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ABSTRACT

The investigation of the structure of Arabic, a Semitic language spoken in many Arab countries, has revealed many typologically important linguistic phenomena, particularly related to syntax. The importance is seen in both its standard and dialectal forms. One of the important syntactic aspects of Arabic is negation, a fundamental phenomenon in the study of syntax. Negation has been investigated by many scholars, such as Pollock (1989), Brustad (2000), Benmamoun (2000) and Ouhalla and Shlonsky (2002). Building on previous studies, this thesis provides a description of the morpho-syntax of negation patterns in Kuwaiti Arabic. By incorporating examples from corpora, this thesis sheds light on different types of negative elements which have not been examined in previous Arabic syntactic studies. The Kuwaiti dialect is considered in this thesis as a representative of Arabic dialects as it encompasses different types of negative elements. This study presents a descriptive work on the morpho-syntax of negation in Kuwaiti Arabic and Standard Arabic by examining the syntactic distributions of the negative markers in these two varieties.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 SIGNIFICANCE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This thesis provides a description of the morpho-syntax of negation patterns in Kuwaiti Arabic (KA), and it aims to give a relatively in-depth overview of the negative elements in KA with an emphasis on the various strategies that characterize negation.

Negation in Standard Arabic (SA) and Arabic dialects has been the focus of many studies: Standard Arabic (Benmamoun, 2000; Al-tamari, 2001; Eid, 1991); Jordanian Arabic (Al-momani, 2011); Yemeni Arabic (Qafisheh, 1996); and Tunisian Arabic (Bahloul, 1996)

Negation is expressed differently from one language to another. Some languages, like English, use one element (Ouhalla & Shlonsky, 2002). A sentence like ‘He is a teacher’ can be negated by using a negative marker ‘not’ as in ‘He is not a teacher’. Languages like French express negation by using two elements, ne and pas (Pollock, 1989; Ouhalla, 1990). For example: Mona n’est pas venu ‘Mona did not come’. Arabic dialects exhibit the use of both one element and two elements to express negation. In some Arabic dialects (Ouhalla & Shlonsky, 2002) negation can be expressed by using the two-negation elements pattern (example from Ouhalla & Shlonsky, 2002):

(1)  ma mļ-af  Omar  
     neg go.3ms-neg  Omar
     ‘Omar did not go’

The use of the two-negation elements pattern ma and -f is one of the interesting aspects of some Arabic dialects (e.g., Moroccan [Ouhalla & Shlonsky, 2002]; Egyptian
Because these Arabic dialects originated from classical Arabic which does not have the use of the two-negation-elements pattern. The two-negation elements pattern \( ma \) and \(-f\) does not exist in either SA or KA. Moreover, Moroccan and Egyptian Arabic use \( ma-f \) (and its variants) as one single discontinuous element in present and future tense with both verbal predicates and non-verbal predicates. Consider example (2) for Moroccan Arabic and (3) for Egyptian Arabic:

(2) \( \text{latiifa maʃi fii d-dar} \)  
    Latifa neg in the-house  
    ‘Latifa is not in the house’

(3) \( \text{la miʃʔadiim} \)  
    neg neg old  
    ‘No, it’s not old’

Jordanian Arabic negation is similar to that of Moroccan and Egyptian Arabic, but allows more variation. Four negative elements are used for negation: \( ma, ma-ʃ, mi-ʃ \) and \( laa \). In general, these negative elements are pre-verbal (Al-momani, 2011). Consider the following example:

(4) \( \text{l-walad ma-nami-ʃ} \)  
    the-boy neg-sleep.3ms-neg  
    ‘The boy did not sleep’

In Syrian Arabic, \( maa \) or \( muu \) is used but not \( ma-ʃ \) (Brustad, 2000), as seen in the following example:

(5) \( \text{maa ha-yzid kti:r} \)  
    (Brustad, 2000, p. 285)
neg fut-add much

‘It is not going to add much’

SA uses different negative elements as explained in (Shlonsky, 1997; Benmamoun, 2000; Ouhalla & Shlonsky, 2002; Ryding, 2005). In SA, every negative element has its own specificities. The negative elements in SA are laa, lam, lan, maa, laysa and y ayr. The specificity of SA negative elements is based on the fact that they vary in their syntactic features. lam and lan, for instance, carry tense, laysa inflects for agreement, laa, on the other hand, neither carries tense nor inflects for agreement. Benmamoun (2000) argues that laa and maa are the main negative elements in SA while the others are simply inflected variants of laa. Alternatively, Ryding (2005) states that the negative elements in Arabic are laa, lam, maa, laysa and y ayr.

This diversity in the use of negative elements is also seen in KA, which uses different negators compared to SA and other Arabic dialects. KA has a variety of ways to express and present negative sentences in different contexts. The main negatives in KA are laa, maa, muu, and y ayr. SA and Arabic dialects differ from KA in the choice of negative elements. Thus, not all the negative elements that exist in SA or other Arabic dialects are found in KA. Consider the following examples:

(6) ?ali-un laysa taalib-an (SA)
    Ali-nom neg.3ms student-acc
    ‘Ail is not a student’

(7) l-bit miʃ hilwa (Egyptian Arabic)
    the-girl neg beautiful
    ‘The girl is not beautiful’

(8) l-bint muu helwa (KA)
the-girl neg beautiful

‘The girl is not beautiful’

In (6), we see the negative marker *laysa* used only in SA and not found in any other Arabic dialect. In (7), *miʃ* as a negative marker is used in Egyptian Arabic (Brustad, 2000) and does not exist in SA and KA. In (8), the negative maker *muu* is used instead of *laysa* in KA and does not exist either in SA or in Egyptian Arabic. Though many studies have discussed sentential negation in Arabic (see Shlonsky, 1997; Benmamoun, 2000; Brustad, 2000; Ouhalla & Shlonsky, 2002), one of the negative elements that has received little attention is *ɣayr* ‘not’. The negative element *ɣayr* is unique because it is a noun used to negate only adjectives in SA and KA. Thus, the negative element *ɣayr* has a particular status. This point will be discussed in detail in sections 3.4 and 4.3.4.

When linguists refer to KA they mean one particular urban dialect. This study provides a description of the morpho-syntact of negation patterns in all the dialects of KA and SA. Thus, data in this study is meant to represent all the dialects of KA. To achieve this goal, the data used in this study are taken from a variety of sources that reflect this diversity: the native Kuwaiti play *We-ṣdean* (Al-muhareb, 2007), the native Kuwaiti play *Wyabqa al-watan* (Al-muhareb, 2011),¹ and the Kuwaiti novel *Rosaasat Manal* (Al-kandary, 2011). Sentences and phrases that possess negative elements were coded and transcribed to investigate the use of negation in KA.

