

Negatives Scoping Over Verbal Clauses in Some Arabic Varieties

Al Zahrani Mohammad, Alzahrani Salih
Taif University, Makkah Province, Saudi Arabia

Both Classical Arabic (CA) and Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) use the six negative particles: *laa*, *maa*, *laysa*, *lam*, *lamma*, and *lan*. Other Arabic varieties have only two negative particles. For instance, Hijazi Arabic (HA) uses *laa* and *maa*. This shows that the three varieties (CA, MSA, and HA) have the same underlying negatives, namely, *laa* and *maa*, but CA and MSA have a number of inflected forms of *laa* that HA does not have. The paper shows how HA uses the two negatives when scoping over verbal clauses while the other two varieties, i.e., CA and MSA, use all the six negatives. It is worthy of note here that HA is descendant from CA which has the six negatives. This suggests that HA must have lost the inflected variants of *laa*.

Keywords: Standard Arabic, Classical Arabic, Arabic Varieties, Negation, Verbal Clauses, Scope

List of Abbreviations and Symbols

| | | | |
|------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Ø | Absence of marking system | Ind | Indicative mood |
| * | Ungrammatical | Juss | Jussive mood |
| 1 | First person | M | Masculine |
| 2 | Second person | MSA | Modern Standard Arabic |
| 3 | Third person | Neg | Negative |
| Acc | Accusative case | Nom | Nominative case |
| CA | Classical Arabic | Pf | Perfective form of verb |
| Det | Determinative | pl | Plural |
| dl | Dual | P | Preposition |
| F | Feminine | sg | Singular |
| Gen | Genitive | HA | Hijazi Arabic |
| Impf | Imperfective form | Subjn | Subjunctive mood |

Introduction

Al Zahrani (2014a) addressed the classical Arabic (CA), modern standard Arabic (MSA), and Hijazi Arabic (HA) negatives in nominal clauses. This paper shows the negatives in the same varieties when dominating verbal clauses. This includes, on the one hand, the CA and MSA negatives *laa*, *maa*, *laysa*, *lam*, *lamma*, and *lan*; and the HA negative *maa*, on the other hand. It shows how the functions and meanings of all the CA and MSA verbal negatives *laysa*, *lam*, *lamma*, and *lan* have been transferred to one HA negative,

Al Zahrani Mohammad, Ph.D., associate professor, Foreign languages Department, Faculty of Arts, Taif University, Makkah, Saudi Arabia.

Alzahrani Salih, Ph.D., assistant professor, Foreign languages Department, Faculty of Arts, Taif University, Makkah, Saudi Arabia.

namely *maa*. It turns out that HA retains the negatives *laa* and *maa*, but has lost all the other forms. The paper also shows that HA has lost all the morphological case markers, which is not the case in CA and MSA. In this paper, we start by a CA and MSA negative form to show how negation is coded in these varieties by that negative form. Notice that we will not investigate the minor differences between CA and MSA since the paper assumes that the negatives of these two varieties show the same functions. Then, we show how HA encodes negation by the same negative form or by an alternative form carrying the function of the lost negative particle. The negative *laa* is the first particle under discussion.

The Negative Particle *laa* in CA and MSA

Ul-Haq (1984) proposed that the negative *laa* is used less frequently before perfective forms and it has two different connotations. The first one, if the sentence is optative, it expresses the meaning of “may never” with no morphological effects on the verbs, and according to Wright (1967), this is used in blessings and curses.

(1) *laa* *faz-a* *al- δ^lalim-u*
 Neg win-Pf Det-oppressor-Nom

“May the oppressor never win!”

(2) *laa* *raʔit-a* *sara-n*
 Neg see-2sg-Pf evil-Acc

“May you never see any harm!”

The second connotation is when the negative *laa* is used before the perfective where it denotes the negation of the simple past and, in this case, it has to be repeated to express the formal meaning of “neither...nor” in English.

(3) *laa* *akal-a* *wa* *laa* *šarib-a*
 Neg eat-Pf and Neg drink-Pf

“He neither ate nor drank.”

(4) *laa* *daras-u* *wa* *laa* *naʔaḥ-u* *fi* *al-extibar*
 Neg study-3pl.PF and Neg pass-3pl.Pf P Det-exam

“They neither studied nor passed the exam.”

These syntactic structures exhibit the restricted use of the negative *laa* when occurring with the perfective forms. This is not the case when it occurs with the imperfective forms as it is quite frequent in CA and MSA for the negative particle *laa* to occur before the different moods of the imperfective. Benmamoun (2000) argued that the imperfective is the default form of the verb (the non-finite form); it is also argued by Benmamoun (1992), Ouhalla (1993), and Shlonsky (1997) that the imperfective in Arabic does not carry tense. The different moods of the imperfective “are distinguished by the vowel of the third radical” (Thatcher, 1922, pp. 76-77). These moods are the indicative, which is indicated by adding the vowel—*u*, the subjunctive, which is indicated by adding the vowel—*a*, and the jussive, that is left without a vowel.

The negative *laa* denotes negation in the simple future once used with a verb in the indicative mood. However, it has no morphological effects with such a mood.

(5) *ʔinnahu* *laa* *yanʔaḥ-u* *al-kasul-u*
 Verily Neg pass-Ind Det-lazy-Nom

“Verily, the lazy (student) does not pass.”

