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Abstract

Modern Arabic Dialects (MADs) have an identical morphological system with some similarities and differences in the choice of the negation morphemes. The main concern of this paper is to discuss the typological properties of the negation morpheme mā- and its variation in four Modern Arabic Dialects (MADs), JA (Jordanian Arabic), KA (Kuwaiti Arabic), SA (Sudanese Arabic), and YA (Yemeni Arabic) taking into account two negation strategies identified by Brustad (2000), namely Verbal Negation and Predicate Negation. Specifically, the study will shed light on the types and positions of the negation morphemes regarding VN and PN strategies. The study employed a descriptive-analytical approach. The data were taken from previous studies on negation in MADs and online sources, i.e., published articles and YouTube. The study found that when the negation morpheme mā- is used as a one-negation system or a two-negation system, as a verbal and predicate negation, it changes to the negation morpheme mā- due to phonological conditions and its pre-verbal position. The study concluded that three negation templates might be generalized in the four dialects, namely one-morpheme template, two-morpheme-template, and predicate negation template. Moreover, blocking of the negation morpheme movement in the sentences happens to do to phonological conditions.
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Introduction

All languages around the world have their own different sentential negation system. MSA, as one of these languages, contains five negation forms, ُلاَّ lā, ُمَّا mâ, ُلِنَّ lan, ُلِيِسْ laîsa, ُلَامْمَّا lammâ, and غَيْرِ ghair. Linguistically, it is known that MSA has two-sentence forms, namely, verbal and nominal sentences, each of which has a different form of word order. Verbal sentences show a VSO typology, whereas nominal sentences exhibit SVO word order.¹

Historically, MSA is widely used in the entire Arabic world as a formal language for schooling, instructing etc, but it is not the language for everyday communication. Thus, Modern Arabic Dialects (MAD) is the alternative communicated language that is systematically different from the MSA in many aspects, e.g., the negation system. For example, although the MSA and MAD share the particles of negation, MADs seem to have a different negation system from their ancestor language MSA.²

Recently, previous studies on negation showed that negation has been used in general as a linguistic principle and especially as a typological norm to analyze the systems of negation of the natural languages.³ Negation in the Arabic language and its dialects has received considerable attention in the last few decades. These studies provide an essential understanding of the negation system, such as.⁴

Syntactically, previous studies on the MAD’s negation system showed that functional projections and negation occur between TP and VP, accounting successfully for sentential negation.⁵ The case of the negation projection is happening in Jordanian Arabic⁶, and there are six particles for negation in the Jordanian dialects,

---

¹ Kristen Brustad, The syntax of spoken Arabic: a comparative study of Moroccan, Egyptian, Syrian, and Kuwaiti dialect, (Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press, 2000), 182.
² Clive Holes, Modern Arabic Structures, Functions, and Varieties, (Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press, 2004), 239.
³ J. Payane, “Negation”, Language typology and syntactic description ,Vol. 1, 1985, 197-242; M. Miestamo, “Negation - An Overview of Standard Negation”, Language and Linguistics Compass , Vol. 1, No. 5, 2007, 552-570; O. Dahl, “Typology of Negation”, The expression of negation, 2010, 9-38.
⁴ M. Falih al-Ghazali, “Translation Assessment of Arabic Implicit Negation into English”, International Journal of English Linguistics, Vol. 3, No. 2, 2013, 129-144; I. Jom‘ah Am‘aitah, “The Semantic Scope of Negation in English and Arabic: A Contrastive Study”, British Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences , Vol. 14, No. 2, 2016, 16-35; M. Ali Al-Zahrani, “The Syntactic Properties of Negatives”, US-China Foreign Language , Vol. 13, No. 1, 2015, 1-18; A. H. Muhammed al-Jumaily, “Negation in Spoken Iraqi Arabic(SIA) with Reference to English”, Journal of Historical and Cultural Studies, Vol. 4, No. 12, 2012, 354-370.
⁵ Brustad, Kristen, The syntax of spoken Arabic: a comparative study of Moroccan, Egyptian, Syrian, and Kuwaiti dialect, 182; Elabbas Benmamoun, The feature structure of functional categories : A Comparative Study of Arabic Dialects, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Joun Aoun, Elabbas Benmamoun, & Lina Choueiri, The Syntax of Arabic, (Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
⁶ I. Mohammed al-Momani, “The Syntax of Sentential Negation in Jordanian Arabic”, Theory and Practice in Language Studies , Vol. 1, No. 5, 2011, 482-496.
and one negative morpheme. Moreover, in Yemeni Arabic, negation is expressed either by a single preverbal negative marker or by a discontinuous negative marker that is realized as both a preverbal and post-verbal clitic at the same time and the omission of the negative marker mà- in Yemeni dialect is due to phonological process. Furthermore, in Kuwaiti dialect, the non-discontinuous negation mu- is used and all negative elements carry neither tense nor agreement.

