



**A GRAMMAR OF NEGATION IN TONGA**

**BY**

**SHEILA NKOLOLA**

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA IN PARTIAL  
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF  
ARTS IN LINGUISTIC SCIENCE**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA**

**LUSAKA**

**2019**

## **COPYRIGHT**

All rights reserved. No copy of this work should be published anywhere without permission from the Author or the University of Zambia.

## **DECLARATION**

I Sheila Nkolola, declare that this dissertation:

- (a) Represents my own work;
- (b) Has not been submitted before for a degree at this or any other University; and
- (c) Does not incorporate any published work or material from another dissertation. In an event where somebody's work has been applied, acknowledgements have been made.

Signed: ..... Date: .....

**APPROVAL**

This dissertation of SHEILA NKOLOLA is approved as fulfilling in part the requirements of the award of the degree of Master of Arts in Linguistic Science by the University of Zambia.

Signed: .....Date: .....

Signed: .....Date: .....

Signed: .....Date: .....

Signed: .....Date: .....

## ABSTRACT

The study examined *A Grammar of Negation in Tonga*. The research was explored in order to investigate the morphological, syntactic and the semantic structure of negation in Tonga. The objectives of the study were; to analyze the morphology of negation in Tonga, to examine the syntactic distribution and some semantic aspects of negation in Tonga. In particular, the study examined incorporation, productivity of negative markers across the noun class system, the necessity of the negative marker ‘ta’ within a statement and the negative concord. Secondary and Primary sources were employed in data collection.

The study employed a qualitative approach and the findings were analyzed in line with the objectives. The major negative markers under discussion include: ‘ta’, ‘na’, ‘ni’, ‘ti’, ‘pe’, ‘tu’, ‘li’ and ‘he’. From the morphological point of view, the study reveals that negation is manifested through prefixation and suffixation.

Following the Jespersen’s cycle theory, the negative marker ‘ta’ is considered as an original negator or necessity in the sense that, when it is dropped in a negative expression, the statement loses its grammaticality. The example is illustrated as: *Utakkali pe*,’ direct translated as ‘you should not sit no’. When the negative marker ‘ta’ is dropped, the statement is presented as: *\*Ukkali pe* ‘you sit no’. From the given illustrations, the second statement is considered ungrammatical because of the absence of the original negative marker ‘ta’. Hence, the negative marker ‘ta’ generates the theme called necessity.

Nonetheless, the negative markers ‘li’ and ‘ta’ are considered to be the most productive elements in the noun class system. The marker ‘li’ can be applied in the noun class (1); these are nouns that begin with the morpheme ‘mu’. An example is illustrated as: *Tali Muntu* ‘it is not a person’, among others.

Syntactically, the theory of negation that encompasses sentential and constituent negation played a very important role in this study. With regards to sentential negation, the negative marker scopes over the entire sentence whereas constituent negation focuses on a particular category. Semantically, the study reveals that Tonga is a negative concord language; this is because most of the negative expressions manifest more than one negative marker with a single interpretation. Having achieved the study’s objectives, the study recommends other studies to investigate a comparison of negation between English and Tonga and other Bantu languages.

**Keywords:** *Negation, Incorporation, Productivity, Necessity and Negative Concord*

## **DEDICATION**

This study was supposed to be dedicated to my late Father Passmore Malinki Nkolola who had the passion of seeing his children prosper in Education. However, I dedicate it to my Mother Ethel Milimo Lubaya Nkolola and my two young Sisters Betty and Chinyama Nkolola.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A huge gratitude goes to my Supervisor Dr. Hambaba Jimaima for his guidance and tireless corrections amidst his busy schedules. This dissertation would not have been a success without his input. I appreciate you very much; may you live long. I would also like to extend my gratitude to some lecturers that helped me understand the components I used in my research, these include: Dr. Simwinga who helped me understand the components of research during the research methods lectures, his input helped me understand what should be involved in the research.

I also appreciate Dr. Banda for his explanations that made the research lighter for me. His examples were precise, I equally thank him for his input especially on the literature review. I am equally indebted to Dr. Mambwe, Mr. Hirst, Dr. Lubinda and Professor Chanda for the useful components they applied during the lecture hours; most of the components made my work valid. I thank you very much.

I also give my gratitude to my Head Teacher Mrs. Christine Shumba and the Deputy Head Teacher Mr. Pumulo Mukumbuta for unclogging my study leave. I appreciate my Mother, my Brothers and Sisters for their understanding and support during my study. I give thanks to Mr. Adrian Chisale for helping me have access to some important books during difficult times. I appreciate Dr. David Sani Mwanza for his encouragements especially when I seemed to have lost track. My other appreciations go to my friends such as Chikonde, Robinson, Lucy, Felistus, Mutinta, Harriet, Edrine, Edgar, John, Tina, Shadreck, Hamooba and many more. Your presence as well as your encouragements meant a lot to me.

All in all, I say to God be the glory for he has been with me throughout my entire study. When things seemed to be uneasy; I could feel his presence. Therefore, he is worthy to be praised.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>COPYRIGHT .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>DECLARATION .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>APPROVAL .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>DEDICATION .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 Background to and contextualization of the study .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 Language situation in Zambia .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.3 Statement of the problem .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.4 Aim of the study .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.5 Specific objectives .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.6 Research questions .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.7 Significance of the study .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.8 Scope of the study .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.9 Definition of terms .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.10 Structure of the dissertation .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.11 Summary .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>CHAPTER TWO .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.1 Studies done in the non bantu languages .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.2 Studies done on bantu languages .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.3 Summary .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>CHAPTER THREE .....</b>	<b>33</b>

<b>THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>3.0 Introduction.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>3.1 The Jespersen’s cycle theory.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>3.2 The theory of negation.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>3.2.1 Sentential negation.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>3.2.2 Constituent negation.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>3.3 Semantic categorisation of negation.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>3.3.1 Explicit and implicit negation.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>3.4 The negative concord theory.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>3.5 Summary .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>CHAPTER FOUR.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.0 Introduction.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.1 Research design.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.1.1 Research methodology.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.1.2 Study area.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>4.1.3 Study population.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>4.1.4 Sampling techniques.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>4.1.4.1 Purposive sampling technique.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>4.1.5 Data collection methods .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>4.1.5.1 Primary data collection.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>4.1.5.2 Desk research.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>4.1.5.3 Introspection .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>4.1.5.4 Data collection instruments .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>4.1.5.5 The structured questionnaire .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>4.1.5.6 Data collection procedure .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>4.1.5.7 Data analysis instruments and procedure.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>4.1.5.8 Ethical considerations .....</b>	<b>41</b>

4.2 Summary .....	42
<b>CHAPTER FIVE.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>5.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>5.1 Taxonomy of negative markers in Tonga.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>5.2 The Morphology of Negation in Tonga .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>5.2.1 Imperative sentences expressed in the second person singular.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>5.2.1.1 Negative marker ‘ta’ prefixed to the verb.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>5.2.2 Declarative statements expressed in the third person singular.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>5.2.2.1 Negative marker ‘ta’ placed before the pronoun .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>5.2.3 Declarative statements expressed in the third person plural .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>5.2.3.1 Negative marker ‘ti’ placed before the subject marker.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>5.2.4 Declarative statements expressed in the third person plural .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>5.2.4.1 Negative marker ‘ta’ placed before the subject marker.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>5.2.5 Interrogative sentences expressed in the third person singular.....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>5.2.5.1 Negative marker ‘ni’ placed before the tense marker .....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>5.2.6 Declarative statements expressed in the third person plural .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>5.2.6.1 Double negation .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>5.2.7 Incorporation of the subject marker within the negative marker .....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>5.2.8 Productivity of the negative particles across the noun class system in Tonga.....</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>5.2.8.1 Summary of table 7 .....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>5.2.8.2 Analysis of the data on the table .....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>5.2.9 Application of the Jespersen’s cycle theory .....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>5.2.9.1 Analysis.....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>5.3 The Syntax of Negation in Tonga.....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>5.3.1 Sentential negation .....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>5.3.2 Constituent negation .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>5.4 The Semantics of Negation in Tonga .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>5.4. 1 Explicit and implicit negation .....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>5.4.2 Application of the negative concord theory .....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>5.5 Summary .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>CHAPTER SIX.....</b>	<b>75</b>

<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>6.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>6.1 Summary .....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>6.1.1 Conclusion.....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>6.1.2 Productivity.....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>6.1.3 Incorporation .....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>6.1.4 Necessity .....</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>6.1.5 Feature percolation .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>6.1.6 Unexpressed meaning.....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>6.1.7 Negative concord .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>6.2 Recommendations .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>6.2.1 Recommendations for further research .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Appendix A .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>The presentation of negative expressions and their gloss .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Appendix B.....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>The Morphological structure of Negation in Tonga.....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>The Syntactic structure of Negation in Tonga .....</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>The Semantic structure of Negation in Tonga .....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>Appendix C .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Structured questionnaire .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Appendix D .....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>Interview guide .....</b>	<b>102</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1: Pre-verbal negative markers</b> .....	44
<b>Table 2: Pre-subject negative markers</b> .....	44
<b>Table 3: Post subject negative markers</b> .....	45
<b>Table 4: Pre-tense negative markers</b> .....	46
<b>Table 5: Multiple negative markers</b> .....	47
<b>Table 6: Tense/Aspect marking and their illustrations in Tonga</b> .....	49
<b>Table 7: Nominal Prefixes in Tonga</b> .....	63

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

NM	Negative marker
NEG	Negation
SM	Subject marker
VB	Verb
OBJ	Object marker
MOD	Modifier
PRS	Present tense
PRSCNT	Present continuous tense
PSTPFT	Past perfect tense
FUT	Future tense
EMP	Emphatic marker
INANIM	Inanimate
TM	Tense marker
AUX	Auxiliary verb
NS	Noun stem
VS	Verb stem
PRN	Pronoun
PL	Plural
FV	Final vowel
FUTPRG	Future progressive

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.0 Introduction

This study conceived as ‘A Grammar of Negation in Tonga’ attempted to identify and describe the categories of negation in Tonga. In particular, the study sought to investigate the morphological, syntactic and the semantic structure of negation in Tonga. For, “[n]egation is what makes us human, imbuing us with the capacity to deny, to contradict, to misrepresent, to lie and to convey irony” (Horn 2010:1). This entails providing the taxonomy of negative markers, providing a morphological description of the negative markers and showing their distribution within the syntactic structure as well as showing the scope of negation at sentential and constituent levels.

The study demonstrates the productivity of the negative markers across the noun class system, incorporation, negative concord, the necessity of the negative marker ‘ta’ as well as the typologies of negation that include explicit and implicit negation.

Therefore, this chapter elucidates and gives expression to the background to and contextualises the study. It describes the language situation in Zambia, the statement of the problem, aim of the study and the specific objectives. The chapter equally points out the research questions, the significance of the study and the definition of terms. The structure of the dissertation is also illustrated and thereafter, the conclusion is drawn.

### 1.1 Background to and contextualization of the study

Tonga is a Bantu language mainly spoken in the Southern Province of Zambia. It is more central to the whole Bantu Botatwe group. Hence, it is considered as Regional Official Language (Kashoki and Ohannessian 1978 Editors). Tonga is also spoken in some rural parts of Central province - that is - in some parts of Kabwe rural Chibombo and Mumbwa District (cf. Banda and Jimaima 2019a; Banda and Jimaima 2019b).

In the Education Sector, Tonga is taught as a subject at primary and secondary school level in the Southern Province as well as in some rural districts of Central Province. Tonga is classified in the M64a zone. This is because, the language belongs to group sixty (60) of zone ‘M’ and it is

indicated as the fourth in the group consisting four languages which include ciLenje, ciSoli, ciIla and ciTonga. In addition, the Zambian Tonga is indicated as dialect 'a' which means, it is the first dialect of the language (Guthrie1967).

Furthermore, Tonga has two major geographical dialectal clusters, these are; the Valley and the Plateau Tonga. The Valley Tonga is spoken in areas such as Gwembe, Sinazongwe and Siavonga while the Plateau Tonga is spoken in areas such as, Mazabuka, Monze, Pemba, Choma, Kalomo some parts of Livingstone, Kabwe rural and some parts of Mumbwa District. For the sake of contextualization, the current study investigated negation of the Plateau Tonga which is spoken in Monze District.

## **1.2 Language situation in Zambia**

The majority of the present Bantu language groups in Zambia, particularly in the Northern, Eastern and Western parts of the country migrated from the Southern part of the Democratic Republic of Congo formerly Zaire (cf. Jimaima 2016). Other languages that were not derived from Congo may have originated from East Africa. This group includes the Mambwe and the Inamwanga. The other group is the Ngoni which is an offshoot of the Nguni group; they live in the Southern African countries of Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia. They originally came from the South Eastern part of South Africa, near Natal (Kashoki and Ohannessian1978 Editors).

Kashoki and Ohannessian1978 further states that, even though it is accepted that the Tonga and their neighbours which include; the Ila and the Lenje of the Southern and Central province recently called Bantu Botatwe are related, little information is known about their origins. There are suggestions that they are of an Eastern Bantu stock just like the Inamwanga and the Mambwe.

In Zambia, the most important official language is English (cf. Jimaima & Simungala 2019; Banda et al. 2019). As a result of Government decisions, English is required to be used in schools as the only medium of instruction from Grade 5 upwards (cf. MOE 2013). In parliament, it is used for the administration of the country. Additionally, English is generally used for all national and international official communication and in the commercial and industrial institutions.

Besides English, there are Seven Zambian Regional Official (local) Languages. These are; Bemba, Kaonde, Lozi, Lunda, Luvale, Nyanja and Tonga (Banda and Jimaima 2017; Jimaima 2016; Kashoki and Ohannessian 1978). These languages are used officially for certain official

purposes such as Literacy, Campaigns, broadcasting and the dissemination of official information in government newspapers.

In terms of their usage, Bemba is used in the Luapula, Northern and Copper belt Provinces and in Kabwe area only of the Central Province. Nyanja is used in Central (Lusaka area) and Eastern Provinces, Lozi is used in the Western Province, Kaonde is chiefly used in Solwezi and Kasempa Districts, Lunda is mainly used in Mwinilunga, Zambezi and Kabompo Districts. Luvale is used in Zambezi and Kabompo Districts and Tonga is applied in the Southern Province and part of the Central Province (Banda and Jimaima 2017; Jimaima 2016). The study at hand focuses on the Tonga Language of the Plateau.

### **1.3 Statement of the problem**

While studies such as O'Brien (1992) explored the *Tonga Grammar*, Hopgood (1940) did *a Practical Introduction to Chitonga Grammar* and Hazel (2002) examined an Outline of Chitonga Grammar among others, literature has proven that, their coverage does not extend to the morphology, syntax and semantics of negation in Tonga as a package. The studies have not examined the productivity of the negative markers across the noun class system. These studies have not examined incorporation, double negation, the typologies of negation and neither of the studies has attempted to apply any theory in their analysis. Therefore, the question under discussion is: what is a grammar of negation in the Tonga language?

### **1.4 Aim of the study**

The aim of the study was to explore the morphology, the syntactic distribution and the semantics of negation in Tonga.

### **1.5 Specific objectives**

The objectives of the study were:

1. To analyze the morphology of negation in Tonga.
2. To examine the syntactic distribution of negation in Tonga.
3. To examine some semantic aspects of negation in Tonga.

### **1.6 Research questions**

In order to achieve the above objectives, the following questions were inquired:

1. What are some of the morphological forms of negation that are found in Tonga?

2. What is the syntactic nature of negation in Tonga?
3. What is the semantic structure of negation in Tonga?

### **1.7 Significance of the study**

The study would add value to the body of knowledge as ‘A Grammar of Negation’ has not been tackled comprehensively in the Tonga language. The research would also be useful to scholars that might be interested in knowing the Grammar of Negation in general and in Tonga. Specifically, knowing its morphological, syntactic and the semantic structure. It would also add up to the existing literature on negation in English and other Languages.

### **1.8 Scope of the study**

The study focused on *A Grammar of Negation in Tonga*. In this regard, it sought to examine the morphological, syntactic and the semantic structure of negation only of the Tonga language spoken in Monze District. Note also that, only few examples have been analyzed because most of the examples given in many sections have the similar analysis. This has been done to avoid repetition.

### **1.9 Definition of terms**

The study has pointed out some concepts that if left un-contextualized, they might be misinterpreted and used outside the scope of the study. Therefore, the following are some of the terms defined:

Affirmative: Asserting that something is true or correct.

Negation: The capacity to deny, to contradict, to misrepresent, to lie and to convey Irony.

Morphology: The study of the internal structure of words and the rules governing the formation of the words in the language.

Syntax: The branch of grammar dealing with the ways in which words with or without appropriate inflections are arranged to show connections of meaning within the sentence.

Semantics: The study of meaning in a language.

Prefixation: A morphological process whereby a bound morpheme is attached at the beginning of a root or stem.

Suffixation: Adding a suffix to the base with or without a change of word class.

Explicit Negation: Negation expressed as part of the asserted meaning (sentence meaning of an utterance).

Implicit Negation: Negation expressed as part of the non-asserted meaning (Speaker meaning of an utterance).

Sentential Negation: Negative marker scoping over the entire sentence.

Constituent Negation: Negation pointing out to a particular category.

Negative Concord: one negative idea expressed by means of two or more negative elements.

### **1.10 Structure of the dissertation**

The first chapter introduces the study by explicating the thesis of the study. The introduction is followed by the background to the study, this gives a detailed description of the language under discussion. Apart from that, language situation in Zambia has been explained in order to understand its history. Thereafter, the statement of the problem follows; this gives a clear picture of the knowledge gap.

Moreover, the aim of the study has been outlined followed by the specific objectives and the research questions. Subsequently, the significance of the study, the scope, the operational definitions, the structure of the study and the summary have been displayed.

The second chapter presents the literature review, this is divided into two parts. The first part encompasses the studies done on negation in the non Bantu Languages. Their findings are analyzed and compared in order to assess the differences as well as the knowledge gap. The second part looks at the studies done in the Bantu languages, this is done by examining their analysis pertaining to negation and a clear assessment with regards to what was not focused upon has been drawn.

The third chapter dwells on the theoretical and conceptual framework. Under the Morphology of negation, the study utilizes the Jespersen's cycle theory. Sentential and constituent negation have been utilized on the Syntax of negation while Semantics has been discussed using the typologies of negation which include explicit and implicit negation. The negative concord theory has been applied as well.

The fourth chapter looks at the methodology of the study. This includes the research design used, the research methodology and the study area. The study further discusses the study population and the sampling technique that encompasses the purposive sampling technique. The data collection methods that include the primary data collection, the desk research, introspection, data collection instruments, the structured questionnaire and the data collection procedure have been drawn. Afterwards, the data analysis instruments and procedure as well as the ethical considerations have been discussed.

Chapter five presents the findings and discussion of the study; these are discussed in line with the objectives and the theoretical and conceptual framework of the study. Under the Morphology of negation, the negative markers are discussed in terms of their distribution in a number of statements. The Jespersen's cycle theory has been applied successfully. Sentential and constituent negation have been discussed under the syntactic structure of negation. Under the Semantics of negation, the negative markers are discussed in line with the typologies of negation which include explicit and implicit negation. Thereafter, the negative concord theory has been elucidated.

The last chapter encompasses the conclusion, recommendations, the recommendations for further studies as well as the appendices, this concludes the Dissertation.

