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Abstract

We discuss the combination of negation and coordination in an Arabic construction which is somewhat akin to the *neither...nor* construction in English and many other languages. In Arabic however, the form marking the non-initial conjunct is transparently related to the *and* coordinator rather than the *or* form. We provide an analysis of bisyndetic negative coordination expressing both sentential and constituent negation, and also as negative concord in certain contexts. We draw exclusively on data from the Turaif variety of Arabic in our discussion. The central facts concerning the use and distribution of the bisyndetic negative coordination construction are broadly similar across the Arabic vernaculars.

1 Introduction

We discuss the combination of negation and coordination in an Arabic construction somewhat akin to the *neither...nor* construction in English illustrated in (1) and (2) (for the coordination of predicates and arguments respectively), corresponding in logical meaning to the monosyndetic examples with a single *and/or* in (3).

(1) John neither washed nor dried the dishes.

(2) Leo ate neither the rice nor the carrots.

(3) John did not wash the clothes and did not hang them out to dry (either).
   John did not wash or dress.
   Leo did not eat rice or carrots.

Haspelmath (2004, 2007) describes coordinated structures of the bisynthetic (and polysynthetic) types such as (1) and (2) as instances of ‘emphatic coordination’ (or focusing coordination), arguing that where every term has a negative coordinator, the terms are indicated as being in some sort of contrast. On the other hand, the examples in (3) have a less ‘emphatic’ flavour.

Our discussion draws on data from the Turaif dialect (of Saudi Arabia), but the facts are broadly similar in other contemporary varieties of Arabic. The bisynthetic construction, also referred to as emphatic bisynthetic coordination (Haspelmath, 2004, 2007) is illustrated in (4) and (5). We focus in particular on the use of *wala* and *la*.

(4) a. mansūr mā akal l-ruz wala šarab
   Mansour.3SGM NEG eat.PFV.3SGM DEF-rice NEG.CONJ drink.PFV.3SGM
   l-gahwa
   DEF-coffee
   Mansour neither ate the rice nor drank the coffee.
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b. mansūr lā akal l-ruz wala šarab
Mansour.M NEG eat.PFV.3SGM DEF rice NEG CONJ drink.PFV.3SGM
l-gahwa
DEF coffee
Mansour neither ate the rice nor drank the coffee.

(5) lā ?ahmad wala mhammad ţ-aw
NEG Ahmad.M NEG CONJ Mohammad come.PFV-3PLM
Neither Ahmad nor Mohammad came.

The element wala is polysemous - we will gloss the wala which appears in this
construction as NEG CONJ and refer to it as ‘coordination wala’. We will gloss
lā as NEG (reflecting its etymological source). Coordination wala is transparently
related to a combination of the conjunction and a negative particle. The main ques-
tions which we address here are: (i) does coordination wala contribute negation or
is it simply restricted to a negative environment?; (ii) what are the constraints on
the constructions illustrated above and how can they be captured in LFG?

2 Agreement, Coordination, Disjunction

In Turaif Arabic we find full agreement in both SVO and VSO word orders (SVO
is the common or default word order). Both 3SG and 3PL show gender agreement
(i.e. there is a 3PLF form in this variety of Arabic). When the agreement controller
is coordinate we find fully resolved agreement in SVO order and both fully re-
solved and closest conjunct agreement (CCA) in VSO word order. With disjunctive
agreement controllers, we find a closest conjunct agreement pattern in both word
orders. As we will see in section 4.3, the lā...wala negative coordination structure
exhibits its coordinative (rather than disjunctive) nature by following the agreement
pattern of w ‘and’ (6) rather than yā ‘or’ (7).

(6) a. huda w mansūr ţ-aw
Huda.F CONJ Mansour.M come.PFV-PLM
Huda and Mansour came.

b. huda w nora ţ-an
Huda.F CONJ Noura.F come.PFV-3PLF
Huda and Noura came.

(7) yā abō-i yā ?umm-i rah ti-ţ-i
either father.M-1SG.GEN or mother.F-1SG.GEN FUT 3SGF-come.IMPV
bokra
tomorrow
Either my father or my mother will come tomorrow.
3 Negation

3.1 Sentential Negation

Like many other vernacular Arabics, sentential negation in verbal sentences in Turaif Arabic uses the particle *mā* immediately before the verbal element, as in (8). This verbal strategy with *mā* also extends to use with pseudo-verbs as in (9).¹

(8) a. ʿAlī mā kitab ʿl-waḡib
   Ali.M NEG write.PFV.3SGM DEF-homework
   Ali didn’t do the homework.

b. ʿAlī mā ya-ktib ʿl-waḡib
   Ali.M NEG 3SGM-write.IMPV DEF-homework
   Ali doesn’t do the homework.

