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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 mă- 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 mă- is used as a one-negation system or a two-negation system, as a verbal and predicate negation, it changes to the negation morpheme mă 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, *làَۢ*, *mâَة*, *lanَن*, *laïsَة*, *lammâَّن*, and *ghaiřَة*. 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 Arabic,\(^6\) and there are six particles for negation in the Jordanian dialects,

---

and one negative morpheme.\textsuperscript{7} Besides, 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 \textit{mâ-} in Yemeni dialect is due to phonological process.\textsuperscript{8} Furthermore, in Kuwaiti dialect, the non-discontinuous negation \textit{mu-} is used and all negative elements carry neither tense nor agreement.\textsuperscript{9}

Khawla Ghadgoud\textsuperscript{10} 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 \textit{maš} and \textit{miš} 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 \textit{miš} is not a negation marker exclusive for metalinguistic negation, it is a unique metalinguistic marker that signals the metalinguistic reading of verbal sentences.\textsuperscript{11}

Al-Horais\textsuperscript{12} studied the interface between syntax and information structure, focusing on the Arabic negation marker \textit{laysa}. He used the interface-based approach to investigate the negation marker \textit{laysa} 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 \textit{laysa} 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.\textsuperscript{13}
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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{ما} ماش is in parallel with French and English languages. The negation marker \textit{ما} ماش 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}, and imperfective, as in \textit{ما يقول الحق}.

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{ما} ماش has in the Kuwaiti, Jordanian, Sudanese, and Yemeni dialects and the usage of the negation marker \textit{ما} ماش in the Kuwaiti, Jordanian, Sudanese, and Yemeni dialects.

\textbf{Method}

The study used a descriptive-analytical approach in describing the usage of the negation marker \textit{ما} ماش 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 la (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


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Verbal negation</th>
<th>Predicate negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kuwaiti</td>
<td>mà</td>
<td>mù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>mà ...hi</td>
<td>mà ﬁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese</td>
<td>mà ....sy/i mà</td>
<td>ماتشي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemeni</td>
<td>mà ....syi</td>
<td>ماتشي</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 - وما 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 ma- وما and its Variation in MADs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kuwaiti</th>
<th>Jordanian</th>
<th>Sudanese</th>
<th>Yemeni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>mà</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>mù</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>mà ...si/yi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>musy</td>
<td>P.Neg</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>misy</td>
<td>P.Neg</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>mee</td>
<td>P.Neg</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>maho</td>
<td>P.Neg</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>mahee</td>
<td>P.Neg</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>mafi/si/yi</td>
<td>P.Neg</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>maku</td>
<td>P.Neg</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 2 demonstrates, nine variations of the negation morpheme mà - وما 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 وما and mù وما, the Jordanian Arabic has all the variations of the negation morpheme mà - وما, that are listed in the table above, the Sudanese Arabic has four variations of the negation morpheme, namely mà وما, musy مش, maho وماهو, and
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mafi/syi مافي/ماشي, and the Yemeni Arabic like JA has almost all the variations excluding the negation marker mee-

**Correlation of mâ ما and Personal Pronouns**

Brustad has identified the first correlation pair between the negation marker mâ وما 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, ma—sy ما—شي hosts subject clitics, as shown in the table below and has been inspired by.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negation Copula</th>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>KA</th>
<th>JA</th>
<th>YA</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>ما أنا</td>
<td>مانيش</td>
<td>ماانيا</td>
<td>مانيش</td>
<td>ماانيا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma-anna</td>
<td>ma-ni</td>
<td>ma-niis</td>
<td>ma-nasy</td>
<td>Ma-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>مانحن</td>
<td>مانحنش</td>
<td>ماانحنا</td>
<td>ماانحناش</td>
<td>ماانحناش</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma-nahnuu</td>
<td>ma-hna</td>
<td>ma-hnaas</td>
<td>ma-hnaasy</td>
<td>ma-hnaasy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>ماانت</td>
<td>ماانتش</td>
<td>مااننت</td>
<td>مااننتش</td>
<td>مااننتش</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma-anta</td>
<td>mi-nt</td>
<td>ma-ntaasy</td>
<td>ma-ntaasy</td>
<td>ma-ntaasy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs</td>
<td>ماانتي</td>
<td>ماانتي</td>
<td>ماانتي</td>
<td>ماانتي</td>
<td>ماانتي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma-anti</td>
<td>mi-nti</td>
<td>ma-ntis</td>
<td>ma-ntisy</td>
<td>ma-anti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>ماانتوم</td>
<td>ماانتومش</td>
<td>ماانتم</td>
<td>ماانتمش</td>
<td>ماانتمش</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma-antum</td>
<td>mi-ntu</td>
<td>ma-ntuus</td>
<td>ma-ntus</td>
<td>ma-ntus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>ماهو</td>
<td>ماهوش</td>
<td>ماهو</td>
<td>ماهوش</td>
<td>ماهو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma-huwa</td>
<td>ma-hu</td>
<td>ma-husy</td>
<td>ma-husy</td>
<td>ma-huwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fs</td>
<td>ماهي</td>
<td>ماهي</td>
<td>ماهي</td>
<td>ماهي</td>
<td>ماهي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma-hia</td>
<td>mi-hi</td>
<td>ma-hisy</td>
<td>ma-hisy</td>
<td>Ma-hia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>ماهم</td>
<td>ماهمش</td>
<td>ماهم</td>
<td>ماهمش</td>
<td>ماهم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma-hinna</td>
<td>mu-hum</td>
<td>ma-humisy</td>
<td>ma-humsy</td>
<td>ma-humsy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