This thesis is comprised of six chapters. Chapter one includes the background and introduction. Chapter two compares sentence structure in SA and KA. Chapter three presents negation in SA. Chapter four discusses negation in KA. Chapter five examines

---
¹ The play *wyabqa al-watan* has not yet been publicly performed, but the author, Muhammad Al-muhareb
agreement in negation and chapter six summarizes the current study.
In order to investigate negation in SA and KA, it is important to first present a brief overview of sentence structure in these dialects. This chapter examines and explains the most important grammatical features in SA and KA related to word order and tense.

2.1 WORD ORDER

Word order in Arabic is an essential topic in syntax as well as the focus of many early scholars who wrote about the grammar of Arabic. To start building a syntactic analysis for a sentence in Arabic, one should first know whether it belongs to a nominal or verbal paradigm. In early Arabic grammars there was disagreement about what is called ʔal-ʔumlatu ʔal-ʔismiatu ‘the nominal sentence’ (ʕalamah, 1993). Some Arabic scholars argued that a nominal sentence is any that does not have a verb, while others argued that a nominal sentence can be any sentence that starts with a nominal word even if it contains a verb. In SA, if a verbal sentence has a transitive verb, there are six possible word orders: SVO, VSO, OVS, OSV, VOS and SOV. Consider the following examples:

(9)  a. SVO

 paradise-u ʔakala ʔtaʔsam-a

 paradise-nom ate.3ms the-food-acc

‘Hamad ate the food’

b. VSO

 ʔakala paradise-u ʔtaʔsam-a

---

2 For further discussion see ʕalamah (1993).
Note that all of the previous sentences do not carry the same pragmatic effects. For instance, in SVO the speaker is attempting to focus on and attract the listener’s attention to the subject, Hamadu. In contrast, the OVS order highlights the object. The choice of word order in SA can be affected by the overt case that the subject and object carry (the former takes nominative case as in Hamad-u, the latter takes accusative case realized overtly as in t-taśam-a): When the subject and the object cannot carry these overt cases for some phonological reason, they are restricted to VSO order. If an alternative word order is used in these cases, ambiguity will exist. For instance, the following sentence in SA has to be in VSO order and cannot be in SOV:

(10)
a. raʔat Monaa Suhaa
‘Mona saw Suha.’

b. * Monaa Suhaa ra?at
Mona Suha saw.3fs

The reason behind the ungrammatically of (10b) is that neither Monaa nor Suhaa can carry overt case because these words end in vowels. Therefore, the meaning of the sentence will be ambiguous in word orders other than VSO because tone cannot distinguish between the subject and the object. Due to the absence of case marking in KA, the most frequent word order is SVO or VSO. KA also allows other word orders as long as the subject precedes the object. Consider the following examples:

(11)

a. SVO

?aafnaan ʃaafat Emaan
?aafnaan saw.3fs Emaan

‘Afnan saw Eman’

b. VSO

ʃaafat ?aafnaan Emaan
saw.3fs ?aafnaan Emaan

‘Afnan saw Eman’

c. OVS

* Emaan ʃaafat ?aafnaan
Emaan saw.3fs ?aafnaan
We can see that even though Afnan and Eman, as shown in (11c), do not end with vowels, the OVS order in KA is ungrammatical.

2.2 TENSE

In this section I discuss tense in SA and KA. As shown in the previous section, the subject in SA takes a nominative case which is realized overtly, while in KA overt case has disappeared. Nevertheless, we can still see nominative case in the subject in KA through its pronouns. Independent pronouns in KA cannot be used in non-nominative places. Consider the following examples:

(12)

a. uhwa laʕab maʕaa-h min-zimaan
   he played.1ms with-him for-long time
   ‘I played with him for a long time.’

b. * laʕab uhwa maʕaa-h min-zimaan
   played.1ms he with-him for-long time

In SA and KA there are two forms of verbs: perfective and imperfective. The former is used with the past tense while the latter is used with the present tense. Moreover, one can distinguish between perfective and imperfective based on their prefixes or suffixes. Tables (13) and (14) present the perfective forms in SA and KA:

(13) Perfective in SA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Verb+Affix</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>daras-tu</td>
<td>I studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-naa</td>
<td>daras-naa</td>
<td>We studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>daras-ta</td>
<td>You studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>daras-ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>Verb+Affix</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>daras-t</td>
<td>I studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>daras-na</td>
<td>We studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>daras-t</td>
<td>You studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>daras-ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-taw</td>
<td>daras-taw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Daras</td>
<td>He studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-at</td>
<td>dris-at</td>
<td>She studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-aw</td>
<td>dris-aw</td>
<td>They studied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(14) Perfective in KA

The perfective forms always occur in the past tense and are created with suffixes (no perfective forms have prefixes in both SA and KA). Moreover, we can notice that there are no dual markers or gender plural distinctions in KA as in SA. In addition, the
suffixes in the perfective forms in SA and KA carry agreement. There are three suffixes that KA shares with SA in the perfective form: na, ti, at. Consider the following examples:

(15) KA
a. kitabna risaalah
   wrote.1p letter
   ‘We wrote a letter’

b. kitabti risaalah
   wrote.2fs letter
   ‘You wrote a letter’

c. ektebat risaalah
   wrote.3fs letter
   ‘She wrote a letter’

(16) SA
a. katabna risaalat-an
   wrote.1p letter-acc
   ‘We wrote a letter.’

b. katabti risaalat-an
   wrote.2fs letter-acc
   ‘You wrote a letter’

c. katabat risaalat-an
   wrote.3fs letter-acc
   ‘She wrote a letter.’

We can notice that the only difference between these example sentences in SA and KA is that the object in SA has an overt case while it does not in KA. Moreover, the
affixes -taw and –aw are used for the plural forms in the second and third persons in KA but do not exist in SA.

(17)

a. drastaw ?ams studied.2p yesterday
‘You studied yesterday’
b. drisaw ?ams studied.3p yesterday
‘They studied yesterday’

The imperfective in SA and KA has different affixes than the perfective form.

