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Abstract

Secondary grammaticalization is commonly viewed as a process of expansion in functionality or morpho-phonological reduction. This paper investigates the secondary grammaticalization of the negative particle laa in Rural Jordanian Arabic. It demonstrates that laa in this vernacular variety is a case of secondary grammaticalization as expansion in functionality. It shows that laa acquired three functions, namely conditionality, warning and introducing a proposition. Further, the paper shows that the peculiarity of laa is that it exhibits reduction in functionality. More specifically, despite acquiring three new functions, it nevertheless lost its function as a negative particle in declarative sentences. Evidence for expansion and reduction is synchronic. From a cross-linguistic perspective, this implies that secondary grammaticalization as reduction is not necessarily morpho-phonological. It can also be functional/meaningful. Finally, this paper, consistent with Hopper (1991) and Smirnova (2015), argues with the proposal that a grammaticalization path can be non-linear, as divergence from the linear path is possible.
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1. Introduction

Grammaticalization is a type of language change that is cross-linguistically common. It is generally viewed as the process of grammar formation from lexical or grammatical source (Bybee et al. 1991; Narrog 2012). It typically occurs in paths and encompasses some sub-processes, such as desemanticization (or semantic bleaching). In the relevant literature, some researchers propose that grammaticalization should branch into two sub-types, primary and secondary (cf. Givón 1991; Traugott 2002; Waltereit 2011; Norde 2012, 2019; Smirnova 2015). Primary grammaticalization is viewed as the shift from the lexical domain to the functional/grammatical domain, such as the evolution of the Old English lexical verb of volition willan ‘to want/to wish’ and the Arabic motion verb raah ‘went’ to the modal verb will and the modal-like verb raah that denote futurity (Tagliamonte et al. 2014; Jarad 2014). This sub-type is generally characterized by the following sub-processes: (1) decategorization, which is the
shift from a major category into a minor category accompanying by loss of inflections (Hopper and Traugott 1993; Norde 2019) and (2) desemanticization (or semantic bleaching) which is the loss or reduction of the lexical meaning of an item. On the other hand, secondary grammaticalization does not target a lexical item. Its input is rather a grammatical(ized) element. Thus, the input of each sub-type is a main difference between them (Breban 2015).

Analogous to grammaticalization, it is also reported in the relevant literature that secondary grammaticalization should branch into two sub-types. The first sub-type is secondary grammaticalization as expansion in functionality. It is characterized with acquiring new grammatical meanings, such as the expansion in the functionality of the ability-denoting modal verb can in English, as in he can speak two languages to mean possibility, as in it can be true (Ziegeler 2011; Narrog 2012). The second sub-type of secondary grammaticalization is marked with non-trivial phonological and/or morphosyntactic reduction. This sub-type increases morphosyntactic bondedness, such as reducing will into the clitic ’ll and reducing the adverbial hatta into the pro-clitic ta- in Rural Jordanian Arabic (henceforth RJA) (Jaradat 2021).

The current paper provides a case of secondary grammaticalization as expansion in functionality from RJA. It investigates the grammaticalization and the interpretations of the functional item laa, which is a case of polysemy, in RJA. It demonstrates that the functionality of this particle in this vernacular Arabic variety was expanded, with no phonological or morphological reduction. More precisely, it acquired new functions, namely, conditional, warning-expressing and proposition-introducing function.

Moreover, the current paper provides an interesting observation: This particle indicates that secondary grammaticalization can also be accompanied by reduction in functionality, which is rare, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge. It can no longer act as a negative particle in RJA, unlike in Standard Arabic (SA). Based on this observation, the peculiarity of the case of laa in RJA is that it involves both expansion and reduction in functionality in its path of grammaticalization. Additionally, this study, consistent with Hopper (1991) and Smirnova (2015), argues that a grammaticalization path is not always linear. Divergence away from the linear path is possible. Noteworthy is that evidence to the main claims of this paper is exclusively synchronic. Diachronic evidence to the expansion and reduction of the functionality of the particle laa is out of the scope of the current paper due to restrictions on data collection (i.e., the lack of written and oral data from RJA that are recorded at different temporal stages).

