

The morphosyntax of negation in Zargulla

Azeb Amha (Leiden University Centre for Linguistics)

1. Introduction¹

Zargulla is the name by which the language examined in the present study is known among linguists and in official documents in Ethiopia. The 1994 national census, for instance, reports that there are 7800 mother tongue speakers of Zargulla. The speakers refer to themselves as *Gamo* and to their language as *Gamotsoto*. They use ‘Zargulla’ to refer to the area where they live and in reference to their ritual chief (senior sacrificer) whom they call *Zargulla kaati* (chief/king). Confusing to the outsider, there is another dominant linguistic group (700,000 people in the 1994 census) who *also* refer to themselves as *Gamo* and to their language as *Gamotsoto* and are known officially by this name. The Zargulla people, however, identify this group as *Zeege* or *dâac’e* and they refer to the language of these people as *Zeegetso* or *dâac’etso*. The Zargulla and the ‘official’ Gamo (i.e., *Zeegetso* or *dâac’etso*) languages are not mutually intelligible. However, some of the members of the two language groups live in the same villages and are bilingual in Zargulla and Gamo. The two groups are agriculturalists in a similar ecological setting but, according to the British social anthropologist Dena Freeman, who did extensive field work in the area, they have different social structures, oral traditions and rituals (cf. Freeman 2006).

¹ I would like to thank the Dutch National Science Foundation (NWO), for its financial support under its Endangered Languages Program, which made research on Zargulla possible. I am grateful to Sasha Aikhenvald, Felix Ameka, Maarten Mous and the editor of the volume, Leo Wetzels, for helpful comments. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 5th International Conference on Cushitic-Omotc Languages, 16-18 April 2008, LLACAN/Inalco Paris. I thank the participants of the conference for comments and stimulating discussion. All remaining errors and shortcomings are of course my responsibility.

The Zargulla language belongs to the East Omoto branch of Omotic, whereas Gamo belongs to the North Omoto branch (cf. Fleming 1976). The current administrative division in Ethiopia (introduced in 1992) is mainly based on ethno-linguistic identity. Due to their shared ethnic identity name (Gamo), the Zargulla and North Omoto Gamo are considered the same. The two are part of the same administrative unit, and primary education is given to Zargulla children using the (North Omoto) Gamo language, which has become one of the few written local languages in the area. This will enhance bilingualism in Gamo and may endanger the continuation of Zargulla as a distinct language.

Omotic is part of the larger Afroasiatic language family, whose other members are Berber, Chadic, Cushitic, Egyptian and Semitic. Languages that are closely related to Zargulla and are also classified as East Omoto languages are Koorete, Haro, and Zayse and a number of other little-known languages or dialects, such as Garbantsa, Mäle and Ganta. Zargulla and Zayse are the closest within the branch and they are claimed to be dialects of the same language. The two indeed are very similar but there are some lexical as well as morphological differences between them.

Zargulla is a tone-accent language with a limited number of monosyllabic words. That is, although high and low tone are readily distinguishable and form some minimal pair contrasts, the distribution of the high tone suggests a lexical rule whereby every disyllabic or multisyllabic word must have at least one high tone, with obligatory contrast in accentual prominence among the syllables. There are no multi-syllabic words with low tone on all syllables.² SOV word order in clauses is frequent but variations are also attested. The case roles of subject, object as well as genitive, dative and ablative are morphologically marked on the noun (cf. Yimam 1994). Depending on verbal focus and mood, the subject may also be co-indexed on the verb through agreement suffixes. Object is not marked on the verb. Verbs are also morphologically marked for tense-aspect, mood and in certain tenses for negation. All nominal and verbal bound morphemes are suffixes; there are no prefixes in the language.

² In the present study, high tone-accent is marked by the grave accent (`), low tone is not marked.

In the present contribution we deal with clausal negation, which involves at least seven different morphemes used in different tenses and moods in main and dependent clauses.³ Two of the seven negation markers examined in the present contribution are only used in dependent clauses. The remaining five, which exhibit formal correspondences with each other, are used in the main clause. Negation is marked by bound morphemes attached to the verb in the non-past tenses of declarative and interrogative moods and in dependent clauses. In the past tense of declarative and interrogative clauses and in the imperative/optative mood, however, it is expressed by negative verbs. There is partial similarity between the independent negative verbs and negative affixes, suggesting a (historical) link between the two. The purpose of the present work is to address analytical problems emerging from the formal similarity between the bound negative markers and independent negative verbs. Specifically, the question arises whether the bound negative markers reflect morphologization of a syntactic (periphrastic) negative verb phrase and whether the non-inflecting negative verbs in the declarative emerged through simplification of inflectional paradigms. Based on comparison of negation marking in declarative, interrogative and imperative/optative moods in Zargulla and taking note of the situation in related languages and general typological tendencies we suggest an answer to this question. As background for the discussion on negation, we will present in section 2 a brief summary of predicate types in Zargulla and point out how each of these is marked for negation. In section 3, we elaborate on bound and independent morphemes that mark negation and illustrate their use in context. This section is intended to show that the distribution of the negative markers is determined by the predicate type, tense and mood. Section 4 presents a summary of the interaction of mood/modality and negation. In section 5 we briefly discuss negation in dependent clauses and conclude the paper.

