Chapter Three

The Syntax of Sentential Negation in Yemeni Arabic

3.1 Introduction:

The present chapter is devoted to the discussion and analysis of the system of sentential negation in YA. It discusses the syntactic properties and the behavior of negative markers with respect to other elements in the structure. The discussion will focus on the negative particles that are used to express sentential negation, in particular on the different ways of expressing negation in four dialects in YA. These dialects capture most of the variation, if not all, in the syntax of negation in this language. It demonstrates that three negative markers express sentential negation: ma, mish and ma...sh, which indicates that there are two main systems of negation employed by these dialects: the one-part negative marker, which always occupies the pre-verbal position and the two-part/discontinuous negative marker. In this chapter, I will focus on the dialects that employ the two-part negative marker due to the interesting aspects that these dialects demonstrate.

The facts provided by the data show that previous analyses are inadequate to capture all the variation. Therefore, the analyses I provide depart from the previous ones, e.g. the one offered in Benmamoun (2000). I argue that NegP is positioned above TP, not above vP as claimed by Benmamoun. Moreover, I claim that the two-part negative marker is not generated in the same node, but in two separate functional nodes. This analysis explains in a straightforward manner the process of the merger between negation and other elements, and circumvents the conundrums raised by the previous analyses.
This chapter is organized as follows. In section 3.2, I provide a brief overview of the diachronic evolution of the negative markers where I examine the nature of negative markers through uncovering their historical roots in Classical Arabic (henceforth CA). It is demonstrated that *ma* is an inherent negative marker, while *sh* is not. In section 3.3, it is established that the negative markers in YA range between heads and adverbials, so they are generated in different functional nodes. Section 3.4 provides a detailed discussion of the position of NegP. I argue that *ma/mish* are basically positioned in the negative head while *sh* is originated in the Spec of a phrase I call *shP*. The discussion in section 3.5 focuses on auxiliaries and auxiliary-like elements. It investigates the various ways of incorporation between negation and these elements. In section 3.6, I argue that *sh* has an inert/weak focus feature to justify its incompatibility with focused constituents. In section 3.7, I discuss a novel syntactic phenomenon completely ignored by many authors who have worked on some Arabic dialects, namely, the expression of emphatic negation by the use of the negative conjunctive *wala*. Section 3.8 focuses on the mechanisms that drive the merger between negation and clitics. Section 3.9 throws some light on imperative sentences and it shows that negative imperatives have distinct forms from their positive counterparts. Section 3.10 concludes the discussion.

### 3.2 The etymology of the negative markers:

This section focuses on the diachronic development of the negative markers in YA. As was illustrated in the previous chapter, there are three forms of negative markers: *ma* in the Hadhrami dialect, *mish* in the Abyani dialect, and the discontinuous negative marker *ma...sh* in the Adeni and Taizi dialects. *Ma* is common among all dialects, while *sh* is not employed in some dialects such as the Hadhrami dialect and it is
obligatorily dropped in certain environments in the other dialects. The behavior of *sh* raises several questions about the semantic nature of this morpheme such as if *sh* is semantically negative, then, why it is incompatible with focus constituents and why the omission of *sh* does not affect the negativity of the sentence.

To answer these questions, we need to examine the syntactic and semantic properties of these negative markers in order to identify the accurate role of each element. First, I will discuss the properties of *ma* through shedding some light on its historical usage in CA. CA employs several negative markers, such as *ma, laa, lan, lam,* and *laysa* to express sentential negation. Negation in CA is known for its interaction with tense, i.e. tense is marked on the negative marker rather than the verb. The only element that has a neutral property is *ma,* it is not restricted to a certain tense and it can negate both verbal and nominal predicates. The following examples illustrate the behavior of each negative marker:

1. *lao yahibu allahu algahara bi assuwi?i*
   
   neg love.pres.3ms Allah.Nom the revelation with the evil.Gen
   
   'God does not like the revelation of evil.'

   As show, *lao* negates the present tense. Besides, it can negate nominal clauses:

2. *zaidun laa adeebun wala sha?irun*
   
   zaid.Nom neg author.Nom and not poet.Nom
   
   'Zaid is neither an author nor a poet.'

   *lan,* on the other hand, is employed to negate the future tense.

3. *lan naharibu ila ganibi-hum*
   
   neg.fut fight.3mp to side.Gen-their
‘We will not fight on their side.’

*lam* is used to negate the past tense. Consider this example:

4. lam yanfa‘ al-ammuma illa ?ibna?u-ha almaxlisuun

   neg.past help.3ms the nations.Acc except sons.Nom.its the faithful.Nom

   (Lit. there was no benefit to the nations except its faithful sons)

*laysa* is an inflected verb that negates nominal clauses:

5. laysa ?almu?min ba ta’aan

   neg.3ms the believer with slanderous

   ‘The believer is not slanderous.’

As mentioned above, *ma* compared to these elements is a neutral element. It can negate nominal and verbal clauses and it can occur with all tenses.

6. ...ma hatha basharan

   neg this human.Acc

   ‘This is not a human.’

Likewise, it can negate predicates in the past and present tense:

7. ma ga?ina min basheerin wala natheer

   neg come.past.3ms from herald and neg portent

   ‘A herald neither came to us nor a portent.’

8. ma ya’idhum ashshitaan ?illa yaruran

   neg promise.pres.3ms-them the satan except pride.Acc

   ‘The Satan does not promise them but pride/arrogance’.

I speculate that the neutral properties of *ma* saved this element from the extinction that happened to the other negative markers, which are totally eliminated from the system.
of negation in dialectal Arabic. This reveals that *ma* inherited its properties from CA though it does not negate nominal predicates anymore in YA.

The other negative marker *sh* is derived from the word *shiʔ* ‘thing’. This word is still used in its full form with a slight phonological change, i.e. the glottal stop is lost. It can occur in various types of sentences acting as an existential quantifier, or as an NPI and when it is preceded by the word *kull*, it acts as a universal quantifier. Consider these examples:

9. *shahadtu shiʔun ?ajeebun*

   *see.past.1s thing.Nom extraordinary.Nom*

   ‘I saw an extraordinary thing.’

10. *hal wagadata shiʔan?*

    *QP find.past.2m thing.Acc*

    ‘Did you find anything?’

11. *lam ?akul shiʔan.*

    *Neg.past eat.inf.1s thing.Acc*

    ‘I did not eat anything.’

12. *tarakta kull shiʔin*

    *leave.past.1s every thing.Gen*

    ‘I left everything.’