The outline of the current paper is as follows: Section 2 discusses secondary grammaticalization and its sub-types. Section 3 explores the interpretations (or functions) of laa in SA and RJA. The current study relies on a number of data sources including the intuition of the researcher as a native speaker of RJA and naturally occurring data elicited from Twitter and Facebook free speech and RJA television series. With respect to SA, data of this variety is collected from various Arabic grammar textbooks. In Section 4, it is argued that the secondary grammaticalization of laa comprises both expansion and reduction in functionality. Section 5 is the conclusion.
2. Secondary grammaticalization

In the relevant literature, it is reported that secondary grammaticalization can lead to expansion in the functionality of a grammatical item (Detges & Waltereit 2002; Kranich 2010; Waltereit 2011; Breban 2014, 2015) by assigning it a new function. For example, Heine (2003) proposes that it is common cross-linguistically that (a) present tense and imperfective markers are derived from progressive markers, and (b) epistemic modality markers are derived from markers of deontic modality and/or future and past tense markers (see Bybee, 1985; Bybee & Dahl 1989 for further discussions of the derivation of tense markers from aspect markers). Consider the following examples of secondary grammaticalization as expansion in functionality:

(1) a. The development of the vocative ja: to a disjunctive coordinator in positive bisyndetic construction (Jaradat 2021c) and the negative particle maa into a discourse linker (Jaradat 2021a) in RJA.
   b. The development of the English -ly that was originally used to form manner adverbs to a suffix that can form sentence adverbs (Killi 2015).
   c. The development of the auxiliary verb dâštan ‘have’ functioning primarily as a progressive aspect marker in durative situations, into a prospective marker with achievement verbs (Davari and Naghzguy-Kohan 2017).

On the other hand, secondary grammaticalization may result in increasing morphosyntactic bondedness and morphophonological reduction (Traugott 2002; Norde 2012, 2019; Jaradat 2021b). This occurs once a grammatical item undergoes further grammatical restrictions by changing its morphosyntactic status (e.g., from a free grammatical item into a clitic) through phonological reduction. This in turn makes the grammatical item that underwent secondary grammaticalization morphosyntactically more dependent on its surroundings in the containing grammatical structure. For example, a pronoun in its full form, such as the Arabic 3rd person masculine pronoun huwa ‘he’, can stand alone in a sentence; however, its phonological reduction into the clitic -hu causes its submission to more structural restrictions. In other words, it cannot stand alone and must have a host, in la-hu ‘to-him’. Another case of secondary grammaticalization as reduction is the development of affixal determiner from free demonstrative in the Scandinavian languages (Börjars & Harries 2008, Norde 2019). Note that the output of secondary grammaticalization as reduction does not always lead to the development of items that are morpho-phonologically more contingent on the surrounding components. To illustrate, the secondary grammaticalization of will results in the emergence of the clitic ‘ll, whereas the secondary grammaticalization of going to into gonna keeps the output a free morpheme (Norde 2019).

This research paper demonstrates that the secondary grammaticalization of laa in RJA is a case of expansion in functionality. The significance of this paper is in proposing that secondary grammaticalization may involve functional reduction, in addition to functional expansion and morphosyntactic reduction.
3. Functions of laa

This section investigates the functions of laa in SA and RJA.

3.1 Functions of the particle laa in Standard Arabic

According to most Arab grammarians, the particle laa in SA has several types. They conventionalized these types based on the functions/interpretations of laa. First, if it rules out the occurrence of an event or action, as shown in (2a), it is a negating particle so-called laa ʔal-naafijah ‘negative laa’ in the Arabic literature. On the other hand, if it prevents the occurrence of a certain event or action (i.e., the speaker is strongly asking the hearer not to do a certain action), as in (2b), it functions as a negative imperative particle (or according to Arab grammarians laa ʔal-naahijah ‘forbidding laa’).

(2) a. laa (judjiiid-u) (ʔudjiiid-u) ʔal-sibaah
   NEG master.3SG.M-NOM master.1SG-NOM DEF-swimming
   ‘(He) (I) cannot swim.’

b. laa tasbah
   NEG 2.SG-swim.M
   ‘Do not swim!’

Both types of laa precede imperfective verbs. Nevertheless, the imperative laa can only be combined with 2nd person inflected imperfective verbs, as shown in (2b), unlike the negated laa which can be followed by any imperfective verb regardless of its person inflection (1st, 2nd or 3rd person), as exemplified in (3).

(3) a. ʔana laa ʔasbah
   NEG NEG 1.SG-swim
   ‘I don’t swim.’

b. ʔanta laa tasbah
   you NEG 2.SG-swim.M
   ‘You do not swim.’

c. huwa laa jasbah
   he NEG swim.3SG.M
   ‘He does not swim.’

