



University of
Salford
MANCHESTER

Negation in Mehri, stages of Jespersen's cycle

Watson, JCE and Rowlett, PA

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Title | Negation in Mehri, stages of Jespersen's cycle |
| Authors | Watson, JCE and Rowlett, PA |
| Type | Book Section |
| URL | This version is available at: http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/22679/ |
| Published Date | 2012 |

USIR is a digital collection of the research output of the University of Salford. Where copyright permits, full text material held in the repository is made freely available online and can be read, downloaded and copied for non-commercial private study or research purposes. Please check the manuscript for any further copyright restrictions.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: usir@salford.ac.uk.

Negation in Mehri, stages of Jespersen's Cycle
Janet CE Watson and Paul Rowlett (both University of Salford)
Email address for correspondence: J.C.E.Watson@salford.ac.uk

1 Introduction

There are three major dialect groups of Mehri: Western Yemeni Mehri (henceforth WYM); Mahriyōt, also known as eastern Yemeni Mehri; and Mehreyyet, also known as Omani Mehri. In this chapter, we argue that negation patterns in Mehri result from grammaticalisation of the anaphoric negator,¹ examine negation patterns in the dialects as reflecting stages in Jespersen's Cycle of negation, and consider the extent to which morpholexical and syntactic factors influence negation patterns.

The Mahriyōt and Mehreyyet examples in this chapter have come from Watson's own fieldwork in Yemen and Oman or from the texts in Sima (2009). WYM examples are taken from Bittner (1914), Wagner (1953) or Simeone-Senelle (2011). Mahriyōt fieldwork examples are followed by the abbreviation (Mo); Mahriyōt examples taken from Sima (2009) by Sima and text:line number; thus, (Sima2:11) refers to Sima (2009) text 2, line 11; Mehreyyet fieldwork examples are followed by the abbreviation (M). Data from recorded narratives are followed by N, from Watson's bank of SMS text messages by txt, from rhymes and chants by R, from elicited speech by ES, and from partially elicited speech by PES. SMS text messages are given in the original Arabic script followed by a transcription. WYM examples are followed by the appropriate reference to Bittner, Wagner or Simeone-Senelle.

The majority of Modern South Arabian languages (MSAL) differ from other Semitic languages with respect to negation insofar as the negative particle *lā* generally follows the whole proposition, even where the negated term is the initial element. In (1) and (2), the negative particle follows the subordinate clause, although the main verb (the fact of knowing) is negated rather than the subordinate verb (the fact of staying in Muscat in (1), or the identification of 'far' in (2)).

(1) *wadak kam lašxawwal bi-maskūt lā* [lit: I knew how long I stay in Muscat not] 'I don't know how long I'll stay in Muscat' (M)

(2) *widʕak hō rāḥaḵ lā* [lit: I knew where 'far' not] 'I didn't know where 'far' was' (Sima78:17)

No other Semitic language family, not even the closely related Ethio-Semitic languages and southern Arabic, negates by means of postposed *l*. The ancient Semitic languages, including Ancient South Arabian and Ge'ez, are recorded as having at least one negative particle containing *l* or derived from **l* that precedes the negated element. On the basis of data from Johnstone (1981) and Simeone-Senelle (1997), Lucas & Lash (2010: 399) suggest that the MSAL exhibit different stages of Jespersen's Cycle of negation, a historical change whereby pre-verbal negative markers are joined by new markers of negation in post-verbal position, which eventually come to replace the pre-verbal markers of negation. The term Jespersen's Cycle (henceforth JC) was coined in 1979 by Dahl (1979). Jespersen's original observation is as follows:

The history of negative expressions in various languages makes us witness the following curious fluctuation: the original negative adverb is first weakened, then found insufficient and therefore strengthened, generally through some additional word, and this in its turn may be felt as the negative proper and may then in course of time be subject to the same development as the original word. (Jespersen 1917: 4)

¹ This is the term we use to refer to the word 'no' – i.e. the negative one-word answer to a yes–no question – and its equivalents in other languages.

Seen from the perspective of JC, stage I is characterised by a pre-verbal negator, as in Old French and Old English *ne*; at stage II, the pre-verbal negator is reinforced optionally by a post-verbal element grammaticalised to form a bipartite negative construction, as in Middle English *ne ... noht* and French *ne ... pas/rien*, etc.; at stage III, the pre-verbal negator is replaced by the post-verbal element as the primary negative particle, as in some varieties of Modern French *je (ne) sais pas* ‘I don’t know’, with *ne* now optional, and Early Modern English *I say not* (Lucas & Lash 2010). A further stage, described as stage I’ (Lucas & Lash 2010: 380), involves leftward movement of the rightmost negator, as in Modern English *I don’t say* where the negator is placed before the main verb.²

According to Lucas & Lash (2010: 400), the MSAL occupy the three main stages of JC: stage I, involving a pre-verbal or pre-predicate negator, is exhibited solely by Soqotri (Simeone-Senelle 1994: 198, 207; 1997: 414; Miranda Morris, p.c.); stage II, involving a pre-verbal negator reinforced by a post-verbal element, is exhibited by Šherēt, also known as Jibbali (Hofstede 1998: 157), and Mehreyyet; and stage III involving replacement of the original pre-verbal negator by the post-verbal element is exhibited in most contexts by Harsūsi and WYM. One difference between the negation patterns exhibited by French and English on the one hand and those exhibited by MSAL on the other is that the post-predicate negator in MSAL is (almost) identical to the pre-predicate negator. Thus Lucas & Lash’s (2010) proposal is based on analysing the post-predicate negator in MSAL as the result of grammaticalisation of the anaphoric negator *lā* ‘no’.

In this chapter, we demonstrate not only that different MSAL, but also different dialect groups within Mehri exhibit different stages of JC. Mehreyyet exhibits significantly more bipartite negation – with a negative particle (realised as *al-*, *l-* or *la-*) both preceding and following the negated element – than Mahriyōt. Mahriyōt exhibits bipartite negation in contexts where WYM shows only monopartite negation, and thus appears here, as elsewhere (Watson, in press), to occupy a stage between that of the most conservative dialect group, Mehreyyet, and the least conservative WYM dialect group. Dialect differences in negation are acknowledged in the literature: bipartite negation is said to be exhibited in Mehreyyet and some eastern Yemeni dialects while western Yemeni dialects exhibit monopartite (post-negation) (Simeone-Senelle 1997: 413–414, 2011: 1103). However, bipartite negation exists alongside monopartite post- and pre-negation in both Mehreyyet and Mahriyōt, and, indeed, does occur in limited contexts in WYM. Although the dialects appear to occupy different stages of JC, the choice of monopartite or bipartite negation, we argue, is constrained in all dialect groups by morpholexical and syntactic factors.

