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1 Introduction

My contribution describes negation particles in Jukunoid. It covers the following information: negation strategies, including an overview of the shapes and status of the various negators and how they are used in context, as well as an attempt at tracing the probable source of the particles.

The languages under consideration are: two southern Jukunoid languages (Yukuben and Kuteb) and three Central Jukun languages (Wukari-Jukun (alias “Wapan”), Takum-Jukun, and Hone-Jukun). Concerning Yukuben, two dialects will be involved, namely Bā-lāābān and Bā-līsā. Geographically, Yukuben and Hone lie in the periphery. Hone is the only language that shows a wider and more complex variety in negation, e.g. multiple negation, standard vs. non-standard negation, symmetric vs. asymmetric negation.

2 Jukunoid negation

As tables Table 1. & Table 2 show, negation is basically marked by a clause-final (or a verbal stem suffix, as in the case of Hone) negator, which can also be accompanied by other elements which I prefer to describe as ‘reinforcers’ in form of secondary modification.

The description considers the major ways of encoding negation strategies in world languages. These include the principles of standard vs. non-standard negation strategies, as proposed by Miestamo (2005). Another classification of negation proposed by Miestamo (op. cit.) proposes the division of negative structures according to whether they are “symmetric” or “asymmetric”. Structures are symmetric when the positive ones do not differ from the negative ones “in any other way than by the presence of the negative marker” (Miestamo 2007:556) and in asymmetric structures further differences or asymmetries are noted, such as the reduction or loss of finiteness of the verbal element, the marking of a non-realised category in addition to a negative marker, a marking that expresses emphasis in non-negatives, and changes in the marking of grammatical categories like TAM or PNG in the negative vis-à-vis the positive.
2.1 Strategies

2.1.1 Standard negation and non-standard negation

The term ‘standard negation’ refers to the basic way(s) a language has for negating declarative verbal main clauses (Miestamo 2005:1). Accordingly, non-verbal (e.g. imperative, injunctive/prohibitive, subjunctive, locative, nominal, adjectival, possessive, existential, potential) and subordinate clauses are often negated by ‘non-standard’ negation strategies in the world’s languages (Miestamo 2007:561).

Jukunoid languages variably make use of both standard and non-standard negation strategies. In addition to the application of non-standard negation strategy, Yukuben, Wukari-Jukun and Takum-Jukun also tend to extend standard negation strategy to other environments, such as the imperative and existential constructions. Hone (though restrictively) also tends to extend standard negation strategy to other environments and is the only language here that is richer not in symmetric but asymmetric structures (cf., for instance 23).

2.1.2 An overview of the negators

2.1.2.1 Basic general clause-final negator

In Yukuben, the clause-final negator is either kọŋ or kẹ-ŋ, dependent on dialect, whereby the former can be regarded as a grammaticalised form of the lexeme kọ-họŋ ‘not true, false/falsehood’, and the latter an adverb. In Kuteb the negator is bẹ, while in Wukari-Jukun (alias ‘Wapan’) and Takum-Jukun it is Bà (according to Shimizu 1980) and ìbà (according to Welmers 1968), respectively. The situation in Hone is a little bit more complicated; there is a variety of morphemes involved, dependent on various factors, such as scopus type, TAM type, number, as well as standard vs. non-standard negation.

The way these elements are used seems to form a typology; their deployment simply tends to change the meaning of a given expression from positive to negative, especially in terms of symmetric structures.
### Table 1. Jukunoid negation particles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>strategy</th>
<th>position</th>
<th>content type</th>
<th>origin/source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>non-SN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bá-láábɔ̀n-Yukuben</td>
<td>kɔŋ</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>final</td>
<td>kɔŋ-hɔŋ ‘not true, false/falsehood’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bá-líssà-Yukuben</td>
<td>ké-nɔŋ</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuteb</td>
<td>bɛ</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wukari-Jukun</td>
<td>&quot;bá/bá&quot;</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takum-Jukun</td>
<td>&quot;bá&quot;</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(àndá)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone-Jukun</td>
<td>mɔŋ</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-é/-è</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>suffix</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>báñɔŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
<td>predicative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>composite (&lt; <em>bá‌́ ayé mɔŋ</em> - Jibo: ‘the thing is not inside’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.1.2.2 Secondary modification (‘reinforcers’)

Secondary modification is characterised by special inflection of the verb in Yukuben, whereby a verbal prefix, which functions as subject marker attaches to the verb. On the other hand, in the rest of the Jukunoid languages (with the exception of Hone), a post-verbal (anaphoric) pronoun (alias “copy pronoun”) occurs. In Kuteb, for example, it agrees in number with the entity (noun or pronoun, as the case may be) in subject position. I will expand on this later.

