

The historical relation between clause-final negation markers and phasal polarity expressions in Sub-Saharan Africa

Dmitry Idiatov
LLACAN (CNRS – USPC/INALCO)

e-mail: dmitry.idiatov@cnrs.fr

Dmitry Idiatov
LLACAN – UMR 8135 du CNRS
7, rue Guy Môquet – BP 8
94801 Villejuif Cedex
France

Abstract

Clause-final negation markers, although typologically rare, can be found in a very wide range of languages of Sub-Saharan Africa. Given that clause-final negation markers tend to occupy the same constructional slot as phasal polarity expressions and that strong semantic and often also formal links are known to exist between phasal polarity expressions and negation, default clause-final negation markers may be expected to often develop out of phasal polarity expressions. However, this expectation is not borne out by the data available on the development of default clause-final negation markers in the languages of Sub-Saharan Africa. The paper discusses a number of cases from Mande languages where clause-final negation markers may be argued to be historically related to phasal polarity expressions. In line with the general rarity of the change from a phasal polarity expression to a default clause-final negation marker, when evolving into negation markers phasal polarity expressions tend to maintain the phasal element of their semantics or become restricted to certain TAM constructions. In those rare cases where phasal polarity expressions may be argued to have evolved into default clause-final negation markers, this evolution is not direct and necessarily proceeds through the addition (or foregrounding) of a free-choice indefinite semantic component (such as ‘not yet’ > ‘not ever yet, not on any occasion yet’) and the development of the implicature of an intersubjective operator processing hearer-sided expectations and presuppositions (such as ‘not ever yet, not on any occasion yet’ > ‘not at all, really not’).

Keywords: African languages, clause-final negation, historical linguistics, intersubjectivity, Jespersen cycle, Mande languages, negative polarity items, phasal polarity expressions, right periphery, semantic change, syntax

The historical relation between clause-final negation markers and phasal polarity expressions in Sub-Saharan Africa

1. Introduction¹

Clause-final negation markers are elements that may be used in the right periphery of negative verbal predications with clause scope negation but that do not appear in the corresponding positive predications and whose position is determined with respect to the clause as a whole.² A clear example of a clause-final negation marker is provided by the Gbaya Kara [gya]³ marker *ná* in (1) which is the sole marker of negation placed at the very end of the utterance, also following the subordinate clause which is not negated itself.

Gbaya Kara

(1) *?ám gbé sàdî há kóò kóm nój ná*

1SG kill\IPFV animal so.that wife POSS.1SG eat\IPFV NEG

‘I did not kill game to feed my wife (lit.: so that my wife eats)’ (Roulon-Doko 2012:5).

As I show in Idiatov (2018), clause-final negation markers form a clear areal pattern within Sub-Saharan Africa and typologically represent the most striking property of negation marking in Sub-Saharan Africa. On a world-wide scale, clause-final negation markers are much more unusual than post-verbal negation markers and multiple negation exponence, the other two features of negation

¹ This work is part of the projects LC2 “Areal phenomena in Northern Sub-Saharan Africa” and GL7 “Reconstruction, genealogy, typology and grammatical description in the world’s two biggest phyla: Niger-Congo and Austronesian” of the Labex EFL (program “Investissements d’Avenir” overseen by the French National Research Agency, reference: ANR-10-LABX-0083). I would like to thank Mark Van de Velde for his comments on an earlier version of this paper. Last but not least, I am grateful to the referees and the editor for their comments.

² See Idiatov (2018:122–133) for a discussion of various aspects of this definition.

³ The three-letter codes between square brackets after the name of language are ISO 639-3 language codes.

marking that have been shown to be common in Sub-Saharan Africa and whose distribution has also been argued to show a certain areal skewing (cf. Beyer 2009, Dryer 2009, Devos & van der Auwera 2013). As I argued elsewhere (Idiatov 2012a), clause-final negation markers in Sub-Saharan Africa tend to be characterized by a number of peculiarities in their morphosyntax and diachronic development that set them apart from similar markers elsewhere in the world. Some of these differences are more a matter of degree, yet some do seem to be more fundamental. For instance, clause-final negation markers in African languages are often associated with the presence of multiple negation exponence within a clause, most commonly double but sometimes also triple and occasionally quadruple. clause-final negation markers in Africa often happen to be morphosyntactically deficient as compared to more canonical grammatical markers in being optional or lacking in some types of clauses as conditioned by the TAM value of the predicate of the clause, the subordination status of the clause, the associated information structural and speech act type values or the discourse type that the clause belongs to (cf. Idiatov 2015). Diachronically, clause-final negation markers in the area tend to be rather unstable and appear to be relatively easily borrowable (cf. Idiatov 2012b; 2015), unlike negators in other parts of the world but more like discourse markers, focus particles and phasal polarity expressions (cf. Matras 2009).

