iniquitates nostras, attritus est propter scelera nostras. = Aghraf o bniedem (ighuit hauna bi dmuh fghaineih S. Bern) Aghraf, u icconosci, o bniedem chem hhmam hmasicenn, chem huma gravi, chem huma enormi, u detestabili il piagh ta ruhgh tighcheg, 2dbiiether cioc, chem huma orribi, la darba chien hem bzon illc icun bda il mot impigaur, u midrub l’istes G.C. signur tagnha, la darba chien hem bzon li hua ihallih hhauiat fost tant duluri, u turmeriti G.C. bniedem Alla, Unigenitui tal missier etern, il Verb Divin incarnat, issignur tas-sema, u lard, inssoma = Agnose o bono quam gravia sunt vulnera, pro quibus nessesse est Dominum Christum vulnerari = Adorat Red. tighi, imssalab, mudrub, u mejet ghaliha, issa jena tablibhak kigheb naghrar chem huma detestabili durbieti la darba chien il hhtih funesta tal meut crudelissima. tighcheg, nobjodhom ghal daktan, nitubchaschom, niinem minhom. Imma inti o Signur li hhfirt tant hhmam u tieba lil hud li salbch, deh ahfhefer lii ucol, pieta Signur hhmam, misercordia. Jena naf ben tajeb il irigat sallakath tant chem il darba dnbis, musse reghsichet, u hhkarchet. Ma inizic iziet po’ Alla tighi, ma inizic iziet nofendich, inni ussalmilu il koddiea inna irrit immut mighec, irrid immut ghaddigna, ghal passioni tighi, ghal dach colliu le meus piaic tighi.


T. IX, MEDITAZIONI PER LI ESERCIZI

ALTRO PROEMIO P. L’ISTESSA PROD. RETROSCHRITTA IN S. DOM. QUADRAGESIMA

‘Ductus est Jesus in deserto a Spiritu, ut tentaretur a diablo.” (Evang)

Hchargiu appena tali chelmiet min fommi ta l’odiern Sacrassant Ev., mali già nisrhalcom tintleu bil ghabeb, u tipku scentati schhin tifmu illi il ‘iben unigeniti tal Missier Etern, l’Ommipotent Alla, il Verb Divin, chelu isostdini l’assali tal isipru ribelli; schhin tifmu, illi l’istes’Innozenza, l’istes tieba chelha tcun cumbattura mil cap tal hhusia Luciferu; schhin tifmu illi l’impeccabili per essenzha chelu icun sollecitit biesc iaka fi dnu; schhin tifmu insomma illi sidna G.C., Sultan tal gloria chelu icun intentat mi demoniu princep ta damiet infernali: = ductus est Jesus ets. Ghancom ragiu iwa tistaghbihu, li u ma chenic tobilgan memnmuh il fidi, ghando ragiu chieuu tissubuai min hchana il fat orribili fistessu zmien li hua terribili: = mens refugit credere (istkarru ucol S. Gregoriu) et humane hoc audire aures expavescunt. = Imma la darba tant hu hekk tablibhahk hedana il fatt chem hua veru l’Evangelhu iniambla da parti ghabeb, u naghmul sci considerazioni isiet validi. Iddemomu juttat li Gesu Xtu, u juttat liina ucol, u iaghmel imdir tighu colliu biesc tigiarratnu fi dnuh, u ieach fihh Alla iahhares ninسابa iortbona, u incatnata tant chem ista biesc dejem nipkgh midimbin, appuntu ghase iobghot l’innocenza, iobghot il gmiel supranaturali ta ruhgh taghna meta tcun in grazia t’Alla, u igibha phhalu.


NEGATION IN ENGLISH AND MALTESE:
Common Rules and Typological Differences

L.A. GROZDANOVA

The purpose of this paper is to compare the major means of expressing negation in Standard English and Maltese. The syntactic patterns involved are: a. verbal negation (Jackendoff 1969), which Dominates the predicate in the semantic formula Arg, Pred. Arg (Leech 1974); b. subject and/or object negation (with or without negating the verb); c. negative complements (Soyanova 1985). The goal being to work out the rules connecting the syntactic and semantic structures under study, these will be handled in terms of semantic-syntactic correspondences rather than in morphological terms.