### Table 2. Secondary modification strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary modification</th>
<th>status/function</th>
<th>language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verbal prefix</td>
<td>a special reinforcer with subject agreement traits</td>
<td>Yukuben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tones</td>
<td>(polar) tones on TAM and verbal stem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-verbal (anaphoric) pronoun</td>
<td>a special reinforcer with ‘agreement’ (and probably) intensifier/focus-marking properties</td>
<td>Kuteb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-idem-</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
<td>W-J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-idem-</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
<td>T-J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preverbal TAM -tì/-tɔ̀/- -ʔ-</td>
<td>standard negation (via declarative sentences)</td>
<td>H-J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence-initial particle fé</td>
<td>non-SN (discontinuous (double) imperative marker)</td>
<td>Yukuben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence initial prefix ká-</td>
<td>-idem-</td>
<td>H-J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Negators in context

A distinctive feature of a negative sentence is an obligatory verbal prefix (in Yukuben) and a post-verbal pronoun in Kuteb and some Central Jukun languages e.g. Wukari-Jukun and Takum-Jukun. Both the verbal prefix and the post-verbal pronoun seem to be a mirror-image of one another particularly in terms of agreement properties and functions. Hence, they can be described as being in complementary distribution. (See more on the post-verbal pronoun in 4, p. 5.)

3.1 Yukuben (Anyanwu (ms.))

All the Yukuben examples used here originate from the present author’s fieldtrips.

3.1.1 Standard negation

3.1.1.1 Declarative

Whereas the occurrence of the verbal prefix is obligatory in the negative, it is not always used in affirmative constructions. A similar thing happens in Takum-Jukun with respect to the occurrence of the post-verbal pronoun (see 4.3, p. 10) In the affirmative in Yukuben, the verbal prefix tends to occur mainly exclusively with verbs that have what Payne (1997:51) describes as a prototypical patient. A prototypical patient undergoes a physical, visible change in state, as can be seen in, for instance example 1, where it is the “basket” that is undergoing such a change. By implication, therefore, verbs with “dummy” or “cognate” objects may then be ruled out.

3.1.1.1.1 Bā-lāābôn-Yukuben

1. Clausal negation

a) Positive

Émí ̀rì à-ŋù kè-tégbôn.
3sg IMPERFV SM-weave cl-basket
‘S/he is making a basket.’

b) Negative

Émí ́rì á-ŋù kè-tégbôn kổŋ.
3sg IMPERFV SM-weave cl-basket NEG
‘S/he is not making a basket.’

Note the tonal alternation in the verbal unit: In the positive, both the TAM marker (́rì) and the verbal prefix (á-) are on a L-tone, while the verb root itself is on a H-tone. On the other hand, in the negative, the reverse is the case: whereas the TAM marker (́rì) and the verbal prefix (á-) are on a H-tone, the verb root is on a L-tone.

2. Constituent negation via cleft-sentence: subject-focus

È-hǐ i-bú nǐm è-jíìm kổŋ;
EP-COP cl-dog 1sg.POSS ANAPH.REF-bark NEG;
é-hǐ à-mí "hé.
EP-COP.PAST REL-CONC EMPH
‘It was not my dog that barked; it was another one.’ [Lit.: ‘It was dog mine it barked not; it was that one there.’]
3.1.1.1.2 Bá-lísà-Yukuben


a) Positive
   *Mè dôŋ 'èyí iCaleb.*
   1sg go with Caleb
   ‘I went with Caleb.’

b) Negative
   *Mè dôŋ èyí iCaleb kénŋ.*
   1sg go with Caleb NEG
   ‘I went without Caleb.’

Here again, tonal alternation is shown to play a major role in the distinction of positive and negative sentences. Not only is the verb affected, the tonal pattern of the preposition is also affected, which goes to indicate that the latter (èyí) might be a grammaticalised verb. In the positive, the verb (dôŋ) is on a H-tone and the preposition ('èyí) is on a raised 'L-DS-H. (L-raising is a common tonal process in Yukuben, depending on grammatical construction type, whereby a L-tone found between two non-L-tones is raised.) In contrast, in the negative, the verb is on a L-tone while the preposition is on a L-H tone pattern. Here, L-tone raising fails because the preceding dôŋ is on a L-tone.