Moreover, the negating laa branches into two sub-types. The first sub-type, so-called naafijah l-il-djin ‘kind negating’ among Arabic grammarians, rules out the possibility that any member of a kind did a certain action. As shown in (4a), kind-negating laa indicates that none of the students is at school. This type of negation is also known as absolute negation (Ryding 2005). Note that kind/absolute negating laa must be followed by a nominal whose case is accusative. On the other hand, the second sub-type is called naafijah l-il-wihdah ‘member-negating’. It denotes that there is no single member did a certain action or has a certain description. As shown in (4b), member-negating laa indicates that there is more than one student in the school (at least two). Syntactically, member-negating laa leaves its following nominal in the nominative case, as in (4b).
Expansion and Reduction of Functionality in Secondary Grammaticalization: The Case of the Negative "Laa" in Rural Jordanian Arabic

(4)  

\[ \text{a. } \text{laa } \text{ʕaalib-} \text{a-n } f\text{-il-madrasat-i} \]  

\begin{tabular}{ll}
  \text{NEG} & \text{student-ACC-INDEF} \\
  & \text{in-DEF-school-GEN} \\
\end{tabular}  

‘There isn’t any student in the school.’

\[ \text{b. } \text{laa } \text{ʕaalib-u-} \text{n } f\text{-il-madrasat-i} \]  

\begin{tabular}{ll}
  \text{NEG} & \text{student-NOM-INDEF} \\
  & \text{in-DEF-school-GEN} \\
\end{tabular}  

Intended: ‘There is more than one student in the school.’

Further, "laa" can act as a disjunctive coordinator. For example, "laa" in (5a), as a disjunctive coordinator, combines the two nominal conjuncts, "ʔal-fiizjaa?-a" ‘Physics’ and "ʔal-handasat-a" ‘engineering’. It is a coordinator that has a negative sense. It denotes that the second conjunct is excluded (e.g., the speaker in (5a) will not study engineering). Evidence for this coordinating function of "laa" comes from structural case copying in the context of coordination by "laa". To illustrate, the accusative case of the first disjunct, which is the object of the transitive verb "ʔadrus-u" is copied to the right edge of the second conjunct. Consequently, assigning the nominative case to the second conjunct in (5b) renders the structure ungrammatical.

\[ \text{(5) a. } \text{sa-ʔadrus-u } \text{ʔal-fiizjaa?-a laa } \text{ʔal-handasat-a} \]  

\begin{tabular}{llllll}
  \text{FUT-study.1.SG-NOM} & \text{DEF-physics-ACC} & \text{NEG} & \text{DEF-engineering-ACC} \\
\end{tabular}  

‘I will study physics but not engineering.’

\[ \text{b. } \text{sa-ʔadrus-u } \text{ʔal-fiizjaa?-a laa } \text{ʔal-handasat-*u} \]  

\begin{tabular}{llllll}
  \text{FUT-study.1.SG-NOM} & \text{DEF-physics-ACC} & \text{NEG} & \text{DEF-engineering-*NOM} \\
\end{tabular}  

In this sub-section, it has been demonstrated that "laa" is a case of polysemy in SA. It can be a negative particle in declarative sentences, negative imperative particle or disjunctive coordinator.

\[ \text{3.2 Functions of "laa" in Rural Jordanian Arabic} \]

It has just been reported that in SA "laa" can rule out the occurrence of an event or action in a declarative sentence, and it can act as a negative imperative particle. In RJA, "laa" can only perform the second function. Therefore, the structure in (6a) is grammatical in RJA, as "laa" is a negative imperative particle, whereas the structure in (6b) is unattested in this dialect, as "laa" cannot act as negative particle in declarative sentences.

\[ \text{(6) a. } \text{laa } \text{ʔhki} \]  

\begin{tabular}{ll}
  \text{NEG} & \text{talk.2SG.M} \\
\end{tabular}  

‘Don’t talk!’

\[ \text{b. } \text{sami } \text{*laa } \text{jidrus} \]  

\begin{tabular}{ll}
  \text{Sami} & \text{NEG} \\
  & \text{study.3SG.M} \\
\end{tabular}  

Intended: ‘Sami does not study (or is not studying).’

Alternatively, RJA uses the negative particle "maa" to rule out the occurrence of an event/action, as shown in (7).²

\[ \text{(7) } \text{sami } \text{maa } \text{bidrus} \]
Sami NEG study.3SG.M

‘Sami does not study (or is not studying).’

