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Clause-final negation markers (CFNMs):

- typologically rare
- found in a very wide range of languages of northern sub-Saharan Africa (NSSA)

CFNMs tend to occupy the same constructional slot as phasal polarity expressions (PPEs)

Strong semantic and often also formal links are known to exist between PPEs and negation

CFNMs may be expected to often develop out of PPEs

However, this expectation is not borne out by the available data…
- **Objective #1**: An analysis of spatio-temporal language dynamics in sub-Saharan Africa with respect to the feature CFNM

- **Objective #2**: Discuss a number of cases from Mande languages where CFNM does happen to be historically related to PPEs
I. An areal typology of clause-final negation in Africa
Dryer (2009): “neutral negation”, i.e. obligatory and productive (general) negation marking patterns in declarative verbal main clauses expressed by negation markers that are words, in languages with SVO order in Africa.
Beyer (2009): “double negation-marking” for “sentential negation” in a large group of West African languages centred on the **Volta River basin**

Double negation marking in West African languages centred on the Volta River basin (Beyer 2009:222).
- Devos & van der Auwera (2013): an in-depth study of multiple negation exponence in Bantu languages
A sample of 618 African languages of which:

- 452 have post-verbal negation markers (PVNMs) (including CFNMs)
- 256 have CFNMs
- 452 languages with PVNMs of any kind do not form any distinctive areal pattern
- 256 languages with CFNMs of any kind do form a clear areal pattern

Figure 5. The geographic distribution of the 618 languages of the sample and a plot of their spatial intensity

Figure 6. The geographic distribution of the 256 languages with CFNMs and their spatial intensity
- Languages **with CFNMs** vs languages **without CFNMs**

*Figure 6.* The geographic distribution of the 256 languages with CFNMs and their spatial intensity

*Figure 7.* The geographic distribution of the 362 languages without CFNMs and their spatial intensity
AFRICAN CFNMs ARE TYPOLOGICALLY UNUSUAL

- Typologically peculiar morphosyntax and diachrony of CFNMs in sub-Saharan Africa
  - Associated with *multiple negative exponence* (double, sometimes triple or even quadruple)
  - Often *morphosyntactically deficient* as compared to the more canonical grammatical markers in being optional or lacking in some types of clauses as conditioned by their:
    - TAM value
    - main/subordinate status
    - information structure and associated speech act type
    - text genre
  - Diachronically rather *unstable*
  - relatively *easy borrowable*, unlike negators in other parts of the world but like discourse markers, focus particles and PPEs (cf. Matras 2009)
**Dzuun** (Western Mande; Mali, Burkina-Faso; Solomiac 2007)

- A *variety of CFNMs*, in combination with a pre-V negative AUX-like markers. The most common and semantically neutral CFNM is *wāā*.

  - bādā **“jamais”**  bāỹ **“jamais”**  dē **“plus”**  fyeū **“jamais”**
  - kūrāā **“jamais”**  wāā **“pas”**  wāārū **“pas du tout”**

  - ŋē **“(ever) yet’**, tsū **“(not X) either’**
  - wāārū < *wāā tú* (where *tú > tsū **“(not X) either’**

- *wāā* is in **complementary distribution** with **CF particles of emphasis and polar questions**.

- *wāā* is **optional or lacking** in **some constructions** (PROH, conditional subordinates).

- *wāā* is sometimes lacking in **proverbs**.

- Most of the CFNMs are clear **borrowings** from Jula, while *wāā* is probably a borrowing from Bobo.(cf. Idiatov 2015)
**WHAT KIND OF CFNMS ARE WE LOOKING AT?**

- **Morphosyntactic properties** of negation constructions *differ*:
  - across languages
  - within a given language from one predicative construction to another.

- Depending on our goals and means we can **cut up this variation space in different ways**.
An **inclusive definition**: synchronic **diversity** as a window on language change

- **Jespersen Cycle** (cf. van der Auwera 2009, 2010 for a general overview and Devos & van der Auwera 2013 on Bantu languages)
  - proceeds through a number of stages
  - most intermediate stages characterized by variation
  - related languages do not proceed on this path in exactly the same manner
I consider as **CFNMs** the 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.
AN INCLUSIVE DEFINITION

- not confined to double negation-marking
- not confined to markers that mark negation only
- the degree of morphological bounding of CFNMs is not relevant
- not restricted to the negation of declarative verbal main clauses

*Negation of nominal predicates is beyond the scope*

- I consider both **obligatory** and **optional** CFNMs
**THE ISSUE OF OPTIONALITY**

- **Obligatory CFNMs:**
  - throughout
  - in a subset of negation construction

- **Optional CNFMs** are considered in so far as:
  - their addition does not change the *propositional meaning* of the negative predication
  - the constraints on their use are conditioned primarily by *structural properties of their environment* rather than their meaning

- A clear-cut distinction is **not always possible**
  - language change is *gradual*
  - ‘at all’ emphatic negation markers
  - rule of thumb: follow the grammatical description
Obligatoriness in disguise of optionality: it is the use of a negation marker in a particular slot within a negation construction that is obligatory, but not the specific negation markers

- French (cf. van der Auwera & Van Alsenoy 2016)
- Dzuun (cf. Idiatov 2015)
The description *clause-final* in CFNM refers to the *canonical position* of the negation marker on the extreme right periphery of a clause.

