Abstract

The Tanzanian Bantu languages Rangi and Mbugwe both employ a double negation marking strategy. In Rangi, verbal negation is achieved through the presence of a pre-verbal negative marker and a negative marker which appears either post-verbally or in a clause-final position. In Mbugwe, negation is indicated by a prefix that appears on the verb form and an optional post-verbal negative marker. This paper presents a descriptive account of negation in these two closely related languages, as well as exploring possible origins and grammaticalisation pathways involved in the development of the respective negation strategies in each instance. We propose that negation in these two languages shows evidence of the stages of Jespersen’s cycle: with what started out as a single marker of negation giving way to a bipartite negation strategy. We present data exemplifying negation in the two languages, contributing to the discussion of the development of negation in Bantu and the applicability of Jespersen’s cycle in the language family, as well as highlighting the possible role played by language contact in the development of negation in these languages.
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1. Introduction

Rangi and Mbugwe are two closely related Bantu languages spoken in northern central Tanzania. Although the present-day varieties of these languages are no longer in direct contact, the Rangi- and Mbugwe-speaking communities share a long history and a number of common contact languages. Rangi and Mbugwe are classified as F33 and F34 respectively (following Guthrie (1967–71:48) and the revised Guthrie system outlined in Maho (2003:646)) and share an estimated 72% lexical similarity (Masele and Nurse 2003:121). Both Rangi and Mbugwe
employ a double negation marking strategy. In Rangi, negation is achieved through the presence of the negative marker *sí* which appears before the verb and the negative marker *tuko* which appears either after the verb (1) or clause-finally (2). In Mbugwe, sentential negation is most commonly achieved through the presence of the negative prefix *te-*, which appears before the verbal complex (3). The negative marker *tokó* can also appear clause-finally, serving to emphasise the negative polarity of the sentence (4).  
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1. Where no other reference is provided, data are from fieldwork conducted by the authors. Rangi data were collected by the first author October 2009–May 2010 and October–December 2011. Mbugwe data were gathered by the second author September–December 2011 and July 2012, expanding on data previously collected by Julia Larsen and Viggo Larsen. Data represent a combination of elicited and spontaneous speech. Negation was not the specific target of the data-collection, and as such, those data discussed in the current paper reflect available data at the time of writing.

2. Rangi and Mbugwe are tonal languages, analysed as having a high vs. toneless distinction underlingly. Throughout the paper, surface high tone is marked with an acute accent over the vowel whilst surface low tone remains unmarked.
This paper has two goals. Firstly, to present a synchronic account of negation in Rangi and Mbugwe, with a view to extending the state of description of these two under-documented languages. Secondly, the paper aims to shed light on the possible stages of the diachronic development of negation in these two languages. We propose that the development of negation in the two languages reflect stages of the Jespersen’s cycle. Whilst we consider both languages to reflect inherited Proto-Bantu negation strategies – in the forms sti in Rangi and te- in Mbugwe – we also propose that the presence of the post-verbal negative markers toku and tokó in Rangi and Mbugwe is the result of lexical borrowing from neighbouring Cushitic languages. The paper contributes to the growing body of work examining negation in Bantu languages (see, amongst others, Güldemann (1999), Devos et al. (2010), Devos and van der Auwera (2013)), as well as providing a discussion of a possible instance of contact-induced grammatical change.

Section 2 provides an overview of negation strategies in Rangi, while Section 3 details negation in Mbugwe. Section 4 discusses a contact-induced account for the post-verbal negators found in Rangi and Mbugwe, identifying possible sources for the lexical items involved. Section 5 discusses possible routes of development for negation in the two languages, making reference to the stages of the Jespersen’s cycle. Section 6 constitutes a conclusion, providing a summary of the findings of the paper, as well as highlighting potential areas of further research.

2. Negation in Rangi

Rangi (F33) is a Bantu language spoken in the Kondoa region of central Tanzania. Estimates put the number of speakers at between 370,000 and 410,000 people (LOT 2009, Lewis et al. 2014). Rangi has a basic Subject-Verb-Object order which allows for some flexibility of constituents. It has morphologically complex verbs and nouns and an extensive system of agreement which is particularly apparent in the verbal domain. Lexical subjects and objects are cross-referenced by agreement markers on the verb. The verbal template is constructed in the usual Bantu manner. Inflectional and derivational affixes adjoin to an obligatory verb stem to encode tense-aspect-mood, polarity, subject and object information, amongst others. Whilst not all elements are present in a given verb form, elements appear in a highly specified order (see Meeussen (1967), Bearth (2003)). The outline of the verbal complex for Rangi is shown in Figure 2 below.

![Figure 2: The Rangi verbal template](image)

Tense and aspect distinctions in Rangi are encoded through a rich inventory of prefixes and suffixes which are adjoined to the verb stem, as well as independent auxiliary forms. Simple verbs are comprised of a single verb stem inflected for tense and aspect information which appears either in the pre-verb stem (slot 3 in Figure 2 above) and/or
the post-stem position (slot 8 in Figure 2). This can be seen in example (5) below, where the verb form hosts the
prefix á- and the suffix -íré which combine to indicate recent past tense. Complex verb forms use a combination of
an auxiliary and a main verb. This can be seen in example (6) below where the distant past auxiliary -íja combines
with the perfective suffix -íré on the main verb to encode the distant past perfective.

   1sg.PP SM1SG-PAST1-drink-PAST1 5-home.brew 17-my
   ‘I have drunk homebrew at my place.’

(6) Mama   a–íja   a–dóm–íré.
   1a.mother SM1-AUX.PAST2 SM2SG1.PAST2-go-PFV
   ‘Mother has gone.’

Sentential negation in Rangi is achieved through use of the negative marker sí which appears before the verb and the
negative marker toku. Whilst sí always appears in the pre-verbal position, toku can appear either immediately after
the verb (7) (repeated from (1) above) or clause-finally – i.e. after object nominal or adjuncts which appear post-
verbally (8) (repeated from (2) above).³

(7) Sí   n–íyó–dom–a   toku   na Dodoma.
   NEG SM1SG-PRS.PROG-go-FV NEG PREP Dodoma
   ‘I am not going to Dodoma.’

