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Abstract
This paper compares negative constructions in Standard Yorùbá (SY) and Ègbá dialect (ED) using the Principles and Parameters theory as a theoretical framework. A major finding of this study is that while ‘má’ is attested as a negative marker in SY, it is attested as a progressive marker in ED. It is also found that, the negative marker ‘kò’ is the only negative marker in SY that has variants ‘kò’ and ‘ò’; but all negative markers in ED except ‘ài’ and ‘tí’ have variants. In terms of behaviour and features of these negative markers in different syntactic positions, a lot of differences exist between those that are attested in SY and ED, bringing about differences in their negative constructions. The paper concluded that, despite the fact that Ègbá dialect is a dialect of Yorùbá, a lot of differences were seen in their negative constructions as a result of the differences in the syntactic positions and features of the negative markers attested in the two speech forms.
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1.0 Introduction

Yorùbá language is one of the major languages spoken in Nigeria. It is widely spoken in the following seven states: Lagos, Ògùn, Òhódó, Òyó, Òṣun, Ékitì and kwara. It is also spoken in Delta, Edo and the western part of Kogi State, though the population of Yorùbá speakers in these three states is less than those in the seven states mentioned earlier.

According to Center for Word Languages/Language Materials Project, University of California, Los Angeles (www.imp.ucla.edu) (Accessed on December 6th, 2011) and Oyétádé (2011:1-2), Yorùbá is spoken by around thirty million (30,000,000) people in Nigeria as a first language. The number rises to thirty-two million (32,000,000) if we include the population of Yorùbá as a second language in Nigeria.

Different researches like Fáfúnwá (2008:1), Adétúgbọ (1982:207-211), Adéyínká (2000:136-154), and Oyétádé (2011:12) have shown that Yorùbá language is equally spoken in some West African countries like, Benin Republic, Togo, Ghana and Cote d’ Voire. Other places include, Cuba, Brazil, Haiti and Trinidad in the Southern part of America.

According to Adéyínká (2000:142), the wide spread of the language has brought about variants in the way the language is spoken in all the areas mentioned above, and it has led to the increase in number of its dialects of which Ègbá is one. Despite the numerous dialects of the language, Yoruba has a variant that is accorded more social status than the other dialects. It is referred to as the Standard Yorùbá (SY).
1.1 Ẹgbá Dialect (ED) and Its Speakers

Ẹgbá speaking areas are located in the eastern part of Ogun state in Nigeria. It is bordered in the North by the Àwòrò people, while it has its boundary to the South of Yewa in Ègbádò. It shares boarder with Èjìbú in the Eastern and South-eastern parts of Ogun State. It occupies an area of about one thousand, eight hundred and sixty-nine (1, 869) square kilometers, with an estimated population of about one million, six hundred and six people (1.66 million) as at the year 2009. Ègbá speaking areas consist mainly of four geographical locations namely: Ègbá Aláké, Ègbá Òkè-ọ̀mà, Ègbá Gbágırà and Ègbá Òwù. Six out of the twenty Local Governments Areas in Ogun State fall within the geographical area of Ègbálánd.

Scholars like Adétúgbò (1973:183-185,1982), Akinkùgbé (1976, 1978), Oyèláràn (1976:621), Awóbùlúyì (1998:10) and Adéniyì (2005:23-54) have worked on Yorùbá dialect classifications. They classified about thirty-two different dialects of the language into different categories. In their different classifications, Ègbá dialect was classified under the North-West Yorùbá.

This paper compares the negative constructions in Standard Yorùbá and Ègbá dialect by taking a look at the different negative markers in the two speech forms, as well as the different syntactic positions in which such markers can occur.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

Government and Binding (GB) Theory is the theory chosen for our analysis in this study. It is otherwise known as Principles and Parameters Theory. It is a theory of Universal Grammar.