Consider the following tables which illustrate these affixes in SA and KA:

(18) Imperfective in SA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Verb+Affix</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>?a-</td>
<td>?a-drusu</td>
<td>I study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>na-drusu</td>
<td>We study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ta-</td>
<td>ta-drusu</td>
<td>You study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ta-iin</td>
<td>ta-drus-iina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>ta-aani</td>
<td>ta-drus-aani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ta-uuna</td>
<td>ta-drus-uuna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ta-na</td>
<td>ta-drus-na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ya-</td>
<td>ya-drusu</td>
<td>He studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ta-</td>
<td>ta-drusu</td>
<td>She studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ya-aani</td>
<td>ya-drus-aani</td>
<td>They study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>Verb+affix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>?a-</td>
<td>?a-dris</td>
<td>I study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>na-dris</td>
<td>We study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ta-</td>
<td>ta-dris</td>
<td>You study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ta-iin</td>
<td>ta-dris-iin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>ta-uun</td>
<td>tadrus-uun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ya-</td>
<td>ya-dris</td>
<td>He studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ta-</td>
<td>ta-dris</td>
<td></td>
<td>She studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>ya-oon</td>
<td>ya-drus-uun</td>
<td>They study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can again notice that in KA there are no dual markers or gender plural distinction. In addition, imperfective forms in SA and KA can be used in the future tense by adding the future particles *sawfa* or *sa-* in SA and *raḥ* or *b-* in KA:

(20)

a. hum yadrusuun  
   they study.3mp  
   ‘They are studying’

b. hum sawfa yadrusuun  
   they fut study.3mp
‘They will study’

c. hum yidrusuun (KA-Present)
   they study.3mp

‘They are studying’

d. hum rah yidrusuun (KA-Future)
   they fut study.3mp

‘They will study’

While the imperfective form in KA shares all its affixes with SA, the perfective form in KA has two affixes that do not exist in SA. Moreover, the affixes in the perfective and imperfective in both SA and KA can carry agreement.

In verbless sentences, wherein the verbal copula is absent, tense plays an important role. In the present tense, the copula is absent (Neżmat, 1973, Fassi, 1993). As previously mentioned, early Arabic grammarians called this type of verbless sentence ʔal-ʔumlatu ʔal-ʔismiatu ‘the nominal sentence’:

(21) Muhammad-u muhandis-un
    Muhammad-nom engineer-nom

‘Muhammad is an engineer’

This sentence is in the present tense and does not have a verbal copula. However, in the past and future tense, this sentence would be ungrammatical without the verbal copula (Bakir, 1980; Fassi, 1993; Benmamoun, 2000). Consider the following examples in SA:

(22) a. Muhammad-un sawfa yakuunu muhandis-an
Muhammad-nom fut is.3ms engineer-acc

‘Muhammad will be an engineer’

b. Muhammad-un kaana muhandis-an

Muhammad-nom was.3ms engineer-acc

‘Muhammad was an engineer.’

c. *Muhammad-un sawfa mohandis-un

Muhammad-nom fut engineer-nom

Similar situations can be found in KA. In KA, the verbless sentence in the present tense does not have a verbal copula, as in (23a). On the other hand, in the past and future tense the sentence will be ungrammatical without the verbal copula as in (23d):

(23)

a. Mahammad muhandis

Mahammad engineer

‘Mahammad is an engineer’

b. Mahammad rah yukuun muhandis

Mahammad fut be engineer

‘Mahammad will be an engineer’

c. Mahammad kaan muhandis

Mahammad-nom was.2s engineer

‘Mahammad was an engineer’

d. *Mahammad rah muhandis

Mahammad fut engineer
To summarize, this chapter has presented information related to word order in SA and KA. I showed that in SA if the sentence has a transitive verb, there are six possible word orders: SVO, VSO, OVS, OSV, VOS and SOV. In contrast, in KA word order is restricted to SVO or VSO due to the absence of case marking. Examples of perfective and imperfective forms in SA and KA were also presented. The perfective and imperfective forms in KA are less complex than in SA because there are no dual markers or gender plural distinctions. In addition, the imperfective form in SA and KA can be used in the future tense by adding the future particles sawfa or sa- in SA and rah or b- in KA. Moreover, I showed that in both SA and KA the verbless sentence in present tense does not have a verbal copula, while in the past and future tense the sentence will be ungrammatical without the verbal copula.
There are several negative elements in SA. Every negative element has its own specific use and structure. The negative elements that are commonly used in SA (Shlonsky, 1997; Benmamoun, 2000; Ouhalla & Shlonsky, 2002) are laa, lam, lan, maa, and laysa. γ ayr is an additional negative element that has not received attention in past syntactic studies (Shlonsky, 1997; Benmamoun, 2000; Ouhalla & Shlonsky, 2002) and will be the focus of further discussion in section 3.4.

The specificity of all negative elements in SA is based on the fact that they vary in their syntactic features. lam and lan carry tense, laysa inflects for agreement, γ ayr neither carries tense nor inflects for agreement. In previous studies (Benmamoun, 2000; Ouhalla & Shlonsky, 2002), the negative elements in SA were divided into three groups. However, in the current study I add a fourth group that contains the negative γ ayr:

1- Negation with laa, lam, and lan.
2- Negation with maa
3- Negation with laysa
4- Negation with γ ayr

Each group will be discussed separately.

3.1 FIRST GROUP: laa, lam, and lan

The first group consists of laa, lam, and lan. laa occurs in the present tense, lam carries past tense, and lan carries future tense (Nešmat, 1973). In addition, all these elements occur with only the imperfective verb, and their occurrence with the perfective will lead to ungrammatically, as in (25).
(24)

a. laa yafhamu ?al-kitaab-a
   neg understand.3ms the-book.acc
   ‘He does not understand the book’

b. ?al-bint-u lam tanam
   the-girl-nom neg.past sleep.3fs
   ‘The girl did not sleep’

c. hamad-u lan yansa
   Hamad-nom neg.fut forget.3ms
   ‘Hamad will never forget’

(25)

a. * laa fahima ?al-kitaab-a
   neg understood.3ms the-book.acc

b. * ?al-bint-u lam naam-at
   the-girl-nom neg.past slept.3fs

c. * hamad-u lan yansa
   Hamad-nom neg.fut forgot.3ms

Moreover, laa, lam and lan must be adjacent to the imperfective, which explains
the ungrammatically in (26 a, b and c):

(26)

a. * laa ?al-kitaab-a yfhamu
   neg the-book.acc understand.3m
b. *lam ʔal-bint-u tanam  
   neg.past the-girl-nom sleep.3fs

c. *lan ʔahmad-u yansa  
   Neg.fut Ahmad-nom forgot.3ms

In addition, laa negates the subject, which has a special feature in the sense that it negates the existence of something absolute. This explains why it is referred to as an absolute negation (Ryding, 2005). Consider the following example:

(27) laa ʔahada fii ʔal-bayti  
   neg one in the-house

‘No one is in the house’

Benmamoun (2000) presented a comprehensive analysis that accounts for sentential negation in Arabic. He argued that negative elements in Arabic head their own functional projections and that the NegP projection occurs between the tense phrase (TP) and verb phrase (VP). Thus, negative elements in SA occupy the head of Neg. In addition, the same syntactic representation will be extended for negative elements in KA in chapter four.

