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In Somali there is an obligatory focus marking system. Every main declarative clause must have one (and only one) constituent marked for focus. This marking is carried out by means of a set of particles traditionally called "indicators". The focus system appears to have a pervasive influence on the syntax of the language: all of the major syntactic processes affecting a clause (relativization, subordination, noun modification, question formation, negation, etc.) are dependent on it. This paper attempts to show that significant generalizations regarding the formation of interrogative, negative, and negative-interrogative clauses can be captured only with reference to the focus structure of corresponding main declarative clauses.

1. Introduction

This article is a continuation of a study on the syntactic organization of the Somali language according to a certain perspective which was outlined in its predecessor (see Antinucci and Puglielli [1980], hereafter referred to as "Part One"). There we wrote: "We will try to show that most of the Somali sentence patterns (relative and subordinate clauses, yes-no and focalized questions, negative, co-ordinated and 'presentative', etc.) can be optimally accounted for if we derive them from a basic kernel containing only main declarative sentences. The different types of sentence patterns will naturally correlate with the different types of main declarative clauses, once these are defined in terms of their indicator structure."

In Part One we presented evidence for the correctness of this approach by applying it to the description of relative clauses, subordinate clauses and certain types of noun modifiers in Somali. More evidence will be presented in this paper through the analysis of yes/no questions, negative clauses, and negative yes/no questions. Specifically, we will argue that significant

*I wish to thank all the Somali friends who take part in the linguistic program at the Somali National University for their patience and help in supplying and analyzing the data, and my colleagues B. Andrzejewski, L. Gebert, R. Hetzron, and A. Puglielli for enlightening discussions.
generalizations concerning the behavior of these types of sentences can be naturally captured when

(a) they are derived from main declarative sentences;
(b) this derivation makes crucial reference to the indicator structure of the sentence.

As will be clarified below, indicators are particles whose function is to mark the constituent focussed upon in a sentence. They are, therefore, focus markers. It is characteristic of Somali that: (a) every main declarative sentence must contain one (and only one) focus marker; (b) focus markers can mark only one of the major constituents of the sentence, i.e. either a NP or the verb. From (a) it follows that a sentence like:

(1) *Axmed yimid
A. came

is ungrammatical because it doesn't contain any focus marker. From (b) it follows that there are two (and only two) grammatically acceptable ways of expressing the propositional content of (1). Since in (1) there are two major constituents (NP and verb), we can either mark for focus the NP, as in:

(2) Axmed baa yimid
A. P came

or the verb, as in:

(3) Axmed waa yimid
A. P came

1The term "indicator" is taken from Andrzejewski [1975], which provides the most extensive treatment of this topic of the Somali grammar. This term is here retained because it is largely traditional in the literature on Somali, though more appropriate terms might be "focus-marker", "focus-particle", or "focus-indicator".

2Except when otherwise indicated, Somali sentences are quoted following the conventions of the national Somali orthography (see Andrzejewski[1974]). Notice that c stands for a voiced pharyngeal fricative, x for an unvoiced pharyngeal fricative. In the English glosses, "p" stands for "indicator".

3 Baa is the NP-focus marker (which has a variant form ayaa) and is
We call the "indicator structure" of a sentence the whole complex of phenomena, both formal (form of the noun, form of the verb, agreement pattern, etc.—see below for details) and semantic, associated with the use of a given indicator. In what follows we will see that both the formal and the semantic properties of the various types of yes/no questions, negative clauses, and negative yes/no questions match those of main declarative sentences that have the same indicator structure. In our exposition we will first illustrate the formal aspects of this correspondence and then the semantic ones.

2. Interrogative Sentences

2.1. The structure of yes/no questions. Yes/no questions (henceforth, Y/N questions) are formed in Somali by marking the sentence with an interrogative particle ma. This particle can occupy a number of different positions in the sentence, depending on the number of sentence constituents which are present. Thus, in a sentence with two constituents (NP and verb) ma can occupy two possible positions:

always placed at the end of the NP to be marked for focus; waa is the verb focus marker and is instead placed in front of the verb complex. When a NP followed by baa ends in a short vowel, a regular contraction takes place by which the short vowel ending and the initial b- of baa undergo elision. Thus, sequences such as Cali baa or hilibka baa are pronounced as Calaa and hilibkaa. For the sake of clarity, we will disregard these contractions and will always spell the NP and the indicator in their full form. Choice of the constituent to be marked for focus depends on which part of the sentence is considered to constitute new information for the hearer. To take the clearest case, (2) would be an appropriate answer to the question 'Who came?', while in this context (1) would be totally inappropriate; on the other hand, (1) would be appropriate (and (2) inappropriate) as an answer to the question 'What did Axmed do?'. A precise statement of the contextual conditions governing focus choice would require a detailed analysis of texts and conversations, a task which is outside the scope of this article concerned more with the structure of the various sentence types than with their use. Some aspects of the use of indicators are dealt with in Andrzejewski [1975], Hetzron [1965], and Zholkovsky [1971]. Notice that glosses included in double quotes (as those of (2), (3) and following) indicate that the sentences to which the glosses refer have the same "cognitive" or "propositional" meaning, while they differ in focus choice.
(4) a. ma Axmed baa yimid "did Axmed come?"
    Q A. P came

b. Axmed ma yimid

In a sentence with three constituents (two NPs and a verb), ma can occupy three different positions:

(5) a. ma Axmed baa hilibka cunay "did Axmed eat the meat?"
    Q A. P the-meat ate

b. Axmed ma hilibka buu cunay⁴
    A. Q the-meat P-he ate

c. Axmed hilibka ma cunay

and so on. In general, in a Y/N question ma is placed in front of any one of the sentence major constituents, i.e. NP's or verb. There are, however, many cooccurrence restrictions on the placement of ma. Thus, all of the following sentences are ungrammatical, although ma does precede one of the major constituents (a NP in (6), (8), (9), (10), (11) and the verb in (7), (12), (13)):

(6) *ma Axmed yimid
(7) *Axmed baa ma yimid
(8) *ma Axmed hilibka cunay
(9) *ma Axmed hilibka buu cunay
(10) *Axmed ma hilibka cunay
(11) *Axmed baa ma hilibka cunay
(12) *Axmed baa hilibka ma cunay
(13) *Axmed hilibka buu ma cunay

A comparison between (4-5) on the one hand and (6-13) on the other allows us

⁴ Buu in this sentence is a combination of the indicator baa plus the short form of the 3p. sing. subject pronoun, uu. The short forms of the subject pronouns are the following:

1p. sing. and pl. aan 3p. sing. fem. and 3p. pl. ay
2p. sing. and pl. aad 3p. sing. masc. uu

Their combinations with baa give rise to baan, baad, bay, buu. The conditions of occurrence of such pronouns are discussed below.
to pick up the relevant properties involved in this grammaticality contrast:

(c) ma can be placed in front of a NP if and only if this NP is marked by the indicator baa;
(d) ma can be placed in front of the verb if and only if no NP is marked by baa (and, in general, no indicator occurs in the sentence).

On the basis of (c) and (d) above, we could formulate a rule that directly generates Y/N questions in Somali. The rule could be stated in the following way:

(e) enclose one of the NPs of the sentence between the particles ma ...
    baa;
    or else
(f) place ma in front of the Verb.