Chomsky (198b:7) sees Universal Grammar “as some systems of principles, common to the species and available to each individual prior to experience”. According to Haegeman (1991:13) “Universal Grammar is a system of all the principles that are common to all human languages”. It is the basis for acquiring language; it is seen as underlying all human languages. It is a study of the conditions that must be satisfied by the grammar of all human languages. There is an embedding principle that holds for all languages and this is regarded as Universal Principles. This embedding principle, according to Haegeman (1991:12) tries to render explicit part of the tacit knowledge of the native speaker.

According to Cook and Newson (2007:3,11), “UG Theory holds that speaker knows a set of principles that apply to all languages, and parameters that vary within clearly defined mits from one language to another”. It is a system of components and sub-theories, which are also referred to as modules of grammar, form an interlocking network that interacts with each other. These modules include;

Case Theory: which is concerned with the distribution of NPs within grammatical sentences.
Theθeta Theory: deals with the assignment of semantic roles to participants in a sentence.
Binding Theory: is concerned with the relationships of NP participants in the sentence.
Government Theory: refers to a particular relationship of high abstraction.
X-Bar Theory: deals with the relationship between the head of a phrase and its complement.
Control Theory: specifies the referential possibility of the abstract pronominal elements in infinitive clauses.
Bounding Theory: imposes restrictions on the movement of constituents within a sentence.

GB-Theory has two levels of syntactic structures, the D-structure and the S-structure. At the D-structure, all element are in their original syntactic positions, while at the S-structure, the operation Move-α has restructured the elements.
1.1 Move Alpha

According to Cook and Newson (2007:121), Move-α maps the D-structure onto the S-structure. Its work has to do with transformation whereby it changes the form of one linguistic structure to another. Transformation performs four major functions on a linguistic structure; it can delete formatives which had earlier occurred at the D-structure of a sentence, it can involve substitutions, it can insert new elements into a structure, it can move elements from one position to another in a sentence.

Negation is a form of movement transformation involving insertion of a new element at the S-structure of an affirmative sentence. Negation in SY and ÒD is effected by inserting a negative marker in an affirmative sentence. This marker transforms the affirmative sentence to a negative one. This means, once there is negation movement transformation has also taken place.

2.0 Defining Negation

The concept of ‘Negation’ has been a subject matter that has continued to attract interest from scholars in linguistics. According to Jackson (2007:43), negation is the expression of the denial or reverse of a state of affairs. Lyons (1977:771), also defines negation as denial of a positive proposition, or a predication that a proposition is untrue.

Jesperson (1933:296-300) defines it as a contradiction of an affirmative proposition. According to him, “a sentence may be either negative or positive or else expresses a doubt on the part of the speaker which the hearer is asked to resolve, that is, it may contain a question”. The reason for this, according to him, is that negation is a stronger expression of feelings than affirmative.

Givon (1978:109), clearly differentiates negatives from affirmatives. According to him, negatives constitute a different speech act from affirmatives, whereas affirmatives are used to convey new information on the presumption of the hearer’s ignorance, negatives are used to correct misguided belief on the assumption of the hearer’s error.

In the view of Crystal (2008:323), negation is “a process or construction in grammatical and semantic analysis which typically expresses contradiction of some or all of a sentence’s meaning. In English grammar, negation is expressed by the presence of the negative particle not or n’t (the contracted negative).

Looking critically at these definitions, it could be said that the primary function of negation is to change affirmative sentences from positive to negative sentences. Negation is universally attested in many human languages. However, the process of its realization varies from language to language. Some languages express negation phonologically, through the use of tone, as we find in Igbo language. On the other hand, a language like Yorùbá expresses negation morphologically through the use of negative morphemes. It can also be expressed both phonosyntactically and morphosyntactically as in the case of Echie, a dialect of Igbo (Ndimele 1995:110).

It is widely believed that there are two types of negation in natural languages, negation of the entire sentence and negation of a constituent in the sentence (Quirk and Greenbaum 1988:183-190). Negation has its scope. This scope is the stretch of language over which the negative meaning operates. That is, the scope of negation ranges from the place where the negative morpheme is positioned to the end of the sentence. In other words, every constituent that occurs after the negative morpheme is within the domain of negation and therefore is influenced by the negative reading. This domain is technically referred to in the literature as ‘scope’.