(9) huda mā ʿinda-ha/maʿa-ha sayyārah
   Huda.F NEG with-3SGF.GEN/with-3SGF.GEN car
   Huda doesn’t have a car.

Sentential negation with non-verbal predicates (other than the set of pseudo-verbs which exhibit the verbal strategy with *mā*) uses the particle *mū*, and its inflectional counterparts which show agreement with the subject, in (10).²

(10) a. ʿAlī imdars
   Ali.M teacher.SGM
   Ali is a teacher.

b. ʿAlī mū/mahu imdars
   Ali.M NEG/NEG.3SGM teacher.SGM
   Ali is not a teacher.

The distribution of *lā* is much more constrained in vernacular Arabic than it is in Modern Standard Arabic. In connection with Palestinian Arabic, Hoyt observes: “In Classical Arabic and early forms of the dialects (c.f. Blau, 1967), the *la*-particle was itself ambiguous between three uses: (i) expressing present tense verbal negation; (ii) expressing existential or categorial negation (Arabic *nafi līgins* “negation of the kind”) …; and (iii) negative imperatives. Of these, (i) and (ii) have

¹The term pseudo-verb is used for forms diachronically related to prepositions and nouns which do not inflect as regular verbs (but by means of a GEN affix coding the SUBJ) but exhibit verbal functions, including that of occurring as the main sentential predicate. The use of the verbal strategy for negation distinguishes the pseudo-verb from its prepositional counterpart (such as the locative prepositions ʿind “at” and *māl “with”).

²As shown by (10) there is no copula in the affirmative predicational clause with present tense interpretation. It is sometimes claimed that *mū* (and inflectional variants) is a form of copula verb. Whether or not this is the case, the main point here is that (10b) is an instance of sentential negation.
largely been reduced to formulaic borrowings from Standard Arabic, leaving negative imperatives...as the primary productive use of *le?*”. (Hoyt, 2010, 108). (11) illustrates existential or categorial negation in MSA.

(11) là šakka-a fî dâlîka
\[ \text{NEG doubt-ACC.INDEF on that.FSG} \]
There’s no doubt about that. (Ryding, 2005, 179)

Beyond the coordinative constructions we discuss here, the particle là occurs only in the prohibitive (negative imperative), shown in (12), in Turaif Arabic.³

(12) a. ?ktib l-waġîb!
\[ \text{write.IMPV DEF-homework} \]
Do the homework!

b. là ta-ktib l-waġîb!
\[ \text{NEG 2SGM-write.IMPV DEF-homework} \]
Don’t do the homework!

### 3.2 Other Strong Negative Elements

Alongside sentential negative particles, there are certain other expressions in Turaif Arabic which have inherently negative meaning, as shown by the fact that they may occur as fragment negative answers to questions. Of these, relevant to the current topic, we find (i) the negative (pronominal) quantifier màhâd ‘no one’ and (ii) the negative quantifier wala ‘not even one’ in its scalar focus particle (SFP) use, which combines with an indefinite NP. Note that, as observed in section 1, wala is polysemous, and indeed there are other languages where the same word form occurs both in SFP and negative coordinator uses, such as ani in Polish (cf. also Russian, Hungarian, Modern Greek and Romanian (Haspelmath, 2004)).

The examples in (13) show that màhâd ‘no one’ is an inherently negative word appearing in preverbal position, and as a consequence combining it with the sentential negation marker leads to a ‘double negative’ interpretation, as in (13b). It does not occur in postverbal position where instead we find the corresponding item ?ahad anyone, which does not itself express any negative meaning. As shown in (13c) to convey ‘no one’ it will occur in the context of a preceding sentence negative mà, mà, etc. SFP wala, illustrated in (14), also has an inherently negative meaning preverbally, which is negated if the sentential negative occurs in the same sentence. However, it also occurs in postverbal position, as in (15) where it behaves like ?ahad in that it requires a preceding sentence negator to convey its usual negative meaning. Thus strong preverbal SFP wala contributes negation while weak

³The (positive) imperative is formed of the imperfective stem (without the agreement prefix), and an epenthetic augment. We gloss it simply as an imperfective stem. The prohibitive is formed of the imperfective stem with second person inflection, preceded by là.
postverbal SFP *wala* occurs in a “negative context”, and arguably exhibits negative concord (*NC*). However as Lucas (2009, 187) claims, “the Arabic varieties that exhibit true negative concord are fewer than what is claimed in the literature”.