### **1.11 Summary**

The above chapter has provided a summary of the research by explaining the background to the study and the language situation in Zambia. It has also given an outline of the statement of the problem and the aim of the study. The specific objectives and the research questions have been spelled out, this gives a clear picture of what was investigated. Additionally, the significance of the study, the scope, the definition of terms and the structure of the thesis have been displayed in order to give light to the study.

The subsequent chapter presents the literature review that hangs on the information related to the topic under discussion

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.0 Introduction

The preceding chapter introduced the study by explicating the background to the study and the language situation in Zambia. The study has equally displayed the statement of the problem which pointed out the gap. Additionally, the aim of the study, specific objectives, research questions, significance of the study as well as the scope of the study have been drawn. The chapter concludes by providing the structure of the thesis and the summary.

This chapter discusses the literature which feeds directly into the Grammar of Negation. The review is divided into two sections. The first section dwells on the studies done in the non bantu languages and the theories adopted have been displayed. The other section explores the studies done on the bantu languages. In principle, the reviewed studies will show how negation was handled and invariably bring into the spotlight the gap which the study sought to fill.

#### 2.1 Studies done in the non bantu languages

This section reviews literature on negation in languages other than Tonga as a way of situating the current study in the existing literature. The work by Hulse (2010) which studied *Productivity in Morphological Negation in English* acts as Launchpad for this undertaking.

The study focused on the morphological productivity from the perspective of negative prefixation that can be achieved by the incorporation of a number of different negative prefixes. For instance, from the adjective expression ‘moral’, the negative illustrations that are formed include: Amoral, immoral, non-moral and unmoral. In the examples that Hulse (2010) gives, one notices that the marker of negation is not one uniform prefix: there are different prefixal materials used to signify negation. Namely, ‘a+’; ‘in+’; ‘non+’...

It is further observable that, from the Latin origin, the adjective *moral* would formerly be negated by the addition of the prefix ‘in’ which gives the negated form as *immoral*. However, due to changes in the acceptability of combining Latin bases with non-Latin prefixes, the above negatives for the adjective *moral* are permissible (Hulse 2010).

Additionally, the study proclaims that the prefix ‘non’ is shown to be the most productive of all the negative prefixes examined whereas the marker ‘in’ is indicated as the least productive of the prefixes. This is because, the marker ‘in’ has a tendency to combine with common everyday words of the language resulting in lesser productivity in terms of new formations. The example is demonstrated in the illustration ‘*inhuman*’.

The study further reveals that, the marker ‘non’ is often used with euphemistic intentions. This can be seen in words such as; non-drinker, non-smoker... Therefore, the study concludes that word class is clearly a contributory factor in determining which negating prefix is used in a new formation. The negative prefixing is more productive when nouns are formed but less productive in terms of the creation of verbal formations. This revelation was explored in the context of negation in Tonga.

Jespersen (1917) investigated *The History of Negation in English and other Languages*. Other than English, other languages include; French, Latin and Scandinavia. The study proclaims that negation was realized by the use of the marker ‘ne’ in the languages outlined above. In Latin for example, the negative marker ‘ne’ could be prefixed to verbs such as; *nescio* ‘I do not know’, *nequeo* ‘I cannot’, among others. In French, the negative marker ‘ne’ was felt to be so weak and it was strengthened by the negative marker ‘pas’, this can be seen in the illustration; je **ne** dis **pas** ‘I do not say.’

Conversely, in Scandinavian languages, another way of strengthening a negative was preferred. Namely; by placing the negative marker *eigi* or *ekki* after the verb. In Modern and Old English period, the negative marker ‘ne’ was applied as well. In the long run, the marker ‘ne’ was pronounced with very little stress and it was about to disappear. Hence, the Standard English negative marker ‘not’ became the regular negative in all cases. An example given is the statement “(I say not), this points to the practical disappearance of the negative marker ‘ne’ and the exclusive use of the term ‘not’ which was reached in the fifteenth century” (Jespersen 1917: 9).

In addition to the dynamics of the negative markers stated above, the study attests that the most important negative prefixes are ‘un’ and ‘in’. The marker ‘un’ is the native English form while the marker ‘in’ is the Latin form. The study further reveals that, the negative marker ‘un’ is preferred before the shorter words and the marker ‘in’ is preferred before the longer words. The

examples given include expressions such as; **unable**, **unjust**, **inability** and **injustice**, among others. He also argues that most adjectives with the negative marker ‘un’ or ‘in’ have a depreciatory sense. They are reflected in expressions such as, **unworthy**, **undue**, **imperfect**, among others

Therefore, it can be stated that Jespersen’s discussion is in conformity with Hulse (2010) who examines the negative expressions ‘in’ and ‘un’ in a derogatory sense. The only difference observed is, Hulse (2010) discusses the negative markers in line with productivity in the noun and verbal formations while Jespersen (1917) discusses the markers in line with language differences.

The current study examines the productivity of negative markers across the noun class system in Tonga. Additionally, it analyzes the negative markers that show the aspect of incorporation. This does not come out in the reviewed studies.

Moreover, Mohsen (2011) did *A comparison of Negation between English and Norwegian*. The study aimed at providing a syntactic explanation of the different negation patterns of English and Norwegian. In her arguments, Mohsen differentiates negation patterns using three theories. These include; negative concord, negation and the Jespersen’s cycle.

Negative concord is defined as; “one negative idea expressed by means of two or more negative elements” (Mohsen 2011:6). The examples are expressed as follows:

1. Je **n** ai vu **personne**.

I NEG have seen n-body

I haven’t seen anybody.

From the given illustration, the negative elements identified are ‘n’ and ‘personne’. Suffice it to note that, even if the negative markers identified are two, the interpretation of the statement is considered unitary.

However, Mohsen argues that in Standard English, negative concord is considered ungrammatical. An example is demonstrated as follows:

2. \*You didn’t see **nobody**.

She further articulates that, the negative concord reading of example (2) corresponds to the Standard English statement demonstrated as:

3. You didn't see anybody. Mohsen (2011:6)

Under the theory of negation, Mohsen (2011) discusses two components termed as constituent and sentential negation. Constituent negation is described as negation that scopes only a particular constituent while sentential negation is described as the negative element scoping over the entire sentence (Mohsen 2011). The examples are demonstrated as:

4. They live **not** far from here.

5. It is for this reason that I don't believe that John was fired.

From the 4<sup>th</sup> illustration, the negative marker 'not' negates the constituent 'far from here.' This is because, the negative marker follows the finite lexical verb and it does not have scope over the verb. The 5<sup>th</sup> statement demonstrates sentential negation because the meaning is deduced from the speaker's belief.

Under the Jespersen's cycle theory, the cyclic structure of the Jespersen's cycle theory is illustrated as follows:

(i) The original negator is gradually weakened and loses its negative force, (ii) it is then reinforced by an additional negator which eventually is perceived as the true negator. Eventually, (iii) the original negator is dropped and the cycle may start over again (Mohsen 2011:7). The example of the given explanation is demonstrated below:

Old English

(i) Ic **ne** secge 'I don't say'

Middle English

(ii) I **ne** seye **not** 'I don't say'

Early Modern English

(iii) I say **not**

Adapted from (Lindstad 2007)

From the illustration given above, Mohsen (2011) argues that in the Old English period, negation was realized by the use of the negative marker 'ne'. However, in the Middle English, the negative

marker ‘ne’ was pronounced with very little stress, consequently, the Standard English negative marker ‘not’ was introduced in order to strengthen it. As a result, the negative concord became the regular form of negation at this stage. In the Early Modern English, the negative marker ‘ne’ was dropped and the Standard English marker ‘not’ remained as shown above. This analysis is in conformity with Jespersen (1917) in light with a history of negation in English and other languages.

Mohsen clearly demonstrates the structure that each theory displays, this motivated the study at hand to explore the theories in the context of Tonga language.

Abdullah (2015) explored *The Semantic-Syntactic scopes of Negation in English language*. The study aimed at describing how negation operates with different negative particles and to illustrate the different positions of negation in English language. The study discusses five types of negation in English. These include auxiliary negation, noun phrase negation, adverb negation, describing and rejecting negation.

A detailed explanation is given on the adverb and the noun phrase negation. Under noun phrase negation, the study argues that the expression ‘more than’ is grammatical when negated while the expression ‘few’ becomes ungrammatical. The examples are presented as follows:

6. Not more than 200 people attended the opening gala celebration.

7. \* Not few people came to the meeting. (Abdullah 2015:3)

The study postulates that, the expression ‘not few’ could mean both ‘no’ and ‘many’ which is ambiguous. Hence, the expression ‘few’ cannot be negated in example (7).

Under the adverb negation, the study argues that in English, there are some negative adverbs which create negative sentences without adding ‘no’, ‘not’ and ‘any’. An example given is the expression ‘barely’. The illustrations are demonstrated as follows:

8. I almost don’t know him

Which is rephrased as:

9. I barely know him.

From example (9), the adverb ‘barely’ is already negative. Hence, there is no need of adding another negative marker.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the above study dwells on the five types of negation as discussed above. The study does not dwell on explicit, implicit, sentential and constituent negation. This motivated the study at hand to embark on a research.

It is cardinal to note that, the Morphology, Syntax and the Semantics of negation in Tonga has not been investigated immensely. Hence, there was need for the research to be conducted.

## **2.2 Studies done on bantu languages**

Ampofo (2015) investigated *The Syntax and Semantics of Negation in Akan*. “Akan is one of the Kwa languages, it is the main Language widely spoken in Ghana” (Schneider 2017:15). The study focused on how negation is marked as well as the negative polarity items (NPIs). The study defines negative polarity items as expressions that can only occur in contexts that are in some sense negative. The examples of (NPIs) given in Akan include: huu for (nothing), hwee for (any) and siaga for (getting nowhere) among others.

Under the syntactic categorization, the types of negation the research identifies are sentential and constituent negation. Sentential negation is described as a scenario in which the negative element scopes over the entire sentence whereas constituent negation is described as negation that scopes only a particular constituent. Sentential negation is demonstrated in the following example:

10. Me **n** ko fie nne

1sg-neg-go home today

I will not go home today.

(Ampofo 2015:51)

From the illustration given in example (10), the study attests that, the truth value of the sentence is nullified by the negative marker ‘n’ which is equivalent to the English marker (not). This is because, the negative marker negates the nexus of the sentence (go). Therefore, the entire sentence is negated. Under constituent negation, the study adopts constituent clefting in negating the



reveals that sentential negation in Kiswahili is marked by the use of two markers on the verb. The first marker that is used is the ‘si’ indicating the first person singular and the second one is the marker ‘ha’ used in the rest. The second marker occupies the same slot as tense; an illustration on the affirmative and negative verb Morphology in the future tense is presented below:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
13. Nitaondoka ‘I will leave.’	Sitaondoka ‘I will not leave.’
14. Utaondoka ‘you will leave.’	Hutaondoka ‘you will not leave.’
15. Ataondoka ‘she/he will leave.’	Hataondoka ‘she/he will not leave.’

(Ngonyani 2001:19)

From the illustrations given, the affirmative expressions are marked by the subject agreement markers ‘ni’ ‘u’ and ‘a’ in the three illustrations. The subject markers are followed by the tense marker ‘ta’ which is prefixed to the verb.

However, the negative expression in (13) is marked by a negative prefix ‘si’ indicating the first person singular. The second and third person singular in (14) and (15) are marked by the negative marker ‘h’ equivalent to the English marker (not). In the case of the former, the marker ‘h’ is followed by the subject marker ‘u’ while in the latter, the marker ‘h’ is followed by the subject marker ‘a’. The subject markers are followed by the tense marker ‘ta’ which is in future and later, the verb follows as shown above.

In contrast, the study postulates that tense marking between the affirmative and the negative is clearly seen in the past tense. In such a case, the tense marker of the affirmative is replaced by the negative marker as demonstrated below:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
16. Niliondoka ‘I left.’	Sikuondoka ‘I did not leave.’
17. Uliondoka ‘you left.’	Hakuondoka ‘you did not leave.’
18. Aliondoka ‘she/he left.’	Hakuondoka ‘she/he did not leave.’ (Ngonyani 2001:20)

The study clarifies that the past tense marker ‘li’ in the affirmative expressions is replaced by the negative marker ‘ku’ in the negative expressions and the final vowel is not affected. The research also concludes that, in Kiswahili, the negative marker is prefixed to the verb.

The studies in Akan and the Kiswahili language reveal that the negative markers are prefixed to the verb. The study at present examines negation in verbs and other word classes that have not been dealt with by the previous studies. It assesses other ways of negating a verb other than prefixation.

Yanda (2005) investigated *The structure of Negation in Mokpe and two related coastal Bantu languages*. These two languages include the Oroko and Nfaw spoken in Cameroon. The study sought to examine the various negative markers and their distributions syntactically. The study postulates that the main negative markers in Mokpe include ‘zra’ and ‘zri’. The negative marker ‘zra’ is examined under double negation and the example is illustrated as follows:

19. Na` **zra**´ la to` **mo**`le`li. `

I NEG eat NEG food

I will not eat any food.

Yanda (2005:211)

From the above illustration, double negation is expressed in the negative markers ‘zra’ and ‘mo’. The study also attests that in Mokpe, the change of the negative morpheme is determined by the aspect of the verb in question. In this case, the negative marker ‘mo’ has substituted the negative marker ‘zri’. Furthermore, the study argues that, tense determines the distribution of the negative particles in Oroko and Nfaw. In Oroko language, a demonstration is illustrated below:

**Affirmative**

**Negative**

20. Mu`kwe`le` a` ko`no`ko`

Mu`kwe`le` a` **fa** `ko`no`ko`

Mukwele SM sing

Mukwele SM NEG sing.

Mukwele is singing

Mukwele is not singing. (Yanda 2005:211)

From the above examples, it can be argued that the negative morpheme /fa/ is placed before the verb and it negates sentences that are expressed in the present continuous tense.

On the other hand, the study exemplifies the Nfaw language in the statement given below:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
21. A` kwƏ bwƏ`h	A je kwƏ bwƏ`h
she cut trees	she NEG cut trees
she will cut down trees.	she will not cut down trees.
(Yanda 2005:214)	

Unlike Mokpe and Oroko languages, Nfaw takes a different negative vowel.

Therefore, Yanda concludes that Mokpe, Oroko and Nfaw share much in their negative illustrations. While Oroko uses /ʃa`/ Nfaw uses /je/ and Mokpe uses /zra/, the morpheme used is the same; the difference lies in the phonotactics of the languages. Literature has also shown that, while the consonant is the same in the three languages, Nfaw takes a different vowel. Therefore, negation occurs preverbally in Mokpe, Oroko and Nfaw languages.

The three consecutive studies discussed above reveal similar findings in different languages. In all the three, negative expressions are prefixed to the verb. In the broader context of the current study on negation in Tonga, the findings of how negation is accomplished in the reviewed studies will illuminate the discussion of negation in Tonga, particularly, how different parts of speech are negated in the language.

*A Morphosyntactic verb inflection for tense and aspect in Bemba* was done by Mwita (2016). The study postulates that, Bemba verbs have roots which cannot stand on their own thereby requiring one or more affixes. In his discussion, negation was not left out. The research discloses that, “negation is usually indicated by adding the morpheme ‘ta’ in the Bemba language. However, when the subject is the first person pronoun, negation is shown by inserting the morpheme ‘shi’ after the person prefix of the subject” (Gray and Bwalya 2015:14).

The examples advanced from the above description are: **ta**-uleepepa ‘you are not praying’. In this circumstance, the negative marker ‘ta’ is expressed in the second person singular and in the expression **nshileetuma** ‘I am not sending’, the negative marker ‘shi’ is expressed in the first person singular.

Similarly, Zemba (2015) did *A grammatical sketch of Kunda language* and negation is discussed under the verbal Morphology. The study asserts that, there are two negative morphemes in Kunda and these are expressed as; ‘ta’ and ‘nsi’. Literature shows that the morpheme ‘ta’ can co-occur with nearly every finite verb form and does not change the tense-aspect.

The negative marker ‘ta’ is exemplified in the following illustration; ku-**ta**-lamb-a ‘not to write’. The other negative marker discussed is ‘nsi’ and it is normally used with the first person singular. The example given is; **nsi**-li wino ‘I am not well’, among others.

Jimaima (2014) investigated *The Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics of conditional clauses in Tonga and English*. Negation is discussed under the English if and its Tonga equivalents. The study states that, in expressing the negative conditional involving a third person singular, the a-t- is used while, in the third person singular honorific and the third person plural, the ba-t-a is used. For example, *kuti atakabooli nkokuti tayandi* ‘if he won’t come, then he doesn’t want’. The study further argues that, the ‘t’ denotes negation while in English, negation is denoted by the use of ‘not’.

Nkolola (1997) did *An analysis of the Applied, Causative and Passive Verb Extension in Tonga*. Negation is discussed on some aspects of Tonga verbal Morphology. The study reveals that Tonga is characterized by the agglutinative nature of the verb form. Thus, affixes are added to the verb radical to indicate the subject, object, tense, aspect, negation, mood and other grammatical and lexical constituents. She further asserts that, Tonga verb constituents include; the pre prefix, prefix, post prefix, tense and aspect marker, object marker, root extension and the ending. The study discusses the terms that encompass negation below:

### **Pre prefix**

In Tonga, the pre prefix denotes negation and it is therefore the negative marker. The examples are illustrated as follows:

#### **Affirmative**

22. tu-la-yand-a

SM TM VS FV

we prs want

#### **Negative**

ta-tu-yand-i

NM SM VS FV

neg we want

we want.

we do not want.

From the negative illustration in example (22), the study articulates that the term ‘ta’ is the negative marker referring to the expression ‘not’. The morpheme ‘tu’ is the subject marker equivalent to the English pronoun ‘we’. The verb stem ‘yand’ combines with the discontinuous morpheme ‘i’ which is part of the negative expression constituting a change from the positive form ‘a’ as expressed in the affirmative statement.

### **Post prefix**

The study further states that, the post prefix is described as a morpheme which comes after the prefix and it denotes negation. The example is demonstrated as follows:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
23. ba-nt-u ba-belek-a	ba-nt-u ba-ta-belek-i
SM NS FV SM VS FV	SM NS FV SM NM VS FV
people they work	people they neg work
people who work.	people who do not work.

As can be seen from the negative illustration above, the post prefix is the negative marker ‘ta’ and it comes immediately after the prefix ‘ba’.

Suffice it to note that, though the four studies discussed above attempted to look at negation, three of them looked at it from the morphological point of view while Jimaima discussed it from the syntactic point of view. It can also be attested that, Mwita (2016), Zemba (2015) and Jimaima (2014) examined negation in line with number. The difference is, Mwita and Zemba focuses mainly on the tense and aspect while Jimaima includes honorific illustrations. Nkolola (1997) examines negation indicating the pre and post prefix illustrations. One fascinating aspect in the four studies is that the negative marker ‘ta’ is dominating and it is placed before the verb.

Therefore, it can be postulated that, the current study intends to examine other negative markers that can be used to negate a verb other than the negative marker ‘ta’. Additionally, the gap still

stands because negation in form of productivity as well as incorporation has not been examined in Tonga.

Other studies that attempted to tackle negation include; O'Brien (1992) who wrote on *Tonga grammar*. The study which aimed at investigating speech and constructing a model which would help in the understanding of the way Tonga is spoken. Negation was dealt with in line with standardization. The study asserts that, in text books and examinations, some of the negative expressions are considered standardized while others are considered non-standardized. The examples are expressed in the following expressions:

24. nse-yand-i	25. ta-ndi-yand-i
SM VS FV	NM SM VS FV
neg/I want	neg I want
I do not want.	I do not want.