With regard to the disjunctive laa in RJA, it is not attested in the structure in (8). Instead, the negative functional item mif ‘not’ is typically used in this exact context:

(8) badrus fiizja "laa/mif/ handaseh
Study.1SG Physics NEG engineering

‘I study physics not engineering.’

However, this disjunctive use of laa can only surface in the structure in (9). In this structure, which should be considered a negative bisyndetic coordinating construction, laa repeats at the left of each conjunct, yet it undergoes vowel reduction and fusion with the conjunction ʔu ‘and’ at the left of the second conjunct producing wala. This entails that RJA did not lose the disjunctive function of jaa, but its use as a disjunctive coordinator is restricted in the current form of this variety.

(9) laa bisoolif, wa-la bixalli hada jsoolif
NEG talk.3SG.M and-NEG allow.2SG.M one talk.3SG.M

Intended: ‘He neither talks nor allows anybody to talk.’

In the remainder of this section, the interpretations (or sub-types) of laa that are attested in RJA, but not in SA, are discussed.

3.2.1 Conditional laa

The first sub-type of laa that exists in RJA, but not in SA, is the conditional laa. As exemplified in (10), laa is somehow equivalent to the common conditional particle in Arabic ʔiidi ‘if’; however, it is closer in denotation to the English conditional once or when, as seen in the translations in (10). As observed in the examples in (10), the conditional clause headed by laa is typically located in sentence-internal position (i.e., the conditional clause comes last). Furthermore, the conditional laa is exclusively compatible with perfective verbs, such as faft ‘saw’ in (10).

(10) a. taʕaal la-hoon, laa faft-ni rafaʕit ʔiidi
Come.2SG.M to-here, once saw.1SG raise.PST.1SG hand.1SG.POSS

‘Once you see me raising my hand, come here.’

b. soolif, laa faft-ni xallasʕit
Talk.2SG.M, once saw.1SG finish.PST.1SG

‘Once I finish talking, you may talk.’

c. ʔabbaʕ-h badd-ʔu jifjarri-l-ʔu sajjaraah, laa
father-3SG.M.POSS want-3.SG.M buy-to.3.SG.M car, once

succeeded.PST.3SG.M

‘His father will buy him a car when he passes (his exams).’

It is worth discussing here how the conditional laa and ʔiidi in RJA are different in terms of use and denotation. First, the conditional laa expresses certainty. This entails that the speaker is certain that the
action or event expressed by the verb following the conditional laa will happen. For instance, the use of laa in (10c) indicates that the speaker is certain that the father will buy a car to his son once he graduates.

On the other hand, the conditional clause headed by ʔiða typically expresses uncertainty (or possibility). The replacement of laa with ʔiða in (10c) implies that the speaker is not certain whether the son will graduate or not. Likewise, the use of ʔiða in (11) indicates that it is not necessary that the speaker will raise his hand, unlike the use of laa, which signifies certainty.

(11) \textit{taʕaal la-hoon, ʔiða/laa ʃuft-ni raʕat}

\textit{Come.2SG.M to-here, if/once see-1SG raise.PST.1SG}

ʔiidi

\textit{hand.1SG.POSS}

‘Come here if you see me raising my hand.’

Another point of difference is that the conditional laa is exclusively a property of temporally conditioned contexts. To illustrate, all the conditionals in (10), which are headed by the conditional laa, are temporal conditionals; that is, the occurrence of the action or event of the independent clause is conditioned by the time of the occurrence of the action or event of the conditional clause. Based on this discussion, conditional laa is incompatible with conditional sentences that comment, for example, on truth condition. In (12), the occurrence of conditional laa is unattested in RJA as the containing conditional clause questions the truth condition of certain news. This context is compatible with the conditional ʔiða.

(12) *\textit{ləa/ʔiða ʔil-xabar had ʃəh יתר, laazım ʔil-kull}

\textit{once/if DEF-news this true, obligatory DEF-all juuxuð}

\textit{ʔil-matʕum b-agrab wagit}

\textit{take DEF-vaccine in-closest time}

Intended: ‘if what you have said is true, all must take the vaccine very soon’.

To wrap up, laa is a conditional particle that denotes certainty and is restricted in use in RJA, i.e., it is a temporal conditional particle that is somehow equivalent to English once, unlike ʔiða that cannot guarantee the occurrence of an action or event and can be used in conditionals that have varying denotations.