   2 CHILD. NEG SM3PL-PRS-want-FV INF-eat-FV 11.finger.millet NEG
   ‘Children do not like to eat finger millet.’

The same negation strategy is employed throughout the range of tense-aspect combinations, as can be seen in the
future tense (9), distant past tense (10) and the present habitual (11).

   1sg.pp NEG SM1SG-AUX go-FV NEG PREP Kondoa
   ‘I will not go [walk] to Kondoa.’

(10) Sí   á–terék–á  nyama   íra   síkó  toku.
   NEG SM3SG.PST2-cook-p2 9.meat 9.DEM 9.day NEG
   ‘S/he did not cook meat that day.’

³ For the purposes of the current paper, we follow the orthographic convention of writing the Rangi negative marker sí as an
independent word when it appears before the subject marker (see also Dunham (2005) and Stegen (2011)). We also posit a slot 1
pre-initial position in the Rangi verbal template (Figure 2 above). However, the status of sí as a bound or unbound morpheme
remains ambiguous and we make no conclusions in this regard in the current paper.
The negative marker tuku appears immediately after the verb the scope of negation appears to extend only over the verb form. In example (12) only the movement verb dom ‘go’ is negated, whilst in example (13) the entire proposition ‘going to farm’ is negated (data from Stegen 2011:238).

\[
(11) \text{Mo-sungaati sí a-lóng-áa na mu-keva tuku.} \\
1\text{-rich.person NEG SM3PL-spend.day-HAB PREP 1\text{-poor.person NEG}} \\
\text{‘A rich person does not spend the day with a poor person.’}
\]

In declarative contexts the presence of the negative marker tuku is obligatory and its omission results in an ill-formed sentence (14). However, in interrogative contexts the negative marker tuku is absent from the clause ((15) (16)).

\[
(12) \text{Vaa-ntu sí voo-dom-a tokʊ noo rɪm-a} \\
2\text{-people NEG SM3PL-PROG-go-FV NEG COP.REF farm-FV} \\
\text{‘People are not going to farm.’}
\]

\[
(13) \text{Vaa-ntu sí voo-dom-a noo rɪm-a tokʊ} \\
2\text{-people NEG SM3PL-PROG-go-FV COP.REF farm-FV NEG} \\
\text{‘People are not going to farm.’}
\]

\[
(14) \text{*Sɪí n-ìyó-dom-a na Dοdoma.} \\
\text{NEG SM1SG-PRS-PROG-go-FV PREP Dodoma} \\
\text{‘I am not going to Dodoma.’}
\]

\[
(15) \text{Sa che sí o-luosik-a na i-ruumbʊo r-aako?} \\
\text{For what NEG SM2SG-talk-FV PREP 5-sister 5-your} \\
\text{‘Why do you not talk with your sister?’ (Stegen 2011:395)}
\]

\[
(16) \text{Joolí sí w-oo-vooof-a va-antu va-kooolʊ va-vʊmb-a na ma-ta} \\
\text{How NEG SM2SG-PROG-fear-FV 2\text{-people 2\text{-big SM3PL-be.bad-FV PREP 6\text{-bow}} na ma-chimʊ?}} \\
\text{PREP 5-spears} \\
\text{‘...how do you not fear big bad people with bows and spears?’ (Stegen 2011:413)}
\]

It appears that negative relatives also employ the negative marker sɪí but that this can appear without the post-verbal negative marker tuku (17). However, additional data would be needed to test whether tuku is always absent in such constructions or whether its omission is optional.

\[
(17) \text{Mw-eene sí a-chuund-a-a na iyo chuund-wa} \\
\text{1\text{-having NEG SM3PL.GEN-teach-PASS-FV PREP 1\text{-mother teach-PASS-FV a-ri ni vaa-ntu au dunia}} \\
1\text{-COP COP 2\text{-people or 9.world} ‘Who is not taught by (his) mother will be taught by people or the world.’ (Stegen 2011:285)}
\]

The negative marker sɪí can also be used in non-verbal predication, as can be seen in examples (18) and (19) below. We consider sɪí in sentential negation and the sɪí in negative non-verbal predication to be the same element despite the
distinct functions (a similar proposal is made for Kanincin by Devos et al. (2010)). From a historical perspective, Kamba Muzenga (1981:100-101) explicitly links the pre-initial negative marker to the negative copula in a number of Bantu languages and includes Rangi amongst those languages in which the pre-initial -nka/ha- negative marker has been replaced by the negative copula sǐ. As can be seen in these examples, in this context sǐ can appear independent of any other verb form. However, the negative marker tuku is still regularly present ((18)–(19)), although it does not appear to be obligatory (20).

(18) ohō sǐ mo-osí Leo tuku.
1.DEM NEG 1-old.man Leo NEG
‘This is not Mr Leo.’

(19) kĩ ki-kombe sǐ ch-aani tuku.
7.DEM 7-cup NEG 7-my NEG
‘This cup is not mine.’

(20) Hoomi ni-ku–tuung-e na lu–fyo kweeri n–koon–e sǐ komī
Look–IMP.PL SM1SG-OM2SG-cut-SBJV PREP 11-knife truly SM1SG-see-SBJV NEG 9.true
‘Look, I should cut you open with a knife, truly I should see it is not true.’ (Stegen 2011:498)

The intensifier bweete ‘at all’ can be used for emphatic purposes. Consider the examples below where (21) shows the use of the negative marker tuku, resulting in a standard negative reading. However, example (22) employs the intensifier bweete and a stronger, intensified negative reading obtains.4

NEG SM1SG-AUX dance–FV NEG
‘I will not dance.’

(22) Sǐ n-dĩ–rĩ vin–a bweete.
NEG SM1SG-AUX dance–FV at.all
‘I will not dance at all.’

The intensifier bweete can appear instead of tuku, as in examples (22) and (23). However, it is also possible for tuku and bweete to co-occur, in which case an emphatic reading also holds (24).

‘These stones are not at all suitable for building a floor.’

