NEGATION IN HAMAR

BINYAM SISAY MENDISU

ABSTRACT

This study deals with the negation of declarative and interrogative main clauses, imperatives, and non-verbal and existential sentences in Hamar, an Aroid language of the Omotic language family. It describes the ways in which negation is expressed in the language, and positions the discussion in light of cross-linguistic observations made by Dahl (1979, 2010), Payne (1985), Miestamo (2005, 2007), Eriksen (2011) and others. The morpheme *-t* is used in Hamar to mark negation in both verbal and non-verbal clauses. This means that Hamar has a morphological or affixal negation (Dahl 2010). The language uses two different sets of subject agreement affixes for the affirmative and negative counterparts. While affirmative sentences employ a shortened pronoun, a set of agreement suffixes is used in the negative. In this study, it is suggested that the negative verbs may have preserved older subject agreement morphemes which are now lost in the affirmative, as negatives are less affected by innovation, cf. Zargulla in Azeb 2009 and Canadian French in Poplack 2001. Moreover, close interaction is reported between negation and TAM (Tense, Aspect and Mood) categories. For example, some of the aspect/tense categories that occur in the affirmative are neutralised in the negative. Negative constructions in Hamar are not only different from their affirmative counterparts due to the presence of the negation morpheme *-t*, but also in terms of subject agreement marking and tense/aspect categories. As a result, it is argued that Hamar has an asymmetric negation system, cf. Miestamo 2005.

[1] INTRODUCTION

This paper examines negation in Hamar, which is one of the linguistically less-investigated languages in Ethiopia. The Hamar language, which belongs to the Aroid group of the Omotic language family¹, has about 46,000 native speakers (CSA 2008). The people mainly live as semi-pastoralists keeping cattle near the Omo valley in the South Omo Zone of the Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Regional State (SNNPR) of Ethiopia. The Hamar language has two dialects, namely Benna and Beshada, and it is closely related to languages like Ka-

[1] The genetic classification of Aroid languages within and outside Omotic is controversial, and readers are recommended to look at the recent works of Moges (2007 and 2015a) and Theil (2012) for further information.

ra, Aari and Dime (Moges 2015b).

Although numerous anthropological studies are available on Hamar, linguistic investigations are limited in number and sketchy in depth. The main linguistic studies on the language include Lydall (1976, 1986, 2000), Mary (1987), Getahun (1991), Cupi et al (2013), Binyam and Moges (2014) and Moges and Binyam (2015). Some of the studies listed above deal with the verbal system of the language. For example, Lydall (1976) briefly describes the verb system of Hamar as part of her sketch grammar, while Binyam and Moges (2014) deal with copula constructions. More importantly, a preliminary account of the verb in Hamar is provided by Cupi et al (2013). The authors, admit, however, that their study is incomplete and no account is given of negative constructions. The focus of the present study is therefore the negation of main clauses in Hamar, which has not been thoroughly investigated in any of the earlier works.

The data for the present paper is elicited from native speakers of the language over consecutive field studies in the area where the language is spoken in 2014 and 2015. In addition to that, the analysis has been checked against and complemented by naturally occurring texts of various genre collected from the speakers of the language. The paper is organised as follows. The brief introduction about the language and earlier studies given in the current section will be followed by the presentation of major verbal predicate types in Section 2. Section 3 summarises major typological issues related to negation marking. Then, Section 4 deals with negation marking in verbal main clauses of both declarative and interrogative sentences. A brief account of negation in nonverbal, existential and imperative clauses is provided in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 summarises the main findings of the study.

[2] MAJOR TYPES OF VERBAL PREDICATES

Hamar is an SOV language. Although the language has some portmanteau morphemes, it is mainly an agglutinating language. As is the case in most Omotic languages, the verb root in Hamar does not occur as a word on its own, cf. Koorere (Binyam 2010), Maale (Azeb 2001), Zayse (Hayward 1990) among others. The most frequent verb root in the language is a closed syllable with a single peak, i.e. CVC (e.g. *ʔis*- ‘eat’, *wod*- ‘sleep’, *ʔim*- ‘give’ etc.) (cf. Cupi et al 2013:184).

Cupi et al (2013:185) identify two verbal forms in Hamar, i.e. simple and compound. According to them, simple forms are made up of a lexical verb, while compound ones include a lexical verb plus an auxiliary and/or a copula. In this study a four-way categorisation of the verbal predicates is proposed. The present study diverges from the Cupi et al (2013) analysis in two ways: first, various realisations of the main verb have been found and second, there is a

difference between the status of the auxiliary and the copula elements. To this end, four structurally different types of verbal predicates are identified and presented. The structural categorisation of the predicate verb types is crucial for providing a systematic description of the negative and affirmative verbs. First, there are nonverbal sentences of copula constructions which are without a verb, as in example (1):

- (1) ʔinta fora-ne
 I Fora-DECL
 'I am Fora.'

Second, there are verbal predicates which include simply a main verb, as in example (2). Here the main verb occurs alone with various inflectional suffixes:

- (2) fora durbo ʔis-idi-ne
 Fora porridge eat-PST-DECL
 'Fora ate porridge.'

The third category consists of verbal predicate types that exhibit the double occurrence of the main verb, as in example (3):

- (3) kodi rat-a rat-a
 She sleep-PRES sleep-PRES
 'She sleeps.'

And finally, a predicate verb type has been identified, which is comprised of a main verb and an existential auxiliary. An example is presented in (4):

- (4) kidi ʔis-ete ki-daa
 he eat-PROG 3MS-AUX
 'Is/was he eating?'

As can be observed from the examples above, Hamar verbs carry different types of inflectional markers. Verbs in the language are inflected for tense, aspect and person. In addition, verbs carry sentence type and negation suffixes. Hamar has two sets of tense and aspect categories in the affirmative and negative. With regard to tense and aspect marking, it has been determined that the tense/aspect categories of simple past, remote past, present, present perfect and progressive occur in the affirmative². All these tense/aspect categories are

[2] The categorisation of the tense/aspect categories provided in this study for affirmative sentences still needs further investigation.

merged into three main aspects in the negative: namely perfective, imperfective and progressive. A detailed discussion of the negative constructions in relation to their affirmative counterparts will be given in section 4.