2. Types of verbal predicates in main clauses in Zargulla

On morphological grounds, we distinguish three main verbal predicate types in Zargulla. The largest group comprises verb roots which inflect

³ Term-negation, negative quantifiers and adverbs will not be discussed.

for (present, past, future and progressive) tenses or negation. We will refer to verbs from this class as ‘simple lexical verbs’ in contrast to ‘compound or complex predicates’ and ‘existential-predicative (auxiliary) verbs’ which form the remaining two verb types. The structure of the three predicate types and how negation is marked on them is briefly discussed in sections 2.1-2.3.

2.1 Existential and predicative verbs *yese* and *yene*

The verbs *yese* and *yene* can head a main clause or they may serve as auxiliary verbs, occurring in combination with other lexical verbs. These two are affirmative verbs characterized by the fact that they do not inflect for subject agreement. Moreover, tense and negation are expressed by replacing *yese* and *yene* with their corresponding suppletive forms.

The verb *yese* has the lexical meaning ‘exist’ as in (1a) and with a dative-subject it expresses possession (1b).

- (1) a. košáll-aa ?uúnnó-y yésa
košalle-LOC malaria-NOM EXIST:PRES
 ‘There is malaria in Koshalle (i.e. name of a village)’
 b. ?ésú-s lagó gaiddeé-tte yésa
 3PL-DAT a.lot ox-FOC exist:PRES
 ‘They have a lot of oxen’

yene is a general predicative verb, comparable to the “BE-verbs” in English (2).

- (2) a. k’ottó-y ?ánn-aa yéne
 axe-NOM where-LOC BE:PRES
 ‘Where is the axe?’
 b. yés’s’-í díkk-áwo taí ?oótsó
 sing-SS:CNV NEG.VB-3PL:OPT 1SG.SBJ work
 gallá-tte yéne
 body-FOC. BE:PRES
 ‘Let them not sing! I am working’

The past tense form of both *yese* and *yene* is *yéšše*, as illustrated in (3a) and (3b), respectively. While affirmative simple and complex verbs dis-

tinguish present, past, progressive and future tenses, existential verbs only make a distinction between present and past tense.

- (3) a. nú gáde ga mačo bínnatheyéšše
 1SG:EXCL:POS land LOC a.lot heat EXIS:PAST
 ‘There was too much heat in our area’
 b. ʔísóy s’oolínté-tte yéšše
 3F.SG:SBJ star-FOC BE:PAST
 ‘It was a star’ (lit. ‘She was a star’)

Moreover, the verbs *yese* and *yene* have a common declarative negative form *baáʔa* ‘there is no X’, ‘there was no X’ or ‘(He, she, etc.) is/was not X’, as illustrated in the examples in (4). Tense is not distinguished in negative existential or predicative declarative clauses; subject-agreement and other verbal categories are also not marked (4a,b). Such morphological reduction in the negative is attested in many languages (cf. Miestamo 2005). However, as we will show in section 3.2., a verbal base *b-*, formally similar to *baáʔa*, is inflected for subject-agreement in negative interrogative clauses in Zargulla.

- (4) a. dímall-a ʔuúnno-y baáʔa
 dímale-LOC malaria-NOM exist.NEG
 ‘There is/was no malaria in Dimalle’
 b. ʔésí ʔayyéla mala dič’ó baáʔa
 3M.SG.SBJ ayyele:ABS SIML tall BE:NEG
 ‘He is/was not so tall as Ayyele’

2.2 Simple lexical verbs

Simple lexical verbs may only be marked for tense, e.g. *dǎy-ínne* in (5a) or they could be fully inflected taking tense and subject-agreement as in (5b) when the verb is in focus. Fully inflecting main verbs are derived from complex verbs comprising two verbs (V_1 and V_2) but the V_2 is often not expressed and morphological material associated with it are pronounced as part of V_1 (cf. Amha 2007a). For this reason focused verbs such as *yew-* in (5b) are treated on a par with simple verbs in this work.

- (5) a. budó ?ekk-í ?ol-í ?udúla gá-tte
 fire:ACC take-SS:CNV give.up-SS:CNV mortar interior-FOC
 dáy-ínne
 throw-PAST
 ‘He took fire and put it *in a mortar*’
- b. ?aadé yew-aá-tt-us-éne
 true come-PROG-FOC-3PL-FUT
 ‘They are (really) *coming*’

Like the affirmative declarative past tense marker *-ínne* in (5a) above, the non-past negative declarative marker, *-aá?a*, is directly attached to the verb root, as in example (6).

- (6) hínno-y hamm-aá?a
 that:F-NOM go-NEG:NON-PAST:DCL
 ‘That one (F) does not go/ is not going’

In contrast to the affirmative (cf. 5b), the negative imperfective verb in (6) does not take other affixes such as subject-agreement or focus. In terms of tense-aspect, a situation expressed by a verb root + *-aá?a* is viewed as non-complete: depending on context, it can be interpreted as a present tense form, a progressive, or a habitual action. Thus only past and non-past distinction is made in the negative declarative. Past negative declarative clauses are formed using a complex predicate which is discussed in the next section (2.3).