(28)
We can conclude that all the elements in this group (\textit{lāa}, \textit{lan}, and \textit{lam}) occur only with imperfective verbs, and their occurrence with the perfective will lead to ungrammatically. In addition, \textit{lāa} is the only negator in this group that can negate a subject.

3.2 SECOND GROUP: \textit{maa}

The second group consists of \textit{maa}. It negates perfective and imperfective verbs and does not carry tense. Consider the following sentences:

(29) \textbf{maa} saafara μuhammad-un
\textit{neg} traveled.3ms \textit{Muhammad-nom}

‘Muhammad did not travel.’

(30) \textbf{maa} yusaafiru μuhammad-un
\textit{neg} travel.3ms \textit{Muhammad-nom}

‘Muhammad doesn’t travel’

The above examples show that \textit{maa} differs from the previous negative elements in that it does not carry tense and can occur with both the perfective as in (29) and the imperfective as in (30).\textsuperscript{3} Moreover, \textit{maa} can negate the subject in a verbless sentence.

\textsuperscript{3} The word order of \textit{maa} affects its interpretation. Hence its interpretation when it occurs before the subject differs from its occurrence after the verb as can be seen in the following examples:

(i) \textbf{maa} saafara μuhammad-un
Consider the following:

(31) \textbf{maa} 
\text{muhammad-un} 
\text{mu\textasciitildeallim-un} 
\textbf{neg} 
\text{Muhammad-nom} 
\text{student-nom} 

‘Muhammad is not a teacher’

The underlying representation of the sentence in (31) is represented in (32).

(32)

We can conclude that \textit{maa} in SA does not carry tense and can occur with all verb forms. Moreover, \textit{maa} can negate nouns and does not require adjacency to the following verb as do the negative elements in the first group.

3.3 THIRD GROUP: \textit{laysa}

\textbf{neg} 
\text{traveled.3ms} 
\text{Muhammad-nom} 

‘Mohammad did not travel’

(ii) \textbf{maa} 
\text{Muhammad-un} 
\text{saafara} 
\textbf{neg} 
\text{Muhammad-nom} 
\text{traveled.3ms} 

‘Mohammad did not travel’

The meanings of the two sentences above are different. Sentence (i) means “Muhammad did not travel (and neither did anyone else)” but sentence (ii) means “Muhammad did not travel but maybe someone else did”.
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The third group consists of *laysa*. *laysa* is the only verbal negative element in SA. It is inflected for agreement. *laysa* is a verb and only occurs with imperfective verbs (Ou halla, 1990).

(33)

   
   neg.3fs the-teachers-nom eat.3fp the-now
   
   ‘The teachers are not eating now’

b. ?al-kitaab-u **laysa** žadiid-an
   
   the-book-nom neg new-acc
   
   ‘The book is not new’

We can say that *laysa* is different from other negative elements in two aspects:

1-It is a verb and assigns accusative case to the predicate.

2-It carries subject agreement.

The following table in (34) shows agreement for *laysa* (the table is taken from Benmamoun, 2000):

(34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Neg+affix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>las-tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-naa</td>
<td>las-naa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>las-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>las-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>-tumaa</td>
<td>las-tumaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-tum</td>
<td>las-tum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
laysa, unlike other negative particles, is a verb that has to agree with its subject; however, it does not have to be adjacent to the verb as is the case with elements in the first group.

(35)  laysat  ?al-banaat-u  naa?imaat-in
      neg.3pf  the-girls-nom  sleeping-acc

‘The girls are not sleeping’

In addition, laysa can occur with verbless sentences, as in (36). Furthermore, laysa assigns accusative case to its predicate in the verbless sentence, as the case for maa.

(36)
   a.  ?ahmad-u  ṭaalib-un
       Ahmad-nom  student-nom
   ‘Ahmad is a student’
   b.  laysa  ?ahmad-u  ṭaalib-an
       neg.3m  Ahmad-nom  student-acc
   ‘Ahmad is not a student’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-tunna</td>
<td>las-tunna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Laysa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>lays-at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-ataa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-uu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sentence in (37) is represented in (38).

(37) ʔahmad-u layoffs yabkii
     Ahmad neg cry.3ms
     ‘Ahmad is not crying’

(38)

To conclude, *laysa* is the only verbal negative element in SA; it carries agreement and can occur with imperfective verbs or with verbless sentences.

3.4 FOURTH GROUP: *ɣayr*

The fourth group consists of the noun *ɣayr*. As previously mentioned, *ɣayr* has received little to no attention in prior studies. *ɣayr* is unique because it is a negative element that does not specify for tense and exclusively negates adjectives. The use of *ɣayr* gives the meaning of ‘not’ or ‘un-‘. The word *ɣayr* is used in several ways, one of which is negation. I focus on its negation function because other functions are beyond
the scope of this study. *ɣayr* is different from other negative elements in three aspects:

1- It carries case.

2- It negates only adjectives.

3- It assigns genitive case to the predicate.

In order to express negation with *ɣayr*, one must negate an adjective phrase and place *ɣayr* in front of the negated adjective. Having an adjective precede *ɣayr* will lead to ungrammatically, as in (39b). The following examples come from Ryding (2005):

(39)

a. ʔal-bilaad-u *ɣayu* l-islamiyyat-i
    the-countries-nom neg the-Islamic-gen
    ‘The non-Islamic countries’

b. *ʔal-bilaad-u l-islamiyyat-i *ɣayru*
    the-countries-nom the-Islamic-gen neg

Another constraint on *ɣayr* is that it has to carry the same case of the noun it modifies as shown in the following examples from Ryding (2005):

(40)

a. bi-ʃakl-in *ɣayi* montaḍim-in
    in-design-gen neg organize-gen
    ‘In a disorganized manner’

b. kalb-un *ɣayru* ?aṣiil-in
    dog-nom neg pedigreed-gen
    ‘A non-pedigreed dog’
In (40b), \( \gamma yr \) is in the nominative case, parallel to the subject it modifies. If \( \gamma yr \) modifies a definite noun, it should be followed by a definite adjective, and if \( \gamma yr \) modifies an indefinite noun it should be followed by an indefinite adjective. Consider the following examples from Ryding (2005):

(41)

a. \(?al-\text{ʔawa}l\text{aad-}\text{u } \gamma yru \)?al-\text{ʔawla}d-id-i\text{in}  
    the-boys-nom neg the-hardworking-gen  
    ‘The non-successful boys’

b. \(\text{ʔaw}l\text{a}d-\text{u } \gamma yru \) mu\(\text{ʔa}hi\text{d}i\text{n} \)
    boys-nom neg hardworking-gen
    ‘Un-successful boys’