We begin by considering the origin of the post-predicate negator and looking at tag questions and the anaphoric negator. We then examine negation of the predicate in the three dialects, and consider topic–comment sentences, *šād ... lā* ‘yet ... not’ structures, negative commands, and constituent negation. In the penultimate sections, we look at fixed negative phrases and co-ordinated structures which in all dialects exhibit pre-predicate negation. In the final section, we consider instances where the rightmost negator has moved leftward, and thus where dialects show signs of moving to stage I’ of JC.

2 The anaphoric negator and tag questions

The anaphoric negator in all dialects is *lā* ‘no’. In many languages, tag questions are realised by a simple negative or, less commonly, positive particle. Tag questions turn a declarative clause into a yes–no question that requests confirmation or disconfirmation, but implies

² The negative marker *pa* (< French *pas*) found in several French-lexifier creoles is pre-verbal (Rowlett 1998: 94–5) and, within a Chomskyan syntactic framework, in Haitian Creole is argued by DeGraff (1993) to have been reanalysed from specifier to head of the negative phrase. If this analysis is tenable, then Haitian Creole is at what Lucas & Nash call stage I’ within JC.

expectation of a positive answer (Payne 1997: 296–297). Tag questions in Mehri are realised by *lā* ‘no’; utterance-final tag questions may also be realised by the positive particle *ahā*, or by juxtaposition of the positive and negative particles *ahā lā* ‘yes no’. Examples include:

(3) *b-ḥāwēl ḥābū ysākfām ār b-mīsāt – lā* ‘At first, people used to just make roofs with [wood from] *mīsāt* trees, didn’t they?’ (Sima2:15)

(4) *hīs nūka hāl baʔlī hbēr lā* ‘When he arrived at the camel herders, didn’t he’ (M)

Tag questions realised by *lā* occur far more frequently in Mehri than negative tag questions in English, for example; they may interrupt phrases and propositions, and in translation are often best left untranslated.

(5) [*hīs yḥaym yizīm tah [^]gawāz[^] lā*] *yḥaym yidāʔam bih fnōhan hēh man ḥō* ‘when they m. are about to give him a passport, don’t they? They want to know beforehand where he is from’ (M.N)

(6) *wa-hīs mgōran ḥābū [lā] baʔlī [^]šurṭah[^] d-išxabīrah* ‘And then when the people [not], the police, were asking him’ (M.N)

The original pre-predicate negator most probably took the form *lā* in the dialects. Through grammaticalisation, *lā* was reduced phonologically to *la-*, and we see the pre-negator *la-* in more careful speech in all dialects. The further reduced forms *l-* and *al-* attested most frequently today result from sonorant metathesis found elsewhere in the grammar (cf. Watson, in press). Phonological reduction of the original negator together with the frequency of occurrence of the *lā* tag question led to *lā* losing its function of negative tag question in some contexts and coming to strengthen the negation of pre-negated clauses in MSAL. Once final *lā* became reinterpreted as a predicate negator, the original initial negator could, in certain contexts and certain dialects, fall away.

3 Negation of the predicate

Negation of the predicate in WYM is, with the exceptions noted in section 3.6, always realised as monopartite post-negation (Bittner 1914: 31; Wagner 1953: 33). In Mahriyōt and Mehreyyet, the choice of monopartite or bipartite negation with predicates in non-topic–comment clauses is subject to rather complex morpholexical and syntactic constraints. With few exceptions, main and subordinate clauses exhibit monopartite post-negation in Mahriyōt. Personal-pronoun and VP-initial conditional clauses may exhibit bipartite negation. The choice of monopartite post-negation or bipartite negation in main clauses in Mehreyyet is subject to the following morpholexical constraints: monopartite post-negation is mandatory where the clause-initial element is a PP, existential *šī*, a locative, a noun, an indefinite pronoun, or a demonstrative. Bipartite negation may occur for emphasis where the clause-initial element is an independent personal pronoun or a VP. Bipartite negation in subordinate clauses and syndetically linked co-ordinated clauses may occur *unless* the initial element is a substantive or a demonstrative.

3.1 Mahriyōt

PP-initial main clauses in Mahriyōt are invariably singly post-negated whether they are independent main clauses or second conjuncts.

(7) *šī ḥatm lā* ‘I’m not sure’ (Mo)

(8) *w-bīs šī xadmāt gahrīt lā* ‘It f. doesn’t have any more work [i.e. there isn’t any other work associated with it]’ (Sima6:17)

Negated NP-initial clauses of all types almost always have monopartite post-negation. The following examples include a locational clause, a nominal clause, and a verbal clause.

(9) *w-lākān sēh hāl ḥābū kāll lā* ‘but it f. [i.e. the knowledge of *raṣbūt*]³ is not with everyone’ (Sima1:7)

(10) *nahj dōm jīd lā* ‘that game isn’t good’ (Mo)

(11) *d-šēh fēšāl lā* ‘he who has no work’ (Sima11:9)

A personal-pronoun-initial subordinate clause may have bipartite negation, though cases are rare. In the conditional clauses below, bipartite negation is shown in the first example, monopartite negation in the remaining examples:

(12) *w-hān l-sēh zbānyōt lā* ‘and if it is not a spring [tree]’ (Sima2:16)

(13) *hān sēh mḥōlām lā* ‘if it f. is not a [matter of] blood poisoning’ (Sima1:58)

(14) *w-hīn [...] sēh ṣayd ḥnōb lā* ‘and if [...] they [= it f.] are not big sardines’ (Sima51:16)

VP-initial main and subordinate clauses display monopartite post-negation, although they may exhibit bipartite negation in a positive–negative or negative–negative co-ordinate complex (cf. below).

(15) *yḥarsām hēh lā* ‘They m. don’t guard it m.’ (Sima56:81)

(16) *mākk tāfsaḥ b-nābyūk dā-ttōmār lā* ‘Won’t you m.s. stop taking the dates?’ (Sima33:34)

(17) *ḥābū kall snīnan yḡarbam šī lyōmah dā-nṣrōmah lā / yḡarbam šī [^]mustawrad[^] man barr lā* ‘People in the past didn’t know these [things] of now. They m. didn’t know about [things] imported from abroad’ (Mo)

(18) *aḥōm dēh lā / aḥōm ār dēh* ‘I don’t want that, I just want that’ (Mo)

The following are negated adverbial (conditional and time) clauses respectively:

(19) *hān mōt īmōh lā* ‘If he doesn’t die today’ (Sima74:16)

(20) *wa-tfāsk b-ṣaynātā ḥmūh, tfāsk, tfāsk, / at-tā ykāṣ rgāz wīyā lā wi-ykāṣ kwī kwī lā* ‘You m.s. soften [it] with a little water, until it m. becomes neither too soft or too hard’ (Sima57:93)

A VP-initial conditional clause may have bipartite negation in Mahriyōt, particularly where two or more conjuncts are involved, as in (22) below, though examples are rare:

(21) *hām lā-tḡarbāmsān lā* ‘If you m.pl. don’t know them f.’ (Sima99:33)

(22) *hīn lā-rkank lēh tū lā w-l-āsš^ābaṣk mān mālḥōt lā* ‘When you m.s. haven’t preserved it m. well or put enough salt in’ (Sima58:44)

3.2 Mehreyyet

³ Traditional treatment for snake bites and puncture wounds (Lonnet & Simeone-Senelle 1987; Sima 2009, text 1, text 67).

