EXPLORATION OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO NEGATIVE MARKERS *ha-* AND *(-)si(-)* IN SWAHILI

Christa Beaudoin-Lietz
Memorial University

1.0. INTRODUCTION

When dealing with negation, grammars of Standard Swahili generally present three basic negative markers, *ha-*, *(-)si(-)*, and *-to-*. For two of these three markers, *ha-* and *-si-*, grammars describe their distribution, but explanations of their difference in meaning are either not provided or often unsatisfactory. The difference between *ha-* and *-si-* in form, position and function has led to the hypothesis, which will be explored in this paper, that both negative markers differ in meaning.

The forms *ha-* and *-si-* are considered here with reference to the markers *hu-*, *-me-*, *-na-*, *-ki-*, *-li-*, *-ta-*, *-nge-*, *-ngali-*, *-ja-*, and *-ku-*, which are treated here as markers of tense/aspect.[1]

It will be argued that since *ha-* and *-si-* cannot co-occur, occur in different positions in the verbal construction, have (in part) different co-occurrence restrictions with respect to tense/aspect markers and finals, and may occur in different clause types, a difference in meaning can be established. It is proposed that both *ha-* and *-si-* negate events, but differ in that *ha-* negates the time that is specified as necessary for the execution of the event by the tense/aspect marker, and *-si-* negates the assertion made by the verb.

2.0. BACKGROUND

2.1. The structure of simple verbal constructions in Swahili

This section provides a brief background on verbal constructions in Swahili. Only those aspects that pertain to the following discussion are included.

The order of morphemes in simple verbal constructions (without the 'slot' for the relative markers (REL)) is described in the following template:

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10
\end{array}
$$

$$
\text{NEG}_1 - \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{SC} \\ \text{INF} \\ \text{HAB} \end{array} \right\} - \text{NEG}_2 - \text{TA} - \text{OC} - \text{STM} - \text{VB} - \text{E} - \text{F} - \text{PF}
$$

1. Preinitial: negative marker *ha-* (NEG$_1$)
2. Initial: subject concord (SC), *ku-* infinitive/verbal noun (INF), or *hu-* 'habitual' (HAB)
3. Postinitial: negative marker *-si-* (NEG$_2$)
4. Tense/aspect markers[2] (T/A): *-to-* negative[3], *-a-* alternative for 'progressive'[4], *-na-* 'progressive', (PRO), *-li-* 'past' (P), *-ku-* 'negative past in conjunction with *ha-*' (PNEG), *-ta-* 'future' (FUT), *-me-* 'retrospective or perfect' (RET), *-ka-* 'narrative'[5], *-ki-* 'imperfective or continuative' (IMP), *-ja-* 'in conjunction with *ha-*, often translated as 'not yet' (yet), *-nge-* 'conditional' (COND), *-nga-* 'although'[4], *-ngali-* 'conditional' (COND).
5. Stem marker (STM): *-ku-*[6] is obligatory with verbs where the verbal base is monosyllabic and vowel-initial verbs like *-enda* 'go' and *-isha* 'finish'. When the verb form contains an object marker, the stem marker is deleted.
6. Object marker: object concord (OC)
7. Verbal base: (VB)
8. Extensions: (E)
9. Final: (F): *-a* 'neutral' (neut.), *-e* 'uncertain, potential' (poten.), *-i* 'negative' (in conjunction with *ha-*)[7] (neg.)
10. Postfinal: (PF): *-ni* indicates the plurality of the addressed party.

---

2 For practical purposes, the order is accepted here as presented. Some of the morphemes might be placed in different 'slots' (see footnote 3).

3 *-to-* 'negative' is listed in various positions in the literature. While I am following Schadeberg (1984), *-to-* could nevertheless be in a different slot. That *-to-* does not co-occur with tense/aspect markers does not necessarily mean that it is in a paradigmatic relationship with them. Further investigation into the order of morphemes and their 'slots' is necessary. The discussion of the negatives is limited to *ha-* and *-si-*.

