudo-verbs. The striking pattern that emerged is the alignment of pseudo-verbs with the auxiliary (non-standard verbs) illustrated in the fact that the same marker was used with both categories.

This further shows that the type of the predicate affects the negation strategy in Lebanese Arabic and other varieties. However, that is not to say that the patterns shown above are absolute, exceptions and deviations from these patterns in the presented data testify to the diverse nature of the investigated constructions and data in general.

Table (21) summarises the distribution of negation markers used in the investigated fifteen Arabic varieties from Sudanese Arabic, which shows the least variation, to Lebanese Arabic, which shows the most, with verbal and non-verbal predicates. Table (22) shows the
distribution of negation markers with pseudo-verbs in Sudanese, Libyan, and Lebanese Arabic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUA</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>EA, TA</th>
<th>LY</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>YA</th>
<th>PA, JA</th>
<th>LE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard past</strong></td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma V-iš</td>
<td>ma V-iš</td>
<td>ma V-iš</td>
<td>ma V-iš</td>
<td>ma V(-iš)</td>
<td>ma V(-iš)</td>
<td>(ma) V(-iš)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard non-tensed</strong></td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma V-iš</td>
<td>ma V-iš/ -iš</td>
<td>ma V-iš</td>
<td>ma V-iš</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard non-tensed (with future marker)</strong></td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>ma/ miš/ -iš</td>
<td>ma FUT-iš</td>
<td>ma FUT-iš</td>
<td>ma/ miš</td>
<td>ma/ miš</td>
<td>ma/ miš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active participles</strong></td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>miš/ ma/ mū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary past</strong></td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma AUX-iš</td>
<td>ma AUX-iš</td>
<td>ma AUX-iš</td>
<td>ma AUX(-iš)</td>
<td>ma AUX(-iš)</td>
<td>(ma) AUX(-iš)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary non-tensed (with future marker)</strong></td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>miš/ ma AUX(-iš)</td>
<td>miš/ ma AUX/ -iš</td>
<td>ma FUT-iš AUX</td>
<td>ma FUT-iš AUX</td>
<td>ma/ miš</td>
<td>ma/ miš</td>
<td>miš/ (ma) FUT AUX(-iš)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-verbal predicates</strong></td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ma/ mū/ mub</td>
<td>miš/ muš</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>māši</td>
<td>māši/ ma NV-iš</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>miš</td>
<td>mū/ miš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (21): The distribution of negation markers with verbal and non-verbal predicates in the fifteen investigated Modern Arabic varieties.
As mentioned above, the variation found in the Arabic varieties can be classified according to predicate type and form. It is shown that a distinction in negation patterns is based on verbal vs. non-verbal predicates, and that the occurrence of an active participle form, even when grammaticalised, affects the negation of verbal elements. Further distinctions within the verbal category, such as the auxiliary and pseudo-verbs, also affect the choice of negation markers. These patterns can be explained in terms of the role of predicate form and type.

The variation in negation patterns shown above is reflected in the geographical distribution of the varieties as well. It is represented in the fact that neighbouring varieties are more likely to share similar features and patterns in terms of the use of negation markers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudo-verb</th>
<th>LY</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>SUA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fi ‘exist’</td>
<td>ma PV-š</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi ‘can/be.able’</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>badd-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maš-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʕand-</td>
<td>ma PV-š</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
<td>ma PV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (22): The distribution of negation markers with pseudo-verbs in Libyan, Lebanese and Sudanese Arabic.
However, it is important to note that these patterns and tendencies are subject to exceptions and deviations. These exceptions can be observed in the negation patterns of Sudanese and Yemeni Arabic in that they tend to differ from the patterns of geographically-close varieties.

8.3. Pragmatic functions of negation

The current research sheds light on the pragmatic application of some negative elements in Lebanese, Sudanese and Libyan Arabic. This is represented in the investigation of emphatic negation, the function of the negative auxiliary, and metalinguistic negation.