In Mehreyyet, the predicate in PP-initial main clauses is typically singly post-negated. In the examples below, PP-initial clauses are bracketed off where they occur within larger contexts. Where they occur at the end or beginning of larger contexts, for example where the PP-initial clause follows the conjunction *lahinna* ‘but’, the PP-initial clause is separated by a forward slash:

(23) *šīn ḥawš lā* ‘we don’t have a paddock’ (M)

(24) *nakan [šīn ḥōgat lā] xaṭṭawr* ‘we came, we had no particular reason, [we were] passing through’ (M)

(25)

lahinna / šay farsēt lā ‘but I don’t have the opportunity’ (M.txt)

In contrast to Mahriyōt, a PP-initial main clause in Mehreyyet may have bipartite negation as opposed to monopartite post-negation to emphasise the negation.

(26)

al-šay sfōt bi-xbēr dōmah lā ‘I haven’t heard that news’ (M.txt)

PP-initial conditional clauses have monopartite post-negation in the unmarked case, but may exhibit bipartite negation, as in example (28) below:

(27) *wa-hām bīs ḵrūn lā / tkūn ḵarḥayt* ‘And if she has no horns, she’s [described as] *ḵarḥayt*’ (M)

(28) *wa-lū mank lā / ankāʔan bawmah lā* ‘If it weren’t for you m.s., I wouldn’t have come here’ (M.PES)

(29) *ašigarīt klift / hām al-būk ḥamāt lā* ‘The climb is difficult, if you m.s. don’t have strength’ (M.PES)

PP-initial clauses introduced by the attributiviser *da-* typically have bipartite negation (cp. Mahriyōt *d-šēh fēsāl lā* ‘he who has no work’ Simal1:9):

(30) *da-l-šēh mgarbēt lā / yūkōf* ‘He who has no knowledge remains silent’ (M)

(31) *da-l-šēh ^Agawāz lā* ‘He who has no passport’ (M)

In the unmarked case, main clauses of all types which start with a non-topicalised NP have monopartite post-negation. Of the following examples of pronoun-initial clauses, (31a) and (31b) are locational clauses, (32a) and (32b) nominal clauses, and (33a) and (33b) verbal clauses:

Pronoun-initial clauses

(31a) *hōh bawmah lā* ‘I am not here’ (M)

(31b) *hēt bark abayt lā* ‘You s. aren’t at home’ (M)

(32a) *hōh fōna ḥbūr lā* ‘I wasn’t cold before’ (M)

(32b) *hēt ansyūt lā / hēt ār ḵaʔyūt* ‘You s. are not human, you are a spirit’ (M)

(33a) *hō ḵdark latikḵah waḥsī lā* ‘I can’t drink it m. all myself’ (M)

(33b)

وهو وداك هيس ذهائن لا *wa-hōh wadak tēs ḍa-hāsan lā* ‘I don’t know what it f. is about’ (M.txt)

In contrast to Mahriyōt, however, the predicate in pronoun-initial utterance-initial declarative clauses may have bipartite negation in Mehreyyet. Bipartite negation here is claimed by speakers to strengthen the negation:

(34) *al-hēh wōḍam yiḳā? šīn lā* ‘There is no need for him to be with us’ (M)

(35) *lā, al-hēh ḍa-haʔnoh lā* ‘No, he didn’t do it deliberately’ (M)

(36) *waylōb al-hōh sīrōna waḥsay lā* ‘I’m certainly not going on my own!’ (M)

In contrast to Mahriyōt, Mehreyyet typically exhibits bipartite negation of pronoun-initial conditional and circumstantial clauses.

(37) *hām al-hēh man ḥaybī lā* ‘If it m. weren’t for my father’ (M)

(38) *adammis faṣṣawt tilifūn / wa-l-sēh ḍa-haʔnūt lā* ‘She probably leant on her phone while she wasn’t aware’ (M)

Again in contrast to Mahriyōt, pronoun-initial hypotactically and paratactically linked complement clauses typically have bipartite negation in Mehreyyet, as in the following examples:

(39) *hāsan haḡrabūk tay / ḍa-l-hōh šūkaḥk lā illōh* ‘What made you m.s. know that I wasn’t able to sleep last night?’ (M)

(40) *haṣbaḥk / al-hōh ḳdark lā* ‘It turned out [= I became] that I was unable to’ (M)

(41) *ḍa-śnawwan ḥnaḥs / al-sēh ankayta fīsē? lā* ‘She thinks she won’t be back soon’ (M)

(42) *hankūr / al-hēh šaff ḍa-msēr šādī lā* ‘He realised it m. was not the track of a normal pace’ (M.N)

(43)

ذئوك الهوه قدرون لنكاء خلال نئيرحيوم حولين ليومه لا *ḍa-śnawwak / al-hōh ḳadrōna lankā ^Axilāl^A aḡsar ḥāyōm ḥawlaytan lyōmah lā* ‘I think I won’t be able to come during these next ten days’ (M.txt)

The predicate in clauses with an initial noun or demonstrative invariably has monopartite negation in both main and subordinate clauses.

Main clause

(44) *abayt nōb wīyan lā* ‘The house isn’t very big’ (M)

(45) *ḥaybitk ṣalḥayt lā* ‘Your m.s. female camel isn’t fat’ (M)

(46) *ḍōmah yinōfa sī lā* ‘This m. is no use’ (M)

Subordinate clause

(47) *aḥḥazmayyat [hām aḍnōbas bih šiffā lā] ykūn ḍōmah ḡayb* ‘The ḥazmayyat [camel], if her tail doesn’t have much hair, that m. is a fault’ (M.N)

(48) *īrān thōm sūriya tiftēk lā* ‘Iran doesn’t want Syria⁴ to leave’ (M)

(49)

لا استاذ عمور اموه اساتذه انكيا لا ^A*ustād*^A *ʕamūr īmōh* ^A*asātīdah*^A *ankyēyā? lā* ‘The lecturer said, ‘The lecturers aren’t coming today’’ M.txt

In the unmarked case, VP-initial main and complement clauses have monopartite post-negation.

