Chapter Four
The Scope of Negation in Yemeni Arabic

4.1 Introduction:

This chapter is concerned with the discussion of scopal relations of negation in YA. It is worth noting that the data and the discussion are novel because this topic has not been tackled yet. Generally, the study of scope has been approached from semantic, pragmatic, and syntactic perspectives; apart from this, my concern is to tackle this phenomenon from a syntactic perspective within the confines of the minimalist framework.

Some of the earlier approaches to the syntax of scope linked the scope of negation to the c-command relation. It is claimed that the negative operator has a wide scope if it is in a c-commanding position. Most of the relevant discussion in this connection has been articulated in Takubo (1985), Aoun and Li (1993), Matos (1999), Wu (2005), etc. Some of these analyses show that it is not always the case that scope respects the linear order of the arguments, at least in English.

Principally, I attempt to address two major questions: i) where the scope of negation is determined, through investigating various contexts that usually exhibit scope interaction and affect the ways of scope taking like quantifiers. ii) the second question will address Negative Raising phenomenon where I attempt to offer an explanation to the phenomenon within the guidelines of Pesetsky and Torrego (2007).

As was presented in the previous chapters, sentential negation is expressed by using any of the following ways: the unmarked negative marker ma/mish/ma...sh, the
negative element *wala* or the negative quantifier *mahhad*. Each element differs in the way it takes scope as will be shown later in this chapter.

By hypothesis, YA does not present any structural ambiguity with respect to the scope of negation, since negative elements cannot extend their scope beyond the surface position. Evidence in favor of this claim is provided by NPIs, positive quantifiers and Neg(ative)-Raising verbs. The discussion reveals a variety of considerable syntactic and semantic aspects of this language.

The chapter is organized as follows. Section 4.2 initiates the discussion by examining the scope of the unmarked negative marker. In section 4.3, the scope of the negative quantifiers is highlighted. In section 4.4, I show how local negation determines negative scope. Section 4.5 examines empirically the evidence provided by quantifiers that supports the claim that the scope of negation is determined by the word order. Section 4.6 throws some light on how negation gives only a narrow scope reading when it is associated with focus. Section 4.7 is devoted to the Neg-Raising verbs. In section 4.8, I present some of the recent analyses that discuss these two phenomena within the confines of the recent developments in the linguistic theory. In section 4.9, I attempt to account for Neg-Raising in the light of Chomsky (2001); and Pesetsky and Torrego (2007). Section 4.10 concludes the discussion.

### 4.2 How negative markers take scope:

This section focuses on the mechanism of the scope taking of the negative markers in YA and it investigates the ways that determine the scope of negation. The predominant idea of the scope of negation is that it is determined by a negative operator generated in the specifier position of a negative phrase. Szabolcsi (2001) defines the
scope of an operator as the domain in which it has the ability to affect the interpretation of other expressions such as negative polarity items, quantifiers, and adverbs. Presumably, a negative operator scopes over the elements that occur within its domain, i.e. c-commanded by it. Consider these examples:

1. I did not beat anyone.
2. *anyone did not beat me.

Obviously, negation does not c-command the subject position so anyone is not licensed. Yet, it is not always the case that negation must c-command all the arguments in the clause in order to take scope. Wu (2005) claims that QPs can give rise to ambiguity in the environment of negation. Consider this example:

3. I was not listening all the time. (from Wu 2005: 5)

The quantifier phrase all the time can be interpreted inside or outside the scope of negation giving rise to two readings. Consider these readings:

4. a. For the whole time I wasn’t listening.
   b. I was listening occasionally.

It seems that negation affects the interpretation of the quantifier all; therefore, it can have either wide or narrow scope readings.

To begin with, I claim that the scope of negation in YA is determined by word order. That is, negation scopes only over its c-commanding domain within the clausal boundaries.
A strong piece of evidence is provided by quantifiers, in particular the collective construal\textsuperscript{16}. These quantifiers show different readings in the context of negation, i.e. their scope is determined according to their position in the sentence. In other words, the occurrence of these elements above negation widens their scope while their occurrence below negation narrows their scope. Consider these examples:

5. a. mish kulla-hum gaw
   neg all-them come.past.3mp
   'Not all of them came.'

   b. kulla-hum mish gaw
   all-them neg come.past.3mp
   'All of them did not come.'

The behavior of these elements will be discussed in detail in section 4.5.

Further, it is observed that negation cannot license an NPI in the subject position in SVO order indicating that it must be c-commanded by negation.

6. *aiy had mish raah sana\'a

   anyone neg go.past.3ms Sana\'a

   This sentence becomes acceptable when the NPI appears in the subject position in the VSO order, at least in some dialects.

7. ma-raah-sh (aiy) had sana\'a

\textsuperscript{16}As mentioned in BegHELLIE and Stowell (1997).
neg-go.past.3ms-neg anyone Sana’a

(Lit. anyone did not go to Sana’a/no one went to Sana’a).

The licensing of an NPI in the VSO order gives credence to the following observations: i) the scope of negation is determined by word order and ii) NPIs are licensed by a c-commanding negative operator.

Further, the alternation of negation between the pre/post-position of some auxiliary-like element provides evidence for the claim in this chapter, i.e. the scope of negation is determined by the word order; the alternation has some semantic effects on the interpretation of negation.

For instance, the adverbial element ʕaad17 ‘still/anymore’ gives rise to two readings based on its occurrence in the context of negation or outside its boundaries. Consider these examples:

8. a. mish ʕaad yashtiqal henna

    neg   anymore work.pres.3ms here

‘He does not work here anymore.’

b. ʕaad-ah mish yashtaqil henna

    still-3ms neq  work.pres.3ms here

17The occurrence of ʕaad before or after negation has some aspectual effect on the sentence. Since YA does not use auxiliaries to express the grammatical aspect, such as the perfective or imperfective, adverbials or auxiliary-like elements such as ʕaad can do.
‘(Lit: still, he has not started working here)’

Obviously, negation changes the reading of ُسُيِّد from still to anymore when the latter occurs within its scope, ignoring the aspeсtual properties of this word; this behavior points out that ُسُيِّد in (8b) is not within the scope of negation.

