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1. Introduction

Post-verbal, respectively post-predicate or clause-final, negation patterns are found in a fair number of Chadic languages. Typologically and genealogically, we are most likely dealing with a feature of great age in the family since we find clause-final negation patterns in all the major branches of Chadic. This particular negation pattern can, therefore, be reconstructed for Proto-Chadic with a high degree of confidence.

Given the great age of the Chadic language family and the high degree of its internal diversification, present-day languages display a wide array of synchronic patterns involving post-verbal negation marking. This, however, are not the exclusive patterns since we find also occurrences of pre-verbal negation markers. Further, pre- and postverbal negation markers may cooccur in the same clause. This conspicuous feature reminds one of the so-called Jespersen Cycle, and indeed, it would appear that Chadic provides further typological evidence for the particular diachronic processes which are implied by the Jespersen Cycle.

Irrespective of the still open question whether “post-verbal”, “post-predicate”, or “clause-final” would be the adequate terminology to describe the position of what could be assumed to be the “default” negative marker in Chadic, in this paper and for reasons of terminological simplification, I will use the descriptive label “post-verbal” in order to match the official topic of the WOCAL-7 workshop.
The primary aim of this paper is to outline the typological variation of post-verbal respectively clause-final negation patterns in three selected Chadic languages, one from each of the three major branches of the family, and derive questions from it that might be interesting for further discussions of cross-linguistic typology in this workshop. The three major branches of the Chadic language family are: West Chadic, Central Chadic (aka Biu-Mandara), and East Chadic.\(^2\)

2. The geographical and genealogical spread of post-verbal negation within Chadic

Post-verbal negation is found in the three major branches of the Chadic family which covers a vast area in the sub-Saharan Sahel zone expanding, in West-East direction, from the Nigerian Middle Belt across the wider Lake Chad Basin into the central Republic of Chad. Its geographic distribution makes the languages of the Chadic family a salient candidate for inclusion in the large linguistic convergence zone which has more recently been identified and described as the “Macro-Sudan belt” (Güldemann 2008).

There are about 140 languages in the Chadic family which makes it the largest family within the Afroasiatic macro-family in terms of number of individual languages. For the purpose of this presentation, three languages are selected to illustrate post-verbal vs. pre-verbal negation patterns, one from each major branch of Chadic, for which reliable descriptive monographs are available which have been duly consulted:\(^3\)

- East Chadic: Kera (cf. Ebert 1979)

\(^2\) For technical reasons, languages of the so-called Masa Group have not been taken into consideration for this paper. The Masa Group of languages, originally separated as representing a somewhat undecided status between Central and East Chadic, is meanwhile treated by some authors as if it was an established separate fourth branch of the Chadic family.

\(^3\) For this presentation and to avoid any discussion of possibly controversial accounts in the three available reference grammars, the “authoritative source” for Hausa, including the quoted examples, will be Newman (2000). For Lamang-Hdi, the “default” choice of source is Wolff (1983, 2009) unless indicated otherwise. For Kera, only one source was available to me.
Among the Chadic languages, West Chadic Hausa stands out for at least three important reasons:

- It is the best known and a widely taught Chadic language given its earliest descriptive accounts from the mid 19th century;
- It is the most widely spoken Chadic language and ranks among the most important African *linguae francae* (likely spoken, as L1 and L2, by close to 100 million speakers) in probably more than 10 African countries;

Central Chadic Lamang-Hdi may be considered particularly interesting for at least three other reasons:

- It covers a “language continuum” including both mutually intelligible and non-intelligible variants along the northern Nigerian-Cameroonian border (with Lamang representing a set of Nigerian varieties, and Hdi representing a unique variety spoken exclusively in Cameroon);
- It involves language variants which are, at the same time, very close in terms of lexicon and inventory of grammatical morphemes, but would appear to be quite distinct in terms of a fair number of typological features. Further, the two mutually unintelligible variants Lamang and Hdi are characterized by fairly consistent patterns of “tone reversal” (Wolff 2011/12, in press);
- It prides itself of two fairly comprehensive monographic descriptions from different authors and based on different theoretical predispositions (Wolff 1983, Frajzyngier 2002) which address two remote and unintelligible variants within this language continuum.

East Chadic Kera has been chosen to complete the picture from the third major branch of the Chadic language family, and because it has also been blessed with a reliable descriptive monograph which avoids any kinky idio-syncrasies of description.

