




## AFRIKA UND ÜBERSEE

Trilingual Journal of African Languages and Cultures  
Revue trilingue des langues et cultures africaines  
Dreisprachige Zeitschrift für afrikanische Sprachen und Kulturen

Volume 94

### Aspects of negation in Makaa (A83)

Njoya Ibrahīm   
University of Yaoundé 1  
ibrahim\_1980@yahoo.fr

DOI: 10.15460/auue.2021.94.1.254

Peer-reviewed article  
Submitted: 19.07.2021  
Accepted: 15.12.2021  
Published: 31.12.2021

Recommended citation:

Ibrahīm, Njoya. 2021. Aspects of negation in Makaa (A83).  
*Afrika und Übersee* 94. 39–79.

Licence: © Njoya Ibrahīm. This article is licensed under the Creative Commons  
Attribution 4.0 International License.



Published by Hamburg University Press

## Aspects of negation in Makaa (A83)

*Njoya Ibrahim*

University of Yaoundé 1  
ibrahim\_1980@yahoo.fr

### **Abstract:**

Polarity is a topic that has attracted much attention in semantics but as well in language typology regarding the syntactic and morphological realisations of negation. This paper studies negation in Makaa (A83) following two major perspectives. First, typologically, it examines the system of Makaa negation against the backdrop of polarity theory and second, from a (comparative) Bantu perspective, it examines the system of Makaa negation against the backdrop of other Bantu languages; including grammaticalization. Makaa negation displays divergent and very complex negation patterns studied under the contrast standard vs. non-standard negation. Concerning the origin of negators in Makaa, it is argued that Makaa negators might derive from grammaticalized verbs, the 3SG personal pronoun, possessive adjectives or object marker, and locative pronouns. Others are probably old negation particles.

**Keywords:** Makaa (A83), negation, tam and negation, semantics, asymmetric paradigms.

## 1 Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Bantu verbs are known for having rich morphological paradigms which may include several derivational as well as inflectional affixes.

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper could not have been written without the invaluable contribution of Mrs Apang Lucie Valerie (†), my main informant, to whom this paper is dedicated. Special thanks to the editors of *Afrika und Übersee* and anonymous reviewers for invaluable discussions and comments. Equally, I am indebted to Maud Devos whose valuable comments helped me so much ameliorating my arguments. Thanks to Oumarou Mal Mazou R. for proofreading an older version of the current article. My heartfelt gratitude goes to Ken Safir and the audience at the Afranaph Project Development Workshop II held at the University of Rutgers, New Brunswick, New Jersey State on December 12-14, 2013 where I presented the first draft of this paper. All errors are mine.

These markers typically do not only specify time, aspect and mood but also a range of other semantic categories including polarity (Schadeberg 2003: 151). The canonical form in (1) is recognized as the typical structure of the Bantu inflected verb form, with negation being marked before or after the subject marker.

(1) clitic + [NEG<sub>1</sub>- SCD - NEG<sub>2</sub>- TM<sub>1</sub>- TM<sub>2</sub>[OCD [= VB - FV]]] + clitic

There are six morphological strategies for encoding negation in finite forms across Bantu (Nurse 2008: 180ff.):

- (i) inflectional morphemes at NEG<sub>2</sub> (predominant strategy in Zone A, B, D, E, F, and M but less frequent in H (especially), K, L and N);
- (ii) inflectional morphemes at Pre-SM (present in all Zones except A, and frequent in most Zones except in B, C, and F);
- (iii) inflectional morphemes at FV (predominant in two areas, G40 and Zones S, and in related, adjacent or influenced languages, namely E71-72, G30, K21, K30, M6, P311, R11);
- (iv) post-verbal clitics or participles (scattered across Zones A, B, C, and in G50, N10-20, D14, E60, H21, H33),
- (v) pre-verbal clitics or participles (K42, A72) and,
- (vi) use of auxiliaries (B25, B11, L41, P13, H42).

Recently, works on negation in Bantu languages have focused on the (iv) post-verbal clitics or particles (Devos et al. 2010, Devos & Van der Auwera 2013). It is argued that they often derive from (1) locative pronouns, (2) possessives pronouns, (3) and negative (answer) particles and, take part in what is known as Jespersen cycle (Devos & Van der Auwera 2013: 1). The particles first function to reinforce negation and then become an obligatory part of negation giving rise to double negative constructions. Whereas in the typical French case (*ne > ne ... pas > pas*) the cycle ends with the new negative marker becoming the only negative marker (at least in colloquial speech) (Jespersen 1917, Van der Auwera 2009, 2010), in Bantu languages strengthening of a double negative construction and giving rise to a triple negative construction appears to be a recurrent phenomenon. Makaa negation does not fit the template in (1) and the language displays divergent and very complex negation patterns. Makaa counts

a variety of negative constructions and negators depending on the tense, the mood, the finiteness of the sentence, or the scope of negation within a given construction in contrast to other Bantu languages (see section 4 for detail). This study surveys negation patterns in Makaa. Accordingly, it investigates the correlation between negation and tense, aspect, and mood (henceforth TAM), and the meaning conveyed by negation constructions. Section 2 presents some relevant background information necessary to understand the present study. Section 3 revisits previous accounts of negation in Makaa; section 4 provides an overview of negation constructions in Makaa. More so, it outlines, characterizes and distinguishes different types of negation constructions discussing, where relevant, some semantic, syntactic and morphophonological issues. Finally, Section 5 concludes the investigation by presenting some major findings and the implication this work could have on the typology of negation in Bantu.

## 2 Background

Makaa [mcp] is a Niger-Congo, Narrow Bantu language belonging to the Makaa-Njem group of languages spoken in Cameroon, precisely in the East Region, Upper Nyong Division, Messamena, Abong-Mbang, Doume, Nguelemendouka, Lom et Djerem subdivisions, and in the Center Region, Nyong and Mfoumou Division, Akonolinga and Endom localities (Ibrahim 2009: 21). It counts four major dialects, namely: Mbwaanz (spoken in the Upper Nyong Division), Beband (spoken in Messamena Division), Shikunda (spoken in Nguelemendouka Division) and Besep (spoken in the Lom et Djerem and Nyong and Mfoumou Divisions) and it is spoken by about 110.000 people (Crystal 2010: 476). The dialect used for this analysis is the Mbwaanz variety. These dialects also designate ethnic groups and present mostly phonological and lexical differences. Beband and Besep are related to the languages Kol [biw] and Byep-Besep [mkk] respectively. Makaa is surrounded by the Koonzime-Bajwe [ozm] language in the south, the Kwakum-Pol [kwu] and the Mpiemo [mcx] languages in the north as well as the Mpongmpong [mzg] and Ewondo [ewo] languages in the west (Heath & Heath 1982). Kol, Byep-Besep, Koonzime-Bajwe, Kwakum-Pol, Mpiemo and Mpongmpong belong to the Makaa-Njem group of languages; and Ewondo to the Fang-Beti

group. Makaa is the dominant lingua franca in the area where it is spoken.

The analysis is data oriented and essentially based on established general patterns of negation crosslinguistically, language use, and diachronic changes observed across a significant number of constructions drawn from consulted sources (Heath 2003, Hewson 2016, Heath & Heath 1996), texts and discourse-based investigation carried out between October 2011 to April 2014 while I was doctorate student and assistant lecturer at the Asien-Afrika-Institut, Universität Hamburg. The data benefitted from my expertise as a linguist and native speaker of the Makaa language coupled with additional information and verification from other native speakers, namely, Simplicio Mitale, Marie Madeleine Mbieng, Dominique Sandrine Mpouel, Ghislain Simon Mikoague and Rostand Bekole Aba Makaa. The informants were reached via Facebook Messenger, phone and WhatsApp video and audio calls, realized sometimes during lectures in order to enable students to familiarize themselves with fieldwork practices and exercises.

## 2.1 The internal structure of inflection

As earlier stated, the verb in Bantu languages is well known for its complex agglutinating morphology (Meussen 1967; Nurse et al. 2016: 13f.). The verb in Bantu languages has two main constituents, namely the inflectional stem and the macrostem (Myers 1998, following Meeussen 1967). The inflectional stem precedes the macrostem and consists of the morphemes marking subject, tense, aspect, and/or modality. The object marker (OM) and the verb combined are referred to as the verbal macrostem. The verb stem consists of the root, its suffixes (extensions) marking participant roles such as causative, passive, reciprocal and so on, and a terminal vowel. Generally, the object marker immediately precedes the verb stem. Makaa does not deviate from this pattern (cf. (2)). However, Makaa belongs to a set of northwestern Bantu languages that differ significantly, especially in their analytic verbal morphology, from most other Bantu languages (Hewson 2016: 215). Consider the position of the OM, with reference to the main verb of the sentence, *kwìd* ‘help’, in the examples in (2): whereas it is pre-verbal in (2a), it is post-verbal in (2b).

- (2) a. *Ìbâ ɲǎ ðì ɲgə̀ númbà² lè:l kə̀ é kwì:d bìlálílè málí: mɛ jí*  
 Ìbâ ɲǎ = a H<sub>1</sub> ðì ɲgə̀ númbà lè:l kə̀ é  
 Iba SM=P3 PH.T HAB PROG AUX AUX go 3SG.OM  
*kwì:d bìl-àl-Hlè H<sub>2</sub> mà-lí: m-é jí*  
 help fall-CAUS-INF PH.T C6-tree C6-3SG.POSS down  
 ‘Iba used to (stupidly) go help him quickly fell his trees.’
- b. *Ìbâ ɲǎ ðì ɲgə̀ númbà lè:l kə̀ kwì:d ê bìlálílè málí: mɛ jí*  
 Ìbâ ɲǎ = a H<sub>1</sub> ðì ɲgə̀ númbà lè:l kə̀ kwì:d  
 Iba SM=P3 PH.T HAB PROG AUX AUX go help  
 é bìl-àl-Hlè H<sub>2</sub> mà-lí: m-ε jí  
 3SG.OM fall-CAUS-INF PH.T C6-tree C6-3SG.POSS down  
 ‘Iba used to (stupidly) go help him quickly fell his trees.’

In (2), the main verb is preceded by the following constituents: the subject marker SM *ɲǎ*; the tense marker TM *á*; a first H<sub>1</sub> that marks the beginning of the verb complex domain; the habitual aspect marker AM *ðí*; the progressive aspect marker *ɲgə̀*; two consecutive auxiliaries AUX *númbà* and *lè:l*. The auxiliaries are followed by a verb *kə̀* ‘go’, which in turn is followed by an object marker OM *é* and a series of two verbs *kwì:d* ‘help’ and the infinitive verb *bìlálílè* ‘cause to fall’. The infinitive verb stem comprises a root *bìl* followed by two extensions: the causative *-àl* and the infinitive marker *H<sub>1</sub>-lè*. Finally, a second H<sub>2</sub> closes the verb complex domain.

Based on the syntactic relations between the constituents in (2), the Makaa internal structure of inflection is well summarized as in Hewson (2016: 215f.):

“[...] The verbal complex has three parts: (i) a subject marker with a following tense marker, and a verb complex that begins and ends with a high tone, and is divided into (ii) a set of independent prestem morphemes, and (iii) a stem consisting of a root with prefixed om and suffixed extension and final vowel [...]”