In some dialects of rural areas, *shiy* is used instead of *sh*. One of these dialects is called the Awuthali dialect studied by Adhuriabi (1998). Adhuriabi offers a detailed descriptive study of this dialect in Arabic and tackles all the syntactic and phonological
aspects including negation. According to him, the Awuthali dialect employs the two-part negative marker, which is composed of *ma...shiy. shiy*, according to him, emphasizes negation. Consider this example:

13. a. ma-talqa’i’ shiy badhila-ha.
   
   neg bite.pres.3fs thing with tail-its
   ‘It does not bite with its tail.’

b. ma-ni shiy dari aish taquul
   
   neg-1s thing know.part.1s what say.pres.2ms
   ‘I do not know/understand what you are saying.’

In both verbal and nominal sentences, *shiy* is employed as a negative marker to emphasize negation. The same as the dialects, which use the two-part negative marker, *shiy* is dropped in the contexts of emphasis. In the urban areas, such as Taiz and Aden, *shiy* is reduced to *sh*, an instance of grammaticalization.

There is also a history of the occurrence of *shiʔ* in negative contexts in Standard Arabic. Lucas (2009) presents some examples from Classical Arabic where *shiʔ/shiy* appears in negative contexts as a minimizer or a negative polarity item. In the examples below, *shiʔan* is employed as a minimizer to mean ‘not even a thing’ and to emphasize negation.

14. lā yaḍurr-u-kum kaydu-hum shiʔan
   
   neg harm.pres.3mp-you cunning.Nom-their thing.Acc
   ‘Their cunning will not harm you at all.’

---

8 Grammaticalization is a morpho-syntactic process that affects lexical words and turns them into clitics (Kemenade, 2007)
15. xalaqty-ka min qabli wa lam taku shay?an

Create.past.2ms-you from before.Gen and neg.past be.2ms thing.Acc
‘I created you before, when you were not even a thing (nothing).’

The transformation of sh?i? into sh did not affect its main function in the context of negation, i.e. to emphasize negation. The incompatibility of sh with focus constituents provides a strong piece of evidence to this claim as will be discussed later.

To conclude I argue that shiy is not semantically negative and it is used to reinforce negation and express emphasis. This claim is reinforced by the behavior of sh in the context of focus; sh is proved to be incompatible with inherently focused constituents.

3.3 The syntactic status of the negative markers:

Negative markers cross-linguistically are either adverbial elements or functional heads. This generalization is based on the behavior of these markers with respect to the other elements in the clause, especially the verbal heads. This section will address the syntactic status of the negative markers in YA.

Negative markers that appear in the preverbal position are claimed to exhibit a behavior identical to functional heads. However, the headedness of these markers varies in strength with respect to the capacity of blocking the movement of other heads and the capacity of negation to encliticize to other heads. These aspects are discussed at length in Zanuttini (1997, 2001), Rowlett (1998), Zeijlstra (2004), Ouhalla (1990) and others.

Earlier analyses patterned Arabic with French along the lines of Pollock (1989). French employs the two-part negative marker ne...pas as a way of expressing sentential negation. ne is treated as a weak head that cliticizes to the verb while pas as an adverbial
element. They have distinct categorial features that put them into different positions, i.e. *ne* is in Neg⁰ while *pas* is in the specifier of NegP. As known, *ne* in French is a weak head because it does not block head movement, but it encliticizes to it, while *pas* is categorized as an adverbial element. Therefore, *ne* is positioned in Neg⁰ and *pas* in Spec, NegP, as in:

16. 

```
          TP
            Spec
                T'
                  ne-V
                     NegP
                        pas
                            Neg'
                                ne-V
```

This analysis was adopted earlier for Arabic; *sh* is patterned with *pas* and *ma* with *ne*. Benmamoun (2000) and Aoun, Benmamoun and Choueiri (2010) argue against this proposal based on several facts, such as the inadequacy of the account to explain the operation that brings *ma* and *sh* together as one element *mush*. The claim that *sh* is base-generated in Spec, NegP, higher than *ma* in the clause structure gives rise to an undesired word order. Benmamoun in order to solve these problems argues that the two-part negative marker is a complex head generated in Neg⁰.
He treats the negative marker as a single unit made up of a proclitic and enclitic. The discontinuous negative marker *ma...sh* becomes *mush* when no element moves across Neg°. Whereas this assumption accounts nicely for the realization of *mush*, it poses other problems to the two-part negative marker.

Further, Benmamoun's arguments for the merger between negation and pronominal clitics, NPs and adjectives were based on the claim that sentential negation is specified for [+D] EPP feature. His assumption is based on the capacity of negation to merge with nonverbal predicates and on the realization of some agreement features on the negative marker *ma*. Consider this example:

18. a. ma-dri

    neg-know.1s

    'I do not know.'

b. anaa ma-ni braayi

   1    neg.1s leaving

   'I am not leaving.'
These examples are taken from Mattar (1976) as cited by Benmamoun. This system of negation is employed in some dialects of the Gulf region. As illustrated, ma negates both verbal and nonverbal constructions; the only difference is that in nonverbal constructions, negation is merged with a nominal clitic. In my data, the Hadhrami dialect shows similar aspects, ma is attached to a nominal clitic in nonverbal constructions. Consider this example:

19. a. ma namit samh al-barih
   neg sleep.past.1s early last night
   ‘I did not sleep early last night

b. (addar) ma-hi kabeer
   the house.3fs neg-3fs big
   ‘The house is not big.’

The clitic hi agrees completely with the subject in (19b) but these agreement features do not occur in the verbal predicate in (19a). Moreover, it is observed that the sentence can stand by itself in the absence of a lexical subject, which indicates that the nominal clitic that is merged with ma is not part of the morphology of the negative marker but it is part of the subject agreement. To recall, the dialects that employ the discontinuous negative marker ma...sh do not require a nominal clitic in this environment, but ma is merged with sh instead. This casts doubt on Benmamoun’s proposal and shows an important fact about the negative marker ma, which is its clitical nature and the necessity for a phonological host. It also explains why ma does not merge with a nominal clitic in nonverbal predicates in other dialects and it is satisfied by the merger with sh.
Benmamoun (2000) goes far with his claim that negation is specified for a [+D] feature and suggests several ways for checking this feature. For instance, this feature can be checked either by moving the verb to Neg$^0$ or by moving the subject to its specifier in the absence of the merger, in particular in the present tense constructions. Therefore, he explains why the merger between negation and verbal predicates in the past tense is compulsory while it is optional in the present tense constructions in some dialects such as Egyptian Arabic. If this assumption is on the right track, dialects, such as the Abyani dialect, pose a threat to this claim. In the Abyani dialect, negation cannot merge with any category and the negative marker is always realized as a free morpheme mish. If the merger is always compulsory in the past tense, then, the negative marker will always be realized as a two-part element in this environment and subsequently only one system of negation will exist. The realization of the negative marker as one element blocks the merger with any category. I find this as a strong piece of evidence to reject Benmamoun’s claim about the [+D] feature and I argue that the merger is motivated by the clitical nature of the negative marker ma and its need for a phonological host.