Khawla Ghadgoud in her dissertation defended in Manchester University compared the negation marker in the Libyan Arabic and Modern Arabic Varieties. She concluded that there are essential roles that she believes they determine the usage of the negation markers in the Libyan Arabic, namely, “the type of the predicate, such as verbal and nonverbal predicates, as well as the form of the verbal predicate, such as active participle as opposed to other verbal forms”. Furthermore, her conclusions give “a comprehensive account of several negative elements in Libyan Arabic, namely the negative auxiliary, negative particle màš and màš as a metalinguistic marker, and establish the morpho-syntactic properties and pragmatic functions of these elements”. She goes beyond the syntactical and semantic functions of the negation markers to claim that they give pragmatic functions “negative auxiliary is used for a specific pragmatic function, which is to deny assumed background information”. It also found that even though màš is not a negation marker exclusive for metalinguistic negation, it is a unique metalinguistic marker that signals the metalinguistic reading of verbal sentences.

Al-Horais studied the interface between syntax and information structure, focusing on the Arabic negation marker laysa ليس. He used the interface-based approach to investigate the negation marker laysa ليس in interpreting focus under negation, paying emphasis to the interaction between the semantic and syntax from a formal generative perspective. His findings showed that the negation marker laysa ليس might express the focus in two different ways, namely “the information focus and the contrastive focus”, which leads to three different readings of focus, namely, wide, bound, and free.

---

7 A. Mrayat, “Negative Particles and Morphemes in Jordanian Arabic”, Journal of Education and Practice, Vol. 6, No. 36, 2015, 87-90.
8 J. M. M. Ahmed, “The Syntax of Negation in Yemeni Arabic”, PhD Dissertation, Department of Linguistics and Phonetics, The English and Foreign Languages University, 2012.
9 E. Alsalem, “Negation in Standard and Kuwaiti Arabic”, M.A Thesis, Department of Arts and Linguistics, University of Illinois, 2012.
10 K. Ghadgoud, “Negation Patterns in Libyan Arabic and Modern Arabic Varieties”, PhD Dissertation, the Faculty of Humanities, University of Manchester, 2017.
11 K. Ghadgoud, “Negation Patterns in Libyan Arabic and Modern Arabic Varieties”, 2017.
12 N. Al-Horais, “On Negation and Focus in Standard Arabic: interface-based Approach”, Journal of universal Language, Vol. 18, No.1, 2017, 1-18.
13 N. Al-Horais, “On Negation and Focus in Standard Arabic: interface-based Approach”, 1-18.
Zoubir and Amine\textsuperscript{14} investigated the negation system in the Modern Standard Arabic claiming that negation is a universal system found in all languages, but the negation system in the Arabic language distinguished itself from other systems in western languages. He adds that this negation marker mainly found in the Arabic dialects \textit{ma-šy} ماش is in parallel with French and English languages. The negation marker \textit{ma-} ما is mostly used in the modern Arabic dialects and is found in a pre-verbal position in both the perfective, as in \textit{ما جاء أحد} وما جاء أحد, and imperfective, as in \\

To date, many modern studies on the MAD take into account the syntactical properties of the negation neglecting the morphological features. Thus, typologically, the principle concern of this paper is to investigate the sentential negation system of four Modern Arabic Dialects, namely Kuwaiti, Jordanian, Sudanese, and Yemeni from the perspective of the morphology of the negation morpheme. Interestingly, the four languages under investigation are members of the MSA that belongs to the Semitic language family. More specifically this paper is aimed to reveal what similarities and differences of negation morphemes concerning the structure of the negation system of the four languages and come out with generalizations that may contribute to the studies of the linguistic of MAD. The purposes of this study was to find the typological properties the negation marker \textit{mâ -} ما has in the Kuwaiti, Jordanian, Sudanese, and Yemeni dialects and the usage of the negation marker \textit{mâ -} ما in the Kuwaiti, Jordanian, Sudanese, and Yemeni dialects.

\section*{Method}

The study used a descriptive-analytical approach in describing the usage of the negation marker \textit{ma-} ما in four Arabic dialects, namely Kuwaiti, Jordanian, Sudanese, and Yemeni. The data were taken from a published doctoral dissertation regarding the syntaxes negation of the Yemeni Arabic. The other sources were two journal articles of the Jordanian Arabic and a series of published speeches on YouTube. In addition, authentic books on the sentential negation system in the modern Arabic dialects like Brustad (2000), Benmamoun and Benmamoun, et al (2000 & 2010) respectively, and Hales (2004) for Gulf Dialect data. The aforementioned books included data from different MADs. Regarding the Sudanese Arabic, online videos, including Sudanese drama and episodes were adapted for collection data. Finally, the researcher himself and Ahmed’s study of negation in the Yemeni Arabic were the main sources for collecting data of the YA.

For syntactic analysis features of the negation system of MAD under investigation, the study adapted the extensive representation by Benmamoun et.al\textsuperscript{16} and followed Brustad’s classification of the sentence negation system in the MAD. Brustad studied

\textsuperscript{14} D. Zoubir & D. Amine, “The Negation System in Arabic: an issue for Translation”, unpublished article, 2012, 1-17.