4 *-a-*, *-ka-*, and *-nga-* are not being dealt with; *-a-* appears to be in the process of being replaced by *-na-*. Schadeberg also includes *-mesha-* and *-japo-*.

5 *-ka-* is excluded from the discussion. It is used in verb forms that are dependent (whether explicitly or implicitly) on a verb form with tense/aspect forms discussed.

6 The stem marker and *ku*-INF are diachronically the same morpheme.

7 The traditional grammatical terms have been replaced by notional terms (Contini-Morava 1989, Nurse & Hinnebusch 1993).

In simple verb forms there are many co-occurrence restrictions. Except for (8.), generally any morpheme of a 'slot' cannot co-occur with any other morpheme that occupies the same 'slot'. With respect to *ha-* and *-si-*, the form in (1.) cannot co-occur with the form in (3.). (For further details see e.g., Contini-Morava 1989, Nurse & Hinnebusch 1993, Schadeberg 1984).

2.2. Occurrence of the negative markers *ha-* and *-si-*

The negative markers are usually described with respect to their distribution and certain co-occurrence restrictions which are summarized in the following:

A. *ha-* and *-si-* do not co-occur in the same simple verbal construction, as the following example illustrates:

(1) a. ha-tu-ta-zi-imb-a   b. *ha-tu-si-ta-zi-imb-a
         NEG_1-SC-FUT-OC-VB-F NEG_1-SC-NEG_2-FUT-OC-VB-F
           1.p.pl. 3.p.pl.   neut.   1.p.pl.   neut.
         'We will not sing them.'

B. *ha-* and *-si-* differ in position: *ha-* occurs initially, *-si-* to the right of the subject concord.

C. *ha-* occurs as an affix only, while (-)*si*(-) can occur as an affix or as an independent morpheme.

D. *ha-* and *-si-* occur (in part) with different finals. *ha-* occurs with the final *-i* as in (2a) when the tense/aspect 'slot' is not overtly filled, or with *-a* as in (3b) and (5) when the tense/aspect 'slot' is filled. *-si-* occurs with the final *-e* ((4) and (6)) or *-a* in certain cases (see the discussion below).

(2) a. ha-wa-imb-i   b. *ha-wa-imb-a
         NEG_1-SC-VB-F NEG_1-SC-VB-F
           3.p.pl. neg.   3.p.pl.   neut.
         'They are not singing; they do not sing (habitually);
         they are not continuously singing.'

(3) a. tu-ta-imb-a   b. ha-tu-ta-imb-a
         SC-FUT-VB-F NEG_1-SC-FUT-VB-F
           1.p.pl.   neut.   1p.pl.   neut.
         'We will sing.'   'We will not sing.'

(4) a. tu-si-pik-e   b. *ha-tu-pik-e
         SC-NEG_2-VB-F NEG_1-SC-VB-F
           1.p.pl.   poten.   poten.
         'Let's not cook.'

(5)   ha-tu-nge-pat-a jibu   tu-si-ngali-fikiri.[8]
            NEG$_1$.SC-COND-VB:get-F answer SC-NEG$_2$ COND-VB:think-F
               1.p.pl.   neut.   1.p.pl.
            'We could not have got the answer, had we not thought.'

(6)   a.   m-si-som-e sasa!   b. *ha-m-som-e
            SC-NEG$_2$-VB-F now   NEG$_1$-SC-VB-F
            2.p.pl.   poten.   poten.
            'Don't (pl.) study now!'   (Hinnebusch & Mirza 1979: 174-175)

E.   *ha-* and *-si-* can be used in different clause types. *ha-* tends to
            occur in main clauses, while *-si-* is generally used in pro-
            hibitives and subjunctives ((4) and (6)), and relative clauses
            where the relative pronoun is incorporated in the verbal con-
            struction. More frequently than *ha-*, *-si-* is used in verbal con-
            structions with *-nge-* or *-ngali-*. (For details see 3.2).