The present tense is categorized for [+D] feature while the past tense is categorized for [+V, +D] features. Thus, he argues that the merger between negation and the verb in the past tense is obligatory but it is optional with the verb in the present tense. Accordingly, all the verbs in the past have to merge with negation in all dialects. This generalization is empirically violated by the data from the Abyani dialect. In this dialect, negation does not merge with the verb at all, as illustrated earlier, indicating that the verb in the past also does not move to T$^0$ to check its [V] feature. This observation casts doubt on the categorial features of tense suggested by Benmamoun (2000).
Moreover, this proposal comes upon some theoretical problems, for instance, the claim that two heads are generated in the same head is not standard; the moved element will adjoin either to the right or the left of Neg\(^0\) but not in between the negative markers.

In the light of the above-mentioned discussion, I argue that the negative marker ma/mish is a functional head generated in Neg\(^0\), on the one hand. On the other hand, sh is a clitic originated in the specifier of a different functional node. The syntactic status of the negative markers is examined by applying some diagnostics such as the head movement constraint. In Arabic, the verb has to move overtly to T\(^0\), this movement becomes illicit if another head intervenes. Therefore, if the negative marker is a head, V-to-T\(^0\) movement will be blocked. Let us examine mish/ma. Consider this example:

20. a. ?alaustaad mish ga ames
   the teacher neg come.past.3ms yesterday
   ‘The teacher did not come yesterday.’
   b. [......[NegP [Neg\(^0\) mish/ma[ VP ?alastaad [ v\(^0\) ga]]]]]

The verb is not allowed to cross the negative marker; if it did, the negative marker should end up following the verb. Furthermore, it cannot merge with mish since mish is a free morpheme, not affixal. Consider these examples:

21. *?alastaad  ga ma/mish ames
   the teacher come.past.3ms neg mish yesterday

In (21), mish blocks verb movement to T\(^0\), therefore, moving ga across mish violates the head movement constraint. On the other hand, sh does not block verb movement but it allows the verb to move through it. Consider this:

80
22. **ma-raah-sh**  
**Yali ma'ana**

* neg-go.past.3ms-neg ali with us  

‘Ali did not go with us.’

(22) shows that the position of the verb is higher than *sh* and lower than *ma*. Obviously, these two negative markers are not originated in the same position. In addition, they do not exhibit the same behavior with respect to verb movement, i.e. *ma* blocks v°-to-T° movement, while *sh* does not.

As pointed out in the preceding section, *sh* is not inherently negative, but it is derived from *shi? thing*. Further, it cannot express negation by itself as illustrated by (23). In the light of these observations, I argue that *sh* is not generated in NegP but in a different functional node.

23. *gaa-sh alyoom*  

*Come.past.3ms-neg today*

Furthermore, it is worth emphasizing that there are many contexts in which *ma* can express negation by itself without the support of *sh*. (these aspects will be discussed later on in this chapter).

The next section discusses the position of the negative phrase in YA with respect to the other functional projections in the clause.

### 3.4 The position of the negative phrase:

Works on the structure of negation treats NegP as a functional category ever since Pollock (1989). This line has been pursued in Ouahla (1990), Zanuttini (1997), Haegeman (1995), Benmamoun (2000), Aoun et al. (2010), Ouali (2005), Rowlett
(1998), Tubau (2009) and others. Though the position of NegP with respect to the other functional categories in the clause remains subject to parametric variations.

Ouhalla (1990) argues that NegP can be generated in different positions, i.e. above TP or above vP. Zanuttini (1997) proposes four positions for NegP in Romance calling them NegP1, NegP2, NegP3 and NegP4. According to her, NegP1 is occupied by a preverbal negative marker that can negate a clause by itself, as in Italian. The other projections hosting post-verbal negative markers are realized in various positions such as NegP2, NegP3 and NegP4 for varieties such as Piedmontese, Milanese, etc (for more discussion see Zanuttini 1997). The possibility of generating the NegP in various positions is also discussed by Cinque (1999). His arguments are based on the scope interaction between adverb phrases and negation, especially when the surface word order does not determine the scope of negation. In brief, the syntactic position of NegP is not fixed to a particular position but it varies cross-linguistically.

Earlier works on Arabic such as Benmamoun (2000), Shlonsky (1997), and recent works such as Aoun et al. (2010) argue that NegP occupies a position between vP and TP in both Standard and dialectal Arabic. Yet, patterning Arabic with English with respect to the position of NegP does not explain the merger between negation and the other categories. This proposal is ridden with several problems and is inadequate to account for the data provided by YA.

In this section, I argue that NegP is generated above TP. The merger between the verb and the two-part negative marker will be obtained elegantly. The order NegP>TP avoids all the issues raised by the previous analyses.
Before proceeding, let us review some of the significant points discussed so far. First, the negative markers are both head and adverb-like element. Second, *sh* is derived from *shi*? 'thing' and not semantically negative. Third, *sh* and *ma* are not both generated in NegP. In the light of these ideas, I assume that *ma* is the head of the NegP while *sh* is a clitic generated in Spec, *shP*. This proposal is schematized in (24):

24. NegP
   Spec
      Neg'
      ma/mish
      TP
      Spec
         T'
         T°
         ShP
         Sh
         vP
         Spec
            v'
            v°
            VP
            v°
            XP
The idea of generating the two-part negative marker in two different functional projections is not novel in the literature as Rowlett (1998) for French and Ouali (2005) for Berber suggest a similar structure. The latter discusses some aspects of negation in some dialects of Berber 'Tamazight', which expresses negation by a discontinuous negative marker 'ur-V-sha'.

25. **ur-da-dux** sha

   neg1-Aux- go.1s neg2

   'I will not go.'

Ouali (2005) claims that neg1 is generated above TP, while neg2 is positioned above vP. In this dialect, it is observed that sometimes the negative marker can be realized as one constituent but with a reversed word order. That is, Neg2 sha precedes Neg1 ur, they merge and make up shaur. Consider this example:

26. Shaur dix gher-s

   neg2-negl go-past to him

   'I did not go to him/I did not visit him.'

He assumes that the negative marker sha is merged above vP and later it moves to Spec, NegP while the other negative marker ur is base-generated in the negative head above TP. Consequently, sha will end up in Spec, NegP, similar to *pas* in French.

To generate the discontinuous negative marker in two different positions seems more plausible than to generate it in one head node. Now let us examine how this proposal will work on with YA. Consider these examples:

27. a. ahmed ma-raah-sh alkulliyah.

   ahmed neg-go.past.3ms-neg the college
"Ahmed did not go to the college."

b. ahmed mish/ma raah alkulyah
   ahmed neg go.past.3ms the college.

"Ahmed did not go to the college."