There is strong evidence to believe that \( \gamma yr \) heads its own negative projection as do other negative elements in SA. This stems from the fact that \( \gamma yr \) assigns genitive case to its predicate, which cannot precede \( \gamma yr \), as illustrated in the following examples:

(42)

a. \(?al-\text{b}i\text{n}-\text{u } \gamma yru \) \(?al-\text{ʕarabiyy}a\text{t-}\text{u} \)
    the-girl-nom the-Arabic-nom
    ‘The Arabic girl’

b. \(\text{ʔal-b}i\text{n}-\text{u } \gamma yru \) \(\text{ʔal-ʕarabiyy}a\text{t}-\text{i} \)
    the-girl-nom neg the-Arabic-nom
    ‘The non-Arabic girl’

c. * \(\text{ʔal-b}i\text{n}-\text{u } \gamma yru \) \(\text{ʔal-ʕarabiyy}a\text{t-}\text{u} \)
    the-girl-nom neg the-beautiful-nom
Building on Benmamoun’s analyses for the previous negative elements, I assume that \( \gamma ayr \) is generated between TP and AP. The underlying representation of sentence (42b) is represented in (43).

(43)

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Spec} \\
&\text{T} \\
&\text{NegP} \\
&\text{Spec} \\
&\text{Neg'} \\
&\text{Neg} \\
&\gamma ayr \\
&\text{Spec} \\
&\text{A} \\
&?\text{albintu} \\
&?\text{aljarabiyyati}
\end{align*}
\]

To conclude, I showed that \( \gamma ayr \) is unique because it is a noun and assigns genitive case to the predicate. Moreover, \( \gamma ayr \) exclusively negates adjectives in SA. I showed that the syntactic representation in Benmamoun (2000) can account for \( \gamma ayr \).

To summarize, in this chapter I showed that SA has six negative elements: \( laa \), \( lam \), \( lan \), \( maa \), \( laysa \), and \( \gamma ayr \). In addition, I examined the syntactic distribution of these negative elements which I placed into four groups. For the first group, I showed that \( laa \) occurs in the present tense, \( lam \) carries past tense, and \( lan \) carries future tense. I also showed that all of the elements occur only with imperfective verbs. For the second group, I showed that \( maa \) negates the sentence in perfective and imperfective verbs and does not carry any tense. For the third group, I showed that \( laysa \) is the only negative verbal element in SA. For the fourth group, I demonstrated that \( \gamma ayr \) is the only negative element in SA which exclusively negates adjectives. Moreover, I showed that the same
syntactic representation used in Benmamoun (2000) can be successfully extended to \( \gamma \). We can conclude from this section that \( \text{lam} \) and \( \text{lan} \) are the only negative elements in SA that do not occur in verbless sentences. Thus, SA uses five negative elements to negate verbal sentences (\( \text{laa, lam, lan, maa, laysa} \)), while it uses four negative elements to negate verbless sentences: (\( \text{laa, maa, laysa and yayr} \)).
CHAPTER 4
NEGATION IN KUWAITI ARABIC

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The use of the term Kuwaiti dialect is problematic as it does not do justice to the diversity of dialects within Kuwait. This point has been raised by some researchers who have attempted to make a distinction between Kuwaiti dialects to demonstrate that the Kuwaiti dialect contains sub-dialects. Al-maatoog (1986) identified the features of the Al-Ajmaan dialect, one of the Kuwaiti Bedouin dialects; Al-sebaan (2002) discussed the development of different Kuwaiti dialects; Dashti (2004) studied the dialect of Kuwaiti Ajam families who use both Farsi and a Kuwaiti Arabic dialect; and Al-rashed (2011) produced a valuable encyclopedia of the Hadari Kuwaiti dialect. The studies conducted on Kuwaiti dialects are relatively few compared to other Arabic dialects. In terms of studies conducted on the syntax of Kuwaiti dialects we can include Johnstone (1967), Al-maatoog (1986), Holes (1990), Brustad (2000), and Al-qenaie (2011). These linguists examined negation in Kuwaiti dialects, but their studies did not include a comprehensive investigation of all of the aspects of negation in KA. Johnstone (1967) states that maa in KA can negate forms of the personal pronouns. Holes (1990) divided negation in Gulf dialects (which include Kuwaiti dialects) into two categories. The first one is sentence negation, which includes the negative element maa for verbs in the perfective and imperfective tense, and laa for imperative mood. The second one is constituent negation, which includes muu. Brustad (2000) divided negative elements in KA into verbal negation, which consists of the negative marker maa, and predicate negation, which consist of muu.
4.2 CORPUS

Conducting a corpus study will allow us a more accurate description of negation in KA. The research objective is to examine the syntactic properties of negative elements in KA using data from several different written sources. The first source is a Kuwaiti play by Mohammad Al-muhareb (2007) entitled *we-baadean* ‘and then’ (play1), which was performed at the Kiifaan Kuwaiti Theater. The duration of this play is approximately one hour. The second source is another Kuwaiti play, *wyabqaa al-watan* ‘and the nation remains’ (play2), which has not yet been performed (Al-muhareb, 2011). Using data from these types of sources can facilitate our understanding of the use of negation under a relatively more spontaneous setting. The corpus includes approximately 13,730 words. Microsoft Word was used to track the frequency of negative elements employed in the plays. Because automatic analysis also selects negative elements in the corpus used in functions other than negation, a follow-up manual analysis was used to select only those elements used for negation. *laa*, used as a negative answer to questions in the corpus, was excluded.

The following tables show the frequency of the negative elements used in play1 and play2, respectively:

(44) Negative Elements in play1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of negative elements in the entire play</th>
<th>94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>laa</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maa</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muu</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḡayr</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(45) Negative Elements in play2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of negative elements in the entire play</th>
<th>194</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>laa</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maa</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muu</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y ayr</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following graph shows the frequency of the negative elements used in the entire corpus.

(46)

The results show that *maa* is used most frequently compared to other negation elements, and *y ayr* has the lowest frequency.

4.3 KA NEGATIVE ELEMENTS
KA uses four negative elements: *lala, maa, muu* and *ɣayr*. In the following section, I examine each element, investigating its properties and syntactic distribution.

4.3.1 *lala*

One of the common negative elements in KA is *lala*. It is used second most frequently and more than any other negative element to indicate a negative command.

(47)  

```plaintext
lala tiktubuun  
eg write.3mp

‘Don’t write’
```

In addition, *lala* occurs in verbal sentences with imperfective verbs. Consider the following examples:

(48)

a.  

```plaintext
lala ti-s?iluu-unun vi?unun wa?iif-tii  
eg ask.3mp-me what job-mine

‘Do not ask me what my job is’
```

b.  

```plaintext
lala tinsuun ?innu-kum ?i?yaal diirah wahdah  
eg forget.3mp you-are sons country one

‘Don’t forget that you all belong to one country’
```

The same syntactic representation of the negative elements in SA will be extended for KA negative elements. Thus, *lala* in KA heads its own syntactic projection as it does in SA. The underlying representation of sentence (47) is represented in (49).