(13) a. *māḥad* ǧ-َا l-yōm  
   no.one come.PFV-3SGM DEF-day  
   No one came today.

   b. māḥad mā ǧ-َا  l-yōm  
   no.one NEG come.PFV-3SGM DEF-day  
   No one didn’t come today. (= Everyone came today.)

   c. mā ǧ-َا  ?ahad l-yōm  
   NEG come.PFV-3SGM one DEF-day  
   No one came today.

(14) a. wala ǧālīb ǧ-َا l-yōm  
   NEG.SFP student.SGM come.PFV-3SGM DEF-day  
   Not even a (single) student came today.

   b. wala ǧālīb mā ǧ-َا l-yōm  
   NEG.SFP student.SGM NEG come.PFV-3SGM DEF-day  
   Not even a single student didn’t come today.  
   (= Every student came today.)

(15) a. mā ǧ-َا wala ǧālīb l-yōm  
   NEG come.PFV-3SGM not.even student.SGM DEF-day  
   Not even a (single) student came today.

   b. *ǧ-َا wala ǧālīb l-yōm  
   come.PFV-3SGM not.even student.SGM DEF-day  
   Intended: Not even a (single) student came today.

Following Przepiórkowski and Patejuk (2015) (see also Sells (2000), Laczkó (2014) and Laczkó (2015)) on the syntactic aspects of such negative items, we will represent the distinction between constituent negation and eventuality negation at f-structure, using two features *ENEG* and *CNEG* (standing for eventuality negation and constituent negation). Thus an example such as (14b) with *NQ SFP wala* and a realisation of sentential negation will be represented as in (16).

---

4For the data which we discuss here, it would in principle be possible to replace the features *ENEG* and *CNEG* by a more general feature *NEG*, available in the f-structures corresponding to sentences and their dependents alike. Discussion of the further aspects of negation in Arabic which do in fact motivate the maintenance of the *ENEG/CNEG* distinction we make use of here would take us too far afield.

5The feature *SFOC* simply provides a syntactic indication of the scalar focussing property of negative quantifier *wala*. It is not important in the present context.
4 Negative Coordination

There are several strategies for expressing the coordination of negated predications in Turaif Arabic. In particular, although neither lâ nor wala are used as markers of sentential negation they occur in widespread strategies for negative coordination.

4.1 With Verbal Predicates

The examples in (17) involve coordination at the lexical level where we see three variants are possible: mā ... w mā in (17a) involves the standard marker of verbal negation on the first conjunct and the coordinating particle w followed by the standard marker of verbal negation on the second conjunct (and any subsequent conjuncts); mā ... wala combining the standard marker of verbal negation on the first conjunct with negative conjunction wala (17b); and finally lâ ... wala which marks negation on the first conjunct using the negative element lâ combined with the negative conjunction wala before the second conjunct (and any subsequent conjuncts), in (17c).

(17) a. huda mā nazẓaff-at w mā rattib-at l-bêt
   Huda.F NEG clean.PFV-3SGF CONJ NEG tidy.PFV-3SGF DEF-house.SGM
   Huda did not clean and did not tidy the house.

b. huda mā/lâ nazẓaff-at wala rattib-at
   Huda.F NEG/NEG clean.PFV-3SGF NEG.CONJ tidy.PFV-3SGF
   l-bêt
   DEF-house.SGM
   Huda neither cleaned nor tidied the house.

c. huda lâ nazẓaff-at wala rattib-at
   Huda.F NEG clean.PFV-3SGF NEG.CONJ tidy.PFV-3SGF
   l-bêt
   DEF-house.SGM
   Huda neither cleaned nor tidied the house.

These three strategies are all equally available to cases of coordination with a shared subject, at the VP and I’ levels, as shown in (18) and (19).
Mansour did not eat the rice and did not drink the coffee.

Mansour neither ate the rice nor drank the coffee.

Huda didn’t either play any sport or go to the gym.

Huda didn’t either play any sport or go to the gym.

Mansour did not wake up and nor did Ali come from work.

Mansour did not wake up and nor did Ali come from work.
Mansour did not wake up and nor did Ali come from work.

4.2 With Non-Verbal Predicates

Negative coordination of non-verbal predicates is grammatical with all three strategies, as shown below. Where mà occurred in corresponding verbal sentences in (17) - (19) we find mû or its inflected forms.

(21) a. hûdû mi/lâ tûl-a wa mi tûl-a Hûdû.F NEG.3SGF tall-SGF in DEF-house NEG.3SGF tall-SGF

Hûdû is not tall nor short.

