



HAL
open science

Babanki negation patterns

Pius W. Akumbu

► **To cite this version:**

| Pius W. Akumbu. Babanki negation patterns. SKY Journal of Linguistics, 2016, 29. hal-03691861

HAL Id: hal-03691861

<https://hal.science/hal-03691861v1>

Submitted on 9 Jun 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Squibs

Babanki negation patterns

Pius W. Akumbu
University of Buea

Abstract

There are languages in the world in which the normal negation (NEG) construction includes a discontinuous morpheme or a double negative. In many of such languages with SVO structure, the first NEG morpheme precedes the verb while the second follows it, preferably occupying the end of the clause. Dryer's (2009) survey reports a number of such languages in Central Africa with different characteristics. One of the languages, Hausa, employs double NEG only some of the time. Babanki, a central Ring Grassfields Bantu language of Northwest Cameroon presents a case close to Hausa but different in that the second part of the standard negation construction is optional and can always occur except in negative questions where the question particle occupies the end of the clause preventing it from occurring. In central Ring, Babanki shows a unique pattern using the same discontinuous morpheme *kó`...bwen* for standard negation in all tenses/aspects.

Keywords: Babanki, Grassfields, negation, patterns

1 Introduction

This study describes particles that are used to negate a clause in Babanki, a central Ring Grassfields Bantu language of Northwest Cameroon.¹

¹ Native speakers prefer to use Kejom when referring both to the language and the two villages where it is spoken but I have chosen to use Babanki, the administrative name by which the language and the people are widely known.

Negation patterns have been described in five of the seven central Ring languages, namely, Kom (Shultz 1997), Mmen (Möller 2012), Oku (Nforbi & Ngum 2009), Bum (Akumbu & Mbong 2007) and Kuk (Kießling 2016), leaving out only Babanki and Kung. The discussion of Babanki negation particles in this paper is therefore meant to contribute to the current typological studies of negation in Grassfields Bantu.

Negation is the act of reversing the truth value of a proposition. According to Payne (1997: 282) the function of negation is to negate the clause which asserts an affirmation of an event, situation, or state of affairs. While many of the world's languages use a single negation marker for this purpose, there are some in which the normal negation construction includes a discontinuous morpheme or a double negative, e.g. Bafut (Chumbow & Tamanji 1994; Tamanji 2002). In many of such languages with SVO structure, the first negation morpheme (NEG1) precedes the verb while the second follows the verb, preferably occupying the end of the clause. Dryer's (2009) extensive survey of negation in some languages of Central Africa identifies many with double negators with some of them, such as Hausa, employing double negation only some of the time. Babanki, not mentioned in Dryer's work, singles out itself in that the second negation morpheme (NEG2) is generally optional unless the question particle *à* or the emphatic marker *l̩* occupy the end of a clause, preventing the (optional) negation morpheme from occurring. It appears that the only function of NEG2 is to reinforce negation. In Section 2 of this paper, I present some of the languages of Central Africa with double negators as well as discuss how negation works in other central Ring languages. In Section 3, I describe negation in Babanki and then mention briefly the relationship between negation and the question particle in Section 4. An attempt is made in Section 5 to examine Babanki negation in relation to Jespersen's Cycle and this is followed by a conclusion to the study in Section 6.

2 Negation in neighboring languages

It has been demonstrated that in Central Africa, there are "languages in which the normal construction for negation is a double negative, with one morpheme preceding the verb (possibly prefixed) and one following the verb (possibly suffixed)" (Dryer 2009: 315). This is the case, for example, in Kanakuru, Hausa, Mupun (West Chadic; Nigeria); Ma, Pambia (Adamawa-Ubangi, Niger-Congo; DR Congo); Bongo (Bongo-Bagirmi, Nilo-Saharan; Sudan); Ewe (Kwa, Niger-Congo; Ghana, Togo); Babungo

(Bantu; Cameroon); Amo (Kainji, Niger-Congo; Nigeria) which can be described as SNegVONeg. The following examples from Dryer (2009: 315–316) show the occurrence of double negatives in some of these languages.