### 3. The occurrence of post-verbal negation across Chadic

In West Chadic Hausa, the post-verbal negation marker only occurs in the shape of **discontinuous negation marking** and is restricted to
(a) TAMs other than the continuous aspect and subjunctive mood, and (b) equational (non-verbal) clauses, NPs, etc.\(^4\)

Outside the discontinuous marker construction, single markers báa and báà/báabù do occur in other negative constructions, but never post-verbally. Whereas in Standard Hausa the post-verbal negation marker bá tends to occur in clause-final position (with certain exceptions allowed), this is not necessarily the case in “northern” dialects. Cf. the following straightforward example of disjunctive negation marking in Hausa, displaying the post-verbal occurrence of the second negative marker bá (note that Hausa has S-V-O order and obligatorily uses a repetitive subject pronoun in agreement with a nominal subject which precedes the verb and which tends to carry markers of aspect and tense):\(^5\)

\[ (1) \quad yáarìnyàa \ báa \ tà \ dáawóo \ bá \]

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>girl</td>
<td>NEG₁</td>
<td>3SG.F</td>
<td>return</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISJUNCTIVE NEGATION

The girl didn’t return.

(AFF. yáarìnyàa táa dáawóo “The girl [has] returned.”)

Central Chadic Lamang also uses a marker bà (like Hausa and Kera do) which, however, is restricted to the negation of FOCUS CONSTRUCTIONS (i.e., predication focus and contrastive term focus) and enters various combinations with the general and always post-verbal negative marker wó.\(^6\) The following is a simple but typical example of post-verbal negation in Lamang (note that Lamang has V-S-O order which means that the subject pronoun is suffixed to the verb):

\[ \]

\(^4\) Note that the so-called subjunctive negation does not involve any of the non-subjunctive negation markers at all: it is best viewed as a prohibitive which is introduced by a pre-verbal particle kádà ~ kâr).

\(^5\) For the purpose of this paper and irrespective of the sources used, Hausa examples will be tone-marked with diacritics for both High and Low tone on each syllable, and distinctive vowel length will be indicated by doubling the vowel symbol.

\(^6\) Due to fairly shallow phonological rules in Lamang, \([wó]\) represents the phonetic realisation of phonological /wù/. This is interesting in view of the fact that one of the shapes of the post-verbal negation marker in closely related Hdi is wù (besides wà). The obvious tonal difference is attributable to an instances of regular “tone reversal” between grammatical morphemes in Central Lamang (as described in Wolff 1983) and Hdi (as described in Frajzyngier 2002) – cf. Wolff (2011/12 in press).
They didn’t do (it).

In East Chadic Kera, the negation marker tends to occupy clause-final position, only ideophones and modal particles would be allowed to follow it (note that Kera, again, has S-V-O order, so the subject pronoun precedes the verb like in Hausa):

(3) \[ \text{wà} \quad \text{hàmànà} \quad \text{kùsúkí} \quad \eta \quad \text{bà} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
3\text{SG.M} \\
\text{eat.PRF} \\
\text{meat} \\
\text{DEF} \\
\text{NEG}
\end{array} \]

He hasn’t eaten the meat.

Note, however, that not *\text{ba} is reconstructed as the general negation marker in Proto-Chadic even though it would appear to have a wider distribution in present-day languages (such as in Hausa, Kera and, in a restricted way, in Lamang), but rather *\text{wa} (as reflected in Lamang \text{wó} and Hdi \text{wù} ~ \text{wà}). In terms of Chadic linguistic history it may be interesting to take notice of the following remark by Paul Newman on the Chadic situation in general which is found somewhat hidden in his Hausa reference grammar (2002: 361):

“The typical pattern in Chadic is to have the negative at the end of the sentence, with or without a preverbal neg marker, and Proto-Chadic can almost certainly be reconstructed with a single neg marker at the end (Newman n.d.). The initial neg markers that are found in various Chadic languages have derived independently from a number of different sources, like the prohibitive, negative existential, etc.”

Therefore, if post-verbal position of the regular negative marker could be considered the genealogically inherited default situation in Chadic, it may be useful to not only analyse the conditions and principles of post-verbal negative marking in this family, but also look at the conditions under which the pre-verbal position is preferred – if at all occurring in a given Chadic language.

In terms of diachronic and wider cross-linguistic typological terms, therefore, the occurrence and relationship between post- and preverbal markers of negation would, most likely, make interesting data for the study of the Jespersen Cycle in which an originally non-negative marker eventually replaced the original negative marker with which it, in an intermediate stage,
once co-occurred. In case in point would be the Hausa post-verbal marker \textit{bá} which has diachronically replaced, as it would appear, the Proto-Chadic post-verbal negative marker \textit{*wa}.

\textbf{4. Occurrence and position of the post-verbal negation marker \textit{bá} in Hausa}

Hausa has, first of all, two quite distinct types of negation which can be neatly grouped apart as follows:

A. The “prohibitive” negation of the subjunctive TAM paradigm which is also used for negative commands.

The marker is a clause-initial adverbial \textit{kádà/kár} which, as such, would not qualify as a proper negation marker. The “prohibitive”, therefore, will not enter into our following discussion of pre- and post-verbal negation patterns.