3.1.2 Non-standard negation

4. Imperative
   a) Positive
      *Dôŋ!*
      go
      ‘Go/leave!’

b) Negative - singular imperative (fé … ksão)
   *Fé dôŋ ksão!
   PROHIB go NEG
   ‘Don’t leave!’

Example 4 shows that in addition to the non-standard negation strategy fé, there is also the presence of the standard negation strategy ksão.

4 A brief note on the post-verbal pronoun

The post-verbal pronoun has been given various names, such as “repeating pronoun”, “recapitulating pronoun”, “copy pronoun” or “intransitive copy pronoun” (cf., for instance Koops & Bendor-Samuel (1974)) and has been interpreted as a ‘copy’ of the subject pronoun. Actually, at a first glance, this type of pronoun sometimes ‘resembles’ the pronoun in subject position, predominantly from the point of view of segmental disposition (structure: form and shape). This ‘resemblance’ might more or less be misleading.
Gelderren van (2010) appeared not to be quite impressed by the “copying” approach and failed, however, to make any further alternative suggestions.

Both the meaning and function of the post-verbal pronoun have been analysed variously; sometimes as a marker of ‘intransitive’ verbs, or as an object pronoun (e.g., Tuller (1977), for Tangale). However, it was Schuh (2005, 2009:12f.) who (first?) identified/interpreted such post-verbal pronouns as ‘true anaphors’ functioning “… as an auxiliary focus or focus on the event of the verb phrase” in West Chadic. Koops (2009:230) also identifies it (sometimes) as “verb-focus” and also as “possessive pronoun (co-referent with subject)” (2009:140). Hence, these two latter references tend to imply strongly to the fact that the post-verbal pronoun may not necessarily be a sheer “copy” of the subject pronoun itself, but is an anaphor functioning eventually as a type of emphatic marker, precisely a focus marker.

This goes to support my own quick (though impressionistic) view of the post-verbal pronoun in the Jukunoid languages considered here (Kuteb, Takum-Jukun and Wukari-Jukun), viz. that:

- it appears to be a reflexive (emphatic) pronoun; certainly functioning as a reinforcer in the framework of secondary modification
- at the same time (as already explained in 3, p. 5), it may also be regarded as a mirror image (though naturally with some limitations) of the verbal prefix found in Yukuben (as already indicated, especially from the point of view of agreement properties and functions), which goes to imply that it may also be viewed as some sort of anaphor.

Part of the motivation for considering the Jukunoid post-verbal pronoun as a reflexive pronoun comes from a language, such as Igbo. In Igbo, although the reflexive pronouns tend to ‘resemble’ the subject pronouns in form from a segmental point of view, they may not necessarily be “copies” of the subject pronouns. As the following examples show, they can literally translate one-to-one as their corresponding English equivalents. Consider the following paradigms:

5. Igbo post-verbal reflexive pronouns (based on present author’s own knowledge)

a) 1sg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*mú nà ̀n’é</td>
<td>'mí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1sg with/and own 1sg.REFLEX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I myself’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) 2sg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*gí nà ̀n’é</td>
<td>‘gí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg with/and own 2sg.REFLEX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘you yourself’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) 3sg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*yá nà ̀n’é</td>
<td>‘yá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg with/and own 3sg.REFLEX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘he himself / she herself’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) 1pl
\[ \text{ànǐ} \quad \text{nà} \quad \text{òn}^{w̄} \text{é} \quad \text{tà}^{nú} \]
1pl with/and own 1pl.REFLEX
‘we ourselves’

e) 2pl
\[ \text{úmú} \quad \text{nà} \quad \text{òn}^{w̄} \text{é} \quad \text{únù} \]
2pl with/and own 2pl.REFLEX
‘you yourselves’

f) 3pl
\[ \text{há}/\text{fá} \quad \text{nà} \quad \text{òn}^{w̄} \text{é} \quad \text{há}/\text{fá} \]
3pl with/and own 3pl.REFLEX
‘they themselves’

(where há/fá are dialectal variants: há = Central Igbo; fá = Onicha Igbo)

The reflexive pronoun in Igbo regularly shows tonal alternations. The same thing applies in Wukari-Jukun and Takum-Jukun; there is a regular tonal alternation in the post-verbal pronoun. Furthermore, as can be deduced from the examples above, it is probably this distinction in tonal pattern that partially sends a signal that distinguishes the status of the pronoun in subject position from that of the post-verbal reflexive pronoun. Hence, the latter cannot just be dismissed as a mere “copy” of the former, simply based on the misleading fact that both pronouns, in each case, have similar segmental forms. Hence, ignoring the vital role played by, for instance, tonal distinction strategy in such cases and beyond can be fatal.