Crystal’s (2008:323) definition of Negation is adopted in this work. According to his definition, English Language makes use of morphemes like ‘not’ or ‘n’t’ (the contracted negative), prefixes such as un-, non-, as its negative markers. This is also the case in Standard Yorùbá and Ògbá dialect.
3.0 Negative Markers in Standard Yorùbá

Yorùbá language, like any other natural language, has a way of negating a constituent or the whole sentence with the use of some negative markers. A lot of research has been carried out by scholars like Awóbúláyì (1978), Bámgbọ́ṣé (1990), Ògúnbọ́wálé (1970), Àdéwọ́lẹ̀ (1992, 2000), Fábùmí (2004), Abódẹ́rín (2005) and others on what negation is in Standard Yorùbá and in some of its dialects. For example, Abódẹ́rín (2005) examined the structural analysis of negation in Àwórí dialect and compared it with what obtains in Standard Yorùbá. Her research revealed that the pronouns affect the shape of the variety of kò in Àwórí dialect and that the number of negators and their variants are more in Àwórí dialect than Standard Yorùbá.

Earlier researches have shown that there are several kinds of negative sentences in Standard Yorùbá and that every such sentence contains at least one negative morpheme that is referred to as the negative marker. The negative markers that are used in Standard Yorùbá, as shown in earlier works, include: kò/ò, kó, kií, má, tí, and ì. They can be exemplified as in (1) below.

(1) a. Adé kò/ò sùn
   Adé NEG sleep
   ‘Adé did not sleep.’

   b. Sángó kí i jé obi
   Sángó NEG eat kola nut
   ‘Sángó doesn’t eat kola nut’

   c. È má pa èkùtè
   2PL NEG kill rat
   ‘Don’t kill rat.’

   d. Adé kó ni ó ni báta
   Adé, NEG FM e, owns shoe
   ‘It is not Adé that owns the shoe.’

   e. Èkò bájé tí
   Lagos spoil NEG
   ‘Lagos did not spoil.’

   f. Àì-fì àkára mu ìòkò
   1PL NEG use bean cake take pap
   ‘We don’t take pap with bean cake.’

As seen in these examples, the negative marker ‘kí’ which the habitual tense marker ‘i’ do occur with [kì i] is used in negating sentences denoting habitual tense, as shown in data (2).

(2) a. Adé a máa sùn
   ‘Adé always sleeps.’
   Adé NEG always sleep
   ‘Adé don’t always sleep.’

   b. Ta ni ó máa ì wá
   ‘Who is always come
   Who NEG came
   ‘Who doesn’t always come.’

It is this same negative marker that is used in negating verb-phrase that has been nominalized and brought forward for focusing in focus construction, as seen in (3) below:

(3) a. Tità ni aṣò
   Sale is cloth
   ‘The cloth is for sale.’

   Kí i sẹ títà ni aṣò
   NEG sale FM cloth
   ‘The cloth is not for sale.’
The negative marker ‘kọ́’ is used in SY to negate noun-phrase and also in focus construction, as shown in (4) below:

(4) a. Ọmọ pupa lọ : Ọmọ pupa kọ́ ni ó lọ
Child red go  Child red NEG FM go
‘Fair complexioned child went.’ ‘It is not the fair complexioned child that went.’

b. Mo fẹ Bọlá : Bọlá kọ mo fẹ́
I marry Bọlá  Bọlá NEG FM i marry
‘I married Bọlá.’ ‘It is not Bọlá that I married.’

Also in SY, ‘má’ is used in negating imperative sentences, as shown in (5):

(5) a. Lọ : Má lọ
‘go!’ NEG go
‘Don’t go.’

b. jáde : Má jáde
‘go out!’ NEG go out
‘Don’t go out.’

