Syntactic Analysis of the Arabic Word “laysa”: An Auxiliary Verb or a Negative Particle
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Abstract

The aim of this paper is to show that ‘laysa’ is an auxiliary verb rather than a negative particle. The status of 'laysa' in Arabic grammar is one of the most controversial issues. Generally, it has been treated as a negative particle. Whenever there is a discussion about negative particles, you will find 'laysa'. However, the verbal function of it has not been ignored. That is, it shares some features with negative particles and others with auxiliaries. However, closer inspection indicates that syntactically and semantically 'laysa' behaves differently from Arabic negative particles. Applying Minimal Approach, I will argue in this paper that 'laysa' is not a negative particle, rather, it is a negative auxiliary verb. This argument will be supported by some semantic and syntactic behaviors of 'laysa'.
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1. Introduction

The usage of negative particles has received much attention. The syntactic and semantic variations of the behavior of negation among languages attract the attention of many scholars. The behavior of Arabic negative particles in general and *laysa* in particular could be an interesting issue to research. In this paper I don’t intend to review what has been said about negation. I will focus on two main questions:

**The first:** does *'laysa'* exhibit the same structural distribution as other negative particles in Arabic?

**The second:** is it a negative particle?

Generally, *'laysa'* is treated as one of the negative particles in Arabic, such as, *laa, lam, lan* and *maa*, although there are many structural differences between these particles and *'laysa'*. *laa, lam, lan* and *lan* are called preverbal negative particles. That is, they must be followed by a verb. Moreover, *laa* selects indicative verb form, *maa* selects jussive verb form and *laa* and *maa* select subjunctive form. Unlike these negative particles, *'laysa'* cannot be followed by a verb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a- laa</th>
<th>yaktub-u</th>
<th>alwaladu</th>
<th>addarsa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neg [pres] [he]write [Ind] the boy [nom] the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the boy does not write the lesson.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- lam</td>
<td>yaktub</td>
<td>alwaladu</td>
<td>addarsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg [past] [he] write[Juss] the boy [nom] the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the boy did not write the lesson)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addarsa</td>
<td>c- maa</td>
<td>katab-a</td>
<td>alwaladu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg [past] [he] write [Sub] the boy [nom] the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the boy did not write the lesson.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addarsa</td>
<td>d- lan</td>
<td>yaktub-a</td>
<td>alwaladu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg [fut] write [Sub] the boy [nom] the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(the boy will not write the lesson.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* e- Laysa</td>
<td>yaktub-u/katab-a/yaktub</td>
<td>alwalad-u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg [he] wite [Ind/Sub/Juss] the boy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Arabic negative particles contain temporal reference. There is a strong association between them and tense. For instance, *Laa* is used to negate present and habitual situation. That is, when we say: *laa yaktubu*, it could mean that he is illiterate or he is not writing now. *Lam* is used to negate the past, it indicates the non-occurrence of the situation before now. *Lan* has a future reference as can be seen in the examples in (1).
'laysa', on the other hand, doesn't occur with verbs and it does not carry tense. It occurs with nominal or equational sentences. Nominal or equational sentence is the sentence which doesn’t contain a verbal predicate. These sentences have a present tense, they describe general facts, habitual situations,…etc. to express temporal reference the auxiliary verb *kaana* is used. For example:

2- a- Alwald-u fii albayt-i
   The boy [nom] in the house.
   'the boy is in the house.'

   b- kaana alwald-u fii albayt-i
   be [past][he] the boy [nom] in the house.
   'the boy was in the house.'

   c- sa-yakuunu alwald-u fii albayt-i
   [fut] be [he] the boy [nom] in the house.
   'the boy will be in the house.'

Since the sentence in (a) does not contain a verb, the only way to negate the sentence is to use *laysa*. You cannot use any of the other negative particles whereas the sentences in (b & c) are negated by *lam* and *lan* respectively since they contain verbs.

