iniquitates nostras, attritus est propter scelera nostras. = Aghraf o bniedem (ighait hauna bi dmuh fghaineihh S. Bern) Aghraf, u icconosci, o bniedem chem hhuma hhsiena, chem huma gravi, chem huma enormi, u detestabili il piaghi ta ruhh tighech, dnubietech cioè, chem huma orribili, la darba chien hem bzon illi icun bda il mot impiagat, u midrub l'istes G.C. signur taghna, la darba chien hem bzon li hua ihhalli hhaitu fost tant duluri, u turmenti G.C. bniedem Alla, Unigenitu tal missier etern, il Verb Divin incarnat, issignur tas-sema, u lard, insomma = Agnosce o homo quam gravia sunt vulnera, pro quibus necesse est Dominum Christum vulnerali = Adorat Red. tighi, imsallab, mudrub, u mejet ghalia, issa jena tabilhhak kighed naghraf chem huma detestabili dnubieti la darba chienu il hhtiha funesta tal meut crudelissima. tighech, nobghodhom ghal dakstant, nituahhaschom, nindem minhom. Imma inti o Signur li hhfirt btant hhniena u tieba lil hud li salbuch, deh ahhfer lili ucol, pietà Signur hniena, misericordia. Jena naf ben tajeb il irgait sallabtek tant chem il darba dnibt, musc bis reghisctech, u hhkartech. Ma inzic iziet po' Alla tighi, ma inzic iziet noffendich, anzi millum il koddiem iena irrit immut mighec, irrid immut ghaddigna, ghal passioni tighi, ghal dach collu li meusc piacir tighec.

Imma inti o Signur illi tispirali dina isceuka, atini grazia o Signur illi incompli bl'opera dach illi inuieghedech illu bil cliem, jena nitolboch di il grazia ghal meriti tal passioni tighech, ta iddem presiosissimu. li ciarciart ghalia, ghal meriti flahharnett tal Crocifissioni tighech, atini grazia li inhhobboch millu il koddiem fil hhaia tighi colha, biesc icolli isciorti nigi giurnata ingaudi il fort tal meut hharscia tighec. Amen.

T. IX, MEDITAZIONI PER LI ESERCIZI
ALTRO PROEMIO P. L'ISTESSA PROD. RETROSCRITTA IN S. DOM. QUADRAGESIMA

"Ductus est Jesus in deserto a Spiritu, ut tentaretur a diabolo" (Evang)

Hhargiu appena tali chelmiet min fommi ta l'odiern Sacrosant Ev:, malli già nisthhailcom tintleu bil ghageb, u tipku scantati schhin tifmu illi l'iben unigenitu tal Missier Etern, l'Onnipotent Alla, il Verb Divin, chellu issostini l'assalti tal ispirtu ribelli; schhin tifmu, illi l'istes'Innocenza, l'istess tieba chelha tcun cumbattuta mil cap tal hhsunia Luciferu; schhin tifmu illi l'impeccabili per essenza chellu icun sollecitat biesc iaka fi dnub; schhin tifmu insomma illi sidna G.C., Sultan tal gloria chellu icun ittentat mi demoniu princep ta dlamiet infernali: = ductus est Iesus etc. Ghanctom ragiu iva tistaghgibu, u li ma chenic tobligana nemmnuhh il fidi, ghandtco ragiun chiecu tiddubitau min hhedana il fat orribili flistessu zmien li hua terribili: = mens refugit credere (istkarru ucol S. Gregoriu) et humane hoc audire aures expavescunt. = Imma la darba tant hu hekk tabilhhakk hedana il fatt chem hua veru l'Evangeliu inhhalla da parti ghageb, u naghmlu sci considerazioni iziet validi. Iddemoniu ittanta li Gesù Xtu, u ittanta lilna ucol, u iaghmel idmir tighu collu biesc igiarrafna fi dnub, u iech fihh Alla iahhares ninsabu iorbotna, u incatnana tant chem ista biesc dejem nipkghu midimbin, appuntu ghasc iobghot l'innocenza, iobghot il gmiel supranaturali ta ruhh taghna meta tcun in grazia t'Alla, u igibha phhalu.

NEGATION IN ENGLISH AND MALTESE:
Common Rules and Typological Differences[1]

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 correlates with negation of the predicate in the semantic formula Arg_1. $Pred$. Arg_2 (Leech 1974); b. subject and/or object negation (with or without co-occurring verbal negation), which correlates with complete negation (Stoyanova 1985). The goal being to work out the rules connecting the syntactic and semantic structures under study, these will be handled in terms of semantico-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 language 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. Which 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 ca*n't* ever *not* answer the telephone.
   (b) *Lanqas* biss nista' *ma* nwieġibx it-telefon.

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

It is suficient 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 ca*n't* ever answer the telephone.
   (b) *Lanqas* biss nista' nwieġeb it-telefon.

By deleting one of the negative exponents in (1(a) and (b)) we obtain grammatical, though semantically different, sentences (3(a) and (b)). The omission of one *neg* in (2(a) and (b)), on the other hand, makes them ungrammatical (4(a) 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 Bald'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 (2(a)) 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
       . . . . .
   (b) The writer will believe the boy.
                                    (after Klima 1964, p. 254)

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 jmur parti. (Rarely he goes party.)

7. *Qatt ma* jmur 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* jmur 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 (9(a)) and (9(b)) 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 interdependence 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 (11(a)) and polynegative in Maltese (11(b)). In addition, the *neg*-reduction rule in English is followed by a *neg*-incorporation rule (Klima 1964), which is obligatory in subject position (10(a)) and optional in object position (11(a)).

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

AFFIRMATIVE versus NEGATIVE

12.	(a) Peter saw John.	Peter did *not* see John.
	(b) Pietru ra 'l Ganni.	Pietru *ma* rax 'l Ganni.
13.	(a) Peter saw someone.	Peter did *not* see anyone.
	(b) Pietru ra lil xi hadd.	Pietru *ma* ra 'il *hadd*.
	(c) Someone saw John.	*No* one saw John.
	(d) Xi hadd ra 'l Ganni.	*Hadd ma* ra 'l Ganni.

On the basis of the data above we can outline the following basic syntactic patterns:

14. Subject+*neg*-Verb^2+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.

References

Bald 1971: N.D. Bald. The Scope of Negation and Copula Sentences in English. *Language and Behavior Abstracts*. 1971.
Comrie 1982: B. Comrie. Syntactic-Morphological Discrepancies in Maltese Sentence Structure. *Communication and Cognition* 15, 281−306.
Grozdanova in press: L.A. Grozdanova. *Some Observations on Quantification in English and Bulgarian.* Sofia University Press.
Jackendoff 1969: R.S. Jackendoff. An Interpretive Theory of Negation. *Foundations of Language* 5, 1969.
Klima 1964: E.S. Klima. Negation in English. *The Structure of Language*, ed. by J.A. Fodor and J.J. Katz. New Jersey, 1964.

Leech 1974: G. Leech. *Semantics.* Hardmondsworth, Middlesex, 1974.
Miller 1985: J. Miller. *Semantics and Syntax.* Cambridge University Press, 1985.
Rotman 1987: B. Rotman. *Signifying Nothing.* London: The MacMillan Press Ltd., 1987.
Stoyanova 1985: J. Stoyanova. Dublirane na otritsanieto v savremennija Bulgarski ezik. *Bulgarsi ezik*   5, 1985.

2 The actual form and place of *neg* within the phrase is beyond the scope of this paper.