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11. Negation

In this chapter, I analyse negation. The chapter has three sections. Section 11.1 treats verbal negation in declarative clauses. Section 11.2 deals with negation in nominal sentences. Section 11.3 presents lexical negation.

11.1. Negation in declarative sentences

Negation in declarative sentences is marked by subject clitics and/or negative suffixes on the verb. The forms of negative subject clitics are an= for first persons, aʔ= for second persons and in= for third persons. Note that the form of the negative subject clitic for third persons and the form of the affirmative subject clitic for first persons are homophonous. The forms of the negative suffixes on the verb vary according to aspect as discussed below.

11.1.1. Negative Perfective

The negative marker in the perfective is the suffix -n. This morpheme precedes the perfective aspect marker -i. Except for the first person plural and second person plural, subject personal pronouns are optional. In other words, first person plural and second person plural require subject personal pronouns. Number and gender is not marked on the negative perfective verb.

(1a)  
\begin{align*}
\text{anti-} & \text{t} \text{oyrasiʔ} \text{ʔammurri} \\
\text{anti=} & \text{t} \text{oyra-siʔ} \text{an=mur-n-i} \\
1SG.PRO-NOM & \text{tree-DEF.M/F} \text{1NEG=cut[SG]-NEG-PF} \\
\text{‘I did not cut the tree.’}
\end{align*}

(1b)  
\begin{align*}
\text{iʃinat} & \text{tikupa aɗɗeʔni} \\
iʃin= & \text{tika-opa aʔ=ɗey-n-i} \\
2PL.PRO-NOM & \text{house-to 2NEG=come-NEG-PF} \\
\text{‘You (PL) did not come home.’}
\end{align*}

(1c)  
\begin{align*}
\text{inantasip} & \text{piʃaa-siniʔ ʔinʔoraapni} \\
inanta-siʔ & \text{piʃaa-siʔ in=ʔoraap-n-i} \\
girl-DEF.M/F & \text{water-P 3NEG=fetch-NEG-PF} \\
\text{‘The girl did not fetch the water.’}
\end{align*}

Without overt subjects, the present imperfective affirmative for first person singular is segmentally identical to that of the perfective negative for third persons. The affirmative and negative distinction for these persons is made by tone: a low tone marks the present imperfective affirmative for first person singular as in (2a), while a high tone marks perfective negative for third persons as in (2b).
(2a) immukni
   \( in = muk-ni \)
   1NEG-sleep-IPF.PRES
   ‘I sleep.’

(2b) immuknì
   \( in = muk-n-i \)
   3NEG=sleep-NEG-PF
   ‘He/She/They did not sleep.’

The paradigm in (3) is an additional example. The optional subject pronouns are left out in the paradigm. The verb root used in the paradigm is muk-‘sleep’. Note that the alveolar nasal of the first person and third person subject clitics, and the glottal stop of the second person subject clitic are realised as m due to assimilation.

(3) ammukni \( an = muk-n-i \) ‘I did not sleep.’
    inom mukni \( ino = an muk-n-i \) ‘We did not sleep.’
    ammuknì \( aʔ = muk-n-i \) ‘You (SG) did not sleep.’
    iʃīnām muknì \( iʃin = aʔ muk-n-i \) ‘You (PL) did not sleep.’
    immuknì \( in = muk-n-i \) ‘He/she/they did not sleep.’

Sometimes, the lexeme nama ‘person’ is used instead of the first person plural subject pronoun in negative verbs in all aspects. For example, in (4a) we have an interrogative sentence for which a negative answer is given with the first person subject pronoun in (4b), and with the lexeme nama ‘person, man’ in (4c). The latter renders the sentence impersonal.

(4a) χormasip patay itteytinee
     \( χorma-siʔ = pat-ay = tey-t-i-n-e \)
     ox-DEF.M/F lose-PF 2=find-2-PF-P-Q
     ‘Did you (PL) find the lost ox?’

(4b) inon teynì
     \( ino = an \)
     1PL.PRO.NOM=1NEG find-1PL-PF
     ‘We did not find it.’