3- a- Laysa alwald-u fii albayt-i
   Aux [Neg] the boy [nom] in the house.
   'the boy is not in the house.'

   b- lam yakun alwald-u fii albayt-i.
   'the boy was not in the house.'

   c- lan yakuun-a alwald-u fii albayt-i
   'the boy will not be in the house.'

   d- *Lam/*lan/*lamma/*laa alwald-u fii albayt-i
   Neg [part.] The boy [nom] in the house

As can be noted, *'laysa’* in the above examples behave like the auxiliary verb *‘kaana’* in its occurrence with nominal sentences.
Unlike all negative particles, 'laysa' shows agreement with the subject. That is, it carries agreement morphem. For instant, laysa (sing-mas), laysat (sing-fam) laysuu (plu-mas), etc. and It selects a nominative subject and accusative predicate, for example:

4- a- Alwalda-u  lays-a  fii albayt-i
   The boy [nom]  Aux [Neg] [he]  in the house.
   'the boy is not in the house.'

   b- Al?awlad-uu  lays-uu  fii albayt-i
   The boys[nom]  Aux [Neg][they] in the house
   'the boys are not in the house.'

   c- Albint-u  lays-at  fii albayt-i
   The girl[nom]  Aux [Neg][she] in the house
   'the girl is not in the house.'

In this sense, it behaves like the auxiliary verb kaana, occurs with nominal sentences and agrees with the subject.

5- a- Alwalda-u  kaan-a  fii albayt-i
   The boy[nom]   be [past][he]  in the house.
   'the boy was in the house.'

   b- Al?awlad-uu  kaan-uu   fii albayt-i
   The boys[nom]  be [past][they] in the house
   'the boys were in the house.'

   c- Albint-u  kaan-at  fii albayt-I
   The girl[nom]  be[past][she] in the house
   'the girl is not in the house.'

In addition to agreement, laysa contrasts with other negative particles in that it doesn’t co-occur with the auxiliary verb kaana. As stated above, negative particles must be followed by a verb the occurrence of kaana in the sentence allows negative particles to occur.

6- a- lam  yakun  alwaladu  yaktubu
   Neg [past]  be [pres] the boy  write-pres
   'the boy was not writing.'

   b- *laysa  kaana  alwaladu  fii al bayti.
   Aux [Neg]  be[past] the boy  in the house.
Unlike 'kaana', 'laysa' is not inflected for tense. It is used to negate present and habitual situation. Whereas 'kaana' has three temporal forms, i.e. 'kaana' (be-past), 'yakuunu' (be-present) and 'sayakuunu' (be-future).

To conclude, laysa differs from other negative particles in many ways:

1- It does not occur with verbs or verbal sentences.
2- It occurs with nominal sentences.
3- It shows agreement with the subject.
4- It doesn’t show any temporal reference.
5- It doesn't occur with auxiliary verbs.

2. Negation and Syntax

Sentential negation is a universal phenomenon. However, languages differ in the way they express negation. In his survey about sentential negation, Payan (1985) (in Zanuttini, 2003:513) states that all languages use one or more of his four strategies to express negation which he outlines in his survey.

I- The clause is negated by a negative particle which has the characteristics of a verb. This type is found in Tongan, a Polynesian language. For example,

7- Na'e 'kai [ke 'alu 'a Siale]
    [Asp]neg [asp] go absolute Charlie

'Charlie didn't go'.

In this language, the negative marker shares some properties with the verb. Such negative verbs are a combination of aspect and negative.

II- The clause is negated by a negative marker which has the characteristics of an auxiliary verb. It is inflected for number, person, tense, aspect and mood. This type is found in the Siberian language Evenki. For example,

8- Bi ø-ø-w dukuwun-ma duku-ra
    I [neg] [past] [sing] letter [obj] write [part]

'I didn't write a letter.'

III- The third type is the use of a separate negative particle such as ne in Russian, ne or nem in Hungarian which has mood, or laa and lam in Arabic which has tense and aspect. Generally these particles are used before the verb, they are pre-verbal negative particle. For example,

9- Lam yaktub alwaladu
    Neg [past] [he] write [juss] the boy
'the boy did not write'

IV- in this type, negative markers are part of the verb morphology. They occur as a prefix, infix or a suffix. The best example is the Turkish *me*.

