# A CONTRASTIVE STUDY
# OF THE ENGLISH AND ARABIC NEGATIVE PATTERNS
# WITH SAMPLE LESSONS

by

Abdul Baki As-Safi

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in

the Department of Education of the

American University of Beirut

Beirut, Lebanon

1967

# D E D I C A T I O N

To my elder brother and my professors

I dedicate this work.

A.B.S.

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

I would like to express my gratitude and indebtedness to Professor James Redden, the Chairman of my committee, for his wise guidance and constant encouragement which helped me to confront more confidently a number of thorny problems and for making the study less complicated and more straightforward.

My fondest indebtedness is to Professors Munir Bashshur of the Department of Education and Sami Makarim of the Arabic Department, who generously accepted appointment to the committee. I am indebted to them particularly for their valuable suggestions concerning both content and procedure.

I am also grateful to Professor Frederick Cadora who patiently worked with me in my Arabic analysis of the negative patterns.

I would like to thank Mr. Ibrahim Kankashian of the English Department and Mrs. Marilyn Norstedt of the Center For English Language Research and Teaching, whom I consulted on some stylistic and structural matters.

# A B S T R A C T

The present study is an attempt to analyze and delineate as objectively and economically as possible the problem of bilingual negation in English and Arabic. The general procedure can be summed up as follows:

The first chapter presents the rationale underlying the study, a brief survey of research status which shows the place of the study among others in the field, what has already been done and what is still lacking, objectives, and finally, definitions and delimitations.

Both chapters two and three are devoted to describing negation in English. The criteria employed in classification of kinds and patterns are: form, meaning, and distribution. An attempt is also made to present a two-system analysis through the complementary approaches of structural and transformational grammar.

The same procedure is followed in the description of negation in Arabic. Again, a structural-transformational approach is employed in the analysis of the most frequently recurring negative patterns.

Chapter five is devoted to comparing the patterns in the two languages so as to state the level of dif-

ficulty of each pattern in English. There are three levels of difficulty: easy, difficult, and deceptive.

Based on the conclusions, findings, and levels of difficulty, five sample lessons have been constructed. These lessons cover the English negative patterns which are considered problematic for Arab students to master.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# CHAPTER I

# I N T R O D U C T I O N

## I. The Rationale Underlying The Study:

Native speakers of English are rarely conscious of the difficulties involved in learning the negative patterns of the language. The reason is obvious: they reduced these patterns to automatic habits in early childhood. Hence they fail to understand, for instance, that a sentence like *"Not walk the man" or "Not the man rich" is not due simply to carelessness, but to other factors that account for most of the incorrectly constructed sentences. Specifically, such ungrammatical structures might be a literal translation of the Arabic counterparts: /lā yamši r-ražulu/ or/laysa r-ražulu ganīyan/. In other words, the wrong structuring of such sentences follows a definite and correct grammatical order, but it is that of the native language.

That English negative patterns are inherently difficult for Arab students to master and consequently cause them a great deal of trouble is linguistically invalid. Rather, the seemingly perennial mistakes can only be attributed to negligence, inadequate treatment, and/or bad teaching. This does not necessarily

---

*The asterisk indicates that the form is either ungrammatical or known to be impossible.

mean, however, that we should follow the traditional approaches in dealing with negation, for an approach as modern as pattern practice, for example, may fail to eliminate these mistakes simply because it does not lay due emphasis on the problematic patterns and ignores the easy ones that cause no problem to the students. In other words, no matter how the approach may look, it has to be implemented by a bilingual study of the negative patterns in English and Arabic. In Lado's words: "We get closest to the language problems by a systematic comparison of the native language and the foreign language."[1]

The foregoing paragraph is obviously trying to demonstrate the role of contrastive studies in learning and teaching a foreign language. Their significance, however, has been solidly established and thoroughly exhausted by men like Charles C. Fries and Robert Lado, to the extent that any attempt to speak in favor of these studies involves inevitable duplication and plagiarism besides wasting time and effort. It suffices for our purpose here to point out that these studies generally aim at the discovery of the differences and

---

[1]Robert Lado, Linguistics Across Cultures (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1957), p. 4.

similarities between two languages so as to delineate the specific linguistic problems which demand special attention and different emphasis in the teaching of the foreign language. To quote Lado again, "in the comparison between native and foreign languages lies the key to ease and difficulty in foreign language learning."[1]

Lado's remark is general enough to apply to the problem of bilingual negation; that is to say, we can know which negative patterns are difficult and which are easy only by contrasting the two sets of patterns with each other. Such a contrast is advantageous not only to linguists but to teachers as well. It helps them in preparing new materials or texts based on a sound foundation, in substituting adequate materials for inadequate texts, and in providing better and more effective methods of teaching. In fact, "The most effective materials," says Fries, "are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1.

[2] Charles C. Fries, The Teaching and Learning of English as a Foreign Language (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1945), p. 9.

II. The Problem:

The foregoing discussion suggests that mistakes in the production of the negative patterns generally contribute to the "un-Englishness" of the speech of Arab students. By and large, such errors can be attributed to negative interference by the patterns of the native language. An Arab student may fail, especially in the early stages, to use an auxiliary before a negative particle, or follow the correct word order. He may also find it quite natural to respond to a question by "Yes, I didn't do it," or "No, I can," since in Arabic the form of the answer depends on whether the form of the preceding question is negative or positive. In linguistic terms, the extra-linguistic fact of the answer is dependent on the linguistic form of the foregoing utterance. On the other hand, he may find other patterns very easy because they coincide with those of his native language. The problem then can be stated in the following hypothesis: English negative patterns may either parallel or diverge from those of Arabic. The question that will immediately arise is this: What are the specific differences and similarities between English and Arabic negative patterns?

III. Summary of The Research Status:

There have recently been quite a number of contrastive studies and bilingual analyses. Their main objective, it has already been pointed out, is the discovery of the similarities and dissimilarities between the native and the target language, and the resultant problems which call for special attention and different emphasis in the teaching of the foreign language.

Yet despite the great number of these studies, the problem of bilingual negation has not been thoroughly investigated. This has stimulated the writer as well as non-Arab scholars to try to fill the gap. One important, but very brief, study is by a Polish scholar, Jan Cygan,[1] who tries to describe as adequately and concisely as possible the systems of negation in English and Polish. Cygan's account of the kinds of negation in English has been particularly helpful to the present study, which has made use of some of the tables and diagrams devised in the article. Besides, it has stimulated the writer to conduct a bilingual analysis and to cover all areas of negation in Arabic and English in a thorough and elaborate manner.

---

[1] "On the systems of Negation in English and Polish," Language Learning, (vol. xv, No. 1 and 2, 1965), pp. 17-27.

However, it is one thing for a problem to be feasible or amenable and quite another thing for it to be worthwhile and not marginal. Specifically speaking, it is a question of a contribution besides that of feasibility - that is, one might ask: Are the negative patterns of English really problematic and thus worthy of investigation and contrast with those in Arabic? A definite positive answer is provided by recent research, a master's thesis, done by a graduate student at A.U.B.[1] According to that study, which is oriented at the discovery of the grammatical mistakes of Iraqi students, negative patterns constitute one of the three major areas that show interference from the native language. The other two are the question patterns and the affirmative statements.

But it must be admitted that contrastive negation has not been entirely disregarded. In his book, The Teaching of English to Arab Students, Raja Nasr[2] has listed five major patterns and their linguistic problems. Because of conciseness of book, however, the author could not afford to devote more than four pages to a skeletal introduction of these pat-

---

[1] El-Witri, Khalida H. A Study of The Interference of Classical and Colloquial Arabic of the Written Grammatical Mistakes in English, (Unpublished Thesis: Beirut, A.U.B., 1966).

[2] (London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1963).

terns in an economic way. His approach represents a structural account which might be well complemented by a transformational one. The latter is done by Edward S. Klima[1] who exhaustively offers a very detailed transformational analysis of negation in English. Because Klima's study is not a contrastive one, it only provides a transformational account of one side of the coin, hence leaving the other side to be accounted for by another study like the present one.

The last major study on negation to be acknowledged in this swift survey of research status is a doctoral dissertation which investigates affixal negation in English and other Indo-European languages.[2] Dr. Zimmer comes out with some original and worthy conclusions concerning the restriction of the productivity of the negative affixes, which in actuality cover five prefixes only.

---

[1] "Negation in English," The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language, e. Jerry A. Foder and Jerrold J. Katz (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.,1964.)

[2] "Affixal Negation in English and Other Languages: An Investigation of Restricted Productivity," Word (Supplement No. 5, vol. xx, 1964).

IV. Methodology and Objectives:

The present study aims at achieving four main objectives which can be presented in a four step procedure:

First, to show as adequately and economically as possible, the similarities and dissimilarities between the English and the Arabic systems of negation. The comparison will cover all kinds of negation and those patterns that pertain to the grammatical and lexical kinds of negation. The first kind will be referred to as "verbal negation" which includes only patterns containing not or its contracted form n't, whereas the second type of negation will be referred to as "sentence negation," which covers the patterns that bear any signal of negation except not.

Secondly, to predict the types of problems that Arab students may face in learning the English negative patterns. Whenever the patterns of the two languages do not coincide, such patterns are assumed to be problematic and hence requiring special treatment.

Thirdly, to classify these patterns into three levels of difficulty: easy, difficult, and deceptive.

Finally, to try to provide teaching materials and techniques for overcoming the difficulties that Arab

students have in negation.

It goes without saying, however, that any classification into kinds and patterns implies the existence of some criteria. Furthermore, the more the rigorous the criteria are, the better will the classification be and the sounder the discussion. In this study the rigorous criteria of <u>form, meaning, and distribution</u> will be employed. Regarding the materials from which the patterns and examples are derived, the following books will provide the main sources for those patterns:

Bulos, Afif A., <u>The Arabic Triliteral Verb</u>, Beirut: Khayats, 1965.

Erwin, Wallace M., <u>A Short Reference Grammar of Iraqi Arabic</u>, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1963.

Hayden, Rebacca E., Pilgrim, Dorothy, W., and Haggard, Aurora Quiros, <u>Mastering American English</u>, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Fries, Charles C., <u>The Structure of English</u>, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1952.

Robert, Paul, <u>English Syntax</u>: Alternative Edition, New York:: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964.

At times, however, the writer is obliged to resort haphazardly to informants who are native speakers of English and Arabic at AUB or to other sources to provide the pattern when the above sources fail to do so, as in the case of the literary Arabic patterns which are derived from the Glorious Koran.

V. Delimitations and Definitions:[1]

Although terminology is not important per se, it is almost indispensible to any discussion to clarify the terms which are coined or employed. Whenever possible, most frequently used terms, even though they are traditional, are used throughout this study.

Quite a number of these terms pertain to what are known as parts of speech. Traditionally, there are eight parts. But in most cases, the traditional definitions are stated either in terms of meaning or in terms of function. But they disregard form which signals meaning. In this study, however, parts of speech are not defined in terms of meaning, which is overemphasized by the traditionalists, nor in terms of form

[1]Some of the definitions introduced here are taken from Sledd's glossary of grammatical terms, James Sledd, A Short Introduction to English Grammar, (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1959).

alone, which is highly stressed by modern linguists, but in terms of distribution -- that is, the class to which a form belongs is also determined by the places in which it occurs.

By applying the criteria of form, meaning, and distribution we arrive at two distinct sets of classes: the first is the morphological classes which includes nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs: The second is the syntactic classes which include nominals, verbals, adjectivals, and adverbials. By combining the two sets together, we get the following binary system of definitions of parts of speech which applies not only to English but also to Arabic:

1. Nouns and Nominals: A noun can be simply defined as any word that can be inflected by plural and/or possessive morphemes, e.g., girl, girls, girl's or girls'. This definition is obviously narrower than the traditional notional statement whereby a noun is defined as a name of a person, place, or thing. The traditional definition explicitly mixes up the morphological classes with the syntactic ones, for it applies to words other than nouns that can at the same time occupy the positions typically occupied by nouns. It fits, however, the term nominal which includes a noun as well as any

other word that can fill the slot of a noun, such as a pronoun and a gerund.

2. Verbs and Verbals: A verb can be morphologically defined as "any word belonging to an inflectional series that marks the difference between present and past tense."[1] This definition obviously excludes verb phrases and some auxiliaries, such as must and ought, to which the term verbal can be applied. In a word, the term verbal is related to the term verb in the same way as nominal is related to noun.

3. Adjectives and Adjectivals: The term adjective refers to any compared word such as rich, richer, and richest wich is, by and large, a monomorpheme. As to words like healthful, breakable, practical and many others, the term adjectival is employed. Syntactically, adjectivals occupy the positions typically occupied by adjectives as in, for example:

The rich girl left.

The beautiful girl left.

4. Adverbs and Adverbials: An adverb can be best defined by the following formula: a positive degree of an adjective or adjectival plus the derivational suf-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 254.

fix - ly. Such a definition is so narrow that it excludes words like then, there, thus, yesterday and so on. For these words, the term adverbial is used which can be syntactically tested if they fill the slot of an adverb, e.g.,

He went quickly.

He went there.

It goes without saying that the syntactical classes always overlap the morphological ones - that is, any noun or a pronoun can be a nominal too but not vice versa. Similarily, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs can be at the same time verbals, adjectivals, and adverbials but not the other way round.

Besides the main classes, there are eight minor syntactical subclasses. These are:

1. Determiners
2. Prepositions
3. Conjunctions
4. Relatives
5. Interrogatives
6. Intensive-reflexives
7. Auxiliaries
8. Intensifiers or Adverbials of degree

Out of these eight subclasses, two call for some

passing remarks: the first is the determiner which can be defined as a subclass of adjectivals. They normally stand under tertiary or weak stress before a following noun as in a book, the book, that book, these books, neither book, etc... Determiners are divided into:

a. Definite determiners (definite article accordind to some grammarians) which include the, that, this, these, those, and the first possessives such as my, his, her; and

b. Indefinite determiners (or articles: a and some) which include a(n), each, no, neither, etc.

The second which is subclass of adverbials, is the intensifiers or the adverbials of degree, such as very, extremely, and quite. They regularly stand under secondary or tertiary stress but they occur before adjectivals or other adverbials.

In addition to the terms which pertain to the parts of speech, the present study employs some terms whose frame of reference must be explicitly stated.

1. Affixes: An affix is a bound morpheme (or a suprasegmental morpheme as in the case of the superfix) which is added to the base or stem. Based on the criterion of distribution, affixes are divided into:

a. Infix: Gleason defines an infix as"a mor-

pheme which is inserted into the stem with which it is associated."[1] There are no infixes in English whereas in Arabic there are some infixes which are inserted into the triradical verbs, but none of which expresses negation.

b. Prefix: It is an affix that precedes the base with which it is associated. In English, there are five prefixes that convey negation: a- (an-), dis-, in- (im-, il-, or ir-), non-, and un-. In Arabic, on the other hand, the classical language employs no negative prefix, but in colloquial Iraqi Arabic there are two: /la-/ and /ma-/.[2] The prefixes de- and mis- are exluded.

c. Suffix: It is any affix that follows the base. It is also subdivided into two kinds:

c1. Derivational suffix which commonly changes the class of the form to which it is added, as in the case of the negative suffix -less; and

c2. Inflectional suffix which follows the base or other derivational suffixes but it closes the cons-

---

[1]H.A. Gleason, An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics, (New York: Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961),p.73.

[2]The slants are used to enclose materials in phonemic notation while the orthography or ordinary spelling is enclosed by < > or underlined.

pheme which is inserted into the stem with which it is associated."[1] There are no infixes in English whereas in Arabic there are some infixes which are inserted into the triradical verbs, but none of which expresses negation.

b. Prefix: It is an affix that precedes the base with which it is associated. In English, there are five prefixes that convey negation: a- (an-), dis-, in- (im-, il-, or ir-), non-, and un-. In Arabic, on the other hand, the classical language employs no negative prefix, but in colloquial Iraqi Arabic there are two: /la-/ and /ma-/.[2] The prefixes de- and mis- are exluded.

c. Suffix: It is any affix that follows the base. It is also subdivided into two kinds:

c1. Derivational suffix which commonly changes the class of the form to which it is added, as in the case of the negative suffix -less; and

c2. Inflectional suffix which follows the base or other derivational suffixes but it closes the cons-

---

[1]H.A. Gleason, An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics, (New York: Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961),p.73.

[2]The slants are used to enclose materials in phonemic notation while the orthography or ordinary spelling is enclosed by < > or underlined.

truction in which it occurs as in the case of the plural suffix /-z/.

2. The base, the root, and the stem: The term base is used interchangeably with root, for they both refer to the form which follows prefixes and precedes suffixes. Bases constitute the most numerous and meaningful parts of the words in the language. The term stem refers to the form in which an infix can be inserted and which contains a base and one or more derivational suffixes but no inflectional suffixes, e.g., scientist, scientific and the like.

3. Words and Sentences: The definition of a word or a sentence is one of the most difficult problems which have recently been the subject of a controversy among linguists and grammarians. In writing, a word can be easily identified as a form consisting of one or more letters preceded and followed by a space.[1] In speech, however, the problem of definition is much harder. But it suffices for our purpose here to refer to it as "any form which consists of a single base, with or without accompanying prefixes, but with a superfix."[2]

---

[1] Sledd, op. cit., p. 246.

[2] Ibid., p. 246.

The foregoing definition of the word in English obviously rests on a phonemic-morphemic criterion which is not sufficient to provide a counterpart in Arabic. This criterion has to be supplemented by a syntactic one whereby a word must be considered as any grammatically structured unit, for Arabic is highly inflectional language where the order of the morphemes is somewhat rigid and much more restricted than the order of the words in the sentence.