8.3.1. Emphatic negation

With regard to emphatic negation, which is characterised by the dropping of the postverbal marker -iš, Sudanese speakers did not use -iš in the first place, and Lebanese speakers mostly used it with auxiliaries and pseudo-verbs and therefore its absence would not necessarily have been indicative of emphatic negation. Libyan speakers dropped the postverbal marker -iš in the contexts of emphatic negation but this was not done consistently, which suggests this issue is in need of further investigation.

8.3.2. The negative auxiliary

The function of the negative auxiliary was investigated through a task where the speakers were given contexts that investigated the use of the negative auxiliary and their choices gave certain clues about the function of the negative auxiliary. With regard to Libyan Arabic, it was found from the speakers’ responses, and my own native judgement of Libyan Arabic, that the negative auxiliary was used to deny assumed background information that was shared between the speaker and the listener. By using the negative auxiliary, the speakers signalled both their awareness of this shared information and their denial of it. The results also suggested that it cannot be used to deny new information or information about a new referent.

The context of example (17) represents a situation where there is shared background information between the speaker and listener where they previously disagreed on the distance
of the post office from the speaker’s house. In example (17), the speaker is signalling his/her denial of this assumed information on the part of the listener of which he/she is aware, using the negative auxiliary (for more details on the context of these examples see 7.1.4.2).

17. li maktib l-barīd lī mahūš bīīd min
to office DEF-post that NEG.3MSG far from
hne
here
‘To the post office that’s not far from here.’ (LY)

The context of (18) represents a situation where a new referent is introduced into the discourse and new information is presented about him, and what was used was miš. In this context, the participant was asked to imagine a situation where he/she is telling a group of children the story of Little Red Riding Hood and introduce the wolf’s character. All Libyan participants were found to use the negation marker for non-verbal predicates and not the negative auxiliary.

18. kān fī ḍīb fī l-ḡābā miš
be.PST.3MSG exist wolf in DEF-woods NEG
Ṣārif ennā Laila jāya
know.AP.MSG that Laila come.AP.FSG
‘There was a wolf in the woods who does not know that Red Riding Hood is coming.’
(LY)

Some Lebanese and Sudanese speakers used the negative auxiliary in examples (19) and (20), but no one used it in the context of examples (21) and (22).

19. li maktab l-barīd lī mahū baṣīd min
to office DEF-post that NEG.3MSG far from
hena
here
‘To the post office that’s not far from here.’ (SUA)
This suggests that the pragmatic function of denying assumed background information suggested for the negative auxiliary in Libyan Arabic in (7.1.4.2) might hold for Sudanese and Lebanese Arabic as well. However, this is in need of further investigation.

8.3.3. Metalinguistic negation

Lebanese speakers made use of miš and mū in examples (23, 24) to indicate metalinguistic negation.
Nevertheless, the use of *miš/mū* for metalinguistic negation in other varieties requires further investigation to see if it has a non truth-conditional function and if they use *miš* as a special marker for metalinguistic negation.

With regard to Libyan Arabic, the data supports Horn’s analysis of the non truth-conditional function of the negation marker. The use of a cardinal number in (25) invokes the notion of exactness, which is either an implicature negated metalinguistically, as Horn (1985) suggests, or a non-lexical sense that is negated descriptively, as Geurts (1998) claims. The use of the oath particle *wallāhi* in (25) is ungrammatical despite Geurt’s claim that the negation marker is descriptively negating a sense rather than an implicature, i.e. the ‘exactly’ sense. If the negation marker has a truth-conditional function, the introduction of the oath particle should not affect the grammaticality of the sentence, but only emphasise the truth-conditional function of the negation marker. This suggests that the negation marker is not negating the truth conditions of the clause but the implicature of exactness denoted by the cardinal number (see 7.3.2.1).
25. *wallāhi  miš  klēt  xāmsa̱ sāndwitšāt
   by.God  NEG  eat.PST.1SG  five  sandwiches
   klēt  setta
   eat.PST.1SG  six
   ‘I swear I did not eat five sandwiches, I ate six.’ (LY-NQ)

It is also shown in (7.3.2.1) that in Libyan Arabic, miš is used to unambiguously indicate the metalinguistic negation of verbal predicates. In example (26), what is being objected to is the form of the word and not the truth conditions of the sentence.

       read.PST.1SG-3FSG.OBJ  DEF-story
       ‘I read the story.’