In (27a), the verb moves to T° to check its agreement and tense features; it skips sh since it occupies Spec, shP. The verb does not have to move further, thus the right word order is yielded. Consider this configuration:

28. \[[\text{NegP} [\text{Neg}^0 \text{ma} [\text{TP} [T^0 \text{raah} [\text{shP} sh [\text{vP Subj} [v^0 \text{raah}[\text{VP} \ldots \ldots]]]]]]]]

 Obviously, this proposal does not raise any problems like the one offered by Benmamoun (2000). In (27b), the verb will move to T°, the negative marker is realized higher than TP by virtue of generating NegP above TP. Consequently, the word order of Neg-V is obtained in a straightforward fashion. Consider this configuration:

29. \[[\text{NegP} [\text{Neg}^0 \text{ma/mish} [\text{TP} [T^0 \text{raah} [\text{vP Subj} [v^0 \text{raah}[\text{VP} \ldots \ldots]]]]]]

 The proposal also offers a better explanation for the languages that allow negation to merge with XPs such as Moroccan Arabic. In Benmamoun's (2000) story, the XP in nominal predicates moves and merges with negation to check the putative [+D] feature on NegP. But if the XP moves to Spec, NegP to check the [+D] of negation, it leaves the negative head behind. Consequently, a wrong word order is obtained and in order to get the right word order, the derivation must resort to one of these possibilities: either the XP
lowers below Neg" or Neg" moves to Spec, NegP. However, both movements are illicit and are not feature driven. Consider this example from Moroccan Arabic, which illustrates the merger between negation and NPs:

30. omar ma-mudir-sh
    omar neg-director-neg
    ‘Omar is not a director.’

My proposal accounts for the merger between negation and other categories without raising the issues of Benmamoun’s proposal. Yet, the subject position still poses a problem to the proposal I adopt here, in particular if we accept the assumption that the subject in Arabic is generated in Spec, TP. In this case, the subject will intervene between the predicate and the negative marker ma, as in:

31. *ma-Omar-mudir-sh
    neg-omar-director-neg

In fact, there is a lot of controversy in the literature about the subject position. As known, Arabic has two word orders: VSO and SVO. The derivation of SVO is a controversial topic. In fact, one team argues that the subject moves higher than TP while the other one assumes that it moves to the specifier of TP. In this paper, I argue that the subject can move to a position higher than NegP, following Rizzi (2005). Rizzi (2005) argues that the subject can move to a position called the Subject phrase, which is higher than TP. His analysis militates against restructuring the subject position to the head that hosts agreement features and the nominative case since the subject can bear quirky or dative case, which does not trigger verbal agreement. The movement of the subject to that position is feature-driven; Rizzi calls it [+aboutness] that extends the domain of the
subject position to host miscellaneous sorts of subjects. The criterial properties of this position align it with TopicP and FocusP in being able to project a functional head. It occupies a position between CP and IP and determines its subject-predicate articulation in the same way the topic and focus determine their predicate articulation. Rizzi’s (2005) proposal seems to fall in line with some previous accounts on Arabic that claims that the subject position moves higher than TP. If the assumption that the subject position is higher than TP is on the right track, then, I argue that the subject in YA is located above NegP sandwiched between TP and CP domains. Here, I propose the following clausal structure to YA:

32. CP
   spec
       SubjP
           Spec
               NegP
                   spec
                       Neg'
                           spec
                               ma
                                   TP
                                       Spec
                                           T'
                                               T'
                                                   shP
                                                       sh
                                                           vP
                                                               v'
                                                                   subj
                                                                       v'
                                                                           VP
Likewise, verb-less predicates are also assumed to correspond to finite sentences and to have the same structure as argued in Aoun et al. (2010).

3.5 Negation and auxiliary verbs:

This section focuses on the merger between negation and auxiliaries/auxiliary-like elements. Auxiliaries in Arabic, in general, cannot be compared to their counterparts in English for several reasons. For instance, tense is not usually marked on the auxiliary. They can have default agreement features and some exhibit identical behavior to finite verbs. For instance, the verb *yakuun* ‘to be’ is the only auxiliary verb that when it is used with a non-finite verb can express continuity. Other auxiliaries showing auxiliary-like or modality behavior are derived from verbal forms but have lost their verbal features due to some diachronic change. For instance, *yaqa /yagi* ‘is allowed’ has the same meaning like *yaguuz* ‘is allowed’ in Standard Arabic, but it is distinguished in that the former has default features (present tense form, 3rd masculine, singular). Furthermore, *laad* ‘still/anymore’ is derived from the verb *yaânuud* ‘return’ but it has lost most of its verbal

---

9 They argue that verb-less sentences require TP based on several arguments such as the minimality effect, the case assignment, the obligatory occurrence of the complementizer in clausal complements of verbs such as *think*, etc and the forced movement of the subject in the presence of negation in those sentences. Consider this example:

i) d-dar mashi kbira
   = the house not big
   = *The house is not big."

ii) *mashi d-dar khira
    = not the house big

10 I mean it functions as a helping verb to express continuity in tenses like the past continuous and future continuous. Consider these examples:

i. kaan yafab kurah
   = be.past.3ms play.inf.3ms ball
   = ‘He was playing football’.

ii. assatâb ëxams bayakuun yafab kurah
    = five fut.be.3ms play.inf.3ms ball
    = ‘At five o’clock, he will be playing football.’
properties and retained only the past tense feature as a default feature. The above-
mentioned verbs are distinguished from each other in that the first verb takes the present
tense form as a default form while the second keeps the past tense form. In addition, Saad
expresses durative aspect, while yaqaS/yaggi expresses modality.

Here, the discussion will not focus on investigating the number of auxiliaries in
YA and their various ways of articulation, but only on the distinctive behavior of these
elements that emerge in the context of negation. The other aspects are out of the scope of
this paper. The focus in this section will be on how auxiliaries behave in the context of
negation, in particular on whether auxiliaries and auxiliary like elements allow the
merger with negation as the main verb does.

The verb yakuun 'to be' is realized only in the context of past tense as kaan and
exhibits the same behavior as main verbs in the context of negation.

33. mish kunt ʔalʕab
   neg be.past.1s play.inf.1s
   'I was not playing.'

34. ma-kuntuu-sh ʔalʕab
   neg-be.past.1s-neg play.inf.1s
   'I was not playing.'

As illustrated, negation is placed before the auxiliary verb in the dialects that
employ the one-part negative marker while it is cliticized to the auxiliary in the dialects
that employ the two-part negative marker.
The auxiliary-like elements \textit{yagii/yaqqa} 'is allowed' and \textit{\textaeed} 'still/anymore' exhibit a different behavior; \textit{yagii/yaqqa} can merge with negation by itself while \textit{\textaeed} cannot. The merger between negation and \textit{\textaeed} includes the main verb too. Consider these examples:

35. a. ma-\textit{yaqqa}-sh \textit{?ashul hagah mush haqqi} (AdD)
   neg-allow.pres.3ms-neg take.inf.1s thing neg mine
   'It is not allowed to take something that is not mine.'