Main clause

(50) *siddam lā* ‘They m. didn’t make up’ (M)

(51) *imših bīšak lā* ‘Yesterday it m. didn’t snap’ (M)

(52) *wat da-ḥatūgak tʔōmar lā lā* ‘When you m.s. are in need, you don’t say, ‘No’’ (M)

Complement clause

(53) *aḡarbah yiḡōrah b-ārēb lā* ‘I know he doesn’t like Arabs’ (M)

(54) *ḡrūb maharradūtan tah lā* ‘He knew they m. wouldn’t send him back’ (M)

A VP- or pronoun-initial main clause without an initial topic may have bipartite negation in Mehreyyet, although this occurs considerably less in our data⁵ than suggested by Rubin for the Johnstone texts (Rubin 2010: 265–266). Bipartite negation is almost invariably characteristic of non-utterance-initial clauses, most particularly second conjuncts, and where it does occur in utterance-initial clauses it serves to add strength to the negation.⁶ Thus, both the following partially elicited clauses express the proposition ‘I didn’t forget my phone in the restaurant’, with negation strengthened in the first bipartite example:

(55) *al-hanhayk tilifūnī bark amṭām lā* ‘I didn’t forget my phone in the restaurant’ (M)

(56) *hanhayk tilifūnī bark amṭām lā*

Bipartite negation may serve to disambiguate a clause in Mehreyyet. The monopartite example (57) is ambiguous between negation of the main verb or negation of the verb in the subordinate clause. The bipartite examples (58) and (59) disambiguate: (58), placing the pre-negator before the main verb, negates the main verb, and (59), placing the pre-negator before the subordinate clause, negates the subordinate clause.

(57) *wkōh hēt klaṭk hīs da-hēt ṭbaxk lā* ‘Why didn’t you m.s. tell her that you cooked?’ ~ ‘Why did you tell her that you didn’t cook?’ (M)

(58) *wkōh hēt al-klaṭk hīs da-hēt ṭbaxk lā* ‘Why didn’t you m.s. tell her that you cooked?’

(59) *wkōh hēt klaṭk hīs da-l-hēt ṭbaxk lā* ‘Why did you m.s. tell her that you didn’t cook?’

⁴ i.e. the Syrian government. Recorded in February 2011 during the protests in the Arab world that removed the presidents of Tunisia and Egypt.

⁵ Including those supplied by T.M. Johnstone’s consultant, Ali Musallam.

⁶ In the context of many approaches to JC, which see the rise of the post-negation as a reinforcement of an apparently weak pre-negator, the pattern referred to here, whereby the post-negator is reinforced by the pre-negator, is noteworthy.

The predicate in syndetically linked VPs, and in VPs and verb-initial clauses linked by the adversative conjunct *ār hīs* more, often has bipartite rather than monopartite negation in Mehreyyet, as exemplified below:

(60) *hōh baʔlīt abayt / wa-l-hamrīta lā* ‘I’m f.s. one of the family and I won’t be shy [and hold back [from eating]]’ (M)

(61) *hōm laǧtayr ār hīs al-matwiyak lā* ‘I wanted to speak, but I couldn’t’ (M)

Bipartite negation of VP-initial conditional clauses occurs far more frequently in Mehreyyet than in Mahriyōt.

(62) *wa-hām al-da-ratkaz haydantsa lā* ‘and if her [the camel’s] ears aren’t pointing up’ (M.N)

In at least one case, lexical factors determine the choice between monopartite and bipartite negation: VPs involving *aḥōm* ‘I want’ have bipartite negation in main clauses more frequently than other verbs. The frequency of occurrence of pre-negated *aḥōm* in Mehreyyet has led to *lhōm* occurring in place of *aḥōm* in positive clauses, as in (64) and (65) below:

(63) *lhōm lankā lā* ‘I don’t want to come’ (M)

(64) *lḥamš b-xayr* ‘I want you f.s. well’ (M)

(65)

لحمش تكتيبى هه *lḥamš taktēbī hēh* ‘I want you f.s. to write to him’ (M.txt)

3.3 Indefinite pronoun predicand

Clauses with an initial indefinite pronoun predicand *ḥād ~ aḥād* are usually singly post-negated by *lā* in all three dialects:

(66) *ḥād yinōka bā-warqāt ʔ lā* ‘niemand kommt mit einem Papier’ (no one comes with a paper) (Wagner 1953:33)

(67) *w-ḥād mānkīh d-āṭōrāb l-ḥād lā, w-ḥād mānkīh yāfrōk ḥād lā* ‘Neither of you DUAL has [officially] offered protection to the other, but neither of you DUAL fears the other’ (Sima48:27)

(68) *ḥād yikōdar yišnē sī lā* ‘No one can see anything’ (M)

3.4 Co-ordinated clauses

Syndetically linked independent-pronoun-initial clauses exhibit monopartite post-negation in WYM, but may exhibit bipartite negation in Mahriyōt, as in the examples (69) and (70) below:

(69) *bākšāt tkūn bāk šamk, [tālḥaks mālsē wīyān wīyān lā, / wa-l-sēh mšā b-jārbīb tāl kāsšayt kāsšayt lā]* ‘The place is in the central region, the rain doesn’t reach it that much, nor is it as dry as on the coastal plain’ (Sima23:10)

(70) *mhāršay axah fārd män kbīlāt ḡayj män kbīlāt [l-hēh ḡayj mkaddām lā, / wa-l-hēh kbīlāt lā]* ‘a normal person is someone from the tribe who is neither a leader nor a ḥalfēt-partner’ (Sima48:13)

(Poly)syndetically linked pronoun-initial clauses (almost) invariably exhibit bipartite negation in Mehreyyet:

(71) *fāmha ḡ-īgirssan b-aḡa?* [*wa-l-hēh ḡa-rīkab lā / wa-l-hēh ḡ-isyūr lā / wa-l-hēh bark hōla lā / wa-l-hēh bark ḡarḡ lā*] ‘His feet were dragging on the ground, and he wasn’t mounted and he wasn’t walking, and he wasn’t in the shadow and he wasn’t in the heat’ (M.N)

In a co-ordinate complex of verbal predicates, bipartite negation may occur in Mahriyōt and Mehreyyet, at least in the second conjunct, as an alternative to monopartite pre-negation (cf. below).

(72) *Ṣamōr abdan* [*aḡṣamh lā ḡaḡ / wa-l-ḡamh lā*] ‘He said, “No way! I won’t taste it m. and I don’t want it!”’ (Mo.N)

(73) *w-ḡābū lyēk ḡād* [*rīzam / aw l-rīzam lā*] ‘These people will either agree or not agree’ (Sima48:30)

(74) *hōh ḡiggōna* [*wa-l-yiḡtalīb bay lā / wa-l-yiṣays lay lā*] ‘I am going on the Hajj and they m. shouldn’t worry about me or be afraid for me’ (M.N)

In syndetically linked conjuncts where the sense of negation is strengthened, (*a*)ḡād-initial clauses may have bipartite negation in Mahriyōt and Mehreyyet.