\textsuperscript{15} D. Zoubir & D. Amine, “The Negation System in Arabic: an issue for Translation”, 1-17.

\textsuperscript{16} Benmamoun, Elabbas, \textit{The feature structure of functional categories : A Comparative Study of Arabic Dialects.} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Joun Aoun, Elabbas Benmamoun, & Lina Choueiri, \textit{The Syntax of Arabic.} Cambridge, 2010.
the negation system in four languages Kuwaiti, Egyptian, Morocco, and Syrian focusing on the syntactical and pragmatic features of the four dialects and identified three strategies of negation namely, verbal negation, predicate negation, and categorical negation.

| Table 1: Negation Strategies in MAD |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Dialect         | Verbal negation | Predicate negation |
| Kuwaiti         | mà              | mù              | مَ       |
| Jordanian       | mà …hi         | ما هي           | مَا       |
| Sudanese        | mà ….sy/i mà   | ماشي/مَا       | مَا       |
| Yemeni          | mà ….sy      | مالشي          | مَا       |

Based on the given two-types of negation in Table 1, the researcher did not go on the details of all the three categories, but he concerned on his analysis on two strategies, namely verbal and predicate negation focusing on the negation marker mà- and its variation in the four languages under investigation.

Result

As mentioned earlier, the concern of this paper was to investigate the phenomena of the negation morpheme structure, focusing on two negation strategies verbal and predicate strategies. The negation marker mà - مَ and its variation were taken into consideration. Table 2 below summarizes findings of the negation markers in the four languages, it is marked by [✓] if the negation marker is present and the [-] when the negation marker is absent in the four dialects.

| Table 2: The Negation ма- and its Variation in MADs |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Dialect         | Kuwaiti | Jordanian | Sudanese | Yemeni   |
| 1 mà             | ✓       | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | مَا       |
| 2 mù             | ✓       | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | مَو       |
| 3 mà …sy/i mà   | V.Neg   | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | مَاشي/مَا |
| 4 musy           | P.Neg   | rarely    | ✓         | ✓         | ماشي    |
| 5 messy          | P.Neg   | ✓         | rarely    | ✓         | مِش      |
| 6 mee            | P.Neg   | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | مَي      |
| 7 maho           | P.Neg   | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | مَاهو     |
| 8 mahee          | P.Neg   | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | مَاهي    |
| 9 mafi/sy/i mà  | P.Neg   | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | مَافي    |
| 10 maku          | P.Neg   | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ماكو    |

As Table 2 demonstrates, nine variations of the negation morpheme mà - مَ have been identified in the four dialects. However, not all of the dialects under investigation share all of them. For example, the Kuwaiti Arabic has two negation markers, namely, mà مَا and mù مَو, the Jordanian Arabic has all the variations of the negation morpheme mà مَا, that are listed in the table above, the Sudanese Arabic has four variations of the negation morpheme, namely mà مَا, musy مش, maho مَاهو, and
Correlation of mà مَا and Personal Pronouns

Brustad has identified the first correlation pair between the negation marker mà مَا and the personal pronouns in four MADs from a syntactic and pragmatic perspective. Adapting Brustad’s classification, the four dialects contain different agreement with the pronoun. In other words, mà-ṣy مَا-ṣي hosts subject clitics,¹⁷ as shown in the table below and has been inspired by.¹⁸

| Negation Copula | MSA | KA | JA | YA | SA |
|-----------------|-----|----|----|----|----|
| 1s ma-anna      | ma-anna | ma-ni | ma-niisy | ma-nasy | Ma-na |
| 1p ma-nahnuu     | ma-nahnuu | mi-hna | mi-hnaasy | mi-hnaasy | - |
| 2ms ma-anta      | ma-anta | mi-nt | mi-ntaasysy | mi-ntaasysy | - |
| 2fs ma-anti      | ma-anti | mi-nti | mi-ntiisysy | mi-ntiisysy | - |
| 2p ma-antum      | ma-antum | mi-ntu | mi-ntuusysy | mi-ntuusysy | - |
| 3ms ma-huwa      | ma-huwa | ma-husysy | ma-husysy | ma-huwa | ma-husysy |
| 3fs ma-hia       | ma-hia | mi-hi | mi-hisy | ma-hisy | Ma-hiia |
| 3p ma-hinna      | ma-hinna | mu-hum | mu-humisysy | mu-humisysy | - |

As Table 3 shows, all the four dialects above treat the negation morpheme mà مَا as a pre-pronoun without a morpheme /–ṣy/, as in the Kuwaiti and the Sudanese Arabic, or with the morpheme /–ṣy/, as in the Jordanian and the Yemeni Arabic.