(22) a. hûdû mi/lâ tûl-a wa mi gisîr-a Hûdû.F NEG.3SGF tall-SGF in DEF-house NEG.3GF short-SGF

Hûdû is not tall and not short.

4.3 With Nominal Dependents

In sections (4.1) and (4.2) we have seen a number of patterns for expressing sentential or eventuality negation. The possibilities are much more restricted when it comes to the constituent negation of coordinate nominal arguments such as subject and object. Since these are nominal arguments, rather than main sentential predicates, neither mà nor mû are possible marking the coordinate argument; hence the only pattern which arises is that combining lâ on the first conjunct with wala on the second (and any subsequent) conjunct. Parallel to what we saw above in section 3.2 for certain negative words such as SFP wala, the negative coordination of arguments with lâ...wala preverbally is inherently negative (see (23a)) and can combine with sentential negation to give a double negative meaning, as in (23b). Again like SFP wala, postverbal negative coordination with lâ...wala exhibits negative concord (NC) and requires the presence of sentential mà (see (24)). The agreement behaviour that we see is the coordination-appropriate pattern for this variety of Arabic — full (resolved) agreement in SVO and both fully resolved
and CCA agreement in VSO (examples (23) and (24) show resolved agreement and (25) illustrates CCA). When we have the CCA agreement pattern with a (negative) coordinate subject it is possible to drop the lā marking the first conjunct, as in (25).

(23) a. lā ?ahmad wala mhammad ġ-aw  
NEG Ahmad.M NEG.CONJ Mohammad.M come.PFV-3PLM  
Neither Ahmad nor Mohammad came.

b. lā ?ahmad wala mhammad mā ġ-aw  
NEG Ahmad.M NEG.CONJ Mohammad.M NEG come.PFV-3PLM  
Neither Ahmad nor Mohammad didn’t come.  
(= Both Ahmad and Mohammad came.)

(24) *(mā) ġ-aw lā ?ahmad wala ŋali  
NEG come.PFV-3PLM NEG Ahmad.M NEG.CONJ Ali.M  
Neither Ahmad nor Ali came.

(25) mā ġ-at (lā) huda wala ŋali  
NEG come.PFV-3SGF NEG Huda.F NEG.CONJ Ali.M  
Neither Huda nor Ali came.

The same positional dependent alternation between NEG in (26b) and NC (in 26a) readings arises with non-subject arguments to verbs, as illustrated in (26). Negative coordination of arguments to non-verbal predicates such as the pseudo-verb ŋind ‘have’ is parallel in all respects, as in (27a) and (27b).

(26) a. ŋali mā šarab lā gahwa wala šāy l-yōm  
Ali.M NEG drink.PFV.3SGF NEG coffee NEG.CONJ tea DEF-day  
Ali has drunk neither coffee nor tea today.

b. lā gahwa wala šāy šarab ŋali l-yōm  
NEG coffee-SGF NEG.CONJ tea.SGF drink.PFV.3SGF Ali.M DEF-day  
Ali has drunk neither coffee nor tea today.

(27) a. mā ŋind-i (lā) rayṣ-a wala sayyār-ah  
NEG have-1SG.GEN NEG license-SGF NEG.CONJ car-SGF  
I have neither a license nor a car.

b. lā rayṣ-a wala sayyār-ah ŋind-i  
NEG license-SGF NEG.CONJ car-SGF have-1SG.GEN  
I have neither a license nor a car.
5 Sentential Negation and Negative Coordination: Analysis

We start by considering the \( m\bar{a} .. w m\bar{a} .. \) pattern illustrated in (17a), (18a) and similar examples. In these examples the SUBJ is outside the coordinate structure (in terms of c-structure) and distributed in (in terms of f-structure). Sentential negation is independently marked in each conjunct by the negative particle \( m\bar{a} \), and the conjunction \( w \) defines CONJTYPE as AND and CONJFORM as W for the coordinate structure as a whole.

The negative particle \( m\bar{a} \) is obligatorily adjacent to the verb (and is a morphologically bound form in some vernaculars). We treat it as a non-projecting word adjoined to I and defining \( \text{ENEG} = + \). For the conjunction \( w \), two possible analyses are plausible. We adopt the flat structure in (31a) as the more standard assumption. The alternative would be the structure shown in (31b) in which the conjunction forms a constituent with the following conjunct.

![Diagram](image-url)
5.1 The wala conjunct

Consider now coordination *wala* as in (18b) and other similar examples above. Coordination *wala* (distinct from SFP *wala*) occurs only before non-initial conjuncts, expresses coordination and contributes negation to the following conjunct. Again there are two possible structures, differing in whether *wala* forms a constituent with the second conjunct or occurs at the level of the coordinate structure as a whole.

