

Cycles of negation in Rangi and Mbugwe

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.

Keywords: Negation, Jespersen's cycle, Bantu languages, language contact

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 *tuku* 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).^{1, 2}

- (1) **Sí n-íyó-dom-a tuku na Dodoma.** [Rangi]
 NEG SM1SG-PRS.PROG-go-FV NEG PREP Dodoma
 ‘I am not going to Dodoma.’
- (2) **Va-singa sí va-saak-a ku-riy-a udo tuku.** [Rangi]
 2-children NEG SM3PL-PRS-want-FV INF-eat-FV 11.finger.millet NEG
 ‘Children do not like to eat finger millet.’
- (3) **Te-ko-jé-rém-a y-oonda r-éytó lo-ví.** [Mbugwe]
 NEG-SM1PL-FUT-cultivate-FV 5-field 5-1PL.POSS 11-tomorrow
 ‘We shall not cultivate our farm tomorrow.’
- (4) **Síyé te-kw-á-re-fééŋ-ér-a ma-sibitalí tokó.** [Mbugwe]
 SM1PL.PP NEG-SM1PL-PST-PROG-run-APPL-FV 6-hospital NEG
 ‘We were not running to the hospitals at all.’

It has long been noted that strategies of negation undergo comparable stages of diachronic development cross-linguistically. A negative marker often starts out as a marker of emphasis before developing into a fully-fledged obligatory marker of negation, according to what has been termed ‘Jespersen’s cycle’ (after Jespersen (1917), Dahl (1979)). The cycle may also go one step further to result in a construction in which the original marker of negation is dropped (Dahl 1979). Data from French are often used to exemplify this process. The stages proposed for this process in French are outlined in Figure 1 below (adapted from Willis et al. (2013:7)).

Figure 1: Outline of the stages of Jespersen's cycle in French

Stage I	Stage II	Stage III
<i>ne</i>	<i>ne...pas</i>	<i>pas</i>

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 underlyingly. 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 *sf* in Rangi and *te-* in Mbugwe – we also propose that the presence of the post-verbal negative markers *tuku* 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 Kondo 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

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Pre-initial Neg1	SM	Post-initial Neg2	TAM	OM	Root	Extension	Final vowel

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 **-iré** 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 **-ija** combines with the perfective suffix **-iré** on the main verb to encode the distant past perfective.

(5) **Níni n-á-nyw-iré i-rúso kw-ááni.**
 1sg.pp SM1SG-PAST1-drink-PAST1 5-home.brew 17-my
 ‘I have drunk homebrew at my place.’

(6) **Mama a-ija a-dóm-iré.**
 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 **tuku**. Whilst **sí** always appears in the pre-verbal position, **tuku** 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 tuku na Dodoma.**
 NEG SM1SG-PRS.PROG-go-FV NEG PREP Dodoma
 ‘I am not going to Dodoma.’

(8) **Va-singa sí va-saak-a ku-riy-a udo tuku.**
 2-children 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).

(9) **Níni sí n-dí~rɪ dóm-a tuku na Kondoa.**
 1sg.pp NEG SM1SG-AUX go-FV NEG PREP Kondoa
 ‘I will not go [walk] to Kondoa.’

(10) **Sí á-terék-á nyama íra síkú tuku.**
 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.

- (11) **Mu-sungaati sí a-lóng-áa na mu-keva toku.**
 1-rich.person NEG SM3SG-spend.day-HAB PREP 1-poor.person NEG
 ‘A rich person does not spend the day with a poor person.’

When **toku** 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).

- (12) **Vaa-ntu sí voo-dom-a toku noo rim-a**
 2-people NEG SM3PL.PROG-go-FV NEG COP.REF farm-FV
 ‘People are not going to farm.’

- (13) **Vaa-ntu sí voo-dom-a noo rim-a toku**
 2-people NEG SM3PL.PROG-go-FV COP.REF farm-FV NEG
 ‘People are not going to farm.’