(75) *w-ṣī ḡābū mān Ṣūr wa-l-ḡād mnān sīlām lā* ‘I had people from Ṣūr with me, and not one of us was saved’ (Sima75:23–24)

(76)

amaḡbōs^A murtāḡīn^A wa-l-aḡād bih sī lā ‘The prisoners are happy, and no one has anything [wrong] with him’ (M.txt)

3.5 Negation within comment of topic–comment clause

Unlike what is found in WYM (cf. Wagner 1953: 33), Mehreyyet usually displays bipartite negation, and Mahriyōt may display bipartite negation when the whole predication within the comment of a topic–comment clause is negated and the predicand within the comment is an independent pronoun.⁷ Where a clause takes an initial noun or demonstrative predicand, a negated clause is said by Mehreyyet informants to be topicalised preferably. In the negated topic–comment clause, the anaphoric pronoun predicand of the comment clause is usually pre-negated.⁸ In the less acceptable negated non-topic–comment clause, the predicand is not pre-negated. Thus, while both the following clauses are acceptable, the topic–comment clause in (78) is preferable:

(77) *aḡlēm ḡād lā* [lit: the pen good not] ‘The pen is not good’ (M.ES)

(78) *aḡlēm al-hēh ḡād lā* [lit: the pen not it m. good not] ‘The pen is not good’ (M.ES)

Further contextual examples of bipartite negation within topic–comment clauses from Mehreyyet include:

(79) *bawmah aḡaww / al-hēh ṣabḡ lā* ‘Here the weather isn’t reliable’ (M)

⁷ Bipartite negation where a clause takes an initial independent pronoun is significantly more common in Mehreyyet than in Mahriyōt: the 75 Jōdab texts in Sima (2009) show six tokens of pre-negated *hēh* ‘he’ and three tokens of pre-negated *sēh* ‘she’, but no other independent pronouns are pre-negated. There are no examples of pre-negated pronouns in the Rēhan texts.

⁸ However, even here there are exceptions, as in Mehreyyet: *naṣrā sēh bawmah lā* ‘Nasra isn’t here’ (M.txt); *wa-ḡīmah sēh karmaym lā taḡhūm* ‘That f. isn’t a mountain moving’ (M).

(80) [*tayt / al-sēh ḥūrūt wīyan lā*] *nḏōmar hašarīt* [lit: one f. not she very black not we call *hašarīt*] ‘one f. [camel] that is not very black we call *hašarīt*’ (M)

(81)

لا اجبيل الهه اقاء ذهبار لا *agbēl / al-hēh akā? da-hbε:r lā* ‘The mountains are not the place for camels’ (M.txt)

In Mahriyōt, the personal-pronoun-initial predicate of a topic–comment clause may have bipartite negation, but considerably fewer instances of bipartite negation are shown here than in Mehreyyet. In the following examples, the predicate of the topic–comment clause is separated by /, and the entire topic–comment clause placed in square brackets where it occurs in a larger context. Compare (82) below, in which bipartite negation is exhibited, with (83), in which it is not.

(82) *w-šarbī ynōkaš b-[{šī} / l-hēh lbōn lā]* [lit: and post-monsoonal comes with {s.th.} not it m. white not] ‘And the post-monsoonal fat has {something} that is not white’ (Sima27:22)

(83) *jārmīyāt / sēh xwōrāt lā* [lit: *jārmīyat* it f. *xwōrat* not] ‘The *jārmīyat* camel is not [like] the *xwōrat* camel’ (Sima47:75)

The VP predicate of a topic–comment clause may have bipartite negation in Mahriyōt, as in (84) below, but more frequently has monopartite negation, as in (85).

(84) *ār kād [hēt maḥḥ dēk xōzār / lā-trāknāh wīyān lā]* ‘That [uncooked] fat, that butter, you m.s. can’t preserve it m. very long’ (Sima58:42)

(85) *wa-ḏār [hōh bašš manhām / aḡarbaham lā]* ‘but I, some of them m., I don’t know them’ (Mo)

In Mehreyyet, a PP-initial predicate in a topic–comment clause may have monopartite negation, particularly when the topic is a personal pronoun:

(86) *hēt bayš šābar h-aḡanyawm mākanī [hōh / bay šābar lā]* ‘You f.s. have patience with children, but I don’t have patience’ (M)

(87) *nḥah / šīn šfōt lā manh* ‘We haven’t had any news about him’ (M)

(88) *bāš min ḥārawn / bīsan ḡrūn lā* ‘Some goats, they f. don’t have horns’ (M)

In the case of a substantive or demonstrative topic, the PP-initial predicate of a topic–comment clause more commonly has bipartite negation, as in the examples below:

(89) *arabd / al-hēh dīwē lā* [lit: treachery not to it m. cure not] ‘There is no cure for treachery’ (M)

(90) *wa-hēh ḡayg kaṭ [aḡrawš ḡa-ḡagg / al-šīh ḡrawš lā]* ‘And he was a man certainly [in terms of] money for the Hajj, he had [= with him] no money’ (M)

(91)

بعلی مسکوت المنهیم خبیر نیلا *baḡlī maskūt / al-manhēm xbēr šī lā* ‘The people of Muscat, there is no news of them m.’ (M.txt)

In Mahriyōt, by contrast, a PP-initial predicate in a topic–comment clause has monopartite post-negation, irrespective of the morpholexical identity of the topic:

(92) *hābū / šīhām xaṣṣōr lā* ‘People don’t have a relish’ (Sima12:38)

(93) *bīdōrāt – bāk kalbi – / šīs häbbōt lā* ‘Sowing, I think, doesn’t have a song’ (Sima63:48)

(94) *nḥah / šān sī ṣilm lā būmah* ‘We don’t have any experience here’ (Sima2:70)

Bipartite negation in topic–comment clauses is mandatory in Mahriyōt and Mehreyyet, but apparently not in WYM, where a personal pronoun topic takes an anaphoric pronoun as predicand of the clausal predicate (cf. Rubin 2010: 265).

(95) *w-hēh / l-hēh xōdām ḡ-dākmāh baṣl mōl lā* ‘and he who is [no longer] a worker for that m. livestock owner’ (Sima18:24)

(96) *hōh / al-hōh waḥī lā* ‘I am not an angel’ (M)

(97) *hām āzūm al-šī wa-[hēh fnōhan / al-hēh šīh sī lā]* ‘When [someone] is determined [to do] something, and before he has nothing’ (M.N)

However, where the anaphoric pronoun is post-posed to the predicate, bipartite negation is not found unless a second anaphoric pronoun also occurs predicate-initially. Thus, (98) and (99) below, which exhibit bipartite negation, contrast with (100), which does not.

(98) *aḡāy al-hēh bawmah lā* ‘My brother, he isn’t here’ (M)

(99) *aḡāy al-hēh bawmah hēh lā* ‘My brother, he isn’t here’ (M)

(100) *aḡāy bawmah hēh lā* ‘My brother, he isn’t here’ (M)

**aḡāy al-bawmah hēh lā*

In other cases of anaphora, bipartite negation is usually found to the exclusion of monopartite negation in Mehreyyet. Co-referentiality is indicated in the following examples by subscript *i*.