(49)
To conclude, *laa* in KA is used to indicate a negative command, and it occurs in verbal sentences with imperfective verbs as in SA.

4.3.2 *maa*

*maa* occurs in verbal sentences with perfective or imperfective verbs.

(50)

a. *ʔinta maa taʕaddeat haiduud-ik*  
   you neg crossed.2ms boundaries-yours  
   ‘You didn’t cross the boundaries’

b. *ʔiʕdir-nii maa jift-ik*  
   forgive-me neg saw.3ms-you  
   ‘Forgive me, I didn’t see you’

c. *ʔil-beat maa fii ʔakil*  
   the-house neg in food  
   ‘There is no food in the house’
Brustad (2000) stated that maa in KA is a verbal negative. I argue that maa can also negate nouns as in the following example:

(51) haaða ma-hu maŋguul (Al-maatoog, 1986, p. 163)

this neg-he reasonable

‘This is not reasonable’

In addition, maa can negate a prepositional clause in KA as in (52):

(52) maa fii jay ?ismah rimaayah (Al-kandary, 2011, p. 83)

neg in thing called shooting

‘There is nothing called shooting’

maa in KA shares most features of maa in SA such as its occurrence in verbless sentences. However, the main difference between maa in KA and SA is that the former can negate future tense as in (53a) while maa in SA cannot (53b). SA uses the element lan to negate future tense, but KA does not have this element.

(53)

a. maa raah yaakil ?ahmad ?ayʃay (KA)

neg fut eat.3ms Ahmad anything

‘Ahmad will not eat anything’

b. *maa sa-yusaafir ?ali-un (SA)

neg fut-travel.3ms Ali-nom

c. lan yusaafir ?ali-un (SA)

neg.fut travel.3ms Ali-nom

‘Ali will not travel’
In KA, negation of future or past tense occurs by using the negative element *maa* with the imperfective verb in the future or past tense. As we saw in section 2.2, the imperfective can be used in past and future tense by adding future particles: *rah* or *b-* or the past verbal copula *kaan*. The use of *rah* or *b-* in KA is illustrated in the following examples.

(54)

a. hum **maa** yadrus-uun  
   they **neg** study-3mp  
   ‘They are not studying’

b. hum **maa** rah yadrus-uun  
   they **neg** fut study-3mp  
   ‘They will not study’

c. hum **maa** kaanaw yadrus-uun  
   they **neg** was.3mp study-3mp  
   ‘They were not studying’

A summary of the strategies for future and past negation in KA is shown in (55).

(55)  
Neg + *rah / b-* + imperfective = Future negation  
Neg + *kaan + imperfective = Past negation

Because *lam* and *lan* are not used in KA, but are used to negate the past and future in SA, respectively, *maa* in KA is used to negate past (verbal copula) and future tense. The use of other negative elements such as *laa* or *muu* to negate the future or verbal copula will lead to ungrammatically. Consider the following sentences:
This analysis explains the finding in (46) that *maa* is used most frequently in KA because, unlike SA, KA lacks the future and past elements *lam* and *lan. maa* in KA can host subject clitics as shown in table (57) (taken from Johnstone, 1967).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he+Neg</td>
<td>mahuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she+Neg</td>
<td>mhii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you.ms+Neg</td>
<td>mint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you.fs+Neg</td>
<td>minti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+Neg</td>
<td>maani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The underlying representation of sentence (50c) is represented in (60).
To conclude, I showed that *maa* in KA occurs in verbal sentence with perfective and imperfective verbs and it can negate verbless sentences. Moreover, *maa* in KA negates the future tense by using the verb in the imperfective with future particles: *rah* or *b-* and it negates the past tense by using the verb in the imperfective with the past verbal copula *kaan* ‘was’.

4.3.3 *muu*

The negative element *muu* in KA usually negates nominal sentences. It precedes nouns, adjectives, prepositions, and pronouns. Consider the following examples:

(59)

a. (*muu+noun*)

```
muu  muʃkilah
```

*neg*  problem

‘There is no problem’

b. (*muu+ adjective*)

```
muu  muhim  ʃunu  ʔasawwi
```

*neg*  important  what  do.1s

(Al-muhareb, 2011, p. 31)

(Al-muhareb, 2011, p. 5)
'It is not important what I’m doing’

c. (muu+preposition)

\[
\text{muu} \ \text{ʕalaa} \ \text{hesaab} \ ?il-qaanoon \quad \text{(Al-muhareb, 2011, p. 6)}
\]

\[
\text{neg} \ \text{on} \ \text{account} \ \text{the-law}
\]

‘Do not override the law’

d. (muu+ pronoun)

\[
\text{muu} \ ?inta \ \text{tiguul-ly} \ \text{ruu} \quad \text{(Al-kandary, 2011, p. 160)}
\]

\[
\text{neg} \ \text{you} \ \text{say.2ms-me} \ \text{go.2ms}
\]

‘You can’t ask me to go out’

Moreover, \textit{muu} can be used to express a warning:

\[
\text{(60) muu} \ \text{tegʕuun} \ ?il-kahribah \quad \text{(Al-muhareb, 2007, p. 53)}
\]

\[
\text{neg} \ \text{cut.2mp} \ \text{the-power}
\]

‘Don’t cut the power’

\textit{muu} is the only negative element in KA that does not exist in SA. However, I argue that \textit{laysa} is similar to \textit{muu} in three diverse syntactic aspects. First of all, both \textit{laysa} and \textit{muu} are negative elements that can occur with verbless sentences. Consider examples (36b) and (59a) (repeated here):

(36b) \[
\text{laysa} \ ?ahmad-u \ \text{taalib-an}
\]

\[
\text{neg.3ms} \ \text{Ahmad-nom} \ \text{student-acc}
\]

‘Ahmad is not a student’

(59a) \[
\text{muu} \ \text{muʃkilah}
\]

\[
\text{neg} \ \text{problem}
\]

‘There is no problem’
Secondly, the negative elements *laysa* and *muu* can carry subject agreement.

Consider the following examples:

(61) ?al-banaat-u lasna muʕallimaat-in
the-girls-nom neg.3pf teachers-acc
‘The girls are not teachers’.

(62) mu-hu b-zean (Al-maatoog, 1986, p. 165)
neg.he with-nice
‘It is not nice’

Thirdly, a proclitic *b-* can be attached to their predicates.