(24) Sǐ n-tutte ki–mtu tuku bweete.
NEG SM1SG-AUX.HAVE 7-thing NEG NEG
‘I do not have a thing.’ (Stegen 2011:148)

4 Dunham (2005) considered bweete ‘at all’ to have its origins in the Swahili word bure ‘free’. However, we consider this to be an unlikely source of this lexical item due to its use in these contexts. If it has its origins outside Rangi it may well be an example of a loanword from Cushitic.
In addition to its function as an intensifier, *bweete* can also be used as a negative answer word, as can be seen in example (25) below.\(^5\)

\[(25)\]  
\[\text{bweete, } \text{*si-} \text{n-} \text{iyó-} \text{haand-} \text{a} \text{vi-} \text{ryo} \text{uhu} \text{mw-áá} \text{a} \text{toku.}\]  
\[\text{NEG} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{SM1SG-PRS.PROG-plant-FV} \quad 8-\text{millet} \quad 3.\text{DEM} \quad \text{NEG}\]  
\[\text{‘No, I am not planting millet this year.’}\]

Rangi also has two negative possessive constructions. These take the forms *situte* ‘not have’ and *sina* ‘not have’. We consider the construction *situte* ‘not have’ to be the counterpart to the affirmative possessive auxiliary *-tute* ‘have’ (26), simply with the inclusion of the negative marker *si*, as can be seen in examples ((27)-(28)).

\[(26)\]  
\[\text{Na-} \text{tute} \quad \text{va-} \text{ki} \quad \text{va-} \text{vir} \text{.}\]  
\[\text{1SG.PP} \quad \text{NEG-SM,NEG1SG-AUX.HAVE} \quad 2-\text{wife} \quad 2-\text{two}\]  
\[\text{‘I have two wives.’}\]

\[(27)\]  
\[\text{Ní} \text{ntu} \quad \text{si-} \text{n-} \text{tute} \quad \text{ki-} \text{taabu} \quad \text{toku.}\]  
\[\text{1SG.PP} \quad \text{NEG-SM,NEG1SG-AUX.HAVE} \quad 7-\text{book} \quad \text{NEG}\]  
\[\text{‘I do not have a book.’}\]

\[(28)\]  
\[\text{Va-} \text{si-} \text{tute} \quad \text{vi-} \text{ryo} \quad \text{toku.}\]  
\[\text{SM3PL-NEG-AUX.HAVE} \quad 8-\text{millet} \quad \text{NEG}\]  
\[\text{‘They do not have millet.’}\]

As can also be seen in the examples above, in the first person singular form the negative marker *si*- appears before the first person singular subject marker *n-*, yielding *sintute* ‘I do not have’. However, in the third person plural form *vasitute* ‘they do not have’ the negative marker appears after the subject marker (28). The forms of the subject agreement for human referents with the negative possessive *-tute* are summarised in Figure 3 below.

**Figure 3: Subject marking in Rangi negative possessive forms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First person</td>
<td><em>sintute</em></td>
<td><em>twasitute</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second person</td>
<td><em>usitute</em></td>
<td><em>musitute</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third person</td>
<td><em>asitute</em></td>
<td><em>vasitute</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tendency for first person singular subject markers in negative constructions to exhibit different behaviour from other person/class distinctions – as is shown for Rangi above – has been noted across Bantu (Kamba Muzenga 1981:181). Swahili, Tonga, Kamba and Kilega, for example, all exhibit different forms in the first person singular. A similar alternation in the first person singular and other person agreement is also observable in Mbugwe (see Section 3).

\(^5\) The use of *bweete* as a negative answer particle is of particular interest to the current discussion relating to the development of negation in the language more broadly. Devos and van der Auwera (2013) observe that negative answer particles are a common source of post-verbal negative markers in Bantu. This is discussed in more detail in Section 4 below.
The second negative possessive construction is based around the form -sina ‘not have’. We consider -sina to be a combination of the negative marker sí and the preposition na ‘and, with’, yielding a possessive construction conveying ‘be not with, be without’. This form of the negative possessive construction also exhibits subject agreement and follows the standard paradigm as determined by the class of the noun involved. This can be seen in example (29) below where subject agreement is with the class 9 noun mpichi ‘hyena’ and in example (30) where subject agreement is with the non-overt first person plural subject. Similarly, in example (31), -sina hosts the class 17 locative marker to form an expletive construction.6

(29) Mpichi i-sina m–ryoongo toko.
    9.hyena SM9-NEG.have 3-brain NEG
    ‘The hyena has no brains.’ (Margaret Dunham p.c.)

(30) Twa–sina mpeesa baa chá–korya.
    SM1PL-NEG.have 9.money nor 7-food
    ‘We do not have money or food.’

(31) Ku–sina ma–yi toko.
    17-NEG.have 6-egg NEG
    ‘There are no eggs.’

These negative possessive constructions are two of only a few instances in which the negative marker appears in the post-initial position. Another instance in which the negative marker appears in the post-initial position is in negative subjunctive clauses. In example (32) below, the negative marker appears after the first person plural subject marker in the subjunctive construction tuskere ‘we should not lose’. Example (32) also shows the formation of the negative conditional in which, although at appears after the conditional marker ka-, we still consider it to occupy the pre-initial position since it appears before the first person plural subject marker t-.7

(32) Ka-st-t–óó-vyaal-a to-si-ker-e tama toko.
    COND-NEG-1PL-PROG-bear-FV SM1PL-NEG-cut-SBJV 9.desire NEG
    ‘If we do not bear (children), we should not lose hope.’ (Stegen 2011:129)

It is also possible for toku to appear without the negative marker sí. This happens in negative infinitive constructions (33), the prohibitive (34) and instances of non-verbal predication (35).8

---

6 It seems that in negative possessive constructions such as example (30), the post-verbal negative marker is optional (although other examples do seem to indicate its presence is preferred). In this specific context, the use of baa ‘nor’ may also motivate the absence of toku by serving to negate the set of alternatives.

7 Additional data are required to determine the position in which the negative marker at appears in other dependent tenses. However, we believe that the data presented for the negative subjunctive form and possessive constructions motivates the inclusion of the post-initial slot for negation in Rangi.