[3] TYPOLOGICAL NOTES ON NEGATION

All known languages that have been investigated until now express negation, which suggests that negation is a universal feature of language (Dahl 1979, Miestamo 2005, Bond 2007). Underscoring the universality of negation and its total absence in animal communication systems, Horn (2010:1) further claims that ‘negation is what makes us human, imbuing us with capacity to deny, to contradict, to misrepresent, to lie, and to convey irony’. Although the universality of negation is fascinating in its own right, a closer look both at individual languages and cross-linguistically reveals that negation is a highly complex phenomenon which interacts closely with many grammatical categories (Miestamo 2007). With regard to the marking of negation, Dryer (2013) states that all languages use some kind of negative marking morpheme and no language has been found in which it is expressed through intonation or word order.

Standard negation is the main focus of this study, but non-standard negation constructions such as imperative, nonverbal and existential sentences will also be briefly discussed. The idea of standard negation was first proposed by Payne (1985) and followed by many other typologists. Miestamo (2007:553) defines standard negation, in simple terms, as ‘the basic means that languages have for negating declarative verbal main clauses’. In most languages, the specific strategy and markers used to mark standard and nonstandard negation constructions is different (Miestamo 2007). Negation closely interacts with Tense-Aspect-Mood (hereafter “TAM”) and agreement categories in many languages (Miestamo 2005), and the course of influence can be in both directions.

The focus of much of the typological literature on negation has been on standard negation, with little attention provided to non-standard negation from cross-linguistic perspectives (Eriksen 2011). In recent years, this seems to have changed slightly with significant contributions from Eriksen (2011) and Veselinova (2013) on the expression of nonverbal and existential sentences respectively. Eriksen (2011) proposes that even if nonverbal sentences often use non-standard means for expressing negation, they can still be analysed as an indirect way of expressing the same negation phenomenon in a language. In his own words, Eriksen (2011:304) writes that ‘non-standard negation of nonverbal predicates may be analysed as various means to negate such predicates indirectly’. To account for this, he proposes a typological universal rule he re-

fers to as ‘Direct Negation Avoidance (DNA)’. Regarding the negation of existential clauses, Vaseleva (2013:107) underscores that ‘the use of special strategy to negate existential sentences is cross-linguistically extremely common’. She also identifies four different types of languages in connection with the strategy they use and the strategy’s comparison to standard negation.

The typology literature on negation proposes slightly differing approaches to negation marking, cf. Dahl (1979), Payne (1985), Dryer (2013) etc. However, for this study, Dahl’s (2010:12) suggestion to classify them into three main types has been adopted. These are: morphological or affixal negation, negative particles and negative verbs. Of the three, Dryer’s (2013) study of 1157 languages reveals that the use of negative particles is the most common strategy among the languages of the world. On the other hand, a second proposal to categorise negation into ‘symmetric’ and ‘asymmetric’ is made by Miestamo (2005), based on existing structural correspondences between affirmative and negative sentences. Miestamo (2007:556) explains that the ‘distinction pays attention to whether or not negatives differ structurally from affirmatives, in addition to the presence of negative markers’. Languages in which the distinction between affirmative and negative constructions is limited to the addition of the negative morpheme, are said to have symmetric negation. Those languages, on the other hand, that exhibit more structural differences than just the addition of the negation morpheme are said to have an asymmetric negation system.

[4] NEGATION IN VERBAL MAIN CLAUSES

The negation of verbal main clauses in Hamar is expressed morphologically. In verbal main clauses, negation is marked by suffixing *-t-* on verbs. The morpheme *-t-* is used to mark negation in Hamar verbs in all of the three verbal paradigms that are attested in the negative constructions, namely perfective, imperfective and progressive paradigms. In addition to the negation suffix *-t-*, all the negative paradigms in Hamar exhibit a separate set of subject agreement markers which is not attested in the affirmative (see section 4.3 for a detailed discussion). Subsequent sections of this article will examine negation marking in Hamar in declarative and interrogative sentences.

[4.1] *Negative, Declarative*

In this section, the expression of negation in declarative sentences will be discussed. Declarative sentences in Hamar are mainly expressed by adding the morpheme *-ne* onto verbs. The negative suffix *-t-* is suffixed to the verb preceding the agreement and declarative markers. Negation in each of the three

verbal paradigms: namely negative perfective, negative imperfective and negative progressive, will be examined.

Negative Perfective

In Hamar, verbs in both the simple past and remote past are negated with the same negative construction. The two-way tense distinction in the affirmative is neutralised into a single aspect category of perfective in the negative construction. Such a type of merger is known as neutralisation in typology and it has been attested cross-linguistically in some other languages (Payne 1985). Prior to discussing the negative perfective verbal forms, however, the two affirmative constructions of simple and remote past are presented for the purpose of comparison. Both affirmative categories make use of simple verbs and the tense markers are directly added to the verb.

(5) Simple past:

kidi	noq'o	wuɬʰ-idi-ne
he	water	drink-PST-DECL

'He drank water.'

(6) Remote past:

a.	ʔinta	noq'o	ʔi-wuɬʰ-ade
	I	water	1SG-drink-REM
	'I drank water (remote time).'		
b.	kidi	noq'o	ki-wuɬʰ-ade
	he	water	3MS-drink-REM
	'He drank water (remote time).'		

The negative counterpart of the affirmative example in (5) and (6a&b) is one and the same. The full paradigm of the negative counterpart of (5) and (6) is provided in (7) and the verb carries a perfective aspect marker.

In the negative perfective paradigm, the negative morpheme *-t-* is added to the verb. The negative suffix is added inbetween the aspectual marker and subject agreement morpheme. The negative, declarative paradigm of the verb *wuɬʰ*- 'drink' in the perfective aspect is given in (7) below:

(7) Declarative, Negative Paradigm (Perfective)

I did not drink. (etc.)