3.2.2 Warning laa

Earlier in this research paper, it has been shown that laa can be a negative imperative particle. In this case, it occupies imperative statement-initial position. In (13), laa follows another imperative statement diir baalak ‘be careful’, which is used to express general warning. In this example, an exclamation mark is located to the right of diir baalak, as this warning statement is independent from the following negative imperative statement headed by laa. Further, there should be a break (full pause) after diir baalak. If these conditions are met, the statement \textit{ləa tiksir ʔil-kaas} is a negative imperative statement that means that the speaker is commanding the hearer not to break the cup, and thus laa is a negative imperative particle.
On the other hand, if diir baalak co-exists with laa tiksirʔil-kaas in the same statement (i.e., no break between them), as shown in (14), laa is not a negative imperative particle, as it is not in imperative statement-initial position. It is rather warning particle embedded in the imperative statement headed by the imperative verb diir. Consider the translations in (13&14) to figure out the difference between the negative imperative laa and the warning laa.

(14)  
\[
\text{diir} \hspace{1em} \text{baalak} \hspace{1em} \text{laa} \hspace{1em} \text{tiksir} \hspace{1em} \text{ʔil-kaas} \\
\text{Turn on thinking-2SG.M.POSS \ NEG \ break.2SG.M \ DEF-cup} \\
\text{Meaningful: ‘Be careful! You are about to break the cup unintentionally.’}
\]

Based on the previous discussion, the diagnostic that can distinguish between the negative imperative laa and the warning laa, is that the former must occupy an imperative statement-initial position. On the contrary, the latter can only appear in an imperative-statement-non-initial position (medial position).

Another piece of evidence supporting the proposal that laa can be a warning particle (not necessarily a negative imperative particle), is that this warning particle is compatible with declarative sentences. For exemplification, consider the presence of the copula-less declarative sentence ana xaajif to the left of laa in (15). In this case, the statement laa laatiksirʔil-kaas is a declarative sentence embedded in the matrix clause ana xaajif. This implies that laa is not a (negative) imperative particle in this sentence, as it does not start an imperative statement. It is well documented that imperatives cannot be embedded in subordinate clauses (Katz and Postal 1964; Sadock and Zwicky 1985). Therefore, it should be noted that if laa is a negative imperative particle, the copula-less sentence ana xaajif or laa should not be inserted, as they are incompatible in the same sentence.

(15)  
\[
\text{ʔana} \hspace{1em} \text{xaajif} \hspace{1em} \text{laa} \hspace{1em} \text{tiksir} \hspace{1em} \text{ʔil-kaas} \\
\text{I \ NEG \ break.2SG.M \ DEF-cup} \\
\text{‘I am worried that you will unintentionally break the cup.’}
\]

It is worth highlighting here that the occurrence of a complementizer, such as ʔinno ‘that’ between the matrix clause and the embedded clause headed by the warning laa is ungrammatical, as shown in (16a). Only one of them can surface, as exemplified in (16b&c). Note that in (16b), ʔinno can be inflected for person (i.e., ʔinn-ak ‘that-2SG.M’).

(16)  
\[
\text{a. ʔana \ xaajif \ ʔinno \ laa \ tiksir \ ʔil-kaas} \\
\text{I \ NEG \ break.2SG.M \ DEF-cup} \\
\text{‘I am worried that you will unintentionally break the cup.’}
\]

b. ana \ xaajif \ ʔinno \ tiksir \ ʔil-kaas  

c. ana \ xaajif \ laa \ tiksir \ ʔil-kaas

This complementarity in distribution of the complementizer ʔinno and the warning laa implies that they occupy the same syntactic position. In other words, from a syntactic perspective they are two
manifestations of the head C of CP of the embedded conditional clause. However, it should be admitted here that the use of the complementizer *laa* is very restricted in comparison with that of *ʔinno*. *laa* is only used with matrix clauses that show concern, such as *ʔana xaajif* and *ʔana galgaan* ‘I am worried’. Hence, *laa* in this subsection has a warning denotation from a meaningful perspective, and syntactically speaking it is a complementizer in RJA.

The previous discussion implies that *laa* in RJA can be used to express warning, yet in this case it is not an imperative particle, as it can only occur in imperative statement-internal position or with in a declarative sentence (more specifically, within a relative clause).