(4c) naman teynì
     \( nama = in \)
     person=3NEG find-NEG-PF
     ‘We did not find it.’
     (lit.: ‘A person did not find it.’)
Bliese and Sokka (1986:22) provide an example (adapted here) from the Karatte dialect in which the negative for first person plural occurs without either an overt personal subject pronoun or the lexeme nama ‘person’. In my dialect, the example must have the first person singular as the subject and example (5) would be ungrammatical.

(5) *andámmi
\[ an = d\text{"a}m-n-i \]
1NEG = eat-NEG-PF
‘I/We did not eat.’

11.1.2. Negative future imperfective

In the future imperfective, negation is marked by the subject clitic for all persons, and, except for second person plural and third person plural, also by the negative suffix -u on the verb. The second person plural and third person plural do not have the negative suffix -u on the verb. All subject personal pronouns can be left out. The following are illustrative examples.

(6a) \( \text{ɗettow} \quad an = \chi\text{"a}?-u \)
     early 1NEG = wake.up-IPF.FUT.NEG
     ‘I will not wake up so early.’

(6b) \( \text{ʛoyra-siʔ} \quad \text{ʔimmur}t\text{a} \)
     2NEG = cut[SG]-2-IPF.FUT.NEG
     ‘You (SG) will not cut the tree.’

(6c) \( \text{inanta-siʔ} \quad \text{fatanaa-oppa} \quad \text{impiʔtu} \)
     girl-DEF.M/F exam-in
     3NEG = fail-3F-IPF.FUT.NEG
     ‘The girl will not fail in the exam.’

The sentences in (7) are equivalent affirmative forms of the examples in (6):

(7a) \( \text{ɗettow} \quad in = \chi\text{"a}?-a \)
     early 1 = wake.up-IPF.FUT
     ‘I will wake up so early.’

(7b) \( \text{ʛoyra-siʔ} \quad \text{ʔimmur}t\text{a} \)
     2 = cut[SG]-2-IPF.FUT
     ‘You (SG) will cut the tree.’
(7c) inantasif fatanaappa ṭipiṭa
   inanta-siʔ fatana-oppa i=ṭipiʔ-t-a
   girl-DEF.M/F exam-in 3NEG = fail-3F-IPF.FUT
   ‘The girl will fail in the exam.’

Consider the paradigms in (8) as well.

(8a) ammuku < in=muk-u ‘I will not sleep.’
    ammuknu < an=muk-n-u ‘We will not sleep.’
    ammuktu < aʔ=muk-t-u ‘You (SG) will not sleep.’
    ammuktan < aʔ=muk-t-a-n ‘You (PL) will not sleep.’
    immuku < in=muk-u ‘He will not sleep.’
    immuktu < in=muk-t-u ‘She will not sleep.’
    immukan < in=muk-a-n ‘They will not sleep.’

(8b) immuka < in=muk-a ‘I will sleep.’
    immukna < in=muk-n-a ‘We will sleep.’
    immukta < iʔ=muk-t-a ‘You (SG) will sleep.’
    immuktan < iʔ=muk-t-a-n ‘You (PL) will sleep.’
    imuka < i=muk-a ‘He will sleep.’
    imukta < i=muk-t-a ‘She will sleep.’
    imukan < i=muk-a-n ‘They will sleep.’

From the examples in (6) and (7), as well as the paradigms in (8), we can see that negation in the future imperfective is marked by the suffix -u while affirmative future imperfective is marked by the suffix -a.

