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ABSTRACT
THE SYNTAX OF NEGATION IN IRAQI ARABIC
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Saja Albuarabi
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Under the Supervision of Professor Hamid Ouali

This dissertation is a study of negation in Iraqi Arabic. It investigates the syntactic properties of negation in this dialect by presenting some previously unnoticed empirical facts about this phenomenon and by analyzing its theoretical significance for Arabic syntax in particular and Human language in general. Iraqi Arabic is a cluster of subdialects that show an interesting systematic microvariation in the use of negative expressions. The first goal of this dissertation is to present the syntactic properties of negation in all these subdialects through a detailed description and comprehensive survey. Based on this survey and description, these subdialects, are divided into two major groups: ma group and maʃ group. A syntactic analysis is then developed to explain the behavior of negation in each subgroup, challenging some standard and widely accepted analyses in the literature (Benmamoun 2000, 2013, and Soltan 2007, 2014). The second major goal of this dissertation is to examine the interaction between negation and the so-called Negative Sensitive Items (NSIs) namely: Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) and Negative Concord Items (NCIs). NSIs rely on their syntactic distribution and semantic interpretation on negation, and here again, and as expected, the Iraqi dialects show some variation when it comes to what type of NSIs are licensed and how they are licensed.

This dissertation is the first such work to study in detail negation in Iraqi Arabic and to provide a detailed survey and analysis of it. It is a contribution to the syntax of negation in general, and the syntax of Iraqi Arabic in particular.
The locus of sentential negation is discussed in light of previous theories that are primarily based on the distribution of sentential negation in Arabic dialects. The investigation of the locus of sentential negation indicates that the High-Neg hypothesis, where NegP occupies a position higher than Tense Phrase (TP), cannot provide an explanation for the case when the imperfective verb has the option to merge with the negative marker in both the ma group and the ma-ʃ group; therefore, the High-Neg analysis cannot be extended to Iraqi Arabic.

The examination of NSIs licensing in Iraqi Arabic illustrates that previous NSIs licensing analyses proposed in the literature cannot extend to Iraqi Arabic. Alternatively, a novel account through appealing to both syntax and semantics is proposed which is a modification of Zeijlstra’s proposal (2004, 2008). In this study, I argue that NCIs are specified with an uninterpretable [uNeg] feature that needs to be checked against an interpretable [iNeg] feature of a semantic negation that can be either overt or covert in the clause.
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Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

This dissertation is a study of negation in two groups of Iraqi Arabic (IA). The first group is what I call the ma group, which includes Baghdadi, Najafí, and Moslawi dialects, and which uses the free morpheme negative marker ma/la ‘not/no.’ The second group is what I call the ma-f group that includes Nasiriya, Amarah, and Basrawi dialects. The ma-f group expresses negation by using the two-part negative marker ma-f. In this dissertation, I investigate the locus of sentential negation in both the ma group and the ma-f group with the primary goal to provide an analysis for the structural position of sentential negation in these two dialect groups.

Negation in IA varies in that some dialects have the same pattern of negation that is found in Egyptian Arabic (EA), Moroccan Arabic (MA), Jordanian Arabic (JA), and Sanʕani Arabic, while other dialects pattern with Kuwaiti, Saudi, among other dialects. However, an interesting feature of IA that distinguishes it from other Arabic dialects is the use of the quantifier *kull ‘every’ combined with the indefinite pronoun *ʃi ‘thing’ when expressing negative polarity. The Negative Polarity Item (NPI) *kullʃi ‘anything’ must always co-occur with a negative marker as shown in (1) and (2).

1) kullʃi *(ma) qɔll-i. (Moslawi)

anything Neg told-me-3MS

‘He did not tell me anything.’

2) kullʃi *(ma) gɔll-iʃ. (Basrawi)

anything Neg told-me-3MS. Neg

‘He did not tell me anything.’
1.2. Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The importance of negation in Arabic and other languages has long been recognized by researchers. However, there has been a wide disagreement among researchers regarding the locus of negation and how Negative Sensitive Items (NSIs) get licensed. To my knowledge, there has not been any research on IA negation and NSIs. Previous research was done by Ingham (2000), Abu-Haidar (2002), and Hassan (2015), have presented general information about negation in IA, but none of these studies have offered a syntactic analysis that explains the distribution of negation and the licensing of the different NSIs in IA. Therefore, the first goal of this dissertation is to examine the syntax of negation in the different IA dialects and how facts from these dialects fit in the overall typology of negation in Arabic dialects.

Question 1: What is the syntactic distribution of negation in Iraqi dialects and what syntactic analysis can be devised to account for this distribution?

The second goal of this dissertation is to describe and analyze the distribution of NSIs in the ma and the ma-f groups taking into consideration previous analyses of NSI licensing. Data from both groups demonstrates that the language displays both types of NSIs examined in the literature: NPIs and Negative Concord Items (NCIs). Previous studies (Benmamoun, 1996, 1997, 2006; Hoyt, 2010; Alqassas, 2012, 2016, 2019) which only focused on Arabic dialects such as MA, EA, and Levantine Arabic (LA), offer various diagnostic tests to distinguish between NPIs and NCIs and propose different syntactic analyses to explain the licensing conditions for these NSIs. The second goal leads to the second main question of this dissertation:

Question 2: What is the distribution of NPIs and NCIs in the ma group and the ma-f group, and what syntactic analysis can be devised to account for their licensing?
1.3. The Language of the Study

This study mainly focuses on the distribution of negation in the two groups of IA. The first group I call the *ma* group and it includes: Baghdadi, Najafi, and Moslawi. The second group I call the *ma-f* group and it includes: Amarah, Nasiriyah, and Basrawi. The *ma* group and the *ma-f* group cover different dialects of IA that are spoken in the country of Iraq. These two groups were chosen in this study because they are considered as the main dialects of IA.\(^1\) The *ma* group and the *ma-f* group can be classified into three varieties: urban, rural, and Bedouin. In this dissertation, the data is taken mainly from the urban and rural groups. The classification of these dialects is built on the presence or absence of certain linguistic properties. The *ma* and the *ma-f* groups exhibit systematic phonetic, phonological, morpho-syntactic differences and the purpose of this section is to briefly discuss some of these differences.

The phonemes /q/, /r/, /ʧ/, /ʤ/ and /a/ are examples of the phonetic differences between these dialects.\(^2\) The phoneme /q/ is realized as [g] in the Baghdadi, Najafi, Amarah, Nasiriyah, and Basrawi dialects but it is realized as [q] in the Moslawi dialect. The phoneme /r/ is realized as [ʁ] in the Moslawi dialect in some cases, but it is realized as [r] in the rest of the *ma* and the *ma-f* groups. The phoneme /ʧ/ and /ʤ/ are realized as [j] by the speakers of the *ma-f* group in general. These features can be shown in the following examples:

---

1 Baghhdadi dialect is mainly spoken in the province of Baghdad and the surrounding area. Najafi is spoken in the province of Najaf. Moslawi is mainly spoken in the province of Mosul. Amarah dialect is spoken in the province of Amarah. Nasiriyah dialect is spoken in the province of Nasiriyah. Finally, Basrawi is spoken in the Basra province.

2 One feature of Iraqi Arabic in general is that the phoneme /k/ in most cases is realized as either [ʧ] in some dialects or as [j] in other dialects.
3) a. …gil-t-u, bəlkən ʔə-ʔdəʔ ʔə-ʔbir həl.  
I.told-him, hope I.could I.sell this
ʕəsˤfur br-ʔə-l-sˤuq.
bird in-the-market
‘I said, I hope I could sell this bird in the market.’
b. …gil-ləh, bəlki ʔə-gdər ʔə-ʔbir həddə  
I.told-him, hope I.could I.sell this
ʕəsˤfur br-ʔə-l-sˤug.
bird in-the-market
‘I said to him, I hope I could sell this bird in the market.’

4) a. wəla wahid ḏalīṣ.  
NCI no one sit-3MS
‘No one is sitting.’
b. ma ḟən-ət br-ʔə-l-məktəbəh.  
Neg was-3SF in-the-library
‘She was not in the library.’

5) a. wəla wahid  jalis-ıʃ.  
NCI no one sit-3MS-Neg
‘No one is sitting.’
b. ma ḏən-ət br-ʔə-l-maktibih.  
Neg was-3SF in-the-library
‘She was not in the library.’
Finally, the vowel /a/ surfaces as /i/ when it occurs in the middle of the word for Moslawi speakers. See the following examples:

6) ʁaŋ ji-dʒi ?əl-ʃi t w noqʃod mn ?əl-s'obh, biʒdi θildʒ. (Moslawi)
   will 3SM-come the-winter and 3P-wake from the-morning cold snow
   ‘Winter will come and we will wake up in the morning with a very cold weather.’

7) rah jidʒi ?əl-ʃita w nɔɡʃod mn ?əl-s'oboh bardah θildʒ. (Najafi)
   will come.3SM the-winter and 3P-wake from the-morning cold snow
   ‘Winter will come and we will wake up in the morning with a very cold weather.’

8) a. wəla wiθd ʃi-j-dɾos. (Moslawi)
   no one PROG-3-study-S
   ‘No one is studying.’

b. wəla wahd gaʃ-j-dɾos. (Najafi)
   no one PROG-3-study.S
   ‘No one is studying.’

Negation and aspect are two examples of the morpho-syntactic differences between these subdialects. Sentential negation is expressed by using the proclitic negative markers *ma* and the enclitic -ʃ, as a discontinuous morpheme in the *maʃ* group while sentential negation is expressed by using only the free morpheme *ma* as the negative marker in the *ma* group. The continuous morpheme *muʃ* is used in the *maʃ* group, while the negative marker *mu* is used in the *ma* group to express negation. The morpheme [ga-], [da-], [kɔ-, qi, ʃi] are used to express aspects (progressive aspect). For example, Najafi and the *maʃ* group use the morpheme [ga-] to express the progressive aspect; Baghdadi dialect uses the morpheme [da-] while Moslawi dialect uses the
morpheme [kə-, qi-, ʕi-] when expressing the progressive aspect as shown in the following examples:

9)ʔəl-tˤalɪb ga-j-drus bi-ʔəl-məktəbəh. (Najafi dialect)
the-student.3SM проg-3M. study. s-imprf in-the-library
‘The student is studying in the library.’

10)ʔəl-tˤalɪb da-j-drus bi-ʔəl-məktəbəh. (Baghdadi dialect)
the-student-3SM проg-3M. study. s-imp in-the-library
‘The student is studying in the library.’

11)ʔəl-tˤalɪb kə/qi/ʕi-j-dרח bi-ʔəl-məktəbî. (Moslawi dialect)
the-student-3SM проg-3M-study. s-imprf in-the-library
‘The student is studying in the library.’

1.4. Significance of the Study

To the best of my knowledge, this dissertation will be the first comprehensive study on negation in the two major dialect groups of IA. It is a contribution to the typology of negation across Arabic dialects since most of the previous studies of negation have focused only on Arabic dialects, such as EA, JA, MA, LA. Besides providing a comprehensive description of the distribution of negation in IA dialects, this dissertation also provides a syntactic analysis explaining this distribution. It sheds some light on the problems in the previous analyses of negation in other Arabic dialects, such as Benmamoun (2000, 2013), Alqassas (2012, 2016, 2019), Hoyt (2010), and Soltan (2007, 2014), and provides an analysis that accounts for IA data. This dissertation is also the first work to provide a detailed description of the syntactic distribution of the NSIs, namely: NPIs and NCIs in the ma group and the ma-f group and propose an analysis that captures the syntactic behavior of NPIs and NCIs in these two dialect groups.
1.5. Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized as follows: chapter two focuses on works that concern sentential negation and NSIs in different languages. In this chapter, I provide an overview of previous research in the field of sentential negation and NSIs. Moreover, this chapter reviews the disagreements in the previous studies about the structure of negative clauses and the structural positions of sentential negation, and how NSIs get licensed in Arabic dialects. For example, some scholars, such as Benmamoun (1997, 2006), Alsarayreh (2012), among others, state that NSI’s licensed by three configurations namely: c-command, Spec-head, and Head-complement. Other scholars, such as Hoyt (2010), Soltan (2007, 2014), Alqassas (2012, 2019), among others argue that NSIs can either be licensed by c-command or Spec-head relation.

Chapter three examine sentential negation in the *ma* group and the *maʃ* group. In this chapter, I present facts about sentential negation in both groups, showing that the *ma* group uses the negative marker *ma* to express sentential negation with verbal sentences while it uses the negative marker *mu* with verbless clauses. The other group, the *maʃ* group, uses the negative marker *maʃ* to express sentential negation with verbal sentences, whereas it uses the negative marker *muʃ* with verbless clauses. This chapter indicates that the High-Neg hypothesis cannot provide an explanation for the case when the imperfective verb has the option to merge with the negative marker in both groups. Therefore, I will argue that sentential negation in both groups occupies a projection which occurs between TP and VP.

Chapter four investigate expressions that function as NPIs in IA. This chapter shows that *ʔəj wahidʃi “anyone/thing,” ʕʊmr “never,”* and *kullʃi “anything”* are considered as NPIs because they cannot pass the tests which are used to differentiate between NPIs and NCIs. First, the NPIs in both groups cannot express negation on their own as they cannot stand alone as a
fragment answer. Second, NPIs cannot occur preverbally. Third, NPIs always require the presence of negation. Finally, NPIs are not sensitive to locality restrictions. In this chapter, I introduce the quantifier *kullfi* and show that both the *ma* group and the *ma-f* group use it as an NPI which is different from all other Arabic dialects that have been described in the literature, in that none of these dialects use the quantifier *kullfi* as a nominal NPI. Furthermore, this chapter discusses how NPIs are licensed in consideration of the previous analyses. The previous theories of NPIs licensing are discussed and tested by presenting data from the *ma* group and the *ma-f* group. Finally, this chapter presents my proposed analysis supported by data from both groups which shows that NPIs can be mainly licensed by c-command in this language.

Chapter five examines NCIs in the *ma* group and the *ma-f* group. The chapter demonstrates that *wala wahid* “even one,” *ʔəbəd* “never,” and *bəʕd/ʔɪlhɪssəḥ* “not yet” are considered as NCIs because they can pass the tests which are used to differentiate between NPIs and NCIs. Furthermore, the chapter discusses how NCIs are licensed in the *ma* group and the *ma-f* group and whether the enclitic *-f* is in complementary distribution with the NCIs.

Chapter six concludes the dissertation by summarizing the discussion in the previous chapters and proposing future research questions.
Chapter Two

LITERATURE REVIEW

2. Introduction

Negation has been one of the most important topics of continued theoretical study (Jespersen 1917; Klima 1964; Kitagawa 1986; Lasnik 1972; Pollock 1989; Chomsky 1989, 1992, 1995; Ouhalla 1990, 2002; Zannuttini 1990, Benmamoun 1992; Haegeman 1995; Shlonsky, 1997; Hoyt, 2005; Lucas, 2007; Penka 2011, Benmamoun, Abunasser, Al-Sabbagh, Bidaoui, & Shalash, 2013; Ouali and Soltan, 2014; among other sources), which is not surprising given that negation plays a central role in the theory. In general, there are two fundamental points that every study of negation considers which are the syntactic properties of negative markers and the location of Negative Phrase (NegP) in the structure.

This chapter presents an overview of the discussion of some of the important work on the syntax of negation. First, I briefly review the main theoretical assumptions and frameworks that motivate the analyses of single and multiple negations in different languages and dialects. Second, I provide different analyses about the syntax projection of sentential negation discussed by different scholars regarding Arabic dialects. Furthermore, the chapter presents works that concern NSIs in different languages and different dialects. Previous studies (Benmamoun 1997, 2006; Alsarayreh 2012; Hoyt, 2010; Soltan, 2007, 2014; Ouali and Soltan, 2014; Alqassas, 2012, 2016, 2019) have a disagreement about the structure of NSIs and how they get licensed in Arabic dialects. Some scholars, such as Benmamoun (1997, 2006), Alsarayreh (2012) argue that NSI is licensed by three configurations such as c-command, Spec-head, and Head-complement configuration. Other scholars, such as Hoyt (2010), Soltan (2007, 2014), Alqassas (2012), among
others state that NSIs can either be licensed by c-command, or by Spec-head relation excluding the Head-complement configuration.

2.1. Sentential Negation

Sentential negation is expressed by using particular negative markers in most languages. However, languages differ with respect to “the number, the syntactic position and the syntactic status of these negative markers” (Zeijlstra, 2004). For example, the sentential negation in Italian is expressed by using a preverbal negative marker “non” while in Catalan an optional negative adverb “no” in addition to the preverbal negative marker “pas” is permitted. In contrast, the combination of a preverbal negative marker “ne” and a negative adverb “pas” is obligatory in Standard French. Finally, a language like German expresses negation by means of a single negative adverb “nicht” (Zeijlstra, 2004). This is illustrated in example (1).

1) a. Gianni non ha telefonato. (Italian)
   Gianni Neg has called
   ‘Gianni did not call.’

b. No ser. (pas) facil. (Catalan)
   Negbe$_{\text{FUT.3S}}$ Neg easy
   ‘It will not be easy.’

c. Jean ne mange pas. (French)
   Jean Neg eats Neg
   ‘Jean does not eat.’
d. Hans kommt nicht.  

Hans comes Neg  
‘Hans does not come.’  

(Adopted from Zeijlstra, 2004: 64)

Sentential negation in languages, such as French (Pollock, 1989), West Flemish (Haegeman, 1995), MA (Benmamoun, 1992), EA (Soltan, 2007, 2014), JA (Alsarayreh, 2012), and LA (Alqassas, 2012, 2016, 2019) is expressed by using a bipartite negation consisting of a proclitic negative and another negative marker. Other languages, like Japanese (Kitagawa, 1986), Italian (Belletti & Stowell, 1997), Standard English (Penka, 2011), express sentential negation by a single negative marker. See the following examples:

2) ma-safr-tʃ nadja.  

Neg-traveled-3SF-Neg Nadia  
‘Nadia did not travel.’  

(Adapted from Benmamoun, 1992)

3) It is not raining.  

Klima (1964) following Jespersen (1917) states that sentential negation is a syntax phenomenon, not a semantic notion as some scholars argues. To distinguish sentential negation from constituent negation, Klima presents different tests to analyze sentential negation in English: the neither tags, the positive tags, the co-occur with any, ever, NPI, either coordination, and a not even continuation. If the negated sentence allows the above tests, then the sentence has a sentential negation reading not a constituent negation reading. This is shown in (4):

4) a. Not much rain fell, and neither did much snow.  

(neither tags)

b. Jean doesn’t know how to swim, does she?  

(positive tags)
c. There was not any snow falling anywhere else.  

   (any)

d. Publishers will not reject suggestions, and writers will not accept them, _either._  

   (either coordination)

e. Nobody likes John, _not even_ Mary.  

   (not even continuation)

Lasnik’s (1972) analysis developed Klima’s (1964) approach to negation. According to Klima, the Neg _not_ has a single source which is “pre-sentential Neg” while according to Lasnik, sentential negation has two positions: the pre-sentential and the auxiliary position. The Neg _not_ is generated under Complementizer (Comp) when it triggers inversion. However, following Klima, Lasnik states that in cases where the negative elements do not trigger inversion such as ‘_not long ago,’ then _not_ is not the pre-sentential particle, but is a part of the constituent because its scope is limited to that constituent. See example (5):

5)  a. Not long ago, John passed a test.

    b. Not often does John pass tests.

The derivation of (5) is schematized below:

6)  \[ S’ \ [Comp \ [S \ [AdvP \ not \ long \ ago \ [NP \ John \ [Aux \ past \ [VP \ pass \ a \ test]]] \]]] \]

7)  \[ S’ \ [Comp \ [Neg \ Not \ [S \ [AdvP \ ago \ [NP \ John \ [Aux \ past \ [VP \ pass \ tests]]] \]]] \]

   (Adopted from Lasnik, 1972: 33)

Haegeman (1995) develops an analysis of the syntax of negation which is contrary to the Principles and Parameters framework introduced by Noam Chomsky. Haegeman’s work plays an important role in the syntax of negation. Her work focuses primarily on the earliest version of Chomsky’s Minimalist Program (1992) and Brody’s Radical Minimalism (1993b). The author did not restrict the discussion to the syntactic analysis of negation aspects; rather, she brought particular attention to the parallelism between negative sentences and interrogative sentences
which can be obtained cross-linguistically. According to the author, negative sentences have similar aspects to interrogative sentences which are as follows:

First, both negative elements and interrogative elements can license polarity items. As the following examples show.

8) a. Did you see anyone?
   b. I did not see anyone.
   c. *I saw anyone.

9) a. Who said anything?
   b. No one said anything?
   c. *I said anything.

Second, they both trigger subject-auxiliary inversion, as shown in (10) and (11):

10) a. What did you see?

    *Not often Jack attends parties.
    b. Not every day does Jack eat bagels.
    *Not every day Jack eats bagels.

Third, both can give rise to inner island effects, as in (12):

12) a. Bill is here, which they (don’t) know.
    b. *Bill is here, as they (*don’t) know.

This fact is also true in French as example (13) shows.

13) a. Pierre est ici, ce qu’ils savent/ne savent pas.
    ‘Pierre is here, which they know/don't know.’
b. Pierre est ici, comme ils le savent/*ne le savent pas.

‘Pierre is here, as they it know/don't know.’

(Haegeman, 1995, adopted from Rizzi, 1990)

Fourth, both negative elements and interrogative elements bring out the syntactic phenomenon called “absorption.”

14) a. Qui disait quoi?

who said what

‘Who said what?’

For which x, y [x: a person; y: a thing] [x said y]

b. Personne ne disait rien.

no one ne said nothing

‘No one said anything.’

No x, y [x: a person; y: a thing] [x said y]

Fifth, they are subject to that-trace filter effects and Logical Form (LF) movement, as illustrated by example (15) and (16):

15) a. Non pretendo che tu dica niente. (LF movement)

non I-ask that you say (subj) nothing

‘I don't ask that you say anything.’

b. Non pretendo che nessuno dica questo.

non I ask that no one say (subj) that

*‘I don't ask that anyone say that.’

16) a. *Who did you think that t would arrive first? (that-trace)

---

3 Absorption refers to a sentence that has one single reading even when it has more than one negative element.
b. Who did you think would arrive first?

Finally, both give rise to connectedness effects where the subject negative phrases are licensed by LF movement of an object negative phrase as illustrated in (17):

17) a. *Non fa questo lavoro [per aiutare nessuno].  
non does this work to help no one
b. Non fa niente [per aiutare nessuno].  

(Examples adopted from Haegeman, 1995)

Zeijlstra (2004) examines sentential negation and negative concord. The author shows that negative markers have different forms; for example, as preverbal particles such as Italian non (18), or affixal elements such as Czech ne (19) or as negative adverbs such as Dutch niet (20):

18) Gianni ha arrivato non oggi. (Italian)  
Gianni has arrived Negtoday  
‘Not today Gianni arrived.’

19) Milan nevidi. (Czech)  
Milan neg.sees  
‘Milan doesn’t see.’

20) Jan hoeft niet schoon te maken. (Dutch)  
Jan needs Negclean to make  
‘John doesn’t need to clean.’

(Zeijlstra, 2004)

Zeijlstra (2004) proposes that sentential negative markers have an uninterpretable [uNeg] feature which causes the projection of NegP. The author states that Spec-NegP has a null
negative operator which has an interpretable [iNeg] feature. Therefore, the negative markers which have [uNeg] feature enter in an Agree relation with the negative operator that has the [iNeg] feature. According to Zeijlstra, the locus of negation in the sentence is determined by the semantic properties of negation. NegP can be located below TP in some languages, or it can dominate TP in other languages. The structure of negation is the result of the semantic properties of the negative operator, not the syntactical properties. The author assumes that when NegP occupies a projection higher than TP, “the negative operator binds temporal variables which yields a logical form that is understood as sentential negation. In contrast, when NegP is below TP the negative operator binds event variables, yielding a logical form, which is also interpreted as sentential negation” (Zeijlstra, 2004). The syntactic distribution of NegP, according to the author, proposes that every NegP in the syntactic clause presents one semantic negation. Therefore, it is not necessary for the multiple positions for NegP. In this dissertation, I will follow Zeijlstra’s analysis which illustrates that there is a null negative operator “\(Op^-\)” that carries [iNeg] feature; however, I will depart from his analysis and argue that the negative marker ma in the two groups of IA, ma group and ma-ʃ group, has the [iNeg] feature instead of either the [iNeg] or [uNeg] feature. More details are presented in the next chapters.

So far, I have presented and discussed how sentential negation is expressed in different languages. In the rest of the chapter, I will present previous analytical approaches that discuss sentential negation in Arabic dialects. Arabic dialects differ in how they express sentential negation (Benmamoun 1992, 2000; Ouhalla 1992, 1993, 1994; Shlonsky 1997; Watson 1993, Benmamoun et al., 2013; Soltan 2007, 2014; among others). Some dialects such as MA, PA, EA, San?ani (Yemeni) Arabic, and Lebanese Arabic, use the bipartite ma-ʃ to express sentential negation while others like Kuwaiti, Sudanese Arabic, and IA use the negative marker ma only.
Here, I will argue against the argument which claims that IA only uses the free morpheme *ma* when negating a statement and illustrate that some dialects of IA use the bipartite *ma-f* alongside the free morpheme *ma* when expressing sentential negation.

Arabic scholars (Brustad 2000; Benmamoun 2000; Aoun, Benmamoun, Choueiri, 2010; Alsarayreh, 2012; Alqassas, 2012, 2016, 2019; among others) state that sentential negation is realized differently in the context of verbal predicates and non-verbal predicates. In verbal predicates, the discontinuous morpheme *ma-f* is obligatory in MA, EA, PA, and Sanʔani (Yemeni) Arabic (21). While the enclitic -ʃ, in the discontinuous morpheme *ma-f*, is optional in Lebanese Arabic as in (22):

21) ma-qra-ʃʔəl-wəld.  
\text{Neg-read.PAST.3MS-Neg the-boy}  
‘The boy did not read.’

22) ʔəl-wəld ma-ʔara-(ʃ) ʔəl-ktab.  
\text{the-boy Neg-read.PAST.3MS-(Neg) the book}  
‘The boy did not read the book.’

(Adopted from Brustad 2000; Benmamoun 2000)

In non-verbal predicates, the non-discontinuous morpheme *mu* is used in EA (24), LA, PA, and MA (23). In Syrian Arabic, on the other hand, the negative *mu* is used as in (25):

23) huwa mafi hna.  
\text{he Neg here}  
‘He is not here.’
Benmamoun (1992, 1997, 2000) investigates negation in MA. The author states that sentential negation in MA is achieved by two combined morphemes: the proclitic morpheme *ma*- and the enclitic morpheme *-ʃ*. The proclitic morpheme *ma*- is the head of NegP. According to the author, Arabic dialects are classified into three categories based on how they express negation. The first category includes dialects that have two negative morphemes, the proclitic *ma*- and the enclitic *-ʃ* (26) such as MA, EA, PA, and Sanʔani (Yemeni) Arabic.4

26) a. ma-dʒa-t-ʃ nadja. (MA)

Neg-come._PAST.3SF-Neg Nadia

‘Nadia did not come.’

b. nadja ma-dʒa-t-ʃ.

Nadia Neg-come._PAST.3SF-Neg

‘Nadia did not come.’

The second category contains dialects that have one negative marker *ma* (27), such as Sudanese Arabic and Hassaniyya dialect.

---

27) a. Šomar ma dʒa.
   Omar Neg come.PAST.3SM
   ‘Omar didn’t come.’

b. ma ţɔχæl-t.
   Neg work.PAST.1S
   ‘I didn’t work.’

The third category includes dialects that express negation with the negative morpheme -ʃ only (28) as in some Lebanese and Jordanian dialects.

28) a. bi-t-hib-f jîqîl ʔtî-bəjt.
   ASP-3F-likes-Neg work the-house
   ‘She does not like housework.’

b. bɔdd-i-f.
   want-my-Neg
   ‘I do not want.’

Benmamoun states that Neg projects a head below TP, Low-Neg-hypothesis.\(^5\) The main reason for this hypothesis is that it can explain the fact that the negative marker ends up as a prefix on the verb. According to Benmamoun, the proclitic ma and the enclitic -ʃ occupy the head position of negation. The author shows that Neg blocks the verb movement to T. As the examples above display, the perfective verb (27) must move to T to check the \([+V]\) and \([+D]\) features. Benmamoun (2000), Benmamoun and Al-Asbahi (2014), following Chomsky’s (1995) Minimalist Program, hypothesizes that negation in Arabic is specified for an uninterpretable [-D] feature that needs to be checked against an applicable interpretable [+D] feature. The author

---

\(^5\) In chapter 3, I provide a full explanation for both hypotheses regarding the position of the negative marker in the clausal hierarchy in Arabic dialects. These hypotheses are known as High-Neg-hypothesis and Low-Neg-hypothesis.
states that in verbal negation, the merger takes place either via head movement or incorporation. Therefore, the verb movement in example (27) cannot occur unless the verb merges with Neg on its way to T to avoid minimality violation. In contrast, the imperfective verb (28) does not require to check [+V] feature. Hence, the verb only needs to merge with Neg to check [+D] feature. In this dissertation, I will follow Benmamoun’s (1997) analysis and show that the Low-Neg analysis will provide the correct rationale for the merger of the negative marker and the verbal predicate, or the verbless predicate in IA.

In his recent work, Benmamoun, co-authored with Abunasser, Al-Sabbagh, Bidaoui, & Shalash (2013) argues that the NegP occurs higher than TP, High-Neg-hypothesis. In their paper titled “The Location of Sentential Negation in Arabic Varieties,” the authors present pieces of evidence to support the High-Neg-hypothesis which is proposed by Fassi Fehri (1993), Shlonsky (1997), and Soltan (2007). The first piece of evidence is that the negative marker in MA (29), EA (30), LA (31), and Gulf (32) dialects merges with the future tense markers ha-, rah, ta-“will.” The authors treat the future tense as a head occupies T. In this dissertation, I treat what is referred to as a future tense marker as a light verb that occupies a projection head under vp. See chapter 3 for more details.

29) ma-ɣadi-ʃ nɣru3. (MA)

Neg-Fut-Neg exit.1p

‘I will not go out.’

---

6 According to Benmamoun (2000), as cited in Alsarayreh (2012), the head movement can be expected to happen with main verbs, auxiliaries, and inflected prepositions because these are treated as heads which can attach to negation by head movement. Incorporation happens with existential particles, indefinite pronouns, and inflected adverbs as these are not considered to be heads but rather are XPs; therefore, assuming movement to a head position with these disobey construction perpetuation.
30) mɪʃ ha-jiskut-u ʕala kida ʔɔbɔd˚ən.  
Neg Fut-silent-3P on this ever  
‘They will never remain silent about it.’