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

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

- (15) **Sa che sí u-loosik-a na i-roombo r-aako?**
 For what NEG SM2SG-talk-FV PREP 5-sister 5-your
 ‘Why do you not talk with your sister?’ (Stegen 2011:395)

- (16) **Jooli sí w-oo-voof-a va-antu va-kuulu va-vih-a na ma-ta**
 How NEG SM2SG-PROG-fear-FV 2-people 2-big SM3PL -be.bad-FV PREP 6-bow
na ma-chimu?
 PREP 5-spears
 ‘...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 **sí** but that this can appear without the post-verbal negative marker **toku** (17). However, additional data would be needed to test whether **toku** is always absent in such constructions or whether its omission is optional.

- (17) **Mw-eene sí a-chuund-a-a na iyo chuund-w-a**
 1-having NEG SM3PL.GEN-teach-PASS-FV PREP 1.mother teach-PASS-FV
a-ri ni vaa-ntu au dunia
 1-COP COP 2-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 **sí** can also be used in non-verbal predication, as can be seen in examples (18) and (19) below.

We consider **sí** in sentential negation and the **sí** 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 *sí*. As can be seen in these examples, in this context *sí* 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) **uhu sí mo-osí Leo tuku.**
 1.DEM NEG 1-old.man Leo NEG
 ‘This is not Mr Leo.’

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

(20) **Hooni ni-ku-tuong-e na lu-fyo kweeri n-koon-e sí komi**
 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

(21) **Sí n-dí~ri vin-a tuku.**
 NEG SM1SG-AUX dance-FV NEG
 ‘I will not dance.’

(22) **Sí n-dí~ri 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).

(23) **Ma-wiye a-ya sí ya-fa-a ku-jeng-er-a sakafu bweete.**
 6-stones 6.DEM NEG SM6-suit-FV INF-build-APPL-FV 9.floor at.all
 ‘These stones are not at all suitable for building a floor.’

(24) **Sí n-tite ki-ntu 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) **Bweete, sí n-íyó-haand-a vi-ryo uhu mw-ááka toko.**
 NEG NEG SM1SG-PRS.PROG-plant-FV 8-millet 3.DEM 3-year NEG
 ‘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 *sí*, as can be seen in examples ((27)-(28)).

- (26) **Na-tute va-ki va-viri.**
 SM1SG-AUX.HAVE 2-wife 2-two
 ‘I have two wives.’

- (27) **Níni sí-n-tute ki-taabu toko.**
 1SG.PP NEG-SM.NEG1SG-AUX.HAVE 7-book NEG
 ‘I do not have a book.’

- (28) **Va-si-tute vi-ryo toko.**
 SM3PL-NEG-AUX.HAVE 8-millet NEG
 ‘They do not have millet.’

As can also be seen in the examples above, in the first person singular form the negative marker *sí-* 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

	Singular	Plural
First person	<i>sintute</i>	<i>twasitute</i>
Second person	<i>usitute</i>	<i>musitute</i>
Third person	<i>asitute</i>	<i>vasitute</i>

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 toku.**
 9.hyena SM9-NEG.have 3-brain NEG
 ‘The hyena has no brains.’ (Margaret Dunham p.c.)

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

(31) **Ku-sina ma-yi toku.**
 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 **tusikere** ‘we should not lose’. Example (32) also shows the formation of the negative conditional in which, although **si** 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-si-t-óó-vyaal-a tu-si-ker-e tama toku.**
 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 **si** 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).

- (33) **Na pat-a tuku mpaka kw-a kw-iir-a.**
 CONN get-FV NEG until 15-of INF-get.dark-FV
 ‘...and not catching anything until nightfall.’ (Stegen 2011: 163)
- (34) **Ku-n-va-a na nkome tuku!**
 INF-OM1SG-hit-FV PREP 9.stick NEG
 ‘Do not hit me with a stick!’
- (35) **Ní mbóri vii noo ji-chung-irwe na ndihi, ngoombe tuku.**
 COP 10.goats only COP SM10-tie-APPL.PASS.PFV PREP 9.rope 10.cows NEG
 ‘It is the goats that have been tied with a rope, not the cows.’