(1) Babungo

ɲwá kée gə táa yìwìŋ m̄
 he NEG go.PFV to market NEG
 ‘He did not go to the market.’

(2) Hausa

a. *bàn san sūna-n-sà ba*
 NEG.1SG know name-LINK-3SG NEG
 ‘I don’t know his name.’

b. *ba nà uwà dà kai*
 NEG CONT come with 2SG
 ‘I am not going with you.’

(3) Bongo

a. *ma nja ami a’ji wa*
 1SG NEG make thing NEG
 ‘I am not doing anything.’

b. *m-u-yε le’ji wa*
 1SG-PST-drink beer NEG
 ‘I did not drink beer.’

The data also illustrate that double negation is sometimes obligatory in Hausa (2a) but not always required (2b). In Bongo, double negation is possible (3a) but the first negation morpheme can be left out (3b).

Among central Ring Grassfields Bantu languages of Northwest Cameroon, Babanki appears to be the one with the most reduced system of negation, particularly because tense, aspect and mood (TAM) do not interact with negation. In the other languages of this sub-group, negation is generally influenced by TAM, as illustrated in the following paragraphs.

In Kom, Shultz (1997) identifies four particles that can be used alone or in combination with other negators. One negator, *wi*, is used in present tense (imperfective) constructions, another, *bu*, is used with the past tense (perfect), while a different one, *tì*, is used with the past tense (perfective). In addition, *ka* is used with the future tense to negate imperative

constructions. The negators *bu* and *ti* can be used in combination in a past tense construction with present implications conveying the idea of unrealized expectations. Finally, the negators *bu* and *wi* can be used with the morpheme *fi* (which indicates repetition or “do again”) and a future tense morpheme to describe a negative finality or certainty.

Mmen has “several different morphemes marking negation”, the usage of which “is conditioned by tense, aspect and mood” (Möller 2012: 43). One of the morphemes, *pá’á*, is used with perfective aspect while *và* combines with imperfective aspect. On the other hand, *vàyn* occurs mainly together with the auxiliary *kà’á* ‘can’ and is used with any tense marker in perfective constructions. *Tà’á* is used to negate optative and conditional sentences while imperatives and hortatives are negated by *ká’*.

According to Nforbi & Ngum (2009), there are at least eight negation morphemes in Oku. While *bàa* is used in the present and past tenses, covering both perfective and imperfective forms, the interrogative and necessity moods, *jia* is used essentially with the future tenses as well as with possibility and certainty moods. The rest of the negation morphemes in Oku make further subtle distinctions within tense and aspect.

At least three negation morphemes have been found in Bum (Akumbu & Mbong 2007), namely, a discontinuous morpheme *tá...(jè)* which combines only with the past tenses to mark negation and *wí(jè)* which combines with the present and future tenses. In both cases *jè* is optional because it may occur with *ta* and *wi* or it may be left out completely without changing the meaning of the negative sentence. The third morpheme is *bú* which can combine with present and past tenses to form negative constructions. In other words, negation in the present tense can be achieved by the use of either *wí(jè)* or *bú*, in the past tenses by *tá...(jè)* or *bú*, and finally, in the future tenses by *wí(jè)*.

Kießling (2016) illustrates that negation in Kuk is accomplished by a three-way contrast of negators depending on aspect and mood. The verbal proclitic *káʔà ~ kâa* negates the perfective declarative, while the verbal enclitic *wà* negates the imperfective declarative, and the clause initial proclitic *kâ* marks the prohibitive which is used for the negation of the imperative. Finally, the hortative is negated by *lâ*.

A common feature of the above central Ring languages is the interaction between negation and TAM. Crosslinguistically, negation is known to interact with TAM and in some languages, e.g. Lamnso (Baertsch 2001) and Mokpe (Tanda & Neba 2006), the use of the negative marker

can even prevent certain tense markers from occurring. The way negation is achieved in Babanki is discussed in the next section.