31) ṭəna ma-raḥ ʔɔχud-ha.  
I Neg-Fut take.1S-it  
‘I will not take it.’

32) ma-raḥ ʔɔgul ɬək ṭəna min.  
Neg-Fut say.1S to.you me who  
‘I will not tell you who I am.’  
(Adopted from Benmamoun et al., 2013: 92)

Another piece of evidence that the authors use to support their analysis for the locus of Neg is NPIs. The NPIs, in MA, consist of hatta+N can occur preverbal (33) and postverbal (34).

33) həṭta wəld ma-qra lə-ktab.  
any boy Neg-read.3SM the-book  
‘No boy read the book.’

34) ma-qra həṭta wəld lə-ktab.  
Neg-read.3SM any boy the-boy  
‘No boy read the book.’  
(Adopted from Benmamoun, 1997: 297)

In example (33) the authors argue that the NPI hatta occupies the specifier of NegP which occurs higher than the tense and must be licensed in a Spec-bead relation with negation in the preverbal position.
Moreover, the head NPI ʕəmmər “never” enter into a Head-complement relationship with the negative marker in MA and LA. According to the authors the NPI must be adjoining to NegP which cannot be achieved unless negation is higher than TP. Furthermore, in LA, the NPI ʕumr can merge with negation instead of the perfective verb. See the following examples:

35) ʕəmmər ma-ʒa.  
   never Neg-came.3SM  
   ‘He never came.’

36) ma-ʕʊmriʃ sməʃna-ha.  
   Neg-never-Neg heard.1S-it  
   ‘I never heard it.’

(Benmamoun et al., 2013)

Later in this dissertation, we will see that data from the ma-ʃ group shows that example (36) is ungrammatical in IA. There is no merger between the negative marker and the NPI ʕumr in the ma-ʃ group or even the ma group which I will use as a piece of evidence when I argue against the High-Neg-hypothesis. Furthermore, I will show that the data from the ma and the ma-ʃ groups does not show any examples when the NPIs or the NCI s must be licensed by Spec-head or Head-complement relationship. In this dissertation, I will argue that NSIs are mainly licensed by c-command.

Finally, Benmamoun et al., (2013) claim that the progressive aspect (37), existential particles (38), and possessive particles (39) occupy the head of T which requires negation to merge with them. In chapter 3, I argue against this analysis and propose that the progressive aspect occupies the head of AspP instead of T which occurs below TP. Similarly, I will show that the existential and the possessive particles occupy a head that occurs below TP.
37) mə-to-jqrə-f.  
   Neg-PROG-read.3SM-Neg  
   ‘He is not reading/does not read.’

38) mə-fi-f wəla ʕajjil hna.  
   Neg-there-Neg none child here  
   ‘There is no one child here.’

39) mə-ʕandi-f əl-ktabl.  
   Neg-POSS.1S-Neg the-book  
   ‘I don't have the book.’

(Adopted from Benmamoun et al., 2013:99)

Hoyt (2005, 2010) discusses sentential negation marking in LA. Similar to Benmamoun’s analysis (1992, 1997, 2000), Hoyt displays that Arabic dialects have three strategies to express sentential negation. The first strategy is the use of a proclitic ma-. This marker is used in clauses ruled by verbal categories and occurs at the left edge of the clausal nucleus which follows topicalized elements, so ma- can be used with a finite verb (40), an auxiliary (41), a pseudo-verb (42) and an existential particle (43):  

40) Verb:  
   əmberif fillil mə-ʕirtif ʔənæm.  
   yesterday in-the-night Neg-knew.1S sleep.1S  
   ‘Last night, I was not able to sleep.’

---

7 Examples (40)45 are adopted from Hoyt (2005, 2010).
41) Auxiliary:

`təbʕən, ma-kæn fi ʔəj ʔəlag ʔilha.

naturally Neg-was exist any treatment to-her

‘Of course, there was no way to treat her.’

42) Pseudo-Verb:

maʕindi ʔifí mumkən ʔəhki ʔənnu.

Neg-at-me thing possible speak.1s about-him

‘I do not have anything I can talk about.’

43) Existential Particle:

mə-fi həda ʔsmu bɨhərf ʔssin.

Neg-exist one.SM name- with-letter the-s

‘There is not anyone whose name has an ‘s’.’

The second strategy is the use of mif/mifi, or mu which are considered as independent morphemes. Hoyt (2005) treats the non-discontinuous mif as a negative auxiliary. This is illustrated in (44):

44) a. ʔəna mif ʔostæð.

I Neg professor.

‘I am not a professor.’

b. ʔəna mu dʒuʕaŋ.

I Neg hungry

‘I am not hungry.’

The negative marker ma- can occur with the enclitic -/. The negative particle ma-f can appear with the main verb or an auxiliary verb. This is seen in the following examples:
45) a. ?inta ma-nimti-f ʔəmbərih.
you Neg-slept.3SM-Neg yesterday
‘Did not you sleep yesterday?’
b. ma-konti-f ʔərif ʔaʃnu ʔəʃi.
Neg-was.1S-Neg know.1S about.3SM thing
‘I did not know a thing about him.’

Finally, some dialects (i.e., PA) express negation with the negative morpheme -ʃ or ma-only.8 Either the proclitic ma- or the enclitic -ʃ is omitted in some cases. This is shown in the following examples:

46) kal-ʔilbadwi wəllahi ma bintam fi baladʒim.
say.3SM-the-bedu.SM by-God Neg sleep.3SM in village.2PM
‘The Bedu said ‘By God, your village cannot be slept in.’

47) kalət ʔona bihun-liʃ fik.
say.3SF I neglect.1S-Neg. in.2SM
‘She said ‘I will not neglect you.’

(Adopted from Hoyt, 2005)

In addition to the non-discontinuous mif. Hoyt shows that LA has what is called “the pronouns of negation” which is another kind of negative auxiliary that has a similar feature of the non-discontinuous mif. These pronouns of negation express more emphasis or polarity contrast compared with mif. According to the author, the pronouns of negation are a combination of a pronoun that is sandwiched by the proclitic ma and the enclitic -ʃ (48). Similarly, Brustad (2000)

8 Similarly, Lebanese dialects and JA show the same phenomenon. (Abu-Haidar, 1979; Aoun et al., 2010).
1. bi-t-hib-f ʃiyl ʔəl-bijt.
Asp-3F-like-Neg work the-house
‘She does not like housework.’
demonstrates that the pronouns of negation also exist in MA, as shown in table 1. Based on the observed data from the $ma$-f group and unlike LA, this group does not have the pronouns of negation.

48) ئنا manif ژسلان.
Neg-I-Neg angry
‘I am not angry.’

Table 1: The pronouns of negation in MA (Brustad, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1$^{st}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>manif “I am not”</td>
<td>mahnaʃ “we are not”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2$^{nd}$</td>
<td>Masc.</td>
<td>mantaʃ “you are not”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem.</td>
<td>mantif “you are not”</td>
<td>mantumaf “you are not”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3$^{rd}$</td>
<td>Masc.</td>
<td>mahuwaf “he is not”</td>
<td>mahumaf “the are not”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fem.</td>
<td>mahjaʃ “she is not”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Benmamoun (2000) and Aoun et al. (2010), the negative marker $ma$- heads its own projection. The first reason for this is because $ma$ and its variant form $ma$-f can host subject clitics as in (49):

49)  
a. Moroccan Arabic  b. Egyptian Arabic  c. Kuwaiti Arabic  Gloss
ma-nta-ʃ  ma-nta-ʃ  mint/mant  you.ms + Neg
ma-nti-ʃ  ma-nti-ʃ  ma-nti-ʃ  you.fs + Neg
huwa-ʃ  huwa-ʃ  huwa-ʃ  he + Neg
ma-hija-ʃ  ma-hija-ʃ  ma-hija-ʃ  she + Neg
ma-hna-ʃ  ma-hna-ʃ  ma-hna-ʃ  we + Neg
Second, in some dialects, it can carry agreement which is a property of a head (50). In the example below *ma* becomes *mi* when it agrees with the object *zudžti* “my wife.”

50) haði mi zudžti.

this Neg wife-my

‘This is not my wife.’

(Aoun et al., 2010, adopted from Matar, 1976)

Finally, the authors state that sentential negation is generated between TP and VP, as shown in (51). This is because, in the verbal clauses, the perfective verb must move to T to check the [+V] and [+D] features, but it cannot cross over Neg. To avoid minimality violation the verb must move to Neg then to T. The result is that the verb hosts *ma-* on its way to T (52).

51) a. ma-qra-ʃ l-wəld.

Neg-read.past.3MS-Neg the-boy

‘The boy did not read.’

(Aoun et al., 2010: 96)

According to Aoun et al., the adjective and the imperfective verb (53) do not need to move to T because they do not require checking the [+V] feature like the perfective verb. Therefore, there is no need to merge with negation. The author indicates that the optional merger between the verb and negation may have to do with focus and scope.
In the next chapter, I will show that even though the negative marker *ma* and the bipartite *
*ma-f* in the *ma* group and the *ma-f* group do not host subject clitics or carry agreement inflection; 
the negative marker *ma* is still treated as a head because it disallows what is known as the “*why 
not*” constructions proposed by Merchant (2001). Instead, the *ma* group and the *ma-f* group 
allow “*why no*” constructions, as shown in the following examples:

54) *liʃ ma?*

why Neg  
‘Why not?’

55) *liʃ la?*

why no  
‘Why no?’

Soltan (2007, 2014), on the other hand, claims that negation occupies a projection higher 
than TP. The author argues that sentential negation in Cairene Egyptian Arabic is higher than TP 
and that the NegP in this dialect is split into two separate heads, one which shows formal 
negativity, and another expressing semantic negation as shown in (56):
The author presents two problems with the Low-Neg analysis. The first problem is that Low-Neg analysis does not provide an explanation for dialects where the non-discontinuous negation marker mɪʃ/appears with a past verb as shown in (57):

```
57) ?oña mɪʃ liʃəb-t.  (Sharqiyyah)

   I   Neg  play.PERF-1S

   ‘I did not play.’
```

(Soltan, 2014:119)

Soltan (2007, 2014) argues that the structure in (57) cannot be derived if Neg were between TP and VP without the verb skipping over Neg when moving to T. If this were to happen, then the negative marker must move to the head above T to form the word order in (57). Both movements will violate the Head Movement Constraint (HMC). Therefore, the structure in (57) is simply underivable if Neg were located below T. The structure is allowed if Neg is above TP, and if the past tense is not required to merge with Neg.

The second problem is that the structure of negation shown in (57) is used in Egyptian children’s speech in an early stage of acquiring negation in this dialect. According to the author, if Neg were below TP by default then it would be very difficult to explain this issue. However,
the High-Neg analysis explains that the children assume that T does not need to raise to Neg; therefore, they use the negation marker \(mj\)' in the early stage.

Soltan provides a morphological algorithm to derive the distribution of negation structures in EA and claims that this algorithm can be expanded to other Arabic dialects.

a. In contexts where Neg is adjacent to a hosting head H, H moves to Neg and then to Pol, and the discontinuous \(ma-H-f\) pattern arises.

b. Otherwise, Neg incorporates into Pol, giving rise to the \(mi-f\) pattern

This algorithm shows that if a hosting head is present then it gives us discontinuous negation. Otherwise, a non-discontinuous pattern occurs.

It is worth mentioning that Soltan’s analysis does not provide an explanation for the structure where the imperfective verb has the option to merge with the bipartite negative \(ma-f\) (58). In chapter 3, I argue that Soltan’s analysis cannot apply to the \(ma-f\) group in IA because this group of dialects, as we will see later in this dissertation, does not allow the structure in (57).

Furthermore, the imperfective verb has the option to merge with negation.

58) ʔəhməd ma-jə-liʃb-f.  
Ahmed Neg-3M-play.IMP.S-Neg
‘Ahmed does not play.’

Finally, the author argues that the splitting analysis provides an explanation for formulating a rule to why -\(f\) is deleted in certain NPI contexts (59), but not in others. See Soltan (2014) for more details.

59a. ma-dʒə(*-f) hətta wahiḍ.  
Neg-came.3SM (-Neg) even one
‘No one came.’
b. ħatta wahid ma-dʒa(*-j).

   even one Neg-came.3SM(-Neg)

   ‘No one came.’

c. nadja ʕummɔr-ha ma-dʒat(*-j).

   Nadya ever-her Neg-came.3SF(-Neg)

   ‘Nadya never came.

(Adopted from Soltan, 2014)

According to Alsarayreh (2012), JA expresses sentential negation in two ways: first by using the proclitic ma- in the context of verbal predicates (60) and the pronouns of negation in the context of non-verbal predicates (61).

60) a. jazan ma-laʃib football.

   Yazan Neg-played.3SM soccer

   ‘Yazan did not play soccer.’

b. jazan ma-biʃab football.

   Yazan Neg-play.3SM soccer

   ‘Yazan does no play soccer.’

61) a. marjam m-i maʃalmih.

   Maryam Neg-she teacher

   ‘Maryam is not a teacher.’

b. əl-wlad ma-humah fi-əl-dar.

   the-boys Neg-they in-the-house

   ‘The boys are not in the house.’

(Adopted from Alsarayreh, 2012: 42-43)
Alsarayreh discusses the two hypotheses, Low-Neg-hypothesis and High-Neg-hypothesis, and shows that the negative marker surfaces as a prefix on an element such as auxiliary verbs (62), prepositions hosting a pronoun clitic (63), indefinite pronouns (64), existential particles (65), and adverbials hosting a pronoun clitic (66). According to the author, these elements are argued to be base-generated in a position in TP or even above TP which cannot be explained by the Low-Neg-analysis.

62) ma-kan bihib t-tuffah.
   Neg-was.3SM like.3SM the-apples
   ‘He did not like apples.’

63) ma-ʕind-i sajjarah.
   Neg-at-me car
   ‘I do not have a car.’

64) ma-hāda 3a.
   Neg-one came.3SM
   ‘No one came.’

65) ma-ʃi hāda 3a.
   Neg-there one came.3SM
   ‘No one came.’

66) ma-ʃumr-u ḥad'ir l-ʒtimʕ.
   Neg-ever-him attended.3SM the-meeting
   ‘He has not ever attended the meeting.’

Alsarayreh argues that the High-Neg-hypothesis can provide an explanation for example (63) above where the expletive particle which occupies Spec-TP merges with the negative
marker. Therefore, the Low-Neg-hypothesis cannot clearly account for example (63) in JA. Here, I will argue that the Low-Neg-hypothesis can still account for example (63) as I will argue that the expletive particle occupies the head of the Prepositional Projection (PP) and not base-generated in TP or above TP. See chapter 3 for more information.

Alqassas (2012, 2016, 2019), who investigates the locus of Arabic negation, states that it is not necessary for the negative markers to be adjacent to the verb as previous studies argued. Instead, he argues that they can be separated by adverbs (67) or definite subjects (68):^9

67) ma-hada fiʔlan bi-safir kul yom. (JA)
   Neg-one really  ASP-travel.3SM every day
   ‘No one really travels every day.’

68) ma-hada  bi-safir kul yom. (JA)
   Neg-one  ASP-travel.3SM every day
   ‘No one travels every day.’

In the above examples, negative markers scope over the whole sentence, even the quantifier  kʊll “all.” However, ma, mɪʃ, and mub in JA, Qatari Arabic (QA), and Standard Arabic are considered as constituent negation and cannot scope over the whole sentence or the NPI  ħada “anyone” as the ungrammaticality of (69):

69) mɪʃ kul yom bi-safir (*ḥada) (JA)
   Neg every day  ASP-travel.3SM NPI-one
   ‘*Not every day anyone travels.’

---

^9 Example (67) - (75) are adopted from (Alqassas, 2012, 2016, 2019).
The negative marker *la* is used in JA, QA, and Standard Arabic to negate imperatives. In this case, it precedes the imperfective verb as illustrated in (70):

70) la t-safir. \[\text{(QA)}\]

Neg $\text{IMP} \cdot \text{travel.3SM.IMP}$

‘do not travel.’

Furthermore, the negative marker *ma* can precede or follow the copula *kan* “was” as examples (71) and (72) show.

71) ma kan ji-lʔab. \[\text{(JA)}\]

Neg was $\text{3.play.SM}$

‘He was not playing.’

72) kan ma ji-lʔab. \[\text{(JA)}\]

was Neg $\text{3.play.SM}$

‘He was not playing.’

The author shows that NegP can occur above (71) or below TP (72). Alqassas proposes that weak *ma-*/*la-* (74) is a head of a Neg projection below TP, while strong *ma/la* (73) is a head of a Neg projection on top of TP. See the following examples:

73) ma kan ji-lʔab. \[\text{(QA)}\]

Neg was $\text{M-play.3S}$

‘He was not playing.’

74) ma-ʃuft-iʃ. \[\text{(JA)}\]

Neg-saw.I

‘I did not see.’
According to the author, the difference between locating Neg above or below TP is motivated by syntactic and semantic/pragmatic reasons. His analysis is somehow similar to Zeijlstra’s (2004) regarding the multi-locus of the negative marks. One reason why the single negative marker *ma occurs above TP is that this marker allows for adverbs, subjects, and the auxiliary verb *kan to intervene between the negative marker and the verb. Bipartite negation *ma-ʃ, on the other hand, does not (75). Therefore, Neg can occur above or below TP.

75) a. ʔəhmad ma-ʃ|arʃ-ʃ.

Ahmad Neg PRT-1-know-Neg
‘Ahmad does not know.’

b. *ma ʔəhmad b-əʃ|arʃ-ʃ.

Neg Ahmad PRT-1-know-Neg
‘Ahmad does not know.’

Here, I will argue that Alqassas’ analysis has two problems. The first problem is that his analysis cannot apply to IA. As I will argue in the next chapter, that adverbs, subjects, or other arguments cannot intervene between the negative marker and the verb. Moreover, I will argue that the Determiner Phrase (DP) in both the *ma group and the *ma-ʃ group are treated as subject, not as Topic. More details are provided in chapter 3. Therefore, Neg cannot occur above TP in both groups. The second problem is that his analysis cannot provide an explanation for example (57), repeated here as (76). Alqassas claims that the bipartite negation *ma-ʃ occurs below TP, then how can we explain the phenomenon found in Sharqiyyah Arabic or similar dialects that allow such structure? I will provide an answer to this question in chapter 3.
2.2. Negative Sensitive Items

Negative Sensitive Items, in natural languages, are divided into two categories: NPIs and NCIs. This section reviews expressions that function as NSIs in Arabic and present previous analytical approaches to licensing NSI negation in different languages and Arabic. Arabic exhibits two types of NSIs: NPIs and NCIs. Previous studies have used some tests to differentiate NPIs from NCIs. I present these tests in the next sub-sections.

2.2.1. Negative Polarity Items

The study of NPIs can be traced back to the beginning of generative grammar ever since Klima (1964). NPIs refer to the lexical items that require the presence of negation markers which are licensed by negation (Ladusaw, 1980). According to Haegeman (1995), NPIs must be c-commanded by a negative marker, as shown in (78). C-command configuration is defined as follows:

77) C-command: A node X c-commands a node Y iff:
   a) X does not dominate Y;
   b) Y does not dominate X;
   c) The first branching node Z dominating X dominates Y.

(Arrdoted from Haegeman, 1995)

78) I did not see anyone.

According to Progovac (1994), Haegeman (1995), Roberts and Roussou (2003), among others, if either the NPI any does not have a licenser or if it occupies the subject position then the
negative marker *not* cannot license the NPI *anyone* because it does not c-command it. The result then is ungrammatical sentences:

79) *I saw anyone.

80) *Anyone did not go there.


81) *I said anything. (English)

82) Chi hai visto?  *Alcuno. (Italian)

who have seen anybody

‘Who have you seen?’ ‘Anybody.’

Benmamoun (1997, 2006), Alqassas (2012, 2016), Hoyt (2010), Alsarayreh (2012), Ouali and Soltan (2014) state that NPIs and NCIs can be licensed either by c-command, or Spec-head relation. Moreover, Benmamoun (1997, 2006) and Alsarayreh (2012) argue that NPIs and NCIs can also be licensed by Head-complement configuration along with the other two configurations. There was a debate about whether the language allows all the three requirements or only some. For example, Alqassas (2016) illustrates that JA does not allow Head-complement configuration. The author states that the NPIs cannot enter into Head-complement relationship with negation as the NPI *ʕumr* “never” cannot precede the negative *məħəd* or the NCI *wəla wahid*. This is shown by the ungrammaticality of the following examples:
According to Aoun et al (2010), MA has two different classes of NPIs. One class which can precede sentential negation (85) and another class that cannot precede sentential negation (87). The former can both follow and precede sentential negation (86) which the authors use as a piece of evidence for Spec-head configuration.

85) ⴻⴰⴷⵜⴰ ⴰⴰⵊⵔ ⴷⴰⵎⴰ ⴰⴷⵔⴰ ⴷⴰⵎⴰ ⴷⴰⵎⴰ ⴷⴰⵎⴰ.

even one Neg-come.3MS

‘No one came.’

86) ⴷⴰⵎⴰ ⴻⴰⴷⵜⴰ ⴰⴰⵊⵔ ⴷⴰⵎⴰ ⴷⴰⵎⴰ ⴷⴰⵎⴰ ⴷⴰⵎⴰ.

Neg-come.3MS even one

‘No one came.’

87) ⴷⴰⵎⴰ ⴻⴷⴷ.

Neg-come.3MS one

‘No one came.’

(Aoun et al, 2010:123)

In addition to the NPI ⴻⴰⴷⵜⴰ, MA has another class which is the adverbial NPI ʕəmmər.

Benmamoun (2006) shows that the NPI ʕəmmər in example (88) cannot be licensed by neither c-
command nor by Spec-head configuration. Therefore, the author proposes another relationship which is Head-complement configuration.

88) nadja ʒəmər-hə ma-dʒə.

nadja never-her Neg-came.3MS

‘Nadia never came.’

Benmamoun (1992, 1997, 2000, 2006) investigates negation in MA. The author states that NSIs in MA is licensed under c-command, Spec-head, and Head-complement relation. The author states that the enclitic marker -ʃ is in complementary distribution with the NPI ʰətta+NP in MA which is similar to the distribution of the negative marker pas used in French, as in (89). The author shows that the licensing of NPIs must take place overtly when they are c-commanded by or in a Spec-head relation with the negative marker ma, as seen by the ungrammaticality of (90):

89) a. ma  qrit  ʰətta  ktab.

Neg read.1S even book

‘I did not read any book.’

b. *ma-qrit-ʃ ʰətta  ktab.

Neg read.1S-Neg even book

‘I did not read any book.’

90) a.* ʰətta  ktab səlwa ma qrat.

even book Salwa Neg read.3SF

‘Salwa did not read any book.’
b. ma-tlaqtʕəamm həṭta wahid.

Neg-met.1S uncle even one

‘I did not meet with the uncle of anyone.’

(Adopted from Benmamoun, 1992)

NPIs in MA can occur preverbally or post-verbally. When they occur in a preverbal position they must be licensed in a Spec-head relation with negation as shown in (85) repeated here as (91). When they occur in a postverbal position they are licensed by c-command, as shown in (89) above.

91) həṭta wahid ma-dʒa.

even one Neg-come.3MS

‘No one came.’

Like wh-movement, NPIs does not obtain across a complex NP (92) or an adjunct clause (93). However, NPIs differ from wh-movement in that licensing NPIs within an NP or PP is possible as long as it is in the c-command domain of negation, as in (87) above and that NPIs are not allowed in context from which wh-phrases can easily be extracted. For example, an NPI within a tense clause cannot be licensed by negation in the higher clause (94). However, an NPI in a non-finite embedded clause or a small clause can be licensed by a mixed negative (95):

92) *ma-qritʃ li-kitab lliʕə-ni həṭta wahid.

Neg-read.1S-Neg the-book that gave-me even one

‘I did not read the book that anyone gave me.’

93) *ma-dʒa baʃ jəṭlaqa həṭta wahid.

Neg-came.3MS in order meet even one

‘He did not come in order to meet anyone.’
94) *ma-qult boli qriti hatta ketab.
    Neg-said.1s that read.2s even book
    ‘I did not say that he read any book.’

95) ma-byit hatta wahid jdgi.
    Neg-wanted.1s even come
    ‘I did not want anyone to come.’

(Adopted from Benmamoun, 1992)

Moreover, Benmamoun treats the NPIs as heads since they have the properties of the head in Arabic. Hence, the author shows that the head NPIs in MA can occur higher than negation (96). Neither c-command nor in Spec-head configuration can license them. Only Head-complement can license the head NPIs. In this dissertation, I will argue that the NPI is based-generated postverbally and moved pre-verbally. More details are provided in chapter 4.

96) ʕəmmr-u ma-kan tajbyi nadja.
    NPI-him Neg-was love Nadia
    ‘He never loved Nadia.’

Hoyt (2014) discusses NPIs in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and Arabic dialects. The author discusses the theories that are argued to license NPIs which are downward monotonicity (Fauconnier 1975; Ladusaw 1980, von Fintel 1999), pragmatic strengthening (Krifka 1995a-b, Lahiri 1998), or non-veridicality (Giannikadou 1998, 1999, 2000). JA has many different types of NPIs. First, Nominal NPIs which include ʔʃi “thing”, hadd “one,” and ʔaj “any.”

97) a. ma-juft-iʃi bass ʃəla koll hal səawar haifa ʃalwat ktir.
    Neg-saw.1s-Neg thin but on every case pictures Haifa beautiful.PF much
    ‘I did not see anything but, in any case, the pictures of Haifa are very nice.’
b. ma-bayit hadd jruh məsa-k.

 Neg-wanted.1S one go.3SM with.2S

 ‘I did not want anyone to go with you.’

(Adopted from Hoyt, 2014)

Second, Adverbial NPIs such as bi-l-marra “once, ever”, ʃumr “ever”, ʔahad “one” and feij? “thing.” According to Hoyt, bi-l-marra is ambiguous between an NPI and non-negative interpretations, as shown in (98). The adverb ʃumr must co-occur with a licensor. See example (99):

98) ?ənta lam təwdiḥ feijʔ-an bi-l-marra.

 you.SM Neg-past clarify.2SM thing-Acc in-the-once

 ‘You did not ever clarify anything.’

99) a. ʔəna ʃumr-i ma-ʃuft wahad miθl-u. (LA)

 I ever-my not-saw.1S one like-him

 ‘I have never seen anyone like him.’

b. bba ʃammar-u ma-ka-ʃreb. (MA)

 father-my every.3SM Neg-Asp-drink.3SM

 ‘My father, he never drinks.’

(Harrel and Sobelman, 1964)

The last two types of NPIs in JA are the NPI auxiliaries, and the NPI idioms. Examples of the NPI auxiliaries are qam “rise, stand” and ʃad, ʃawad, rajaʕ “return” which are developed from the motion verbs. NPI auxiliaries include tʕallaq ʃəla rijał-u “hang from someone’s shoe”, rafaʕ l-u qafaʕ “lift a match for someone.” This is shown in the following examples:
100) a. ma-bit'allaq šala rjj-l-i ū bja'ṭaqād huwwā.

Neg-hang.3SM upon foot-my what thinks.3SM he

‘What he says doesn’t hang from my shoe.’

b. wālla ma-barfaš-l-u qaʃā.

by-God Neg-lift.1S-to.3SM match

‘I will not lift a match for him.’

(Hoyt, 2014)

It is worth mentioning that Hoyt only provides a descriptive analysis of the NPIs categories in LA without discussing how these types get licensed.

Alsarayreh (2012) presents the NPIs types that are used in JA. These types are nominal NPIs (101), Determiner NPIs (102), adverbial NPIs (103), and idiomatic NPIs (104). The author indicates that some of the NPIs such as $i/i$ does not exclusively appear in negative contexts. The NPI $i/i$ can sometimes occur in affirmative declarative sentences, as shown in (105):

101) a.*(ma)-ʒa $h$ada.

Neg-came.3S one

‘No one came.’

b. mārjam *(ma)-ʃafat $h$ada.

Mary Neg-saw.3SF one

‘Mary did not see anyone.’

102) a.*(ma)-halls $?āj$ t'lib s-suʔal.

Neg-answered.3S which student the-question

‘No student answered the question.’
b. mərjəm *(ma)-halla ʔajj suʔal.

Mary Neg-answered.3SF which question

‘Mary did answer the question.’

103) mərjəm *(ma)-ʃumr-ha hallat l-waʔib.

Mary Neg-ever-her answered.3SF the-assignment

‘Mary has not ever answered her assignment.’

104) mərja *(ma)-sˤaráfat fils ʔahmer.

Mary Neg-spent.3SF cent red

‘Mary did not spend a red cent.’

105) mərjəm jafat jī ʕala-tˤwlih.

Mary saw.3SF thing on the-table

‘Mary saw something on the table.’

(Adopted from Alsarayreh, 2012)

Alqassas (2012, 2019) examines NSIs in JA. The author presents the categories of the NPIs and their distribution. JA like other Arabic dialects exhibits the four categories of the NPIs i.e., nominal NPIs (106), Determiner NPIs (107), adverbial NPIs (108), and idiomatic NPIs (109):

106) maʔṣa-ʃ jajj hada.

Neg-came.3SM-Neg. any one

‘No one came.’

107) maʃaf-ʃ jīʃī.

Neg-saw.3SM thing

‘I did not see anything.’
108) ʕʊmr-u ma-zar ʔəl-batra.
    ever-him Neg-visited.3SM the-Petra
    ‘He has never visited Petra.’
109) ma-maʃ-huʃ griʃ/fils ʔəhmər.
    Neg-with-him-Neg. penny/cent red
    ‘He does not have a penny/red cent.’

(Adopted from Alsarayreh, 2012)

According to Alqassas, all the NPIs in JA can occur both postverbally and preverbally with the presence of the negative marker ma. The preverbal NPIs can be licensed under Spec-head relation with the negative marker while the post-verbal NPIs can be licensed under c-command by the negative marker. Moreover, Alqassas states that NPIs in JA can only be licensed by c-command or by Spec-head relation. The author illustrates that the NPI ʕʊmr cannot be licensed under Head-complement configuration, claimed by Benmamoun (2006), as ʕʊmr cannot precede the negative compound məḥəd-ʃ (110) and the NCI wəla ḡəda (111).