To summarise, sentential negation in Rangi is achieved through the presence of the negative marker *sí* which appears before the verb form and the negative marker *tuku* which appears either after the verb or clause-finally (with slightly different scope effects found in each instance). Both the negative markers *sí* and *tuku* 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 *-situte* 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 *tuku*, resulting in a stronger emphatic negation. However, it is also possible for *tuku* and *bweete* to co-occur. The negative marker *tuku* 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 (*tuku* 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).

Figure 4: The Mbugwe verbal template

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Pre-initial Neg1	SM	Post-initial Neg2	TAM	OM	Root	Extension	Final vowel	Post- final

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.

(36) **O-rem-iyé** **y-oonda** **r-áákó** **éénsíku na** **mo-tóóndɔ.**
 SM2SG-cultivate-HOD 5-field 5-2sg.POSS today PREP 3-morning
 ‘You cultivated your farm this morning.’

(37) **W-á-rém-iyɛ** **y-oonda** **r-áákó** **nayjɔ.**
 SM2SG-PST-cultivate-HEST 5-field 5-2SG.POSS yesterday
 ‘You cultivated your farm yesterday.’

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.

(38) **Te-w-á-rém-iyɛ** **y-oonda** **r-áákó** **nayjɔ.**
 NEG-SM2SG-PST-cultivate-HEST 5-field 5-2SG.POSS yesterday
 ‘You did not cultivate your farm yesterday.’

(39) **O-kéé-j-á** **te-o-jé-n-kúúnd-y-a.**
 SM2SG-COND-come-COND NEG-SM2SG-FUT-OM1SG-meet-CAUS-FV
 ‘If you come, you will not meet me.’

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).⁹ 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).

(40) **N-sí-réét-íye kéra ch-ákóra.**
 SM1SG-1SG.NEG-bring-HOD 7.DEM 7-food
 ‘I have not brought that food.’

(41) **N-sí-jé-rém-a y-oonda r-ááné n-síko j-óónse.**
 SM1SG-1SG.NEG-FUT-cultivate-FV 5-field 5-1SG.POSS 10-day 10-all
 ‘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.

(42) **O-káysé-ókerer-a.**
 SM2SG-NEG.SBJV-return-FV
 ‘Do not return.’

(43) **N-késé-rém-a y-oonda r-ááné.**
 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)).^{10, 11}

(44) **A-ré mo-n-sóoch-a.**
 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-sóoch-a* ‘NEG-SM2PL-OM1SG-hate-FV’. However, the segments are known from other forms to represent the past (*a-*) and the locative copula (*-re*) (which also marks the progressive) so we maintain the analysis presented above.

- (45) **A-ré mó-n-siningal-a.**
 PST-COP.LOC SM2PL-OM1SG-stalk-FV
 ‘Do not stalk me!’

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).¹²

- (46) **Te-ré ch-ákóra ke-já.**
 NEG-COP.LOC 7-food 7-good
 ‘It is not good food.’

- (47) **Te-á-ré ná ngɔ**
 NEG-PST-COP.LOC PREP 10.clothes
 ‘She had no clothes.’

- (48) **Te-ko-teeté mó-remɔ.**
 NEG-SM1PL-have 3-work
 ‘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.¹³

- (49) **Sí-ré na máli, sí-ré ná ɲɔɔmbe.**
 1SG.NEG-COP.LOC PREP wealth 1SG.NEG-COP.LOC PREP 10.cow
 ‘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).

- (50) **N-jéere te-á-ré-kɔɔ mo-nto w-a-mo-nól-á.**
 10-hair NEG-PST-COP.LOC-LOC 1-person SM3SG-PST-OM3SG-cut-FPST
 ‘There was no one who cut her hair.’

- (51) **Ngáré o-j-íye t-oo-káá-n-kúnd-íye.**
 If SM2SG-come-HOD NEG-SM2SG-CFCT-OM1SG-meet-HOD
 ‘If you had come, you would not have met me.’