The study postulates that, the negative expression in example (24) is regarded as the standardized present negative form of the verbal and the negative expression in example (25) is regarded as the non-standard form.

Consequently, it can be articulated that O'Brien discusses negation in terms of standardization in text books and examinations. This study does not give out any structure regarding any deeper analysis of Morphology, Syntax and Semantics. This motivated the current study to embark on a survey.

Other negative aspects brought about by O'Brien include the verbals 'li' and 'kwe'. The marker 'li' is demonstrated as follows:

26. ta-li- mu-enz-u	27. ta-ba-li-ba-enz-u
SM NM PRN NS FV	NM PRN NM PRN NS FV
she/he neg visitor	neg they neg visitors.
she/he is not a visitor.	they are not visitors.

The negative marker 'kwe' is applied in the following structure:

28. ta-a-kwe-naa-ka-ziku-a

NM SM NM SM TM VS FV

neg she/he neg she/he fut buried

she/he was never buried.

O'Brien further attests that, the negative marker 'kwe' can be alternated with the term 'kunyina' in the following illustration:

29. ku-nyina- naa-ka-sik-a

LOC NM SM TM VS FV

loc neg she/he past come

she/he never came.

From the given illustrations, O'Brien (1992) clearly shows the use of the negative marker 'li' in the third person singular as shown in example (26). He also exemplifies it in the third person plural as shown in example (27). Additionally, he has also demonstrated on how the negative marker 'kwe' alternates with the marker 'ku-nyina' as shown in examples (28) and (29). He also argues that the negative markers 'kwe' and 'kunyina' bare the same meaning which is; 'never' or 'not at all.'

Therefore, it can be stated that O'Brien (1992) does not apply any theory to any negative expression given. It is also not clear on whether the negative marker 'nyina' can only be discussed under alternatives. Hence, this motivated the study at hand to embark on the formation of negative expressions and the productivity of negative markers across the noun class system, among others.

Another scholar who explored Tonga is Hopgood (1940). His main aim was to give students a practical introduction to the subject. His work is composed of sentence drills where, each lesson commences with a sentence drill. The sentences are provided in both direct and indirect English

translations. Additionally, the notes on grammar, vocabulary and the exercises are provided at the end of each lesson.

In many instances, the study expresses negative statements where the reader is expected to translate them either in Tonga or English. In other instances, the study provides the alternatives of the negative statements and their meanings. It can be noted that there is less explanation given with regards to a number of negative items used.

Some illustrations that depict negation are expressed as follows:

30. nsi-ly-i-pem-o-pe	pepe-nda-end-a endikk-e
NM VS FV NS FV NM	NM PRN VS FV NS FV
neg/I eat Nose no	neg I walk alone
I do not eat the nose.	no I walked alone.

31. ta-mu-ink-i-pe, ta-tu-nyw-i, ino-mu-la-kakil-a-nzi-ku-nyw-a?

NM PRN VS FV NM NM PRN VS FV PRN TM NM FV VS FV

neg you go neg neg we drink why you present neg drink

Are you not going? No, we do not drink and why are you going to refuse to drink?

From examples (30) and (31), the explanation is only attached to an extract of example (31); *mulakakila nzi?* ‘Why are you going to refuse?’ The study argues that, “the interrogative ‘why’ is often expressed as ‘nzi’, being added to the applied form of the verb. Thus, *kaka*, to ‘refuse’, *kakila*, to ‘refuse for’ we get *mwakakakila nzi*” literally, why did you refuse?” (Hopgood 1940:117).

The study labored to explain on the literal meaning and the change of tense from an extract of example (31). The negative marker discussed is *kaka* ‘to refuse’. The study does not give explanations on the negative particles used in example (30) apart from giving the gloss. Therefore, this gave room for a detailed study of negation to be conducted in Tonga.

The study also discusses negation in terms of alternatives. The examples of negative markers that alternate are presented as follows:

32. ti-i-nsi	te-e-nsi
NM SM NM	NM SM NM
neg thing neg	neg thing neg
it is not....	it is not...

Literature has shown that the negative statements discussed above are mainly used to show alternatives. This analysis is in conformity with O'Brien (1992) who also tackles negation in form of alternatives. The difference is, O'Brien (1992) discusses negation in line with standardization while Hopgood (1940) dwells much on the language learner.

Nevertheless, the formation of negative markers, their arrangement in sentences as well as meaning has not been clearly stated. Therefore, the current study sought to fill the gap.

Other negative statements that are illustrated in the study include: 'empo', 'enko', 'emo'... denoting 'it is not'... Moreover, the research gives a complete list of negative forms as follows:

- 33. 1<sup>st</sup> person singular endime 'it is not I'. Pl. Endiswe 'it is not we'
- 34. 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular enduwe 'it is not you'. Pl. endinywe 'it is not you'
- 35. 3<sup>rd</sup> person has the following; 1. engwe, 2. embo, 3. engo, 4. enjo, 5. endyo, 6. engo, 7. enco, 8. enzyo, 9. enjo, 10. enzyo, 11. endo, 12. engo, 13. enko, 14. embo, 15. enko, 16. empo, 17. enko and 18. emo. Meaning; 'it is not...' (Hopgood 1940:250).

Hopgood (1940) has classified the negative marker 'e' as expressed in the first, second and third person singular and plural as widely used as expressed above. His analysis dwells much on the Choma dialect. The current study focuses on the context of negative markers of Monze dialect.

It is important to note that Hopgood (1940) applies a number of negative statements in his study. In some instances, to indicate the tense, on many instances, to help some statements have complete meanings, among others.

Consequently, the three linguistic levels have not been applied clearly as a person who does not have the knowledge with regards to word formation, organization of the morphemes and meaning cannot follow vividly. Hence, this motivated ‘A Grammar of Negation’ to be embarked on in order to enhance a clear distinction.

Gleason (1918) also explored Tonga. The study was an attempt to help European officials, Missionaries and others who would use the language. In his analysis, negation was not overlooked.

He illustrates the demonstration where a negative pronoun is prefixed to a pronoun as follows:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
36. ndi-m-e	e-ndi-m-e
PRN NS FV	NM PRN NS FV
prs I	neg prs I
it is I.	it is not I.
37. ndi-sw-e	e-ndi-sw-e
PRN NS FV	NM PRN NS FV
prs us	neg prs us
it is us.	it is not us.

From the illustrations given above, it can be articulated that Gleason’s (1918) study is similar to Hopgood (1940). This is because, both of them analyzed the use of the negative marker ‘e’ in a broader context. Though they both discuss the negative marker ‘e’ in nominal constructions, Hopgood (1940) focuses much on number.

On the other hand, Gleason also discusses the negative marker ‘e’ as a connector. The examples are demonstrated as follows:

38. e-nguw-e

NM NS FV

neg prs him/her

it is not him/her

39. e-mbab-o

NM NS FV

neg prs them

it is not them...

As can be seen from the above illustrations, the negative marker ‘e’ is used in a broader context. In examples (36) and (37), it is used as a prefix while in examples (38) and (39), it is used as a connector. Therefore, the question on what kind of negative markers are productive across the noun class system in the Plateau Tonga still remains unanswered.

Additionally, Gleason attests that when the pronoun is prefixed to a noun, the following form is achieved:

**Affirmative**

**Negative**

40. ndi-nyw-e

ta-mu-di-ndi-nw-e

PRN NS FV

NM SM NM PRN NS FV

prs you

neg you neg you

it is you.

it is not you.

It can be stated that the negative expression in example (40) displays double negation. Therefore, it is not clear on whether double negation can only be achieved when a pronoun is prefixed to a noun in the Plateau Tonga. Hence, the study at hand sought to fill the gap.

*An elementary Tonga grammar* was done by Collins (1958). The book was designed for practical purposes in that, a person who is conversant with the language is expected to read the sentences provided and the learner is expected to imitate the pronunciation as well as the tone.

On the other hand, the learner is expected to read the notes and answer the exercises given by translating English into Tonga and vice versa. Thereafter, the learner is expected to compare the answers using the key that is given. Amongst the components advanced by the study, negation was not overlooked. Under the negative verbs, the study states that positive verbs end in ‘a’. When

they appear in the negative form, they end in ‘i’ and they are preceded by the expression ‘ta’. Some of the examples given are:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
41. ba-la-yand-a	ta-ba-yand-i
SM TM VS FV	NM SM VS FV
they prs want	neg they want
they want.	they don’t want.

Additionally, the study demonstrates the negative illustrations indicating indefinite nouns as follows:

42. ta-li- mu-nt-u	te-e-syi mu-nt-u
SM NM PRN NS FV	NM SM NM PRN NS FV
it neg person	neg it neg person
it is not a person.	it is not a person.
43. ti-i-li-mi-sam-u	ti-i-syi mi-sam-u
NM SM NM PRN NS FV	NM SM NM PRN NS FV
neg they neg trees.	neg they neg trees.
they are not trees	they are not trees

It can be argued that example (41) displays the change of the discontinuous morpheme from ‘a’ to ‘i’ while examples (42) and (43) display the alternation of the negative marker ‘li’ to ‘syi’. This analysis is in conformity with Hopgood (1940) and O’Brien (1992). The difference lies on the kind of constructions used. Collins further argues that “when the negative predicate is definite for instance in the statement ‘the man’, the negative term ‘teesyi’ is employed with the reduplicated predicate. Thus, the statement becomes; “teesyi ngomuntu” (it is not the person) (Collins 1958:23).

From the literature given so far, there is less documentation on the Morphology, Syntax and the Semantics of Negation in Tonga. No study has attached any theory in any analysis. Hence, this study sought to cram the gap.

In 1962, Collins explored a *Tonga Grammar*, this was a revised edition of *an elementary Tonga grammar*. The study aimed at giving a reasonably complete view of the fundamentals of Tonga Grammar. In his analysis, negation is discussed under vowel assimilation. The study articulates that certain vowels in Tonga combine with others to form different sounds. Some of the examples given are: “‘a-e becomes ‘ee’ as in *teendi* ‘she/he does not walk’ and a-o becomes ‘oo’ as in *tooni* ‘she/he does not sleep’” among others (Collins 1962:5).

Collins equally discusses negation on the verbals and adverbals. The study proclaims that negatives generally end in ‘i’ and not in ‘a’. For the past tenses and the infinitives, the negative is ‘ta’ but the past tenses which do not change the final ‘a’ into ‘i’ change ‘ta’ into ‘tii’ except in the second and third person singular. Some of the examples given include:

<p>44. Present: nse-sik-i</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">SM VS FV</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">neg reach</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">I do not reach.</p>	<p>hodiernal past: tii-nda-sik-a</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">NM SM VS FV</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">neg I reach</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">I did not reach.</p>
<p>45. Prehodiernal past: tii-nda-ka-sik-a</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">NM SM TM VS FV</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">neg I fut reach</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">I did not reach.</p>	<p>present: to-sik-i</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">NM VS FV</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">neg/you reach</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">you do not reach.</p>
<p>46. Hodiernal: to-o-sik-a</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">NM SM VS FV</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">neg you reach</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">you did not reach.</p>	<p>prehodiernal: to-o-ka-sik-a</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">NM SM TM VS FV</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">neg you pst reach</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">you did not reach.</p>

It can be argued that Collins (1962) discusses the formation of negative expressions in line with vowel assimilation. He also discusses their formation in a number of tenses as illustrated above. Collins does not explain other functions of the negative markers given. Therefore, the study at present sought to fill the gap.

Collins further postulates that the negative verb *nyina* ‘to be without’ can be followed by the vowel ‘a’ to show emphasis. This verb is mostly accompanied by the locative ‘ku’ as exemplified below:

47. *ku-nyina a-mapopw-e*

LOC NM EMP NS FV

loc neg emp maize

There is no maize.

The study has demonstrated on how the vowel ‘a’ is applied to show emphasis. Additionally, the study attests that the word ‘no’ means ‘peepe’ which is in emphatic form and the marker ‘ipe’ (yes no) is in unemphatic form.

It is important to note that Collins does not attach any theory in the analysis of negation. This motivated the research to be conducted in order to examine the clear distinction between emphatic and non-emphatic negators using the Jespersen’s cycle theory.

Collins also discusses the negative copula ‘li’. He argues that, it is negative in form. He further postulates that the expression ‘li’ can also be illustrated in a second form and this expression is identified as ‘syi’. A demonstration is illustrated as follows:

48. *ta-li mu-nt-u*

SM NM PRN NS FV

it neg person

it is not a person.

49. *te-e-syi mu-nt-u*

NM SM NM PRN NS FV

neg it neg person

it is not a person.

Literature has shown that the negative marker ‘syi’ can be alternated for ‘li’. This analysis is similar to Hopgood’s (1940) and Collin’s (1958) study. The difference lies on the type of negative illustrations expressed. Therefore, the gap on the productivity of the negative marker ‘li’ across the noun class system still stands. Hence, there was need for this study to be explored.

Consequently, it can be argued that Collins (1962) discusses negation in line with vowel change, emphasis and tense. Other than focusing on the formation of negative markers in imperative, declarative and interrogative sentences and the organization of negative markers in their word classes and meaning, the current study encompasses tense and emphatic negators, among others.

Suffice it to note that, Hazel (2002) investigated *An outline of Chitonga grammar*. In her analysis, negation is discussed under the component of tone sequences. The structure manifesting negation is demonstrated as follows:

50. ta`-ba`-na´-si`k-a`

NM PRN NM VS FV

neg they neg arrive

they have not arrived yet.

Hazel asserts that the tone bearing elements in a construction are the vowels. In example (50), the vowels are represented by; ‘a’ and ‘i’. Therefore, the tone is lowered on the first two vowels represented by ‘a’, it is then raised on the third vowel presented as ‘a’. Thereafter, the voice is later lowered on the two subsequent vowels presented as ‘i’ and ‘a’.

Another negative term discussed is advanced under the Tonga verbs. The study proclaims that, Tonga verbs show the typical bantu structure of affixes attached round a lexical core called the radical. The example is given under the verb stem tum ‘send’. Literature shows that this verb may combine with an auxiliary to make a compound. An example is illustrated in the sentence below:

51. tii´-ba´-ka´-t`um-a´

NM PRN TM VS FV

neg they pst send

they did not send.

Hazel argues that the verb ‘send’ is analyzed as an expression consisting of the following elements: ‘tii’ negative maker, ‘b’ is regarded as the contracted subject prefix of class two (they) and ‘a’ka’ is regarded as the tense marker. The morpheme ‘t`um’ is the verb root for the action send and the suffix ‘a’ is regarded as the final vowel (part of the tense marker).

In example (50), negation is discussed in line with tone sequence. Example (51) is based on the analysis of the verb root being attached to a number of affixes as shown above.

Furthermore, negation is also discussed on imperatives. The study articulates that imperative statements express command. An example is demonstrated below:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
52. sal-a	‘u-ta´-sa´l-i’
VS FV	PRN NM VS FV
choose	you neg choose
choose.	you should not choose.

Moreover, Hazel postulates that negation is also manifested in subjunctives. She defines subjunctives as illustrations that express wish or the intended result. Subjunctives are often used with the expression kuti ‘if’. The example is displayed as follows:

53. kuti- tu-ta´-sa´l-i
PRN NM VS FV
if we neg choose
if we do not choose.

Nonetheless, other negative expressions are discussed under completives. The study describes completives as terms used to express completed actions. The example is demonstrated as follows:

54. 'tii'-twa-ka'-la'ngid-e'

NM SM TM VS FV

neg we pst look

we had not looked.

It can be noted that Hazel discusses negation on imperatives, subjunctives and completives but the main focus is on tone. Therefore, the study at hand focuses on the morphological, syntactic and the semantic structure. This study equally examines negation on imperative statements though the Phonological aspect has been overlooked.

Additionally, Hazel proclaims that negation is also reflected in inceptives. Such expressions have the meaning 'not yet'. The markers that are used are; 'ninga' and 'na...' some of the examples given are; tatu-**ni**'nga' sala and tatu-**na**'sala 'we have not yet chosen' among others.

The above analysis is in conformity with Collins's (1962) study. This is because, both studies discuss negation in a number of tenses; the difference lies on the negative expressions examined. The study is equally similar to Gleason's (1918) study who equally discusses double negation in his constructions. Therefore, the question on what negative markers percolate through the negative concord illustrations still remains unanswered. This motivated the study at present to embark on a research.

*The Syntax and Semantics of adverbial clauses in Tonga* was done by Sikota (2016). The study explicates on the negative markers 'tii' and 'ta'. These markers are discussed under the syntactic polarity in conditional clauses. She argues that the markers 'tii' and 'ta' are variants of the negative morpheme 'ta' (not) and each of the variants is only possible in particular environments.

In the clauses of comparison, specifically in the past tenses, the study attests that the marker 'ta' takes the 'tii' form and precedes the whole verbal constituent. The example is illustrated as: *bausyi bakalikusalala kaali banyina tiibakalikusalala* 'His father was light in complexion while his mother was dark.' This analysis agrees with Hazel (2002) who also discusses the marker 'tii' in the past form. The difference is; Hazel (2002) discusses it in completives while Sikota (2016) discusses it under the clauses of comparison.

In clauses of place, the negative marker follows the subject marker. The example is displayed below:

55. u-a-sik-a nku-ba-ta-mu-yand-i

SM VS FV LOC SM NM PRN VS FV

she/he reach loc they neg she/he want

she/he has arrived where they do not want him.

Sikota (2016) explores the negative markers ‘ta’ and ‘tii’ vividly. However, it is not clear on whether the negative markers ‘ta’ and ‘tii’ can only be examined syntactically as she puts it. It is also not clear on whether the negative marker ‘ta’ can only function as a negator. Therefore, the gap on what negative marker is a necessity still remains unanswered.

Consequently, Sibajene (2013) attempted to assess negation in his study; *A Dialectological Study of Tonga*. The study was conducted to identify variations at the phonological, morphological, syntactic and the lexical level. The dialects considered in the study include; the Valley Tonga which includes the Tonga spoken in Siavonga and the Plateau Tonga of Mazabuka, Monze, Choma and Kalomo Districts.

Negation was observed at syntactic level. The study argues that both the Valley Tonga and the Plateau Tonga dialects express simple negation with a negative verbal morpheme ‘ta’ and the particle ‘pe’ which occurs at sentence final position. The study further asserts that in question tags, the valley Tonga realizes *teembumbubo na?* ‘Isn’t it so?’ after a positive statement while the Mazabuka and Monze dialects use the words *tabusi hena?* ‘Isn’t it so?’ The Choma and Kalomo dialects use *embo na?* ‘Isn’t it so?’ after a positive statement.

The above analysis agrees with Hopgood’s (1940) study *A practical introduction to Chitonga Grammar*. Both of them dwelt on the Valley as well as the Plateau Tonga. The difference is; Sibajene (2013) discusses negation in line with dialectal differences while Hopgood (1940) dwells much on the Choma dialect, specifically, on the application of the negative marker ‘e’. The analysis equally agrees with Sikota (2016) in the sense that both studies focus on the use of the negative marker ‘ta’.

The study at hand examines the context of negative markers used in the Plateau. Specifically, Monze dialect.

### **2.3 Summary**

The studies that have examined negation comprehensively are non bantu as expressed above. Other bantu languages have also examined negation immensely though Tonga is not incorporated. Most of the studies applied the Jespersen's cycle theory, the negative concord, the theory of negation and of course other theories that have not been adopted by the current study. In their analysis, there is no study that has discussed negation considering the Morphology, Syntax and Semantics as a package.