3.0   THE NEGATIVE MARKERS *HA-* AND *-SI-*

The above mentioned differences in co-occurrence and further restric-
tions discussed below led to the hypothesis that there is a difference in
meaning between *ha-* and *-si-*, which is explored in the following for
Swahili. This difference is observed, in general, by Güldemann (1996) for
Bantu languages from a historical perspective:

> Preinitial negation [i.e., *ha-* for Swahili (CB)] evolved out of a complex predicate
> pattern in which the predicate can be analyzed as a binary structure wherein a
> negative nucleus bears the illocutionary force and a final satellite conveys the
> propositional information of the predication. (Güldemann 1996: 6)

while in contrast for postinitial negation, [i.e., *-si-* in Swahili (CB)]:

> The postinitial-complex appears in a way to correlate with descriptive negation.
> (Güldemann 1996: 10)

Güldemann gives 'to have/have not' as an example of a descriptive
negative. Along the same lines, some grammars of Swahili suggest that
-si- expresses 'the opposite'. Here it is proposed that in contrast to *ha-*,
which negates the event with its duration as specified by the tense/aspect
marker, *-si-* negates the idea of the event expressed in the verb. *-si-*
negates the assertion made by the verb.

The following section will analyze in detail the correlation of the nega-
tive markers with tense/aspect markers and finals. First, forms with *ha-*

---

[8] Some of the verbs and adjectives which are borrowed from other languages
     do not end in the final *-a*. Here *-i* does not indicate the negative.

will be presented, then forms with *-si-*. Finally, cases where either *ha-* or *-si-* can occur will be discussed.

3.1.   *ha-*

3.1.1.   *ha-* and tense/aspect markers: *ha-...T/A...-a*

Within the simple verb form, *ha-* does not co-occur with certain tense/aspect markers, including, among the markers discussed *-me-, -na-, -ki-, -li-* and *hu-*, as can be seen from the following examples:

(8)   a.   tu-me-imb-a
SC-RET-VB-F
1.p.pl.   neut.
'We have sung.'

b.   *ha-tu-me-imb-a/-e/-i
NEG$_1$-SC-RET-VB-F
1.p.pl.

(9)   a.   tu-li-imb-a
SC-P-VB-F
1.p.pl. neut.
'We sang.'

b.   *ha-tu-li-imb-a/-e/-i
NEG$_1$-SC-P-VB-F
1.p.pl.

c.   ha-tu-ku-imb-a
NEG$_1$-SC-PNEG-VB-F

'We didn't sing.'

(10)   a.   tu-na-imb-a
SC-PRO-VB-F
1.p.pl.   neut.
'We sing; we are singing.'

b.   *ha-tu-na-imb-a/-e/-i
NEG$_1$-SC-PRO-VB-F
1.p.pl.

c.   tu-ki-imb-a
SC-IMP-VB-F
1.p.pl.   neut.
'If we sing (we ... singing)'

d.   *ha-tu-ki-imb-a/-e/-i
NEG$_1$-SC-IMP-VB-F
1.p.pl.   neut.

e.   hu-imb-a
HAB-VB-F
         neut.
'He/she sings.' (The subject is implied by the context
or would be stated in pronominal form.)

f.   *ha-hu-imb-a
NEG$_1$-HAB-VB-F
         neut.

g.   ha-tu-imb-i
NEG$_1$-SC-VB-F
         1.p.pl. neg.
'We are not singing; we do not sing (habitually);
we are not continuously singing.'

ha- can, however, occur with other tense/aspect markers, i.e., *-ku-, -ja-, -ta-, -nge-,* and *-ngali-*. In all of these cases the final is *-a,* as the following examples illustrate:

(11)   a.   ha-tu-ja-imb-a
NEG$_1$-SC-'yet'-VB-F
         1.p.pl.   neut.
'We have not yet sung.'

b.   ha-tu-ku-imb-a
NEG$_1$-SC-PNEG-VP-F
         1.p.pl.   neut.
'We did not sing.'