¹² 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.

¹³ 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.

In addition to the standard negative prefix *te-* (or *sí-*), 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 *tejasaidiá* ‘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-jish-er-y-á m-pɔɔngó**
 Even 16.DEM SM3PL-VENT-PST-OM1SG-do-APPL-CAUS-FPST 10-things
j-á jirá lákini te-j-a-saidí-á chɔchóɔnse tokó.
 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.’

- (53) **Síyé te-kw-á-re-fééŋ-ér-a ma-sibitáli tokó.**
 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

- (54) **Baa ŋaré tokó m-pɔɔngó y-á jóva, sí-káá-ré-kó.**
 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.

- (55) **Tokó, ne Mwaijwa á-a-fón-y-á.**
 NEG COP Mwaijwa 3SG.SM-PST-make.mistake-CAUS-FPST
 ‘No, it is Mwaijwa 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 *sí-* which appears instead of *te-* and occupies the post-initial (slot 3) position. The negative subjunctive *káysé-* ~ *késé-* 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 *-teeté*. In the negative counterfactual, *te-* is used as a prefix on the regular counterfactual form marked with the prefix *káá-*. The prohibitive stands out as there is no overt negative

¹⁴ Whilst *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.

morpheme, which is unusual in the wider context of East African Bantu. The negative marker **tokó** can appear together with a negative verb form clause-finally, where it serves to emphasise the negation. The marker **tokó** can also function independently in non-verbal predication, as well as being used to encode ‘no’ in negative interjection.

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 **tuku** and **tokó** 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-* ~ *sí-* 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-verbal negation. This takes the form of a set of negative clitics which are inflected for person information in realis clauses, and the invariable clitic **ʼtsʼé**,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-verbal negative markers **tuk^u** 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 **tuk^u**,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-ɪ ya'áy gú daka'u tuk^u.**
 S3.PST eat-3SG.M fruits M baobab <totality>
 ‘He ate all the baobab fruits.’

(61) **'Ay-k-írɪ k-o-sɪ yáa 'oonid-ɪ tuk^u háang**
 father-M.DEM-DEM.REF POSS.M-POSS-3SG.POSS S3.PST get.drunk-PFV <totality> even
na-k-írɪ k-ó-sí-see.
 boy-M.DEM-DEM.REF POSS.M-POSS-3SG.POSS-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 **túk^u/tuk^u** ‘all’, as can be seen in examples (62) and (63) below (data from Mous (forthcoming)).¹⁸

(62) **Yaamu tuk^u.**
 land all
 ‘The whole land.’

¹⁵ The symbol **ʼ** refers to downstep whilst **tsʼ** 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 (ʼ) to a glottal stop (Kießling 1994). Glosses are adapted to the format used in this paper.

¹⁷ If **tuk^u** 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 **tuk^u** in Burunge is restricted to that of an adverb or ideophone as outlined above. Questions are answered with **/aka/ʼ** ‘no’ which expresses a ‘particularly violent negation’ whilst **ʼee** 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 **túk^u** and **tuk^u** are found.

- (63) **K-y-aa gu/umin na ama irimi túk^u adóo dití ha chooka.**
 SUB-3-PST swallow:HAB:IMPF by Ama Irimi all manner place-F:DEM:ALL with Chooka
 ‘...and they were all swallowed by Ama Irimi at that place Choka.’

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 *túk^u/tuk^u*. 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 *túk^u/tuk^u* 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, *túku/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^u* from Burunge for example?¹⁹ 2) Were the lexical items borrowed independently from two languages, i.e. was *tuk^u* borrowed into Rangi from Burunge and *túk^u* 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-e-a-o-u*. 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 *śi*.²⁰ We propose that the negative marker *śi* originally

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 **tuku** (possibly a lexical borrowing from the Cushitic languages, as outlined in Section 4 above). The presence of **tuku** would have initially been optional and pragmatically–motivated, serving to emphasise negation. However, over time, the bipartite **sí... tuku** construction became the standard way to encode negation. It appears that, at least in declarative main clauses, the use of **tuku** is obligatory – reflecting a shift to Stage II. Note however, that in non-verbal predication, the use of **tuku** 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

Stage I	Stage II	Stage III
sí	sí...tuku	...