As for a sentence, the traditional definition of a sentence as a group of words expressing a complete thought is wholly disregarded. Instead, Sledd's definition is adopted whereby a sentence is phonologically defined as a stretch of speech that ends in one of the terminals / ↗ / or / ↘ / but never / → /, while syntactically it consists of at least one independent combination, except in subjectless imperatives, of complete predicate whether such a combination is expanded or unexpanded.[1]

VI. Phonetic Symbols:

The phonetic symbols employed in this study can be best presented in the following phonetic charts. In

---

[1]Sledd, op.cit., p. 247.

these charts,[1] length which is phonemic in Arabic is shown by a macron over the vowel, e.g., /ā/ or by doubling the consonant so as to indicate the difference in the nature of length in the vowels and consonants. The length of the vowel is a matter of continuity of the air stream while in case of long consonants there are usually two onests, e.g., /mada/ extent, /mādā/ what, and /madda/ stretched. The other phonemic feature in Arabic which has no counterpart in English is velarization. It is indicated by a dot under the symbol, e.g., /ṭ/

---

[1]The following charts are based upon Dr.Nasr's, see R. Nasr, The Teaching of English to Arab Students, (London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1963),pp.11- 15 and 25-27.

Phonetic Charts

English and Arabic Phonemes

English Consonants

| Manner of Articulation | | Bilabial | Labio-dental | Dental | Alveolar | Retroflex | Alveo-palat. | Palatal | Velar | Glotal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Stops | vl. | p | | | t | | | | k | |
| | vd. | b | | | d | | | | g | |
| Affricates | vl. | | | | | | č | | | |
| | vd. | | | | | | ǰ | | | |
| Fricatives | vl. | | f | θ | s | | š | | | h |
| | vd. | | v | ð | z | | ž | | | |
| Nasals | vd. | m | | | n | | | | ŋ | |
| Laterals | vd. | | | | l | | | | | |
| Semi-Vowels | | w | | | | r | | y | | |

Arabic Consonants

| | | Bilabial | Labio-dental | Dental | Inter-dent. | Alveolar | Velarized | Alveo-palat. | Palatal | Velar | Pharyngeal | Glotal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Stops | vl. | | | t | | | ṭ | | | k | q | ʔ |
| | vd. | b | | d | | | ḍ | | | | | |
| Affricates | vl. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | vd. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fricatives | vl. | | f | | θ | s | ṣ | š | | x | ḥ | h |
| | vd. | | | | ð | z | ẓ | ž | | ġ | ʕ | |
| Nasals | vd. | m | | | | n | | | | | | |
| Laterals | vd. | | | | | l | l | | | | | |
| Semi-Vowels | | w | | | | | r | | y | | | |

English Vowels

| | | Front Unrounded | Central Unrounded | Back Rounded |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| High | Close | iy | ɨ | uw |
| | Open | i | | u |
| Mid | Close | ey | ə | |
| | Open | e | | ow |
| Low | Close | æ | | ɔ |
| | Open | | a | |

Arabic Vowels

| | | Front Unrounded | Central Unrounded | Back Rounded |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| High | Close | ī | | ū |
| | Open | i | | u |
| Mid | Close | | a | |
| | Open | [e] | | |
| Low | Close | [æ] | | |
| | Open | | ā | |

# CHAPTER II

## NEGATION IN ENGLISH

### I. What is Negation?

In order to present a somewhat comprehensive perspective of what is meant by negation in English, two bases are to be employed. The first is a functional or semantic basis while the other is a formal or grammatical one. These two bases are not necessarily mutually exclusive; rather, each one overlaps and complements the other.

On one dimension, negation is defined as "The act of denying, the absence or the opposite of what is actually positive or affirmative."[1] This lexicographical definition, besides being a rational and notional one, involves an inevitable circularity since it refers to a negative status as something which is not positive and conversely, but equally true, a positive status as something that is not negative. Furthermore, the definition mixes up form and meaning - that is, it confuses the grammatical criterion of classification with the functional one: it speaks about the affirmative status in terms of being positive.

---

[1] ACD (The American College Dictionary), p. 813.

Two affirmative sentences, however, might functionally be quite contrary to each other: one might be absolutely positive; the other absolutely negative. A single example may clear up this point: a sentence like "He is happy" and "He is miserable" are both formally affirmative. Yet, functionally, they run contrary to each other. At the same time, a sentence like "He isn't unhappy" is structurally as positive as "He is happy" though the latter is felt to be a little stronger than the former.

On another dimension, but still on the semantic level, logicians distinguish between two kinds of negation: arithmetic and linguistic negation. The former can be explicitly elucidated in the following example: -5 does not mean anything different from +5, but a point as much below zero as 5 is above it.

Linguistic negation, which is the object of the present study, is further subdivided into two categories: the contradictory and the contrary types of negation. The distinction between these two is well brought out by K. Zimmer[1], who thinks that two contradictory terms exhaust all the possibilities along a given dimension as in the case of white and not white, or happy and unhappy

[1] "Affixal Negation in English and Other Languages: An Investigation of Restricted Productivity," Word, (Supplement no. 5 vol. xx, 1964), p. 21.

while two contrary terms represent areas at the opposite poles of that dimension but at the same time leave some room for other possibilities between them as in black and white or in happy and miserable.

Some traditionalists even try to establish a relationship between form and meaning with respect to these two types. Otto Jesperson associates the two types with certain formal characteristics.[1] For contradictory terms, he believes, either derivatives like unhappy, miserable, or composite expressions containing not as in not white, not happy are usually employed. As for the contrary type of negation, separate roots are commonly used to express the most necessary contrary terms as in black and white, happy and miserable and so on.

Having thus examined negation from the semantic standpoint, it is well-nigh imperative to consider it from the grammatical or formal one. Based on the criterion of form, a sentence is regarded as either affirmative or negative depending on whether it does or it does not contain a verbal negator, namely not or its variant n't.

Compared to the traditional tripartition of English sentences into affirmative, negative, and interro-

---

[1] Philosophy of Grammar (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1924), p. 322.

gative, the above binary classification of sentences into affirmative and negative lends itself to empirical linguistic evidence which can be easily pointed out by the fact that negative and interrogative sentences do not exclude each other. As a matter of fact, the traditional tripartition is only a combination of two binary oppositions which intersect each other and thus eventually yield a total of four instead of the three different kinds of sentences.[1] The binary contrasts can be explicitly shown by the following tabulation:

I. Positive vs. Negative

II. Affirmative vs. Interrogative[2]

The arrows show the possible combination of the four different kinds which can be tabulated as follows:

1. Positive-affirmative: traditionally labeled "Affirmative".
2. Positive-interrogative: traditionally labeled "Interrogative".
3. Negative-affirmative: traditionally labeled "Negative".

---

[1]Jan Cygan, "On the Systems of Negation in English and Polish," Language Learning, (vol. xv, no. 1 and 2, 1965), p. 19.

[2]The Solid-Line arrow indicates the combination which is more emphasized here.

4. Negative-interrogative: traditionally labeled "Negative question or negative interrogative".

In this way both the bases of form and meaning are employed. Again, some examples may clear up this approach:[1]

| II \ I | Positive | Negative |
|---|---|---|
| Affirmative | 1 He is rich. | 2 He isn't rich. |
| Interrogative | 3 Is he rich? | 4 Isn't he rich? |

It is the second cell (no. 2) which is the concern of the present study. For the sake of simplification, however, the negative-interrogative of cell no. 4 will be labeled as merely "negative" throughout this study whereas the positive affirmative will be referred to as "affirmative".

II. Kinds of Negation:

On the bases of form, meaning, and distribution

---

[1] Some of the tables presented in this chapter are basically drawn from J. Cygan (ibid.) with occasional additions and modifications.

as rigorous criteria for classification, negative patterns in English can be divided into three main kinds including some minor subdivisions.

A. Contextual or Absolute Negation

With the exception of question-word questions and the tags, general questions can be answered either positively by yes or negatively by no. The negative response usually takes the form of a single word, i.e., no or no followed by an elliptical sentence consisting of a pronoun (in the subject form) plus an auxiliary inflected by n't as in: No, I can't or No, I don't. In both cases no[1] stands for the whole utterance, hence labeled here "an absolute negator."

Related to this kind of negation, there is an interesting fact which characterizes the English negative system but not that of the Arabic or many other languages. In English, the extra-linguistic fact of the response is independent of the kind of question expressed in the linguistic form whether it is negative or positive. To illustrate, let us consider the following questions with their extra-linguistic as well as their linguistic ans-

---

[1]This no is identical with Fries' group L., Charles C. Fries, The Structure of English (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952), p. 102.

wers:

| The Linguistic Form of The QUESTION | The Extra-Ling. FACT | Ling. Form of the ANSWER |
|---|---|---|
| 1.Positive, e.g., Are you ready? | positive | yes |
| 2.Positive, e.g., Are you ready? | negative | no |
| 3.Negative, e.g., Aren't you ready? | positive | yes |
| 4.Negative, e.g., Aren't you ready? | negative | no |

B. General or Verbal Negation

Sentences are grammatically considered negative when they contain not or n't as a part of the verb phrase, hence labeled a "verbal negator".[1]

---

[1]Three things distinguish not as a verbal negator from that as a lexical or sentence negator:

1. As a verbal negator, it occurs in free variation with another variant, i.e., n't. As a sentence negator, it has no other variant, e.g.,

All the pupils won't come to school tomorrow.
We cannot say however:

*N't all the pupils will come to school tomorrow.
Rather we must say:

Not all the pupils will come to school tomorrow.

2. As a verbal negator, it normally receives a weak stress whereas as a sentence negator it does not:

All the pupils won't come to school tomorrow.

3. As a sentence negator, not together with the immediately following word can be substituted by another word without drastically changing the meaning, e.g.,

Not all the pupils = some of the pupils.

Fries differentiates between two kinds of not: one constitutes a group by itself - that is, group C (which is equivalent to verbal negator) whereas the other type is only a member of two groups: group A where not behaves as a determiner, and group E where it acts as a conjunction joining two similar parts of speech.[1] In this study, in any slot except that after an auxiliary or those verbals that behave like auxiliaries, not will not be considered a verbal but a sentence negator.[2]

C. Lexical or Sentence Negation

This kind of negation is subdivided into two types:

1. Explicit (Formal) Negation:

A negative sentence of this kind is formally characterized by containing a signal of negation, called a sentence (or a lexical) negator. These negators include: not, no (whether a determiner, an adverbial, or a part of a compound nominal as in nobody, nothing, nowhere,

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 88 - 94.

[2] Verbs that behave like auxiliaries are need and dare. But with some particular verbs other than these two, not does not follow an auxiliary, yet it is regarded as a verbal negator. This is the special case when not is used after one of the following verbs: expect, suppose, think, believe, etc... In this very case, however, there is always the alternative of using an auxiliary without changing the meaning of the sentence, e.g., I think not and I don't think so.

no one etc...), none, neither, nor, neither ... nor (as a correlative conjunction) and/or the semi-negators (also called negative adverbials) which include words like never, little, hardly, scarcely, rarely. These will be discussed in detail in this chapter.

Affixes expressing negation are considered here as lexical or sentence negators too. Furthermore, any sentence that contains one of the sentence negators is functionally or semantically similar to that with a verbal negator. In other words, except for emphasis from the semantic standpoint, a sentence like "He isn't happy" is approximately synonymous to that "He is unhappy". This can be further elaborated by tabulating the possible semantic equivalents:

| Function / Form | Assertion | Denial |
|---|---|---|
| Positive | 1<br>He is happy<br>I met somebody. | 2<br>He is unhappy.<br>I met nobody. |
| Negative | 4<br>He isn't unhappy<br>----------[1] | 3<br>He isn't happy.<br>I didn't meet anybody. |

[1]The lower half of cell no. 4., i.e., I didn't meet nobody is left empty because it does not exist in standard English.

The sentences in cell no. 4 express a multiple negation whereby two or more negators are employed. Formerly, this was quite an acceptable practice but nowadays it is looked upon as substandard English.

2. Implied (Semantic) Negation:

In the previous discussion on the meaning of negation it has been pointed out that for a contrary type of negation separate forms are usually employed. This type differs from the contradictory counterpart which can be only signalled by a negator - that is, the contrary type takes only the form of explicit or formal negation while the contradictory type can take the shape of an implied negation. On the higher level, however, both types express almost the same meaning. Again, this point can be clarified by the following examples tabulated as follows:

| Form \ Meaning | Assertion | Denial |
|---|---|---|
| Positive | 1 It's true. | 2 It's false. |
| Negative | 4 It isn't false. | 3 It isn't true. |

The above table shows, among other things, that

the sentences beneath the odd numbers match with those under the even numbers: no. 1 comes to approximate the meaning of no. 4, and similarily no. 2 is almost synonymous with that of no. 3.

Now that we have discussed the kinds of negation, we need to introduce with the same elaboration all negators in American English, for these negators are greatly interrelated to the kinds of negative patterns which will be a analyzed in the coming chapter. All negators will be examined according to the same criteria of form, meaning, and distribution.

III. Negators in American English:

Not:

A. As a verbal negator

Form: /nat, -nt/

Except for special emphasis as in You will not do it, not is always reduced to a contracted form in normal conversation. This contracted form in turn often shrinks to /t/ or syllabic /n̩/ or is even dropped altogether as in rapid speech. In a word, the contracted form has the following allomorphs distributed as follows:

/n̩/ occurs before a dental or alveolar stops and fricatives, e.g., /ay didn̩ duw it/ I

the sentences beneath the odd numbers match with those under the even numbers: no. 1 comes to approximate the meaning of no. 4, and similarily no. 2 is almost synonymous with that of no. 3.

Now that we have discussed the kinds of negation, we need to introduce with the same elaboration all negators in American English, for these negators are greatly interrelated to the kinds of negative patterns which will be a analyzed in the coming chapter. All negators will be examined according to the same criteria of form, meaning, and distribution.

III. Negators in American English:

Not:

A. As a verbal negator

Form: /nat, -nt/

Except for special emphasis as in You will not do it, not is always reduced to a contracted form in normal conversation. This contracted form in turn often shrinks to /t/ or syllabic /n̩/ or is even dropped altogether as in rapid speech. In a word, the contracted form has the following allomorphs distributed as follows:

/n̩/ occurs before a dental or alveolar stops and fricatives, e.g., /ay didn̩ duw it/ I

didn't do it.

/wiy kudn̩ stap/ We couldn't stop.

/hiy hazn̩ gan awt yet/ He hasn't gone out yet.

/t/, /ø/ occur in free variation after /kæ n̩/ in rapid utterance. Usually the quality of the vowel changes simultaneously from /ə/ to /æ/, e.g.,

/ay kən duw it/ I can do it.

/ay kæ nt duw it/ I can't do it.

/nč/, /nǰ/ occur before /y/ , e.g.,

/didnč yuw duw it/ Didn't you do it?

/hæ vnč yuw/
/hæ vnǰ yuw/ Haven't you?

/nt/ elsewhere

B. As a sentence negator

Form: /nat/

Meaning and distribution: Besides the meaning of contradictory negation which is inherent in not, it conveys another meaning that fluctuates between less and more than, e.g.,

Not half: less than half, e.g., The glass is not half full.

Not quite the average: below the average.

Not once or twice: more than once or twice; several times.

1. Before nominals:

   a. nouns: not Ali but Ahmed.

   b. pronouns: not I, not him, etc.

   c. compounds: Not anyone / Not everybody } can do it.

2. Before adjectives:

   a. positive degree: not much

   b. comparative: not more than

   c. superlative: not least.

3. Before adverbials:

   a. of time: not today, not now

   b. of place: not here, not in this room

   c. of frequence: not always, not everyday.

   d. of manner: not easily.

4. Before intensifiers: not quite, not very much.

5. Before infinitives: Not to see is not to believe.

6. Before participles: Not seen is not believed.

7. Before subordinators: not that I can't do it.

No

Form /now/

Meaning and distribution: The three kinds of negation apply only to no - that is, it can be a contextual, a verbal, or a sentence negator.

No
1. A contextual or absolute negator:
Will you come? No.
2. A verbal negator (in complementary distribution with not):
He is no ordinary man. Also: He is not an ordinary man.
3. A sentence negator:
It occurs in the slot of:
a. a determiner, e.g., No rule can be applied.
b. an intensifier, e.g., no more, no worse than...
c. a part of a compound noun, e.g., nothing, nobody...

None

Form /nən/

Meaning and distribution: It fills the slot of:

1. a determiner, meaning any, no one, e.g.,
I saw none of them.
2. an intensifier (before comparatives) meaning: in no way, not in the least, e.g.,
She is none the worse for her experiences.

Semi-negators or Negative Adverbials

They include adverbials of frequency, such as never, seldom, rarely, and of manner, such as hardly, scarcely. The grammatical distribution of these adverbials is:

1. They can replace the verbal negator not:

He may not come again.

He may never come again. He may rarely come again.

2. They can precede the main verb without calling for auxiliaries:

He does not come early.

He never comes early.

3. They can introduce the sentence, in which case an auxiliary must be used before the nominal, a situation identical to yes/no questions, e.g.

Never have I heard of that in my life.

Hardly did anyone notice her coming.

Neither

Form: /niyðər/

Meaning and distribution: It is a contrary negation of either. It fills the slots of:

1. a nominal, e.g., I liked neither. Neither is satisfactory.

2. a determiner, e.g., Neither book is useful.

3. a conjunction, e.g., He doesn't like it. Neither do I.

Nor

Form: /nor/

Meaning and distribution: Nor is a conjunction used to join two sentences when the first one is negated by a verbal negator while the second is negated by nor followed by an auxiliary, e.g.,

I don't know, nor do I care.

It can also be used as a correlative conjunction with neither. They both join similar parts of speech or sentences:

She neither moves nor speaks.

Neither John nor Jack came to our party last night.

He will neither help us nor shall we help him.

English Negative Affixes[1]

1. a-, an-

These prefixes are commonly added to bases of Greek origin, most of which are technical or scientific, e.g., apathy, anhydrous, etc. Out of 69 adjectives that are inflected with a- or an-, listed in N C D[2], 23 are exclusively terms pertaining to biology, botany, medicine, physics, psychopathology, and zoology.

---

[1]The prefixes de- and mis- or some other prefixes are excluded from this study because they convey meanings other than negation.

[2]Webster's New College Dictionary, 1958 ed.

Nor

Form: /nor/

Meaning and distribution: Nor is a conjunction used to join two sentences when the first one is negated by a verbal negator while the second is negated by nor followed by an auxiliary, e.g.,

I don't know, nor do I care.

It can also be used as a correlative conjunction with neither. They both join similar parts of speech or sentences:

She neither moves nor speaks.

Neither John nor Jack came to our party last night.

He will neither help us nor shall we help him.