With the subjunctive, the particle *laa* before the imperfective requires a subjunctivizing element. It must be preceded by either *ʔan*, *li*, *liʔan*, *ħatta*, *kay*, or *likay* to change the verb mood from indicative to subjunctive (Ryding, 2005) as shown in (6-8) below. Notice that *liʔan* and *likay* are created by prefixing the particle *li* to the elements *ʔan* and *kay* respectively. The elements *ħatta* and *kay/likay* are glossed according to their meanings, i.e., “in order to” and “so that” respectively.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------------|
| (6) <i>jajibu</i> | <i>ʔan</i> | <i>laa</i> | <i>talʕab-a</i> | <i>fi</i> | <i>al-ʕari ʕ-i</i> |
| necessary | C | Neg | play-Subjn | P | Det-street-Gen |

“You must not play in the street.”

Literally: It is necessary that, not to play in the street.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------------|
| (7) <i>udros</i> | <i>ħatta</i> | <i>laa</i> | <i>taffal-a</i> | <i>fi</i> | <i>al-extibar-i</i> |
| Study | in order to | Neg | fail-Subjn | P | Det-exam-Gen |

“Study in order not to fail in the exam.”

| | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------------|
| (8) <i>udros</i> | <i>(li)kay</i> | <i>laa</i> | <i>taffal-a</i> | <i>fi</i> | <i>al-extibar-i</i> |
| Study | so that | Neg | fail-Subjn | P | Det-exam-Gen |

Lit: “Study! so that (you) will not fail in the exam.”

The example in (6) shows that both the subjunctive element *ʔan* and the verb *yajibu* (it is necessary that) are followed by the negative *laa* that selects for the subjunctive mood of the verb *talʕab*. The examples in (7-8) show the subjunctivizing elements *ħatta* and *(li)kay* that have changed the verb mood to subjunctive.

With the jussive, the particle *laa* is used before the imperfective to indicate prohibition where it is called “the *laa* of prohibition” (Ibn Aqeel, 1980, p. 349). When using *laa* to show the prohibitory sense, the verb mood must change into the jussive mood which has no overt marker. Therefore, the sign “Ø” is used.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| (9) <i>jajibu</i> | <i>ʔan</i> | <i>taʔti-ya</i> | <i>wa</i> | <i>talʕab-a</i> | <i>ma ʕa-na</i> |
| must | C | come-Subjn | and | play-Subjn | with-us |

“You must come and play with us.”

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------|------------|----------------|-----------------|
| (10) <i>laa</i> | <i>taʔti-Ø</i> | <i>wa</i> | <i>laa</i> | <i>talʕabØ</i> | <i>ma ʕa-na</i> |
| Neg | come-Ø | and | Neg | play-Ø | with-us |

“Do not come and do not play with us.”

In (9), the sentence is in the subjunctive mood as it has the subjunctivizing particle, i.e., the complementizer *ʔan*. Therefore, the verbs have inflected for the subjunctive mood *taʔti-ya* and *talʕab-a* as shown by the subjunctive marker—*a*. In (10), the *laa* of prohibition causes the verb mood to change into jussive. The next section shows how HA uses the negative *laa* in very restricted structures.

The Negative Particle *laa* in HA

With the perfective, *laa* is used in optative sentences where the sentence usually starts with the phrase *Allah laa* meaning “May God not”. However, the phrase *Allah laa* will change the verb aspect from perfective to imperfective with the loss of the perfective marker, *-a*.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| (11) <i>Allah</i> | <i>laa</i> | <i>ya-ʕʕal-Ø</i> | <i>al- ʔalim</i> | <i>ya-fuz-Ø</i> |
| God | Neg | Impf-make-Ø | Det-oppressor | Impf-win- Ø |

“May Allah not allow the oppressor to win.”

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------|--------------------|---------------|
| (12) <i>Allah</i> | <i>laa</i> | <i>yu-wari-k-Ø</i> | <i>ʕara-Ø</i> |
|-------------------|------------|--------------------|---------------|

God Neg Impf-see-2sgAcc-Ø harm-Ø
 “May Allah never show you any harm.”

The examples in (11) and (12) show how good and bad wishes are coded in HA by virtue of the negative *laa* followed by imperfective forms.

With the imperfective, *laa* is also used when behaving as a particle of prohibition to convey the meaning of “do not” in English. This *laa* is followed by the jussive mood that has no overt marker.

(13) *laa taktub-Ø haða*
 Neg write-Ø this

“Do not write this.”

Interestingly, HA uses another morpheme to express the prohibitory sense. It is the cautionary morpheme *es ħa*. Like the prohibitive *laa*, *es ħa* is followed by the jussive that is left with no overt marker. However, it differs from the prohibitive *laa* as it not only commands the addressee but also warns him/her not to do something.

(14) *es ħa taktub-Ø haða*
 Neg write-Ø this

“Do not write this.”

Furthermore, *laa* is used in the construction of *laa wa laa* (neither...nor) with the perfective (15) and only with the indicative mood of the imperfective (16) which has lost its marker in HA.

(15) *laa akal-Ø wa laa farib-Ø*
 Neg eat.Pf-Ø and Neg drink.Pf-Ø

“He neither ate nor drank.”