Following Heath & Heath (1996) and Noutsu (2009: 96ff.), and relying on personal observations, my intuition about H<sub>1</sub> and H<sub>2</sub> is that both

2 *Númbà* derives from the auxiliary verb *númbälè* which I am unable to translate appropriately into English, French or in any other language I speak. It is pejorative and used for insults. In (2a) it is used as an auxiliary though it has the meaning of an adverb that I translate as ‘stupidly’.

tones<sup>3</sup> have to do mostly with phrasal phonology than syntax. They are used as juncture tones and certainly serve to delimit intonational phrases. None of them marks TAM.  $H_1$  behaves differently depending on the context. It can replace the preceding TBU tone, coalesce with it resulting in a contour tone, dock on the following TBU and replace its tones or remain inactive.  $H_2$  behaves likewise though its presence is prescribed each time an object is added to the construction. Consequently,  $H_2$  also seems to mark the syntactic relation between the verb and its object. With regard to (2), one can posit a linear structure for inflection in (3).

(3) SM TM  $H_1$  AM AM AUX AUX VERB (OM) VERB OM root-EXT-EXT-FV  $H_2$

Considering the fact that certain elements in (3) are recursive (auxiliaries, extensions, and verb roots), and that the OM in Makaa can either precede or follow the main verb in non-serialized verb constructions (see 2), the internal structure of the verb in (3) can be simplified as in (4).

(4) SM TM  $H_1$  AM<sup>n</sup> AUX<sup>n</sup> (OM) root<sup>n</sup>-EXT<sup>n</sup>-FV (OM)  $H_2$

## 2.2 Morphology

This section briefly presents Makaa tense, aspect, and mood. Tense and aspect are treated under the same section as in Makaa, generally, the present tense is either habitual or progressive.

### 2.2.1 Tense and aspect

Makaa counts seven absolute tenses: three future tenses symmetrical to three past tenses in addition to a present tense. The present tense has two sub-categories, namely a general present and a gnomic present (Ibrahim 2007, 2009, 2013b). The aforementioned tenses are negated differently (see 4.1.1).

Based on Nurse's 2008 analysis of TAM in Bantu and on empirical data from Makaa, Ibrahim (2013b: 14ff.) shows that Makaa uses inflectional morphemes at pre- and post-stem position, reduplica-

---

<sup>3</sup> The analysis of the nature and function of  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  being far beyond the scope of this study, I will limit myself to marking them in the underlying forms. Due to the fact that at this stage of research on Makaa it is still difficult to state their exact function, they are glossed PH.T (phrasal tone) and their influence on surrounding tones will be highlighted where necessary.

tion, repetition and compounding to mark 13 aspects grouped as follows: (i) imperfective (progressive, habitual, iterative, persistive and continuative), (ii) perfective (factive, completive and evidential), and miscellaneous aspects (inceptive, prioritive, proximate, counter-assertive and haste). For the reason of space, the complete paradigm of tense and aspect in Makaa will not be given here, but the paradigms in Table 1 are sufficiently representative.

Table 1. Tabular overview of the correlation of tense with progressive and habitual aspects in Makaa

Tense		Aspect	Progressive (PROG)	Habitual (HAB)
			<i>ŋgə</i>	<i>d̥i</i>
P3	<i>a</i>	Remote past	+	+
P2	<i>ámə</i>	Recent past	+	+
P1	<i>má</i>	Immediate past	+	–
P0	∅	General present	+	+
	<i>Hl̥ə</i> (INF)	Gnomic present	+	+
F1	<i>e</i>	Immediate future	+	+
F2	<i>bá</i>	Recent future	+	+
F3	<i>e bá</i>	Remote future	+	+

### 2.2.2 Mood

Makaa distinguishes three moods: indicative, subjunctive and imperative (Heath 2003: 345). The indicative is the unmarked or default construction used to express realis or irrealis situations. The imperative and the subjunctive are both marked by the inflectional enclitic /-*ýg*/ in the 2nd person singular.

In the 1st/2nd person plural, the morpheme *á* is suffixed to the aforementioned imperative/subjunctive maker resulting in /-*ýg-á*/. The nucleus of the imperative/subjunctive marker turns to [i] when the verb root ends in a consonant (5) or it is identical to the final verb root vowel, causing lengthening of that vowel (6). The difference between both constructions lies in the covert (in the subjunctive, see (5a), (6a)) or overt (in the imperative, see (5b) and (6b)) realization of the subject pronoun.





In the present tense, the toneless clitic =a is followed by a  $\underset{\circ}{L}$  which coalesces with the tone of the subject pronoun when it bears L (8a<sub>1</sub>) or remains floating when the clitic attaches to a H subject pronoun causing any following H to downstep (8b).

(8) a. *Má tʃàl málándú*

mà                      tʃàl                      mà-lándú  
1SG MACH cut MACH C6-palm.tree  
'I cut down palm trees.'

a<sub>1</sub>. *Mà àtʃálé málándú*

mà    a $\underset{\circ}{L}$ -tʃàl-é                      mà-lándú  
1SG NEG-cut-NEG MACH C6-palm.tree  
'I do not cut down palm trees.'

b. *Sá á<sup>H</sup>tʃálé málándú*

sá    a $\underset{\circ}{L}$ -tʃàl-é                      mà-lándú  
1PL NEG-cut-NEG MACH C6-palm.tree  
'We do not cut down palm trees!'

In the subjunctive and the imperative, negation is marked by the morpheme *kú* followed by a  $\underset{\circ}{L}$  that causes any following H to downstep.

(9) a. *Wítíngíg ómpjâ*

wítíng-g      ò-mpjâ  
chase-IMP C2-dog  
'Chase the dogs away!'

b. *kú<sup>H</sup> wítíng ómpjâ*

kú     $\underset{\circ}{L}$     wítíng                      ò-mpjâ  
NEG NEG chase MACH C2-dog  
'Do not chase the dogs away!'

However, while the illustration in (8a<sub>1</sub>, b)–(9b) provided by Heath (2003: 345f.) does support the two-way contrast indicative vs. subjunctive/imperative, Hewson (2016: 259), based on examples (10) and (11) from Heath (2003: 347) and Heath & Heath (1996: 29) respectively, further notes that negation in Makaa may not be quite as simple as it looks like.

In (10), the focus marker *ó* occurring in the affirmative sentence (10a) is replaced by the negative focus marker *dí* in the negative construction (10b).

- (10) a. *Mà ó má dzámb*                      b. *Mà dí mà dzámb* [sic]<sup>5</sup>  
           *mà ó        mà dzámb*                      *mà dí        mà dzámb*  
           1SG FOC 1SG cook                      1SG NEG.FOC 1SG cook  
           ‘It is me who cooks.’                      ‘It is not me who cooks.’

Regarding example (11), Hewson (2016: 222) wonders “how and why sentence [(11b)] contains a [negative] subjunctive” as originally labelled by Heath & Heath (1996: 29).

- (11) a. *mà níngèg ngè wámbilè ifàmbá?*  
           *mà H<sub>1</sub>      níngè-g      ngè      wámbilè      H<sub>2</sub>      ì-fàmbá*  
           1SG PH.T again-SBJV PROG sweeping PH.T C8-field  
           ‘Should I be sweeping the fields again?’
- b. *mà kú nìngè ngè wámbilè ifàmbá* [sic]  
           *mà kú              H<sub>1</sub>      nìngè      H<sub>2</sub>      ngè      wámbilè*  
           1SG NEG.SBJV PH.T again PH.T PROG sweep  
           *ì-fàmbá*  
           C8-field  
           ‘I am not sweeping the field again.’ [sic]

To provide an answer to Hewson, it should be noted that sentence (11b) is grammatical in Makaa only if it is in the interrogative form *mà kú nìngè ngè wámbilè ifàmbá?* ‘I should not be sweeping the fields again?’. It is a follow up question (from a speaker) addressed to a listener in order for the latter to confirm a previous order he gave, *wò kú nìngè ngè wámbilè ifàmbá!* ‘You should not be sweeping the fields again!’. The existence of a previously attested negative focus marker in Heath & Heath 1996 omitted in Heath 2003 and the apparently random occurrence of a subjunctive marker suggest that a more systematic investigation of Makaa negation would be worthwhile.

#### 4 Negation constructions in Makaa: Detailed account

Makaa counts a diversity of negators used in marking several distinct negative constructions. The choice of each of these markers is conditioned either by TAM or by the scope of negation within a given construction. From a typological point of view (cf. Miestamo 2005,

5 The mistake lies on the 1SG *mà*, it should be *má* instead.

2007, Payne 1985), Makaa negative constructions can be classified into two groups, standard (4.1) and non-standard negation (4.2).

#### 4.1 Standard negation

Standard negation<sup>6</sup> (henceforth SN) refers to ‘the basic way(s) a language has for negating declarative verbal main clauses ... [or] to the basic clausal negation construction(s) in a language’ (Miestamo 2005: 3). Makaa standard negative constructions do not show paradigmatic symmetry as the marking of the bipartite negation clitics differs from one tense to another. They also do not show syntagmatic symmetry. Although at first sight negation appears to involve the simple addition of the bipartite negative clitic, more complex changes depending especially on the time frame, are involved. Makaa also uses additional auxiliaries, grammaticalized verbs, to mark negation as shown in the following sections.

##### 4.1.1 Correlation between tense and negation

Generally, negation in the indicative mood occupies the second position in the clause. It is marked by the bipartite enclitic =*a* (NEG1) ... = (C)*ε* (NEG2). The bipartite clitic varies from tense to tense as summarized in Table 2, of which the content is explained in detail in the following subsections. The enclitic =*a* (NEG1) always cliticizes with the SM or the subject pronoun, and the enclitic = (C)*ε* (NEG2) with the element occurring in the second position. In the remote and the recent past tenses, the negator is made up of the evidential marker *ʃi* to which the enclitic =*é* is attached resulting in *ʃiǵé*. A tertiary negator *liɛ ~ lɛ* (NEG3) can be added to the bipartite negator or to *ʃiǵé* to convey the French meaning *ne ... plus* (‘not VERB again/anymore’) (cf. 4.1.2). The bipartite clitic can be also coupled with some grammaticalized verbs or negation particles to mark other meanings such as ‘never VERB, not yet VERBed’ (4.1.3).

In Makaa, the enclitic =*a* probably originates from the 3rd person singular pronoun *a* (*â zâg* ‘he is coming’). On the other hand, the enclitic =*ε* could derive from the 3rd person singular object marker *ε* (*Mâ kâ dǵ-é* ‘I am going to see him/her’), or from the 3rd person singular possessive stem -*ε* (*Miká:ndá mj-é* ‘His/her clothes’). The link made between the aforementioned negative markers and the prob-

<sup>6</sup> It is also known in the literature as sentential or clausal negation (Dahl 2010, Mihás 2009, Miestamo 2007, Payne 1985).

able sources from which they could originate is based essentially on formal similarities and on the report of similar cases across languages by Devos & Van der Auwera (2013: 256).

