Negation in the Gulf of Guinea creoles: typological and historical perspectives
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Aim of the talk:
1. To place the discontinuous/final negation patterns in the Gulf of Guinea creoles (GGC) in a typological/historical perspective;
2. To explain how these patterns appeared historically in the GGC, with focus on the final marker.

1 Negation in the Gulf of Guinea creoles

1.1 Linguistic data

- Preverbal marker (\(na\)) typically occurs between the subject and the TMA-complex;
- The final marker typically occurs in clause or sentence final position (data from ST).

(i) Sentence final

- Simplex sentences (VP+ adjuncts):

(1) Ê \(na\) ka bila konsë xitu ku kwa sa nê \(fa\).
   3SG NEG ASP turn know place that thing be in-it NEG
   ‘He doesn’t recognize the place where the thing is.’

- Complex sentences (complement clauses & low adjunct clauses)

(2) Ome se \(na\) fla kuma ê sa kunhadu bô \(fa\).
   man SP NEG say that 3SG is brother-in-law POS NEG
   ‘That man didn’t say he’s your brother-in-law.’

(3) A \(na\) mêsê pa bô be \(fa\).
   IP NEG want for 2SG go NEG
   ‘They don’t want you to go.’

(4) Zon \(na\) kume plumê zo pa bèbê \(fa\).
   Zon NEG eat first then for drink NEG
   ‘Zon didn’t eat first to drink next.’
When both domains are negated, the final marker occurs only once.

(5) Ome se na fla kuma è na sa kunhadu bò fa.
man SP NEG say that 3SG NEG is brother-in-law POSS NEG
‘That man didn’t say he’s your brother-in-law.’

(ii) Clause final
- High adjunct clauses

(6) Mina na ka pò kaza ku poblî fa, pundî poblî sa poblî.
Girl NEG ASP can marry with poor NEG because poor be poor
‘The girl cannot marry a poor guy because a poor guy is a poor guy.

(7) Xi è na bè faka fa, è na bèbè vin fa.
if 3SG NEG see knife NEG 3SG NEG drink wine NEG
‘If he doesn’t find the knife, he won’t drink wine.’

• Exclusive preverbal negation typically occurs
- in negative purpose clauses:

(8) Soku n sa tlaxi san ku sustu pa san
1SG be behind lady with fear for lady
na da mu sòtxi.
NEG give me whip
‘So I stood frightened behind the lady so she wouldn’t hit me.’

- in other semantically or pragmatically marked environments:

(9) Milhon pa bò na b’êlê.
better for 2SG NEG see-3SG
‘You better don’t see him.’

(10) Kloson na ka dwê sun an?
heart NEG ASP hurt you INT
‘Doesn’t your heart ach?’

(11) Kê kwa!? N na fada nansê kwa se!
what thing / 1SG NEG tell 2PL thing SP
‘What!? Didn’t I tell you so!’

• Exclusive final negation typically occurs in contrastive environments

(12) Ni glêntu d’awa? Sabi kyê nè fô!
in inside of-water / key fall in-3SG NEG-EMPH
‘In the water? The key didn’t fall in there!’

(13) Karu fa!
Car NEG
‘Not the car!’

(14) Zon ka fla, glita fa!
Zon ASP speak shout NEG
‘Zon speaks; he doesn’t shout!’
**Negative Concord with quantifiers/minimizers**

(15) **Nadaxi**i, non na té pa a fe kume fa.
    nothing 1PL NEG have for IMP make food NEG
    ‘We haven’t got ANYTHING to prepare food with.’

(16) Inen na té nê ùa mina fô!
    3PL NEG have not one child NEG -EMPH
    ‘They don’t have any children!’

(17) Ê na kume nê minge fa.
    3SG NEG eat not-even crumb NEG
    ‘He didn’t eat anything at all.’