### 3.2.3 Proposition-introducing *laa*

In addition to its conditional and warning function in RJA, *laa* as a case of polysemy, may introduce catch-up propositions. As shown in (17), the speaker is introducing a late assumption. More specifically, in the first sentence *hakaali ʔinno mariið*, he thought that the employee told him that he is sick without any other intentions. However, in the second sentence, which starts with *laa*, the speaker is changing his mind. He assumes that the employee told him that he is sick as an indirectly request to leave. Yet, this assumption is not necessarily the intention of the employee. (17) *(Context: in company meeting, an employee has informed his manager that is sick, and the manager is thinking why the employee did so.)*

(17) *hakaali ʔinno mariið, laa jruu baddu*

*Said-to-1SG that sick. NEG AUX need-3SG.M*

*jštadír san ʔil-ʔidtimaʕ*

have excuse about DEF-meeting

‘He told me that he is sick. Does that mean that he was trying to take a leave.’

The (catch-up) proposition-introducing *laa* is not compatible with all verbs. It can only be combined with auxiliary verbs, such as *jruu* in (17) and *jkuun* in (18&19). Further, the resulting structure in (17-19) is interrogative. In other words, the speaker is asking himself or hearers whether his proposition/assumption is true or not.

(18) *maa smiʕ-na ʔanno min zamaan, laa jkuun saafar*

*NEG hear-1PL that from long time NEG is travelled*

*w maa gaal la hada*

and NEG said to one

‘We have not heard anything about him since a long time. Does that mean that he travelled without telling anyone?’

(19) *mif faajif hada b-il-faaríʕ. laa jkuun źiih haðír*

*NEG see one in-DEF-company. NEG is there quarantine.*

‘There is no one in the company. Does this mean that the quarantine has started’.

If *laa* co-exists with a contentful verb, such as *jsaafir* ‘travel’ in (20), it is not to introduce a proposition. It is rather to expressing warning, as discussed in 3.2.2.
‘We have not heard anything about him since a long time. Be careful! He may travel without telling anyone.’

A final remark is that the proposition-introducing laa is always optional. This implies that it can be omitted in the examples in (17-19).

4. Secondary grammaticalization of laa in Rural Jordanian Arabic

This section discusses the secondary grammaticalization of laa in RJA. In 4.1, I argue that laa is a case of reduction in functionality; that is, it lost its negating function within declarative sentences. On the other hand, it is presented as a case of expansion in functionality in 4.2, as it has gained three functions that are not attested in SA.

4.1. laa as a case of reduction in functionality

In Section 3, it has been demonstrated that laa in RJA, akin to its use in SA, is a negative imperative particle. However, in this vernacular dialect it cannot perform the negating function in declarative sentences that is common in SA. In accord with that, I propose that laa, as a case of polysemy, has lost its negative function in declarative sentences in RJA, and the particle maa has taken over as the typical negating particle in declaratives. Hence, the use of laa in the declarative sentence in (21) is ungrammatical.

(21) maa/*laa badd-u jihki
NEG/*NEG want-3SG.M talk

‘He does not want to talk.’

What supports the proposal that laa had a negating function in RJA, but lost it gradually, is that, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, it can be used in one special construction in the current form of RJA, namely, disjunctive construction. In (22), and as shown in (12) above, laa is used as a negative particle to the left of each declarative conjunct. The observation that laa can only be a negative particle with declaratives in such a coordinating construction indicates that this function of laa is maintained in this context, and it was lost in the other context in RJA, which is simple declarative sentence involving no coordination.

(22) a. laa badd-u jihki, wala baddu jismaʕ
NEG want-3SG.M talk, and want-3SG.M listen

‘He wants neither to talk, nor to listen.’

b. laa buuxuð, wala biʕʕi
neither take, nor give

Intended: ‘it is too difficult to talk with him.’
Now, it is of great importance to elaborate on the structure in (22). It is obvious in the structure of these sentences that laa obligatorily occurs at the left of each conjunct. The deletion of one of them renders the sentences ungrammatical, as exemplified in the ungrammatical structures in (23).

(23) a. *badd-u jihki, wala baddu jismaʕ
   want-3SG.M talk, and want-3SG.M listen
   ‘He wants neither to talk, nor to listen.’

   b. *laa badd-u jihki, wa baddu jismaʕ
      NEG want-3SG.M talk, and want-3SG.M listen
      ‘He wants neither to talk, nor to listen.’

Based on this discussion, laa in the structures in (22) is an integral part of coordinating construction, especially after its fusion with the conjunction ʔu at the left of the second conjunct. Thus, the construction laa X, wala Y, which is very similar to the English negative bisyndetic coordinating structure neither X, not Y, should be rendered in Haspelmath’s (2004, 2007) terms as a negative bisyndetic coordinating structure that requires the occurrence of laa at the left of each conjunct.