- a. 1SG wuɟʱ-aa-t-i-ne
 drink-PFV-NEG-1SG-DECL
- b. 2SG wuɟʱ-aa-t-a-ne
 drink-PFV-NEG-2SG-DECL
- c. 3MS wuɟʱ-aa-je
 drink-PFV-DECL.3.NEG
- d. 3FS wuɟʱ-aa-je
 drink-PFV-DECL.3.NEG
- e. 1PL wuɟʱ-oo-t-o-ne
 drink-PFV-NEG-1PL-DECL
- f. 2PL wuɟʱ-ee-t-e-ne
 drink-PFV-NEG-2PL-DECL
- g. 3PL wuɟʱ-aa-je
 drink-PFV-DECL.3.NEG

The position of the different morphemes in the verb can be schematically represented as:

VERB-PFV-NEG-AGRE-DECL

- (8) ʔinta wuɟʱ-aa-t-i-ne
 I drink-PFV-NEG-1SG-DECL
 'I did not drink.'

Although what is provided above can be considered as a general schematic representation of the negative verb in the perfective, not all of the verb forms in the verbal paradigm neatly fit the template. For example, the negative morpheme *-t-* is absent from all the third person verb forms (i.e. 3MS, 3FS and 3PL). The absence of the negative morpheme from the third person verb forms (most probably through its deletion) triggers morphophonemic changes in the sentence type marker (i.e. its change from *-ne* to *-je*). The third person verb form behaves differently from other verb forms and it is considered here as a marked form³, as is the case in closely related Aroid languages, cf. Aari (Hayward 1990) and Dime (Fleming 1990). Notice that the sentence type morpheme *-je* synchronically appears in all third person verb forms. Thus, in this study, *-je* is considered as a portmanteau morpheme marking both sentence type, third

[3] The markedness of the third person verb form should be studied further in all verbal paradigms occurring in the language.

person and negation. An example is given below:

- (9) kidi/kodi/kidi wuŋ¹-aa-je
 he/she/they drink-PFV-DECL.3.NEG
 'He/She/They didn't drink.'

A morphophonemic process worth mentioning in connection with the perfective verb paradigm is the change in vowel quality that occurs inbetween the subject agreement suffix and the perfective aspect marker in the 1PL and 2PL. The subject agreement morphemes -o (1PL) and -e (2PL) trigger a regressive vowel assimilation of the perfect morpheme -aa- to -oo- and -ee- respectively. Illustrative examples are given in (10a&b).

- (10) a. wosi wuŋ¹-oo-t-o-ne
 we drink-PFV-NEG-1PL-DECL
 'We didn't drink.'
 b. kidi wuŋ¹-ee-t-e-ne
 you drink-PFV-NEG-2PL-DECL
 'You (PL) didn't drink.'

More examples of the declarative, negative verb form in the perfective are provided below:

- (11) a. ʔinta durbo ʔis-aa-t-i-ne
 I porridge eat-PFV-NEG-1SG-DECL
 'I did not eat porridge.'
 b. ja durbo ʔis-aa-t-a-ne
 you porridge eat-PFV-NEG-2SG-DECL
 'You did not eat porridge.'
 c. kidi durbo ʔis-aa-je
 he porridge eat-PFV-DECL.3.NEG
 'He did not eat porridge.'
 d. kodi durbo ʔis-aa-je
 she porridge eat-PFV-DECL.3.NEG
 'She did not eat porridge.'
 e. wosi durbo ʔis-oo-t-o-ne
 we porridge eat-PFV-NEG-1PL-DECL
 'We did not eat porridge.'
 f. jesi durbo ʔis-ee-t-e-ne
 you porridge eat-PFV-NEG-2PL-DECL
 'You did not eat porridge.'

- g. kidi durbo ʔis-aa-je
 they porridge eat-PFV-DECL.3.NEG
 'They did not eat porridge.'

Negative Imperfective

Once again, the suffix *-t-* is used to express negation in verbal main clauses in the imperfective verb paradigms. Before we look at the negative construction, let us once again consider the affirmative counterparts, i.e. the present perfect and present:

- (12) Present perfect
 kidi noq'o ki-daa wuʔ^ŋ-e
 he water 3MS-exist drink-PRES
 'He has drunk water.'
- (13) Present
 kidi noq'o wuʔ^ŋ-a wuʔ^ŋ-a
 he water drink-PRES drink-PRES
 'He drinks water.'

The two affirmative tense categories have one negative counterpart. This is once again an instance of neutralisation in the negative (Payne 1985). The full paradigm of the negative imperfective of the verb *wuʔ^ŋ-* 'drink' is provided below in (14):

- (14) Declarative, Negative Paradigm (Imperfective)
 I do not drink. (etc.)
- a. 1SG wuʔ^ŋ-a-t-i-ne
 drink-IPFV-NEG-1SG-DECL
 - b. 2SG wuʔ^ŋ-a-t-a-ne
 drink-IPFV-NEG-2SG-DECL
 - c. 3MS wuʔ^ŋ-e-je
 drink-IPFV-DECL.3.NEG
 - d. 3FS wuʔ^ŋ-e-je
 drink-IPFV-DECL.3.NEG
 - e. 1PL wuʔ^ŋ-a-t-o-ne
 drink-IPFV-NEG-1PL-DECL
 - f. 2PL wuʔ^ŋ-a-t-e-ne
 drink-IPFV-NEG-2PL-DECL
 - g. 3PL wuʔ^ŋ-e-je
 drink-IPFV-DECL.3.NEG

In the imperfective paradigm as well, the negative suffix *-t-* is added to the main verb following the imperfective aspect marker *-a-*. It is then followed by the subject agreement suffix and the sentence type marker *-ne*. The order of the morphemes can be summarised as:

VERB-IPFV-NEG-AGRE-DECL

- (15) ʔinta wutʃ^ɾ-a-t-i-ne
 I drink-IPFV-NEG-1SG-DECL
 'I do not drink.'

An interesting morphophonemic process is once again observed in the third person verb form. Akin to the perfective paradigm, the third person verb forms behave differently from the others. First, the negative morpheme *-t-* is not overtly shown, rather it is expressed in a portmanteau morpheme. Second, there is morphophonemic change of the sentence type morpheme and regressive vowel assimilation.