From the studies that have been conducted on Tonga, literature reveals that there is no study that has examined the Morphology, Syntax and the Semantics of negation in Tonga comprehensively. Studies such as Nkolola (1997) focused on the verbal Morphology. Collins (1962) and Hazel (2002) focused on the phonological perspective while Jimaima (2014) and Sikota (2016) dwelt on the syntactic perspective. Studies such as Hopgood (1940), Collins (1958), Gleason (1918) and O'Brien (1992) focused on the constructions of the negative expressions.

The context of negative markers with regards to incorporation, negative concord, necessity, productivity of negative markers across the noun class system and the typologies of negation has not been examined by the studies reviewed in Tonga. Literature has equally proven that no theory has been applied on any documentation. The study at hand incorporates the theories and the typologies of negation.

The succeeding chapter presents the theories and concepts that have been used in this study.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

#### 3.0 Introduction

The previous chapter has provided the literature review. In the first section, the study discussed the studies done in the non bantu languages while the other section dwelt on the studies done in the bantu languages. Literature has proven that there is less documentation pertaining to the Morphology, Syntax and the Semantics of Negation in Tonga.

This chapter presents the theories and the concepts used in the analysis of negation. The theories include the Jespersen's cycle, negative concord and the theory of negation that encompasses sentential and constituent negation. The typologies of negation that encompass explicit and implicit negation have been adopted as well.

This study adopts the aforesaid theories and concepts because they give a clear guide on why some negative morphemes cannot stand on their own. These theories also give a clear distinction on which negative markers are considered as necessities, markers that indicate emphasis, those whose meanings are influenced by the subject marker as well as the tense, among others.

#### 3.1 The Jespersen's cycle theory

The central theory to this disquisition is the Jespersen's cycle theory. The term Jespersen's cycle was coined by Dahl (1979) but the cyclical change of negation was discussed by Meillet (1912). It is called a cycle because, some negative markers were considered to be weak, hence, other negative markers were added to strengthen them. In the long run, other negative markers were dropped and the cycle could restart again in Jespersen's (1917) study of *A History of Negation in English and other languages*. The stages of Jespersen's cycle are demonstrated below:

(i) The original negator is gradually weakened and loses its negative force, (ii) it is then reinforced by an additional negator which eventually is perceived as the true negator. Eventually, (iii) the original negator is dropped and the cycle may start over again (Mohsen 2011:7).

A demonstration on the three stages of Jespersen's cycle theory is illustrated under the three French stage model below:

56. Old French

Jeo **ne** di

1SG NEG Say. Prs.1SG

‘I do not say.’

57. Middle and Modern written French

Je **ne** dis **pas**.

1SG NEG Say.PRS.1SG NEG.

‘I do not say.’

58. Colloquial French

Je dis **pas**

1SG Say.PRS.1SG NEG

I do not say.

(Wills et al 2013:7 and Jespersen 1917:7)

The summary of the Jespersen’s cycle theory is presented in the following structure:

(i) Stage one

Neg+vb

(ii) Stage two

Neg+vb+neg

(iii) Stage three

Vb+neg

Literature has shown that the first example employing the preverbal negation in Old French is an example of stage one. The Middle and Modern written French with double negation shows stage two and the colloquial French that indicates post verbal negation illustrates stage three.

The study at present employs the above theory because it clearly displays the morphological structure of negative markers in the language under discussion. In the Tonga language, negation is equally achieved by prefixing a negative marker before the verb stem. Additionally, when a post verb negative marker is added, it is regarded as an emphatic negator as it strengthens the preverbal negator. Consequently, when the preverbal negator is dropped, the structure takes the colloquial form as displayed above. It is cardinal to note that the study employs the Jespersen’s cycle theory because it states what negative marker is considered as a necessity and the one denoting emphasis in an illustration.

### 3.2 The theory of negation

The theory of negation is composed of two components. These include sentential and constituent negation (Haegeman 1996). Sentential negation involves negating the finite verb as it is said to be the link or the nexus of the sentence (cf Jespersen 1917). Once the link of the sentence is negated, the entire sentence is diluted. Under constituent negation, only a particular category is negated. This is achieved by the application of the constituent cleft sentence ‘it is’ which emphasizes the category being negated (Ampofo 2015).

#### 3.2.1 Sentential negation

Sentential negation is demonstrated in the following example:

##### **Affirmative**

##### **Negative**

59. John ate the food.

John did **not** eat the food.

In the examples illustrated in (59), the truth value of the affirmative sentence is nullified by the negative marker ‘not’ in the negative statement. Hence, the negative sentence can have various interpretations. It can mean:

60. John did not eat the food, Ama did.

61. John did not eat the food, he drunk the water.

(Ampofo 2015:22)

### 3.2.2 Constituent negation

It can be proclaimed that constituent negation is employed to avoid ambiguity in the sentence. In negating a constituent, this study utilizes the cleft sentence manifested by the expression ‘it is’. Cleft sentences are used to show emphasis. The examples are illustrated below:

62. It is not John who ate the food.

63. It is not the food that John ate. (Ampofo 2015)

From the given examples, the noun *John* as displayed in example (62) and the expression *the food* as expressed in example (63) are the entities being negated.

Therefore, the study at hand benefits from this analysis as negation is examined at both sentential and constituent levels in Tonga. At sentential level, the negative marker scopes over the entire clause as the marker negates the nexus of the sentence. At constituent level, the negative marker specifies to a specific category. This is achieved by the application of the constituent cleft sentence ‘it is’ that emphasizes the category being negated. The above concepts are discussed under the Syntax of negation in Tonga.

### 3.3 Semantic categorisation of negation

Semantically, the current study analyzes meaning using explicit and implicit concepts. Explicit negation refers to “[n]egation expressed as part of the asserted meaning (sentence meaning) of an utterance whereas implicit negation refers to negation ‘expressed as part of the non-asserted meaning (speaker meaning) of an utterance’” (Xiang et al 2014:72).

#### 3.3.1 Explicit and implicit negation

Examples under explicit and implicit negation are demonstrated in the conversation below:

64a. Question: Are you coming to the party tonight?

64b. Response: I have some work to do.

The response given in example (64b) can be understood at two levels, the explicit or sentence meaning can be explained as; ‘the respondent has some work to do’ while the implicit or speaker meaning can be deduced as; ‘the respondent cannot come to the party’ (Ampofo 2015:17). Hence, negation is worked out from the implicit point of view.

Therefore, the study at hand adopts the two categories of meaning because there are some negative illustrations that do not have direct interpretations in Tonga. Meaning is deduced implicitly.

### **3.4 The negative concord theory**

Another theory that this study adopts is the negative concord. This term has already been defined in the literature review. For the sake of convenience, it will be redefined here. Negative concord is defined as a scenario where two or more negative elements expressed in one illustration yield a single interpretation (Zeijlstra 2004).

The example though considered colloquial has already been stated in the literature review, for the sake of clarity, it will be repeated here:

65. \*You didn't see **nobody**. (Mohsen 2011)

Example (65) displays negative concord as it manifests two negative elements presented as; 'n't' and 'no'. Therefore, it can be argued that in Standard English, negative concord is regarded as ungrammatical. This is not the case in local languages. This theory was adopted because most of the negative illustrations have multiple negative markers with a single interpretation in Tonga.

### **3.5 Summary**

This chapter has explained the theories as well as the concepts that the current study adopts. The Jespersen's cycle theory has been applied on the morphological structure of negation and the sentential and constituent negation have been utilized on the syntactic structure. The negative concord, explicit and implicit categories have been applied on the semantic structure of negation. Therefore, the subsequent chapter discusses the methodology of the study.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### METHODOLOGY

#### 4.0 Introduction

The study aimed at analyzing *A Grammar of Negation in Tonga*. Therefore, this chapter gives a detailed discussion of the methodology. It discusses the research design used, the research methodology applied and the study area involved. The study population and the sampling technique that encompasses the purposive sampling technique has also been discussed. The data collection methods that include the primary data collection, the desk research, introspection, data collection instruments, the structured questionnaire and the data collection procedure have been drawn. Thereafter, the data analysis instruments and procedure as well as the ethical considerations have been displayed.

#### 4.1 Research design

A research design is “a master plan specifying the methods and procedure for collecting and analyzing the needed information” (Jamia 2016:68). The type of design the study employs is descriptive. Descriptive research describes the social events, social situations and social structure of a particular issue (Jamia 2016).

Therefore, this study employs the mentioned design because it focuses on information that people experience and learn on a daily basis. The structured questionnaire as well as the interview guide helped in collecting the data.

##### 4.1.1 Research methodology

The qualitative approach was employed in this research. A qualitative research involves an interpretive and naturalistic approach. In such a case, the researcher studies and interprets things in their natural settings (Sonia 2004).

This approach was adopted by this study in the sense that the study required the respondent’s experience both by what is learnt as they grow and what is taught at professional level. In as much as this study involved the native speakers of Tonga, it required learned people with the acquaintance of negation in natural languages. This enhanced proper understanding of the questionnaire.

#### **4.1.2 Study area**

The primary data were collected from Monze District of Southern Province. The respondents were picked from the following schools: two were selected from Monze College of Education. The other two were selected from Manungu Secondary School and a retired teacher was picked from Kayuni village. The study targeted the mentioned College and School because the respondents are well acquainted with the language as they are Authors of some of the Tonga grammar books.

The secondary data were derived from the University of Zambia Main Library as well as the mentioned schools. The main focus of the study was the Plateau Tonga of Monze District.

#### **4.1.3 Study population**

The study considers the entire population of Monze District as constitutive of its study population. From this population, five participants were selected purposefully in this study. These were considered as having reliable information as they were teachers of Chitonga in secondary schools and in college. In addition, they were native speakers of Tonga. These respondents were within the range of forty (40) to seventy (70) years. Furthermore, numerous texts were used as a source of data.

#### **4.1.4 Sampling techniques**

Sampling technique is defined as “taking a subset from the entire population” (Hamed 2016:20). Purposive sampling technique was employed as the researcher had a type of respondents in mind. Hence, the respondents were teachers of Chitonga. By gender, there were three males and two females. This was done in order to extract the relevant information.

##### **4.1.4.1 Purposive sampling technique**

Purposive sampling signifies “a series of strategic choices about with whom, where and how one does the research” (Palys 2008:697).

The study applied purposive sampling technique where, a number of individuals targeted represented the entire population. The respondents were teachers of Chitonga as stated earlier. The few respondents chosen represented a large population as negation in Tonga is considered the same even if a huge number of respondents were to be involved.

#### **4.1.5 Data collection methods**

##### **4.1.5.1 Primary data collection**

Five trained teachers of Tonga were picked purposefully. These were teachers of the language. Three of them were presented with lists of declarative, interrogative and imperative sentences designed in the affirmative form. The respondents were asked to re-write the sentences in the negative form. Thereafter, the other two were presented with the same documents in order to pass judgment based on the structure of negation given and the data were subjected to analysis in line with the objectives.

##### **4.1.5.2 Desk research**

Under desk research, the study collected data from dissertations, Journal articles and Chitonga books through the internet. Other books were sourced from secondary schools. A number of studies that explored negation in other languages employed the Jespersen's cycle theory, the negative concord, the theory of negation and other concepts that include; explicit and implicit negation, among others. Similar and different conclusions were made with regards to their findings as stated in the literature review.

##### **4.1.5.3 Introspection**

This method was also applied during the data collection in the sense that, the researcher understands the concept of negation as she is the native speaker of the language. (Radford 1997:24) postulates that, "A grammar of a language is a model of the grammatical competence of the fluent native speaker's intuitions about grammaticality and interpretation." Based on this argument, the researcher was able to make adequate judgment with regards to the morphological, syntactic and the semantic structure of negation in Tonga.

##### **4.1.5.4 Data collection instruments**

Data collection instruments refer to the device used to collect data. These devices may include; notebook, questionnaire, observation or computer assisted interviewing system, among others (Annum 2017).

The structured document was used to collect data. This was specifically subjected to the teachers of Chitonga because the kind of information that was needed required someone with a deeper understanding of tenses, noun class system, among others. Respondents were expected to answer

the questionnaire as soon as it was presented in order to enhance the validity and truthful grammar.

#### **4.1.5.5 The structured questionnaire**

The researcher designed a questionnaire as a guide to enhance a thorough collection of data. The guide contained different kinds of statements in a number of tenses where, the respondents were required to transform the positive statements into the negative form. These respondents were given the same information and they spoke the standard dialect of the Plateau Tonga.

The respondents were also asked to identify where the actual negatives are in the statements given. They were asked to explain the roles of each particular morpheme on each statement, for instance, whether certain morphemes play more than one role or not. The respondents were also asked to deduce the kind of negative markers that are more productive in the noun class system. Other negative statements other than what was provided in the document were also provided by the respondents. The context in which they are used was also illustrated.

#### **4.1.5.6 Data collection procedure**

The secondary data collection was embarked on in May 2018. Books on negation were read and analyzed. The primary data collection was conducted from 25<sup>th</sup> of June to the 5<sup>th</sup> of July, 2018. The researcher visited the mentioned schools where, the introductory letter was presented to the Principal and Head Teacher who later introduced the researcher to the members of staff. The teachers of Chitonga were directly projected as the study required such.

#### **4.1.5.7 Data analysis instruments and procedure**

The data analysis exercise begun immediately after the data collection. The designed documents were organized and analyzed in line with the objectives. Additionally, the Jespersen's cycle theory was discussed under the morphology of negation in Tonga. Sentential and constituent negation were applied on the syntax of negation and the negative concord and other concepts such as explicit and implicit negation were applied on the semantics of negation in Tonga.

#### **4.1.5.8 Ethical considerations**

Ethics is a branch of philosophy that deals with the conduct of people and guides the norms or standards of behavior of people. Ethical standards prevent against the falsifying of data and promote the pursuit of knowledge and truth which is the primary goal of a research (Kovacs 1985)

When collecting the data, the researcher explained the relevance of the research to the respondents. Apart from that, the letter of authority from the University of Zambia was presented in order to create a conducive atmosphere.

#### **4.2 Summary**

This chapter analyzed the methodology as applied by the researcher. The research design used, the research methodology applied and the study area involved have been displayed. The study population and the sampling technique that encompasses the purposive sampling technique have been elucidated at length. The data collection methods that include the primary data collection, the desk research, introspection, data collection instruments, the structured questionnaire and the data collection procedure have been drawn. Thereafter, the data analysis instruments and procedure as well as the ethical considerations have been discussed. The subsequent chapter dwells on the findings and discussions of the study.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

#### **5.0 Introduction**

In the preceding chapter, the methodology has been highlighted. This has been done by discussing the research design, the research methodology applied and the study area. The study population and the sampling technique that includes the purposive study sample have been discussed. Additionally, the data collection methods that include the primary data collection, the desk research, introspection, data collection instruments, the structured questionnaire and the data collection procedure have been displayed. The chapter ended with the discussion on the data analysis instruments and procedure as well as the ethical considerations.

This chapter presents the findings and discussion pertaining to the Morphology, Syntax and the Semantics of Negation in Tonga. The discussion has been done in the order of objectives and the theoretical and conceptual framework of the study.

The chapter begins by outlining the taxonomy of negative markers that are there in Tonga, the structure of tense/aspect in Tonga. This is followed by the examination of the morphological structure of negation which has been done by discussing the formation of negative expressions in imperative, declarative and interrogative sentences. Thereafter, the study examines incorporation and productivity of negative markers across the noun class system. The Jespersen's cycle theory has also been applied.

The second part discusses the syntactic distribution of negation in Tonga. In particular, the study provides data that feed into the examination of negation to account for sentential and constituent negation in Tonga.

The last part presents data which deals with some aspects of the semantics of negation in Tonga. The data were used to examine meaning by means of two categories of negation namely explicit and implicit negation. Finally, the negative concord theory is applied.

#### **5.1 Taxonomy of negative markers in Tonga**

In order to address the objective of the study which sought to identify the negative markers in Tonga, this section of the dissertation presents tables showing the negative markers, illustrations

in which they appear, place of the markers, their realisation in the final vowel and the comment with regards to discontinuous morphemes. The Tables are presented below:

**Table 1: Pre-verbal negative markers**

Negative marker	Example	Place	Realisation of final vowel	Discontinuous morpheme
ta	u-ta-kkal-i you neg sit 'you should not sit'	pre-verbal	I	✓
he	he-yand-i I/neg want 'I do not want'	pre-verbal	I	✓

Table 1 above shows the negative markers which are productive in pre-verbal negation. In a way, the data help to illustrate the distributive nature of the negative markers 'ta' and 'he' in negated constructions. Observably, all the three negative markers identified trigger off a change in the form of the final vowel of the verb stem, hence showing instances for the manifestation of discontinuous morphemes. A discontinuous morpheme is a morpheme that is interrupted by the insertion of another morphological unit (Kosch 2005): for example, *kkal-a* 'sit' when negated changes to *u-ta-kkal-i* 'you should not sit'. Thus, 'ta' (not) triggers off a noticeable morphological change in the final vowel from 'a' to 'i'.

**Table 2: Pre-subject negative markers**

Negative marker	Example	Place	Realisation of final vowel	Discontinuous morpheme
ta	ta-a-ka-amb-a neg she/he pst say 'she/he did not say'	pre-subject	A	✗

ti	ti-ba-a-imb-a neg they pst sing 'they did not sing'	pre-subject	A	⊗
----	--	-------------	---	---

In Table 2, the data presented show the distribution of the negative markers 'ta' and 'ti'. As can be seen from the table above, these negative markers are pre-subject negative markers. In terms of their effect on the final vowel, it can be observed that both of them do not trigger off the change in the final vowel.

Therefore, it can be argued that, when the negative marker 'ta' is manifested in the past tense specifically, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular as displayed in the first row, the final vowel does not change. For example, when the statement *ua-ka-amb-a* 'she/he said' is negated, it changes to *ta-a-ka-amb-a* 'she/he did not say'. Hence, the negative marker 'ta' does not trigger off the change in the final vowel. In the similar breath, the negative marker 'ti' expressed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural as shown in the second row does not trigger off the change in the final vowel.

**Table 3: Post subject negative markers**

Negative marker	Example	Place	Realisation of final vowel	Discontinuous morpheme
li	ta-li muntu it neg person 'it is not a person'	post subject	U	⊗

In Table 3, the data presented show the distribution of the negative marker 'li'. This negative marker is post subject negative marker. In terms of its effect on the final vowel, it can be observed that this negative marker does not trigger off the change in the final vowel. Therefore, it can be concluded that when the negative marker 'li' is applied in the present form specifically, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular as shown above, the negative form takes the marker 'li'. For example, the noun

*Muntu* ‘it is a person’ when negated changes to ‘*ta-li muntu* ‘it is not a person’. Thus, the negative form takes the marker ‘li’ due to the prefixation of the subject marker ‘ta’.

**Table 4: Pre-tense negative markers**

Negative marker	Example	Place	Realisation of final vowel	Discontinuous morpheme
ni	ta-ni-kuya-ku-jik-i she/he neg futcnt be cook ‘she/he will not be cooking’	pre-tense	I	✓
na	ta-ba-na-kuli-ba-li-ended-e neg they neg fut they have walk ‘they will not have walked’	pre-tense	E	✗

In Table 4 above, the data show the distribution of the negative markers ‘ni’ and ‘na’. These negative markers are pre-tense negative markers. In terms of their effects on the final vowel, the negative marker ‘ni’ triggers off the change in the final vowel showing instances for the manifestation of a discontinuous morpheme. For example, when the statement *uni-kuya-ku-jik-a* ‘she/he will be cooking’ is negated, it changes to *ta-ni-kuya-ku-jik-i* ‘she/he will not be cooking’. Thus, ‘ni’ (not) triggers off the morphological change in the final vowel from ‘a’ to ‘i’. Therefore, it can be concluded that, when the negative marker ‘ni’ is applied in the future continuous tense specifically, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular as shown above, the final vowel changes.