This evidence manifests that c-command relation has a major role in determining the scope of negation.

4.3 The scope of negative quantifiers:

Negative quantifiers (henceforth NQs) also determine their scope by word order. These elements are always placed higher than the verb as will be illustrated in the next two sub-sections:

4.3.1 ُوالا ‘and not’:

As discussed in Chapter 3, ُوالا ‘and not’ is an emphatic negative quantifier that expresses sentential negation. It is always placed in the sentence initial position when it has a sentential scope. Consider this example:

9. ُوالا ُهُرَم ُهَدَحَرَت ُعَالَمَرَاغِان.

and not woman attend.past.3fs the festival

‘Not even a woman attended the festival.’

This sentence has the following reading:

10. It is not the case that even a single woman attended the festival.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, ُوالا has a focus feature that can attract any element in the clause to a FocusP posited immediately below it. However, the scope of ُوالا is
not restricted to that focused element; it still has a sentential scope. Consider this example:

11. wala mahragaan hadharna.

and not festival attend.past.1p

‘We did not attend even a single festival.’

The wide scope of *wala* is indicated by the ability of *wala* to license NPIs in this context. In (12), *wala* licenses the NPI *shiya* ‘anything’ irrespective of the presence of a focused element:

12. wala hurmah aštat-na hatta shiy

and not woman give.past.3fs-us even thing

‘Not even a woman gave us anything.’

Substantially, *wala* has always a wide scope interpretation of negation and its link to emphasis does not weaken its scope properties.

4. 3.2 *mahhad* ‘no one’ and *maashi/mafiish* ‘nothing’

NQs in YA are not comparable to their counterparts in English for a number of reasons:

First, they are always placed in the clause initial position.

13. a. mahhad qaal la-na shiy

no one say.past.3ms to-us thing
‘No one told us anything.’

14. a. maashi maʕ-i (aiy) hagah

neg with-me any thing

‘I do not have anything.’

b. ma-fii-sh maʕ-i (aiy) hagah/shiy

neg-there-neg with-me any thing

‘I do not have anything.’

Second, the occurrence of the NQ in the object position is not allowed.

15. *shafit mahhad alyawoom

see.past.is no one today

‘I saw no body today.’

16. *maʕ-i ma-fii-sh (aiy) hagah/shi

with-me neg-there-neg any thing

‘I have nothing.’

It is also observed that NQs cannot appear in the subject position of VSO order because it cannot scope over the verb from that position. Therefore, I argue that NQs in order to have wide scope must be placed higher in the clause structure and must c-command all the other arguments.
17. *aga mahhad alyawoom

come.past.3ms no one today.

The availability of the NQ in English in the object position does not prevent it from having wide scope, given that no one moves at LF to Spec, NegP where its scope is widened. It is explicit that scope assignment is not determined by word order in English. The issue at hand is concerned with the non-availability of NQs in the clause-internal position in YA. Therefore, I consider this as a piece of evidence to argue that negation determines its scope by the word order and to emphasize the significance of the c-command relation for scope assignment in YA.

4.4 Constituent negation and its scope assignment:

In general, local/constituent negation can obtain only narrow scope readings. Haegeman (1995) distinguishes local from sentential negation in English by highlighting the capability of the latter to trigger subject-auxiliary inversion, she argues that since constituent negation yields only narrow scope readings, they are not sentential operators. In YA, we do not have such a distinction but local negation is distinguished from sentential negation by employing a different negative element bala 'with no' or badoon 'without'. Consider this example:

18. safiru bala shunat (AbD)

travel.past.3mp with no bags

'They traveled without bags.'

The narrow scope reading of bala can be demonstrated by the following example:

ever-their travel.past.3mp with no bags

'They have ever traveled without bags.'

ṣumr is not licensed by a c-commanding negative operator but by a clause-mate sentential negative marker. The ungrammaticality of (19) indicates that bala 'with no' does not have a sentential scope. This behavior emphasizes the observation that the scope of bala-NP is restricted to its local domain.

To conclude, evidence from constituent negation also falls in line with the claim that negation cannot present any ambiguity and c-command relation is crucial. Other evidence will be provided by the data in the next section.

4.5 The scope interaction between negation and quantifiers:

The main concern of this section is to discuss the scope of quantifiers in connection to negation. Before proceeding with the discussion, let us consider some of the properties of the universal quantifier kull 'all'. This term is construed as a collective and distributive quantifier based on the context in which it appears. The distinction that holds between these two items is dependent on the subsequent DP, especially its number feature, i.e. the distributive reading is obtained by [kull+NP₃] and the collective reading by [kull+NP₉]. Consider these examples:

20. kull talib shal kitaab

every student take.past.3ms book

'Every student took a book.'
It is worth highlighting that there is no distinction held between distributive construals in YA as in the case of English. In English, as discussed by Beghelli and Stowell (1997) (henceforth B&S), distributivity is captured by the existence of two distinct words in the lexicon, each and every; the reading obtained by each is stronger than the one obtained by every. In YA, this distinction is not available in view of the fact that there is only one construal expressing both the distributive and the collective construal. The lack of such distinction has some consequences on the behavior of these quantifiers in the context of negation, as will be examined in this section.

The focus in this section will not be on examining the distributive vs. collective readings and the various ways of expressing them or the scope of quantifiers with respect to each other, but it will be on the interaction between these quantifiers and negation.

To begin with, let us consider the following examples:

22. a. mish kulla-hum gaw
   neg all-them come.past.3mp

   'Not all of them came.'

b. kulla-hum mish gaw
   all-them neg come.past.3mp
'All of them did not come.'