---

**Table 1. Negation patterns in the GGC.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>default negation</th>
<th>irrealis (purpose clauses, etc.)</th>
<th>contrastive negation</th>
<th>emphatic negation</th>
<th>emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lungwa</strong></td>
<td>na…fa</td>
<td>na…</td>
<td>…fa</td>
<td>na…fô</td>
<td>fa-fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santome (ST)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fa d’ambô</strong></td>
<td>na…f</td>
<td>na…</td>
<td>…f</td>
<td>na…fa / fuf</td>
<td>f-fa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lung’ie</strong></td>
<td>…fa</td>
<td>na…</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>…fa ò</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lunga Ngola</strong></td>
<td>(a-na)...wa~va</td>
<td>na…</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(na)...fô</td>
<td>?eya*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Eya ‘yes’ (Maurer 1995: 216) is possibly the contraction of e+va~wa and similar to ST efan ‘yes indeed’, from e+fan.

---

**1.2 The proto-creole of the Gulf of Guinea**

- Discontinuous negation pattern (*na…fa*) can be reconstructed for the four GGC (Hagemeijer 2003);

- This reconstruction underscores previous claims that these languages branched off from a **proto-GGC** (Ferraz 1979) spoken on the island of S. Tomé, prior to diffusion.

- Assuming the reconstructed discontinuous pattern, the individual creoles are at different stages of Jespersen’s cycle:
1.2.1 Emphasis

In ST and FA, the final marker is homonymous with affirmative emphasis particle fa–fan (xx-xx). Ferraz (1979) refers to fa in his example below as a respectful morpheme.

(19) Ba non fa. (Ferraz 1979:118)
    go we EMPH
    ‘Please let us go.’ / ‘Shall we go?’

(20) Aglasa mu sa Ernestino fa.
    Name my be Ernestino EMPH
    ‘My name is Ernestino!’

(21) Fô wê mu fan!
    Get.out eye my EMPH
    ‘Get out of my sight!’

Sporadically, fan also occurs as the final negation marker (xx) (cf. also Negreiros 1895)

(22) Sangê na-a plopi men bô fan.
    lady NEG-be proper mother POSS NEG-EMPH
    ‘She’s not your real mother.’

Like other emphatic particles, fan, e.g. ô in (xx), is also able to follow the negation marker (xx).

(23) Sun na tôlô fa ô!
    He Neg1 silly NEG EMPH
    ‘He (formal) is not silly!’

(24) Kyê avo, punda Dêsu avo, na da mu
    EXCL grandma because God grandma NEG give me
    fa fan!
    NEG EMPH
    ‘Oh, please grandma, don’t beat me!’

Fan is most likely the result of the contraction of fa + a/an (particle of surprise, interrogation, emphasis in ST, NG, LU). Interestingly, the two languages with (tendency towards) final negation, LU and NG, do not have an affirmative emphasis marker homonymous with the final negation marker.
**Hypothesis A**: final marker started out as an intensifier of negation (e.g. *fava*, Schuchardt (1882: 914).

**Hypothesis B**: final marker started out as an emphasis marker/discourse particle and specialized for negation (e.g. speech verb *fa* 'to say' as an emphatic element).

2 Verb-object order and clause-final negation from a typological and African perspective

2.1 *Cross-linguistic survey of NEG position*

Dryer (1988, forthc.):
- universal preference to place NEG before the verb, irrespective of basic word order type (VO vs. OV)
- even stronger preference in VO languages

- São-Tomense with a typologically rare pattern

Map 1: Order of verb and negative word in VO languages (Dryer forthc.)

![Map 1: Order of verb and negative word in VO languages](image)

- VO&VNeg  □ VO&NegV

2.2 *Clause-final negation in the Macro-Sudan belt*

- Macro-Sudan as a large area of linguistic convergence (Güldemann forthc.)
- excludes most of Narrow Bantu

- one feature of the areal hotbed: VO&VNeg (Dryer forthc.)
2.3 Negation reinforcement in Bantu

2.3.1 Inherited predicate structure and negation

- inherited pre-verbal negation marked by prefixes before the verb stem (Westphal 1958, Kamba-Muzenga 1981, Güldemann 1996)

Figure 1: The morphological structure of finite verb forms in Bantu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLOT</th>
<th>(preinitial)</th>
<th>initial</th>
<th>(postinitial)</th>
<th>(preradical)</th>
<th>radical</th>
<th>(prefinal)</th>
<th>final</th>
<th>(postfinal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAM/</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td>TAM/</td>
<td>object</td>
<td>TAM/</td>
<td>TAM/</td>
<td>participant/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIONS</td>
<td>negation/</td>
<td>negation</td>
<td>valence</td>
<td>negation/</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>clause type/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clause type/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clause type/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (...) possibly empty; " possibly multiple occurrence, " presumably local innovations