‘kọ́/ọ́’ negates simple and interrogative sentences, as seen in (6) :

(6): a. Olú jó : Olú kọ jó. /Olú ọ jó
Olú dance  Olú NEG dance
‘Olú danced’ ‘Olú did not dance’

b. Ta ni ó wá : Ta ni kọ́ wá. / Ta ni ọ́ wá
Who is PRO. come  Who NEG came
‘Who came?’ ‘Who did not come?’

c. Owó wá ni Ògbá : Kọ́ sí owó ní Ògbá
Money PRESENT in Ògbá NEG PRESENT money in Ògbá
‘There is money in Ògbá.’ ‘There is no money in Ògbá.’

As shown in (6), the negative marker has two variants; ‘kọ́’ and ‘ọ́’. The variant ‘kọ́’ can occur at both initial and medial positions in negative constructions, while ‘ọ́’ can only occur at medial position.

Another negative marker in the language is ‘tì’. The negative marker is used in sentential negation. It negates the whole sentence as shown in (7).

(7) a. Ògbá bájé : Ọkọ bájé tì
Lagos spoil  Lagos spoil NEG
‘Lagos is spoil’d.’ ‘Lagos did not spoil.’

b. Adé wa mótò : Adé wa mótò tì
Adé drive a car/vehicle  Adé drive a car/vehicle NEG
‘Adé drove a car/vehicle’. ‘Adé could not drive a car/vehicle’.
To negate a verb-phrase in SY, the negator ‘àì’ is used, as seen in example (8).

(8) a. Gbá bóòlù : Àgbábóòlù
   Play ball   NEG play ball
   ‘Play ball.’ : Not playing ball.’

   b. ãe iyè : Àlìíyè
   do work    NEG do work
   ‘To do a work’. ‘The act of not working’.

4. Negative Markers in Ègbá Dialect

   Compared with the amount of literature on negation in general linguistics and in Standard Yorùbá, little or nothing has been done on negation in Ègbá dialect, but much has been done on Àwórì, a sister dialect also spoken in Ogun state and part of Lagos state. Data collected for this research revealed that Ègbá dialect, like the Standard Yorùbá, exhibits two types of negation; sentential and constituent negations with the use of the following negative markers: kò/èè, kò ú/èè ú, kó/èèí, àì and ti. Their syntactic distribution can be shown as in (9):

   ‘Kò/èè’
   (9) i. a. Dede wa kò gbà yèn
         All of us   NEG accept that
         ‘All of us did not accept that.’

 b. Adé éè  r’Olù
    Adé NEG see Olú
    ‘Adé did not see Olú.’

c. Èè s’ówó li Ègbá
    NEG money in Ègbá
    ‘There is no money in Ègbá.’

   ‘Kó/èèí’
   ii. a. Adé kò re mo pè
         Adé NEG FM I call
         ‘It is not Adé that I called.’

 b. Èèí ñe ‘rè, Bólá wà
    NEG you Bólá FM
    ‘It is not you, it is Bólá.’

   ‘kò ú/èè ú’
   iii. a. Omò kò ú bó li òwó Akëdun
         Child NEG drop be hand monkey
         ‘Child does not drop from monkey’s hand.’
b. Leè kò ñ wè
   who NEG bath
   ‘Who does not bath.’

c. Èè ñ şèmi rò má şè yèn
   NEG be me FM will do that
   ‘It is not me that will do that.’

d. Adè éè ñ sùn
   Adè NEG Sleep
   ‘Adè does not sleep.’

   ‘tì’

   iv. a. Wón ș’asëti
        They did NEG
        ‘They could not finish.’

   b. Èkò bâjè tì
      Lagos NEG spoil
      ‘Lagos did not spoil.’

   ‘àì’

   v. a. Àì-fì ilá jè láffùn
        NEG use okra eat cassava flour
        ‘We don’t eat okra with cassava flour.’

Going by the data in (9) above, it is seen that most of the negative markers attested in Ègbá dialect have variants. For example, the negative marker ‘kò/éè’ which the habitual tense marker in the dialect ‘ní’ do occur with has two variants; ‘kò ñ’ and ‘éè ñ’. This negative marker is used in negating sentences denoting habitual tense, as shown in (10):

(10) a. Adé a má sùn : Adè éè ñ sùn
       ‘Adè always sleeps.’       Adè NEG always sleep
       ‘Adè don’t always sleep.’

       b. Sàngó a má jobí : Sàngó kò ñ jobí
          ‘Sàngó always eat kola nut..’ Sàngó NEG always eat kola nut
          ‘Sàngó don’t always eat kola nut.’