Table 2. A tabular overview of the correlation tense-negation in Makaa SN

Primary Negator	Primary + Secondary Negator (+ X)	Tense
<b>a</b> (TM) + <b>ǰígé</b>	<b>a</b> (TM) + <b>ǰígé</b> = <b>ǰílé</b> (i) <b>a</b> (TM) + <b>ǰígé</b> = <b>lé</b> (ii)	P3
<b>ǰígé</b>	<b>ǰígé</b> = <b>ǰílé</b> (i) <b>ǰígé</b> = <b>lé</b> (ii)	P2
<b>a</b> + = <b>é</b> <b>a</b> <b>fwé</b>	not applicable not applicable	P1
= <b>a</b> + <b>ǰ</b> + = <b>é</b> (i) = <b>a</b> + <b>ǰ</b> + = <b>é</b> = <b>ǰé</b> (ii)	= <b>a</b> + <b>ǰ</b> + = <b>ǰílé</b> (1) = <b>a</b> + <b>ǰ</b> + = <b>lé</b> (2) = <b>a</b> + <b>ǰ</b> + = <b>é</b> = <b>ǰé</b> = <b>ǰílé</b> (1) = <b>a</b> + <b>ǰ</b> + = <b>é</b> = <b>ǰé</b> = <b>lé</b> (2)	P0
= <b>a</b> + = <b>è</b> (i) = <b>a</b> + = <b>è</b> = <b>ǰè</b> (ii)	= <b>a</b> + = <b>ǰílé</b> (i) = <b>a</b> + = <b>lé</b> (ii) = <b>a</b> + = <b>è</b> = <b>ǰè</b> = <b>ǰílé</b> (i) = <b>a</b> + = <b>è</b> = <b>ǰè</b> = <b>ǰèlé</b> (ii) = <b>a</b> + = <b>è</b> = <b>ǰè</b> = <b>lé</b> (iii)	F1
= <b>a</b> + <b>bá</b> (TM) = <b>lé</b>	= <b>a</b> + <b>bá</b> (TM) = <b>ǰílé</b>	F2
= <b>a</b> + <b>bá</b> (TM) = <b>ǰè</b> + <b>bá</b> (TM)	= <b>a</b> + <b>bá</b> (TM) = <b>ǰílé</b> + <b>bá</b>	F3

#### 4.1.1.1 Negation in remote past (P3) and recent past (P2): **ǰígé**

In the remote and the recent past tenses, negation is marked by **ǰígé** occurring immediately after the SM in P2 (12b<sub>1</sub>), and after the TM in P3 (12a<sub>1</sub>). The negator is made up of the evidential marker **ǰí** to which the enclitic =**é** attaches resulting in **ǰígé** (12a<sub>1</sub>, b<sub>1</sub>). The evidential marker **ǰí** derives from the verb **ǰín** ‘finish’. It associates with lexical verbs in Makaa to mark completed actions at the moment of utterance. As a consequence, it inherently encodes past tense. The subject pronoun vowel undergoes total assimilation when the P3 (12a and 12a<sub>1</sub>) or P2 (12b) marker attaches to it.

(12) a. *Mǎ: kà:dí nà ìdǎw*

*mà = a*       $H_1$       *kà:d*       $H_2$       *nà*      *ì-dǎw*  
 1SG = P3      PH.T      serve      PH.T      3SG      C8-food  
 ‘I served him/her food.’

a<sub>1</sub>. *Mà: fí gé kà:di nà ìdǎw*

*mà = a*       $H_1$       *fí = gε*      *kà:d*       $H_2$       *nà*  
 1SG = P3      PH.T      EVID.PAST = NEG      serve      PH.T      3SG  
*ì-dǎw*  
 C8-food  
 ‘I did not serve him/her food indeed.’

b. *Mǎ:mà kà:dí nà ìdǎw*

*mà = ámà*       $H_1$       *kà:d*       $H_2$       *nà*      *ì-dǎw*  
 1SG = P2      PH.T      serve      PH.T      3SG      C8-food  
 ‘I serve him/her food.’

b<sub>1</sub>. *Mà fí gé kà:di nà ìdǎw*

*mà*       $H_1$       *fí = gε*      *kà:d*       $H_2$       *nà*  
 1SG      PH.T      EVID.PAST = NEG      serve      PH.T      3SG  
*ì-dǎw*  
 C8-food  
 ‘I did not serve him/her food indeed.’

The recent past tense in Makaa is a past perfective construction. There are two possibilities to negate a P1 sentence. The clitic = *a* coalesces with the subject pronoun and bears the same tone.

(i) = *a* ... = *ε* ‘not VERBed’ (13)

(ii) = *a f w é* ‘not VERBed yet’ (14)

(13) a. *Mà mǎ kà:dí sǎ ìdǎw*

*mà*      *mǎ*       $H_1$       *kà:d*       $H_2$       *sǎ*      *ì-dǎw*  
 1SG      P1      PH.T      serve      PH.T      1PL      C8-food  
 ‘I have served us food.’

b. *Mà: ká:dé sǎ ìdǎw*

*mà = a*       $H_1$       *kà:d-ε*       $H_2$       *sǎ*      *ì-dǎw*  
 1SG = NEG      PH.T      serve-NEG      PH.T      1PL      C8-food  
 ‘I have not served us food.’

The negator = *a* ... *fwé* consists of the aforementioned bipartite clitic = *a* ... =  $\varepsilon$  coupled with the dummy verb *fwà*. The enclitic =  $\varepsilon$  cliticizes with the verb root *fwà* replacing its vowel. *Fwà* derives from the auxiliary verb *fwǎlǎ* ‘to perform or undergo an action prior to another one’. In (14b) it is used as an adverb meaning ‘yet’.

(14) a. *Sá má wó:sì tón*

<i>sâ</i>	<i>má</i>	$H_1$	<i>wó:s</i>	$H_2$	<i>tón</i>
1PL	P1	PH.T	go.out	PH.T	outside

‘We have gone out/outside.’

b. *Sá: fwé wó:sì tón*

<i>sâ = a</i>	$H_1$	<i>fwà = é</i>	<i>wó:s</i>	$H_2$	<i>tón</i>
1PL = NEG	PH.T	AUX = NEG	go.out	PH.T	outside

‘We have not yet gone out/outside’

#### 4.1.1.2 Negation in present tense (P0)

In the present tense, the toneless clitic = *a* bears the same tone with the preceding subject marker or pronoun with which it cliticizes. A floating L follows the clitic. When the clitic = *a* associates to a L subject pronoun or marker, the  $L$  coalesces with it (15a<sub>1</sub>). On the other hand, if it rather associates to a H subject pronoun or marker, the  $L$  remains active and downsteps any following H (15b<sub>1</sub>).

(i) Present tense (P0) negator: *a L* ... =  $\varepsilon$

(15) a. *Má kà:dé jà ìdǎw*

<i>mà</i>	$H_1$	<i>kà:d</i>	$H_2$	<i>jà</i>	<i>ì-dǎw</i>
1SG	PH.T	serve	PH.T	3SG	C8-food

‘I serve him/her food.’

a<sub>1</sub>. *Mà: ká:dé jà ìdǎw*

<i>mà = a</i>	$L$	$H_1$	<i>kà:d = é</i>	$H_2$	<i>jà</i>
1SG = NEG	NEG	PH.T	serve = NEG	PH.T	3SG

*ì-dǎw*

C8-food

‘I do not serve him/her food.’

b. *Sám wó:sí tón*

*Sâ* = *m*             $H_1$             *wó:s*             $H_2$             *tón*  
 2PL = DPRON    PH.T            go.out            PH.T            outside  
 ‘We get out/outside.’

b<sub>i</sub>. *Sá: wó:sé tón*

*sâ* = *a*             $L_1$              $H_1$             *wó:s* =  $\varepsilon$              $H_2$             *tón*  
 2PL = NEG            NEG            PH.T            go.out = NEG            PH.T            outside  
 ‘We do not get out/outside.’

Semantically, the negated sentences in (15a<sub>i</sub>, b<sub>i</sub>) can also stand as replies for the following imperative sentences *Kà:díg nà ìdîw!* ‘Serve him food!’ and *Wó:sígâ tón!* ‘Get out/outside!’. However, if a speaker instead of giving an order formulates questions in (16a–b), an additional enclitic =*jé* will be adjoined to the initial negator resulting in =*a L<sub>1</sub> ... =  $\varepsilon$  = j $\varepsilon$*  (16a<sub>i</sub>, b<sub>i</sub>). Note, however, that the contextual distinction between the negators in (15) and that in (16) is not strict. Both forms are used interchangeably mostly by younger speakers. More so, certain verb stems can only take the form in (16) for euphonic reasons. In rapid speech, the negator =*jé* can be silent or omitted.

(ii) Present tense (PO) negator (ii): *a L<sub>1</sub> ... =  $\varepsilon$  = (j) $\varepsilon$*

(16) a. *Wá kà:dí nà?*

*wà*     $H_1$             *kà:d*     $H_2$             *nà*  
 2SG    PH.T            serve    PH.T            3SG  
 ‘Are you serving him/her?’

a<sub>i</sub> *Mbô, Mâ: ká:déjé nà*

*mbô*    *Mâ* = *a*             $L_1$              $H_1$             *kà:d* =  $\varepsilon$  = *jé*             $H_2$   
 no            1SG = NEG            NEG            PH.T            serve = NEG = NEG            PH.T  
*nà*  
 3SG  
 ‘No, I do not serve him/her.’

b. *Bim wó:sí?*

*bĩ* = *m*             $H_1$             *wó:s*             $H_2$   
 2PL = DPRON            PH.T            go.out            PH.T  
 ‘Do you go out/outside?’



b<sub>1</sub>. *Mbô, sá: ʷó:séjé*

<i>mbô</i>	<i>sâ = a</i>	$\underset{\circ}{L}$	$\underset{\circ}{H}_1$	<i>wó:s = é = jé</i>	$\underset{\circ}{H}_2$
no	1PL = NEG	NEG	PH.T	go.out = NEG = NEG	PH.T

‘No, we do not go out/outside.’

#### 4.1.1.3 Negation in immediate future (F1)

In the immediate future, like in the present tense, negation is marked by two distinct negators, (i) *a ... ε* and (ii) *a ... εjε* ‘not VERB’, depending on the meaning expressed by the negative construction. Often, both forms are used in free variation.

(i) (F1) negator: *a ... ε*

The negator in (i) is used when the negated sentence expresses refusal to execute a proposal or an order (17a).

(17) a. *Mě: kà:dí nà*

<i>mà = e</i>	$\underset{\circ}{H}_1$	<i>kà:d</i>	$\underset{\circ}{H}_2$	<i>nà</i>
1SG = F1	PH.T	serve	PH.T	3SG

‘I will serve him.’

a<sub>1</sub>. *Mă: kà:dε nà*

<i>mà = a</i>	$\underset{\circ}{H}_1$	<i>kà:d = ε</i>	$\underset{\circ}{H}_2$	<i>nà</i>
1SG = NEG	PH.T	serve = NEG	PH.T	3SG

‘I will not serve him.’

(ii) (F1) negator: *a ... εjε*

The negator in (ii) is used as default and expresses in a neutral way the speaker’s deliberate refusal to perform an action (17b).

(17) b. *Mě: kà:dí nà*

<i>mà = e</i>	$\underset{\circ}{H}_1$	<i>kà:d</i>	$\underset{\circ}{H}_2$	<i>nà</i>
1SG = F1	PH.T	serve	PH.T	3SG

‘I will serve him/her.’

b<sub>1</sub>. *Mǎ: kà:dɛ̃jɛ nɔ̀*

<i>mɔ̀ = a</i>	$\overset{H_1}{\circ}$	<i>kà:d = ɛ = jɛ̃</i>	$\overset{H_2}{\circ}$	<i>nɔ̀</i>
1SG = NEG	PH.T	serve = NEG = NEG	PH.T	3SG

‘I will not serve him/her.’