In (22a), negation has scope wider than the quantifier in the subject position, but in (22b) the quantifier scopes over negation. I argue that word order determines the scope of negation in YA. If the word order does not change the interpretation of these sentences or if the same interpretation is yielded by the two examples, we can conclude that negation scopes over the quantifier in the two sentences. Nevertheless, these sentences give two different readings. Consider the interpretations for (22a) where negation scopes over the quantifier:

23. It is not the case that all of them came. (some of them did not come)

(22b) yields the following interpretation where the quantifier scopes over negation:

24. It is the case that none of them came. (all of them, not some did not come)

Notice that the scopal order of negation and quantifiers matches their word order, the operator that comes first invariably scopes over the other. Without exception, the semantic representation is the image of the syntactic derivation.

In logic, when negation has sentential scope, it is signaled as \( \neg > S \), which means that negation has always wide scope over the entire sentence. The facts presented so far are far from being captured in terms of logic. Scope assignment is a complex linguistic phenomenon that cannot be approached solely from a semantic or syntactic point of view or in terms of logic. Scopal aspects, at least as they appear to me, are subject to parametric variations. The scope of negation in English is more inclined to be determined at LF or semantics, but in YA, word order is probably the optimal candidate.
that can define the scope of negation. In fact, the simplest syntactic relation that holds here is c-command. The data presented so far fall in line with this observation that negation in YA scopes over all the elements that appear in the field of its c-commanding domain.

YA, compared to Hungarian, also involves overt scope assignment. However, quantifiers do not always move to a specific position in order to determine their scopal relations, the quantifier can scope from its original position and cannot extend its scope beyond that position. Although, Hungarian shares with YA the aspect of determining scope by word order, it has to move quantifiers to higher positions if they have wide scope. Consider this example:

25. a. Sok ember mindenkit felhivott. (from Szabolcsi 1997:27)

   many man everyone.Acc up-called

   'Many men phoned everyone'

   =many men>everyone

b. Mindenkit sok ember felhivott.

   everyone.Acc many man up-called

   'Many men phoned everyone'

   =Everyone>many men

According to Szabolcsi, the scopal order of quantifiers matches their left-to-right order. The quantifier that has a wide scope moves to a higher position and so forth.
So far, I have been discussing the interaction between negation and the collective construal avoiding its distributive counterpart. It is worth noting that the collective quantifier is not restricted to a particular position in the context of negation, i.e. it can alternate among various positions such as SubP, presumably Spec, TP and Spec, vP, etc, on the one hand (see Benmamoun 1999). On the other hand, the distributive quantifier is not free to alternate in the context of negation; it is not allowed in the subject position at all. Consider this example:

26. a. kull wahad qara? kitaab
   every one read.past.3ms book
   'Everyone read a book.'

   b. *mish kull wahad qara? kitaab
      neg every one read a book
      'Everyone did not read a book.'

   c. *kull wahad mish qara? kitaab
      every one neg read.past.3ms book
      'Everyone did not read book.'

(26b) can be rescued if the distributive quantifier appears as a part of a relative clause, but not (26c). Notice that only a narrow scope reading is obtained by (27a).

27. a. mish kull wahad qara? kitaab assabah Yalim
neg every one  read.past.3ms a book  become.past.3ms scientist

(lit. ‘Not every one reads a book becomes a scientist.’)

b. *kull wahad mish qara? kitaab assabah  ?alim

neg every one  read.past.3ms a book  become.3ms scientist

The incompatibility of negation and the distributive quantifier in the subject position looks like a puzzle. Take into account that the occurrence of the quantifier in the object position is compatible with negation. Unfortunately, no generalization can be formulated here that bans the distributive quantifier in the subject position in the context of negation. Consider this example, which illustrate the distributive quantifier in the object position:

28. a. ?inda kull talib kitaab

give.past.1s every student  book

‘He gave every student a book.’

b. mish ?inda kull talib kitaab

neg  give.past.3ms every student  book

‘He did not give every student a book.’

With regard to the occurrence of the quantifier in the object position, B&S (1997) argue that the structure every-DP ranges over a set of variables, thus, negation is expected to range over each variable in the set. However, it is not always the case in YA. Notice
that example (28b) is not the opposite of (28a) because (28b) does not produce a reading in which every member in the set is negated. Consider this configuration:

```
29. ¬
   a
   b
   c
   d
```

Significantly, ambiguity is not presented by such examples and we always get one reading in which negation scopes over the quantifier. B&S (1997) claim that the distributive quantifier in the object position cannot scope over negation because it introduces a set variable, which gets bound by the closest potential binder available. In this context, the negative quantifier is the closest unselective quantifier, which ends up in Spec, NegP and can fulfill this requirement. The crucial point is that the occurrence of the distributive construal in the object position in the presence of a sentential negative marker prevents the quantifier from taking a wide scope or moving to the distributive phrase, which is generated above negation as illustrated in this structure. (This structure is from B&S 1997:2):
Therefore, sentences in which negation scopes over DistQP are grammatical.

Consider this example:

    (from B&S 1997: 29a and 32a)

b. One boy did not read every book.

The situation in YA is quite tricky because, though negation scopes over DistQP, it does not bind the set variable introduced by DistP.

---

18 RefP=reference phrase, GQP=group denoting quantifier phrase, NGQ=negalive quantifier phrase, CQP=counting quantifier phrase, D/DistQP=distributive quantifier phrase.
Turning to the distributive QP in the subject position, B&S (1997) claim that negation cannot comply with a distributive construal in this position when neither the quantifier nor the negated verb is focused. A neutral, non-focused intonation will render the sentence ungrammatical:

32. a.?? Every boy did not leave.

b.?? Each boy did not leave.

Apart from this, the presence of an overt GQP such as one book in the object position rescues the sentence. Consider this example:

33. a. Every boy did not read one book.

b. Each boy did not read one book.