   B:  miš  grīt-hā  grēt-hā
       NEG  read.PST.2MSG-3FSG.OBJ  read.PST.2MSG-3FSG.OBJ
       ‘You did not read it, you read it.’ (LY-NQ)

However, miš is not the only means of signalling metalinguistic negation, as it can be expressed using the combined marker ma-iš, as in (27) and negative auxiliaries, as in (28), too.

27. A:  grīt-hā  l-qiṣṣa
       read.PST.1SG-3MSG.OBJ  DEF-story
       ‘I read the story.’

   B:  ma  grīt-hā-š  grēt-hā
       NEG  read.PST.2MSG-3FSG.OBJ-NEG  read.PST.2MSG-3FSG.OBJ
       ‘You did not read it, you read it.’ (LY-NQ)

28. mahīš  miš  jdīda  xurda
       NEG.3FSG  NEG  new  rubbish
       ‘It’s not not modern, it’s rubbish.’ (LY-NQ)
Miš is used in other constructions as well, which means that even though it distinguishes metalinguistic negation from truth-conditional negation in the negation of verbal predicates, it does not do so when it negates non-verbal predicates. In the negation of non-verbal predicates, it is ambiguous between a metalinguistic and a truth-conditional negation marker.

Finally, the facts that miš is used in a wider range of contexts and that the negative auxiliary can be used to indicate metalinguistic negation suggests that miš is not a marker exclusive for metalinguistic negation. However, it is a special marker for metalinguistic negation in the sense that its presence in a verbal sentence makes it identifiable as a metalinguistic context.

8.4. Issues for further research

This thesis explored negation patterns and variation with a focus on Libyan Arabic. While the methodology used in this thesis made it possible to obtain data from different Modern Arabic varieties on various negation constructions, it could not be used to obtain detailed data on a number of negation phenomena, such as emphatic and metalinguistic negation and the functions of the negative auxiliary. With regard to Libyan Arabic, detailed information on these was obtained from my own native judgements of the variety but this is in need of further investigation for other varieties. Moreover, some negation patterns reported in this thesis such as the optionality of both negation markers in Lebanese Arabic discussed in Chapter Five is problematic and in need of further investigation before reliable generalisations can be made.

Other issues in need of further investigation include the forms, morpho-syntactic behaviour and functions of the negative auxiliary in other Modern Arabic varieties. While its function seems to be similar in Egyptian and Libyan Arabic, the negative auxiliary in Syrian Arabic is reported to be in complementary distribution with miš (Brustad 2000: 299). This suggests that its function is different which requires further investigation of both Syrian Arabic and Lebanese Arabic, as their forms of the negative auxiliary are almost identical. The forms of the negative auxiliary in varieties that do not make use of the postverbal negative marker -iš, like Saudi Arabic have not been addressed either. The ability of the negative auxiliary to
occur before the future marker and non-tensed forms in Algerian and Tunisian Arabic also raises questions about its morpho-syntactic properties and functions in these varieties.
References


Paris 8 dissertation.


Börjars, Kersti, Khawla Ghadgoud & John Payne. Aspectual object marking in Libyan Arabic. In Doug Arnold, Miriam Butt, Berthold Crysmann, Tracy Holloway King & Stefan Muller


Stanford: CSLI Publications.