A given negation marker *need not* be in the absolute clause-final position *in every possible construction* to count as a CFNM.

The position of the CFNM *with respect to other right periphery markers* and verbal predicate modifiers may be fixed or depend on a range of factors, such as their scope, meaning, morphosyntactic structure, length.

A clear-cut distinction is *not always possible*

- language change is *gradual*
- relevant *examples are lacking*
The relative order of object and verb is **not relevant** (unlike Dryer 2009)

VO and OV order may present **different types of analytic problems**

In Africa unlike elsewhere, **post-O negation markers** are usually also **CF** (cf. Dryer 2009:319)
African languages with **OV order and a post-V negation** marker:

- **OVX Neg** (mostly Mande) → CFNM
- **OV & XV & V Neg** (Afro-Asiatic except Chadic; Saharan, Fur, Nubian; Dogon; Ijoid) → Neg usually best analysed not as CF but as **PV**
The patterns of geographic distribution of the languages of the sample are basically **point patterns** which show:

- the *overall extent* of the pattern
- the *regions of concentration* of the two types of languages

This binary representation **hides important diversity**

We need to **increase the degree of granularity** of our data

**Two parameters:**

- **obligatoriness** of CFNMs
- **constructional freedom** of CFNMs
### Table 1. Constructional restrictions and optionality: two ranking options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructional freedom highest</th>
<th>Constructional freedom</th>
<th>Obligatoriness</th>
<th>Obligatoriness highest</th>
<th>Number of languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>no CFNM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>restricted</td>
<td>optional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>unrestricted</td>
<td>optional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>restricted</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>unrestricted</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CFNMs: Constructional Functional Markers*
- Either of the two parameters could be ranked first.

- For this particular distribution, both options produce very similar results.

- A principled preference for ranking **obligatoriness highest**: obligatoriness as the defining property of **grammatical meanings** (cf. Idiatov 2008).

- CFNMs that are both obligatory and free of constructional restrictions are **canonical grammatical markers** (in the sense of canonical typology, cf. Brown, Chumakina & Corbett 2013).

- The classification **classifies languages**, not CFNMs.
Two methods of spatial analysis and visualization:

• spatial interpolation
• generalized additive modelling (GAM)

The two methods converge on the same spatial pattern of the feature CFNM
**TWO METHODS CONVERGE**

**Figure 8.** The spatial interpolation graphic of the different values of the feature CFNM using Gaussian kernel smoothing (the default bandwidth value adjusted by 1.3)

**Figure 10.** A contour plot with the heat map colour scheme visualizing a GAM produced using Scheme 1 for coding of the feature CFNM (k=13, family = Gaussian, edf = 41.73, p < 2e-16, deviance explained = 43.7%, AIC = 2234)
Two focal areas:

- the Central Focal Area (CFA) – primary
- the Western Focal Area (WFA) – secondary

Separated by a major discontinuity around Ghana, Togo and Benin
THE CENTRAL FOCAL AREA: THE CORE ISSUE

(Idiatov to appear)

- The prominent region in southern Chad and the CAR cannot be the historical core of the CFA

- The primary historical core of the CFA is situated immediately to the northwest of the CAR along the Benue River corridor going from southern Chad through northern Cameroon into central Nigeria
The prominent region in southern Chad and the CAR served as the **source for the spread** of the feature CFNM **among Bantu** languages further south.

*Figure 19*. The suggested direction of spread of the use of CFNMs in Bantu from a major focal area of CFNMs use in northern Central Africa into the Congo River corridor and the two secondary prominence zones.
Idiatov (2012, in preparation)

- **CF position** of CFNMs: their origin in other clause-final markers

- **High frequency** of CNFM* s in the area: common presence of a grammatical category of clause-final markers whose core function is the expression of *intersubjective* meanings

- The grammatical category of intersubjective CF markers = a conventionalization of a particular conversational strategy:

  Express your awareness of and engagement with the addressee’s attitudes and beliefs when your assertive authority may be at stake!
Combined with the fact that negation is one of those situations when “the speaker’s assertive authority is at stake and a special effort is needed to win over the hearer’s confidence” (cf. Matras 2007:67; Miestamo 2005:209), the use of intersubjective CF markers will be frequent with negation in these languages.