The first important methodological distinction to be made is between the content and form of negation, i.e. between the semantic operator NEG and its exponent neg. The application of NEG signifies absence by means of presence (Rotman 1987). It indicates that the semantic information conveyed by any entity A in its scope is zero, or NEG predicates zero of A (Grozdanova in press). The fact that NEG is assumed to be universal, to retain its meaning across languages, makes various language-specific patterns comparable. Its meaning is expected to be conveyed systematically and consistently by neg(s) in contrast to the affirmative counterpart. This suggests that in spite of their morphological differences languages can be given a kind of unified account. As pointed out in Miller (1985, p. 212), “when the same facts obtain in different languages or where the same syntactic situation is brought about in different languages” these facts “are not to be regarded as accidental but as systematic and indicative of semantic structure”.

Before discussing the affirmative-negative opposition in English and Maltese, we have to make another crucial distinction between two classes of sentences with more than one neg-form: a. sentences with more than one application of NEG (1(a) and 1(b) below); b. those with one application of NEG, which is expressed by more than one negative form (2(b) below). The latter case does not exist in Standard English (2(a)) but is the rule in Maltese (2(b)). English employs one negative form only (e.g. nobody).

1. (a) I can’t ever not answer the telephone.
   (b) Lanquas biss nisa ma nwiqgix it-telefon.

2. (a) Peter did not see anybody.
   (b) Peter saw nobody.
      (b) Pietru ma ra’d hadd. (Peter not saw obj-marker nobody.)

It is sufficient to remove one of the negative exponents from the two groups of sentences above and compare the results to see the crucial difference between them:

3. (a) I can’t ever answer the telephone.
   (b) Lanquas biss nisa nwiqgix it-telefon.
By deleting one of the negative exponents in (1a) and (b) we obtain grammatical, though semantically different, sentences (3a) and (b). The omission of one neg in (2a) and (b), on the other hand, makes them ungrammatical (4a) and (b) below:

4. (a) *Peter did see (saw) anybody.
(b) *Pietru ra 'l hadd.

So, NEG can be expressed by either one negative form, in which case the number of negs will correspond to the number of the applications of NEG, or by more than one neg-form functioning jointly. Adopting BAL's definition (BALD 1971) we shall refer to the former cases as patterns with double negation. In such cases English and Maltese employ the same one-neg-per-NEG technique in expressing each application of NEG independently. The latter case involves the obligatory expression of NEG by means of more than one neg — a phenomenon called polynegation. In (2a) the neg + any pattern seems to exhibit a certain structural similarity but cannot be considered a genuinely polynegative pattern, since any, in spite of its special status of a negatively dependent item, does not trigger negation of the verb, as do real negative items such as hadd.

In his classic on the subject KLIMA (1964) shows that the distributional similarities of what he calls negative premodifiers produce systematically negative sentences in opposition to a class of affirmative sentences. For instance:

5. (a) The writer will not believe the boy.
   never
   scarcely
   hardly
   rarely
   . . .
   (after KLIMA 1964, p. 254)

(b) The writer will believe the boy.

As shown in an earlier paper (Grozdanova in press) not and never turn out to be closer in meaning to each other than to the rest of the modifiers. No matter how delimitative rarely, scarcely, etc. are, they still express a certain quantity, whereas the ultimate "delimiters" not and never express zero quantity. This subdivision within the class, which in English can be manifested mainly in semantic terms, correlates with a grammatical difference in Maltese. For instance:

6. Rari jnur parti. (Rarely he goes party.)
7. Qatt ma jnur parti. (Never not he goes party.)

Note the different verb forms — positive in (6) and negative in (7). The obligatory character of the negation of the verb triggered by qatt in the latter is revealed by the ungrammaticality of (8) below:

8. *Qatt jnur parti. (Never he goes party.)