Haspelmath, Martin & Sandro Caruana. 2000. Subject diffuseness in Maltese: On some subject properties of experiential verbs. Folia linguistica 34.3-4, 245-266.


Martins, Ana Maria. 2014. How much syntax is there in metalinguistic negation?. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 32.2, 635-672.


Murphy, Isa Wayne. 2014. *The realization of negation in the Syrian Arabic clause, phrase, and word*. Dublin: Dublin University Press


[https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=INU.30000036433856;view=1up;seq=5].


Appendix 1: The broad questionnaire

Negation in Modern Arabic Varieties

Thank you for participating in this study. The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out about how you negate sentences in your own everyday-spoken Arabic variety and not in standard written Arabic or any other Arabic variety that you might have heard.

Questions:

A  Can you please negate the following sentences: (e.g. there is juice in the fridge= there isn’t juice in the fridge, the house is white= the house is not white). If there is more than one way to negate the sentence, please list all possible ways.
1. There was juice in the fridge

2. I will be able to forget her

3. I have two cars

4. I had money

5. There was juice in the fridge
6. I swear I saw her شفتها

7. I will have two cars سيارتين

8. The house is white البيت أبيض

9. I will want to sleep أتام

10. I was capable of forgetting her فني انسها

11. There will be juice in the fridge في الثلاجة
12. He was here

13. There will be juice in the fridge

14. The boy sees the girl every day

B Pick one of the following options with regard to the below sentences: Acceptable (A), Unacceptable (U), or Odd but acceptable (O). If none of the options listed below is how you would express that sentence in your variety or if there is another acceptable way that is not listed, please give it in the space below.
1. I didn’t have two cars
ما كان عندي سيارتين
I didn’t have two cars
كانت عندي سيارتين
I didn’t have two cars
ما كان عندي سيارتين

2. There isn’t juice in the fridge
بیش عصير في الثلاجة
There isn’t juice in the fridge
ما بي عصير في الثلاجة
There isn’t juice in the fridge
ما بیش عصير في الثلاجة

3. I didn’t want to sleep
ما كان بدي انام
I didn’t want to sleep
كانت بدي انام
I didn’t want to sleep
ما كان بدي انام

4. I don’t have money
معيش فلوس
I don’t have money
ما معي فلوس
I don’t have money
ما معيش فلوس
5. The house won’t be white
البيت ما ح يكون أبيض
The house won’t be white
البيت ح يكون أبيض
The house won’t be white
البيت ما ح يكون أبيض

6. I cannot forget her
ما فيني انساهما
I cannot forget her
فينيش انساهما
I cannot forget her
ما فيني انساهما

7. He won’t be here
هو مش ح يكون هناهون
He won’t be here
هو ح يكون هناهون
He won’t be here
هو ما ح يكون هناهون
He won’t be here
هو ما ح يكون هناهون

8. There isn’t juice in the fridge
ما في عصير في الثلاجة
There isn’t juice in the fridge
فيش عصير في الثلاجة
There isn’t juice in the fridge
ما فيش عصير في الثلاجة

9. I won’t have money
ما ح يكون معي فلوس
I won’t have money
ح يكوتش معي فلوس
I won’t have money

ما ح يكونش معي فلوس

----------------------------------------------

10. I don’t want to sleep

ما بديش انام

I don’t want to sleep

بديش انام

ما بدي انام

----------------------------------------------

11. The house wasn’t white

البيت ما كان أبيض

The house wasn’t white

البيت كانش أبيض

The house wasn’t white

 البيت ما كانش أبيض

----------------------------------------------

12. He isn’t here

هو مش هنآهون

He isn’t here

هو مو هنآهون

He isn’t here

هو هناث هونش

He isn’t here

 هو ما هناث هونش

----------------------------------------------

13. The boy didn’t see the girl

الولد ما شافش البننت

The boy didn’t see the girl

الولد ما شاف البننت

The boy didn’t see the girl

الولد شافش البننت

----------------------------------------------

348
14. Ahmad won't see the principal next week

Ahmad won't see the principal next week
Ahmad won't see the principal next week
Ahmad won't see the principal next week
Ahmad won't see the principal next week

---

C  Pick one of the following options with regard to the below sentences: Acceptable (A), Unacceptable (U), or Odd but acceptable (O). If none of the options listed below is how you would express that sentence in your variety or if there is another acceptable way that is not listed, please give it in the space below.