## 4.1.1.4 Negation in near future (F2)

Negation in the near future is marked by *= a ... = (l)ɛ*. The enclitic *= a* merges with the subject pronoun and the tone remains unchanged. The enclitic *= ɛ* merges with the F2 marker, and an epenthetic *l* is inserted to disrupt the sequence of vowels. It is also noticed that the addition of the enclitic raises the F2 marker vowel from *a* to *ə* (18b).

(18) a. *Mə̀ bá kà:dí nɔ̀ ìd̥f̥w*

<i>mə̀</i>	<i>bá</i>	$\overset{H_1}{\circ}$	<i>kà:d</i>	$\overset{H_2}{\circ}$	<i>nɔ̀</i>	<i>ì-d̥f̥w</i>
1SG	F2	PH.T	serve	PH.T	3SG	C8-food

‘I will serve him/her food.’ (Recent)

b. *Mà: bálɛ̃ kà:dí nɔ̀ ìd̥f̥w*

<i>mə̀ = a</i>	$\overset{H_1}{\circ}$	<i>bá = ɛ</i>	<i>kà:d</i>	$\overset{H_2}{\circ}$	<i>nɔ̀</i>	<i>ì-d̥f̥w</i>
1SG = NEG	PH.T	F2 = NEG	serve	PH.T	3SG	C8-food

‘I will not serve him/her food.’

4.1.1.5 Negation in remote future (F3): *= a ... = (l)ɛ*

The remote future (F3) is marked by *e bá* (19a). The F3 marker is in fact a combination of F1 marker *e* with F2 marker *bá*. In F3 negative constructions, *e* becomes *bá* and its vowel raises to *ə* when the enclitic *= (l)ɛ* attaches to it (19b).

(19) a. *Mě̀ bá kà:dí nɔ̀*

<i>mě̀ = e</i>	<i>bá</i>	$\overset{H_1}{\circ}$	<i>kà:d</i>	$\overset{H_2}{\circ}$	<i>nɔ̀</i>
1SG = F3	F3	PH.T	serve	PH.T	3SG

‘I will serve him/her.’

b. *Mà: bálɛ̃ bá kà:dí nɔ̀*

<i>mə̀ = a</i>	<i>e = ɛ</i>	<i>bá</i>	$\overset{H_1}{\circ}$	<i>kà:d</i>	$\overset{H_2}{\circ}$	<i>nɔ̀</i>
1SG = NEG	F3 = NEG	F3	PH.T	serve	PH.T	3SG

‘I will not serve him/her.’

The examples in (12)–(19) illustrate so far how the bipartite clitic *= a* (NEG1) ... *= (C)ɛ* (NEG2) combines with different tenses in Makaa

to encode negation. Additionally, the tertiary interchangeable negation clitic<sup>7</sup> = *lilɛ* ~ = *ɛ* ~ = *ɛɛ* (NEG3) can be coupled with the aforementioned negator (in the constructions in (12)–(19)) to convey the meaning ‘ne ... plus’ (‘not VERB again’ or ‘anymore’) (cf. 20). The enclitic = *lilɛ* ~ = *ɛ* is incompatible with P1. It is the fourth negation clitic in certain P0 (20d) and F1 (20f) constructions. In F2 (20g) and F3 (20h), it is mutually exclusive/incompatible with the primary negative proclitic = (*l*)*ɛ*.

(i) (P3) negator:  $a + \text{f}i\text{g}\acute{\epsilon} = \text{lil}\epsilon \sim = \text{l}\epsilon$

(20) a. *Mà: fígélílél ~ lé kà:dì jà ìdîw*

*mà-a*       $H_1$       *fí = (g)ɛ = lílél ~ = lé*      *kà:d*       $H_2$       *jà*  
1SG = P3    PH.T    EVID.PAST = NEG = NEG    serve    PH.T    3SG

*ì-dîw*

C8-food

‘Indeed, I did not serve him/her food again/anymore.’ (A long time ago)

(ii) (P2) negator:  $\text{f}i\text{g}\acute{\epsilon} = \text{lil}\epsilon \sim = \text{l}\epsilon$

b. *Mà fígélílél ~ lé kà:dì jà ìdîw*

*mà*       $H_1$       *fí = (g)ɛ = lílél ~ = lé*      *kà:d*       $H_2$       *jà*  
1SG    PH.T    EVID.PAST = NEG = NEG    serve    PH.T    3SG

*ì-dîw*

C8-food

‘Indeed, I did not serve him/her food again/anymore.’ (recently)

(iii) (P0) negator (i):  $a L_\circ = \epsilon = \text{lil}\epsilon \sim = \text{l}\epsilon$

c. *sá: wó:sélílél ~ lé tón*

*sâ-a*       $L_\circ$        $H_1$       *wó:s = ε = lílél ~ = lé*       $H_2$       *tón*  
1PL-NEG    NEG    PH.T    go.out = NEG = NEG    PH.T    outside

‘We do not get out/outside again/anymore.’

7 For presentation reasons, affirmative sentences will be left out (cf. 12–19).

(iv) (P0) negator (ii):  $a \underset{\circ}{L} = \varepsilon (=j\varepsilon) = \text{lil}\varepsilon \sim = \text{l}\varepsilon$

d. *Mbô, mà: kà:dé(jé)lilé ~ lé*

*mò-a*    *mà=a*     $\underset{\circ}{L}$      $\underset{\circ}{H}_1$     *kà:d=é(=jé)=lilé ~ =lé*     $\underset{\circ}{H}_2$   
 1SG=NEG    PH.T    NEG    PH.T    serve=NEG(=NEG)=NEG    PH.T  
 ‘No, I do not serve again/anymore.’

(v) (F1) negator (i):  $a \dots \varepsilon = \text{lil}\varepsilon \sim = \text{l}\varepsilon \text{l}\varepsilon \sim = \text{l}\varepsilon$

e. *Mă: kà:dèlilè ~ lèlè ~ = lε jà ìdîw*

*mò-a*     $\underset{\circ}{H}_1$     *kà:d=ε=lilè ~ =lè*     $\underset{\circ}{H}_2$     *jà*    *ì-dîw*  
 1SG=NEG    PH.T    serve=NEG=NEG    PH.T    3SG    C8-food  
 ‘I will not serve him/her food again/anymore.’ (Immediate)

(vi) (F1) negator (ii):  $a \dots \varepsilon(j\varepsilon) = \text{lil}\varepsilon \sim = \text{l}\varepsilon \text{l}\varepsilon \sim = \text{l}\varepsilon$

f. *Mă: kà:dè(jè)lilè ~ lèlè ~ lε jà ìdîw*

*mò-a*     $\underset{\circ}{H}_1$     *kà:d=ε(=jè)=lilè ~ =lèlè ~ =lè*     $\underset{\circ}{H}_2$   
 1SG=NEG    PH.T    serve=NEG(=NEG)=NEG    PH.T

*jà*    *ì-dîw*  
 3SG    C8-food

‘I will not serve him/her food again/anymore.’ (Immediate)

(vii) (F2) negator =  $a \dots = \text{lil}\varepsilon$

g. *Mà: bálilè kà:dí jà ìdîw*

*mò-a*     $\underset{\circ}{H}_1$     *bá=lilè*    *kà:d*     $\underset{\circ}{H}_2$     *jà*    *ì-dîw*  
 1SG=NEG    PH.T    F2=NEG    serve    PH.T    3SG    C8-food  
 ‘I will not serve him/her food again/anymore.’ (Recent)

(viii) (F3) negator (i):  $= a \dots = \text{lil}\varepsilon$

h. *Mà: bálilè bá kà:dí jà ìdîw*

*mò-a*    *e=lilè*    *bá*     $\underset{\circ}{H}_1$     *kà:d*     $\underset{\circ}{H}_2$     *jà*    *ì-dîw*  
 1SG=NEG    F3=NEG    F3    PH.T    serve    PH.T    3SG    C8-food  
 ‘I will not serve him/her food again/anymore.’ (Remote)

#### 4.1.2 Correlation between aspect and negation

As previously mentioned, negated constructions in the indicative mood generally vary depending on the tense marker. When an aspect marker is added to the construction (see example 21), negation is still marked as described previously.

## (i) Future progressive

(21) a. *Mà bá ɲgə̀ kà:dí ɲə̀*

*mà*   *bá*    $H_1$    *ɲgə̀*   *kà:d*    $H_2$    *ɲə̀*  
 1SG   F2   PH.T   PROG   serve   PH.T   3SG  
 ‘I will be serving him/her.’

a<sub>1</sub>. *Mà: bɛ̀lè ɲgə̀ kà:dí ɲə̀*

*mà = a*   *bá = ε*    $H_1$    *ɲgə̀*   *kà:d*    $H_2$    *ɲə̀*  
 1SG = NEG   F2 = NEG   PH.T   PROG   serve   PH.T   3SG  
 ‘I will not be serving him/her.’

## (ii) Future habitual

b. *Mà bá dí kà:dí ɲə̀*

*mà*   *bá*    $H_1$    *dí*   *kà:d*    $H_2$    *ɲə̀*  
 1SG   F2   PH.T   HAB   serve   PH.T   3SG  
 ‘I will usually serve him/her.’

b<sub>1</sub>. *Mà: bɛ̀lìlè dí kà:dí ɲə̀*

*mà = a*   *bá = ε = lîlè*    $H_1$    *dí*   *kà:d*    $H_2$    *ɲə̀*  
 1SG = NEG   F2 = NEG = NEG   PH.T   HAB   serve   PH.T   3SG  
 ‘I will not usually serve him/her.’

## (iii) Past progressive

c. *Mắ ɲgə̀ kà:dí ɲə̀*

*mà = a*    $H_1$    *ɲgə̀*   *kà:d*    $H_2$    *ɲə̀*  
 1SG = P3   PH.T   PROG   serve   PH.T   3SG  
 ‘I was serving him/her.’

c<sub>1</sub>. *Mà: fí́gɛ́ ɲgə̀ kà:dí ɲə̀*

*mà = a*    $H_1$    *fí = gɛ*   *ɲgə̀*   *kà:d*    $H_2$    *ɲə̀*  
 1SG = P3   PH.T   EVID.PAST = NEG   PROG   serve   PH.T   3SG  
 ‘I was not serving him/her.’

## (iv) Past habitual

d. *Mắ dî kà:dí sâ*

*mà = a*    $H_1$    *dî*   *kà:d*    $H_2$    *sâ*  
 1SG = P3   PH.T   HAB   serve   PH.T   1PL  
 ‘I used to serve us.’

d. *Mà: s̄íǵéǵé d̄í kà:d̄í s̄á*

*Mà = a*  $H_1$  *s̄í = ǵé = ǵé* *d̄í* *kà:d*  $H_2$  *s̄á*  
 1SG = P3 PH.T EVID.PAST = NEG = NEG HAB serve PH.T 1PL  
 ‘I did not use to serve him/her again indeed.’