In the third person, the verb formally remains the same for the singular and plural, the imperfective morpheme *-a-* is realised as *-e-* assimilating regressively with the vowel in the sentence type marker *-je*. Here there are no separate morphemes which overtly mark negation and subject agreement. Instead, the sentence type marker *-ne* is realised as *-je* only in third person verb forms. Historical changes aside, it is more plausible to treat *-je* as a portmanteau morpheme, marking sentence types, person agreement and negation synchronically. Consider the following example:

- (16) kidi/kodi/kidi wutʃ^ɾ-e-je
 he/she/they drink-IPFV-DECL.3.NEG
 'He/She/They do not drink.'

Notice that the vowel assimilation, which has been observed in the 1PL and 2PL verb forms of the perfect paradigm explained in example (10a & b) above, does not occur in the imperfective paradigm. Instead, similar regressive vowel assimilation is noted in the third person verb form, as illustrated in example (16).

More examples of the negative imperfective paradigm are provided below for the verb *rar-* 'sleep':

- (17) a. ʔinta rat-a-t-i-ne
I sleep-IPFV-NEG-1SG-DECL
'I do not sleep.'
- b. ja rat-a-t-a-ne
you sleep-IPFV-NEG-2SG-DECL
'You do not sleep.'
- c. kidi rat-e-je
he sleep-IPFV-DECL.3.NEG
'He does not sleep.'
- d. kodi rat-e-je
she sleep-IPFV-DECL.3.NEG
'She does not sleep.'
- e. wosi rat-a-t-o-ne
we sleep-IPFV-NEG-1PL-DECL
'We do not sleep.'
- f. jesi rat-a-t-e-ne
you sleep-IPFV-NEG-2PL-DECL
'You do not sleep.'
- g. kidi rat-e-je
they sleep-IPFV-DECL.3.NEG
'They do not sleep.'

Negative Progressive

In the progressive aspect, akin to perfective and imperfective paradigms, the suffix *-t-* marks negation. The progressive aspect in Hamar uses a verbal construction made up of a main verb and an existential auxiliary *daa-* 'exist'. While the progressive aspect morpheme *-ete* is directly added to the main verb, the negative suffix *-t-* is instead suffixed to the existential auxiliary *daa-* 'exist'. In addition to the negation suffix, the existential auxiliary carries the subject agreement and sentence type morphemes. The use of similar complex verbal constructions, consisting of a main verb and an auxiliary in the progressive aspect, is common in many Omotic languages (cf. Koorete in Binyam 2010 etc.). The declarative, affirmative and negative paradigm in the progressive aspect for the verb *wuʔ* 'drink' are given below in (18) and (19) respectively:

(18) Declarative, affirmative (Progressive)

I am (was) drinking. (etc.)

a. 1SG	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	ʔi-daa-de
	drink-PROG	1SG-exist-DECL
b. 2SG	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	xi-daa-de
	drink-PROG	2SG-exist-DECL
c. 3MS	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	ki-daa-de
	drink-PROG	3MS-exist-DECL
d. 3FS	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	ko-daa-de
	drink-PROG	3FS-exist-DECL
e. 1PL	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	wo-doo-de
	drink-PROG	1PL-exist-DECL
f. 2PL	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	je-dee-de
	drink-PROG	2PL-exist-DECL
g. 3PL	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	ki-daa-de
	drink-PROG	3PL-exist-DECL

The affirmative progressive verb form presented in (18) above illustrates that the progressive aspect suffix is suffixed to the main verb and the existential auxiliary carries the shortened pronouns which indicate the person and sentence type markers. The negative counterpart is provided below:

(19) Declarative, negative (Progressive)

I am (was) not drinking. (etc.)

a. 1SG	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	daa-t-i-ne
	drink-PROG	exist-NEG-1SG-DECL
b. 2SG	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	daa-t-a-ne
	drink-PROG	exist-NEG-2SG-DECL
c. 3MS	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	daa-je
	drink-PROG	exist-DECL.3.NEG
d. 3FS	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	daa-je
	drink-PROG	exist-DECL.3.NEG
e. 1PL	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	doo-t-o-ne
	drink-PROG	exist-NEG-1PL-DECL
f. 2PL	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	dee-t-e-ne
	drink-PROG	exist-NEG-2PL-DECL
g. 3PL	wuŋ ^ŋ -ete	daa-je
	drink-PROG	exist-DECL.3.NEG

The overall schematic representation of the negative progressive paradigm in

Hamar can be presented as:

VERB-PROG AUX-NEG-AGRE-DECL

- (20) ?inta wuɬʃ-ete daa-t-i-ne
 I drink-PROG exist-NEG-1SG-DECL
 'I am/was not drinking.'

Equally, in the progressive verbal paradigm, the negation suffix and the subject agreement marker are elided from the auxiliary in the third person verb forms. Similar to the two negative verbal paradigms we have discussed earlier, the declarative/third person/negation marker *-je* is directly suffixed to the auxiliary *daa-* 'exist'. Consider the example below:

- (21) kidi/kodi/kidi wuɬʃ-ete daa-je
 he/she/they drink-PROG exist-DECL.3.NEG
 'He/She/They is/was/are/were not drinking.'

Similarly to the perfective paradigm illustrated in example (10a & b) and unlike the imperfective paradigm discussed in example (16), regressive vowel assimilation is observed between the subject agreement morpheme and the long vowel in the auxiliary in the 1PL and 2PL verb forms. Note that the long vowel *aa* in the existential auxiliary *daa-* changes to *oo* in the 1PL and to *ee* in the 2PL, assimilating with the subject agreement suffixes *-o* and *-e* respectively. Here are examples:

- (22) a. wosi wuɬʃ-ete doo-t-o-ne
 we drink-PROG exist-NEG-1PL-DECL
 'We are/were not drinking.'
- b. jesi wuɬʃ-ete dee-t-e-ne
 you drink-PROG exist-NEG-2PL-DECL
 'You are/were not drinking.'