36. a. ma-\textit{\textaeed-agat-naa-sh}\textsuperscript{11}
   neg-anymore-come.past.3fs-us-neg
   'She has not come to us.'

   b. *ma-\textit{\textaeed-sh} \textit{?agat-naa}
   neg-anymore-neg come.past.3fs-us
   'She has not come to us.'

(36b) shows that \textit{\textaeed} cannot merge with negation without including the main verb. This behavior indicates that the auxiliary-like elements do not display the same behavior in the context of negation.

\textsuperscript{11}The merger between negation and prepositional and object clitics will be discussed in section 3.8.
The question that raises now concerns the properties of $aad$ that lead to such behavior compared to $yaqa/yaggi$ and the position of this element in the structure. First, $aad$ is followed by a tensed verb, which has to check its features against $T^0$. Consider these examples:

37. a. ma-$aad$-yal$ab$-sh  ma$a$-na

neg-anymore-play.pres.3ms-neg with-us

‘He does not play with us anymore.’

b. ma-$aad$-la$ab$-sh  ma$a$-na

neg-anymore-play.past.3mp-neg with-us

‘He did not play with us.’ (Talking about a particular period of time in past)

Second, it can be reduced to a clitic $a$ in the Taizi dialect:

38. ma-$a$-ga$a$-sh

neg-anymore-come.past.3ms-neg

‘He has not come.’

Third, it has a default past tense feature and never expresses tense. On the other hand, $yaqa/yaggi$ is followed by an infinitive, it cannot be reduced to a clitic and it always expresses a prohibition ‘not allowed’ in the present tense.
Based on this, I suggest that \textit{Saad} is generated in a position higher than the TP while \textit{yaga\textasciitilde/yaggi} is generated within the TP.

Examining the possibilities of generating \textit{Saad} within TP always results in problems, for instance, if we generate \textit{Saad} above vP, it will block the verb movement to T\textsuperscript{o} or it may adjoin to the right edge of the verb yielding a wrong word order. Generating \textit{Saad} in the head of TP is ruled out by virtue of the fact that the main verb in Arabic always moves to T\textsuperscript{o} to check the strong [+V] feature and also for the reason that \textit{Saad} is not marked for tense or agreement features. Consequently, generating \textit{Saad} above TP seems to be the only way to avoid these consequences and to obtain the right word order. This proposal is schematized below:
39. NegP
    spec Neg'
    ma XP
    Ṣaad TP
    spec T'
    yalṣabu shP
    sh vP
    Spec v'
    yalṣabu VP

As illustrated, generating Ṣaad above TP maintains the right word order and dispenses with the above-mentioned issues.

To conclude, I attempt to throw some light on the behavior of some auxiliaries and auxiliary-like elements in the context of negation. I demonstrate the syntactic
properties of these elements in question and suggest some explanation to their behavior in this environment.

3.6 The effect of focus on the negative markers:

As shown previously, the negative marker $sh$ is diachronically derived from the non-negative word $shi'? 'thing'. The history of this word dates back to CA where it is used in the context of negation as an NPI or a minimizer to reinforce negation. In dialectal Arabic, it had transformed into a clitic and came to be used as a negative marker, a case of grammaticalization. Lucas (2009) discusses the phenomenon of grammaticalization in dialectal Arabic. He focuses on the diachronic development of negation in the sense of Jesperson's cycle of negation (1917). As reported in the literature, the diachronic development of negation is claimed to pass through four stages, as follows:

40. Stage 1: negation is expressed by one negative marker.

Stage 2: negation is expressed by a negative marker in combination with a negative adverb or noun phrase.

Stage 3: the second element in stage 2 takes on the function of expressing negation by itself; the original negative particle becomes optional.

Stage 4: the original negative marker becomes extinct.

Stages 1 and 2 are present in the dialects under investigation. However, this cycle does not account for the development of the two-part negative marker in stage 2 into one element as exemplified by the Abyani dialect. Precisely, $ma...sh$ becomes $mish$ in the Abyani dialect and the other dialects spoken in the south of Yemen. This stage of development is missing in Jesperson's negative cycle. The occurrence of stage 2,
according to Lucas (2009), is for emphatic reasons, but he suggests that the emphatic feature of the second negative particle *sh* disappears in dialectal Arabic. If we agree with the point that the emphatic feature of *sh* disappears from the surface, we should accept the assumption that it remains silent until another constituent with a strong focus feature shows up in the same sentence. In my view, *sh* loses its overt emphatic feature because it underwent reduction from a word into a clitic, but that feature appears in the presence of other elements that have the same feature.

It is observed that *sh* cannot co-occur with the following constituents: oath invoking God *wallah* ‘by God’, the emphatic NPI *ז'ומר* ‘in one’s life/ever’, sentences that are associated with a prosodic/focal stress and in the context of emphatic negation. Consider these examples:

41. *wallah ma-aqum-(*sh) men mahl-i* (AdD)
   by God neg-fut.stand.1s from place-my
   ‘By God, I will not leave my place.’

42. *ז'ומר ma-?akaltu(*sh) gambri* (AdD)
   ever neg-ate.1s prawn
   ‘I have not eaten prawn ever.’

43. a. *kaneen ma(*sh) yatshershafain ammaat awwal* (AbD)
   be.3fp neg wear.pres.3fp mothers first
   ‘Women in the old days were not wearing veils.’

   b. *banaat alhadaarim lala?an ma (*sh) yaqaablesian almazawagaat* (AbD)
   daughters the Hadhrami until now neg meet.pres.3fp the married.3fp
   ‘The unmarried girls in Hadhramout do not meet the married women until now.’
44. ma (*sh) baa faxii-k wala fels

neg fut.give.1s-you and not penny
‘I will not give you a penny.’

Obviously, focus affects on the negative marker by reducing it into ma. That is because that sh has also a focus feature that becomes incompatible with the occurrence of another focus phrase in the clause. This observation falls in line with Rizzi (1997), there, he argues that focus phrases are not recursive, i.e. a clause cannot host more than one focus phrase. Consequently, I argue that sh has a weak focus feature that makes it awkward to be in the same environment with another element having a similar feature. sh is dispensed with because it has no effect on the output and its presence might cause awkwardness to the articulation of the sentence.

In brief, I argue that the loss of sh is due to the constraints on the occurrence of more than one focus phrase in one clause. The behavior of sh in this context might be considered as a piece of evidence to argue that sh has a concealed focus feature that shows up in emphatic contexts and its presence in negative contexts is for emphatic purposes.