Yet (e) and (f) are still inadequate, in that they will also generate ungrammatical sentences. Let's consider (e) first.

Notice that in (5b) baa occurs combined with a pronominal copy of the subject NP, constituted by the short form of the subject pronoun ( uu ), while it occurs alone in (4a) and (5a). This feature will have to be specified in rule (e), because if we change it the sentences become ungrammatical:

(14) *Axmed ma hilibka baa cunay (cf. 5b)
(15) *ma Axmed buu hilibka cunay (cf. 5a)
(16) *ma Axmed buu yimid (cf. 4a)

Since in (4a) and (5a) ma ...
baa marks a subject NP while in (5b) a non-subject NP, this could be done by adding to (3) the specification that baa must be combined with the subject pronoun when ma ...
baa marks a non-subject NP. However, this is not enough. If we invert the order of subject and object in (14), the sentence becomes grammatical:

---

5We use the term "non-subject NP" rather than "object NP" because NPs other than subjects are not functionally distinguishable in Somali. See "Part one", n.4.
Inverting instead the order of subject and object in (5b) does not alter the grammaticality of the sentence:

(18) ma hilibka buu Axmed cunay "did Axmed eat the meat?"

If, however, the subject NP is shifted to postverbal position, then again the ma ... baa marking a non-subject NP must carry the subject pronoun:

(19) ma hilibka buu cunay Axmed "did Axmed eat the meat?"
(20) *ma hilibka baa cunay Axmed

Furthermore, the distribution of the subject pronoun accompanying baa changes if the subject NP happens to be first or second person, rather than third person as in all the examples considered so far. In this case the subject pronoun must always be present, no matter what the order of the NPs is:

(21) adigu ma hilibka baad cuntay "did you eat the meat?"
    you Q the-meat P-you you-ate
(22) *adigu ma hilibka baa cuntay
(23) ma hilibka baad adigu cuntay ""
(24) *ma hilibka baa adigu cuntay
(25) ma hilibka baad cuntay adigu ""
(26) *ma hilibka baa cuntay adigu

This fairly complex set of restrictions will have to be included in the formulation of (e), if the rule has to generate directly all the correct Y/N questions. Even if we do this, however, the rule will still be inadequate.

In fact, it must be noticed that in the ma NP baa questions the verb shows two different sets of forms, depending on which NP is marked by the particles. In (5a) (and also in (4a)) the final syllable of the verb carries a high-tone, while in (5b) a middle tone (tones are not shown in the standard orthography):

(5') a. ma Axmed baa hilibka cunay
    b. Axmed ma hilibka buu cunay
This difference emerges even more clearly when the subject NP is plural:

(27) ma wiilasha baa hilibka cunáy "did the boys eat the meat?"
   Q the-boys P the-meat ate-3 sg
(28) wiilashu ma hilibka bay cuneen ""
   the-boys Q the-meat P-3 pl ate-3 pl

Although the subject NP is plural the verb retains its 3 p. singular form in (27), while taking the 3 p. plural form in (28). In the present tense, besides the different agreement pattern, there is a difference in the length of the final vowel of the verb inflection:

(29) ma Axmed baa hilibka cunay "is Axmed eating the meat?"
   Q A. P the-meat is-eating
(30) Axmed ma hilibka buu cunayaa ""
   A. Q the-meat P-he is-eating

This distinction is carried over, through different formal means, in all classes of verbs and in all tenses. We will not dwell on this anymore, since it has been described by Andrzejewski [1964], who called the two sets of forms "restrictive" and "extensive" paradigms. The important point to notice for our purposes is that when ma ... baa marks the subject NP of the sentence the verb appears in the "restrictive" paradigm, while when ma ... baa marks a non-subject NP the verb appears in the "extensive" paradigm. Rule (e) will also have to include this specification. There is, of course, finally the question of which of the NPs will get ma ... baa by rule (e).

Also rule (f) needs some refinements to generate the correct set of Y/N questions of the ma verb type. First of all, since, as we have just seen, Somali has two different complete sets of verbal forms, we will have to state that a Y/N question of the ma verb type always requires the "extensive" paradigm:

(31) Axmed hilibka ma cunay = (5c)
(32) *Axmed hilibka ma cunay
(33) wiilashu hilibka ma cuneen "did the boys eat the meat?"
   the-boys the-meat Q ate-3 pl
(34) *wiilashu hilibka ma cunay
(35) Axmed hilibka ma cunayaa "is Axmed eating the meat?"
A. the-meat Q is-eating

(36) *Axmed hilibka ma cunaya

Second, rule (f) does not generate some perfectly grammatical Y/N questions of the ma verb type. In fact, in addition to (4b) and (5c), the following sentences are also possible:

(37) Axmed muu yimid (cf. (4b))
(38) Axmed hilibka muu cunay $^6$ (cf. (5c))

Uu is again the short form of the subject pronoun, which can occur together with ma. Contrary, however, to the cases where the subject pronoun occurs in the ma ... baa questions, this occurrence is not syntactically conditioned. The subject pronoun can freely occur or not, no matter what the order of the NPs in the sentence:

(39) Axmed {muu} cunay hilibka {ma}
(40) hilibka {muu} cunay Axmed {ma}
(41) hilibka Axmed {muu} cunay {ma}

Furthermore, it can be freely present or not even when the subject NP is not 3rd person:

(42) adigu hilibka {maad} cunfay
     you the-meat Q you-ate

Thus, in our rule (f) we will have to state that a pronominal copy of the subject NP can optionally occur together with ma.

A third problem, finally, has to do with the definition of the position which is to be occupied by ma in these sentences. Up to now we simply said that ma is placed in front of the verb. This is not enough, however, because in a Somali sentence the verb can be immediately preceded not only

---

\(^6\) Muu = maa + uu. Other combinations of the interrogative particle plus the subject pronouns are maa + aad = maad, etc. These combinations can also appear in their full form: maa uu, ma aad, etc.
by a NP, but also by a series of elements of various nature: adverbs, possessive pronouns, prepositional particles, object pronouns, etc. (the full list of these elements and their relative ordering is given in Zholkovsky [1971]).

(43) hilibka ma la cunay "was the meat eaten?" (lit. "did one eat the meat")

(44) Cali warshaddaas ma ka shaqeyaa "does Ali work in that factory?"

(45) shineemada maad igu aragtaay "did you see me in the cinema?"

In (43) the verb is preceded by the impersonal pronoun (la), in (44) by a prepositional particle (ka), in (45) by the combination of an object pronoun (i) plus a prepositional particle (ku). As it can be seen, ma has to precede all these elements. Thus, in order to place ma in the right place, rule (f) will have to list all the elements that can precede the verb and state that ma precedes all of them.

To sum up, any attempt to formulate directly the rule to generate Y/N questions in Somali will have to include, in addition to (e) and (f) above, statements correctly describing (at least) the following phenomena:

(g) conditions of occurrence and distribution of the subject pronouns both in the ma NP baa and in the ma verb questions;

(h) conditions of occurrence of the "extensive" and "restrictive" paradigms of the verb both in the ma NP baa and in the ma verb questions;

(i) placement of ma with respect to the preverbal elements in the ma verb questions.