The previous argument shows that the negative laa in declarative sentences has not been completely abandoned or lost in the current form of RJA. It is still used in one special construction. This observation should be taken as synchronic evidence that supports the proposal that the negative function of laa was productively used in declarative sentences in an earlier form of RJA. Thus, the negative laa in RJA is a case of reduction in functionality. In other words, its use is restricted to one grammatical construction.

4.2 laa as a case of expansion in functionality

The main topic in this part is how laa, which is originally a negative particle, gained new functions in RJA. It can be conditional, warning and proposition-introducing. I argue below that the negative meaning, in a way or another, is partially maintained in laa when performing these functions. Hence, the meaning of the negative particle laa has not be totally bleached out. This explains why that there should be a path of secondary grammaticalization of this functional item. I propose that the conditional and warning laa are the output of the secondary grammaticalization of the negative imperative laa, whereas the proposition-introducing laa is the product of the secondary grammaticalization of the negative laa of declarative sentences.

With regard to the conditional laa, what supports its evolution from the negative imperative laa is the negative connotation and prohibition expressed by this particle. In (24), laa at the left edge of the conditional clause carries a negative meaning, which is temporary prohibition. It indicates that the hearer is not allowed to move until he gets the permission from the speaker by raising the speaker’s hand.

(24) a. taʃaʕal la-hoon, laa faʃt-ni rafʕit ?iidi
    Come.2SG.M to-here, once see-1SG raise.PST.1SG hand.1SG.POSS
    ‘Once you see me raising my hand, come here!’
This explains why conditional *laa is incompatible with the sentence in (25) in RJA. The cause of the ungrammaticality of *laa in (25) is that the sentence does not denote prohibition. It only questions the truth condition of a certain news.

\[(25) \quad *\text{laa} /\text{ʔ} \text{ʔiða} /\text{ʔ} \text{il-xabar} /\text{hað} /\text{s'ahi̞h}, \text{laazim} /\text{ʔil-kull} /\text{ʔil-ma̲l'uum} /\text{b-agrab wagit} /\text{take} /\text{DEF-vaccine} /\text{in-closest} /\text{time}\]

\[\text{Intended: ‘if what you have said is true, all must take the vaccine very soon’}.

Likewise, the warning *laa has been evolved from the negative imperative *laa, as it also has a negative/prohibitive connotation. To illustrate, the intention of the speaker is to prevent the occurrence of a certain action or event. In (26), for instance, *laa is warning not negative imperative; however, it indicates that the speaker does not want the hearer to break the cup unintentionally.

\[(26) \quad \text{diir} /\text{baalak} /\text{laa} /\text{tiksir} /\text{ʔil-kaas}\]

\[\text{Turn on thinking-2SG.M.POSS NEG break.2SG.M DEF-cup} \]

\[\text{Meaningful: ‘Be careful! You are unintentionally about to break the cup.’}.

With respect to the proposition-introducing function of *laa, it should have been developed from the negative *laa of declarative sentences (the one that negates the occurrence of an action or event). As shown in (27), the sentence that begins with the proposition-introducing *laa indicates that the speaker has changed his mind. He thought there is no any hidden message when one of the employees told him that he is sick. Then, he realized that the employee, may be, wanted to take a leave. This implies that this *laa still has a negative meaning in this context. More precisely, the speaker is ruling out or suspecting his first thought (that there are no hidden messages) and replacing with another thought (that the employee is indirectly asking for a leave). More generally, this *laa negates a certain idea/proposition, and this is very similar to the function of the negative *laa that negates the occurrence of an action or event. It does not denote any prohibition or prevention, and thus the negative *laa (the non-imperative one) should be the source of the secondary grammaticalization of the proposition-introducing *laa.

\[(27) \quad \text{ʔakaali} /\text{ʔinno} /\text{marii̞h}, \text{laa} /\text{juu̲h} /\text{baddu}\]

\[\text{Said-to-1SG that sick. NEG AUX need-3SG.M} \]

\[\text{jįla̲d祀ir} /\text{ʕan} /\text{ʔil-ʔidz̲i̞maa̲ʕ}\]

\[\text{have excuse about DEF-meeting}\]

\[\text{‘He told me that he is sick. Does that mean that he was trying to take a leave.’}.