(101) *ṣāyantani; ṭawran bīsan arḥūmat lākan al-sēni; ^{^mahamm^} lā ṣāyantani* ‘The eyes also have a beauty aspect, but they are not very important, the eyes’ (M.N)

(102) *amšaḡarēt yḡāḡ aḡatyasi; al-hēhi; ḡṣayr lā* ‘The next thing is that her neck should not be short’ (M.N)

Compare the following example from Mahriyōt, where bipartite negation is not exhibited in the case of anaphora:

(103) *dōmah_i ḡ-hēhi; mšandīb lā* ‘the one m. who is not someone with *raṣbūt* knowledge’ (Sima1:38)

3.6 Ṣād (ād) ... lā structures

In all major dialects of Mehri including WYM (Bittner 1914: 31; Wagner 1953: 33), bipartite negation occurs where the clause is modified by the adverbial particle *ṣād* (*ād*) ‘still; yet’. With few exceptions,⁹ *l-* precedes *ṣād* where the *ṣād* element is negated along with the following phrase, and follows *ṣād* where only the following phrase is negated. Thus, Mehreyyet *l-ād šinkə tēham lā* ‘I haven’t seen them m. again’ (i.e. I am no longer in a state

⁹ e.g. *amūr ḡōmah [l-ād ḡduh lā] ḡōmah bawmah hēh* ‘He said, “That one m. has not died. He is here.”’ (M); or double pre-negation, as in: *l-ād al-bih wōram lā* ‘There wasn’t yet a road’ (M).

where I see them) contrasts with *ād al-šinkə tēham lā* ‘I have not yet seen them m.’ (i.e. I am still in a state where I have not seen them).

3.6.1 *šād (ād) la-*

šād (ād) la- typically negates a following locational or verbal clause.

Locational clause

(104) *hābū šād l-šihām byōt mākān lā* ‘People didn’t yet have many houses’ (Sima33:17)

(105)

وَاد الشين ضيفت ذوقوت هيس نيس لا *w-ād al-šīn šyaft d-ūḳōt hīs tīs lā* ‘We have not yet had a wedding like it f.’ (M.txt)

Verbal clause

With a following perfect verb, *šād (ād) la-* denotes that the action or state has not, or had not, yet occurred:

(106) *šād lā-hfāḳk lā* ‘I hadn’t yet got married’ (Sima4:2)

(107) *ād al-aḥād xadmīs lā* ‘No one had yet made it f.’ (M)

With a following imperfect verb and the focus adverbial *ār*, *šād (ād) la-* may restrict the action or state to the time or place indicated. Here the clause is singly pre-negated, at least in Mehreyyet, as for other exception clauses:¹⁰

(108) *ād al-ahōma? agrōy dōmah ār šarōmah* [lit: I don’t hear that talk except now] ‘That is the first time I’ve heard that talk’ (M)

(109) *ād al-ašaynham ār imōh* [lit: I don’t see them m. except today] ‘I saw them m. for the first time today’ (M)

3.6.2 *l-šād (l-ād)*

l-šād (l-ād) may negate a following nominal (110), verbal (111) or locational clause (112) and (113) in all three dialects.

(110) *ū hē, / lād ī šeh ḥass ē lā* ‘und er selbst war unbesinnungslos’ (he was no longer conscious) (Wagner 1953:33)

(111) *l-šād yaxyūs lā* ‘It m. will no longer go bad’ (Sima27:10)

(112) *wa-nš^arōmah sārḥat dīmāh / l-šād sēh mākān lā* ‘And now we don’t have this custom much anymore’ (Sima20:24)

(113) *ḳhawr / l-ād bīs šxōf wīyan lā* ‘The *ḳhawr* [camel], she doesn’t have much milk left’ (M)

In both Mahriyōt and Mehreyyet, though more commonly in Mahriyōt, *šād*-initial phrases may lack the pre-*šād* negator in verbal and locational clauses. No examples of this structure were found in the published WYM data. Exceptional instances of monopartite post-negation can only be interpreted as negation of the entire phrase including *šād (ād)*:

(114) *nš^arōmah šād yāršaybām lā* ‘Now don’t they m. do *rašbūt* anymore?’ (Sima1:56)

¹⁰ No examples of this type of structure are attested in the Mahriyōt data.

(115) *šād widšak hīboh lašmōl lā* ‘I no longer knew what to do’ (Sima4:5)

(116) *ād hābū da-hšawbah šahh lā* ‘People no longer thought he was alive’ (M)

4 Negative command

Negative command is expressed by the subjunctive followed by *lā* in all three dialects.¹¹ My database for Mehreyyet and Stroomer (1999) contain a few examples of bipartite negation in negative commands, but the majority of examples are singly post-negated in both Mahriyōt and Mehreyyet. Examples include:

(117) *tǧīra kahwēt lā?* ‘Don’t drink coffee!’ (Simeone-Senelle 2011:1103)

(118) *tagtīr at-tā bahlīt tīt lā!* ‘Don’t say a single word!’ (Sima33:28)

(119) *tāšayšī lā* ‘Don’t f.s. be afraid!’ (M)

In Mehreyyet, bipartite negation of a negative command may occur to strengthen the prohibition, when *ād* precedes the verb, and in second conjuncts. No examples of bipartite negation of a negative command are attested in either the Mahriyōt or WYM data.

(120) *al-tabarkay lā / sīrī l-xarxawr hōram mayar fanwayš* ‘Don’t f.s. run! Go slowly! The road in front of you is steep’ (M)

(121) *l-ād thasray lā bi-šigarīt xṭayrat* ‘Don’t f.s. speed down dangerous hills again!’ (M)

5 Constituent negation

A particular constituent within a proposition may be negated to the exclusion of other constituents. Constituent negation usually involves monopartite post-negation in all dialects, but in the case of co-ordinated negated phrases may involve monopartite pre-negation (see section 6.3). It is, however, sometimes difficult to distinguish constituent negation from negation of the predicate. Negation of a repeated predicand in the second conjunct but not in the first, for example, could either be seen as negation of the predicand or negation of an elided predicate, as in (122) below.

(122) *bašš hābū yaštākādām b-^Ašašwadāh^A / w-bašš lā* ‘Some people believe in magic and some don’t’ (Sima1:31)

Similarly, negation of the fronted adverb in the example below takes scope over the whole predicate.

(123) *ṭawr lā / hamak bahlīt arabīyat* ‘Not once did I hear an Arabic word’ (M)

Negation of the constituent occurs in reformulative apposition, when a negated phrase is apposed to an incorrect positive phrase:

(124) *šādi hōh kannūn – kannūn lā* ‘I was young – not [very] young’ (Sima33:2)

(125) *trōb lyōmāh ār kanyūn – kanyūn lā* ‘Those branches are just small – not small’ (Sima90:18)

¹¹ According to work by the Wiener Expedition, in WYM the negated indicative is more common in negative commands than the negated subjunctive (Wagner 1953: 13), but this is not confirmed by Simeone-Senelle (1994: 206).