In the present progressive (22) and habitual (23) constructions, due to the absence of an overt tense marker, the aspect markers fill the second position targeted by negation and cliticise with the enclitics =*é*, =*lé* meaning ‘not verb’, or =*lilé* ‘not VERB again’. An example of each enclitic is given in (22b–d)–(23b–d). However, a deviant behavior is noted in (22b–d). The progressive marker is followed by the preposition *nà* ‘with’ without which the constructions are ill-formed. More so, the adjunction of the negation marker changes the progressive marker vowel from *ə* to *ɛ* (22b–d).

## (v) Present progressive

(22) a. *Mà ǵǵə kà:d̄í ǵà*

*mà*  $H_1$  *ǵǵə* *kà:d*  $H_2$  *ǵà*  
 1SG PH.T PROG serve PH.T 3SG  
 ‘I am serving him/her.’

b. *Mà: ǵǵé nà kà:d̄í ǵà*

*mà = a*  $H_1$  *ǵǵə = ɛ* *nà* *kà:d*  $H_2$  *ǵà*  
 1SG = NEG PH.T PROG = NEG PREP serve PH.T 3SG  
 ‘I am not serving him/her.’

c. *Mà: ǵǵéǵé nà kà:d̄í ǵà*

*mà-a*  $H_1$  *ǵǵə = ɛ* *nà* *kà:d*  $H_2$  *ǵà*  
 1SG = NEG PH.T PROG = NEG PREP serve PH.T 3SG  
 ‘I am not serving him/her again.’

d. *Mà: ǵǵéǵǵé nà kà:d̄í ǵà*

*mà-a*  $H_1$  *ǵǵə-é-lǵé* *nà* *kà:d*  $H_2$   
 1SG = NEG PH.T PROG = NEG = NEG PREP serve PH.T  
*ǵà*  
 3SG  
 ‘I am not serving him/her again.’

Likewise, in habitual constructions (23), the adjunction of the negation marker changes the habitual marker vowel from *i* to *ɛ* (23b–d).

## (vi) Present habitual

(23) a. *Má dí kà:dí sâ*

*mà*  $H_1$  *dí* *kà:d*  $H_2$  *sâ*  
 1SG PH.T HAB serve PH.T 1PL  
 ‘I am used to serving us.’

b. *Mà: dé kà:dí sâ*

*mà = a*  $H_1$  *dí-ε* *kà:d*  $H_2$  *sâ*  
 1SG = NEG PH.T HAB = NEG serve PH.T 3SG  
 ‘I am not used to serving us.’

c. *Mà: dèlé kà:dí sâ*

*mà = a*  $H_1$  *dí = ε = lé* *kà:d*  $H_2$  *sâ*  
 1SG = NEG PH.T HAB = NEG = NEG serve PH.T 1PL  
 ‘I am not used to serving us.’

d. *Mà: dèlilé kà:dí sâ*

*mà = a*  $H_1$  *dí = ε = lilé* *kà:d*  $H_2$  *sâ*  
 1SG = NEG PH.T HAB = NEG = NEG serve PH.T 1PL  
 ‘I am not used to serving us again.’

## 4.1.3 Correlation between tense-aspect and negation: Further notes

The preceding sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 have just revealed how complex negation in Makaa is. In addition to the aforementioned primary and secondary negators used in marking standard negation, Makaa counts other negated constructions worth describing separately due to their complexity. These constructions are particular in the sense that they make use of the negators discussed previously coupled with grammaticalized items for semantic purposes described in the two following sub-sections 4.1.3.1 & 4.1.3.2.

4.1.3.1 Negation + *ná*

Table 3 presents a summary of possible combinations between standard negation and the grammaticalized adverb *ná* ‘again/at first’.

Table 3. Tabular overview of standard negation (SN) coupled with the grammaticalized marker *ná*

Primary Negator	Primary + Secondary Negator	Tense
$a$ (TM) + $fígé$ + $ná$ + AM	$a$ (TM) + $fígé$ = $lílé$ + $ná$ + AM (i) $a$ (TM) + $fígé$ = $lé$ + $ná$ + AM (ii)	P3
$fígé$ + $ná$ + AM	$fígé$ = $lílé$ + $na$ + AM (i) $fígé$ = $lé$ + $ná$ + AM (ii)	P2
not applicable	not applicable	P1
$= a + L_o + AM = \acute{e} + ná + (nə)$ (i)	$= a + L_o + AM = lílé + ná$ (i) $= a + L_o + AM = lé + ná$ (ii)	P0
not applicable with $= \acute{e} = jé = lílé$	not applicable with $= \acute{e} = jé = lílé$	
not applicable	not applicable	F1
$= a + b\acute{\beta} = lé + ná + AM$	$= a + b\acute{\beta} = lílé + ná + AM$	F2
$= a + b\acute{\beta} = lè + ná + b\acute{a} + AM$		

In general, the morpheme *ná* is associated with the progressive or habitual aspect marker to indicate persistive aspect (24).

(24) a. *Mwán ηgà ná dà*

*mu-ân*  $H_1$  *ηgà* *ná* *dà*  $H_2$   
 C1-child PH.T PROG again eat PH.T  
 ‘The child is still eating.’

b. *Mwán má dí ná dà*

*mu-ân* *mə*  $H_1$  *dí* *ná* *dà*  $H_2$   
 C1-child SM PH.T HAB again eat PH.T  
 ‘The child is still used to eating.’

The same marker can be added to any of the negative constructions discussed so far (as illustrated in Table 3) to mean ‘do not VERB anymore as announced previously’ (25a), with the exception of P1, P0 second negation form and F1 where it is not applicable.

(25) a. *Mà: ké ná*

*mà = a*  $H_1$  *kà = é* *ná*  $H_2$   
 1SG = NEG PH.T GO = NEG again PH.T  
 ‘I am not going anymore.’



b. *Mà: kélilé ná*

$m\grave{a} = a$        $H_1$        $k\grave{a} = l\acute{i}l\acute{e}$        $n\acute{a}$        $H_2$   
 1SG = NEG    PH.T    go = NEG    again    PH.T  
 ‘I am not going anymore (as promised).’

In (25b), the secondary enclitic =*lilé* is associated to the construction for more prominence to convey the meaning ‘again/anymore’. Semantically, the difference between (25a) and (25b) lies in the fact that the former implies that ‘I went somewhere and now I do not wish to return there anymore’ whereas the latter implies that ‘I promised I will go somewhere; but I changed my mind and decided not to go any more’.

In past tenses (26), the distinction between (25a) and (25b) is neutralised. A general observation regarding the behavior of *ná* within negated constructions is that it always follows immediately the element to which the second part of the bipartite clitic =*é*, =*lilé*, or =*lé* attaches to.

(26) a. *Mà: sígélé ná kà*

$m\grave{a} = a$        $H_1$        $\acute{s}i = g\acute{e} = l\acute{e}$        $n\acute{a}$        $k\grave{a}$        $H_2$   
 1SG = P3    PH.T    EVID.PAST = NEG = NEG    again    go    PH.T  
 ‘I did not go anymore.’

a<sub>1</sub>. *Mà: sígélé ná kà*

$m\grave{a} = a$        $H_1$        $\acute{s}i = g\acute{e}$        $n\acute{a}$        $k\grave{a}$        $H_2$   
 1SG = P3    PH.T    EVID.PAST = NEG    again    go    PH.T  
 ‘I did not go anymore.’

b. *Mě: kà*

$m\grave{a} = e$        $H_1$        $k\grave{a}$        $H_2$   
 1SG = F1    PH.T    go    PH.T  
 ‘I will go.’ (Immediate)

b<sub>1</sub>. *Mà: bálilè ná kà*

$m\grave{a} = a$        $e = l\acute{i}l\grave{e}$        $n\acute{a}$        $H_1$        $k\grave{a}$        $H_2$   
 1SG = NEG    F1 = NEG    again    PH.T    go    PH.T  
 ‘I will not go again.’

c. *Mě: bá kà*

*mà = e*      *bá*       $H_{\sigma_1}$       *kà*       $H_{\sigma_2}$   
 1SG = F3      F3      PH.T      go      PH.T  
 ‘I will go.’

c<sub>1</sub>. *Mà: bá lîlè ná bá kà*

*mà = a*      *e = lîlè*      *ná*      *bá*       $H_{\sigma_1}$       *kà*       $H_{\sigma_2}$   
 1SG = NEG      F3 = NEG      again      F3      PH.T      go      PH.T  
 ‘I will not go again.’

The tense marker *e* in the F1 (26b<sub>1</sub>) and F3 (26c<sub>1</sub>) negative constructions, as previously observed in 4.1.1.6, mutates into *bá* and its vowel raises to *ə* when the enclitic =*lîlé* attaches to it.

4.1.3.2 Negation + *nîngə/kwǎlə/bwələ*

The verb *nîngə* derives from the infinitive verb *nîngǎlə*<sup>8</sup> ‘to return’. Besides its primary meaning (27a), it can be grammaticalised, used as an auxiliary (coupled with a lexical verb) with the adverbial meaning ‘again’ (27b).

(27) a. *Má nîngə ηgwála*

*mà*       $H_{\sigma_1}$       *nîngə*       $H_{\sigma_2}$       *ηgwála*  
 1SG      PH.T      return      PH.T      city  
 ‘I return to the city.’

b. *Má nîngə kǎ ηgwála*

*mà*       $H_{\sigma_1}$       *nîngə*      *kà*       $H_{\sigma_2}$       *ηgwála*  
 1SG      PH.T      return      go      PH.T      city  
 ‘I return to the city again.’

When associated to the primary negator = *a* ... = *ε*, *nîngə* renders the meaning ‘not VERB again’ (28a). Furthermore, the secondary negator = *lîlé* ~ = *ε* can be added to the construction to mark prominence (28b).

(28) a. *Mà: nîngé dà*

*mà = a*       $H_{\sigma_1}$       *nîngə = é*      *dà*       $H_{\sigma_2}$   
 1SG = NEG      PH.T      AUX = NEG      eat      PH.T  
 ‘I am not eating again/anymore.’

8 Recall that the infinitive marker *ŋ-lə* is left out when the verb is tensed.

b. *Mà: níngé = lílé ~ = lé dà*

<i>mà = a</i>	$H_{\circ_1}$	<i>nìngà = lílé ~ = lé</i>	<i>dà</i>	$H_{\circ_2}$
1SG = NEG	PH.T	AUX = NEG	eat	PH.T
'I am not eating again/anymore.'				

The dummy verb *kwǎlà* 'to redo' can substitute the verb *nìngà* in (28) to render the same meaning as illustrated in (29b). Both forms, *nìngà* and *kwǎlà*, are used interchangeably (28)–(29) or combined within the same sentence for the same meaning with a bit more emphasis (see 30).

(29) a. *Mà: kwǎlé dà*

<i>mà = a</i>	$H_{\circ_1}$	<i>kwǎlà = é</i>	<i>dà</i>	$H_{\circ_2}$
1SG = NEG	PH.T	AUX = NEG	eat	PH.T
'I am not eating again/anymore.'				

b. *Mà: kwá = lílé ~ = lé dà*

<i>mà = a</i>	$H_{\circ_1}$	<i>kwǎlà = lílé ~ = lé</i>	<i>dà</i>	$H_{\circ_2}$
1SG = NEG	PH.T	AUX = NEG	eat	PH.T
'I am not eating again/anymore.'				