In Sub-Saharan African languages, phasal polarity expressions tend to occupy the same clause-final constructional slot as clause-final negation markers, the slot they equally tend to share with markers of illocutionary force, epistemic stance and various other intersubjective operators (or “monitoring-and-directing operators” in terms of Matras 2009:99). In a given language, this competition for the slot on the right periphery of a clause may be resolved in different ways (cf. Idiatov 2018:127–129). For instance, in Dzuun [dnn] the clause-final phasal polarity expression *ηē* ‘yet, still’, as in (2), when combined with negation would usually be used without the default clause-final negation marker *wāā*, as in (3), in which case *ηē* functions as a semantically specific clause-final negation marker occupying the clause-final negation marker slot of the default clause-final negation marker *wāā*. However, the two markers can also be used together, in which case the phasal polarity expression precedes the clause-final negation marker, as in (4) (cf. Idiatov 2015:256). In Bena-Yungur [yun], the clause-final phasal polarity expression *kālkāl* ‘yet, still’, as in (5), when combined with negation follows the clause-final negation marker *ré*, as in (6).

Dzuun

- (2) *dzín nìí kéréū shē, tà kó nìí dón nī*
 child REL born.PFV today DEM and REL belly COP
ē nāà jàn ŋē, twēī ráá wár'là bèé min
 REFL mother in yet DEM POSS money.DEF go.IPFV where
 ‘[The tax, as its amount was not settled,] where did the money go of a child that has been born today or of a child that is yet in his mother’s belly?’ (Solomiac 2007:571)
- (3) *kàbī mún kéréū, mún nā kèìn nèē tsūrū jà ŋē*
 since 1SG born.PFV 1SG NEG bird DEM like see yet
 ‘Since I was born, I have never seen a bird like that (yet).’ (Solomiac 2007:250)
- (4) *tò y’á tàrà wó nā kéré ŋē wāā*
 DEM SBJV.3SG find 2SG NEG born yet NEG
 ‘[The old man should tell you that there has been this intelligence like this], while you were not yet born.’ (Solomiac 2007:252)

Bena-Yungur

- (5) *áyà kēp mbú káfā kálkāl*
 3SG.AN.COP.at eating thing eaten still
 ‘He is still eating (food)’.
- (6) *ā sóm á kēp mbú káfā rē kálkāl*
 3SG.AN COP.NEG at eating thing eaten NEG yet
 ‘He is not eating (food) yet’.

Given that clause-final negation markers tend to occupy the same constructional slot as phasal polarity expressions in Sub-Saharan African languages and that strong semantic and often also formal links are known to exist between phasal polarity expressions and negation (cf. various semantic and typological accounts of phasal polarity expressions, such as Löbner 1989; van der Auwera 1993; van der Auwera 1998; van Baar 1997), clause-final negation markers may be expected to often develop out of phasal polarity expressions. Yet, this expectation is not borne out by the data available on the development of clause-final negation markers in the languages of NSSA (cf. Idiatov 2012a; 2012b; 2015; Devos & van der Auwera 2013). In fact, it seems to be a more broad cross-linguistic generalization that phasal polarity expressions

rarely develop into default negation markers. Thus, in some cases of a Jespersen cycle type of emergence of negation markers (cf. van der Auwera 2009), phasal polarity expressions are known to have been competing for the status of the new default negation marker and to have lost this competition to expressions of other semantics. For instance, in the history of French it was the minimizer *pas* ‘(not) a step’ which has become generalized as the default negation marker rather than a phasal polarity expression such as *plus* ‘(not) anymore’.

This paper discusses a number of cases from Mande languages where clause-final negation markers may be argued to be historically related to phasal polarity expressions. In line with the general rarity of the change from phasal polarity expressions to default clause-final negation markers, when evolving into negation markers phasal polarity expressions tend to maintain the phasal element of their semantics or become restricted to certain TAM constructions (Section 2). In the rare cases where phasal polarity expressions may be argued to have evolved into default clause-final negation markers, this evolution is not direct and necessarily proceeds through the addition and foregrounding of a free-choice indefinite semantic component (such as ‘not yet’ > ‘not ever yet, not on any occasion yet’) and the development of the implicature of an intersubjective operator processing hearer-sided expectations and presuppositions (such as ‘not ever yet, not on any occasion yet’ > ‘not at all, really not’) (Section 3). Finally, I highlight the fact that we need to pay careful attention to the source semantics of the element that has both phasal polarity expressions and default clause-final negation markers as reflexes, as the phasal polarity expression uses may not be the source of the clause-final negation marker uses (Section 3).