Similarly in conjoined adverbs, the constituent in the second conjunct may be negated to the exclusion of the first:

(126) *hōh aḡṣōn minsēn āṣamī / ṣarōmah lā* ‘I used to find them f. sweet, [but] not now’ (M)

(127) *kanhūr tayw nhūr / wa-nhūr lā* ‘In the past, she used to eat one day and one day not’ [i.e. she used to eat every other day] (M)

(128)

وقونا من فنوهن ذغروب اعينت وين لا *wkōna man fnōhan ḡa-ḡrūb aḡaynat / wīyan lā* ‘He may have already known a little, but not much’ M.txt

6 Fixed phrases and co-ordinated negated phrases

Possible evidence for monopartite pre-negation being the original form is found in frozen fixed phrases. Monopartite pre-negation takes place in fixed phrases and in cases of co-ordinated negated phrases usually restricted to two conjuncts.

6.1 Negative phrases and clauses

Fixed negative phrases, such as *la-hanw-* ‘not in mind’ and *wa-l-ḡayrab ~ wa-l-ḡarabūt* ‘not at all!’, post-posed conditional clauses *hām (ḡa-)al X* ‘if not X’, and negative phrases invoking God involve monopartite pre-negation in Mahriyōt and Mehreyyet. No examples of pre-negated fixed negative phrases were found in the WYM data.

(129) *la-hanwīh* ‘He didn’t mean it’ (M)

(130) *la-hanwī ḡiskā¹² bih lā* ‘I didn’t mean it. I didn’t notice it’ (M)

(131) *aḡāk ḡa-ḡatyāḡ lay imṣih – wa-l-ḡarabūt ~ wa-l-ḡayrab* ‘Did your m.s. brother get angry with me yesterday?’ ‘Not at all!’ (M)

(132) *ṣay wkōna ḡaṣrayn / hām al-axayr* ‘I have around twenty, if not more’ (M)

(133) *yaftūṣaḡ aḡayḡ / hām al-syūr ṣīham* ‘The man will be embarrassed, if he doesn’t go with them m.’ (M)

(134) *abēlī al-tawuzmī tēt ūṡōmah* ‘God please don’t give me a woman like that!’ (M)

Both in co-ordinated phrases in which the second element alone is negated and in co-ordinated negated clauses and phrases, monopartite pre-negation is often found to the exclusion of both monopartite post-negation and bipartite negation in all three dialects.¹³ Monopartite pre-negation is found in these cases irrespective of the morpholexical properties of the clause-initial element. Data such as these and data which show monopartite pre-negation exclusively in set phrases suggest that the original negator was the initial element and that bipartite negation resulted from the addition of a negative element based on the anaphoric negator *lā*.

Syndetically co-ordinated negated clauses and phrases of all types are typically singly pre-negated in all three dialects, with pre-negation of both conjuncts.

6.2 Co-ordinated negated clauses

¹² < **ḡissak bih*.

¹³ As in Ḥarsūsi (Johnstone 1977: 2).

Of the following examples from Mahriyōt, the first two are negated verbal clauses, of which the first takes an initial indefinite pronoun, and the final example a negated clause of attribution.

(135) *l-ḥād wīdaṣ b-ḍikm šāfrēt ḥlākmāh / wa-l-ḥād wīdaṣ b-hāh sī mādfīn* ‘And no one knew about that knife there and no one knew what was hidden’ (Sima42:19)

(136) *l-āsūnyās / wa-lā-śśūnyā* ‘I don’t see her and she doesn’t see me’ (Sima76:9)

(137) *tʕajnah at-tā ykāṣ [l-hēh kwī kwī, / wa-l-hēh rgāz rgāz]* ‘You m.s. kneed it m. until it is neither too tough nor too soft’ (Sima84:4)

Of the following examples of co-ordinated negated clauses from Mehreyyet, examples (138a) and (138b) are verbal clauses; (139a) and (139b) are nominal clauses – a clause of attribution and a clause of proper inclusion respectively; (140a) and (140b) are locational clauses.

(138a) *hōh [al-hōh ḍa-gilwak / wa-l-hōh b-xayr]* ‘I am neither ill nor well’ (M)

(138b) *lū amnādam yiwōda l-hān wḵōna lih taksāyan tah [l-ād yitāyw / wa-l-ād yišḥōk]* ‘If man knew what was coming to him you would find him no longer eating and no longer laughing’ (M.R)

(139a) *ḥaybīt ḍīmah [al-sēh ṭwaylat / wa-l-sēh ḵṣayrat] amḵiyēt* ‘This camel is neither tall nor short, [she’s] in between’ (M)

(139b) *la-hēh nagd / wa-l-hēh šḥayr* ‘It is neither the desert nor the mountains’ (M)

(140a) *hōh ḡayg [ḍa-l-šay [^]gawāz[^] / wa-l-šay [^]itbāt[^]]* ‘I am a man who has no passport and no identification papers’ (M.N)

(140b) *amūr hōh [al-šay [^]gawāz[^] / wa-l-šay [^]ayya ḥāḡah[^]]* ‘He said, ‘I haven’t got a passport or anything’’ (M.N)

6.3 Co-ordinated negated phrases

Co-ordinated negated noun phrases, adjective phrases, verb phrases and prepositional phrases are pre-negated in all three dialects.

(141) *ū ḡalagak [lā šiwōṭ / ū lā nūr]* ‘und hast du weder Feuer noch Licht gesehen?’ (have you seen neither fire nor light?) (Wagner 1953: 33)

(142) *wa-l-ḥād mnān sīlām lā, [l-šōx mnān / wa-l-ḵannūn] ṣsē hōh* ‘Not one of us was saved, neither old nor young, apart from me’ (Sima75:24)

(143) *ḡayg [al-xṣawb līham ba-xaṭṭ / wa-l-xṣawb līham bi-sī]* ‘The man hadn’t sent them m. a letter or sent them anything’ (M)

6.4 Co-ordinated negative/positive clauses and phrases

Co-ordinated positive and negative clauses and phrases are typically pre-negated.

(144) *āṣar ṭwayl wa-ḥyūm hīs tah / wa-l-kūsan ṣḡayḵ ḍ-iḵaṣran tah* ‘The night is long and the daytime too and we’ve found no friend to shorten it’ (M.R)

Where a positive phrase is co-ordinated to its negative counterpart, it frequently involves repetition of the verb.

(145) *aḥḥawalk / w-lī aḥḥawalk* ‘whether I understand or not’ (Mo)

(146) [*tḥōm / w-lī tḥōm*] *madī laḥkām lūk* ‘whether you m.s. like or not I’ll force you’ (Mo)

The second clausal conjunct may be elliptical in co-ordinated negated clauses and phrases.

(147) *ḥābū lyōmah [al-sītham muh / wa-l-ḳawt]* [lit: those people, not with them m. water and not food] ‘Those people have neither water nor food’ (M)

(148) *sēh [al-ṣabarūt min aḳanyawn / wa-l-min ḥābū sīyēx]* [lit: she not manage without the children and not without old(er) people] ‘She can’t do without [other] children or adults’ (M)

7 Stage I’ in Jespersen’s Cycle

The element which in bipartite negation is the post-negator does not always come at the end of the proposition, or indeed to the right of the negated term. In some cases, in particular the negation of propositions involving *wīdaʿ* (*wīda*) ‘to know’ *ḳdūr* ‘to be able’ or *sānūs* ‘to dare’, the negative particle may follow the initial verb rather than the whole proposition (cf. also below). This movement of the post-negator closer to the verb arguably represents stage I’ in JC (Lucas & Lash 2010: 380).