Conversely, when the negative marker ‘na’ is applied in the future perfect tense specifically, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural as can be seen above, the final vowel does not change. For example, when the statement *ba-na-kuli-ba-li-ended-e* ‘they will have walked’ is negated, it changes to *ta-ba-na-kuli-ba-li-ended-e* ‘they will not have walked’. Hence, the negative marker ‘na’ (not) does not trigger off the change in the final vowel.

**Table 5: Multiple negative markers**

Negative marker	Example	Place	Realisation of the final vowel	Discontinuous morpheme
ta and na	ta-ba-na-kuli-ba-li-kked-e neg they neg fut they have sit 'they will not have sat'	pre-subject and pre-tense	E	✘
ni	ta-ni-kuya-ku-let-i she/he neg futcnt be bring 'she/he will not be bringing'	pre-tense	I	✓
ta and li	ta-ba-li-baaba ba-yaku-bwez-a neg they neg these fut get 'it is not these that will get'	pre-subject and pre-object	A	✘
ta and ni	ta-ba-ni-kuya-ku-bwez-i neg they neg futcnt be get 'they will not be getting'	pre-subject, pre-tense	I	✓
ta	ta-ba-ka-end-i neg they fut walk 'they will not walk'	pre-subject	I	✓

ta	ta-ku-li Kujwe neg loc prs east 'it is not in the east'	pre-locative	E	⊗
----	--	--------------	---	---

In Table 5 above, the data show the distribution of the negative markers 'ta' and 'na'. The marker 'ta' is prefixed to the subject while the marker 'na' is prefixed to the tense. In terms of their effects on the final vowel, the negative markers 'ta' and 'na' do not trigger off the change in the final vowel. Therefore, it can be concluded that when the negative markers 'ta' and 'na' reflect in the future perfect tense specifically in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural, the final vowel does not change.

In the second row, the data shows the distribution of the negative marker 'ni' prefixed to tense. This negative marker triggers off the change in the form of the final vowel in the verb stem hence showing instances of the discontinuous morpheme. For instance, when the statement *uni-kuya-ku-let-a* 'she/he will be bringing' is negated, it changes to *ta-ni-kuya-ku-let-i* 'she/he will not be bringing'. Thus 'ni' (not) triggers off a noticeable morphological change in the final vowel from 'a' to 'i'. Consequently, it can be concluded that, when the negative marker 'ni' is reflected in the future continuous tense specifically in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular, the final vowel is affected.

In the third row, the data show the distribution of the negative markers 'ta' and 'li'. The marker 'ta' is prefixed to the subject while the negative marker 'li' is prefixed to the object. In terms of their effect on the final vowel, the negative markers 'ta' and 'li' do not trigger off the change in the final vowel. For example, *mba-baaba ba-yaku-bwez-a* 'it is these that will get' when negated changes to *ta-ba-li-baaba ba-yaku-bwez-a* 'it is not these that will get'. Hence, the negative markers 'ta' and 'li' do not trigger a change in the final vowel. Therefore, it can be concluded that, when the negative markers 'ta' and 'li' are manifested in the future tense specifically, in the third person plural as indicated above, the final vowel is not affected.

In the fourth row, the data show the distribution of the negative markers 'ta' and 'ni'. The marker 'ta' is prefixed to the subject and the marker 'ni' is prefixed to the tense. In terms of their effect on the final vowel, the negative markers 'ta' and 'ni' trigger off the change in the final vowel. For example, the statement *Ba-ni-kuya-ku-bwez-a* 'they will be getting' is negated as *ta-ba-ni-kuya-ku-bwez-i* 'they will not be getting'. Thus, the negative markers 'ta' and 'ni' trigger off the

noticeable morphological change in the final vowel. Hence, it is observable that, when the negative markers ‘ta’ and ‘ni’ are manifested in the future continuous tense specifically in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural, the final vowel is affected.

In the fifth row, the data show the distribution of the negative marker ‘ta’. The marker ‘ta’ is prefixed to the subject and the final vowel changes. For example, the statement *Ba-yaku-end-a* ‘they will walk’ is negated as *Ta-ba-ka-end-i* ‘they will not walk’. Thus, the negative marker ‘ta’ triggers off the morphological change in the final vowel. Therefore. It can be noted that, when the negative marker ‘ta’ is reflected in the future tense specifically, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural, the final vowel is affected.

In the sixth row, the data show the distribution of the negative marker ‘ta’. The marker ‘ta’ is prefixed to the locative and the final vowel does not change. For instance, the statement *nku-u-jw-e* ‘it is in the east’ when negated changes to *ta-ku-li ku-jw-e* ‘it is not in the east’. Thus, ‘ta’ does not trigger off the noticeable morphological change in the final vowel. It is important to note that, when the negative marker ‘ta’ is manifested in an infinitive illustration specifically, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular, the final vowel is not affected.

Having discussed the taxonomy of the negative markers in Tonga, the study presents a table indicating the tense/aspect marking in the language under discussion. Tense refers to “the time of an event relative to the time at which the sentence is either spoken or written” (Carnie 2013: 276). The table showing the tense and aspect as well as the illustrations in both affirmative and negative expressions is presented as follows:

**Table 6: Tense/Aspect marking and their illustrations in Tonga**

Tense/Aspect	Affirmative	Negative
Present (habitual)	ba-la-jik-a they prs cook they cook	ta-ba-jik-i neg they cook they don’t cook
Present (perfect)	ba-jik-a they cook they have cooked.	ti-ba-jik-a neg they cook they have not cooked.
Past (simple)	ba-ka-jik-a	ti-ba-ka-jik-a

	they past cook they cooked.	neg they past cook they did not cook.
Past (perfect)	ba-kali-jikid-e they pstpft cook they had cooked.	ti-ba-ka-jikid-e Neg they pstpft cook they had not cooked.
Future (simple)	ba-yaku-jik-a they fut cook they will cook.	ta-ba-ka-jik-i neg they fut cook they will not cook.
Future (progressive)	ba-ni-kuya-ku-jik-a they futprg be cook they will be cooking.	ta-ba-ni-kuya-ku-jik-i neg they neg futprg be cook they will not be cooking.

In the first row, the data show the distribution of the negative illustration in the present (habitual) form. It can be noted that the illustration takes the negative marker ‘ta’ and the final vowel changes from ‘a’ to ‘i’. For example, the illustration ba-la-jik-a ‘they cook’ when negated changes to ta-ba-jik-i ‘they do not cook’. Hence, it can be noted that when the negative illustration is presented in the present (habitual) form, specifically, in the third person plural, the negative illustration takes the ‘ta’ form and the final vowel changes from ‘a’ to ‘i’.

Unlike the present (habitual) form, the negative illustration in the present perfect tense takes the marker ‘ti’ and the final vowel does not change. For example, when the expression ba-jik-a ‘they have cooked’ is negated, it changes to ti-ba-jik-a ‘they have not cooked’. Hence, it can be concluded that when the negative marker ‘ti’ is illustrated in the present perfect tense, specifically, in the third person plural, the final vowel changes from ‘a’ to ‘i’. Suffice it to note that tense as well as number determine what negative marker an illustration should take.

On the other hand, the third row shows the distribution of the negative marker ‘ti’ prefixed to the pronoun and the final vowel does not change. For example, the illustration ba-ka-jik-a ‘they cooked’ when negated changes to ti-ba-ka-jik-a ‘they did not cook’. Consequently, it can be concluded that when the negative marker ‘ti’ is manifested in the past simple tense specifically, in the third person plural, the final vowel does not change.

In the fourth row, the data present the distribution of the negative marker ‘ti’ in the past perfect tense and the final vowel does not change. For example, the illustration ba-ka-li-jikid-e ‘they had cooked’ when negated changes to ti-ba-ka-jikid-e ‘they had not cooked’. Hence, it can be concluded that when the negative illustration is presented in the past perfect tense, specifically, in the third person plural, the negative marker takes the ‘ti’ form and the final vowel does not change.

In the fifth row, the data present the distribution of the negative marker ‘ta’ in the future simple tense. For example, the illustration ba-yaku-jik-a ‘they will cook’ changes to ta-ba-ka-jik-i ‘they will not cook’ when negated. Therefore, it can be stated that when the negative illustration is presented in the future simple tense specifically, in the third person plural, the negative illustration takes the marker ‘ta’ and the final vowel changes from ‘a’ to ‘i’

Nonetheless, in the sixth row, the data show the distribution of the negative marker ‘ta’ in the future progressive construction. For example, the illustration ba-ni-kuya-ku-jik-a ‘they will be cooking’ is negated as ta-ba-ni-kuya-ku-jik-i ‘they will not be cooking’. Hence, it can be concluded that, when the negative illustration is presented in the future progressive specifically in the third person plural, the negative illustration takes the ‘ta’ form and the final vowel changes from ‘a’ to ‘i’.

## **5.2 The Morphology of Negation in Tonga**

In this section of the dissertation, the findings on the morphology of negation in Tonga are presented. This entails showing the morphemic boundaries of the negative markers. The study is mindful of the fact that morphology is defined as “the study of the internal structure of words and the rules governing the formation of the words in the language” (Oz 2014:83). In this respect, morphologically, negative markers in Tonga as demonstrated in the Tables above are affixed either pre-verbal, pre-subject marker, post-subject marker or pre-tense marker to illustrate negation. Thus, the morphological nature of the negative markers can be said to be agglutinative, as they get affixed with other morphemes such as subject markers in order to transform a positive statement into a negative one in Tonga. As provided for in the literature, we take a morpheme to be a smallest linguistic unit which has a grammatical function (Lieber 2009). In what follows, the distributional nature of negation is presented.

## 5.2.1 Imperative sentences expressed in the second person singular

### 5.2.1.1 Negative marker 'ta' prefixed to the verb

The study reveals that, imperative sentences in the present form bare the following structure:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
66. ko-kkal-a	u-ta-kkal-i
SM VS FV	SM NM VS FV
you sit	you neg sit
you sit.	you should not sit.
67. ko-yend-a	u-ta-yend-i
SM VS FV	SM NM VS FV
you walk	you neg walk
you walk.	you should not walk.
68. ko-bikk-a	u-ta-bikk-i
SM VS FV	SM NM VS FV
you put	you neg put
you put.	you should not put.
69. ko-imb-a	u-ta-imb-i
SM VS FV	SM NM VS FV
you sing	you neg sing
you sing.	you should not sing.

From the given illustrations, the affirmative expression of example (66) can be summarized as follows: the morpheme 'ko-' is equivalent to the English 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun (you). The verb stem 'kkal-' combines with the final vowel '-a' to form the action (sit) in the affirmative form.

On the other hand, the negative illustration is described as follows: the morpheme 'u' is equivalent to the English 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronoun (you). The marker 'ta' is equivalent to the English negative

marker (not) and the verb stem ‘kkal-’ combines with the discontinuous morpheme ‘-i’ to form the negative action. The subsequent structures take the similar analysis.

Therefore, it has been noted that the ending vowel in the negative expressions changes from ‘-a’ to ‘-i’ due to the prefixation of the negative marker ‘ta-’ to the verb. Prefixation is a morphological process whereby a bound morpheme is attached at the beginning of a root or stem (Ado and Bidin 2017). Hence, the negative morphemes ‘ta-’ as well as ‘-i’ are what (Oz 2014) terms as bound morphemes. A bound morpheme “is a morpheme that cannot stand on its own, it must be typically attached to another form for it to have a complete idea” (Oz 2014:89).

It is paramount to note that, the negative marker ‘ta’ is a principle marker for imperative statements expressed in the present form in Tonga. Additionally, the structure bares a discontinuous morpheme ‘i’ in order to enhance subject verb agreement. Therefore, it can be concluded that the marker ‘ta’ has a great influence on the final vowel in imperative statements.

The above analysis is in conformity with grammarians such as; Nkolola (1997) and Jimaima (2014). The difference is; Nkolola (1997) focuses on both markers while Jimaima (2014) focuses much on the marker ‘ta’. Additionally, the findings are also in conformity with Yanda’s (2005) study *the Structure of Negation in Mokpe and two related Coastal Bantu languages*, Ngonyani’s (2001) study *the Morpho-Syntax of Negation in Kiswahili* and Ampofo’s (2015) study *the Syntax and Semantics of Negation in Akan*. In their analysis, the negative markers are always prefixed to the verb as illustrated in the literature review.

## 5.2.2 Declarative statements expressed in the third person singular

### 5.2.2.1 Negative marker ‘ta’ placed before the pronoun

Declarative statements in the past tense take the following structure:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
70. u-a-kkal-a	ta-a-ka-kkal-a
PRN TM VS FV	NM PRN TM VS FV
she/he past sit	neg she/he past sit

she/he sat.	she/he did not sit.
71. u-a-amb-a	ta-a-ka-amb-a
PRN TM VS FV	NM PRN TM VS FV
she/he past say	neg she/he past say
she/he said.	she/he did not say.
72. u-a-bikk-a	ta-a-ka-bikk-a
PRN TM VS FV	NM PRN TM VS FV
she/he past put	neg she/he past put
she/he put.	she/he did not put.
73. u-a-imb-a	ta-a-ka-imb-a
PRN TM VS FV	NM PRN TM VS FV
she/he past sing	neg she/he past sing
she/he sung.	she/he did not sing.
74. u-aka-end-a	ta-a-ke-end-a /Taakayenda
PRN TM VS FV	NM PRN TM VS FV
she/he past walk	neg she/he past walk
she/he walked.	she/he did not walk.

The affirmative statement of example (70) is analyzed as follows: the morpheme ‘u-’ is the 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun equivalent of the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (she/he). The succeeding vowel ‘a’ represents the tense and the verb stem ‘kkal-’ combines with the final vowel ‘a’ to form an action (sit).

However, the morpheme ‘ta’ in the negative expression is a negative marker equivalent to the English negative marker (not), the succeeding vowel ‘a’ represents the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (she/he). The subsequent morpheme ‘ka’ represents the tense (past) and the verb stem ‘kkal’

combines with the final vowel ‘a’ to complete the negative action. The subsequent statements bare the similar analysis.

It is observable that, negative expressions in declarative statements expressed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular have the negative marker ‘ta’ placed before the subject marker in Tonga. The final vowel is not affected due to the word class as well as the tense applied. This is contrary to the imperative statements discussed above. Therefore, it can be stated that the place of negative markers is not uniform in Tonga. Word class determines the location of negative markers.

This analysis is in conformity with Hulse (2010) in her study, *productivity in morphological negation in English*. In her analysis, word class is the contributory factor in determining which negating prefix is used in a new formation. She attests that, negative prefixing is more productive when nouns are formed compared to verbal formations. In a similar manner, this study has shown that the negative marker ‘ta’ is prefixed to the pronouns and the final vowel does not change.

Considering the negative expression of example number (74), the study postulates that both expressions have the same denotation. The only difference is; the first expression is considered as a short version of the other. The study reveals that people would prefer using the short form when they are hastening and the other one is normally applied when they are relaxed.

### 5.2.3 Declarative statements expressed in the third person plural

#### 5.2.3.1 Negative marker ‘ti’ placed before the subject marker

It is important to note that, declarative expressions in plural take a unique form. A demonstration is displayed below:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
75. ba-a-kkal-a	ti-ba-a-kkal-a
SM TM VS FV	NM SM TM VS FV
they past sit	neg they past sit
they sat.	they did not sit.
76. ba-a-bwez-a	ti-ba-a-bwez-a
SM TM VS FV	NM SM TM VS FV

they past get	neg they past get
they got.	they did not get.
77. ba-a-bikk-a	ti-ba-a-bikk-a
SM TM VS FV	NM SM TM VS FV
they past put	neg they past put
they put.	they did not put.
78. ba-a-imb-a	ti-ba-a-imb-a
SM TM VS FV	NM SM TM VS FV
they past sing	neg they past sing
they sung.	they did not sing.

The affirmative illustration in example (75) is analyzed as follows: the morpheme ‘ba’ is the 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun equivalent of the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (they). The ensuing vowel ‘a’ represents the tense (past). The verb stem ‘kkal-’ combines with the final vowel ‘a’ to form the affirmative action (sit).

In the negative expression, the morpheme ‘ti’ is equivalent to the English negative marker (not). The pronoun ‘ba’ is the 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun equivalent of the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (they). The subsequent vowel ‘a’ represents the tense marker (past) rather, the time at which an incident was expected to happen. The verb stem ‘kkal’ is combined with the ending vowel ‘a’ to form the action in the negative form. The subsequent statements bare the similar morphological analysis.

It can also be noted that declarative statements in the past form specifically in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural take the negative marker ‘ti’ prefixed to the pronoun. Just like it has been observed in the previous discussion, the final vowel does not change. The reason could be, they both share the same tense as well as the word class. The difference lies on the number involved. Hence, it can be concluded that the number involved determines what negative prefix to be used in Tonga.

Therefore, it can be argued that in Tonga, negation is not limited to any kind of structure as it has been discussed in a number of languages. The negative markers are affixed depending on the tense and the number involved. This analysis is in conformity with Jimaima (2014) in his study

*the Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics of Conditional clauses in Tonga and English.* While Jimaima’s analysis is based on the negative marker ‘ta’, this study dwells on the negative marker ‘ti’.

## 5.2.4 Declarative statements expressed in the third person plural

### 5.2.4.1 Negative marker ‘ta’ placed before the subject marker

The study further reveals that, negation in the future simple tense takes a compelling form in Tonga. An illustration is exemplified as follows:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
79. ba-yaku-kkal-a	ta-ba-ka-kkal-i
SM TM VS FV	NM SM TM VS FV
they fut sit	neg they fut sit
they will sit.	they will not sit.
80. ba-yaku-end-a	ta-ba-ka-end-i
SM TM VS FV	NM SM TM VS FV
they fut walk	neg they fut walk
they will walk.	they will not walk.
81. ba-yaku-bwez-a	ta-ba-ka-bwez-i
SM TM VS FV	NM SM TM VS FV
they fut get	neg they fut get
they will get.	they will not get.
82. ba-yaku-bikk-a	ta-ba-ka-bikk-i
SM TM VS FV	NM SM TM VS FV
they fut put	neg they fut put
they will put.	they will not put.
83. ba-yaku-imb-a	ta-ba-ka-imb-i

SM TM VS FV

they fut sing

they will sing.

NM SM TM VS FV

neg they fut sing

they will not sing.

From the given illustrations, example (79) is analyzed as follows: the morpheme ‘ba’ is equivalent to the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (they). The morpheme ‘yaku-’ represents the tense (future simple) and the verb stem ‘kkal-’ combines with the final vowel ‘a’ to form the action (sit).

Nevertheless, the negative expression takes the following structure: the marker ‘ta’ is equivalent to the English negative marker (not), the morpheme ‘ba’ is equivalent to the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (they). The morpheme ‘ka’ represents the tense and the verb stem ‘kkal’ combines with the final vowel ‘i’ forming the negative action. The subsequent expressions take the similar analysis.

Therefore, it can be articulated that the declarative statements expressed in the future simple tense take the negative marker ‘ta’ placed before the pronoun in Tonga. The final vowel changes from ‘a’ to ‘i’. It can be noted that in many instances, the marker ‘ta’ causes the change of final vowel regardless of the tense, word class and the number involved. For this reason, it can be concluded that when this marker is prefixed in Tonga, it affects the morphology of the entire statement. This analysis is in conformity with Nkolola (1997) and Collins (1958).