Shona (S10)
(25) ndai-dá  
1S:HAB-want  
I used to like  
(26) ndi-pé  
1S-give:SUBJ  
I should/may give

ha-ndái-dá  
NEG-1S:HAB-want  
I did not used to like (Dale 1972: 266)  
ndi-sá-pé  
1S-NEG-give:SUBJ  
I should/may not give (Dale 1972: 264-5)
2.3.2 Innovative postverbal negation

recurrent subsequent reinforcement of negation, in particular by markers after the verb (Güldemann 1996: 256-8)

- **Suffixes**
  
  cf. Westphal (1958: 301f)

  Nkoya (L62)
  
  (27)a. **Ki-bá-kú-já-há.**
      
      NEG-2-FUT-eat-NEG
      
      ‘They will not eat (today).’
  
  b. **Ni-ku-mu-longesh-ha.**
      
      1S-FUT-1-teach-NEG
      
      ‘I will not teach him (today).’ (Yukawa 1987: 145)

- **Postverbal particles**

  Sena (N44)
  
  (28)Si-da-mu-’ona **tayu.**
      
      NEG-1S-PST-1-see NEG
      
      ‘I did not see him.’ (Torrend 1900: 162)

  Matumbi (P13)
  
  (29)U-yenda **lili.**
      
      2S-go NEG
      
      ‘You don’t go.’ (Krumm 1912: 37)

- **Clause-final particles or clitics**

  Lunda (L52)
  
  (30)**Hi-tu-ku-zata mudimu ku.**
      
      NEG-1P-FUT-?do work NEG
      
      ‘We will not do this work.’ (Westphal 1958: 300)

  Ndendeule (N101)
  
  (31)A-ki-tola ngöndi yê.
      
      1-PST-take beans NEG
      
      ‘He didn’t take beans.’ (TG, field notes)

  Umbundu (R11)
  
  (32)**Ha-tü-vi-mbandá-kó.**
      
      NEG-1P-8-doctor-NEG
      
      ‘We are not doctors.’ (Schadeberg 1990: 54)
  
  (33)**Ka-tu-a-kokele ukolo ko**
      
      NEG-1P-PST-pull rope NEG
      
      ‘We did not pull the rope.’ (Westphal 1958: 300)

- possible loss of pre-stem negation (Westphal 1958: 302ff)
  
  > entirely without inherited pre-stem strategy ~ full Jespersen’s cycle
geographical hotbed at the west-central domain of Bantu


**Suffix:** Mbundu (H21), Yaka (H31), Hungu (H33), Phende (L11), Holu (L12b), Salampasu (L51)

**Particle:** Vili (H12), Central Kongo (H16b), Yombe (H16c), Laadi (H16f), Zoombo (H16k), Suku (H32), Mbagani (L22), Ndembo (?L50)

- larger geographical patterns regarding the distribution of different negation strategies in Bantu (Westphal 1958)

Map 3: Distribution of types of negation over the Bantu language zones (Westphal 1958)
2.4 Summary
- Gulf of Guinea creoles with a typologically marked pattern;
- potential sources in Africa: Macro-Sudan belt as well as western Bantu further south;
- more fine-grained evaluation of attested layers.

3 Negation in the contributing/adstrate languages

3.1 Historical layers
There is substantial evidence for the following, chronologically ordered, layers in the GGC:

1. Portuguese (superstrate)
   Permanent settlement of S. Tome dates back to 1493.

2. Edoid substrate
   Linguistic & historic evidence strongly suggest a very early founder effect of the Edoid cluster on the formation of the proto-GGC that correlates with the so-called société de habitation.

3. Kongo adstrate
   Historical evidence suggests that after 1505 the slave trade to S. Tomé started shifting to the Kongo area. Therefore, Kongo slaves started arriving on S. Tomé slightly before the shift towards a société de plantation. The Kongo languages left a significant lexical imprint on ST (Ferraz 1979).