LO 1. If he is not here in 10 minutes, I am leaving.

 لو كنت هناهون في 10 دقائق، ح ، امشي ابمشي
 لو ما كان هناهون في 10 دقائق، ح ، امشي ابمشي
 لو ما كان هناهون في 10 دقائق، ح ، امشي ابمشي

---

2. If I hadn't seen you, I would have left.

 لو ما كنت شفتك، كنت مشيت
 لو كنتش شفتاك، كنت مشيت
 لو ما كنتش شفتاك، كنت مشيت
3. If you don’t come, I won’t go either

Lo ma ha Tijji, ma ha Amshi
If you don’t come, I won’t go either
Lo ma ka Tijji, ma ha Amshi
If you don’t come, I won’t go either
Lo ma ha Tijji, ma ha Amshi

4. I didn’t see if he didn’t come

Ma shafat lo ma jash
I didn’t see if he didn’t come
Ma shafat lo ma jash
I didn’t see if he didn’t come
Ma shafat lo ma jash

5. Don’t go

La Tamsyi
Don’t go
Ma Tamsyi
Don’t go
La Tamsyi
Don’t go
Ma Tamsyi

6. He neither saw nor heard

La shaf wala sama
He neither saw nor heard
Shaf wala sama
He neither saw nor heard
La shaf wala sama
7. He neither sees nor hears

لا يشوف ولا يسمع

He neither sees nor hears

He neither sees nor hears

8. He will neither see nor hear

لا ح يشوف ولا ح يسمع

He will neither see nor hear

He will neither see nor hear

9. He did not see the boy or the girl

لا شاف الولد ولا الولد

He did not see the boy or the girl

He did not see the boy or the girl

10. I don’t know if he saw her or not

ما يعرف انعرف كان شافها ولا ما كان

I don’t know if he saw her or not

I don’t know if he saw her or not

I don’t know if he saw her or not

11. He didn’t see anybody

ما شاف حد

He didn’t see anybody

He didn’t see anybody

ما شاف حد
He didn’t see anybody
ما شافش حد

-------------------------------------
12. He doesn’t see anybody
يشوفش حد
He doesn’t see anybody
ما يشوفش حد
He doesn’t see anybody
ما

-------------------------------------
13. He won’t see anybody
مش ح يشوف ح
He won’t see anybody
ما ح يشوف ح
He won’t see anybody
ما ح يشوف ح
He won’t see anybody
ح

-------------------------------------
14. He never saw her
عمرو ما شافها
He never saw her
عمرو شافها
He never saw her
عمرو ما شافها

-------------------------------------
Appendix 2: The narrow questionnaire

Negation in Modern Arabic Varieties

شكرًا على مشاركتك في هذه الدراسة. الغرض من هذا الاستطلاع هو معرفة كيف يتم قول الجمل في لهجتك العربية العامة الخاصة بك وليس في اللغة العربية الفصحى أو ما قد تكون سمعته في لهجات أخرى.

مقدمة

الاسم:
العمر:
اللهجة:
مكان الولادة:
اسم المدينة أو القرية:
أماكن أخرى عشت فيها:

الأسئلة:

A In light of the following contexts, pick one of the below options as the most appropriate response to the given sentences. If none of the options listed below is how you would express that sentence in your variety or if there is a better way that is not listed, please give it in the space below.