## **5.2.5 Interrogative sentences expressed in the third person singular**

### **5.2.5.1 Negative marker ‘ni’ placed before the tense marker**

The interrogative sentences in the future continuous tense take the following structure:

#### **Affirmative**

84. Hena u-ni-kuya-ku-let-a?

SM MOD TM AUX VS FV

she/he fut be bring

will she/he be bringing?

#### **Negative**

Hena ta-ni-kuya-ku-let-i?

SM NM TM AUX VS FV

she/he neg fut be bring

will she/he not be bringing?

85. Hena u-ni-kuya-ku-jik-a?

SM MOD TM AUX VS FV  
she/he fut be cook  
will she/he be cooking?

Hena ta-ni-kuya-ku-jik-i?

SM NM TM AUX VS FV  
she/he neg fut be cook  
will she/he not be cooking?

86. Hena u-ni-kuya-ku-bikk-a?

SM MOD TM AUX VS FV  
she/he fut be put  
will she/he be putting?

Hena ta-ni-kuya-ku-bikk-i?

SM NM TM AUX VS FV  
she/he neg fut be put  
will she/he not be putting?'

87. Hena u-ni-kuya-ku-kkal-a?

SM MOD TM AUX VS FV  
she/he fut be sit  
will she/he be sitting

Hena ta-ni-kuya-ku-kkal-i?

SM NM TM AUX VS FV  
she/he neg fut be sit  
will she/he not be sitting?'

A morphological analysis of the affirmative expression in example (84) is outlined as follows: the expression 'hena' is an interrogative marker used when asking a question. The morpheme 'u' is the 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun equivalent of the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (she/he). The marker 'ni' is a modifier, this marker modifies the verb phrase that comes after it. The morpheme 'kuya' represents the tense (future) and the marker 'ku' is equivalent to the English auxiliary verb (be). The verb stem 'let' combines with the final vowel 'a' to form the action (bring) in the affirmative form.

Nonetheless, the negative expression takes the following form: the marker 'hena' is an interrogative expression and the morpheme 'ta' is equivalent to the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (she/he). The succeeding morpheme 'ni' is equivalent to the English negative marker (not). The expression 'kuya' (will) denotes the tense. Additionally, the marker 'ku' is equivalent to the English auxiliary verb (be) and the verb stem 'let' combines with the final vowel 'i' forming a negative action (bring).

It can be noted that, the negative expressions in the future continuous tense have the negative marker 'ni' prefixed to tense and the final vowel changes from 'a' to 'i' in Tonga. Just like it has

been observed with the negative marker ‘ta’, the negative marker ‘ni’ equally has a greater influence on the final vowel. Therefore, it can be proclaimed that, declarative statements in 5.2.4.1 and interrogative sentences in 5.2.5.1 have the discontinuous morpheme ‘i’ suffixed at the end. A suffix is an affix which is bound after the base (Hall 2000).

This analysis is in conformity with Ngonyani’s (2001) study *the Morpho-Syntax of Negation in Kiswahili*. In his analysis, the tense marker ‘li’ in the affirmative illustrations is replaced by the negative marker ‘ku’ in the negative illustrations and the final vowel does not change. In a similar manner, the marker considered as the modifier in the affirmative expressions is considered negative in the negative expressions and the final vowel changes as displayed above.

### 5.2.6 Declarative statements expressed in the third person plural

#### 5.2.6.1 Double negation

Consequently, declarative statements in the future perfect tense are negated distinctively in Tonga. A demonstration is presented below:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
88. ba-na-kuli-ba-li-kked-e	ta-ba-na-kuli-ba-li-kked-e
SM MOD TM PRN AUX VS FV	NM SM NM TM PRN AUX VS FV
they fut they have sit	neg they neg fut they have sit
they will have sat.	they will not have sat.
89. ba-na-kuli-ba-li-ended-e	ta-ba-na-kuli-ba-li-ended-e
SM MOD TM PRN AUX VS FV	NM SM NM TM PRN AUX VS FV
they fut they have walk	neg they neg fut they have walk
they will have walked.	they will not have walked.
90. ba-na-kuli-ba-li-bwezed-e	ta-ba-na-kuli-ba-li-bwezed-e
SM MOD TM PRN AUX VS FV	NM SM NM TM PRN AUX VS FV

they fut they have get	neg they neg fut they have get
they will have gotten.	they will not have gotten.
91. ba-na-kuli-ba-li-bikkid-e	ta-ba-na-kuli-ba-li-bikkid-e
SM MOD TM PRN AUX VS FV	NM SM NM TM PRN AUX VS FV
they fut they have put	neg they neg fut they have put
they will have put.	they will not have put.
92. ba-na-kuli-ba-li-imbid-e	ta-ba-na-kuli-ba-li-imbid-e
SM MOD TM PRN AUX VS FV	NM SM NM TM PRN AUX VS FV
they fut they have sing	neg they neg fut they have sing
they will have sung.	they will not have sung.

From the above illustrations, example (88) is analyzed as follows: the morpheme ‘ba’ is equivalent to the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (they) and the subsequent morpheme ‘na’ is a modifier that modifies the verb phrase that comes after it. The morpheme ‘kuli’ (will) denotes the tense (future) and the other morpheme ‘ba’ is a pronoun as well. The marker ‘li’ is equivalent to the English auxiliary verb (have) and the verb stem ‘kked-’ combines with the final vowel ‘e’ to form the affirmative action (sit).

Nonetheless, the negative expression takes the following structure; the marker ‘ta’ is equivalent to the English negative marker (not) and the morpheme ‘ba’ is a pronoun equivalent to the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (they). The subsequent marker ‘na’ is equivalent to the English negative marker (not) as well. Additionally, the morpheme ‘kuli’ denotes the tense (future) and the succeeding marker ‘ba’ is the pronoun expressed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural as well. The marker ‘li’ is equivalent to the English auxiliary verb (have) and the verb stem ‘kked’ combines with the final vowel ‘e’ to form the action (sit) in a negative form.

The morphological structure of the negative expressions in the future perfect tense display double negation presented as ‘ta’ and ‘na’ in Tonga. In this instance, the negative marker ‘ta’ is prefixed to the pronoun while the negative marker ‘na’ is prefixed to the tense. Additionally, the structure equally bares double 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun ‘ba’ which comes after the negative marker ‘ta’ and the

other one is displayed after the tense. Therefore, it can be argued that the negative marker ‘ta’ has the power to change the nature of the markers that come after it. In this case, the marker ‘na’ which is considered to be a modifier in the affirmative illustrations turns out to be negative in the negative illustrations. This happens because of the negative prefix attached to the pronoun.

Fascinating to note that, when the marker ‘na’ appears in the affirmative statements, it modifies the verb phrase it follows while, when it is displayed in the negative expressions, it negates the verb phrase it follows. This is because, its meaning is triggered by the negative prefix attached. Rather, the position of the negative marker ‘ta’ has an impact on the markers that come after it.

This analysis agrees with Gleason’s (1918) study of *A Tonga Grammar*. In his analysis, double negation is displayed when pronouns are prefixed to nouns while this study displays it in verbal constructions.

### **5.2.7 Incorporation of the subject marker within the negative marker**

In Tonga, there are some negative expressions that take or assume the role of the subject as well as the negative. In short, incorporation is an instance in which a negative marker and the subject marker are conflated in one morpheme. The structure is distributed as follows:

93. he-yand-i

SM/NM VS FV

neg/I prs want

I do not want.

94. ta-unk-i

SM/NM VS FV

neg/she/he fut go

she/he will not go.

From the illustrations displayed above, example (93) is analyzed as follows: the morpheme ‘he’ is equivalent to the English 1<sup>st</sup> person pronoun (I) as well as the English negative marker (not). The verb stem ‘yand’ combines with the discontinuous morpheme ‘i’ forming the negative action (want).

In example (94), the morpheme ‘ta’ is equivalent to the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (she/he) as well as the English negative marker (not). The verb stem ‘unk’ combines with the final vowel ‘i’ forming the action (go) in a negative form.

Therefore, it can be argued that the negative markers ‘ta’ and ‘he’ display more than one function in Tonga. Other than negating, they also function as subject markers and the final vowel changes. For instance, in example (93), the statement *ndayanda* ‘I want’ is negated as *heyandi* ‘I do not want’. Thus, the marker ‘he’ triggers off the morphological change in the final vowel from ‘a’ to ‘i’. In the similar manner, the example *ulaunka* ‘she/he will go’ negated as *taunki* ‘she/he will not go’ in example (94) display the change of final vowel from ‘a’ to ‘i’.

The above analysis is in conformity with Jimaima (2014) in his study, *the Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics of Conditional clauses in Tonga and English*. In his arguments, the marker ‘twa’ equivalent to the English first person plural ‘we’ in the expression; **twataboola** ‘if we do not come’ functions as a subject as well as an object. Therefore, it can be proclaimed that some subject markers perform more than one function in Tonga.

Moreover, other negative particles revealed include expressions such as; *ndakaka* and *ng’ang’a*. In the case of the former, the first morpheme ‘nda’ (I) is a pronoun expressed in the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular, the succeeding expression ‘kaka’ is the negative particle equivalent to the English negative marker (not). In the latter one though colloquial, the first *ng’a* (I, no) represents both the subject and negation while the other *ng’a* (not) represents the negative particle only.

Furthermore, the other negative particle that is found in Tonga is the expression *nyina* (I do not have). In this case, the morpheme ‘nyi’ is equivalent to the English 1<sup>st</sup> person singular (I) while the morpheme ‘na’ is equivalent to the English negative marker (not). The other negative expression identified is the marker ‘ine’ (English equivalent = nay) which refers to denial or refusal, this expression cannot be split apart.

**5.2.8 Productivity of the negative particles across the noun class system in Tonga**

When dealing with the noun class system in Tonga, there are negative markers that are productive across almost all the noun class system and those that are not. The illustration displaying the above explanation is presented in the Table form below:

**Table 7: Nominal Prefixes in Tonga**

CLASS	PREFIX	EXAMPLE

1.	mu	tali Muntu (it is not a person.) Third person singular.
1a.	si	tali Sibbuku (He/She is not the Headman.) Third person singular.
2.	ba	tabali Bantu (They are not human beings.) Third person plural.
2a.	ba	tabali Batumba (They are not Owls.) Third person plural.
2b.	ba	tabali Bakaapa (She is not my Grandmother.) Third person honorific singular.
3.	mu	tuuli Musamu (it is not a tree.) Third person singular.
4.	mi	tiili Misamu (they are not trees.) Third person plural.
5.	li	talili Linyo (it is not a tooth.) Third person singular.
6.	ma	taali Masaka (they are not bags.) Third person plural
7.	ci	tacili Cilonda (it is not a wound.) Third person singular.
8.	zi	tazyili Zisaka (they are not bags.) Third person plural.
9.	n	tiili Nseke (it is not a Hen.) Third person singular.
10.	m	tazyili Mpongo (they are not goats) Third person plural.
11.	lu	taluli Lubayi (it is not a slap.) Third person singular.
12.	ka	takali Kabwa (it is not a small Dog.) Third person singular.
13.	tu	tatuli Tunwe (they are not small fingers.) Third person plural.
14.	bu	tabuli Bulowa (it is not Blood.) Third person singular.
15.	ku	takuli Kutwi (it is not an Ear.) Third person singular.
16.	a	taali Atala (it is not on Top.) Third person singular.
17	ku	takuli Kujwe (it is not in the East.) Third person singular.

18.	mu	tamuli Mumpemo (it is not in the nose.) Third person singular.
-----	----	--

### 5.2.8.1 Summary of table 7

The noun classes 1, 1a, 2 and 2b refer to human beings. The noun class 2b is expressed to show respect. Noun classes 3 and 4 refer to names of trees and noun classes 5, 6, 7 and 8 refer to different things. Noun classes 2a, 9 and 10 refer to names of animals, birds and other things while classes 12 and 13 are used in diminutive expressions. Noun classes 11 and 14 refer to abstract ideas and class 15 refers to infinitives. Classes 16, 17 and 18 refer to locatives equivalent to English prepositions ‘in’ and ‘on’ among others (Collins 1958 and Hazel 2002).

The summary of the table is in conformity with Hang’ombe’s (2015) study of *the Morphology and Semantics of Tonga Anthroponyms*. In his analysis, he classifies noun classes 16, 17, and 18 as locatives corresponding to English prepositions ‘on’, ‘to’ and ‘at’. He also classifies the noun classes 12 and 13 as diminutive and the noun class 14 as abstract among others.

### 5.2.8.2 Analysis of the data on the table

From the given table, literature shows that the negative marker ‘ta’ is the most productive marker across most of the noun class system in Tonga. The marker is reflected in the noun classes 2b, 5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 which are expressed in the third person singular. This marker is also productive in the third person plural as shown in the noun classes 2, 2a, 6, 8, 10 and 13. This is followed by the negative marker ‘li’ which is productive in the noun classes 1, 1a, 2, 2a, 2b, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 16. This analysis is in conformity with Hopgood (1940) who looked at the broader use of the negative marker ‘e’ presented in the Choma dialect.

The analysis is also in conformity with Hulse’s (2010) study of *Productivity in Morphological negation in English*. In her analysis, she identifies the negative marker ‘non’ to be the most productive negative prefix in nominal formations. In Tonga, the negative marker ‘ta’ is the most productive marker across most of the noun classes as can be noticed in the table above.

Nonetheless, the negative maker ‘ti’ is less productive as it is seen in the noun class 4 representing the third person plural as well as in the noun class 9 representing the third person singular.

Moreover, the negative marker ‘tu’ is the least productive, it is expressed in the noun class 3 representing the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular.

Therefore, it can be argued that the negative maker ‘li’ cannot negate a statement without the presence of the negative markers ‘ta’, ‘ti’ and ‘tu’ as illustrated in Table (7) above. In view of that, these three markers can be termed as necessities as their presence is always required for the marker ‘li’ to be functional.

Suffice it to note that, some of the negative expressions in Table (7) manifest negative concord. These expressions are displayed in classes; 2, 2a, 2b, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15 and 16. The outlined classes apply the negative makers ‘ta’+ ‘li’ and ‘ti’ + ‘li’ though the meaning of every statement is considered single. This analysis agrees with Gleason (1918) who also displays double negation in his constructions.

### **5.2.9 Application of the Jespersen’s cycle theory**

The Jespersen’s cycle theory is discussed in three stages, the following are the stages as well as a demonstration:

(i) The original negator is gradually weakened and loses its negative force, (ii) it is then reinforced by an additional negator which eventually is perceived as the true negator. Eventually, (iii) the original negator is dropped and the cycle may start over again (Mohsen 2011:7).

#### **5.2.9.1 Analysis**

The analysis is based on the negative expression discussed in 5.2.1.1. example number (1). For clarity purposes, it will be re-illustrated below:

95. u-ta-kkal-i

SM NM VS FV

you neg sit

you should not sit.

In reference to the expression given in example (95), the original negator is the negative marker ‘ta’. When this marker loses its negative force as mentioned in stage (i), it is strengthened by the addition of another negative marker which is regarded as the negative proper in stage (ii).

Therefore, the structure will be presented as:

96. u-ta-kkal-i pe

SM NM VS FV NM

you neg sit neg

you should not sit.

In this instance, the original negator is the marker ‘ta’ and the negative proper is the marker ‘pe’. This marker equally indicates emphasis. When the original negator is dropped as stated in stage (iii), the expression takes the following colloquial form:

97. \*u-kkal-i-pe

SM VS FV NM

you sit neg

you sit no.

When the above form appears, the statement becomes ungrammatical. Hence, the cycle may start over again.

From the given analysis, it can be concluded that even if negation did not undergo any developmental stages in the Tonga language as it did in French and other languages, the Jespersen’s cycle theory is applicable. This is because, Tonga language manifests the three stages as well.

Therefore, what Meillet (1912) calls a negative proper is classified as an emphatic negator in Tonga – the ‘pe’ as illustrated above. Thus, this study agrees with Collins (1962) in his study *a Tonga grammar* who classifies the negative marker ‘peepe’ as emphatic. This analysis is also in conformity with Mohsen (2011) in her study of *A comparison of Negation between English and*

*Norwegian* in light with the Jespersen’s cycle theory. The analysis also agrees with Abdulla (2015) in his study, *the Semantic-Syntactic scopes of Negation in English language*.

### **5.3 The Syntax of Negation in Tonga**

Syntax refers to “the branch of grammar dealing with the ways in which words with or without appropriate inflections are arranged to show connections of meaning within the sentence” (Robert and Van 2001:1). Under the Syntax of negation in the language under discussion, the study utilizes two categories of negation. These include; sentential and constituent negation. A detailed discussion is illustrated below:

#### **5.3.1 Sentential negation**

A sentence is said to have been negated if the negative marker scopes over the entire clause. A demonstration is given in declarative statements expressed in the past tense below:

##### **Affirmative**

98. u-aka-unk-a ku-cikol-o

SM TM VS FV LOC NS FV

she/he past go to school

she/he went to School.

##### **Negative**

ta-a-ka-unk-a ku-cikol-o

NM SM TM VS FV LOC NS FV

neg she/he past go to School

she/he did not go to School.

The study reveals that the negative marker ‘ta’ (not) scopes over the entire clause in the negative illustration. This is because, the finite verb *unka* ‘go’ which is the nexus of the sentence is negated. A finite verb is a verb which has a subject and displays the tense. Therefore, if the nexus of the sentence is negated, the entire sentence becomes negated, hence diluted.

Other declarative statements that manifest sentential negation are presented as follows:

### **Affirmative**

99. u-aka-let-a Meend-a

SM TM VS FV NS FV

she/he past bring Water

she/he brought the Water.

### **Negative**

ta-a-ka-let-a Meend-a

NM SM TM VS FV NS FV

neg she/he past bring Water

she/he did not bring the water.

From the given illustrations, the negative marker ‘ta’ (not) in the negative expression (99) nullifies what is stated in the affirmative illustration. Its meaning scopes over the entire clause as the main verb *leta* ‘bring’ is negated. This analysis is in conformity with Ampofo (2015) in her study *the Syntax and Semantics of Negation in Akan*.

### **5.3.2 Constituent negation**

Unlike sentential negation, constituent negation is applied to avoid ambiguity in the statements. An argument under the concept of constituent negation is; only a particular part of a sentence adheres to negation.

The study utilizes the cleft sentence ‘it is’ in discussing constituent negation. The analysis is presented in the future perfect tense below:

#### **Affirmative**

100. ba-na-kuli-ba-li-kked-e

PRN MOD TM PRN AUX VS FV

they fut they have sit

they will have sat.

#### **Negative**

ta-ba-na-kuli-ba-li-kked-e

NM PRN NM TM PRN AUX VS FV

neg they neg fut they have sit

they will not have sat.

When the cleft sentence is applied to the above illustrations, the structure is presented as follows:

**Affirmative**

101. mba-baaba-ba-na-kuli-ba-li-kked-e

SM OBJ PRN MOD TM PRN AUX VS FV

it these they fut they have sit

it is these that will have sat.

**Negative**

ta-ba-li -baaba-ba-na-kuli-ba-li-kked-e

NM PRN NM OBJ PRN MOD TM PRN AUX VS FV

neg they neg these they fut they have sit

it is not these that will have sat.

From the given illustrations, the study reveals that the category being negated in the negative illustration is the object marker *baaba* ‘these’. This is because, the constituent cleft sentence ‘it is not’ particularizes it.