(16) *laa y-rooh-Ø wa laa yi-ġi-Ø*
 Neg Impf-go-Ø and Neg Impf-come-Ø

“He neither goes nor comes.”

Lit: “He does not go and he does not come.”

So far, we have seen that the three varieties use the negative *laa* to express wishes. However, the varieties differ in that CA and MSA use the negative followed by the perfective forms, whereas HA uses the imperfective form in such a case. We have also seen that CA and MSA use *laa* to denote negation in the simple future. This function of *laa* is not found in HA and it has been transferred to the negative *maa* as shown below.

The Negative Particle *maa* in CA and MSA

In both CA and MSA, the negative *maa* can select for a perfective or an imperfective verb form. It is used before the perfective form (17) and only before the indicative mood of the imperfective form to show definite or absolute negation where it has no morphological effects on verbs it negates (Wright, 1896; 1898).

(17) *maa ta ġalam-u al-faranseyat-a*
 Neg learn-Pf.3Pl.Ind Det-French-Acc

“They did not learn the French Language.”

(18) *maa ya-takalam-u al-italiya-ta*
 Neg Impf-speak-3sg-Ind Det-Italian-Acc

“He does not speak Italian.”

Both the perfective verb form *ta ṣalam-u* and the imperfective verb form *ya-takalam-u* occur immediately after the negative *maa*. Notice that in Arabic varieties, including CA, MSA, HA, Faifi Arabic, and Zahrani Arabic, the perfective is associated with the past time interpretation, and the imperfective is associated with the present time interpretation (Al Zahrani, 2013, 2016, 2018; Alzahrani, 2009, 2015, 2016).

Like *laa* in the correlative structure *laa wa laa*, the particle *maa* can be used only before *laa* to form the correlation, so it is *maa wa laa* but not **laa wa maa*. This has led some linguists to consider *wa laa* one compound morpheme for the correlative structure. This construction, however, would mean the same as *laa wa laa* like the English “neither ...nor”. The difference between them is that *laa wa laa* would negate the simple past as in (3, 4, and 15) above but *maa wa laa* indicates the absolute negation as in (19), adopted from Rammuny (1978, p. 253).

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| (19) <i>maa</i> | <i>ḍʿarab-tu</i> | <i>wa</i> | <i>laa</i> | <i>ṣatam-tu</i> | <i>aḥad-an</i> | <i>fi</i> | <i>ḥayat-i</i> |
| Neg | hit-1sg.Pf | and | Neg | abuse-1sg.Pf | one-Acc | P | life-1sg.Gen |

“I neither hit nor abused anyone in my life.”

Interestingly, *maa* with the perfective, can show negation where the past is connected to the present (Harrama, 1983b). In such a case, we must have *ba ṣdu* meaning “yet” where it looks completely like the negative particle *lam*; but the former does not affect the form of the verb like the latter. Consider the example below.

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|
| (20) <i>maa</i> | <i>aṣraq-a-t</i> | <i>al-ṣams-u</i> | <i>ba ṣdu</i> |
| Neg | rise-Pf-F | Det-sun-Nom | yet |

“The sun has not risen yet.” (Rammuny, 1978, p. 253).

| | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|---------------|
| (21) <i>lam</i> | <i>t-uṣriq</i> | <i>al-ṣams-u</i> | <i>ba ṣdu</i> |
| Neg | Impf.3sg.F-rise.Juss | Det-sun-Nom | yet |

“The sun has not risen yet.”

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------|------------------|
| (22) <i>lam</i> | <i>tuṣriq</i> | <i>al-ṣams-u</i> |
| Neg | rise-Juss | Det-sun-Nom |

“The sun did not rise.”

It is worthy to note that the absence of the adverbial marker *ba ṣdu* in (20) makes the interpretation in the past “the sun didn’t rise”, which is similar to (17) with the negative *maa*, and to (22) with the negative *lam*. Also, the presence of the adverbial element makes both *maa* and *lam* convey the same meaning of “the sun has not risen yet”. This shows that the same function of *lam* can be expressed by the negative *maa*. This may account for the absence of *lam* in HA as shown in Section “0”. The following section shows how *maa* behaves in HA.

The Negative Particle *maa* in HA

The HA negative *maa* behaves completely the same as CA and MSA negative *maa* in that it negates the absolute past when coming before the perfective and/or the imperfective. Also, it is used in the correlative structure *maa wa laa*. In all three varieties, the negative *laa* has no morphological effects on the verb forms following it. For the exceptive particle *ba ṣdu*, HA uses the morpheme /*baqi*/ which conveys the same meaning (see0”). Once again, with the imperfective, HA has lost the marking system of the mood inflections.

(23) *maa* *aḥraq-a-t* *al-ḥams*
 Neg rise-Pf-F Det-sun

“The sun did not rise.”

(24) *maa* *yi-ṭkalam-Ø* *al-italiyah*
 Neg Impf-speak-3sg.M-Ø Det-Italy

“He does not speak Italian.”

(25) *maa* *yi-ṭkalam-Ø* *al-italiyah* *wa* *laa* *al-ḥarānīyah*
 Neg Impf-speak-3sg.M-Ø Det-Italy and Neg Det.French

“He neither speaks Italian nor French.”