In all dialects, final complement clauses may occur to the right of the right-most negator.

(149) *wūdāš lā ḡajinôt tayt reḥēmet?* ‘hast du nicht ein schönes Mädchen bemerkt?’ (aren’t you aware of a beautiful girl?) (Wagner 1953: 33)

(150) *w-ḡād sānusk lā / lšukf at-tār sāḥ* ‘and I no longer dared sleep on the roof’ (Sima95:14)

(151) *atēt msūmēt tḳawdar lā / tšēfaḳ trōh ḡayḡi trōh* ‘a Muslim woman can’t marry two, two men’ (M.N)

In all three dialects, final adverbials, including adverbial PPs, may occur to the right of the right-most negator.

(152) *ḥād yinōka bā-warqāt ʿ lā / ḥā-msejīd* ‘niemand kommt mit einem Papier in die Moschee’ (no one comes with a paper into the mosque) (Wagner 1953: 33)

(153) *n^uṣrōmāh dōmāh d-yāmsūš šamm d-rēšīt, [yāztārūr lā / mānh]* ‘Now the one who sucks out the snake poison, isn’t he harmed by it?’ (Sima1:44)

(154) *ḥābū [l-ḡād ḥād ysōkān b-Qāṭan lā / nṣ^arōmāh]* ‘No one lives in the dry uplands anymore’ (Sima29:33)

(155) *śafs illōh [šukafūt lā / min aṣarb ḡa-haflas]* ‘It turns out she didn’t sleep last night because of the pain in her stomach’ (M)

(156) *hanwī sattal lā / man ḥlakmah* ‘My mind hasn’t moved from there’ (M)

Similarly, a post-posed topic, as in (157) and (158), or predicand, as in (159) and (160), may follow *lā* in all three dialects.

(157) *fekkāysē lā / héybes* ‘ohne daß ihr Vater sie verheiratete’ (without her father marrying her off) (Wagner 1953: 33)

(158) *ḥād yābtirnās lā / šōḥawṭat* ‘No one catches it f., the whale’ (Sima44:50)

(159) *ṣamōr takmalī lā / faṭḥ al-maṣīn* ‘He said, ‘Faṭḥ al-Maṣīn won’t cope with me!’’ (Mo.N)

(160) *dah tabarūt ḥayḍānah mākanay dah tabarūt lā / ḥayḍānah* ‘That m. one’s handle is broken, but that m. one’s handle isn’t broken’ (M)

In one Mehreyyet text (Watson, in press), several instances occur of a pre- and post-negated personal pronoun, with the right-most negative particle preceding rather than following the negated predicate.

(161) *taḳā [al-sēh lā] ḳannitt* [lit: she should be she not small] ‘She should be not small’ (M)

(162) *wa-fʿamsā nyūb arwaṣtan [al-sēn lā] ḥīrartan* ‘and her feet have to be large and wide and not narrow’ (M)

8 Conclusion

We have shown that the choice of monopartite pre-, monopartite post- or bipartite negation in all three Mehri dialect groups is at least partially dependent on syntactic factors, and in the case of Mahriyōt and Mehreyyet also on morpholexical factors. We have also seen that bipartite negation in Mehreyyet, at least, can be used to disambiguate clauses.

The presence of monopartite pre-negation in a closed set of fixed negative phrases, the fact that Soqoṭri, the only MSAL that invariably exhibits monopartite pre-negation, appears in other areas of the grammar to be more conservative than other MSAL, and the fact that the MSAL are the only Semitic languages to exhibit post-negation strongly suggest monopartite pre-negation to be the older form. An examination of syntactic constraints on the choice of monopartite or bipartite negation, and consideration of negation patterns in the three dialect groups leads to a conclusion that negation in Mehri is moving along a trajectory from monopartite pre-negation to bipartite negation to monopartite post-negation with some evidence of subsequent leftward movement of the final negator. All three dialects exhibit monopartite post-negation, bipartite negation and monopartite pre-negation; however, Mehreyyet displays bipartite negation in syntactic and morpholexical contexts where Mahriyōt does not, and Mahriyōt exhibits bipartite negation in syntactic contexts in which only monopartite negation is attested in WYM. Thus Mahriyōt occupies a stage in JC between the least conservative WYM and the most conservative Mehreyyet.

References

- Bittner**, Maximilian 1914. *Studien zur Laut- und Formenlehre der Mehri-Sprache in Südarabien. IV. Zu den Partikeln*. Wien: Hölder.
- Dahl**, Östen 1979. Typology of Sentence Negation. *Linguistics* 17: 79–106.
- DeGraff**, Michel. 1993. A riddle on negation in Haitian. *Probus* 5: 63–93.
- Hofstede**, Antje Ida 1998. *Syntax of Jibbāli*. PhD thesis, University of Manchester.
- Jespersen**, Otto 1917. *Negation in English and other languages*. Copenhagen: Høst.
- Johnstone**, T.M. 1981. *Ḥarsūsi lexicon and English–Ḥarsūsi word list*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Lonnet**, Antoine & Marie-Claude **Simone-Senelle** 1987. Rābūt: Trance and incantations in Mehri folk medicine. *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies* 17: 107–115.
- Lucas**, Christopher & Elliot **Lash** 2010. Contact as catalyst: The case for Coptic influence in the development of Arabic negation. *Journal of Linguistics* 46: 379–413.
- Payne**, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing Morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rowlett**, Paul. 1998. *Sentential Negation in French*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rubin**, Aaron. 2010. *The Mehri Language of Oman*. Leiden: Brill.
- Sima**, Alexander. 2009. *Mehri-Texte aus der jemenitischen Sharqīyah: Transkribiert unter Mitwirkung von Askari Sa'd Hugayrān*. Edited, annotated and introduced by Janet C.E. Watson & Werner Arnold. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Simeone-Senelle**, Marie-Claude 1994. La négation dans les langues sudarabiques modernes. *Matériaux arabes et sudarabiques* 6: 187–211.
- Simeone-Senelle**, Marie-Claude 1997. The Modern South Arabian Languages. In Robert Hetzron (ed.), *The Semitic Languages*. New York: Routledge. 378–423.
- Simeone-Senelle**, Marie-Claude 2011. Modern South Arabian. In Stefan Weniger, Geoffrey Khan, Michael Streck & Janet C.E. Watson (eds), *Handbook of Semitic Languages*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 1073–1113.
- Wagner**, Ewald 1953. *Syntax der Mehri-Sprache unter Berücksichtigung auch der anderen Neusüdarabischen Sprachen*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Watson**, Janet C.E. (in press) *The Structure of Mehri*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.