2.3 Complex predicates

Complex predicates in Zargulla comprise two verbal elements. The V_1 is either a converb (7a-b), a derived intensive or progressive verb stem or an ideophonic verb. V_2 may be one of the existential-predicative verbs (as in 7c) or one of a restricted set of simple lexical verbs including directional verbs such as *yew-* ‘come’, *ham-* ‘go’ or aspectual verbs such as *kes-* ‘go out’, *?ol-* ‘give up’ which, respectively, express the ‘start’ or ‘completion’ of the state of affairs expressed by V_1 , illustrated in (7a,b). In example (7) the complex predicates are underlined.

- (7) a. kiítá-y ham-úm boč'oc'-átt-us
 message-NOM go-DS:CNV present-FOC-3PL:SBJ
ʔekk-í yeénne
 take-SS:CNV come:PAST
 'The message having gone (to them), (the hyenas) brought
 a present'
- b. ʔudúla ga ḍay-í ʔol-í budó
 mortar:ABS inside throw-SS:CNV give.up-SS:CNV fire
 ga waatsé-tte huúʔʔ-ínne
 inside water-FOC pour-PAST
 'After hiding (some of the fire) in a mortar (he) spilled water on
 the hearth (i.e., to extinguish the rest of the fire so that his friend
 would not have fire)'
- c. gožž-éne-tte-s híyy-áa yéne
 get_drunk-FUT-FOC-3M.SG say-PROG BE:PRES
 'He is a little drunk'

As mentioned earlier, the past negative declarative is also expressed by a complex predicate comprising the converb form of the negated lexical verb and the negative existential verb *baáʔa*. Note for example, the structural similarity between the underlined affirmative complex predicate in (7a) and the past tense negative verb in (8).

- (8) ʔésí núná haar-í baáʔa
 3M.SG:NOM 1PL:EXCL:OBJ rule-SS:CNV NEG:PAST:DCL
 'He did not rule/administer us'

To summarize the present section, the three predicate types in Zargulla declarative clauses are associated with different ways of marking negation. Existential-predicative verbs have a corresponding negative existential verb: *baáʔa* 'there is/was not, it is/was not.' In contrast, the negative of simple or complex predicates may be formed by affixing a bound negative morpheme to the verb or by combining a converb form of the verb and the negative verb *baáʔa*. Next to *baáʔa*, there are two other negative verbs: *b-* and *dikk-/dokk-* which combine with a simple or complex predicate. The choice of using a bound negative marker or any of the three negative verbs *baáʔa*, *b-* or *dikk-/dokk-* depends on the tense

and mood/modality value of the clause, as we will show in sections 3 and 4.

3. Negation in main clauses

3.1 Negation in declarative clauses

In past affirmative clauses, negation is indicated by the verb *baáʔa* which is preceded by the converb form of the negated lexical verb. Hereafter, negative verbs are highlighted using boldface letters.

- (9) háy taa **mišš-í** **baáʔa**
 this:M-NOM 1SG:OBJ satiate-SS:CNV NEG:PF:DCL
 yaá-tte-inne gaámmé-y
 that_say-FOC-PAST lion-NOM
 “‘This (food) did not satisfy me’ said the lion’

As an existential verb *baáʔa* does not distinguish tense-aspect; it may be used to express a denial of an event in the past or present. But in combination with a lexical verb it denotes only the past negative. As such, it contrasts with *-aáʔa* which is directly affixed to the verb root and designates a non-past negative declarative clause (10). The latter is clearly a bound morpheme. Other than derivational affixes such as the causative or the passive (10b), no other inflectional material can intervene between the verb root and *-aáʔa*, and no other inflectional or derivational affix can follow it.

- (10) a. dokkó maahé-y **míy-aáʔa**
 cabbage:ABS leopard-NOM eat-NEG:NON-PAST:DCL
 ‘A leopard does not eat cabbage’
 b. ʔúsúní **téʔ-útt-aáʔa**
 3PL:NOM stop-PASS-NEG:NON-PAST:DCL
 ‘They are not prevented/ They will not be prevented’

The imperfective negative declarative marker *-aáʔa* is formally similar to the negative existential verb *baáʔa*. This formal similarity leads to raising the following question: does the verb *baáʔa* consist of more than one morpheme or is the imperfective negative marker *-aáʔa* a phonologically reduced part of a single morpheme *baáʔa*? This issue will be discussed in

section 4, where we propose the first analysis based on evidence from other parts of the grammar. As we show in the next section, there are other formally corresponding independent negative verbs and bound negation markers in Zargulla.

3.2 Negation in interrogative clauses

In the present section we address polar interrogatives only. The negative declarative and negative interrogative differ mainly by the fact that the negative verb in the interrogative indicates person, number and gender distinctions of the subject whereas the negative declarative does not inflect for subject as we showed in sections 2.1-2.3 and 3.1.

In negative interrogative clauses past, progressive, and future or present tenses are distinguished. The head in the past and progressive negative interrogative clauses is a complex predicate and subject inflection is marked on the negative verb which occurs as V_2 . The examples in (11a-c) illustrate subject-agreement distinctions among third person masculine singular, first person plural, and first person singular. The full paradigm of interrogative negative verbs is given in (16).