English Negative Affixes[1]

1. a-, an-

These prefixes are commonly added to bases of Greek origin, most of which are technical or scientific, e.g., apathy, anhydrous, etc. Out of 69 adjectives that are inflected with a- or an-, listed in N C D[2], 23 are exclusively terms pertaining to biology, botany, medicine, physics, psychopathology, and zoology.

---

[1]The prefixes de- and mis- or some other prefixes are excluded from this study because they convey meanings other than negation.

[2]Webster's New College Dictionary, 1958 ed.

2. dis-

This prefix conveys the meaning of "apart," "asunder," or "away" besides having a privative, negative, or reversing force. Like the preceding prefix, dis- is "of marginal synchronic productivity."[1] As for its distribution, it occurs before the following bases:

a. Adjectivals, e.g., disable, discontinuous, disorganized...

b. Nominals, e.g., disability, discontinuity, disorganization...

c. Verbals, e.g., dislike, discontinue, disappear...

d. Adverbials, e.g., disorderly, discontinuously...

3. in-

This is the only prefix which has three allomorphs, though there are four orthographical variants, namely in-, im-, il-, and ir-. The distribution of these allomorphs is phonologically conditioned:

/in-/ occurs before bases with initial dental, alveolar, or velar stops and fricatives, e.g., /infinit/ infinite, /indefanit/ indefinite,

---

[1]Karl E. Zimmer, op.cit., p. 22.

/insikyur/ <u>insecure</u>, or /inkəmpliyt/ <u>incom-</u>
<u>plete</u>.

/im-/ before bilabial stops, e.g., /impeyšənt/ <u>impatient</u>, /imbæ ləns/ <u>imbalance</u>.

/i-/ before nasals,[1] laterals, and retroflex, e.g., /imowrəl/ <u>immoral</u>, /inakyuəs/ <u>innocuous</u>, /iliygəl/ <u>illegal</u>, /ilijitəmit/ <u>illegitimate</u>, or /iregyələr/ <u>irregular</u>.

4. <u>non-</u>

This prefix is more freely used as an English formative, hence it has more productivity than the other ones. Unlike the foregoing prefixes or <u>un-</u>, it conveys a simple or mild negation indicating the absence of the meaning expressed by the base (and not the opposite or reverse of it). It generally expresses a contradictory opposition, whereas the other prefixes often express a contrary type of negation. Syntactically, it differs from the rest in that its bases cannot be compared nor can they be preceded by an intensifier such as <u>very</u>. It would be extremely rare to say,for example, "This is very non-legal" nor "This is more non-legal than that." Yet it is possible to do so with, say, <u>illegal</u>.

---

[1]Except /ŋ/ for it never occurs initially in English.

5. un-

The last prefix to examine here is un-, which can precede bases of different parts of speech such as participles, adjectivals other than participles, and verbals. Dr. Zimmer[1] gives a neat description of the distribution of this prefix and the frequency of its occurrences with each of the above bases. This can be summarized as follows:

50% with past participles;

13% with adjectivals ending in -able;

7% with present participles;

2% with adjectivals ending in -ful;

28% subdivided into three groups;

1. monomorphemic adjectivals, e.g., unkind, untrue;
2. derivatives from clear-cut patterns such as friendly; and
3. derivatives from more complex patterns such as unsocial, unprofessional.

6. -less

This is the only suffix that expresses a meaning which is nearer to the negative preposition without than

---

[1] K. Zimmer, op.cit., pp. 35 - 36.

to any kind of negation discussed in this chapter. It inflects some nouns and thus changes them into adjectivals, such as childless, peerless or waterless.

But before concluding this brief introduction to the English negative affixes, there are some problems which call for some passing remarks. A major problem is when the base can be prefixed by more than one prefix expressing negation as in the case of, say, discover, and uncover, disjoined and unjoined, inactive and unactive, or insanitary and unsanitary. The question that might arise is this: Are such prefixes semantically distributed? ACD, for example, tries to provide a positive answer to this question and goes so far as to give a "rule" of thumb with respect to the distribution of un- and in-. According to this rule un- is to be added to a frequently used word in a common meaning as in unsanitary (not clean), and in- with the same word in a more technical sense, as in insanitary (likely to cause disease).[1]

Yet it is obvious that such a "rule" for semantic distribution is not only superfluous but it lacks validity too, for it is not general enough to cover a large number of words. It suffices to point out it does not

---

[1]The American College Dictionary, p. 610.

hold true with words like inactive and unactive, which are both cited as synonymous in NID$_3$[1]. As for those bases that take one particular prefix but not the other as in inexpensive and not unexpensive, it is only usage that can decide which base take which prefix.

For pedagoical as well as other reasons, it would be advantageously pertinent to the present study to show the frequency of the English negators.

## IV. Frequency of Negators in American English

It would have been more profitable had the present study been able to exhibit the frequency of the signals of negation as they occur in normal speech which is, in effect, the language. This, however, was not amenable as it requires facilities which, unfortunately, are not available to the writer. Instead, two contemporary books were studied. The first[2], a book of science, gives the following negators and their percentages:

---

[1]Webester's Third New International Dictionary, 1963 edition (G & C. Merriam Company, Springfield, Massachusetts, U.S.A.).

[2]Williem A. Van Berjeik, John R. Pierce, and Edward E. David, Waves and the Ear (New York: Anchor Books Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1960). The total number of words is 57500 approximately.

| Negators | No.of Occurrences | Percentages |
|---|---|---|
| Not (a verbal negator) | 190 | 50% |
| Not (a sentence negator) | 42 | 11% |
| No (a determiner or in compounds) | 48 | 12.5% |
| Negative adverbials and conjunctions | 21 | 5% |
| Prefixes | 82 | 21.5% |
| | 383 | |

The other book is a novel by E. Hemingway[1] which reads the following:

| Negators | No.of Occurrences | Percentages |
|---|---|---|
| Not (a verbal negator) | 165 | 41.8% |
| n't (mainly in dialogues) | 34 | 8.5% |
| Not (a sentence negator) | 20 | 5 % |
| No (an absolute negator) | 14 | 4 % |
| No (a sentence negator and in compounds) | 38 | 9.7% |
| No (a determiner) | 55 | 14 % |
| Nor | 18 | 4.5% |
| Never | 21 | 5 % |
| Prefixes | 29 | 7.5% |
| | 394 | |

[1] The Old Man and the Sea (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952). The total number of words is 22000 approximately.

According to M. West,[1] not (both as a verbal and sentence negator) occurs 21587 times in every five million words, no 8394 (as an absolute negator and a determiner), nobody 422, nowhere 84, nothing 1826, nor 1172, neither 733, none 576, and never 3085.

In a similar study made by H. Eaton[2], the following negators occur in the first 500 words: not, no, nothing, no more, no one, and no longer. In contrast with those negators, the following ones occur in the second 500 words: nobody, none, never, neither, nor and neither ... nor.

---

[1] A General Service List of English Words (London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1964).

[2] An English-French-German-Spanish Word Frequency Dictionary (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1961.

# CHAPTER III

# TWO APPROACHES TO THE ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH NEGATIVE PATTERNS

In this chapter an attempt is made to present a two-system analysis through the complementary approaches of the structural and the transformational grammar. It is believed that the first approach will reveal the place of the negators in relation to the other major constituents of the negative sentence in English, while the second will account for the systematics underlying the patterns.

## A. The Structural Approach

The negative patterns which are structurally examined here do not claim that they are prototypes of all the patterns in American English; rather, they represent only the most recurring ones. It is perhaps convenient before exhibiting these patterns to recall what is operationally meant by a negative pattern. It is a statement that bears any signal of negation except affixes. In other words, the patterns presented here cover those that contain the verbal negator not or n't and one of the following sentence negators: no, never, none, neither, nor, neither ... nor, in addition to the

negative adverbials, such as hardly, scarcely, rarely, etc...

Pattern I: Sentences Containing Auxiliaries

This pattern is structurally characterized by an auxiliary followed by not or an auxiliary attached to the contracted form n't. The auxiliaries in this pattern include verbs to be, to have (followed by a participle), modals, and words that behave like auxiliaries, such as need and dare.[1]

The above pattern can also be subdivided into the following subpatterns:

1. Verb to Be

Negative forms: am not, is not, are not, was not, and were not.

Contractions: ain't,[2] isn't, aren't, wasn't, and weren't.

In this subpattern, however, the verb to be behaves in two ways:

---

[1]The verb to do is excluded in this pattern be because it does not exist in the affirmative sentences except in emphatic forms, e.g., He did come early yesterday.

[2]In most cases, ain't is considered substandard.

1.a. Be Followed by a Participle as a Main Verb:

| Nominal | -- | Be | -- | Not | -- | M.V. | -- | Comp(lement) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The man | | is (isn't) | | not | | walking<br>killed | | in the garden |

1.b. Be Followed by a Complement:

| Nominal | -- | Be | -- | Not | -- | Comp |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The man | | is | | not | | a teacher.<br>rich.<br>here. |

2. Verb to Have

Negative forms: have not, has not, and had not.

Contractions: haven't, hasn't, and hadn't.

When the verb to have is used as an auxiliary in American English, it must be followed only by the past-participle of the main verb:[1]

| Nominal | -- | Have | -- | Not | -- | Vpp | -- | Comp |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The man | | has<br>hasn't | | not | | written | | three books of poems. |

---

[1] In British English, however, the verb to have can be followed by a complement which is commonly a nominal and still negated as the above pattern, whereas in American English it is treated as a verbal:

He had milk for supper last night.(Affirmative)

He hadn't milk for supper last night.(Negative;British)

He didn't have milk for supper last night.(Negative; American)

3. Modals

Negative forms: shall not , will not, cannot, could not, may not, must not, should not, would not, might not, and ought not (to).[1]

Contractions: shan't, won't, can't, couldn't, mustn't, shouldn't, wouldn't, and mayn't.

| Nominal | -- Modal | -- Not | -- M.V. | -- Comp. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The man | will / won't | not | come | with us. |

Pattern II: Auxiliary Followed by Sentence Negators:

In this pattern, the verbal negator not is replaced by a sentence negator, such as, never, hardly, scarcely, seldom, little, rarely. The auxiliary in this pattern is usually the verb to have and modals:[2]

1. $Nomin_{a}l$ -- Have -- S-negator -- M.V. -- Comp.

The man has {never / seldom / rarely / scarcely} believe-d the boy.

---

[1]There are two other verbs that sometimes, but not always, behave like modals: they are need and dare, e.g.,
He need not do it again. He needn't do it again.
She dare not speak with me. She daren't speak with me.

[2]The pattern also covers sentences containing verb to be as a main verb or as an $auxili_{a}ry$ in the passive constructions:
The man is never ready on time.
The servant is rarely given any tip.

2. Nominal -- Modal -- s-negator -- M.V. -- Comp.

The man { will / would / can / might } { hardly / never / scarcely } believe the boy.

Pattern III: The Verb to Do

When the main verb of an affirmative sentence is/a one-word verbal (other than the verb to be), it calls for the verb to do to be used as an auxiliary before the verbal negator not or n't in the negative counterpart. This do takes the same tense morpheme of the main verb and thus changes it into an unmarked infinitive. But in case that the tense morpheme is Ø, then Ø morpheme must be added to do, otherwise it must be inflected by either /-Z$_3$/ for the present or /-d/ for the past tense morpheme:

| Nominal- | Do-tense- | Not | -- M.V. -- | Comp. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The man | | | live-s | in New York. | (Affir.) |
| The man | do-es | not | live | in New York. | (Negative) |
| | doesn't | | | | |
| The man | | | live-d | in New York. | (Affir.) |
| The man | di-d | not | live | in New York. | (Negative) |
| | didn't | | | | |
| The men | | | live-Ø | in New York. | (Affir.) |
| The men | do-Ø | not | live | in New York. | (Negative) |
| | don't | | | | |

Pattern IV: Sentence Negators Before the Main Verb:

By definition, a sentence negator is any formal signal of negation except not, n't, or the lexical negators, i.e., the affixes. Unlike the previous pattern where the verbal negator is preceded by the verb to do, this pattern is characteristically marked by a sentence negator immediately before the verbal. In other words, the sentence negator does not call for an auxiliary verb at all.

Nominal -- S-negator - M.V. -- Comp.

The man { never / seldom / rarely / hardly } believe-s the boy

Pattern V: Sentence Negators Before the Auxiliary

This pattern, which is structurally marked by not or a negative adverbial standing initially, can be divided into two subpatterns depending upon whether the affirmative sentence does or does not contain an auxiliary.

1. Subpattern a.

S-negator + { Be / Have / Modal }

When the affirmative sentence contains an aux-

iliary, it can be negated either by a verbal negator as in the first pattern or by employing a sentence negator, in which case the sentence will resemble yes-no questions where the auxiliary shifts from the position following the nominal to that before it:

Affirmative:

Nominal -- {Be / Have / Modal} -- M.V. -- Comp.

The man {is / has / can} {ready on time. / believed the boy. / do it by himself.}

Negative:

S-negator -- {Be / Have / Modal} -- Nominal -- M.V. -- Comp.

{Never / Rarely / Scarcely / Hardly} {is / has / can} the man {ready on tome. / believed the boy. / do it by himself.}

2. Subpattern b.

S-negator + Do

But when, on the other hand, the affirmative sentence does not contain an auxiliary, i.e., have, be, or a modal, the verb to do must be used after the sentence negator. Like pattern III, do takes the tense

morpheme of the main verb.

Affirmative:

Nominal -- M.V. -- Comp.

The man believe-s the boy.
-d

Negative:

S-negator -- Do -- Nominal -- M.V. -- Comp.

{Never / Seldom / Hardly / Scarcely} {do-es / di-d} the man believe the boy.

Pattern VI: <u>Negative Conjunctions</u>:

There are three negative conjunctions in English: <u>(and) neither</u>, <u>nor</u>, and the correlative conjunctions: <u>neither</u> ... <u>nor</u>. Thus this pattern divides itself into three subpatterns:

1. <u>(And) Neither</u>

Two negative statements can be joined either by <u>and ... either</u> (which stands finally) or by <u>(and) neither</u>. In the first case, the verbal must be negative whereas in the second, it must be affirmative in an auxiliary-nominal order. Both ways, however, result in semantically equivalent sentences:

| Negative | and | Negative |
|---|---|---|
| Mary doesn't speak French | and | John doesn't either. |
| Mary doesn't speak French | (and) | neither does John. |
| Mary won't sing | and | Charles won't either. |
| Mary won't sing | (and) | neither will Charles. |

2. Nor

This subpattern is similar to the above one except that nor replaces (and) neither:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mary doesn't speak French | nor | does John. |
| Mary won't sing | nor | will John. |

3. Neither ... Nor

When the correlative conjunctions neither...nor joins similar parts of speech, they do not call for any change in the word order of the sentence. These parts include:

a. Nominals:

Neither Mary nor John will want to go.

b. Verbals:

Mary neither will nor should help John in this matter.

c. Adjectivals:

Mary was neither pleased nor thankful.

d. Adverbials:

Mary did it neither carefully nor thoroughly.

e.Prepositions:

Mary was neither for nor against it.

In joining two sentences, however, there must be a reverse nominal-auxiliary order like yes-no questions, e.g.,

Mary will neither help us nor shall we help her.

Pattern VII: Sentence-negators Used as Determiners, Nominals and Intensifiers:

This pattern covers four sentence negators: not, no, none, and neither. As a determiner, no precedes both singular and plural nouns while neither usually precedes the singular nouns only.

No + Subject Nominal — Predicate

No classes are meeting today.

Neither statement is true.

As determiners too, they can precede the nominal in the predicate part as well:

He takes neither class

She has neither degree.

He really has no home.

There are no classes today.

None and neither can also be nominals or heads of nominal phrases, e.g.,

| | |
|---|---|
| Neither<br>Neither of them | is satisfactory. |
| None of them | are satisfactory. |

The above sentences reveal an interesting structural point concerning the concord between none or neither and the verbal following it: after neither, the verbal tends to be singular, whereas after none, it tends to be plural. Yet there are some cases where the singular follows none, e.g.,

It's none of his business.

None of the food is edible.

When the sentence negators not, no, and none precede adjectivals or adverbials, they perform the function of intensifiers, such as very, quite, or extremely.

| Subject | | Predicate |
|---|---|---|
| S-Negator -- Adjal -- Nom | | |
| Not many students<br>No more than three<br>Not more than three | students | attended the party. |

These sentence negators can also be parts of the predicate:

He's a little older but no wiser.

The instructions are none too clear.

Pattern VIII: No-Words

One simple way of negating an affirmative sentence which contains a determinative pronoun, i.e., some, every, or any before body, one or thing, can be done by changing the determinative pronoun into no, in which case, no other change is required:

| Affirmative | | Negative |
|---|---|---|
| {some, any, every} | + {one, body, thing} | no + {one, body, thing} |

Examples:

| Affirmative | Negative |
|---|---|
| Something happened. | Nothing happened. |
| Everybody left. | Nobody left. |
| Any one can do it. | No one can do it. |

In the above examples, the compounds are parts of the subject. They can also be parts of the predicate, e.g.,

I saw {every / some} {one / body}

I'll accept anything you suggest.

I saw no- {one / body}

I'll accept nothing you suggest.

Pattern IX: No: An Absolute Negator

As an absolute negator, no commonly stands alone or before an elliptical sentence that contains a verbal negator in the contracted form, i.e., n't e.g.,

Absolute Negator - Nominal - Aux-n't - Comp.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| No, | I | don't. |
| | she | won't. |
| | we | didn't do it. |
| | the girls | can't come tomorrow. |

The above pattern concludes the presentation of the most frequently recurring patterns of negation in American English examined from the structural standpoint. Although the structural approach provides a brief and neat description of these patterns, it is desirable to complement it with a transformational one so as to account for the other side of the same coin.

B. The Transformational Approach

No matter how neat, lucid, and explicit the structural description of the patterns of the language is, the systematics underlying those patterns can be best accounted for by a generative transformational grammar which is, in effect, "a system of explicit rules that assign to each sequence of phones, ... a structural description,"[1] and that can generate an infinite number of sentences called transforms from a relatively small number of sentences called kernels. A kernel can be delineated as "a simple, active, declararive"[2] sentence.