However, Alqassas’ argument is only limited to JA. It would be more accurate if his argument was supported by other Arabic dialects. Moreover, his argument cannot provide an explanation for dialects that allow the NPI ʕʊmr to precede məḥəd-ʃ and the NCI wəla. In this paper, I argue that the NPI ʕʊmr can precede məḥəd-ʃ and the NCI wəla by showing some evidence from the ma group and ma-ʃ group. However, data from both groups illustrates that NSIs in IA can only be licensed by c-command. I will argue that even though the NPI ʕʊmr can precede məḥəd-ʃ and the NCI wəla; yet it cannot be licensed under Head-complement configuration. Finally, I will demonstrate that the preverbal NPIs and NCIs are licensed by c-command and not by Spec-head relation as the previous authors argued. More details are provided in the next chapters.
Scholars such as Benmamoun (2006), Soltan (2012), Alqassas (2015, 2019) argue that the enclitic -ʃ is in complementary distribution with the preverbal NPI such as the NPI ūmr, or the NPI ḥatta as shown in (112) and (113). In this dissertation, data from the ma-ʃ group will be used to argue against their claims and illustrates that the enclitic -ʃ is not in complementary distribution with the preverbal NPI ūmr or any preverbal NSIs in the ma-ʃ group which distinguishes this group from other Arabic dialects.

112) lajla ūmr-ha ma-safart (*-ʃ).

Laila never-her Neg-traveled.3FS-Neg

‘Laila never traveled.’

113) *ma-qrit-ʃ ḥatta ktab.

Neg read.1S-Neg even book

‘I did not read any book.’

(Adopted from Benmamoun, 2006)
2.2.2. Negative Concord Items

NC refers to using two or more negative elements that do not cancel each other out but they still express a single negation (Zeijlstra, 2004). Unlike NPIs, NCIs can stand alone (114) and can occur in the fragment answers (115).

114) Nessuno ha telefonato a nessuno.  
N-body has telephoned to n-body  
‘Nobody called anybody’

115) ¿A qui n viste?  
A Nadie.  
to who saw.  
to nobody  
‘Who i you see?’  
‘Nobody.’

(Zeijlstra, 2004: 62; 270)

Generally speaking, Languages are divided into either a Strict-NC or a Non-Strict NC.10 Languages, such as Japanese, Creek, Slavic languages are known as a Strict-NC which means that the NCIs require the presence of a negative marker. Other languages, such as Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian, are referred to as a Non-Strict NC which means that the NCIs are allowed to occupy a subject position and to occur without a negative marker (Zeijlstra 2004).

NCIs have three different constructions which are Negative Doubling (116), Negative Spread (117), and Negative Doubling and Spread (118) (Den Besten, 1989; Van der Wouden & Zwarts, 1993; Van der Wouden,1994a; Zeijlestra, 2004). Zeijlestra (2004) argues that all NC languages

---

According to Den Besten, 1989; Van der Wouden, 1994, Giannakidou, 2000; Zeijlstra, 2004, NC has many different types in addition to Strict-NC and a Non-Strict there is a Paratactic Negation and an Emphatic Negation.

1) J’ai peur qu’il ne vient.  
I am afraid that he Neg comes  
‘I am afraid that he comes.’

2) Hij gaat nooit niet naar school.  
He goes n-ever Neg to school  
‘He never ever goes to school.’

(French: Paratactic Negation)  
(Dutch: Emphatic Negation)
exhibit both Negative Spread and Negative Doubling. However, in this dissertation, I will show that this fact is not true and cannot be applied in IA. These constructions are defined as follows:

a. Negative Spread: the distribution of the negative feature over any number of indefinite examples that occur within its scope.

b. Negative Doubling: sentences that include a negative phrase with a marked negative component.

c. Negative Spread and Doubling: sentences that include more than one negative expression with a marked negative constituent.

116) T ee niemand niets gezeid. (West Flemish)

it has n-body n-thing said

‘Nobody said anything.’

117) Jean ne dit rien. (French)

John Neg says n-thing

‘John doesn’t say anything.’

118) Nikdo nedá nikomu nic. (Czech)

N-body.NOM Neg gives n-body.ACC n-thing.DAT

‘Nobody gives anything to anybody.’

(Zeijlestra, 2004:62)

Hoyt (2005) compares two Arabic dialects PA and MA which exhibit NC. His study shows that PA and MA have some similarities in several aspects of NC but they differ in terms of the interpretations of available for the n-words and with the positions in the sentence.\(^{11}\) Hoyt

\(^{11}\) N-words which were first introduced by Laka (1990) refer to a nominal and an adverbial component that occurs with NC construction. According to Giannakidou (2002), an n-word is different from other negative elements in that it is defined as “An expression \(a\) is an n-word iff: (a) \(a\) can be used in structures containing sentential negation or
claims that the n-word \textit{wəla} “not.even” in PA expresses negation when it occurs preverbally while it is treated as an NPI when it occurs post-verbally. The n-word \textit{ḥotta} “even one” in MA is interpreted as an NPI when it occurs both preverbally and post-verbally. This is shown in the following examples:\textsuperscript{12}

119) a. \textit{ma-ʃaf-ni-f wəla ḥədda fi-hum.} \hfill (PA)

\hspace{1em} \text{Neg-see.3MS-1S-Neg not.even one in-them.3MP}

\hspace{1em} ‘Not even one of them saw me.’

b. \textit{wəla ḥədda fi-hum ma-ʃaf-ni-f.}

\hspace{1em} \text{not.even one in-them.3MP Neg-see.3MS-1S-Neg}

\hspace{1em} ‘Not even ONE of them did not see me.’

120) a. \textit{ma-ʃaf-ni-f ḥotta ḥədd.} \hfill (MA)

\hspace{1em} \text{Neg-see.3MS-1S-Neg even. one.3MS}

\hspace{1em} ‘Not even one person saw me.’

b. \textit{ḥotta ḥədd ma-ʃaf-ni-f.}

\hspace{1em} \text{even. one.3MS Neg-see.3MS-1S-Neg}

\hspace{1em} ‘Not even one person saw me.’

The reason why example (119) differs from example (120) according to Hoyt is because the n-word \textit{wəla} in PA is ambiguous between an NPI interpretation (119) and a negative quantifier (NQ) interpretation (120). Therefore, \textit{wəla} has the value [pol -] (119) and the negative marker \textit{ma} is specified as [pol +] but assigns its complement a [pol -] value. The NQ-\textit{wəla} has an unmatched polarity feature with a positive value [↑pol +]) which enters into Accord under a

\textsuperscript{12} Examples (119) – (129) are taken from Hoyt (2005, 2012).
specifier-head relation with the [pol +] feature on ma.\textsuperscript{13} Therefore, the example has a double negation reading.

121) a. \text{NQ-}wəla \rightarrow \text{N [pol +]}
   b. \text{NPI-}wəla \rightarrow \text{N [pol -]}

The author concludes that both dialects have two respects when it comes to expressing negation i.e., (a.) Palestinian n-words are ambiguous between a negative quantifier and existential reading, (b.) N-words are not licensed inside construct state nominals. (a.) Moroccan n-words are uniformly existential quantifiers, and (b.) N-words are licensed inside construct state nominals. In this dissertation, I will argue against Hoyt’s analysis and show that example (119) has a double negation reading because there is a negative operator which occurs higher in the structure which has the interpretable feature [iNeg]. More details are presented in chapter 4.

Hoyt (2010) discusses the NCIs in LA. The author states that NCIs are licensed semantically not syntactically. When wəla-phrases are interpreted with new information status, they are required to be licensed (122); otherwise, they would have a different meaning. The NCIs ʔəbədan (123) and bilmarra (124), on the other hand, are required to be licensed in all locations which are licensed morpho-syntactically.

122) wəla wahid ʕərafat.

\text{not.even one knew.1S}

‘Not one [of them] did I know.’

\textsuperscript{13} According to Hoyt (2005), Accord is a variation on the Agree relation which permits either “top-down” or “bottom-up” matching and to take place under either c-command or specifier-head relation (Chomsky 2000, Chomsky 2001). See Hoyt (2005) for further details.
123) ma-fi ?əjj muʃkila ʔəbadan.
    not-exist which problem never
    ‘There is not a problem ever.’

124) əlbosina, ma-baḥəb-hæ-ʃ bilmarra.
    the-pool, Neg-1S.like-her-Neg never
    ‘The swimming pool, I do not like it at all.’

Alsarayreh (2012) shows that JA exhibits all three types of NC-constructions found in other languages: Negative Doubling (125), Negative Spread (126), and Negative Doubling and Spread (127).

125) məryəm *(ma)-ḥakat wala kilmih.
    Mary Neg-said.3SF NCI-DET word
    ‘Mary did not say any word.’

126) wəla ʕalib hall wəla suʔal.
    NCI student answered.3SM NCI question
    ‘No student answered any question.’

127) məryəm *(ma)-kɪtbət wəla baḥəθ lahassa.
    Mary Neg-wrote.3SF NCI paper NCI-time.
    ‘Mary has not written any paper yet.’

    (Alsarayreh, 2012: 150-1)

According to the author, JA is the first language that displays both types of NC which are strict NC and non-strict NC. The former indicated that the NCIs must always co-occur with a negative marker both preverbally and postverbally without yields a double negation reading whereas the latter indicates that only the postverbal NCIs must co-occur with a negative marker.
If the preverbal NCI co-occurred with a negative marker the result is a double negation reading not a concordant reading. See the following example:

128) a. məryəm *(ma)-btakil tuffah bilmarrah.
   Mary Neg-eat.3SF apples NCI-time
   ‘Mary does not eat apples at all.’

b. bilmarrah məryəm *(ma)-btakil tuffah.
   NCI-time Mary Neg-eat.3SF
   ‘Mary does not eat apples at all.’

129) a.*(ma)-ʒa wəla wahd.
   Neg-came.3SM NCI one.
   ‘No one came.’

b. wəla wahd ma-ʒa.
   NCI one Neg-came.3SM
   ‘No one did not come.’

Following Zeijlstra and Penka’s proposal, Alsarayreh treats the NCIs as non-negative indefinites specified with an [uNeg] feature which requires to be checked against a semantic negation that has an [iNeg] feature. Moreover, the author adopts the assumption that there is an abstract negative operator that can license the NCIs. Following Benmamoun, on the other hand, the author treats the NCIs as heads projects their own projections. Alsarayreh argues that an NCI can check its [uNeg] feature either under c-command, Spec-head agreement, or Head-complement agreement. Finally, the author states that the strict NCIs in JA are licensed at LF, while the non-strict NCIs in JA are licensed in the surface syntax. Data from the ma and the ma-f groups of IA will show some similarities to the NCIs structure in JA.
According to Ouali & Soltan (2014), ħəṭta is treated as NCI, not as NPIs which was claimed by Aoun, Benmamoun, and Choueiri (2010). This is because the NCI ħəṭta can pass the fragment answer (130) and can occur in a preverbal position (131). In this dissertation, I agree with the authors in regard to the fact the previous analyses cannot be extended to Arabic dialects; however, I depart from their analysis regarding the feature of NCI wəla. I will show that the NCI wəla can only carry an uninterpretable feature [uNeg] and it is not ambiguous between the interpretable [iNeg] or the uninterpretable [uNeg] feature.

130) a. Question: Answer:

?qinta juf-t min?  wəla wahid.  (EA)
you saw-2SM who no one

‘Who did you see?’  ‘Nobody.’

b. Question: Answer:

ʃkunʃəf-ti?  həṭta wahəd.  (MA)
who saw-2SM not-even one

‘Who did you see?’  ‘Nobody.’

131) a. wəla wahid gih.  (EA)

no one came.3SM

‘Nobody came.’

b. həṭta wahəd ma-ʒə.  (MA)

not-even one Neg-came.3SM

‘Nobody came.’

Ouali & Soltan show that NCIs in MA and EA can only be licensed locally by negation; however, these two dialects are not similar to negation requirement when licensing NCIs. While
the NCI ħatta in MA always requires the presence of negation which behaves as a strict NC language NCI wəla in EA only requires negation when it follows the verb which behaves as a non-strict NC language. See the following examples:14

132) a. wəla wahid gih.  
   no one came.3SM  
   ‘Nobody came.’

b. wəla wahid ma-ga-. 
   no one Neg-came.3SM-Neg  
   ‘Nobody did not come.’ #‘Nobody came.’

133) ma -ʃəf-t ħatta wahad.  
   Neg-saw-1S not-even one  
   ‘I did not see anyone.’

(Adopted from Ouali & Soltan, 2014)

Furthermore, the authors present and discuss previous analyses (i.e., NPI analysis, NQ analysis, Lexical ambiguity, and Syntactic agreement) and proposed a hybrid analysis of NC which is a mixture of the syntactic agreement and the lexical ambiguity approaches to NC. Under their analysis, the NCIs enter into a licensing relation with the overt negative marker by Agree to check the required features. Moreover, under their analysis, the NCI wəla in EA is either specified for the [uNeg] or [iNeg] feature while the NCI ħatta in MA is specified for the [uNeg] feature as shown in example (132) above.

Finally, the authors show that economic principle plays a role here. However, it does not affect the distribution of the NCI wəla post-verbally. The authors show that example (132)b is

---

14 Data from the ma and ma-ʃ groups indicates that Iraqi Arabic similar to JA behaves as both a strict NC language NCI and as a non-strict NC language.
illicit according to the economic principle because the derivation of \( \text{wəla} \) with \([iNeg]\) is more economical than merging the NCI \( \text{wəla} \) with \([uNeg]\) and then get licensed by Neg through \( Agree \).

This is shown in the following structure:

134) *[\(\text{NegP wəla}[\text{uNeg}] \ [\text{NegP Neg[iNeg]} \ [\text{vp} \ [\ldots ]]]]]

\( Agree \)  

(Ouali & Soltan, 2014)

Alqassas (2012, 2016, 2019) analyzes the locus of negation in southern Levantine, Gulf, and Standard Arabic. The author distinguishes between NPIs and NCIs according to their sensitivity to negation. For example, NPIs always require the presence of negation (135); whereas NCIs do not always require the presence of negation (136):

135) *(ma-\text{j}ər\text{jət-f} wəla-ʔəjī.

\text{Neg-bought}_{1S}-\text{Neg no-thing}

‘I did not buy anything.’

136) wəla ḥada zar ʔəl-batra.

\text{NCI} \ one \ visited_{3MS} \text{the-Petra}

‘No one has ever visited Petra.’

Similar to PA and MA, the NCI \( \text{wəla} \) in JA and EA cannot occur with the negative marker \textit{ma} in the preverbal position without yielding a double negation reading. See the following examples:

137)a. ma-ʔəzə-ʃ wəla-ḥada.  

\text{Neg-came}_{3SM}-\text{Neg no-one}

‘No one came.’
Moreover, Alqassas states that similar to the NPIs, the NCIs in JA can only be licensed by c-command or by Spec-head relation. The postverbal determiner and adverbial NCIs are licensed by c-command while the preverbal determiner NCIs are licensed by Spec-head relation. According to Alqassas, the preverbal *wəla həda* in JA and EA cannot occur with negation is because there is no dependency relation with negation. Arguing against Alqassas analysis, I will show later that the reason why the preverbal *wəla* cannot co-occur with negation can be better explained by the existence of the negative operator which has the [iNeg] feature.

In his recent work, Alqassas argues that the multi-locus analysis provides an explanation for the phenomenon when the enclitic *-ʃ* disappears in the presence of the NSIs. Alqassas (2015, 2019) argues that the enclitic *-ʃ* in MA is in complementary distribution with some of the NCIs, such as *ḥətta wahid*, as shown in (139).
According to the author, the free negative marker *ma* occurs above TP while the bipartite negative marker *ma-f* occurs below TP. Therefore, when the NPI ʕʊmɾ occurs preverbally the enclitic -f does not surface. This is because the bipartite negative marker *ma-f* which occupies a head lower than TP cannot license the adverbial ʕʊmɾ NPI which merges above TP and requires to be licensed either by c-command or Spec-head relation. This fact is supported by the ability of the preverbal ʕʊmɾ to co-occur with the bipartite negative marker *ma-f* where the latter can c-command it.

140) a. ʕʊmr-u ma-zar ʔəl-batra. (JA)
   ever-him Neg-visited.3SM the-Petra
   ‘He has never visited Petra.’

   ever-him Neg-visited.3SM-Neg the-Petra
   ‘He has never visited Petra.’

(Alqassas, 2019: 118)

Finally, Alqassas claim that the NPI ʕʊmɾ is base-generated preverbally and postverbally while the NCI bəʕd is base-generated postverbally and moved pre-verbally. In this dissertation, I argue that both the NPI and the NCI are base-generated postverbally and moved pre-verbally. More details are provided in chapter 4 and 5.
2.3. Summary

In this chapter, I have provided previous analyses about sentential negation. I started with general cross-linguistic analyses, then focused on previous analyses about sentential negation in Arabic dialects. As shown in this section, different scholars have different analyses for the locus of sentential negation. Some scholars argue that NegP is higher than TP, and other scholars argue that NegP is between TP and VP. However, all scholars have agreed that the negative marker in Arabic heads its own projection and that it is associated with an uninterpretable [-D] feature that needs to be checked against an interpretable [+D] feature.

This chapter also presents previous work on the NSI in different languages and Arabic dialects. As shown from the discussion above, there is a disagreement about how the NSIs get licensed in Arabic. Some scholars have argued that the three configurations c-command, Spec-head, and Head-complement configuration can be applied to license the NCIs while other scholars have claimed that the NSIs can only be licensed by c-command or Spec-head relation. Additionally, some scholars have treated some of the NSIs as heads that project their own projections while others have treated them as adverbs that are either base-generated preverbally and postverbally or are base-generated postverbally and moved pre-verbally.

In the next chapter, I will argue that the High-Neg analysis, which is proposed by Soltan (2007, 2014), Hoyt (2010), Benmamoun et al. (2013), does not adequately predict negation in IA. The High-Neg analysis cannot provide an explanation for the merger of the imperfective verb with the negative marker in the ma-f group or the merger between the negative marker and the progressive, prospective, existential and possessive particles in both groups. Therefore, I will argue that the Low-Neg analysis, which is proposed by Benmamoun (1993, 2000), and Aoun et al. (2010) is consistent with what is found in IA because the Low-Neg analysis can give an
explanation for the merger of the imperfective verb with the negative among other problems. The next chapter presents evidence showing that Neg occupies a projection between TP and VP in the $ma$ group and the $ma-f$ group.
Chapter Three

THE SYNTAX OF SENTENTIAL NEGATION IN IRAQI ARABIC DIALECTS

3. Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the discussion and analysis of the syntax of sentential negation in the two groups of IA. It discusses the syntactic properties of sentential negation and focuses on the negative particles that are used to express sentential negation in the *ma* group and the *ma-ʃ* group, which captures most of the variation in the syntax of negation in these groups. Moreover, in this chapter, I argue against the claim that IA only uses the free morpheme *ma* to negate a statement and present data which shows that some dialects of IA use other negative markers beside the negative marker *ma*, such as *ma-ʃ*.

The research questions I would like to pose and answer in this chapter are:

I. Does Iraqi Arabic require a single element, two elements, or both to form negation?

II. What is the structure of negation in Iraqi Arabic? Does NegP occur above or below TP?

III. What is the structural status of the enclitic -ʃ in the bipartite negation *ma-ʃ*?

In this chapter, I present data from the aforementioned groups of dialects to support my proposed analysis for the structures of sentential negation. To illustrate certain central themes of this chapter, consider the following examples:

1) Verbal Predicates:

*ma* group:

a. ʕəli ma  dɪrəs.  
   (Baghdadi)
   Ali  Neg  studied.\textsubscript{PAST,3SM}
   ‘Ali did not study.’
b. ʕəli ma jo-dros kul yum.  
Ali Neg 3SM-study every day  
‘Ali does not study every day.’

c. ʕəli ma rah jo-dros.  
Ali Neg will 3SM-study  
‘Ali will not study.’

2) Verbal Predicates:

ma-f group:

a. ʕəli ma-dəɾəs-ʃ.  
Ali Neg studied.PAST.3SM-Neg  
‘Ali did not study.’

b. ʕəli ma-jo-dros-ʃ kul yum.  
Ali Neg 3SM-study-Neg every day  
‘Ali does not study every day.’

c. ʕəli ma-raḥ-ʃ jo-dris.  
Ali Neg-will-Neg 3SM-study.  
‘Ali will not study.’

3) Verbless Predicates:

a. ʔəhməd mu tˤabib.  
Ahmed Neg doctor.3MS  
‘Ahmed is not a doctor.’
b. ʔəl-bnəjəh mə ḥīw-ah.  
   the-girl  Neg  beautiful-3FS  
   ‘The girl is not beautiful.’  

(Najafi)

c. ʔəhməd mə bi-ʔəl-bibjət.  
   Ahmed  Neg  in-the-house  
   ‘Ahmed is not in the house.’  

(d. ʔəhməd məʃ tˤəbirb.  
   Ahmed  Neg  doctor.3MS  
   ‘Ahmed is not a doctor.’  

(Amarah)

e. ʔəl-bnəjəh məʃ hīw-əh  
   the-girl  neg  beautiful-3FS  
   ‘The girl is not beautiful.’  

(Nasiriyah)

(f. ʔəhməd məʃ bi-ʔəl-biṣət.  
   Ahmed  Neg  in-the-house  
   ‘Ahmed is not in the house.’  

(Basrawi)

The data from the two groups demonstrates that there are two main systems of negation in IA: the one-part negative marker, free morpheme, and the two-part, bipartite, negative marker.

I will argue that the facts from the ma and the ma-f groups call for an analysis that captures the variation among these dialects; and departs from the previous analyses that, I believe, fail do to so, e.g., the analyses proposed by Alqassas (2012, 2019), Soltan (2014), Hoyt (2010), Alsarayreh (2012), among others. Here, I argue that NegP is positioned below TP, not above TP. This chapter is organized as follows. In section (3.3.1), I introduce the facts of sentential negation in the ma group and the ma-f group. In this section, I show that IA uses ma, mu, ma-f, and muf
among other particles to express sentential negation. The *ma* group uses the negative markers *ma* and *mu* to express sentential negation, while the *ma-ʃ* group uses the negative markers *ma-ʃ* and *muʃ*. From the data presented in this section, it is clear that *ma* has similar feature to the negative marker *ma* in Standard Arabic, while the enclitic marker *-ʃ* is not. In section (3.1.1), I introduce the features of sentential negation in the *ma* group. The section provides an overview of the diachronic development of the negative markers in this group and compares them with the negative markers used in standard Arabic. Similar to section (3.1.1), section (3.1.2), present the features of sentential negation in the *ma-ʃ* group. In this section, I argue that this group uses the bipartite negative marker *ma-ʃ* among other negative markers that are not found in other Arabic dialects, such as *mamif* “there is not” and *ʃib* “shame.”

In section (3.2), I provide previous analyses about the locus of sentential negation. This section discusses the two disagreements regarding the location of sentential negation. The first claim is that the negative morpheme is the head of a NegP located above TP (Shlonsky 1997; Soltan, 2007, 2014; and Alqassas, 2012, among others). The second claim is that Neg occupies a position lower than T (Benmamoun 2000, Ouhalla 2002, and Aoun et al. 2010). Section (3.3) provides a detailed discussion of the position of NegP. I argue that the negative particle is basically positioned in the negative head between TP and VP. In this section, I argue that Neg must merge with the progressive, the existential, and the possessive particles in both groups. Moreover, the imperfective verb has the option to merge with the negation marker *ma-ʃ* in the *ma-ʃ* group. Section (3.4) concludes the discussion.

3.1. Facts about Sentential Negation in Iraqi Arabic

This section discusses the facts of sentential negation in IA and tries to answer the question of how IA expresses sentential negation. The section presents two groups of IA, the *ma*
group and the \textit{ma-f} group. As we have seen in the previous chapter, Arabic dialects differ in at least two ways with respect to the expression of sentential negation. Some dialects, like MA, JA, and EA, have a bipartite negation consisting of a pre-verbal negative clitic and another negative marker (4); in other dialects, like Kuwaiti Arabic, and Syrian Arabic sentential negation is expressed by a single negative marker (Benmamoun 2000; Aoun et al., 2010), as shown in (5):

4) a. ma-hdˤrti-f lwaqt. \hfill (MA)
   \begin{flushright}
   Neg-\text{arrive.3MS-Neg in-time}
   \end{flushright}
   ‘You did not arrive on time.’

b. ma-tismaʕ-kalam-hum. \hfill (EA)
   \begin{flushright}
   Neg-\text{listen.2S-Neg talk-their}
   \end{flushright}
   ‘Don't listen to them!’

(Adopted from Benmamoun, 2013)

5) a. ??l-li, baʕod ma zərt ?asarat ləbnan. \hfill (Syrian Arabic)
   \begin{flushright}
   tell-me, yet Neg visited.\text{2MS ruins Lebanon}
   \end{flushright}
   ‘Tell me, have not you visited the ruins of Lebanon yet?’

b. ma χallaw fay ma χadu. \hfill (Kuwaiti Arabic)
   \begin{flushright}
   Neg left.\text{3P thing Neg took.3P}
   \end{flushright}
   ‘They did not leave anything they did not take.’

(Adopted from Aoun et al., 2010)

IA is no exception. Iraqi dialects can be classified into two categories based on how they express negation. Dialects that use a single element \textit{ma} ‘not’ to express sentential negation include Moslawi, Baghdadí, and Najafi dialects, among others (6).
In other dialects, such as Nasiriya, Amarah, and Basrawi, sentential negation is expressed by using two negative morphemes, the proclitic ma- and the enclitic -ʃ, or the discontinuous negative marker muʃ, as illustrated in (7):

7) a. maʔəhi-huʃ. (Basrawi)
   Neg-like.1S-Neg
   ‘I do not like it.’

   b. ʔə-montəzəh muʃ nədɨif.
      the-park   Neg clean.3SM
      ‘The park is not clean.’

The data show that the system of negation in the two groups demonstrates several comparable features. In what follows, I will provide a descriptive overview of the system of negation in the two groups.
3.1.1. Sentential Negation in ma Group

This section discusses sentential negation in the *ma* group that includes Moslawi, Baghdadi, and Najaf dialects which use the free morpheme negative marker *ma/la* “not.” It presents the facts of sentential negation in this group and discusses how the *ma* group negates verbal and non-verbal predicates.

As the examples in (6) above show, the negative marker *ma* has neutral properties. It is used with the present, past, and future tenses. One feature of the *ma* group is that the negative marker *ma* can be used either as proclitic *ma-* when it has a short vowel and when it is adjacent to the predicate it negates, as illustrates in (8) and (9), or it can be used as an independent morpheme *ma*, as shown in example (6) above.

8) ʔəl-səna al-madˤja ma-ʕirefət ʔə-suq. (finite verbs)
    the-year the-last Neg₁-knew-s 1s-drive
    ‘Last year, I was not able to drive.’

9) qəbİL ma-tʃan ʔəku zlazl bə-ʔəl-ʃiraq. (auxiliary)
    beforeNeg-was exist earthquake in the Iraq
    ‘Before, there was not any earthquake in Iraq.’

10) ʔilli ʃafəh ʔəl-ʃiraqin məhad ʃafə. (indefinite pronoun)
    Rel saw.₃p Iraqi not-one saw-him.
    ‘What Iraqi people saw, no one has seen it.’

Furthermore, *ma* unlike *la* can negate an active participle (11) or a passive participle (12).

11) ʔəhməd ma sakən ʔəb-mədinət baʔdəd.
    Ahmed Neg live.₃SM in-city Baghdad
    ‘Ahmed does not live in Baghdad.’
12) haða ħazi ma maʔqul.

this talk neg proper

‘This is not a proper talk.’

So far, all the examples of negation mentioned above show that the particle Neg occurs with the main predicate. Additionally, the negative marker *ma* can precede aspect particles, such as “da/ga/qa”¹⁵ “-ing” (13), “rah” “will” (14). It can co-occur with the quantifier “wahid” “one” to form a negative quantifier (15), and can precede the auxiliary “ʔaʔan” “was” (16).

13) a. fəd təlib ma da-j-drus. (Baghdadi)

    a student.3SM Neg PROG-3M.study.S-IMP

    ‘A student is not studying.’

b. fəd təlib ma ga-j-dros. (Najafi)

    a student.3SM Neg PROG-3M-study.S-IMP

    ‘A student is not studying.’

c. təlib wiħd ma qa-j-drus. (Moslawi)

    student.3SM one Neg PROG-3M-study.S-IMP

    ‘A student is not studying.’

14) ʔəhməd ma rah ʔiruh liʔəl-dʒamʕəh. (Najafi)

    Ahmed Neg will go.PAST.3MS the college

    ‘Ahmed will not go to the college.’

---

¹⁵ The three main dialect Baghdadi, Najafi and Moslawi use different prefixes/particles to express present progressive aspect. This is shown in (13) above.
15) māhād niḥōḥ bi-ʔal-ʾamṭifān.

no one passed in-the-exam

‘No one passed the exam.’

16) ʔal-ʾalīb ma ḥaŋ da-j-dros. (Baghdadi)

the-student3SM Neg was PROG3M study3IMP

‘The student was not studying.’

Standard Arabic uses the negative markers lan, laysa, and lam to express sentential negation, but these markers are not used in Modern Arabic dialects, while ma is one of the markers that has been saved from extinction. The particle ma has similar properties to the negative marker ma in Standard Arabic; however, it does not negate nominal predicates in the ma group as noted in the ungrammatical examples of (17), (18), and (19) when we use the particle ma. Instead, mu is used which can negate nominal (17), adjectival (18), and prepositional predicates (19).

17) ʔāhmād *ma/mu tʿābib.

Ahmed Neg doctor3MS

‘Ahmed is not a doctor.’

18) ʔal-bnajāḥ *ma/mu ḥilw-ah.

the-girl Neg beautiful3FS

‘The girl is not beautiful.’

19) ʕalī *ma/mu bī-ʔal-biḥāt.

Ali Neg in-the-house

‘Ali is not in the house.’
The negative marker *mu* does not exist in Standard Arabic, but the negative particle *mu* shares the same syntactic aspects of the Standard Arabic *laysa* “not” (18). One syntactic aspect is that both *laysa* and *mu* are negative elements that occur with verbless sentences. However, *mu*, unlike *laysa* does not inflect for agreement or gender. See the following examples:

20) a. ʔal-walad-u laysa tˤælib-an.  
   the boy-NOM.3S Neg.3MS student-3MS-Acc  
   ‘The boy is not a student.’

b. ʔal-bint-u laysat tælib-tan.  
   the girl-NOM.3S Neg.3SF student-3SF-Acc  
   ‘The girl is not a student.’

21) a. ʕəli mu tˤæləb.  
   Ali Neg student-3MS  
   ‘Ali is not a student.’

b. sarəh mu tˤælib-əh.  
   Sarah Neg student-3SF  
   ‘Sarah is not a student.’