11.1.3. Negative present imperfective

Generally, the negative present imperfective is characterised by a main and auxiliary verb construction plus a set of (negative) subject clitics and, depending on the person/number of the subject, an additional negation marker -u/o. In the negative present imperfective of the verbs up- ‘know’, sah- ‘be able to’, pah- ‘resemble, look like’ and heen- ‘want’, the auxiliary verb is not used (see below in the present section). When the subject is first or second person, the subject clitics are attached to both the main and auxiliary verb (9a-d). When the subject is third person, the subject clitics are attached only to the existential verb (9e-g). In addition, when the subject is singular or first person plural, a negation marker -u/o is affixed at the final slot of the existential verb, but when the subject is second person plural or third person plural, the negation marker -u/o is not affixed to the existential verb (compare example (9d) and (9g) to the other examples in (9)). The negative suffix is realised as -o when the form of the existential verb has a final palatal consonant. It occurs as -u when the existential verb has a final alveolar consonant. The following are illustrative examples:
In fast speech, the negative subject clitics of the existential verb are often encliticised to the main verb. This encliticisation deletes the glottal stop of the subject clitics. This in turn results in vowel coalescence for first and second persons: i+a=ee as shown in (10a). For third persons, the final vowel of the present imperfective suffix and the initial vowel of the negative subject clitic become a short vowel (i+i=i) as illustrated in (10b).

(10a) kawwattasiʔ ?addানweek kittu  
_kawwattas-iʔ_ aʔ=daw-ni=aʔ  _kit-t-u_  
terrace-DEF.M/F 2.NEG-build-IPF.PRES = 2NEG be-2-NEG  
‘You (SG) are not building the terrace.’
With overt objects, it is possible to have three negative subject clitics for first and second person: one occurs with the object as a prefix, the second one with the main verb and the third one with the existential verb. Compare (11a-b) with (11c-d).

(11a)  aʔ=ʛoyra-siʔ aʔ=ʛoyra-siʔ aʔ=ʛoyra-siʔ  
2NEG = tree-DEF.M/F 2NEG = tree-DEF.M/F 2NEG = tree-DEF.M/F
‘You (SG) did not cut the tree.’

(11b)  1NEG = ox-DEM.M/F 1NEG = ox-DEM.M/F 1NEG = ox-DEM.M/F
‘I will not buy this ox.’

(11c)  1NEG = beans 1NEG = beans 1NEG = beans
‘I do not eat beans.’

(11d)  2NEG = fields 2NEG = fields 2NEG = fields
‘You (SG) do not work on fields.’

The negative subject clitics that occur with overt objects are optional, (12).

(12a)  2NEG = fields 2NEG = fields 2NEG = fields
‘You (SG) did not cut the tree.’

(12b)  ox-DEM.M/F 1NEG = ox-DEM.M/F 1NEG = ox-DEM.M/F
‘I will not buy this ox.’

(12c)  1NEG = beans 1NEG = beans 1NEG = beans
‘I do not eat beans.’
The verb roots in (13a) do not require the existential verb for negation in the present imperfective as shown in (13b-d). In 6.2.1.2, we also saw that these verb roots differ from other verb roots in that they do not attach the present imperfective aspect marker -ni.

(13a)  
up- ‘know’
sah- ‘be able to’
pah- ‘resemble, look like’
heen- ‘want’

(13b)  
χopoosiniʔʔanheenu  
χopaa-osiniʔ  an=heen-u  
shoes-DEM.P 1NEG = want-NEG  
‘I do not want these shoes.’

(13c)  
iʃak kawwatta dawiya insahu  
iʃaʔ  kawwatta  daw-iya  
3SGM.PRO-NOM  terrace  build-VN  
in=sa-h-u  
3NEG-be.able.to-NEG  
‘He is not able to build a terrace.’

(13d)  
iʃinaʔ ʔoli aʔʔuptan  
iʃinaʔ  ʔoli  
2PL.PRO-NOM  each.other  
ʔaʔ=ʔup-t-a-n  
2NEG = know-2-IPF.FUT-P  
‘You (PL) do not know each other.’

11.1.4. Negative dependent

Negative dependent in conditional clauses and temporal clauses is marked by negative subject clitics, as well as negative suffixes. Here are some examples:

(14a)  
oon ankalin kikawpan deya  
oo-n  an=kal-in  ke  
if-N 1NEG = return.home-NEG 2SG.PRO.ACC  
kapa-opa=in  dey-a  
near-to=1  come-IPF.FUT  
‘If I do not return home, I will come to you.’
(14b) kandé urmalaaapa anaanin koɔasiʔ? ʔinkiʔ? ʔiyyaɗa
kandé-n urmalaa-opa an=aan-in
if-N market-to 1NEG = go-NEG
kɔaasiʔ in=kiʔ iyyaɗ-a
work-DEF.M/F 1 = 2SG.PRO.ACC-DAT help-IPF.FUT
‘If I did not go to the market, I will help you with the work.’