- (11) a. ?ú keelá-y **kong-í** **b-áye**
 3PL:POS terrace-NOM fill-SS:CNV NEG:VB:PAST:Q-3M.SG
 gáda
 land
 ‘Didn’t their (Woraze people’s) terrace fill the land?’
 (i.e. ‘There are many terraces made by them’)
- b. took’ám-eđe **híyy-útt-a** **b-áwo**
 took’ame-PL say-PASS-INT NEG:VB:PAST:Q-3PL
 ‘Aren’t they called *took’ame*?’
 (*took’ame* = name of a group/descent line)
- c. harge-í táná hátte hátte ?aíkk-í
 disease-NOM 1SG:OBJ now now hold-SS:CNV
 wóđ-ó ?aík-um **dákk-í** **b-ánna**
 kill-INT hold-DS:CNV send-SS:CNV NEG:VB:PAST:Q-1SG
 ‘Didn’t I divorce her when disease kept catching me frequently and started to kill me?’ (i.e., ‘I divorced her when I got sick frequently’)

The progressive takes the same negative verb (i.e. *b-*) and similar subject agreement markers as the past tense form but in the former the lexical verb must end in a long vowel *-áa* as illustrated in (12).

- (12) *tá* **ʔoots-áa** **b-ánna**
 1SG work-PROG NEG:VB:PAST:Q-1SG
 ‘Am I not busy working?’

The suffix *-áa* is also used in the declarative negative to indicate the progressive aspect (13).

- (13) *tá* **ʔoots-áa** **baáʔa**
 1SG work-PROG NEG:PF:DCL
 ‘I am not working’

In the future and present tense form, the interrogative negative is marked by *-ikk-* (14). This morpheme is directly attached to the lexical verb and it is followed by the same subject-agreement markers that are used in the past and progressive negative interrogative forms discussed earlier in the present section.

- (14) *híkko* *taí* *tá* *ʔaccó* *ʔul-í*
 INTJ 1SG:SBJ 1SG:POS meat.ACC return-SS:CNV
ʔep-ikk-ánna
 take-NEG:NON-PAST:Q-1SG
 ‘Well in that case, won’t I/don’t I take my meat back?’

It is possible to leave out the negation markers (*b-* or *-ikk-*) from an utterance as a consequence of which the interrogative subject-agreement markers appear directly affixed to the verb. In such cases the subject agreement markers function as the only morphological indicators of negation and interrogation. For example, the sentence in (15) cannot be a declarative clause; it can, however, be ambiguous with the affirmative optative, which takes the same subject-agreement markers as negative interrogative and imperative/optative verbs. It is possible that intonation plays a role in distinguishing between the negative interrogative and imperative/optative interpretation but this has not yet been fully investigated.

- (15) gomé maák'k'-iya hí ?ute
 curse/taboo become-3F.SG that reason
 'Doesn't it become a taboo because of that?'
 Or: 'Let it become a taboo because of that.'
 [Not: 'It becomes a taboo because of that']

In (16a) and (16b) we illustrate the full paradigm of past and future/present negative interrogative verbs. Note the alternation of the verb into *hang-* ~ *ham-* 'go' depending on tense-aspect. Such stem alternation, corresponding to tense-aspect and mood, is observed only for a few verbs (cf. Amha 2007a) and it will not be further discussed here because it is not directly relevant for our analyses.

(16) a. Negative Interrogative, Non-Fut:

1SG.	hang-í b- <u>ánna</u>	'Didn't I go?'
2SG.	hang-í b- <u>ay(e)</u>	'Didn't you go?'
3F.SG.	hang-í b- <u>íya</u>	'Didn't she go?'
3M.SG.	hang-í b- <u>áye</u>	'Didn't he go?'
1PL.EXCL.	hang-í b- <u>únno</u>	'Didn't we go?'
1PL.INCL.	hang-í b- <u>ínno</u>	'Didn't we go?'
2PL.	hang-í b- <u>íte</u>	'Didn't you (pl.) go?'
3PL.	hang-í b- <u>áwo</u>	'Didn't they go?'

b. Negative Interrogative, Future/ present:

1SG.	ham-íkk- <u>ánna</u>	'Will I not/Don't I go?'
2SG.	ham-íkk- <u>ay(e)</u>	'Won't you/Don't you go?'
3F.SG.	ham-íkk- <u>íya</u>	'Won't she go/Doesn't she go?'
3M.SG.	ham-íkk- <u>áye</u>	'Won't he go/Doesn't he go?'
1PL.EXCL.	ham-íkk- <u>únno</u>	'Won't we go/Don't we go?'
1PL.INCL.	ham-íkk- <u>ínno</u>	'Won't we go/Don't we go?'
2PL.	ham-íkk- <u>íte</u>	'Won't you go/Don't you go?'
3PL.	ham-íkk- <u>áwo</u>	'Won't they go/ Don't they go?'