(63) ?al-faqr u laysa bi-ʕayb-in (Neʕmat, 1973, p. 152)
Poverty neg.3sm with-shame-gen
‘Poverty is not shameful’

(64) ?i-l-ʕarab mu-hum b-wahid (Al-maatoog, 1986, p. 165)
the-Arab neg-they with-one
‘The Arabs are not the same’

The same syntactic representation that has applied for *laysa* in SA can be extended to *muu* in KA. Thus, *muu* is a head of the negative projection. The underlying representation of the example in (65) is represented in (66).

(65) Mahammad muu muhandis
Mahammad neg engineer
‘Muhammad is not an engineer’
To conclude, I showed that *muu* in KA negates nominal sentences. It precedes nouns, adjectives, prepositions, and pronouns. I also argued that *muu* in KA is similar to *laysa* in SA.

4.3.4 *ɣ ayr*

The word *ɣ ayr* is used in several ways in KA, and one of them is negation. In this study, I focus on its negation function. *ɣ ayr* exclusively negates adjectives in KA, as is also the case in SA. The use of *ɣ ayr* gives the meaning of ‘not’ or ‘un-’. The corpus analysis shows that *ɣ ayr* is used least frequently compared to the other negative elements. This finding parallels Al-qenaie’s (2011) claim that *ɣ ayr* is not as common as other negative elements in KA. Furthermore, *ɣ ayr* in KA is different from other negative elements because it negates only adjectives. Consider the following examples:

(67) latyah fii lisaan-ah tiżal kalaam-ah *ɣ ayr* waaḏih (Al-maatoog, 1986, p. 212)

lisp in tongue-his make.3fs speech-his **neg** clear

‘He has a lisp which makes his speech not clear’

(68) ?il-walad *ɣ ayr* ʂaadeq fii maʃaaʃr-ah
The boy **neg** honest in feelings-his

‘The boy is not honest’

Moreover, *yayr* in KA does not differ from *yayr* in SA. Thus, the same syntactic representation is extended here. The underlying representation of sentence (68) is represented in (69).

(69)

To conclude, the negative element *yayr* is unique in both KA and SA because it negates adjectives. Moreover, in KA, *yayr* as a negative element is not used as frequently as other negative elements.\(^4\)

---

\(^4\) In addition, *yayr* in KA can be used in Kuwaiti idioms:

(i) \(\textit{yayr} \quad \textit{hal} \quad \textit{hačiy?} \quad \textit{neg} \quad \textit{this} \quad \textit{proposed?} \quad \textit{Al-qenaie, 2011}\)

‘Do you have any other offers other than the one you proposed?’

(ii) \(\textit{yayr} \quad \textit{salfa} \quad \textit{neg} \quad \textit{thing} \quad \textit{Al-qenaie, 2011}\)

‘This is not a proper thing’
To summarize, in this chapter I showed that KA has four negative elements: *laa*, *maa*, *muu*, and *ɣayr*. I also examined the syntactic properties and distribution of these negative elements. I demonstrated that *laa* in KA behaves as in SA as it occurs in verbal sentences with imperfective verbs. Moreover, I argued that the negative element *maa* in KA can negate future and past tense by using the future particles: *raḥ* or *b*- or the past verbal copula *kaan*. In addition, I showed that *muu* can negate verbless sentences. I argued that the negative *ɣayr* is unique because it negates only adjectives in KA. Finally, I showed that the same syntactic representation of the negative elements in SA has been extended for all negative elements in KA.
CHAPTER 5
NEGATION AGREEMENT AND CONJUNCT AGREEMENT

Arabic has a rich system of agreement. Several studies have investigated different types of agreement in Arabic (Ayoub, 1981; Mohammad, 1989; Benmamoun, 2000). In this chapter, I examine person agreement in negative verbs and agreement in the conjunct negative sentence.

5.1 PERSON AGREEMENT IN NEGATIVE VERBS

There is a difference between negative imperatives and positive imperatives in SA and KA due to person agreement.\(^5\) In the positive imperative, person agreement is not required; however, it is required in the negative imperative. In order to understand the difference between the positive imperatives and negative imperatives in SA and KA, the second person plural masculine imperfective verb will be taken as an example. Consider the following paradigms:

(70) **SA Imperative 2mp:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA imperative</th>
<th>SA positive imperative</th>
<th>SA negative imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taʔlisuu</td>
<td>?iʔlisuu</td>
<td>laa taʔlisuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sit.2mp</td>
<td>sit.2mp</td>
<td>neg sit.2mp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Sit.’</td>
<td>‘Sit.’</td>
<td>‘Do not sit.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(71) **KA Imperative 2mp:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA imperative</th>
<th>KA positive imperative</th>
<th>KA negative imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tiʔdaw</td>
<td>giʔdaw</td>
<td>laa ti-ʔdaw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) Negative imperative and positive imperative verbs in SA take a jussive mood which means the absence of the vowel and nasal ending that are found in indicative forms. For more details see Ryding (2005).
In SA, the negative imperative verb *lāa ta-žīlis-uû* ‘Do not sit’ has person agreement (Aoun, Benmamoun & Choueiri, 2010), while it does not have agreement in the positive imperative *ādīl-uû* ‘Sit’. The same pattern can be found in KA: the negative imperative verb *lāa ti-gʃid-uûn* ‘Do not sit’ has person agreement, while it does not have agreement in the positive imperative verb *gʃid-aw* ‘Sit’.

In addition, in SA, the only phonological difference between the 2mp negative imperative verb *lāa ta-žīlis-uû* and the 2mp imperative verb *ta-žīlis-uûn* is the lack of the nasal ending, while in KA there is no difference between the 2mp negative imperative verb *lāa ti-gʃid-uûn* and the 2mp imperative verb *ti-gʃid-uûn*. Moreover, in SA, person agreement in the negative imperative verb displays more variation than in KA. Consider the following paradigms (the SA paradigm is taken from Benmamoun, 2000)

(72) SA negative imperative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>neg sit.2ms</th>
<th>neg sit.2fs</th>
<th>neg sit.3fs</th>
<th>neg sit.2d</th>
<th>neg sit.3mp</th>
<th>neg sit.2fp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>lāa ta-žīlis</em></td>
<td>‘Do not sit.’</td>
<td>‘Do not sit.’</td>
<td>‘Do not sit.’</td>
<td>‘Do not sit.’</td>
<td>‘Do not sit.’</td>
<td>‘Do not sit.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lāa ta-žīlis-i</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lāa ta-žīlis-a</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lāa ta-žīlis-u</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lāa ta-žīlis-n</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(73) KA negative imperative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>neg sit.2ms</th>
<th>neg sit.2fs</th>
<th>neg sit.2mp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>lāa tigʃid</em></td>
<td>‘Do not sit.’</td>
<td>‘Do not sit.’</td>
<td>‘Do not sit.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lāa tigʃidiin</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lāa tigʃid-uun</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In KA, person agreement in the negative imperative is less complex than in SA due to the absence of dual markers and gender plural distinctions in KA.
To conclude, in this section I discussed person agreement differences between negative imperative verbs and positive imperative verbs in SA and KA. Person agreement in negative verbs in KA is less complex than in SA due to the absence of dual markers and gender plural distinctions.