3.7 Emphatic negation:

As was demonstrated in section one, emphatic negation is expressed by the negative element wala ‘and not’. wala can express sentential negation like ma, mish, and ma...sh but it is distinguished in many ways. First, wala is positioned higher than TP. Second, it can negate verbal and nominal predicates. Third, it is associated with a focal stress. Consider this:

45. wala ʃamal hagah
and not do past.3ms thing

'He did not do anything

46. a. wala wahid aga

and not one come past.3ms

'Not even one came.'

b. *wahid wala aga

one and not come past.3ms

Consequently, wala cannot be generated in NegP because it is higher than the subject, which is higher than NegP in the unmarked context. In some contexts, wala occurs in the post-verbal position, but in that case, it has to be c-commanded by NegP. This position does not enable it to take wide scope because sentential negation is expressed by the negative marker ma.

47. ma-baqula-k wala kalimah

neg-fut.tell.1s-you and not word

'I will not tell you even a word.'

This aspect has been tackled by Hoyt (2005) and Lucas (2009). Hoyt (2005) assumes that wala cannot express sentential negation and its negative feature is absorbed by the highest negative marker, taking this as evidence for his claim that Arabic is a negative concord language. Lucas (2009) does not pay attention to this property of wala but he concentrates on its function as a negative conjunctive.

Regarding the position of the second occurrence of wala, Lucas claims that wala is part of another clause basing mainly on the etymology of this element, which is claimed to be derived from the conjunction wa ‘and’ and the negative particle la ‘not’. In
these terms, \( wala \) is a negative conjunctive that joins two negative clauses. Consider this example:

48. a. ma sami\(\text{'et} \) wala kilma

\( \text{neg hear.past.1s and not word} \)

'I did not hear a single word.'

This sentence can have the following interpretation where \( wala \) is part of another clause:

b. I did not hear anything, not even a word.

c. \( \neg \exists x (\text{hear (Me, x)}) \land \neg \exists y (\text{word (y) and hear (Me, y)}) \).

The emphatic feature of \( wala \) is discussed neither by Hoyt (2005) nor by Lucas (2009). However, it is a crucial feature that has semantic and syntactic significance to the interpretation of the sentence. Even if \( wala \) is generated in an elliptical clause as claimed by Lucas (2009), I argue that its focus feature is not lost but restricted to its c-commanding domain. Therefore, for (48), the NP following \( wala \) is focused and moved from the object position to a higher position. Then, the rest of the clause is elided in case we treat the elliptical part in the second clause as equivalent to the one in the higher clause. The elliptical part, in my view, corresponds to the structure in the higher clause with a slight difference.

49. \( \ldots \ldots wala \text{'et} \) kilma

\( \text{and not hear.past.1s word} \)

'And I did not hear a single word.'

The ellipsis takes place after \( \text{kilma} \) moves to focus phrase selected by \( wala \).

Consider this configuration:
This configuration explains how the NP in a lower position appears higher and c-commanded by wala. Obviously, the two negative features are generated in two different clauses so they do not cancel out each other but every feature remains in its domain. This analysis eliminates the possibility that might give rise to Double Negation. The occurrence of wala in this context is to emphasize and restrict the domain of negation to that NP.

The question that seeks an answer now is concerned with determining the position of wala or the structure of wala clauses. Keep in mind that wala occupies a position higher than TP and it can also be followed by a noun phrase, prepositional phrase or by a subject or an object, which indicates that the position which follows wala is not restricted to a particular category or subject to strict lexical selection. This position can host any element if that element is marked for a focus feature:

51. a. wala hurmah hadharat
    and not woman attend.past.3fs
    'No woman attended…'

b. wala fils ?ata-na
    and not penny give.past.3ms-us
    'He did not give us a penny.'

c. wala fi-ha hagah
    and not in-it thing
'There is nothing in it.'

In (51a) hurmah 'woman' is a subject, in (51b) fils is a direct object, while in (51c) fiha is a prepositional phrase. This observation encourages me to argue that *wala* selects a focus phrase as a complement. Subsequently, any focused XP moves to the specifier of a focus phrase immediately below *wala*. I propose the following structure for *wala* clauses:

```
52. walaP
    wala
    FP
    NP/PP F'
        F° ...........
```

In conclusion, I attempt, in this section, to highlight one of the significant properties of *wala*, which is ignored by many authors, i.e. the emphatic negative role. Furthermore, treating *wala* as a focal negative element might provide the right explanation for the behavior of *wala* in the elliptical clause.

### 3.8 Clitic clusters: Evidence from negation:

The merger between negation and complex heads can be considered as evidence for the presence of clitic clusters in dialectal Arabic. In the dialects that employ the discontinuous negative marker; negation can attach to verbal categories, pronominal clitics, inflected prepositions or dative constructions. Moreover, it is observed that it can
incorporate to complex constructions, i.e. the construction composed of the following [V-CL-CL]. The latter provides a piece of evidence for clitic clusters in YA. The properties of clitics in Semitic languages in general and in Arabic in particular are discussed by Shlonsky (1997). Shlonsky (1997) discusses several types of clitics that can attach to several categories. He argues that clitics can attach to the right periphery of verbs, nouns, prepositions, complementizers and quantifiers; they only attach to the right edge of their host, not to the left edge. He further adds that they can attach to X-heads and XPs, they do not manifest case, they do not show any resemblance to nominal determiners and they never cluster.

Most of these criteria apply to YA except the last one, i.e. clitic cluster. For instance, the prepositional clitic la can attach to the object clitic hum before they incorporate with the verb, as in (53):

53. quit-la-hum la
    say.past.ls-to-them no
    'I said no to them.'

Shlonsky (1997) claims that clitics cannot cluster in Semitic but this example can be considered as counter-evidence.

As known, clitics are distinguished from affixes in many respects; the most important property of clitics is their capacity to attach to different categories, not just roots or stems. Consider this example:

54. ma-quina-la-hum-sh hagah
    neg-say.lp-to-them-neg thing
    'We did not say anything to them.'
In negative contexts, sh is sometimes cliticized to complex heads, i.e. it is incorporated to a head made of an inflected verb, object clitic and prepositional clitic providing evidence for the presence of clitic clusters in Arabic.

Clitics can incorporate to negative markers in the absence of verbal heads. Below, I present examples of subject clitics, existential particles and prepositional clitics:

55. a. ma-ni-sh raayahah
   neg-1fs-neg go.part.1fs
   ‘I am not going.’

b. ma-fii-sh hal
   neg-there-neg solution
   ‘There is no solution.’

c. ma-lu-sh hadh
   neg-to.3ms-neg luck
   ‘He has no luck.’

The reason behind this merger is phonologically oriented since these elements cannot stand by themselves and require a phonological host. Benmamoun (2000) considers the merger between negative markers and these elements as a piece of evidence to support his claim that negation is specified for [+D] feature\(^\text{12}\). He attributes the merger to the checking mechanism of the putative [+D] feature of negation; the movement to/through NegP to check this feature results in merging negation with this element. The clitic nature of these elements that requires a phonological host is not brought into discussion in his proposal. If Benmamoun’s claims are right, it will be anticipated that

---

\(^{12}\) The [+D] feature is checked by the agreement feature on the verb, the subject, and the pronominal elements, according to Benmamoun.
negation is always realized as a discontinuous element. The conclusion that can be reached is that the reason behind the merger between negation and these morphemes is the affixal nature of clitics and the necessity to have a phonological host, not the checking of [+D] feature of negation, which may not exist.

