On Post-Verbal Negation in Chadic

H. Ekkehard Wolff
Professor emeritus, Leipzig University, Germany
Visiting Professor, Adama Science & Technology University, Ethiopia

1. Introduction

Post-verbal, respectively post-predicate or clause-final, negation patterns are found in a fair number of Chadic languages.[1] 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.

---

[1] 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]

- West Chadic: Hausa (cf. Wolff 1993, Newman 2000, Jaggar 2001)
- Central Chadic: Lamang-Hdi (cf. Wolff 1983, 2009; Frajzyngier 2002)
- 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;
- It is one of the best documented African languages priding itself of three voluminous modern reference grammars (Wolff 1993, Newman 2000, Jaggar 2001).

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 idiosyncrasies 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 straight-forward 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)   **yáarìnyàa   bàa   tà   dáawóo   bá**

        girl   NEG$_1$ 3SG.F   return   NEG$_2$

                        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 **/wú/**. 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).

(2)   **màná-xáŋ**   **wó**

    do-3PL   NEG

    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)   **wə**   **hàmàŋ**   **kúsúkí**   **ŋ**   **bà**

    3SG.M   eat.PRF   meat   DEF NEG

    He hasn't eaten the meat.

Note, however, that not ***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 ***wa** (as reflected in Lamang **wó** and Hdi **wù ~ 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 occuring 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 **bá** which has diachronically replaced, as it would appear, the Proto-Chadic post-verbal negative marker ***wa**.

4. Occurence and position of the post-verbal negation marker *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 **kádà/kâr** 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 ***ba** which occurs in different variants (pertaining to tone and vowel length) and in different syntactic patterns.

There are three subtypes of **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:

DOMAIN	SINGLE MARKER	DISJUNCTIVE MARKER
VERBAL PREDICATE	**báa...:** VN-based TAM (*continuous* aspect involving nominal predicates)	**bà(a)...bá[7]:** Verb-stem based TAMs with non-nominalized verb forms)
NON-VERBAL PREDICATE, TERM FOCUS, FULL SENTENCE	**báabù/báà...** : Existential, HAVE clauses, etc.	Equational clause negation, term negation (NP, PP, ADV, etc.), term focus negation, full sentence negation

---

[7] The length of the vowel of the first **bà(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 rreplaces 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:

àkwái	there is/are
báabù	there isn't/aren't any[8]

(4b) Existential clauses with overt complement allow two variants of the negative marker: **báabù ~ báà:**

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:

báa	**tà**	**sóoyà**	**kàazáa**
NEG	3SG.F	fry	chicken

She is not frying chicken.

(5b) Non-verbal subtype:

bánkìi	**báa**	**yàa**	**nân**	**à**	**wánnàn**	**tíitìi**
bank	NEG	SG.M	LOC	PREP	DEM.NEAR	street

The bank is not here on this street.

(5c) Dialectal variant of HAVE negation:

báa	**tà**	**dà**	**bíizàa**
báà	**tá**	**dà**	**bíizàa**
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

---

[8] 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 **bá** 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 **bá**…".

Interestingly,

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

(6)   **bà mù káamà bá ɓàráawòn**

   = [SH] **bà mù káamà ɓàráawòn bá**

   We didn't catch the thief.

> Some temporal adverbs or adverb phrases…can occur either before or after the **bá** with essentially the same meaning. The inherently negative adverb **tùkùná** 'not yet', on the other hand, occurs more frequently after the **bá**." (op. cit.)

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

- In a sentence containing an indirect question, the second **bá** may occur at the end of the entire sentence, although some speakers, especially of WH dialects, prefer to have the **bá** earlier, right after the matrix clause.
- A complement clause typically occurs after the **bá**, although sentences with the **bá** 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 **bá** should occur twice in succession, one of them is dropped by a process of morphological haplology, i.e., the one **bá** does double duty…
- There is no problem, however, with a final **bá** being immediately followed by an initial **bà(a)** in the next clause, nor of the final **bá** being followed by the morpheme **bá** 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 **bá** earlier in the sentence is to place the **bá** after the first of the conjoined VPs…", cf.

> (7) **bà mù cí mún sháa bá ~ bà mù cí bá 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 *in situ* for adverbs, prepositional phrases, NPs (without using the stabilizer).

Ad 1:

(8) | **ítá** | **bàa** | **'yáatáa** | **bá** | **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).

Ad 2:

(9) **bàa Tàláatù (cée) tá zàagée shì bá**
NEG Talatu STAB 3SG.F insult 3SG.M NEG

It is not Talatu who insulted him.