(12) a.   tu-ta-imb-a   b. ha-tu-ta-imb-a
           SC-FUT-VB-F   NEG₁-SC-FUT-VB-F
           1.p.pl.   neut.   1.p.pl.   neut.
           'We will sing.'   'We will not sing.'

(13)   mti huu u-nge-anguk-a ha-u-nge-ni-u-a
           tree this SC-COND-fall-F   NEG₁-SC-COND-OC-kill-F
                   3.p.sg.   neut.   3.p.sg.   1.p.sg.   neut.
           'If this tree happened to fall, it wouldn't kill me.'

As can be seen from the examples above, in simple verbal constructions *ha-* can occur in the pattern which can be schematically described as *ha-...T/A...-a.* The negative marker can also occur in the pattern *ha-...-Ø-...-i* (see 3.1.2). For the former pattern only certain tense/aspect markers can fill the T/A 'slot'. Among the tense / aspect markers discussed, they are the following:

        ha- ... -ku- ....- a
        ha- ... -ta-.........- a
        ha- ... -ja-.........- a
        ha- ... -nge- ......- a
        ha- ... -ngali-.....-a.

ha- combines with the tense/aspect marker and expresses the negation of the time that is necessary for the execution of the event as it is specified by the tense/aspect marker. *-ku-* expresses the whole event in its completion in the past; *ha-...-ja-...-a* negates the event that is within the speaker's experience viewed from the moment of speaking to the beginning of the event (therefore the common translation 'not yet'); *ha-...-ta-...-a* negates the completion of the event as it unfolds in the imagination, therefore expressing future. For the last two morphemes see below.

3.1.2   Forms with *ha-...Ø...-i*

In contrast to the above forms, forms with *ha-...Ø...-i* have a not overtly filled 'slot' for the tense/aspect marker and a different final. Contini-Morava points out:

> *-i* is reserved for situations where neither opportunity nor negation is limited, that is, cases where the negative state is expected to continue indefinitely. (Contini-Morava 1989: 138)

Ashton (1947: 71) describes the forms with *ha-...-i* as the 'general negative' and stresses that they express 'the *fact* of negation without reference to time'. Those descriptions support the analysis proposed. In forms with *ha-...Ø...-i* the specification of the event time to be negated is Ø. Therefore,

the negation expressed by *ha-* does not apply to the time specified as necessary for the execution of the event by a tense/aspect marker, but in conjunction with *-i* points to the extension of the negative event. Forms of the schema *ha-...Ø...-i* are ambiguous in their meaning and can correspond to different positive forms that express imperfective aspectual distinctions. *haimbi*, for example, It can mean 'he/she never sings' corresponding to *huimba*, or 'he/she is not singing right now' as the corresponding negative to *anaimba*. It can also negate *akiimba* (see example (10)).

3.1.3.   Examples of forms with *ha-* in two-verb verbal constructions

The following examples (14) and (15) include two-verb verbal constructions in which the first forms indicate the tense and the second form the aspectual distinctions. In (16) the subject concords of the two verbs are different.

(14) a. tu-li-ku-w-a tu-na-imb-a b. tu-li-ku-w-a ha-tu-imb-i
          SC-P-STM-be-F SC-PRO-sing-F   SC-P-STM-be-F NEG_1-SC-sing-F
          1.p.pl.   neut. 1.p.pl.   neut.   1.p.pl.   neut. 1.p.pl.   neg.
          'We were singing.'   'We were not singing.'

(15) a. tu-li-ku-w-a tu-ki-imb-a b. ha-tu-ku-w-a tu-ki-imb-a
          SC-P-STM-be-F   SC-IMP-sing-F NEG_1-SC-PNEG-be-F SC-IMP-sing-F
          1.p.pl.   neut. 1.p.pl.   neut.   1.p.pl.   neut. 1.p.pl.   neut.
          'We were singing   'We were not singing
          (and continued to sing).'   (at that particular time).'