The above three-word definition of a kernel sentence, however, needs a further specification. A declarative sentence might be affirmative as well as negative. In case it is negative, it will no more be a kernel from the transformational standpoint, simply because a negative statement is the output of a transformational process through the application of a T-neg

---

[1]Noam Chomsky, "Some Methodological Remarks on Generative Grammar," Word (vol. 17, August, 1961)p.220.

[2]Owen Thomas, "Generative Grammar: Toward Unification and Simplification," Applied English Linguistics, ed. Harold B. Allen (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofs, Inc., 1964), p. 409.

rule.

Yet the negative patterns presented in this section do not result from one T-neg rule. Rather, they are the product of two transformational rules that can be best expressed in formulas describing the processes of transformation from affirmative into negative very economically.

The first set of these formulas accounts for verbal negation, while the second set pertains to sentence negation.

B.1. Patterns Containing a Verbal Negator

Pattern I:

$$\text{Be} + \left\{\begin{matrix} \text{NP}^1 \\ \text{Adj} \\ \text{Adv-p} \end{matrix}\right\}$$

Where N(oun) P(hrase) $\longrightarrow$ $\left\{\begin{matrix} \text{Proper noun} \\ \text{Indefinite pronoun} \\ \text{Det + Noun} \end{matrix}\right\}^2$

---

[1]The brackets $\{\ \}$ mean that there is an option in choosing one of the items inside, whereas the parentheses indicate that the item may, but need not, occur. The mathematical symbol + shows the order of free forms while - stands for bound morphemes.

[2]The single-bar arrow $\longrightarrow$ means "rewrite as". It is used only with kernel rules, while the double-bar arrow $\Longrightarrow$ indicates a transformation.

Proper noun ⟶ Ali, Dr. Yorkey, U.S.A...

Indefinite pronoun ⟶ somebody, anything, no one...

Det(erminer) ⟶ (Prearticle) + Article + (Demonstrative)+ (Number).

Any affirmative sentence of "Pattern I" can be negated by applying the following formulas:

T-neg.I: tense-be ⟹ tense-be + V-neg [1]

T-af: Af-v ⟹ v-Af [2]

e.g., tense-be ⟹ be-tense

The first formula is obligatory only to produce a negative pattern while the second is always obligatory—that is, it must be applied to every sequence of Af-v before any grammatical sentence can be produced. Af stands for affix, which can be a tense, participle, or ing; v stands for any modal, have, be, or a verbal.[2] The T-af rule switches the tense, the participle, or ing morpheme from the position before the verb to its normal place after it. Thus, by applying T-af:

---

[1]The capital letter T- stands for a transformational rule in contrast with K- for a kernel construction.

[2]By "tense" is only meant the present and the past which takes the following forms: /-z/ or /ø/ for the present and /-d/, a replacive, or a /ø/ for the past.

Present-be $\Longrightarrow$ be-present: $\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{am}^1\\ \text{is}\\ \text{are}\end{matrix}\right\}$

Past-be $\Longrightarrow$ be-past: $\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{was}\\ \text{were}\end{matrix}\right\}$

Examples:

S(entence) $\longrightarrow$ NP + VP

I.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| NP | tense-be | Adj. | |
| The man | present-be | rich. | |
| The man | present-be | V-neg | rich.(By T-neg.I) |
| The man | be-present | V-neg | rich.(By T-af) |
| The man | is | not | rich. |
| The man | isn't | rich. | |

2.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| NP | tense-be | NP | |
| The man | past-be | a doctor. | |
| The man | past-be | V-neg | a doctor.(by T-negI) |
| The man | be-past | V-neg | a doctor.(by T-af) |
| The man | was | not | a doctor. |
| The man | wasn't | a doctor. | |

3.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| NP | tense-be | Adv-p |
| The man | present-be | here. |
| The man | present-be | V-neg. here. (by T-neg.I) |

---

[1]The forms: am, is, are, was, and were are produced by phonological rules which are outside the scope of the present study.

The man be-present V-neg here. (by T-af)

The man is not here

The man isn't here.

Pattern II: Be + Ving[1]

Formulas:

T-neg.I: tense-be + ing-V ⟹ tense-be + V-neg + ing-V

T-af: tense-be ⟹ be-tense

ing-V ⟹ V-ing

Examples:

S ⟶ NP + VP

1. NP tense-be ing-V

The man present-be ing-walk

The man present-be V-neg ing-walk.(by T-neg.I)

The man be-present V-neg walk-ing.(by T-af)

The man is not walking.

The man isn't walking.

2. The man past-be ing-walk.

The man past-be V-neg ing-walk.(by T-neg.I)

The man be-past V-neg walk-ing.(by T-af)

The man was not walking.

The man wasn't walking.

---

[1]Ving stands for a present participle, e.g., coming, walking, playing etc.

Pattern III: Have + $V_{pp}$[1]

Formulas:

T-neg.I: tense-have ⟹ tense-have + V-neg

tense-have ⟹ have-tense

part-verb ⟹ verb-part

part ⟶ past participle : /-d$_2$/

Examples:

The man present-have part-believe the boy.

The man present-have V-neg part-believe the boy.
(by T-neg.I)

The man have-present V-neg believe-part the boy.
(by T-af)

The man has not believed the boy.

The man hasn't believed the boy.

Pattern IV: M(odals)[2]

Formulas:

T-neg.I: tense-M ⟹ tense-M + V-neg

T-af : tense-M ⟹ M-tense

---

[1] $V_{pp}$ stands for the past participle, e.g., walked, believed, gone, etc.

[2] There are five modals in this transformational approach: shall, will, can, may, and must.

Example:

S ⟶ NP VP

NP tense-M Verbal X

The man past-will believe the boy.

The man past-will V-neg believe the boy.(T-neg.I)

The man will-past V-neg believe the boy.(T-af)

The man would not believe the boy.

The man wouldn't believe the boy.

Pattern V: Verbals

By "V(erbal)" is meant any verb other than be, have, or M.

Formulas:

T-neg.I: tense-V ⟹ tense- V-neg V

In the foregoing patterns, tense is attached to be, have, or M. In this pattern, however, tense stands alone and immediately before the verbal negator not. In a case like this, another transformational rule must be applied before introducing T-af rule. This obligatory rule is: T-do.

T-do: tense- V-neg Verbal ⟹ tense-do V-neg Verbal

T-af: tense-do ⟹ do-tense

present-do ⟹ do-present : $\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{do}\\\text{does}\end{matrix}\right\}$[1]

past-do ⟹ do-past: did

[1] These forms are produced by phonological rules and are syntactically conditioned.

Before giving examples for applying these formulas, it would be pertinent here to elaborate on the application of T-do. The transformationalists call a tense that is not followed by be, have, or M a "floating tense", meaning that it is a tense which does not have anything following it that it can be a tense for.[1] In this case, the verb to do must be inserted to fill the "vacuum" created by the application of T-neg.I whereby the verbal negator not follows the tense.

Examples:

S ⟶ NP + VP

NP tense-Verbal X

The man past-leave ∅

The man past V-neg leave. (by T-neg.I)

The man past-do V-neg leave. (by T-do)

The man do-past V-neg leave. (by T-af)

The man did not leave.

The man didn't leave.

Interestingly enough, H.A. Gleason,[2] a struc-

---

[1]Paul Robert, English Syntax (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964), p. 122.

[2]H.A. Gleason, Jr., An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961), pp. 173-174.

turalist, suggests a transformational approach to resolve the problem of inserting the verb to <u>do</u>. Briefly stated, he first changes the verbal from ordinarily stressed form into an emphatic one — that is by using <u>do-tense</u> under primary stress before a verbal inflected with a Ø tense morpheme. In transformational terms, <u>T-affirm</u> (the affirmation transformation, i.e., a transformational rule which produces emphatic verbals) must be applied before <u>T-neg.I</u> which produces negative sentence by inserting the verbal negator <u>not</u> or <u>n't</u> after the <u>tense</u>. By this approach, the stress pattern of the whole sentence remains almost static both in the affirmative and the negative sentences. This point might be well brought out by the following examples:

S ⟶ NP VP

The child past-fall down.

The child fall-past down. (by T-af)

The child fell down.

There are three stress patterns for this sentence:

The child fell dówn ⟹ The child did not fall dówn.

The child fél̀l down ⟹ The child did not fál̀l down.

The chíld fell down ⟹ The chíld did not fall down.

But by Gleason's transformational approach:

The child did fall down ⟹ The child did not fall down.

The child didn't fall down.

## B.2. Patterns Containing Sentence Negators

Pattern VI: NP + $\left\{\begin{matrix} M \\ Have \end{matrix}\right\}$ + S-neg + $\left\{\begin{matrix} V \\ V_{pp} \end{matrix}\right\}$

This pattern can be divided into three subpatterns:

1. By applying T-neg.II instead of T-neg.I, a sentence negator can be used in the same way as a verbal negator.

Formula:

T-neg.II: tense-have ⟹ tense-have S-neg.

tense-M ⟹ tense-M S-neg.

S-neg ⟶ scarcely, hardly, never, rarely, seldom, etc.

Example:

| NP | VP | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The man | present-have | part-believe | the boy. | |
| The man | present-have | S-neg | part-believe | the boy. (T-neg.II) |
| The man | have-present | S-neg | believe-part | the boy. (T-af) |
| The man | has | $\left\{\begin{matrix} never \\ scarcely \\ rarely \end{matrix}\right\}$ | believed the boy. | |

2. The second subpattern is marked by a sentence negator at the beginning of the sentence, in which case the verb to be, have or modal must precede the NP like the structure of yes-no questions. The transformational rule which produces such a change is called here T-trans, i.e., a transformational rule for transposition. This rule is optional —that is, we can apply it only when the negative adverbial (i.e., the sentence negator) is used initially.

$$\text{T-trans:}\quad NP + \left\{\begin{matrix} M \\ Have \\ Be \end{matrix}\right\} \Longrightarrow S\text{-neg} + \left\{\begin{matrix} M \\ Have \\ Be \end{matrix}\right\} + NP$$

Example:

sS ⟶ NP + VP

The man present-have part-believe the boy

The man present-have S-neg part-believe the boy.
(T-neg.II)

The man have-present S-neg believe-part the boy.
(T-af)

The man has {never / hardly / scarcely} believed the boy.

{Never / Scarcely / Hardly} has the man believed the boy.
(T-adv)

3. The third subpattern covers those sentences which contain adverbials of frequency or manner of positive value. By applying T-neg.II, these adverbials are

transformed from affirmative into negative:

T-neg.II: positive adverbials ⟹ negative adverbials or S-neg.

Example:

| NP | VP | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| The man | present-have | always part-believe | the boy. |
| The man | present-have | never part-believe | the boy. (by T-neg.II) |
| The man | have-present | never believe-part | the boy. (by T-af) |
| The man | has never | believed | the boy. |

Pattern VII: NP + S-neg + V

Unlike the V-neg which calls for T-do, the S-neg does not require any transformational rule, nor any other transform in the sentence.

Example:

S ⟶ NP + VP

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| The man | present-believe | | the boy. |
| The man | S-neg | present-believe | the boy.(by T-neg.II) |
| The man | S-neg | believe-present | the boy.(by T-af) |
| The man | scarcely | believes | the boy. |

But when the affirmative sentence contains an adverbial of frequency or manner, T-neg.II will transform that adverbial from the positive into negative:

S ⟶ NP + VP

The man always present-believe the boy.

The man never present-believe the boy. (by T-neg.II)

The man never believe-present the boy. (by T-af)

The man never believes the boy.

In case that the S-neg is used initially, T-trans must be used, in which case only the tense switches the position from the place after the NP into that before it. Again, there is a "floating tense" which demands the application of T-do:

The man always present-believe the boy.

The man never present-believe the boy.(by T-neg.II)

Never present- the man believe the boy.(by T-trans)

Never present-do the man believe the boy.(by T-do)

Never do-present the man believe the boy.(by T-af)

Never does the man believe the boy.

Pattern VIII: Not + Det + N

In this pattern, the sentence negator not precedes the affirmative sentence and thus transforms it into negative:

S ⟶ NP + VP

Det + N + VP

T-neg.II: Det + N ⟹ Not + Det + N

Not Det + N + VP

All of the boys past-come.

Not all of the boys past-come.(by T-neg.II)

Not all of the boys come-past.(by T-af)

Not all of the boys came.

The Det(erminer) in this pattern includes all of the, several of (the), many of the, and the like.

Pattern IX: Indefinite Pronouns

$$\begin{Bmatrix}\text{some-}\\\text{any-}\\\text{every-}\end{Bmatrix} + \begin{Bmatrix}\text{-body}\\\text{-one}\\\text{-thing}\end{Bmatrix} \qquad \text{no-} + \begin{Bmatrix}\text{-body}\\\text{-one}\\\text{-thing}\end{Bmatrix}$$

S ⟶ NP + VP

Indef. pronoun + VP

Some-thing past-happen.

No-thing, past-happen. (by T-neg.II)

Nothing happen-past. (by T-af)

Nothing happened.

Pattern X: Negative Conjunctions

Subpattern 1. N-either ... N-or

The transformational treatment of the correlative conjunctions neither ... nor does not significantly differ from the structural one. When the affirmative sentence contains either ... or, T-neg.II transforms either ... or into n-either ... n-or, otherwise T-neg-con, must be used. T-neg-con is the transformational rule which is employed to join two NP's or two VP's or similar parts of the inner structure of both of them.

S ⟶ NP + VP

Either Mary or John past-will do it.

N-either Mary n-or John past-will do it.(by T-neg.II)

N-either Mary n-or John will-past do it.(by T-af)

Neither Mary nor John would do it.

| S ⟶ NP + VP | . | S NP + VP |
|---|---|---|
| Mary present-will do it. | | John present-will do it. |
| Mary present-will V-neg do it. | | John present-will V-neg do it. (by T-neg.I) |
| Mary will-present V-neg do it. | | John will-present V-neg do it. (by T-af) |
| Mary will not do it. | | John will not do it. |
| Mary won't do it. | | John won't do it. |

N-either Mary n-or John will do it.(by T-neg-con.)

Subpattern 2. N-or

S ⟶ NP + VP . S ⟶ NP VP.

T-neg-con: S ; nor S

T-trans: NP + $\left\{\begin{matrix} M \\ Have \\ Be \end{matrix}\right\}$ nor + $\left\{\begin{matrix} M \\ Have \\ Be \end{matrix}\right\}$ + NP

The above transformational rules are used when the following conditions are met:

a. The first sentence is usually negated by a verbal negator, i.e., not.

b. M, have, or be must be switched from the position following NP to that before it. T-neg-con then must be followed by T-trans.

c. T-do must be obligatorily applied when the sentence following nor does not contain M or be or have (not as a main verb).

d. A juncture must precede nor. Orthographically, this juncture must be represented by a comma, a semicolon, or a period, except when and precedes nor in in which case only a comma must be used.

Example:

S ⟶ NP VP . S ⟶ NP VP.

Mary present-speak French. John present-speak French.

Mary present-V-neg speak French; nor present-John.(T-neg-con)

Mary present-do V-neg speak French; nor present-do John.(T-do)

Mary do-present not speak French; nor do-present John.(T-af)

Mary does not speak French; nor does John.

Mary doesn't speak French; nor does John.

Usually, the parts of the VP following the NP are deleted.

The pattern of negative conjunctions concludes the presentation of the most frequently recurring patterns in English. The same dual approach of structural-transformational analysis will be employed in presenting the Arabic negative patterns in the following chapter.

# CHAPTER IV

## NEGATION IN ARABIC

This chapter consists of two parts: the first part is devoted to examining kinds and signals of negation in Arabic; the second will present a binary analysis of Arabic negative patterns through structural and transformational approaches.

### I. Kinds of Negation and Negators in Arabic:

By employing the same criteria of form, meaning, and distribution, negation in Arabic can be categorized into three kinds:

#### 1. Contextual or Absolute Negation:

General or yes-no questions in Arabic, like those in English, aim at eliciting either a positive or a negative response. The former takes the linguistic utterance of an assertive /naʕam/, نعم /ʔaǰal/ اجل or /ʔī/[1] as an answer to a positive question; the latter, i.e., the negative response, takes the linguistic form of the absolute negator /kallā/, meaning no, after a

---

[1] These three forms which are semantically equivalent to the English assertive yes, are syntactically distributed as follows: /naʕam/ is used in formal speech, /ʔaǰal/ in writing, and /ʔī/ in informal speech and colloquial language.

positively stated question. After a negative question, however, the assertive particle /balā/ is used to express assertion while the assertive /na9am/ is employed to convey negation. In other words, the linguistic form of the answer largely depends on that of the foregoing utterance. This statement might be paraphrased in the following tabulation which explicitly shows the system of negation in Arabic:[1]

---

[1]The use of /balā/ after a negative question to indicate assertion and /na9am/ to express negation is given as a rule by Ali Al-Jarim and Mustafa Amin, an-nahu-l-wādih.

يكون جواب الجمل الاستفهامية المنفية بلفظ (بلى) في حال الاثبات وبلفظ (نعم) في حال النفي : الجارم ،علي وامين ،مصطفى ،النحو الواضح (الجزء الثالث القاهرة : دار المعارف بمصر ١٩٤٢) صفحة ١٦٥ .

| The Linguistic Form of THE QUESTION | The Extra-Linguistic FACT | The Linguistic Form of the ANSWER |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Positive: /hal anta musta9idun/<br>هل انتَ مستعدٌ ؟<br>Are you ready? | positive | positive /na9am/<br>نعم<br>Yes |
| 2. Positive: /hal anta musta9idun/<br>هل انتَ مستعدٌ ؟<br>Are you ready? | negative | negative /kallā/<br>كلا<br>no |
| 3. Negative: /alasta músta9idan/<br>الســـتَ مستعداً ؟<br>Aren't you ready? | positive | positive /balā/<br>بلى<br>yes |
| 4. Negative: /alasta musta9idan/<br>الستَ مستعداً ؟<br>Aren't you ready | negative | positive /na9am/<br>نعم<br>yes |

The system of negation in Arabic also reveals another interesting fact, namely that the assertive or the absolute negator does not have to be in concord with the following sentence— that is, the assertive /na9am/, for example, might be equally be followed by a positive or a negative statement as in /na9am ana musta9idun/ نعم ، انا مستعـــــدٌ Yes I'm ready, or /na9am ana lastu musta9idan/ نعم ،انا لست مستعدا Yes, I'm not ready. Similarily, the absolute negator can be followed by a negative or affirmative sentence depending on the linguistic form of the preceding question.