To account for this behavior, B&S claim that DistP, which is occupied by the DQP activates ShareP with [+share feature]. The presence of a GQP in the object position guarantees the checking process but its absence produces structures, such as (32). This explanation does not solve the problem in YA. The presence of a GQP in the object position does not rescue the grammaticality of this type of sentences.

34. a.*kull wahad ma-raah-sh

   every one  neg-go.past.3ms -neg

   'Everyone did not go/leave

b.??mish kull wahad qara? kitaab

   neg   every one   read.past.3ms  book

   'Everyone did not read a book.'
This behavior gives rise to two possibilities: i) either YA cannot be explained along the same lines of English due to some parametric variations or ii) the claim that DistP activates ShareP is not correct. I will leave this issue open for future research.

To summarize, I have discussed the scope of negation in relation to quantifiers. The discussion provides evidence for the main claim in this chapter that the scope of quantifiers and negation is determined overtly by word order. I also discuss the incompatibility between distributive quantifier in the subject position and negation.

4.6 Narrow scope readings in the context of association with focus:

In view of the above data and in anticipation of the following discussion, the claim that the scope of negation is unambiguous still stands. Although, the earlier discussion complies with the claim that the scope of negation in YA is determined by word order, the data in this section divert slightly from this claim for some exceptional reasons. There appear to be some cases that contradict the previous generalization, i.e. the semantic interpretation differs from the syntactic representation. The norm is that the NegP takes scope over everything within its c-commanding domain. Yet, in certain contexts, negation takes a narrow scope reading irrespective of its high position. Consider this example:

35. a. mish sabanat althiyab ba sabuun.

   neg  wash.past.3fs the clothes with soap

   'She did not wash the clothes with soap.'

b. mish qata'at saba'i' ba sakeen
neg cut.past.1s finger-my with knife

'I did not cut my finger with a knife.'

The PP is the only element that appears in the scope of negation. The readings of (35) are given in (36) respectively, in which the PP can appear in some cleft constructions:

36. a. It is not with soap that she washed the clothes.
   b. *It is the clothes that she washed with a soap.
   c. It is not with a knife that I cut my finger.
   d. *It is not my finger that I cut with a knife.

The asterisk sentences demonstrate that only the PP can occur in cleft constructions while other elements cannot.

Similar structures in English can be ambiguous between wide and narrow scope interpretations, in:

37. I did not cut my salami with a hacksaw.

(37) can have two interpretations, as in:

38. a. It is not the case that I cut my salami with a knife.
   b. It is the case that I cut my salami without a knife.

This phenomenon is known in the literature as association with focus. The point that is relevant for our discussion is that when negation is associated with a focused
constituent, it scopes only over that constituent while the other elements, such as the verb are out of the scope of negation.

For instance, (35b) can give rise to the following presupposition:

39. I cut my finger with something else (not a knife).

This reading denotes that the instrument used in the process of cutting is not a *knife* but something else. Association with focus seems to be a sort of contrastive focus; the element that is associated with focus presupposes that there is another element involved though it is not lexically realized.

Contexts in which negation is associated with focus in YA give only narrow scope readings of negation. It is also indicated that negation does not give rise to ambiguity and the verb is always interpreted outside the scope of negation. This behavior does not weaken our claim because it applies only under certain circumstances.

4.7 Negative Raising:

Neg(ative) Raising or Neg-transportation is a process that refers to the availability of two negative interpretations in the context of non-factive verbs. The predominant claim about Neg-Raising depends on the idea that negation raises from the embedded clause to the matrix clause and one of the negative features is absorbed or deleted. Non-factive predicates such as *believe, think*, etc. are known to be one of the triggers of Neg-Raising phenomenon because they present ambiguity in the context of negation.

40. Max does not believe that Tom will leave.

The ambiguity results in two readings with wide and narrow scope, as in:

41. a. It is not the case that Max believes that Tom will leave.
b. Max believes that Tom won’t leave.

Thus, ambiguity and co-derivation associate this class of verbs. Horn (1989/2001)\(^{19}\) attempts to group verbs, which principally express non-factive propositions, into five semantic classes (this from Horn 2001:56):

42. a. Opinion: think, believe, suppose, imagine, expect, reckon, feel, (%guess, %anticipate)

b. Perception: seem, appear, look like, sound like, feel like

c. Probability: be probable, be likely, figure to

d. Intention/volition: want, intend, choose, plan

e. Judgment/ (weak) obligation: be supposed to, ought, should, be desirable, advise, suggest

In accordance with this, Neg-raising triggers might not range outside the confines of this taxonomy cross-linguistically. However, exceptions are possible due to parametric variations. Taking into account that this classification is cross-linguistically applicable with only minor disparity, I will examine its workability to YA. Notice that non-factive predicates in this language are expressed by various categories such as verbs, nouns, adjectives and nominal verbs. Let us now consider the first class instantiated by the verb *yaṣṭaqīd* ‘think’:

43. a.ṣṭaqīd anu-h ma-bigi-sh alyawoom

think.1s that-3ms neg-fut.come.3ms-neg today

‘I think that he is not coming today.’

b. maʔaʔtaqid-sh annu-h bigi alyawoom

neg-think.pres.1s-neg that-3ms fut.come.3ms today

‘I do not think that he will come today.’

The realization of negation in the matrix clause widens the negative scope unlike when it is realized in the embedded clause. (43b) is ambiguous, but (43a) is not. The former can be interpreted in two ways with wide and narrow scope reading of negation:

44. a. I think it is not the case that that he is coming today.

b. It is not the case that I think he is coming today.

To identify the availability of Neg-raisers and the wide/narrow scope readings, a number of diagnostics are generally employed in the literature. In English, tag questions and the licensing of NPIs in the subject position are proved to be effective. In French, other tests can be applied such as imperfectivity, tag questions, corrective responses, negative particles, and negative polarity items (for more discussion on French, see Prince 1976). In spite of this, these tests cannot all apply to YA except the negative polarity test. This diagnostic is the only test that I will apply here because it can capture the variation thoroughly. The licensing of NPIs requires the presence of a clause-mate negative marker positioned in a c-commanding location. Consider this:

45. maʔaʔtaqid-sh ann (aiy) had bigi alyawoom.
I do not think that anyone will come today.'