(16) a. wa-li-tu-on-a tu-ki-imb-a b. ha-wa-ku-tu-on-a tu-ki-imb-a
          SC-P-OC-see-F SC-IMP-sing-F NEG_1-SC-PNEG-OC-see-F SC-IMP-sing-F
          3.p.pl.   neut. 1.p.pl.   neut.   3.p.pl.   neut. 1.p.pl.   neut.
          'They saw us singing.'   'They didn't see us singing.
                                            (They expected to see us singing.)'

ha- can occur on the auxiliary or the lexical verb. *ha-* occurs on the first or second form depending on the aspectual marker (for co-occurrence restrictions see Ashton (1947)) and the desired meaning. In the main clause affirmative forms (14a), (15a), (16a) the auxiliary indicates the tense and the second form indicates the aspect. In (14b) the main clause negative is on the second form, while in (15b) and (16b) the negative is on the first form. The co-occurrence restrictions described apply in two-verb verbal constructions as well.

3.2.   (-)si(-)

The following examples illustrate usage of *(-)si(-)*.

Negative imperative and subjunctive:

(17) a.   Si-pig-e   b. U-si-som-e sasa! c. M-si-som-e sasa!
            NEG$_2$.beat-F   SC-NEG$_2$.read-F now   SC-NEG$_2$-read-F now
                  poten.   2.p.sg.   poten.   2.p.pl.   poten.
            'Don't beat!'   'Don't study   'Don't (pl.) study now!'
                             [i.e., read] now!'
            (Ashton 1947: 119)   (Hinnebusch & Mirza 1979: 174-175)

Relative clause:

(18) a.   watu wa-si-o-som-a   b. mtu a-si-ye-som-a
            people SC-NEG$_2$-REL-read-F   man SC-NEG$_2$.REL-read-F
                3.p.pl.   neut.   3.p.sg.   neut.
            'people who do not read'   'a man who does not read'
                                                        (Maw 1985: 197)

Negative copula:

(19) a.   Mimi   si   mwivi.   b. Si   kitabu
            1p.sg. pro. NEG$_2$ thief   NEG$_2$ book
            'I am not a thief.'   'It is not a book.'   (Ashton 1947: 93)

Clauses with conditional markers:

(20)   mti huu u-nge-anguk-a   u-si-nge-ni-u-a
            tree this   SC-COND-fall-F   SC-NEG$_2$.COND-OC-kill-F
                3.p.sg.   neut.   3.p.sg   1.p.sg .   neut.
            'If this tree happened to fall, it would not kill me.'

3.2.1.   Sentences with *si* as an independent morpheme

In example (19) *si* occurs as an independent morpheme. It obviously expresses descriptive negation, negating the following element.

3.2.2.   Forms with *-si-Ø...-e* and forms with *-si-Ø-REL...-a*.

-si- is the only negative marker that can occur with final *-e*. Forms with *-si-* represent the negative forms of the subjunctive (17b, c) which are also used to express in politer form the negative imperative. The suffix *-e* is described as 'occurrence, not affirmed, unspecified for probability' (Contini-Morava 1989). Similarly it is described as expressing 'the lack of certainty' (Leonard 1980). It becomes clear why *-si-* co-occurs with the subjunctive. It is possible to negate the logical possibility or the semantic content of something that is in the realm of the potential, and not realized. That is different from negation with *ha-* where the time that is necessary for the execution of the event is specified, presenting the event as realized or realizable. Note that for the subjunctive (and the imperative) a description in

terms of tense contrasts does not come into play in Swahili, since there is only one subjunctive form.

Negative forms of the relative with -si- share with the subjunctive forms that the 'slot' for the tense/aspect marker is not filled. In contrast to the subjunctive forms, the final is -a in forms with the relative. While the final -a establishes these forms as 'neutral' in contrast to the potential of the subjunctive forms, the use of -si- in conjunction with the lack of tense/aspect marking expresses the negation of the assertion expressed by the verbal construction. In sentences like the following examples the tense/aspect marker in the main verb specifies the time.