Furthermore, these negative markers can occur in various clause structures. For example, the negative marker *ma* can occur with the existential particle ʔəku “there is” to become *maku* “there is not” in the *ma* group. This is illustrated in the following examples:

22) a. ʔəku ʔəkil bɨ-ʔəl-ʔəlæʒəh.  
   there food in-the-fridge  
   ‘There is food in the fridge.’
b. maku ʔəkɪl br-ʔəl-ʔɪlæʔəh.

Neg-there food in-the-fridge

‘There is no food in the fridge.’

The negative marker maku is a combination of ma+ʔəku. The existential particle maku has two different functions, serving as either a simple negative particle when it negates non-verbal (22) or as a command when it negates verbs (Abu-Haider, 2002). This is shown in (23):

23) maku tʃəbrini kul nosʕ saʕa.

Neg call.₁FS very half hour

‘Don't call me every half hour!’

In addition to the negative particle ma, the ma group has other negative markers such as la, and wela¹⁶, as shown in the following examples:

24) la nɪdˈʃal fajt waʔɪt hæl-lœla.

Neg stay.₃P late this-night

‘Don't let us stay late tonight!’

(Adopted from Abu-Haider, 2002)

25) Question: ʃɪft ʔəli?

Answer: la.

saw.you.₃SM Ali

‘Did you see Ali?’

no

‘No.’

¹⁶ The negative marker wela has different usages. It can be used as Negative Concord Items (NCIs) as we will see in chapter 6 and it can be used as negative disjunction or additive particle “nor”. la . . . wela “neither . . . nor,” as shown in the following example:

1. wela wahid ʃaf ʕəhməd.
   NCI one saw.₃SM Ahmed
   ‘No one saw Ahmed.’

2. ʕəli ma ʃaf la ʕəhməd wela sarah.
   Ali Neg saw.₃SM Neg Ahmed and not Sarah
   ‘Ali did not see neither Ahmed nor Sarah.’
26) welah h-əfləh.

Neg go.PAST.1S to-the-party

‘I did not go to the party.’

The negative particle *la* as example (24) shows occurs with imperfective verbs to express negative imperative and discourse negation. Imperatives in the *ma* group are recognized in three ways.

27) a. ma truh-in h-əfləh. (Najafi)

Neg go-IMP.3SF to-the-party

‘Do not go to the party.’

b. la truh-in h-əfləh.

Neg go-IMP.3SF to-the-party

‘Do not go to the party.’

c. mu truh-in h-əfləh.

Neg go-IMP.3SF to-the-party

‘Do not go to the party.’

Example (27)a states prohibition without any argument, example (27)b expresses prohibition while (27)c states warning or suggestion. These three ways of expressing negative imperatives are similar to Kuwaiti Arabic imperfective structure reported by Aljenaie (2008).

In addition, it occurs in verbal sentences with the perfect verbs preceded by the auxiliary verb *tʃan* (Abu-Haider, 2002). This is shown in (28):

28) la tʃan dəl-t-ha hal-gad. (Baghdadi)

Neg was spoil-PAST.3SF to this extent

‘You should not have spoiled her to this extent!’
Example (26) shows that the particle *wela* “not” has the same feature of the negative marker *ma* when expressing sentential negation.

### 3.1.2. Sentential Negation in *ma-f* Group

In this section, I provide a descriptive overview of the system of sentential negation in the *ma-f* group. As has been discussed in chapter two, previous studies state that sentential negation in some Arabic dialects, such as PA, JA, LA, EA, MA, Algerian, Tunisia, and Libyan, contains two negative elements which appear as a discontinuous morpheme, as in (4), repeated here as (29).

(29) a. ma-hdˤrti-f  f-twaqt.  \hspace{1cm} (MA)

Neg-arrive.3MS-Neg in-time

‘You did not arrive on time.’

b. ma-tismaʕ-f  kalam-hom.  \hspace{1cm} (EA)

Neg-listen.2S-Neg talk-their

‘Don't listen to them!’

Other studies (Cowell, 1964; Brustad, 2000; Abu-Haidar, 2002; Holes, 2004), on the other hand, argue that dialects such as Syrian, Iraqi, the Gulf, and Saudi Arabic use only the free morpheme *ma*. In this section, I will argue against these studies which claim that IA only uses the free morpheme when negating a statement. This section presents the facts of sentential negation in the *ma-f* group which contains dialects such as Nasiriya, Amarah, and Basrawi. As it has been mentioned before, the *ma-f* group expresses sentential negation by using the two-part negative marker *ma-f*. Moreover, the section discusses the features of the negative marker when negating verbal and non-verbal predicates.
In the verbal sentences, the negative marker *ma* precedes the lexical verb while the enclitic -ʃ occurs after the lexical verb (30), in the *ma*-ʃ group. In contrast, the proclitic *ma* and the enclitic -ʃ are either discontinuous *ma*-ʃ or non-discontinuous *muʃ* in verbless sentences (31).

30) a. maʔəhib-huʃ.

Neg-1S-like-it-Neg

‘I do not like it.’

31) a. sˤəħ fuqrəh maʔidna-ʃ bəs nmliŋʔəhsas.

true poor Neg-have.3P-Neg but have feeling

‘True we are poor; we do not have anything, but we have feeling.’

(Adopted from a Basrawi poem)

b. ?əl-montəzəh muʃ nədˤif.

the park Neg clean. SM

‘The park is not clean.’

Similar to the negative marker *ma*, the bipartite negative *ma*-ʃ, is used with the present, past, and future tenses. It is worth mentioning that speakers of the *ma*-ʃ group vary when pronouncing the proclitic *ma*-ʃ. Some speakers pronounce it with a short vowel or with a long vowel, as illustrates in the following examples:

32) a. ʕəli məʃ-safr-ʃ liʔəl-mosol. (Basrawi)

Ali Neg-3SM-travel-Neg to-the-Mosul

‘Ali does not go to Mosul.’

b. ʕəli ma-safr-ʃ liʔəl-mosol.

Ali Neg-traveled-Neg to-the-Mosul

‘Ali did not go to Mosul.’
33) ʕəli ma rah-ʃ j-safr li-ʔl-Mosul.  
   (Basrawi)  
   Ali Neg-will-Neg travel to-the-Mosul  
   ‘Ali will not go to Mosul.’

   Similar to the negative marker *ma*, the negative marker *ma-ʃ* can negate an active participle (34) or a passive participle (35).

34) sarəh ma-to-dros-ʃ ?əb-ʒamʃat baydaʃd.  
   (Amarah)  
   Sara Neg study.3SF at-university Baghdad  
   ‘Sarah does not study at Baghdad University.’

35) haʃda  haʃi muʃ maʃqul.  
   (Amarah)  
   this talk Neg proper  
   ‘This is not a proper talk.’

   Moreover, these negative markers can occur in various clause structures. First, the two-part negative circumfix *ma-ʃ* can occur with a pronoun in addition to verbless sentences, as illustrated in (36), (37).\(^{17}\)

36) ma-hu-ʃ  ?əhna.  
   (Basrawi)  
   Neg-he.3SM-Neg here  
   ‘He is not here.’

37) ʔəl-muʃlim-əh muʃ lətʃifəh.  
   (Basrawi)  
   the-teacher-3SF Neg nice-3SF  
   ‘The teacher is not nice.’

   Second, the negative marker *ma* can occur with the existential particle *ʔəku* to become *makuʃ* or *mamif* “there is not” in the *ma-ʃ* group. This is illustrated in the following examples:

\(^{17}\) It is worth mentioning that previous studies state that the enclitic -ʃ developed from the noun *ʃaiʔ* “thing” when expressing sentential negation see (Lucas 2007, Aoun et al 2010) for more details.
38) ma-ku-ʃʔokil bi-ʔəl-ʔiłæʔəh. (Amarah)

   Neg-there-Neg food in-the-fridge

   ‘There is no food in the fridge.’

39) mamif məlæhi ʔəb-ʔənuub ʔəl-ʔiraq.

   Neg-there clubs in-South the-Iraq

   ‘There are no clubs in south Iraq.’

   Like the negative marker *mu*, the negative marker *muʃ* has similar features of *laysa* which is negating verbless sentences, as shown in (40):

40) ʔanə muʃ tˤælib.

   I Neg student.3MS

   ‘I am not a student.’

   Similar to the *ma* group, the *maʃ* group uses the negative marker *la*, and *wela* in addition to the negative marker *maʃ*. The negative particle *la* as shown in (41) occurs with the imperfective verbs to express imperative while the particle *wela* has a similar feature to the negative marker *ma* when expressing sentential negation. However, the negative marker *wəla*, unlike the negative marker *ma*, allows the subject to intervene between them. More information about this distribution is discussed later in this chapter. This fact is true for *ma* group too, as stated in the following examples:

41) la tʃəb-ʃʃ biʔəl-mæjj. (Prohibition: Basrawi)

   Neg play.3P-Neg in-the-water

   ‘Do not play with the water!’
42) wəla həbit təmət-hə. (Amarah)
    Neg liked._PAST.1S acting-her
    ‘I did not like her acting.’

43) wəla wahid/bəʃər/wələd ʃaf-ni. (Amarah and Najafi)
    Neg one/human/a boy saw-me
    ‘No one/human/a boy saw me’

Moreover, the maʃ group uses the negative particle ʃib “not” which is a feature of the
Marshland dialect, as stated in Ingham (2000) and Hassan (2015).18 The negative marker ʃib,
which is developed from the word ʃib “shame,” lost its semantic feature and became a general
negative.19 See examples (44), and (45) of the negative marker ʃib.

44) ʃib jtitʃ-ən bərəh. (Basrawi)
    Neg go-3FPl out
    ‘They do not go out.’

45) ʃib nıdri. (Amarah)
    Neg know.3MP
    ‘We do not know.’

(Aingham, 2000: 128)

46) t’ilib ʔəl-ruh ʃib ʔədri ʔə-ʃamal-ha. (Amarah)
    worries.3M the-soul neg knowPRS.1S Q-wrong-3SF
    ‘I do not know why my soul does not feel well.’

(Adopted from Hassan, 2015)

---

18 Marshland dialect is spoken in the South of Iraq like Amarah, Nasiriya, and Basra.
19 I will not discuss this type of negation in my analysis. See (Ingham, 2000; and Hassan, 2015) for more details.
Finally, the negative marker \textit{ma-ʃ} can occur with, the light verb \textit{rah} “will” (47), with the quantifier \textit{wahid} “one” to form a negative quantifier (48), and with the auxiliary \textit{ʃan} “was” (49).

47) ʔəhməd ma-rah ʔiruh-ʃ lə-ʔəl-dʒamətəh.

\begin{flushright} (Basrawi) \end{flushright}

Ahmed  Neg will go.\textit{PAST.3MS-Neg} the college

‘Ahmed will not go to the college.’

48) məḥəd nəzə bi-ʔəl-əmtəhən.

\begin{flushright} (Basrawi) \end{flushright}

no one  passed.\textit{PAST.3S in-the-exam}

‘No one passed the exam.’

49) ʔəl-təːaləb  ma-ʃən-ʃ  gaʃid  j-drous.

\begin{flushright} (Amarah) \end{flushright}

the-student.\textit{3SM}  Neg-was-Neg  PROG. 3M 3M-study. S-IMP

‘The student was not studying.’

To sum up this section, I have presented sentential negation in two groups in IA and argued that some dialects in IA express sentential negation by using the bipartite negation \textit{ma-ʃ} similar to other Arabic dialects. I have also discussed the facts of sentential negation in each group. In the next section, I discuss and present the two well know hypotheses that examined the locus of sentential negation in Arabic dialects.

\section*{3.2. Previous Hypotheses}

In this section, I discuss previous arguments regarding the locus of NegP in the syntactic structure. Zeijlstra (2004), who examines sentential negation in different languages, states that the locus of negation in the sentence is determined by the semantic properties of negation. NegP can be located below TP in some languages, or it can dominate TP in other languages. The structure of negation is the result of the semantic properties of the negative operator, not the syntactical properties. The author assumes that when NegP occupies a projection higher than TP,
the negative operator binds temporal variables which yields a logical form that is understood as
sentential negation. In contrast, when the negative operator binds event variables, yielding a
logical form, the NegP occurs below TP. The syntactic distribution of NegP, according to the
author, proposes that every NegP in the syntactic clause presents one semantic negation.
Therefore, it is not necessary for multiple positions for NegP.

Moreover, this section presents different analyses of sentential negation structures in
Arabic dialects. According to one discussion (Benmamoun (2000), Ouhalla (2002), and Aoun et
al. (2010), the NegP occurs between TP and VP, as illustrated in (50); while other studies
(Shlonsky 1997; Soltan, 2007, 2014; and Alqassas, 2012, among others) argue that NegP
occupies a head above TP. This is shown in (51):

50) Low-Neg Analysis

```
TP
    Spec
    T'
    T
    NegP
    Neg
    VP
```

51) High-Neg Analysis

```
NegP
    Neg
    TP
    Spec
    T'
    T
    VP
```

**3.2.1. Low-Neg-Hypothesis**

This hypothesis states that Neg occupies a position lower than T. Arabic scholars such as
(Ouhalla 1990, 1993, Benmamoun 2000, and Aoun et al 2010) adopt a similar analysis of the
negation pattern in French proposed by Pollock (1989). French uses the two negative markers ne... pas as a way of expressing sentential negation which is also argued to be located between TP and VP. See example (52):

52) Nadia n'est pas venu.  
   (French)

   Nadia ne-is-Neg come

   ‘Nadia didn't come.’

   Another similarity with French is that the bound morpheme -ʃ in Arabic dialects does not surface in the context of negative quantifiers. This can be seen in French (53), and MA (54):

53) J'ai vu personne.  
   (French)

   I have seen no one

   ‘I haven't seen anyone.’

54) ma-ʒa  hɔtta wahəd.  
   (MA)

   Neg-came.3SM  any one

   ‘Nobody came.’

   (Adopted from Benmamoun, 2000)

According to the Low-Neg analysis, example (55) from IA has the representation in (56):

55) a. ma qrah ʔəl-maʒələh.  
    (Najafi)

    Neg-read.3SM the-journal.SF

    ‘He did not read the journal.’

b. ma-qra-ʃʔəl-maʒələh.  
    (Basrawi)

    Neg-read.3SM-Neg the-journal.SF

    ‘He did not read the journal.’
The past tense in Arabic has [+V] and [+D] features which attract verb movement. In order for the verb to raise to T and check the [+V] feature, it has to move through negation to avoid violating the Relativized Minimality (Rizzi, 1990) or the HMC (Travis, 1984). The result is that the verb hosts both tense and negation. Finally, negation is realized as a circumfix on the verb when the verb moves through negation, as shown in (57) (Benamoun, 1992, 2000).

57) ma-qra-f l-wəld.  \(\text{(MA)}\)

Neg-read.PAST.3SM-Neg the-boy

‘The boy did not read.’

The main reason for proposing the Low-Neg analysis in Arabic is to explain the fact that the negative marker can occur as a prefix to the verbal predicate. In Arabic, the verb moves to T to check [+V] and [+D] features. However, it has to move to Neg then to T to avoid minimality violation which indicates that movement of a head across another head is not allowed.
3.2.2. High-Neg-Hypothesis

This hypothesis is proposed by Shlonsky (1997); Soltan, (2007, 2014); and Alqassas, (2012), who claim that the negative morpheme is the head of a NegP located above TP. In this section, I will present previous studies that discuss High-Neg-hypothesis. Moreover, I will discuss the evidence that previous scholars use to support this hypothesis.

Scholars such as (Hoyt 2010, Soltan 2007, 2014, Alqassas 2012, and Benmamoun et al., 2013) claim that NegP occurs higher than TP. This is because the first approach does not provide an explanation for the examples when the negative markers appear with auxiliary verbs (58), indefinite pronouns (59), and existential particles (60):

58) Auxiliary: (Levantine Arabic)

$t^\text{ab\text{"a}n, ma-k\text{"a}n fi: } ?\text{aiy } \text{"ilag ilha.}$

naturally not-was exist any treatment to-her

‘Of course, there was no way to treat her.’

59) Indefinite Pronouns: (Levantine Arabic)

$\text{illi } \text{"if-na ma-h\text{"a}da } \text{"efu.}$

rel saw.\text{1P Neg-one saw-him}

‘What we saw, no one has seen [it].’

60) Existential Particle: (Levantine Arabic)

$\text{ma-fi h\text{"a}da } ?\text{ismu biharf issin.}$

not-exist one.\text{SM name with-letter the-s}

‘There isn’t anyone whose name has an [s].’

(Adopted from Hoyt, 2010)
In the following two subsections, I present evidence showing that Neg in the two groups of IA occupies a projection between TP and VP. Following Benmamoun’s (2000) analysis I argue that the two-part negative markers *ma-f* are one discontinuous morpheme that shares the same Neg projection. Furthermore, I will argue that *muʃ* is located between TP and VP because this marker does not occur with the past tense.

Finally, Soltan (2007, 2014), as has been discussed in chapter 2, presents some problems with the Low-Neg analysis. One of the problems is that Low-Neg analysis does not provide an explanation for dialects where the non-discontinuous negation marker *miʃ* appears with a past verb as shown in (61):

\[ \text{(61) } \text{ʔan} \text{a} \text{miʃ lišib-t.} \]  

(Sharqiyyah)

I Neg play;PERF.1S

‘I did not play.’

Soltan (2007, 2014) argues that the structure in (61) cannot be derived if Neg were between TP and VP without the verb skipping over Neg when moving to T. If this were to happen, then the negative marker must move to the head above T to form the word order in (61). Both movements will violate the Head Movement Constraint (HMC). Therefore, the structure in (61) is simply underivable if Neg were actually located below T. The structure is allowed if Neg is above TP, and if the past tense is not required to merge with Neg.

### 3.3. The Locus of Sentential Negation in *ma* Group and *ma-f* Group

This section presents the analysis of the system of sentential negation in the *ma* and the *ma-f* groups. Then, it discusses my proposed analysis for the locus of sentential negation in both groups trying to answer the following questions:

a. Where is NegP located in the Iraqi Arabic clause structure? Is it above or below TP?
b. What is the structural status of the enclitic -ʃ in the bipartite negation ma-ʃ?

Cross-linguistically, negative markers are treated as either adverbial elements or functional heads. This is based on how these markers behave with respect to the other elements in the sentence. According to Ouhalla (1990, 1993), Benmamoun (2000), Aoun et al (2010), Soltan (2007, 2014), and Alqassas (2012), among others, negation in Arabic projects a NegP. However, as we have seen above, there are various arguments about the locus of sentential negation in Arabic.

As the data presented in section (3.1.1) and (3.1.2) demonstrates, the negative markers ma, muʃ and ma-ʃ in the two groups do not host temporal information in the past and future tense sentences. The information about temporal placement, instead, is found in the verb or the modal as illustrated in (62):

62) a. ma ɗərəs ʔəli. (Baghdadi)

Neg studied.PAST.3SM Ali

‘Ali did not study.’

b. ʔəli ma rə� jʊ-dərəs. (Najafí)

Ali Neg will study.

‘Ali will not study.’

c. ʔəli muʃ jʊ-dərəs. (Amarah)

Ali Neg study.3SM

‘Ali does not study.’

d. ʔəli ma-ɗərəs-ʃ. (Basrawi)

Ali Neg-studied.PAST.3SM-Neg

‘Ali did not study.’
In the rest of the chapter, I present and discuss my analysis and provide evidence that supports my hypothesis showing that Neg occupies a projection between TP and VP in the *ma* and the *ma*-f groups.

### 3.3.1. Distribution of the single negative morpheme *ma* and other negative markers

In this subsection, I present evidence that supports my proposed analysis which illustrates that NegP occupies a projection between TP and VP. Assuming that sentential negation occurs between TP and VP provides an explanation of the merger between the negative marker and the imperfective verb when the latter moves through NegP to T. This merger is considered as a piece of evidence from the fact that in the *ma* group nothing can intervene between them.

Sentential negation *ma*, in the *ma* group, can be pronounced in two ways: short vowel *mə/-lə-* (64) and long vowel *ma/-la* (63). In the former case, *mə- or lə-* is treated as a proclitic because it is always adjacent to the predicate it negates, and it cannot be separated from the verb.\(^{20}\)

63) *ʔəl-wələd ma safər.*

*the-boy Neg travel.PAST.3SM*

‘The boy did not travel.’

64) *ʔəhməd mə-jo-dros.*

*Ahmed Neg-3M-study.Present.S*

‘Ahmed does not study.’

65) *ma- ʔəhməd dırəs.*

*Neg-Ahmed study.PAST3SM*

‘Ahmed did not study.’

---

\(^{20}\) Because the focus here is to present the syntactic feature of negation, I am not going to dwell into detail about the phonological differences between the two forms of negation.
In (64), *ma*- is merged with the verb because the latter should move through the negative projection to T or to a projection higher than TP when checking [+V] and [+D] features to avoid violating HMC. Therefore, sentence (64) has the following derivation:

![Diagram of sentence derivation]

For the latter case and as we have seen above, nothing can intervene between the negative marker *ma* and the verb, as shown in (67):

67) a. ʕəli/ʔəl-wələd ma safər.

Ali/the-boy Neg travel\_PAST\_3SM

‘Ali/the boy did not travel.’

b. ma *ʕəli/ *ʔəl-wələd safər.

Neg Ali/ the-boy travel\_PAST\_3SM

‘Ali/the boy did not travel.’

In the *ma* group, definite or indefinite Noun Phrases (NP) cannot intervene between the negative markers and the verb (69) which differentiate this group from other Arabic dialects. According to Alqassas (2012), preverbal NP can intervene between the negative marker and the
verb when they are treated as subjects in Spec-TP but not when they are treated as a topic in Spec-TP. See the following examples:

68) a. ma ḥāda/ wahīd/ māχlug/ ḭn/ wələd saʕad-ni.  
   Neg anyone/ one/ a creature/ human/ a boy helped-me  
   ‘No one/… helped me’

   anyone/ one/ a creature/ human/ a boy Neg helped-me

(Alqassas, 2012)

As the data shows, the facts in LA cannot extend to the ma group; therefore, I will argue that the preverbal definite/indefinite NP, in this group as well as the ma-f group, is a subject in Spec-TP. Hence, the negative markers ma/la occur between TP and VP.

69) a. *ma/ma- wələd saʕr.  
   Neg   boy travel.PAST.3SM  
   ‘No boy came.’

One reason for treating the preverbal definite/indefinite as a subject here is the interaction between the quantified DPs, such as kull “all” and sentential negation. It is worth mentioning that the interaction between negation and quantifiers has not been examined in IA in general. From the data presented below, we can see that in the ma group there is an ambiguity in the scope of sentential negation and the quantifier when the negative particle ma and the verb precede the quantifier kull. It is not possible for example (70) to have multiple interpretations while example (71) has two interpretations.21 Their structures are clarified in (72) and (73):

70) kull ḥl-tʕolab ma nṛḥ-u bi-ʔol-ʔəmtihan.  
   (Najafi)

21 For some speakers of the Najafi dialect, example (71) has one reading which is ‘Not all the students passed the exam.’
all the-students Neg pass.PAST.3PM in-the-exam

‘All the students did not pass the exam.’

71) ma nr3h-u koll ?al-t’olab br-?ol-?omtihan.

Neg pass.PAST.3PM all the-students in-the-exam

‘Not all the students passed the exam.’

72)

73)

Q + NegP = ∀>¬, ¬>∀

NegP + Q = ¬>∀, ∀>¬
Example (70) has only one semantic interpretation which cannot have an ambiguous reading. The only reading possible is “None of the students passed the exam” which has a narrow scope negation and a wide scope universal quantifier. The only available LF in the ma group for this sentence is $\forall x (T(x) \rightarrow \neg P(x))$. Therefore, there is no ambiguity of scope in this example. Example (71), on the other hand, has two semantic interpretations. The first reading is “some of the students passed the exam and some did not.” The second reading is “None of the students passed the exam.”

Now we want to look at the relationship between the quantifier and the negative marker $mu$. As it has been mentioned before, when the negative particle $ma$ precedes the subject it becomes $mu$ in the $ma$ group. The question now is how many interpretations do we have when the negative marker $mu$ occur before or after the quantifier $koll$? To answer this question, we need to look at the following examples:

74) $ʔəl-tˤɔlab\ hu koll-hum\ nʐh-u\ bɨ-ʔəl-ʔɔmtihan$.

the-students Neg all-them pass-$3PM$ in-the-exam

‘Not all the students passed the exam.’ = ‘Some passed and some not.’

75) $mu\ koll\ ʔəl-tˤɔlab\ nʐh-u\ bɨ-ʔəl-ʔɔmtihan$.

Neg all-the-students pass-$3PM$ in-the-exam

‘Not all the students passed the exam.’ = ‘Some passed and some not.’

Here and as the data above show both examples have the interpretation that “some of the students passed and some did not pass” which have the LF $\sim \forall x (T(x) \rightarrow P(x))$.22

Another reason for why I treat the preverbal definite/indefinite NP as a subject is because, in the $ma$ group, the preverbal definite NP does not occur higher than $TP$ (i.e., Topic

---

22 The semantic interpretation for example (74) and (75) is $\sim \forall x (T(x) \rightarrow P(x))$ which means that (not for all x, if x is a student, then x passed).
Projection (TopP)) this is because the $wh$-phrases can occur in different positions as shown in (76) and (77):

76) a. $ʔəhməd \, wəjən \, rəh$?
   
   Ahmed where go-PAST.3SM
   ‘Ahmed, where did he go?’

b. wəjən $ʔəhməd \, rəh$?
   
   what Ahmed do-PAST.3SM
   ‘Where did Ahmed go?’

77) a. $ʔəl-wələd \, jɪnə \, səwəh$?
   
   the-boy.3SM what do-PAST.3SM
   ‘The boy what did he do?’

b. jɪnə $ʔəl- \, wələd \, səwəh$?
   
   what the-boy.3SM do-PAST.3SM
   ‘What did the boy do?’

According to Rizzi’s (1997), TopP should precede FocP/$wh$-phrases. As the examples above show, in the $ma$ group $wh$-phrase can precede or follow the preverbal definite NP; thus, I argue that the preverbal definite NP along with the indefinite NP is located in Spec-TP.

78) ... Force ... (Topic) ... (Focus) ... Fin IP

   (Rizzi, 1997, p. 288)

To my knowledge, the only word that can separate the negative marker and the verb is the indefinite pronoun $wahid$ “one” which changes its form depending on the negative marker to
which it attaches. The result of this merging between the negative marker *ma* and *waḥid* is a negative quantifier that is treated as NPI. This can be seen in (79), (80):

79) *la-hād j-lḥāb br-ʔal-ʃarʕ*.

Neg-one 3SM-play in-the street

‘No one plays in the street!’

80) *ma-hād safər*.

Neg-one travel.PAST-3SM

‘No one traveled.’

As mentioned above, Hoyt (2010), Soltan (2007, 2014), and Benmamoun et al. (2013), argue that NegP occurs higher than TP because the first approach, Low-Neg-analysis, does not provide an explanation for when the negative markers appear with auxiliary verbs, indefinite pronouns, and existential particles. I will argue that auxiliary verbs (82), indefinite pronouns (83), and existential particles (84), occur below NegP which are located between TP and VP. This is represented in the following structure:

81) [TP [T [NegP [Neg [AuxP [Aux [VP [v]]]]]]]]

82) *ma tʃan-ʊt tu-qra br-ʔal-maktəbəh*.

(Najafi)

Neg was-3SF 3SF-read the-library

‘She was not reading at the library.’

---

23 The focus of this chapter is sentential negation; therefore, I am not going to discuss NPI here. I will discuss NPI in chapter 4.

24 In Iraqi Arabic, the auxiliary verb *tʃan* “was” carries tense, aspect and agreement feature with the subject, as shown in the following examples:

1. a. *ma tʃan j-qra br-ʔal-maktəbəh*.
   Neg was-3SM 3-read.SM the-library
   ‘He was not reading at the library.’
  b. *ma tʃan-u j-qr-un br-ʔal-maktəbəh*.
   Neg were-3PM 3-read.PM the-library
   ‘They were not reading at the library.’
83) ʔəli jaf-əh ʔəl'iraqin məħəd jaf-əh  
(Baghdadi)  
Rel saw-3s Iraqi not-one saw-him.  
‘What Iraqi people saw, no one has seen it.’

84)  
a. ʔəku ʔəkil br-ʔəl-thlæʒəh.  
(Baghdadi)  
there food in-the-fridge  
‘There is food in the fridge.’

b. maku ʔəkil br-ʔəl-thlæʒəh.  
Neg-there food in-the-fridge  
‘There is no food in the fridge.’

The derivation of example (82) and (84) are as follow:

85) a.  
TP  
ma tfan-ət NegP  
Neg’  
Neg AuxP  
Aux’  
Aux’ VP  
V’  
tu-qra PP  
br-ʔəl-məktəbəh
Another piece of evidence to support the argument for Neg to occur between TP and VP is the progressive aspect *gaʕid* “sitting” and the light verb *raḥ* “went.” Benmamoun et al., (2013) treat “*ha*-,” *raḥ/went*” as future tense markers. The authors argue that these markers occupy T which occurs under NegP. Contrary to Benmamoun et al. analysis, I treat *raḥ* as a light verb which is based-generated under *vp* and then moves through Neg to T. While I treat *gaʕid* as a light verb which is used as a progressive marker in the *ma* group. This is also true for the *ma-f* group as we will see in the next subsection in which I will argue that the progressive aspect particle occurs below Neg and head an Aspect Projection (AspP) as illustrated in (86):

86) [TP [Neg [AspP [VP]]]]

---

25 The particle *gaʕid* here does not have the meaning of “sitting,” instead it functions as a progressive aspect. It is worth mentioning that some dialects such as Baghdadi dialect use the enclitic particle “*da*-” while Moslawi dialect uses the enclitic particles “*ka*-,” “*qi*,” “*si*” to express progressive aspect as shown in the following example:

2. ʔəl-ʔalab da-j-drus br-ʔəl-maktabah.
   the-student 3SM PROG 3M-study S-IMPREF in-the-library
   ‘The student is studying in the library.’
   (Baghdadi)
3. ʔəl-talab ka/qi/i-j-dyus br-ʔəl-maktabi.
   the-student 3SM PROG 3M-study S-IMP in-the-library
   ‘The student is studying in the library.’
   (Moslawi)
Another reason for arguing against the High-Neg-analysis is that if it is assumed that NegP occupies a position higher than TP, then it can be predicted that the preverbal definite/indefinite NP is allowed to intervene between the negative marker and the progressive or the tense marker because they occupy Spec-TP. This prediction is born out:

87) a. ʔəhməd ma raḥʔiruh li-ʔəl-dʒamʃəh.

Ahmed Neg will go.PAST.3MS the college

‘Ahmed will not go to the college.’

b.*ma ʔəhməd raḥʔiruh li-ʔəl-dʒamʃəh

Neg Ahmed will go.PAST.3MS the college

‘Ahmed will not go to the college.’