Looking closely to the KA of which that the negation morpheme *mâ-*  לקרוא 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 –sy/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 *mâ-*  lehet (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 *mâ-*  lehet 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 *mâ-*  lehet from the four languages in the perfective tense of the verb (past form):

[1] I-nti *ma-syuft-i-ha* SA
You Neg see.past.3fs it.
‘You did not see it’

[2] كلما حاولت أسئلها، *ma-qadarta* (speaker /he/)
Every time (I) try.past reach-her NEG cannot
‘Every time I try to reach her, I 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. –sh as in *ma-sh... on the contrary, when the same morpheme is followed by dots ma... there is usually verb slot followed by the suffix negation marker –sh, as in *ma-sufi-sh.

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 mà - ــ 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 mà - ــ and the perfective verbs in the sentences. Third, the negation particle mà - ــ 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 mà - ــ in the present...
tense form, is directly attached to the predicate without a required affixation, as in مَا صَاحِبُکُمۡ وَمَا غَوٰی ضَلَّ. 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 المَا + الفعل 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 عَدَ 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 عَدَ and the consonant /b/ in the imperfective mood of the verb نُوم، 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 ما- 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 مو/ماشي 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., المَا مو/ماشاه in their sentential negation rather than the two-negation system. Morphologically, the ما...sy/i مو/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:

I-walad ما نامش. [10]

YA & JA

22 In MSA, the verb عَدَ is in the past tense form and is negated by the negation marker ما- whereas in the present form يُعَدَ is usually negated by the negation morpheme لام. In YA, it is common to use the verb عَدَ after the negation marker ما- (in the perfective and imperfective mood) and لام (in the prohibitive verbs).
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 نامتش.

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-a24

NEG believe- you-1st

‘You did not believe’

As the examples above illustrate, it can be identified that the two-morpheme derivational negation $\text{ما} - \text{mysy}_i$ $\text{ماش}/\text{ماشي}$ is a continuous negation form. Meaning that the negation morpheme $\text{ما} - \text{mysy}_i$ in the perfective mood, presents different derivational morphemes, such as $\text{ش}$, $\text{شيش}$, $\text{شيشش}$, $\text{وش}$, and $\text{ناش}$ in the YA and the JA. However the JA and the YA share identical derivational-suffix-negations $\text{ش}$ and $\text{شيش}$. The JA has the infix $\text{i}$ between the verb and the suffix negation marker $\text{ش}$. Unlike the morpheme $\text{i}$ in (d), which has no grammatical or morphological function, the morpheme $\text{i}$ 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 بنيتش.

I-walad bi-nami-sy

الولد ما بنيتش.

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 $\text{i}$ 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-nami-sy  
He-boy IMPRF-sleep-NEG  
‘The boy does not sleep’

الولد ما يبناش.

I-walad ma bi-nam-isy  
The-boy NEG- IMPRF-sleep-NEG  
‘The boy does not sleep’

ما باعثني ليهم ولا حاجه. 

Ma ba-ain-li-hum wala hajah  
NEG IMPRF-look-to-them and nothing else  
‘I am not looking at them anymore’

والله إلى يوم الأبد ما بيبتاع  

Wallah ila yum al-abad ma biybta’a  
Honestly, to-the last-day it(house) NEG sell  
‘Honestly, to the last day it will not be sold’.

علي ما بيقراشي الكتاب. 

Ali ma bi-yqra-sy/I al-kitab (present)  
على ماشا يقرأشي الكتاب.  
‘Ali doesn’t read the book’

علي ما بيقراشي الكتاب  

Ali ma bi-yqra-sy/i al-kitab (future)  
على ماشا يقرأشي الكتاب.  
‘Ali doesn’t read the book’

علي ما يقراشي الكتاب  

Ali ma ba yqra-sy al-kitab  
على ماعاد يقرأشي الكتاب.  
‘Ali will not read the book’

علي ما يقراشي الكتاب  

Ali ma bi yqra/ sy/i  
Ali NEG IMPRF-read-NEG book  
‘Ali doesn’t read the book’

هم ما يدرسون.  

Hum ma yadrus-nun  
They NEG study  
‘They are not studying’

هم ما راح يدرسون.  