¹⁷ Joun Aoun, Elabbas Benmamoun, & Lina Choueiri, *The Syntax of Arabic*, 89.
¹⁸ Kristen Brustad, *The syntax of spoken Arabic: a comparative study of Moroccan, Egyptian, Syrian, and Kuwaiti dialect*, 2000.
Looking closely to the KA of which that the negation morpheme $mā$ itself has variation morphemes. The variations morphemes are derivational morphemes of the first person, second person (masculine and feminine), duality, and third-person when function as the head element in which the phoneme /a/ has been infixed or modified by the phoneme /i/ and, apparently, the final clitic morpheme –$s$-$y/i has no post-position in the KA. In the JA, YA, and SA, the negation morpheme ma- has no additional infixing. Many changes in the morphology of the negation morphemes in the languages under investigation will appear as we go further in this paper.

**Verbal Negation**

Verbal negation is broken down into two parts. The first part is concerning the morphology of the one-morpheme negation and the second part is about the two-morpheme negation. The two parts discuss the cross-linguistic differences and similarities in the choice of the negation morpheme structure regarding perfective and imperfective verbs, leaving their semantic, grammatical, and pragmatic functions for further research.

a. **One-morpheme Negation: Perfective mood**

The negation morpheme $mā$ (the discontinuous) in the four languages, is used to negate the imperfective and perfective verb forms, and has the feature of affixation. It can be assumed that in the Kuwauti, Jordanian, Sudanese, and Yemeni languages, the one-morpheme negation marker $mā$ is essential element for the sentence negation, but the two-negation marker is optional. The examples [1] through [5] illustrate the one-morpheme negation particle $mā$ from the four languages in the perfective tense of the verb (past form):

1. إنتي ما شفتيها
   I-ni ma-syuft-$i$-ha
   ‘You did not see it’

2. كلما حاولت أسئلها، ماقدرت.
   Kul-ma hawalt asal lijah ma-qadarta (speaker /he/)
   ‘Every time (I) try.past reach-her NEG cannot’

---

19 When the negation morpheme ‘ma’ is attached with a hyphen ma- it means that it is has the possibility to be attached with other suffix negation marker, i.e. –$s$-$b$ as in $mu$b... on the contrary, when the same morpheme is followed by dots ma... there is usually verb slot followed by the suffix negation marker –$s$-$b$ as in $ma$-$s$-$u$-f$-$i$-$u$-$b$.

20 Kristen Brustad, *The syntax of spoken Arabic: a comparative study of Moroccan, Egyptian, Syrian, and Kuwaiti dialect*, 282.
As the examples in [1] through [5] illustrate, three conclusions concerning the one-morpheme negation are drawn. First, no difference is found in the negation morpheme mâ- in the four languages. Second, there is a logical stem-stem combination (there is no affixation required in a one-negation system) of the negation particle mâ - وما and the perfective verbs in the sentences. Third, the negation particle mâ - وما takes place as a pre-verbal negation marker.

Although many similarities are found in the perfective mood regarding one-morpheme negation, many differences are considered in the imperfective tense in the four languages, illustrated in [6] through [8]:

As the examples above illustrate, the four dialects show some differences from the Modern Standard Arabic MSA, in which the negation particle mâ - وما in the present
tense form, is directly attached to the predicate without a required affixation, as in مَا صَاحِبُکُمۡ وَمَا غَوٰی ضَلّ. In other words, The KA, JA, SA, and YA have affixation between the negation marker and the host verb. Meaning that there is infixation, known as ‘slot’ in templatic morphology, to the stem-stem style mà - + verb - الفعل - ما - by the morpheme /bi/ to indicate that the action of the verb to which the infix attaches is in the continuous action and yielding the form (NEG-IMERF+VERB) template. The example in [7], which is from the YA and is somehow complicated, has two possible explanations. First, there are two affixations, namely, the verb ظdd and the imperfective marker bi- in the negation of the verb. Second, phonologically, the IMREF /bi-/ in the JA requires the vowel /a/ of the verb, and a vowel /u/, which requires assimilation between the consonant /d/ in the verb ظdd and the consonant /b/ in the imperfective mood of the verb نوم، means ‘to sleep’. From the perspective of sociolinguistics, the KA belongs to the gulf dialects, and it is common to negate nouns, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, particles, and prepositional phrases by the negation marker مو and usually used before words with “initial double consonants”. However, like the example shown in [9] that مو can be used to negate a verb (b) in its past tense. To this end, it can be generalized that all MADs have either affixation after the negation marker ma- to negate imperfective tenses but not the perfective tense.

b. Two-morpheme Negation

As the data shows, it can be said that all Modern Arabic Dialects under investigation share the two-system negation marker (the continuous negation form), namely ما...sy/i and its variations. From the four languages under investigation, there are two dialects, which use the two-negation system in their sentence negation, namely, the JA and the YA. Moreover, the KA and the SA use one-morpheme negation system, i.e., mà - وما - in their sentential negation rather than the two-negation system. Morphologically, the mà..sy/i ما...ماشي negation has different variation of morphemes agreement with their host verbs when negates the sentences in their tense. Consider the following examples in the perfective mood:

الولد ما نامش. [10]

I-walad ma nam-sy

YA & JA

---

21 John Stonham, & Francis Katamba, Morphology, (New York: Palgrave Macmilan, 2006).
22 In MSA, the verb ظعاد is in the past tense form and is negated by the negation marker ما- whereas in the present form يعهد is usually negated by the negation morpheme لام. In YA, it is common to use the verb ظعع after the negation marker ما- (in the perfective and imperfective mood) and لا- (in the prohibitive verbs).
23 Harrell, A Short Reference Grammar of Gulf Arabic, (Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press, 1962), 242.
الولد مانامشي.
I-walad ma nam-sy-i

الولد ماناميش
I-walad ma nam-i-sy
The boy NEG sleep.past NEG
‘The boy did not sleep’

البنت ما ناميش.
Al-bint ma namat-sy/I
JA & YA

ما درستشي
Ma-darast-i-sy/i
NEG study.past
‘you did not study’

ماصدقتا
Ma-shaddaqt-t-a
NEG believe- you-1st
‘You did not believe’

As the examples above illustrate, it can be identified that the two-morpheme derivational negation \( \text{ما} \rightarrow \text{س} \) is a continuous negation form. Meaning that the negation morpheme \( \text{ما} \rightarrow \text{س} \), in the perfective mood, presents different derivational morphemes, such as \( \text{ش} \), \( \text{شي} \), \( \text{ش} \), \( \text{شي} \), \( \text{وش} \), \( \text{ناش} \) in the YA and the JA. However the JA and the YA share identical derivational-suffix-negations \( \text{س} \) and \( \text{شي} \), the JA has the infix \( \text{س} \) between the verb and the suffix negation marker \( \text{س} \). Unlike the morpheme \( \text{س} \) in (d), which has no grammatical or morphological function, the morpheme \( \text{س} \) in [14] is infixed between the verb and the negation marker to indicate the feminine gender negation agreement. The SA shows germination instead of suffixation, as seen in the other dialects. To this end, it seems that all the dialects under investigation agreed to have different suffix morphemes than the MSA.

A two-negation morpheme is more likely to happen in the imperfective aspects of the verb in MADs. For example:

الولد بينامش.
I-walad bi-nami-sy

الولد ما ناميش.

---

24 In Sudanese Arabic, the final consonant /t/ is stressed (germination in Arabic /tt/). This feature happens when the speech is ending.

25 In JA, the morpheme -i is infixed not to indicate gender but reflects the sociolinguistics variations among MADs. Consider this example from JA: Al-bint ma-nami-i-sh ‘the girl did not sleep’ in which the morpheme /t/ functions as a 3df.
I-walad *ma b-nam-sy*

‘The boy does not sleep’

الولد ما بينانش.

I-walad *ma bi-nam-isy*

‘The boy does not sleep’

ما بعينهم ولا حاجه. [17]

**MA** ma ba-ain-li-hum wala hajah

NEG IMPRF-look-to-them and nothing else

‘I am not looking at them anymore’

والله إى يوم الأبد ما بيبتاع

*Wallab ila yum al-abad ma biybt’a*

Honestly, to-the-last-day it(house) NEG sell

‘Honestly, to the last day it will not be sold’.

علي ما بيقراشي الكتاب. [18]

**YA** ma bi-yqra-sy/I al-kitab (present)

على مانقاريش الكتاب.

**Ali ma sya yqra-sy/i al-kitab** (future)

على ماناقرشي الكتاب.

**Ali ma ba yqra-sy al-kitab**

على ما بياقرشي الكتاب.

**Ali ma ad yqra-sy al-kitab**

على ماناياقرشي الكتاب.

Ali *ma ba yqra/ sy/i*

Ali NEG IMPRF-read-NEG book

‘Ali doesn’t read the book’

هم ما يدرسون. [19]

**KA** ma yadrus-un

They NEG study

‘They are not studying’

هم ما راح يدرسون.

**Hum ma rah yadrus-un**

They NEG will study

‘they will not study’