The question that remains vague is concerned with the actual licenser of the NPI in the embedded clause. Is it the overt negative marker in the matrix clause or the abstract negative feature in Spec, CP? If the second alternative is right, then, how is the abstract negative feature generated?

46. *?aśtaqid ann (aiy) had ma-bigi-sh alyawoom

think.pres.1s that any one neg-fut.come.3ms.neg today.

(46) illustrates the failure of negation to license an NPI in the subject position. This behavior offers relatively supporting arguments in favor of Partee (1970)20 who argues that a pair like this is not the same:

47. a. A does not believe that S.

b. A believes that not S. (from Horn 2001:48)

She claims that (47a) is ambiguous between narrow and wide scope negative readings, but not (47b), a behavior identical to YA. Klooster (2003) points out that the acquisition of wide scope is anticipated by the ability of the Neg-raisers to select CP with an abstract negative feature (see section 4.8).

On the other hand, verbs of perception such as seem are expressed by nominal and adjectival categories. Consider these examples:

20 As reported in Horn (2001).
48. a. shaklu-h ma-bisafer-sh sana’a

shape-his neg-fut.travel.3ms-neg sana’a

‘It seems that he is not traveling to Sana’a.’

b. bayin annu-h ma-bisafer-sh sana’a

shown that-3ms neg-fut.travel.3ms-neg sana’a

‘It seems that he is not traveling to Sana’a.’

In spite of the selection of a non-verbal category, the so-called Neg-raising is possible as is the case with the previous class.

Along the same lines, verbs of probability are also expressed by either the adjective muhtamal or the noun ahtimaal. Nevertheless, Neg-raising is illicit, i.e. negation is always placed in the embedded clause and is barred from the positions, which are contiguous to the probability constituents. Consider this example:

49. a. muhtamal/ahtimaal annu-h ma-yatasil-sh bi-nihna

probable that-3ms neg-call.pres.3ms-neg with-we

‘It is probable that he will not call us.’

b.*mush muhtamal/ahtimaal annu-h yatasil bi-nihna

neg probable that-he call.pres.3ms with-we

‘It is not probable that he will call us.’
The probability constructions are not negative raising triggers, given that they cannot co-occur with negation in the matrix clause. Consequently, no structural ambiguity or any alternation in the negative readings is yielded.

On the other hand, generating negation in the complement of verbs of intention such as *want* is not possible in YA; however, it does not prevent negation in the matrix clause from extending its scope over the embedded clause. Consider these examples:

50. a. ma-ashtii-sh adrus tib
   neg-want.pres.1s-neg study.inf.1s medicine
   'I do not want to study medicine.'

   b.*ashti ma-adrus-sh tib
   want.pres.1s neg-study.inf.1s-neg medicine.
   'I want to not study medicine.'

Negation in the matrix clause can also license an NPI in the infinitival clause, as in (51):

51. a. ma-ashtii-sh *(aiy) had yaklim-na
   neg-want.pres.1s-neg any one talk.inf.3ms-us
   'I do not want anyone to speak with me.'

   b. ma-ashtii-sh ?a?tii-hum *(aiy) hagah
   neg-want.pres.1s-neg give.inf.1s-them any thing
'I do not want to give them anything.'

As known, only Neg-raising verbs exhibit this behavior, the constraints on the occurrence of negation in the embedded clause might be ascribed to the selection properties of yashti, which do not select negative complements.

Verbs of strong and weak obligation will be discussed separately due to the crucial variations that hold among them. I will initially discuss the modal verb lazim 'obligatory/must'. Consider these examples:

52. a. mish/mush lazim taqulla-hum anna-k kasrata-ha
   neg obligatory 2.tell.ms-them that-2ms break.past.2ms-it
   'It is not obligatory to tell them that you broke it.'

b. *lazim mush/mish taqulla-hum anna-k kasrata-ha
   obligatory neg tell.inf.2ms-them that-2ms break.past.2ms-it

The ungrammaticality of (52b) is attributed to the intervention of the negative marker between lazim and the non-finite verb. Since lazim behaves as a modal verb, it does not select CP complements; therefore, ambiguity does not arise.

On the other hand, verbs of weak obligation like yansah 'advise' exhibit an identical behavior to Neg-raisers. A categorial distinction holds among these types of verbs as illustrated by the previous examples. yansah 'advice' is not a modal verb and it can take a clausal complement, therefore, negation can alternate between the embedded and the matrix clauses.
53. a. ?ansaha-k ma-truh-sh alkulyah
   advise.1s-you neg-go.inf.2ms-neg the college
   ‘I advise you not to go to the college.’

b. ma-ansaha-k-sh taruuh alkulayah
   neg-advice.pres.2ms-you-neg go.inf.2ms the college
   ‘I do not advise you to go to the college.’

The verb ansah is out of the scope of negation in (53a), this sentence cannot have
a reading in which negation scopes over the verb in the matrix clause given that NPIs are
not licensed in the object position of the verb ansah. Consider this example:

54. *?ansah aiy had ma-yaruh-sh alkulyah
   advise.pres.1s anyone neg-go.inf.3ms-neg the college
   ‘(Lit. I advise anyone not to go to the college.)’

