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1 Introduction

While negation has fostered a rich field of study among linguists, much of this work is constrained to the domains of well-represented languages. In the context of the understudied Semitic language Tigrinya, the present study aims to provide an analysis of its sentential negation, demonstrate that adverbial negative polarity items (NPIs) such as never are licensed via c-command while NPIs like not one thing and no- are licensed via the Spec-Head relation, and provide evidence that licensing can occur across relative clause boundaries. This finding aligns with previous studies of negative items in related languages, such as Berber (Ouali 2014). To further contextualize our study, we also draw similarities across patterns in other languages, including Berber and Jordanian Arabic (Overfelt 2009, Kogan 1997).

1.1 Methodology

We obtained data through elicitations with two male L1 speakers of the language who lived in Ethiopia and Eritrea before moving to the Atlanta area in the early 2000s. We modelled elicitations after a previous study of NPIs in Jordanian Arabic by Alsarayreh (2012). Elicitation sessions consisted of requests for translation of complete sentences, specific words and morphemes, and grammaticality checks of our own Tigrinya sentences. Because of pandemic restrictions, the majority of sessions were conducted remotely. Elicitations were conducted over the phone with Consultant A and over Zoom with Consultant B, based on their preferences.

2 Negation

Being a negative concord language, the main form of negation is usually expressed as a confix, which is supported by previous literature from Kogan (1997). We summarize this form as follows:

A. prefix a/aj- + suffix -in
   NEG + verb + NEG
   a/aj + verb + in

2.1 Verbs and Predicate Adjectives

We first discuss the negation of verbs using the following examples:

(1) i-bellifr? al-loho
    1SG-eat PROG-1SG
    ‘I am eating.’

(2) aj-bellifr?-in al-loho
    NEG-eat-NEG PROG-1SG
    ‘I am not eating.’

Evidently, the confix surrounds the verb bellifr- in order to negate it. However, as we will see in the following sections, they are not always both necessary.

This pattern is also the case for predicate adjectives, as in:
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(3) huggus di-xa
    happy Q-2SG
    ‘Are you happy?’

(4) aj-huggus-in di-xa
    NEG-happy-NEG Q-2SG
    ‘Are you not happy?’

2.2 Imperatives and Jussives

With negation of verbs used in imperatives (and by extension, prohibitives), the suffix -in is not used. Instead, the -a indicates a prohibitive. Consider (6).

(5) tuffa aj-brilli-a
    apple NEG-eat-PROH
    ‘Do not eat the apple.’

Next, we consider negation of verbs used in jussives. In these cases, negation drops the suffix entirely, as demonstrated below in (7) which is given by Kogan (1997).

(7) aj-ji-mut
    NEG-3SG.M-die
    ‘Let him not die!’

2.3 Relative Clauses

The negation prefix may interact with others. We first discuss relative clauses in which the subject is masculine. In the following examples, the relative clause marker denoted as the prefix z- combines with the negation prefix aj- to form the masculine negative relative clause marker zej-. The masculine subject marker is -j1-, which is generally combined or elided when other prefixes are involved, especially given that the negation prefix is phonetically similar. Also, the negation suffix is dropped.

(8) rt-i rdn zi-brilli zr-ll-a mrgbi ab t’awla all-o
    DET-SG.M Eden REL-eat REL-PROG-SG.F meal on table be-3SG.M
    ‘The meal that Eden is eating is on the table.’

(9) rt-i rdn zej-ti-brilli zr-ll-a mrgbi ab t’awla all-o
    DET-SG.M Eden REL-NEG-3SG.F-eat REL-PROG-F.SG meal on table be-3SG.M
    ‘The meal that Eden is not eating is on the table.’

(10) rt-a go‘al rt-i dawit zr-nbibo z-rll-o mrts’haf ti-riji
    DET-SG.F girl DET-SG.M Dawit REL-read REL-PROG-SG.M book 3SG.F-see
    ‘The girl sees the book that Dawit reads.’