Examples (23-25) show that the HA negative *maa* can be followed by the perfective or the imperfective, which are associated with past and present time interpretations respectively. Notice how the complement of the predicate in (25) is followed by the correlative structure *wa laa*. The next section shows the negative *laysa*.

The Negative Particle *laysa* in CA and MSA

In CA and MSA, this negative element is not frequent with verbal sentences. This, in turn, strengthens the view that considers *laysa* a verb and not a particle. It is used only before the indicative to negate the simple present and it is mostly used with stative or habitual verbs (Rammuny, 1978; Ul-Haq, 1984). When *laysa* is inflected for person, number, and gender, there must be a morphophonemic change of the stem. It is important to know that *laysa* does not need to be adjacent to the verb it negates. The following examples show *laysa* in different structures with different inflections.

(26) *lays-at* *Wafa* *ta-drus-u*
 Neg-F *Wafa* Impf.F-study-Ind

“Wafa does not study.”

(27) *laysa* *ya-drus-u* *Ali*
 Neg Impf.M-study-Ind *Ali*

“Ali does not study.”

(28) *las-tumaa* *ta-drus-ani* *lil-extibar-i*
 Neg-dl Impf-study-dl P-exam-Gen

“You (two) are not studying for the exam.”

(29) *las-tum* *ta-drus-una* *lil-extibar-i*
 Neg-pl.M Impf.M-study-M.pl P-exam-Gen

“You (pl.M) are not studying for the exam.”

(30) *las-tunna* *ta-drus-na* *lil-extibar-i*
 Neg-pl.F Impf.F-study-F.pl P-exam-Gen

“You (pl.F) are not studying for the exam.”

Examples (26-30) posit that the negative particle *laysa* show full agreement for the Phi features. It inflects for person, gender, and number and that the stem is either /*las*/ or /*lays*/ according to the personal pronoun to which it is attached. However, there are cases where *laysa* shows partial agreement. According to Onaizan (2005, p. 30), the negative *laysa* is mobile and this mobility, however, may affect somehow the agreement as can be seen in the following two examples.

(31) *lays-at* *al-banat-u* *ya-drus-na*

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Neg-F | Det-girls-Nom | | Impf-study-F.pl |
| “The girls are not studying.” | | | |
| (32) <i>al-banat-u</i> | | <i>las-na</i> | <i>ya-drus-na</i> |
| Det-girls-Nom | | Neg-F.pl | Impf-study-F.pl |
| “The girls are not studying.” | | | |

In Example (31), the negative *laysa* precedes the subject, and therefore it does not inflect for number; rather, it appears in the singular form inflecting only for gender. The form of the negative *lays-at* is similar to Example (26) where the subject is singular. The second example shows a form of the negative *laysa*, i.e., *las-na*, inflecting for the grammatical categories of number (plural) and gender (feminine) because it comes after the subject. Investigating the syntactic properties of subject-verb agreement, their placement and how agreement is affected by the subject position will take us far afield; the reader is advised to see the work of other linguists (including Abdelhafiz, 2005; Ahmad-Sokarno, 2005; Aoun & Benmamoun, 1999; Bahloul & Harbert, 1992; Carroll, 2000; Harbert & Bahloul, 2002; Mohammad, 1990, 2000). The next section shows the alternative negative form in HA that negates the structures the CA and MSA negative *laysa* negates.

Alternative of *laysa* in HA

HA has lost the negative particle *laysa* completely. While this negative morpheme has been lost, the negative *maa* is used to function in the structures where *laysa* is used in CA and MSA. The negative *maa*, needless to say, does not inflect for person, number, or gender in all varieties. Consider the following examples.

| | | |
|------------------------|------------|------------------|
| (33) <i>Wafa</i> | <i>maa</i> | <i>ta-drus</i> |
| Wafa | Neg | Impf.3sg.F-study |
| “Wafa does not study.” | | |
| (34) <i>Ali</i> | <i>maa</i> | <i>ya-drus</i> |
| Ali | Neg | Impf.3sg.M-study |
| “Ali does not study.” | | |

Comparing the examples of the negative *laysa* in (26-32) with the ones in (33-34), one can observe that HA uses the negative *maa* in the same examples where CA and MSA use *laysa*. The absence of the negative *maa* in (33-34) presents the affirmative counterpart of the same examples where the lexical verb *ta-drus* does not show any morphological changes, i.e., the negative *maa* does not show any morphological impact on the verb. What one can also observe in (33-34) is that, unlike *laysa*, the particle *maa* must be adjacent to the verb it negates, i.e., we cannot separate the negative particle and the verb it negates as we can do with *laysa* in the varieties of CA and MSA. This accounts for the ungrammaticality of the following example.

| | | |
|------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| (35) * <i>maa</i> | <i>Wafa</i> | <i>ta-drus-Ø</i> |
| Neg | <i>Wafa</i> | Impf.3sg.F-study- Ø |
| “Wafa does not study.” | | |

The Negative Particle *lam* in CA and MSA

This negative is particular to verbal sentences, and more precisely to the imperfective form. It must precede the imperfective form immediately; consequently, it causes the case to change from nominative into jussive. Cantarino (1974, p. 127) proposed that “this construction expresses the negation of the perfective in all its different meanings (except the optative for which *laa* is the exclusive negation)”. Interestingly, the jussive

verb occurring after *lam* is imperfective in form and perfective in meaning, and this is exactly the opposite of the negative *laysa* (not to be) in that *laysa* is perfective in form and imperfective in meaning (Bedawi, Carter, & Gully, 2004; Harrama, 1983a).