B. The set of “proper” negations making use of the genuine negation marker \textit{*ba} which occurs in different variants (pertaining to tone and vowel length) and in different syntactic patterns.

There are three subtypes of \textit{ba}-negation which share in the negation of several syntactic constructions, of which one would fully qualify as displaying “post-verbal negation” in the truest sense. This would be the subtype involving the negation of non-nominalized verbal TAM constructions; this negational subtype is shared, however, with the negation of equational clauses, for term and term focus negation, and also for full sentence negation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Single Marker</th>
<th>Disjunctive Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Predicate</td>
<td>\textit{báa}...: VN-based TAM \textit{(continuous aspect involving nominal predicates)}</td>
<td>\textit{bá(a)...bá}': Verb-stem based TAMs with non-nominalized verb forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal Predicate, Term Focus, Full Sentence</td>
<td>\textit{báabù/báà}... : Existential, HAVE clauses, etc.</td>
<td>Equational clause negation, term negation (NP, PP, ADV, etc.), term focus negation, full sentence negation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{7 The length of the vowel of the first \textit{bá(a) is determined by what follows (cf. Newman 2000: 357).} }
If some typological speculation is allowed here, one could argue along the following lines.

1. The wide range of domains synchronically negated by the disjunctive bàa...bá type suggests, first of all, to view this as reflecting the diachronic default negation pattern against which the non-disjunctive types would appear to be specialized options. This would conform to Newman’s quoted (yet unpublished?) idea that the regular position of the negative in Chadic is clause-final, and that the first occurrence of bàa is of secondary nature and would need to be explained in diachronic terms. (With regard to the Jespersen Cycle, one would further have to explain when, why, and how the final negative marker *wa came to be replaces by the originally non-negstive marker bá.)

2. The motivation for introducing the first bàa into what should then become the synchronic default disjunctive negation pattern could be somehow related to “focus”. If so, then term focus (both in situ and with fronting) and predication focus (verbal predicates without fronting) could have played a role. (Note than the predicate-focus TAM paradigms of the affirmative, namely completive and continuous, are not available in the negative.) This speculation is based on the theoretical assumption that “negation” as such attracts “focus” and, therefore, disallows co-occurrence with focus-marked forms of the affirmative!

3. The transfer to both equational clauses and full sentence negation (both characterized by using the stabilizer nee/cee which also plays a role in term focus marking) would be explained as cases of analogy based on the option or obligation of using the stabilizer nee/cee.

It may, therefore, be also interesting to learn which constructions and domains are NOT governed by the synchronic “default” disjunctive pattern, i.e., which features are shared by those constructions which disallow disjunctive negation in Hausa. These are clearly related to basically non-verbal clauses, if we count the use of nominalized verbs in the continuous aspect paradigm with “non-verbal” clauses. Again, there are basically two types of non-discontinuous negation:

(4) Existential clauses

(4a) Existential clauses without any overt complement, i.e., the negation of the affirmative existential particle by its negative counterpart:
Existential clauses with overt complement allow two variants of the negative marker: *báabù ~ báà:

```plaintext
báabù máì ~ báà máì
There isn’t any oil.
```

(5) *Continuous* aspect construction (involving either use of the nominalized verbs and “dynamic” nouns of verbal origin or characteristics, or non-verbal predicates of the HAVE, locative, and stative type)

(5a) “Verbal” subtype:

```plaintext
báa tà sóoyà kàazáa
NEG 3SG.F fry chicken
She is not frying chicken.
```

(5b) Non-verbal subtype:

```plaintext
bánkii báa yàa nân à wánnàn títìi
bank NEG SG.M LOC PREP DEM.NEAR street
The bank is not here on this street.
```

(5c) Dialectal variant of HAVE negation:

```plaintext
báa tà dà búzàà
bàà tà dà búzàà
NEG 3SG.F PREP visa
She doesn’t have a visa.
```

4.1 Disjunctive post-verbal negation *bàa...bá* with verbal predicates

Two general restrictions of occurrence have to be noted first of all: The disjunctive/post-verbal negation with verbal predicates is only allowed

- in the *indicative* mood (i.e., it is disallowed with the *subjunctive* mood paradigm), and

---

3 The full form *báabù* is often interpreted as being bimorphemic: negation *báà + àbù* ‘thing’. In addition, it remains an open historical question whether the original source of *báà* in Hausa is a loan from Kanuri (Newman 2000: 180).
- with fully verbal predicates, i.e., verb stems that have not been nominalized in order to function in the continuous aspect paradigm (which, formally, is based on the use of the so-called verbal noun and other nominalized forms of the verb, or non-verbal predicates).