The examples in (11-15) and the paradigm in (16) show that there is no dedicated question marker in negative interrogative clauses. The same holds for positive/affirmative interrogative clauses which also have no special question morpheme. Moreover, intonation patterns in declarative and interrogative clauses do not differ significantly. The main difference between affirmative interrogative clauses and their declarative counter-

parts is the absence of the focus marker *-tte-*, which is generally present either on the verb or on one of its complements in affirmative declarative clauses, as in (17a) and (17b), respectively. (The focus marker is formally identical to the masculine copula marker *-tte*, see example (18)). When none of these two constituents is focused, e.g. when the speaker wishes to highlight the subject, a special construction based on the relative clause form of the verb is used (cf. Amha 2007b). In example (17a), the verb is in focus and it is marked by *-tte-*. The corresponding interrogative sentence in (17c) is structurally identical to that in (17a), except that the morpheme *-tte-* is absent.

- (17) a. ?ayyele-í šanká hám-á-tte-s-ínne
 Ayele-NOM low_land go-ThV-FOC-3MS-PAST
 ‘Ayele *went* to the low land’
- b. ?ayyele-í šanká-tte-s hám-ínne
 Ayele-NOM low_land-FOC-3MS go-PAST
 ‘Ayele went to *the* low land’
- c. ?ayyele-í šanká hám-á-s-ínne
 Ayele-NOM low_land go-ThV-FOC-3MS-PAST
 ‘Did Ayele go to the low land?’

All of the negative interrogative forms in the paradigm in (16a) may alternatively be replaced by the invariable *hang-í baás-wa*, which is a nominalized relative clause followed by the interrogative copula morpheme *-wa* (18).

- (18) hang-í b-aás-wa
 go:PF-SS:CNV NEG:VB:PAST-REL-COP:Q
 ‘Didn’t I/you/he/she etc. go?’
 [lit. ‘Am I/ aren’t you, etc. not one who is gone?’]

The use of the morpheme *-wa* as a copula marker in non-verbal predicative clauses is illustrated in the question and answer pairs in (19), where *-wa* in the question form contrasts with the affirmative copula markers *-tta/-tte* in the response to the question. The morpheme *-tte* also functions as a focus marker (cf. Amha 2008 for a discussion of the copula construction in Zargulla).

- (19) haí ʔoidé-**wa** hóo ʔoidé-**tta** / -**tte**
 this chair-COP:Q yes, chair-COP:AFF
 ‘Is this a chair?’ ‘Yes, it is a chair’

That the whole negative interrogative paradigm can be replaced by an invariable nominalized form, such as that illustrated in (18), suggests that the language is developing towards reducing inflectional paradigms. In declarative and interrogative affirmative clauses, full verbal inflection involving subject-agreement is used only when focus is involved. Otherwise, the verb occurs as an invariable form with morphemes marking tense-aspect or negation (cf. verbal types discussed in section 2) or in the relative clause form. Moreover, a fully inflected declarative or interrogative affirmative verb can also be optionally replaced by a nominalized relative clause parallel to that in (18).

3.3 Negation in imperative and optative clauses

The negative imperative is formed by a complex predicate consisting of a converb and a negative imperative verb: *dókk-* or *díkk-*.

- (20) a. ʔep-í **dókk-o**
 take-SS:CNV NEG:IMP:VB-2SG
 ‘(You M/F) don’t take!’ (Compare: *ʔepp-á* ‘take (2SG)!’)
 b. ʔep-í **díkk-íte**
 take-SS:CNV NEG:IMP:VB-2PL.
 ‘Don’t take (2PL)!’ (Compare: *ʔepp-á-ite* ‘take (2PL)!’)

A formally related negative verb is used to express negative wishes (negative optative) for first and third person, as illustrated in (21).

- (21) a. ham-í **díkk-ánna**
 go-SS:CNV NEG:IMP:VB-1SG.
 ‘Let me not go!’
 b. ham-í **díkk-ínno**
 go-SS:CNV NEG:IMP:VB-1PL:INCL
 ‘Let’s not go!’

As the examples in (20-21) illustrate, the negative imperative/optative verb is affixed with the subject-agreement markers which are also used

in the negative interrogative (cf. section 3.2). These subject-agreement markers are used with *affirmative* imperative/optative verbs too. The difference between affirmative and negative optative paradigms is that in the negative, the agreement markers are attached to the negative verb, whereas in the affirmative these are affixed to the lexical verb. Negative and affirmative imperative/optative constructions are illustrated in (22a) and (22b), respectively, using the verbs *ham-* ‘go’ and *?epp-* ‘take’. The second person negative and affirmative forms (highlighted in boldface) show slight differences in subject co-indexation.

(22) a. Negative Imp/Optative:

<i>ham-í díkk-ánna</i>	‘Let me not go’
<i>ham-í dókk-o</i>	‘Don’t go!’
<i>ham-í díkk-íya</i>	‘Let her not go’
<i>ham-í díkk-aye</i>	‘Let him not go’
<i>ham-í díkk-úнно</i>	‘Let us not go (EXCL)’
<i>ham-í díkk-ínno</i>	‘Let us not go (INCL)’
<i>ham-í díkk-íte</i>	‘Don’t go!’
<i>ham-í díkk-uússo</i>	‘Let them not go’
<i>?epp-ó</i>	‘Let him/her/them take!’

b. Affirmative Imp/Optative:

<i>?epp-aná</i>	‘Let me take’
<i>?epp-á</i>	‘take! (2SG)’
<i>?epp-<u>iišša</u> / ?epp-íya</i>	‘Let her take’
<i>?epp-<u>ešše</u> / ?epp-áye</i>	‘Let him take’
<i>?epp-uúnno</i>	‘Let’s take (EXCL)’
<i>?epp-ínno</i>	‘Let’s take (INCL)’
<i>?epp-á-íte</i>	‘take! (2PL)’
<i>?epp-<u>uússo</u> /?eppá-wo</i>	‘Let them take’

Some of the subject agreement markers in the examples in (22), namely the first person plural inclusive and exclusive morphemes *-uúnno* and *-ínno*, and one of the three third person plural markers, *-uússo*, partly resemble their respective independent subject pronouns *núní* ‘we (EXCL)’, *níní* ‘we (INCL)’, *?úsúní* ‘they’. As will be discussed in the next section, a more obvious formal correspondence is observed between independent subject pronouns and verbal agreement markers in focused affirmative declarative clauses.

4. The interaction of modality and negation

In the previous section, we demonstrated the use of five negative markers, i.e., verbal lexemes and affixes that are partially similar. The distribution of the morphemes is related to modal distinctions. Declarative main verbs have sets of negation markers that are different from the ones used in imperative and optative clauses. As for the interrogative, half of its negative markers are formally similar to the ones used in the declarative, whereas the other half correspond to the ones used in the imperative/optative (see the broken lines in the boundaries of the column for negative interrogative). The highlighted segments in Table 1 show the formal similarities among bound negation markers and independent negative verbs and their realization in different tenses and moods.

Person	Negative Imperative/ Opt	Negative interrogative		Negative declarative	
	lexical V +	Non-past lexical V +	Past: lexical V +	Past: lexical V +	Non-past: lexical V +
1SG	<i>díkk-ánna</i>	<i>-íkk-ánna</i>	<i>b-ánna</i>		
2SG	<i>dókk-o</i>	<i>-íkk-ay</i>	<i>b-ay</i>		
3F.SG	<i>díkk-íya</i>	<i>-íkk-íya</i>	<i>b-íya</i>	<i>baáʔa</i>	<i>-aaʔa</i>
3M.SG	<i>díkk-áye</i>	<i>-íkk-áye</i>	<i>b-áye</i>		
1PL:EXCL	<i>díkk-únno</i>	<i>-íkk-únno</i>	<i>b-únno</i>		
INCL	<i>díkk-ínno</i>	<i>-íkk-ínno</i>	<i>b-ínno</i>		
2PL	<i>díkk-íte</i>	<i>-íkk-íte</i>	<i>b-íte</i>		
3PL	<i>díkk-uússó</i>	<i>-íkk-áwo</i>	<i>b-áwo</i>		

Table 1: Negation markers in main verbs in Zargulla

It seems that the five negative markers, *díkk-/dókk-*, *-íkk-*, *b-*, *baáʔa* and *-aaʔa*, are derived from two underlying lexical sources. However, the derivational relation among the morphemes in the different moods is not directly apparent. It seems reasonable to assume that the non-past negative interrogative suffix *-íkk-* is derived from the inflecting negative verb *díkk-/dókk-* by deletion of the initial consonantal segment. Similarly, the past negative interrogative marker *b-*+INFL and the past negative declarative verb *baáʔa* are formally related. The question is what is the direction of the derivation in this case? The first possible analysis is that the invariable declarative negative verb *baáʔa* is the basic lexical source from which its inflecting counterpart *b-* in the interrogative evolved. This claim appears to be reasonable since in its use in existential-predicative

clauses *baáʔa* is comparable to affirmative verbal lexemes such as *yese*, *yene* and *yešše*, which are also not inflecting for subject as we showed in section 2.1. Alternatively, *baáʔa* could be derived from the inflecting negative verb *b-* which we observed in negative interrogative clauses. In this second analysis, *baáʔa* could be regarded as a complex form comprising *b-* and the non-past declarative negative marker *-aáʔa*. This analysis is parallel to what we claimed for the relationship between the negative imperative/optative verb *dokk-/dikk-* and the non-past interrogative negative suffix *-ikk*.

Language-internal and external considerations suggest that the second analysis is more plausible. That is, *baáʔa* is derivative of the inflecting negative interrogative verb *b-*, which is structurally and functionally similar to the negative imperative/optative verb *dókk-/díkk*. The verbs *b-* and *dókk-/díkk* take identical subject-agreement markers and they have the same function of expressing negation. The two differ only in their distribution: *b-* is used in assertive/propositional utterances (i.e. in declaratives and interrogatives) whereas *dVkk-* is used in directives (in imperatives and optatives). The question then is what is the motivation for the emergence of a non-inflecting negative verb (i.e. *baáʔa*) in the declarative? An answer to this question must consider both a cross-linguistic typological tendency and the language-specific characteristics of Zargulla declarative clauses.

Language-internal support for our hypothesis comes from the pattern of subject agreement marking in Zargulla. As we showed in section 2.2, the affirmative declarative does either not inflect for subject-agreement at all or, when it is inflected in the case of focused verbs, these agreement forms can be shown to be recently grammaticalized from preverbal independent pronouns. The subject-agreement markers in focused declarative verbs are the highlighted morphemes in the paradigm in (23), which represents an example of the so-called ‘extended paradigm’ representing focused declarative verbs.