In what follows, I will discuss the mechanism that lead to the placement of clitic clusters and makes up this complex head (v-cl-cl-cl).

There are two approaches to clitics: the base generation approach and the movement approach. The movement of clitics is driven either by phonology to locate a phonological host or syntax to satisfy the checking requirement. There are several accounts that advocate these proposals such as Belletti (1999) in which it is argued that clitics move to AgroP to check case. Also Sportiche (1998), Raposo and Uriagereka (2005), Ouhalla (2005) and Terzi (1999) did not divert very much from the core idea of this approach, i.e. clitic movement takes place either in syntax to check features or in phonology to avoid phonological crash. Movement at PF happens later in the derivation at CP phase after completing all the syntactic operations. Note that the landing site of clitics is an empty functional projection posited higher than TP.

Clitic clusters in YA is not a straightforward process since it involves merging with negation. Therefore, tackling the phenomenon either within the confines of syntax or phonology does not explain the behavior of clitic clusters in YA for several reasons. Example (54) is repeated here for convenience.

56. ma-qulna-la-hum-sh hagah
    neg-say.past.1p-to-them-neg thing

'We did not say anything to them.'
The construction in boldface letters is originated within vP. The following configuration illustrates this claim:

I assume that la and hum are fused locally at the PP position, since they cannot be separated and move together as a unit [la-hum]. The idea that the two clitics (la-hum) move individually is not empirically supported since it does not produce the right word order. To be precise, moving the object clitic first followed by the prepositional clitic will result in a wrong word order (*hum-la) where the object clitic precedes the prepositional clitic. This leaves us with one assumption, i.e. local fusion.

In fact, Raposo and Uriagereka (2005) (R&U, henceforth) offer an elegant account for clitic placement in Western Iberian and I build my proposal on their insightful ideas. R&U (2005) argue that the merger between clitics and other elements
takes place in the morphological component basing on the recent trends in the Minimalist Program, (Chomsky, 2000, 2001) and Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz, 1993). In accordance with this, clitic clusters takes place within the domain of the verbal phase via morphological fusion between adjacent heads. Morphological fusion can target the left or the right edge of the word because the morphological rules are not restricted as the syntactic rules, which necessitate adjunction to be leftward. Moreover, it is argued that fusion abides by morphological constraints that aim at only heads. Considering the data from YA, I claim that the prepositional clitic and object clitic fuse within the PP and move as a constituent motivated by the affixal nature of clitics.

   It is worth noting that the prepositional clitic usually appears adjacent to the verb even in the environment of negation. However, the realization of the indirect object clitic as a word prevents the merger with negation. Consider this example:

   58. a. ma-?ata-sh   la ?abuu-h riyal
      neg-give.past.3ms-neg to father-his riyal
      'He did not give his father even a Riyal.'

   b.*ma-?ata- la-?abuuh-sh riyal
      neg-give.past.3ms-to-father.his-neg riyal

   Evidently, fusion targets only heads, especially clitics so when the PP is constituted of a preposition and a noun, no merger with the verb can be obtained.

   R&U (2005) also argue that clitic displacement is not motivated by checking requirements because they do not have morphological features to check and if they do so, checking now can take place locally via Agree, dispensing with movement. They claim that the movement of clitics takes place in the phonological component. Notice that R
&U opt for movement as a last resort when local fusion fails to satisfy the clitic feature. Consequently, two ways of clitic placement were proposed: i) early rightward fusion, which obeys morphological constraints or ii) late leftward fusion, which obeys prosodic constraints. The displacement option is selected to avoid a phonological crash at PF and is motivated by a clitic-like head called $f$; the head of FP\textsuperscript{13}. This step is costly and is associated with another costly operation called 'verb swallowing'. Verb swallowing describes the operation that drives the verb to the $f$ head to fuse with the clitic, this operation takes place when the clitic cannot locate a leftward suitable head in vP to fuse with. Notice that leftward and rightward fusion are both possible in their proposal and fusion is a morphological operation applying within a phonological cycle, which proceeds in parallel with the narrow syntactic cycle in a phase-based derivation.

Returning to the clitics in question, the derivation of these clitics takes two steps: rightward local fusion and phonological movement. The phonological movement is initiated by the derived PP in order to satisfy its clitical feature given that it cannot satisfy this feature within the vP domain because the verb has not checked its morphological features yet. In other words, the presence of the finite verb blocks early fusion with the verb. In light of this discussion, the derivation of the structure (v-cl-cl) will proceed as the following:

\textsuperscript{13} FP hosts affective operators including quantifier phrases, phrases with overt focus operators, elements encoding the polarity of a preposition, the negative morpheme 'nao' and questions and emphatic expressions. (see R&U 2005 for details)
60. qaal-la-hum

say.past.3ms-to-them....

'He said to them...'

As illustrated, the PP moves to the edge of vP to become accessible to further movement. Then, the verb migrates to T⁰. As soon as f is merged, the PP moves and adjoins to it. Then, verb swallowing takes place as a last resort operation to save the structure from crashing. As a result, the structure v-cl-cl is obtained. The complex structure, Neg-v-cl-cl-Neg, is derived in the same way but with a slight difference, i.e. the
PP moves through $shP$ and fuses with the negative marker $sh$ before moving to FP. This operation also finds verb swallowing a requirement to yield the desired word order and because those clitics must fuse with a verbal head.

To sum up, this section provides explanations for the derivation of complex heads that can be considered as supportive evidence for the presence of clitic clusters in Arabic. It sheds light on the mechanisms that are employed to explain this phenomenon. Principally, complex heads are derived via either early morphological fusion or a last resort displacement in the sense of R&U (2005). This line of reasoning seems to be more plausible, as it can handle the main aspects of clitic clusters in YA.

3.9 Negative imperatives:

In YA, the verbal form of imperatives in negative contexts is rich in morphology as negation forces the person feature to surface morphologically, contrary to the positive form where the person feature is marked semantically without an overt morphological realization. The other agreement features such as number and gender are usually suffixed to the verb. Consider this:

61. a. $\emptyset^{14}$ ruuh  
    b. $\emptyset$ ruuh-i  
    c. $\emptyset$ ruuh-u  
    d. $\emptyset$ ruuh-ain  

    go.ms  go.fs  go.mp  go.fp  

    'Go'.