Hum ma rah yadrus-nun  
They NEG will study  
‘they will not study’

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 mâ - م negation morpheme is hosted by different types of morphemes in each dialect with some similarities like the affix biـ in the JA and the YA. In addition, these host imperfective morphemes, such as bـ، biـ، syaـ، baـ، adـ، and rab راح 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, mâ + bـ، biـ،... / مامـ، and mâ + rabـ + verb مابـ،... The KA has only one imperfective morpheme, namely, mâ + rabـ + verb... مابـ، and the SA has three imperfective morphemes, namely, mâ + baـ، biـ، haـ + verb،...، and the YA has four imperfective morphemes, namely، mâ + biـ، baـ، syaـ، adـ + verb،...، 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 –ون، which is not found in the MSA, and maybe the -un عون morpheme that stands instead of the morpheme -syـ 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:

Ma tsdim al-rajil yakhi
NEG shock the man brothr
lit: ‘Do not shock him, brother’

Ma habitah yakhi (the speaker the listener are woman)
NEG like.past бrother
lit: ‘I did not like it brother’

The examples in [20] and [21] illustrate the use of the negation predicate mâ - م and its agreement with the accusative case -ي. 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 maـ and the accusative case اخـ 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.
[20], the accusative case in [21] is *akbi* أختي ‘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 *mâ* 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-sy/i* template, the KA uses the *ma-un* (in the plural) and [*] (in the singular) template, SA uses the *ma-yakbi* template.  

**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* مـو, *mahu* ماىو (masculine), *mahi* ماىي (feminine), *mis* مـى and *masy* 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 *mafis* مافيش ‘two-morphemes negation’ marker.

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

- **Mafi** مايفي *ma’ak*  
  SA & JA

- **Mafi-sy** مايفي *ma’ak*  
  YA & SA

- **Mafi-sy-i** مايفيْ  
  YA

- **Maku** ماكو *ma’ak*  
  KA

NEG have ‘You don’t have’

As the examples in [22] through [25] illustrate the independent negation particles *mafi* مافي, *mafisy* مافيش, *mafisyi* مافيْش 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 mà - مّ has been modified to mu- مَو in some MADs. I argue that it is not arbitrary and randomly happened. It can be confirm that when the negation morpheme mà - مّ is transferred to the negation morpheme mu- مَو is “phonologically conditioned”,\(^{30}\) and this is the second property.

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

\[26\] مش كلهم جو. مشكله حا

\textit{musy} \\ neg
\textit{kulla-hum} \\ gaw

‘not all of them come’

\[27\] علي مو ىان

علي neg han

‘Ali is not in here’

\[28\] مو مشكلة

\textit{Mu} musykilah

NEG problem

‘No problem’

\[29\] البيت ده مش/ما عايز/اه شناه

Al-bait dah \textit{musy/ma aiz/ah} syanah

house this neg need renovation

‘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 /s\textit{y}/ 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 /s\textit{y}/ in [29].\(^{32}\) Another


\(^{31}\) 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):

**Imprefective tense negation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أحمد ما يدرسش</td>
<td>Ahmed does not study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed mà bi  ydrsusy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed NEG IMERF-study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ahmed does not study’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Predicate negation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أحمد مش طالب</td>
<td>Ahmed is not student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed misy thalib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed NEG student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ahmed is not student’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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., yadir eks 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 repositioned in the first verb bga+ the suffix-negation –sy, as in mabgasy.

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 (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 ma 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 because the negation marker is already pre-positioned with the prefix-negation ma-. For example:

[Example sentences and analysis continued...]

---
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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* 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*” 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*” comes in two strategies, namely, verbal and predicate. To this end, the negation marker “*ma*” 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*” 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*”. These changes can be observed within the negation marker itself, as in the KA in which the particle “*ma*” becomes “*mi*” and “*mu*”, which has two gender-based variants, namely, “*muu*” (masculine) and “*mee*” (feminine), or in the personal pronoun that is attached to the negation marker, as in

the “ma-anna” ماناني which becomes “ma-niify/nasy” مانيش/مانانش 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-” مره, 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 (Derivalional 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 derivation 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” بـ, and “ba” بـ, which is found in JA, SA, and YA. The other common form is the final suffixation “-sy” شـ with its allomorphs, such as “syy” شـي and “sya” شـا 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 polarit item”. Surprisingly, the KA and the SA use the accusative case (e.g., “yakhi” ياخي 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” كـ in the KA. Another phonological phenomenon is the substitution of the negation marker “ma” into “mu” مـ in the JA, SA, and the YA. It can be generalized that the “mu” مـ negation morpheme is the allomorph of the negation marker “ma” مـ. The predicate negation, on the other
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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” 

To this end, the negation marker “ma-” is blocked to have affixation at the final suffixation level, such as /-syy/ شـ 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 –syy. 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 -syy (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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