2. The historical relation between phasal polarity expressions and non-default clause-final negation markers

In this section, I illustrate that in their evolution to negation markers, phasal polarity expressions tend to maintain the phasal element of their semantics, such as the non-default clause-final negation marker *ɲē* ‘(not) yet’ in Dzuun [dnn] (2.1) or the emergent negative polarity item *bilen* ‘anymore’ in Bamana [bam] (2.2), or become restricted to certain TAM constructions, such as the Negative Perfect clause-final negation marker *bé* ‘not yet’ in Tura [neb] (2.3). I particularly highlight the intricate historical relations between the phasal polarity and negation uses of these markers.

2.1. Dzuun *ɲē* ‘(not) yet’

As I discuss in more detail in (Idiatov 2015; 2018:125–127), Dzuun [dnn], a Western Mande language spoken in Burkina Faso and described by Solomiac (2007), has a default clause-final negation marker *wāā*, as in (7), which may be omitted under certain conditions. In addition, Dzuun has a number of clause-final negation markers that are semantically narrower than the default clause-final negation marker *wāā*, such as *dē* ‘anymore, no more’, *kūrāā* ‘(n)ever; (not) at all’ and *ɲē* ‘(not) yet’. In fact, some of the forms that function as non-default clause-final negation marker markers can also occur in positive constructions, as the clause-final phasal polarity expression *ɲē* ‘yet, still’ in (2). Although semantically specific clause-final negation markers, such as *ɲē*, can be combined with the default clause-final negation marker *wāā*, as in (4), in which case *ɲē* functions as a phasal polarity expression rather than a clause-final negation marker, usually semantically specific clause-final negation markers replace the default clause-final negation marker *wāā*, as in (3). It is precisely the fact that *ɲē* occupies the clause-final negation marker slot of the default clause-final negation marker *wāā* that makes us analyze it in (3) as a semantically specific clause-final negation marker rather than a phasal polarity expression. From a theoretical perspective, semantically specific clause-final negation markers, such as Dzuun *ɲē*, are particularly interesting for two reasons. First, they illustrate a possibility that a marker need not be a dedicated negation marker (be intrinsically negative in its meaning) to be a clause-final negation marker. Second, they showcase that a particular way of expressing negation within a negation construction, such as the clause-final negation marking, may be obligatory while the negation markers themselves may be optional to various degrees (since all clause-final negation markers can replace each other, albeit sometimes with a change in propositional meaning). The situation in Dzuun is a somewhat more complicated version of what one finds in French, where the new default (post-verbal) negation marker *pas* can be replaced by a number of more specific negation markers, such as *jamais* ‘(n)ever’ or *nulle part* ‘nowhere’, some of which can also be used in positive constructions, such as *si jamais* ‘if ever’ and *pour jamais* ‘forever’.

Dzuun

- (7) *à náà wù è tsí wāā*
 3SG NEG.PST good 3SG.SBJV save NEG

‘It was not good that he be saved.’ (Solomiac 2007:270)

2.2. Bamana *bilen* ‘anymore’

The marker *bilen* (*bèlen*, *bile*) in Bamana [bam], a Western Mande language spoken in Mali without a default clause-final negation marker, can be used in a number of constructions, where it functions as a phasal polarity expression ‘anymore’, repetition marker ‘again’, discourse marker ‘though, yet, however, but’, interjection ‘still?!, now?! (with a nuance of surprise and reproach)’ or a negative conditional clause marker (cf. Bailleul 1996; Dumestre 1990; 2003:311; Vydrin & Tomchina 1999).⁴ The last three uses (discourse marker, interjection and negative conditional marker) are marginal. The most common usage of *bilen* is in negative clauses as a clause-final phasal polarity expression with the meaning ‘not anymore, no longer’, as in (8). The negation is expressed by the negative TAM auxiliary or copula in the immediately post-subject slot.

Bamana

(8) *né té fâama yé bilen*

1SG.EMPH COP.NEG king.ART as anymore

‘I am not the king anymore.’ (Dumestre 2003:311)

Although in verbal clauses with non-present semantics, such as (9) and (10), *bilen* may also sometimes be interpreted as the negation of ‘again’, it is not a repetition marker, as explicitly stated by Dumestre (2003:311) who decomposes the meaning of *bilen* in such examples as ‘from this point forward’ (French *desormais*) plus negation.⁵

Bamana

(9) *é té dénmisen bùgɔ bilen*

2SG.EMPH IPFV.NEG child.ART beat anymore

‘You will not beat the children anymore.’ (Dumestre 2003:311)

⁴ All these uses are historically related and ultimately go back to the verb which has also resulted in the Bamana verb *bàli* ‘(vt) prevent, stop (from doing something); (vi) fail, not succeed (with something, in doing something)’. Both *bilen* and *bàli* are reflexes of the Intransitive form of the Proto Mande verb **bàdāj* ‘bump into, stumble into, unexpectedly come across an obstacle’. A discussion of the details of the reconstruction goes beyond the scope of this paper.