These examples are taken from the Abyani dialect; the other dialects do not display any significant differences, except for that in some dialects the 2nd person

\[^{14} \emptyset \text{ refers to the missing person feature in the context of imperatives.}\]
masculine plural is employed as a default form to express the masculine and feminine plural. Negative imperatives will be realized as follows:

62. a. la taruuh  b. la taruuh-i  c. la taruuh-u  d. la taruuh-ian

\[
\text{neg 2.go.ms} \quad \text{neg 2.go.fs} \quad \text{neg 2.go.mp} \quad \text{neg 2.go.fp}
\]

‘Do not go’.

The difference between positive and negative imperatives lies in the overt morphological realization of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person feature on the verb. According to Benmamoun (2000), the negative imperative forces the person feature to surface because of the so-called [+D] of negation. He claims, contra Zanuttini (1997), that negative imperatives have nothing to do with Mood. Zanuttini’s crucial arguments for Italian hedge on the idea that Mood plays a major role in licensing negation in imperative contexts. This led Zanuttini to argue that negative imperatives are subcategorized for MoodP. The situation in Arabic is entirely different where Mood plays no role in licensing negation with imperatives. It is worth noting that Mood is only realized in SA. However, it is not marked on imperative forms. In dialectal Arabic, there is no morphological or phonological realization of Mood, which indicates that there are other factors apart from Mood contribute to this syntactic phenomenon. I argue that negative imperatives exhibit behavior different from those languages discussed by Zanuttini (1997). To recall, Benmamoun’s explanation is based on the claim that negation is specified for [+D]. The requirement to check this feature leads to the overt realization of the person feature. Benmamoun’s proposal, in general, has several shortcomings that will be listed below:
First, negation in YA is not specified for [+D] feature since negation does not merge with nominal constructions. Second, the merger between negation and some pronominal clitics, which Benmamoun built his account on, might be due to certain features of these categories, not necessarily negation. Third, this account encounters some problems if we consider checking to take place via Agree in the sense of Chomsky (2000, 2001).

In what follows, I will address these questions. Why is negation not allowed to co-occur with imperatives, and why do negative imperatives select a verbal form inflected for phi-features?

It is worth noting that the verbal form that is allowed in negative imperatives has an identical representation to the indicative form when the subject is the 2nd person pronoun. The following table illustrates the correspondence between negative imperatives and the verb in the present simple tense.
The correspondence between the Morphology of Verbs in Negative Imperative sentences and Verbs in Indicative Sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2ms</th>
<th>2fs</th>
<th>2mp</th>
<th>2fp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>antakadib</td>
<td>anti takadibi</td>
<td>antu takadibu</td>
<td>antian takadibain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you.2ms 2.lie.ms</td>
<td>you.2fs 2.lie. fs</td>
<td>you.2mp 2.lie. mp</td>
<td>you.2fp 2.lie. fp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘You lie/you’re lying.’</td>
<td>‘You lie/you’re lying.’</td>
<td>‘You lie/you’re lying.’</td>
<td>‘You lie/you’re lying.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Imperative</td>
<td>la takadib</td>
<td>la ta-kadibi</td>
<td>la takadibu</td>
<td>la takadibain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg 2.lie.ms</td>
<td>neg 2.lie.fs</td>
<td>neg 2.lie.mp</td>
<td>neg 2.lie.fp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not lie.</td>
<td>Do not lie.</td>
<td>Do not lie.</td>
<td>Do not lie.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verbal form, which is used to express the present tense when the 2nd person pronoun is the subject, is identical to the form employed by the negative imperative. The agreement features are realized morphologically, including the 2nd person feature, which is absent in positive imperatives. Apparently, negation cannot take a defective verbal phrase as a complement.
It seems that negation is subcategorized for TP in YA since it can be subcategorized for MoodP in Italian where negation is capable of determining its complement (Zanuttini, 1997). Zanuttini argues that the negative marker non in Italian is subcategorized for MoodP implying that negation can select its complement. The data show that negative imperatives in YA are subcategorized for TP. The reason is that the verb that follows the negative marker is specified for tense features. Zanuttini (1996) discusses similar aspects in Romance and English. There, she attributed the ban on the occurrence of negation with true imperatives to the absence of tense. In Romance, negation cannot occur with true imperatives but it can occur with imperatives that have a suppletive or subjunctive form since those forms contain a certain type of inflectional morphology.

63. a. *Non telefona! (2nd s) (from Zanuttini 1996:24))
   b. Non telefonate! (2nd p)
   'Don’t call.'

This behavior is attributed to the capacity of the negative phrase to project a functional head that takes TP as a complement. The constraints on the occurrence of negation with true imperatives are restricted to languages that express negation by a negative head. Languages that utilize a post-verbal adverbial element to express negation do not show the same constraints because only functional heads can select TP complements.

In imperative sentences, YA employs a different negative marker from the one used in indicative sentences.

15 A form used only in the 2nd person singular.
It is worth emphasizing that the verbal form in positive imperatives is not permitted in negative imperatives due to the lack of the person feature.
This behavior toughens the ground for the claim that negation selects a TP complement with a complete set of phi-features. Negative imperatives require the 2nd person feature to be realized morphologically and when this feature is not present in positive imperatives, it gives rise to ungrammatical sentences as illustrated by (67). In brief, negative imperatives are subcategorized for a TP complement, the same as some Romance languages are subcategorized for MoodP.

3.10 Conclusion:

This chapter attempts to investigate the various ways of expressing sentential negation in YA. I base this discussion on four dialects because their system of negation represents the entire system of negation in this language. The data provides evidence against Benmamoun (2000) especially his claims about generating negation above vP and generating the discontinuous negative marker *ma...sh* both in Neg°. Based on this, I argue that NegP in dialectal Arabic is generated above TP and the discontinuous negative marker is generated in two different nodes, i.e. *ma* in Neg° and *sh* in shP. The reason for not positing *sh* in NegP is because *sh* is an emphatic negative marker and not inherently negative as the discussion shows.

In this chapter, I discuss several syntactic aspects that interrelate with negation and provide analysis for each of them. I concentrate on the elements that effect on negative markers and lead to the cancellation of *sh*. One of the interesting aspects, which I shed light on in this chapter, is the expression of negation with emphasis by the negative element *wala*; I refer to this phenomenon as emphatic negation.

Further, I argue against Shlonsky’s (1997) claim for the absence of clitic clusters in Semitic languages and demonstrate the positions where clitic clusters can take place in
YA. This evidence demonstrates that forming a generalization about any syntactic aspect in Semitic languages based on one variety or two of Arabic is not sufficient because Arabic has multifarious varieties, which exhibit several syntactic differences.

The last section discusses negative imperatives and demonstrates the behavior of negation in this environment. I argue that negation in this context selects a TP complement with a complete set of phi-features and that mood is irrelevant to negative imperatives in YA. I illustrate how negation is not allowed with true imperatives and how it needs all the phi-features to be morphologically marked on the verb. Ultimately, this chapter offers some novel analyses and proposals that might work not only for YA but also for dialectal Arabic.