10- John elemalar-i *ser-me-di*

   John Apple [ACC] like Neg [past][3Sg] [AGR]

   "John does not like Apples."

It has been agreed that, within the GB framework, negative particles are generated under a single functional category NegP.

11-

```
      NegP
         \ /
          spec Neg'
            \ /      \ /
             Neg XP
```

Pollock (1989) provides an influential analysis of negation. According to him, an independent status should be given to the traditional inflections such as tense, agreement and negative. So, instead of having the traditional IP, three distinct syntactic projections should be presented as follows:

12-

```
      TP
         \ /
          NegP
             \ /
              Neg'
                 \ /
                  AGRP
```

In this representation, the projection TP which is headed by tense morpheme, NegP headed by negative morpheme and AGRP headed by agreement morpheme could be overt or abstract.
Since languages differ in how to express negation, they tend to differ in where to place negatives (NegP) with respect to tense (TP) and agreement (AGRP). Accordingly, principles and stipulations insure that the verb will move into discrepancies between languages and movements. For instance, in English and Turkish, Neg appears closer to the verb than AGR and T. NEG in such situation must be placed higher than VP and lower than AGR and T as clarified in (a). In this case, the verb moves to AGR. In contrast, in Berber Neg appears outside T and AGR. (Ouhalla 1991). In this case, the verb moves to Neg. Accordingly, it must be placed higher than AGR and T as in (b).

13-

a-

[Diagram showing the structure of sentence (a)]

b-

[Diagram showing the structure of sentence (b)]

In French (Emonds, 1976; Pollock, 1989), in the case of finite clauses, both auxiliary and finite verb move to the head of TP. In non-finite clauses, the auxiliary moves to the head of TP and main verb moves to the head of AGRP. That is, negatives are treated as having a
syntactic category in their own. However, they receive two types of analyses, either heads of NegP or maximal projection in its specifier. Kayne (1989) views them as heads, assuming that heads interfere with the movements of heads. He assumes that preverbal negative particles such as the French *ne* and the Italian *non* are heads. When in maximal projection they interfere with maximal projection. The best way to test the occurrence of negative particles as heads is to find them in a context in which we have nominal clitics. If negative particles block movement, it means that they are heads. The occurrence of *ne* in embedded clauses makes movement or binding of nominal clitics impossible.

14- a- Jean *la* fait manager par/ a Paul

"John makes Paul eat it."

b- *Jean *l'a* fait *ne* pas manger a l'enfant

"John has made [Neg] [Neg] to eat to the child."

(zanuttini,2003:524)

*ne* as a head blocks government relation between the clitic and it’s antecedent.

The status of negative particles as maximal projection can be supported in two ways, negatively and positively. Negatively, they don’t behave like heads such as blocking head-to-head movement and preventing bindings. Positively, they interfere with movement of maximal projections. The first evidence is clear in languages where the verb or the auxiliary verb moves out side the VP-shell without being blocked by negative particle. If the negative in this case was head, the movement would be blocked. Holmberg and Platzack (1988) provides examples from Swedish in which the negative particle does not block movement of the verb from its base position to its landing site.

15- a- *..om* Jan *inte* köpte boken

That John [Neg] bought books

"..if John did not buy books"

b- Jan köpte *inte* boken

"John didn't buy books."

As noted above, the negative marker *inte* which precedes the verb in the embedded clause in (a) does not prevent the movement of the verb in matrix clause.

The second evidence which is the interference of negative particles with movement of maximal projections can be derived from French language. It is important to distinguish
between maximal projection which is argument position A-\textit{position} and non-argument position A'-\textit{position}.

Negative particles occupy non-argument position. Accordingly, movements of elements in A'-position are predicted to be affected by the presence of negative particles (see Rizzi, 1990).

16-

\begin{itemize}
    \item a- \textit{II n'a pas [résolu \textit{beacoup} de problems]}  
    \hspace{1cm} he Neg' has Neg solved many of the problems  
    \hspace{1cm} "not many problems are such that he solved them."
    