## 2. Grammatical or General Negation

An affirmative sentence in Arabic can be structurally of two types: a verbal or a nominal depending on whether it does or it does not start with a verbal.[1] The first type is negated by special negative particles which are operationaly labeled here as "verbal negators." When the negators precede the nominal, they will be referred to as "nominal negators."

---

[1] By "verbal" is meant the verb stem plus the prefixes which mark the tenses and the subject whether it is masculine, feminine, first person, second and so on. When the subjects and objects are pronouns, they are represented by suffixes which stand in the following order:

tense-stem- subject suffix-object suffix

e.g., Ø ḍarab - tu - hu (I beat him. The tense is the perfect)

or

sa-?aḍrib u hu (I'll beat him).

There are six verbal negators: /lā, lam, lan, lammā, laysa, and mā/. Only three of the above are used as nominal negators: /lā, laysa, and mā/. Both types of negators will now be presented in detail:

a. Verbal negators:

Verbal negators can still be subdivided into two categories: the first category includes those which govern the verbal in such a way as to undergo a morphological change from the perfect or the imperfect into what is called in Arabic the jussive and the subjunctive moods.[1] The second includes those negators which precede only the verbal without calling for any resultant change.

A.1. /lā/ لا

Besides being a verbal and nominal negator, /lā/ can also be a prohibitive in which case it precedes the jussive form of the imperfect, as in, for example, the negative imperative: /lā tasriq/ لا تسرقْ

---

[1]The term jussive refers to the state or the mood of the imperfect form of the verbal minus the final short vowel in the singular, /-ni/ in the dual, and /-na/ in the plural. When the verbal is weak, i.e., ending in long vowel, the jussive form will end in a short counterpart. The subjunctive, on the other hand, is marked by a final short vowel /a/ in the singular, unless the verbal originally ends in /a/ where it remains. In the dual and plural cases, the final nasal is dropped out.

Don't steal or thou shall not steal. But as a verbal negator, however, it precedes the imperfect verb, e.g., /?abatāh, igfir lahum li? annahum lā ya9lamūna mā yaf9alūna/ ابتاه! اغفر لهم لانهم لا يعلمون مايفعلون (My Lord, forgive them for they do not know what they are doing). By and large, the imperfect that follows /lā/ retains its general idea of incompleteness and duration, e.g., /xaraza lā ya9lamu ila ?ayna huwa ~~d~~ahibun/ خرج لا يعلم الى اين هو ذاهبٌ (He went out not knowing where to go) or /lā yukrimu as-saxiyu al-baxila/ لا يكرمُ السخيُ البخيـــلَ (The liberal man does not respect the stingy).

A.2. /lam/ لـم

This verbal negator has rather a more restricted syntactic distribution than the other negators. It is employed to negate the verbal sentences whose tense is the perfect after changing the verbal into the jussive, e.g., /sāfara 9aliyun ?ams/ (Ali traveled yesterday) becomes /lam yusāfir 9aliyun ?ams/ لم يسافرْعليٌ امـــس (Ali did not travel yesterday). But when the sentence does not contain an adverbial of time to indicate the past, the negative sentence may also convey the present perfect tense, as in /lam ya?tī ?a~~h~~adun/ لـم يـأتِ احـدٌ (No one has come or no one came).

A.3. /lammā/[1] لمّا

It is synonymous to the English negative phrase <u>not yet</u>, thus it performs a double function: a verbal negator and an indicator of the present perfect tense. As for its distribution, it precedes the jussive as well as the imperfect forms of the verb, e.g.,

/lammā yafham darsahu/ لمّا يفهمْ درسَهُ (He has not yet understood his lesson,) or /ʔahādā wa-lammā tamḍi li-l-bayni sāʕatun/ (Is this (the case) before our parting is an hour old, or literally: And an hour has not yet gone by since our parting).

اهذا ولما تمضِ للبينِ ساعةٌ .

A.4. /lan/ لن

This verbal negator, meaning <u>shall not</u> or <u>will not</u>, expresses, both futurity and the subjunctive mood of the verbal, e.g.,

/lan yafhama at-talā mi⁂u ad-darsa/
(The pupils will not understand the lesson).

لن يفهمَ التلاميذُ الدرسَ

---

[1] /lammā/ has another homonym meaning <u>when,</u> which commonly precedes the adverbial clause of time, e.g.,

/lammā wasaltu waqʕa al-⁂adiθu/
(When I arrived, the happening took place).

لما وصلتُ وقعَ الحادثُ .

A.5. /laysa/ ليـــس

This negator is more frequently recurring as a nominal than as a verbal, which usually takes the imperfect form, e.g.

/lastu ?aqṣudu ḏālika/ لستُ اقصدُ ذلـكَ (I don't mean that)

/lastum ta9malūna wāžibakum/ لستم تعملـــونَ واجبكـــــــــم

(You are not doing your duty)

A.6. /mā/ مـا

Unlike other verbal negators, /mā/ can precede both the imperfect and the perfect. In both cases, however, it governs neither of them. But when it precedes the imperfect, it denies the present:

/mā yuzakka al-?insānu bi-šahādati ?ahli beytihi/

(A man is not declared righteous by the evidence of his own household). مـا يُزكّى الانسانُ بشهادةِ اهلِ بيتِه When, on the other hand, it precedes the perfect, it denies the past as in:

/mā kāna ḥadiθan yuftara wa-lakin taṣdiqu al-laḏi beyna yadeyhi/ (It (the Koran) is not a story invented by Muhammad, but a confirmation of what (i.e., the sacred writing) precedes it). ما كانَ حديثًا يفترى ولكنْ تصديقُ الذى بينَ يديهِ

b. Nominal Negators:

Based on the criterion of distribution, any negative particle that precedes a nominal sentence is considered a mominal negator. Such a sentence in Arabic does not start with a verbal. It may, however, consist of two nominals, e.g., /ar-raž̌ulu ħayawānun/ الرجلُ حيـوانٌ (The Man (is) an animal), a nominal and an adjectival, e.g., /ar-raž̌ulu ġaniyun/ الرجلُ غنيٌ (The man (is) rich), or a nominal and an adverbial, e.g., /ar-raž̌ulu fi-l-beyti/ الرجلُ في البيتِ (The man (is) at home). The tense expressed in the nominal sentences is the present. But when the nominal sentence is to express the past or the future, verb to <u>be</u>, an auxiliary defective verb, is employed in which case it must be negated by a verbal negator.

Like some verbal negators, nominal counterparts either govern the following nominals to take one particular case, such as, to use the traditional terms again, the nominative or the accusative, or they do not.[1]

---

[1]The traditional terms <u>nominative</u> and <u>accusative</u> can be structurally defined in terms of the inflectional suffixes which indicate number as follows:

nominative markers: /-ū(n)/, /-ānі/, and /-ūna/;
accusative markers: /-a(n)/, /-ayni/, and /-īna/;
for the singular, dual, and the plural respectively.

B.1. /lā/ لا

As a nominal negator, it can be of two types: a signal of ordinary negation in which both nominals take the case of nominative as in /lā ma9rūfun ḍā?i9un/ لا معروفٌ ضائـــعٌ (No charity is ever lost), /lā ražulun ħādirun/ (There isn't only one man present), or a particle of a universal negation known in Arabic as the negation of the genus whereby the nominal following /lā/ takes the accusative case, e.g., /lā ražula fi-aš-šari9i/ لا رجلَ في الشارعِ (There is no single man in the street), /lā ražula ħādirun/ (There is not a single man present).

B.2. /laysa/ ليـــس

Formally, this negator is the only negative particle made up of the negative particle /lā/ prefixed to /?aysa/, meaning <u>is</u>. It is the only negative particle that behaves like a defective verb in the sense that it has no tense form, a participle, nor an imperative form, yet it can be inflected by person, gender, and number:

3rd Masculine:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| /laysa/ | ((he)is not) | ليـــس |
| /laysā/ | ((they-two) are not) | ليســا |
| /laysū/ | ((they) are not) | ليســوا |

3rd Feminine:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| /laysat/ | ((she) is not) | ليست |
| /laysatā/ | ((they-two) are not) | ليستا |
| /lasna/ | ((they) are not) | لسن |

2nd Masculine:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| /lasta/ | ((you-sing.) are not) | لست |
| /lastumā/ | ((you-two) are not) | لستما |
| /lastum/ | ((you-pl.) are not) | لستم |

2nd Feminine:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| /lasti/ | ((you-sing.) are not) | لست |
| /lastumā/ | ((you-two) are not) | لستما |
| /lastunna/ | ((you-pl.) are not) | لستّن |

1st Common:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| /lastu/ | ((I) am not) | لست |
| /lasnā/ | ((We) are not) | لسنا |

/laysa/ governs the nominals following it in such a way as to make the first one in the nominative whereas the second in the accusative:

/laysa al-xādimu qawīyan/ ليسَ الخادمُ قويـــاً (The servant is not strong).

B.3. /mā/[1] ما

As a nominal negator, /mā/ behaves in two different ways:

1. It governs the first nominal to be in the nominative while the second in the accusative case. Thus it can be used in free variation with /laysa/:

/laysa al-xādimu qawīyan/ ليس الخادمُ قوياً
(The servant is not strong)
/mā al-xādimu qawīyan/ ما الخادمُ قوياً

The second nominal after both /laysa/ and /mā/ can be prefixed by the redundant preposition bi:

/al-xādimu qawīyun/ الخادمُ قويٌ (The servant is strong)
/laysa al-xādimu bi-qawīyin/ ليس الخادم بقوي
(The servant is not strong).
/mā al-xādimu bi-qawīyin/ ما الخادم بقوي

2. At other times, however, it does not govern either nominal:

/mā al-xādimu qawīyun/ ما الخادم قويٌ (The servant is not strong).

---

[1]In colloquial Iraqi Arabic, /mā/ has two allomorphs distributed as follows:

/mā-/ as a prefix before /-ku/, meaning <u>there is</u>, e.g.,
/māku filūs/ ماكو فلوس (There is no money)
/mū/ elsewhere: /šifit ?ali mū ?ahmad/ (I saw Ali not Ahmed.)
شفت علي مو احمد

The verbal and nominal negators which have already been examined pertain to the second kind of negation, namely the grammatical or general negation. There is still a third kind which has the least occurrences. This is:

3. Lexical or Special Negation

Lexical or special negation is less frequently recurring than the other two kinds due to the fact that Arabic does not employ affixal negation except in the modern usage when /lā-/ is used as a prefix before a nominal base, e.g., /al-lā-nihāya/ (the infinity or the endlessness).

But aside from the negative affixes, there are three lexical negators in Arabic:

3.a. /gayr/ غير

It is semantically equivallent to the English negative prefixes in- , un- , or non- , while, syntactically, it precedes the nominals and the participles used as adjectivals:

/gayru-maxlūqin/ غير مخلوق (uncreated), or /gayru-mumkin/ غير ممكن (impossible)

/gayru-al-magḍūbi 9alayhim/ غير المغضوبِ عليهم (Not those who earn Thine anger)

/gayru-al-9arab/ غير العرب (Non-Arabs)

It can also be used after the preposition /min/ <u>from</u>, in which case it approaches the meaning of the English negative preposition <u>without</u>;

/min gayri žubnin wa-lā xawf/ من غيرِ جبنٍ ولا خوفٍ

(Without cowardice or fear)

3.b. /dūn/ دون

It expresses two meanings: that of <u>below</u> and <u>without</u>. In the latter case, it may follow the preposition /min/ <u>from</u> or /bi-/, thus it can be used in free variation with /gayri/:

/min duni žubnin wa-lā xawfin/ من دونِ جبنٍ ولا خوفٍ

(without cowardice or fear)

or /duna žubnin wa-lā xawfin/ دونَ جبنٍ ولا خوفٍ

3.c. /9adam/ عدم <u>non-, no</u>

The last lexical negator has more restricted distribution than the other two for it precedes only the nouns:

/9adamu al-kalām/ عدمُ الكلامِ (no speaking),

/9adamu at-tadxīn/ عدمُ التدخينِ (no smoking), or

/9adam al-wožūd/ عدمُ الوجودِ (non-existence).

Having thus presented all kinds of negators in Arabic, the second major constituent of this chapter will be devoted to analyzing the most frequently re-

curring negative patterns which are characteristically marked by containing either a verbal or a nominal negator.

II. Two Approaches to the Analysis of the Arabic Negative Patterns:

1. The Structural Approach

In this section, an attempt is made to present as adequately and economically as possible the most frequently recurring patterns of grammatical or general negation in Arabic. It is believed that such an analysis can be best exhibited by means of tables and formulas which explicitly illustrate the position of the negators in the sentence.

Pattern 1. Verbal Negators With No Governing Power:

This pattern applies to all verbal sentences which are introduced by verbal negators that call for no morphonemic change in the verbal form. It can be subdivided into three subpatterns:

Subpattern a. /mā/ + perfect-verbal[1]

---

[1]In Colloquial Iraqi Arabic, /mā/ is prefixed to both perfect and imperfect forms of the verbal:
/ma-ʔsṯa9malta/ ما استعملتــــه (I didn't use it)
/mā-yxālif/ مـا يخالــف (It doesn't matter.)

Table No. 1

| Affirmative | | Negative | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Verbal | Complement | mā | Verbal | Complement |
| qāla | hādā | mā | qāla | hāḏā ?abadan |
| said-he | this | not | said | this at all |
| samgtuhu | yaḳḏubu | mā | sam9tuhu | yaḳḏubu |
| kuntu | ?aḥsabu anna ad-duxna fākihatun. | mā | kuntu | ?aḥsabu ?anna ad-duxna fākihatun. |

Glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| He didn't say this at all. | ما قال هذا ابدا |
| I didn't hear him telling lies. | ما سمعته يكذب |
| I didn't think that the millet is a fruit. | ما كنت احسبان الذخن فاكهة. |
| (Until I passed by the valley of Amars.). | حتى مررت بوادى آل عمار |

Subpattern b. /lā/ + imperfect-verbal

Table No.2

| Affirmative | | Negative | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Verbal | Complement | /lā/ | Verbal | Complement |
| yukrimu | as-saxīyu al-baxīla. | lā | yukrimu | as-saxīyu al-baxīla. |
| respect | the liberal the stingy. | not | respect | the liberal the stingy. |
| yamna9uhu | šay?un 9an ḏālika | lā | yamna9uhu | šay?un 9an ḏālika. |
| yuḥibu | al-awlādu al-ḥaliba. | lā | yuḥibu | al-awlādu al-ḥaliba |

Glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| The liberal (man) does not respect the stingy. | لا يكرمُ السخيُ البخيلَ. |
| Nothing prevents him from doing that. | لا يمنعُه شيءٌ عن ذلك. |
| The children do not like milk. | لا يحبُ الاولادُ الحليبَ. |

Subpattern c. /lays-/ subject suffix + imperfect-verbal

Table No. 3

| Affirmative | | Negative | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Verbal | Complement | /lays-subj. | Verbal | Complement |
| (?anni) ?aqṣudu | ḏālīka | las-tu | ?aqṣudu | ḏālika |
| (I mean | that) | (not-I | mean | that) |
| (?annakum) ta9malūna | wāžibakum | las-tum | ta9malūna | wāžibakum |
| (?annaki) tužīdīna | ar-raqṣa | las-ti | tužīdīna | ar-raqṣa |

Glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| I don't mean that. | لستُ اقصدُ ذلك. |
| You (pl.) don't do your duty. | لستم تعملونَ واجبكم. |
| You (fem.sing.) don't dance well. | لستِ تجدينَ الرقصَ. |

Pattern 2. Verbal Negators with Governing Power:

In the foregoing subpatterns, the verbal does not undergo any morpho-phonemic change as a result of being preceded by a negator. In this pattern, however, the verbal changes its form from perfect or the imperfect to the jussive or subjunctive. This pattern can

also be subdivided into two subpatterns: each expresses a different tense.

Subpattern a. /lam/ + jussive-verbal

Table No. 4:

| Affirmative | | Negative | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Verbal | Complement | /lam/ | Jussive | Complement |
| ḏahabtu | ?ila-s-sinamā. | lam | ?aḏhab | ?ila-s-sinamā. |
| zāranī | sadīqī fī-l-maktab | lam | yazurnī | sadīqī fī-l-maktab. |
| ?ištaraytu | kitāban | lam | ?aštari | kitāban |

Glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| I didn't go to the movie. | لم اذهبْ الى السينما . |
| My friend didn't visit me in the office. | لم يزرني صديقي في المكتب . |
| I didn't buy a book. | لم اشترِ كتابـــا . |

Subpattern b. /lan/ + Subjunctive-verbal

This subpattern sometimes expresses a strong negation of the future.

Table No. 5:

| Affirmative | | Negative | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Future-verbal | Complement | /lan/ | Subjunctive | Complement |
| sa-aḏhabu | ?ila as-si-namā ǧadan. | lan | ?aḏhabu | ?ila as-si-namā ǧadan. |
| sa-yazurūnī | ṣadīqī fi-l-maktabi. | lan | yazurūni | ṣadīqī fi-l-maktabi. |
| sa-?aštari | kitaban. | lan | ?aštariyā | kitaban. |

Glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| I won't go to the movie tomorrow. | لن اذهبَ الى السينما غدا . |
| My friend will not visit me in the office. | لن يزورني صديقي في المكتب . |
| I will not buy a book. | لن اشترىَ كتابـا . |

Pattern 3: Nominal Negators with Governing Power:

This pattern covers all nominal sentences where the negator stands initially and governs the first nominal to be in the nominative case while the second in the accusative case. There are two subpatterns each of which has its own negator:

Subpattern a.