The crucial point we wish to make is that the inclusion of information relative to (g-i) in the rule for generating Y/N questions will constitute unnecessary duplication, since statements correctly accounting for (g-i) are already included in the Somali grammar. In fact, they are independently needed to generate the set of grammatically well-formed main declarative sentences.
2.2. Formal correspondences between declaratives and Y/N questions. Consider first the ma NP baa questions. Statements accounting for (g) are already available, because they are needed to describe the behavior of subject pronouns in simple declarative clauses containing baa. In fact, the behavior of subject pronouns is exactly the same in the ma NP baa questions and in the baa declaratives, as the reader can see by comparing the following declarative sentences with the ma NP baa questions indicated on the left side (sentences (46-53) mean "Axmed ate the meat"; (54-55) mean "you ate the meat"): 7

(46) Axmed \{ baa\} hilibka cunay \text{cf. (5a)}
(47) *buu " (15)
(48) Axmed hilibka \{ buu\} cunay " (5b)
(49) *baa " (14)
(50) hilibka \{ baa\} Axmed cunay " (17)
(51) buu " (18)
(52) hilibka \{ buu\} cunay Axmed " (19)
(53) *baa " (20)
(54) hilibka \{ baa\} adigu cunay " (23)
(55) *baa " (24)

Rules concerning the selection of the restrictive v. the extensive verbal paradigm (point (h)) are already available too. In main declarative clauses the restrictive paradigm appears only (and always) when the indicator baa marks the subject NP, in all other cases the extensive is used; exactly as in Y/N questions where the restrictive appears only when ma ... baa marks

---

7Definitions of the conditions governing the occurrence of subject pronouns are given in "Part One". We summarize them here:

(a) if baa marks a subject NP, then the subject pronoun can never occur;

(b) if baa marks a non-subject NP and the subject is first or second person, then the subject pronoun must always be present;

(c) if baa marks a non-subject NP and the subject is third person, then the subject pronoun must always be present, except when the non-subject NP precedes the subject NP and they are both preverbal. In the last case the pronoun can be freely present or absent.
the subject NP. Compare again the following declaratives with the questions indicated on the left side:

(56) Axmed baa hilibka cunayy "Axmed ate the meat" cf. (5'a)
(57) Axmed hilibka buu cunay "" (5'b)
(58) wiilasha baa hilibka cunayy "the boys ate the meat" " (27)
(59) wiilashu hilibka bay cuneen "" (28)
(60) Axmed baa hilibka cunaya "Axmed is eating the meat" " (29)
(61) Axmed hilibka buu cunaya "" " (30)

Therefore, we can avoid the duplication involved in stating (g) and (h) if, instead of generating Y/N questions directly, we are allowed to make reference to the structure of the independently generated declarative sentences. In this case the rule for the ma NP baa questions can be formulated in a very simple way:

(j) a Y/N question is formed by taking a main declarative clause and inserting the particle ma in front of the NP which is marked by baa.

The rule thus stated accounts for Y/N questions in two steps. First a declarative sentence is generated, and then it is transformed into a question through the appropriate insertion of ma. Thus, to generate, for example, (3a), (5b), (17), (18), (19), we will start from (respectively) (46), (48), (50), (51), (52) and apply rule (j) to them. In this way all the peculiarities listed in (g), (h) are automatically taken care of by the rules that generate the declarative sentences and need not be mentioned at all in the rule of Y/N question formation.

The same approach can easily solve the problems of the ma verb questions listed in (g), (h), (i) above, since in this case too there are corresponding declarative clauses whose behavior is identical to that of the ma verb questions. As we said in "Part One", every Somali main declarative clause must contain an indicator particle. There are two types of indicators: baa, marking NP's, and waa, marking the verb. Thus, an alternative way of constructing declarative sentences like (56-57) is by using the indicator waa instead of baa:
(62) Axmed hilibka waa cunay "Axmed ate the meat"
(63) Axmed waa yimid "Axmed came"

Declarative sentences of the waa type have, among others, the following properties. A pronominal copy of the subject NP, constituted by the short form of the subject pronoun, may freely appear together with waa:

(64) Axmed hilibka wuu cunay same meaning as (62)
(65) Axmed wuu yimid " " " (63)

This occurrence is syntactically unconstrained: no matter what the relative order of the NP's and Verb is, both the simple waa and the waa + pro constructions are possible ((66-68) have the "same meaning" as (62)):

(66) Axmed \[\{\text{waa}\}\] cunay hilibka \[\{\text{wuu}\}\]
(67) hilibka \[\{\text{waa}\}\] cunay Axmed \[\{\text{wuu}\}\]
(68) hilibka Axmed \[\{\text{waa}\}\] cunay \[\{\text{wuu}\}\]

In waa sentences the verb always appears in the extensive paradigm:

(69) Axmed hilibka waa cunay = (62)
(70) *Axmed hilibka waa cunay
(71) wiilashu hilibka waa cuneen "the boys ate the meat"
(72) *wiilashu hilibka waa cunay
(73) Axmed hilibka waa cunaya "Axmed is eating the meat"
(74) *Axmed hilibka waa cunaya

Besides being placed in front of the verb, waa must also precede all the preverbal elements accompanying the verb:

(75) hilibka waa la cunay "the meat was eaten" cf. (43)
(76) Cali warshaddaas waa ka shaqayeyaa "Ali works in that factory" (44)
(77) shineemada waad igu aragtay "you saw me in the cinema" (45)

---

8Combinations of waa + subject pronoun are: waa + aan = waan; waa + aad = waad; waa + ay = way, cf. fn. 4.
Comparing the set of sentences (64-77) with (31-45), it is easy to see how these properties of the waa declaratives match exactly those of the ma verb questions listed in (g-i) above, once ma is substituted for waa. Therefore, if we have already in our grammar the rules to generate the correct set of waa declarative sentences, stating directly the rules for ma verb questions will again involve a good deal of duplication. This can be avoided if we allow ma verb questions to be derived from waa declaratives by means of a rule of the following type:

\[(k) \text{ a Y/N question is formed by taking a main declarative clause and substituting ma for the indicator waa in it.}\]

Thus, sentences like, for example, (4b) and (5b) will be generated by transforming the corresponding waa declaratives (63) and (62) through application of rule (k). In this way conditions (g-i) will not need to be specified at all in the question formation rule, since they will be automatically taken care of by the independently needed rules that generate main declarative clauses. Notice, furthermore, that the formulation of rule (k) also predicts the non-occurrence of sentences containing both ma and waa (as opposed to ma and baa), since it calls for "substitution" of waa, and in fact these sentences are ungrammatical:

(78) *Axmed waa ma yimid
(79) *Axmed ma waa yimid

2.3. Semantic correspondences between declaratives and Y/N questions. Up to now we have been arguing in favour of a derivation of Y/N questions from declarative sentences on purely formal grounds. We showed that a number of formal properties of Y/N questions (subject pronoun distribution, verb choice, etc.) are most efficiently accounted for in a grammar of Somali if we generate them as transformations of main declarative clauses, because in this way we can capture significant generalizations regarding the common behaviors of questions and declaratives. The pro-derivational argument can be strengthened even more if we allow semantic considerations to play a role in it. First of all, notice that if we generated Y/N questions directly a very important correlation within Somali grammar would be missed,
namely that the number of ways in which a sentence can be questioned corresponds exactly to the number of ways in which the same sentence can be asserted by varying only its indicator structure. Thus, a sentence meaning "Ali went to Xamar yesterday" can be formulated in Somali in four different ways, by varying its indicator structure:

(80) shaley baa Cali Xamar tegay
     yesterday P C. X. went
(81) shaley Cali baa Xamar tegay
(82) shaley Cali Xamar buu tegay
(83) shaley Cali Xamar waa tegay

Now there are four (and only four) ways of asking the corresponding question "did Ali go to Xamar yesterday?":

(84) ma shaley baa Cali Xamar tegay
     Q yesterday P C. X. went
(85) shaley ma Cali baa Xamar tegay
(86) shaley Cali ma Xamar buu tegay
(87) shaley Cali Xamar ma tegay

More than this purely quantitative correspondence, our rule makes the claim that there is a one-to-one correspondence between statements and Y/N questions: each statement has its corresponding Y/N question (the one generated by the application of (j)/(k) to the statement). It turns out that this syntactic correspondence captures a very neat semantic correspondence. As we said in section 1 (see also "Part One"), the semantic function of indicator particles like baa and waa is to mark the focus of assertion. Baa focuses the assertion on the NP marked by it and waa on the verb. Thus, a better approximation for the English translation of sentences (80-83) would be:

(80') 'it was yesterday that Ali went to Xamar'
(81') 'it was Ali that went to Xamar yesterday'
(82') 'it was to Xamar that Ali went yesterday'
(83') 'Ali did go to Xamar yesterday'\(^9\)

---

\(^9\)These glosses are simply suggestive of the differences in focus im-
Y/N questions show the same property: the constituent marked by ma is always in focus. Obviously, in this case, it is the focus of the question and not of the assertion. Sentences (84-87) are, therefore, more appropriately glossed with the question equivalents of (80-83), i.e. "was it yesterday that Ali went to Xamar?", etc. This is the reason why sentences like (7), (9), (11), (12), (13) are ungrammatical: ma cannot mark for question a constituent which is not in focus. The essential generalization underlying the formation of Y/N questions in Somali is that in a sentence only the focused constituent can be questioned. By tying the process of question formation to the focus structure of the corresponding declarative clause, our rule of question formation captures automatically this generalization. Given our framework, the semantic effect of ma can be described as simply changing the illocutionary force of the sentence (from assertion to question): the fact that sets like (80-84), (81-85), (82-86), (83-87) have exactly the same propositional meaning and the same distribution of focused v. non-focused information results automatically from the way in which the rule of question formation is formulated. In fact, the two rules (j-k) can be collapsed into a single unitary statement which is much more revealing:

(1) a Y/N question is formed by marking with ma the focused constituent of a declarative clause.

Rules (j) and (k) can then be seen as "spelling" rules specifying the details of placement of ma (addition to the left of a baa marked constituent and substitution of waa ).

Applied by the Somali sentences, but they are not totally appropriate translations. The cleft construction in English is a highly marked, optional construction, suggesting a contrastive value of the assertion. The Somali sentences are unmarked, simple sentences and they do not have any contrastive value, since, contrary to English, choosing one element to focus upon is obligatory in every Somali sentence. See fn. 3.

Presumably, this generalization holds for every natural language, but in Somali it is remarkably transparent.
3. **Interrogative Form of Verbless Sentences**

The only exception to our rules (j) and (k) is constituted by Y/N questions of verbless sentences. Somali has a class of main declarative clauses of the general form NP waa NP, where no verb appears:

(88) Cali waa macallin "Ali is a teacher"
    C. P teacher

(89) kuwaasi waa geedo timireed "those are date trees"
    those P trees of-dates

(90) kani waa ninkii aan shaley la hadlay "this is the man I talked this P the-man I yesterday with talked to yesterday"

As the glosses show, it is a kind of predicate nominal construction, where no copular verb appears and the predicate NP takes the position normally occupied by a verb, i.e. right after the indicator waa. As is frequently the case with these types of sentences, they can be used only if the temporal reference of the sentence is present. For past (or future) reference one has to resort to a normal construction containing the verb 'to be', such as:

(91) kuwaasi geedo timireed bay ahayeen "those were date trees"
    those trees of-dates P-they were

(92) kuwaasi geedo timireed waa ahayeen ""

The problem for our analysis of Y/N questions is that given the structure of sentences (88-90), rule (k) will automatically apply to them in order to produce the corresponding Y/N questions. Substituting ma for waa, rule (k) will produce:

(93) *Cali ma macallin cf. (88)

(94) *kuwaasi ma geedo timireed " (89)

(95) *kani ma ninkii aan shaley la hadlay " (90)

which are ungrammatical. In fact, the Y/N questions corresponding to sentences (88-90) are:

(96) Cali ma macallin baa "is Ali a teacher?"
    C. Q teacher P

(97) kuwaasi ma geedo timireed baa "are those trees of dates?"
    those Q trees of-dates P
As can be seen, the resulting form of these sentences is that of an ordinary NP question, i.e. the one generated by rule (j). What seems to be happening here is that the rule of question formation is sensitive to the NP status of the questioned constituent rather than to the presence of waa. The rule treats the predicate nominal as a focused NP and not as a verb, even if this constituent is preceded by waa. This is probably due to the ambiguous status of the predicate nominal in (88-90). This constituent behaves like an ordinary predicate, and in fact it shares all the structural properties of a predicate: (a) presence of waa; (b) position of waa.

As with an ordinary verbal predicate, waa must precede and cannot be separated from it:

(99) *Cali macallin waa
(100) *waa Cali macallin

Compare:

(101) Cali waa yimid "Ali came"
(102) *Cali yimid waa
(103) *waa Cali yimid

(c) the NP accompanying it behaves as its subject: it is morphologically marked as a subject NP (see Andrzejewski [1964]); it can be omitted as in verbal sentences such as:

(104) waa macallin
(105) waa yimid

It can be switched in post-"verbal" position in sentences such as:

(106) waa macallin Cali
(107) waa yimid Cali

Yet it also has all the properties of an ordinary NP, as shown by the fact that it can take the definite article and it can be modified by any noun modifier: a genitive noun in (89), a relative clause in (90). In view of this ambiguity, it seems reasonable to consider sentences like (96-98) as
true exceptions to our rule (therefore, to be dealt with separately), rather than counterexamples to our general analysis.

Notice, furthermore, that the really important generalization captured by our analysis and stated in (1), that the questioned constituent is always the focused constituent of the corresponding declarative clause, holds perfectly well also in these sentences. No matter what its structural status is, the predicate nominal in sentences like (88-90) is always the focused constituent of the clause. In fact, if we want a sentence corresponding to (88) where the focus is not on the NP macallin but on the other constituent (Cali), this will appear as:

(108) Cali baa macallin ah
     C. P teacher is

which is an ordinary verbal sentence, containing the verb 'to be' and the indicator baa on the subject NP.11

4. Negative Sentences

In Somali negative sentences are formed by using a negative particle and the negative conjugation of the verb. There are two negative particles, aan and ma. Their use is exemplified in the following sentences:

(109) Cali baan hadiyad keenin "Ali didn't bring a present"
     C. P-neg present bring

(110) Cali hadiyad baanu keenin12 "P-neg-he"

(111) Cali hadiyad ma keenin "P-neg-he"

We can immediately notice that when aan occurs, it accompanies the NP marked by baa, when ma occurs instead there are no indicators and ma

11Since in sentence (108) the focus is on the subject NP, the verb 'to be' appears in the restrictive paradigm form ah (see Andrzejewski [1969]).