(23)	Focused affirmative declarative verb: <i>yewe</i> ‘to come’		
	<i>táy/tání</i>	<i>yeétt-á-tte-t-ínne</i>	
	1SG:NOM	come-EMPH-FOC-1SG-PAST	‘I came’
	<i>néní</i>	<i>yeétt-á-tte-n-ínne</i>	‘you (sg.) came’
	<i>ʔísí</i>	<i>yeétt-á-tt-iš-ínne</i>	‘she came’
	<i>ʔésí</i>	<i>yeétt-á-tte-s-ínne</i>	‘he came’
	<i>núní</i>	<i>yeétt-á-tt-un-ínne</i>	‘we (EXCL) came’
	<i>níní</i>	<i>yeétt-á-tt-in-ínne</i>	‘we (INCL) came’
	<i>wútúní</i>	<i>yeétt-á-tt-it-ínne</i>	‘you (pl.) came’
	<i>ʔúsúní</i>	<i>yeétt-á-tt-us-ínne</i>	‘they came’

Earlier works on Zargulla and on the related language Zayse have shown that the extended paradigm is a recent innovation, derived from a complex verb form (Amha 2007a) or from a syntactic clause (cf. Hayward 1990, 1991). The subject-agreement markers in this construction are derived from preverbal short pronouns. A piece of evidence for this analysis is the similarity between the independent subject pronouns *táy/tání* ‘I’, *néní* ‘you’, etc. and their corresponding verbal subject-agreement markers *-t-*, *-n-*, etc. in (23). Moreover, non-cliticized preverbal subject pronouns are still used in the related east Omoto languages Haro (cf. Woldemariam 2003) and in Koorete (Hayward 1982, Mendisu 2008). In contrast to the agreement morphemes in (23), which are used only in focused construction, the subject agreement forms in the negative interrogative and imperative/optative forms (cf. Table 1) are obligatory and they seem to be well entrenched (older) verbal categories. Considering the presence of verbal subject-agreement marking in affirmative and negative declarative clauses in most branches of Omotic, including the North and West Omoto branches, it is probable that the affirmative and negative declarative have lost earlier verbal inflectional material whereas the imperative/optative and negative interrogative kept the agreement markers. Functional (un)markedness and frequency of the declarative could have motivated the simplification in this mood (cf. Givon 1995, Bybee & Hopper 2001, among others, on the important role of markedness and frequency in innovation or recycling of morphological forms). Within the declarative, the affirmative tends to be more affected by innovation than the negative (cf. Poplack (2001) on the retention of older inflectional forms in the negative forms in Canadian French). From the point of view of this general tendency in language, and considering lan-

guage internal and comparative Omotic, the inflecting negative interrogative and imperative/optative forms of Zargulla seem to represent a more archaic form and the invariable negative declarative *baáʔa* is a later derivation. The fact that all of the inflecting negative interrogative forms may optionally be replaced by an invariable nominalized relative clause followed by the interrogative copula marker *-wa* (cf. example 18) suggests that simplification of paradigms is affecting negative verbs as well.

One question for the proposed analysis remains to be answered: what is the source of the morpheme *-aaʔa* in non-past negative verbs and in the negative existential verb *baáʔa*? This question cannot be fully answered at this point. However, what seems to be a cognate morpheme, *-áʔʔa*, is found in the south Omotic language Maale. The morpheme *-áʔʔa* is affixed to verbal roots to express ‘emphatic denial’ or ‘refusal’ as in (24a). In Maale, *-áʔʔa* may also co-occur with other negative markers: *-ib(á)-* (perfective negative), *-úw(a)-* (imperfective negative) or *-ind-úw(a)-* (future negative) as illustrated in (24b-c), taken from Amha (2001: 224-234).

- (24) a. táání pétte baazzi t-áʔʔo **mad-áʔʔa**
 1SG:NOM one thing BE-CNV₂ do.work-EMPH:NEG
 ‘I shall not do anything’
- b. ʔízá mádd-ó kurs-**ib-áʔʔa** d-á
 3F.SG:NOM work-ABS finish-PF:NEG-EMPH:NEG BE-IPF:Q
 ‘Didn’t she finish the work?’
- c. ʔíntsí wór-ó ʔáád-**úw-áʔʔa** d-á
 2PL.NOM river-ABS go-IPF:NEG-EMPH:NEG BE-IPF:Q
 ‘Aren’t you (PL or SG polite) going to the river at all?’

In the examples in (24b,c), *-áʔʔa* is not a negative marker but one that identifies the utterance as a (negative) assertion which is then questioned by the interrogative copula verb *d-* which has scope over the entire proposition.

5. Negation in dependent clauses

In the present section we briefly discuss two bound negative morphemes which are exclusively used with dependent verbs. The purpose of this section is to show that negation in dependent clauses is only marked by

- b. yee laátso ne **ፊፊፍፍ-ፊፍፍ** yés-um
 VOC chief 2SG open_mouth-NEG:SIML exist-DS:CNV
 šaató-z-í waákk-éne
 child-DEF:M-NOM what:BE-FUT
 ‘Now, chief! If you do not say something, what will happen to
 the child?’

A negative simultaneous clause marked by *-áčče* can take the focus marker **-tte** as well, as in (28).