As already indicated, in examples 6 to 15, parallel to the Yukuben cases where a verbal prefix occurs in the negative, the post-verbal pronoun occurs also in the negative.

4.1 Kuteb

With regard to the nature of the post-verbal pronoun, Kuteb differs when compared with Wukari-Jukun and Takum-Jukun. Contrary to the situation in the latter two, where there is tonal alternation in the post-verbal pronoun, there is no such alternation in the Kuteb examples (cf. 9-16). Furthermore, in the Kuteb examples (with the exception of the 1sg – cf. 7), the form of the subject pronouns generally differs from that of the post-verbal pronouns. Whereas the former (subject pronouns) appear to be full forms, the latter do not appear to be; instead, some of them look like clitics (cf., 6(b) & (c)). In 6(b), for instance, while the subject pronoun is Awū, the post-verbal pronoun is wū, which goes further to indicate that the latter might not necessarily be a “copy” of the former. This, therefore, may imply that both Awū and -wū be rather interpreted as two different entities, the functions of which could be compared to those of say, English ‘he’ and ‘himself’, respectively in emphatic situations. The situation tends to be even more obvious in 6c: there both the ‘subject pronoun’ Ā and the post-verbal pronoun -bā differ in both form and shape altogether. This too, provides further evidence, which tends to weigh on the
assumption that the post-verbal pronoun must always be a “copy” of the ‘subject pronoun’ in these cases in particular. Pace: This view does not, however, rule out the possibility of the post-verbal pronoun being real “copies” of the pronouns in subject position in languages other than the ones discussed here!

   a) Positive
      Awū tēr  ka  wakūnunn.
      3sg run  go  home
      ‘She ran home.’
      (where L-tone is left unmarked by the author.)

   b) Negative
      Awū tēr  ka-wū  wakūnunn  bē.
      3sg run  go-3sg  home  NEG
      ‘She did not run home.’

   c) Negative: 3pl – Koops (op. cit.: 231)
      Ā  wēn-bā  ic”u  bē.
      3pl kill-3pl  leopard  NEG
      ‘They did not kill a leopard.’
      (where L-tone is left unmarked)

7. Negative: 1sg – Koops (op. cit.: 231)
   M  bā-m  iké  bē.
   1sg come-1sg  here  NEG
   ‘I didn’t come here.’

As mentioned above, unlike in Kuteb, there is tonal alternation in the post-verbal pronoun in the Wukari-Jukun and Takum-Jukun examples (cf. 8-16).

4.2 Wukari-Jukun (alias “Wapan”)

Unlike in Takum where the post-verbal pronoun is also used rather frequently in affirmative constructions (in addition to its obligatory use in the negative), according to Welmers (1968:57), Wukari (except for one sentence) does not use the post-verbal pronoun in affirmative constructions.
(Note: All the interlinearisation specifications in examples 8, 10-15, 17-18 are mine.)

4.2.1 Affirmative construction

8. Wukari-Jukun – (the only affirmative case with “recapitulating pronoun”) Welmers (1968: 58)
   M  yā  mī  rā.
   1sg go  RECAP  TAM
   ‘Goodbye!’ (Lit.: ‘I am gone.’)
4.2.2 Negative constructions

4.2.2.1 Standard negation – declarative verbal clauses


a) Positive

\[ \text{Phrasal form: } \\
\text{1sg am go today} \\
\text{‘I am going today.’} \]

b) Negative

\[ \text{Phrasal form: } \\
\text{1sg am go RP today NEG} \\
\text{‘I am not going today.’} \]

(Where M-tone remains unmarked; ‘RP’ = “repeating pronoun”, “recapitulating pronoun” by Koops & Bendor-Samuel (1974))


\[ \text{Phrasal form: } \\
\text{2pl TAM COP RECAP work NEG} \\
\text{‘You aren’t working.’} \]

4.2.2.2 Non-standard negation

As explained in 2.1.1, in addition to the application of non-standard negation strategy, Wukari-Jukun also tends to extend standard negation strategy to other environments, such as the imperative or jussive (“negative permissive or obligatory” Welmers (op. cit.:57). In such constructions, the usual clause-final standard negation strategy (”bá) is used as well as a pre-verbal non-standard negation strategy ká.