12When the negative particle aan combines with baa, or with baa + subj. pro., the following contractions take place:

baa + aan = baan
baa + aan + aan = baanan
baa + aan + aad = baanad
baa + aan + uu = baanu
etc.
precedes the verb. Any other distribution of the negative particles will result in an ungrammatical sentence:

(112) *Cali baa hadiyad aan keenin
(113) *Cali aan hadiyad buu keenin
(114) *Cali aan hadiyad keenin
(115) *Cali hadiyad aan keenin
(116) *Cali baa hadiyad ma keenin
(117) *Cali hadiyad buu ma keenin
(118) *Cali hadiyad waa ma keenin
(119) *Cali hadiyad ma waa keenin

The situation is, therefore, exactly parallel to that of Y/N questions, where the interrogative particle (ma) can either accompany the NP marked by baa or precede the verb in absence of any indicator. In fact, we can use essentially the same arguments we used for Y/N questions to show that negative sentences are to be derived from main declarative clauses. The rules involved in such a derivation will be very similar to (j) and (k) above, differing only in the spelling details.

Consider first the cases of aan negations, i.e., the cases where the negative particle marks a NP. The rule involved can be formulated in the following way:

(m) a negative sentence is formed by inserting aan after the NP marked by baa into a main declarative clause and changing the form of the verb into the negative form.

The arguments we used to justify the corresponding (j) rule for Y/N questions in 2.2 were of four kinds: (1) distribution of the interrogative particle; (2) distribution of the subject pronouns; (3) form of the verbal

The negative conjugation has two forms: an invariable form ending in -in and a person inflected one ending in -0. The last one is identical to the so-called "dependent" verb form (see Andrzejewski [1968]), which is a kind of subjunctive. The -0 form can be used only with the negative particle ma, in which case it has a present tense value, while the -in form has a past tense value. With the negative particle aan only the -in form can be used, and its value can be both present and past.
conjugation; (4) semantic correspondence between pairs of rule related declarative question clauses. The same arguments can be used to justify (m), except for (3) since in Somali there is a special verbal conjugation which is used in all negative sentences (see fn. 12). Let us briefly review such arguments. Obviously, rule (m) will predict the correct distribution of the aan particle. Since aan will be inserted only on a NP marked by baa, sentences like (109–110) will be generated while sentences like (112–115) will be excluded. Subject pronouns in negative clauses behave exactly in the same way as in Y/N questions and main declarative clauses. If the negative particle marks the subject NP, then the pronoun can never be present, no matter what the order of the NP's is:

(120) *Cali baanu hadiyad keenin  cf. (47)
      C.  P-neg-he present bring

(121) *hadiyad Cali baanu keenin

If aan marks a non-subject NP, then the pronoun must appear except when the non-subject NP precedes the subject NP and they are both in preverbal position:

(122) Cali hadiyad \{baanu\} keenin  cf. (48)
      C. present \{P-neg-he\} bring

(123) *baan
      P-neg

(124) hadiyad \{baan\} Cali keenin  (50)

(125) *baan
      P-neg

(126) hadiyad \{baanu\} keenin Cali
      \{*baan\}

(127) hadiyad baanad (adigu) keenin\(^\text{13}\)  cf. (54)
      present P-neg-you you bring

\(^\text{13}\)The combinations of baa + aan + pro. given in these sentences (and in fn. 12 above) are those characteristic of the dialect spoken in the northernmost regions. South of these regions (approximately from the Mudug area), the relative order of aan and pro. is inverted, i.e. the negative
Since rule (m) derives negative clauses from previously generated declarative clauses, all these restrictions on the occurrence of subject pronouns are already taken care of (by the rules generating, e.g. (47-54)) and need not be specified for negative clauses.

Finally the semantic argument parallel to 2.3. Rule (m) enables us to capture automatically the semantic correlation existing between pairs of main declarative and negative clauses. In a negative clause the constituent marked by aan is always in focus. Thus, more revealing glosses for sentences like (109) and (110) are, respectively:

(109') 'it wasn't Ali that brought a present'
(110') 'it wasn't a present that Ali brought'\textsuperscript{14}

Rule (m) derives (109) and (110) from, respectively:

(129) Cali baa hadiyad keenay
    C. P present brought
(130) Cali hadiyad buu keenay
    C. present P-he brought

Now, (129) and (130) have exactly the same focus structure as (109) and (110).

Consider now negative clauses of the ma type. The rule involved in the derivation of these sentences parallels the rule for deriving ma verb questions:

(n) a negative sentence is formed by substituting ma for waa into a main declarative clause, changing the form of the verb into the negative form and, eventually, moving ma after the sequence of object pronoun + preverbal particles inside the verb complex.

The last specification is necessary because the position occupied by nega-

\textsuperscript{14}See fn. 9, above.
tive ma with respect to the verb complex is different from that occupied
by interrogative ma. Thus, while interrogative ma appears, as waa,
at the beginning of the verb complex (see (43-45) and (75-77)), negative
ma occurs inside it. Compare the negative equivalents of (43-45):15

(131) hilibka la ma cunin
      the-meat impers-pro neg ate
"the meat was not eaten"

(132) Cali warshaddaas ka ma shaqeeyo
      C. that-factory from neg works
"Ali doesn't work in that factory"

(133) shineemada igu maad arkin
      cinema-the me-in neg-you saw
"you didn't see me in the cinema"

Again, the same arguments in 2.2 used to support the derivation of ma
verb questions from waa declaratives can be used to support the deriva-
tion of ma negatives from waa declaratives. Let's briefly review them
in the form of predictions that can be formulated from rule (n). If ma
negatives are derived from waa sentences, we will predict that, contrary
to the aan negatives, baa will never cooccur with negative ma, and
since rule (n) calls for "substitution" of waa, negative ma will never
coopcur with waa either. Thus, rule (n) will correctly predict that sen-
tences like (116-117) and like (118-119) are ungrammatical. Rule (n) will
also predict that subject pronouns in ma negatives will behave in the
same way as subject pronouns in waa declaratives. We said above that in
these sentences the occurrence of subject pronouns is syntactically uncon-
strained: they can be freely present or absent (see (62-68)). The same
applies to ma negatives (ma negation + pronoun is never contracted):

15This statement applies to the dialects spoken in Northern Somalia,
with the exclusion of the coastal and southern regions. In the dialects
spoken in these regions, negative ma occupies instead the same position
of interrogative ma and waa, i.e. at the beginning of the verbal com-
plex. Thus, sentences like (131-133) would appear in these dialects as:

(131') hilibka ma la cunin
(132') Cali warshaddaas ma ka shaqeeyo
(133') shineemada maad igu arkin

Maad = ma + aad. The combinations of negative ma plus the subject pro-
nouns are identical to those of interrogative ma (see fn. 6) and they
can also appear in their full form, as in (134-137).
Finally, rule (n) will predict that the focus of *ma* negatives will always be on the verb (cf. 2.3), since they derive from *waa* declaratives, which have focus on the verb. This prediction is confirmed: in sentences like (134-137) the negation bears in every case on the verb, and they contrast with negative sentences like (109-110) where (as shown by (109'-110')) the negation bears on one of the NP constituents.