To summarize, in the environment of such negative words as never and qatt the related verb form can be either positive, as in English, or negative, as in Maltese.

Paradoxical as this may sound, these morphologically different structures express the same underlying relationships. To show this let us first consider some examples of verbal negation:

9. (a) Peter did not see John.
   (b) Pietru ma fax 'l Ganni.

There are obvious formal differences between the exponents of NEG in (9a)) and (9b) above. English negative forms require obligatory Aux-support. Maltese employs a negative circumfix (COMRIE 1982). In spite of this morphological diversity, when compared with the respective affirmative patterns, they seem to follow a common rule: NEG is expressed by a neg-form of the verb, and the subject and object, being outside its scope, remain unaffected.

Now let us see what happens if the subject or object are themselves negative:

10. (a) Nobody saw Peter.
    (b) Hadd ma ra 'l Pietru.

11. (a) Peter saw nobody.
    Peter did not see anybody.
    (b) Pietru ma ra 'l hadd. (Peter not he-saw obj-marker no-body.)

As is well known, Standard English does not allow for no-words to co-occur with negative verb forms within the same simple sentence. In Maltese, on the other hand, this is the obligatory rule, which applies in the case of complete negation. Complete negation can be accounted for in terms of independence of the constituents of such basic semantic complexes as [agent + action], [action + patient], etc. If the categories of [agent] and [patient] in them are assigned zero value, hence have no referents, the related category of [action] will also fail to refer. In other words, [zero-agent] necessarily combines with [zero-action], as do [zero-object] and [zero-action], which makes the complex completely negative. Completely negative constructions have two types of expression patterns — mononegative in English (11a) and polyneagtive in Maltese (11b). In addition, the neg-reduction rule in English is followed by a neg-incorporation rule (KLIMA 1964), which is obligatory in subject position (10a) and optional in object position (11a)).

Now we are in a position to compare the basic negative patterns in English and Maltese in opposition to their affirmative counterparts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE versus NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. (a) Peter saw John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Pietru ra 'l Ganni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. (a) Peter saw someone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Pietru ra lil xi hadd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Someone saw John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Xi hadd ra 'l Ganni.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the basis of the data above we can outline the following basic syntactic patterns:

14. Subject + neg-Verb3 + object – English, Maltese;

15. (a) Subject + neg-Verb + any-object – English, φ;
(b) Subject + Verb + neg-object – English, φ;
(c) Subject + neg-Verb + neg-object – φ, Maltese;
(d) Neg-subject + neg-Verb + object – φ, Maltese;
(e) Neg-subject + Verb + object – English, φ.

Naturally, more complex cases as those related to ditransitive verbs, locative or temporal modifiers, etc. will need further elaboration. What we hope to have shown above is the fact that the systematic expression of negation in English and Maltese, and by logical extension in other languages, depends on two kinds of negation – predicate and complete. Verbal negation as an expression of the former can reasonably be expected to follow the same common rule, with a negative verb form (14) in a systematic opposition to a positive counterpart. Complete negation, on the other hand, is expressed by different types of rules. One such rule combines negative prowords (or zero-words) with negative verb forms, as in Maltese (15(c) and 15(d)). Another rule reduces the negative forms to one (15(a), (b) and (e)). It can be either a negative verb in correlation with a special word like any (15(a)) or a positive verb related to a negative object (15(b)) or subject (15(e)). Subject negation follows an obligatory neg-incorporation rule.

To summarize, in expressing predicate negation English and Maltese employ a common rule of inserting a negative exponent into the verb phrase. In the case of complete negation, however, they diverge significantly. The number of exponents in Maltese corresponds to the number of applications of NEG. In Standard English that number is reduced to one. So, in case of predicate/verbal negation there is symmetry between the corresponding semantic and syntactic constructions, whereas complete negation correlates with two types of syntactic patterns – a symmetric polynegative one and a highly grammaticalized, reduced mononegative one. This accounts for the points of similarity and difference between English and Maltese in the field of negation and allows one to evaluate the extent of convergence and divergence between them.
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