⁵ Presumably, because similarly to the French non-default negation marker *plus*, it should not be possible to use it in contexts like ‘Today, the bus did not come on time again’.

- (10) *à má nà bilen*
 3SG PFV.NEG come anymore
 ‘He did not come anymore.’ (Bailleul 1996)

The free-choice indefinite component inherently present in the semantics of the negative clause-final phasal polarity expression *bilen* ‘not anymore’ may sometimes become foregrounded at the expense of the phasal polarity component, viz. ‘not (on any occasion) from the reference point forward’ > ‘not on any occasion, not at all (from the reference point forward)’ > ‘not on any occasion, not at all’, as in (11).

Bamana

- (11) *ù má sòn kà dòn sánsara kónɔ bilen*
 3PL PFV.NEG agree INF enter cage.ART in on.any.occasion
 ‘They did not agree to enter the cage on any occasion.’ (Vydrin & Tomchina 1999)

Like Dzuun *ηē* (2.1), *bilen* can also be occasionally used in positive clauses, as in (12), where it has the meaning ‘again’. In this rare positive use, *bilen* can not only be used in the clause-final slot, like its negative counterpart, but also in the operator slot immediately after the subject and before the TAM and polarity auxiliary, as in (13), or before the verb in predicative constructions without an auxiliary, as in (14). This operator slot also hosts *bilen* in its use as a discourse marker and as a negative conditional marker. Finally, as a negative conditional marker *bilen* can also itself occupy the TAM and polarity auxiliary slot.

Bamana

- (12) *í bé yàn bilen!*
 2SG COP here again
 ‘You are again here!’ (Vydrin & Tomchina 1999)

- (13) *kònbá bilen y’à fǝ...*
 big.bird.ART again PFV.TR = 3SG say
 ‘The big bird said again...’ (Dumestre 2003:311)

- (14) *à bilen bòli-la kà n'à fɔ à bámuso yé*
 3SG again run-PFV.IT INF come = 3SG say 3SG mother.ART to
 ‘She ran again to tell her mother about it.’ (Vydrin & Tomchina 1999)

As a clause-final phasal polarity expression, *bilen* ‘anymore’ can be characterized as an emergent negative polarity item, since the clause needs to be negative for *bilen* to have its phasal polarity expression meaning ‘anymore’ and *bilen* has a different meaning, ‘again’, when it is used in the same clause-final position in a positive clause. Moreover, *bilen* as ‘again’ in positive clauses can equally occupy a different slot in the clause structure, viz. the post-subject operator slot. From a Mande comparative perspective, the emergence of such a negative polarity item is noteworthy, since generally Mande languages have only few negative polarity items, such as the Bamana determiner *sí* ‘none’ and the clause-final marker *féwú* ‘absolutely not, no way’. Another interesting point with respect to the clause-final phasal polarity expression *bilen* as an emergent negative polarity item is that it illustrates how the foregrounding of the free-choice indefinite semantic component of a phasal polarity expression may lead to the development of the implicature of an intersubjective operator, such as ‘not at all (contrary to what you may have expected)’. This kind of semantic evolution may eventually result into a clause-final negation marker. Thus, in a number of Southeastern Bamana dialects that have default clause-final negation markers, these markers have evolved through a similar semantic change from a frequency adverbial ‘once, at one time, at a certain moment’ (cf. Idiatov 2012b).

2.3. Tura *bé* ‘not yet’

Tura [neb], a Southeastern Mande language spoken in Côte d’Ivoire and described by Bearth (1971), does not have a default clause-final negation marker but it has a non-default clause-final negation marker *bé* that is part of the Negative Perfect construction, as in (15-17).

Tura

- (15) *é ló=ó wó-ó, ðó nú bé*
 3SG.CONJ go = FOC do \PFV-PFV 3SG.PFV.NEG come yet
 ‘Since he left, he has not come back.’ (Bearth 1971:283)

(16) *é wàà = á zé, à lǝǝ = ǝ òó mǝ b'é*
 3SG.CONJ arrive\PFV-PFV here 3SG duration = FOC 3SG.PFV.NEG last yet
 ‘Since he arrived here, not much time has passed.’

(17) *mǝǝ à yé dó b'é*
 1SG.PFV.NEG 3SG see once yet
 ‘I have never seen him.’ (lit.: ‘I have not seen him once’)

Although *b'é* can be glossed as ‘not yet’, I do not use ‘yet’ in the translation because *b'é* is obligatory in the Negative Perfect construction. The presence of the clause-final negation marker *b'é* is the only thing that distinguishes the Negative Perfect construction from the Negative Perfective construction, as in (18) that can be compared to (17).