---

26 E. Alsalem, “Negation in Standard and Kuwaiti Arabic”, 35.
As the examples [16] through [19] illustrate, many typological conclusions seem to be drawn. One general conclusion is that all the four dialects under investigation have a mid-affixation and a final verb suffixation. Although the affixation and suffixation is in all the four dialects, the $ma$ -  $\neg$ negation morpheme is hosted by different types of morphemes in each dialect with some similarities like the affix $bi$ -  $\neg$ in the JA and the YA. In addition, these host imperfective morphemes, such as $b$ $\neg$, $bi$ $\neg$, $sya$ $\neg$, $ba$ $\neg$, $ad$ $\neg$, and $rab$ راح $\neg$ are placed before the verb. Another conclusion is regarding the two-negation system in the imperfective tense in which each dialect presents a different imperfective morphemes. For example, the JA has two imperfective morphemes, namely, $ma + b$, $bi$ -  ... $\neg$, and $ma + rab$ -  $\neg$ + verb$^{27}$ ما راح +فعل, the KA has only one imperfective morpheme, namely, $ma + rab$ -  $\neg$ + verb$^{28}$ ما راح +فعل, the SA has three imperfective morphemes, namely, $ma + ba$, $bi$, $ha$ -  $\neg$ + verb ما بـ ...، ما بيـ ...، ما با $\neg$ ....، and the YA has four imperfective morphemes, namely, $ma + bi$, $ba$, $sya$, $ad$ -  $\neg$ + verb ما بـ ...، ما با ...، ماشا ...، ماعد ... + فعل. The conclusion can be put as a question that why do the KA and the SA do not have a two-negation system in the imperfective tense? Back to the examples in [19] from the KA focusing on the suffix – $un$ ؤون, which is not found in the MSA, and maybe the -$un$ ؤون morpheme that stands instead of the morpheme -$sy$ $\neg$ in the JA and the YA. Interestingly, like the KA, in the SA when negating a transitive verb, the accusative case is mentioned at the end of the sentence as shown in the following example:

\[
\text{Ma tsdim al-rajil yakhi} \quad \text{SA} \\
\text{NEG shock the man brother} \\
\text{lit: ‘Do not shock him, brother’}
\]

\[
\text{Ma habitah yakhi} \quad \text{(the speaker the listener are woman)} \\
\text{NEG like.past brother} \\
\text{lit: ‘I did not like it brother’}
\]

The examples in [20] and [21] illustrate the use of the negation predicate $ma$ -  $\neg$ and its agreement with the accusative case $\mathbf{\neg}$. The difference between the first and the second example is that the interlocutors in the first example are male, whereas the interlocutors in the second example are women. Therefore, the agreement between the negation predicate $ma$ -  $\neg$ and the accusative case $\mathbf{\neg}$ in [20] is accurate and proper to fit the rule of negation+ predicate+accusative case. Unlike the example in

$^{27}$ I. Mohammed Al-Momani, “The Syntax of Sentential Negation in Jordanian Arabic”, 482-496.

$^{28}$ E. Alsalem, “Negation in Standard and Kuwaiti Arabic”, 35.
[20], the accusative case in [21] is *akbi* اختي ‘sister’, which does not change, as the interlocutors are female. Thus, the consequential agreement of the negation (*mâ - ما*) + predicate (*habitah* حبيته ‘love’) + accusative case (*akbi* اختي ‘brother’) instead of negation (*mâ - ما*) + predicate (*habitah* حبيته ‘love’) + accusative case (*ukhti* اختي ‘sister’). Thus, the negation morpheme *ma-* in the SA is used to negate the transitive verb with accusative case marker *yakbi* whether the interlocutor is a male or female.

To conclude, the four dialects under investigation have a two-morpheme negation system in the perfective and imperfective tenses. The JA and the YA use the *ma-syi/i* template, the KA uses the *ma-un* (in the plural) and [ - ] (in the singular) template, SA uses the *ma-yakbi* template.29

**Predicate negation**

Previous research on the negation of the MADs, i.e., Brustad identifies four predicate negation particles found in four languages Kuwaiti, Syria, Egypt, and Morocco. These particles are *mu-* مو, *mahu* ماىو (masculine), *mahi* ماىي (feminine), *misy* مش and *masyi* ماشي and are used to negate nominal sentences. As shown in Table 2 above, all the negation particles do not have any affixations. In other words, the negation marker *ma-* ما presents two properties, it is directly connected with another negation particle in the four dialects, e.i., *ma+fi* ما + فعل ‘one-morpheme negation’ marker or as in *mafi* ما في ... + فعل as in *mafi* ما في ... + فعل ‘one-morpheme negation’ marker.

This feature and many other similar features can be found in the four dialects under investigation. For examples:

[22] مافي معك

**Mafi ma’ak**

SA & JA

[23] ما فيش معك

**Mafi-syi ma’ak**

YA & SA

[24] مافيشي

YA

[25] ماكو معك

**Maku ma’ak**

KA

NEG  have

‘You don’t have’

As the examples in [22] through [25] illustrate the independent negation particles *mafi* ماي, *mafsyi* مايفشي, *mafsyi* مايفشي, and *maku* ماكو. They are independent

---

29 The dash [ - ] marker between the negation marker *ma* and the suffix negation marker indicates that there are two slots of the imperfective marker (i.e. *bi-* ) followed by a verb as in the case of JA and YA.
predicate negation markers because the predicate cannot be slot within the negation predicate marker, like the two-morpheme negation. Unlike the one-morpheme and two-morphemes the negation in which the negation is on the sentence level, the predicate negations are used only with a phrase level. However, Brustad has discussed and categorized the negation particles of two eastern and western dialects, she did not provide a clear explanation why do the pre-position negation marker má - ما has been modified to mu- مو in some MADs. I argue that it is not arbitrary and randomly happened. It can be confirm that when the negation morpheme má - ما is transferred to the negation morpheme mu- مو is “phonologically conditioned”, and this is the second property.