Synchronically, therefore, Newman (2000: 357) can generalize: “Verb phrases of tensed sentences in TAMs other than the continuous and subjunctive are negated by use of the discontinuous marker bà(a)...bá.”

In verbal clauses, according to Newman (2000: 358ff),

“[t]he second bà typically occurs at the end of the basic VP, i.e., after such core arguments as locative goals and direct and indirect objects, but before adverbial clauses … Simple adverbs (e.g., of time, place, or instrument) usually fall within the scope of the second bà...”

Interestingly,

“[i]n some northern dialects, the second neg occurs earlier in the sentence before direct objects, e.g.,

(6) bà mú káamà bà ɓàraáwòn
= [SH] bà mú káamà ɓàraáwọn bà

We didn’t catch the thief.

Some temporal adverbs or adverb phrases...can occur either before or after the bà with essentially the same meaning. The inherently negative adverb tüküná ‘not yet’, on the other hand, occurs more frequently after the bà.” (op. cit.)

Newman (op. cit.) observes a few more restrictions governing the position of the second bà, for illustrative examples cf. the original source, such as

- In a sentence containing an indirect question, the second bà may occur at the end of the entire sentence, although some speakers, especially of WH dialects, prefer to have the bà earlier, right after the matrix clause.
- A complement clause typically occurs after the bà, although sentences with the bà at the very end are possible, depending, inter alia, on the length of the complement...
- The negated VP does not have to be in a main clause; it can also be in an embedded or subordinate clause...
- If two negative sentences co-occur in such a way that the second bà should occur twice in succession, one of them is dropped by a process of morphological haplology, i.e., the one bà does double duty…
- There is no problem, however, with a final bà being immediately followed by an initial bà(a) in the next clause, nor of the final bà being followed by the morpheme bà functioning as a question marker…
- If two negative sentences are conjoined, each comes with its own neg marking…
- If, on the other hand, two VPs are negated, there is only one neg marker, which encompasses the entire sentence… An alternative for dialects that tend to have the second bà earlier in the sentence is to place the bà after the first of the conjoined VPs…”, cf.

(7) bà mù cí mún sháa bà ~ bà mù cí bà mún sháa

We didn’t eat and drink.

4.2 Disjunctive negation bàa...bá outside the domain of verbal predicates

The same disjunctive negation is used for the following four syntactic structures:

1. Equational and identificational constructions (using the stabilizer nee/cee);\(^9\)
2. Term focus (with front shifting) with optional use of the stabilizer nee/cee;
3. Sentence negation (using the stabilizer nee [optionally omitted in certain cases]);
4. Term focus \textit{in situ} for adverbs, prepositional phrases, NPs (without using the stabilizer).

Ad 1:

(8) ítá bàa ’yáatáa bà cèe
3SG.F NEG daughter-my NEG STAB

She is not my daughter.

\(^9\) The shape and tone of the stabilizer is governed by gender agreement (cee for SG.F, nee for SG.M and Pl.C.G.) and immediate environment (polar tone with regard to the preceding syllable).
4.3 Hausa and cross-linguistic typological comparison

The first question which emerges from Hausa for cross-linguistic typological comparison, is the following:

1. Are the restrictions governing the use and position of post-verbal bà in Hausa matched in some significant way by observations from other (African) languages?

A priori one would expect a negative answer if the assumption was correct that clause-final (or near clause-final) position of the negative was an inherited feature from Proto-Chadic and not a marker of some kind for certain constructions.

The second question which emerges from Hausa for cross-linguistic typological comparison, is the following:

2. Are there any indications from other (African) languages that there should be some kind of typological parallelism between post-verbal negation patterns and certain focus constructions (such as term focus and predication focus), but also full sentence negation and equational clause negation?

The answer to this question would shed some light on the question whether the Hausa TAM system is indeed governed by predication focus (Hymes
and Watters 1984: *auxiliary focus* as has been discussed in Chadic literature.

The third question which emerges from Hausa for cross-linguistic typological comparison, is the following:

3. *Are the restrictions governing the use and position of non-post-verbal báà in Hausa matched in some significant way by observations from other (African) languages?*

The answer should be independent of the assumption whether báà was originally a loan from Kanuri. Note that Kanuri of Saharan genealogical affiliation and Chadic languages like Hausa share a long history of contact. Note, however, that Kanuri and Hausa differ with regard to the position of báà.