(21)   ni-$\left\{\begin{array}{c} \text{li} \\ \text{na} \\ \text{ta} \end{array}\right\}$-mw-on-a mtu   a-si-ye-kul-a

SC-$\left\{\begin{array}{c} \text{P} \\ \text{PRO} \\ \text{FUT} \end{array}\right\}$-OC-see   person   SC-NEG$_2$.REL-eat-F

1.p.sg.   neut.

'I$\left\{\begin{array}{c} \text{saw} \\ \text{see} \\ \text{will see} \end{array}\right\}$ a person who $\left\{\begin{array}{c} \text{was} \\ \text{is} \end{array}\right\}$ not eating / who does not eat.'

As with the forms with final -e, the tense/aspect marker is absent in the form with -si-. The illustrated negative relative form does not specify the time necessary for the execution of the event, but is dependent for time specification on the verb in the main clause.

3.2.3.   -si-T/A...-a

There are, however, forms where -si- can occur according to the schema -si-T/A...-a. These are forms with -nge- and -ngali- which are discussed below in contrast to forms with ha-.

3.3.   Forms with -si-T/A...-a and ha-...T/A...-a

As (20) and (22b.) illustrate, either -si- or ha- can occur in forms with -nge- and -ngali-, which are translated as conditionals into English in (20) and (22).

(22) a.   mti huu u-ngali-anguk-a u-ngali-ni-u-a
          tree this SC-COND-fall-F   SC-COND-OC-kill-F
              3.p.sg.   neut.   3.p.sg. 1.p.sg.   neut.
          'This tree, if it had fallen, it would have killed me.'

      b.   mti huu u-nge-anguk-a ha-u-nge-ni-u-a
          tree this SC-COND-fall-F   NEG$_1$-SC-COND-OC-kill-F
              3.p.sg.   neut.   3.p.sg.   1.p.sg. neut.
          'If this tree happened to fall, it wouldn't kill me. (I'll survive).'

These sentences demonstrate an overlap in usage of -*si*- and *ha*-. Forms with -*si*- have been considered to be more frequent. The question arises whether (20) and (22b) can be distinguished in meaning. Several facts complicate and cloud the issue.

For the negative conditional forms, grammars state that both forms of negation exist, but in general the grammars do not provide any information with respect to the difference in meaning. Translations of forms with *ha*- and -*si*- in the conditional are given as identical (i.e., Zawawi 1971), or forms are given side by side with no translation (i.e., Maw 1985). Some authors (Maw 1985, Schadeberg 1984) only comment that -*si*- is more common. Ashton (1947) notes that 'diversity of opinion exists ... as to the difference in usage between the two simple forms' (Ashton 1947: 259). Contini-Morava (1989) describes the difference between forms with *ha*- and -*si*- in general as stronger predication versus weaker predication respectively, but does not deal in detail with forms with -*si*-.

Another complication concerns the forms of the conditional -*nge*- and -*ngali*- (20) and (22a) themselves. Forms with these morphemes are generally translated with conditionals in English. Traditionally and as a normative statement, -*nge*- is/was considered the present conditional and -*ngali*- the past conditional. The distinction between -*nge*- and -*ngali*- does not appear to be clearly maintained. For example, while Contini-Morava (1989) distinguishes -*nge*- and -*ngali*- in terms of probability (*nge*- being somewhat remote, while -*ngali*- has more remote probability), Zawawi (1971) considers the forms as variants of the same morpheme. Miehe states, 'Tatsächlich variieren heute beide [-*nge*- and -*ngali*-] frei im Standard Swahili.' ('in fact both are in free variation today in Standard Swahili') (Miehe 1979: 246, translation CB). Heepe (1914) entitled his article '-*nge*- = -*ngali*-'.