88) a. fəd tə'ālḥ ma gaʃid j-drus bi-ʔəl-məktəbəh.

a student3SM Neg PROG.3MS 3M-study.S in-the-library

‘A student is not studying in the library.’

b. *ma fəd tə'ālḥ gaʃid j-drus bi-ʔəl-məktəbəh.

Neg a student3SM PROG.3MS 3M-study.S in-the-library

‘A student is not studying in the library.’

The derivation of (87) is as follows:
In cases where the progressive particle *gaʕid* occurs with the auxiliary *ʧən* the tense then occurs on the auxiliary *ʧən*. Similar to the perfective verb the auxiliary *ʧən* must move to T to check the [+V] and [+D] features, but it cannot cross over Neg. To avoid minimality violation the auxiliary *ʧən* must move to Neg first then to T, as illustrated in the following example:

90) a. ʔəl-ʔalib  ma ʧən gaʕid  j-drus  bר-ʔəl-məktəbəh.

the-student.3SM  Neg was PROG.3MS 3M.study.IMP in-the-library

‘The student was not studying in the library.’

b. *ma ʔəl-ʔalib  ʧən gaʕid  j-drus  bר-ʔəl-məktəbəh.

Neg the-student.3SM was PROG.3MS 3M-study.IMP in-the-library

‘The student was not studying in the library.’

As has been mentioned in the previous sections, the negative marker *ma* becomes *mu* when it occurs in non-verbal predicates in the *ma* group. This is shown in the following examples.
91) ?əhməd mu t'ābib.

Ahmed Neg doctor.3MS

‘Ahmed is not a doctor.’


the-house Neg big

‘The house is not big.’

93) ?əl-bnajəh mu bɪ-ʔəl-biʃət.

the-girl Neg in-the-house

‘The girl is not in the house.’

The structure of the verbless sentences in the ma group is [Sub+Neg+Predicate] (92), (93). Other structures such as [Neg+Sub+Predicate] (94) will give us a rhetorical reading. However, it is worth mentioning that the structure [Neg+Sub+Predicate] is allowed only with ellipsis to give us a negative reading. This is shown in (95):

94) mu ?əl-biʃət ?əʤəbir?  

Neg the-house big

‘Isn’t the house big?’


Neg Ali old, Ahmed

‘Ali is not old, Ahmed is.’

Benmamoun et al., (2013) support his argument, High-Neg-analysis by arguing that the non-verbal heads, such as existential (52) and possessive particles (97) may require negation to merge with them. However, the authors do not argue that the NegP must be higher than TP as they only emphasize that Neg must merge with the non-verbal heads regardless of position and
this merger cannot be driven by syntax but could be a result of a PF process. Arguing against
their analysis, I will show that the negative marker, in the ma group must merge with the
existential, and the possessive particles. As I have argued above that the existential particle is
located below TP, I will argue that the possessive particle is located below TP as well. See the
following examples:

96) Existential

a. ?əku ?əkɪl bɪ-ʔəl- ʔɪlæʒəh?
   there food in-the-fridge
   ‘There is food in the fridge.’

b. maku ?əkɪl bɪ-ʔəl- ʔɪlæʒəh.
   Neg food in-the-fridge
   ‘There is no food in the fridge.’

According to Eid (1993), the existential particle fi “there” must raise to T to check empty
person features because Spec-TIP is occupied by pro which needs checking the default [3MS]
features in T. Therefore, the existential fi must move to T to check the empty person features.
Following Eid’s analysis, I argue that the existential ?əku, in the ma group is the head of the VP.
The existential particle has to move to T to check the empty person features. In order for the
existential ?əku to move to T it needs to merge with Neg first then moves to T. Therefore, the
existential ?əku ends up hosting ma- as a proclitic.

The possessive śindi “have,” on the other hand, is the head of the Prepositional Projection
(PP). The possessive śindi has to move to T to share agreement feature with T. Thus, śindi must
move to Neg before moving to T to avoid minimal violation. This is shown in the following
example:
97) Possessive

ma-ʕəndi bəjət.

Neg-have house

‘I do not have a house.’

Finally, the last piece of evidence I use against the High-Neg-analysis is the imperfective verb. The imperfective verb, according to Benmamoun (1992, 2000), is not required to move to T because it does not need checking the [+V] feature but it must check [+D] feature which Benmamoun proposes that negation in Arabic is specified for an uninterpretable [+D] feature that needs to be checked against an interpretable [+D] feature. Therefore, the imperfective verb will only move to Neg to give us the structure in (98) because Neg has [+D] that the present verb needs to check.

98) ʔəl-bnəjəh ma-tu-drus  bə-ʔəl-məktəbəh.

the-girl3SF Neg-3F-study3S in-the-library

‘The girl does not study in the library.’

The derivation of (98) is as follows:

99)
Hence, if it is assumed that Neg is higher than TP, then it is not clear how we get the structure in (98). The High-Neg analysis does not provide an explanation of such a problem. Therefore, I argue that NegP occupies a projection below TP.

In sum, I have argued that the free morphemes *ma/la* and the bound morphemes *mə-/*lə-* which are used as sentential negative markers occupy the head of NegP which is located between TP and VP. I have also shown that in the *ma* group the preverbal definite NP does not occur higher than TP. Finally, I have presented evidence from the *ma* group to support my argument against the High-Neg-analysis. In the next subsection, I will present more evidence from the *ma-* group to support my argument for the Low-Neg-analysis.

### 3.3.2. Distribution of the two negative morphemes *ma-* and -*ʃ*

In this section, I analyze the locus of discontinuous *ma-* and non-discontinuous *mə-* in the syntactic structure of the *ma-* group. Dialects such as Nasiriya, Amarah, and Basra have two negative morphemes, the proclitic *ma*, and the enclitic -*ʃ* in addition to the negative marker *ma/la* to express sentential negation. The negative marker *ma-* occurs as the left-most morpheme while the enclitic -*ʃ* occurs as the right-most morpheme even when the verb has the suffix agreement for the subject. This is seen in the following examples:

100) ʔəl-bnejeh ma-liʃb-ət-ʃ.  
   the-girl Neg-play._PAST.3SF-Neg
   ‘The girl did not play.’

101) ʔəl-bnejeh ma-ti-lʃb-ʃ.  
   the-girl Neg-3SF-play-Neg
   ‘The girl does not play.’
The merger between *ma-f* and the past tense is obligatory. In order for the verb to move to T to check [+V] and [+D] features it needs to move to Neg first then moves to T avoiding minimality violation and HMC. Therefore, the verb ends up hosting *ma-* as a proclitic and -*f* as an enclitic. The merger between *ma-f* and the present tense, on the other hand, is optional. The result of merging the verb and the negative marker *ma-f* is shown in (101). If there is no merging between the negative marker *ma-f* and the present verb, the result is the negative marker *muʃ*.

This is illustrated in (102):

102) ʔəl-bnejeh muʃ t-ɪl b'.

  the-girl   Neg 3SF-play

‘The girl does not play.’

As mentioned above, there is a debate about the locus of sentential negation in the Arabic dialects and whether Neg is above or below TP. Another concern regarding sentential negation with dialects that allow bipartite negation is the status of the enclitic -*f* and if it is generated in the Spec of NegP (Benmamoun 1992, Shlonsky 1997, Ouhalla, 2002), or whether the two-part marker *ma-f* forms one complex head (Benmamoun 2000). In this dissertation, I will adopt Benmamoun’s (2000) analysis and argue that *ma-f* forms one complex head. Because the enclitic -*f* in the *ma-f* group does not appear alone when expressing negation as noted in the ungrammaticality of (103):

103) *safr-it-f*.

  travel.PAST-3SF-Neg

‘She did not travel.’
Similar to the *ma* group, the NPs cannot intervene between the negative markers and the verb in the *ma*-f group (104); therefore, they are treated as subjects, not topics which occupies Spec-TP. Hence, the negative markers *ma/-la* occur between TP and VP.

104) a. *ma-wəld safr-əf.

Neg boy travel.PAST.3SM-Neg

‘No boy came.’

The first piece of evidence I use to show that Neg occupies a projection between TP and VP in the *ma*-f group is the merger of negation and the past tense verb. Neg blocks the movement of the perfective verb to T. Therefore, in order for the verb to raise to T to check the [+V] and [+D] feature, it must move to NegP first to avoid minimality violation. Hence, the verb ends up hosting *ma* as a proclitic and -f as an enclitic. If we assume that NegP is above TP, then it is not clear how we got the structure of (105) when the past verb must merge with negation when it moves to T to check [+V] and [+D] features.

105) ?əhməd ma-safr-əf.  

(Amarah)

Ahmed Neg-go.PAST.3MS-Neg

‘Ahmed did not travel.’

The derivation of (105) is as follows:

106)
It is worth mentioning that even if we applied Soltan’s morphological algorithm to derive the distribution of negation structures which indicate that “in contexts where Neg is adjacent to a hosting head H, H moves to Neg and then to Pol, and the discontinuous $ma-Hʃ$ pattern arises,” we still have a problem as the definite NP in the $maʃ$ group occupies Spec-TP. The definite NP starts in Spec-VP and moves to Spec-TP to check the Extended Projection Principle (EPP). Therefore, we end up with the following structure: $[ma-safrʃ+Ahmed]$ instead of $[Ahmed+masafrʃ]$.

The second piece of evidence is that the negative marker $ma$ and $-ʃ$ can appear as a non-discontinuous morpheme when it occurs with a verbless predicate the result is the negative marker $muʃ$. Again, in both groups, the preverbal definite NP occupies the Spec-TP. Therefore, NegP should be below TP to give us the structure in (107), and (108):

107) ʕəli muʃtˤælib.  
Ali Neg student.3MS  
‘Ali is not a student.’

108) ʔəl-bijət muʃʔəʧbir.  
the-house Neg big  
‘The house is not big.’

If it is assumed that Neg occupies a head higher than TP, then we would expect that the $maʃ$ group would allow the structure in (109) when expressing negation; however, this prediction is not born out.

109) *muʃʔəl-bijətʔəʧbir.  
Neg the-house big  
‘The house is not big.’
Like the ma group, the structure in (110) will give us a rhetorical reading instead of negation. This is shown in the following example:

110) muʃʔal-bitʔafbir?  
   Neg the-house big  
   ‘Isn’t the house big?’

The third piece of evidence comes from the fact that the negative marker muʃ in the ma-ʃ group does not occur with verbs in the past tense (111), unlike the Sharqiyyah dialect. The negative marker muʃ in Sharqiyyah can precede the perfective verb. This is illustrated in (111):

111) a.ʔana miʃliʃib-t.  
   I Neg play._PERF.1S  
   ‘I did not play.’

b.*sarah muʃsafre-t.  
   Sarah Neg travel._1S  
   ‘Sarah did not travel.’

Soltan (2014) argues that the structure in (111) cannot be derived if Neg were between TP and VP, without the verb skipping over Neg when moving to T. If this were to happen, then the negative marker must move to the head above T to form the word order in (111). Both movements will violate the HMC. Therefore, the structure in (111) is simply underivable if Neg were actually located below T. The structure is allowed if Neg is above TP, and if the past tense is not required to merge with Neg. In contrast, the ma-ʃ group in IA does not allow this structure; therefore, I argue that Neg occupies a projection lower than TP because the perfective verb has to merge with Neg to give us the structure in (112):
Sarah Neg-travel-₁ˢ-Neg

‘Sarah did not travel.’

The fourth piece of evidence is that the negative marker must merge with the existential (113) and possessive particles (115) in the *ma-f* group. I have argued in the previous subsections that the existential particle is located below TP. I will also argue that the possessive particle is located below TP. As it has been mentioned above, the *ma-f* group unlike other Arabic dialects uses two forms to express existential negation. The first form is *makuʃ* which is derived from *ma+aku+f*. The second form is *mamif*. This is shown in the following examples:

113) Existential

a. ʔəkuʔəkɪlbiʔəlʔɪladʒəh.
   
   there food in-the-fridge
   
   ‘There is food in the fridge.’

b. makuʃʔəkɪlbiʔəlʔɪladʒəh.
   
   Neg food in-the-fridge
   
   ‘There is no food in the fridge.’

c. mamifmalæhiʔəb-dʒənubʔəlʕɪraeq
   
   Neg clubs in-South the-Iraq
   
   ‘There are no clubs in south Iraq.’

The derivation of (113) is as follows:
As I have argued in (3.3.1), I treat the existential ʔəku as the head of the VP. The existential particle has to move to T to check the empty person features. In order for the existential ʔəku to move to T it needs to merge with Neg first then moves to T. Therefore, the existential ʔəku ends up hosting ma- as a proclitic and -ʃ as an enclitic.

The possessive φindi occupies the head of the PP. The possessive φindi has to move to T to share agreement feature with T. Thus, φindi must move to Neg before moving to T to avoid minimality violation. This is shown in the following example:

115) Possessive

   ma-φindi-ʃ bijət.

Neg-have-Neg  house

‘I do not have a house.’

The last piece of evidence I use to argue against the High-Neg-hypothesis is that the negative marker must merge with the auxiliary verb tfan (116), tense marker rah (117), and the progressive gaʕid (118) which I argue to occur below TP.
116) ma-tfan-ət-fʿ tu-qra br-ʔəl-məktəbəh.

Neg-was-3SF-Neg 3SF-read in-the-library

‘She was not reading at the library.’

Like the ma group, the definite/indefinite NP, adverbs, and other arguments in the ma-f group are not allowed to intervene between the negative marker and the auxiliary verb, the progressive, or future marker because they occupy Spec-TP. Hence, the ungrammaticality of (117) and (118) if it is assumed that NegP occupies a position higher than TP.

117) a. ʔəhmed ma-ʔəriuf-i li-ʔəl-dʒamʕəh.

Ahmed Neg-will-go.3MS-Neg the college

‘Ahmed will not go to the college.’

b.*ma- ʔəhmed hə-ʔiruhi f li-ʔəl-dʒamʕəh.

Neg Ahmed will go.3MS-Neg the college

‘Ahmed will not go to the college.’

118) a. ʔəl-ʔəlib  muʃ  gaʕidd  j-drus  br-ʔəl-maktabəh.

the-student.3SM Neg PROG.3MS 3M-study.S-IMP in-the-library

‘The student is not studying in the library.’

b. * muʃ  ʔəl- ʔəlib  gaʕidd  j-drus  br-ʔəl-maktabəh

Neg the-student.3SM PROG.3MS 3M-study.S-IMP in-the-library

‘The student is not studying in the library.’

It is not clear how Soltan’s analysis would provide an explanation for the structure in the above examples. I will leave the discussion about this issue for future research.

To conclude, evidence from the ma-f group shows that NegP occurs between TP and VP, as indicated by the merger between the past verb and the negative marker ma-f to avoid
minimality violation, the fact that the negative marker *muʃ* cannot appear with a verb in the past, and the fact that existential and possessive particles occupy a head below TP.

### 3.4. Summary

This chapter investigates the locus of sentential negation in IA with the primary goal being to provide an analysis for the location of sentential negation within that dialect. The answer to the questions is that first: IA requires both a single element which is used by the *ma* group and two elements which are used by the *ma-f* group when forming negation. The answer to the second question is that: NegP is located between TP and VP as the data from both the *ma* and the *ma-f* groups indicated. Finally, the answer to the last question is that following Benmamoun’s analysis (2000), I argue that the proclitic and the enclitic *-f* in the *ma-f* group projects one head in the structure.

In this chapter, I have discussed the two groups of IA, the *ma* and the *ma-f* group. In section (3.1), I have presented some facts about sentential negation in the *ma* and the *ma-f* group, showing that the *ma* group uses the negative marker *ma* to express sentential negation with verbal sentences while it uses the negative marker *mu* with verbless clauses. The other group, the *ma-f* group, uses the negative marker *ma-f* to express sentential negation with verbal sentences whereas it uses the negative marker *muʃ* with verbless clauses. The data presented in section (3.1.2) demonstrates that the negative marker *muʃ* in the *ma-f* group does not occur with the perfective verb which is evidence consistent with the proposal that NegP occurs below TP. The section also has shown that the indefinite/definite NP cannot intervene between the verb and the negative marker. Moreover, the chapter has indicated that the High-Neg hypothesis cannot provide an explanation for the case when the imperfective verb has the option to merge with the
negative marker in both groups. Therefore, I argue that sentential negation in the *ma* and the *ma-f* groups occupies a projection which occurs between TP and VP.

From the data presented above, we can conclude that the system of negation in IA exhibits a variety of similar aspects to the two groups but does reveal some variation. The main results of the discussion can be summarized as follows:

a. Sentential negation is expressed by the independent morpheme *ma* and by the discontinuous negative marker *ma-f*.

b. The negative bound morphemes *m-*- and *l*- are always adjacent to the verb.

c. Sentential negation can be expressed by the use of *w-* *la* when it occurs preverbally.

d. The distribution of negating verbless and verbal predicates can be summarized as follows:

*Table 1 The distribution of sentential negation in verbal and verbless predicates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialects</th>
<th>Verbal Predicates</th>
<th>Verbless Predicates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>past</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ma</em> group</td>
<td><em>ma</em></td>
<td><em>ma</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ma-f</em> group</td>
<td><em>ma-f</em></td>
<td><em>ma-f</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next two chapters, I examine Negative Polarity Items and Negative Concord Items. The two chapters will provide other pieces of evidence supporting my analysis.
Chapter Four

NEGATIVE POLARITY ITEMS

4.1. Introduction

The aims of this chapter are first to review the first category of NSIs in the ma and the ma-ʃ groups which is NPIs. Both the ma and the ma-ʃ groups exhibit four types of NPIs: nominal, determiner, adverbial, and idiomatic NPIs. The second aim of this chapter is to examine the interaction between negation and NPIs. The importance of negation in Arabic and other languages has long been recognized by researchers. However, there has been a wide disagreement among researchers regarding the locus of negation and how NPIs get licensed. The third goal of the chapter is to describe and analyze the distribution and the categorical properties of NPIs in the ma and the ma-ʃ groups taking into consideration previous analyses of NPIs licensing. Previous studies (Benmamoun, 1996, 1997, 2006; Hoyt, 2010; Alqassas, 2012, 2016, 2019) which only focused on Arabic dialects such as MA, EA, and LA, offer various diagnostic tests to distinguish between NPIs and NCIs and propose different syntactic analyses to explain the licensing conditions for these NSIs. This leads to the main question of this chapter:

Question: What is the distribution of NPIs in the ma and the ma-ʃ groups and what syntactic analysis captures best their licensing can be devised to account for this distribution?

This chapter is organized as follows. Section (4.2) and its subsections (4.2.1) & (4.2.2) introduce some facts about NPIs and discuss the distribution of NPIs in the ma and the ma-ʃ groups. In this section, I highlight the contexts that function as proper environments of NPIs in both groups. Section (4.3) discusses the licensing conditions of NPIs in both groups. Furthermore, previous semantic, and syntactic approaches proposed by Ladusaw (1980, 1983);
Linebarger (1981, 1987); and Giannakidou (1998) are examined and applied to the *ma* group and the *ma-* group. Section (4.4) concludes the discussion.

4.2. Negation and NPIs in *ma* and *ma-* Groups

4.2.1. Negation and NPIs in *ma* Group

The NPIs, in the *ma* group, have four different types namely: nominal, determiner, adverbial, and idiomatic. The nominal NPIs include the indefinite pronoun *waḥid* ‘one’ and *ʃi* ‘thing,’ as shown in example (1):

1) *maʃɪfəwَاḥɪdʃi*.  

Neg saw.1S one/thing

‘I did not see anyone/anything.’

If the indefinite pronouns *waḥid* and *ʃi* occur in affirmative declarative sentences, they would have the interpretation of Positive Polarity Items (PPIs). This is indicated in (2):

2) َِcabəmdʃəfwaḥɪdʃi.  

Ahmed saw.1S one/thing

‘Ahmed saw someone/something.’

The fact that the expressions *waḥid* and *ʃi* can appear in affirmative declarative sentences does not deteriorate their status as NPIs. According to Hoeksema (1994), these NPIs have gone through a process of grammaticalization by which they become restricted to negative contexts; therefore, they change from regular expressions to NSIs. These expressions are referred to as semi-NPIs instead of strict NPIs because the latter can only appear in negative contexts.
In addition to the indefinite pronouns *wahid* and *fi*, the *ma* group uses the quantifier *kollfi*\(^{26}\) ‘everything’ to express a nominal NPI. The nominal NPI *kollfi* can occur preverbally and post-verbally; however, postverbally is limited with verbs of senses in this group. The NPI *kollfi* carries the meaning of “anything” in this context. The NPI *kollfi*, like the NPIs *wahid* and *fi*, always requires the presence of negation. See the following examples:

3)  la ṣalla, *kollfi* *(ma) ʕindi.
   no by-God, anything Neg have.\(_{1S}\)
   ‘I do not have anything.’
   (Adopted from Erwin, 1969)

4)  a. *kollfi* *(ma) qəlli.
   anything Neg told-me.\(_{3MS}\)
   ‘He did not tell me anything.’

   b. *(ma) səmət *kollfi.
   Neg hear-me anything
   ‘I did not hear anything.’

The second type of the NPIs is the determiner NPIs which are formed by the combination of *ʔəj* + indefinite pronoun *wahid* and *fi*, such as *ʔəj* + *wahid* (5) or *ʔəj* + *fi* (6), to create the negative polarity interpretation in a negative sentence.

---

\(^{26}\) The quantifier *kollfi* is a combination of *koll* ‘every’ and *fi* ‘thing’. The quantifier *kollfi* loses its semantic meaning and behaves as an NPI when it occurs with a negative marker. This is shown in the following examples:

1)  *kollfi* ʕindi.
   everything have.\(_{1S}\)
   ‘I have everything.’

2)  *kollfi* *(ma) ʕindi.
   NPI anything Neg have.\(_{1S}\)
   ‘I do not have anything.’
5) ma jaf-at ?aj wahid. (Baghdadi)
   Neg   saw-3FS any one
   ‘She did not see anyone.’

6) ma Jab-at ?aj jii. (Baghdadi)
   Neg   brought-3FS any thing
   ‘She did not bring anything.’

Similar to the indefinite pronouns, the determiner NPI ?aj is not restricted to negative sentences, henceforth it can occur in positive contexts where it can have a wh-reading but not a nominal indefinite reading. This is shown in (7):

7) ʕəħməd jaf ?aj wahid?
   Ahmed   saw.1S which one
   ‘Which one did Ahmed see?’

Following Ladusaw (1980); Progovac (1994); and Giannakidou (1998) in their analysis of NPIs licensing, I will treat the determiner NPI ?aj as NPIs because it is sensitive to the presence of negation. Moreover, if the determiner NPI ?aj occurs in negative-like contexts, such as contexts that can license NPIs (i.e., questions and conditionals) only the indefinite nominal reading is available but never the wh-reading. See the following examples:

8) minu jaf ?aj wahid? (Najafi)
   who   saw.1S any one
   ‘Who saw anyone?’

9) ʕiđa ?aj wahid jī-dʒawob hađa ʕal-suʕal, rah jī-fuz.
   if   any one 3M-answer.S this question, will 3M-win.S
   ‘If anyone answers this question, he will win.’
The third type of NPIs is the adverbial NPI ʕʊmr ‘ever.’ The NPI ʕʊmr can occur preverbally (10) and postverbally (10) in the ma group. The postverbal ʕʊmr is a marked option, while the preverbal ʕʊmr is unmarked.

10) a. ʕʊmr-əh ma ədəs. (unmarked)
   NPI ever-3MS Neg studied.3MS
   ‘He has never studied.’

b. ma ədəs ʕʊmr-əh. (marked)
   Neg studied.3MS NPI.ever-3MS
   ‘He has never studied.’

Like the indefinite pronouns and the determiner NPIs, the NPI ʕʊmr can occur in non-negative contexts such as yes/no questions (11) and conditionals (12) which is a feature that is shared with other Arabic dialects (i.e., JA, EA).

11) Question: Answer (Najafi)
    ʕʊmr-əh safər lɪ-ʔəl-musˤl?  la.
    ever-3MS traveled.3MS to-the-Mosul
    ‘Has he ever traveled to Mosul?’ ‘No.’

12) ʔɪða ʕʊmr-əh safər lɪ-l-musˤl, gul-li. (Najafi)
    if ever-3MS traveled.3MS to-the-Mosul, tell-me
    ‘If he ever traveled to Mosul, tell me.’

---

27 In most cases the adverbial ʕʊmr is replaced by hojawat ‘life’ which agrees with the subject in person, number, and gender. This is shown in the following example:

1) ʔəh-hojawat-əh ma safr-ət lɪ-l-musˤl.
   NPI never-3FS Neg traveled-3FS to-the-Mosul
   ‘She never traveled to Mosul.’
One feature that distinguishes the adverbial NPI ʕʊmr, in the ma group, from other Arabic dialects is that this NPI cannot host negation like EA. This is shown in the ungrammaticality of (13):

13) a. *ma ʕʊmr-i ḍrəs-t. 
   Neg NPI ever-1MS studied-1MS
   ‘I have never studied.’

b. ma ʕʊmr-ʃ ḍrəs-t. 
   Neg NPI ever-1MS-Neg studied-1MS
   ‘I have never studied.’

Another feature that the ma group has which is different from other Arabic dialects is that the adverbial NPI ʕʊmr can either precede or follow the negative məħəd (14) or the NCI wəla wahid (15). This feature is not allowed in JA. Alqassas (2016) argues that the NPI ʕʊmr in JA cannot precede the negative mahədaʃ (16) or the NCI wəla ḡəda (17) which is a piece of evidence the author uses to argue against Head-compliment configuration. Later in this dissertation, I will show that even though that the adverbial NPI ʕʊmr in both groups of IA can precede the negative məħəd or the NCI wəla wahid, however, it still cannot be licensed by the Head-compliment configuration as argued by Benmamoun (2006) and Alsarayreh (2012).

14) (ʕʊmr-əh) məħəd (ʕʊmr-əh) safər irt-l-musˤl. 
   (ever-3MS) no one (ever-3MS) traveled-3MS to-the-Mosul
   ‘No one has ever traveled to Mosul.’

15) (ʕʊmr-əh) wəla wahid (ʕʊmr-əh) safər irt-l-musˤl. 
   (ever-3MS) NCI one (ever-3MS) to-the-Mosul
   ‘No one has ever traveled to Mosul.’
16) (*‘omr-u) mahāda-ʃ (*‘omr-u) zar ʔal-batra.  
(*ever-him) no one (ever-him) visited.3MS the-Petra

‘No one has ever visited Petra.’

17) (*‘omr-u) wəla ḥəda (*‘omr-uu) zar ʔal-batra.  
(*ever-him) NCI one (ever-him) visited.3MS the-Petra

‘No one has ever visited Petra.’

The last type of the NPIs is the idiomatic NPIs which are formed by using the expression
filas ʔəhmər ‘red cent.’ These NPIs can occur preverbally and post-verbally, as shown in the
following examples:

18) ʕəli ma sˤoraf filas ʔəhmər.  
Ali Neg spent.3MS cent red

‘Ali did not spend a red cent.’

19) filas ʔəhmər ʕəli ma sˤoraf.  
cent red Ali Neg spent.3MS

‘Ali did not spend a red cent.’

Another type that is similar to NSI is Negative Quantifiers (NQs) which contain negative
words that express universal quantifications, such as məḥəd ‘no one.’ NQ can express negation in
the absence of a negative particle (20)a while it expresses double negation when it occurs with a
negative marker (20)b.

20) a. məḥəd ʔidʒə l-ʃəfləh.  
no-one came.3MS to-the-party

‘No one came to the party.’
b. məħəd ma-ʔɪʤəh lɪ l-ħəfləh.  

No-one Neg-came.3MS to-the-party

‘No one did not come to the party.’

The expression waḥid, ʃi, kollʃi, and ŋomr among others are considered as NPIs and not as NCIs in the ma group because these elements cannot pass the diagnostic tests that are used to distinguish between NPIs and NCIs. First, they cannot occur preverbally to give us the negative reading as displayed by the ungrammaticality of (21). Second, they cannot pass the fragment answer test (22). Finally, they always require the presence of negation (23).

21)

a. *ʔə j wahid ʔɪʤa.  

Any one came.3MS

‘Anyone came.’

b. *kollʃi sˤar.

everything happened

‘Nothing happened.’

c. *ʔaj fi jifat.

thing saw.1S

‘I did not see anything.’

d. *ŋomr-k dras-ʃt.

NPI ever-2MS studied-2MS

‘You have never studied.’
22) Question: 

a. *munu safar?* 
   who traveled.\textsubscript{3SM} 
   ‘Who did travel?’ 
   *wahd.* 
   ‘One.’ 

b. *munu safar?* 
   who traveled.\textsubscript{3SM} 
   ‘Who did travel?’ 
   *ʔə wahd.* 
   ‘Anyone.’ 

c. * Cushr-əh safar l-it-l-mus'ul?* 
   NPI ever-\textsubscript{3MS} traveled.\textsubscript{3MS} to-the-Mosul 
   ‘Has he ever traveled to Mosul?’ 
   *ʔəh.* 
   ‘Ever.’ 

d. *ʔɪʃ kəd sˤarafit?* 
   how much spent.\textsubscript{2SM} 
   ‘How much did you spend?’ 
   *filsə ŋhmər.* 
   ‘A red cent.’ 

23) 

a. *safr ʔəj wahid.* 
   traveled.\textsubscript{3MS} any one 
   ‘No one traveled.’ 

b. *safr ʔəmr-əh.* 
   traveled.\textsubscript{3MS} NPI.ever-\textsubscript{3MS} 
   ‘He has never traveled.’ 

c. *kolljī s'ar.* 
   nothing happened 
   ‘Nothing happened.’
d. *قالي شورف الفلس ظهور.

Ali spent.3MS cent red

‘Ali did not spend a red cent.’

4.2.2. Negation and NPIs in ma-ʃ Group

This section discusses the syntactic properties of NPIs that are used in the ma-ʃ group. As has been shown in the previous chapters, similar to some Arabic dialects, the ma-ʃ group uses the proclitic ma- and the enclitic -ʃ to negate a sentence (24):

24) ma safərt-ʃ.

Neg traveled.1MS-Neg

‘I did not travel.’

The questions that I answer in this section are:

- Are the NPIs in complementary distribution with the enclitic negative marker -ʃ in the ma-ʃ group, similar to some Arabic dialects?
- How do NPIs interact with the negative marker?

Before discussing those questions, it is important to look at some essential facts about the NPIs in the ma-ʃ group which will help us answer these questions.