It is significant to point out that the force of negation is affected by distance. In other
words, the force of negation in the embedded clause becomes stronger than when
negation is realized in the matrix clause. This claim rests on the assumption that negation
is strengthened when it is contiguous to the constituent that it logically negates, as (53)
illustrates. When negation is realized in the embedded clause, it brings into focus the
verb truh ‘go’.
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The goal of this section is to shed light on the classification made by Horn (2001) on the dichotomy of negative raising predicates in English with contrast to YA. It provides a detailed description of the phenomenon in relation to the scope of negation. It was demonstrated that not all the semantic classes of negative raising verbs in Horn (2001) are negative raisers in YA. A summary of these observations is given in table 3:

Table 3

A Summary of Negative Raising Verbs in YA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The semantic class</th>
<th>Negative raisers</th>
<th>Non-negative raisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligation</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To sum up, I have discussed the semantic dichotomy of Negative raising verbs in YA in the light of Horn (2001). The table demonstrates that probability and strong obligation predicates are excluded from the classification. It is also illustrated that the scope of negation is extended when negation is realized in the matrix clause, a behavior that is only restricted to these predicates. Remarkably, these verbs emphasize that our claim regarding the determination of the scope of negation at the syntactic level is on the right track since negation in the matrix clause scopes over the embedded clause while it cannot when it is realized in the embedded clause.

4.8 A review of some seminal work:

In this section, I will discuss two recent proposals relevant to the phenomenon under investigation. The discussion will begin with highlighting some of the major points of some recent works, in particular Klooster (2003); an approach to Neg-raising within the MP framework and Moscati (2006); an Agree-based approach to the scope of negation

4.8.1 Klooster (2003):

Klooster attempts to establish an account within the early minimalist framework (Chomsky, 1995) for the Neg-Raising phenomenon, which has only been discussed within the late generative grammar and GB theory. His main arguments depend on rejecting the previous accounts that built on the assumption that certain semantic classes of verbs involve a negative operator hosted in their clausal complement. According to him, Neg-Raising phenomenon is faulty and does not exist and the diagnostics proposed in the literature such as Tag Question have nothing to do with Neg-Raising; they are concerned with determining the difference between negative and positive sentences, and
do not necessarily identify negative raising verbs. Based on some analogous aspects that hold between negative raising verbs and inherently negative verbs such as *doubt, deny... etc*, he claims that these verbs select CP complements, which can contain an abstract NEG operator in the specifier position. These observations appeal to the checking mechanism in order to dispense with one of the negative features. Particularly, he assumes that a mechanism called Negative Absorption, proposed by Klima (1964) and expanded by Haegeman (1995) for the Negative Concord phenomenon, is responsible for deleting one of the negative features. In other words, Klooster argues that Negative Raising involves two negative operators; one of them is abstract, as is the case with Negative Concord, which has two lexical negative operators. Then, at a particular point in the derivation, especially at LF, an operation called Negative Absorption takes place to absorb one of those negative features.

In view of this discussion, Klooster suggests that the subordinate clause of any negative raising trigger is endowed with an abstract negative operator. So the embedded clause undergoes a covert movement and adjoins to the highest overt negative operator in the matrix clause, as in (55):

55. I do [NegP [[cp NEG [...]] not] [Neg Neg think t CP]]. (from Klooster 2003: 49)

As illustrated by (55), the embedded CP moves to Spec, NegP to check and delete a feature called [+PNA] (+ Pleonastic NEG Absorption), as according to Klooster (2003). Notice that this feature is particularly dependent on the presence of sentential negative marker or an n-word with a wide negative scope.
To recap, the Negative Raising phenomenon in Klooster’s terms is a by-product of feature checking; apparently his ideas are built chiefly on Chomsky (1995), therefore, reviewing this claim in the light of the Agree mechanism of Chomsky (2000, 2001) will definitely dispense with the displacement requirement.

Now let us throw some light on one of the syntactic accounts for the scope of negation.

4.8.2 Moscati (2006):

Moscati (2006) presents a novel account to the scope of negation in English and Romance languages basing his ideas on Pesetsky and Torrego (2007) (henceforth P&T) and Cheng (1991). He attempts to assemble two main theories (GB and Minimalism) by correlating Clause Typing Hypothesis with Agree. In other words, he argues that a clause can be typed with a negative feature as is the case with interrogative sentences, then, this feature establishes a probe-goal relation with a clause internal negative feature so that valuing this feature widens the scope of negation.

Let us consider the original version of Clause Typing Hypothesis (Cheng, 1991) as noted in Moscati (2006):

56. Clause Typing Hypothesis (CTH): (from Moscati 2006:92)

Every clause needs to be typed.

It is worth highlighting that a clause is typed with a negative feature when there is a negative phrase or an n-word that has wide scope. Consider this:
This proposal is based on a number of significant concepts:

First, the principle of CTH, which has been modified and restricted to the root position of the clause.


Root must host an appropriate valued typing feature where root can be ForceP or FinP.

Second, the process of typing takes place via Agree mechanism basing mainly on P&T (2007)\textsuperscript{21}.

Third, the Thesis of Radical Interpretability (TRI) (Brody, 1997) has been revisited in order to dispense with the structural ambiguity associated with scope. The definition implies that there can be more than one interpretable instance of F giving rise to ambiguity.

\textsuperscript{21} See sub-section 4.8.1
59. Thesis of Radical Interpretability (TRI):

Each feature must receive a semantic interpretation in some syntactic location.

(Brody, 1997 as noted in Moscati 2006)

This thesis is modified as in (60) in order to avoid the ambiguity raised by the previous one:

60. Thesis of radical interpretability revisited:

Each feature must receive exactly one semantic interpretation in some syntactic location.

To examine the hypothesis on empirical grounds, consider the following:

61. El l'ha scrivuu no
s.cl. s.cl written neg

Milanese
(from Moscati 2006: 123)

'He hasn't written.'