(32) a. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\text{Conj} \\
\text{l wala} \\
\text{XP}
\end{array}
\]

b. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\text{Conj} \\
\text{l wala} \\
\text{XP}
\end{array}
\]

In a flat structure we would require annotations along the lines shown in (33), where the conditional \( A \Rightarrow B \equiv A \lor (A_c \land B) \) (Bresnan et al. (2015, 64) originally proposed in Andrews and Manning (1999)), and where \(*\) denotes the right sister of a node and \(\phi^*\) > the f-structure of that node (Dalrymple, 2001, 120). The f-description (\(\downarrow \text{CONJFORM} = \text{WALA} \rightarrow (\phi^* \land \text{ENEG}) = +\) assigns \(\text{ENEG} = +\) to the right sister (the following conjunct) provided that the \(\text{CONJFORM}\) of the coordinate structure as a whole is \(\text{CONJFORM} = \text{WALA}\). This in turn is provided by the lexical description of conjunction *wala*, in (34). The conjuncts themselves have the standard \(\downarrow \in \uparrow\) annotation. The features \(\text{CONJFORM}\) and \(\text{CONJTYPE}\) are non-distributive; when a non-distributive feature is defined on a set the attribute and its value is a property of the set as whole: for example, the f-description (\(\uparrow \text{CONJFORM} = \text{WALA}\) in (34) defines the \(\text{CONJFORM}\) value of the coordinate structure as a whole, as shown in (35). See Dalrymple (2001, 156-158) for the distinction between distributive and non-distributive features.

(33) 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Conj} \\
\text{l wala} \\
\uparrow \\
\text{XP}
\end{array}
\]

(34) *wala* Conj (\(\uparrow \text{CONJFORM} = \text{WALA}\) (\(\uparrow \text{CONJTYPE} = \text{AND}\))
In the case of non-binary negative coordination, as stated in (36) this requires all conjunctions to be wala (which corresponds to the facts).

(36) Iterating Coordination Schema

\[
\text{XP} \rightarrow \text{XP} \quad (\text{Conj} \quad \text{XP})^+ \\
\downarrow \in \uparrow \\
\uparrow = \downarrow \\
\downarrow \in \uparrow \\
(\downarrow \text{CONJFORM} = \text{WALA} \rightarrow \phi^>(\text{ENEG}) = +)
\]

The approach outlined above does seem to permit an analysis of the appropriate facts, though perhaps at a cost of a certain amount of technical machinery. Among the drawbacks of this approach (with a flat c-structure) however, are that wala cannot lexically define its conjunct’s ENEG feature using the notation \(\phi^*\) because it has no sister. While the intuition is that wala directly contributes ENEG information, this information is introduced constructionally.

We now consider an alternative analysis using (32b). On this approach, other coordinate structures involve the flat coordination structure (so wala must be excluded from this), but wala coordination (alone) involves the special coordination schema in (37), which must be limited to this type of coordination. The c-structure rule for the conjunct XP is shown in (38): the inside-out f-description \((\in \uparrow)\) ensures that the f-structure of the XP is a member of a set. Treating ENEG as an instantiated (and non-distributive) feature will ensure that (38) applies only once in each conjunct. The element which we have called coordination wala (to distinguish it from SFP wala) specifies both negative and coordinative information in f-structure,

---

6As given above, this approach actually permits the first conjunct to be either affirmative or negative, but in the general case, both (all) conjuncts are negative if wala is used. To rule out coordination of this type with mixed polarity across the conjuncts, a further condition could be added to the f-description of the Conj node.

7An alternative possibility, still maintaining the flat c-structure, is that this is an instance of lexical sharing, involving a Conj node and a Neg node initial within the following conjunct, however this also requires us to make provision for a special negative l¯a which is not found outside of negative coordination.
and so the question arises as to whether it is categorially a Conj or a Neg. In (38) we have treated it categorially as a Neg element, as (38) is potentially also appropriate for negative incidental adjuncts, which we cannot discuss here. For the coordination data, it would also be possible to treat *wala* NEG.CONG categorically as a conjunction.