11. Imperative – Welmers (1968:57)

\[ \text{Phrasal form: } \\
\text{(2sg) PROHIB go NEG} \\
\text{‘Don’t go!’} \]

12. Jussive – Welmers (op. cit.:57)

\[ \text{Phrasal form: } \\
\text{3sg PROHIB buy guinea corn NEG} \\
\text{‘He shouldn’t buy guinea corn.’} \]
4.3 Takum-Jukun

According to Welmers (op. cit.:57), unlike in Wukari-Jukun (where the post-verbal pronoun is rarely found to be used in the affirmative), in Takum-Jukun, it is used in affirmative constructions rather frequently, and is anyway used obligatorily in the negative.

4.3.1 Affirmative constructions

13. Takum-Jukun – (affirmative constructions with “recapitulating pronoun”) Welmers (op. cit.:58)

M yā m rā.
1sg go RECAP TAM
‘Goodbye!’ (Lit.: ‘I am gone.’)

14. Takum-Jukun – (affirmative constructions with “recapitulating pronoun”) Welmers (op. cit.:58)

bē bē bé rā.
3pl ripe RECAP TAM
‘They are ripe.’

4.3.2 Negative constructions

According to Welmers (op. cit.:57), apart from the general clause-final "bá negator shared by both Wukari-Jukun and Takum-Jukun, the latter also (sometimes) uses another clause-final negator ̀àná, which Welmers assumes to be “somewhat more emphatic”, for the latter occurs more regularly in the environments of non-standard negation constructions, e.g. the imperative (see 17, below).

4.3.2.1 Standard negation – declarative verbal clauses

15. Takum-Jukun – Welmers (op. cit.:56)

bē rī bé "bá.
3pl TAM come RECAP NEG
‘They are not coming.’

16. Takum-Jukun – Welmers (op. cit.:57)

bē mè āzũ à bá ji fò bũká ̀fikyũ bā kàna "bá.
‘They saw that they would not defeat the people of Fikyu in war.’
(Welmers (also as in most cases) failed to provide interlinearisation data for this example.)
4.3.2.2 Non-standard negation

In contrast to Wukari-Jukun which also extends the use of the shared standard negation strategy "mbá to the environment of non-standard negation, Takum-Jukun makes more use of àná beside the former. Compare the following examples:

17. Imperative with àná – Welmers (op. cit.:57)

(Ú) ká yá àná.
(2sg) PROHIB go NEG

‘Don’t go!’

18. Jussive with àná – Welmers (op. cit.:57)

Kú ká h̄w̄ê zá àná.
3sg PROHIB buy guinea corn NEG

‘He shouldn’t buy guinea corn.’

(cf. also similar constructions in Wukari-Jukun in 11 & 12; there "mbá was used instead)

The next language to be discussed is Hone-Jukun. From a typological viewpoint, the language shows much divergence (and consequently richness) in the way it marks negation.

4.4 Hone-Jukun

Hone-Jukun applies complex multiple strategies in negation marking. Here, it distinguishes the negation of declarative verbal main clauses and non-verbal and existential clauses in terms of standard and non-standard negation. In other words, it has exclusive ways of marking negation in constructions involving both types.

As already indicated, in contrast to the rest of the Jukunoid languages discussed here, Hone seems to be the only language that disposes of more asymmetric negation structures (see 23).

4.4.1 Standard negation - declarative clause types

The basic marking strategy used in negating declarative verbal main clauses involves the application of a verbal suffix -é (for verb negation) and the particle m̃ŋ (for object negation). These, in turn, are complemented by the presence of reinforcers (e.g. -tə/-tī) for the Imperfective aspect, and -t for the Perfective.

19. Imperfective (-tə / -tī)

a) Verb negation:

Storch (1999:250-251)

5-ti-ŋi-é.
NsP.2sg-IND.NEG-know-NEG
‘You haven’t learned/known (it).’
b) **Object noun phrase negation**  
*Storch (op. cit.:251)*

3-tâ-rî-fûk  nâm-yûl  môn.  
Nsp.2sg-IND.NEG-PRES-hear-(NEG)  language-PP.1pl  NEG

‘You don’t understand our language.’