(30) a. *Mà: kwǎlé nìngá dà*

<i>mà = a</i>	$H_{\circ_1}$	<i>kwǎlà = é</i>	<i>nìngà</i>	<i>dà</i>	$H_{\circ_2}$
1SG = NEG	PH.T	AUX = NEG	AUX	eat	PH.T
'I am not eating again/anymore.'					

a<sub>1</sub>. *Mà: kwá = lílé ~ = lé nìngá dà*

<i>mà = a</i>	$H_{\circ_1}$	<i>kwǎlà = lílé ~ = lé</i>	<i>dà</i>	$H_{\circ_2}$
1SG = NEG	PH.T	AUX = NEG	eat	PH.T
'I am not eating again/anymore.'				

b. *Mà: níngé kwá dà*

<i>mà = a</i>	$H_{\circ_1}$	<i>nìngà = é</i>	<i>kwà</i>	<i>dà</i>	$H_{\circ_2}$
1SG = NEG	PH.T	AUX = NEG	AUX	eat	PH.T
'I am not eating anymore.'					

b<sub>1</sub>. *Mà: níngé = lílé ~ = lé kwá dà*

<i>mà = a</i>	$H_{\circ_1}$	<i>nìngà = lílé ~ = lé</i>	<i>kwà</i>	<i>dà</i>	$H_{\circ_2}$
1SG = NEG	PH.T	AUX = NEG	AUX	eat	PH.T
'I am not eating anymore.'					

The negator *bwàlè* results from the grammaticalization of the auxiliary verb *bwàlélà* ‘to accomplish or undergo an action prior to another one’ (31a). It is used in negated constructions to mean ‘never VERB’ (31b–c). *Bwàlè* is compatible with the primary bipartite enclitics = *a* ... =  $\varepsilon$ . (31a<sub>1</sub>), and incompatible with the secondary enclitics = *lilè* or = *lè* probably because it ends in *lè*.

(31) a. *Nà: bwàlè jà m̀ ntàdífínìg*

<i>ǹ = a</i>	$\overset{H_1}{\text{PH.T}}$	<i>bwàlè</i>	<i>jà</i>	$\overset{H_2}{\text{PH.T}}$	<i>m̀</i>	<i>ntàdífínìg</i>
3SG = P3		AUX	give		1SG	100.francs

‘He gave me a hundred francs first.’

a<sub>1</sub>. *Nà: bwálé jà m̀ ntàdífínìg*

<i>ǹ = a</i>	$\overset{H_1}{\text{PH.T}}$	<i>bwàlè = <math>\varepsilon</math></i>	<i>jà</i>	$\overset{H_2}{\text{PH.T}}$	<i>m̀</i>
3SG = NEG		AUX = NEG	give		1SG

*ntàdífínìg*  
100.francs  
‘He has never given me a hundred francs.’

b. *Nà: fígé bwálé zà m̀dí*

<i>ǹ = a</i>	$\overset{H_1}{\text{PH.T}}$	<i>fí = gé</i>	<i>bwàlè</i>	<i>zà</i>	$\overset{H_2}{\text{PH.T}}$
3SG = P3		EVID.PAST = NEG	AUX	come	

*m̀-dí*  
1SG-LOC  
‘He never came to my place.’

c. *Nà: ʰbélé bwálé zà m̀dí*

<i>ǹ = a</i>	$\overset{H_1}{\text{PH.T}}$	<i>bá = <math>\varepsilon</math></i>	<i>bwàlè</i>	<i>zà</i>	$\overset{H_2}{\text{PH.T}}$	<i>m̀-dí</i>
3SG = NEG		F2 = NEG	AUX	come		1SG-LOC

‘He will never come to my place.’

## 4.2 Non-standard negation

Non-standard negation refers to any construction using a negation strategy different from the one used to negate basic verbal clauses. Eight non-standard negation constructions are identified in Makaa: (i) negative colloquial expression, (ii) negation of imperative and subjunctive constructions, (iii) negation of constructions with existential verbs, (iv) negation of infinitives, (v) negation of hypothetical

constructions, (vi) negative polarity items, (vii) assertive contrastive negation, and (viii) negation of cleft items.

#### 4.2.1 Negative colloquial expressions: the case of SM *a* + *mú*

Makaa counts some idiomatic expressions (which are not all relevant for this study) used to express denial or refusal. The construction in (32) is particular in that the first part of the bipartite clitic = *a* is associated to an inherently negative copula within a colloquial expression to express denial. The enclitic = *ε* is absent in the construction. The negative copula *mú* embodies both the present tense and negation features.

- (32) a. *Mà: mú*    b. *Sá: mú*
- |                      |           |                      |           |
|----------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
| <i>mà</i> = <i>a</i> | <i>mú</i> | <i>sâ</i> = <i>a</i> | <i>mú</i> |
| 1SG = NEG            | COP.NEG   | 1PL = NEG            | COP.NEG   |
| ‘I do not agree’     |           | ‘We do not agree’    |           |
- c. *Bwá: mú*
- |                       |           |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| <i>bwà</i> = <i>a</i> | <i>mú</i> |
| 3PL = NEG             | COP.NEG   |
| ‘They do not agree’   |           |

#### 4.2.2 Negation in imperative/subjunctive

Negation in both the imperative (33a<sub>i</sub>) and the subjunctive (33b<sub>i</sub>, c<sub>i</sub>) is marked by the negator *kú*. *Kú* encodes simultaneously imperative/subjunctive and negation features. In the plural form (33c<sub>i</sub>), the morphemes -*g-â*, expressing the imperative mood and plurality respectively, are suffixed to it. In the singular form (33a<sub>i</sub>, b<sub>i</sub>), it occurs without the -*g* as shown in 2.3.2, certainly because both morphemes mark imperative/subjunctive.

- (33) a. *kà:díg ídǎw!*    a<sub>i</sub>. *Kú kà:d ídǎw!*
- |               |       |              |                      |             |       |              |
|---------------|-------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|
| <i>kà:d-g</i> | $H_2$ | <i>ì-dǎw</i> | <i>kú</i>            | <i>kà:d</i> | $H_2$ | <i>ì-dǎw</i> |
| serve-IMP     | PH.T  | C8-food      | NEG.IMP              | serve       | PH.T  | C8-food      |
| ‘Serve food!’ |       |              | ‘Do not serve food!’ |             |       |              |
- b. *Wà, kà:díg ídǎw!*
- |                    |               |       |              |
|--------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|
| <i>wà</i>          | <i>kà:d-g</i> | $H_2$ | <i>ì-dǎw</i> |
| 2SG                | serve-SBJV    | PH.T  | C8-food      |
| ‘You, serve food!’ |               |       |              |

b<sub>i</sub>. *Wə, kú kà:d ìdîw!*

wə kú kà:d H<sub>2</sub> ì-dîw  
 2SG NEG.SBJV serve PH.T C8-food  
 ‘You, do not serve food!’

c. *Í kà:dìgâ ìdîw!*

í kà:d-g-â H<sub>2</sub> ì-dîw  
 1PL serve-SBJV-PL PH.T C8-food  
 ‘Let us serve food!’

c<sub>i</sub>. *Í kúgá kà:d ìdîw!*

í kú-g-â kà:d H<sub>2</sub> ì-dîw  
 1PL NEG.SBJV-SBJV-PL serve PH.T C8-food  
 ‘Let us not serve food!’

The enclitic =*lé* can be attached to the negator *kú* in the singular form (34a) or to *kúgâ* in the plural form to express the meaning ‘not again’. In the plural form, =*lé* occurs between *kú* and =*gâ* (34a).

(34) a. *Í kúlégá<sup>9</sup> kà:d!*

í kú=lé-g-â kà:d H<sub>2</sub>  
 1PL NEG.SBJV=NEG-SBJV-PL serve PH.T  
 ‘Let us not serve again!’

b. *Kúlé kà:d!*

Kú=lé kà:d H<sub>2</sub>  
 NEG.IMP=NEG serve PH.T  
 ‘Do not serve again!’

#### 4.2.3 Negation of constructions with an existential verb

Generally, existential constructions in the present tense are expressed by the copulae *dʒisà* ‘to be’ (35a) or *músà* ‘to become’ or ‘to be ... now’ (35b), and their negated counterparts comprise the negator *tʃúgé*. In sentences containing the verb *dʒisà nàʃ<sup>10</sup>* ‘to be with’ (35c), the negator is followed by the preposition *nà* resulting in *tʃúgé nà* ‘be without ...’.

<sup>9</sup> Some speakers also use *kúgálé* with the negator =*lé* suffixed after the plural marker rather than infixed. This form is considered odd by many Makaa native speakers but acceptable.

<sup>10</sup> Literally, the verb meaning ‘to have’ is translated as ‘to be with something’.

(35) a. *Mà dzìsà ñdzów*

*mà*  $H_1$  *dzìsà*  $H_2$  *ñdzów*  
 1SG PH.T COP PH.T home  
 ‘I am at home.’

a<sub>1</sub>. *Mà tǰúgé ñdzów*

*mà*  $H_1$  *tǰúgé*  $H_2$  *ñdzów*  
 1SG PH.T COP.NEG PH.T home  
 ‘I am not at home.’

b. *Mà músà ñdzów*

*mà*  $H_1$  *músà*  $H_2$  *ñdzów*  
 1SG PH.T COP PH.T home  
 ‘I am at home now.’

b<sub>1</sub>. *Mà tǰúgé ñdzów*

*mà*  $H_1$  *tǰúgé*  $H_2$  *ñdzów*  
 1SG PH.T COP.NEG PH.T home  
 ‘I am not at home.’

c. *Mà dzìsà nà ñdzów*

*mà*  $H_1$  *dzìsà* *nà*  $H_2$  *ñdzów*  
 1SG PH.T COP with PH.T home  
 ‘I have a home.’

c<sub>1</sub>. *Mà tǰúgé nà ñdzów*

*mà*  $H_1$  *tǰúgé* *nà*  $H_2$  *ñdzów*  
 1SG PH.T COP.NEG with PH.T home  
 ‘I do not have a home.’

d. *Mà ñkùl zà*

*mà*  $H_1$  *ñkùl*  $H_2$  *zà*  
 1SG PH.T can PH.T come  
 ‘I can come.’

d<sub>1</sub>. *Mà tǰúgé nà ñkùl zà*

*mà*  $H_1$  *tǰúgé*  $H_2$  *nà* *ñkùl* *zà*  
 1SG PH.T COP.NEG PH.T with power come  
 ‘I can not come.’

For constructions containing a modal verb (35d), the negator still is *tfúgέ nà* + modal verb ‘be without MODAL VERB’. Modal verbs lose their finiteness in negative constructions in Makaa, become nominalized and function like a complement of the negative copula. The negator *tfúgέ* seems to be formed as *fiǵé*, i.e. *tfú* + *gέ* with the exception that *tfú* has been completely grammaticalized and corresponds no longer to any existing word or stem. Existential constructions in past tenses and future tenses behave similarly to standard negation constructions (cf. 4.1.1.1, 4.1.1.4–6).

Similarly, as previously described in 4.1, the enclitic  $=\varepsilon \sim =\text{lil}\varepsilon$  can be suffixed to the negator *tfúgέ* to express the meaning ‘not ... again/anymore’, ‘not have ... again/anymore’ ‘cannot ... again/anymore’ depending on the inherent meaning of the verb (36b).