    \item b- \textit{II n'a [pas \textit{beacoup} résolu de problems]}  
    \hspace{1cm} he Neg' has Neg many solved of the problems
    \hspace{1cm} "not many problems are such that he solved them."
\end{itemize}

The contrast between the two sentences is that in the first the verb precedes the quantifier \textit{beacoup} whereas in the second the quantifier precedes the verb. That is, the quantifier moves to A'-position.

The situation of negatives is more complicated than the above simplified analyses. In some cases (Payne, 1985), sentential negation is expressed by a verb form rather than a negative particle. This leads to a major question about whether NegP is a projection in all languages or not. Moreover, since languages vary according to the place and behavior of negative particles, can we assume that the structural position of NegP is fixed in all languages? Across linguistic analyses of negation makes it difficult to postulate such an argument about a fixed position of the projection NegP. Ouhalla (1990) points to the structural difference between languages according to the selectional properties of the head of NegP.

The NEG parameter

\begin{itemize}
    \item a- NEG selects VP
    
    \item b- NEG selects TNS(P)
\end{itemize}

Unlike the sequence in our above analyses (in 12) in which we have the sequence (TP, NegP, AGRP and VP) this analysis suggests (AgrP, TP, NegP and VP).

Accordingly, the English negative \textit{not} takes TnsP as its complement, In the case of English the verb moves to AGR. whereas the Berber negative morpheme \textit{ur-} takes the VP as complement, in this case the verb moves to Neg. An English sentence like 'Bill didn't leave' can be simply analyzed in this way:
Radford (2008) suggests a different analysis for negation in which not is generated under the specifier of NegP (see also Haegeman and Gueron, 1999: 314-320). He states that "The specific implementation of this analysis which we will assume here one which takes the negative particle not to be the specifier of NegP (though it should be pointed out that some linguists adopt an alternative analysis under which not is taken to be the head of NEG constituent of NEGP)" (Radford, 2008:117).

The verb has a successive-cyclic movement which satisfies Head Movement Constraint (the movement is from a head position into another head position). Chang (1998) points out that in Kavalan language negative elements could have more than one projection. For instance the
negative element *mai* could take either verbal root or inflectional verb as illustrated in (a and b) respectively.

19- a- mai=ika qun tu raaq
not want= 1s.NOM eat Acc wine
'I don’t want to drink wine.

b- mai=ika q-ôm-an tu raaq
not= 1s.NOM eat AV Acc wine
'I did not drink wine. (see Tang, 2002: 625)

Chang suggests the following representations for a and b respectively

20- a-

```
  VP
     V      NP/CP
          mai
```

b-

```
  TP
     T      NegP
     past
           Neg        VoiceP
     mai
          voice      VP
          q-ôm-an
```

Yeh (1991) points out that the negative marker *okik* (Saisiyat language) exhibits certain verbal properties like tense and aspect. Moreover, it may negate nonverbal predicate. (see Tang, 2002: 763)

21- a- sia rim?an ?amkik ray taw?an
he/she omorrow neg loc house
'she/he will not be at home tomorrow.'

this one house [nom] Neg[Asp] live [PF] Gen man
'this house was not lived in by anybody.'

C- yako ?okik saysiyat.
I [Nom]       Neg          Saisiyat

'I am not Saisiyat.'

Accordingly, ?okik may project to two kinds of heads, either head of VP or head of NegP. The former type is presented as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
TP \\
\downarrow \\
\text{T} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{AspP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Asp} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{PredP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Pred} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{V} \\
\downarrow \\
?okik
\end{array}
\]

In this case, ?okik should not be treated as a negative particle. Negative particles could be as discontinuous morphemes (two parts) like the French ne....pass.