5. **The occurrence and position of the post-verbal negation marker *wu ~ *wa in Lamang-Hdi**\(^{10}\)

Both Lamang and Hdi have fairly rich inventories of negation sub-systems, which show a high degree of structural and etymological similarities, yet have developed remarkable differences. The two available monographic descriptions on Lamang and Hdi differ considerably in analysis, description, and explanations they offer. This may partly reflect genuine differences in linguistic structure, and partly be the result of quite different theoretical inclinations and approaches (cf. Wolff 2011 for a detailed critical review of Frajzyngier’s Hdi monograph). This is not too surprising given the observation that, from a typological point of view, Lamang and Hdi appear to encode fairly “exotic” semantic categories and functions that have not yet received much theoretical treatment in African linguistics, and they do so in complex ways.

5.1 Lamang

Wolff (1983) reports the existence of six types of negation, neatly grouped according to their respective scopes:

- One modal negation, i.e., “negative subjunctive” (better: *prohibitive* mood);

\(^{10}\) The following section is largely based on Wolff (2009).
two constituent negations:
(a) predicative NP negation,
(b) [item in] sentence perspective negation;

three clause negations:
(i) independent clause negation,
(ii) embedded clause negation,
(iii) final complement clause negation.

I would now add a seventh type called negative “tagging”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEGATION TYPES</th>
<th>MARKING DEVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. general clause negation | clause-final general negation marker  
\[\underbrace{\text{}/wú/}^{/} \ # > [\text{wó} \sim \text{-uwó}]^{/} \ #]  |
| 2. disjunctive negation frame (I) for clauses involving [+focus] marking | the negative focus marker /\text{b-à/} follows the focused constituent and combines with the general clause-final negative marker \text{wó}  
\[\underbrace{\text{}/}^{/} \ # \ # [\text{+focus}] \text{ bà} \ # \ # \ \text{wó} \ #]  |
| 3. disjunctive negation frame (II) for clauses involving [-focus] marking | the auxiliary verb \text{xà- “exist” combines with the general negative marker wó}  
\[\underbrace{\text{}/}^{/} \ # \ # \ \text{xà} \ # \ # \ \text{wó} \ #]  |
| 4. dependent clause negation | negative conjunction (“without”)  
\[\underbrace{\text{}/}^{/} \ # \ # /\text{kwál/} > [\text{kwól} \sim \text{kól}] \ #\ #]  |
| 5. negative “tagging” | the negative focus marker /\text{b(a/-}} combines with the general clause-final negative marker wó, with or without the term focus marker [-é]  
\[\underbrace{\text{}/}^{/} \ # \ # \ \text{búwó} \ # \ #]  |
| [+-focus] | \[\underbrace{\text{}/}^{/} \ # \ # \ \text{béwó} \ # \ #]  |
| 6. prohibitive | obligatory marking of referentiality + completive; tonal distinctions with some extension suffixes |
| 7. final complement clause | special conjunction xi “lest” |

---

[11] Here we are, most likely, dealing with a phonetically fused cleft construction involving the Cop[ula] *YA which would account for the palatalization effect on the vowel /\text{a/} > \[\text{e}, \ i.e.*/…bao-YA-wú/ > \#béwó\#).
Out of these seven, only five belong to the negation domain proper, since both the prohibitive and the final complement clause negation do not make use of genuine negation markers. Further, negative tagging and the dependent claus negation could be disregarded for the present paper since they show little or no relationship to “post-verbal negation” in a narrower sense. This leaves us with three types of truly “post-verbal negation” in Lamang:

1. general clause negation  
   $$\text{#}$$ ______ /wú/ $$\text{#}$$

2. [+focus] disjunctive negation frame  
   $$\text{#}$$ ___ [+focus] bà ___ /wú/ $$\text{#}$$

3. [-focus] disjunctive negation frame  
   $$\text{#}$$ /xà(-dī)/ ______ /wú/ $$\text{#}$$

5.2 Hdi

Frajzyngier (2002) reports the existence of the following negation types and marking devices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEGATION TYPE</th>
<th>MARKING DEVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. disjunctive negation frame (I) for pragmatically independent clauses, incl. identificational and equational clauses (i.e. with nominal predicates)</td>
<td>the negative focus marker /á/ follows the focused constituent and combines with the general clause-final negative marker wù/wà12 $$\text{#}$$ ___ á ___ wù-wà $$\text{#}$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. disjunctive negation frame (II) for pragmatically dependent clauses, incl. “possessive clauses”</td>
<td>the auxiliary verb xàdū combines with the general negative marker wù/wà $$\text{#}$$ xàdū ___ wù-wà $$\text{#}$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. alternative negation of dependent clauses</td>
<td>grammaticalization of auxiliary verb kwálá &gt; kùl, in combination with auxiliary kwálá or xàdū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. negative “tagging”</td>
<td>general clause-final negation marker ...., wù-wà $$\text{#}$$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prohibitive in Hdi (Frajzyngier 2002: 287ff) carries none of the above negative markers and deserves special attention. Like for Lamang, we could disregard negative tagging and the alternative negation of dependent clauses for the present paper since they show little or no relationship to “post-