(11) rt-i k’ol’ia rt-i dawit zej-nbibo mrts’haf ji-ri’i?i
    DET-SG.M boy DET-SG.M Dawit REL-NEG-read book 3SG.M-read
    ‘The boy sees the book that Dawit does not read.’

(12) rt-i zej-t’rmeje ambesa
    DET-SG.M REL-NEG-hungry lion
    ‘The lion that isn’t hungry’
Now we discuss relative clauses with a feminine subject. Consider the following examples.

(13) nt-a drimmamu t-iggw'aji t'rl eje tifottu
    DET-SG.F cat.PL 3SG.F-chase goat be.1SG like
    ‘I like the goat that chases cats.’

(14) nt-a drimmamu zej-t-iggw'aji t'rl eje tifottu
    DET-SG.F cat.PL REL.NEG-3SG.F-chase goat be.1SG like
    ‘I like the goat that does not chase cats.’

In the positive sentence, the relative prefix z- is deleted, in favor of the feminine subject agreement prefix t-. In the negative sentence, the relative marker z- combines with the negation prefix aj-, and also with the feminine subject marker t- to create zejt-. As with other relative clauses, the negation suffix is also dropped here.

Non-predicate adjectives are negated as relative clauses. Consider the following.

(15) nt-i zej-t'rneje ambesa
    DET-SG.M REL.NEG-hungry lion
    ‘The not-hungry lion’

Notice that the elicited phrases are the same for (12) and (15).

(16) nt-i zej-higgus harastaj rt-om k'o'l'yu a-ggw'aju-om
    DET-SG.M REL.NEG-happy farmer DET-PL.M child.PL PST-chase-3PL.M
    ‘The unhappy farmer chased the children.’

(17) nt-i ʃabi zej-kone krlbi dek'isu all-o
    DET-SG.M big REL.NEG-be dog sleep PROG-3SG.M
    ‘The not-big dog is asleep.’

We conclude that Tigrinya uses one main form of negation that slightly varies depending on the grammatical category of the item being negated.

3 Negative Polarity Items

We first discuss negative polarity items (NPIs) within English before returning to Tigrinya. NPIs are words or phrases that are ungrammatical in positive statements, but grammatical in their negated counterpart (Ladusaw 1979, Giannakidou 1979, Horn 2010). Contrast the following:

(18) a. I don’t have any cats.
    b. *I have any cats.

Across languages, it is theorized that NPIs are licensed by negation to exist within its scope (Giannakidou 2011).

(19) a. *Any cats Dorothy doesn’t have.
    b. Dorothy doesn’t have any cats.

This explains why (19a) is ungrammatical because any to the left of negation in this construction entails any in a position not within the scope of negation. When eliciting for NPIs in Tigrinya, we asked our consultants whether the minimal pair using a non-negated context could be used. Consider the following examples of the Tigrinya NPI fets'imu, which means ‘never’.

(20) *nissu tuffah fets'imu ji-bril'yr all-o
    he  apple never 3SG.M-eat PROG-3SG.M
    ‘He never eats apples.’
(21) nissu tuффah fets’imu aj-блъъръ?-ин all-o
he apple never NEG-eat-NEG PROG-3SG.M
‘He never eats apples.’

As seen in these examples, the NPI fets’imu requires the verb to be within the scope of negation for its use to be grammatical. The question then arises of how scope is syntactically defined, which we discuss in the following sections.

3.1 Nominal NPIs

Here, we discuss the nominal NPIs walla hanti and walla hadda, which correspond to not one thing and no-, respectively. As depicted in Figures 1 and 2, they both occur with the negation confix. We argue that these NPIs are licensed via the Specifier-Head relation. In our analysis, we assume the DP hypothesis which argues that every NP is the complement of a D head (Abner 2021). We also assume that Neg heads its own maximal projection, NegP. This assumption has been made for English, Berber, and Romance languages by Ouali (2003, 2014) and Chomsky (1989) among others. Ouali (2014) discusses a number of arguments for Neg as head of NegP, but most relevantly is our finding that Neg inflects with tense in both Standard Arabic (Fassi-Fehri 1993) and Tigrinya (see Figure 1).