Since the negative marker no has wide scope, according to the CTH, an uninterpretable, unvalued feature indicated by u [], is generated in ForceP in order to type the clause with a negative feature. Then, it establishes a probe-goal relation with an interpretable and valued negative feature, denoted by i[val], in NegP in order to get valuation and yield a wide scope interpretation. Consider this example:
There are many cases in which the scope of negation cannot be determined in a straightforward fashion. That is, in some contexts, it can alternate and obtain inverse readings like in the context of modality; negation is mostly associated with two readings (wide and narrow). Consider this example:

63. El ga` de studia` no  

s.cl must of to-study neg

a. he is not required to study.  \(\neg \rightarrow \Box\)

b. he is required not to study.  \(\Box \rightarrow \neg\)

The probe-goal relation is not established and syntax seems to be blind to this process. Therefore, a negative feature in ForceP can switch between \([\ ]\) and \([\text{val}]\) at LF. The direct insertion of a valued feature and the assignment of wide scope dispenses with the requirement of valuing the negative feature in ForceP. Notice that TRI articulated in (60) stipulates that there is only one interpretable feature sent to the semantic component.
to circumvent ambiguity. The possibility of a direct insertion of an interpretable instance of F in ForceP will result in two interpretable instances of the same negative feature at LF; therefore, ambiguity will arise again. In particular, two interpretable instances of F give rise to ambiguity, so the problem still stands.

The other issue that encounters CTH is raised by NQ, principally when they appear in the object position within the verbal phase.

64. He met nobody.

The question that arises is that how negation takes wide scope in that position and how it can escape the PIC. Consider (65):

\[
\text{65. } \\
\text{ForceP} \\
\hspace{1cm} [u \text{ Neg}] \\
\hspace{1cm} \cdots \cdots \\
\hspace{1cm} vP \\
\hspace{1cm} v' \\
\hspace{1cm} [+\text{neg}] \\
\text{NegQ} \\
\text{Nobody i[\text{val}]} \\
\]

According to Moseati (2006), an u[ ] negative feature is inserted in Spec, vP in order to become accessible to the probe in ForceP. Although, this assumption dispenses with the previous claim in the literature that requires the
NQ to move to Spec, NegP at LF to take wide scope, the insertion of a valued negative feature in Spec, vP looks like a movement of a feature rather than a direct insertion.

To recap, three factors participate in typing a clause with a negative feature:

i) A sentential negative marker

ii) An n-word that takes a sentential scope

iii) A direct insertion of a valued negative feature at LF.

This version of clause typing hypothesis adopted by Moscati does not take into account Neg-Raising phenomenon. It does not state clearly how the ambiguity raised by Neg-Raising verbs can be accounted for. Particularly, if we accept the idea that typing is a bottom-up operation triggered by a negative element. Consider this:

66. He does not imagine that Max will lift a finger to help.

Sentences of this type will always have two readings with wide and narrow scope of negation. Two questions arise to CTH with this respect. First, how can CTH capture the alternation between wide and narrow scope of negation within the sentence? Second, what licenses the NPI in the embedded clause; however, it cannot be typed by negation? Put differently, if there is no overt negative element in the embedded clause, it will be read declarative and cannot be typed with a negative feature since the possibility of inserting a valued negative feature at LF is also dependent on a lower negative operator.

Further, there are languages such as YA where the scope of negation is determined by the word order and ambiguity is absent in negative environments. So, CTH is not required here. Consider this example:
67. kull al'ayaal ma-la'abuu-sh kurah.

All the boys neg-play.past.3ms-neg football

'All the boys did not play football.'

In YA, negation cannot scope over the quantifier phrase in the subject position where its scope is restricted to the c-commanding domain. According to CTH, the u[ ] negative feature in ForceP will probe for valuation and the moment it locates an i[ val] negative feature in NegP, it gets valued and the scope of negation is consequently widened. In that case, negation will scope over the quantifier in YA, which is not true. In brief, establishing a unified account for the scope of negation based on CTH does not apply to YA and does not explain properly the scopal aspects of negation or it can be said that CTH does not work for languages that determine their scope by word order.

To sum up, I have discussed some of the recent proposals that tackled Negative Raising and the scope of negation and I have highlighted some of their issues and examined their workability to the phenomenon under investigation. Since the scope of negation in YA is determined by word order and scope ambiguity in the context of negation is not obtained, Moscati’s proposal for the scope of negation is not required.

In the following section, I attempt to provide an account for Neg-Raising phenomenon in YA in the sense of P&T (2007) given that the scope of negation is determined overtly. The proposal, I pursue, depends on the idea that adopts a direct insertion of a valued negative feature in the Spec of the embedded clause by virtue of the presence of a negative element in the matrix clause.
4.9 Feature valuation and Neg-raising phenomenon:

Klooster's proposal for Neg-Raising tackles the phenomenon by using the feature checking mechanism (Chomsky, 1995). He claims that Neg-Raising is a consequence of checking the [+PNA] feature, which takes place through moving the entire subordinate CP to Spec, NegP in the matrix clause. In the recent minimalist trends, movement that is only driven by an edge feature becomes a last resort and the checking of uninterpretable features takes place locally via Agree. This makes Klooster's proposal untenable. Nevertheless, the idea that Neg-Raising verbs/predicates take a complement that hosts a negative feature in CP position seems plausible. The questions that seek an answer are: how is one of the two features deleted since we can get only one negative interpretation at LF? And how can we do without resorting to displacement to eliminate one of those features? To answer these questions, let us first sketch some of the recent proposals of the syntax of features.

4.9.1 Chomsky (2001) and Pesetsky and Torrego (2007):

Chomsky (2001) argues that uninterpretable features enter the derivation without values while interpretable features are valued. The crucial idea of Agree is to establish a relation between uninterpretable and unvalued features and interpretable and valued features called probe-goal relation. For instance, Tcomp will function as a probe since it has a set of uninterpretable phi-features and an EPP feature while nouns function as proper goals since they have a set of interpretable phi-features. Notice that goals must be active at least by having an uninterpretable feature otherwise the probe cannot locate it and it will not participate in a probe-goal relation. Agree determines the relation of these uninterpretable features and determines their elimination from the narrow syntax.
The main purpose of the probe-goal relation is to eliminate the uninterpretable unvalued features from the narrow syntax through assigning values to them. Chomsky (2001, p. 5) states:

"The natural principle is that uninterpretable features, and only these, enter the derivation without values, and are distinguished from interpretable features by virtue of this property. Their values are determined by Agree, at which point the feature must be deleted from narrow syntax (or they will be indistinguishable from interpretable features at LF) but left available for the phonology (since they may have phonetic effects)."