---

12 Hdi wù appears to be the immediate cognate of Lamang wó < /wú/. The alternative form wà would, therefore, need explanation in the bilateral comparison. On the other hand, wa in Hdi corresponds directly to the Proto-Chadic reconstruction of the negative marker.
verbal negation” in a narrower sense. This leaves us with two types of truly “post-verbal negation” in Hdi:

| 1. independent clause negation | ##____{+focus} á ____ wù-wà ## |
| 2. dependent clause negation   | ## xàdû _________ wù-wà ## |

Obviously, these two negation strategies correspond to two of the three post-verbal negation strategies in Lamang (to the exception of the general clause negation which as such doesn’t appear to exist in Hdi).

Negation in the two closely related Central Chadic languages Lamang and Hdi is, first of all, deeply intertwined with issues of focus and clause types, at least as far as the unmarked indicative mood is concerned. Strictly speaking, marked modality and negation are mutually exclusive, both languages have developed a prohibitive mood, which is affirmative in appearance, i.e. does not contain any of the negative markers used in the indicative mood, but has negative semantics. We could, therefore, say that in senso strictu the negation domain in these languages is restricted to the indicative mood. (This, by the way, would also apply to West Chadic Hausa and East Chadic Kera!)

Further, negation interacts in a systematic way with aspectuality through the intrinsic focus characteristics of some of the aspectual forms, namely the perfective and the progressive/continuous. Indirectly, therefore, negation also interacts with referentiality since referentiality links up again with aspectuality and modality. (Referentiality is one of the complex features of verbal grammar in some Central Chadic languages, including Lamang-Hdi.)

Both languages have developed, in an almost parallel fashion, several negation strategies:

- A general & simple negation (only in Lamang);
- A disjunctive [+focus] negation frame;
- A disjunctive [-focus] negation frame;
- A dependent clause negation by grammaticalized auxiliary (*kwala).

In addition, we observe negative tagging in both languages. Lamang has further developed a special contrastive term focus negation strategy.

Interestingly from a dialectological point of view, these negation strategies (plus the prohibitive) show some remarkable differences between the two systems, which are summarized roughly in the following tables. The first
Table gives the underlying categories and marking devices, the second table displays the actual realizations in Lamang and Hdi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEGATION STRATEGIES</th>
<th>NEGATION MARKING DEVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. general &amp; simple</td>
<td>**/**wu/ ##</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. disjunctive [+focus] frame</td>
<td>*/(b)a____wu/ ##</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. contrastive term focus</td>
<td>*/_ba-YA____wu/ ##</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. disjunctive [-focus] frame</td>
<td>*/xa-____wu/ ##</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. negative tagging</td>
<td>**/**kwala/ “lack”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “without”</td>
<td>grammaticalization of auxiliary verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. prohibitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAMANG</th>
<th>HDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. clause-final negative marker, no inherent focus constraints; aorist and IMPERFECTIVE (extended stems) clause negation</td>
<td>[1. not available]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____/**wu/ ##</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. intrinsic [+focus] aspect form negation (PERFECTIVE); negation of equational and qualitative clauses</td>
<td>2.+3. pragmatically independent (PERFECTIVE) negative clauses; negation of equational &amp; identificational clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___b-à___wó ##</td>
<td>___a___wù (~wà) ##</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. combination of focus-negation marker -b plus contrastive focus marker -é (&lt; *YA COPULA) plus general negation marker wó</td>
<td>4. dependent negative clauses with verbomnominal predicate, negative IMPERFECTIVE clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____b-é __ wó ##</td>
<td>xàðú____wù (~wà) ##</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____béwó ##</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. predicative NP negation, IMPERFECTIVE (simple stems) clause negation; non-verbal; locative &amp; existential clause negation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of these seven negation patterns, the first four would represent “post-verbal negation” in a narrower sense. Lamang has all four negations, Hdi only has two of them. Hdi, quite obviously, has simplified its negation system to correspond to a [±focus] dichotomy. Lamang, on the other hand, has created two subtypes of the [+focus] negation, i.e., according to whether we are dealing with predication focus or contrastive term focus. Further, Lamang has created or maintained a simple negation pattern which is reserved for clauses which would disallow any kind of focus marking.