Ad 3:

(10) **bàa ráshìn náamàa (née) záì káshè mùtûm bá**
NEG lack-GEN meat STAB FUT-3SG.M kill person NEG

It is not that lack of meat will kill a person.

Ad 4:

(11) **tánàa gáníi (àmmáa) bàa sòosái bá**
3SG.F-CNT see but NEG clearly NEG

She sees (but) not clearly.

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 **bá** 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 occurence 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".

NEGATION TYPES	MARKING DEVICES
1. general clause negation	clause-final general negation marker ____**/wú/ ## > [wó ~ -uwó] ##**
2. disjunctive negation frame (I) for clauses involving [+focus] marking	the negative focus marker **/b-à/** follows the focused constituent and combines with the general clause-final negative marker **wó** **## ____[+focus] bà _____ wó ##**
3. disjunctive negation frame (II) for clauses involving [-focus] marking	the auxiliary verb **xà-** "exist" combines with the general negative marker **wó** **## xà- _____ wó ##**
4. dependent clause negation	negative conjunction ("without") **## /kwál/ > [kwól ~ kól] _____ ##**
5. negative "tagging" [-focus] [+focus]	the negative focus marker **/b(a)-/** combines with the general clause-final negative marker **wó**, with or without the term focus marker **[-é]** **búwó ##** **béwó**[11] **##**
6. prohibitive	obligatory marking of referentiality + completive; tonal distinctions with some extension suffixes
7. final complement clause	special conjunction **xí** "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 **/a/ > [e]**, i.e.***/…ba-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	##_____ /**wú**/ ##
2. [+focus] disjunctive negation frame	##_____[+focus] **bà** ____ /**wú**/ ##
3. [-focus] disjunctive negation frame	## /**xà(-ɗì)**/_____ /**wú**/ ##

5.2 Hdi

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

NEGATION TYPE	MARKING DEVICES
1. disjunctive negation frame (I) for pragmatically independent clauses, incl. identificational and equational clauses (i.e. with nominal predicates)	the negative focus marker /**á**/ follows the focused constituent and combines with the general clause-final negative marker **wù~wà**[12] ## ____ **á** ____ **wù~wà** ##
2. disjunctive negation frame (II) for pragmatically dependent clauses, incl. "possessive clauses"	the auxiliary verb **xàɗú** combines with the general negative marker **wù~wà** ## **xàɗú** ____ **wù~wà** ##
3. alternative negation of dependent clauses	grammaticalization of auxiliary verb **kwálá > kùl**, in combination with auxiliary **kwálá** or **xàɗú**
4. negative "tagging"	general clause-final negation marker **…, wù~wà** ##

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 negtive 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	## **xàɗú** _____ **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 apectuality 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:

NEGATION STRATEGIES	NEGATION MARKING DEVICES
1. general & simple	_____*/**wu**/ ##
2. disjunctive [+focus] frame	*/__(**b**)**a**__**wu**/ ##
3. contrastive term focus	*/__**ba-YA**__**wu**/ ##
4.disjunctive [-focus] frame	*/**xa-** ____**wu**/ ##
5. negative tagging	
6. "without"	grammaticalization of auxiliary verb */**kwala**/ "lack"
7. prohibitive	

LAMANG	HDI
1. clause-final negative marker, no inherent focus constraints; *aorist* and IMPERFECTIVE (extended stems) clause negation _____*/**wu**/ ##	[1. not available]
2. intrinsic [+focus] aspect form negation (PERFECTIVE); ___**b-à**___**wó** ## negation of equational and qualitative clauses ___**b** ___**wó** ##	2.+3. pragmatically independent (PERFECTIVE) negative clauses; negation of equational & identificational clauses ___**a**___**wù (~wà)** ##
3. combination of focus-negation marker -**b** plus contrastive focus marker -**é** (< *-**YA** COPULA) plus general negation marker **wó** ___**b-é** __ **wó** ## ___ **béwó** ##	
4. predicative NP negation, IMPERFECTIVE (simple stems) clause negation; non-verbal; locative & existential clause negation **xà(-ɗe)**_____**wó** ##	4. dependent negative clauses with verbonominal predicate, negative IMPERFECTIVE clauses **xàɗú**_____**wù (~wà)** ##

5. combination of focus-negation marker **-b** with general negation marker **wó** **…, búwó ##**	5. simple negation marker **…, wù (~wà) ##**
6. embedded/relative clauses; *narrative* (auxiliary constr.) use negative conjunction: **kwol ~ kol** „without"	6. pragmatically dependent clauses **kùl** "without", always together with negative auxiliary (**kwálá, xàɗ ú**)
7. special paradigm (tonality!) obli-gatorily marked for [+referential,+completive]	7. **mà**+ *aorist*/IMPERFECTIVE [+/- referential] options

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 sys-tem 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 re-served for clauses which would disallow any kind of focus marking.