A في ضوء السياقات التالية، اختر واحدًا من الخيارات كأحسن طريقة لتكلمتك أو للرد على الجمل المذكورة. لو لم يكن أي من الخيارات المكتوبة هي الطريقة التي تعتبر بها عن الجملة في لهجتك أو كانت هناك طريقة أخرى أحسن، أرجو منك كتابتها في في المساحة المخصصة.

1. أنت جالس مع أصدقائك في مقهى تتحدثون عن صديق لك اسمه أحمد. يقول أحدهم: أحمد ما بطلش تدخين. لكنك تعن أن أحمد لا يدخن أصلا. قول له:
You’re sitting in a café with your friends talking about a friend of yours called Ahmid. One of your friends says: Ahmid didn’t stop smoking. However, you know that Ahmid doesn’t smoke in the first place, so you say:

• أحمد مش ما بطلش تدخين، أحمد ما يدخش أصلا
• أحمد ما بطلش تدخين، أحمد ما يدخش أصلا
• ........................................................................................................

2. تتشمى أنت وأحدهم قرب من بيكم حين تلاحظون دكانا افتتح مؤخرا ولكنك رأيته مسبقا يقول لك أخوك:

You’re walking with one of your siblings near your house when you notice a shop that has recently been opened but that you have seem before. They say to you: There is a new shop over here! You reply:

• لا مواماش جديد
• لا ماهوا ماهواش جديد
• ........................................................................................................

3. ينزل فيلم جديد في السينما تريد مشاهدته فتتصل بأحد أصدقائك ليذهب معك. يقول صديقك بأن لديه مشاغل أخرى وليس متاحا من أنه يستطيع الذهاب معك. ترد أنت:

There is a new movie at the cinema that you want to see. You call up one of your friends to ask them to go with you. They say that they have other things they have to do and they’re not sure if they’ll be able to go. You say:

• إذا ما عندك عندهك وقت، مشاوماه مشكلة
• إذا ما عندك عندهك وقت، ماهي ماهي مشكلة
• ........................................................................................................
You’re walking with one of your siblings near your house when you notice a shop that has recently been opened but that you have seem before. They say to you: There is a new shop over there! You say that it’s not new. However, he insists that it is new and that he was here two days before and is sure he didn’t see it. You reply:

• والله ماهو جديد
• والله مواهماش جديد
• والله ماهواماهوش جديد

You’re sitting in a public café with your friends having a chat. You start telling them about an incident that you encountered last night in which you were acting unlike yourself. One of your friends asks: What do you mean by that? You reply:

• زي ما أكون أنا مش أنا اللي كنت زمان
• زي ما أكون أنا مانيماتش أنا اللي كنت زمان

You’re at work when you get a call from your father asking you to come home immediately for a family emergency. You tell your boss about what happened and you say you’re going out right now. Your boss refuses and says:

• لا انت مش مو طالع خارج
7. You’re telling a group of children the story of Little Red Riding Hood. In the middle of the narrative you reach the part where you introduce the wolf’s character:

- كان فيه ذنب في الغابة مشعوم عارف ان ليلي جادة
- كان فيه ذنب في الغابة ماهواماهوتش عارف ان ليلي جادة

8. You argue with your friend about whether the post office was close or far from your house. He says that it’s not far. You reply:

- هيا مSMTP: وما مشعوما بعيدا، هي خطة من هنا
- هيا ماهيو: وما مشعوما بعيدا، هي خطة من هنا

9. You’re at work when you get a call from your father asking you to come home immediately for a family emergency. You tell your boss about what happened and you say you’re going out right now. Your boss refuses and says: You’re not going.
You insist and say that you’re going anyway so he refuses again. You get angry with your boss and say:

• ما تقدر تمنعني!!
• ما تقدر تمنعني!!