| 5. combination of focus-negation marker -b with general negation marker wó | 5. simple negation marker || 5. simple negation marker || \( \ldots, \ wù (~wà) \) ##
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| \( \ldots, búwó \) ## | 6. pragmatically dependent clauses; narrative (auxiliary constr.) use negative conjunction: kwol ~ kol „without“ | 6. pragmaticlaly dependent clauses kùl “without”, always together with negative auxiliary (kwálá, xàd ú) | 7. mà+ aorist/IMPERFECTIVE [+/- referential] options
<p>| 6. embedded/relative clauses; narrative (auxiliary constr.) use negative conjunction: kwol ~ kol „without“ | | | |
| 7. special paradigm (tonality!) obligatorily marked for [+referential,+completive] | | | |
| 1. simple negation | <strong>wó ##</strong> clause-final negative marker, no inherent focus constraints; aorist and IMPERFECTIVE (extended stems) clause negation | [not available] | 1. simple negation ||
| 2. [+focus]: predication focus negation | <strong>b-à wó ##</strong> intrinsic [+focus] aspect form negation (PERFECTIVE); <strong>b __ wó ##</strong> negation of equational and qualitative clauses | <strong>a wù (~wà) ##</strong> pragmatically independent (PERFECTIVE) negation clauses; negation of equational &amp; identificational clauses |
| 3. [+focus]: contrastive term focus negation | <strong>b-é wó ##</strong> combination of focus-negation marker -b plus contrastive focus marker -é (&lt; *YA COPULA) plus general negation marker wó | <strong>béwó ##</strong> combination of focus-negation marker -b with general negation marker wó |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. [-focus] negation</th>
<th>xà(-de)____wó ##</th>
<th>xàdú_____wù (~wà) ##</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>predicative NP negation, IMPERFECTIVE (simple stems) clause negation; non-verbal; locative &amp; existential clause negation</td>
<td>dependent negative clauses with verbonominal predicate, negative IMPERFECTIVE clauses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ad 1:

(12) **LAMANG** kws-àa-xán t-ím wó
reach-EXT-3PL OBJ-water NEG
they did not reach the water
(AFF. *kws-àa-xán t-imí “they reached the water”)

(13) **HDI: NOT APPLICABLE**

Ad 2:

(14) **LAMANG** tsxúrá-b-ì wó
sit:PRF-NEG:FOC-1SG NEG
I have not sat down
(aff. tsá-tsxúr-í+[PredFoc] “I have sat (down)”)  

(15) **HDI** lá-á-ká ndá tā tsá wù
go-NEG:FOC-2SG with PREP DEF NEG
You did not go there?

Ad 3:

(16) **LAMANG** γén-b-é tsóts-ì wò
tongue-NEG:FOC- cut[PLURACT]:IMPF-1SG NEG TERMFOC
I don’t keep lying
(lit. “[it is] not the tongue [that] I keep cutting”)

(17) **HDI** hlà-á tā-skwá-tsí wà gú yà
cow-NEG:FOC IMPF-buy -3SG NEG goat COP
It is not a cow that he bought, it is a goat
Ad 4:

(18) **LAMANG** xà-kà tá-mt-úkú wó

exist:NEG-2SG iter-die-STATIVE:NOM NEG

you are not dying (again)

(AFF. *tá-mt-úk-ká “you are dying again”)

(19) **Hdi** xàd-xɔŋ tà-ksá-f-tà dágálá wà

exist:NEG-3PL IMPF-catch-EXT-REF many NEG

they do not catch many

(AFF. *tà-ksá-f-tà xɔŋ dágálá “they are catching many”)

With regard to compatibility of formatives with negative markers, the following observations were made:

- Intrinsic [+focus] marking through verb reduplication is incompatible with negation marking (Lamang and Hdi PERFECTIVE, Hdi PERFECTIVE).

- Central Lamang allows at least four TAM markers to co-occur with negative markers:
  
  (a) in the IMPERFECTIVE: iterative tá- (cf. cognate Hdi tà-), ingressive táɣàa-, continuous (ex-progressive) ŋf-;

  (b) in the PERFECTIVE: habilitative -tà- (“be able to”).

- The only TAM marker available to combine with negative markers in Hdi is the IMPERFECTIVE prefix tà- (cf. cognate Lamang tá-). It is interesting to note that it is the prefix *ta- which is of old age in the family and can be safely reconstructed for Proto-Chadic (Newman 1990).