Tura

(18) *mǝǝ à yé*
 1SG.PFV.NEG 3SG see
 ‘I did not see him.’ (e.g., as an answer to the question ‘Did you see him at the market?’) (Negative Perfective)

Therefore, one might also wish to say that *b'é* is a phasal polarity expression and at the same time a negative polarity item restricted to the Negative Perfective construction, where its presence just implies the negative perfect meaning. However, I prefer the analysis of *b'é* as a clause-final negation marker of a dedicated Negative Perfect construction because in the positive polarity, the Perfect and the Perfective constructions are clearly two different constructions. Thus, the Positive Perfect construction, as in (19), differs from the Positive Perfective construction, as in (20), by the TAM auxiliary used (fused with pronominal subject indexes) and the absence of additional TAM marking on the verb itself.

Tura

(19) *ŋ n'è = è lǝ bòí*
 1SG father = PRF go in.the.field
 ‘My father has gone to the field.’ (Positive Perfect)

(20) *ŋ n'è ké ló-ó bòí*
 1SG father COP go\PFV-PFV in.the.field
 ‘My father went to the field.’ (Positive Perfective)

Outside of the Negative Perfect construction, *bé* is used as an adverbial with existential semantics, usually with the copula or the verb *tó* ‘be(come)’, as in (21-23).

Tura

(21) *póŋé ké bé*

something COP EXIST

‘There is something.’ (Bearth 1971:205)

(22) *póŋé àá bé*

something 3SG.COP.NEG EXIST

‘There is nothing.’ (Bearth 1971:205)

(23) *gběě=ě bé, à lè=è gíé=é wó gwèè lè gǔ zà é*

dog=COP EXIST 3SG FOC=IPFV.FOC pass=FOC do baboon FOC at though this

‘Here you are, it’s the dog though who wins over the baboon.’ (lit.: ‘There is the dog, it is it who wins over the baboon, though, here you are.’) (Bearth 1971:381)

This strongly suggests that, originally, *bé* is not a phasal polarity expression, but some kind of deictic adverbial. That is, *bé* did not become confined to the Negative Perfective construction as a phasal polarity expression with this combination being later conventionalized as the Negative Perfect construction. What is more likely to have happened is that *bé* first developed its phasal polarity semantics when used in the Negative Perfective construction with the verb *tó* ‘be(come)’, then its phasal polarity use became available for other verbs in the Negative Perfective construction and only after that the combination of *bé* and the Negative Perfective became conventionalized as the negative counterpart of the Positive Perfect construction.

3. The historical relation between phasal polarity expressions and default clause-final negation markers: intersubjective implicatures as the middleman and the importance of the source meanings

In this section, I consider the two Mande examples where earlier phasal polarity expressions can be argued to have resulted in default clause-final negation markers. Both examples come from Bobo and Samogo languages, two distantly related Western Mande groups spoken in the same general area in the west of Burkina Faso and the bordering regions of southeastern Mali. The first example (Section 3.1) is represented by the reflexes of the etymon **kè* in a number of Samogo languages, viz. the clause-final negation markers of the Samogo languages Jo [jow] *kì*, Seen [sos] *ɲè* and presumably the Kpeen [cpo] *nè* or *nì*. The same etymon **kè* also resulted in the Dzuun non-default clause-final negation marker and phasal polarity expression *ɲē* ‘yet, still’ already discussed in Section 2.1 (also see examples 2-4 in Section 1). The second example (Section 3.2) comprises a number of reflexes of the etymon **kútà-Cá*,⁶ viz. the default clause-final negation markers of Northern Bobo [bbo] *kā*, Sya Southern Bobo [bwq] *gā* ~ *gá*, the optional clause-final negation marker *kpá* of Bengé Southern Bobo [bwq], the default clause-final negation markers of the Samogo languages Dzuun [dnn] *wāā*, Ban [bxw] *mā* and Kpaan [dnn] *ũ* ~ *ṽ*, and the Dzuun non-default clause-final negation marker *kūrāā* ‘(n)ever; (not) at all’. I discuss both cases in more detail in (Idiatov 2015), where I focus on the formal reconstruction of the two etymons and where I particularly highlight the complex history of parallel evolution and borrowing of these clause-final negation markers in Bobo and Samogo languages. Here, I will focus on the details of their semantic evolution, in particular on the details of the historical relations between their uses as phasal polarity expressions and their uses as clause-final negation markers. The main generalization is that the evolution from a phasal polarity expression to a default clause-final negation marker has proceeded through the addition and foregrounding of a free-choice indefinite semantic component. Furthermore, in the case of **kè* its original meaning as an indefinite determiner ‘some, a certain’ suggests that it

⁶ In Idiatov (2015), I reconstruct this etymon as **kÚDà(C)á*. The revised reconstruction **kútà-Cá* presented here does away with the underspecified first vowel and second consonant, introduces a morpheme boundary before the final syllable and confirms the presence of the third consonant, whose identity remains unknown.

evolution into a default clause-final negation marker need not have proceeded through a phasal polarity expression stage.