“It appears that at least subjectification and perhaps pragmatic intersubjectification are involved in the early development of the Jespersen Cycle.”

(Traugott 2010)

- Frequency ⇒ conventionalization
- This explanation accounts naturally for all the typologically unusual features of the CFNM in NSSA
EXPLAINING CFNM IN NSSA: THE BANTU CASE

- CFNM in Bantu results from a spread from the CFA
- CFNM in Bantu tend to develop through somewhat different pathways than elsewhere
- These pathways are:
  - less likely to lead to constructional restrictions
  - more likely to result in optional CFNM
EXPLAINING CFNM IN NSSA: THE BANTU CASE

- The same sources of CFNM as in Bantu are **rarely attested in NSSA**
  - locative pronouns
  - possessive pronouns
  - negative (answer) particles

(cf. Devos & van der Auwera 2013)
II. CFNMs and PPEs: the Mande case
In sub-Saharan Africa, PPEs rarely develop into default CFNM.

This may be a more broad cross-linguistic generalization about any kind of default NMs (e.g., French has generalized *pas* and not *plus*).

CFNMs originating in PPEs expressions tend to remain restricted to certain TAM constructions.
CFNMs originating in PPEs expressions tend to be restricted to TAM constructions with **perfective semantics**

- **Tura** (Southeastern Mande, Côte d’Ivoire): **Negative Perfect construction** \[\text{NEG.PFV} + (O) \text{ V} + \text{CFNM} \text{ bhê} \]

(1) É lô' wô', ôô nû bhê
   … 3SG.PFV.NEG come yet
   ‘Since he left, he has not come back (yet)’

(2) É waa' zé, à lôôèô ôô mó bhê
   …3SG duration-FOC 3SG.PFV.NEG last yet
   ‘Not much time has passed (yet) since he arrived here’

(3) Môô à yê dôô bhê
   1SG.PFV.NEG 3SG see once yet
   ‘I have never seen him’ (lit.: ‘I have not seen him once (yet)’)


Elsewhere *bhê* is an adverbial meaning ‘there is, being in existence, extant’

(1) Pôñê ké bhê  
    something COP there.is  
    ‘There is something’

(2) Pôñê àâ bhê  
    something 3SG.NEG.COP there.is  
    ‘There is nothing’
When PPEs do evolve into default CFNMs, this evolution is not direct and necessarily proceeds through:

- the addition of an indefinite semantic component (such as ‘not yet’ > ‘not ever yet, not on any occasion yet’)
- 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’)

PPEs AS DEFAULT CNFM
(Idiatov 2015)

- The **PPE *kè ‘yet; still’** as the source of the default CFNMs in some Samogo languages (Western Mande): Jo *kì*, Seen *nè*, and probably Kpeen *nè* or *nǐ*.

- The PPE *kè ‘yet; still’** itself most likely goes back to an **indefinite determiner** ‘a certain, some, any’ whose **reflexes** are found throughout Mande:
  - Tura determiner *ké ‘a certain, some; a little; another; again’, its adverbial derivate *ké-wó ‘again; (no) more, (not) anymore’
  - Gban determiner *ké ‘again, still’
  - Bokobaru determiner *kè ‘a certain; any; none, not any’
Dzuun (Western Mande; Mali, Burkina-Faso; Solomiac 2007)

- A variety of CFNMs, in combination with a pre-V negative AUX-like markers. The most common and semantically neutral CFNM is \( w\ddot{a}a \).

- One of the more specific CFNMs: \( \eta\ddot{e} \) ‘(ever) yet’
(1) dzín nǐ kéréū shē, tà kó nǐ dón nǐ
child REL born.PFV today DEM and REL belly COP
ē náà nàn ṣē. twēi ráá wár’là bèé min
REFL mother in yet DEM GEN 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)

(2) tà y’á tàrà wó nā kéré ṣē 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)

(3) kábì mún kéréū, mún nā kèìn nēē tsūrū jà ṣē
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)
- emergence of uses with an **overtone of universal quantification**: ‘(not) yet’ → ‘(not) ever yet’, ‘never (yet)’

- **weakening of the temporal directionality**: ‘ever yet’, ‘never (yet)’ → ‘never’

- further bleaching of the temporal semantics and strengthening of the **implicature of an intersubjective operator** processing hearer-sided expectations and presuppositions: ‘never’ → ‘not at all’

- **weakening of the implicature of an intersubjective operator**: ‘not at all’ → a default CFNM