(36) a. *Mà dzisà ndzów*

<i>mà</i>	$H_{\sigma_1}$	<i>dzisà</i>	$H_{\sigma_2}$	<i>ndzów</i>
1SG	PH.T	COP	PH.T	home

‘I am at home.’

b. *Mà tfúǵililé ~ lé ndzów*

<i>mà</i>	$H_{\sigma_1}$	<i>tfúgέ = lilé ~ = lé</i>	$H_{\sigma_2}$	<i>ndzów</i>
1SG	PH.T	COP.NEG = NEG	PH.T	home

‘I am not at home again/anymore.’

Makaa native speakers also use the negators *tíǵé* and *tíǵilé ~ tíǵililé*, as respective variants of *tfúgέ*, *tfúǵélé* and *tfúǵéililé*. The variants show signs of segmental mutations. The initial consonant undergoes fortition; the vowel [u] is centralized and loses the labiality feature (37a, b).

(37) a. *Mà dzisà ndzów*

<i>mà</i>	$H_{\sigma_1}$	<i>dzisà</i>	$H_{\sigma_2}$	<i>ndzów</i>
1SG	PH.T	COP	PH.T	home

‘I am at home.’

a<sub>1</sub>. *Mà tíǵε ndzów*

<i>mà</i>	$H_{\sigma_1}$	<i>tíǵé</i>	$H_{\sigma_2}$	<i>ndzów</i>
1SG	PH.T	COP.NEG	PH.T	home

‘I am not at home anymore.’



b. *Mà dzìsà nà ndzów*

mà H<sub>1</sub> dzìsà nà H<sub>2</sub> ndzów  
 1SG PH.T COP with PH.T home  
 ‘I have a home.’

b<sub>1</sub>. *Mà tígélélé ~ lé nà ndzów*

mà H<sub>1</sub> tígélélé ~ lé nà H<sub>2</sub> ndzów  
 1SG PH.T COP.NEG = NEG with PH.T home  
 ‘I do not have a home anymore.’

4.2.4 *Negation of infinitives*

Infinitives are used to express gnomic events (cf. Table 1). The negator *kú* supported by the habitual marker *dí* is used to negate infinitives. These markers can occur at the beginning of the negated construction (38a<sub>1</sub>) or at the beginning of a completive clause (38b<sub>1</sub>). There are two possibilities to negate an independent or an embedded infinitival clause in Makaa, depending on the speaker’s intention. (i) Either the initial-infinitive verb (38a<sub>1</sub>) is negated alone, (39a<sub>1</sub>), or (ii) the initial-infinitive verb and the clause main verb are both negated, such as in (38b)–(39b).

(38) a. *kǎ̀lǎ̀ fàmbá dzìsà báwílà*

kǎ̀-Hlǎ̀ fàmbá dzìsà báw-Hlǎ̀  
 go-INF field COP bad-INF  
 ‘Going to the field is bad.’

a<sub>1</sub>. *Kú dí kǎ̀ fàmbá dzìsà báwílà*

Kú dí kǎ̀ fàmbá dzìsà báw-Hlǎ̀  
 NEG HAB go field COP bad-INF  
 ‘Not going to the field regularly is bad.’

b. *Kú dí kǎ̀ fàmbá í tǎ̀júgélé báwílà*

Kú dí kǎ̀ fàmbá í tǎ̀júgélé báw-Hlǎ̀  
 NEG HAB go field SM.3SG COP.NEG bad-INF  
 ‘Not to go to the field regularly is bad.’

(39) a. *À mpú ná [lújílà dzìsà sám]*

À mpú ná lúj-Hlǎ̀ dzìsà sám  
 3SG know that insult-INF COP sin  
 ‘He knows that insulting is a sin.’

a<sub>i</sub>. *À mpú ná [[kú dǎ] lúj dzísà sòm]*

à mpù ná kú dǎ lúj dzísà sòm  
3SG know that NEG HAB insult COP sin  
'He/she knows that not insulting usually is a sin.'

b. *À mpú ná [[kú dǎ] lújí tǎǎǎ sòm]*

à mpù ná kú dǎ lúj tǎǎǎ sòm  
3SG know that NEG HAB insult COP.NEG sin  
'He/she knows that not insulting usually is not a sin.'

#### 4.2.5 Negation in hypothetical constructions

Negation in hypothetical constructions is marked by *bá ndá ... kú* in the protasis preceded by the conditional marker *kí* or *ká* used interchangeably (40b)–(41b). *Bá ndá* derives from the verb *bǎ̀lè ndà nà* 'be without'.

(40) a. *Má kí/ká bà nà mwàné, mà kùsà mátwá*

mà H<sub>1</sub> kí/ká bà nà mwàné mà kùsà  
1SG PH.T HYP be with money 1SG buy

H<sub>2</sub> mà-twá  
PH.T C6-car

'If I have money, I will buy a car.'

b. *Má kí/ká bá ndá bà nà mwàné, mà kú kùsà mátwá*

mà H<sub>1</sub> kí/ká bà ndá bà nà mwàné  
1SG PH.T HYP be without be with money

mà kú kùsà H<sub>2</sub> mà-twá  
1SG NEG.FUT buy PH.T C6-car

'If I don't have money, I will not buy a car.'

(41) a. *Á kí/ká zà, mà kùsǎ jà mátwá*

a H<sub>1</sub> kí/ka zà mà kùsà H<sub>2</sub> jà  
3SG PH.T HYP come 1SG buy PH.T 3SG.OM

mà-twá  
C6-car

'If he comes, I will buy him/her a car.'

b. *Á kǐ/ká bǎ ndá zǎ, mà kú kùsǎ jǎ màtwá*

*a*       $H_1$       *kǐ/ká*   *bǎ*   *ndá*   *zǎ*  
 3SG   PH.T   HYP   be   NEG   come

*mà*   *kú*      *kùsǎ*    $H_2$    *jǎ*      *mà-twá*  
 1SG   NEG.FUT   buy   PH.T   3SG.OM   C6-car  
 ‘If he doesn’t come, I will not buy him/her a car.’

*Ndà* occurs in protasis without a conditional marker, e.g., in Makaa sentences expressing a warning (the consequence being implicit) (42a). It also occurs in hypothetical constructions lacking an overt conditional marker (mostly proverbs) (42b).

(42) a. *Wǎ ndá zǎ wá!*

*Wǎ*   *ndá*   *zǎ*      *wá*  
 2SG   NEG   come   here  
 ‘(You) don’t dare come here (or else you will regret)!’

b. *Mpámǎ: bjélé, ntà ndá bjél*

*mpámǎ* = *a*      *bjél* =  $\varepsilon$       *ntà*      *ndá*      *bjél*  
 grandparent = NEG   born = NEG   grandson   NEG   born  
 ‘If the grand parent was not born, the grand son would not have been born.’

The negator *mbáǎ* is used in the protasis of certain hypothetical constructions in Makaa as shown in (43). To my knowledge, *mbáǎ* probably derives from the addition of the second part of the bipartite negator =  $\varepsilon$  to the conditional marker *mbám*.

(43) *Wǎ mbáǎ zǎ mú:s, wǎ mbám mpù mà*

*wǎ*   *mbáǎ*      *zǎ*      *mú:s*,   *wǎ*   *mbám*      *mpù*      *mà*  
 2SG   HYP-NEG   come   today   2SG   HYP.FUT   know   1SG  
 ‘If you did not come today, you would have seen what I am made of.’

4.2.6 *Negative polarity items*

A polarity item (e.g.: nothing, no one, nobody) is a lexical item that occurs only in environments associated with either affirmative or negative polarities. A polarity item occurring in an affirmative (positive) context is called a positive polarity item (PPI), e.g.: ‘Nothing will happen to you’; and one that appears in a negative context is a negative polarity item (NPI), e.g.: ‘Nobody won’t bother

you'. Makaa uses negative polarity items (Henceforth NPIs) also to express negation. NPIs have the structure *tò* + noun and they can only occur in negated constructions. Example (44) is another typical case of double negation in Makaa. Examples (44a<sub>1</sub>)–(44b<sub>1</sub>) are ungrammatical because polarity items in Makaa are licensed to occur in a negative context.

(44) a. *Tò sá já sájě wò*

<i>tò</i>	<i>sá</i>	<i>í = á</i>	$H_1$	<i>sá-ε</i>	$H_2$	<i>wò</i>
NEG	thing	SM = NEG	PH.T	do = NEG	PH.T	2SG

‘Nothing will happen to you.’

a<sub>1</sub>. \**Tò sá jé sá wò*

<i>tò</i>	<i>sá</i>	<i>í = e</i>	$H_1$	<i>sá</i>	$H_2$	<i>wò</i>
NEG	thing	SM = F1	PH.T	do	PH.T	2SG

‘Nothing will happen to you.’

b. *Mà jíǵé díǵí tò mù:d*

<i>mà</i>	<i>jí = ǵé</i>	$H_1$	<i>díǵ</i>	$H_2$	<i>tò</i>	<i>mù:d</i>
1SG	EVID.PAST = NEG	PH.T	see	PH.T	NEG	person

‘I did not see anyone/anybody.’

b<sub>1</sub>. \**Mà jí díǵí tò mù:d*

<i>mà</i>	<i>jí</i>	$H_1$	<i>díǵ</i>	$H_2$	<i>tò</i>	<i>mù:d</i>
1SG	EVID.PAST	PH.T	see	PH.T	NEG	person

‘I did see nobody.’

#### 4.2.7 Contrastive negation: *kú bà*

This refers to constructions in which only a part of the utterance is negated in order to mark contrastive focus. The negator *kú* coupled with the copula *bà* ‘to be’ are used to achieve the aforementioned purpose. They introduce the co-ordinate clause on which the emphasis lies.

(45) a. *Mà ǵà kà fàmbá kú bà ǵwá:là*

<i>mà</i>	<i>ǵà</i>	<i>kà</i>	<i>fàmbá</i>	<i>kú</i>	<i>bà</i>	<i>ǵwá:là</i>
1SG	PROG	go	field	NEG	COP	town

‘I am going to the farm and not to the town.’

b. *Nǎmà jà mǎ tʃúdí kú bǎ ntǎ:*

*jǎ = á mǎ*    *jà*        *mǎ*        *tʃúdí*    *kú*        *bǎ*        *ntǎ:*  
 3SG = P2    give    1SG.OM    meat    NEG    COP    rat.mole  
 ‘He gave me meat and not rat mole.’

4.2.8 *Negated emphatic (cleft) NPs: dí*

Generally, emphatic noun phrases are preposed and separated from the rest of the sentence by the focus marker *ó*. Constructions within which the emphatic NPs occur are equivalent to the English cleft construction. In negated cleft constructions in Makaa, the affirmative focus marker *ó* is replaced by the negation focus marker *dí* whose vowel undergoes an assimilatory process in order to harmonize with surrounding vowels as in (46c<sub>1</sub>-d<sub>1</sub>). Note that in (46) the focused NPs are structurally different. In (46a-b), the NP holds in single nouns whereas in (46c-d) the NPs comprise a head-noun followed by a relative clause. The structural difference therefore gives the impression that the focus marker changes its position in (46c-d) though it does not. Note that in Makaa, cleft and relative constructions are almost similar at the exception that clefts comprise a focus marker. *Dí* might originate from the grammaticalization of the locative pronoun *-dí* referring to one’s place such as in *mádí* ‘in/to my place’.