Like the ma group, the ma-ʃ group has four different types of NPIs (nominal, determiner, adverbal, and idiomatic). The nominal NPI is expressed by using the indefinite pronouns ةحاد and ʃi (25) which also can appear in affirmative declarative sentences to give us the interpretation of PPIs (26).

25) ma-ʃʃfət-ʃ ةحاد/ʃi.

(NPI: Amarah)

Neg-saw.1S-Neg one/thing

‘I did not see anyone/anything.’
26) ʕəhməd jəf wahid/ji.  
      Ahmed  saw.1S one/thing
      ‘Ahmed saw someone/something.’

Similar to the ma group, the ma-ʃ group also uses the quantifier kollʃi to express nominal NPI. However, the nominal NPI kollʃi in the ma-ʃ group does not occur postverbally even with the verbs of senses. This is shown in the following examples:

27) a. kollʃi ma-jab-t-iʃ.  
      (Nasiriyah)
      anything Neg brought-3FS-Neg
      ‘She did not bring anything.’

b. *ma jab-t-iʃ kollʃi.
      Neg brought-3FS-Neg anything
      ‘She did not bring anything.’

c. *ma jaf-t-iʃ kollʃi.
      Neg saw-3FS-Neg anything
      ‘She did not see anything.’

As the examples in (27) display, the NPI kollʃi in the ma-ʃ group is different from the other dialects that have been described in the literature (EA, JA, and MA) in that none of these dialects use the quantifier kollʃi as a nominal NPI.

The second type, the determiner NPI, is formed by combining the expression ʔəj with the indefinite pronoun wahid/ji (28). This expression is not restricted to negative sentences because it can occur in positive contexts where it can have a wh-reading but not a nominal indefinite reading (29). However, if the determiner NPI ʔəj occurs in the questions (30), and conditionals
contexts (31) which can license NPIs only the indefinite nominal reading is available but never the \textit{wh}-reading.

28) ma \(\text{フト}-\text{iʃ} \) ūj wahīd/i.

\(\text{Neg} \text{ saw.1S} -\text{Neg any one/thing}\)

‘I did not see anyone/anything.’

29) ūj wahīd ūhmad jaf?

\(\text{which one Ahmed} \text{ saw.1S}\)

‘Which one did Ahmed see?’

30) mnu jaf ūj wahīd?

\(\text{who} \text{ saw.1S any one}\)

‘Who saw anyone?’

31) ūyā ūj wahīd ja-djauwāb haāa ūal-suʕal, rah ūajfuz?

\(\text{if} \text{ any one} \text{ 3M-answer.s this question, will 3M.win.s}\)

‘If anyone answers this question, he will win.’

The third type of the NPIs in the \textit{maʃ} group is the adverbial NPI \textit{ʕʊmr} which can precede (32)a and follow the verb (32)b in this group. The postverbal \textit{ʕʊmr} is a marked option, while the preverbal \textit{ʕʊmr} is unmarked.

32) a. \textit{ʕʊmr-ʕ} ma drās-iʃ. \hspace{1cm} (Basrawi)

\(\text{NPI.ever-3MS} \text{ Neg studied.3MS-Neg}\)

‘He has never studied.’

b. ma drās-iʃ \textit{ʕʊmr-ʕ}.

\(\text{Neg studied.3MS-Neg NPI.ever-3MS}\)

‘He has never studied.’
Moreover, the NPI ʕʊmr can occur in non-negative contexts such as yes/no questions (33) and conditionals (34).

33) Question: 

ʕʊmr-əh safər ləʔəl-musˤl?

ever-him traveled.3MS to-the-Mosul no

‘Has he ever traveled to Mosul?’ ‘No.’

34) ʔɪða ʕʊmr-əh safər lə-l-musˤl, gul-li.

if ever-3MS traveled.3MS to-the-Mosul, tell-me

‘If he ever traveled to Mosul, tell me.’

Similar to the ma group, the adverbial NPI ʕʊmr cannot host negation in the ma-ʃ group.

This is shown in the ungrammaticality of (35):

35) a.*ma ʕʊmr-ʃ drəs-t.

Neg NPI.ever-1MS-I-Neg studied.1MS

‘I have never studied.’

b. ma ʕʊmr-h-ʃ drəs.

Neg NPI.ever-2MS-he-Neg studied.2MS

‘He has never studied.’

From the data above we can see that the ma-ʃ group differs from other Arabic dialects regarding the surface of the enclitic -ʃ with the NPIs. As seen in chapter two, previous studies (Benmamoun, 1997; Soltan, 2012; & Alqassas, 2012,2019) state that the enclitic -ʃ is not allowed to surface when the specific NPIs precedes the verb and when negation is only expressed by the negative marker (36) (37). In contrast, the enclitic -ʃ is allowed to surface when the NPIs occur preverbally. For example, the adverbial NPI ʕʊmr is not in complementary distribution with the
The speakers of the *maʃ* group, have the option to keep or to drop the enclitic -ʃ when it occurs with the adverbial NPI ʕʊmr. This is shown in example (38):

36) ʕʊmr-i ma-safərt-i-(*ʃ) məsˤr.

ever-my Neg-traveled.1S-Neg Masr
‘I have never traveled to Egypt.’

37) ma-ʒa-(*ʃ) həttə wahəd.

Neg-came.3MS-Neg even one
‘Anyone did not come.’

38) ʕʊmr-əh ma safər(-iʃ) li-l-musˤl.

NPI ever-3MS Neg traveled.3MS(-Neg) to-the-Mosul
‘He has never traveled to Mosul.’

Finally, unlike JA, and similar to the *ma* group, the adverbial NPI ʕʊmr can follow or precede the negative məḥəd (39) or the NCI wəla wahəd (40). Interestingly, the enclitic morpheme -ʃ, in the *maʃ* group, does not occur with the quantifier wahid, unlike JA (42) when forming the negative quantifier məḥəd as indicated by the ungrammaticality of (41).

39) (ʕʊmr-əh) məḥəd (ʕʊmr-əh) safər-i-ʃ li-l-musˤl.

(ever-3MS) no one (ever-3MS) traveled.3MS to-the-Mosul
‘No one has ever traveled to Mosul.’

40) (ʕʊmr-əh) wəla wahid (ʕʊmr-əh) safər- i-ʃ li-l-musˤl.

(ever-him3MS NCI one (ever-3MS) to-the-Mosul
‘No one has ever traveled to Mosul.’
41) maḥəd-*f safər 1t-l-mus′l.  (Basrawi)

no one traveled_3MS to-the-Mosul

‘No one traveled to Mosul.’

42) maḥəda-f ʾomr-u zar ʔəl-batra.  (JA)

no one ever-him visited_3MS the-Petra

‘No one has ever visited Petra.’  (Alqassas, 2012)

The last type of the NPIs is the idiomatic NPIs which are formed by using the expression 
filəs ʔəhmər ‘red cent.’ These NPIs can occur preverbally (43) and postverbally (44)

43) ʕəli ma s′orəf-if filəs ʔəhmər.

Ali Neg spent_3MS-Neg cent red

‘Ali did not spend a red cent.’

44) filəs ʔəhmər ʕəli ma s′orəf-if.

cent red Ali Neg spent_3MS-Neg

‘Ali did not spend a red cent.’

The aforementioned elements are treated as NPIs because they cannot pass the test that distinguishes between the NPIs and the NCIs as they cannot occur preverbally (45), they need to co-occur with negation (46), and they cannot pass the fragment answer test (47):

45)

a. *ʔəj wahid ʔidʒa.  (Basrawi)

any one came_3MS

‘Anyone came.’
b. *ji ʃifət.

thing saw.1S

‘I did not see anything.’

c. *ʃomr-i dirəs-t.

NPI ever-1MS studied-1MS

‘I have never studied.’

46)

a. *(ma) jab-t-(iʃ) ʔəj ji.  

Neg brought-3FS-Neg any thing

‘She did not bring anything.’

b. *(ma) dirəs-*(iʃ) ʃomr-əh.

Neg studied-3MS-Neg NPI.ever-3MS

‘He has never studied.’

47) Question:  

Answer:  

(Amarah)

a. ʃiʃnu jab?

what brought.3MS

‘What did he bring?’

‘*anything.’

b. ʃomr-əh safər li-l-musˤl?

NPI-3MS traveled.3MS to-the-Mosul

‘Has he ever traveled to Mosul?’

‘Never.’

c. ?iʃkəd sˤorəfət?

how much spent.2SM

‘How much did you spend?’

‘A red cent.’
d. ʃinu sˤar?  
   *kʊllʃi.  
   what happened  
   nothing  
   ‘What happened?’  
   ‘Nothing.’

To conclude, in this section I have discussed the syntactic features of NPIs in the _ma_ group and the _ma-f_ group and I have shown how each group forms NPIs. Moreover, I have indicated why the expressions, such as _waḥid_, _ʃi_, _kʊllʃi_, and _ʕʊmr_ are considered as NPIs through some tests, such as fragment answer test, the presence of negative marker, and whether they can occur in a preverbal position or not. In the next section, I discuss the licensing of NPIs in both groups.

### 4.3. NPI Licensing in ma Group and ma-f Group

In this section, I discuss the licensing of NPIs in both groups. This section examines whether negation is required to license NPIs in all environments. Furthermore, previous semantic, and syntactic approaches proposed by Ladusaw, 1980, 1983; Linebarger, 1981, 1987; Giannakidou, 1998 are examined in this section. Thenceforth, I discuss my proposed analysis of NPIs that is used in the _ma_ and the _ma-f_ groups. Finally, I show which of the previous analyses could be applied to these two groups when licensing NPIs. The main question that this section tries to answer is:

- How do NPIs get licensed in the _ma_ and the _ma-f_ groups?

According to the semantic approach, which was proposed by Ladusaw (1980, 1983), the NPIs are licensed in Downward Entailing (DE) contexts. The author argues that the DE allows inferences from supersetsto subsets (48) and (49). The DE is defined as follows:

- α is a trigger for NPIs if and only if α is downward entailing.

(Ladusaw, 1980)
48) Sarah never eats meats for supper ~ Sarah never eats fish for supper.

49) No women run ~ no mothers run.

Example (48) shows that meat is a superset that entails the subset of fish and example (49) demonstrates that the superset women entails the subset mothers. The focus of the entailment does not continue from the subset to the superset but vice versa. For example, no mothers run does not entail no women run but no women run entails no mothers run. Hence, the inference is claimed to be downward entailing.

Moreover, the author claims that expressions such as few, and restriction of universal quantifiers (e.g., everyone) are considered as DE even though these contexts are not negative, but they can license NPIs within their scope. This is shown in the following examples:

50) Few women run.

51) Everyone who owns a phone will go to the party.

While the DE is claimed to work cross-linguistically; however, this approach has some problems. As we have seen above questions, and conditionals contexts can license NPIs, yet they are not considered as DE. Moreover, some NPIs can precede their licenser. This is shown in the following examples:

52) minu jaf ʔəj wahd?  
   who saw.1S any one  
   ‘Who saw anyone?’

53) ʔəj wahd jə-dʒawəb haða ʔəl-suʃal, rah jifuz?  
   if any one 3M-answer.3 this question, will 3M-win.3
   ‘If anyone answers this question, he will win.’
54) filos ʔəhmər sarəh ma s'orəf-iʃ.

(Amarah)

cent red Sarah Neg spent.3FS-Neg

‘Sarah did not spend a red cent.’

55) ʔomr-əh ma safər li-l-musˤl.

(Moslawi)

NPI ever-3SM Neg traveled.3MS to-the-Mosul

‘He has never traveled to Mosul.’

A study by Giannakidou (1998, 1999, 2006) examines the NPIs in Greek argues against Ladusaw’s proposal. The author states that Polarity Items (PIs) sensitivity cannot be accounted for under the DE hypothesis and assumes that the licensing of the NPIs is instead based on non-veridicality. Non-veridicality is defined as follows:

- Let $Op$ be a monadic propositional operator. The following statements hold:
  
  (i) $Op$ is veridical just in case $Op \, p \rightarrow p$ is logically valid. Otherwise, $Op$ is nonveridical.

  (ii) A nonveridical operator $Op$ is antiveridical just in case $Op \, p \rightarrow \neg p$ is logically valid.

(Adopted from Giannakidou, 1998)

According to the author, non-veridicality has three operators which are: veridical, non-veridical, and anti-veridical. Giannakidou argues that the operator $Op$ is veridical iff whenever $Op \, p$ is true, $p$ is true too. While an $Op$ is nonveridical iff whenever $Op \, p$ is true, $p$ may or may not be true. This is because the nonveridical operators do not entail the falsity of $p$ while the antiveridical operators can entail the falsity of $p$. See example (56), (57), and (58):

56) I Theodora efije xthes. → I Theodora efije. (Veridical)

the Theodora left.3S yesterday

‘Theodora left yesterday.’ → ‘Theodora left.’
57) Isos i Roxani na efije.  \(-/\rightarrow I\) Roxani efije.  \((\text{Nonveridical})\)

perhaps the Roxanne subj left.\(^3S\)

‘Perhaps Roxanne left.’  \(-/\rightarrow ‘Roxanne left.’\)

58) Andi na milisi, protimise na mini siopilos.  \(\rightarrow\) He did not speak. \((\text{Antiveridical})\)

‘Instead of talking, he preferred to remain silent.’

From the data above, it is clear that Giannakidou’s proposal provides a complete picture of the NPIs licensing under the nonveridicality approach compared to DE approach. Furthermore, Giannakidou’s proposal (1998, 1999, 2006) is not restricted to the semantic part but it appeals to syntax.

The Syntactic approach, on the other hand, states that NPIs are licensed by c-command. Linebarger (1980, 1987), argues against the DE and states that NPI can be licensed either by a c-commanding negative marker or by a negative pragmatic implicature. Linebarger’s analysis is based on Baker’s (1970). According to the author, the former requires NPIs to be within the immediate scope constraints (ISC) (i.e., no logical element can intervene between the NPI and its licensor at LF).

- **The Immediate Scope Constraint (ISC):**

  A negative polarity item is acceptable in a sentence \(S\) if in the logical form of \(S\) the subformula representing the NPI is in the immediate scope of the negation operator \(\text{NOT}\). An item is in the immediate scope of \(\text{NOT}\) only if (1) it occurs in a proposition which is in the entire scope of \(\text{NOT}\), and (2) within this proposition there are no logical elements intervening between it and \(\text{NOT}\).

  \((\text{Linebarger 1980: 49})\)
According to the definition of ISC, the NPIs should occur in a proposition that is within the entire scope of *not* and there should not be any logical elements that intervene between them. The logical elements are identified as elements that can enter into scope ambiguities. Consider the following example:

59) *He did not budge an inch any more often than he stood his ground.*

Example (59) shows that the immediate scope constraint is violated because the logical elements intervene between negation and the NPIs *budge an inch* and *NOT* at LF.

The author also stated that the NPIs can be licensed by the negative pragmatic. The negative pragmatic examines NPIs in cases where the negation is not present. Linebarger (1987) defines negative implicature as follows:

- Negative Implicature (NI):
  (i) Expectation of negative implicature is itself a conventional implicature. A negative polarity item contributes to a sentence S expressing a proposition P the conventional implicature that the following two conditions are satisfied.
  (ii) Availability of negative implicature. There is some proposition NI (which may be identical to P) which is implicated or entailed by S and which is part of what the speaker is attempting to convey in uttering S. In the LF of some sentence S' expressing NI, the lexical representation of the NPI occurs in the immediate scope of negation. In the event that S is distinct from S', we may say that in uttering S the speaker is making an allusion to S'.
  (iii) NI strengthens P. The truth of NI, in the context of the utterance, virtually guarantees the truth of P.

(Linebarger 1987: 346)
Linebarger’s analysis, states that NPIs can occur in affirmative sentences which can license them. Consider the following example:

60) I was surprised that she contributed a red cent.

According to the author, example (60) is considered as negative because surprised can have the pragmatic negative implicature. Moreover, the NPI a red cent is in the immediate scope of the negative marker NOT. The example has the following interpretation:

61) I had expected her not to contribute a red cent.

(Adopted from Linebarger, 1980)

Giannakidou’s proposal (1998, 1999, 2006), in contrast, states that nonveridicality can license NPIs either when the NPIs occur in a non-veridical environment or when the NPI is c-command by the non-veridical licenser at LF. According to the author, NPIs in Greek are divided into emphatics (KANENAS ‘no one, nobody’) and non-emphatics (kanenas ‘anyone, anybody). The two differ in that first non-emphatics NPIs never occur to the left of their licenser (an exception is when they are embedded in constituents in this case they can). Second, non-emphatics NPIs are not sensitive to islands and can freely be licensed by non-local negation. Third, they can be licensed long distance (i.e., by superordinate negation in embedded clauses). Emphatics NPIs, on the other hand, can appear to the left of negation, they are sensitive to islands, and they cannot be licensed long distance. Their licensing is more local than non-emphatics NPIs. The differences between the emphatics and non-emphatics NPIs are related to the claim that the latter is treated as existential quantifiers; therefore, they are licit inside islands, licit with superordinate negation, and not licit to the left of their licensers. The former, in contrast, is treated as universal quantifiers; therefore, they are not licit inside islands, they are not
licit with superordinate negation, and they are licit to the left of their licensers. See the following examples:

62) *Kanenan/KANENAN dhen idha.
   any not saw.1S
   ‘I saw nobody.’

63) Dhen itan isixi [epidhi fovithike kanenan/*KANENAN].
   not was.3S quiet because was-scared-3S anyone
   ‘S/he was not quiet because s/he was scare of anybody.’

64) I Ilectra dhen ipe oti idhe tipota/*TIPOTA.
   the Electra not said.3S that saw.3S anything
   ‘Electra did not say ha she saw anything.’

( Adopted from Giannakidou, 1998)

Similar to the DE approach, both Linebarger and Giannakidou’s proposals have some problems if we apply them to the ma and the ma-f groups. Like JA examined by Alsarayreh (2012), the ma and the ma-f groups allow some NPIs to occur before the negative marker. For example, some of the NPIs, such as ṣomr “never” and filas ḥammar “red cent” can precede negation as example (54) and (55) above show. However, the data from the ma and the ma-f groups shows that nonveridicality approach is the only approach that can account for the distribution of NPIs in both groups compared to the other approaches discussed in this section.

Turning to Arabic, Benmamoun (1997, 2006), Alqassas (2012, 2016, 2019), Hoyt (2010), Alsarayreh (2012), Ouali and Soltan (2014) state that NPIs can be licensed either by c-command, or Spec-head relation. Moreover, Benmamoun (1997, 2006) and Alsarayreh (2012) argue that NPIs can also be licensed by Head-complement configuration along with the other two
configurations. As we have seen in chapter two, there is a debate on whether the language allows all three requirements or only some. For example, Alqassas (2016) illustrates that JA does not allow Head-complement configuration. The author states that the NPIs cannot enter into Head-complement relationship with negation as the NPI ʕomr ‘never’ cannot precede the negative  məḥəd ‘no one’ or the NCI wəla  həda ‘no one/nobody’. This is shown by the ungrammaticality of the following examples:

65) *ʕomr-u mahəda-f zar ʔəl-batra.  
  ever-him no one visited.3MS the-Petra
  ‘No one has ever visited Petra.’

66) *ʕomr-u wəla həda zar ʔəl-batra.  
  ever-him NCI one visited.3MS the-Petra
  ‘No one has ever visited Petra.’

In contrast, Benmamoun (1997, 2006) argues that NPIs are licensed either by c-command (67), a specifier-head relation (68), or Head-complement relation (69).

67) ma-qrit hatta ktab.
  Neg-read.1S NPI even book
  ‘I did not read any book.’

68) hatta wahəd ma-ʒa.
  NPI even one Neg-came.3MS
  ‘Anyone did not come.’

69) ʕəmmr-u ma-kan tajbyi nadja.
  NPI-him Neg-Neg love Nadia
  ‘He never loved Nadia.’
In example (67) the NPI ḥṭta ktab is licensed by the c-command mechanism which is defined as:

70) Node A c-commands node B if neither A nor B dominates the other and the first branching node dominating A dominates B.

(Reinhart, 1976)

The derivation of example (67) is as follow:

71) TP
   pro
   T
   ma-qrit
   NegP
   ma-qrit
   Neg’
   ma-qrit
   VP
   pro
   V’
   qrit
   NP
   [ḥṭta ktab]

As we have seen in chapter 2, MA has two different classes of NPIs. One class which can precede sentential negation (72) and another class that cannot precede sentential negation (74). The former can both follow (73) and precede sentential negation (72) which the authors use as a piece of evidence for Spec-head configuration (Aoun et al., 2010).

72) ḥṭta waẖd ma-ḏa. (MA)
   even one Neg-come.3MS

‘No one came.’
In addition to the NPI ḥəṭṭa ‘even,’ MA has another class which is the adverbial NPI ʕəmmər ‘never.’ Benmamoun (2006) demonstrates that the NPI ʕəmmər in example (75) cannot be licensed by either c-command or by Spec-head configuration. Therefore, he proposes another relationship which is Head-complement configuration.

75) nadja ʕəmmər-hə ma-dʒat.

Nadja never-her Neg-came.3FS
‘Nadia never came.’

The NPI ḥəṭṭa waḥəd in (68), on the other hand, is located in Spec-Neg which is headed by the negative marker ma-. Therefore, the NPI ḥəṭṭa waḥəd is licensed by the Spec-head relation with the negation head ma.

Therefore, sentence (68) has the following derivation:
Finally, the NPI ʕəmmər in (75), is located higher than negation and it takes the phrase containing the sentential negation ma as a complement. Hence, the NPI ʕəmmər is licensed by the Head-complement configuration.

Following Alqassas (2016, 2019), I will argue that NPIs in both groups cannot get licensed by Head-complement configuration; however, I will depart from his argument regarding two issues. First, I will show that NPIs in both groups are mainly licensed by c-command, excluding the specifier-head relation. Second, I will show that the locus of the adverbial NPI ʔomr is different in IA from JA. As the data in the previous sections shows, the NPIs can occur in different environments. When the NPIs occur postverbally they get licensed by c-command as shown in (77):

77) ma saφə ʔəj wahd.  
Neg traveled.3MS NPI any one  
‘No one traveled.’

The structure of (77) is an example of NPIs that are licensed by an overt negative marker ma. It shows that the negative marker ma occupies the head of NegP and the NPI ʔəj wahd functions as a subject which occurs in Spec-VP; therefore, the NPI is c-commanded by the negative marker. The data also shows that the NPIs can be licensed by c-commanded covertly at LF. For example, the idiomatic NPIs can occur both preverbally and post-verbally. This is shown in the following examples:

78) ʕəli ma s'uraf-if filəs ʔəhmər.  
Ali Neg spent.3MS-Neg cent red  
‘Ali did not spend a red cent.’
As we can see in example (79), the subject Ali can intervene between the NPI *filas ḥmər* and the negative marker *ma*; thus, the NPIs is not in a Spec-head relationship with the negation and it is not c-commanded by the negative marker *ma* overtly. The only way for the NPIs to get licensed is to be c-commanded covertly at LF. Similar to that, the data in section (4.2.1) and (4.2.2) shows that the adverbial NPI *ʕʊmr* can precede or follow the negative marker in both groups. This is shown in the examples of (14), repeated here as (80) and (81):

80) *ʕʊmr*-ah məḥad safər ʾl-l-μusˤl.

ever-3MS no one traveled.3MS to-the-Mosul

‘No one has ever traveled to Mosul.’

81) məḥad ʾomr-ah safər ʾl-l-μusˤl.

no one ever-3MS traveled.3MS to-the-Mosul

‘No one has ever traveled to Mosul.’

Alqassas (2016) argues that example (80) and (81) are ungrammatical when *ʕomr* precedes a negative indefinite in JA. This is because the adverbial NPI *ʕomr* cannot be licensed by negation under c-command. This fact cannot apply to the *ma* and the *ma-f* groups as they allow the adverbial NPI *ʕomr* to occur before or after the negative marker. Therefore, I will argue that the adverbial NPI *ʕomr* is base-generated postverbally and moved pre-verbally. Its licensing can take place when they merge in Spec-VP under c-command by negation before it moves from VP. This is indicated in the following structures:

79) *filas ḥmər* ʾali ma sˤurəf.

*cent red Ali Neg spent.3MS*

‘Ali did not spend a red cent.’

(Baghdadi)
As section (4.2.1) and (4.2.2) shows, the NPI kollif in the ma and the maʃ groups, as example (4), and (27) repeated here as (83) and (84) demonstrate, can co-occur preverbally. The data from the maʃ group shows that the NPI kollif unlike other arguments can only occur preverbally. In this case, the preverbal NPI kollif must precede negation. The preverbal NPI kollif starts as an object and gets licensed by c-command before moving to Focus Phrase (FocP). This structure is illustrated in (85):

83) kollif ma goll-i. (Najafi)

anything Neg told-me.3MS

‘He did not tell me anything.’

84) kollif ma-jab-t-ij. (Nasiriyah)

anything Neg brought-3FS-Neg

‘She did not bring anything.’

85) [TP kollif T [NegP Neg ma [VP ... kollif]]]

Finally, similar to JA, the NPIs, such as ʔəj waḥid, ʔəj ʃi, and ʔomr in both groups are not sensitive to locality restriction unlike NCIs as we will see in the next chapter. They can be licensed by distant negation either by the embedded clause that is in the indicative (86) or by the subjunctive mood (87). However, the NPI kollif is an exception from this rule as it is sensitive to locality and needs to be licensed locally (88).

86) a. sarəh ma gal-ət (b) ʔom ʃəli ʃaʃ ʔəj waḥid. (Baghdadi)

Sarah Neg said-3FS (Prop) that Ali saw-3MS any one

‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’
b. sarəh ma gal-ʕat-jʕ (bə)- ʔən ʕəli jafʔəj wəhid.  
Sarah Neg said-3FS-Neg (Prop) that Ali saw-3MS any one

‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’

c. ʕəhməd ma gal (bə)- ʔən ʔələjla ʕəmr-hə safr-ʕət lə-1-musəl.  
Ahmed Neg said-3MS (Prop) that Layla ever-3FS traveled-3FS to-the-Mosul

‘Ahmed did not say that Layla ever traveled to Musul.’

d. sarəgal (bə)- ʔən ʔələjla ʕəmr-hə safr-ʕət lə-1-musəl.  
Ahmed Neg said-3MS (Prop) that Layla ever-3FS traveled-3FS to-the-Mosul

‘Ahmed did not say that Layla ever traveled to Mosul.’

87) a. ʕəli ma-ʔrid jirʕtiri ʔəj jî.  
Ali neg-want.3MS 3M-buy.S any thing

‘Ali does not want to buy anything.’

b. ʕəli ma-jʕrid jirʕtiri ʔəj jî.  
Ali neg-3M-want.S-Neg 3M-buy.S any thing

‘Ali does not want to buy anything.’

88) a. suzan ma gal-ʕat (bə)- ʔən ʕəhməd ʕəkəl kəlʕəjî.  
suzan Neg said-3FS (Prop) that Ahmed ate.3MS everything

‘Suzan did not say that Ahmed ate everything.’

b. suzan ma gal-ʕat-jʕ (bə)- ʔən ʕəhməd ʕəkəl kəlʕəjî.  
suzan neg said.3FS-Neg (Prop) that Ahmed ate.3MS everything

‘Suzan did not say that Ahmed ate everything.’

To conclude, I have followed Giannakidou (2006) and Alqassas (2019) analyses’ and stated that the licensing of the NPIs is better captured under the semantic notion of non-
veridicality and the syntactic notion of c-command in the ma and the ma-f groups. Furthermore, I have argued that NPIs are licensed by c-command only in both groups. I have also demonstrated that the adverbial NPI ʕomr is base-generated postverbally and moved preverbally. The data in this chapter indicates that, unlike other Arabic dialects, the NPI ʕomr can precede or follow the negative quantifier məḥəd in both groups. Finally, I have concluded that the NPIs are not sensitive to locality restriction as they allow long-distance licensing; however, kollfi is an exception to such fact.

4.4. Summary

The present chapter investigates the properties of a set of NSIs that function as NPIs in the ma group and the ma-f group with the primary goal being to provide an analysis for how NPIs get licensed within these two groups. In this chapter, I have delineated which expressions are treated as NPIs in the ma and the ma-f group. For example, ?əj wahid is treated as an NPI because it must co-occur with negation and it cannot stand alone as a fragment answer in the ma group and the ma-f group. I have also introduced a new NPI kollfi which is found in both groups and can occur preverbally except with the verbs of senses when it can occur post-verbally. Then, I presented different approaches such as semantics, and syntactic approaches. I have shown that some of the previous approaches presented in this chapter cannot be applied in the ma and the ma-f groups as the data from both groups show some challenges toward specific approaches. Moreover, I explained how NPIs get licensed and which analysis works better for licensing NSIs in these two groups. The data presented in section (4.3) demonstrates that NPIs can only be licensed by c-command. Finally, the discussion in this chapter has demonstrated that the NPI ʕomr is base-generated postverbally and moved preverbally.
Chapter Five

NEGATIVE CONCORD ITEMS

5.1. Introduction

The goal of this chapter is to present the syntactic properties of Negative Concord Items (NCIs) in the *ma* group and the *maʃ* group. It also aims to provide a syntactic analysis that will explain the interaction between negation and NCIs in each group, as well as ultimately explaining the microvariation in IA. NCIs refer to the multiple negative components which occur in a negative sentence without yielding a double negative interpretation. For example, JA, MA, EA, and LA among others are NC dialects, and when two negative elements occur within a sentence the result is a single negative reading as shown in the following example:

1) maʃ-afni-ʃ wəla-həda

   Neg-saw.me-Neg no-one

   ‘No one saw me.’

   (Adopted from Alqassas, 2012)

   Example (1) includes the NCI *wəla-həda* co-occurring with the sentential negative marker *ma*; however, there is only a single reading of negation. This is because only the negative marker *ma* is semantically negative, whereas the NCI *wəla-həda* is not semantically negative.

As seen in chapter 2, NCIs have three different constructions such as Negative Doubling (2), Negative Spread (3), and Negative Doubling and Spread (4) (Den Besten, 1989; Van der Wouden & Zwarts, 1993; Van der Wouden, 1994a; Zeijlestra, 2004). These constructions are defined as follows:

a) Negative Spread: the distribution of the negative feature over any number of indefinite examples that occur within its scope.
b) Negative Doubling: sentences that include a negative phrase with a marked negative component.

c) Negative Spread and Doubling: sentences that include more than one negative expression with a marked negative constituent.