More examples of the declarative, negative verb forms in the progressive aspect are provided below:

- (23) a. ʔinta durbo ʔis-ete daa-t-i-ne
 I porridge eat-PROG exist-NEG-1SG-DECL
 'I am/was not eating porridge.'
- b. ja durbo ʔis-ete daa-t-a-ne
 you porridge eat-PROG exist-NEG-2SG-DECL
 'You are/were not eating porridge.'
- c. kidi durbo ʔis-ete daa-je
 he porridge eat-PROG exist-DECL.3.NEG
 'He is/was not eating porridge.'
- d. kodi durbo ʔis-ete daa-je
 she porridge eat-PROG exist-DECL.3.NEG
 'She is/was not eating porridge.'
- e. wosi durbo ʔis-ete doo-t-o-ne
 we porridge eat-PROG exist-NEG-1PL-DECL
 'We are/were not eating porridge.'
- f. jesi durbo ʔis-ete dee-t-e-ne
 you porridge eat-PROG exist-NEG-2PL-DECL
 'You are/were not eat porridge.'
- g. kidi durbo ʔis-ete daa-je
 they porridge eat-PROG exist-DECL.3.NEG
 'They are/were not eating porridge.'

[4.2] Negative, Interrogatives

Interrogative counterparts of the negative, declarative verb forms described in section 4.1 for the most part remain the same, with the exception of changes in the sentence type marking. In one of the paradigms, the declarative suffix *-ne* is replaced by the overt interrogative sentence type marker *-nu*. In other cases, the absence of the overt marking of the declarative suffix expresses interrogation. The negative interrogative counterparts of the three negative verbal paradigms described above are listed below. First let us look at the declarative and interrogative counterparts of the perfective paradigm:

(24)	Declarative, Negative (Perfective)	Interrogative, Negative (Perfective)
	I did not drink. (etc.)	Did I not drink? (etc.)
a.	1SG wuʔʎ-aa-t-i-ne
drink-PFV-NEG-1SG-DECL	wuʔʎ-aa-t-i
drink-PFV-NEG-1SG
b.	2SG wuʔʎ-aa-t-a-ne
drink-PFV-NEG-2SG-DECL	wuʔʎ-aa-t-a
drink-PFV-NEG-2SG

c. 3MS	wuɬʰ-aa-je drink-PFV-DECL.3.NEG	wuɬʰ-aa-da drink-PFV-NEG.3
d. 3FS	wuɬʰ-aa-je drink-PFV-DECL.3.NEG	wuɬʰ-aa-da drink-PFV-NEG.3
e. 1PL	wuɬʰ-oo-t-o-ne drink-PFV-NEG-1PL-DECL	wuɬʰ-oo-t-o drink-PFV-NEG-1PL
f. 2PL	wuɬʰ-ee-t-e-ne drink-PFV-NEG-2PL-DECL	wuɬʰ-ee-t-e drink-PFV-NEG-2PL
g. 3PL	wuɬʰ-aa-je drink-PFV-DECL.3.NEG	wuɬʰ-aa-da drink-PFV-NEG.3

In the negative perfective verbal paradigm, it is the absence of the declarative marker *-ne* which expresses interrogation. Following the verb root, aspect, negation and agreement morphemes are added in that order.

As a marked verb form, the third person verb once again behaves differently from the others. Here, following the aspect marker suffix, the morpheme *-da* is added. The element *-da* which is phonologically close to the negation marker *-t-* is analysed as a portmanteau morpheme, both expressing negation and acting as a third person agreement marker. The analysis of *-da* as a negation/third person marker is strengthened by the fact that the sentence type marker is absent in the verb paradigm⁴. A detailed discussion of the interaction between agreement marking and negation is given in section 4.3. Consider the example below:

- (25) kidi/kodi/kidi wuɬʰ-aa-da
 he/she/they drink-PFV-NEG.3
 'Did he/she/they not drink?'

More examples of the negative perfective in the interrogative are given below:

- (26) a. ʔinta durbo ʔis-aa-t-i
 I porridge eat-PFV-NEG-1SG
 'Did I not eat porridge?'
 b. ja durbo ʔis-aa-t-a
 you porridge eat-PFV-NEG-2SG
 'Did you not eat porridge? '

[4] More data is still needed to determine exactly the semantics, form and use of the element *-da* which is synchronically analysed in this study as a negation and third person morpheme. There is a good chance that the function of *-da* could be explained more by diachronic evidence of morphophonemic change, which could be the result of the deletion of some of the morphemes, such as the agreement and sentence type markers that are observed in the non-third person verb forms.

- c. kidi durbo ʔis-aa-da
he porridge eat-PFV-NEG.3
'Did he not eat porridge?'
- d. kodi durbo ʔis-aa-da
she porridge eat-PFV-NEG.3
'Did she not eat porridge?'
- e. wosi durbo ʔis-oo-t-o
we porridge eat-PFV-NEG-1PL
'Did we not eat porridge?'
- f. jesi durbo ʔis-ee-t-e
you porridge eat-PFV-NEG-2PL
'Did you not eat porridge?'
- g. kidi durbo ʔis-aa-da
they porridge eat-PFV-NEG.3
'Did they not eat porridge?'