1. simple negation	___**wó ##** clause-final negative marker, no inherent focus constraints; *aorist* and IMPERFECTIVE (extended stems) clause negation	[not available]
2. [+focus]: predication focus nega-tion	___**b-à___wó ##** intrinsic [+focus] aspect form negation (PERFECTIVE); ___**b ___wó ##** negation of equational and quali-tative clauses	___**a___wù (~wà) ##** pragmatically independent (PERFECTIVE) negative clauses; negation of equational & identificational clauses
3. [+focus]: contrastive term focus negation	___**b-é __ wó ##** ___ **béwó ##** combination of focus-negation marker **-b** plus contrastive focus marker **-é (< *-YA** COPULA) plus general negation marker **wó**	

4. [-focus] negation	**xà(-ɗe)_____wó ##**	**xàɗú_____wù (~wà) ##**
	predicative NP negation, IMPERFECTIVE (simple stems) clause negation; non-verbal; locative & existential clause negation	dependent negative clauses with verbonominal predicate, negative IMPERFECTIVE clauses

Ad 1:

(12) LAMANG **kws-àa-xáŋ**   **t-ím**   **wó**

                reach-EXT-3PL   OBJ-water   NEG

                they did not reach the water
                (AFF. ***kws-àa-xáŋ t-ímí** "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**   **tà**   **tsá**   **wù**

                go-NEG:FOC-2SG   with   PREP   DEF   NEG
                You did not go there?

Ad 3:

(16) LAMANG **ɣén-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**   **tà-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   **xàɗ-xə̀ŋ**   **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 xə̀ŋ 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 PROGRESSIVE).

- 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) **ŋ́**-;

  (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 famliy 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 occurence 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) **wə   hàmàŋ   kúsúkí   ŋ   bà**
    3SG.M   eat.PRF   meat   DEF   NEG

   He hasn't eaten the meat.

(20) **kaa-nə   kéerá   ŋ   á   ə́sn-ú   hóy   ŋ   bə̀   tə́gə̀m...**

   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   pís   bà**
    3.SG.M   NEG₁   good   NEG₂

   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 (synchronic) 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 relationsship 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, **búwó** and **béwó** 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 als, 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

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

References

Ebert, Karen H. 1979. *Sprache und Tradition der Kera (Tschad). Teil III: Grammatik*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt (with Erin Shay). 2002. *A Grammar of Hdi*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Güldemann, Tom. 2008. The Macro-Sudan belt: towards identifying a linguistic area in northern sub-Saharan Africa. In: *A Linguistic Geography of Africa*, ed. by B. Heine and D. Nurse, 151-185. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyman, Larry and John R. Watters. 1984. Auxiliary focus. *Studies in African Linguistics* 15: 233-273.

Jaggar, Philip J. 2001. *Hausa*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Newman, P. 1990. *Nominal and Verbal Plurality in Chadic*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Newman, P. 2000. *The Hausa Language. An Encyclopedic Reference Grammar.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Wolff, H. Ekkehard. 1983. *A Grammar of the Lamang Language (Gwàɗ Làmàŋ).* (Afrikanistische Forschungen, 10.) Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin.

Wolff, H. Ekkehard. 1993. *Referenzgrammatik des Hausa*. Zur Begleitung des Fremdsprachenunterrichts und Einführung in das Selbststudium. Münster-Hamburg: LIT.

Wolff, H. Ekkehard. 2009. The impact of clause types and focus control, aspect, modality, and referentiality on negation in Lamang and Hdi (Central Chadic). In: *Negation Patterns in West African Languages and Beyond*, ed. by N. Cyffer, E Ebermann, G. Ziegelmeyer, 21-56. (Typological Studies in Language 87.) Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wolff, H. Ekkehard. 2011 (submitted 2004). Language Variation, Theoretical Preoccupations and the Lamang-Hdi Language Continuum in Central Chadic. Review of Zygmunt Frajzyngier with Erin Shay: A Grammar of Hdi. (Mouton Grammar Library 21.) Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 2002. *Afrika und Übersee* 90 (2008/09): 213-258.

Wolff, H. Ekkehard. 2011/12 (in press). On the diachronics of Chadic tone systems: From pitch to tone in Lamang-Hdi. In: *Topics in Chadic Linguistics VI*, ed. by Henry Tourneux. (Chadic Linguistics – Linguistique tchadique – Tschadistik Vol. 7.) Köln: Rüdiger Köppe.