4. Mbundu adstrate
   The slave trade from Angola starts taking place when the shift towards a plantation economy on S. Tomé was already completed. The linguistic impact of Mbundu is restricted to Angolar, arguably because of the absorption of great numbers of Mbundu runaways by a previously formed runaway society during the plantation stage and subsequent relexification (Maurer 1992, Lorenzino 1998).

The historical facts suggest that Portuguese and Edoid should be the main contributors to the negation patterns observed in the GGC.

3.2 Portuguese
- Preverbal *na* is related to Portuguese *não*.
- Old Portuguese patterns of negative concord (NC) identical to NC in the GGC:
  - with indefinites:

(34) **Nenhuu nom mostrava que era faminto** (15th century Ptg., Martins, 2000: 194)
   ‘Nobody showed that he/she was starving.’
with intensifiers/minimizers

(35) Não vale isso nem migalha. (Gil Vicente, Farsa dos Almocreves)
‘This ain’t worth a crumb.’

The syntax of fa, however, is not reminiscent of the syntax of NC in Portuguese.

3.3 Edoid

Negation in the Edoid cluster is preverbal. Edo itself exhibits two negation markers, ma for past tense and i for non-past, but lacks a clause/sentence final marker.

(36) Òzó má ri èváré. (Edo, Agheyisi 1991: 14)
Ozo NEG-PAST eat food
‘Ozo did not eat food.’

(37) Òzó i ri èváré. (Edo, Agheyisi 1991: 14)
Ozo NEG-NON-PAST eat food
‘Ozo does not eat food.’ / ‘Ozo will not eat food.’

Differently from Portuguese and Bantu, Edo and ST share the same tripartite preverbal morphosyntax of negation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not</th>
<th>not anymore/no longer</th>
<th>not yet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edo</td>
<td>ma (non-past), i (past)</td>
<td>i ghi</td>
<td>ma he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>nanta~nantan</td>
<td>naxi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(38) E i ghi yo ugbo eghe hia. Edo (Agheyisi 1986: 58)
He NEG anymore go farm time all
‘He does not go to the farm at all time anymore.’

(39) I ma he kpao. Edo (Agheyisi 1986: 59)
1SG NEG yet leave
‘I haven’t left yet.’

It follows that the impact of Edoid may explain some facts about preverbal negation in the GGC, but it cannot explain the syntax of the final marker.

3.4 Kongo (H16) and closely related languages

Oldest sources from 17th century (Guinness 1882: 46-50, 58):
- double negation evident: S NEG-V O NEG
- no Negative Concord (Bantu in general)

Sorongo (H16d or a)
(40) Quifuene curiaco.
    ki-fwene ku-ria ko
    NEG:1S-can INF-eat NEG
    ‘I cannot eat.’ (Guinness 1882: 48)

(41) Cuendi bhumaco
    ku-endi v-uma ko
    NEG:2S-go 16-place NEG
    ‘Do not go elsewhere.’ (Guinness 1882: 50)
Queri qui umaco.
ki-ri     ki-uma  ko
NEG:1S-eat 7-thing NEG
‘I eat nothing.’ (Guinness 1882: 50)

Ongue cucuzi tiss n Peteleco.
ongweku-ku-ziti ss n Petele  ko
you  NEG:2S-FUT-love ? PROP NEG
‘Thou shalt not love Peter.’ (Guinness 1882: 85)

The same situation is observed in modern languages:

Laadi (H16f)
(44) Ka  n-zébia lári  ko.
    NEG 1S-know Laadi  NEG
‘Je ne comprends pas le lári.’ (Nsondé 1999: 62)

Vili (H12)
(45) Be  si-č kwènde  kuvè/ ko
2 NEG-PST go  NEG
‘Ils ne sont pas parties.’ (Loëmbe 2005: 75)

- clause-final particle obligatory as opposed to other languages in the wider area of former Belgian Congo where such an element is facultative (Hulstaert 1950: 57f)
- no double final negative in case of two joined negatives

San Salvador (H16a)
(46) Ku-m-pangi diau adimosi ne ki  mfumu eno  ko.
    NEG:2S-1S-treat like NEG:1S chief your NEG
‘Do not treat me as if I were not your chief.’ (Bentley 1895: 774)

But there is considerable variation within the Kongo language complex.