Similarly, declarative statements expressed in the future simple tense are discussed as follows:

**Affirmative**

102. ba-yaku-bwez-a

PRN TM VS FV

they fut get

they will get.

**Negative**

ta-ba-ka-bwez-i

NM SM TM VS FV

neg they fut get

they will not get.

When the cleft sentence ‘it is’ is added to the above statements, the expressions will have the following structures:

### **Affirmative**

103. mba-baaba-ba-yaku-bwez-a

SM OBJ PRN TM VS FV

it these they fut get

it is these that will get.

### **Negative**

ta-ba-li-baaba ba-yaku-bwez-a

NM PRN NM OBJ PRN TM VS FV

neg they neg these they fut get

it is not these that will get.

From the negative illustration displayed in example (103), the study reveals that the entity that is being negated is the object marker *baaba* ‘these’. This is because, the cleft sentence ‘it is not’ focuses directly on the object. This analysis is in conformity with Ampofo (2015) in her study *the Syntax and Semantics of Negation in Akan*. Therefore, it can be argued that word order determines the category being negated.

It is also paramount to note that sentential negation takes a wider scope while constituent negation takes a narrow scope. When dealing with constituent negation, the entities are specified because of the emphatic expression (it is).

## **5.4 The Semantics of Negation in Tonga**

Semantics is the “study of meaning in a language. It is the most abstract level of linguistic analysis since we cannot see or observe meaning as we can observe and record sounds. Instead, Meaning is related to human capacity to think logically and understand” (Karim 2011:1). Winter (2016) also asserts that, the concept of meaning is a reflection inspired by observing how language is used in everyday situations.

Winter (2016) further argues that, since language is used for various purposes, these purposes may inspire conceptions of meaning that are thoroughly different from one another. Therefore, in the Tonga language, the meaning of the statements is not realized haphazardly. The chronological order of the statements and the situation at hand determine the meaning of every expression. The study adopts the following concepts in analyzing the Semantics of Negation in Tonga:

#### **5.4.1 Explicit and implicit negation**

Explicit negation refers to negation expressed as part of the asserted meaning, that is; the sentence meaning of an utterance whereas implicit negation refers to negation expressed as part of the non-asserted meaning, that is; the speaker meaning of an utterance (Xiang et al 2014). The two types of negation are demonstrated in the following conversation:

104 a. hena ulaunka kucikolo? ‘will you be going to school?’

104 b. ndilabala ‘I am studying’.

From the given conversation, it can be stated that the explicit meaning of the response is; the respondent has some work to do while the implicit meaning is; the respondent is not going to school.

Therefore, it can be argued that negation under the above types is not direct, someone has to work out the meaning on their own. Another example is demonstrated as follows:

105 a. hena uyakwiimba? ‘are you going to sing?’

105 b. ndaciswa linyo ‘I have a toothache’

From this conversation, the explicit meaning can be explained as; the respondent has a toothache but the implicit meaning is, the respondent is not going to sing.

Consequently, it can be concluded that negation is deduced from the implicit (speaker) meaning of an utterance. This analysis is in conformity with Ampofo (2015) in her study *the Syntax and Semantics of Negation in Akan*.

#### **5.4.2 Application of the negative concord theory**

Negative concord refers to a scenario where two or more negative elements expressed in one illustration yield a single interpretation (Zeijlstra 2004).

This theory was found to be useful as most of the negative statements acquire more than one negative marker with a single interpretation in Tonga. The theory is applied to declarative statements expressed in the future continuous tense below:

<b>Affirmative</b>	<b>Negative</b>
106. ba-ni-kuya-ku-kkal-a	ta-ba-ni-kuya-ku-kkal-i
SM MOD TM AUX VS FV	NM SM NM TM AUX VS FV
they fut be sit	neg they neg fut be sit
they will be sitting.	they will not be sitting.
107. ba-ni-kuya-ku-bwez-a	ta-ba-ni-kuya-ku-bwez-i
SM MOD TM AUX VS FV	NM SM NM TM AUX VS FV
they fut be get	neg they neg fut be get
they will be getting.	they will not be getting.
108. ba-ni-kuya-ku-bikk-a	ta-ba-ni-kuya-ku-bikk-i
SM MOD TM AUX VS FV	NM SM NM TM AUX VS FV
they fut be put	neg they neg fut be put
they will be putting.	they will not be putting.
109. ba-ni-kuya-ku-imb-a	ta-ba-ni-kuya-ku-imb-i
SM MOD TM AUX VS FV	NM SM NM TM AUX VS FV
they fut be sing	neg they neg fut be sing
they will be singing.	they will not be singing.

From the given illustrations, it can be stated that the affirmative statement in example (106) takes the following structure: the morpheme ‘ba’ is the 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun equivalent to the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (they). The marker ‘ni’ is a modifier, modifying the verb phrase it follows. The expression ‘kuya’ denotes the tense (future) and the marker ‘ku’ is equivalent to the English auxiliary verb (be). The verb stem ‘kkal-’ combines with the final vowel ‘a’ forming the action (sit).

However, the negative expression takes the following structure: the marker ‘ta’ is equivalent to the English negative marker (not), the morpheme ‘ba’ is equivalent to the English 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (they) and the marker ‘ni’ denotes negation as well. The expression ‘kuya’ represents the tense and the morpheme ‘ku’ represents the English auxiliary verb (be). The verb stem ‘kkal’ combines with the discontinuous morpheme ‘i’ to form the action (sit). The succeeding statements take the similar analysis.

Therefore, it can be asserted that the negative statements in examples (106) to (109) have the negative markers ‘ta’, ‘ni’ and the discontinuous morpheme ‘i’. Despite having two negative markers, the interpretation of the statements is considered single. This analysis is in conformity with Ampofo (2015) and Mohsen (2011) though Ampofo discusses negation in Akan and Mohsen discusses it in English and Norwegian. The analysis equally agrees with Hazel (2002) who also discusses the marker ‘ni’ in the negative illustrations.

It is indispensable to note that, the marker ‘ni’ can either be affirmative or negative in Tonga. When it is used in the affirmative sentences as above, it functions as a modifier, modifying the verb phrase it follows. Whereas, when it is used in the negative statements, it negates the verb phrase it follows.

### **5.5 Summary**

The study has clearly discussed the Morphology, Syntax and the Semantics of Negation in Tonga. Morphologically, the study has revealed that negation is not always preverbal as discussed by scholars such as Ampofo (2015), Ngonyani (2001) and Yanda (2005). Other than being placed before the verb, negative markers can also be placed before and after the pronoun, the tense marker and suffixed at the end of an illustration. Hence, it can be concluded that the position of the negative markers in Tonga is determined by the tense and the number involved.

Sentential and constituent concepts played an important role in discussing the Syntax of Negation in Tonga. The study has clearly shown that sentential negation involves the negative marker scoping over the entire statement while constituent negation narrows to a particular category. The study has also demonstrated how the cleft sentence ‘it is’ is realized in both the affirmative as well as the negative illustrations. This analysis is in conformity with Ampofo (2015) in her study *the Syntax and Semantics of Negation in Akan*.

Semantically, the study applied two categories of meaning. It has been revealed that meaning is understood explicitly as well as implicitly in Tonga. The explicit meaning is direct while the implicit meaning is indirect. Therefore, negation is worked from the indirect meaning. This analysis is in conformity with Ampofo (2015) in her study *the Syntax and Semantics of Negation in Akan*. The succeeding chapter dwells on the conclusion and the recommendations of the study.

## **CHAPTER SIX**

### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **6.0 Introduction**

The preceding chapter has presented the findings in line with the objectives. The chapter commenced by examining the morphological structure of negation in Tonga. Among the themes discussed are productivity, incorporation as well as sufficiency as discussed in the Jespersen’s

cycle theory. Later, the syntactic structure has been examined in which negation has been analyzed by means of sentential and constituent categories. Finally, meaning has been discussed by means of explicit and implicit negation. The negative concord theory has been applied as well.

This chapter presents the conclusion and recommendations of the entire study. Firstly, it displays the discussion pertaining to the morphological structure of negative expressions found in Tonga. This is followed by the conclusion of the entire study which is backed by the themes that display the knowledge gap the study filled. Thereafter, the recommendations, recommendations for further research, references and the appendices conclude the study.

### **6.1 Summary**

It is paramount to note that, the negative marker ‘ta’ is a principle marker for imperative statements expressed in the present form in Tonga. Additionally, the structure bears a discontinuous morpheme ‘i’ in order to enhance subject verb agreement. The example is illustrated as u-**ta**-kkal-**i** ‘you should not sit’. Therefore, it can be concluded that the marker ‘ta’ has a greater influence on the final vowel in imperative sentences.

It is also observable that negative expressions in declarative statements expressed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular have the negative marker ‘ta’ placed before the subject marker in Tonga. The final vowel is not affected due to the word class as well as the tense applied. An example is illustrated as; **ta**-a-ka-amb-a ‘she/he did not say’. This is contrary to the imperative statement discussed above. Therefore, it can be articulated that the place of negative markers is not uniform in Tonga. Word class determines the location of negative markers.

It can also be noted that declarative statements in the past form specifically in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural take the negative marker ‘ti’ prefixed to the pronoun. The example is illustrated as; **ti**-ba-a-bwez-a ‘They did not get’. Just like it has been observed in the previous discussion, the final vowel does not change. The reason could be, they both share the same tense as well as the word class. The difference lies on the number involved. Hence, it can be concluded that the number involved determines what negative prefix to be used in Tonga.

It is cardinal to note that the declarative statements expressed in the future simple tense take the negative marker ‘ta’ placed before the pronoun in Tonga. The final vowel changes from ‘a’ to ‘i’. An illustration is presented as; **ta**-ba-ka-end-**i** ‘They will not walk’. Hence, it can be noted that,

in many instances, the marker ‘ta’ causes the change of final vowel regardless of the tense, word class and the number involved. For this reason, it can be concluded that when this marker is prefixed in Tonga, it affects the morphology of the entire statement.

It is also observable that the negative expressions in interrogative sentences have the negative marker ‘ni’ prefixed to tense and the final vowel changes from ‘a’ to ‘i’ in Tonga. An example is illustrated as; Hena ta-**ni**-kuya-ku-jik-**i**? ‘Will she/he not be cooking?’ Just like it has been observed with the negative marker ‘ta’ in the previous discussion, the negative marker ‘ni’ equally has a greater influence on the final vowel.

Note also that the morphological structure of the negative expressions in the future perfect tense display double negation presented as ‘ta’ and ‘na’ in Tonga. An example is illustrated as; **ta**-ba-na-kuli-ba-li-ended-e ‘they will not have walked’. In this instance, the negative marker ‘ta’ is prefixed to the pronoun while the negative marker ‘na’ is prefixed to the tense marker. Additionally, the structure equally bares double 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun ‘ba’ which comes after the negative marker ‘ta’ and the other one is displayed after the tense.

### **6.1.1 Conclusion**

The study has clearly discussed the morphology, syntax and the semantics of negation in Tonga. Morphologically, the study has revealed that negation is not always preverbal as discussed by scholars such as Ampofo (2015), Ngonyani (2001) and Yanda (2005). Other than being placed before the verb, negative markers can also be placed before and after the pronoun, the tense marker and suffixed at the end of an illustration. Hence, it can be concluded that the position of the negative markers in Tonga is determined by the tense and the number involved.

The study has also revealed the negative markers that manifest an aspect of incorporation in Tonga. Markers such as ‘ta’ and ‘he’ can be considered subject as well as negating. The study has also revealed the negative markers that can be considered negative as well as positive. These are ‘na’ and ‘ni’. Their meaning is determined by the context in which they are used.

The study has discussed double negation and productivity of negative markers across the noun class system as well. It has been revealed that, some negative markers are more productive in the noun class system and others are less productive. In this case, the negative marker ‘ta’ turns out to be the most productive marker across most of the noun classes in the Plateau Tonga. This

analysis is in conformity with Hopgood (1940) who also displays the negative marker ‘e’ as widely used in the Choma dialect.

Morphology has been analyzed using the stages of Jespersen’s cycle theory. It has been revealed that, Tonga undergoes the three stages of Jespersen’s cycle as well. The findings are in conformity with Mohsen (2011) in her study *Negation in English compared to Norwegian*. It has also been revealed that, the negative marker that Meillet (1912) calls the negative proper is considered an emphatic Negator in Tonga.

Sentential and constituent concepts played an important role in discussing the Syntax of Negation in Tonga. The study has clearly shown that sentential negation involves the negative marker scoping over the entire statement while constituent negation narrows to a particular category. The study has also demonstrated how the cleft sentence ‘it is’ is realized in both the affirmative as well as the negative illustrations. Hence, this analysis is in conformity with Ampofo (2015) in her study *the Syntax and Semantics of Negation in Akan*.

Semantically, the study applied two categories of meaning. It has been revealed that meaning is understood explicitly as well as implicitly in Tonga. The explicit meaning is direct while the implicit meaning is indirect. Therefore, negation is worked from the indirect meaning. This analysis is in conformity with Ampofo (2015) in her study *the Syntax and Semantics of Negation in Akan*.

Additionally, Negative concord theory has been applied and literature has proven that Tonga is a negative concord language. This is because, most of the negative illustrations have multiple negative markers bearing a single interpretation. This analysis is in conformity with Mohsen (2011) in her study, *Negation in English compared to Norwegian*.

In what follows, I demonstrate how each aspect of negation is operationalized at morphological, syntactic and semantic levels while paying attention to the existing literature as well as the theoretical conceptual framework applied to the study.

### **6.1.2 Productivity**

As it relates to morphology, an aspect of productivity was observed among the Tonga negative markers. In particular, it was noted that the negative marker ‘ta’ is the most productive marker across most of the noun classes in Tonga. This is evident from the noun class (2) which begins

with the prefix ‘ba’ as in *tabali bantu* ‘they are not people’ and the noun class (2b) which begins with the prefix ‘ba’ expressed as; *tabali bakaapa* ‘she/he is not my Grandmother’ among others.

This analysis is in conformity with Hopgood (1940) in his study “*A Practical Introduction to Chitonga Grammar*”. While Hopgood displays the negative marker ‘e’ as broadly used in the Choma dialect, he does not give further explanations on the constructions other than displaying the gloss. The study does not equally apply any concept to the negative expressions applied. Hence, this study has clearly shown the context in which the marker ‘ta’ is applied, it has also displayed its status in the absence of other negative morphemes.

Additionally, the negative marker ‘li’ is equally productive in most of the noun classes in Tonga. Suffice it to note that in as much as the negative marker ‘li’ is seen to be productive, the negative illustrations in which it is manifested equally display negative concord. This is because, the illustrations manifest more than one negative marker with a single interpretation. For instance, in the negative illustration; *tabali bantu* ‘they are not people’ the negative markers identified are; ‘ta’ and ‘li’. This illustration does not have any additional negative meaning. Hence, Tonga is considered a negative concord language. This analysis is in conformity with Mohsen (2011) in her study *Negation in English compared to Norwegian*. The difference lies on the languages applied.

The study has also revealed that, negative markers ‘ti’ and ‘tu’ are the least productive. Fascinating to note that, the mentioned negative markers cannot stand on their own, they all require the presence of each other for them to be functional. In such a case, for the negative markers ‘ti’, ‘ta’ and ‘tu’ to be functional, they require the presence of the negative marker ‘li’. For example, in the expressions as captured in Table 7: 2b *tabali bakaapa* ‘she is not my grandmother’; 3. *tuuli musamu* ‘it is not a tree’; and 4. *tiili misamu* ‘they are not trees.’ In all the three examples, the presence of ‘li’ is required for negation to be expressed and its grammar to be upheld. Hence, these negative markers generate a theme called necessity for their presence is always needed as discussed in section 5.2.8 under the productivity of the negative particles.

### **6.1.3 Incorporation**

Another important morphological feature of negation in Tonga is incorporation. The study revealed that, the negative markers ‘ta’ and ‘he’ show the aspect of incorporation. This is because ‘ta’ and ‘he’ carry within them both the negative marker and the subject marker. Thus, negation

is blended within the subject marker. For instance, in the expression *tajisi* ‘she/he doesn’t have’, the marker ‘ta’ is equivalent to the English negative marker (not) as well as the 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun (she/he). This analysis is in conformity with Jimaima (2014) in his study *The Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics of Conditional Clauses in Tonga and English*. In his analysis of the English ‘if’ and its Tonga equivalents in Tonga conditionals, he argues that the morpheme ‘twa’ as expressed in the negative illustration; *twataboola* ‘if we do not come’ represents both the subject as well as the object of the verb. In the similar breath, this study has revealed that some subject markers can be incorporated within the negative markers.

#### **6.1.4 Necessity**

In addressing the objective relating to the morphology of negation, the notion of necessity becomes apparent. The study revealed that the negative marker ‘ta’ is considered necessary for some negative expressions to be functional. In an event where this marker is dropped, the statement is considered ungrammatical. This can be seen in the expression *utakkali pe* direct translated as ‘you should not sit no’. In such a case, when the negative marker ‘ta’ is dropped in the given statement, the statement will read *\*ukkali pe* direct translated as ‘you sit no’. Therefore, the negative marker ‘ta’ generates a theme called necessity.

The above analysis is in conformity with Jespersen (1917) in his study *A History of Negation in English and other Languages*. Jespersen (1917) considers the negative marker ‘pas’ as a strengthener, reinforcing the negative marker ‘ne’ in the French language as discussed in (2.1) of the literature review. In the similar breath, this study analyses the negative marker ‘pe’ as emphatic as illustrated in the statement above. Suffice it to note that, the negative marker ‘ta’ has been explored in studies such as Nkolola (1997), Jimaima (2014), Sikota (2016), Hazel (2002), among others. From their analysis, no study attempted to attach any theory to it. Additionally, there is no study that has concentrated on its function at length, hence, this study filled the gap.

Furthermore, the current study demonstrates that ‘ta’ and the final emphatic ‘pe’ are a necessary combination to yield an emphatic negative expression in Tonga. While ‘pe’ could be used alone in a conversational context as a response to a question: *ulaunka hena?* ‘Are you going?’ Response: ‘pe’ (no), its functionality is limited to such contexts. For its full expression and grammaticality, it requires a true negative marker such as ‘ta’ in a sentence or utterance. To this end, one can argue that the negative marker ‘ta’ creates a notion of necessity just as ‘li’ is important for the

negative markers ‘ta’, ‘tu’ and ‘ti’ which have been illustrated above. The above themes answer objective one in the specific objectives.

### **6.1.5 Feature percolation**

As regards the objective that attempts to show the Syntax of negation in Tonga, two syntactic structures were deployed: sentential and constituent. At sentential level, it was noted that, the negative marker ‘ta’ percolates over the entire sentence while at constituent level, the marker is limited to a specific category. In the case of the former, the illustration *taunka kucikolo* ‘she/he did not go to school’ can be considered entirely negated in the sense that, the negative marker ‘ta’ negates the nexus of the sentence *unka* ‘go’, consequently, the entire sentence is diluted, hence negated.

In the case of the latter, the study utilized the cleft sentence ‘it is not’. The example is given in the statement; *tabali baaba bayakukkala* ‘it is not these that will sit’. In this sentence, the category being negated is the object marker *baaba* ‘these’ because the cleft sentence percolates directly to the doers of an activity in the sentence. This analysis is in conformity with Mohsen (2011) in her study *negation in English compared to Norwegian*. While Mohsen (2011) discusses the aforesaid categories in English and Norwegian, this study applied them in Tonga. The above explanation summarizes objective two.