Though in the case of negative clauses we lack the argument based on the form of the verb, there is an additional piece of evidence in favour of our analysis, deriving from the behavior of negation in subordinate clauses. Subordinate clauses (which, as we showed in "Part One", are in Somali all relative clauses) may be negated only by means of *aan*, and never *ma*, as the following sentences show:

(138)  
\[ \text{wiiikii aan af talyaaniga ku hadlin waad aragtaay} \]
\[ \text{you saw the boy who doesn't speak Italian} \]

(139)  
\[ \text{*wiiikii af talyaaniga ku ma hadlin waad aragtaay} \]

(140)  
\[ \text{inaan Cali imaanin waan doonayaa} \]
\[ \text{I want Ali not to come} \]

(141)  
\[ \text{*in Cali ma imaanin waan doonayaa} \]

In "Part One" we argued that all subordinate clauses are derived from main declarative clauses of the *baa* type. Assuming this derivation, rule (m) automatically explains why only *aan* is found in negative subordinates: since they all come from *baa* sentences only rule (m) can apply to them.
(and not rule (n)) resulting, therefore, in the presence of aan.

As with Y/N questions, our analysis allows us to capture the essential generalization underlying the construction of negative clauses in Somali, i.e. that only and always focused constituent are negated. In fact, we can explicitly formulate this generalization in a single more abstract rule of negation covering both (m) and (n), as we did in (1) for question formation:

(o) a negative clause is formed by marking with the negative particle the focused constituent of a main declarative clause.

Then (m) and (n) become (as (j) and (k)) "spelling" rules, specifying how the actual marking is effected.16

Finally notice that verbless sentences, such as (88-90), cannot be negated. In order to negate them we have to resort to their ordinary verbal equivalents:

16Before closing this section, we must mention a third type of negative sentence. This is used very rarely and in highly restricted contexts. It is formed by adding aan to the indicator waa, as in the following sentences:

(i) waanu ku arkin "he didn't see you"
P-neg-he you see
(ii) waanad il sheegiin "you didn't tell it to me"
P-neg-you me-to tell

Formally, this construction can be accounted for by extending rule (m). Instead of specifying the context of aan insertion as the NP marked by baa, one can simply say that aan is inserted after any indicator:

(m') a negative sentence is formed by inserting aan after any indicator into a main declarative clause and changing the form of the verb into the negative form.

Rule (m') will generate both the baa + aan sentences and the waa + aan sentences like (i-ii). This rule will still correctly predict the syntactic behavior of sentences like (i-ii) and the fact that they have verb focus. There is, however, no way of predicting the additional idiosyncratic meaning that such sentences have. Compared to focus equivalent ma negations, waa + aan negations can only be used when the clause implies some sort of opposition to or unfulfillment of the expectations created by the preceding context. Thus, (i-ii) could never be used in isolation, as opposed to the corresponding ma sentences. Examples of appropriate use are the following:
5. **Interrogative Sentences: miyaa Construction**

In addition to the particle ma, there is another particle in Somali which can turn a sentence into a Y/N question. This is the particle miyaa. The syntactic behavior of this particle differs from that of ma, although for each ma sentence there is a semantically identical sentence with miyaa. The use of miyaa appears in the following sentences:

(144) Cali miyaa keenāy

wasi Ali who brought it?

(145) miyaa Cali keenāy

did Ali bring it?

The two sentences are (as can be seen from the glosses) semantically identical to, respectively:

(146) ma Cali baa keenāy

(147) Cali ma keenay

Notice, furthermore, that although no indicator ( baa or waa ) occurs in (144-145), sentence (144) has the restrictive verbal paradigm and sentence (145) the extensive, as shown by the tonal features on the verbal endings.  

---

(1) Cali agtiisa baad soo martay, waanu ku arkin

C. vicinity-his P-youhither passed P-neg-he you see

"you passed near to Ali, (and yet) he didn't see you"

(ii) wuu yimid, waanu ii sheegin

P-he came P-neg-he me-to tell

"he came, (but) he didn't tell it to me"

As can be seen, in order to express in English the appropriate nuance of meaning one has to insert expressions like "and yet" or "but".

---

17 In Somali, the third person object pronoun is zero. Thus, when no NP object appears in sentences with transitive verbs, such as (144-149), a definite object is understood.

18 That the restrictive paradigm is involved in sentences such as (144) and the extensive in sentences such as (145) is also proved by the differ-
We are thus in the presence of the same basic facts that justified our derivation of ma questions from main declarative clauses, i.e. correspondence of focus and correspondence of verb forms (the third group of facts, those related to the distribution of subject pronouns, will be taken up below). Therefore, it appears natural to postulate also for miyaa sentences a derivation from main declarative clauses. In fact, if we derive (144) from a baa sentence and (145) from a waa sentence, both the semantic value of the resulting question (in terms of focus distribution) and the distribution of verb forms will be automatically accounted for. Sentence (144) will be derived from:

(148) Cali baa keenay "Ali brought it" ('it was Ali who brought it')

where the NP subject (Cali) is in focus, and the verb appears in the restrictive paradigm, since baa marks the subject NP. Sentence (145) will be derived from:

(149) Cali waa keenay "Ali brought it"

where focus is on the verb and the verb appears in the extensive paradigm, as in every waa sentence. The rules involved can be formulated in the following way:

(p) a Y/N question is formed by substituting miyaa for baa into a main declarative clause;
(q) a Y/N question is formed by substituting miyaa for waa into a main declarative clause and moving it to the beginning of the clause.

ent agreement pattern with a 3p. plural subject (the restrictive keeps the 3p. sing. ending):

(i) wiilashaas miyaa keenay "did those boys bring it?" (restrictive)
(ii) miyaa wiilashaas keeneen "" (extensive)

or by the contrast between the short (restrictive) and long (extensive) vowel ending of the present tense:

(i) Cali miyaa keenaya "is Ali bringing it?"
(ii) miyaa Cali keenayaa
Furthermore, since both rule (p) and (q) call for "substitution" of the indicators, they also account for the impossibility of occurrence of either baa or waa inside miyaa sentences:

(150) *Cali miyaa baa keenay
(151) *Cali miyaa waa keenay
(152) *miyaa Cali baa keenay
(153) *miyaa Cali waa keenay

Up to now, we haven't considered the third major argument we used to justify our claim that both Y/N questions and negative clauses are to be derived from main declarative clauses, namely, the capability of our analysis of accounting, at no extra cost, for the behavior of subject pronouns inside these types of sentences. Evidence parallel to that found in ma questions and negatives is available also for miyaa sentences, but a more careful analysis is required, since some data appear to contradict the predictions made by rule (p) and (q). Since these rules effect only a substitution of the indicators in the original declarative sentences, we would expect subject pronouns in miyaa clauses to show exactly the same distribution they show in main declaratives. Thus, if miyaa marks a non-subject NP, we would expect the subject pronoun to obligatorily accompany the NP + miyaa when this follows the subject NP or the subject NP is post-verbal, and optionally when the NP + miyaa precedes the subject NP and they are both pre-verbal. These predictions turn out to be correct:

(154) Cali hadiyad {miyuu} keenay\(^{19}\) C. present {Q-he} brought
(155) " (49)
(156) hadiyad {miyuu} keenay Cali
(157) " (52)
(158) hadiyad {miyaa} Cali keenay
(159) " (50)