There are two types of features in Chomsky’s (2001) framework: i) uninterpretable/unvalued and ii) interpretable/valued. The valuation of the uninterpretable features is a syntactic process determined by Agree mechanism. P&T (2007) argue against the association of valuation with interpretability, according to them, it is vacuous and redundant. They offered a proposal that is concerned with the inclusion of two more features to the derivation. They claimed that the lexical entry of v is unvalued for number and person but valued for tense (+PAST, +PRESENT). Valuation of a feature is a process that must take place at syntax while semantics is only concerned with interpretability. The novelty of the account lies in the suggestion that agreement is sharing of features that produces one instance of a feature shared by two locations.

68. Agree (feature sharing version) (from P&T 2007:5)

(i) An unvalued feature F (a probe) on a head H at syntactic location α (Fa) scans its c-command domain for another instance of F (a goal) at location β (Fβ) with which to agree.

(ii) Replace Fa with Fβ, so that the same feature is present in both locations.
The difference between feature sharing and feature assignment is that the former gives rise to more possibilities. For instance, Agree between two unvalued features becomes possible in the former.

69. **Notation for feature sharing**

(from P&T 2007:6)

\[ F[73]...F[73]...F_{val}[73]..F[73] \]

The proposal of P & T allows for four types of features:

70. i) Uninterpretable, valued \( u[\text{val}] \)

ii) Uninterpretable, unvalued \( u[\ ] \)

iii) Interpretable, valued \( i[\text{val}] \)

iv) Interpretable, unvalued \( i[\ ] \).

Among these types, only unvalued features can act as probe. Further, P&T (2007) also argue that the deletion of uninterpretable features does not apply to an occurrence of a feature but only to instances of that occurrence because semantics can be satisfied with only one interpretable instance of F. This claim is built on the TRI condition, which requires instances of features to be interpretable at the semantic interface and does not stipulate that every instance of the feature must be interpretable.

---

22 Unvalued features are indicated by an empty pair of brackets \([\ ]\), and 73 is an arbitrary number indicating that features share the same feature irrespective of being assigned valuations.
4.9.2 The proposal:

According to Klooster (2003) as mentioned above, negative raising verbs select a CP endowed with an abstract negative operator that has +PNA feature. In order to check this feature, the embedded CP moves to Spec, NegP where this feature is deleted or absorbed. If this proposal is on the right track, I will adopt the idea that negative raising verbs endow the embedded CP with an abstract negative feature. Further, I claim that this feature is u[val]. Keep in mind that syntax is concerned with valuation while semantics can see only interpretability. Endowing the embedded CP with an uninterpretable/valued negative feature is syntactic in nature and is justified by the capacity of the complement of a Neg-raiser to license an NPI. Consider this example:

71. I do not think that Mary left until nine.

In this example until is a strict NPI that is licensed in the context of negation but here it is allowed in the context of negative raising predicates. This means that the embedded clause has a negative interpretation too. I assume that the presence of a valued negative feature in the embedded CP renders the sentence nonveridical so this creates a proper environment for the licensing of NPIs, this proposal will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

The predominant idea of Neg-Raising builds on the assumption that these predicates involve the presence of two negative features: one is overt and the other is covert or abstract. Klooster’s (2003) proposal was set entirely to explain how one of these features is eliminated where his claim is based mainly on movement for checking. What I assume here is that the embedded CP hosts an u[val] negative feature while the matrix clause has j[val] negative one, therefore, only one negative interpretation is obtained;
LF. This assumption is in line with the thesis of full interpretation and does not violate the TRI. Since the TRI requires at least one interpretable instance of F to satisfy the semantic component. Consider (60), which is repeated here for convenience as (72):

72. Thesis of Radical Interpretability:

Each feature must receive exactly one semantic interpretation in some syntactic location.

Furthermore, the idea that syntax is blind to interpretability and sensitive to valuation indicates that the uninterpretability of a feature does not qualify it as a proper probe. It is the absence of valuation, which can establish a probe-goal relation. Consequently, this feature does not need to probe.

The significance of this proposal lies in reducing the burden of the computational system through reducing the number of movements, i.e. negation is interpreted in the matrix clause without the trigger of another movement at LF in order to eliminate one of the negative features. The reason is that we have only one negative feature with two instances. The following configuration illustrates the claim:

73. $\left[ TP \left[ T^0 \left[ Neg^o \left[ i[val] \right] \left[ Neg^o \left[ vP \left[ v^o \left[ CP u[val] \right] + neg \left[ c^0 \left[ TP \left[ T^0 \left[ vP \left[ ... \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \]

The $i[val]$ negative feature in the matrix clause does not probe for valuation since it is valued in its position. The other feature in the embedded clause is also valued so syntax is satisfied at the two locations. Notice that the TRI stipulates that one semantic interpretation of a feature at a particular location satisfies semantics.
4.10 Conclusion:

In this chapter, a detailed discussion of all the aspects related to the scope of negation in Yemeni Arabic has been included. I argue that the scope of negation in YA is reflected by the linear order of the negative marker with respect to the other elements in the sentence. Consequently, no structural ambiguity is detected as examined.

I have discussed some recent analyses such as Klooster's (2003) and Moscati's (2006) proposals. It is revealed that the scope of negation in YA does not require typing a negative feature in ForceP because it is determined by word order. Negation always scopes over its c-commanding domain and any element placed higher than NegP is not counted to be within its scope. Consequently, typing a clause with a valued negative feature has nothing to do with the scope of negation in YA. In the last section, I attempt to offer an analysis for Neg-Raising through incorporating insightful ideas from P&T (2007). I claim that Neg-Raising predicates select a CP with an u[val] negative feature so that explains the licensing of NPIs in the embedded clause.