Table No. 6:

| Affirmative | | Negative | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nominative | Nominative Predicate | /laysa/ | Nominative | Accusative Predicate |
| al-xādimu | qawīyun. | /laysa/ | al-xādimu | qawīyan. |
| ar-raẓulu | ṭabībun. | laysa | ar-raẓulu | ṭabīban. |
| al-fatātu | ẓamīlatun. | laysat | al-fatātu | ẓamīlatan. |

Glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| The servant is not strong. | ليس الخادمُ قوياً . |
| The man is not a doctor. | ليس الرجلُ طبيباً . |
| The girl is not beautiful. | ليستْ الفتاةُ جميلةً . |

Sub-pattern b:

/mā/ behaving like /laysa/

Table No.7:

| Affirmative | | Negative | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nominative | Nominative Predicate | /mā/ | Nominative | Accusative Predicate |
| al-xādimu | qawīyun | mā | al-xādimu | qawīyan. |
| ar-raẓulu | ṭabībun | mā | ar-raẓulu | ṭabīban. |
| al-fatātu | ẓamīlatun | mā | al-fatātu | ẓamīlatan. |

Glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| The servant (is)not strong | ما الخادمُ قويـاً . |
| The man (is) not a doctor | ما الرجلُ طبيبـاً . |
| The girl (is) not beautiful | ما الفتاةُ جميلـــة . |

Pattern 4: Nominal Negators Without Governing Power:

In this pattern, the nominal negator /mā/ or /lā/ does not govern either nominal of the sentence. In other words, the negative sentence is structurally the same as the affirmative except that it has an initial negator.[1]

Subpattern a. /mā/ + Nominative

Table No. 8:

| Affirmative | | Negative | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nominative | Predicate | /mā/ | Nominative | Nominative Predicate |
| al-muẑtahidu | fāšilun | mā | al-muẑtahidu | fāšilun |
| fā9ilu al-xayri | makrūhum | mā | fā9ilu al-xayri | makrūhun |
| kulu mā tabgāhu | sahilu al-manāli | mā | kulu mā tabgāhu | sahilu al-manāli. |

[1] /lāta/ and /?in/ لاتَ ، ان behave in the same way, but they are rarely used as negators nowadays.

Glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| The clever (pupil) is not a failure | ما المجتهدُ فاشلٌ · |
| The benevolent (man) is not abominable. | ما فاعلُ الخيرِ مكروهٌ · |
| Not all you yearn for is accessible. | ما كلُ تبغاهُ سهلُ المنالِ · |

Subpattern b: /lā/ + Nominative

Table No. 9:

| Affirmative | | Negative | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nominative | Predicate | /lā/ | Nominative | Nominative Predicate |
| ma9rūfun | dā?i9un | lā | ma9rūfun | dā?i9un |
| mužtahidun | fāšilun | lā | mužtahidun | fāšilun |
| xā?inun | sadīqun | lā | xā?inun | sādīqun |

Glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| Kindness is never lost | لا معروفٌ ضائعٌ · |
| A clever (pupil) is not a failure. | لا مجتهدٌ فاشلٌ · |
| A faithless (friend) is not a friend. | لا خائنٌ صديقٌ · |

Pattern 5: /lā/: A Nominal Negator of the Genus[1]

As a particle of a universal kind of negation, /lā/ behaves in a reverse way to that of the nominal negator /laysa/: it governs the first nominal to be in the accusative without tanwin while the second in the nominative.

Table No. 10:

| Affirmative | | Negative | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nominative | Predicate | /lā/ | The Accusative | The nominative |
| ražulun | fī-š-šāri9i | lā | ražula | fi-aš-šāri9i |
| šukrun | 9ala-al-wāžibi | lā | šukra | 9ala al-wāžibi |
| raybun | fī-ihi | lā | rayba | fī-ihi |

Glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| There is no single man in the street. | لا رجلَ في الشارعِ . |
| There needs be no thanks for a duty. | لا شكرَ على الواجبِ . |
| (There is no doubt about it.) It's not suspicious | لا ريبَ فيهِ |

Pattern 6: Correlative Negators Used as Conjunctions

/lā .... wa-lā/

/mā .... wa-mā/

/laysa.. wa-lā/

/mā .... wa-lā/

/lam ... wa-lam/

/lan ... wa-lan/

Negative correlative conjunctions in Arabic usually, but not always,[1] join two similar parts of speech. These conjunctions are either nominal or verbal negators used in pairs. Hence this pattern divides itself into two subpatterns:

Subpattern a: Nominal Negators

Table No. 14:

| Negator | Nominal(s) | And-Negator | Nominal Complement |
|---|---|---|---|
| lā | ?ahmadun | wa-lā | ʔalīyun zārānā |
| laysa | ar-raẓulu ṭabīban | wa-lā | ẓarīfan |
| mā | ar-raẓulu ṭabīban | wa-lā | ẓarīfan |

[1] This is the case where a verbal follows /mā/ and a nominal follows /wa-lā/:

/mā ẓā?a ?ahmadun wa-lā ʔalīyun (Neither Ahmed nor Ali came) ما جاء احمد ولا علي .

Glosses

| | |
|---|---|
| Neither Ahmad nor Ali came to us. | لا احمد ولا علي زارنا ٠ |
| The man is not a doctor nor is he a surgeon. | ليس الرجلُ طبيباً ولا جراحاً ٠ |

Subpattern b: Verbal Negators

Table No. 15:

| Negator | Verbal | And-Negator | Verbal | Complement |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| mā | ħadaθtuhu | wa-mā | sa?aluhu | 9anka |
| lam | yalid | wa-lam | yūlad | |
| fa?in lam | taf9alū | wa-lan | taf9alū | fa?itaqū annāra |

| | |
|---|---|
| I didn't tell him nor did I ask him about you. | ما حدثتُه وما سألتهُ عنكَ ٠ |
| He (Allah) begetteth not nor was he begotten. | لم يلدْ ولم يولدْ ٠ |
| And if ye do it not - and ye can never do it - then guard yourself against the fire (of hell). | فان لم تفعلوا ولن تفعلوا فاتقوا النار ٠ |

Pattern 7: <u>Negators Followed by Exceptives</u>

| Not | But (except |
|---|---|
| lā | il-lā |
| lam | siwā |
| lan | ġayr |
| laysa | |
| mā | |

The exceptive particle in Arabic does not only occur in negative sentences but in affirmative sentences also, e.g., /žā?a až-žamī9u il-lā Muḥamadun/ جاء الجميعُ الا محمداً (Ali came but Mohammed) But when it occurs in the negative sentence, which is the concern of this study, it may follow a verbal or nominal negator. Thus this pattern, as in the case of the most foregoing patterns, can be divided into two subpatterns:

Subpattern a. <u>Verbal Negator Plus Exceptive</u>

Table No. 16:

| Negator | Verbal | Exceptive | Complement |
|---|---|---|---|
| mā | 9aθartu 9ala kitābin | il-lā | wa-qara?tuhu |
| lam | ?atakalam | il-lā | as-sudq |
| lā | ?uxbiruka | il-lā | al-ḥaqiqa |
| lan | ?uxbiruk | siwā | |

| | |
|---|---|
| I didn't come across a book without having read it. | ما عثرتُ على كتابٍ الا وقرأتُه · |
| I said nothing but the truth. | لم اتكلّمْ الا الصدق · |
| I tell you nothing except the fact. | لا اخبرُكَ الا الحقيقة · |

Subpattern b: Nominal Negator Plus Exceptive

Table No. 17:

| Negator | Nominal | Exceptive | Complement |
|---|---|---|---|
| lā | illāha | il-lā | Allāhu |
| laysa | zeydun | il-lā | šaxs‿an lā yu9ba?u bihi |
| mā | muḥamadun | il-lā | bašarun |

| | |
|---|---|
| There is no god except Allah. | لا آلهَ الا اللهُ . |
| Zeid is nothing but a person of no account. | ليس زيدٌ الا شخصاً لا يُعبأ بهِ . |
| Mohammed is but a human being. | ما محمدٌ الا بشرٌ . |

The pattern of exceptives concludes the presentation of the most recurring negative patterns in Arabic. These patterns have been lucidly and parsimoniously analyzed by the structural approach. But no matter how neat the structural description is, it accounts only for one side of the coin leaving the other side to be accounted for by a complementary transformational approach that might explicitly show the systematics underlying these patterns.

## 2. The Transformational Approach[1]

Transformational approaches to language patterns are sometimes erroneously taken as very complicated and consequently difficult to understand. This, however, may not necessarily be so with the present study which attempts to make the transformational analysis so readily understandable as to appear rather oversimplified.

The transformational rules worked out in this section are of two types: T-neg.I which applies to verbal sentences and T-neg.II to nominal ones. But these two rules are not always sufficient to produce such negative sentences that have to undergo additional transforms. In a case like this, other rules have been worked out such as T-jus[2]. The reader may also find out that the number of the patterns examined here are less than that in the previous section. Patterns of correlative negators or exceptives, for instance, are excluded simply because from the transformational standpoint such patterns essentially belong either to verbal or nominal kind of negation and thus thereeis no point

---

[1]The symbols employed in this section are the same as those of the English counterpart.

[2]T-jus is the transformational rule by which the verbal changes its form from the imperfect to that of the jussive.

in duplicating either one. In other words, the patterns that will soon be presented contain either verbal or nominal negators.

I. Patterns Containing Verbal Negators:

Pattern 1: /mā/ + perfect-verbal

Formulas: Sv ⟶ VP + X

Sv stands for a verbal sentence; VP for a verb phrase which consists of a stem plus affixes:

VP ⟶ tense- stem- subject suffix- object suffix

X stands for what-ever follows the VP even if it is nothing Ø.

T-neg.I: VP + X ⟹ /mā/ + VP + X

T-neg.I is the first transformational rule to produce a negative sentence whose tense is the perfect.

Examples:

Sv ⟶ VP + X

1. Perfect-stem-subj.suf.-obj.suf.+ X

Ø -ħadaθ - tu- hu + 9an-ka

(Past- tell - I - him + about-you)

mã + ħadaθ-tu-hu + 9anka (by T-neg.I)

حدثته عنك ⟸ ما حدثته عنك

I told him about you ⟹ I didn't tell him about you.

2. Sv ⟶ VP + X

Ø - šaraḥa al-mu9alimu ad-darsa

mā+Ø - šaraḥa al-mu9alimu ad-darsa (by T-neg.I)

mā+šaraḥa al-mu9alimu ad-darsa

شرح المعلم الدرس ⟸ ما شرح المعلم الدرس

The teacher explained the lesson ⟹ The teacher didn't explain the lesson

Pattern 2: <u>/lam/ + jussive</u>

The previous pattern where the verbal has a Ø morpheme for the perfect tense can also be negated by /lam/ in which case the VP must undergo a morpho-phonemic change whereby it transforms from the perfect into the jussive. This transformational process is operationally labeled here <u>T-jus</u>, standing for the transformational rule whereby the final short vowel (sometimes precedes the /n/) is obligatorily deleted. <u>T-jus</u> is an obligatory rule after /lam/ or /lammā/.

<u>T-neg.I</u>: tense-verbal ⟹ v-neg + tense-verbal

e.g., perfect-verbal ⟹ /lam/ + imperfect-verbal

<u>T-jus:</u> imperfect ⟹ jussive

Examples:

Sv ⟶ VP + X

tense-stem-subj.suf.-obj.suf-

1. Ø -ħadaθ -tu - hu 9an-ka

lam+ ?u -ħaduθ -u -hu 9an-ka (by T-neg.I)

lam+ ?u -ħaduθ -Ø -hu ,9an-ka (by T-jus.)

لـم احدثـه عنـكَ ⟸ حدثتُـهُ عنـــكَ

ħadaθtuhu 9anka ⟹ lam ?uħaduθuhu 9anka

I told him about you ⟹ I didn't tell him about you.

2. šaraħa li-ya ad-darsa

lam ya-šraħ -u- li-ya ad-darsa (by T-neg.I)

lam ya-šraħ -Ø- li-ya ad-darsa (by T-jus.)

šaraħa al-mu**li-ya**limu ad-darsa ⟹ lam yašraħ

al-mu**li-ya** ad-darsa

He explained the lesson to me ⟹ He didn't explain the lesson to me.

شَـرحَ لـي الدرسَ ⟸ لَـمْ يشَـرحْ لـي الدرسَ

Pattern 3: /lan/ + Subjunctive

This pattern is just like the above one except that the tense of the VP is the imperfect instead of the perfect. The formulas which apply here too: T-neg.I followed by T-Subj.

ya-šraħ - u al-mu9alimu ad-darsa

lan ya-šraħ - a al-mu9alimu ad-darsa

ya-šraħ-u al-mu9alimu ad-darsa ⟹ lan ya-šraħa al-mu9alimu ad-darsa

The teacher explains the lesson ⟹ The teacher doesn't explain the lesson at all.

or The teacher will not explain the lesson.

يَشرحُ المعلمُ الدرسَ ⟸ لَنْ يَشرحَ المعلمُ الدرسَ

In this pattern, /lan/ sometimes expresses a strong negation in the future though the tense of the affirmative verbal is the imperfect. But it is quite possible for the Arabic VP to have the future prefix /sa-/ or the auxiliary /sawfa/ before the imperfect to indicate futurity, in the affirmative sentence. To negate such a sentence, the future prefix /sa-/ must be obligatorily deleted while the auxiliary /sawfa/ meaning <u>shall</u> or <u>will</u> can only be optionally deteted. Thus <u>T-del.I</u> is the obligatory transformational rule that applies to the VP which has the prefix /sa-/ while <u>T-del.II</u>, is the optional rule that applies for that with the auxiliary /sawfa-/. As for the order of the transformational rules, <u>T-del.I</u> or <u>II</u> must be applied after <u>T-neg.I</u> and before <u>T-subj</u>.

Examples:

Sv ⟶ VP X

future- imperfect-stem - subj-obj. x

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | sa | - ʔu | - ħaduθ | - u - hu | 9an-ka | |
| lan | sa | - ʔu | - ħaduθ | - u - hu | 9an-ka | (by T-neg.I) |
| lan | ø | - ʔu | - ħaduθ | - u - hu | 9an-ka | (by T-del.I) |
| lan | ø | - ʔu | - ħaduθ | - a - hu | 9an-ka | (by T-Subj.) |

sa-ʔuħaduθ-u-hu 9an-ka ⟹ Ian ʔuħaduθ- -hu 9an-ka

I'll tell him about you ⟹ I will not tell him about you.

ساحدثُـــهُ عنـــكَ ⟸ لـَنْ احدثَـــهُ عنـــكَ

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. | sawfa | ya-šraħ-u | al-mu9alimu | ad-darsa |
| lan | sawfa | ya-šraħ-u | al-mu9alimu | ad-darsa (by T-neg.I) |
| lan | ø | ya-šraħ-u | al-mu9alimu | ad-darsa (by T-del.II) |
| lan | ø | ya-šraħ | al-mu9alimu | ad-darsa (by T-subj.) |

sawfa ya-šraħ-u almu9alimu ad-darsa ⟹ lan ya-šraħ

al-mu9alimu ad-darsa

سـوفَ يَشـرحُ المعلـمُ الدرسَ ⟸ لَنْ يَشـرَحَ المعلـمُ الدرسَ

The teacher will explain the lesson ⟹ The teacher won't explain the lesson.

Pattern 4: /lammā/ + jussive-verbal

Formulas:

T-neg.I: imperfect + verbal ⟹ /lammā/ + imperfect-verbal

T-jus: imperfect ⟹ jussive

In this pattern, /lammā/, meaning <u>not yet</u>, creates a new tense which is semantically equivalent to the present perfect tense in English.

<u>Examples</u>:

Sv ⟶ VP + X

imperfect-stem x

ya - šraḥ -u al-mu9alimu ad-darsa

lammā ya - šraḥ -u al-mu9alimu ad-darsa (by T-neg.I)

lammā ya - šraḥ -i al-mu9alimu ad-darsa (by T-jus.)[1]

ya-šraḥ u al-mu9alimu ad-darsa ⟹ lammā ya-šraḥi al-mu9alimu ad-darsa

يَشرحُ المعلمُ الدرسَ ⟸ لمّا يشرحِ المعلمُ الدرسَ .

The teacher explains the lesson ⟹ The teacher has not explained the lesson.

Sv ⟶ VP + X

past- stem x

ø - qāra?t -u al-kitāba

lammā ?a qra? -u al-kitāba (by T-neg.I)

lammā ?a qra? -i al-kitāba (by T-jus.)

I read the book ⟹ I have not read the book yet.

قرأتُ الكتـــابَ ⟸ لمـا اقـرأ الكتـــابَ

---

[1] /ø/ ⟹ /i/ before /-al/. This transform is produced by phonological rules which are outside the scope of this study.

Ø -madat li-l-beyani sā9atun

lammā ta-mdii li-l-beyani sā9atun (by T-neg.I)

lammā ta-mdi li-l-beyani sā9atun (by T-jus.)[1]

madat li-l-beyani sā9atun ⟹ lammā tamdi lilbeyani sā9atun

An hour passed since our parting ⟹ An hour has not yet passed since our parting.

مضتْ للبينِ ساعةٌ ⟸ لمّا تمضِ للبينِ ساعةٌ

Pattern 5: /lā/ + imperfect-verbal

Like pattern No. 1, the verbal negator introduces the sentence as a result of applying T-neg.I without calling for any change in the order or forms of the morphemes in the terminal string.

T-neg.I: imperfect-verbal ⟹ /lā/ + imperfect-verbal

Examples:

| Sv | ⟶ | VP | X | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | yu-ħaduθ-u-nī | dā?iman | 9an-ka |
| lā | | yu-ħaduθ-u-nī | dā?iman | 9an-ka (by T-neg.I) |

---

[1]When the form of the imperfect verb ends in a long vowel, the jussive would end in a short one.

He always speaks to me about you ⟹ He doesn't always speak to me about you.

يحدثني دائما عنك ⟸ لا يحدثني دائما عنك

ya-šrah-u al-mu9alimu ad-darsa

lā ya-šrah-u al-mu9alimu ad-darsa (by T-neg.I)

يَشرحُ المعلمُ الدرسَ ⟸ لا يَشرحُ المعلمُ الدرسَ

The teacher explains the lesson ⟹ The teacher doesn't explain the lesson.