The phrasal movement depicted in Figure 1 is optional.\(^1\) In this way, nominal Tigrinya NPIs act differently than English NPIs, which are not allowed to undergo topicalization (Hoeksema 2000). It can be observed that in the Deep Structure (DS), negation exists at Neg, and the specifier of this head is NegP, which contains the NPI walla hanti. So, walla hanti is licensed prior to being topicalized.

Figure 1: Tree for (22).

\(^1\)The dotted line denotes cliticisation (Henry 1995).
We extend this observation to apply to the nominal NPI *walla hadda* as well. This NPI is semantically similar to *walla hanti* but must connect with a noun, unless it is dropped, in which case *seb* is implied. An example would be *walla hadda ambesa*, meaning *no lions*. As depicted in Figure 2, *aj*- + -*in* exist at Neg. The specifier of this head in the DS is once again the maximal projection NegP, containing the nominal NPI *walla hadda*.

As a counterexample, we include (24). Consider that here, *walla hadda* is not the specifier of negation. The utterance was deemed ungrammatical by both of our consultants.

Furthermore, that *walla hanti* and *walla hadda* derive from the numeral ‘one’ aligns with Haspelmath (1997)’s finding that many languages from his survey of indefinite pronouns in 100 languages include negative sensitive items that are derived from ‘one’.

Finally, nominal NPIs in Tigrinya are able to appear in the subject position, as demonstrated in Figure 2. This characteristic differentiates Tigrinya NPIs from those in English (i.e. *Anyone did not meet Mary*), but is a shared trait with NPIs in Korean (e.g., 25) and Japanese (e.g., 26) (Nakao and Obata 2007).

(22)  
\[\text{ab-ti grza walla hanti j-rl-rrn} \]
\[\text{in-DTE.3SG.M house NEG one.NOM NEG-PROG-NEG} \]
\[\text{‘There is nothing in the house.’} \]

(23)  
\[\text{walla hadda srb mṛts’haf aj-}rnbib-in \]
\[\text{NEG one.ADJ person book NEG-3SG.M-read-NEG PROG-3SG.M} \]
\[\text{‘No one is reading a book.’} \]

As a counterexample, we include (24). Consider that here, *walla hadda* is not the specifier of negation. The utterance was deemed ungrammatical by both of our consultants.

(24)  
\[\text{*rt-a g}^{\text{w}}\text{al walla hadda ambesa t-iri?ijo all-a} \]
\[\text{DET-SG.F girl NEG one.ADJ lion 3SG.F-see PROG-3SG.F} \]
\[\text{‘The girl sees no lion.’} \]

Furthermore, that *walla hanti* and *walla hadda* derive from the numeral ‘one’ aligns with Haspelmath (1997)’s finding that many languages from his survey of indefinite pronouns in 100 languages include negative sensitive items that are derived from ‘one’.

Finally, nominal NPIs in Tigrinya are able to appear in the subject position, as demonstrated in Figure 2. This characteristic differentiates Tigrinya NPIs from those in English (i.e. *Anyone did not meet Mary*), but is a shared trait with NPIs in Korean (e.g., 25) and Japanese (e.g., 26) (Nakao and Obata 2007).

(25)  
\[\text{amuto Mary-lul ani mennessta} \]
\[\text{ anybody Mary-ACC not meet} \]
\[\text{‘Anyone did not meet Mary.’} \]
(26) **dare-mo** Mary-o mi-nakat-ta
    anybody Mary-ACC see-not-PST
    ‘Anyone did not see Mary.’

### 3.2 Adverbial NPIs

Here, we discuss the adverbial NPIs *frts’imu* and *ftrs’ima*, which are the masculine and feminine forms of *never*, respectively. We argue that these NPIs are licensed when they are c-commanded by the negation confix, which is a standard licensing configuration (Frank and Vijay-Shanker 2000). This is girded by earlier work in Tigrinya from Overfelt (2009), who has stated that when negation and the NPI are within the relative clause, then the NPI will exist within the c-command of the negation.