(46) a. *Mwán ó nǎmà dǎ fjâ*

*mu-ân*    *ó*        *jǎ = á mǎ*    *dǎ*    *fjâ*  
 C1-child    FOC    SM = P2    eat    avocado  
 ‘It is the child who ate avocado.’

a<sub>1</sub>. *Mwán dí nǎmà dǎ fjâ*

*mu-ân*    *dí*        *jǎ = á mǎ*    *dǎ*    *fjâ*  
 C1-child    NEG.FOC    SM = P2    eat    avocado  
 ‘It is not the child who ate avocado.’

b. *Bwán ó bwǎmǎ dǎ fjâ*

*bu-ân*    *ó*        *bwǎ = á mǎ*    *dǎ*    *fjâ*  
 C2-child    FOC    SM = P2    eat    avocado  
 ‘It is the children who ate avocado.’

b<sub>i</sub>. *Bwán dí bwǎmè dè fjâ*

*bu-ân*      *dí*              *bw = ámè*      *dè*      *fjâ*  
 C2-child    NEG.FOC    SM = P2    eat    avocado  
 ‘It is not the children who ate avocado.’

c. *Mù:d nǎ: bjá mǒ nè*

*mù-ùd*      *nǎ = a*      *H<sub>1</sub>*      *bjá*      *mè-ó*      *nè*  
 C1-person    SM = P3    PH.T    father    1SG-FOC    DEM.SG  
 ‘That is the person who fathered me.’

c<sub>i</sub>. *Mù:d nǎ: bjâ mǒ dé nè*

*mù-ùd*      *nǎ = a*      *H<sub>1</sub>*      *bjâ*      *mǒ*      *dí*      *nè*  
 C1-person    SM = P3    PH.T    father    1SG    NEG.FOC    DEM.SG  
 ‘That is not the person who fathered me.’

d. *Bù:d bwá: bjá mǒ gà*

*bù-ùd*      *bwè = a*      *H<sub>1</sub>*      *bjá*      *H<sub>2</sub>*      *mè-ó*      *gà*  
 C2-person    SM = P3    PH.T    father    PH.T    1SG-FOC    DEM.PL  
 ‘These are people who fathered me.’

d<sub>i</sub>. *Bù:d bwá: bjâ mǒ dó: gà*

*bù-ùd*      *bwè = á*      *bjâ*      *mǒ*      *H<sub>2</sub>*      *dí-ó*  
 C2-person    SM = P3    father    1SG    PH.T    NEG.FOC-C2.SM

*gà*

DEM.PL

‘These are not people who fathered me.’

## 5 Summary

This paper set out to provide a thorough description of negation patterns in Makaa with an emphasis on negator types and their distribution, the correlation between TAM and negation, and the semantics of negated constructions. From the discussion, one retains that Makaa counts several distinct negation constructions depending on the tense, mood, the finiteness of the sentence, or the scope of negation.

Regarding the interrogation on the slot(s) occupied by NEG(s) (see 3.2), it is shown that standard negation in Makaa targets any element

occupying the second position of the inflectional phrase. Negation is marked by the primary bipartite clitic = *a* ... = (C)ε(= *je*) in P0, P1, F1, F2 and F3 and by *ǰígé* in P2 and P3 to express the meaning ‘not verb’. More so, a secondary enclitic = *lilé* ~ = *lélé* (F1) ~ = *lé* can be added to the primary clitic to express the meaning ‘not verb again or anymore’. With regard to the foregoing discussion, the negated counterpart of the structure in (4) can be written as in the scheme in (47). In the structure in (47), NEG<sub>1</sub> stands for the proclitic = *a*, NEG<sub>2</sub> for the enclitic = ε, NEG<sub>3</sub> for the additional enclitic = *je* taken by certain verbal forms in P0 and F1. NEG<sub>4</sub> stands for the enclitic = *lilé* ~ = *lélé* (F1) ~ = *lé*. X stands for any element ranked first in the extended verb base. X can be an aspectual marker, F2 or F3 tense markers, and auxiliary or a verb. Note that for F3, the first tense marker particle (*e* which becomes *bə* in negative constructions) will occupy the X-slot immediately after NEG<sub>1</sub> and the second tense particle (*bá*) will occur after NEG<sub>1</sub>, NEG<sub>2</sub>, NEG<sub>3</sub> or NEG<sub>4</sub> depending on the construction. However, within simple P0 and F1 negative counterpart constructions, i.e. P0 and F1 constructions without an aspectual marker, the verb base ([[ROOT]<sup>n</sup>-EXT-FV]) occupies the X-slot.

$$(47) \text{ SM } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{P}_3 \\ \text{NEG}_1 \end{array} \right\} \text{H}_1 \text{X} = \text{NEG}_2 \text{-(NEG}_3 \text{)-(NEG}_4 \text{)} \mathbf{b\acute{a}}(\text{OM})[[\text{ROOT}]^n\text{-EXT-FV}](\text{OM})\text{H}_2$$

Concerning the interaction between TAM and negation, it is observed that negators are compatible with aspect markers and with almost all tense except from P1 (*ámà*) and F1 (*é*) markers which are banned in negative constructions. The fact that the P3 marker *a* occurs in a position further front to the slot occupied by the past tense negator *ǰígé* and that the F2, and F3 markers rather occur preceded by the proclitic = *a* suggests that the P3 marker certainly occupies a slot preceding that occupied by F2 and F3. In addition, the position occupied by F2 and F3 certainly precedes that occupied by F1.

Concerning the origin of negators in Makaa, some of them might derive from grammaticalized verbs, e.g.: *ǰígé* (the past tense negator) might come from the verb *ǰin* ‘finish’, *bə ndà nə* (used in hypothetical constructions) from the verb *bǎlə ndà nə* ‘be without’. Forms like *mbágé* or *ndà* (used in hypothetical constructions), *tò* (used for NPIs), and = *lilé* ~ = *lélé* (F1) ~ = *lé* (used in sentential constructions) are probably old negation particles. Particles of the bipartite negator

=a ... =(C)ε might derive from the 3rd person singular and 3rd person singular possessive adjectives or the 3rd person singular object marker respectively. *Dí* (used in negating clefted NPs) could derive from the locative pronoun *-dí*. However, there is no diachronic evidence or comparative data from neighboring languages to sustain these predictions, they remain hypothetical.

Some negative constructions couple auxiliaries such as *nìngà*, *bwàlè* with the primary bipartite negator for prominence. Finally, Makaa associates the marker *kú* (used for negating imperatives) with other particles to form different negation markers, namely, *kú bə̀* (used in assertive constrictive negation), *kú dí* (used in infinitives), and *bə̀ ndà ... kú* (used in hypothetical constructions).

### Abbreviations

1.PL	first person plural	IMP	imperative mood
1.SG	first person singular	INF	infinitive marker
1PL.INCL	first person plural inclusive	L	low tone
2.PL	second person plural	l̥	floating low tone
2.SG	second person singular	LOC	locative
3.PL	third person plural	MACH	macrostem high
3.SG	third person singular	NEG	negator
AUX	auxiliary	OCD	object concord marker
CAUS	causative	OM	object marker
COP	copula	P1	immediate past
C	noun class	P2	recent past
DEM	demonstrative	P3	remote past
DPRON	dummy pronoun	PH.T	phrasal tone
EVID	evidentiality	POSS	possessive
EXT	verbal extension	PL	plural
F1	immediate future	PROG	progressive aspect marker
F2	recent future	SBJV	subjunctive mood
F3	remote future	SCD	subject concord marker
FV	final vowel	SG	singular
FOC	focus marker	SM	subject marker



H	high tone	T̥	floating tone
H <sub>1</sub>	phrasal floating high tone 1	TAM	tense-aspect-mood
H <sub>2</sub>	phrasal floating high tone 2	TBU	tone bearing unit
HAB	habitual aspect marker	TM	tense marker
HYP	hypothetical	VB	verbal base

## References

- Crystal, David. 2010. *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Östen. 2010. Typology of negation. In Laurence R. Horn (ed.), *The expression of negation*. The Expression of Cognitive Categories 4. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter. 9–38.
- Devos, Maud & Johan van der Auwera. 2013. Jespersen cycles in Bantu: Double and triple negation. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 34(2). 205–274.
- Devos, Maud, Michael Kasombo Tshibanda & Johan van der Auwera. 2010. Jespersen cycles in Kanincin: Double, triple and maybe even quadruple negation. *Africana Linguistica* 16. 155–182.
- Heath, Daniel & Teresa Heath. 1996. *A preliminary grammar sketch of the noun and verb morphology*. Yaoundé: SIL.
- Heath, Teresa. 2003. Makaa (A83). In Derek Nurse & Gérard Philippson (eds.), *The Bantu languages*. London & New York: Routledge. 335–348.
- Hewson, Johnson. 2016. Makaa. In Nurse, Derek, Sarah Rose & Johnson Hewson. (eds.). *Tense aspect in Niger-Congo*. Tervuren: Royal Museum for Central Africa
- Ibrahim, Njoya. 2007. Identificational vs. information focus in Makaa: Interaction between syntax and semantics. Yaoundé: University of Yaoundé 1 Maîtrise dissertation.
- Ibrahim, Njoya. 2009. Issues in the phonology of CV [High] reduplication in Makaa (A83). Yaoundé: University of Yaoundé 1 D.E.A. dissertation.
- Ibrahim, Njoya. 2013a. Reduplication in Makaa (A83). *Afrika und Übersee* 91(2). 259–298.
- Ibrahim, Njoya. 2013b. Tense-aspect-mood in Makaa (A83). Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Bantu languages. Paris 12–15, 2013.

- Jespersen, Otto. 1917. *Negation in English and other languages*. København: A. F. Høst & Søn.
- Meeussen, Achiel Emiel. 1967. Bantu grammatical reconstructions. *Annalen van het Koninklijk Museum voor Midden-Africa* 61. 79–121.
- 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 Linguistic Compass* 1(5). 552–570.
- Mihas, Elena. 2009. Negation in Metta. *Rice Working Papers in Linguistics* 1. 197–222.
- Myers, Scott. 1998. Aux in Bantu morphology and phonology. In Larry Hyman & Charles Kisseberth (eds.), *Theoretical aspect of Bantu tone*. Stanford: CSLI. 231–264.
- Noutsa, Clarisse. 2009. Phrasal phonology of tone in Makaa: Evidence from proverbs. Yaoundé: University of Yaoundé 1 DEA dissertation.
- Nurse, Derek, Sarah Rose & John Hewson. 2016. Introduction. In Derek Nurse, Sarah Rose & Johnson Hewson (eds.), *Tense aspect in Niger-Congo*. Tervuren: Royal Museum for Central Africa
- Nurse, Derek. 2008. *Tense and aspect in Bantu*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Payne, John. R. 1985. Negation. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description. Vol 1: Clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 197–242.
- Schadeberg, Thilo C. 2003. Historical linguistics. In Derek Nurse & Gérard Philippson (eds.), *The Bantu languages*. London & New York: Routledge. 146–163.
- Van der Auwera, Johan. 2009. The Jespersen cycles. In Elly van Gelderen (ed.), *Cyclical change*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 35–71.
- Van der Auwera, Johan. 2010. On the diachrony of negation. In Laurence R. Horn (ed.), *The expression of negation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 73–109.