Now let us look at the negative, interrogative imperfective paradigm. In this case, the interrogative sentence type marker *-nu* is suffixed to the verb at the end. For the purpose of comparison, the negative interrogative imperfective paradigm is provided below, parallel to its declarative counterpart:

(27) Declarative, Negative (Imperf.)	Interrogative, Negative (Imperf.)
I do not drink. (etc.)	Do I not drink? (etc.)
a. 1SG wuʔʎ-a-t-i-ne drink-IPFV-NEG-1SG-DECL	wuʔʎ-a-t-i-nu drink-IPFV-NEG-1SG-INT
b. 2SG wuʔʎ-a-t-a-ne drink-IPFV-NEG-2SG-DECL	wuʔʎ-a-t-a-nu drink-IPFV-NEG-2SG-INT
c. 3MS wuʔʎ-e-je drink-IPFV-DECL.3.NEG	wuʔʎ-a-ju drink-IPFV-INT.3.NEG
d. 3FS wuʔʎ-e-je drink-IPFV-DECL.3.NEG	wuʔʎ-a-ju drink-IPFV-INT.3.NEG
e. 1PL wuʔʎ-a-t-o-ne drink-IPFV-NEG-1PL-DECL	wuʔʎ-a-t-o-nu drink-IPFV-NEG-1PL-INT
f. 2PL wuʔʎ-a-t-e-ne drink-IPFV-NEG-2PL-DECL	wuʔʎ-a-t-e-nu drink-IPFV-NEG-2PL-INT
g. 3PL wuʔʎ-e-je drink-IPFV-DECL.3.NEG	wuʔʎ-a-ju drink-IPFV-INT.3.NEG

As can be noted above, the negative, interrogative imperfective paradigm is

distinct from the declarative one, due to the suffixation of the interrogative marker *-nu*. In line with their markedness behavior, the third person verb form behaves differently. The negation and the subject agreement suffixes do not occur overtly and the interrogative suffix is realised as *-ju*. The suffix *-ju* is analysed as a portmanteau morpheme, expressing interrogation, third person agreement and negation.

More examples of the interrogative, negative imperfective are provided below, using the verb *rar-* 'sleep'.

- (28)
- a. ?inta rat-a-t-i-nu
 I sleep-IPFV-NEG-1SG-INT
 'Do I not sleep?'
 - b. ja rat-a-t-a-nu
 you sleep-IPFV-NEG-2SG-INT
 'Do you not sleep?'
 - c. kidi rat-a-ju
 he sleep-IPFV-INT.3.NEG
 'Does he not sleep?'
 - d. kodi rat-a-ju
 she sleep-IPFV-INT.3.NEG
 'Does she not sleep?'
 - e. wosi rat-a-t-o-nu
 we sleep-IPFV-NEG-1PL-INT
 'Do we not sleep?'
 - f. jesi rat-a-t-e-nu
 you sleep-IPFV-NEG-2PL-INT
 'Do you not sleep?'
 - g. kidi rat-a-ju
 they sleep-IPFV-INT.3.NEG
 'Do they not sleep?'

In the progressive paradigm, the absence of the declarative sentence type marker shows interrogation. Note that a similar strategy is employed for the negative interrogative perfective paradigm discussed above. The negative interrogative paradigm of the progressive aspect with its declarative counterpart is provided below for the verb *wuŋʔ-* 'drink'.

(29) Declarative, negative (Progressive) Interrogative, negative (Progressive)

	I am (was) drinking. (etc.)		Am (was) I drinking? (etc.)	
a. 1SG	wuɟʰ-ete	daa-t-i-ne	wuɟʰ-ete	daa-t-i
	drink-PROG	exist-NEG-1SG-DECL	drink-PROG	exist-NEG-1SG
b. 2SG	wuɟʰ-ete	daa-t-a-ne	wuɟʰ-ete	daa-t-a
	drink-PROG	exist-NEG-2SG-DECL	drink-PROG	exist-NEG-2SG
c. 3MS	wuɟʰ-ete	daa-je	wuɟʰ-ete	daa-da/daa-ju
	drink-PROG	exist-DECL.3.NEG	drink-PROG	exist-NEG.3/INT.3.NEG
d. 3FS	wuɟʰ-ete	daa-je	wuɟʰ-ete	daa-da/daa-ju
	drink-PROG	exist-DECL.3.NEG	drink-PROG	exist-NEG.3/INT.3.NEG
e. 1PL	wuɟʰ-ete	doo-t-o-ne	wuɟʰ-ete	doo-t-o
	drink-PROG	exist-NEG-1PL-DECL	drink-PROG	exist-NEG-1PL
f. 2PL	wuɟʰ-ete	dee-t-e-ne	wuɟʰ-ete	dee-t-e
	drink-PROG	exist-NEG-2PL-DECL	drink-PROG	exist-NEG-2PL
g. 3PL	wuɟʰ-ete	daa-je	wuɟʰ-ete	daa-da /daa-ju
	drink-PROG	exist-DECL.3.NEG	drink-PROG	exist-NEG.3/INT.3.NEG

In the negative interrogative paradigm of the progressive aspect above, one can see that in general the absence of the declarative suffix expresses interrogation. Similar to the perfect paradigms exemplified in (26) above, the third person verb form takes the suffix *-da*, which is a portmanteau morpheme for third person subject agreement and negation. Interestingly, the third person verb form also has a free alternant, in which the interrogative/agreement suffix/negation *-ju* is directly added to the auxiliary.

More examples of the interrogative, negative verb forms in the progressive aspect are provided below:

- (30) a. ʔinta durbo ʔis-ete daa-t-i
 I porridge eat-PROG exist-NEG-1SG
 'Am/was I not eating porridge?'
- b. ja durbo ʔis-ete daa-t-a
 you porridge eat-PROG exist-NEG-2SG
 'Are/were you not eating porridge?'
- c. kidi durbo ʔis-ete daa-da/-ju
 he porridge eat-PROG exist-NEG.3/INT.3.NEG
 'Is/was he not eating porridge?'
- d. kodi durbo ʔis-ete daa-da/-ju
 she porridge eat-PROG exist-NEG.3/INT.3.NEG
 'Is/was she not eating porridge?'

- e. wosi durbo ?is-ete doo-t-o
 we porridge eat-PROG exist-NEG-1PL
 'Are/were we not eating porridge?'
- f. jesi durbo ?is-ete dee-t-e
 you porridge eat-PROG exist-NEG-2PL
 'Are/Were you not eat porridge?'
- g. kidi durbo ?is-ete daa-da/-ju
 they porridge eat-PROG exist-NEG.3/INT.3.NEG
 'Are/were they not eating porridge?'