(14c) an ʔaʃ akkinu male andeʔnu
a=in ʔaʃ akki-n-u
REL=1 3SGM.PRO[OBJ] see-PL-NEG.IPF.FUT
male an=dey-n-u
without 1NEG = come-PL-NEG.IPF.FUT
‘Unless we see him, we shall not come (back).’

(14d) kandé punu deta ohtaʔiʔ? ʔiʃeennaʔ? ʔandaaʃo
kandé=i punu dey-t-a ohta-siʔ?
if=3 even come-3F-IPF.FUT cloth-DEF.M/F
iʃeennaʔ an=ɗaaʃ-o
3SGF.PRO[ACC]-DAT 1.NEG = give-NEG.IPF.FUT
‘Even if she comes, I will not give her the cloth.’

(14e) awtan ankeerin, iʃa anʛaɗɗaapu
awta-n an=keer-in ʔaʃ
when=N 1NEG = run-PF 3SGM.PRO[ACC]
an=ɗaɗaap-u
1NEG = catch.up.with-NEG
‘When I do not run, I don’t catch up with him.’

For additional examples and details, see conditional clauses in Section 12.1.1 and temporal clauses in Section 12.1.2.

11.1.5. Prohibitives with opa

Prohibition is expressed by opa (or its short form o) and negative subject clitics on the existential verb. The sentences in (15a and 16a) are interrogatives and those in (15b and 16b) are responses expressing prohibition. The responses may occur with innaʔ ‘no’ as in (16c).
(15a) tikaayupa iʔannee
   \textit{tika-ayfu-opa} \quad \textit{i-an-ni-e}
   house-POSS.M/F.3PL-to \quad 3 = \text{go-IPF.PRES-Q}
   ‘Is it possible to go to their house?’

(15b) \textit{opa annin can}
   \textit{opro \quad ?an-ni=in \quad kiy-a-n}
   PROH \quad go-IPF.PRES=3.NEG \quad be-IPF.PRES-P
   ‘It is forbidden to go (in).’

(16a) kupalaata idammee
   \textit{kupalaata \quad i=ɗam-ni-e}
   rabbit \quad 3 = \text{eat-IPF.PRES-Q}
   ‘Is rabbit eaten?’

(16b) \textit{opa dammin can}
   \textit{opro \quad dam-ni=in \quad kiy-a-n}
   PROH \quad eat-IPF.PRES=3.NEG \quad be-IPF.PRES-P
   ‘It is forbidden to eat (rabbit).’

(16c) \textit{innaʔ \textit{opa dammin can}}
   \textit{innaʔ \textit{opro \quad dam-ni=in}}
   no \quad PROH \quad eat-IPF.PRES=3.NEG
   \textit{kiy-a-n}
   \text{be-IPF.PRES-P}
   ‘No! It is forbidden to eat (rabbit).’

11.1.6. Negative imperative

As discussed in Section 6.4.1, the affirmative imperative verb is marked by -\textit{i} when the addressee is singular and by -\textit{a} when it is plural, but it is not marked with subject clitics. Negative imperatives, on the other hand, have negative subject clitics. In addition, the negative imperative verb is marked by the suffix -\textit{an}, for both singular and plural addressee. Consider the following examples:

(17a) \textit{in=aan-an}
   2NEG = go-NEG.IMP.SG/PL
   ‘(You (SG/PL)) Do not go!’

(17b) \textit{goyraasiʔ \textit{ʔimmuran}}
   \textit{goyra-asiʔ \textit{iʔ=μur-an}}
   tree-DEM.M/F \quad 2NEG = cut[SG]-NEG.IPM
   ‘(You (SG/PL)) Do not cut the tree!’
11.1.7. Negative optatives

Negative optative is marked on the verb by the negative subject clitic in= and the negative suffix -in on the verb. These morphemes do not distinguish number; both third person singular and plural are marked by these morphemes, as illustrated in (18a and 18b). Number is sometimes expressed in the lexical root if the root is inherently plural, as is the case in (18b).