3 Negation in Babanki

In Babanki, standard negation is expressed by means of a pre-verbal and an optional post-verbal morpheme irrespective of tense and aspect. Babanki can be described as an STVO language because in the verb phrase, the subject marker (S) occurs first, followed by the tense and/or aspect marker (T), the verb root (V), followed by an aspect marker, and then the object (O) as exemplified in (4). It should be noted that Babanki distinguishes eight tenses, namely, an unmarked present tense, four pasts (immediate (P1), hodiernal (P2), distant (P3), and remote (P4)), and three futures (immediate (F1), hodiernal (F2), and distant (F3)).²

- (4) a. *nyàm t̀ k̀m byí*
nyàm t̀ k̀m byí
 C4.animal P3 touch C9.goat
 ‘An animal touched a goat.’
- b. *f̀nyì fyìf̀ né f̀áŋ á ŋg̀əŋ*
f̀-nyì fyìf̀ né` f̀áŋ á ŋg̀əŋ
 C19-knife DEM F2 remain PREP C9.house
 ‘That knife will remain in the house.’

Word order in Babanki negative constructions is SNegTVO(Neg). NEG1 comes after the subject marker, is followed by a tense or aspect marker, if present, or by the verb while NEG2 occupies the final position of the clause:

- (5) a. *f̀nín f̀ k̀ f̀ǎǎ (bwèn)*³
f̀-ńín f̀ k̀` f̀əŋ-ə bwen
 C19-bird SM NEG fall-PROG NEG
 ‘The bird is not falling.’

² As a native speaker of Babanki, I have provided the data used in this study.

³ *Bwen* is shown to be underlyingly toneless and occurs with a polar tone, taking the opposite of the preceding tone-bearing unit. In addition, the underlying /e/ is realized as [ɛ] because in Babanki, /e/ and /o/ are realized as [ɛ] and [ɔ] respectively in closed syllables (Mutaka & Chie 2006: 75).

- b. *fānín fǎ kó fǎŋ (bwèn)*
fā-nín fǎ kó` fǎŋ bwen
 C19-bird SM NEG fall NEG
 ‘The bird hasn’t fallen.’
- c. *fānín fǎ kó jì fǎŋ (bwèn)*
fā-nín fǎ kó` jì fǎŋ bwen
 C19-bird SM NEG P2 fall NEG
 ‘The bird didn’t fall.’
- d. *fānín fǎ kó tǎ fǎŋ (bwèn)*
fā-nín fǎ kó` tǎ fǎŋ bwen
 C19-bird SM NEG P3 fall NEG
 ‘The bird didn’t fall.’
- e. *fānín fǎ kó mfǎŋ (bwèn)*
fā-nín fǎ kó` N-fǎŋ bwen
 C19-bird SM NEG P4-fall NEG
 ‘The bird didn’t fall.’
- f. *fānín fǎ kó fǎŋ (bwén)*
fā-nín fǎ kó` á fǎŋ bwen
 C19-bird SM NEG F1 fall NEG
 ‘The bird won’t fall.’
- g. *fānín fǎ kó né fǎŋ (bwén)*
fā-nín fǎ kó` né` fǎŋ bwen
 C19-bird SM NEG F2 fall NEG
 ‘The bird won’t fall.’
- h. *fānín fǎ kó lú fǎŋ (bwén)*
fā-nín fǎ kó` lú` fǎŋ bwen
 C19-bird SM NEG F3 fall NEG
 ‘The bird won’t fall.’

As seen, the second negation marker is optional. Apparently, it is only used to reinforce negation because even when left out, the sentences still have negative semantics. This is similar to Bum where the negation morpheme *jè* is optional both in the discontinuous marker *tá...(jè)* and in *wí(jè)*. The data in (5) also show that unlike in other central Ring languages where the markers change depending on tense or aspect, the same discontinuous morpheme is used to mark standard negation in all Babanki tenses/aspects.

Apart from *kó`...bwen* (6b), *bwén* (6c) and *kèn* (7c–e) can be used as negative predicative markers (Storch 1999) to express non-existence/unavailability.

- (6) a. *fə̀nín fə̀ dí? á shà*
fə̀-nín fə̀ dí? á shà
 C19-bird SM COP PREP here
 ‘There is a bird here.’
- b. *fə̀nín fə̀ kó` dí? á shà (bwén)*
fə̀-nín fə̀ kó` dí? á shà bwen
 C19-bird SM NEG COP PREP here NEG
 ‘There is no bird here.’
- c. *fə̀nín fə̀ bwén á shà*
fə̀-nín fə̀ bwén á shà
 C19-bird SM NEG PREP here
 ‘There is no bird here.’