[4.3] *Interaction between negation and subject agreement marking/TAM*

There is a close interaction between negation and subject agreement marking in Hamar. The language has a set of subject agreement suffixes that occur only in negative verbs. Note that subject agreement in affirmative sentences is indicated by means of cliticised pronouns. The agreement suffixes generally occur immediately following the negative suffix *-t-*. The subject agreement morphemes for first and second person are listed below:

	Negative	Affirmative
1SG	-i	?i-
2SG	-a	xi-
3MS	-	ki-
3FS	-	ko-
1PL	-o	wo-
2PL	-e	je-
3PL	-	ki-

The situation with the third person agreement marker is a little complicated. In Hamar, the third person verb form remains the same for 3MS, 3FS and 3PL. Due to what seems to be a historical process of the deletion of some of the morphemes, the third person verb form appears different. On this basis, this study proposes a portmanteau morpheme analysis for the sentence type and negation morphemes which occur in the third person verb form. Accordingly, a portmanteau analysis is suggested for the following morphemes:

-je	DECL.3.NEG
-ju	INT.3.NEG
-da	NEG.3

In short, the close interaction between negation and subject agreement mark-

ing in Hamar is shown on two levels. On the one hand, there is a separate set of agreement marking morphemes used in the negative for first and second persons. On the other hand, in the interrogative paradigm of the perfective and progressive aspects, the portmanteau morpheme *-da* expresses both negation and third person simultaneously. Similarly, the morphemes *-je* and *-ju* signify sentence type, negation and person marking simultaneously. Although further investigation is needed on the diachronic aspects of the subject agreement markers, a comment is warranted on their historical development and status. Most importantly, it is worth mentioning that the set of agreement morphemes seem to be archaic morphemes which are kept in negative constructions, since negative verbs are less affected by innovation than affirmative ones. Similar findings have been reported for the closely related Omotic language Zargulla by Azeb (2009) and in Canadian French by Poplack (2001).

Close interaction between TAM (Tense, Aspect, Mood) and negation is also observed in Hamar. The number of tense/aspect categories in the affirmative is reduced to three in the negative. These are the perfective, which is marked by *-aa-*, the imperfective, which is marked by *-a-* and the progressive, which is marked by *-ete*. Thus, some of the tense/aspect categories in the affirmative are neutralised in the negative. According to Payne (1985), the reduction of an inflectional category in the negative is cross-linguistically attested in the Uralic language Livonian, which is described as neutralisation.

Most importantly, when one compares affirmative and negative constructions in Hamar, a greater difference is to be found between the two than a simple suffixation of the negative morpheme *-t-*. Accordingly, Hamar has an asymmetric negation system, in line with the typological classification provided by Miestamo (2005). Interestingly enough, Hamar exhibits two sets of subject agreement markers and tense/aspect categories for affirmative and negative sentences.

[5] NEGATION IN NON-VERBAL, EXISTENTIAL AND IMPERATIVE CLAUSES

Hamar uses the same negative morpheme *-t-* to mark negation in all non-verbal sentences (Binyam and Moges 2014). In other words, the language uses the same strategy for standard negation and non-verbal sentences. This is reported to be less common typologically. Therefore, the direct similarity in the use of negation strategy across languages like Hamar clearly supports Eriksen's (2011) claim that the two sentence types should be analysed as subtypes of the same phenomenon. Examples are provided below:

- (31) a. γ inta hamar-ne
I Hamar-DECL
'I am Hamar.'
b. γ inta hamar-te
I Hamar-NEG
'I am not Hamar.'
- (32) a. γ inta hamar-u
I Hamar-INT
'Am I Hamar?'
b. γ inta hamar-ta-ju
I Hamar-NEG-INT
'Am I not Hamar?'

The morpheme *-te* in (31b) and *-ta* in (32b) are added to the nominal predicate to mark negation.

Existential clauses use suppletive verbs in the affirmative and negative. The existential verb *daa-* 'exist' and *q'ool-* 'not_exist' are employed. Unlike non-verbal clauses, the negation of existential predicates is different from standard negation in Hamar, which is the most common approach cross-linguistically (Vaselinova 2013). The strategy used in Hamar falls into the type which Vaselinova (2013:112) described as a 'prototypical difference', in the sense that it 'involves a complete formal and constructional difference between the expressions used'. Consider the following examples:

- (33) a. ʔinta q'uli daa-ne
I goat exist-DECL
'I have a goat.'
b. ʔinta q'uli q'ool-e
I goat not_exist-DECL
'I do not have a goat.'

In the imperative mood, the verb *gar-* ‘leave/avoid’ is used together with the main verb to show negation:

- (34) a. wutʃ^ɿ-aa ‘drink!’
 drink-IMP.2SG
 b. wutʃ^ɿ-an⁵ gar-aa ‘do not drink!’
 drink-? avoid-IMP

[5] The exact role of the element $-an$ needs further investigation in the future.

- [6] SUMMARY

Hamar has a separate set of subject agreement markers which occur only in the negative constructions. Their affirmative counterpart uses shortened/cliticised pronouns to mark subject agreement. It is probable that the affirmative verb forms have lost the agreement suffixes which have been preserved by the negative constructions, cf. Zargulla in Azeb (2009). Poplack (2001) in her study of Canadian French, for example, argues that affirmatives are more affected by innovation than negatives. In other words, older inflectional forms are retained more in negative constructions.

Close interaction between negation and tense/aspect marking has been observed in Hamar. For five tense/aspect categories in the affirmative, only three aspectual paradigms have been found in the negative. These are the perfective, imperfective and progressive paradigms. This is a clear example of the neutralisation of tense/aspect categories in the negative, which is also reported cross-linguistically, cf. Payne (1985).

In all three of the negative verb paradigms, the third person verb forms were found to behave differently from the other verb forms. In this study, they are considered as marked and the negative suffix *-t-* does not generally occur in the third person verb form. This is in line with the case in many Omotic languages, cf. Aari, Hayward (1990), Koorete, Binyam (2010), Dime, Fleming (1990), in which the third person verb forms behave differently from the others, and this may have something to do with their frequency of use and functional markedness. Negative existential sentences use suppletive verbs in Hamar. Finally, negation in imperative clauses is shown by means of a phrasal construction using the verb *qar-* 'avoid/leave'.