The negative *lam* is always followed by the imperfective form in the jussive mood. Compare the following examples.

- (36) *la ṣīb-a* *al-walad-u*
 Pf.3sg.Mplay-Ind Det-boy-Nom
 “The boy played.”
- (37) *lam* *ya-lṣāb-Ø* *al-walad-u*
 Neg Impf.3sg.M-play-Juss Det-boy-Nom
 “The boy did not play.”

In (36-37), we observe that *lam* negates the past but the verb form is imperfective, i.e., *yalṣāb*, and it causes the imperfective verb to change its mood into jussive. This change is achieved by deleting the final short vowel, *u*. Once again, the use of *lam* is used to negate the past and it is, as Aniis (1972) proposed, stronger than negating the past with *maa*. This in turn suggests that the negative *lam* inflects for tense. Notice that *lam* can be used with the time markers *ba ṣḍu* (yet) or *ḥatta alʔaan* (until now) to express negation of the past connected with the present (Rammuny, 1978) as shown in the examples in (38-39).

- (38) *lam* *a-ḏhab-Ø* *ila* *al-madrasat-i*
 Neg Pf.1sg-go-Juss P Det-school-Gen
 “I did not go to school.”
- (39) *lam* *aḏhab- Ø* *ila* *al-madrasat-i* *ba ṣḍu*
 Neg Pf.1sg-go-Juss P Det-school-Gen yet
 “I have not gone to school yet.”

The next section sheds light on the negative *lamma*, which is very close in functions from *lam*.

The Negative Particle *lamma* in CA and MSA

Like *lam*, *lamma* is particular to the perfective form of the verb and it affects the mood of the verb to change it to jussive. It negates the past that extends to the present. Hence, the negative *lamma* inflects for tense. It is used for the negation of the resultative perfective or of the perfective preceded by *qad* with the meaning of “had already” (Cantarino 1974, p. 127). The resultative perfective expresses actions started in the past and, as such, completed but understood as still lasting in their results or consequences—thus, equivalent to the imperfective (Ghalayini, 1986, p. 185). Hence, *lamma* is for negating an action in the past connected with the present.

- (40) *ya-tahadṯ-u* *ṣan-ni* *wa* *lamma* *ya-ra-Ø-ni*
 Impf.3sg.M-speak-Ind P-1sg.Gen and Neg Impf.3sg.M-see-Juss-1sg.Gen
 “He speaks about me but has not seen me.”
- (41) *ya-tahadṯ-u* *an-ni* *wa* *lamma* *ya-ra-Ø-ni* *ba ṣḍu*
 Impf.3sg.M-speak-Ind P-1sg.Gen and Neg Impf.3sg.M-see-Juss-1sg.Gen yet
 “He speaks about me but has not seen me, yet.”

This function of *lamma* can be expressed by the negative *lam* with the morpheme *ba ṣḍu* or *ḥatta alʔaan*. This shows the very rare use of this negative in CA and MSA (Ayyub, 1957). The fact that its restricted

structure and meaning has led to its rare use in both varieties of CA and MSA can be more plausible reasoning to account for its loss in HA. However, the substitution of *lamma* for *lam* does not mean they are entirely the same. There are some similarities as well as some differences between these two negatives.

Traditional Arab grammarians like Ibn Hisham (1985) and Ibn Aqeel (1980) as well as some linguists like Wright (1898), Ul-Haq (1984), and Ghalayini (1986) argued that both negative particles are articular to the imperfective, both affect the mood as they cause it to change to jussive, and both show the negation in the past even followed by the imperfective form of the verb. Therefore, if you say “*lam* *ʔaktub*” or “*lamma* *ʔaktub*”, both structures convey the meaning of “I did not write”.

However, the two negatives differ from each other in the following. First, traditional grammarians differentiate them in the way that *lam yafʕal* (He did not do) is the negation of *fa ʕal-a* (He did); but *lamma yafʕal* (He has not yet done it) is the negation of the certainty *qad fa ʕal-a* (He has done it) meaning, (He has not yet done it, but he will certainly do it afterwards). This concludes that *lam* is for the negation in the simple past which is equivalent to “did not” while *lamma* is for the negation of the past that extends to the present “have not yet” (Wright, 1898).

Second, as Ghalayini (1986) proposed, *lam* is for the absolute negation in the past which may happen afterwards, as in *lam afʕal thumma fa ʕaltu* (I did not do, then I did), while *lamma* is for negating the past connected with the present. Then, you cannot say **lamma afʕal thumma fa ʕaltu* (*I have not yet done, then I did). Traditional grammarians call it a particle of absorption as it absorbs the whole past time till it connects with the present.

Third, Ibn Aqeel (1980) argued that *lam* accepts the conditional particle *ʔin* (42a) while *lamma* does not as shown by the ungrammaticality of (42b).

| | | | |
|---------------------|------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| (42) (a) <i>ʔin</i> | <i>lam</i> | <i>ta-drus-Ø</i> | <i>ta-rsub- Ø</i> |
| If | Neg | Impf.2sg-study-Juss | Impf.2sg-fail-Juss |

“If you do not study, you will fail.”