\(^{19}\)The usual contractions take place: miyaa + aan = miyaan; miyaa + aad = miyaad; miyaa + ay = miyay; miyaa + uu = miyuu.
Second, we would expect that when miyaa comes from waa (and is, therefore, preposed to the whole sentence, as prescribed by rule (q)), the subject pronoun can be freely present or absent, no matter what the order of the NP's is. Also this prediction turns out to be correct:

\[(\text{160}) \{\text{miyaa}\} \text{ Cali hadiyad keenay} \quad \text{cf. (62)}\]
\[\{\text{miyuu}\} \quad " \quad (64)\]
\[(\text{161}) \{\text{miyaa}\} \text{ Cali keenay hadiyad} \quad " \quad (66)\]
\[\{\text{miyuu}\} \]
\[(\text{162}) \{\text{miyaa}\} \text{ hadiyad keenay Cali} \quad " \quad (67)\]
\[\{\text{miyuu}\} \]
\[(\text{163}) \{\text{miyaa}\} \text{ hadiyad Cali keenay} \quad " \quad (68)\]

Third, when miyaa marks a subject NP, the subject pronoun should never be able to accompany it, since a NP subject marked by baa can never be accompanied by a subject pronoun. The rule, therefore, correctly predicts the ungrammaticality of:

\[(\text{164}) \quad *\text{Cali miyuu keenay}\]

and of:

\[(\text{165}) \quad *\text{Cali miyuu hadiyad keenay}\]

There is, however, a problem: if the verb in (164) and (165) is changed from the restrictive to the extensive paradigm, then the two sentences become perfectly grammatical:

\[(\text{166}) \quad \text{Cali miyuu keenay}\]
\[(\text{167}) \quad \text{Cali miyuu hadiyad keenay}\]

The problem is that there is no way of predicting the grammaticality of (166-167) on the basis of our rules. Given the way (p) and (q) are formulated, sentences like (166-167) will not be generated at all. Sentences (166) and (167) could only come from sentences:

\[(\text{168}) \quad *\text{Cali buu keenay}\]
\[(\text{169}) \quad *\text{Cali buu hadiyad keenay}\]
which are ungrammatical. Is this then a counterexample for our analysis of miyaa sentences? It would be a counterexample if in the two sentences the focus of the question were on the subject NP Cali. In fact, if this were the case, our most general claim that the focus of the resulting question is always predictable from the focus of the corresponding declarative would be falsified. There is no way in which the presence of the subject pronoun and of the extensive form of the verb in (166-167) can be predicted from a main declarative clause where the subject NP is in focus. Fortunately, however, in both (166) and (167) the focus of the question is not on the subject NP Cali. In (166) the focus is on the verb keenay and in (167) on the object NP hadiyad. Thus, in order to preserve the general condition of focus invariance, (166) should be derived from a declarative where the focus is on the verb, and (167) from a declarative where the focus is on the object NP hadiyad. It turns out that such sentences do exist and they show both the presence of the subject pronoun and the extensive form of the verb. They are, respectively:

(170) Cali wuu keenay
(171) Cali hadiyad buu keenay

Therefore, the condition of focus invariance does make the correct predictions concerning both the presence of the subject pronoun and the form of the verb. What is wrong with our analysis is not the general claim that the semantic value and the syntactic behavior of miyaa questions can be predicted from those of main declaratives, but the spelling details concerning the placement of miyaa contained in our rules (p) and (q). If sentences like (166-167) are to be derived from, respectively, (170-171), this means that when the subject pronouns are present the placement of miyaa is freer than when they are absent. In fact, from (170-171) rules (q) and (p) would only derive:

(172) miyuu Cali keenay
(173) Cali hadiyad miyuu keenay

(which, by the way, have exactly the same meaning as (166-167)). What seems to be happening is that if a subject pronoun accompanies miyaa, i.e. if a
subject pronoun is present in the starting declarative clause, then

(p') the combination of miyaa + pro, resulting from a baa substitution, can be optionally moved in front of the NP;

(q') the combination of miyaa + pro, resulting from a waa substitution, can optionally remain in its original place (without having to be moved in front of the sentence).

By adding specifications (p') and (q') to (p) and (q), we are now able to obtain the correct results. The newly stated rules will also make some further predictions. For example, they will predict that sentences such as:

(174) Cali hadiyad miyuu keenay
(175) miyuu hadiyad keenay Cali

are ambiguous as far as focus is concerned, since they have two possible sources: (174) can be derived both from

(176) Cali hadiyad buu keenay
via simple (p) and from

(177) Cali hadiyad wuu keenay
via (q-q'). Sentence (175) can be derived both from

(178) hadiyad wuu keenay Cali
via simple (q) and from

(179) hadiyad buu keenay Cali
via (p-p'). And in fact (174-175) have each two interpretations: one where the focus of the question is on the verb and one where the focus is on the NP hadiyad. Finally, notice that the qualification in (p'), (q') "if a subject pronoun is present in the starting declarative clause" is essential to allow the additional possibilities of miyaa placement. Leaving miyaa in its place when it is derived from waa (q'), and preposing it to the NP when it is derived from baa (p'), is possible only if a subject pronoun is present, as shown by the ungrammaticality of the following sentences where no subject pronoun is present:
To sum up, the effects of the two rules with their possible double output can be schematically represented as follows (where parentheses indicate optionality):

\[
\begin{align*}
... & \quad NP + miyaa + (pro) \quad ... \quad (p) \\
... & \quad NP + baa + (pro) \quad ... \quad (p') \\
miyaa + (pro) + NP & \quad ... \quad (p'') \\
miyaa + pro + V & \quad ... \quad (q) \\
\end{align*}
\]

As for Y/N questions of the ma type and for negative clauses, also in the case of miyaa questions we can formulate a higher level rule, covering both (p) and (q), explicitly stating the essential generalization common to the three analyses:

(r) a Y/N question is formed by marking with the interrogative particle miyaa the focused constituent of a main declarative clause.

6. Verbless Sentences: miyaa Construction

Verbless sentences of the type NP waa NP can also form miyaa questions. As the ma questions seen above, the miyaa questions derived from these sentences also behave exceptionally with respect to our rules. In fact, given the presence of waa in a sentence like:

(182) Cali waa macallin

C. P teacher

rule (q) would apply, producing

(183) *miyaa Cali macallin

which is ungrammatical. The correct form of this question is instead:

(184) Cali macallin miyaa

Here again, as in the ma question form of these sentences, it seems that the rule inserting miyaa is more sensitive to the NP status of the questioned constituent (macallin) than to the presence of waa. It places
miyaa as if macallin were a NP marked by baa, 20 which is what happens also to the ma question form of (182):

(185) Cali ma macallin baa

In view of our analysis of ma questions, however, there is no need to analyze also this case as an exception to rules (p-q). It is obvious that there is only one bit of exceptional behavior: in all cases of Y/N question formation the predicate of sentences like (182) is treated as a NP, and, therefore, it is the rule for NP focus that is applied. Formally, the problem can be easily solved, without having to state the same exception twice, if we reformulate the rules for miyaa questions in such a way that they apply to already formed ma questions, rather than directly to declarative sentences. For example, rule (p) could be formulated in the following way:

(s) .... ma + NP + baa ... → ... NP + miyaa ...