It is unclear whether *bwén* (6c) is the same optional NEG2 morpheme that occurs in previous examples. This is so because it does not occupy clause final position and has a high tone irrespective of the preceding tone (see footnote 3 above). However, the fact that it is not repeated as NEG2 suggests that it is the same morpheme that moves to ensure that negation is marked morphologically in the locality of the verb since *kó`* is absent. The data also show that *bwén* is used only with the present tense and that there is no verb involved.

On the other hand, the morpheme *kèn* combines with *bwen* (7c–e) irrespective of tense/aspect.

- (7) a. *tsòŋ tə̀ vɪ̀ wù bú̀nə̀*
tsòŋ tə̀ vɪ̀ wù bú̀n-ə̀
 C1.thief P3 come 2SG sleep-PROG
 ‘The thief came when you were sleeping.’

- b. *tsòŋ jì vì kò ndí? lá wù búnnà (bwén)*
tsòŋ jì vì kó` ñ-dì? lá wù búnn-ə bwen
 C1.thief P2 come NEG N⁴-COP COMP 2SG sleep-PROG NEG
 ‘The thief came when you were not sleeping.’
- c. *tsòŋá vìà kèn lá wù búnnà (bwén)*
tsòŋ á vì-ə kèn lá wù búnn-ə bwen
 C1.thief SM come-PROG NEG COMP 2SG sleep-PROG NEG
 ‘The thief is coming whereas you are not sleeping.’
- d. *tsòŋ tà vì kèn lá wù búnnà (bwén)*
tsòŋ tà vì kèn lá wù búnn-ə bwen
 C1.thief P3 come NEG COMP 2SG sleep-PROG NEG
 ‘The thief came when you were not sleeping.’
- e. *tsòŋá né vì kèn lá wù búnnà (bwén)*
tsòŋ á né vì kèn lá wù búnn-ə bwen
 C1.thief SM F2 come NEG COMP 2SG sleep-PROG NEG
 ‘The thief will come when you are not sleeping.’

It is worth noting that it is the subordinate clause that is negated and again the negation marker occurs before the verb but this time also before the complementizer and the subject, that is, at the initial position of the subordinate clause. This suggests that Babanki has only sentence negation, not constituent negation. The data also illustrate that to negate the subject, the negative marker leaves the pre-verbal position and the copula structure is introduced with pre-clausal negation (7b). As also seen (7c–e), the copula verb can be omitted, though the complementizer remains.

Negation of the imperative is achieved by the use of an identical clause initial prohibitive proclitic in most of Central Ring: *kâ* in Mmen and Kuk, and *ká* in Kom while Babanki uses *ká... (bwen)*:

- (8) a. *ká kùm (bwén)*
ká kùm bwen
 NEG touch NEG
 ‘Don’t touch!’

⁴ The nasal has simply been glossed ‘N’ because its origin and function remain unclear not only in Babanki (Akumbu & Chibaka 2012) but also in Kom (Shultz 1997) where it has been analyzed as induced by the verb.

- b. *ká yàŋ kúm (bwèn)*
ká yàŋ kùm bwen
 NEG 2PL touch NEG
 ‘You shouldn’t touch!’

Ká occupies the initial position of the clause and is followed by the subject, if present, then the verb and finally *bwen*.

4 Negation and question formation

Questions are formed in Babanki by adding a question marker at the end of a statement:

- (9) a. *wùá kúmà lí à*
wù á kùm-à lí à
 2SG SM touch-FV PFV Q
 ‘Have you touched?’
- b. *wùá né kùm à*
wù á né` kùm à
 2SG SM F2 touch Q
 ‘Will you touch?’