20. **Perfective (“Aorist” -î) - verb negation**  
*Storch (op. cit.:250)*

3-î-mû-é.  
Nsp.2sg-AOR.NEG-know-NEG

‘You did not know (but know now).’  (Original: “du wusstest (es) nicht.”)

---

**4.4.2 Non-standard negation - non-verbal and existential clauses**

In Hone, as in Yukuben, the Imperative employs discontinuous (double) negation:

21. **Non-verbal expression (subject noun phrase)**  
*Storch (op. cit.:252)*

Kîn-dâá  bûnôná.  
head-PP.3sg  NEG

‘S/he is mentally deranged.’  ((a) “S/he is not with her/his head or (b) Her/his head isn’t there.”)

22. **Imperative - Storch (op. cit.:251)**  

a) **Stative**

Ká-î-li-é!  
IMP.NEG-know-NEG

‘Do not “know”/learn (of)/hear (it)!’  (Original: “wisse nicht!; erfahre (es) nicht!”)

b) **Action**

Ká-yûg  bûr-Kààsàà  môn!  
IMP.NEG-gehen-(NEG)  Kasan Dare  NEG

‘Don’t go to Kasan Dare!’

Here, non-standard negation strategies (the morphological operations *bûnôná* and *môn*) are used in 21 and 22b, respectively, while 22a makes use of standard negation strategy (-é verbal suffix) in addition to non-standard negation strategy, the discontinuous (double) negative marker *ká-* , which also occurs in 22b.

23. **Potentialis vs. anti-potentialis**

a) **Potentialis**  (Storch 1999:175)

Bû-î  kyênû.  
Nsp.3.pl.-AOR-POT  wandering

‘They can (“are able to”) wander.’

b) **Anti-potentialis**  (Storch 1999:176) - asymmetric structure

ní-dân  yûgê.  
Nsp.1sg.-AOR-APOT  going/to go (Germ.: “Gehen”)  

‘I cannot go anymore/any longer.’
Example 23(b) illustrates an asymmetric structure. There are no noticable negation particles in that example, yet the infeasibilty of the action is understood. The negation is rather realised via a combination of asymmetries: a special lexically inherent negative auxiliary (“modal verb”) “dán”, the Aktionsart of which reads, ‘no more able to’, is introduced and at the same time, the finite lexical verb yāk is transformed into an infinitive yāgē, signalling the loss of finiteness of the lexical verb.

4.5 The origin of the other clause-final particles
Apart from the seemingly determined cases of the Yukuben kōŋ and the Hone-Jukun bānŋ, the origin of the other particles is still rather not (quite) clear, and probably may never be. There are no concrete persuasive hints, e.g. cognates that could help facilitate the reconstruction of such entities.

4.5.1 The Yukuben clause-final negator kōŋ
It may be assumed that the kōŋ particle must have derived from k̕-hōŋ ‘not true/false/falsehood’, the opposite of which is k̕-vāŋ ‘true/truly’.

24. k̕-vāŋ ‘true/truly’: the opposite of k̕-hōŋ
Í-sāŋ k̕i k̕-vāŋ.
3sg-see it cl-true/truly
‘He certainly saw it.’

Following Heine & Kuteva (2002) on grammaticalisation mechanisms, a hypothesis about the grammaticalisation paths of the present-day negative particle can be formulated as follows:

25. Desemanticisation > decategorialisation > erosion
Following this path, it will be assumed that k̕-hōŋ changes from bisyllabic to monosyllabic structure kōŋ.

At first, k̕-hōŋ undergoes loss in meaning content, which results automatically in decategorialisation. The final stage will subsequently employ what Heine & Reh (1984:21) call “Syllabic erosion” to change the k̕-hōŋ from a bisyllabic to a monosyllabic structure kōŋ. This would mean that the segmental part of -hōŋ gets elided via syncop; its coda ‘ŋ’ as well as its M-tone survive, thereby docking to and fusing eventually with the remaining part k̕- to yield the particle kōŋ.

4.5.2 The Hone -è, mōŋ, and bānŋ
4.5.2.1 The verbal suffix -è
With regard to the final -è verbal suffix, exact correspondences have been found in, for instance Lega, Bemba, Rwanda, Rundi, as well as northern Sotho (cf. Muzenga (1978:315)).
4.5.2.2 The negative predicative marker bánỳə

According to Storch (op. cit.:240f.), the negative predicative marker (“der negierende Predikator”) bánỳə expresses ‘to be non-existent/not available’ (original: “nicht vorhanden sein”), and appears to be an old composite, the origin of which could be traced back to the Jìbì (also Central Jukun) expression “bú ̀jìyé màjì” ‘the thing is not inside’; containing the Hone object negator màjì.