### **6.1.6 Unexpressed meaning**

Semantically, it was revealed that negation is not assessed explicitly in Tonga; meaning is worked out implicitly. The example is illustrated in 5.4.1, for the sake of convenience, the discussion will be re-displayed here:

A. hena uyakwiimba? ‘are you going to sing?’

B. ndaciswa linyo ‘I have a toothache’

From this conversation, the explicit meaning is; the respondent has a toothache but the implicit meaning is deduced as; the respondent is not going to sing.

Therefore, it can be concluded as, negation is not deduced explicitly, it is analyzed from the speaker meaning of an utterance. This analysis is in conformity with Ampofo (2015) in her study

*the Syntax and Semantics of Negation in Akan* in light with the typologies of negation. While Ampofo (2015) concentrated on Akan, this study concentrated on Tonga.

### **6.1.7 Negative concord**

It was noted that Tonga is a negative concord language because, most of the negative expressions manifest more than one negative marker with a unitary interpretation. This is seen in the illustration; *ba-ni-kuya-ku-kkal-a* ‘they will be sitting’ and *ta-ba-ni-kuya-ku-kkal-i* ‘they will not be sitting’ where, the negative markers are identified as ‘ta’ and ‘ni’ though the meaning is considered single. The concord is seen in the double negative markers all of them contributing to one unitary meaning. This analysis is in conformity with Mohsen (2011) in her study, *Negation in English compared to Norwegian*. The above themes summarize objective three.

## **6.2 Recommendations**

As this study reveals a number of terminologies pertaining to the Morphology, Syntax and the Semantics of Negation in Tonga, a serious observation has been made. That is, for Tonga to have a codified Grammar with regards to negation, other concepts as well as other theories other than what the current study has applied need to be explored. From a number of scholars that investigated negation in Tonga, none of them gives a detailed sketch of the negative structures expressed and neither is there any theory applied. Therefore, detailed studies would help the language have a wider grammar of negation just like what other languages have done.

### **6.2.1 Recommendations for further research**

Having looked at *A Grammar of Negation in Tonga*, a number of recommendations that are beyond the research objectives have been brought out. These include the following:

- A Grammar of Negation in Tonga incorporating the four linguistic levels of analysis can be investigated. These include; Phonology, Morphology, Syntax and Semantics.
- Another study can be done on the comparison of negation between Tonga and English and other local languages.
- A detailed study can also be explored considering the negative expressions used by young people in Tonga.
- There could be other negative markers that have been left out by the study at hand, other scholars can take up the task and examine deeper.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah, N. A. (2015). The Semantic Syntactic Scopes of Negation in English Language. Aligarh Muslim University. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, Vol. 5.
- Ado, M. A. and Bidin, S. J. (2017). *Morphological Description of Noun Formation Process: A Case of Affixation and Prefixation in Iguta Language*. Universiti Utara Malaysia
- Ampofo, J. S. (2015). *Syntax and Semantics of Negation in Akan*. University of Ghana.
- Anne, B. Lucas, C. and Wills, D. (2013). *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean*. Oxford university press.
- Annum, G. (2017). *Research Instruments for Data Collection*. Retrieved from [http://Campus.Education.com/newmediart/file.php/1/gii/madstore/ugradResearch/aca Research index.htm](http://Campus.Education.com/newmediart/file.php/1/gii/madstore/ugradResearch/aca%20Research%20index.htm)
- Banda, F. and H. Jimaima, (2017). *The Linguistic Landscapes and the Sociolinguistics of Language Vitality Multilingual Contexts of Zambia*. Cape Town: University of Western Cape.

Banda, F. and H. Jimaima, (2019a). “Multilingual Memories: Artefactual Materiality of Erasure and Downscaling in Linguistic and Semiotic Landscapes of Livingstone Town, Zambia” in *Multilingual Memories: Monuments, Museums and the Linguistic Landscape*, 89.

Banda, F. and H. Jimaima, (2019b). Selling a presidential candidate: linguistic landscapes in time of presidential elections in Zambia. *Social Semiotics*, 1-18

Banda, F., Jimaima, H. and Mokwena, L. (2019) Semiotic remediation of Chinese signage in the linguistic landscapes of two rural areas of Zambia. In Elisabetta Adami and Ari Sherris (eds). *Making signs, Translanguaging ethnographies: Exploring urban, rural, and educational spaces*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bwalya, P. and A. Gray, (2015). *Bemba: A Learner’s Guide, Zambia’s Largest Language*.

Collins, B. (1958). *Elementary Tonga Grammar with Exercises and Key*. Lusaka: Bureau publications.

Collins, B. (1962). *Tonga Grammar*. Lusaka: National Education Company of Zambia Limited (NECZAM).

Camilla, L. (2013). *Negation in Romance Languages- A Micro Typological Study of Romance Languages*. Stock Holms University.

Carnie, A. (2013). *Syntax: A generative introduction*. Third edition. Malden, MA & Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dahl, O. (1979). *Typology of Sentence Negation*. Linguistics. Pp. 79-106.

Giannakidou, A. and M. Xiang, (2014). *Explicit and Implicit Negation, a Negative Polarity and Levels of Semantic Representation*. University of Chicago, United States.

Gleason, A. (1918). *A Tonga Grammar*. London: William Clows and Sons Limited.

Guthrie, M. (1967). *Comparative Bantu. An introduction to Comparative Linguistics and the Pre-history of Bantu Languages. 4 Volumes*. Farnberough, Hants, English: Gregg Press.

Haegeman, L. (1996). *The Syntax of Negation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hall, C. J. (2000). Prefixation, Suffixation and Circumfixation in Booji, Geert Lehmann, Christian, Mugdan, Joachim, Kesselheim, Wolfgang and Skopeteas, Stavros, (ed.) *Morphology Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science (17.1)*. Berlin De Gruyter, pp. 535-545.
- Hamed, T. (2016). *Sampling Methods in Research Methodology: How to Choose a Sampling Technique for Research*. Switzerland: Helvetic editions LTD.
- Hang'ombe, K. (2015). *Morphology and Semantics of Tonga Anthroponyms: A case of Tonga given names and Nicknames*. Lusaka: The University of Zambia.
- Hazel, C. (2002). *An Outline to Chitonga Grammar*. Lusaka: Book world Publishers.
- Hopgood, C. R. (1940). *A Practical Introduction to Chitonga*. London: Longman, Green Company Limited.
- Horn, L.R. (2010). 'Multiple Negation in English and other Languages'. In: *Horn, L. R. (ed). The expression of negation*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 111-148.
- Hulse, V. (2010). *Productivity in Morphological Negation: A Corpus –Based Approach*. University of Manchester.
- Jamia, M. I. (2016). *Research in Social Science: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. New Delhi
- Jespersen, O. (1917). *Negation in English and other Languages*. Hobenhavn: Host and Son.
- Jimaima, H. (2008). *Determination and modification in English and Tonga: A Contrastive account*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Zambia.
- Jimaima, H. and Simungala, G., (2019). Semiotic Creativity and Innovation: Offshoots of Social Media Addiction. In *Addiction in South and East Africa* (pp. 143-156). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Jimaima, H. (2014). *The Syntax Semantics and Pragmatics of conditional clauses in Tonga and English: A comparative analysis*. Unpublished MA dissertation: The University of Zambia, Lusaka.

Jimaima, H. (2016). *The Social Structuring of Language and the Mobility of Semiotic Resources across the Linguistic Landscapes of Zambia: A Multimodal Analysis*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of the Western Cape, South Africa.

Karim, N. B. (2011). *A Short Introduction to Semantics*. Islamic Azad University. Iran.

Kosch, I. M. (2005). *Discontinuous Elements in Morphology*. University of South Africa. South Africa.

Kovacs, A. (1985). *The research Methods. Theory and practice*. Nairobi: ART Press

Lieber, R. (2009). *Introducing Morphology*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lindstad, A. M. (2007). *Analyses of Negation: Structure and Interpretation*. Faculty of Humanities. University of Oslo.

Meillet, A. 1926 (1912). *Linguistique Historique et Linguistique generale*. (Collection Linguistique). Paris: Champion.

Ministry of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education. (2013). Curriculum Development Centre. Lusaka, Zambia.

Mohsen, K. H. (2011). *Negation in English compared to Norwegian*. University of Agder.

Mwita, C. (2016). *A Morphosyntactic Verb Inflection for Tense and Aspect in Bemba*

Nairobi: University of Nairobi.

Ngonyani, D. (2001). *The Morpho-Syntax of Negation in Kiswahili*. Afrikanistische, Arbeitspapiere.

Nkolola, M. (1997). *An analysis of the Applied Causative and Passive Verb Extension in Tonga*. Lusaka: The University of Zambia.

O'Brien, D. (1992). *Tonga Grammar*. Lusaka: Multimedia Publications.

Ohannessian, S. and M. E. Kashoki (1978). *Language in Zambia, Ford Foundation Language Surveys*. London: International African Institute.

- Oz, H. (2014). *Morphology and Implication for English Language Teaching*. In A. Saricoban (ed.), *Linguistics for English Language Teaching Studies* (pp83-120). Ani Publishing.
- Palys, T. (2008). *Purposive Sampling*. In L. M. Given (Ed.) *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. (vol.2). Sage: Los Angeles, pp. 697-8
- Polome, E. C. (1966). *Swahili Language Hand book*. Texas: University of Texas.
- Radford, A. (1997). *Syntactic Theory and the Structure of English. A minimalist Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Robert, D. and Van Valin, JR. (2001). *An Introduction to Syntax*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, L. E. (2017). *Negation Patterns in the Kwa Language Group*. Trinity Western University
- Sikota, E. (2016). *The Syntax and Semantics of Adverbial Clauses in Tonga*. Lusaka: the University of Zambia.
- Sonia, O. (2004). *Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Winter, Y. (2016). *Elements of Formal Semantics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Yanda, V. A. (2005). *Negation in Mokpe and Two Related Coastal Bantu Languages of Cameroon*. University of Buea.
- Zeijlstra, H. H. (2004). *Sentential Negation and Negative Concord*. Utrecht: Netherlands.
- Zemba, M. (2015). *A Grammatical Sketch of Kunda Language*. Lusaka: The University of Zambia.

## **APPENDICES**

The data was gathered through dissertations, books, a structured questionnaire as well as oral interviews. Appendix A presents the negative expressions gathered and their gloss.

### **Appendix A**

#### **The presentation of negative expressions and their gloss**

##### **The negative particle ‘ta’ expressed in the third person singular**

1. **taakabikka** (she/he did not put)
2. **taakaimba** (she/he did not sing)
3. **taakazyana** (she/he did not dance)
4. **taakakkala** (she/he did not sit)
5. **taakaenda** (she/he did not walk)

##### **Negative particle ‘ta’ expressed in the third person plural**

6. **tabakakkali** (they will not sit)
7. **tabakeendi** (they will not walk)
8. **tabakabwezi** (they will not get)
9. **tabakajoki** (they will not come back)

10. **tabakaiti** (they will not call)

**Negative particle ‘ti’ expressed in the third person plural**

11. **tibaakkala** (they did not sit)

12. **tibaabweza** (they did not get)

13. **tibaaimba** (they did not sing)

14. **tibaabikka** (they did not put)

15. **tibaajoka** (they did not come back)

**Negative marker ‘ni’ embedded within the clause**

16. **tabanikuyakukkali** (they will not be sitting)

17. **tabanikuyakweendi** (they will not be walking)

18. **tabanikuyakubwezi** (they will not be getting)

19. **tabanikuyakuyaki** (they will not be building)

20. **tabanikuyakuzyani** (they will not be dancing)

## **Appendix B**

### **The Morphological structure of Negation in Tonga Prefixation of the negative marker ‘ta’**

**Affirmative****Negative**

- |                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 1. ualeta? (Has she/he brought?) | <b>ta</b> -a-let-a? (Hasn't she/he brought?) |
| 2. uajika? (Has she/he cooked?)  | <b>ta</b> -a-jik-a? (Hasn't she/he cooked?)  |
| 3. uabweza? (Has she/he gotten?) | <b>ta</b> -a-bwez-a? (Hasn't she/he gotten?) |

**Negative marker 'na' prefixed to the tense marker****Affirmative****Negative**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 4. banakuyakuita (They will be calling)   | <b>ta</b> -ba- <b>na</b> -kuya-ku-it-i (They will not be calling)  |
| 5. banakuyakubikka (They will be putting) | <b>ta</b> -ba- <b>na</b> -kuya-ku-bik-i (They will not be putting) |
| 6. banakuyakwaamba (They will be saying)  | <b>ta</b> -ba- <b>na</b> -kuya-ku-amb-i (They will not be saying)  |

**Suffixation of the discontinuous morpheme 'i'****Affirmative****Negative**

- |                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| 7. kokkala (You sit)   | u-ta-kkal- <b>i</b> (You should not sit)  |
| 8. koenda (You walk)   | u-ta-end- <b>i</b> (You should not walk)  |
| 9. kobweza (You get)   | u-ta-bwez- <b>i</b> (You should not get)  |
| 10. koyaka (You build) | u-ta-yak- <b>i</b> (You should not build) |

**The Syntactic structure of Negation in Tonga****Sentential negation****Affirmative****Negative**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 11. uakaunka kucikolo (she/he went to school)  | <b>ta</b> akaunka kucikolo (she/he did not go to school). |
| 12. uakaleta Meenda (she/he brought the water) | <b>ta</b> akaleta meenda (she/he did not bring the water) |

The negative sentences given above manifest sentential negation in the sense that, the negative marker 'ta' (not) negates the main verbs *unka* 'go' in the first illustration and the verb *leta* 'bring' in the second illustration. Therefore, the entire structures are diluted since the main verbs which are said to be the links of the sentences are negated.

## Constituent negation

### Constituent cleft sentence (it is)

#### Affirmative

13. mbabaaba banakulibalijokede (it is these that will have come back)

#### Negative

**ta-ba-li**-baaba ba-‘na’-kuli-ba-li-joke-de (it is not these that will have come back)

When negating a constituent, only a particular category is focused, in such a case, the expression being negated is the object marker *baaba* ‘these’.

#### Affirmative

14. mbabaaba bayakuzyana (it is these that will dance)

#### Negative

**ta-ba-li** baaba bayakuzyana (it is not these that will dance).

In the same vein, the category being negated from the above negative statement is the object marker *baaba* ‘these’. This is because, the cleft sentence points out the category being negated

## The Semantic structure of Negation in Tonga

### Explicit and implicit negation

15a. hena ulaunka kucikolo? (will you be going to school?)

15b. ndilabala (I am studying).

#### Explicit meaning

The respondent has work to do.

#### Implicit meaning

The respondent is not going to school.

From the given illustrations, negation is deduced from the speaker/implicit meaning of an utterance and not from the explicit/sentence meaning of an utterance.

## **Appendix C**

### **Structured questionnaire**

#### **Sample statements**

This guide is designed for academic purposes, the data is gathered under the title: *A Grammar of Negation in Tonga*. Kindly assist with relevant information.

Change the following illustrations into the negative form.

**Imperative statements in the present tense**

- 1. kokkala (you sit.)  
.....
- 2. koenda (you walk.)  
.....
- 3. kobweza (you get.)  
.....
- 4. koyaka (you build.)  
.....
- 5. kobikka (you put.)  
.....
- 6. koita (you call.)  
.....
- 7. koamba (you say.)  
.....
- 8. kojoka (you come back.)  
.....
- 9. koimba (you sing.)  
.....
- 10. kozyana (you dance.)  
.....

**Declarative statements in the past tense**

- 1. uakkala (she/he sat.)  
.....

2. uakeenda (she/he walked).

.....

3. uabweza (she/he got.)

.....

4. uayaka (she/he built.)

.....

5. uabikka (she/he put.)

.....

6. uaita (she/he called.)

.....

7. uakaamba (she/he said.)

.....

8. uajoka (she/he came back.)

.....

9. uaimba (she/he sung.)

.....

10. uazyana (she/he danced.)

.....

### **Declarative statements in the past tense**

1. baakkala (they sat.)

.....  
2. bakeenda (they walked.)  
.....

3. baabweza (they got.)  
.....

4. baayaka (they built.)  
.....

5. baabikka (they put.)  
.....

6. baaita (they called.)  
.....

7. bakaamba (they said.)  
.....

8. baajoka (they came back.)  
.....

9. baaimba (they sung.)  
.....

10. baazyana (they danced.)  
.....

**Declarative statements in the future simple tense**

1. bayakukkala (they will sit.)

.....  
2. bayakweenda (they will walk.)

.....  
3. bayakubweza (they will get.)

.....  
4. bayakuyaka (they will build.)

.....  
5. bayakubika (they will put.)

.....  
6. bayakwita (they will call.)

.....  
7. bayakwaamba (they will say.)

.....  
8. bayakujoka (they will come back.)

.....  
9. bayakwimba (they will sing.)

.....  
10. bayakuzyana (they will dance.)  
.....

**Declarative statements in the future continuous tense**

1. banikuyakukkala (they will be sitting.)

.....

2. banikuyakweenda (they will be walking.)

.....

3. banikuyakubweza (they will be getting.)

.....

4. banikuyakuyaka (they will be building.)

.....

5. banikuyakubikka (they will be putting.)

.....

6. banikuyakwiita (they will be calling.)

.....

7. banikuyakwaamba (they will be saying.)

.....

8. banikuyakujoka (they will be coming back.)

.....

9. banikuyakwiimba (they will be singing.)

.....

10. banikuyakuzyana (they will be dancing.)

.....

**Declarative statements in the future perfect tense**

1. banakulibalikkede (they will have sat.)

.....

2. banakulibaleendende (they will have walked.)

.....

3. banakulibalibwezede (they will have gotten.)

.....

4. banakulibaliyakide (they will have built.)

.....

5. banakulibalibikkide (they will have put.)

.....

6. banakulibaliitide (they will have called.)

.....

7. banakulibalaambide (they will have said.)

.....

8. banakulibalijokede (they will have come back.)

.....

9. banakulibaliimbide (they will have sung.)

.....

10. banakulibalizyanide (they will have danced.)

.....

**Interrogative sentences in the present perfect tense**

1. ualeta? (has she/he brought?)  
.....
2. uajika? (has she/he cooked?)  
.....
3. uabikka? (has she/he put?)  
.....
4. uaboola? (has she/he come?)  
.....
5. uabweza? (has she /he gotten?)  
.....
6. ualila? (has she/he cried?)  
.....
7. uakkala? (has she/he sat?)  
.....
8. uaseka? (has she/he laughed?)  
.....
9. uasika? (has she/he reached?)  
.....
10. uabota? (has she/he looked good?)  
.....

**Interrogative sentences in the future continuous tense**

1. hena unikuyakuleta? (will she/he be bringing?)  
.....
2. hena unikuyakujika? (will she/he be cooking?)  
.....
3. hena unikuyakubikka? (will she/he be putting?)  
.....
4. hena unikuyakuboola? (will she/he be coming?)  
.....
5. hena unikuyakubweza? (will she/he be getting?)  
.....
6. hena unikuyakulila? (will she/he be crying?)  
.....
7. hena unikuyakukkala? (will she/he be sitting?)  
.....
8. hena unikuyakuseka? (will she/he be laughing?)  
.....
9. hena unikuyakusika? (will she/he be reaching?)  
.....
10. hena unikuyakubota? (will she/he be looking good?)  
.....

## **Appendix D**

### **Interview guide**

1. Apart from the negative expressions you have given in the document, what other negative markers do you know in Tonga?
2. In what context are they used?
3. Which ones are more productive in the noun class system?
4. What negative markers perform more than one role?
5. Give reasons to question four (04).