Thus, to derive (184) we would start from (182), apply the ma question rule, deriving (185), and then apply to the output of this rule rule (s), which is now the ordinary rule for NP focus. Rule (s) would then cover both the ordinary cases of NP focus and predicate nominals. We can make both miyaa rules ((p) and (q)) dependent on the previous formation of a ma question, since this will have no consequences on any other cases (the two formulations make exactly the same predictions, except for the NP waa NP case). 21

20 Notice that the rule involved in deriving (184) from (182) cannot be conceived as a sort of "mirror image" of rule (q), i.e. substituting miyaa for waa and moving it to the end of the sentence instead of to the beginning of it. The place of miyaa is not at the end of the sentence but right after the predicate nominal. If the subject is switched in post-verbal position as in

(i) waa macallin Cali

the corresponding question appears as

(ii) macallin miyaa Cali

21 In view of this case, one is tempted to analyze miyaa as a combination of the interrogative particle ma plus the indicator ayaay, an al-
7. Negative-Interrogative Sentences

One important consequence of our analysis of Y/N questions and negative clauses is that the rules provided to account for these sentence types will automatically generate negative questions. As we shall see, negative questions result from the simple application of both the rule for Y/N questions and that for negation to the usual starting sequences constituted by main declarative clauses. Given our approach, they can be accounted for at no extra cost in the grammar of Somali.

Consider first negative questions with NP focus:

(186) ma Cali baan hadiyad keenin  "didn't Ali bring a present?"
    Q C. P-neg present bring

(187) Cali ma hadiyad baanu keenin  ""
    P-neg-he

(188) Cali miyaan hadiyad keenin  ""
    Q-neg

ternant of baa. Ayaa can always substitute for baa, without any change in the meaning or structure of the sentence. The only case where this substitution is impossible is in the NP-focus questions:

(i) ma Cali baa yimid  "did Ali come?"
    *ma Cali ayaa yimid

(ii) ma macallin baa  "is he a teacher?"
    *ma macallin ayaa

One could then argue that the difference between a ma NP baa question and a NP miyaan question is only that the first comes from a declarative containing baa and the second from a declarative containing ayaa. The two indicators trigger two different rules of ma insertion: when baa is present, ma is inserted in front of the NP, while when ayaa is present, ma is inserted after the NP but in front of the indicator, thus giving origin to a sequence NP ma ayaa. Besides accounting for the "origin" of miyaan and for the fact that the two types of questions are identical in meaning (since there is no difference in declaratives between the use of baa and that of ayaa, and in both types of questions the same interrogative particle, ma, is inserted), this analysis would also explain the non-occurrence of ma NP ayaa constructions, which is the only asymmetry in the otherwise identical distribution of the two indicators. We are, however, unable to offer any kind of phonological and/or historical evidence justifying the analysis of miyaan as ma + ayaa. Furthermore, this derivation could not be claimed to work synchronically, because it would obviously not account for verb-focus miyaan questions.
As it can be seen, negative questions can be freely formed by changing the verb form and adding *aan* , the negative particle, to any Y/N question, either of the *ma* type (186-187), or of the *miyaanu* type (188-190). Thus the simple application of both rule (m) and (j) to structures like:

(191) Cali baa hadiyad keenay
(192) Cali hadiyad buu keenay

will produce (186) and (187). Application of rules (m) and (p) to the same starting sequences will produce (188) and (189). Finally, by applying (m) and (p') to (192) we will derive (190). There is nothing more to say on negative questions with NP focus, since their behaviors are completely predicted by the two sets of rules.

Negative questions with verb-focus require instead some additional qualifications, because in this case the only possible constructions are the following:

(193) miyaan Cali hadiyad keenin
(194) miyaanu Cali hadiyad keenin
(195) Cali hadiyad miyaanu keenin

There are two technical problems here. The first is that only *miyaanu* questions can give rise to negative questions (as (193-195) show), while verb focus sentences have two possible forms for Y/N positive questions: the *ma* type and the *miyaanu* type. In fact, from:

(196) Cali hadiyad waa keenay

one can derive (by means of, respectively, (q) and (k)):

(197) miyaan Cali hadiyad keenay
(198) Cali hadiyad ma keenay

Therefore, (198) has to be excluded as a possible source of negative questions. This can be done by using the reformulation of the *miyaanu* question rules given in the preceding section. According to this reformulation,
miyaa questions are not formed directly from waa sentences but from questions of the ma type. One could render the application of the rule deriving miyaa constructions from ma verb questions obligatory if the sentence is negative.

The second problem is that, as they are formulated now, the rules of negation are not able to insert the negative particle aan into a verb focus clause, since the insertion of aan is dependent on the presence of baa. One way of solving this problem would be to adopt the enlarged formulation of the rule of aan insertion given in fn. 16 (m') in order to account for waa + aan negatives. However, we will not pursue any further the technical problems involved in a more precise formulation of the rules and their interplay, since such problems can be discussed in a meaningful way only on a higher level of formalization than the one we have been adopting throughout this paper.

\[22\]A possible solution would involve an ordering of the rules along the following lines. The first rule to (optionally) apply would be negative formation. If we adopt the formulation (m') given in fn. 16 above, then (n) and (m') will have three outputs, two for waa sentences and one for baa sentences:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \text{waa } V \\
(2) & \text{NP baa} \\
(3) & \text{ma } V \quad (4) \text{waa aan } V \\
(5) & \text{NP baa aan}
\end{align*}
\]

Then the rules for ma question formation apply. Since these rules are dependent on the presence of either waa or baa for their application (see (j) and (k)), they will apply either to (1) and (2) generating simple Y/N questions:

\[
\begin{align*}
(6) & \text{ma } V \\
(7) & \text{ma NP baa}
\end{align*}
\]

or to (4) and (5), generating negative questions but not to (3), since this structure does not contain either baa or waa. Application to (4) and (5) will generate:

\[
\begin{align*}
(8) & \text{ma aan } V \\
(9) & \text{ma NP baa aan}
\end{align*}
\]

Now the rules for miyaa question formation can apply, since in the section on "verbless sentences" we made them dependent on the prior application of the ma question rules (see p. 32). These rules can now apply either to (6) and (7), generating positive miyaa questions:

\[
\begin{align*}
(10) & \text{miyaa .. } V \\
(11) & \text{NP miyaa}
\end{align*}
\]
In any case, once mà verb questions are excluded, the rules for question formation will correctly predict that there will be three possible constructions for negative interrogative verb focus sentences. When the starting declarative is a sentence like (196), where no subject-pronoun is present, the output of rules (q-q’) is only one, and therefore only (193) will be generated. When the starting declarative is instead:

(199) Cali hadiyad wuu keenay

where a subject pronoun is present, rules (q-q’) provide two possible outputs, and therefore both (194) and (195) will be generated.

Finally notice that, since there is no negative construction for verbless sentences, such sentences will also lack a negative question form.

or to (8) and (9) which also contain the relevant substructures needed to trigger the rules, generating negative miyaa questions:

(12) miyaa aan .. V (13) NP miyaa aan

All we have to stipulate is that in case (8), i.e. when a mà verb question is accompanied by aan, application of the miyaa rule is obligatory, rather than optional as in all other cases. In fact, contrary to (6), (7), and (9), (8) is an intermediate structure which doesn't correspond to any grammatical surface sentence.
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