8 As can be seen in example (33), it is also possible for the infinitive in Rangi to appear without the class 15 infinitival prefix ku-. Further investigation into the distribution of the infinitival maker is required. However, it appears to be related to at least, specificity and main versus subordinate status of the clause, as well as phonological considerations (Gibson 2012).
To summarise, sentential negation in Rangi is achieved through the presence of the negative marker só which appears before the verb form and the negative marker tʊkʊ which appears either after the verb or clause-finally (with slightly different scope effects found in each instance). Both the negative markers só and tʊkʊ are invariable and do not interact with the subject morphology on the verb form. The two exceptions to this generalisation are found in the negative possessive expressions formed using -sitante or -sina both of which host a subject marker prefix, and in negative subjunctive forms. The intensifier bweete ‘at all’ can also be used. In some instances bweete takes the place of tʊkʊ, resulting in a stronger emphatic negation. However, it is also possible for tʊkʊ and bweete to co-occur. The negative marker tʊkʊ is used alone in negative infinitival constructions, prohibitive clauses and instances of non-verbal predication. In declarative clauses, there is a preference for at least one of the post-verbal negative markers (tʊkʊ or bweete) to be present. However, in interrogative contexts the post-verbal negative marker can be omitted.

3. Negation in Mbugwe

Mbugwe (F34) is spoken by approximately 37,000 people in the Babati district of northern Tanzania (LOT 2009). Mbugwe also has a dominant Subject Verb Object constituent order, with verbs constructed through prefixes and suffixes adjoining to a verbal stem. Some verb forms have an additional periphrastic form where the prefix of the simple form functions as an auxiliary (Mous 2000). Tense-aspect distinctions are encoded through a combination of markers which appear in the pre-stem position and inflectional endings (including the default final vowel -a) which appear after the verb stem, as well as through the associated tone marking. An object marker (when present) appears in between the tense marker and the verb stem. An outline of the verbal template for Mbugwe is shown in Figure 4 below adapted from Nurse (2008).
In example (36), the hodiernal is marked by the suffix -iyɛ and a melodic high tone on the penultimate mora of the verb stem. There is no TAM marker in slot 4. In example (37), the hesternal is marked by the TAM prefix á-, the suffix -iyɛ and no melodic tone.

Negation in main clauses is achieved primarily through the presence of the negative prefix te- which appears in the pre-initial (slot 1 in Figure 4 above) position. There is no other morphological marking of negation in the clause, and the subject marker appears in the same form as in an affirmative verb (in slot 2 in Figure 4). This can be seen in example (38) below, where te- appears before the second person singular marker o- (realised as w-) and with the same TAM marking as in the affirmative hesternal form (cf. example (37)). In example (39), the negative prefix te- is used in a future construction, again, with the second person singular subject marker.

In contrast to other contexts, in the first person singular the negative marker takes the form sí- (instead of te-) and appears immediately after the subject marker in the post-initial position (slot 3 in Figure 4 above). As noted in Section 2, a difference in behaviour between first person singular and other person/class distinctions is often found in negative forms across Bantu. This distinction also occurs in Mbugwe, as can be seen below, where the first person singular
subject marker $n$- is immediately followed by the negative marker $sí$- (40). In verb forms which employ the pre-stem position for encoding tense, the tense marker intervenes between the negative prefix $sí$- and the verb stem, as in the future tense (41).

                 7.DEM  7-food  
SM1SG-1SG.NEG-bring-HOD  
‘I have not brought that food.’

                        5-field  5-1SG.POSS  10-day  10-all  
SM1SG-1SG.NEG-FUT-cultivate-FV  
‘I will never cultivate my farm.’ lit.: ‘I will not cultivate my farm all days.’

The negative markers $te$-/sí- are employed in all indicative forms of the verb in Mbugwe. In the negative subjunctive, the negative marker $káysé$- (which shows free variation with the form $késé$-) is used. This marker is the same for all persons and noun classes and appears as a prefix before the verb stem in the post-initial slot 3 position (see Figure 4 above). This can be seen in examples (42) and (43) below.

SM2SG-NEG.SBJV-return-FV  
‘Do not return.’

SM1SG-NEG.SBJV-cultivate-FV  5-field  5-1SG.POSS  
‘Let me not cultivate my farm.’

Another negative form which does not use the prefix $te$-/sí- is the prohibitive. In the prohibitive construction, there is no dedicated negative morphology. Rather, the construction as a whole conveys a prohibitive meaning. The lexical verb is not inflected for tense-aspect-mood information, but carries a subject marker ((44)–(45)). Whilst these forms are unusual from a comparative perspective, it has been noted that it is not uncommon for the prohibitive to employ a different strategy than standard sentential negation (see for instance Devos and Van Olmen (2013)).

PST-COP.LOC  SM2PL-OM1SG-hate-FV  
‘Do not hate me!’

\(^9\) The nasal prefix is not syllabic in Mbugwe, but assimilates to the voicing and place of articulation of the following consonant. Before voiceless consonants the nasal is dropped by some speakers. Nasals do not carry tone in Mbugwe.

\(^10\) More research is needed in order to understand the origin and composition of the prohibitive form. Whilst the construction most closely resembles a subjunctive or an imperative (due to the absence of any tense-aspect morphology) the tone on the lexical verb stem does not correspond to either the imperative or the subjunctive. There are only two examples of this construction in our Mbugwe data, and the form was also given in elicitation.

\(^11\) An alternative analysis is to consider $aré$- as occupying the NEG1 position: $aré$-mo-n-sóóch–a ‘NEG-SM2PL-OM1SG-hate-FV’. However, the segments are known from other forms to represent the past (a-) and the locative copula (-ré) (which also marks the progressive) so we maintain the analysis presented above.
The negative prefix te-/sí- is also used in negative predication, negative possessive constructions and in the formation of negative existential constructions. For negative predication and negative possessive constructions, the negative marker te- is prefixed onto the locative copula -ré ‘to be at’ (46). It is also possible for this possessive construction to be inflected with temporal information, such as the past tense prefix á- (47). The negative possessive can also be constructed using the form -teeté, ‘have’, in which case the negative marker te- appears in the pre-initial position (48).\footnote{We do not have examples with the first person singular subject form -teeté in the negative and so the position of this subject marker (whether it appears in the pre- or post-initial slot) cannot be ascertained.}


\begin{verbatim}
NEG-COP.LOC 7-food 7-good
\end{verbatim}

‘It is not good food.’