So far it has been shown that *bwen* occupies the final position of negative clauses. However, it loses that position to the question particle in negative questions:

- (10) a. *fānín fǎ kó` tsífǎ à*
fā-nín fǎ kó` tsíf-ǎ à
 C19-bird SM NEG peck-PROG Q
 ‘Is the bird not pecking?’
- b. *fānín fǎ kó` jì tsíf á`sán à*
fā-nín fǎ kó` jì tsíf à-sán à
 C19-bird SM NEG P2 peck C6-corn Q
 ‘Did the bird not peck?’
- c. *fānín fǎ kó` né` tsíf à*
fā-nín fǎ kó` né` tsíf à
 C19-bird SM NEG F2 peck Q
 ‘Will the bird not peck?’

The occurrence of the Babanki question particle in (10) confirms the previous finding that it is crosslinguistically common for question markers to occur in sentence-final position, and that “final question particles are especially common in Africa” (Dryer 2009). It is further observed that in this construction type, NEG2 is not allowed in Babanki. Since both the question and negation markers prefer the final position but that slot is available only for one, the negation morpheme can drop because *kó`* is already used and the absence of *bwen*, which is needed only for emphasis, will not affect the semantics.

The incompatibility of negation and the question marker is also seen in embedded questions where only *kó`* is allowed:

- (11) a. *mà bèm lá wùá kó` tà vì byìghò ló*
 mà bèm lá wù á kó` tà vì byìghò ló
 1SG ask COMP 2SG SM NEG P3 come why EMPH
 ‘I asked why you didn’t come.’
- b. *mà kè lá wùá kó` tà vì byìghò ló*
 mà kè lá wù á kó` tà vì byìghò ló
 1SG know COMP 2SG SM NEG P3 come why EMPH
 ‘I knew why you didn’t come.’

An additional observation to be made from (11) is that the emphasis marker functions similarly to the question marker, replacing NEG2 as well.

5 Babanki negation and Jespersen’s Cycle

There has been a historical development of the expression of negation in a variety of languages, from a simple pre-verbal marker of negation, through a discontinuous marker and in some cases through subsequent loss of the original pre-verbal marker. This cyclic process of morpho-phonological weakening and strengthening known as Jespersen’s Cycle (Jespersen 1917; Dahl 1979) is stated as follows:

the original negative adverb is first weakened, then found insufficient and therefore strengthened, generally through some additional word, and this in turn may be felt as the negative proper and may then in the course of time be subject to the same development as the original word (Jespersen 1917: 4).

The cyclical process of weakening, strengthening, and replacement has been widely exemplified in the literature with data from French and many

other languages. To illustrate the diachrony of the change, a general schema of four basic structural stages for the French negative cycle has been offered (Schwenter 2006):

Stage 1. NEG + VERB	<i>Je ne sais.</i> ‘I don’t know.’
Stage 2. NEG + VERB + EMPHATIC NEG	<i>Je ne sais (pas).</i>
Stage 3. NEG + VERB + OBLIGATORY NEG	<i>Je ne sais pas.</i>
Stage 4. VERB + NEG	<i>Je sais pas.</i>

At Stage 1, negation is expressed by a pre-verbal negative marker while at Stage 2, a post-verbal emphatic negative element is introduced which may or may not be required. At Stage 3, the post-verbal element becomes obligatory and negation is expressed by a bipartite negative marker. At this stage, the grammaticalization process of the reinforcing element has begun. At Stage 4, the original pre-verbal marker is dropped and the post-verbal negative marker is completely grammaticalized, and functions as the sole negative marker.

In Babanki, the post-verbal negative element which adds emphasis to the pre-verbal sentential negative is gradually being lost because, due to its optional status, many speakers tend to drop it altogether leaving only pre-verbal *kó`* as the marker of negation. In other words, the post-verbal element is undergoing weakening while the pre-verbal marker is undergoing strengthening. Without diachronic evidence, it is not possible to tell if Babanki is indeed on Jespersen’s Cycle nor to determine the stage of development at which it is. The hypothetical claim made in this paper, based entirely on introspective data, is that the grammaticalization process is towards the pre-verbal element becoming the sole marker of negation. This might suggest that at some point in the history of Babanki, negation was marked solely by the post-verbal *bwen* which does not have any other known meaning in the language today. As the language developed, the post-verbal marker began to weaken and there was need to introduce a pre-verbal marker to reinforce negative semantics. Today, this pre-verbal element has been strengthened and can be used as the only marker of negation while the weaker post-verbal *bwen* is there only for emphasis.