Therefore, it can be said that the mu- مو negation morpheme is the allomorph of the negation marker ma- ما. For example:

\[
\text{مش كلهم جو.} \quad [26] \\
\text{musy kulla-hum gaw} \\
\text{neg all-them come} \\
\text{‘not all of them come’}
\]

\[
\text{علي مو ىان.} \quad [27] \\
\text{Ali mu han} \\
\text{Ali neg here} \\
\text{‘Ali is not in here’}
\]

\[
\text{مو مشكلة.} \quad [28] \\
\text{Mu musykilah} \\
\text{NEG problem} \\
\text{‘No problem’}
\]

\[
\text{البيت ده مش/ما عايز/اه شناه.} \quad [29] \\
\text{Al-bait dah musy/ma aiz/ah syanah} \\
\text{house this neg need renovation} \\
\text{‘This house does not need renovation’}
\]

As indicated from the examples in [26] through [29] it can be said that the choice of the close back vowel /u/ in [27] and [28] is based on the distribution of its corresponding morphemes in each sentence. For example, the fricative post alveolar /sy/ ش in [26] and the plosive velar /k/ in [25], the fricative glottal /h/ in [27], the nasal bilabial /m/ in [28], and the fricative post alveolar /sy/ in [29]. Another

---

30 John Stonham & Francis Katamba, *Morphology*, 2006.
31 A. Mrayat, “Negative Particles and Morphemes in Jordanian Arabic”, 89.
32 This type of analysis raises another problem regarding the phonological distribution of the negation markers in the MSA that needs further research in this area.
typological area of the choice of morpheme of the negation morpheme is regarding the personal agreement.

The second conclusion or ‘generalization’ is about the morpheme movement to the IMERF placement in the imperfective tense. Earlier is given the negation formula in the imperfective tense NEG+IMERF+VERB+NEG in which there is ‘slot’ between the two negations, namely the IMERF and the verb whereas. The predicate negation, on the other hand, has the formula NEG+NEG of which the suffix negation marker is usually attached to the negation mà - and its allomorphs, i.e. misy. Consider the following examples from JA, SA, YA, and KA (rarely):

| Imperfective tense negation | Predicate negation |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| أحمد ما بيدرسش. (1)        | أحمد مش طالب. (2)  |
| Ahmed ma bi ydrusu        | Ahmed misy thalib |
| Ahmed NEG IMERF-study     | Ahmed musy thalib |
| ‘Ahmed does not study’     | Ahmed NEG student  |
| ‘Ahmed is not student’     |                    |

**Blocking**

In some cases, the sentence in some MADs, e.g., the KA, the JA, the SA, and the YA contains two verbs, namely, the negation verb and the main verb of the sentence. As illustrated in example [33] below, the pre-verbal negation mà - mà is blocked to have the suffix-negation morpheme –sy in the main verb, e.g., yadirـش in the SA. This type of blocking happens only if the negation morpheme mà - mà is used to negate sentences in the ‘perfective’ tense and the ‘imperfective’ tense, but not in the future in all MADs. Thus, I can argue that the prevention suffix-negation -sy in the main verb is when the sentence contains two verbs the –sy is blocked to be transferred to the main verb of the sentence, e.g., the Kuwaiti dialect suffix-negation morpheme –sy, which is prepositioned in the first verb bga+ بگی, the suffix-negation –sy, as in mabgas. مابغاش.

The second type of blocking is concerning with the predicate negation in the MADs sentences. As illustrated in example (b) below, the negation contains the suffix-negation morpheme –sy that is attached to the main verb marouf معروفش (this case is rarely used), and it considers ungrammatical in the MADs in which the suffix-negation morpheme is blocked to be attached to the negation morpheme mà for unclear reasons. On the contrary, sentence (c) is the alternative of sentence (b), which is grammatically correct in the MADs, but it is not in correct in the MSA. The blocking in sentence (c) of the –sy suffix negation morpheme is in the verb marouf معروفش because the negation marker is already pre-positioned with the prefix-negation ma-. For example:

...
It can be concluded that the feature of blocking of the negation morphemes is regarding some phonological conditions. To this end, when the negation morpheme ma ما is used to negate predicate sentences, as in [34], it is impossible for the vowel /a/ to host the suffix negation /ʃ/. On the contrary, when the phoneme /a/ changed to /u/, it has the possibility to host the negation suffix morpheme /ʃ/. The blocking feature in the MADs is one of the remaining issues that have not been studied by the Arab linguists.