The same negative marker negates verb-phrase that has been nominalized and fronted for focusing in ÈD, as seen in (11) below:

(11) Tità re așo : Èè ñ şe tità re așo
       Sale is cloth       NEG sale FM cloth
       ‘The cloth is for sale.’       ‘The cloth is not for sale.’
With data (10) and (11), it is clear that ‘kọ́ ń’ occur only at medial position of a negative construction in ÉD while ‘éé ń’ can occur at both initial and medial positions. It occurs at the initial position when it is negating the verb-phrase that has been nominalized and brought forward for focusing in focus construction, as seen in (11). In a situation like this, it will be followed by the auxiliary ‘ṣe’. But when it occurs at the medial position, the NP that precedes it must end with vowel ‘é’, with a rising tone. As shown in (10a)

‘kọ́’ is the negative marker employed in negating noun-phrase, and focus construction in ÉD, it also has two variants; ‘kọ́’ and ‘éé’ as the examples in data (12) below as shown:

(12) a. Òmọ́ pupa lọ́ : Ẹ́è i s’ọmọ́ pupa rọ́ lọ́
   Child red go NEG is child red FM go
   ‘Fair complexioned child went.’ ‘It is not the fair complexioned child that went.’

   b. Mo fẹ́ Bólá : Ẹ́è i s Bólá re mo fẹ́/ Bólá kọ́ re mo fẹ́
      I marry Bólá NEG is Bólá FM i marry/ Bólá NEG FM i marry
      ‘I married Bólá.’ ‘It is not Bólá that i married.’

The variant ‘kọ́’ occurs in the medial position of a negative construction in ÉD while it changes form to ‘éé’ whenever it occurs at the initial position. If we compare what we have in (3a) with (12) it shows clearly that ‘éé’ behaves exactly like the negative marker ‘kì ń’ in SY when it appears at the initial position. The reason for this behaviour is not far from the fact that, just as the negative markers ‘kì ń’ and ‘kọ́’ negate focus construction in SY so do the negative markers ‘kọ́’ and the variant ‘éé’ in ÉD.

In negating interrogative and simple sentences in ÉD, the negative marker ‘kọ́’ is employed. Like other negative markers in the dialect, ‘kọ́’ also have ‘kọ́’ and ‘éé’ as variants. Unlike its behaviour and distribution in SY, that ‘kọ́’ can feature at both the initial and medial positions, ‘kọ́’ in ÉD will only occur at the medial position of a negative construction while ‘éé’ has the opportunity of occurring at both the medial and initial positions. Whenever it occurs at the medial position, the last vowel of the NP that precedes it must be vowel ‘é’ with a rising tone, just as it is for the negative marker ‘éé ń’, the variant of ‘kọ́ ń’ as seen in (9c.iv and 10a.) above.

With this observation, we can then conclude that, it is the variants that call for the types of NPs that will precede them. Data (13) below illustrate our explanation:

(13)

   a. Òwó wà lì Ògábá : Ẹ́è s’òwó wà Ògábá
      Money PRE. in Ògábá NEG money in Ògábá
      ‘There is money in Ògábá.’ ‘There is no money in Ògábá.’

   b. Adé r’Òlá : Ẹ́è sì Òlá
      Adé see Olú Adé NEG see Olú
      ‘Adé saw Olú.’ ‘Adé did not see Olú.’

   c. Ènì iyi mọ́kọ́n : Ènì iyi kọ́ mọ́kọ́n
      One who understand One who NEG understand
      ‘One who understands.’ ‘One who does not understands.’