(47) Te–á–ré ná ngɔ

\begin{verbatim}
NEG-PST-COP.LOC PREP 10.clothes
\end{verbatim}

‘She had no clothes.’


\begin{verbatim}
NEG-SM1PL–have 3–work
\end{verbatim}

‘We did not have work.’

As was also shown for sentential negation, in the first person singular form of the negative possessive construction, the negative prefix appears as sí- instead of te-. This can be seen in example (49) below.\footnote{This construction was only used by one speaker who tends to drop the nasal prefix before a voiceless consonant. It is therefore unclear whether the first person singular subject marker n- may occur in this construction.}

(49) Sí–ré na máli, sí–ré ná ŋɔɔmbe.

\begin{verbatim}
1SG.NEG-COP.LOC PREP wealth 1SG.NEG-COP.LOC PREP 10.cow
\end{verbatim}

‘I do not have riches, I do not have cattle.’

The negative prefix te- is also used in the formation of the negative existential construction and the negative counterfactual. The negative existential is formed using the copula -ré and the locative suffix -kɔɔ which is attached to the verbal complex (50), whilst the negative counterfactual employs the marker káá- (51).


\begin{verbatim}
10-hair NEG-PST-COP.LOC-LOC 1-person SM3SG–PST-OM3SG–cut–FPST
\end{verbatim}

‘There was no one who cut her hair.’


‘If you had come, you would not have met me.’
In addition to the standard negative prefix te- (or st-), the negative marker tokó can appear clause-finally to intensify the negation. The scope of the negation extends over the whole clause. This can be seen in example (52) below where the presence of tokó serves to add emphasis to the negated verb tejasaídíá ‘they did not help’. Similarly, the utterance in example (53) would be acceptable in a context where the people being spoken about gave birth at home rather than running to the hospital (i.e. they neither walked to the hospital nor ran anywhere else).

(52) Baa áfá vá-ja-á-n-jísh-er-y-á m–pôngó
10-ASSOC 10.DEM but NEG-SM10-PST-help-FPST 7.any NEG
‘They even did all these things to me, but they did not help at all.’

1PL_PP NEG-SM1PL-PST-PROG-run-APPL-FV 6-hospital NEG
‘We were not running to the hospitals at all.’

In instances of non-verbal negation, it is also possible for tokó to function alone. This can be seen in the conditional construction in example (54). 14

even if NEG 9-thing 9-ASSOC 5.God 1SG.NEG-CFCT-COP-LOC-LOC
‘If it were not for the word of God, I would not be here.’

The negative marker tokó is also used alone as the negative answer particle. This can be seen in example (55) below, where tokó is used to answer negatively to a question.

NEG COP Mwajjiwa 3SG.SM-PST-make.mistake-CAUS-FPST
‘No, it is Mwajjiwa who has made a mistake.’

In summary, negation in Mbugwe is achieved through the use of the negative marker te- which appears in the pre-initial slot 1 position as part of the verbal complex. In the first person singular, the negative marker takes the form si- which appears instead of te- and occupies the post-initial (slot 3) position. The negative subjunctive kôsê- also appears in this position. Negative predication, negative possession and negative existential constructions can also be achieved through the use of te-, which appears as a prefix on the locative copula -re. For negative possession te- may also be combined with the possessive verb -teetê. In the negative counterfactual, te- is used as a prefix on the regular counterfactual form marked with the prefix kâá-. The prohibitive stands out as there is no overt negative

14Whilst tokó does not appear to be in a clause-final position, one reviewer remarked that if the conditional marker ŋáre contains the copula -re, then in this instance (at least) historically tokó is appearing post-verbally. The etymology of ŋáre remains unclear, although an account of it comprising of the copula -re and a conditional marker along the lines of ŋa- seems plausible.
4. The origins of the Rangi and Mbugwe negative markers

Bantu languages employ a range of different strategies to encode negation. The current section discusses possible origins of the negative markers in Rangi and Mbugwe. Whilst the negation strategies found in these two languages fit within the broader typology of negation marking in Bantu, we propose that the post-verbal negative markers tokó and tuku have their origins in non-Bantu languages, specifically the neighbouring Cushitic languages Alagwa or Burunge.

Main clause, sentential negation in Bantu is commonly marked verbal-internally (cf. Meeussen (1967), Kamba Muzenga (1981), Güldemann (1999)). Two positions are available for this verb-internal marking of negation: the pre-initial position (i.e. before the subject marker) and the post-initial position (i.e. after the subject marker). Güldemann (1996, 1999) suggests that this post-verbal negative position was historically associated with non-main clause contexts such as infinitives, relatives and subjunctives as is still the case in many languages. Swahili (G42), for example marks negation in the pre-initial position with the negative marker ha- appearing before the subject marker (56). In contrast, the post-initial position is used in dependent clauses such as the negative subjunctive (57).

(56) Ha–tu–ta–som–a ki–tabu hiki
NEG-SM1PL-read-FV 7-book 7.DEM
‘We will not read this book.’ (Swahili)

(57) U–si–end–e!
SM2-NEG-go-SBJV
‘Do not go!’ (Swahili)

In some Bantu languages, negation is double marked. This often takes the form of a pre-verbal negative marker combining with a post-verbal negative marker. Amongst East African Bantu languages, Rangi and Mbugwe are not alone in employing post-verbal negation markers. Dawida (E74a), Lubukusu (E31), Kuria (JE43), Gweno (E65), Hehe (G62) and Machame (E621B), amongst others, all employ post-verbal negative markers (Devos and van der Auwera 2013). The use of a post-verbal negation marker can be seen in Lubukusu where negation involves the post-verbal negative marker ta (58). Kuria (JE43) exhibits double negation with a combination of a pre-initial negative marker and a post-verbal negative marker (59).
(58) **Wakesa se–a–a–tim–a ta**
Wakesa  NEG-1SM-PST-run-FV NEG
‘Wekeasa did not run.’ (Lubukusu, Wasike (2007:243))

(59) **Te–bá-som–ere hai**
NEG-SM2-read-PFV  NEG
‘They have not read today.’ (Kuria, Cammenga (2004))

From a historical perspective, post-verbal negation is considered to be a more recent innovation across Bantu than pre-verbal negation markers (Güldemann 1999, Nurse 2008:57, 182–3, 289). We propose that the negative marker *sí* found in Rangi and the prefixes *te–* in Mbugwe are reflexes of the Proto-Bantu pre-initial negative markers *ti/ci* and reflect the inherited strategy of using a pre-initial verbal marker for negation (see Nurse (2008:181)). We consider the post-verbal negative markers *tuku* and *tokó* to be examples of more recent additions to the languages. We further propose that the presence of these elements in the languages is representative of Stage II of the Jespersen’s Cycle (see Section 5 below), as has been noted for post-verbal negation across Bantu more broadly (Güldemann 1996: 256-8).