(18a) in=?aan-in
     3NEG=go-NEG.OPT
     ‘Let him/her/them not go.’

(18b) in=hir-in
     3NEG=run[PL]-NEG.OPT
     ‘Let them not run.’

11.1.8. Negation in adjectival clauses

Negation in adjectival clauses requires an adjectival root and the existential verb. Negative subject clitics occur with the adjectival root for first and second persons but not for third person subject. Likewise, negative suffixes do not occur with the adjectival root for all persons. The existential verb in adjectival clauses contains negative subject clitics for all persons. Moreover, except for second person plural and third person plural, the remaining persons occur with negative suffixes on the existential verb. (See Section 11.1.3, where similar restrictions are observed in non-adjectival lexical verbs). The negative suffixes are -u/o. Plural subjects require the reduplication of the adjectival root’s initial $C_1V(C_1)$ for number agreement. Subject personal pronouns are optional. The following are illustrative examples:

(19a) anderi anco
     an=ɗer-i an=kiy-o
     1NEG=be.tall-PF 1NEG=be-NEG
     ‘I am not tall.’

(19b) addeddderi akkittan
     aʔ=ɗeɗ-ɗer-i aʔ=kit-t-a-n
     2NEG=PL-be.tall-PF 2NEG=be-2-IPF.FUT-P
     ‘You (PL) are not tall.’

(19c) der-i in=kit-t-u
     be.tall-PF 3NEG=be-3F-NEG
     ‘She is not tall.’

Inchoative adjectival clauses contain the suffix -aad. Furthermore, all persons have negative subject clitics. Except for second person plural and third person
plural, the remaining persons occur with a negative suffix on the adjectival root. In (20a-b) are sentential examples with the adjectival root der- ‘be tall, long’. In (20c), I give the surface form of the complete paradigm.

(20a) anderaadu
   \[ an = \text{der-aad-u} \]
   1\text{NEG}=\text{be.tall-INCH-NEG.IPF.FUT} 
   ‘I will not become tall.’

(20b) addederaattan
   \[ a? = \text{ded-der-aad-t-a-n} \]
   2\text{NEG}=\text{PL-be.tall-INCH-2-IPF.FUT-P} 
   ‘You (PL) will become tall.’

(20c) anderaadu
   ‘I will not become tall.’
andederaannu
   ‘We will not become tall.’
adderaattu
   ‘You (SG) will not become tall.’
addederaattan
   ‘You (PL) will become tall.’
inderadaadu
   ‘He will become tall.’
inderaaantu
   ‘She will not become tall.’
indeederaaddan
   ‘They will not become tall.’

11.2. Negation in nominal clauses

Negation in nominal clauses is marked by the clause final clitic -nnin. The following are illustrative examples:

(21a) seni tuuyawwaannimma χarχarayaa
   \[ seni? \quad tuuyawwaa-nnin-ma \quad \chi\chi\text{arayaa} \]
   DEM.PL pigs-NEG-but warthogs 
   ‘These are not pigs, but warthogs.’

(21b) an = akim-itta-nnin < hakim ‘physician’ Amh.>
   \[ l = \text{physician-AGENT.SGM-NEG} \]
   ‘I am not a physician.’

In the future imperfective, nominal clauses require the verb root kodf- ‘become’ to which negative subject clitics and a negative suffix are added. Here are some examples:

(22a) akim-itta
   \[ \text{physician-AGENT.SGM} \quad 1\text{NEG}=\text{become-IPF.FUT.NEG} \]
   ‘I will not become a physician.’
Possessive nominal clauses also add the clitic -nnin to express negation. The following are illustrative examples:

(23a) init tikaawunnin
     iniʔ tika-aawu-nnin
     DEM.M/F house-1SG.POSS.M/F-NEG
     ‘This is not my house.’