26. bánỳə in context
   zààŋàrè bánỳə 
   water not available
   ‘There is no water.’

4.5.2.3 The general negative particle màjì

The marker màjì, on the other hand, has a sound correspondence in Yukuben. In contrast to Hone where it is used in the negative, in Yukuben it is used in the affirmative as TAM marker, and may be reconstructed as an adverb, with the meaning ‘already’. Compare the example below:

27. The use of màjì in Yukuben
a) Bó bóỳì bò-tú màjì. 
   3pl kill 3pl.RECIPR.-each other PERFV
   ‘They have killed each other.’

b) Kó ó-kì̀ú màjì. 
   3sg.non-human SM-die PERFV
   ‘It’s dead.’

What does this say of the morpheme màjì? The answer tends to lie in the fact that the examples portray màjì as a ‘bipolar’ adverb, which can be used in the affirmative in one language, and in the negative in another. This analysis corresponds partially to a similar observation made by Jaggar (2009), who also describes a set of negative adverbial intensifiers in Hausa. These include adverbs of time frequency and degree, which can be both positive (e.g. meaning ‘always’) or negative (e.g. meaning ‘never’) dependent on their environment.

4.5.3 The negative imperative sentence-initial Yukuben fé and Hone ká-

The sentence-initial Yukuben fé and Hone ká- particles found in the imperative mark non-standard negation and can be analysed as part of discontinuous negation, maybe comparable to the French ne in ne ... pas. If confirmed, this may render a clue as to the original form of the other negation markers in structures other than the imperative, such as the declaratives. However, as it is now, there is not enough evidence to support the assertion.
4.5.4 The bë/bá/"bá particle

The bë, bá, and "bá particles found in Kuteb and Central Jukun seem to be an areal feature. They have, for instance, a (near) sound correspondence in Yukuben. It is the morpheme "bë, used as emphatic marker/intensifier/focus marker. It often translates as ‘just’, ‘only’, or ‘well’, dependent on environment. Compare the following examples:

28. The use of "bë

a) É-lé "bë.
   EP-EXIST INTENS
   ‘It certainly exists.’

b) Í-bá kāŋ "bë.
   3sg-come.FUT OBLIG EMPH
   ‘S/he is (surely) bound to come.’

c) É-áí bùkrá "bë.
   3sg-eat fast EMPH/INTENS
   ‘S/he eats quickly.’

Besides, negation particles of similar shapes are not uncommon outside Jukunoid. It is found, for instance in some far away Bantu languages and in also in a variant of Igbo, where it can be used in isolation, as in answering a yes-no question:

29. Igbo

Ô-rí-ëlé ‘yá? Answer: mbà ‘no’
   3sg-eat-TAM 3sg
   ‘Has s/he eaten it?’

In this regard, the following table shows comparable negating morphemes found in some Bantu languages:
Table 3. Negators functioning as potential sound correspondences: (Central) Bantu (in particular Congo) on B; MB (*mb > m – Hulstaert (1949))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>particle</th>
<th>independent words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batabwa (Babemba)</td>
<td>abe = awe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batelela</td>
<td></td>
<td>mbu = ngu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batswa</td>
<td></td>
<td>embé, môná</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewondo (Yaounde, Cameroon)</td>
<td>béé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libobi</td>
<td>be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokele</td>
<td></td>
<td>mbai or mba or mbayio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamvu-Walese-Mangutu</td>
<td>ambi or embi (= synonym bi ‘no’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndembó</td>
<td>ba, or bayi (before imperatives)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, these negators can serve as potential sound correspondences. Unfortunately, it is not easy to determine whether they (even the Jukunoid ones in some cases) are shortened forms of full independent words or not. Nevertheless, in the absence of fitting corresponding translations, they all seem to be representing one type of adverb or another.