A growing amount of work examines the development of negation strategies in Bantu languages (Kamba Muzenga 1981, Güldemann 1999:288, Kamba Muzenga 2005, Nurse 2008, Devos et al. 2010, Devos and van der Auwera 2013). Devos and van der Auwera (2013) present an account of Jespersen’s cycle in Bantu, with a focus on the distribution of post-verbal negative marking and the sources of negative markers in the Bantu languages. They identify six common sources for post-verbal negative markers found in Bantu languages: negative answer particles, other negative words, two types of locative pronouns, possessive pronouns and locative possessive pronouns. We claim that whilst the post-verbal negative markers in Rangi and Mbugwe might fall into one (or more) of these categories, an additional option which is not explicitly explored in the account provided by Devos and van der Auwera (2013) is also possible. We explore the possibility that the lexical items *tuku* and *tokó* are the result of contact with non-Bantu languages spoken in the region.

The Tanzanian Rift Valley area is characterised by a sustained history of language contact, patterns of multilingualism and language shift (Kießling et al. 2008). Linguistic observations of the Bantu and Cushitic languages in this area indicate that there has been significant interaction between the languages, and that they together with other languages in the area form a language area or Sprachbund (Kießling et al. 2008). The nature of this contact is further characterised by the fact that the languages in the area come from different language families and represent differing language types. Both Rangi and Mbugwe can be considered linguistic enclaves to some extent, being surrounded by non-Bantu languages. The present-day Rangi-speaking community is surrounded by speakers of the Cushitic languages Gorwaa, Burunge and Alagwa, the Nilotic languages Datooga and Maasai and the Khoe language Sandawe (Kießling 2007:180). The Mbugwe-speaking community also finds itself with non-Bantu neighbours, in particular, speakers of the Cushitic languages Iraqw and Gorwaá and the Nilotic languages Datooga and Maasai.

Rangi and Mbugwe both show a number of features which can be considered to result from contact with non-Bantu languages. Both, for example, exhibit the comparatively and typologically unusual constituent order in which
an auxiliary appears post-verbally in restricted syntactic contexts (see Gibson (2012)) for an account of this in Rangi and Mous (2000, 2004) for this in Mbugwe). Indeed, a contact-induced account has been proposed for this marked constituent order (Mous 2000, Stegen 2003, Dunham 2005). A number of Cushitic loan words, as well as possible morphosyntactic innovation which may result from contact with non-Bantu languages can also be observed (Stegen 2003, Gibson 2013).

From an areal perspective, many of the non-Bantu languages spoken in the area mark negation through the presence of a suffix on the verb. In Iraqw, negation is achieved through the verbal suffix -ká (Mous 1993:168). Sandawe also exhibits post-verbual negation. This takes the form of a set of negative clitics which are inflected for person information in realis clauses, and the invariable clitic ṭs’é,15 which is used in other contexts, including non-verbal negation (Steeman 2010:114–116). These clitics are positioned immediately after the verb, but in non-verbal utterances they always appear clause-finally. Moreover, the two primary contact languages for Rangi and Mbugwe – Burunge and Alagwa – both have lexical items which could be appropriate candidates for sources for the post-verbual negative markers tuku and tokó.

In Burunge, the negative suffixes -ba and -basli (used in declarative and interrogative contexts respectively) are used to encode negation (Kießling 1994:201). However, Burunge also has a lexical item tuĸa,16 which has been described as an “ideophone which expresses totality, e.g. the patient of an action is affected in its entirety” (Kießling, p.c.). This can be seen in examples (60) and (61) (data from Kießling (p.c)). 17

(60) Yáa /agim-ᵱ yáa/yí gu daka’u tuká.
S3.PST eat-3SG.M fruits M baobab <totality>
‘He ate all the baobab fruits.’

(61) ‘Ay-k-írr k-o-si yáa ’oonid-ᵱ tuká háang
father-M.DEFL-DEM,REF POSS-M-POSSESS-3SG,POSSESS S3.PST get.drunk-PFV <totality> even
na-k-írr k-ósí-see.
boy-M.DEFL-DEM,REF POSS-M-POSSESS-3SG,POSSESS Also
‘His father got drunk completely and so did even his brother.’

In Alagwa, negation is achieved through the addition of the verbal suffix -basl (Mous forthcoming). However, Alagwa also uses the form tuĸa’/tuká ‘all’, as can be seen in examples (62) and (63) below (data from Mous (forthcoming)).18

(62) Yaamu tuká.
land all
‘The whole land.’