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 **tuku** without the negative marker **sí** (cf. van der Auwera et al. (2013)). The co-occurrence of **tuku** and **bweete** may also reflect a similar process with **bweete** ‘at all’ serving to reinforce the negation and its presence alongside **tuku** 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

Stage I	Stage II	Stage III
te- ~ sí	te- ~ sí ... (tokó)	...

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 *tuku* 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 *tuku* without the negative marker *si* 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 *tuku* 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 *si* which appears before the verb and the negative marker *tuku* 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 *si-*. 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 – *tuku* and *tokó* respectively – may have their origins in Cushitic languages spoken in the linguistic area. We propose that the items *tuku* 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.

Acknowledgements

Hannah Gibson gratefully acknowledges the support of the Arts and Humanities Research Council and the British Academy for her part of this research. The authors would also like to acknowledge discussion and contributions from Colman Chuchu, Niklas Edenmyr, Elisabeth Kesembe, Roland Kießling, Paulo Kijuu, Julia Larsen, Viggo Larsen, Lutz Marten, Alawi Masare, Leonard Mavere, Maarten Mous, Anna Mrisi, Naomi Richards, Ntisi Saria and Oliver Stegen. We would also like to thank Maud Devos and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments and feedback. Any inaccuracies naturally remain our own.

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, S.3 = subject/referent, SBVJ = subjunctive, SG = singular, SM = subject marker, SUB = subordinating, VENT = ventive.

References

- Bearth, T. 2003. 'Syntax'. In: *The Bantu Languages*. D. Nurse and G. Philippson (ed.) London, Routledge: 121–142.
- Breitbarth, A., C. Lucas and D. Willis. 2012. 'Incipient Jespersen's Cycle: The (non-)grammaticalization of new negative markers'. In: *Sprachwandelvergleich - Comparing Diachronics*. J. Fleischer and H. J. Simon (ed.) Berlin/Boston, Walter De Gruyter: 141–162.
- Cammenga, J. 2004. *Igikuria phonology and morphology: A Bantu language of South-West Kenya and North-West Tanzania*. Köln, Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Dahl, Ö. 1979. 'Typology of Sentence Negation' *Linguistics* 17: 79–106.
- Devos, M., M. Kasombo Tshibanda and J. van der Auwera. 2010. 'Jespersen cycles in Kanincin: double, triple and maybe even quadruple negation.' *Africana Linguistica* 16: 155–182.
- Devos, M. and J. van der Auwera. 2013. 'Jespersen cycles in Bantu: double and triple negation.' *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 34(2): 205–274.
- Devos, M. and D. Van Olmen. 2013. 'Describing and explaining the variation of Bantu imperatives and prohibitives.' *Studies in Language* 37(1): 1-57.
- Dryer, M. S. 1988. 'Universals of Negative Position'. In: *Studies in Syntactic Typology*. M. Hammond, E. A. Moravcsik and J. Wirth (ed.) Amsterdam, John Benjamins: 93–124.
- Dunham, M. 2005. *Eléments de description du langi, langue Bantu F.33 de Tanzanie*. Louvain-Paris-Dudley MA, Peeters.
- Gibson, H. 2012. *Auxiliary placement in Rangî: A Dynamic Syntax perspective*. PhD. School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- Gibson, H. 2013. 'Auxiliary placement in Rangî: A case of contact-induced change?' *SOAS working papers in linguistics* 16: 153–166.