3.1. Reflexes of *kè

The default clause-final negation markers of the Samogo languages Jo [jow] *kì*, Seen [sos] *ɲè* and presumably Kpeen [cpo] *nè* or *nì* are all related to the Dzuun non-default clause-final negation marker and phasal polarity expression *ɲē* ‘yet, still’. Example (3), reproduced here as (24), shows how a clause-final negation marker meaning ‘yet’ may acquire an additional overtone of universal quantification, as ‘ever yet’, ‘never (yet)’.

Dzuun

(24) *kàbī mún kéréū, mún nā kèìn nèē tsūrū jà ɲē*
 since 1SG born.PFV 1SG NEG bird DEM like see yet

‘Since I was born, I have never seen a bird like that.’ (lit.: ‘Since I was born, I have not seen a bird like that yet.’) (Solomiac 2007:250)

Example (24) contrasts with the Tura example (17) where the adverb *dó* ‘once’ (meaning ‘not once’ under negation) is used to add the same universal quantification meaning. From here, the temporal directionality inherent to the meaning ‘yet, still’ of *ɲē* may weaken, especially if the marker becomes confined to negative predications, to come to mean plainly ‘never’. A further foregrounding of the free-choice indefinite component present in the semantics of ‘never (yet)’ at the expense of its temporal semantics to something like ‘(not) at all’ is easy to conceive, viz. ‘not (on any occasion) before the reference point’ > ‘not on any occasion, not at all (before the reference point)’ > ‘not on any occasion, not at all’. In this respect, recall the possibility of a similar foregrounding of the free-choice indefinite component in the semantics of the Bamana negative clause-final phasal polarity expression *bilen* ‘not anymore’ in (11). Also compare several other Dzuun non-default clause-final negation markers, such as *fyēū* ‘(n)ever; (not) at all’ and *kūrāā* ‘(n)ever; (not) at all’, that can equally express both meanings. In addition to the restriction of the marker in question to negative predications, this addition of a free-choice indefinite semantic component as a possible implicature and later foregrounding and conventionalization of the latter at the expense of the phasal polarity component are necessary steps for the evolution of this marker into a default clause-final negation marker.

Comparative Mande data show that the original meaning of the etymon **kè* is an indefinite determiner ‘some, a certain, any’. Thus, among its cognates across Mande we find the Tura [neb] determiner *ké* ‘a certain, some; a little; another; again’,⁷ its adverbial derivate *ké-wó* ‘again; (not) anymore’, the Gban [ggu] determiner *ké* ‘another, again’, the Bokobaru [bus] determiner *kē* ‘a certain; any; none, (not) any’. The semantic evolution starting with ‘a certain, some’ proceeding through ‘another’ to, as a verbal modifier, ‘again’, and subsequently to a phasal polarity expression ‘still’ is not particularly striking. No more striking is the subsequent shift within the domain of phasal polarity expressions from ‘still’ to ‘not yet’, through the mechanism of “internal negation” (viz. ‘still (not P)’ = ‘not yet P’), and from ‘still’ to ‘not anymore’, through the mechanism of “external negation” (viz. ‘not (still P)’ = ‘not anymore P’) (cf. the Duality Hypothesis of Löbner 1989 describing the semantic relations between various phasal polarity expressions in terms of internal and external negation). However, the origin of **kè* in an indefinite determiner ‘some, a certain, any’ also makes conceivable another path towards a default clause-final negation marker through a minimizer and without passing through the stage of a phasal polarity expression, viz. ‘some, a certain’ > ‘a bit, a little’ > ‘(not) a bit’ > ‘(not) at all’. Both paths are equally plausible. Thus, the history of **kè* highlights the fact that we need to pay careful attention to the source semantics of the element that has both phasal polarity expressions and default clause-final negation markers as reflexes, as the phasal polarity expression uses may not be the source of the clause-final negation marker uses.