Also, for some speakers, -*nge*- can occur as a reduced variant of a dialect variant of -*ngali*-: -*ngeli*- (both forms go back to the same form and have to be considered one morpheme (Miehe 1979)), and therefore could be used in the meaning of the past conditional (i.e., *ngali* > *ngeli* > *nge*). As the above indicates, to establish a clear meaning difference between -*nge*- and -*ngali*- with respect to tenses does not seem to be possible.

According to Miehe (1979), -*ngali*- indicates that the event can only be realized (depending on the time frame) when the expressed conditions in the sentence are fulfilled. This description may be applied to the difference between *ha*-...-*a* and -*si*-...-*a*. It may be possible to distinguish *ha*-...-*a* from -*si*-...-*a* along the same lines as argued earlier. That is, if the possibility (realized or not) exists of actualizing the particular time of the event,

that is, perceiving the event as realizable once the conditions are fulfilled, *ha-* would be a choice as a negation marker, while otherwise *-si-* would be selected.

The use of forms with *ha-...-a* and of forms with *-si-...-a* is illustrated in Ashton (1947). In these cases, there is one form in each sentence:

(23) a.   **Angekuwa** mgonjwa, **asingekuja** mjini kwa miguu.
            'If he were an invalid, he would not come to town on foot.'

      b.   Laiti **ningalifuata** shauri lako, mambo haya yote **yasingalitokea**.
            'If only I had followed your advice, these things would not have happened.'

      c.   Hao Waarabu **walijua** kwa hakika kama hiyo manowari **inga-likuwako, hayangalitendeka** haya.
            'These Arabs knew for certain that if the man-of-war had been there, such things could not have been done.'

      d.   Watoto hao ... kama **wangalikuwa** wakikaa sana, **hawangali-weza** kupanda kurudi kwao katika Nchi ya Mawingu.
            'If these children had made a habit of staying too long, they would have been unable to go up again to their homeland in Cloudland...'
            (Ashton 1947: 259)

The examples appear to support this view: in (23a) and (23b), the uncertainty of the realizableness in the second clause based on the conditions in the first clause leads to the use of the negation marker *-si-*. In (23c) and (23d), the use of *ha-* expresses that under conditions (which are stated in the preceding clause), that which is stated in the clause with *ha-* would/could not be actualized in time.

Further evidence comes from the following examples with negative compound tense forms:

(24)   Kama mama yake **angekuwa hamkemei**, asingetoroka.
            'If his mother had not reproved him, he would not have run away.'
            (Ashton 1947: 260)

Ashton comments on the example:

'In negative compound tenses the main verb [*hamkemei* not the auxiliary *angekuwa*, CB] carries the negative particle when reference is made to a *particular* action.' (Ashton 1947: 259) [italics CB]

One could interpret the form with *ha-....-i* as actualizing the negative event in contrast to the following form with *-si-* where the event and its realization is negated. Other circumstantial evidence comes from a negative form with *-si-* that can correspond to a form with *-ki-*. As mentioned earlier, to a form with *-ki*, the corresponding negative form can be represented by *ha-...Ø...-i*. In addition, *-ki-* can be translated with 'if' or

'when', as in the examples below.[9] Then the 'corresponding' negative form changes to *-sipo-*, formed with the negative *-si-* as (25b) illustrates:

(25)   a.   tu-ki-imb-a tu-ta-furahi   b.   tu-sipo-imb-a   tu-ta-furahi
            SC-IMP-sing-F SC-FUT-be happy   SC-NEG₂ LOC-sing-F SC-FUT-be happy
            1.p.pl.   neut. 1.p.pl.   1.p.pl.   neut. 1.p.pl.
            'If we sing, we will be happy.'   'If we don't sing, we will be happy.'

It seems that for the imperfective aspectual marker, the completion of the event is moved to the realm of the imagination; thus the negation of the possibility of the event is expressed by *-si-*.