On the other hand, there may be a temptation to assume that the Jukunoid bé, bà, and “bá, “bë particles must have come from Hausa, hereby relating to the Hausa discontinuous negation bàa ... bà, as in bàa sùunánda Maryama bà ‘My name is not Maryama.’ The affinity for such an assumption might, however prove to be misleading, especially given the fact that similar (or rather comparable) particles also occur elsewhere far beyond the immediate neighbourhood of Hausa and its influence (e.g. Yukuben, Igbo and Bantu languages). Conversely, it might be equally assumed that even Hausa itself must have borrowed its bà/bá from the neighbouring Benue-Congo languages to which the Jukunoid languages also belong.
Summary and conclusion

summary:
- the various types of negation markers in Jukunoid, their forms, features, probable sources of origin, and how they are used in sentences have been presented
- apart from the Yukuben kọ and the Hone báŋ and (and to a certain extent, the Hone mōŋ), it is difficult to trace the origin of the rest of the negation markers for lack of sufficient (and plausible) clues
- the languages show a certain degree of coherence in terms of negation patterns, whereby the more central ones show more coherence than those that lie in the periphery, namely Yukuben and Hone
- comparatively, Hone shows more complex and multiple negation system than the rest of the languages
- an attempt was made to formulate the grammaticalisation paths of the present-day kọ negative particle in Yukuben
- it was observed that the sentence-initial Yukuben fé and the Hone ká-particles found in the imperative can be analysed as part of discontinuous (double) negation
- sound correspondences were found for the Hone particles -è and mōŋ, as well as for the bē, bá and ñbá particles found in the rest of the languages

conclusion:
- although these languages (including Yukuben) may differ in the content and semantics of their negation marking (including secondary modifications), they all have one basic type of negation marking pattern in common, namely clause-final negation encoded by a general negation particle
- negation can be marked by positive polarity items, such as adverbs, which can sometimes be ‘bipolar’, i.e. some types can be used in the affirmative as well as in the negative
- negation patterns can uncover other patterns of (hidden) language structure, for example it was observed that Yukuben makes use of an obligatory verbal prefix, while Kuteb and some Central Jukun languages (Wukari-Jukun and Takum-Jukun) make use of an obligatory post-verbal pronoun. This tends to reveal the fact that the negative may be typologically more complex, and more conservative than the affirmative
- the post-verbal pronoun in Kuteb and some Central Jukun languages can be viewed as a mirror image of the pre-verbal subject marker in Yukuben, and can as such alternatively be rather analysed as some sort of anaphoric intensifier (comparable probably to the reflexive pronoun found elsewhere in world’s languages)

An issue for further investigation:
- since negatives, as shown in van Gelderen (2008), have proven to be a frequent source of interrogative, making a diachronic connection between negatives and interrogatives tends to be a worthwhile venture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>predominant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaph</td>
<td>Anaphor</td>
<td>Anaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aor</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apot</td>
<td>Anti-potentialis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cl</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conc</td>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cop</td>
<td>Copula</td>
<td>Copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Downstep</td>
<td>Downstep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emph</td>
<td>Emphasis/emphatic (marker)</td>
<td>Emphatic (marker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep</td>
<td>Expletive</td>
<td>Expletive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exist</td>
<td>Existential verb</td>
<td>Existential verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact</td>
<td>Factative</td>
<td>Factative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fut</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-J</td>
<td>Hone-Jukun</td>
<td>Hone-Jukun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-tone</td>
<td>High tone</td>
<td>High tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfv</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intens</td>
<td>Intensifier</td>
<td>Intensifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-tone</td>
<td>Low tone</td>
<td>Low tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ms.</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-tone</td>
<td>Mid tone</td>
<td>Mid tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>Negative/negation</td>
<td>Negative/negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsp</td>
<td>Nominal subject pronoun</td>
<td>Nominal subject pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblig</td>
<td>Obligation</td>
<td>Obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfv</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Png</td>
<td>Person-number-gender</td>
<td>Person-number-gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>Potentialis</td>
<td>Potentialis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pp</td>
<td>Possessive pronoun</td>
<td>Possessive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Present tense</td>
<td>Present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohib</td>
<td>Prohibitive</td>
<td>Prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recap</td>
<td>“Recapitulating” pronoun</td>
<td>“Recapitulating” pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipr</td>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Referential</td>
<td>Referential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflex</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>Relating/relative (marker)</td>
<td>Relating/relative (marker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Subject marker</td>
<td>Subject marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Standard negation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tam</td>
<td>Tense-aspect-mood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-J</td>
<td>Takum-Jukun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-J</td>
<td>Wukari-Jukun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†</td>
<td>raised L-tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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