- alternative final particles and particle “stacking”

San Salvador (H16a)
(47) Kw-endi  kwe.  (< ko+e ~ interrogative)
    NEG:2S-go  NEG
‘Are you not going?’ or ‘Do not go!’ (Bentley 1887: 146)

Yombe-Cabinda (H16)
(48) a. Ku-yiba  pe.
    NEG:2S-steal  NEG
‘Tu ne voleras pas.’

b. Ku-iza  peko!
    NEG:2S-come  NEG
‘(Tu) ne viens pas (encore)!’ (Troesch 1953: 135)

- in general no difference between realis and irrealis (Kamba Muzenga 1981: 44f), but some exceptions, e.g., the “unnatural negative”: 
San Salvador (H16a)

(49) a. Ba-nete kio kiau ke ba-tolodi.  
2-carry:PST 7:OBJ 7:DEM NEG 2-break  
‘They carried it without breaking it.’ (Bentley 1887: 607)

b. Toma kanga e nkombo zau ke ji-tayi  
tie.carefully AUG 10.goats 10:DEM NEG 10-escape  
‘Tie the goats carefully, lest they run away.’ (Bentley 1887: 608)

- “Le signe négatif le plus fréquent est ka...ko ... Dans les langues de l’Ouest et en Bembe, la particule ko est employée seule.” (Soret 1959: 29), latent loss of inherited preverbal negation also in parts of Kongo

- in some varieties ko behaves tonally like a suffix (Carter 1974: 33-5) > enclitic

- in some varieties ko can occur earlier in the clause (Carter 1974: 37-8) > non-final

- ko probably derives ultimately from a postverbal locative adverb (class 18)

San Salvador (H16a)

(50) Ki-ele ko kwame ko  
NEG:1S-stay:PST there 1:EMPH NEG  
‘I have not been there.’ (Bentley 1887: 598)

- final negatives with additional function as emphatic/intensifying ~ focus particle; probable grammaticalization of emphatic particle to negative intensifier

Koki-Cabinda (H16)

(51) Iza ko minu ko.  
come EMPH I EMPH  
‘Viens donc moi meme.’ (Troesch 1953: 135)

Yombe (H16)

(52) Mi pe i be mona.  
I ADD.F 1S PERF see  
‘Moi aussi j’ai vu.’ (Troesch 1953: 135)

- final negatives identical with or similar to ‘No!’ (secondary development?), some start with a labial consonant: ko, ve, pe(le) (Bentley 1887: 145, 1895: 774; Troesch 1953: 135)

3.5 Mbundu (H21)

- post-verbal negative occurs before object etc.

(53) Muene kana ka-ri-ê xitu.  
1:DEM NEG 1:PST-eat-NEG meat  
‘Ela não comia carne.’ [she didn’t eat meat] (Chatelain 1888: 147)

- final negative as verb suffix co-varying with subject; same phenomenon in neighboring Hungu (H33) (Atkins 1954: 157f)
no difference between realis and irrealis (Kamba Muzenga 1981: 44f)
• variable marker, non-phrasal scope of final marker

3.6 Summary
♦ Portuguese: presumable input for Negative Concord;
♦ Edo: presumable input for tripartite preverbal negation;
♦ Kongo: primary contribution;
♦ Mbundu lacks explanatory power.

4 Conclusions
1) creole is typologically marked;
2) Kongo primary source of syntactic pattern → final negation in creoles typically correlated with strong substrate (Berbice Dutch ~ Ijoid, Palenquero ~ Kongo, Afrikaans ~ Khoekhoe);
3) Much of the variation found in Kongo languages is also found in the GGC, suggesting that substantial transfer may have taken place with a more limited role for internal development;
4) two hypotheses on origin of fa:
   i) general emphatic and specialization (parallel in Kongo), fa can be a non-Kongo element of the proto-creole
   ii) inherently negative intensifier
5) if the Kongo hypothesis is adequate, Kongo is not a substrate but just as a contact language;
   i) negation as a result between an early founder creole and Kongo
   ii) difference to Palenquero (Schwegler 1991, forthc., Dieck 2000), where Kongo is the crucial substrate.
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