(37) **Negative Coordination Schema**

\[
\begin{align*}
XP & \rightarrow XP \\
& \quad \downarrow \in \uparrow \\
& \quad (\downarrow ENEG) =_c +_c \\
& \quad (\downarrow CONJFORM) \neq WALA \\
\end{align*}
\]

(38) \[
\begin{align*}
XP & \rightarrow \quad \text{Neg} \quad XP \\
& \quad \uparrow = \downarrow \\
& \quad (\in \uparrow)
\end{align*}
\]

(39) *wala* Neg \[ (\uparrow CONJFORM) = WALA \]
\[ (\uparrow ENEG) = +_c \]
\[ ((\in \uparrow) \text{CONJTYPE}) = \text{AND} \]

The analysis of (18b) (the variant with *mā*) in this approach is as follows. In the first conjunct ENEG = +_c is contributed by *mā*, a non-projecting word introduced as sister to the verbal element (see (29)): the CONJFORM annotation on the first daughter of (37) prevents *wala* occurring in this conjunct. The lexical entry for *mā*, revised to treat ENEG as an instantiated feature, is shown in (40). (37) requires the second conjunct to have the feature CONJFORM = WALA which is satisfied by adjunction of *wala* using (38). The f-structure is shown in (41).

(40) \[
\begin{align*}
mā \text{Neg} & \quad (\uparrow ENEG) = +_c \\
\end{align*}
\]

(41) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{CONSTYPE} & \quad \text{AND} \\
\text{PRED} & \quad \text{‘EAT< SUBJ, OBJ’} \\
\text{ENERG} & \quad +_c \\
\text{SUBJ} & \quad \text{PRED} \quad \text{‘MANSOUR’} \\
\text{OBJ} & \quad \text{PRED} \quad \text{‘RICE’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PRED} & \quad \text{‘DRINK< SUBJ, OBJ’} \\
\text{ENERG} & \quad +_c \\
\text{CONJFORM} & \quad \text{WALA} \\
\text{OBJ} & \quad \text{PRED} \quad \text{‘COFFEE’} \\
\text{SUBJ} & \quad \text{PRED} \quad \text{‘COFFEE’}
\end{align*}
\]
5.2 Status of \( \text{l¯a} \)

We can now turn to the status of \( \text{l¯a} \), the special marker of negation which occurs only on the initial conjunct of a coordinate phrase in examples such as (42).

(42) \( \text{mans¯or l¯a akal l-ruz wala šarab} \)
Mansour.M NEG eat.PFV.3SGM DEF-rice NEG.CONJ drink.PFV.3SGM
l-gahwa
DEF-coffee

Mansour neither ate the rice nor drank the coffee.

In Turaif Arabic (and other vernaculars), \( \text{l¯a} \) marks negation in the initial conjunct of negative coordination and provides some additional emphatic, focussing, or related information as compared to the counterpart sentences with \( \text{m¯a} \) or \( \text{m¯u} \) on the first conjunct (this is not dissimilar to the choice between \text{not A or B} and \text{neither A nor B} in English). Beyond this use in coordination, \( \text{l¯a} \) only occurs (vestigially) in fixed collocations, and as part of the negative imperative (prohibitive). In Classical Arabic and MSA, on the other hand, \( \text{l¯a} \) appears as a marker of sentential negation in a position immediately adjacent to the imperfective form of the verb, hence in a structure similar to (29), (see (43)).

(43) \[ I' \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
  I \\
  \text{VP} \\
  \text{Neg} \\
\end{array} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
  l \\
  \text{l¯a} \\
\end{array} \]

While \( \text{l¯a} \) in Turaif Arabic may appear immediately adjacent to the verb (as it does in (42)) it is not restricted to this position and so does not share the positional restrictions of its CA/MSA cognate. It may occur initially (before the subject) in the negative coordination of sentences, as shown in (44). While \( \text{m¯a} \) is a non-projecting \( \text{Neg} \) word immediately adjoined to the verb in I, the syntax of \( \text{l¯a} \) is like that of coordination \( \text{wala} \): it combines with a following phrase (including an IP) in accordance with (38). The proposed lexical description for \( \text{l¯a} \) is shown in (45).

(44) \( \text{lā mans¯or ga¯ıad min n-n¯om, wala ŏali} \)
NEG Mansour.M wake.PFV.3SGM from DEF-sleep, NEG.CONJ Ali.M
ˇg-a min d-dawām
come.PFV-3SGM from DEF-work

Neither did Mansour wake up nor Ali come (home) from work.