(23b) ɗila-adi-nnin
     field-3SG.POSS-NEG
     ‘It is not his/her field.’

The verb root kid- ‘say’ is sometimes used with object form of pronouns in negative clauses. Negative subject clitics as well as the negative suffix -n occur with this verb root. In the following examples, (24a) is a context for the reply in (24b).

(24a) kee ʛoyrasim muraye
     ke-é ʛoyra-siʔ mur-ay-e
     2PRO.ACC-CLF tree-DEF.M/F cut[SG]-PF[3M]-Q
     ‘Is it you (SG) who cut the tree?’

(24b) anan kiʔni
     ana=in kiɗ-n-i
     1SG.PRO.ACC=3NEG say-NEG-PF
     ‘Not me.’
     (lit.: ‘He/she/they did not say me.’)

11.3. Lexical negation

There are certain verb roots that inherently have a negative meaning. For instance, the verb root diiʃ- ‘stop’ carries a negative reading in relative clauses, as shown in (25)
The other lexical item with a negative meaning is `male` ‘without’, which stands in lexical contrast with the word `olle` ‘with’. This is shown below.

(26a)  
\[
\text{iʃa olleen aana} \\
\text{iʃa \, olle=in \, an-a} \\
3\text{SGM.PRO[ACC] \, with} = 1 \text{\, go-IPF.FUT}
\]
'I will go with him.'

(26b)  
\[
\text{iʃa maleen aana} \\
\text{iʃa \, male=in \, an-a} \\
3\text{SGM.PRO[ACC] \, without} = 1 \text{\, go-IPF.FUT}
\]
'I will go without him.'

Each of the above clauses may occur with negative markers rendering the opposite meaning.

(27a)  
\[
\text{iʃa olle anaanu} \\
\text{iʃa \, olle \, an=aan-u} \\
3\text{SGM.PRO[ACC] \, with} \text{\, } 1\text{NEG=go-NEG.IPF.FUT}
\]
'I will not go with him.'

(27b)  
\[
\text{iʃa male anaanu} \\
\text{iʃa \, male \, an=aan-u} \\
3\text{SGM.PRO[ACC] \, without} \text{\, } 1\text{NEG=go-NEG.IPF.FUT}
\]
'I will not go without him.'

Still another lexical item with a negative meaning is `malaal`- ‘be unable to’. The following is an illustrative example:

(28)  
\[
\text{iʃak keerinta imalaalay} \\
\text{iʃa?-\, \, keer-inta \, i=malaal-ay} \\
3\text{SGM.PRO-NOM \, run[SG]-VN \, 3=be.unable.to-PF}
\]
'He was unable to run.'

11.4. Movement of subject clitics and emphatic negation

Unlike their affirmative counterparts, negative subject clitics cannot be separated from the verb and do not occur with overt subjects. This is illustrated by the ungrammatical forms in (29).
Negation is emphasized by using the lexeme *apare* ‘somewhere’. It renders a meaning equivalent to the English adverb ‘never’. Here are some examples:

(30a)  
\[\text{kussitto} \ ? \text{apare} \text{toχupa} \text{inanní}\]
\[kussitto-NOM \ somewhere \ Toχa-to \ 3NEG=go-NEG-PF\]
‘Kussitto has never been to Toχa.’

(30b)  
\[\text{anti} \ ? \text{apare} \text{koommaytipa} \text{ananní}\]
\[1SG.PRO-NOM \ somewhere \ koommayte-to \ 1NEG=go-NEG-PF\]
‘I have never been to Koommayte.’

(30c)  
\[\text{ifás} \ ? \text{apare} \text{dīla} \text{inkanní}\]
\[3SGM.PRO-NOM \ somewhere \ field \ 3NEG=sell-NEG-PF\]
‘He never sold a field.’

(30d)  
\[\text{ifọonna} \ ? \text{apare} \text{incán}\]
\[3PL.PRO-NOM \ somewhere \ 3NEG=be-IPF.FUT-NEG\]
‘They are nowhere.’