2) Tee niemand niets gezeid.  
   (West Flemish)  
   it has n-body n-thing said  
   ‘Nobody said anything’

3) Jean ne dit rien.  
   (French)  
   John Neg says n-thing  
   ‘John does not say anything’

4) Nikdo nedá nikomu nic.  
   (Czech)  
   N-body\textsubscript{NOM} Neg gives n-body\textsubscript{ACC} n-thing\textsubscript{DAT}  
   ‘Nobody gives anything to anybody’

(Zeijlestra, 2004)

Finally, this chapter discusses the licensing of NCIs in the \textit{ma} and the \textit{ma-ʃ} groups by presenting previous analyses that have been proposed in past literature to discuss the NCIs licensing in different languages, specifically in Arabic dialects. Data from both groups illustrates that not one of the previous analyses that have been proposed for NC can account for the distribution of NCIs in the \textit{ma} and the \textit{ma-ʃ} groups. Therefore, I will show that the alternative analysis I propose can explain the distribution and licensing of NCIs in both groups of IA.
5.2. Negation and NCIs in *ma* and *ma-f* Groups

5.2.1. Negation and NCIs in *ma* Group

This subsection discusses the syntactic properties of NCIs that are used in the *ma* group by presenting the distribution of NCIs and showing how NCIs interact with the negative marker *ma*. In this subsection, I will answer the following questions:

- Is the *ma* group a strict NC or a non-strict NC dialect?
- How do NCIs interact with the negative marker?

There are two types of NCIs in the *ma* group. The first type includes the determiner NCIs, such as *wəla* ‘no’ and the second type includes the adverbial NCIs, such as *ʔəbəd/nihaʔiăm* ‘at all/never,’ *bəʕəd/lɪssəh* ‘yet.’ The NCIs *wəla* is a combination of the conjunction particle *wə* ‘and’ and the negative marker *la* which can never occur in affirmative context. Therefore, it was assumed that *wəla* is semantically and formally negative. This can be shown in the following examples:

5) *wəla wahid ʔidʒəh.*
   
   no one came.3MS
   
   ‘No one came.’

6) *ʃɪf fit wəla wahid.*
   
   saw.1S no one
   
   ‘I saw someone.’

Moreover, the negative *wela* can be used as negative disjunction *la . . . wela* ‘neither . . . nor,’ as illustrated in example (7):

5) *wəla wahid ʔidʒəh.*
   
   no one came.3MS
   
   ‘No one came.’

6) *ʃɪf fit wəla wahid.*
   
   saw.1S no one
   
   ‘I saw someone.’
The adverbial NCIs ʔəbədən/nihaʔjən is a combination of the adjective ʔəbəd/nihaʔj ‘never/final’ and the adverbial marker -ən (8).28 Other adverbial NCI types are the NCIs bəʕəd and lɪssəh which are used interchangeably in this group. The NCI lɪssəh is a grammaticalized form of the prepositional phrase li-həssəh ‘to-now’ (9). Similar to the NCI wela, the adverbial NCIs bəʕəd and lɪssəh cannot occur in affirmative contexts, as examples (10)a and (10)b show:

8) a. sarəh ma risb-ət ʔəbəd.  
Sarah  Neg  failed-3FS at all  
‘Sarah did not fail at all.’

b. ʔəbəd sarəh ma risb-ət.  
at all Sarah  Neg  failed-3FS  
‘Sarah did not fail at all.’

9) a. ʕəli ma safər lɪssəh.  
Ali  Neg  traveled.3MS yet  
‘Ali has not traveled yet.’

b. lɪssəh ʕəli ma safər.  
yet  Ali  Neg  traveled.3MS  
‘Ali has not traveled yet.’

28 The speakers of the ma group use the short form of ʔəbədən which is ʔəbəd in most cases. The expression ʔəbədən is used when the speaker wants emphases on something.
10) a.*sarəh risb-ət ʔəbəd.  
Sarah failed-3FS at all  
‘*Sarah failed at all.’

b.*ʕəli safər lissəh.  
Ali traveled.3MS yet  
‘Ali has traveled yet.’

Unlike the NPIs discussed in the previous chapter, the expression ʷəla wəhɪd is treated as NCI and not as NPI because it can occur as a fragment answer to a question, and it can occur preverbally without the presence of negation, as indicated in the following examples:

11) Question: 
   münu ʔidʒə?  
   who came.3MS 
   ‘Who did come?’

   Answer: 
   wəla wəhɪd.  
   no one 
   ‘No one.’

12) wəla wahɪd ʔidʒəh. 
   no one came.3MS 
   ‘No one came.’

According to the data presented in this chapter, some NCIs are similar to the NPIs in regard to the requirement of the presence of negation. For example, the adverbial NCIs ʔəbədən, nihaʔən, bəʕəd, and lissəh must always co-occur with negation regardless of whether they appear postverbally or preverbally such as listed in examples (13) (14). However, they are treated as NCIs and not as NPIs because they can pass the fragment answer test, as shown in (15):
13) a. lājla ma safr-ət lī-l-mosˤ-ul ?əbəd. (Moslawi)

Layla Neg traveled-3FS to-the-Mosul at all

‘Layla did not travel to Mosul at all.’


at all Layla Neg traveled-3FS to-the-Mosul

‘Layla did not travel to Mosul at all.’

14) a. ʕəməd ma ?ɪʤa lissəh. (Baghdadi)

Ahmed Neg came.3MS yet

‘Ahmed has not came yet.’

b. lissəh ʕəməd ma ?ɪʤa.

yet Ahmed Neg came.3MS

‘Ahmed has not come yet.’

15) Question: Answer:

a. suzan safrət lu lissəh? lissəh.

Suzan traveled.3FS or not yet not yet

‘Has Suzan travel or not?’ ‘Not yet.’


Layla visited.3SM the- Mosul Never

‘Did Layla visit Mosul?’ ‘Never.’

The NCI wəla wahid, by contrast, can only occur postverbally with the presence of a negative marker (16). It cannot co-occur with negation preverbally as it yields a double negative reading (17) and never a concord reading.
16) *(ma) ?dʒəh wəla wahid.  (Baghdadi)
   Neg came.3MS no one
   ‘No one came.’

17) wəla wahid ma ?dʒəh.  (Baghdadi)
   no one Neg came.3MS
   ‘No one did not come.’

As seen in chapter 4, the NPIs in IA similar to other Arabic dialects (i.e., JA) can be licensed long distance (i.e., by superordinate negation in embedded clauses). Contrarily, long-distance licensing is not possible for NCIs. The contrast between NPIs and NCIs is shown in the following examples:

18) a. sarəh ma gal-ət (bɪ)- ?ən ʕəli ʃaf ʔəj wahid.  (Baghdadi)
    Sarah Neg said-3FS (Prop) that Ali saw.3MS any one
    ‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’

   b. sarəh ma gal-ət-ʃ (bɪ)- ?ən ʕəli ʃaf ʔəj wahid.  (Amarah)
    Sarah Neg said-3FS-Neg (Prop) that Ali saw.3MS any one
    ‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’

19) a. *sarəh ma gal-ət (bɪ)- ?ən ʕəli ʃaf wəla wahid.  (Baghdadi)
    Sarah Neg said-3SF (Prop) that Ali saw.3MS NCI no one
    ‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’

   b. *sarəh ma gal-ət-ʃ (bɪ)- ?ən ʕəli ʃaf wəla wahid.  (Amarah)
    Sarah Neg said-3SF-Neg (Prop) that Ali saw.3MS NCI no one
    ‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’
Generally speaking, languages are divided into either a strict-NC or a non-strict NC. Languages such as Japanese, Greek, Catalan, and Slavic languages are known to have Strict-NC which means that the NCIs always require the presence of a negative marker. However, in other languages such as Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian they are referred to as a non-strict NCs which means that the NCIs are allowed to occupy a subject position, and to occur without a negative marker (Giannakidou, 1998; Zeijstra, 2004). From the data presented in this subsection, it is clear that the *ma* group can be considered as either a strict-NC or a non-strict NC because the NCI *wəla wahid* requires the presence of the negative marker *ma*, and only when it occurs in a postverbal position in which it is an example of a non-strict NC (20). On the other hand, the Adverbial NCIs always require the presence of the negative marker *ma* whether they occur in a postverbal (21) or a preverbal position which is an example of a strict-NC (22) (23).

20) *(ma) nidzəh wəla wahid br-l-ʔəmtihan. (Najafi)

Neg passed.3MS no one in-the-exam

‘No one passed the exam.’

21) wəla wahid ma nidzəh br-l-ʔəmtihan. (Najafi)

no one Neg passed.3MS in-the-exam

‘No one did not pass the exam.’

22) a. sarəh *(ma) rəb-ət ʔəbd. (Baghdadi)

Sarah Neg failed-3FS at all

‘Sarah did not fail at all.’

b. ʔəbd sarəh *(ma) rəb-ət.

at all Sarah Neg failed-3FS

‘Sarah did not fail at all.’
23) a. ʕəli *(ma) safər ɪssəh.
   Ali Neg traveled.3MS yet
   ‘Ali has not traveled yet.’

   b. ɪssəh ʕəli *(ma) safər.
   yet Ali Neg traveled.3MS
   ‘Ali has not traveled yet.’

   It is worth mentioning that the Negative Spread (NS) is restricted in the ma group. In the NS construction, two NCIs are morpho-phonologically marked for negation in the absence of a negative marker. Unlike other Arabic dialects (i.e., EA, JA) (24) (26), and similar to MA (25), the ma group does not allow NS structures of the same NCIs to occur in the same clause as demonstrated in the ungrammaticality of examples (27) (28). However, the NS construction is allowed in this group if the NCIs are not identical such as listed in example (29).

24) wəla tˤalib gawəb əla wəla suʔal.  
   NCI no student.3MS answered3MS on NCI no question
   ‘No students answered any question.’

25) *ḥatta tˤalib ʒawəb əla ḥatta suʔaal.  
   NCI no student.3MS answered3MS on NCI no question
   ‘No students answered any question.’

   (Adopted from Ouali and Soltan, 2014:164)

26) wəla tˤalib hall wəla  suʔal.  
   NCI no student answered.3MS NCI no question
   ‘No students answered any question.’

   (Alsarayreh, 2012:150)
27) *wəla t’alib dʒawəb ʂəla wəla suʔal. (Najafi)
   NCI no student.3MS answered.3MS on NCI no question
   ‘No students answered any question.’

28) *bəʕəd/lıssəh t’alib dʒawəb ʂəla bəʕəd/lıssəh suʔal. (Baghdadi)
   NCI no student.3MS answered3MS on NCI no question
   ‘No students answered any question.’

29) wəla t’alib ʔiftira səjarəh lıssəh. (Najaf)
   NCI student.3MS bought.3MS car NCI
   ‘No students bought a car yet.’

Examples (27) and (28) display that the same NCI types cannot co-occur in the same clause without the presence of the negative marker. Nonetheless, the ma group allows Negative Spread and Doubling. See example (30):

30) ʔəmħəd *(ma) həl wəla suʔal lıssəh.
   Ahmed Neg answer.3SM NCI question NCI.
   ‘Ahmed has not answered any question yet.’

Another feature of the adverbial NCI bəʕəd which is similar to the adverbial NPI ʃʊmr is that the adverbial NCI bəʕəd can precede and follow the negative quantifier məħəd (31) or the NCI wəla wahid (32). This feature is similar to JA; yet it differs in that the ma group allows the adverbial NPI ʃʊmr to precede and follow the negative quantifier məħəd, or when the former NCI wəla wahid is not allowed according to Alqassas (2016). The adverbial NCI bəʕəd that precedes the negative quantifier məħəd or the NCI wəla wahid is a marked option in the ma group, while the adverbial NCI bəʕəd that follows the negative quantifier məħəd, or the NCI wəla wahid is unmarked in this group.
31) (bəʕəd-əh) məhəd (bəʕəd-əh) safər l-1-məsˁul. (Baghdadi)
(yet-3SM) no one (yet-3SM) traveled.3MS to-the-Mosul
‘No one has traveled to Mosul yet.’

32) (bəʕəd-əh) wəla wahid (bəʕəd-əh) safər l-1-məsˁul. (Baghdadi)
(yet-3SM) NCI one (yet-3SM) to-the-Mosul
‘No one has traveled to Mosul yet.’

In this subsection, I have analyzed the syntactic distribution of NCIs in the ma group. I have shown that wəla, ʔəbədən, nihaʔjən, bəʕəd, and lissəh are considered as NCIs and not NPIs because they can pass the fragment answer test as well as the presence of negative marker tests. Data from the ma group demonstrates that this group exhibits both varieties of NC: strict NC and non-strict NC. For the next subsection, I will examine the syntactic properties of NCIs in the maʃ group.

5.2.2. Negation and NCIs in maʃ Group

This subsection discusses the syntactic properties of NCIs that are used in the maʃ group. The central questions that I answer in this subsection are:

- Is the maʃ group a strict NC or a non-strict NC dialect?
- Are the NCIs in complementary distribution with the enclitic negative marker -ʃ in the maʃ group?
- How do NCIs interact with the negative marker?

The maʃ group exhibits two types of NCIs which are: the determiner wəla, and the adverbial NCIs ʔəbəd ‘at all,’ and bəʕəd/ʔɪlhissəh ‘yet.’ The NCI ʔɪlhissəh, as is the case in the ma group, is grammaticalized from the prepositional l- ‘to’ and the adverb həssəh ‘now’. The
adverbial NCIs *baʔad and *ʔilhissəh can only occur in negative contexts as shown by (33) and (34), but not in affirmative contexts as shown by (35):

33) a. sarəh ma rısb-ət-ıf?əbəd.  
Sarah Neg failed-3FS-Neg at all
   'Sarah did not fail at all.'
   (Basrawi)

   b. ?əbəd sarəh ma rısb-ət-ıf.
      at all Sarah Neg failed-3FS-Neg
      'Sarah did not fail at all.'

34) a. ŋəli ma safər-ıf*ʔilhissəh.  
Ali Neg traveled.3MS-Neg yet
   'Ali has not traveled yet.'
   (Basrawi)

   b. *ʔilhissəh ŋəli ma safər-ıf.
      yet Ali Neg traveled.3MS-Neg
      'Ali has not traveled yet.'

Sarah failed-3FS at all
   '*Sarah failed at all.'
   (Basrawi)

   b. *ŋəli safər *ʔilhissəh.
      Ali traveled.3MS yet
      'Ali has traveled yet.'

The NCI *wəla wahid can occur both preverbally and post-verbally. However, when the NCI *wəla wahid precedes the verb, it cannot co-occur with negation as it will yield a double
negation reading (36). In contrast, when the NCI \textit{wəla wahid} follows the verb, it requires the presence of negative marker (37).

36) \textit{wəla wahid ma safar-(iʃ)}. \hspace{1cm} \text{(Nasiriyah)}

\begin{center}
\text{no one Neg traveled.3MS-Neg}
\end{center}

‘No one did not travel.’

37) *(ma) safar-iʃ wəla wahid. \hspace{1cm} \text{(Nasiriyah)}

\begin{center}
\text{Neg traveled.3MS-Neg no one}
\end{center}

‘No one traveled.’

Nevertheless, the adverbial NCIs \textit{ʔəbəd} and \textit{bəʕəd/ʔɪlhissəh} always require the presence of negation whether they occur preverbally or post-verbally. See the following examples:

38) a. sarəh *(mə-)-t-hib-iʃ ʔəl-səfar ʔəbəd. \hspace{1cm} \text{(Basrawi)}

\begin{center}
\text{Sarah Neg-3F-like. S-Neg the-travel at all}
\end{center}

‘Sarah does not like to travel at all.’

b. ʔəbəd sarəh *(mə-)-t-hib-iʃ ʔəl-səfar.

\begin{center}
\text{at all Sarah Neg-3F-like. S-Neg the-travel}
\end{center}

‘Sarah does not like to travel at all.’

39) a. ʕəli *(ma) safar-iʃ ʔɪlhissəh. \hspace{1cm} \text{(Nasiriyah)}

\begin{center}
\text{Ali Neg traveled.3MS-Neg yet}
\end{center}

‘Ali has not traveled yet.’

b. ʔɪlhissəh ʕəli *(ma) safar-iʃ.

\begin{center}
\text{yet Ali Neg traveled.3MS-Neg}
\end{center}

‘Ali has not traveled yet.’
Similar to the *ma* group, the expression *wəla wahid* in the *ma-f* group is treated as NCIs because it can occur preverbally and it can pass the fragment answer test, as shown in the following examples:

40) *wəla wahid dir̂-iʃ.*

NCI no one studied.₃⁵₃-Neg.

‘No one studied.’

41) Question:       Answer:         (Amarah)

₃⁴₃ minu jif-it? wəla wahid.

who saw.₃⁴₃-you no one

‘Who did you see?    ‘No one.’

Furthermore, the NCI *wəla wahid* cannot occur in affirmative contexts to give a negative reading as shown by the ungrammaticality of (42).

42) *safər wəla wahid.*

traveled.₃⁴₃ no one

‘No one traveled.’

As example (42) shows, the adverbial NCIs ʔəbəd and bəʕəd/ʔɪlhissəh in the *ma-f* groups always require the presence of negation like NPIs; however, they are treated as NCIs because they can occur as a fragment answer. This is shown in example (43):

43) Question:       Answer:

₃⁴₃ a. ʔəli safər lu lissəh? ʔɪlhissəh.

Ali traveled.₃⁴₃ or not yet not yet

‘Has Ali traveled or not?    ‘Not yet.’
b. ʔəmor ʔəl-mos'ul? ṭəbədən.

Ø visited.3SM the-Mosul Never
‘Did you visit Mosul?’ ‘Never.’

Like the ma group, the ma-f group is treated as both a strict-NC and a non-strict NC because the NCI wa'la wahid requires the presence of the negative marker ma only when it occurs in a postverbal position, which is an example of a non-strict NC (47). In contrast, the Adverbial NCIs always require the presence of the negative marker ma whether they occur in a postverbal or a preverbal position which is an example of a strict-NC. This is shown in examples (33) and (34), as well as repeated here in examples (44) and (45):

44) a. sarəh ma risb-ət-iʃ?əbəd. (Basrawi)
Sarah  Neg  failed-3FS-Neg at all
‘Sarah did not fail at all.’
b. ʔəbəd sarəh ma risb-ət-iʃ.
at all Sarah  Neg  failed-3FS-Neg
‘Sarah did not fail at all.’

45) a. ʔəli ma safər-iʃʔilhissəh. (Basrawi)
Ali  Neg  traveled.3MS-Neg yet
‘Ali has not traveled yet.’
b. ʔilhissəh ʔəli ma safər-iʃ.
yet  Ali  Neg  traveled.3MS-Neg
‘Ali has not traveled yet.’
46) wəla wahid ma safər-(iʃ).  
   no one Neg traveled.\textsubscript{3MS-Neg}  
   ‘No one did not travel.’

47) *(ma) safər-iʃ wəla wahid.  
   Neg traveled.\textsubscript{3MS-Neg} no one  
   ‘No one traveled.’

   Additionally, the NS structure in the \textit{ma-f} group is restricted. This group, like MA, does not allow NS structures of the same NC to occur in the same clause without the presence of negative marker \textit{ma}, as indicated by the ungrammaticality of the following examples:

48) *wəla ˈtalib dʒawəb ʕəla wəla suʔal.  
   NCI no student.\textsubscript{3MS} answered on NCI no question  
   ‘No students answered any question.’

49) *bəʕəd/?ilhissəh ˈtalib dʒawəb ʕəla bəʕəd/?ilhissəh suʔal.  
   NCI no student.\textsubscript{3MS} answered on NCI no question  
   ‘No students answered any question.’

50) *ḥatta ˈtalib ʒawəb ʕəla ḥatta suʔal.  
   NCI no student.\textsubscript{3MS} answered on NCI no question  
   ‘No students answered any question.’  
   (Ouali and Soltan, 2014:164)

   As the data shows, the same NCI types cannot co-occur in the same clause without the presence of the negative marker; however, NS is allowed when the NCI \textit{wəla wahid}, co-occurs with the adverbial NCIs \textit{ʔəbəd} and \textit{bəʕəd/?ilhissəh}. See the following examples:
51) wəla samıl ʔiftrə səjarəh ʔiłhiṣsəh. (Basrawi)

NCI worker.₃MS bought.₃MS car NCI

‘No worker bought a car yet.’

On the contrary, Negative Spread and Negative Doubling are allowed in the *ma*-f group. Such can be seen when two NCIs can occur with the negative marker *ma* as shown in example (52):

52) ?əmħəd *(ma) həl-ıʃ wəla suʔal ʔiłhiṣsəh. (Amarah)

Ahmed Neg answer.₃SM-Neg NCI question NCI.

‘Ahmed has not answered any question yet.’

As the data demonstrates, the enclitic -ʃ in the *ma*-f group is allowed to surface when the NCIs occur preverbally and post-verbally. For example, the adverbial NCIs wəla wahid and ʔiłhiṣsəh are not in complementary distribution with the enclitic -ʃ. The speakers of the *ma*-f group have the option to keep or to drop the enclitic -ʃ when it occurs with the adverbial NCIs. Finally, similar to JA and as it was stated by Alqassas (2012, 2019), the adverbial bəʕəd can precede or follow the negative quantifier məħəd (53) and the NCI wəla wahid (54):

53) (bəʕəd-əh) məħəd (bəʕəd-əh) safər l-l-moslul. (Nasiriyah)

(yet-₃MS) no one (yet-₃MS) traveled.₃MS to-the-Mosul

‘No one has traveled to Mosul yet.’

54) (bəʕəd-əh) wəla wahid (bəʕəd-əh) safər l-l-moslul. (Nasiriyah)

(yet-₃MS) NCI one (yet-₃MS) to-the-Mosul

‘No one has traveled to Mosul yet.’
(55) (bəʃəd-o) mahāda-f (bəʃəd-o) zar ʔəl-batra.  
(yet-him) no one (yet-him) visited.3MS the-Petra
‘No one has visited Petra yet.’

(56) (bəʃəd-o) wəla-ħəda (bəʃəd-o) zar ʔəl-batra.  
(yet-him) NCI-one (yet-him) visited.3MS the-Petra
‘No one has visited Petra yet.’

(Examples (55) & (56) are adopted from Alqassas, 2016)

In conclusion for this subsection, I have discussed the syntactic features of NCIs in the
ma-f group. I have shown how the ma-f group contains NCIs. Moreover, I have indicated which
NSIs are considered as NCIs through several tests such as with the fragment answer test, the
presence of a negative marker, and whether they can occur in a preverbal position or not.
Therefore, the answer to the first question I proposed and as the data shows, the structure of the
ma-f group is similar to French and JA as these languages are treated as strict NC and non-strict
NC languages. The ma-f group behaves as a non-strict NC language because only the postverbal
NCI wəla wahid requires the presence of a negative marker under a concordant reading.
Furthermore, the ma-f group behaves as a strict NC language because both the preverbal and the
postverbal adverbial NCIs require negation under a concordant reading. The answer to the
second question I had proposed is that the NCIs in the ma-f group are not in complementary
distribution with the enclitic negative marker -ʃ. As the data demonstrates, the enclitic negative
marker -ʃ can co-occur with the NCIs. Finally, some of the NCIs always require the negative
marker while others only require the presence of negation preverbally which answers the final
question. In the next section, I will explore the licensing of NCIs in both groups and discuss the
previous analyses.
5.3. NCIs Licensing in both *ma* Group and *ma*-ʃ Group

This section discusses the licensing of NCIs in both groups. It examines whether negation is required to license NCIs in all environments, and whether NCIs can license another NCI or another NPI. Later, I discuss my proposed analysis of NCIs that are used in the *ma* and the *ma*-ʃ groups. Finally, I show which of the previous analyses could be extended to the *ma* group and the *ma*-ʃ group when licensing NCIs. This section tries to answer two main questions:

- How do NCIs get licensed in both groups?
- Which of the previous analyses can explain the licensing of NC in the *ma* and the *ma*-ʃ groups?

Licensing NCIs has been the center of attention for many decades. Previous analyses like (Benmamoun, 1997, 2006; Alqassas, 2012, 2016; Hoyt, 2010; and Alsarayreh, 2012; among others) try to answer the main question which is whether NCIs are inherently negative or not. As we have seen in the previous subsections (5.2.1, 5.2.2) some NCIs can occur without the presence of negation while others always require negation. This is illustrated in the following examples:

57) a. ważلا wahld (*ma) safار-(iʃ).

no one Neg traveled.3MS-Neg

‘No one traveled.’

b. *(ma) safar-iʃ ważلا wahld.

Neg traveled.3MS-Neg no one

‘No one traveled.’
58) a. *(ma) ʔidʒ-ʔəl wəla wahid.
    Neg come-3MS no one
    ‘No one came.’

    b. wəla wahid *(ma) ʔidʒə.
    no one Neg came.3MS
    ‘No one came.’

59) a. sarəh *(mə-)t-ḥib-ijʔəl-səfor ʔəbəd.
    Sarah Neg-like-3FS-Neg the-travel at all
    ‘Sarah does not like to travel at all.’

    b. ʔəbəd sarəh *(mə-)t-ḥib-ijʔəl-səfor.
    at all Sarah Neg-like-3FS-Neg the-travel
    ‘Sarah does not like to travel at all.’

60) a. ʕali *(ma) safər lissəh.
    Ali Neg traveled.3MS yet
    ‘Ali has not traveled yet.’

    b. lissəh ʕali *(ma) safər.
    yet Ali Neg traveled.3MS
    ‘Ali has not traveled yet.’

As seen in the preceding chapter, previous studies such as Benmamoun (1997, 2006), Alqassas (2012, 2016), Hoyt (2010), and Alsarayreh (2012) state that NPIs can be licensed either by c-command, or Spec-head relation. Additionally, Benmamoun (1997, 2006) and Alsarayreh (2012) argue that NPIs can also be licensed by Head-complement configuration along with the
other two configurations. Similar to NPIs, NCIs can be licensed either by c-command, Spec-head relation, or Head-complement configuration.

On one hand, Aoun et al. (2010) treat ḥəṭṭa wahd in MA as an NPI. The NPI ḥəṭṭa wahd can precede (61) and follow (62) sentential negation, which the authors use as a piece of evidence for Spec-head configuration. Alqassas (2012, 2016), Ouali and Soltan (2014), on the other hand, treat ḥəṭṭa wahd as NCI and not as an NPI. This is because the NCI ḥəṭṭa wahd can pass the fragment answer test (63) and can occur in preverbal position (64):

61) ḥəṭṭa wahd ma-dʒa. (MA)
    even one Neg-come.3MS
    ‘No one came.’

62) ma-dʒa ḥəṭṭa wahd. (MA)
    Neg-come.3MS even one
    ‘No one came.’

(Aoun et al., 2010:123)

63) Question Answer (MA)
    ḟkun ḟaf-ti? ḥəṭṭa wahd.
    who saw.2S not-even one
    ‘Who did you see.” ‘Nobody.’

64) ḥəṭṭa wahd ma-ʒa. (EA)
    not-even one Neg-came.3SM
    ‘Nobody came.’

(Ouali and Soltan, 2014: 162)
According to Hoyt (2010), the NCI \textit{wəla} generally does not require licensing, and can express negative meaning when it occurs in sentence-initial topic positions (65), causal adjuncts (66), and predicate nominals (67):

65) \textit{wəla} ktab ʕɪrifit min kan ʔɪlli katab-u. \hspace{1cm} \text{(JA)}
not-even book knew.$_{1S}$ who was that wrote-him

‘Not even one book [was such that] I knew who it was who wrote it.’

66) ʔintə zaʔlan ʕəla ʕəla iʃi. \hspace{1cm} \text{(JA)}
you.$_{2SM}$ angry upon not-even thing

‘You are angry for nothing at all.’

67) ʔəna ʔəla iʃi ʔlmudir ʔlli mumkîn ʔısaʔd-ək. \hspace{1cm} \text{(JA)}
I not-even thing the-director who can $3_{help-you}$

‘I am nothing. [It is] the director who can help you.’

(Adopted from Hoyt, 2010)

In contrast, \textit{wəla} needs to be licensed when it occurs in positions that correspond to existential entailments of a predicate and is interpreted with new informational focus. This can be seen in the following examples:

68) a. \textit{wəla} ḥəda $\text{biddu}$ j-ʔəʃa $\text{məʃi}$. \hspace{1cm} \text{(JA)}
not.even one want.$_{3SM}$ $3_{dine with-me}$

‘Not even one person wants to have dinner with me.’

b. məʃuʃ $\text{wəla}$ wahəd minhum
not.saw.$_{1S}$ not.even.one from-them

‘I did not see even one of them.’

(Adopted from Hoyt, 2010)
Another study that focuses on negation in JA by Alqassas (2016, 2019), shows that LA is a non-strict NC language because the postverbal NCIs always require the presence of the negative marker \( ma \) (69) while the preverbal NCIs do not (70). The postverbal NCI \( wəla-ħəda \) in (69) is licensed by the negative marker \( ma \). Therefore, the NCI \( wəla-ħəda \) is licensed under c-command.

69) a. \( ma-ʃafni-ɪʃ \text{ wəla-ħəda}. \)
   
   Neg-saw.me-Neg no-one
   
   ‘No one saw me.’

   b. \( *ʃafni \text{ wəla-ħəda}. \)
   
   saw.me no-one
   
   ‘No one saw me.’

70) a. \( wəla-ħəda ʃafni. \)
   
   no-one saw.me
   
   ‘No one saw me.’

   b. \( * wəla-ħəda ma-ʃafni-ɪʃ. \)
   
   no-one Neg-saw.me-Neg
   
   ‘No one saw me.’

In the previous chapter, I had discussed the distributions of NPIs. From the data presented in this chapter and from the previous chapter, we can summarize the differences between NPIs and NCIs distributions. One difference between NPIs and NCIs is the ability for the former to occur and be licensed in negative-like contexts (i.e., without-clauses, before-clauses, wh-questions, yes/no questions, as-if-clauses,). The latter, in contrast, can only occur with without-clause. See the following examples:
Another difference between NPIs and NCIs is locality restriction. The data from chapter four shows that the NPIs are not sensitive to locality restrictions. They can be licensed by distant negation, either by the embedded clause, which is in the indicative, or by the subjunctive mood. This is illustrated in example (18); (19) repeated here as (75); (76):

75) a. sarəh ma gal-ət (bɪ)- ?ən əli jafə aj wahid. (Baghdadi)

Sarah Neg said-3SF (Prop) that Ali saw.3MS any one

‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’

b. sarəh ma gal-ət-iʃ (bɪ)- ?ən əli jafə aj wahid. (Amarah)

Sarah Neg said-3SF-Neg (Prop) that Ali saw.3MS any one

‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’
76) a. ʕəli mə-j-rid ji-ftiri ʔaj fi.  
Ali Neg-3M-want.S 3M-buy.3 any thing  
‘Ali does not want to buy anything.’

b. ʕəli mə-j-rid-iʃ ji-ftiri ʔaj fi.  
Ali Neg-3M-want.S-Neg 3M-buy.3 any thing  
‘Ali does not want to buy anything.’