You and a friend of yours get a new job after a successful interview with someone you both thought is your manager. On your first day at work you find out that that person is not the manager but your friend doesn’t. Your friend tells you that he is going to ask him for time off work for an emergency, so you say:

• هذا مش المدير!!
• هذا ماهو/ماهوش المدير!!
•

You argue with your friend about whether the post office was close or far from your house. He says that it’s not far. The next day, you’re preparing yourself to go to the post office when your friend asks where are you going? You reply:

• لمكتب البريد اللي موامش بعيد من هنا \ هون
• لمكتب البريد اللي ماهو/ماهوش بعيد من هنا \ هون
•
You’re sitting with your family at a restaurant to have dinner, but your father hasn’t arrived yet. You suggest that you order fish, as you know that your father likes fish. However, your mother says that he wouldn’t eat fish, so you say:

• موامةً ماء يحب يحب السمك؟
• ما يحب يحب سمك؟
• ...

Can you please negate the following sentences: (e.g. there is juice in the fridge= there isn’t juice in the fridge, the house is white= the house is not white). If there is more than one way to negate the sentence, please list all possible ways.

أرجو نفي الجمل التالية (مثلًا: في عصير في الثلاجة=ما في عصير في الثلاجة، وأما في عصير في الثلاجة، أو في عصير في الثلاجة، أرجو نفي الجملة، أو في عصير في الثلاجة. البيت أبيض= البيت مي أبيض، أو البيت مؤ أبيض). لو كان هناك أكثر من طريقة لنفي الجملة، أرجو مك كتابة كل الطرق الممكنة.

1. معي فلس

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

2. هنادي

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
3. في عصير في التلاجة


4. بدي إلام


5. عندي سيارتين


6. الولد كان يكتب الرسالة


7. الولد يكون يكتب في الرسالة الآن: هلاً توا


8. البيت كان أبيض
البيت ح يكون أبيض

هو كان في المدرسة

هو ح يكون في المدرسة

انا كنت عارفة العونان

هو ح يكون عارف العونان
14. هو المدير.

15. هو حيكون المدير.

16. كانعني سياراتين.

17. كان بدي نم.

18. ح يكون معى فلوس.

19. كان في عصير في التلاجة.
20. ح يكون فيني انساه.

21. كان معي فلوس.

22. ح يكون عندي سيارتين.

23. ح يكون بدي انام.

24. كان فيني انساه.

25. ح يكون في عصر في الثلاجة.
انا عارف العنوان.  

انا ماشي للمدرسة.  

هو لايس حذايه.  

هي راكضة عاليبيت.  

هي جاية بسرعة.  

هو قادر يعملها.  

احدنا كنا اصحاب البيت.
انا كنت اكتب الرسالة.

المرأة التي عارفة العنوان.

هلباكي ناس كانوا هنا؟هون.

C Pick one of the following options with regard to the below sentences: Acceptable (A), Unacceptable (U), or Odd but acceptable (O). If none of the options listed below is how you would express that sentence in your variety or if there is another acceptable way that is not listed, please give it in the space below.
الولد ما شاف البتت
الولد شاف البتت

----------------------------------------
2. الولد مش بيشوف ع عم يشوف بيشوف البتت كل يوم
الولد ما بيشوف ع عم يشوف بيشوف البتت كل يوم
الولد ما بيشوف ع عم يشوف بيشوف البتت كل يوم
الولد بيشوف ع عم يشوف بيشوف البتت كل يوم

----------------------------------------
3. أحمد مش راح يشوف المدير الأسبوع الجاي
أحمد ما ح يشوف المدير الأسبوع الجاي
أحمد ما ح يشوف المدير الأسبوع الجاي
أحمد ما ح يشوف المدير الأسبوع الجاي
أحمد ح يشوف المدير الأسبوع الجاي

----------------------------------------
4. هو ما أعطى البتت هديتها
هو ما أعطاه البتت هديتها
هو عطاش البتت هديتها

----------------------------------------
5. هو ما رحح يعطي البتت هديتها
هو مش رحح يعطي البتت هديتها
هو ما رحح يعطي البتت هديتها
6. هو ما يعطي البناء حقهم
هو ما يعطي البناء حقهم
هو يعطي البناء حقهم