3.2. Reflexes of **kútà-Cá*

The default clause-final negation markers of Northern Bobo [bbo] *kɔ̄*, Sya Southern Bobo [bwq] *gā ~ gá*, the optional clause-final negation marker *kpá* of Bengé Southern Bobo [bwq], the default clause-final negation markers of the Samogo languages Dzuun [dnn] *wāā*, Ban [bxw] *mā* and Kpaan [dnn] *ũ ~ ã*, and the Dzuun [dnn] non-default clause-final negation marker *kūrāā* ‘(n)ever; (not) at all’ can all be argued to be reflexes of the etymon **kútà-Cá*. As I argue in (Idiatov 2015), the Dzuun non-default clause-final negation marker *kūrāā* ‘(n)ever; (not) at all’ is the direct reflex of **kútà-Cá*, while the default clause-final

⁷ This determiner may have the meaning ‘again’ when it modifies a nominalized verb in a construction with a light verb *wó* ‘do’, viz. something like ‘do another going’ meaning ‘go again’. In the same construction, this determiner may also have its indefinite quantifying meaning, viz. something like ‘do some, a bit of going’ meaning ‘go a bit’.

negation markers of Dzuun, Kpaan and Ban are only indirect reflexes resulting from a lateral transfer of the Bobo clause-final negation marker, which expanded an already rich system of semantically more specific clause-final negation markers in these Samogo languages. The initial part **kútà* is originally a modifier ‘new, next, recent’, in its adverbial use meaning ‘anew, again’. Thus, among its cognates across Mande we find the Bamana adjective *kúrá* ‘new, next, recent’ (corresponding to Mandinka [mnk] *kútá*), also as part of the adverb *kó-kúrá* ‘again’ (lit. ‘matter new’), the Bamana expressive adverb *kúdáyí* ‘forever; definitely; (not) forever, never again’, Susu [sus] *kàré* ‘henceforth, from now/then on; (not) anymore, never’, and the Tige Bozo [boz] adverb or operator *xua* ‘again; (not) again; (not) anymore’. The final part **-Cà* must be an adverbial marker, most likely sourced from a postposition or a light verb.⁸

Given the original meaning ‘new, next, recent’, we can be much more sure than in the case of **kè* discussed in 3.1 that the semantic evolution of this etymon to a default clause-final negation marker has proceeded through a phasal polarity expression stage. However, like in the case of the phasal polarity expression-scenario for the evolution of **kè* into a default clause-final negation marker, the phasal polarity expression stage in the evolution of **kútà-Cá* towards a default clause-final negation marker must also have proceeded through the addition of a free-choice indefinite semantic component as a possible implicature and later foregrounding and conventionalization of the latter at the expense of the phasal polarity component. This later evolution is exemplified by the Dzuun non-default clause-final negation marker *kūrāā* ‘(n)ever; (not) at all’. The proposed semantic development of **kútà-Cá* can be summarized as follows (focusing on the use of this marker in negative predications): ‘new, recent, next’ > ‘anew, again’ > ‘again; still’ > (through the mechanism of “external negation” of ‘still’) ‘(not) anymore’ > ‘not (on any occasion) from the reference point forward’ > ‘not on any occasion, not at all (from the reference point forward)’ > ‘not on any occasion, not at all’ > clause-final negation marker.

4. Conclusions

Although in Sub-Saharan African languages clause-final negation markers tend to occupy the same constructional slot as phasal polarity expressions and strong

⁸ Thus, compare Tura *ké-wó* ‘again; (not) anymore’, the adverbial derivate of the determiner *ké* ‘a certain, some; a little; another; again’ mentioned in Section 3.1, where the adverbial marker goes back to the light verb *wó* ‘(vt) do; (vi) happen’.

semantic and often also formal links are known to exist between phasal polarity expressions and negation, phasal polarity expressions rarely develop into default clause-final negation markers. As I have argued on the example of a number of Mande languages, in those rare cases when phasal polarity expressions do develop into default clause-final negation markers, this evolution necessarily proceeds through a number of intermediate steps (Section 3). It begins with the addition of a free-choice indefinite semantic component as a possible implicature. This implicature is later foregrounded and conventionalized at the expense of the phasal polarity component. For instance, a phasal polarity expression such as ‘not yet, not before the reference point’ by preference used in negative predications may be added a free-choice indefinite semantic component as a possible implicature to mean ‘not (on any occasion) before the reference point’ (i.e. ‘never yet’). This implicature may later be foregrounded at the expense of the phasal polarity component resulting in ‘not on any occasion, not at all (before the reference point)’ and finally conventionalized as ‘not on any occasion, not at all’ with the loss of the phasal polarity component. On this last stage before being conventionalized as a default clause-final negation marker, i.e. when these markers are generally glossed as ‘not at all’, they effectively become integrated in the paradigm of clause-final intersubjective operators processing hearer-sided expectations and presuppositions (“monitoring-and-directing operators” in terms of Matras 2009:99), particularly common in the languages of Sub-Saharan Africa, especially in its northern part. Most commonly, this integration is manifested by the competition for the clause-final slot between clause-final negation markers and various other intersubjective operators, as briefly illustrated in Section 1 (see also Idiatov 2015:242–245 for an illustration of some less trivial manifestations of this integration in Dzuun). Finally, I draw attention to the fact that when considering an apparent relationship between a phasal polarity expression and a default clause-final negation marker in a given language, we need to pay careful attention to the source semantics of the element that has both phasal polarity expressions and default clause-final negation markers as reflexes, as the phasal polarity expression uses may not be the source of the clause-final negation marker uses (Section 3.1).