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| (b) * <i>ʔin</i> | <i>lamma</i> | <i>ta-drus-Ø</i> | <i>ta-rsub- Ø</i> |
| If | Neg | Impf.2sg-study-Juss | Impf.2sg-fail-Juss |

It is clear that the sentence refers to the future as is expressed by the meaning due to the presence of the conditional particle. The mood of the imperfective verb forms have changed since the particle *lam* causes the verbs *ta-drus* and *ta-rsub* to be in the jussive mood.

Fourth, the use of *lamma* can suggest a gapping structure. In other words, the verb may be ellipsed after *lamma* and can be predicted from the context. This is not the case with *lam*. Consider the following example where the verb *adxul* (entered) after *lamma* is ellipsed.

| | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| (43) <i>qaarab-tu</i> | <i>al-bait-a</i> | <i>wa</i> | <i>lamma...</i> |
| approach-Pf-1sg | Det-house-Acc | and | Neg... |

“I approached the house, but had not yet...”

Intended meaning: “I approached the house, but had not yet entered”

The negative *lamma* presupposes that the negated action might take place, like saying “*lamma usafir*” (I have not yet travelled) where it means your travel is soon; but it is not the case with *lam*. This accounts for the fact that we cannot express impossible negation using *lamma*, but that is possible with *lam* as shown in the following example where only *lam*, but not *lamma*, is accepted. Note that *lamma* has the asterisk indicating the ungrammaticality of its use.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------|---------------|
| (44) <i>Lam</i> (* <i>lamma</i>) | <i>a-fʕal-Ø</i> | <i>ma</i> | <i>laa</i> | <i>yumkin</i> |
| Neg | Impf.1sg-do-Juss | what | Neg | possible |

“I did not do what was impossible.”

To conclude, it is clear that *lam* and *lamma* are very similar in their functions; and the function of *lamma* can be conveyed by *lam* if some adverbial time markers are present.

Alternative of *lam* and *lamma* in HA

HA does not use the negative particles *lam* or *lamma*. Instead, it uses the negative particle *maa* with adverbial time markers to function like *lam* and *lamma* in CA and MSA. This shows that the functional load of the negatives *lam* and *lamma* has been transferred to the negative *maa*. In other words, HA uses the negative particle *maa* accompanied by the time marker *baqi* “yet” to show the negation of the past connected to the present. If the time marker *baqi* is ellipsed, the negation will be like using the particle *maa* before the perfective in HA compared to its use in MSA (See Sections “The Negative Particle *maa* in CA and MSA” and “The Negative Particle *maa* in HA”). Now consider the examples in (45-46).

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| (45) <i>maa</i> | <i>daras-Ø</i> | <i>al-walad-Ø</i> |
| Neg | Pf.3sg.M.studied-Ø | Det-boy-Ø |

“The boy did not study.”

| | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| (46) <i>maa</i> | <i>daras-Ø</i> | <i>al-walad-Ø</i> | <i>baqi</i> |
| Neg | Pf.3sg.M.studied-Ø | Det-boy-Ø | yet |

“The boy has not studied yet.”

These two examples remind the reader of our discussion about *maa* above where Harrama (1983) claimed that *maa* with the perfective is somehow similar to that of *lam* with the imperfective as they almost convey the same meaning regardless of the claim some grammarians have made that *lam* negates the remote past while *maa* negates the near past. It is a matter of stylistic variation only because the meaning is identical. Harrama made this claim because the use of *maa* + the perfective, or *lam* + the imperfective, in the above two sentences expresses the negation of “The boy did not study” while the addition of the adverbial time marker *baqi* conveys the meaning of “The boy has not studied yet”. This indicates that the HA *maa* may behave like *lam* in MSA; therefore, it functions in HA instead of *lam* that this variety has lost. The adverbial time word *baqi* differentiates between the HA *maa* that is used instead of *lam*, and the HA *maa* that is the counterpart of the MSA's negative *maa*. This supports the argument that the negative *maa* has the functional load in HA.

Worthy of notice here is the loss of the marking system in HA where all moods markers show no morphological content.

The Negative Particle *lan* in CA and MSA

It is agreed upon by all the grammarians and linguists that *lan* is always followed by an imperfective verb form in the subjunctive mood denoting negation in the future (Al Zahrani, 2014a, 2014b; Ibn Aqeel, 1980; Ibn Hisham, 1985). This in turn means that the negative *lan* inflects for tense. Moreover, like *lam*, this particle compels the verb to change its mood into subjunctive.

| | | |
|----------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| (47) <i>sa</i> | <i>a-zuur-u</i> | <i>Salih-an</i> |
| will | Impf.1sg.visit-Ind | <i>Salih</i> -Acc |

“I will visit Salih.”

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| (48) <i>lan</i> | <i>a-zuur-a</i> | <i>Salih-an</i> |
| Neg | Impf.1sg.visit-Subjn | <i>Salih</i> -Acc |

“I will not visit Salih.”

Example (47) shows the future morpheme /*sa*/ that is absent in (48) due to the presence of the future negative particle *lan*. This function of *lan* has led some linguists like Cantarino (1974) to propose that *lan* is the negative counterpart of the imperfective after the future morphemes /*sa*/ and /*sawfa*/. This supports Onaizan’s (2005) claim that the future negative *lan* cannot co-occur with the future morphemes /*sa*/ or /*sawfa*/; thus, **lan sa aktub*, **lan sawfa aktub* are ungrammatical.