- (28) taa **laá?-áčče-tte-n** ?ol-ínne
 1SG:OBJ kiss-NEG:SIML-FOC-2SG give_up-PAST
 hí-seési baá?a
 say-REL:NMZ EXIST:NEG
 ‘There is no one who says “you did not kiss me”’

Another dependent verb that is directly marked for focus is the affirmative anterior/simultaneous converb.

6. Summary and conclusion

The paper addresses negation marking in Zargulla, an Omotic language spoken in Ethiopia. Zargulla has several (independent and bound) morphemes that mark clausal negation. The distribution of negative markers is determined by the predicate type (i.e. auxiliary, simple lexical verb or a complex predicate), tense-aspect, mood and on the status of the clause as a dependent or main clause. Negation is marked by affixes attached to the verb in the non-past tense of declarative and interrogative clauses and in dependent clauses. In past declarative and interrogative clauses and in the imperative/optative mood however, it is expressed by independent negative verbs. There is partial similarity between the independent negative verbs and negative affixes in main clauses, suggesting a (historical) link between the two. We attempted to account for the formal correspondences among these morphemes by identifying the direction of the historical derivation. To this end, we considered language internal evidence as well as material from related languages and views on the interaction of frequency in language use and markedness. The negative verbs in the imperative/optative and the past tense interrogative are *dókk-/díkk-* and

b- respectively. We claim that the non-past interrogative negative *-ikk-* and the negative declarative verb *baáʔa*, respectively, originate from these two inflecting verbs.

Abbreviations used

ABS	Absolutive/Accusative case	M	Masculine
AFF	Affirmative	NEG	Negative
CNV	Converb	NMZ	Nominalizer
COMP	Complementizer	NOM	Nominative
COP	Copula	OBJ	Object
DAT	Dative case	PASS	Passive
DCL	Declarative clause	PAST	Past tense
DEF	Definite	PF	Perfective
DS	Different subject	PL	Plural
EMPH	Emphatic	POS	Possessive
EXCL	Exclusive	PRES	Present tense
F	Feminine gender	PROG	Progressive
FOC	Focus	PURP	Purposive
FUT	Future tense	Q	Question/interrogative
IMP	Imperative mood	REL	Relative clause
INCL	Inclusive	SG	Singular
INFL	Inflection	SIML	Simultaneous
INT	Intensive	SS	Same subject
INTJ	Interjection	VB	Verb
IPF	Imperfective aspect	VOC	Vocative
LOC	Locative		

References

- Amha, Azeb (2001). *The Maale Language*. Leiden: Research School CNWS, Leiden University (CNWS Publications, vol. 99).
- Amha, Azeb (2007a). Are *-a-* and *-o-* in the indicative verb paradigms of Zargulla nominalizers? In Azeb Amha, Graziano Sava & Maarten Mous (eds.), *Omotiic and Cushitic Languages Studies: papers from the Fourth Cushitic Omotic Conference, Leiden, 10-12 April 2003*. Pp. 1-22. Cologne: Köppe.
- Amha, Azeb (2007b). Questioning forms in Zargulla. In Rainer Voigt (ed.), *“From Beyond the Mediterranean”: Akten des 7. internationalen Semitohamitistenkongresses, Berlin 13-15 Septemebr 2004*, 197-210. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- Amha, Azeb (2008). Gender distinction and affirmative copula clauses in Zargulla. In John D. Bengtson (ed.), *In Hot Pursuit of Language in Prehistory: essays in the four fields of anthropology in honour of Harold Crane Fleming*, 39-48. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Bybee, Joan and Paul Hopper (2001). Introduction to frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure. In Joan Bybee and Paul Hopper (eds.), *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*, 1-24. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fleming, Harold (1976). Omotic Overview. In Marvin L. Bender (ed.), *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*, 299-323. East Lansing: African Studies Center, Michigan State University.
- Freeman, Dena (2006). Who are the Gamo? And who are the D'ache? In Siegbert Uhlig (ed.), *Proceedings of the XVth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, Hamburg, July 20-25, 2003*, 85-91. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- Givón, T. (1995). *Functionalism and Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hayward, Richard J. (1982). Notes on the Koyra language. *Afrika und Übersee* 65(2): 211-268.
- Hayward, Richard J. (1990). Notes on the Zayse Language. In Richard J. Hayward (ed.), *Omotic Language Studies*, 210-355. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Hayward, Richard J. (1991). Concerning a vocalic alternation in North Omotic verb paradigms. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 54(3): 535-553.
- Mendis, Binyam Sisay (2008). Aspects of Koorete verb morphology. PhD thesis, Faculty of Humanities, Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo.
- Poplack, Shana (2001). Variability, frequency, and productivity in the irrealis domain of French. In Joan Bybee and Paul Hopper (eds.), *Frequency and the Emergence of Linguistic Structure*, 405-428. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Woldemariam, Hirut (2003). *The grammar of Haro with comparative notes on the Ometo linguistic group*. PhD thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Yimam, Baye (1994). Some aspects of Zargulla morphology. In Bahru Zewde, Richard Pankhurst and Taddese Beyene (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*, Vol. I, 419-428. Addis Ababa: The Institute of Ethiopian Studies.