(45) \( \text{l¯a Neg} \)
\[ (\uparrow \text{CONJFORM}) = \text{L¯A} \]
\[ (\uparrow \text{ENEG}) = +_\text{-} \]
\[ ((\in \uparrow) \text{CONJTYPE}) = \text{AND} \]
5.3 Further Issues

The analysis of cases in which the main sentential predicate in each conjunct is non-verbal will follow straightforwardly from the above, given an appropriate sentential analysis for cases of non-verbal predication in Arabic. In these sentence types, \textit{ENEG} can be marked by \textit{mā} and its variants or \textit{lā} on the initial conjunct and by \textit{mā} and its inflectional variants or \textit{wala} on the non-initial conjuncts. If \textit{lā} is used, then \textit{wala} is required on subsequent conjuncts. However there is a remaining issue concerning negative coordination of full IPs (see the data in (20)). If (46) applies to IP (as stated above), then it will additionally (and incorrectly) permit \textit{lā} and \textit{mā} in clause internal position in the first conjunct (the ungrammatical pattern in (20b)). One possibility (which we do not explore further here) is that there are additional linearisation constraints which require the \textit{NEG} element to be initial in each conjunct. Another possibility is that negative coordination of IPs is excluded from (46) and falls instead under the rule for saturated arguments discussed in section 6 below.

6 Negative Coordination of Dependents

We can now turn to the negative coordination of dependents, illustrated by an example such as (47). There are considerable reasons for concluding that the syntactic f-structure analysis of such examples should reflect rather directly the external syntactic manifestation which involves the coordination within the dependent, with each conjunct showing constituent negation.\footnote{That is, in contrast to closely mirroring the interpretation. We leave matters of interpretation to one side here, but note that the interpretation (at least the most salient) is \( \neg \text{came}(\text{Ahmad}) \land \neg \text{came}(\text{Mohammad}) \) or equivalently, \( \neg (P \lor Q) \).} These are that the pattern of agreement between the subject and the predicate is consistent with the pattern we find with conjunction rather than disjunction in Turaif Arabic, and the combination of (preverbal) negative coordination of dependents with the expression of predicate negation gives rise to a double negative reading, shown in (48). Accordingly we take the f-structure for (47) to be as in (49), with (50) for the ‘double negative’ reading in (48).

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{(47)} \textit{lā} \textit{?ahmad} \textit{wala} \textit{mhammad} \textit{āl-aw}
  \item \textit{NEG Ahmad.M} \textit{NEG.CONJ Mohammad} \textit{come.PFV-3PLM}
  \item Neither Ahmad nor Mohammad came.
\end{itemize}
Neither Ahmad nor Mohammad didn’t come.

(= Both Ahmad and Mohammad came.)

If we are right about this, then we need lexical descriptions for lā and wala in their CNEG incarnation, alongside the lexical descriptions which are motivated by the use of these conjunctions in sentential negation (adjoined to verbs and pseudo-verbs and their projections), if we maintain the assumption that ENEG and CNEG are distinct attributes (rather than instances of the same attribute in different f-structures). So in addition to (45) (for lā) and (39) (for wala) we postulate (51) and (52), alongside a version of the Negative Coordination Schema for dependents, in (53). Note that there are real distributional differences between wala and lā in their (clausal) predicate negating and argument negating functions: in the latter function we require lā on the first conjunct, whereas in the former negation can be realised in a variety of different ways, as we have seen.

(51) lā Neg
    (↑ CONJFORM) = LĀ
    (↑ CNEG) = +
    ((∈ ↑) CONJTYPE) = AND
6.1 Negative Coordination of Dependents: Negative Concord

We now turn briefly to the question of lâ...wala nominal (and prepositional) dependents as negative concord elements. While lâ...wala marking of dependents in preverbal position marks negation (as we have seen above), in the postverbal position lâ...wala constitutes an instance of (non-strict) negative concord. Because position is a crucial factor, there is an apparently irreducible syntactic component to the phenomenon of negative concord (which arises postverbally).

In (55), mâ... contribute ENEG = +, and lâ and wala are NC items, so they do not contribute CNEG = + to their respective f-structures:
Przepiórkowski and Patejuk (2015) briefly outlines an approach to the (strict) negative concord items in Polish nikt ‘nobody.NOM’ and its inflectional counterparts, which occur in the context of the marker of sentential negation nie, in (57) (NW stands for n-word). They associate an inside-out constraint with these NC items which requires ENEG to be defined as + in the appropriate containing f-structure, as shown for nikt ‘nobody.NOM’ in (58).