From this description of *lan*, it is worth noting that *lan* behaves in the opposite way of *lam* in the condition that the latter is not accompanied by any temporal adverbials. This posits that both negatives inflect for tense and are restricted to the imperfective form where *lam* expresses negation in the past while *lan* expresses negation in the future.

Alternative of *lan* in HA

As is the case with *laysa*, *lam*, and *lamma*, HA has also lost the negative particle *lan*. However, it is similar to the other lost particles in that its functions are expressed by virtue of the HA negative particle *maa*. Nevertheless, the negative *maa* is not used alone to function on behalf of the lost particle *lan*. HA uses the future morphemes, namely, /*bi*/ or /*ha*/, which are the counterparts of the CA and MSA future morphemes /*sa*/ and /*sawfa*/, to prefix the verb where all co-operate to function like the negative *lan*. Hence, the structure of the HA negative *maa* plus a future morpheme: [*maa* + *bi/ha*] functions like the negative *lan* in CA and MSA. It is worthy of note here that the two future morphemes can be used interchangeably without any distinctions. It goes without saying that HA has lost the mood marking system, i.e., the particle *maa* along with the other two morphemes will not affect the form of the verb at all. The following examples show the CA and MSA negative *lan* and the HA *maa* with the other morphemes convey the same task of *lan*.

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| (49) <i>lan</i> | <i>ya-drus-a</i> | <i>Ahmad-un</i> |
| Neg | Impf.3sg.M-study-Subjn | <i>Ahmad</i> -Nom |

“Ahmad will not study.”

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| (50) <i>maa</i> | <i>bi-yi-drus-Ø</i> | <i>Ahmad-Ø</i> |
|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| (51) <i>maa</i> | <i>ha-yi-drus-Ø</i> | <i>Ahmad-Ø</i> |
| Neg | Fut-Impf.3sg.M-study-Ø | Ahmad-Ø |

“Ahmad will not study.”

Examples (50-51) show that HA alternatively uses *maa*, which shows no morphological influence on the lexical verb forms, to scope over the verbal clauses negated by *lan* in both MSA and CA.

Conclusion

So far, this paper has addressed negation in verbal sentences in three Arabic varieties: CA, MSA, and HA. Some negatives come with different aspects while others are restricted only to the imperfective. Some of the negative particles can cause the verb form to change as it inflects for different moods.

The CA and MSA *laa* is used with the perfective in optative sentences or to show the simple past where it must be repeated. This *laa* has no morphological impact. With the imperfective, it comes with the different moods as it is used with the indicative for regular negation, with the jussive to express prohibitory sense, and

with the subjunctive, once attached to a subjunctivizing element, to negate the future. The HA *laa*, on the one hand, looks like the MSA *laa* where it is used in optative sentences or to show the simple past where it must be repeated. On the other hand, its uses with the imperfective form have transferred to the HA *maa*.

The CA and MSA *maa* is used for absolute negation with no inflectional impacts on the perfective and the imperfective forms. *Laysa*, in CA and MSA, is very infrequent with verbal sentences and this infrequency supports the view of *laysa* being a verb. However, once *laysa* occurs with the imperfective, it is used only with the indicative where it does not morphologically affect the verb forms.

The other three negatives *lam*, *lamma*, and *lan* are very restricted to the imperfective form of verbs. *Lam* and *lamma* have almost the same function though there are some differences between them. *Lam* with the jussive has maintained its function primarily to convey regular negation of the past. Like *lamma*, *lam* expresses the past connected with the present and this is indicated by certain time markers occurring after the jussive mood of the imperfective form.

On a par with Benmamoun's (2000) findings that in CA and MSA there are only two negatives *laa* and *maa* where the others are inflected variants of *laa*, this paper concludes that CA, MSA, and HA have the same underlying negatives, *laa* and *maa*. However, CA and MSA have five inflected variants of *laa* carrying the functional load; whereas HA has the negative *maa* carrying the functional load. That is, the HA *maa* functions instead of the following CA/MSA negatives: (a) *laa* with the imperfective; (b) *maa* with the perfective/imperfective; (c) *laysa* with the indicative imperfective; (d) *lam* with the jussive; (e) *lamma* with the jussive, and (f) *lan* with the subjunctive. The HA *maa* in verbal clauses does what the six CA/MSA negatives do. We have seen how HA *maa* has the functional loads of the CA and MSA negatives. When functioning like the negative *lam*, it is used with the morpheme *baq* "yet". For *lamma*, HA uses the combination of *lam...baqi* instead of the MSA *lamma*. Finally, HA uses the morphemes /bi/ or /ha/ with the negative *maa* to function like the MSA *lan*. It is apparent that HA has lost the different mood endings. The fact that the jussive in CA and MSA is left without a vowel proves why all verb forms in HA look like the CA and MSA jussive mood that has no overt ending markers.