- Güldemann, T. 1996. *Verbalmorphologie und Nebenprädikation im Bantu*. Bochum, Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer.
- Güldemann, T. 1999. 'The genesis of verbal negation in Bantu and its dependency on functional features and clause types'. In: *Bantu historical linguistics: theoretical and empirical linguistics*. J.-M. Hombert and L. M. Hyman (ed.) Stanford, CSLI: 545–587.
- Guthrie, M. 1967–71. *Comparative Bantu*. Farnborough, Gregg.
- Jespersen, O. 1917. *Negation in English and other languages*. København, A. F. Høst & Son.
- Kamba Muzenga, J. G. 1981. *Les formes verbales négatives dans les langues bantoues*. Tervuren, Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale.
- Kamba Muzenga, J. G. 2005. 'Le négatif du verbe être en bantou'. In: *Studies in African Comparative Linguistics with Special Focus on bantu a nd Mandé*. K. Bostoen and J. Maniacky (ed.) Tervuren, MPRAC: 343–360.
- Kießling, R. 1994. *Eine Grammatik des Burunge*. Hamburg, Research and Progress.
- Kießling, R. 2007. 'The "marked nominative" in Datooga.' *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 28 (2): 149–191.
- Kießling, R., M. Mous and D. Nurse. 2008. 'The Tanzanian Rift Valley area. A Linguistic Geography of Africa'. In: B. Heine and D. Nurse (ed.) Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 186–227.
- Kuteva, T. and B. Heine. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- LOT. 2009. *Atlas ya lugha za Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam, Chuo Kikuu cha Dar es Salaam.
- Lucas, C., D. Willis and A. Breitbarth, (eds). 2013. *History of negation in the languages of Europe and the Mediterranean*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Maho, J. F. 2003. 'A classification of the Bantu languages: an update of Guthrie's referential system'. In: *The Bantu languages*. D. Nurse and G. Philippson (ed.) London, Routledge: 639–651.
- Masele, B. F. Y. P. and D. Nurse. 2003. 'Stratigraphy and prehistory: Bantu Zone F'. In: *Language Contacts in Prehistory*. H. Andersen (ed.): 115–134.
- Meeussen, A. E. 1967. *Bantu grammatical reconstructions*. Tervuren.
- Mous, M. 1993. *A grammar of Iraqw*. Hamburg, Helmut Buske.
- Mous, M. 2000. 'Counter-universal rise of infinitive-auxiliary order in Mbugwe (Tanzania, Bantu, F34.)'. In: *Mehr als nur Worte... : afrikanistische Beiträge zum 65. Geburtstag von Franz Rottland* R. Vossen, Angelika Mietzner, Antje Meissner (ed.) Köln, Köppe: 469–481.
- Mous, M. 2004. *A grammatical sketch of Mbugwe: Bantu F34, Tanzania*. Köln, Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Mous, M. forthcoming. *Alagwa Grammar, Texts and Lexicon*. Köln, Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Nurse, D. 2008. *Tense and Aspect in Bantu*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Steeman, S. 2010. *A grammar of Sandawe: A Khoisan language of Tanzania*. PhD. Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics, Utrecht.
- Stegen, O. 2003. First steps in reconstructing Rangi language history. 33rd Colloquium on African Languages and Linguistics. University of Leiden, August 2003.
- Stegen, O. 2011. *In quest of a vernacular writing style for the Rangi of Tanzania: Assumptions, processes, challenges*. PhD. University of Edinburgh.
- van der Auwera, J. 2009. 'The Jespersen cycles'. In: *Cyclical change*. E. van Gelderen (ed.) Amsterdam, Benjamins: 35–71.
- van der Auwera, J., F. Vossen and M. Devos. 2013. 'Le cycle de Jespersen à trois ou quatre négations'. In: *La linguistique de la contradiction*. J. François, P. Larrivière, D. Legallois and F. Neveu (ed.) Bern, P. Lang: 19–30.
- Wasike, A. 2007. *The left periphery, wh-in-situ and A-bar movement in Lubukusu and other Bantu languages*. PhD. Cornell University.
- Willis, D., C. Lucas and A. Breitbarth. 2013. 'Comparing diachronies of negation'. In: *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean*. D. Willis, C. Lucas and A. Breitbarth (ed.) Oxford, Oxford University Press: 1–50.