**5.3 Lamang-Hdi and cross-linguistic typological comparison**

The first set of questions which emerge from Lamang-Hdi for cross-linguistic typological comparison, is the following:

1. *How widespread or “natural”, in a cross-linguistic perspective, is the sensitivity for and relationship between, (post-verbal) negation patterns and (a) aspectuality, (b) focus, and (c) pragmatic dependency of clauses?*
The second set of questions which emerge from Lamang-Hdi for cross-linguistic typological comparison, is the following:

2. *How widespread or “natural”, in a cross-linguistic perspective, is the incompatibility between (post-verbal) negation patterns and TAM markers, particularly in relationship, again, with intrinsic predication focus marking (for instance with regard to PERFECTIVE and, possibly, PROGRESSIVE/CONTINUOUS)?*

6. The occurrence and position of the post-verbal negation marker *ba* in Kera

The only source available to me for Kera is the monograph by Karen Ebert (1979) which contains a rather short yet informative descriptive account of negation. Clearly, East Chadic Kera uses post-verbal negation, and does so, like Hausa, in both absolute and disjunctive shapes. In the case of the negation by post-verbal *bà*, Ebert identifies it as negation of the VP (“Negation der Verbalphrase”, p. 222) and adds the observation that *bà* may only be followed by modal particles and ideophones (cf. ex. 20).¹³

(3) \( \) wo hàmàn̄ kúsúkí ñ bà
3SG.M eat.PRF meat DEF NEG

He hasn’t eaten the meat.

(20) kaa-\(n\) kéérá ñ á ̀sn-ú hóy ñ b̀ tég̣ém...
people-REL Kera DEF PRET know-3SG.M ever DEF NEG MOD

The Kera people had never seen him before at all...

Term negation requires the disjunctive pattern *paapá...bà* which frames the term to be negated.

(21) \( \) tó paapá píš bà
3.SG.M NEG\(_1\) good NEG\(_2\)

It is not good.

¹³ Ebert (1979) does not provide interlinear translations. The following examples contain my own interlinearizations and should be accepted as tentative only.
Like Hausa báabù, the NEG₁ paapá also serves as a negative answer to questions and to negate the expression “there is/are”. Note, however, that in Kera the negation again occurs in clause-final position (unlike in Hausa).

(22) hàm-é paapá
    eat-VN NEG
    There is no food.

7. Summary and Conclusion

It is at least remarkable to observe that post-verbal negation occurs in all three major branches of Chadic. This has led to the assumption that post-verbal negation would be reconstructable for Proto-Chadic.

The examples from the selected languages further suggest that, in Chadic, there might be a (synchronous) tendency for post-verbal negation to cooccur with disjunctive negation patterns involving both pre- and post-verbal positions for the disjunctive negation markers. The data that I have looked at also suggest that information structure, i.e. the marking of various kinds of focus, has a considerable role to play in explaining the variation in negation patterns.

Less so for cross-linguistic typology, but first of all for historical and comparative linguistics within Chadic, remains the question of how the widespread negation marker *ba relates to the reconstructed Proto-Chadic negation marker *wa – and whether this has something to do with the intrinsic relationship between negation and focus, and how, eventually, the possibly focus-related marker *ba came to be generalized as general negation marker (as instance of the Jespersen Cycle).

The following question for further cross-linguistic analysis would appear to arise from looking at the selected Chadic languages:

1. Are the restrictions governing the use and position of post-verbal bá in Hausa, wó-wù-wà in Lamang-Hdi, and bà in Kera, matched in some significant way by observations from other (African) languages?

2. Are the restrictions governing the use and position of non-post-verbal báà and báabù in Hausa, bùwó and bèwó in Lamang, and paapá in Kera, matched in some significant way by observations from other (African) languages?
3. Are there any indications from other (African) languages that there should be some kind of typological parallelism between post-verbal negation patterns and certain focus constructions (such as term focus and predication focus), but also, possibly, for full sentence negation and equational clause negation?

4. How widespread or “natural”, in a cross-linguistic perspective, is the sensitivity for and relationship between (post-verbal) negation patterns and (a) aspectuality, (b) focus, and (c) pragmatic dependency of clauses?

5. How widespread or “natural”, in a cross-linguistic perspective, is the incompatibility between (post-verbal) negation patterns and TAM markers, particularly in relationship, again, with intrinsic predication focus marking (for instance with regard to PERFECTIVE and, possibly, PROGRESSIVE/CONTINUOUS)?

It is hoped that the research following from this workshop will allow to throw some light also on these questions.

**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>adverb(ial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF.</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.G.</td>
<td>communis generis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNT</td>
<td>continuous (aspect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite MARKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT</td>
<td>extension (verbal derivative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future (tense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>imperfective (aspect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITER</td>
<td>iterative (aspect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>modal particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>direct object marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLURACT</td>
<td>pluractical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>prepositional phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREDFOC</td>
<td>predication focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRET</td>
<td>preterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>perfective (aspect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
<td>referential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Standard Hausa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAB</td>
<td>stabilizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>tense/aspect/mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERMFOC</td>
<td>contrastive term focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN</td>
<td>verbal noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>Western Hausa (dialects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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