**Discussion**

The aim of this study was of two-folds, namely, to find out the linguistic features of the negation marker “ma” ما in four modern Arabic dialects, and then to generalize the typological properties of that negation marker. This discussion is built on the results and findings presented and illustrated in the previous sections in which the negation marker “ma” ما comes in two strategies, namely, verbal and predicate. To this end, the negation marker “ma” ما plays a major role in the MSA and the MADS in the written and spoken contexts “to reverse the meaning of a statement” or to deny an allegation. However, based on the findings of this study, the negation marker (particle) “ma” ما is being shifted its morphosyntactical properties from those in the Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). In other words, the shifting occurs in different forms, namely, omission, substitution, and deletion of essential linguistic elements of the negation marker “ma” ما. These changes can be observed within the negation marker itself, as in the KA in which the particle “ma” ما becomes “mi”, which has two gender-based variants, namely, “mu” م (masculine) and “mee” مي (feminine), or in the personal pronoun that is attached to the negation marker, as in

---

33 A.H. Muhammed Aljumaily, “Negation in Spoken Iraqi Arabic (SIA) with Reference to English”, *Journal of Historical and Cultural Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 12, 2012, 367.
34 M. Ali al-Zahrani, “The Syntactic Properties of Negatives”, *US-China Foreign Language*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 2015, 8.
the “ma-anna” مانا أنا, which becomes “ma-niit/naisy” مانيش/منئش in the JA and YA. In its morphosyntax, it is proposed that “the “ma” and the “ma…sy/I” variations are separate heads Pol and Neg, respectively in which the “ma” is specified for semantic negation, whereas “ma…sy/I” is merely formally negative”.  

As the one-morpheme negation, the negation marker “ma” is found in the four dialects, which is used to negate the imperative and the perfective verb forms, which is similar in function with the negation in the Hijazi Arabic in Saudi Arabic and “only for a (+V features)”. Typologically, the differences occur in the morphosyntactical properties of the linguistic elements that construe the negation marker mainly in the affixation and infixation, see table 2 above. Other differences occurred due to phonological and sociolinguistic reasons. For example, as stated earlier that it is common to negate nouns, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, particles, and prepositional phrases by the negation marker “mu” مو, and it is “usually used before words with initial double consonants”.  

The significant difference in the negation marker is in the two-morpheme negation, which has several types of affixations and infixation, such as in NEG+PREDICATE+DM (Derivational Morpheme). In other words, the JA and the YA have similar, but not typical, derivational morphemes, the SA is somehow closer to the MSA in the negation, and KA, as it belongs to Gulf dialects, has a different derivational the negation marker hosted a mid-affixation and final suffixation. The most common mid-affixation is the “b-” بـ, and its allomorphs, such as “bi” بين, and “ba” ب, which is found in JA, SA, and YA. The other common form is the final suffixation “-sy” ش with its allomorphs, such as “sya” شا, which is mainly found in JA and YA and it is not used as a negation marker but to assert and emphasis the negation. Such expressions that are not negations markers by themselves include “wala” ولا and “hatta” حتى in Palestinian and Morocco dialects, which are “in-word and express negative polarity item”. Surprisingly, the KA and the SA use the accusative case (e.g., “yakhi” يخا in the SA) rather than the final-suffixations.  

The other typological phenomenon is the predicate negation in which the negation “ma” is used to negate nominal sentences and is affixed with the particle “fi” في in the JA, SA, and the YA, and the particle “ku” كوك in the KA. Another phonological phenomenon is the substitution of the negation marker “ma” into “mu” مو in the JA, SA, and the YA. It can be generalized that the “mu” مو negation morpheme is the allomorph of the negation marker “ma” م. The predicate negation, on the other
hand, has the formula (NEG + NEG (assertive)) of which the suffix negation marker is usually attached to the negation ma- and its allomorphs, e.g., “misy” مش. To this end, the negation marker “ma-” is blocked to have affixation at the final suffixation level, such as /-syi/ ش in the YA by some phonological features and some unclear reasons.

**Conclusion**

This paper is a typological study discussing and clarifying the nature of similarities and differences of the pre-verbal negation system mâ - ّ and its variations in four MADs, namely, Kuwaiti, Jordanian, Sudanese, and Yemeni. Similarities and differences have been found in the four dialects. Regarding the similarities, the study concludes that three negation templates might be generalized in the four dialects, namely one-morpheme template, two-morpheme template, and predicate negation template. Although, the negation templates may be generalized in the four dialects, in some cases blocking is restricting the templatic phenomena.

Regarding the differences, the study concluded that not all the dialects have the same affixation in the imperfective tense and the suffix negation marker in the imperfective and predicate negation strategies. In other words, KA and SA do not (gradually but rarely) use the negation marker ma without any suffixation, i.e., the suffix negation morpheme -ṣy-ش. From this phenomenon, I argue that KA and SA will develop and have the same negation markers as in the YA and JA as the centuries go. To prove that, YA, many years ago, not use the suffix negation morpheme -ṣy-ش (emphatic morpheme) in the imperfective tense and the predicate as well but with the spread of media YA developed its negation system mainly from Egyptian Arabic. In addition to the aforementioned, there are some phonological conditions controls the negation-suffix movement in the sentences in the MADs.
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