15 The symbol * refers to downstep whilst ts’ is an alveolar ejective affricate (Steeman 2010).
16 In the Burunge data, the superscript u refers to a voiceless vowel, the forward slash (/) to a voiced pharyngeal fricative and the apostrophe (’), to a glottal stop (Kießling 1994). Glosses are adapted to the format used in this paper.
17 If tuĸa were used in Burunge to emphasise negation, this may have added support to our proposal that it was borrowed into Rangi and Mbugwe as a marker of emphasis. However, it appears that the usage of the tuĸa in Burunge is restricted to that of an adverb or ideophone as outlined above. Questions are answered with /aka/ ‘no’ which expresses a ‘particularly violent negation’ whilst ‘e is used to confirm the negative statement of a negatively formulated question.
18 In the Alagwa data, as in Burunge, a forward slash (/) indicates a voiced pharyngeal fricative, and a superscript vowel indicates a voiceless vowel (Mous forthcoming). Tone is marked as in the original, where both tuĸa and tuĸa are found.
We therefore propose that one possible source for the post-verbal negative markers *tuku* and *tokó* found in Rangi and Mbugwe, are the neighbouring Cushitic languages Burunge or Alagwa. Whilst Rangi and Mbugwe have not borrowed the negation strategies in these two languages – i.e. the negative suffix /ba/ from Burunge, for example – the structures found in Rangi and Mbugwe could represent instances of lexical borrowing, specifically of the adverbs *tük/*tuk*. Consider the case of Rangi: the change could therefore be the result of native Burunge (or Alagwa) speakers acquiring Rangi as a second language and innovating with the intensifier *tük/*tuk* to emphasise negation. Alternatively, it could be the result of Rangi speakers with some knowledge of Burunge or Alagwa borrowing this lexical item from the Cushitic language in question. Adverbs and individual lexical items are frequently candidates for lexical borrowing. The use of indefinite pronouns as generalisers, such as ‘anything (at all)’ is also widespread in emphasising polarity in negation (Breitbarth et al. (2012)). For first language speakers of Rangi, this would not have been in conflict with the presence of the pre-verbal, verb-internal markers of negation. Rather, this borrowed post-verbal element would have maintained its emphasiser function and developed into a regular way to emphasise the polarity of negation. This change may have been aided by analogy with the wider presence of post-verbal negation strategies in the area, as well as the availability of post-verbal negation strategies in Bantu languages more broadly.

Against this background of high bilingualism, children exposed to this pattern and acquiring Rangi as a first language reanalyse this negation strategy as the standard method of encoding verbal negation, regardless of the possible historical origins of the lexical item. A similar pathway could be proposed for Mbugwe, with *tokó* being borrowed and subsequently being adopted as an optional element for emphasising negation. The possible stages involved in this process are outlined in Section 5.

An additional insight into the development of these negation strategies could be achieved with closer examination of the observed cross-Bantu etymologies for negative markers. Devos and van der Auwera (2013:233) observe that negative answer particles are common sources of negative markers in double negation constructions. In Mbugwe, the post-verbal negative marker *tokó* can function alone as a negative answer particle. This is also the case with *bweete* in Rangi. However, *tük*/tuku does not function as a negative answer word in Burunge or Alagwa although it does serve as a marker of totality. As such, we consider this to represent borrowing of a marker of emphasis rather than as a negative answer word.

This proposed pathway of change still leave a number of questions remaining: 1) Did Rangi and Mbugwe borrow the same word from the same language, simply applying their own phonological processes to derive the difference in vowel quality attested, i.e. both Rangi and Mbugwe borrowed *tuk* from Burunge for example? 2) Were the lexical items borrowed independently from two languages, i.e. was *tuk* borrowed into Rangi from Burunge and *tük* into

---

19 The reason for the difference in vowel quality and tone is unknown. Rangi is a 7 vowel language with the phonemes /i-e-a-o-u/, whereas Mbugwe has the seven vowel qualities /i-e-a-o-a-o/. Burunge and Alagwa are analysed as 5 vowel systems with the phonemes /i-e-a-o-u/ (Kießling 1994, Mous forthcoming). If this is indeed a case of borrowing, it would appear that both Mbugwe and Rangi speakers interpreted the vowel as a second degree back vowel in their respective systems.
Mbugwe from Alagwa? 3) Is the presence of this construction the result of borrowing into Rangi which was in turn borrowed into Mbugwe (or vice versa)? 4) Was this structure borrowed by Proto-Rangi-Mbugwe from the predecessor language of these Cushitic languages, i.e. Proto-Burunge-Alagwa?

Whilst our description has gone some way to outlining the negation strategies found in these two languages, it is difficult to tease apart these remaining issues without additional historical information or further information on the socio-linguistic and historical processes in all of the (possible) languages involved. Of the options outlined above, the route which can be considered to be least likely is the borrowing between Rangi and Mbugwe (3 above) since these speech communities have not been in sustained contact for quite some time. This therefore leaves the remaining – and associated – option of contact between a Proto-Rangi-Mbugwe language and a Proto-South Cushitic. Whether the lexical item was borrowed into Rangi and Mbugwe from the same language or from two languages independently (and the associated possibility of it being borrowed across Cushitic as well) is difficult to ascertain on the basis of our current state of description of these languages. Finally, it must also be noted that even if a contact-induced change account is adopted, it is difficult to ascertain with any certainty that the direction of borrowing is from Cushitic into Bantu. Given the history of sustained contact between these two language families – and Rangi/Mbugwe and Alagwa and Burunge in particular – it is also possible that this is an example of borrowing from Bantu into Cushitic.

5. Cycles of negation in Rangi and Mbugwe

Following work by Jespersen (1917), Dahl (1979:88) coined the term ‘Jespersen’s cycle’ to refer to the observation that the expression of sentential negation can be seen to go through a cross-linguistically common set of stages. Under this process, a language can go from having a single marker of sentential negation to a double marker, and back again to a single marker (Dryer 1988, van der Auwera 2009, Lucas et al. 2013, Willis et al. 2013). The development of negation in French is often referred to as a Jespersen’s cycle (as outlined in Figure 1 above). Negation in French was historically achieved through the presence of the pre-verbal negator ne (Stage I). This was subsequently reinforced by the addition of the newly created emphatic element pas ‘step’ (which had previously been used as a minimiser i.e. ‘I did not go one step’ (Willis et al. 2013:7)). Whilst the presence of pas was initially optional – serving to emphasise negation – it developed into an obligatory part of the negative system with the original pre-verbal negator ne having undergone semantic bleaching. This resulted in the bipartite negative strategy ne…pas becoming the regular means of encoding negation (Stage II). The next stage of the process sees the weakening – and ultimately the loss – of ne. This leaves pas as the sole negator and represents a return to the system in which there is a single marker of negation (Stage III).

