ABSTRACT

A keen look at the literature available on Makaa (A83) reveals that a sizeable amount of scientific works worthier to be mentioned has been carried out on the target language. These studies, generally, deal with various aspects of Makaa phonology, noun and verbal morphology, history of the people, some cultural aspects, and syntax. To put it clearly, the main goal of this paper is not to come out with a synopsis of these studies, rather, it will focus on the co-relation between tense-aspect-mood (Henceforth TAM) on the one hand and negation on the other. This analysis will be guided by the following questions any study based on negation have to address.

- How is negation marked in Makaa?
- Which element(s) of the sentence is/are effected or involved?
- What is/are the negator(s) distribution in the internal structure of the inflection?
- How does negation interact with TAM?
- Which meanings do negative constructions express?

Before presenting some results in connection with the questions above, let us revisit what has been previously said on TAM and negation in Makaa. Heath (1989, 1991), Heath (2003: 344), Nurse, Rose and Hewson (2010) and Hewson (2010) following an intuition by the aforementioned works of Heath and Heath distinguish five absolute tenses in Makaa, namely, distant past, recent past, present tense, near future and distant future; four aspects, Progressive, Habitual, Anterior and Perfective of which the latter is unmarked; and three moods, Indicative, Subjunctive and Imperative, the indicative being the unmarked or default form.

According to Heath (2003:345) ‘Negation in the indicative is marked by both a pre-stem clitic and a suffix in the position of Final Vowel. The clitic (toneless a + H + suffix è or ẻ) varies somewhat from tense to tense. Hewson (2010:8) will add that the Final Vowel attaches to ŋ in past tense, and with tonal adjsusment. In the subjunctive and Imperative (1b), negation is
expressed by $kù + L$, and the L causes any following H to downstep. See examples below from Heath (2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.a.</th>
<th>$mà: tʃålé  mlàʊndù$</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>$kù \ 'wùŋg òmpjɔ$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$mà â-tʃål-ɛ$  $' mlàʊndù$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$kù \ 'wùŋg \ ' òmpjɔ$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>NEG-cut-NEG MacH cl2-dog</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEG chase MacH cl2-dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I do not cut down palm trees [sic]’</td>
<td>‘Do not chase the dogs!’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, even though the summary given above seems to show clearly that Makaa TAM and negation have received a very close attention, it will be shown in this paper that negation and the TAM system in Makaa is not as simple as it is described presently in the literature.

(a) Instead of five tenses, Makaa counts seven absolute tenses: three future tenses symmetrical to three past tenses in addition to a present tense. The additional tenses are immediate past and remote future (Ibirahim 2007, 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P3</th>
<th>á</th>
<th>Remote past</th>
<th>earlier than yesterday and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>ámɔ̀</td>
<td>Recent past</td>
<td>earlier today; yesterday; two days ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>mò</td>
<td>Immediate past</td>
<td>a while ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>General present</td>
<td>now or a in a while</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H-ɔù$ (Inf)</td>
<td>Gnomic present</td>
<td>undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>é</td>
<td>Immediate future</td>
<td>later today; can stretch till tomorrow and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>bá</td>
<td>Recent future</td>
<td>tomorrow and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>ébá</td>
<td>Remote future</td>
<td>several days, weeks, months or years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Though not mentioned in the literature, Makaa also counts relative tenses. In narrative discourse, the morphemes $kà/kì$ (used interchangeably) or $mù$, often translated as ‘then’ for both), are used to support verbs in enumeration of consecutive events.

(c) Instead of four aspects, it will be shown that Makaa uses Inflectional morphemes at Pre-Stem, Post-stem position, reduplication, repetition and compounding to mark 11 distinct
aspects: factitive, progressive, habitual, iterative, inceptive, completive, Prioritive, proximate, counter-expectation, persistive and continuative.

(d) As for negation, it will be shown that negation in Makaa is much more complex due to the fact that it varies depending on the tense, the aspect, the mood; on whether the construction is focused or not. The various constructions just named are subjected to important tonal fluctuation. Below are few illustrations

2.a. Mǒ Sal     Mǒ di Sal
    Mǒ-ô Sal     Mǒ di Sal
    1Sg-FOC Sal  1Sg FOC+NEG Sal
    ‘I am Sal’    ‘I am not Sal’

b. Mə ʧǐsəw     Mə ʧǐsəwɛjɛ
    Mə ʧǐsəw     Mə-à ʧǐsəw-ɛjɛ
    1Sg bear     1Sg-NEG bear-NEG-Ce-NEG
    ‘I bear it’   ‘I cannot bear it’

3.a. Ömpú: ɔ bá ná ɲɡə ɲwɔ.
    ɔ-mpú: ɔ bá ná ɲɡə ɲwɔ
    C2-rain SM F2 PER PROG rain
    ‘Rains will be still falling’

b. Ömpú: bwáː bɛlɛ ná ɲɡə ɲwɔ.
    Ö-mpú: bwɔ-à bá-ɛ lɛ ná ɲɡə ɲwɔ.
    C2-rain SM-NEG F2-Ce-NEG PER PROG rain
    ‘Rains will not be still falling’

4.a. Mèba kàdɛ jɔ ɬdəw
    Mè bá kàdɛ jɔ ɬdəw
    I F3 dish-Ve him Cl8-food
    ‘I will dish him food’

b. Mə: bàlɛ bá kàdɛ jɔ idəw
    Mə-à bá lɛ bá kàdɛ jɔ ɬdəw
    1Sg-NEG F2,Ce,NEG F2 dish-Ve him Cl8-food
    ‘I will not dish him food’

This study, we hope, will enrich Makaa with a detail study on negation and clarify the interaction between TAM and negation in Makaa verbal constructions.
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