References

- Abdelhafiz, A. S. (2005). Verb agreement in standard Arabic: An analysis in the minimality program. *Language and Linguistics*, 4(1), 100-120.
- Ahmad-Sokarno, A. H. (2005). Verb agreement in standard Arabic: An analysis in the minimality program. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 4(1), 100-120.
- Al Zahrani, M. (2013). Morphosyntactic and semantic properties of Hijazi Arabic Modals (Ph.D. thesis, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland).
- Al Zahrani, M. (2014a). Negation in non-verbal clauses—modern standard Arabic (MSA) and spoken Hijazi Arabic (SHA). *Pakistan Journal of Languages and Translation Studies*, 2, 31-49.
- Al Zahrani, M. (2014b). The syntactic properties of negatives. *US-China Foreign Language*, (1), 1-17.
- Al Zahrani, M. (2016). Aktionsarten projection and subcategorization. *The International Journal of Arabic Linguistics (IJAL)*, 2(1), 46-69.
- Al Zahrani, M. (2018). Morphosyntactic and semantic properties of epistemic modals modifying verbal clauses. In P. G. Medina, R. T. Alonso, and R. V. Escarza (Eds.), *Verbs, clauses and constructions: Functional and typological approaches* (pp. 149-166). Newcastle: United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Alzahrani, S. (2009). Faify Arabic: Clause structure and negation (Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia).

- Alzahrani, S. (2015). Topics in the grammar of Zahrani spoken dialect (Unpublished doctotal thesis, University of Newcastle, Australia).
- Alzahrani, S. (2016). Ma: and la: take over all the negative particles in Zahrani spoken Arabic. *Faculty of Arts Journal*, (80), 81-97.
- Aniis, I. (1972). *Min Asrari Allughati* (4th ed.). Cairo: Maktabatu Al-Anglu Al-Masriyaah.
- Aoun, J., & Benmamoun, E. (1999). Gapping, PF merger, and patterns of partial agreement. In S. Lappin and E. Benmamoun (Eds.), *Fragments: Studies in ellipsis and gapping* (pp. 175-192). New York ; London: Oxford University Press.
- Ayyub, A. (1957). *Dirasat Naqdeeyah fi Al-Nahw Al-Arabi* (Vol. 1). Cairo: Matb'at Mukhaymar.
- Bahloul, M., & Harbert, W. (1992). Agreement asymmetries in Arabic. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*.
- Bedawi, E. S. M., Carter, M. G., & Gully, A. (2004). *Modern written Arabic: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Benmamoun, E. (1992). Functional and inflectional morphology: Problems of projection, representation and derivation (Ph.D., USC, Los Angeles).
- Benmamoun, E. (2000). *The feature structure of functional categories: A comparative study of Arabic dialects*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cantarino, V. (1974). *Syntax of modern Arabic prose* (Vol. 1 & 2). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Carroll, R. (2000). Word order, agreement, and sentential structure in standard Arabic (MA dissertation, California State University Dominguez Hills, California).
- Ghalayini, M. (1986). *Jami'e Al-Duroos Al-Arabiyyah* (All the Arabic Lessons) (Vol. 2). Beirut: Al Maktabah Al Asriyah.
- Harbert, W., & Bahloul, M. (2002). Postverbal subjects in Arabic and the theory of agreement. In J. Ouhalla and U. Shlonsky (Eds.), *Themes in Arabic and Hebrew syntax* (pp. 45-70). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Harrama, A. M. (1983a). Some aspects of negation in standard Arabic (MA thesis, University of Arizona).
- Harrama, A. M. (1983b). Some aspects of negation in modern standard Arabic (MA thesis, University of Arizona).
- Ibn Aqeel, A. (1980). *Sharh Ibn Aqeel* (Ibn Aqeel's Explanations of Arabic) (Vol. 1 & 2). Beirut: Daru Al-Uloom
- Ibn Hisham, A. (1985). *Mughni Al-labeeb 'an Lughati Al-I'rab*. Damascus: Dar Al-Fikr.
- Mohammad, A. (2000). *Word order, agreement, and pronominalisation in Standard and Palestinian Arabic* (Vol. 181). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mohammad, M. A. (1990). The problem of subject-verb agreement in Arabic: Towards a solution. In M. Eid (Ed.), *Perspectives in Arabic linguistics I* (pp. 95-125). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, .
- Onaizan, N. (2005). Functions of negation in Arabic literary discourse (Ph.D. thesis, University of Kansas).
- Ouhalla, J. (1993). Negation, focus and tense: The arabic laa and maa. *Rivista di Linguistica*, 5, 275-300.
- Rammuny, R. M. (1978). Functional and semantic developments in negation as used in modern literary Arabic prose after World War I. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 37, 245-264.
- Ryding, K. C. (2005). *A reference grammar of modern standard Arabic*. Cambridge Cambridge University Press.
- Shlonsky, U. (1997). *Clause structure and word order in Hebrew and Arabic: An essay in comparative Semitic syntax*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thatcher, G. (1922). *Arabic grammar of the written language* (2nd ed.). London: Kessinger Publishing
- Ul-Haq, Z. (1984). *Negation in Arabic: A morphosyntactic and semantic description*. (Ph.D. thesis, Indiana University, Indiana).
- Wright, W. (1896). *A grammar of the Arabic language* (3rd ed., Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, W. (1898). *A grammar of the Arabic language* (3rd ed., Vol. 2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, W. (1967). *A grammar of the Arabic language* (3rd ed., Vol. 2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.