In contrast to the examples above, the following examples contain a negation marker in both clauses:

(26)   a.   Tu-si-nge-fikiri   tu-si-nge-pat-a jibu.
            SC-NEG₂-COND-think.F   SC-NEG₂.COND-get-F answer
            1.p.pl.   1.p.pl.   neut.
            'Had we not thought, we could not get (have got) the answer.'

       b.   Ha-tu-nge-pat-a jibu   tu-si-ngali-fikiri.
            NEG₁-SC-COND-get-F answer SC-NEG₂-COND-think
            1.p.pl.   neut.   1.p.pl.
            'We could not have got the answer, had we not thought.'
                                        (Nathan Ogechi, personal communication)

The translation appears to be identical. Note the use of 'could' in English which can be ambiguous with respect to potentiality/possibility and ability. Further discussion revealed that in (26b), the form with *ha-* expresses the result or consequence. This would provide further evidence for what has been said above. *ha-* negates events whose time of actualization is specified by the form in the tense / aspect slot. *-si-* is used to negate the assertion made by the verb, and as a consequence may be used for events that may remain in the realm of uncertainty and potentiality. As mentioned earlier, this difference provides some explanation why *-si-* is used with subjunctives, prohibitives, and the types of subordinate clauses illustrated.

What has become clear from forms with *-si-...-a* is that *-si-* appears to have a different function and meaning from *ha-* in that the negation with *-si-* is not specifically related to the time that is necessary for the execution of the event.

---

[9]   There is one morpheme underlying both of these meanings of *-ki-* (Moshi 1988).

4.0. CONCLUSION

This paper has considered the negative markers *ha-* and *-si-* in Swahili. Forms with *ha-* express that the realization of time of the event necessary for its execution specified in the verbal form is negated. The function of *-si-* appears to be different from the other negative marker in that *-si-* does not negate the time of the event, but the assertion made by the verb, the description of the event. It can, therefore, be used in forms like the subjunctive. In the analysis of the negative markers an integrated approach has been applied: the meaning of the verb final morphemes has been taken into consideration in order to establish the difference in meaning of the negative markers.

REFERENCES

ASHTON, E.O. 1947 [1944]. *Swahili Grammar.* (2nd ed., reprinted 1993) Harlow: Longman Group.

CONTINI-MORAVA, ELLEN. 1989. *Discourse Pragmatics and Semantic Categorization: The Case of Negation and Tense-Aspect with Special Reference to Swahili.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

GÜLDEMANN, TOM. 1996. Verbal negation in Bantu and its dependency on functional features of clause types. Paper presented at conference on Bantu Historical Linguistics in Lyon, France. To appear in published conference proceedings .

HEEPE, M. 1914. Suaheli *-nge- = -ngali-. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 68: 590-595.

HEWSON, JOHN & DEREK NURSE. 1997. Chronogenetic staging in the Swahili verbal system. ms. Memorial University of Newfoundland.

HINNEBUSCH, THOMAS J. & SARAH M. MIRZA. 1979. *Swahili: A Foundation for Speaking, Reading and Writing / Kiswahili: msingi wa kusema kusoma nakuandika.* Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

LEONARD, ROBERT A. 1980. Swahili: *e, ka,* and *nge* as signals of meanings. *Studies in African Linguistics, Vol. II*, 2: 209 - 226.

MAW, JOAN. 1985. *Twende: A Practical Swahili Course.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MIEHE, GUDRUN. 1979. *Die Sprache der älteren Swahili-Dichtung*. Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer.

MOSHI, LIOBA. 1988. The grammar of *ki* in KiSwahili. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 18: 105-134.

NURSE, DEREK & THOMAS HINNEBUSCH. 1993. *Swahili and Sabaki: A Linguistic History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

SCHADEBERG, THILO C. 1984. *A Sketch of Swahili Morphology*. (2nd. ed.) Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

ZAWAWI, SHARIFA. 1971. *Kiswahili Kwa Kitendo*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.