We propose that both Rangi and Mbugwe can be shown to have undergone processes representative of Jespersen’s cycle. For Rangi we assume that negation in Rangi was historically achieved through the use of a verbal prefix. Kamba Muzenga (1981) considers Rangi to be amongst those languages in which the inherited negative pre-initial prefix nka-/ha- has been replaced by the negative copula si.\textsuperscript{20} We propose that the negative marker si originally

\textsuperscript{20} The development of a negative copula to a negative marker is a cross-linguistically common path of grammaticalisation (Kuteva and Heine (2002)).
started out as the sole marker of negation – representing Stage I in Jespersen’s cycle. However, this was then joined by the post-verbal element toku (possibly a lexical borrowing from the Cushitic languages, as outlined in Section 4 above). The presence of toku would have initially been optional and pragmatically-motivated, serving to emphasise negation. However, over time, the bipartite sí...toku construction became the standard way to encode negation. It appears that, at least in declarative main clauses, the use of toku is obligatory – reflecting a shift to Stage II. Note however, that in non-verbal prediction, the use of toku has remained optional although it does appear to be preferred. The proposed stages of the development of negation in main clauses found in Rangi, exemplifying the Jespersen’s cycle, are outlined in Figure 5 below.

Figure 5: Outline of stages of Jespersen’s cycle in Rangi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage I</th>
<th>Stage II</th>
<th>Stage III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sí...toku</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also reason to think that Rangi may have begun the shift to the typologically more unusual triple negation strategy in which the pre-verbal negative marker is lost and an emphatic negative marker appears post-verbally. Indeed, this seems to be the case in the prohibitive form which employs only toku without the negative marker sí (cf. van der Auwera et al. (2013)). The co-occurrence of toku and bweete may also reflect a similar process with bweete ‘at all’ serving to reinforce the negation and its presence alongside toku possibly reflecting the continuing development of negation in Rangi.

We propose a similar pathway of development for negation in Mbugwe. We consider the pre-verbal markers te-~sí- in Mbugwe to reflect an older negation strategy and to be reconstructable to the Proto-Bantu verb-internal negative markers. The presence of these negative markers would represent Stage I of the cycle in which negation is marked solely on the verb through the presence of these prefixes. We propose that this stage is followed by the optional use of the negative marker tokó which can appear post-verbally or clause-finally for emphatic purposes. The use of te-~sí- and tokó together therefore represents Stage II in the cycle. However, there does not appear to be any evidence in Mbugwe that tokó has begun to undergo a process of semantic bleaching and as such, the process can be considered to have remained at Stage II. The proposed stages for the development of negation in Mbugwe are outlined in Figure 6 below (parenthesis around tokó indicate optionality).

Figure 6: Outline of stages of Jespersen’s cycle in Mbugwe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage I</th>
<th>Stage II</th>
<th>Stage III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>te~sí</td>
<td>te~sí...(tokó)</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The development of negation can therefore be seen to have gone through the first two stages of Jespersen’s cycle in both languages. However, whilst the post-verbal negative marker tokó is optional in Mbugwe, the post-verbal negative marker toku in Rangi is obligatory in declarative main clauses. We therefore propose that the process of grammaticalisation has gone further in Rangi than in Mbugwe. Moreover, the use of toku without the negative marker sì suggests that Rangi also shows signs of Stage III of the process (albeit in restricted contexts) with the loss of the original negative marker (cf. Devos and Van Olmen 2013). Similarly, the presence in Rangi of examples in which toku is accompanied by bweete could be considered to represent a new stage of the process, with the cycle ‘starting again’ before even reaching the third stage.

6. Summary and conclusions

Negation in Rangi and Mbugwe is achieved through the use of morphological markers which appear either side of the verb form. Verbal negation in Rangi is achieved through the presence of the negative marker sì which appears before the verb and the negative marker toku which appears either after the verb or clause-finally. In Mbugwe, sentential negation is achieved through the presence of the negative marker te- in the pre-initial position except for in first person singular verb forms where the negative marker appears as sì-. An optional negative marker tokó can also appear after the verb, serving to emphasise the negative polarity of the clause.

We propose that negation in these two languages has undergone a number of stages which are representative of Jespersen’s cycle. We propose that negation in present-day Rangi and Mbugwe can be seen to have reached at least Stage II with the presence of a pre-verbal negator accompanied by a post-verbal negative marker (which is obligatory in Rangi and optional in Mbugwe). It is also possible that an additional stage of development is also observable in Rangi with the presence of the post-verbal negator bweete serving to emphasise the negation. We believe that the data presented in this paper present compelling, comparative evidence in support of the claim that the stages of Jespersen’s cycle can be identified in Rangi and Mbugwe. The presence of this process in these two languages therefore adds additional support to the proposal that Jespersen’s cycle is indeed attested in Bantu more widely (Devos et al. 2010, Devos and van der Auwera 2013).

The structure of negation found in these languages – the use of pre-verbal and post-verbal, as well as verb-internal and external material, is not unusual within the wider context of Bantu languages. However, we claim that the forms that appear post-verbally in Rangi and Mbugwe – toku and tokó respectively – may have their origins in Cushitic languages spoken in the linguistic area. We propose that the items toku and tokó represent lexical borrowings in a linguistic context in which post-verbal negation is well documented, both within Bantu and within the non-Bantu languages spoken in the linguistic area, and no doubt aided by the backdrop of high linguistic diversity with a sustained history of language contact.
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Abbreviations

Surface high tones are indicated through the presence of an acute accent whilst surface low tones are unmarked. Numbers refer to noun classes except for those which are followed by SG or PL which indicate person information.

The following abbreviations are used throughout: ALL = allative, APPL = applicative, ASSOC = associative, AUX = auxiliary, CAUS = causative extension, CFCT = counterfactual, COND = conditional, COP = copula, DEM = demonstrative, F = feminine, FPST = far past, FV = final vowel, GEN = general, HAB = habitual, HEST = hesternal, HOD = hodiernal/anterior, INF = infinitive, IMPV = imperfective, LOC = locative, M = masculine, N = neuter, NEG = negative, OM = object marker, PASS = passive, PFV = perfective, PL = plural, PP = personal pronoun, POSS = possessive pronoun, PREP = preposition, PRS = present, PROG = progressive, PST = general past, PAST1 = recent past, PAST2 = distant past, REF = referential, S3 = subject/referent, SBV = subjunctive, SG = singular, SM = subject marker, SUB = subordinating, VENT = ventive.
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