![Tree for (27).](image)

(27) **rt-i** wrddi zuxone mets’haf *frets’imu* aj-je-nbib-in ij-u
    DET-M.SG boy any book never NEG-M.3SG-read-NEG HAB-M.SG
    ‘The boy never reads any books.’

First we discuss *frets’imu*, as in Figure 3 and (27). It is evident that the first branching node of Neg, Neg’, also dominates the AP containing *frets’imu*. Thus, negation c-commands *frets’imu* and thus licenses it.

Note that in Figure 4 below, while *ajjfedelin* is taken to have the same meaning of *never* as *frets’ima* does, the direct translation of the root *felet* is actually a conjugated form of *to know*. This forms a double-verb construction. *felet* is not an NPI, as demonstrated in (28), where there is no negation.

(28) **hrlen ambesa ri?-a t-felet** all-a
    Helen lion see-F 3SG.F-know PROG-SG.F
    ‘Helen sees a lion.’
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Figure 4: Tree for (29).

(29) hrilen ambesa a-ri?i-ja fets’im-a ajf-ferl-in ij-a
Helen lion PST-see-F never-F NEG.3SG.F-know-NEG HAB-SG.F
‘Helen has not ever seen a lion.’

Figure 4 depicts a similar relation to Figure 3 in that Neg also c-commands fets’ima.

3.3 Licensing across CP boundaries

Whether or not NPIs can be licensed across CP boundaries, which is also referred to as “long distance licensing”, varies cross-linguistically. Consider that this is possible in English (i.e., “Mary did not believe that she did anything wrong”), whereas it is not in Hungarian (e.g., as glossed by Vu (2018) in (30)) and Korean (e.g., (31) as glossed by Nakao and Obata (2007)).

(30) *Mari nem kezdett olvasni semmit
Mari NEG start.PST read.ING NPI.ACC
‘Mari didn’t start to read anything.’

Mary-NOM John-NOM anything bought-C believe not did
‘Mary did not believe that John bought anything.’

We depict a usage of the idiomatic NPI k’ejja sántim in Figure 5, which literally translates to red cent, meaning penny. The phrase is used to describe someone who does not have any money or who is poor, similar to the English idiom “he doesn’t have a penny (or cent) to his name”. This NPI also exists in Jordanian Arabic as fils aHmar (Alsarayreh 2012). The Tigrinya elicitation of “Jafet doesn’t have a red cent”, surprisingly yields a relative clause, and the English equivalent is better thought of as “Jafet doesn’t have a thing called a red cent”. We know that this example includes
a relative clause despite the absence of a marker because as discussed in Section 2.3, a feminine subject marker can replace a relative clause marker in a non-negated context. While the matrix clause is negated in Figure 5, the embedded clause is not. In Figure 5, we can see that \textit{k’ejjah santim} is licensed through the CP boundary by the negation confix. Thus, we conclude that Tigrinya NPIs can be licensed across clause boundaries.

(32) jafret \textbf{k’ejjah santim} t-brhal j-rblu-n
    Jafet red cent REL.F-call NEG-have-NEG
    ‘Jafet doesn’t have a red cent.’

4 Conclusion

This paper has offered four results. It first demonstrated how negation manifests in Tigrinya. Second, it provided evidence that nominal NPIs are licensed via the Spec-Head relation with negation in their surface structures. Third, it argued that adverbial NPIs are licensed when c-commanded by negation. These two arguments are inversely similar to previous studies of NPIs in Berber, in which NPI adverbs like \textit{never} are licensed via Spec-Head, while NPIs like \textit{no one} and \textit{nothing} are licensed via c-command (Ouali 2014). Finally, it demonstrated that negation can license Tigrinya NPIs over clause boundaries.
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