\[\text{The previous discussion entails that all the new functions that *laa acquired in RJA are linked to its most common functions (i.e., negation and prohibition). Since the three functions discussed above are not found in SA, I assume that the acquisition of these three functions is a case of secondary grammaticalization as expansion in functionality without being accompanied by morpho-phonological reduction.}

\[\text{Furthermore, consistent with Smirnova (2015) and Hopper (1991) I propose that the grammaticalization path of *laa in RJA is non-linear it is branching, as exemplified in (29) below. First, I} \]
suggest that laa might have a lexical source that is still anonymous. From this lexical source, the negative
lala with declarative sentences evolved first, and then the negative imperative type developed. What
supports this claim is that the former in some Arabic varieties (e.g., SA) is compatible with verbs
inflected for any sub-types of person (i.e., 1st, 2nd and 3rd person), as shown in the SA sentence in (28).

(28) a. ?ana  laa  ?atSab
    I        NEG   tired
    ‘I do not get tired.’

    b. ?anta  laa  tatSab
    You      NEG   tired
    ‘You do not get tired.’

    c. ha?  laa  jitSab
    he       NEG   tired
    ‘He does not get tired.’

On the other hand, the negative imperative laa is only compatible with verbs inflected for the 2nd
person (the hearer). The restricted use of the negative imperative laa should imply that the original
grammatical meaning of laa is to negate the occurrence of an action or event, and then the negative
imperative function was acquired:

(29)

Lexical source → negative laa → negative imperative laa → conditional laa

Then, the negative imperative laa acquired the conditional and warning functions in RJA, and the
proposition-introducing laa is evolved from the negative laa, which is currently very restricted in use this
variety. The grammaticalization non-linear path in (29) implies that there a grammaticalization path can
be non-linear, as secondary grammaticalization may split (in Hopper’s (1991) terms). In (29), divergence
from the linear path occurred twice.

5. Conclusion

Secondary grammaticalization is viewed as a process of expansion in functionality (Givón 1991;
Detges & Waltereit 2002; Kranich 2008, 2010; Waltereit 2011; Breban 2014, 2015) or morpho-
phonological reduction (Traugott 2002; Norde 2012, 2019). This paper has shown that the secondary
grammaticalization of the negative particle laa in RJA is a case of secondary grammaticalization as
expansion in functionality. It shows that this item acquired three functions, namely conditionality,
warning and proposition introducing. Further, it has also been demonstrated in this paper that the case of
lala in this dialect is peculiar, as it is also characterized by reduction in functionality, which is not
common cross-linguistically. More specifically, despite its acquisition to three new functions, it lost its
function as a negative particle that negates the occurrence of an action or event in declarative sentences. On this basis, the reduction of secondary grammaticalization is not necessarily morphosyntactic and phonological. It can also be functional/meaningful.

Jaradat

التفعيل الثاني بين التوسع والتقلص الوظيفي: الت椭الية

عبد العزيز جرادات
قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، جامعة العلوم التطبيقية الخاصة، الأردن

الملخص
يقدم التفعيل الثاني على أنه توسّع في الوظيفة أو تقلص في الشكل الصفوي والصرف كما بدأ من الدراسات السابقة، أما في هذه الدراسة فقد حصل التفعيل الثاني لأداة النفي "لا" في اللغة المحكرية الأردنية. وقد تبين أن هذا التفعيل يستعمل على نوعين من التطور، وهما التوسع والتقلص في الوظيفة. أما التوسع الوظيفي فقد اكتملت هذه الأداة في اللغة الأردنية وظائف شرطية وتحذيرية واستهلاكية، وأما ما يميز هذه الأداة فهو فقدها وظيفة النفي في الجمل الخبرية في هذه اللغة.


الكلمات المفتاحية: التفعيل الثاني، التوسع والتقلص الوظيفي، مسار التفعيل التشيعي.
Endnotes

1 Another prominent example of primary grammaticalization is the development of the Old English verbs *cunnan* and *magan* that used to denote ability to the modal verbs *can* and *may* that mean permission (Véliz Campos 2007: 217).

2 Another example on secondary grammaticalization as reduction in RJA is the reduction of the polysemous *hatta* into the proclitic *ta*—(Jaradat 2021).


4 It is worth noting here is that the particle *maa* in RJA can be used as an alternative to the prohibiting *laa*:

   a. *maa* thi
   
   NEG talk.2SG.M
   
   ‘Don’t talk.’

5 See Kruger (2012) for further details of the exceptional cases where imperatives can be subordinated.

6 Note that the use of *laa* in (22) is optional, as it can be substituted with the negating *maa*.
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