6 Conclusion

A language with a double negative, the second being optional, has not previously been identified or described in Central Africa (Dryer 2009). It has been shown in this paper that Babanki makes use of *kó`...(bwen)* in standard negation. Contrary to what obtains in other Grassfields Bantu languages, Babanki uses this discontinuous morpheme to negate sentences in all tenses/aspects. It has also been hypothesized in this paper that at some point in the history of the language, negation was marked by the post-verbal marker *bwen* which is now undergoing weakening and gradually giving way to the pre-verbal marker *kó`* to be the sole marker of negation.

The only other language in the central Ring sub-group with a discontinuous negation morpheme is Bum. However, the two languages differ slightly in that unlike Babanki, Bum selects the tenses with which to use specific morphemes in standard negation. This study has been meant to add to the descriptive knowledge of negation patterns in Grassfields Bantu and, hopefully, it will increase the drive to further linguistic work on these languages.

Symbols and abbreviations

↓	Downstep
c1...19	Noun Class
CONT	Continuous
EMPH	Emphatic
F1	Immediate Future Tense
F2	Hodiernal Future Tense
F3	Remote Future Tense
FV	Final Vowel
N	Nasal
P1	Immediate Past Tense
P2	Hodiernal Past Tense
P3	Distant Past Tense
P4	Remote Past Tense
PREP	Preposition
SM	Subject Marker

References

- Akumbu, Pius W. & Chibaka, Evelyn. 2012. *A pedagogic grammar of Babanki*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Akumbu, Pius W. & Mbong, Laura. 2007. *Bum verb phrase*. Ms. Bamenda: CABTAL.
- Baertsch, Karen. 2001. Morphological and syntactic aspects of negation in Lamnso. *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 69. 125–143.
- Chumbow, Sammy & Tamanji, Pius. 1994. Bafut. In Kahrel, Peter & van den Berg, René (eds.), *Typological studies in negation*, 211–236. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dahl, Östen. 1979. Typology of Sentence Negation. *Linguistics* 17. 79–106.
- Dryer, Matthew. 2009. Verb-Object-Negative order in Central Africa. In Cyffer, Norbert & Ebermann, Erwin & Ziegelmeier, Georg (eds.), *Negation patterns in West African languages and beyond*, 307–362. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1917. *Negation in English and other languages*. Reprinted in *Selected writings of Otto Jespersen*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Kießling, Roland. 2016. *Kuk*. Ms. Hamburg: University of Hamburg.
- Mutaka, Ngessimo M. & Chie, Esther P. 2006. Vowel raising in Babanki. *Journal of West African Languages* 33(1). 71–88.
- Möller, Mirjam. 2012. *The noun and verb in Mmen: A center Ring Grassfields Bantu language*. Yaoundé: SIL.
- Nforbi, Emmanuel & Ngum, Peter. 2009. *Oku grammar*. Dschang: Dschang University Press.
- Payne, Thomas. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax: A guide to field linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwenter, Scott A. 2006. Fine-tuning Jespersen's cycle. In Birner, B. J. and Ward, G. (eds.), *Drawing the boundaries of meaning: Neo-Gricean studies in pragmatics and semantics in honor of Laurence R. Horn*, 327–344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Shultz, George. 1997. *Kom language grammar sketch, Part 1*. Yaoundé: SIL.
- Storch, Anne. 1999. *Das Hone und Seine Stellung im Zentral-Jukunoid* [The place of Hone in Central-Jukunoid]. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Tamanji, Pius. 2002. Negation, verb movement and word order in Bafut. *Journal of West African Languages*. 29(1). 45–64.
- Tanda, Vincent & Neba, Ayu'nwi. 2006. Negation in Mokpe and two related coastal Bantu languages of Cameroon. *African Study Monographs* 26(4). 201–219.

Contact information:

Pius W. Akumbu
 Department of Linguistics
 University of Buea
 P.O. Box 63, Buea, Cameroon
 e-mail: akumbu(dot)pius(at)ubuea(dot)cm