This study is sponsored by the NORHED project - *Linguistic Capacity Building - tools for inclusive development of Ethiopia* and I would like to acknowledge the

generous support provided by The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD). I would like to express my gratitude to participants of the project workshop in Rondane, Norway (1-4 September 2015) for useful comments and suggestions during the presentation of the paper. I would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for critical, rich and insightful suggestions. Appreciations are also due to my Hamar language consultants: Shanko Muga and Fora Garsho.

SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
AUX	auxiliary
DECL	declarative
F	feminine
IMP	imperative
INT	interrogative
IPFV	imperfect
M	masculine
NEG	negation, negative
PFV	perfective
PL	plural
PRES	present
PROG	progressive
PST	past
REM	remote past
SG	singular

REFERENCES

- Azeb Amha. 2001. *The Maale Language*. Leiden: Research School CNWS, Leiden University (CNWS Publications, vol. 99).
- Azeb Amha. 2009. The morphosyntax of negation in Zargulla. In L. Wetzels (ed.) *The Linguistics of Endangered Languages: contributions to morphology and morphosyntx*. LOT, Utrecht. 199-220.
- Binyam Sisay Mendisu. 2010. *Aspects of Koorete Verb Morphology*. (Cushitic and Omotic Studies, 1.) Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.

- Binyam Sisay & Moges Yigezu. 2014. Notes on Copula construction in Hamar, *Studies in Ethiopian Languages*, 3 (2014), 71-82.
- Bond, Oliver. 2007. Towards a canon for negation. In Peter K. Austin, Oliver Bond & David Nathan (eds) *Proceedings of Conference on Language Documentation and Linguistic Theory*. London: SOAS. 39-49.
- CSA (Central Statistics Agency). 2008. *Ethiopia: Statistical Abstract*. Central Statistical Agency. Addis Ababa.
- Cupi, Loredana, Sara Petrollino, Graziano Sava and Mauro Tosco. 2013. Preliminary notes on the Hamar verb. In Marie-Claude Simeone-Senelle and Martine Vanhove (eds.) *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Cushitic and Omotic Languages*. Koln: Rudiger Koppe. 181-195.
- Dahl, Östen. 1979. Typology of sentence negation. *Linguistics* 17, 79-106.
- Dahl, Östen. 2010. Typology of Negation. In Horn Laurence R. (ed.). *The Expression of Negation*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2013. Negative Morphemes. In Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martine (eds.) *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (Available online at <http://wals.info/chapter/112>, Accessed on 2016-06-23.)
- Eriksen, Pål K. 2011. 'To not be' or not 'to not be'. The Typology of negation of non-verbal predicates. *Studies in Language* 35(2). 275-310.
- Fleming, H. 1976. Omotic Overview. In M.L. Bender (ed.), *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*, 299-323, East Lansing: African Studies Centre, Michigan State University. Michigan.
- Getahun Amare. 1991. *The Structure of Noun Phrase in Hamar*. M.A thesis. Addis Ababa University.
- Hayward, R. 1990. Notes on the Aari Language. In R. Hayward (ed.), *Omotic Language Studies*, 425-493, School of oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Horn, Laurence R. 2010. Introduction. In Horn Laurence R. (ed.). *The Expression of Negation*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lydall, Jean. 1976. Hamar. In M.L. Bender (ed.), *The Non-Semitic Languages of Ethiopia*, 393-438, East Lansing: African Studies Center, Michigan State University.

ty. Michigan.

Lydall, Jean. 1980. History and social organization: the case of Widows in Hamar. In *Working papers on Society and History in Imperial Ethiopia: The Southern Periphery from the 1880s to 1974*, eds. Donald Donham and Wendy James, 147-156. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lydall, Jean. 2000. Having fun with ideophones: A socio-linguistic look at ideophones in Hamar, southern Ethiopia. In Baye Yimam et al. (eds.), *Ethiopian Studies at the End of the Second Millenium. Proceedings of the XIVth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies November 6-11, 2000*, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia. vol. III, 886-911.

Mary Yohannes. 1987. *Hamar Phonology*. B.A thesis in Linguistics. Addis Ababa University.

Miestamo, Matti. 2005. *Standard negation. The negation of declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Miestamo, Matti. 2007. Negation – An Overview of Typological Research. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1/5. 552-570. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Moges Yigezu. 2005. Some observations in the pronouns of Hamar: A comparative perspective. In *Cushitic-Omotic Studies 2004*, edited by Yoichi Tsuge, 113-132. Kanazawa University.

Moges Yigezu. 2007. The vowel system of Kara from a historical-comparative perspective. Rainer Voigt (ed.) *From Beyond the Mediterranean: Akten des 7. internationalen Semito-hamitistenkongresses (VII. ISHaK)*, Berlin 13-15 September 2004, , 245 -252. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.

Moges Yigezu. 2015a. Is Aroid Nilo-Saharan or Afro-Asiatic? Some evidences from phonological, lexical and morphological reconstructions, In Angelika Mietzner and Anne Storch (eds.), *Nilo-Saharan - Models and Descriptions*, 381-401. Koln: Rudiger Koppe Verlag.

Moges Yigezu. 2015b. The Hamar-Benna Cluster: a Lexicostatistics survey. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies (JES)*, vol. 38, 1-32.

Moges Yigezu & Binyam Sisay. 2015. The orthography of Hamar. *Studies in Ethiopian Languages*, vol. 4, 1-16.

Payne, John R. 1985. Negation. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description. Vol I. Clause structure*, 197-242. Cambridge: Cambridge university-

press.

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 Linguistics Structure*. 405-428. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Theil, Rolf. 2012. Omotic. In Lutz Edzard (ed.), *Semitic and Afroasiatic: Challenges and Opportunities*. 369-384. Harrassowitz.

Veselinova, Ljuba. 2013. Negative existentials: A cross-linguistic study. *Rivista di Linguistica* 25 (1). 107-145.

CONTACT

Binyam Sisay Mendisu
Department of Linguistics
Addis Ababa University
b.s.mend@gmail.com