7. البيت مع أبيض
البيت مع أبيض
البيت ما أبيض

8. هو مش في المدرسة
هو مو في المدرسة
هو ما في المدرسة

9. هو مش المدير
هو مو المدير
هو ما المدير

10. أنا مش عارفة العنوان
أنا مو عارفة العنوان
أنا ما عارفة العنوان
11. ما هو ما هو
هو مش ما هو

12. لا تمشي .
ما تمشيش
تميش
لا تمشيش
ما تمشي

13. حب ما ضايق جدا .
حب ما ضايق حد
حب مش ضايق حد
حب مو دايق حد
حب ما اضيق حد

14. بفضل الفضل انفضل ما يكون جديد .
بفضل الفضل انفضل ما يكون جديد
بفضل الفضل انفصل يكش جديد
بفضل الفضل انفصل مش او يكون جديد

15. حبيت انه ما كان كبير .
حببته إنه ما كانش كبير
حببتة إنه كانش كبير
حببته إنه مشامو كان كبير

------------------------------------------------------------------------

هو حب ما يضايقني 16.
هو حب ما يضايقني
هو حب يضايقني
هو حب مشامو يضايقني

------------------------------------------------------------------------

مش ح يكون عنننا سبارتين 17.
ما ح يكون عنننا سبارتين
ما ح يكونن عنننا سبارتين
ح يكونن عنننا سبارتين

------------------------------------------------------------------------

ما كان عندهم بيت 18.
ما كانش عندهم بيت
كانش عندهم بيت

------------------------------------------------------------------------

شاف ولد مقاعد بالحديقة 19.
شاف ولد مش مقاعد بالحديقة
شاف ولد ما مقاعد بالحديقة
E. In your opinion, do the following sentences mean the same thing? If you think they mean the same thing, put (S). If you think they mean different things, please explain the two different meanings as much as possible. Also elaborate on the contexts each one of the sentences can be used in.

1. اعرف ما عنني؟
أنا ما عنني، أعرف عنه

2. لو كنت تعتقد أن الجملتين تحملان نفس المعنى، ضع (S).
أعط تفاصيل عن السياقات المختلفة التي تستخدم فيها كل جملة.

ما عجبني انه مش فاهم الموضوع
ما عجبني أنه مش فاهم الموضوع
ما عجبني انه مش فاهم الموضوع
ما عجبني أنه مش فاهم الموضوع

هو ليس حذائه، اكتسرته
هو لباس حذائه، اكتسرته
3. هي أعطت اخوها الكرت
هي عاطفة اخوها الكرت

4. هو ينام بهالوقت في هالوقت
هو نائم بهالوقت في هالوقت
Appendix 3: Lists of participants’ origins

List of the hometowns of the participants of the broad questionnaire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LY</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Benghazi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>Amman</td>
<td>Amman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YA</td>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>SanSa</td>
<td>SanSa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Al-Hasa</td>
<td>Jadda</td>
<td>Riyadh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Doha</td>
<td>Doha</td>
<td>Doha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>Muscat</td>
<td>Sur</td>
<td>Muscat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUA</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td>Kusti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Asyut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Tunis</td>
<td>Tunis</td>
<td>Sousse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Algiers</td>
<td>Algiers</td>
<td>Algiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Meknes</td>
<td>Rabat</td>
<td>Rabat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of the hometowns of the participants of the narrow questionnaire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LY</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Sebha</td>
<td>Gheryan</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Qabb Ilyas</td>
<td>Akkar</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUA</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td>Merowe</td>
<td>Omdurman</td>
<td>Nyala</td>
<td>Atbara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LY</td>
<td>Yefren</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>Mesrata</td>
<td>Tripoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Sidon</td>
<td>Sidon</td>
<td>Sidon</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUA</td>
<td>Gezira</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td>Kenana</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
<td>Khartoum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

371