4.2 NEGATION AND CONJUNCTION

In SA and KA, negative elements can be joined with \textit{wala}. \textit{Wala} consists of \textit{wa} ‘and’ and \textit{laa} (Neg) and is used to negate two clauses:\textsuperscript{6}

(74)
\begin{itemize}
\item[a.] \textbf{laa} yibuug \textbf{wa-la} jay \hspace{1cm} (Al-muhareb, 2007, p. 12)
\textbf{neg} steal.3ms \textbf{and-neg} thing
\end{itemize}

‘He does not steal nor does he do anything bad’

\begin{itemize}
\item[b.] \textbf{maa} šittešal-t fiini \textbf{wa-la} wišal-nii masig (Al-muhareb, 2007, p. 17)
\textbf{neg} called.2ms with.me \textbf{and-neg} receive.1ms-me message
\end{itemize}

‘You neither called nor sent me a message’

Conjunct agreement in negative sentences in the VS order in SA occurs in gender but not in number. Consider the following SA examples (Fadel, 2012):

(75) \textbf{laa} yahammal-hu šaql-un \textbf{wa-la} manšiq-un
\textbf{neg} bear.3m-his mind-nom \textbf{and-neg} logic-nom

‘It does not make sense’

\textsuperscript{6} In Kuwaiti dialects, two negative commands can be joined by \textit{wa-la} which means \textit{and-neg} as we can see from the following Kuwaiti idiom (Qafisheh, 1977):
\begin{itemize}
\item[(i)] \textbf{laa} te-buug \textbf{wa-la} taxaaf
\textbf{neg} steal \textbf{and-neg} be.afraid
\end{itemize}

‘Don’t steal and don’t be afraid’
KA exhibits the same pattern. In VS order the verb has to agree with the leftmost conjunct in gender but not number. Consider the following examples:

(76)

a. **maa** ya ?ali **wa-la** ?ahmad  
   **neg** came.3ms Ali and-neg Ahmad  
   ‘Neither Ali nor Ahmad came’

b. * **maa** yaw ?ali **wa-la** ?ahmad  
   **neg** came.3mp Ali and-neg Ahmad

SA and KA have partial conjunct agreement in VS order. Conjunct agreements in SV order in negative sentences do not differ in SA and KA. In SA, the verb in SV order can agree with both conjuncts in full agreement or agree in number with the leftmost conjunct. Consider the following SA examples (Kajlaa, 2012):

(77) **laa** ?al-ʕuquubaat-u **wa-la** ?al-ʔaʕmaal-u ?al-ʕaskariyyat-i  
    sa-ʕuuqif-u t-taxšiib  
    **neg** the-sanctions-nom and-neg the-action-nom the-military-nom  
    fut.stop.3ms the-enrichment  
    ‘Neither sanctions nor military action will stop the enrichment’

(78) **laa** 1-ʔab-u **wa-la** al-ʔumm-u yaḏharaan fii ?al-naṣṣ-i  
    **neg** the-father and-neg the-mother appear.3m.dual in the-text  
    ‘Neither the father nor the mother appear in the text’

In (77) the verb shows partial agreement in gender but not number. However, in (78) the verb shows full agreement in number and gender.
KA exhibits the same pattern as SA in SV order. Consider the following examples:

(79)

a. **l̪aː [q]ali**  
   **w̱a-la**  
   ?ahmad  
   ya
   
   Neg  
   Ali  
   **and-neg**  
   Ahmad  
   came.3ms
   
   ‘Neither Ali nor Ahmad came’

b. **l̪aː [q]ali**  
   **w̱a-la**  
   ?ahmad  
   yaw
   
   neg  
   Ali  
   **and-neg**  
   Ahmad  
   came.3mp
   
   ‘Neither Ali nor Ahmad came’

In (79a) the verb shows partial agreement in gender but not number. However, in (79b) the verb shows full agreement in number and gender. The following table summarizes conjunct agreement in negative sentences in SA and KA in VS and SV word order:

(80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>KA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VS + Neg + conjunction</td>
<td>Partial Agreement</td>
<td>Partial Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV + Neg + conjunction</td>
<td>Full / Partial Agreement</td>
<td>Full / Partial Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To conclude, SA and KA share the same pattern of conjunct agreement in negative sentences. In VS order the verb and subject display partial agreement in gender only, while in SV order, where the subject precedes the verb, the verb and subject may display full agreement in gender and number or partial agreement in gender only.

In this chapter I examined person agreement in negative imperatives. I argued that the difference between negative imperative and positive imperative verbs in SA and KA
is due to how person agreement is manifested. Moreover, I showed that person agreement in negative verbs in KA is less complex than SA due to the absence of dual markers and gender plural distinctions. I also discussed conjunct agreement in negative sentences in SA and KA. I argued that SA shares the same agreement patterns with KA. In VS order the verb and subject display partial agreement in gender only, while in SV order, where the subject precedes the verb, the verb and subject may display full agreement in gender, number, or partial agreement in gender only.
CHAPTER 6
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study provided a description of the morpho-syntax of negation patterns in SA and KA using data from a corpus. This paper sheds light on negation in KA and SA and introduces new negative elements such as γ ayr. SA has six negative elements: laa, lam, lan, maa, laysa, and γ ayr, whereas KA has four negative elements: laa, maa, muu, and γ ayr. I demonstrated that negative elements in SA vary in their syntactic features. lam carries past tense, lan carries future tense, and laysa inflects for agreement, whereas laa, maa and γ ayr carry neither tense nor agreement. For KA, I illustrated that all negative elements carry neither tense nor agreement. I also stated that KA and SA share three negative elements: laa, maa, and γ ayr. Moreover, I stated that γ ayr in SA and KA is unique because it is used to negate adjectives. I also showed that the SA negative elements lam, lan, and laysa are not found in KA. I provided a corpus analysis showing that maa in KA is used more frequently than any other negative element. I showed that maa in KA is unique because it is used to negate present, past, and future tenses. In addition, I investigated conjunct agreement in negative sentences in SA and KA. I argued that there is no difference in conjunct agreement between SA and KA in VS order wherein the verb and subject display partial agreement in gender only. As for SV order, where the subject precedes the verb, the verb and subject may display full agreement in gender, number, and person, or partial agreement in gender only.
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