(57) Nikt nie lubi nikogo.

nobody.NW.NOM NEG likes nobody.NW.GEN


(58) nikt (nobody) N  (↑ CASE) = NOM

((XCOMP* GF⁺ ∈ ↑ ) ENEG) = c₁ +

For the non-strict NC element lâ ... wala, we need to treat the negative coordination of an argument as introducing CNEG or as a case of NC depending on its position with respect to the verb and the expression of sentential negation (non-strict NC language). The NC interpretation arises if there is ENEG in the clause and the marker of ENEG precedes the conjunctive negative markers (lâ and wala). The interpretation as a marker of constituent negation (CNEG) arises if there is no marker of ENEG and no marker of TNS which f-precede the conjunctive negative markers. To capture the precedence relations we need both the values of the ENEG and the TNS feature to take a position in the f-precedence relation independent of the larger (sentential) f-structure. The lexical description for the dependent-marking wala, taking account of the fact that it occurs as a marker of CNEG in some circumstances and as an NC marker in other circumstances, would then be along the lines shown in (59) replacing (52). In both negative and NC uses, wala defines CONJFORM and CONJTYPE features (first two equations in (59)). Alongside this, either it defines the CNEG feature to be positive (under certain f-precedence conditions, namely when the f-structure it which it appears as an attribute is not f-preceded by either the marker of ENEG or that of TENSE) or the NC feature to be positive (under distinct conditions, namely when it f-precedes these same elements). We use a feature NC here essentially for expository convenience (it would be possible to introduce the appropriate conditions without this feature), but in any case such a feature might eventually turn out to play a role in guiding the mapping to the semantics.

(59) wala Neg  (↑ CONJFORM) = WALA  ((↑ ) CONJTYPE) = AND

{(↑ CNEG) = +_∧ ((GF⁺ ∈ ↑ )ENEG) f⊈ ↑ ∧ ((GF⁺ ∈ ↑ ) TNS) f⊈ ↑ |
(↑ NC) = + ∧ ((GF⁺ ∈ ↑ )ENEG)=c₁ +_∧ ((GF⁺ ∈ ↑ )ENEG) f≺ ↑ }

Note that we assume here that both the values of ENEG and that of the TENSE feature to take a position in the f-precedence relation independent of the larger, sentential f-structure.
A Further Option: Note that the meaning of a sentence such as (60) is not equivalent to that of an and coordination in the dependent under the scope of sentential negation. That is, it does not correspond to \( \neg (P \land Q) \), where \( P \) is drank(ali, coffee) and \( Q \) is drank(ali, tea), but rather it corresponds to meaning \( \neg (P \lor Q) \).

In the light of this we might consider an alternative approach to the dependent data, separating the conjunctive CNEG reading from a disjunctive NC reading in the entries for wala and lā, leading to entries such as (61) and (62).

(60) ʿali mā šarab lā gahwa wala šāy l-yōm
    Ali.M NEG drink.PFV.3SGM NEG coffee NEG.JCONJ tea DEF-day
    Ali has drunk neither coffee nor tea today.

(61) wala Neg
    (↑ CONFORM) = WALA
    ((↑ CONJTYPE) = AND
    (↑ CNEG) = +,
    ((GF\(^+\) ∈ ↑) ENEG) \( f \not\prec \uparrow \)
    ((GF\(^+\) ∈ ↑) TENSE) \( f \not\prec \uparrow \)

(62) wala Neg
    (↑ CONFORM) = WALA
    ((↑ CONJTYPE) = OR
    (↑ NC) = +
    ((GF\(^+\) ∈ ↑) ENEG) \( = _c + _- \land ((GF\(^+\) ∈ ↑) ENEG) \( f \prec \uparrow \)

However, we note that it is possible to have full (resolved) agreement in VSO order with a NC-marked lā...wala SUBJ. This is consistent with conjunction, but disjunctive agreement controllers give rise to a single conjunct pattern. Although this is not conclusive evidence, we do not propose to follow this alternative.

7 Conclusion

We have considered the analysis of the bisyndetic negative coordination strategies in vernacular Arabic, on the basis of data from Turaif Arabic and in particular the combination of lā (which does not otherwise occur as a marker of sentential negation) with wala, which also has a SFP use. We have argued that wala and lā in these negative coordinate constructions both negate individual conjuncts and also contribute CONJTYPE information to the coordinate structure as a whole.

We have shown that when lā... wala is used in the coordination of dependents (rather than predicates), it gives rise to either a negative reading or a negative concord reading. The conditions under which these interpretations arise are parallel to those for other items in Arabic which show an alternation between a negative and a NC reading, including the element wala used as a SFP. The diachronic development of a SFP by compounding a conjunction with a negative marker is attested in a number of languages, and the Arabic facts appear similar in some respects to these cases (see e.g. Gajić (2016) (Serbian), Herburger (2003) (Spanish), Gianollo...
(2017) (Latin), Haspelmath (1997) and especially Hoyt (2010) for a discussion of Palestinian Arabic, in which he proposes that the SFP weak-

wa may have developed out of constructions in which a final disjunct closes off a set of alternatives).
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