## II. Patterns Containing Nominal Negators

Pattern 6: $Sn \longrightarrow NP + Pred \begin{Bmatrix} Sub \\ Adv \end{Bmatrix}$

T-neg.II: $NP + \begin{Bmatrix} Sub \\ Adv \end{Bmatrix} \Longrightarrow \begin{Bmatrix} laysa \\ mā \end{Bmatrix} + NP + \begin{Bmatrix} Sub \\ Adv \end{Bmatrix}$

Where Sn stands for a nominal sentence, Pred for predicate which can be Sub for a substantive which can also be either an NP (noun phrase) or an Adjectival, and Adv for an adverbial which includes here only adverbial of place.

T-neg.II is the transformational rule for producing nominal negative sentences. In this pattern /laysa/ or /mā/, when it behaves like /laysa/, governs the predicate to be in the accusative case. In transformational terms, the final short vowel (or that before

the final /n/) transforms from /u/ into /a/ or /i/ by a phonological rule which applies simultaneously with <u>T-neg.II</u> when the negator is /laysa/ and optionally with the negator /mā/.

<u>Examples</u>:

Sn ⟶ NP + Predicate)

Det- N Adj

al-xādimu qawīyun

laysa al-xādimu qawīyan (by T-neg.II)

or optionally:

mā al-xādimu qawīyan

الخادمُ قويٌ ⟸ {ليس / ما} الخادمُ قويـاً

The servant is strong ⟹ The servant is not strong.

The servant isn't strong.

Sn ⟶ NP + Pred. (NP)

Det-N Ø-N

ar-raẓulu ṭabībun

laysa ar-raẓulu ṭabīban (by T-neg.II)

mā ar-raẓulu ṭabīban

الرجلُ طبيبٌ ⟸ {ليس / ما} الرجل طبيبـا

The man is a doctor ⟹ The man is not a doctor.

The man isn't a doctor.

Sn ⟶ NP Adv-p

al-awlādu fi -ṣ-ṣafi

laysa al-awlādu fi aṣ-ṣafi (by T-neg.II)

الاولادُ في الصفِ ⟸ ليس الاولادُ في الصفِ

The boys are in the class ⟹ The boys aren't in the class.

Pattern 7: Sn ⟶ NP + Pred.

<u>T-neg.II</u>: NP + Pred. ⟹ {laysa / mā} + NP + bi-Pred.

This pattern, which can be an optional alternative to the previous one, is formally marked by a redundant preposition /bi-/ before the predicate which is similar to the English substantive. <u>T-neg.II</u> is simultaneously accompanied by a phonological rule, like the foregoing one, which transforms the final short wowel /u/ into /i/. In this pattern too, the redundant preposition /bi-/ can be optionally inserted by a special transformational rule labeled here as <u>T-prep</u>.

<u>Examples</u>:

Sn ⟶ NP + Pred

al-xādimu qawīyun

laysa al-xādimu qawīyan (by T-neg.II)

mā al-xādimu qawīyan

or optionally:

laysa al-xādimu bi-qawīyin (by T-prep.)

mā al-xādimu bi-qawīyin

الخادمُ قويٌ ⟸ { ليس / ما } الخادمُ بقوي

The servant is strong ⟹ The servant isn't strong.

Similarily:

ar-ražulu ṭabībun

{ laysa / mā } ar-ražulu ṭabīban (by T-neg.II)

or: { laysa / mā } ar-ražulu bi-ṭabībin (by T-prep.)

The man is a doctor ⟹ The man is not a doctor.

الرجلُ طبيبٌ ⟸ { ليس / ما } الرجلُ بطبيب

Pattern 8: Sn ⟶ NP + Prep.

T-neg.II: NP + Pred ⟹ { lā / mā } + NP + Pred.

The nominal negators in the above pattern do not occur in free variation with each other, for /mā/ commonly precedes Det-N while /lā/ Ø-N. Both nominals, however, do not call for any other transformational or phonological rule.

Examples:

| Sn ⟶ | NP | + | Sub |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Det-N | | Adj |
| | al-mužtahidu | | fāšilun |
| mā | al-mužtahidu | | fāšilun (by T-neg.II) |

المجتهدُ فاشلٌ ⟸ ما المجتهدُ فاشلٌ

| Sn ⟶ | NP | + | Predicate |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Ø - N | | Adj |
| | ma9rūfun | | dā?i9un |
| lā | ma9rūfun | | dā?i9un (by T-neg.II) |

معروفٌ ضائعٌ ⟸ لا معروفٌ ضائعٌ

/lā/ in this final pattern sometimes requires the NP to be in the accusative case where the final short vowel /u/ transforms into /a/ by a phonological rule. This negator is referred to as the negator of the genus.

Examples:

| Sn ⟶ | NP | + | Pred |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Ø - N | + | Adj<br>Adv-p |
| | ma9rūfun | | dā?i9un |
| lā | ma9rūfa | | dā?i9un (by T-neg.II) |

No kindness is useless (lost),

معروفٌ ضائعٌ ⟸ لا معروفَ ضائعٌ

ražulun fi-š-šāri9i

lā ražula fi-š-šāri9i

(There is not any man in the street.)

رجلٌ في الشارعِ ⟸ لا رجلَ في الشارعِ

In this kind of negation, the tanwin is to be dropped out.

The above pattern concludes the transformational analysis of the most frequently recurring patterns in Arabic. Now that the patterns of both languages have been elaborately analyzed by the structural and transformational approaches, the coming chapter will be devoted to comparing of these patterns so as to classify them into the three levels of difficulty: easy, difficult and deceptive.

# CHAPTER FIVE

## COMPARISON AND LEVELS OF DIFFICULTY

One of the recent findings of descriptive linguistics that best serves to introduce this chapter with is that there can hardly be two languages that are structurally alike. The fact that even languages of common origin or family might operate on entirely different systems makes it quite natural for us to accept both the similarities and the dissimilarities between English and Arabic negative patterns. In effect, the two languages reveal varying degrees of differences between the bilingual negative patterns in form, meaning, and distribution. Consequently, they fluctuate in their levels of difficulty for Arab students: they are easy, difficult, and deceptive.

1. Patterns of Contextual or Absolute Negation: Deceptive.

Of the three kinds of negation in English, the contextual or absolute negation is not only difficult for Arab students to recognize or to produce but it is deceptive too. This might explain why people of the two linguistic backgrounds sometimes misunderstand each other in such a way as to take refusal for consent, or

a negative response for a positive one or the other way round. When, for example, an English-speaking person hears the absolute negator, he little bothers himself to catch the rest of the elliptical sentence following it since his native language employs a system of concord between the two parts of the utterance. Thus, he hardly expects that his speaker whose English is not a native language would say, for instance, "No, I can," or "Yes, I can't," which is a literal translation of /kallā astaṭi9/ or /na9am lā astaṭi9/ respectively. On the other hand, an Arab student might easily misinterpret "No, I can't," as "No, I can" especially when the final voiceless consonant is dropped out or in the form of its allophone [ʔ]. In a word, Arabic operates on a system of negation whereby the extra-linguistic fact of the answer largely depends on the linguistic form of the foregoing utterance as to whether it is negative or affirmative. English, however, employs quite a different system of contextual negation whereby the extra-linguistic fact is wholly independent of the linguistic form of the preceding question. In other words, the answer which the speaker intends to enunciate can alone find its appropriate linguistic form with respect to being negative or affirmative.

He might say "Yes, I can," or "No, I can't" depending on his intention whether the preceding question is negative, such as, "Can't you come with us?" or affirmative such as, "Can you come?" The two different systems of contextual negation can be explicitly clarified by tabulating examples together with mathematical signs: (+) for positive and (-) for negative:[1]

| The Linguistic Form of the QUESTION | Sign | The Extra-Linguistic FACT | Sign | The Ling. Form of the ANSWER | Sign |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Positive | | | | | |
| Eng. Are you ready? | + | Positive | + | Positive Yes | + |
| Arab./hal anta musta9idun/ | + | Positive | + | Positive/na9am/ | + |
| 2. Positive | | | | | |
| Eng. Are you ready? | + | Negative | - | Negative No | - |
| Arab./hal anta musta9idun/ | + | Negative | - | Negative/kallā/ | - |
| 3. Negative | | | | | |
| Eng. Aren't you ready? | - | Positive | + | Positive Yes | + |
| Arab./alasta musta9idan/ | - | Positive | + | Positive/balā/ | + |
| 4. Negative | | | | | |
| Eng. Aren't you ready? | - | Negative | - | Negative No | - |
| Arab./alasta musta9idan/ | - | Negative | - | Positive/na9am/ | + |

[1] A similar conclusion where mathematical terms are employed is given by J. Cygan ibid.,pp. 25-27, in comparing English and Polish contextual kind of negation.

To conclude, in mathematical terms, the contextual kind of negation in English resembles the process of addition in algebra whereby similar signs do not change in the final outcome of computation while the different ones result in either positive or negative depending upon the extra-linguistic fact. In Arabic, on the other hand, it is similar to the process of multiplication whereby (-) multiplied by (-) results in (+). This is the case where the linguistic form of the question is negative (-) and the extra-linguistic fact is also negative (-) yet the answer is positive (+) taking the linguistic form of /na9am/ (yes). Thus, the English patterns of this kind of negation are either difficult or deceptive for Arab students on both levels of recognition and production.[1]

Yet, most of the negative patterns that have been elaborately analyzed by the binary structural-transformational approach pertain to the grammatical or general kind of negation. Like the foregoing patterns, these patterns also vary in their level of difficulty, though the majority are difficult.

---

[1]Interestingly enough, the last conclusion supports what Blackstone calls a golden rule for English-speaking people travelling abroad: "Never, use a negative question when addressing a foreigner." J. Cygan, Op.Cit., p. 27.

2. Patterns of Verbal Negation: Difficult.

Besides the differences in form, meaning, and distribution between the English and Arabic verbal negators, they also differ in number and function. There is only one verbal negator in English, viz., not or its allomorph n't, whereas in Arabic there are six, each of which has a two-fold function: as a negative particle before the verbal and as a tense indicator. This two-fold function of the Arabic negator can be empirically shown by comparing pairs or sets of negative sentences with partial contrast in both content and expression:

| | |
|---|---|
| /lam aštari ktāban/ | I didn't buy a book. |
| /lammā aštari kitāban/ | I haven't bought a book. |
| /lā aštarī kitāban/ | I don't buy a book. |
| /lan aštariya kitāban/ | I won't buy a book. |

The difficulty that an Arab student may encounter in the production of this pattern stems from the fact that the English negator not or n't has no other function save negation. The problem becomes more complicated for him when he has to produce a negative sentence with the verb to do. Furthermore, since in Arabic the verbal negator precedes not only the verbal but the whole sentence, he might say "Not the

man walk," or "The man not walk," exactly as he would say in his native language /lā yamšī ar-ražulu/ for the English sentence "The man does not walk."

The above difficulty decreases, however, in the case of the negative sentances that contain auxiliaries other than the verb to be, to do , or to have, simply because of the similarities of such patterns with those in Arabic. As a matter of fact, it might be only a problem of using the correct word order in producing a sentence like "Shall not I meet him" /sawfa lan uqābiluhu/ for "I shall not meet him," or "May not the man come early" /qad lā ya?tī ar-ražulu mubakiran/ for "The man may not come early."

3. Patterns of Verbal Negation in English as Equivalent to Those of Nominal Negation in Arabic: Difficult and Deceptive:

One of the most seriously problematic patterns for Arab students to master is that which contains the verb to be in the present. This pattern, however, might be one of the easiest patterns for the native speaker of the language, because he can only insert not or n't after the verb to be and thus converting the sentence from affirmative into negative:

$$\text{Nominal} + \text{be} + \text{not} + \begin{cases}\text{noun (a doctor)}\\ \text{adjectival (rich)}\\ \text{adverbial (here)}\\ \text{participle (walking)}\end{cases}$$

The above structure is equivalent to the nominal sentence in Arabic where the nominal is immediately followed by a noun, an adjectival, adverbial, or a participele. Moreover, to negate such a pattern, the nominal negator /laysa/ must be used initially. Since /laysa/ is composed of /lā/ and /?aysa/, meaning <u>be</u>, the above pattern is deceptive for Arab learners because the negative particle, which is a defective verb, implies the verb to <u>be</u>:

| | |
|---|---|
| /laysa/ + /ar-raǯulu/ + | /tabīban/ (a doctor) |
| (Not - be) (The man) | /ganīyan/ (rich) |
| | /huna/ (here) |
| | /mašīyan/ (walking) |

Again, the difficulty in the production of this pattern decreases till it becomes a matter of a correct word order when the verb to be is in the past of the future because in both cases it will parallel another similar pattern in Arabic:

Affirmative:

| | |
|---|---|
| /kāna/ + /arraǯulu/ + | /tabīban/ (a doctor) |
| (was) (the man) | /ganīyan/ (rich) |
| | /huna/ (here) |
| sa-yakūnu/ | /mašīyan/ (walking) |
| (will be) | |

Negative:

/mā kāna/
/lam yakun/
(not was)
/lan yakūna/
(not will be)

" /ar-raẑulu/ + (the man)

/tabīban/ (a doctor)
/ganīyan/ (rich)
/huna/ (here)
/maš̄īyan/ (walking)

In the passive construction, however, the patterns of the verb to be remain difficult or deceptive because they do not have parallels in Arabic. In other words, Arabic does not employ the verb to be in the past, present, or the future. Thus, ungrammatical sentences, such as, "Not killed the man" /lam yuqtalu ar-raẑulu/ for "The man was not killed", can easily be predicted.

4. Patterns of Sentence Negation in English as Equivalent to Patterns of Verbal Negation in Arabic: Difficult and Deceptive.

Patterns of sentence negation in English cover all the negative sentences where not precedes any part of speech except the verbal. When this sentence negator is used initially, it parallels the Arabic nominal negator /laysa/ whose problem has just been demonstrated. The patterns of this kind of negation also include negative sentences which contain no as a part of a compound, a determiner, or an intensifier, the negative

adverbials, and the affixes.

Besides, the patterns which contain no-words are also deceptive because Arabic rarely employs equivalent counterparts where /lā/ is used as a prefix or a nominal negator before the noun. In the affirmative sentences, however, Arabic does employ /mā/ meaning some after indefinite nouns, such as /šay?/ or /šaxṣ/ meaning body or one exactly in the same way as English. To negate a sentence that has such a compound, the Arab learner is more apt to use a verbal negator so as to say "I didn't see anybody" /lam ?ara ?aya šaxṣ/ than to say "I saw nobody" which has no equivalent in Arabic.

Concerning the patterns of negative adverbials, they are difficult to produce in so far as the auxiliary-nominal order is concerned. They become deceptive, however, when the negative adverbial calls for an auxiliary, i.e., the verb to do, which must be used in the above order. As a matter of fact, even the students of advanced stages may fail to produce correctly such patterns. They would more likely say "Rarely we eat our supper before seven," /nādiran mā na?kulu 9ašā?anā qabla as-sābi9a/ for "Rarely, do we eat our supper before seven."

Finally comes the problem of the English negative affixes which are sometimes difficult to handle even for the native speakers of the language. With the exception of the prefix /lā/, Arabic does not employ affixal negation. In most cases, however, the English negative prefixes semantically parallel the lexical negator /ġayr/ or /dūn/ meaning not, non-, in-, or un- as in /ġayru al-ʔarab/ the non-Arab, or /ġayru ṣāliḥ/ unsuitable. There are two other lexical negators: /ʔadam/ meaning no and /ʔadīm/ which is semantically equivalent to the English negative suffix -less. Both negators are usually followed by the nominals in the genitive case as in /ʔadamu al-kalāmi/ no speaking or in /ʔadīmu al-lawni/ colorless.

5. Patterns of Negative Conjunctions: Easy and Difficult.

In chapter three, these patterns have been categorized into three subpatterns: one containing (and) neither, the other (and) nor, and the third the correlative conjunctions neither ... nor. Of these three subpatterns, the last one is the least problematic for Arab students to master. This is the case when the correlative conjunctions join two similar parts of speech in which case they are identical to

the Arabic ones both in meaning and distribution:

Neither Ahmed nor Ali visited us.

/lā ʔaḥmad wa-lā ʕalī zāranā/

But when the correlative conjunctions join sentneces, the pattern will be difficult to produce correctly especially when the verb to do must be used before the subject just as in yes-no questions. This applies to the other negative conjunctions, such as (and) neither or (and) nor. The mistakes that can be predicted consist of the failure of using the verb to do or following the correct word order, such as, "Selma not like me and not I like her".

/selma lā taḥibu-ni wa-lā anā uḥibu-ha/

for "Selma doesn't like me nor do I like her".

Before concluding this chapter, it must be recalled that some of the grammatical mistakes predicated here are, in most cases, extreme cases of the negative interference of the patterns of the native language. The samples lessons in the coming chapter will be directed at preventing or curing those errors.

the Arabic ones both in meaning and distribution:

Neither Ahmed nor Ali visited us.

/lā ʔaḥmad wa-lā ʕalī zāranā/

But when the correlative conjunctions join sentneces, the pattern will be difficult to produce correctly especially when the verb to do must be used before the subject just as in yes-no questions. This applies to the other negative conjunctions, such as (and) neither or (and) nor. The mistakes that can be predicted consist of the failure of using the verb to do or following the correct word order, such as, "Selma not like me and not I like her".

/selma lā taḥibu-ni wa-lā anā uḥibu-ha/

for "Selma doesn't like me nor do I like her".

Before concluding this chapter, it must be recalled that some of the grammatical mistakes predicated here are, in most cases, extreme cases of the negative interference of the patterns of the native language. The samples lessons in the coming chapter will be directed at preventing or curing those errors.

# CHAPTER VI

## SAMPLE LESSONS

This chapter is devoted to developing some sample lessons based on the conclusions reached in the foregoing chapters, particularly the previous one which illustrates the various linguistic problems involved in the production of the negative patterns in English and their resultant levels of difficulty for Arab students. There are four major problems:

1. Wrong word order,

2. The problem of concord between the absolute negator and the following elliptical sentence,

3. Failure to use the verb to do, and

4. The problem of the verb to have and to be in the present.

These problems are not necessarily mutually exclusive: all of them may contribute to making the pattern difficult or deceptive. In handling these problems, however, the sample lessons are presented in sequence of difficulty and in accordance with the principle of gradation of materials whereby the easy pattern is introduced first, followed by the difficult and eventually comes the deceptive. Briefly stated, the general procedure of each lesson is as follows:

1. Introduction of the Pattern:

Three things must be presented here:

a. The focus of the lesson

b. Attention pointer: What kind of problem is involved in the pattern, and

c. Key example(s)

2. Procedure and Technique:

The general procedure followed in the lessons heavily rests upon an inductive-deductive approach according to which the students are provided with as many examples as possible in order to come to some sort of generalizations which function as rules. These generalizations will then deductively be used in the production of the pattern. Thus, explanation must be reduced to the minimum. It should by no means exceed 15% of the whole period and 85% should be allocated to practice both chorally and individually.