*Ne* is generated under the head of NegP while *pass* under the spec of NegP. The verb moves from the head of VP to the head of NegP to join *ne*, the both move to the spec of NegP to join *pass* then all as a complex head move to the head of TP, as illustrated in th following tree diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
TP \\
\downarrow \\
\text{T'} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{T} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{NegP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{neg} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{T} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{pass} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Neg'} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{neg} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{ne} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{V'} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{V} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{XP}
\end{array}
\]
The relationship between negation and auxiliaries cannot be ignored. Categories like T, Neg and AuxPs, which head-projection, are referred to as functional categories. In this sense auxiliaries are regarded as dependents of lexical verb heads. Generally, auxiliaries, when appear in the tree diagram, are lower than Neg. The head of the TP hosts tense and modals whereas the Spec of the TP serves as a landing site for the subject. The head of NegP hosts the negative particle (i.e. English not). The head of AuxP hosts auxiliaries like need, be, etc. However, whether auxiliaries are generated under Aux or V, they move to T.

Cross-linguistically, as noted in the above discussion, data from a number of languages show an interesting amount of variations in the syntactic behavior of negation. It could be base generated under VP, sometimes under AuxP, in other languages head of NegP or spec of NegP, or having a different functional projection. Still NegP is the main host of negation. However, The place of NegP is not fixed depending on the language and the syntactic behavior of negation in a certain language. Moreover, negative particle could be a free morpheme or a bound morpheme attached to the verb or auxiliary verb.

2.1 Arabic Negatives

Negation in Arabic language is not away from this conflict and disagreement. Arabic negative particles receives extensive and different analyses (Al-Horais, 2007; Ouhalla, 2002; Benmamoun, 2000; and Shlonsky 1997; among others). I don't intend to review all the literature in this respect, however, I will pin point some of the main issues relevant to this work. It has been suggested that there is a strong correlation between T/AGR and the position of the subject. For instance, in VSO languages, like Arabic, tense is projected higher than Aux. While in SVO, like English, Aux is higher than T (see Teaple, 2011 and Ouhalla, 1998).
Following many scholars, I assume that every clause must have a CP as its higher projection and that the head of the CP has an uninterpretable tense feature (Pesetsky and Torrego, 2000). In Arabic V climes to T and the subject [spec, VP] climes up to [spec, TP] (Benmamoun, 1992; Mohammad, 2000, among others)

Accordingly, the general schemata for Arabic clause could be as follows.

25-

```
CP
  \--- C
    \--- TP
       \--- T'        NegP
           \--- T     Neg'
               \--- Neg AGRP
                   \--- AGR' AGR AspP
                       \--- Asp Asp' V V' DP subject
```

V
DP
The location of NEGP receives more than analyses, according to Benmamoun (1992, 2000) and Ouhalla (1993) Neg is located between T and VP since T appears on Neg rather than the verb because verb movement into T is blocked by NEG as shown in (30). Shlonsky (1997), on the other hand, locates NEGP above TP. He adds that the verb does not raise to T because it is imperfect and lacks Tense features.

\[(26)\]  

```
TP  
  \(\overline{XP}\)  
    T'  
      T  NegP  
          Neg  VP  
              \(\overline{XP}\)  V'  
                  V  
```

The negative particles *laa*, *lam* and *lan* are generated in Neg, whereas, Tense is generated on the T node.

Hoyt (2006:9) points out that "*ma-* must appear no further left than the left edge of the IP-string, except when preceded by an auxiliary verb." That is, regardless of the structure, the negative particle is part of the IP.

\[27\]  

```
CP  
  \(\overline{NP}\)  
    AP  IP  
        ma…….  
          \(\overline{CP}\)  Q  IP  
              ma…..  
```
Following Pollock's (1989) proposal, Shlonsky (1997) proposes a different analysis for negative particles in Arabic in which the negative particle occupies a functional projection which dominates the IP constituent in the clause.