Another type of historical relations between phasal polarity expressions and clause-final negation markers that I illustrated in the paper with the help of Mande data is the possibility of an evolution of phasal polarity expressions into non-default clause-final negation markers (Section 2). The historical relations between the phasal polarity and negation uses of a given marker can be rather intricate, but the main generalization is that when evolving into negation markers phasal polarity expressions tend to maintain the phasal element of their semantics or become restricted to certain TAM constructions.

Abbreviations:

AN	animate	NEG	negation
ART	article	PFV	perfective
COP	copula	POSS	possessive
CONJ	conjoined	PRF	perfect
DEM	demonstrative	PST	past
EMPH	emphatic	REFL	reflexive
EXIST	existential	REL	relative
FOC	focus	SG	singular
INF	infinitive	SBJV	subjunctive
IPFV	imperfective	TAM	tense-aspect-modality
IT	intransitive	TR	transitive

Bibliographic references:

- Bailleul, Charles. 1996. *Dictionnaire bambara-français*. Bamako: Éditions Donniya.
- Bearth, Thomas. 1971. *L'énoncé toura (Côte d'Ivoire)*. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of Oklahoma.
- Beyer, Klaus. 2009. Double negation marking: A case of contact-induced grammaticalization in West-Africa? In Norbert Cyffer, Erwin Ebermann & Georg Ziegelmeyer (eds.), *Negation patterns in West African languages and beyond*, 205–222. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 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.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2009. Negation patterns in West African languages and beyond. In Norbert Cyffer, Erwin Ebermann & Georg Ziegelmeyer (eds.), *Verb-object-negative order in Central Africa*, 307–362. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dumestre, Gérard. 1990. Notes sur le morphème de l'hypothétique *bilen* en bambara. *Mandenkan* 20. 41–46.
- Dumestre, Gérard. 2003. *Grammaire fondamentale du bambara*. Paris: Karthala.
- Idiatov, Dmitry. 2012a. On the history of clause-final negation in the Mande languages of the Bani - upper Mouhoun rivers area. Paper presented at the Workshop “The history of post-verbal negation in African languages” (7th World Congress of African Linguistics). URL: http://idiatov.mardi.myds.me/WOCAL7_Negation/IDIATOV_2012_Presentation.pdf.
- Idiatov, Dmitry. 2012b. Clause-final negative markers in southeastern Bamana dialects: a contact-induced evolution. *Africana Linguistica* 18. 169–192.
- Idiatov, Dmitry. 2015. Clause-final negative markers in Bobo and Samogo: parallel evolution and contact. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 5(2). 235–266. DOI: 10.1075/jhl.5.2.02idi.
- Idiatov, Dmitry. 2018. An areal typology of clause-final negation in Africa: language dynamics in space and time. In Daniël Van Olmen, Tanja Mortelmans & Frank Brisard (eds.), *Aspects of linguistic variation*, 115–163. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: 10.1515/9783110607963-005.
- Löbner, Sebastian. 1989. German *schon - erst - noch*: An integrated analysis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12(2). 167–212. DOI: 10.1007/BF00627659.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Roulon-Doko, Paulette. 2012. Le marqueur de négation ná en gbaya. Paper presented at the Workshop “The history of post-verbal negation in African languages” (7th World Congress of African Linguistics), Buea. URL: http://idiatov.mardi.myds.me/WOCAL7_Negation/ROULON-DOKO_2012_Presentation.pdf.
- Solomiac, Paul. 2007. *Phonologie et morphosyntaxe du dzùùngoo de Samogohiri*. Lyon: Université Lumière Lyon 2 PhD thesis.
- van Baar, Tim. 1997. *Phasal polarity*. Amsterdam: IFOTT.
- van der Auwera, Johan. 1993. “Already” and “Still”: Beyond Duality. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16(6). 613–653. DOI: 10.1007/BF00985436.
- van der Auwera, Johan. 1998. Phasal adverbials in the languages of Europe. In Johan van der Auwera & Dónall P.O. Baoill (eds.), *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*, 25–145. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- van der Auwera, Johan. 2009. The Jespersen cycles. In Elly van Gelderen (ed.), *Cyclical change*, 35–71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vydrin, Valentin & Svetlana Tomchina. 1999. *Manding-English dictionary (Maninka, Bamana)*. Vol. 1 (A, B, D-DAD, supplemented by some entries from subsequent volumes). St. Petersburg: Bulanin.