3. Oral Drills and Written Exercises:

After giving the key example(s) which serves as a model for the students to follow, choral and individual repetition must be provided. The first type of repetition helps the students overcome inhibition and hesitation whereas the second gives each student a chance to produce the pattern and the teacher to

detect the students' mistakes. At times, however, the student(s) may mispronounce a word or a certain sound, such as /nowt/ for/nat/. In a case like this, it is recommended that the teacher only ask the student(s) to repeat the correct form provided by him so as not to interrupt the grammatical pattern in order to drill on pronunciation practice.

The types of drills employed in the sample lessons are based on Brook's pattern practice,[1] a system which aims at establishing automatic production of the pattern under consideration. Therefore, they should be presented in a rapid repetitious manner without hesitation or intellectualization.

In order to eliminate the vocabulary problems, the selection of words has been limited within the 2000 words listed in West's A General Service List of English Words.[2] Yet, some vocabulary items, which are beyond the elementary or early intermediate level for which the lessons are designed, are sometimes deliberately inserted in order to attract attention and thus direct

---

[1]Nelson Brooks, Language and Language Learning (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 2nd ed., 1964), pp. 152 - 163.

[2]Michael West, op. cit.

conscious attention away from the pattern in practice. Furthermore, throughout the presentation of the lesson and the drills, only the contracted forms are introduced whereas the full ones are left to the written exercises so as to establish the correct use of each form and at the same time avoid the confusion in teaching these forms.

## Lesson One

### -n't after a Modal

Focus: To establish the correct word order

Attention Pointer:

Ali will come tomorrow.

Ali won't come tomorrow.

Key Example:

Ali won't come tomorrow.

Procedure and Technique:

The first step is to write the key example on the blackboard followed by a thorough practice till it becomes an automatic response. When it is established as unconscious habit by overlearning, the other modals can be introduced in the following sequence: shall and shan't, must and mustn't, may and may not and lastly can and can't. The last modal, i.e., can't has a

special learning problem arising when the final voiceless stop /t/ takes the form of the allophone [ʔ] or when it is dropped out completely in some rapid utterances. Hence the teacher must be aware of this problem so as to insist on the production of clear-cut /t/ by the students.

Drills:

The oral drills are at the beginning mechanical and carefully controlled but at the end they become rather meaningful by providing cues for freer, more interesting, and relevant responses.

I. Mechanical drills:

1. Repetition: (choral and individual)

Teacher: Ali won't come tomorrow.

Student/s: Ali won't come tomorrow.

Teacher: He mustn't smoke in the class.

Student/s: He mustn't smoke in the class.

Teacher: She can't swim.

Student/s: She can't swim.

Teacher: You may not go out.

Student/s: You may not go out.

Teacher: We shan't come tomorrow.

Student/s: We shan't come tomorrow.

special learning problem arising when the final voiceless stop /t/ takes the form of the allophone [ʔ] or when it is dropped out completely in some rapid utterances. Hence the teacher must be aware of this problem so as to insist on the production of clear-cut /t/ by the students.

Drills:

The oral drills are at the beginning mechanical and carefully controlled but at the end they become rather meaningful by providing cues for freer, more interesting, and relevant responses.

I. Mechanical drills:

1. Repetition: (choral and individual)

Teacher: Ali won't come tomorrow.

Student/s: Ali won't come tomorrow.

Teacher: He mustn't smoke in the class.

Student/s: He mustn't smoke in the class.

Teacher: She can't swim.

Student/s: She can't swim.

Teacher: You may not go out.

Student/s: You may not go out.

Teacher: We shan't come tomorrow.

Student/s: We shan't come tomorrow.

2. Substitution drills:

Basic Substitution Table

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
| Ali | won't | come tomorrow. |
| Ahmed | can't | play tennis. |
| They | mustn't | smoke here. |

a. Single-Slot Substitution: (using slot No. 1)

Teacher: Ali won't come tomorrow. Ahmed.

Student/s:Ahmed won't come tomorrow.

Teacher: They

Student/s:They won't come tomorrow.

b. Double-Slot Substitution: (using slots No. 1 and 2)

Teacher: Ali won't come tomorrow. Ahmed.

Student/s:Ahmed won't come tomorrow.

Teacher: Can't

Student/s:Ahmed can't come tomorrow.

Teacher: Mustn't

Student/s:Ahmed mustn't come tomorrow.

c. Multiple-Slot Substitution: (using all three slots)

Teacher: Ali won't come tomorrow. She.

Student/s:She won't come tomorrow.

Teacher: Mustn't

Student/s:She mustn't come tomorrow.

Teacher: Late

Student/s:She mustn't come late.

3. Transformation:

Teacher: Ali will come tomorrow.

Student/s:Ali won't come tomorrow.

4. Written Exercises:

Change each of the following sentences from the affirmative to the negative. Use full forms instead of the contractions:

Example: Ali will come tomorrow.

Ali will not come tomorrow.

1. I can speak English.
2. They may smoke in the class.
3. She must ask her friend to do it.
4. We shall come tomorrow.
5. Ahmed will buy a book.

Note: The same procedure can be followed for introducing the modals in the past with adverbials of time indicating the past tense.

## Lesson Two

### The Absolute Negator Followed by a Modal

Focus: To establish a concord between yes or no and the following elliptical sentence.

Attention Pointer:

Yes, he will.

No, he won't.

Key Example:

No, he won't.

Procedure and Technique:

a. Review

b. Introducing yes-no questions with /231/ intonation contour.

c. Elliptical sentences are not required first.

d. A modal is given and repeated.

e. Practice the concord between the two parts of the answer.

Drills:

I. Mechanical Drills:

1. Repetition: (choral and individual)

Teacher: No, he won't.

Student/s:No, he won't.

2. Substitution Drills:

a. A Single-Slot Substitution:

Teacher: No, he won't. She.

Student/s:No, she won't.

b. A Double-Slot Substitution:

Teacher: No, I can't. He.

Student/s:No, he can't.

Teacher: Mustn't.

Student/s:No, he mustn't.

3. Transformation:

Teacher: Yes, I can.

Student/s:No, I can't.

II. Meaningful Drill:

The students are allowed to bring about some realistic variations within the same pattern. This type of drill is commonly conducted individually in chain questions:

Student A (speaking to B and pointing to C): Will Kammal come with us?

Student B: No, he won't. (to student C): You can't come with us, can you?

Student C: No, I can't. (to student D): Can you come with us?

Student D: No, I can't. and so on. Other modals can be introduced and practiced in this type of drill.

III. Written Exercises:

Answer each of the following sentences in two ways: one time in the affirmative and another in the negative.

Example: Will Ali come with us?

Yes, he will.

No, he won't.

1. Shall I take it with me?
2. Must we speak English all the time?
3. Can she swin?
4. Will the teacher give us new exercises?
5. May he smoke in the class?

## Lesson Three

### The Verbs to Be and to Have

The verb to be, it has already been pointed out, is of two different levels of difficulty —that is, it is more difficult or even deceptive in the present than in the past or the future, because it does not exist in Arabic. Hence, once this verb is established by over-learning, there will be little or no difficulty in learning the other forms or the verb to have.

Focus:

am not [1]

is, are } -n't

Attention Pointers and Key Examples:

I'm happy. He is happy. They are happy.[2]

I am not happy. He isn't happy. They aren't happy.

Procedure, Technique, and Drills: The same as in the first two lessons.

## Lesson Four

### The Verb to Do

Focus:

do, does, did } -n't plus the unmarked infinitive

Attention Pointer:

I get up early.

I don't get up early.

---

[1]The contracted form of am not, i.e., ain't should not be introduced because it is substandard.

[2]In the key examples the adjective must be used first to avoid the problem of articles before the nouns.

Key Examples:

I don't get up early.

He doesn't get up early.

He didn't get up early

Procedure and Technique:

The problem of using the verb to do, which is one of the most difficult problems in the production of the English negative patterns for Arab students, is treated here in accordance with the transformational approach suggested in chapter three. There it has been suggested that T-affirm can be used before T-neg - that is, the affirmative sentence should first be transformed into an emphatic form whereby do, does, or did precedes the verbal which takes the form of the unmarked infinitive as a result of that process. The contracted form will then be easily inserted after the verb to do:

I get up early.

I do get up early.

I don't get up early.

Drills:

I. Mechanical Drills:

1. Repetition:

Teacher: He doesn't get up early.

Student/s:He doesn't get up early.

2. Substitution:

a. Single-Slot Substitution:

Teacher: He doesn't get up early. She.

Student/s:She doesn't get up early.

b. Double-Slot substitution:

Teacher: She doesn't get up early. The boy.

Student/s:The boy doesn't get up early.

Teacher: Go to school.

Student/s:The boy doesn't go to school early.

c. Multiple-Slot Substitution:

Teacher: The boy doesn't get up early. He.

Student/s:He doesn't get up early.

Teacher: Didn't.

Student/s:He didn't get up early.

Teacher: Work.

Student/s:He didn't work early.

3. Substitutions That Force Change:

Teacher: He doesn't get up early. They.

Student/s:They don't get up early.

4. Transformation: Each sentence should be changed into an emphatic affirmative first then into negative:

Teacher: The child fell down.

Student/s:The child did fall down.
The child didn't fall down.

II. Meaningful Drills:

Chain questions:

Student A (speaking to B, and pointing to the teacher) I don't know the teacher's first name. Do you know his first name?

Student B (to A) I don't know the teacher's first name. (to student C) Do you know his first name?

Student C (to B) I don't know his first name. But I'll ask.

III. Written Exercises:

Change each of the following sentences first into emphatic and then into negative. Use full forms instead of the contractions:

Example: The boy killed the cat.
The boy did kill the cat.
The boy didn't kill the cat.

1. We went home early.
2. The man drinks much wine.
3. The teacher punished the pupils.
4. The boys play tennis well.
5. The child broke the glass.

## Lesson Five

## Negative Conjunctions

(Part One)

Focus: N-either ... N-or

Attention Pointer:

Either ... Or

N-either ... N-or

Key Example:

Neither Ahmed nor Ali went home.

Procedure and Technique:

The pattern where neither ... nor join two similar parts of speech is easy for Arab students to produce, partly because it has a counterpart in Arabic and partly because the integration of sentences into one sentence involves only the deletion of some parts, such as the repeated subject or the predicate:

Ahmed went home. Ali went home too.

Ahmed or Ali went home. (by deleting the repeated predicate). Now either can be used initially:

Either Ahmed or Ali went home.

N-either Ahmed n-or Ali went home.

Drills:

1. Repetition: (choral and individual)

Teacher: Neither Ahmed nor Ali will go with us.

Student/s:Neither Ahmed nor Ali will go with us.

2. Substitutions:

Single, double, and multiple slots.

3. Transformation:

Teacher: Either Ahmed or Ali will go with us.

Student/s:Neither Ahmed nor Ali will go with us.

4. Integration and transformation:

Teacher: I'll buy a book. I'll buy a pencil

Student/s:I'll buy either a book or a pencil.
I'll buy neither a book nor a pencil.

(Part Two)

Focus: Nor Followed by the Auxiliary Verb:

Attention Pointer:

Ahmed didn't go home. Ali didn't go either.

Ahmed didn't go home, nor did Ali.

Key Examples:

Ahmed isn't rich, nor is Ali.

Ahmed won't go home, nor will Ali.

Ahmed hasn't gone home, nor has Ali.

Ahmed doesn't get up early, nor does Ali.

Procedure and Technique:

The procedure for joining two sentences by using nor or (and) neither can be presented in four steps: the first, is to write the two affirmative sentences each beside the other, the second, to transform each sentence into an emphatic affirmative, the third is to insert n't after the verb to do of the first sentence and to change the position of do so as to follow nor. The second step, however, must be eliminated in case that the sentence has an auxiliary.

Ahmed went home. Ali went home too.

Ahmed did go home. Ali did go home too.

Ahmed didn't go home, nor did Ali.

But, when the sentence has an auxiliary, the procedure can be as follows:

He is happy. I'm happy too,

He isn't happy. I am not happy either.

He isn't happy, nor am I.

Drills:

1. Repetition: (choral and individual)

   Teacher: He can't do it, nor can I.

   Student/s:He can't do it, nor can I.

2. Substitutions:

a. Double-Slot Substitution:

Teacher: Ahmed can't swim, nor can Ali, Fuad and Musa.

Student/s:Fuad can't swim, nor can Musa.

b. Multiple-Slot Substitution:

Teacher: Musa can't swim, nor can Fuad. He and she.

Student/s:He can't swim, nor can she.

Teacher: Won't

Student/s:He won't swim, nor will she.

Teacher: sing.

Student/s:He won't sing, nor will she.

3. Substitutions That Force a Change:

Teacher: He doesn't get up early, nor does she. They and I.

Student/s:They don't get up early, nor do I.

4. Integration:

Teacher: My father doesn't smoke. I don't smoke either.

Student/s:My father doesn't smoke, nor do I.

5. Written Exercises:

Join each pair of the following sentences into one sentence using nor followed by an auxiliary. If the sentence does not contain an auxiliary, use the verb to do.

Examples:

A. Mary speaks English. John speaks English too.

Mary does speak English. John does speak English too.

Mary doesn't speak English, nor does John.

B. Mary is rich. John is rich too.

Mary isn't rich, nor is John.

1. My father left early. I left early too.
2. She will sing. He will sing too.
3. Ali can do it. Ahmed can do it too.
4. The man helped us. We helped him too.
5. The pupils left the class. The teacher left the class too.

---

The foregoing sample lessons cover most of the English negative patterns which are considered problematic for Arab students to master. Above all, it is left to the textbook writers to make use of the other findings and conclusions found throughout the study or to modify these lessons so as to fit the requirements of the texts and their level.

With regard to those negative patterns which contain lexical negators, the study suggests treating them as affirmative sentences that have new or separate vocabulary items characteristically marked by negative affixes since no feasible "rule" for their semantic distribution could be worked out. Instead, the writer has considered that their distribution largely depends on usage. Yet, he calls upon other investigators to go deeper into the problem of affixal negation and work out some transformational rules whereby a sentence containing a lexical negator could be transformed into another with a verbal or a sentence negator or vice-versa.

## Selected Bibliography


Brooks, Nelson. Language and Language Learning. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 2nd ed., 1964.

Bulos, Afif A. The Arabic Triliteral Verb. Beirut: Khayats, 1965.

Chomsky, Noam. "Some Methodological Remarks on Generative Grammar," Word (vol.xvii, August 1961), pp.219-239.

Cygan, Jan. "On the systems of Negation in English and Polish," Language Learning, (vol. xv, no. 1-2, 1965), pp. 17-27.

Eaton, Helen S. (Compiler) An English-French-German-Spanish Word Frequency Dictionary. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1961.

El-Witri, Khalida, H. "A Study of the Interference of Classical and Colloqial Arabic As a Cause of Written Grammatical Mistakes in English." Beirut: A.U.B. 1966 (Unpublished Thesis).

Erwin, Wallace M. A Short Reference Grammar of Iraqi Arabic. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1963.

Francis, W. Nelson. The Structure of American English. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1958.

Fries, Charles,Carpenter. The Structure of English. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1952.

_____. The Teaching and Learning of English as a Foreign Language. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1945.

Gleason, H.A.Jr. An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

Hayden, Rebecca E., Pilgrim, Dorothy W., And Haggard, Aurors Quiros. Mastering American English. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.

Hemingway, Ernest. The Old Man and the Sea. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952.

Jesperson, Otto. The Philosophy of Grammar. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1924.

Jones, Shella. "The Effect of a Negative Qualifier in an Instruction," Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, (vol. V, no.5, October 1966), pp. 497-501.

Joos, Martin. The English Verb: Form and Meaning. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

Klima, S. Edward. "Negation in English," The Structure Of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language.Foder, Jerry A., and Katz, Jerold J. (ed.) New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Koutsoudas, Andreas. Writing Transformational Grammars. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Lado, Robert. Linguistics Across Cultures. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1957.

_____. "Patterns of Difficulty in Vocabulary," Teaching English as a Second Language. Allen, Harold B. (ed) New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1965, pp. 208-222.

Nasr, Raja. The Teaching of English to Arab Students. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1965.

Roberts, Paul. English Syntax: Alternative Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964.

Sledd, James. A Short Introduction to English Grammar. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1959.

Suhrawardy, Maulana Obaidullal-Obaidi. A Grammar of Arabic Language. Calcutta University Press, Calcutta, 1938.

Thomas, Owen. "Generative Grammar: Toward Unification and Simplification," Applied English Linguistics. Allen, Harlod B. (ed) New York: Apleton-Crofs, Inc. 1964, pp. 405-414.

West, Michael. A General Service List of English Words. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1964.

Wright, W. A Grammar of the Arabic Language. London: Fredric Norgate, 1875.

Zimmer, Karl E. "Affixal Negation in English and Other Languages: An Investigation of Restricted Productivity," Word (Supplement): Monograph no. 5, vol. xx, 1964.

## Dictionarries

The American College Dictionary. (ACD) New York: Random House, Inc., 1964.

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. (NCD) G& C. Merriam Company, Springfield, Massachusetts, U.S.A., 1958.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary. ($NID_3$) G & C. Merriam Company, Springfield, Massachusetts, U.S.A., 1993.

# المصـــــادر العـربيـة

الجارم ، علـي · النحو الواضح (الجزء الثالث) القاهرة ، دار المعـارف بمصـــر ، ١٩٤٢ ·

حســن ، عباس · النحـو الوافـي · (الجزء الاول) القاهـرة : دار المعارف بمصر ، ١٩٦٢ ·

مصطفـى ابراهيم · احيـاء النحـــو · (لجنة التأليـــف والترجمـة والنشـر) القاهـرة ١٩٣٧ ·