NCIs, on the other hand, are sensitive to locality restriction. They do not allow long-distance licensing as shown by the ungrammaticality of (77). However, they can only allow long-distance licensing when the embedded clause is in the subjunctive mood (78).

77) a. *sarəh ma gal-ət (br)‑ʔən ʕəli jaf wəla wahd.  
Sarah Neg said-3SF (Prop) that Ali saw.3MS NCI-no one  
‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’

b. *sarəh ma gal-ət-iʃ (br)‑ʔən ʕəli jaf wəla wahd.  
Sarah Neg said-3SF-Neg (Prep) that Ali saw.3MS NCI-no one  
‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’

78) a. ʕəli mə-j-rid ji-ftiri wəla fi.  
Ali Neg-3M-want.S 3M-buy.3 NCI-no thing  
‘Ali does not want to buy anything.’

b. ʕəli mə-j-rid-iʃ ji-ftiri wəla fi.  
Ali Neg-3M-want.S-Neg 3M-buy.3 NCI-no thing  
‘Ali does not want to buy anything.’

Example (77) shows that NC is clause-bound, whereas NPIs are not. This fact is only accurate when the NCIs are taken to be syntactically marked for negation, as NPI’s are not
(Zeijlstra, 2004, 2008). According to Giorgi (2004), movement out of the clause is not blocked in the subjunctive clauses. For example, long distance anaphora in embedded clauses cannot refer to main clause antecedents when they are in an indicative clause (79); however, they can when they are in a subjunctive clause (80). This fact is supported by Rizzi’s (1997) proposal, whereas indicative clauses have a full CP layer which contains ForceP and FinP, while subjunctive clauses lack ForceP.

79) *Quel dittatore ha detto che i notiziari televisivi parleranno (Italian)

That dictator said that news programs TV will talk

a lungo delle proprie gesta.

a lot about self’s deeds

‘That dictator said that the TV news programs will talk a lot about self’s deeds.’

80) Quel dittatore spera che i notiziari televisivi parlino

That dictator hopes that news programs TV will talk

a lungo delle proprie gesta

for long-time about self’s deed

‘That dictator hopes that TV news programs will talk for a long time about self’s deed.’

(Adopted from Giorgi, 2004: 4-5)

NCIs licensing has been the main focus in linguistic research for decades. Many analyses have been proposed to answer the main question which is how NCIs get licensed. These analyses are known as: NPI analysis, Negative Quantifier analysis, Lexical Ambiguity analysis, and Syntactic Agreement analysis. (Laka, 1990; Zanuttini, 1991, 2004, 2008; Haegeman and Zanuttini, 1991, 1996; Ladusaw, 1992; Haegeman, 1995; Watanabe, 2004; Penka, 2007, 2011; Alqassas 2012, 2016, 2019; Hoyt, 2010; Alsarayreh, 2012; Ouali and Soltan, 2014).
According to the NPI analysis proposed by (Laka, 1990; Ladusaw, 1992), the NCIs are treated as non-negative NPIs. Under this analysis, the non-negative NPIs need to be licensed either by overt or covert negation. Laka (1990) argues that postverbal NCIs are licensed by an overt negative marker, while preverbal NCIs are licensed by a covert negative operator that heads a ΣP, and therefore the ΣP hosts an operator such as sentential negation. According to the author, preverbal NCIs occupy the Spec-ΣP; hence they are licensed under Spec-head agreement while postverbal NCIs get licensed by a covert negative operator in the head of ΣP. This is shown in the following examples:

81) a.*(No) vino nadie. (Spanish)
   Neg came NCI-person
   ‘Nobody came.’

b. Nadie (*no) vino.
   NCI-person Neg came
   ‘Nobody came.’

(Laka, 1990:104)

As shown in (81)a, in order for the postverbal NCI nadei to be licensed, the negative head needs to be overt because there is no element in Spec-ΣP. In (81)b, the preverbal NCI nadie, in contrast, which occupies the Spec-ΣP gets licensed by the covert negative head.

This analysis faces a few challenges in regard to NCIs in the ma and the ma-ʃ groups. First, it assumes that preverbal NCIs must always occur with a covert negative operator. This fact is true with the preverbal NCI ḡala ḡahid as it cannot occur with the overt negative marker ma when it appears in the preverbal position without yielding a double negative, and never a
concord interpretation (82); (83). Data from both groups shows that the NCI *wela wahid* must be accompanied by the overt negative marker *ma* only when it appears in a postverbal position.

82) *wela wahid *ma dîrs

NCI no one Neg studied.3MS

‘No one studied.’

83) *wela wahid *ma dîrs-îf

NCI no one Neg studied.3MS-neg.

‘No one studied.’

However, as the data from the *ma* and the *ma-ʃ* groups shows, the NCIs like *lissəh*, *ʔîlhissəh* among others must always occur with the overt negative marker *ma*, whether it occurs in a preverbal or a postverbal position. Therefore, when the preverbal NCIs occur with a covert negative operator, the result is ungrammatical sentences as shown in examples (84) and (85).

84) *lîssəh ʕəli safər.

yet Ali traveled.3MS

‘Ali has not traveled yet.’

85) *ʔîlhissəh ʕəli safər-ʃ.

yet Ali traveled.3MS-Neg

‘Ali has not traveled yet.’

The second challenge of the NPI analysis is that it does not provide an explanation of why NPIs can be licensed by long distance, while NCIs cannot. This is demonstrated in examples (18) and (19), as well as repeated in (86) and (87):
86) a. sarəh ma gal-ʔət (bi)- ʔən ʕəli jəf ʔəj wahıd. (Baghdadi)
   Sarah Neg said-3SF (Prop) that Ali saw.3MS any one
   ‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’

   b. sarəh ma gal-ʔət-ʔən (bi)- ʔən ʕəli jəf ʔəj wahıd. (Amarah)
   Sarah Neg said-3SF-Neg (Prop) that Ali saw.3MS any one
   ‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’

87) a. *sarəh ma gal-ʔət (bi)- ʔən ʕəli jəf wəla wahıd. (Baghdadi)
   Sarah Neg said-3SF (Prop) that Ali saw.3MS NCI-no one
   ‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’

   b. *sarəh ma gal-ʔət-ʔən (bi)- ʔən ʕəli jəf wəla wahıd. (Amarah)
   Sarah Neg said-3SF-Neg (Prop) that Ali saw.3MS NCI-no one
   ‘Sarah did not say that Ali saw anyone.’

The Negative Quantifier analysis which was proposed by (Zanuttini,1991; Haegeman and Zanuttini, 1991, 1996; and Haegeman, 1995) treats NCIs as negative quantifiers rather than non-negative NPIs; therefore, they are inherently negative. Under this analysis, we can provide an explanation of why NCIs can function as fragment answers and why they can occur without the presence of the negative marker in preverbal position. To solve the co-occurrence of multiple NCIs and the co-occurrence of postverbal NCIs with the negative marker without yielding a double negative reading, Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) proposed a rule of negative absorption for the latter and a rule of negative factorization for the former which are defined as follows:

- Neg-absorption:
  \[ (\forall x^-) (\forall y^-) (\forall z^-) = [\forall x, y, z]^- \]
- Neg-factorization:

\[ [\forall x -] [-] = [\forall x]^- \]

However, the negative quantifiers’ analysis has some problems. The first problem is that this analysis fails to explain why postverbal NCIs must always co-occur with a negative marker, but the presence of the negative marker is not required with preverbal NCIs. The second problem that faces this analysis is that it assumes that all postverbal NCIs can express negation without the presence of the negative marker. This is not true in the ma and the ma-f groups as illustrated in examples (88) and (89):

88) *dirs wəla wahid. \hspace{1cm} \text{(Baghdadi)}

\text{studied.3MS NCI no one}

‘No one studied.’

89) *jaʃ wəla wahid. \hspace{1cm} \text{(Basrawi)}

\text{came.3MS NCI no one}

‘No one came.’

Lexical Ambiguity analysis, instead, indicates that NCIs in non-strict NC-languages are lexically ambiguous (Herburger, 2001). Postverbal NCIs are considered as NPIs because they always require the negative marker, whereas preverbal NCIs are considered as negative quantifiers because they do not require the negative marker. This analysis is supported by the fact that preverbal NCIs can license postverbal NCIs without yielding a double negation reading (90):

90) Nadie miraba a nadie. \hspace{1cm} \text{(Spanish)}

\text{n-body looked at n-body}

‘Nobody looked at anybody.’
The author treats the preverbal NCI *nadie* as a negative quantifier, while the postverbal NCI *nadie* is treated as an NPI. Therefore, the postverbal NPI *nadie* is licensed by the preverbal quantifier *nadie*.

Similar to the other two aforementioned analyses, this analysis faces a few problems. First, the lexical ambiguity analysis fails to provide an explanation for the distribution of NCIs in contexts where negation is not present. The previous chapter shows that NPIs in both groups can be licensed in different contexts, such as yes-no questions and conditional sentences. Under this analysis, we expect that the preverbal NCIs can be licensed in contexts like yes-no questions and conditional sentences; however, this is not true for the NCIs in the *ma* group and the *ma-f* group as illustrated in the following examples:

91) Question: ‘Has he ever traveled to Mosul?’

   *wəla/lisass/ʔiḥissə/wəbəd safər ɬ-ɬ-musˤl?*

   NCIs traveled.3MS to-the-Mosul no

   ‘No.’


   if NCIs traveled.3MS to-the-Mosul, tell-me

   ‘If he ever traveled to Mosul, tell me.’

Second, this analysis predicts that the preverbal NCI *wəla wahid* can license the postverbal NCI *wəla wahid* in both groups. According to this analysis, the preverbal NCI *wəla wahid* should be treated as a negative quantifier while the postverbal NCI *wəla wahid* should be treated as an NPI. This prediction is born out as shown in the following examples:

93) *(wəla wahid) jaf wəla wahid.*  

   no one saw.3MS NCI no one
‘No one looked at anyone.’

94) *wəla wahid faf wəla wahid. (Basrawi)

no one saw.3MS NCI no one

‘No one looked at anyone.’

As seen from the data presented in subsection (5.2.1) and (5.2.2), both groups do not allow NS structures of the same NCIs, hence examples (93) and (94) are considered as ungrammatical sentences.

The third challenge proposed is that this analysis assumes that the preverbal of non-strict NCIs only have a non-negative NPI reading. According to Herburger (2001), the preverbal NCIs in non-strict languages (i.e., Spanish) cannot have an NPI reading because NCIs cannot be licensed preverbally. This assumption cannot be extended to the ma and ma-f groups because NPIs can be licensed in preverbal position as was shown in the previous chapter. See the following examples:

95) filəs ʔəhmər ʕəli *(ma) sˤorəf. (Amarah; Najafi)

cent red Ali Neg spent.3MS

‘Ali did not spend a red cent.’

96) a. ʕomr-əh *(ma) dirləs. (Moslawi)

NPI ever-3MS Neg studied.3MS

‘He has never studied.’

b. ʕomr-əh *(ma) dirəs-if. (Basrawi)

NPI ever-3MS Neg studied.3MS-Neg

‘He has never studied.’
According to the examples listed, NPIs can be licensed in the preverbal position by c-command with the negative marker *ma*. Additionally, and similar to JA, the preverbal non-strict NCI *wəla wahid* in both groups cannot have a non-negative NPI reading as was assumed by the lexically ambiguous analysis, whether the negative marker *ma* is present or not as shown in examples (98) and (99):

97) a. kollfi *(ma) gəll-i.  
anything Neg told-me.3MS
‘He did not tell me anything.’

b. kollfi *(ma-)jab-t-ij’  
anything Neg brought-3FS-Neg
‘She did not bring anything.’

98) a. wəla wiḥd  nidʒh.  
no one passed.3MS
‘No one passed.’

b. wəla wahid nidʒh.  
no one passed.3MS
‘No one passed.’

99) a. wəla wiḥd ma niḍʒh.  
no one Neg passed.3MS
‘No one did not pass.’

b. wəla wahid ma- niḍʒh-if.  
no one Neg passed.3MS-Neg
‘No one did not pass.’
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Finally, the Syntactic Agreement analysis proposed by (Zanuttini, 2004, 2008; Watanabe, 2004; Penka, 2007, 2011) treats NCIs as non-negative indefinites. NC has an uninterpretable negative feature [uNeg] which needs to be checked by an interpretable negative feature [iNeg] (i.e., elements that are semantically negative) under Agree relation which was introduced first by (Chomsky 1995, 2000, 2001). According to Zeijlstra and Penka, NCIs licensing in strict NC language always requires an overt Neg which carries the [iNeg], whereas in non-strict NC language, NCIs can be licensed by an abstract negative operator $Op^\neg$ carries the [iNeg]. The $Op^\neg$ only emerges when an element with a [uNeg] feature occurs in a clause that needs to be checked. This is illustrated in the following examples:

100) a. Jean ne mange pas

\[
\text{Jean neg eats neg}
\]

‘Jean does not eat’

b. $[\text{NegP pas}[\text{NEG}][\text{Neg ne mange}[\text{uNEG}]][\text{vP a Jean}]$


\[
\text{NCI-person call to Gianni}
\]

‘Nobody calls Gianni.’

b. $\text{Op}\neg[\text{NEG}][\text{Nessuno}[\text{uNEG}]]\text{ telefona a Gianni}$

(Adopted from Penka, 2011:49)

This analysis however faces a few major problems. First, it does not explain why only the NCI $\text{wəla wahid}$ can occur preverbal (102)a without the presence of the negative marker $\text{ma}$, while other NCIs like $\text{ʔəbəd/nɪhaʔiən}$ or $\text{bəʕəd/lissəh}$ cannot (102)b (102)c.
102) a. wəla wahid ʔidʒəh.  
no one came.3MS  
‘No one came.’

b. *lissəh ʔəhməd ʔidʒə.  
yet Ahmed came.3MS  
‘Ahmed has not come yet.’

c. *ʔəbəd ləjla safr-ət li-l-mosˤul .  
at all Layla traveled-3FS to-the-Mosul  
‘Layla did not travel to Mosul at all.’

Second, part of Zeijlstra’s analysis cannot be extended to the ma and the ma-f groups. According to Zeijlstra’s analysis, the overt negative marker carries the [iNeg] feature only in non-strict NC languages, while it has the [uNeg] feature in strict NC language. Previous sections have shown that the ma and the ma-f groups display both strict NC and non-strict NC. The NCIs ʔəbəd/nihaʔiən or bəʕəd/lissəh must always occur with the presence of the negative marker ma, despite appearing in a preverbal position or a postverbal position as shown in (103). The NCI wəla wahid, by contrast, can only occur with the negative marker ma postverbally (104). However, the negative marker ma is semantically active in both strict NC and non-strict NC in the ma and the ma-f groups. Moreover, both strict and non-strict NCIs can occur in the same clause (105).

103) a. ləjla ma safr-ət-ʃər li-l-mosˤul ʔəbəd.  
(Layla Neg traveled.3FS.past-Neg to Mosul at all  
‘Layla did not travel to Mosul at all.’)
b. ʔəbəd ləjla ma safr-ət-ʃə ləl-məs'ul.

at all Layla Neg traveled-3FS-Neg to-the-Mosul

‘Layla did not travel to Mosul at all.’

104) a. wəla wihid risəb. (Moslawi)

no one failed.3MS

‘No one failed.’

b. wəla wihid ma risəb.

no one Neg failed.3MS

‘No one did not fail.’ = ‘everyone failed.’

105) a. ma ʤəwəb-ət wəla suʔəl nəhəʔiən. (Najafi)

Neg answered.3FS NCI question NCI

‘She did not answer any question at all.’

b. ma ʃəwəb-ət-ʃə wəla suʔəl nəhəʔiən. (Basrawi)

Neg answered.3FS-Neg NCI question NCI

‘She did not answer any question at all.’

As example (105) shows, the non-strict NCI wəla wahid and the strict NCI nəhəʔiən allow both the negative marker ma to appear. Hence, when applying the syntactic agreement analysis here, it is not clear whether we need to assign an [iNeg] or a [uNeg] feature to the negative marker ma.

It is clear that regardless of the problems that face the syntactic agreement analysis, it provides an explanation of NCIs licensing compared to the other analyses. In what follows, I will present an alternative analysis to NCIs licensing in the ma group and the ma-ʃ group. Following Zeijlstra (2004, 2008), I will argue that NCIs in the ma and the ma-ʃ groups are specified for an
uninterpretable negation feature [uNeg] which needs to be licensed by an interpretable negation feature [iNeg]. However, I will depart from his analysis and argue that the negative marker *ma* in the *ma* group and the *ma-f-* group always carries the [iNeg] feature instead of the [uNeg] feature. Furthermore, I will argue that the NCIs in both groups get licensed only by c-command.

Departing from Zeijlstra’s analysis, I am proposing that the negative marker *ma* is semantically negative, hence it always carries an [iNeg] feature which can license NCIs. As the data presented in subsection (5.2.1) and (5.2.2) shows, strict NCIs such as *ʔəbəd/*nihaʔiən or *bəʕəd/*lisəh always require the presence of the negative marker *ma*, whether in a preverbal or a postverbal position. It is clear that the preverbal NCIs are not c-command by the negative marker, and they are not in Spec-head relation, hence they cannot get licensed. I have argued in the previous chapters that preverbal NPIs are not based-generated preverbally as it was argued by Alqassas (2012, 2019), but they are the result of a movement. This fact is true for the preverbal NCIs; therefore, their licensing can take place when they merge in Spec-VP under c-command by negation before they move to TP. This is illustrated in (106):

106) a. ma-ken ʔəfə-ʃ-na ḥakəd ʔəɣid ʔəbəd.
    Neg-was saw-3P-us such cold at all
    ‘We did not see such cold at all.’

b. ʔəbəd ma-ken ʔəfə-ʃ-na ḥakəd ʔəɣid.
    at all Neg-was saw-3P-us such cold
    ‘We did not see such cold at all.’

c. [TP ʔəbəd [T ma ʔəfə [NegP [Neg ʔəbəd [NCI ʔəbəd [uNeg] [VP ʔəfə [NCI ʔəbəd [uNeg] [c-command]]]]]]]

(Moslawi)
The non-strict NCI \textit{wəla wahid} only requires the presence of the negative marker \textit{ma} post-verbally. When the NCIs occur post-verbally, they get licensed by c-command as shown in (107):

107) a. ma safər \textit{wəla wahid} \hfill (Najafi)
   Neg traveled\textsubscript{3MS} no one
   ‘No one traveled.’

b. ma safər-∫\textit{wəla wahid}. \hfill (Nasiriyah)
   Neg traveled\textsubscript{3MS-Neg} NCI no one
   ‘No one traveled.’

The examples in (107) show that the NCI \textit{wəla wahid} is licensed by an overt negative marker \textit{ma}. It shows that the negative marker \textit{ma} occupies the head of NegP and the NCI \textit{wəla wahid} functions as a subject which occurs in Spec-VP; therefore, the NCI is c-commanded by the negative marker. This is shown in the following structure:

108) [TP [T ma safər-∫ [NegP [Neg ma safər-∫ [VP safər [NCI wəla wahid [uNeg]]]]]]]

The preverbal NCI \textit{wəla wahid} in both groups are licensed by an abstract negative operator ‘\textit{Op¬}’ which occurs higher in the structure than the NCI \textit{wəla wahid} and c-command it (109). The abstract negative operator \textit{Op¬} is only inserted when the negative marker is not presented and when the NCIs with a [uNeg] feature cannot be unchecked. Consequently, the insertion of \textit{Op¬} in sentences that already contain a negative marker will violate the economy condition proposed by Zeijlstra (2004, 2008). Here, I will justify that the abstract negative operator \textit{Op¬} only surface with the preverbal NCI \textit{wəla wahid}, and when the negative marker is not presented.
Therefore, when the preverbal NCI wəla waḥid co-occurs with the negative marker ma, the result is a double negation reading. This is because both the abstract negative operator $Op^-$ and the negative marker ma contain two semantics negation as shown in (110):

110) a. wəla waḥid ma safər.

no one neg traveled. 3MS

‘No one did not travel.’

b. $[Op^- [\text{Neg} [\text{NCI wəla waḥid [\text{Neg ma [\text{Neg safər}]]]]]}]$

The abstract negative operator $Op^-$ can also apply to the structure where the preverbally NCI wəla waḥid co-occurs with the NPI ʔəj without the presence of the negative marker ma.

Since abstract negative operator $Op^-$ is inserted in the structure, it can license both the NCI and the NPI. This is demonstrated in the following examples:

111) a. wəla waḥid ʔəkəl ʔəj fi.

NCI no one ate 3MS NPI any thing

‘No one ate anything.’

b. $[Op^- [\text{Neg} [\text{TP NCI wəla waḥid [\text{Neg \ ʔəkəl [\text{NPI ʔəj fi}]]}}]]]$

Moreover, the data in this chapter displays that similar to JA, the adverbial NCI bəʕəd can precede or follow the negative marker in both groups. This is shown in example (112) and (113):
(yet-3MS) no one (yet-3MS) traveled to-the-Mosul

‘No one has traveled to Mosul yet.’

(yet-3MS) NCI one (yet-3MS) to-the-Mosul

‘No one has traveled to Mosul yet.’

Following Alqassas (2016), I argue that the adverbial NCI ʔəbəd are base-generated postverbally and moved pre-verbally as shown in example (112) and (113). Their licensing can take place when they merge in Spec-VP under c-command by negation before it moves from VP. This is indicated in the following structure:

114) [FP ʔəbəd [TP T [NegP Neg ma (ʃ) [VP … bəʕəd]]]]

To conclude, the discussion presented in this subsection shows that both the ma and the ma-ʃ groups can exhibit strict NCs and non-strict NCs. The NCIs ʔəbəd and bəʕədʔɪlhissəh always require the presence of negation preverbally and postverbally which occurs under the definition of strict NCs, while the NCI wəla occurs under the definition of non-strict NCs because the presence of negation is only obligatory when the NCI wəla wahid occurs post-verbally. Additionally, I have argued that NCIs are licensed only by c-command. I have also demonstrated that the adverbial NPI bəʕəd and the Adverbial NCI ʕʊmr are base-generated postverbally and moved preverbally. This subsection has also indicated that the NCIs are subject to locality as they cannot form an agreement relation with negation in a higher clause. This is because Agree is clause-bounded when it functions as a syntactic operation. Therefore, they do not allow long-distance licensing. Furthermore, I have presented evidence that the NCIs are specified for [uNeg]; therefore, they get licensed by c-command before they move from the VP.
The NCI \textit{wəla wahid}, on the other hand, gets licensed by the abstract negative $Op^-\text{ when it occurs preverbally.}$

\textbf{5.4. Summary}

The present chapter investigates the properties of NCIs in the \textit{ma} and the \textit{ma-f} groups with the primary goal being to provide an analysis of how NCIs get licensed within that dialect. In this chapter, I have delineated which expressions are treated as NCIs in the \textit{ma} and the \textit{ma-f} group. For example, \textit{wəla wahid} is treated as an NCI because it does not have to co-occur with negation, and it can stand alone as a fragment answer in the \textit{ma} group and the \textit{ma-f} group. I have also demonstrated that even the NCIs \textit{bəʕəd}, \textit{lissəh}, \textit{ʔɪlhissəh}, and \textit{ʔəbəd} require the presence of negation in both positions, however, they are treated as NCIs because they can pass the fragment answer test. Furthermore, this chapter has indicated that the \textit{ma} group and the \textit{ma-f} group can be considered as both a strict NC and a non-strict NC. Data from both groups illustrates that these two groups display both types of NC, strict NC and a non-strict NC. The NCIs \textit{bəʕəd}, \textit{lissəh}, \textit{ʔɪlhissəh}, and \textit{ʔəbəd} are examples of non-strict NC, whereas the NCI \textit{wəla wahid} is treated as strict NC. This is because the former cannot occur preverbally and postverbally without the presence of the negative marker \textit{ma}, which is the feature of non-strict NC languages. The latter, in contrast, only requires the presence of the negative marker \textit{ma} when it occurs in the postverbally.

Furthermore, I have presented the previous approaches of NC and how they were tested against data from both groups. According to the first approach, NPI analysis, the non-negative NPIs need to be licensed either by overt or covert negation. The second approach, Negative Quantifier analysis, treats NCIs as negative quantifiers rather than non-negative NPI. The third approach, Lexical Ambiguity analysis, indicates that the NCIs are lexically ambiguous between
NPIs and negative quantifiers. The postverbal NCIs are considered as NPIs because they always require the negative marker; whereas preverbal NCIs are considered as negative quantifiers because they do not require the negative marker. The last approach, Syntactic Agreement analysis, treats NCIs as non-negative indefinites which have an uninterpretable negative feature [uNeg] that needs to be checked by an interpretable negative feature [iNeg] under Agree relation. In addition, I have shown that each of these four analyses faces some challenges if we applied them to the ma and the maʃ groups. Afterward, I presented my alternative analysis and explained how NCIs get licensed in the ma group and the maʃ group. The data presented in section (5.3) demonstrates that NCIs can only be licensed by c-command. I have further argued that the negative marker ma always carries the [iNeg] feature while NCIs always have the [uNeg] feature.
Chapter Six

CONCLUSION

6.1. Summary and Conclusion

This dissertation has investigated the locus of negation in IA and the licensing of NSIs with the primary goals being to first provide an analysis for the distribution of sentential negation within IA dialects and second to provide an analysis for how NPIs and NCIs get licensed in these dialects. In this study, I have discussed sentential negation in two groups in IA, the ma and the maʃ group. I have shown that the ma group uses the negative marker ma to express sentential negation with verbal sentences while it uses the negative marker mu with verbless clauses. The other group, the maʃ group, uses the negative marker maʃ to express sentential negation with verbal sentences whereas it uses the negative marker muʃ with verbless clauses. The data presented in this study has demonstrated that the negative marker muʃ in the maʃ group does not occur with the perfective verb which is evidence consistent with the proposal that NegP occurs below TP. Furthermore, I have argued that indefinite/definite NPs are subjects and not topics. This argument is supported by the fact that indefinite/definite NP cannot intervene between the verb and the negative marker.

Regarding the locus of the sentential negation, this study has indicated that the High-Neg hypothesis cannot provide an explanation for the case when the imperfective verb has the option to merge with the negative marker in both groups. I have argued that sentential negation in the ma group and the maʃ group is generated between TP and VP. My proposed analysis is supported with empirical evidence. For instance, and as the examples in chapter three have indicated, the perfective verb must merge with Neg when it moves to T to check [+V] and [+D] features because Neg blocks the verb movement which avoids minimality violation, and which explains why the verb ends up hosting Neg, [ma-vʃ]. Therefore, I have argued that Neg occurs...
below TP because the Low-Neg hypothesis provides an explanation for the structure of negation and the imperfective verb among other problems that cannot be explained by the High-Neg hypothesis.

Regarding the NSIs, I have delineated which expressions are treated as NPIs or NCIs and investigated their distribution in the *ma* and the *ma*-ʃ group. For example, I have shown that *ʔəj wahid* is treated as an NPI because it must co-occur with negation and it cannot stand alone as a fragment answer in the *ma* group and the *ma*-ʃ group. In contrast, *wəla wahid* is treated as an NCI because it does not have to co-occur with negation, and it can stand alone as fragment answer in these two groups. Then, I have shown that the *ma* group and the *ma*-ʃ group use the quantifier *kullʃi* as NPI which is different from all other dialects that have been described in the literature; for example, EA, JA, and MA, in that none of these dialects use the quantifier *kullʃi* as a nominal NPI.

Furthermore, I have explained how NPIs and NCIs get licensed and which analysis works better for licensing NSIs in the *ma* group and the *ma*-ʃ group. The previous approaches and analyses (i.e., semantic approach, syntactic approach, NPI analysis, Negative Quantifier analysis, Lexical Ambiguity analysis, and Syntactic Agreement analysis) have been examined in both groups. The data presented from the *ma* and the *ma*-ʃ groups has shown that the previous analyses cannot be applied to these two groups. Therefore, I have proposed an alternative analysis which better captures the licensing of NSIs in the *ma* group and the *ma*-ʃ group. I have followed Zeijlstra’s (2004) analysis and argued that NCIs are not semantically negative, and they are specified with a [uNeg] feature that needs to be checked against an [iNeg] feature that is semantically negative. I have also indicated that their licensing can occur either overtly by the negative marker *ma* or covertly by the abstract operator *Op¬* under *Agree* relation. Moreover, I
have shown that c-command is the only licensing configurations for NSIs, and I have excluded the Spec-head agreement and Head-complement configurations. Additionally, the discussion in this dissertation has suggested that the NPI ꞏomr and the NCI bəbaḏ are base-generated postverbally and move preverbally which is contrary to JA. Likewise, the data has indicated that the ma group and the ma-f group in IA can be considered as both a strict NC and a non-strict NC language. I have also argued that the NPI ꞏomr can precede or follow the negative məḥəd and the NCI ṭala ẓahid.

To conclude, the current study has contributed to the theory of sentential negation and NSIs in that it has provided further evidence that the Head-complement agreement cannot be extended to other Arabic dialects (i.e., IA) as was argued by (Benmamoun 2006; Alsarayreh, 2012). The data from the ma and the ma-f groups has shown that the Spec-head relation also cannot be extended to both groups when licensing NSIs and only c-command can be applied as the data in this study showed.

6.2. Directions for Future Work

This dissertation lays the groundwork for further research on sentential negation and NSIs in other IA dialects. One of my future goals is to extend the study of NCIs to include Jewish IA where the preverbal NCI ṭala ẓahid does not yield a double negative reading when it co-occurs with the negative marker ma but instead, it has a concord reading. Furthermore, I would like to investigate NC in Najafi dialect spoken in the rural areas. Some speakers of this dialect, for instance, use the expression ḥatta ẓahid instead of ṭala ẓahid. The expression ḥatta ẓahid has some similar features to the NPI ḥatta ẓahid in MA. Finally, the preverbal NCI ṭala ẓahid in elder population, has a concord reading when it co-occurs with negation and never a double negative reading. This is shown in the following examples:
1)  wəla wahid ma-safr   l-l-mosol.  (Jewish & Najafi)
    NCI     Neg-traveled    to-the-Mosul
    ‘No one traveled to Mosul.’

2)  ḥətta wahid ma-safr   l-l-mosol.  (Najafi: rural)
    NCI     Neg-traveled    to-the-Mosul
    ‘No one traveled to Mosul.’

The data from the above-mentioned dialects raises interesting questions. The first question is: is the term ḥətta wahid considered as an NCI or an NPI in the Iraqi dialects? The second question is: how can we account for example (1) and (2) under Zeijlstra (2004), and Alqassas’s (2019) licensing analyses? These types of questions I leave for future research.
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