Negative particles in Arabic except *laysa* cannot be separated from the verb. They are always adjacent to the verb in pre-verbal position, no matter in what order (Bahloul 1996, Ouhalla 1998 and Mohammad 2000). The verb, in cases of verbal negations, must emerge with T(ense), since NEG(ation) is lower than T, it must pass through the marked property of NEG (Mohamed & Ouhalla 1995).
This strong adjacency between negative particles in Arabic and the verb leads Teeple (2011) to assume that these negative particles are prefixes. Accordingly, the verb moves to Asp, Agra, Neg and T. In Arabic, regardless of the different views about negation, the situation is different from all the above languages, tense is expressed by negative particles (lam, lan, lamma and laa) whereas Agreement is attached to the verb. Accordingly, it is assumed that Neg moves to T and the verb moves to AGR.
3. Arabic ‘laysa’

Taking into consideration all these cross-linguistic variations concerning the syntactic and semantic behavior of negatives, let us try to find a suitable analysis for the Arabic *laysa*. *Laysa* cannot be classified with Arabic negatives in type three above since it doesn’t express mood, tense or aspect. It is close to type two in which the negative marker has the characteristics of auxiliary verb which shows agreement inflections. As stated above, *laysa* shows agreement with number, person and gender.

On the basis of the data examined so far, the conditions of the distribution of *laysa* are different from those of other negative particles. Accordingly,

a- Can we assume that *laysa* may head a projection of lexical category rather than NegP?

b- Can we assume that the attachment of agreement morpheme to *laysa* is done by syntactic head movement?
Could *laysa* be analyzed as a copular verb taking a nominal structure as a complement? In other words, can we assume that *laysa* carries the meaning of *not* in addition to the verb *to be* 'be not'.

Since nominal sentences are those which lack verbal predicate, how to analyse these sentences is a question of much debate. Can we analyse them as IPs structure or as SCs (small clauses)? Many scholars addressed these questions in more general and theoretical issues (Benmamoun, 2000; Fasi-Fehri, 1993; Ouhalla, 1988, 1991; among others). Many scholars (al-Khawalda, 1997; Fassi-Fehri, 1993; among others) argue that Arabic nominal sentences have implicit auxiliary verb which carries (abstract) T and AGR”. This implicit verb becomes explicit when the tense is changed either to the past or future. Bahloul (2008) proposes a Mod(ality)P which takes NP, PP or VP as a complement.

All the previous debatable issues make the analyses of *laysa* a question of disagreement. Al-Horais, 2006:19) assumes that *laysa* occupies spec FocusP projection.

---

Benmanoun (2000) treats *laysa* as a negative particle generated in Neg and since *laysa* inflects for agreement and shows no temporal reference, it does not raise to T for purposes of feature checking. Since *laysa* syntactically and semantically differs from all negative particles in not having tense, not occurring with verbs, and having agreement inflection, it cannot be treated as one of them. *Laysa* behaves like auxiliary verbs in showing agreement and having a nominative subject and accusative predicate. Linguistically, as noted above, negation could be expressed by auxiliary verb or by a lexical verb. According to what is mentioned above, *laysa* can be treated as a negative auxiliary verb base generated under AuxP and moves up to AgrP and another movement to NegP:
That is, nominal or equational sentences are negated by means of a copular negative marker which has the characteristics of auxiliary verb taking a sentential complement. The predicate could be NP, AP or PP. The following tree diagram clarifies the idea.

![Tree Diagram]

Arabic nominal sentences cannot be treated as a small clause (SC) simply because the copular verb is implicit in the case of present temporal reference and it becomes explicit when the sentence has a past or a future temporal reference. The absence of the auxiliary verb in present allows the negative auxiliary verb *laysa* to appear. *Laysa* which is generated in the head of AuxP has a successive-cyclic movement which satisfies Head Movement Constraint (the movement is from a head position into another head position). It moves up to head of AGRP to pick agreement and another movement to NegP to behave as a negative Auxiliary.

**4. Conclusion**

I have briefly outlined the basic differences between *laysa* and negative particles in Arabic. It turns out that *laysa* differs from other negative particles in many aspects which can be summarized in three main things: First, it doesn’t show tense. Second, it does not take verbal complement. Third, it shows agreement with the subject. Arabic negative particles *lāa, māa, lam* and *lan* select verbal complement, express tense and do not show agreement.
Accordingly, laysa does not behave like a negative particle, it behaves like the Arabic auxiliary verb kaana. Hence, the best way to handle laysa is as a negative auxiliary verb rather than a negative particle. Laysa should be generated under AuxP then moves in a cyclic way to pick agreement and negation.
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