With data (1a, 6a-b,&10) it is clearly shown that the syntactic position and behaviour of the variant ‘éé’ in ÉD is quite different from that of ‘ó’ which is also a variant of the negative marker ‘kọ́’ in SY. Where the difference lies is that, while it is possible for the variant ‘éé’ in ÉD to occur at both the initial and medial position of Ògábá negative constructions, it is not so for the variant ‘ó’ in SY. This negative marker can only occur at the medial position, and whenever it occurs, it occurs with any type of noun, unlike what obtains for the negative markers ‘éé’ and ‘éé ń’ to feature at the medial positions in ÉD negative constructions.
As it is in SY, ED also makes use of the negative marker ‘tì’. This marker is used in sentential negations, as seen in (14) below:

(14)  
a. Òkó bàjé : Òkó bàjé tì  
   Lagos spoil : Lagos NEG spoil  
   ‘Lagos is spoilt.’ : ‘Lagos did not spoil.’

   b. Olú ṣe isé : Olú ṣe isé tì  
     Olú did work : Olú did work NEG  
     ‘Olú worked.’ : ‘Olú did not work.’

In negating verb-phrase in ED, the negative marker ‘àì’ is employed as shown in (15):

(15)  
a. Àìláya ló mú wọ̀n tòṣi  
     NEG wife is make 3PLR wretched

   b. Àibímọ̀ ró dún mí  
     NEG give birth is pain me

   ‘Not having wife makes them wretched.’

   ‘Not giving birth pains me.’

With respect to all the data in (4.1) and (5.1) it is further clear that both SY and ED exhibit sentential and constituent negations with the use of negative morphemes referred to as negative markers. However, it has been noted prior to our analysis that the syntactic positions and behaviours of some negative markers in ED and SY differ.

5. Comparing Negative Constructions in Standard Yorùbá and Ègbá Dialect

There are various kinds of sentences among which are: simple, compound and complex sentences. By Dawl’s (1973:183) definition of negation, “negation means converting S₁ to S₂ such that S₂ is false while S₁ is true”. It then means that through transformation, all sentences can be negated. This section compares the negative constructions in SY with that of ED so as to know the area of similarities and differences. We will not be able to compare all sentences in this work, for this reason, we will limit our comparison to simple sentence, imperative sentence and focus construction.

5.1 Simple Sentence Negation

Tallerman (2005:68-69), describes a simple sentence as a sentence containing a single predication. It is made up of one noun phrase subject and a predicate traditionally regarded as a single verb. Simple sentences usually expresses one main idea. It has one subject and one finite verb. Below are examples of simple sentence in SY and ED:

(16)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>SY</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Olú jó</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>Olú kò/ò jó.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olú dance</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>Olú NEG dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Olú danced.’</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Olú did not dance.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Owó wà ní Ègbá</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>Kò sì owó ní Ègbá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money PRESENT in Ègbá</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>NEG PRESENT in Ègbá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘There is money in Ègbá.’</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘There is no money in Ègbá.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c.

(17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aphormative</th>
<th>ẸD</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Adé sùn</td>
<td>Adé kò/éè sùn</td>
<td>Adé sùn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adé sleep</td>
<td>Adé NEG sleep</td>
<td>Adé did not sleep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Adé slept..’</td>
<td>‘Adé did not sleep.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Owó wà lí Ègbá</td>
<td>Éè s’ówó lí Ègbá</td>
<td>Money PRE. in Ègbá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘There is money in Ègbá.’</td>
<td>‘There is no money in Ègbá.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Adé kò [+PAST] sùn</td>
<td>Adé kò [+PAST] sùn</td>
<td>Adé did not sleep.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adé éè sùn</td>
<td>Adé did not sleep.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Going by what we have in data (16a, b, c) and (17a, b, c) above, ‘kò’ is the negative marker employed by the speech forms in negating simple sentences. The syntactic position of the marker in the two languages is the same and it is usually being preceded by a third person as its subject. However, the behaviour and distribution of the marker is not the same in these two speech forms.

In terms of behaviour, this negative marker as ‘kò’ and ‘ò’ has variants in SY. The variant ‘ò’ is morphologically conditioned to occur at the medial position and before any type of noun phrase of a negative construction, while ‘kò’ has a wider distribution of occurrence by featuring in the medial and initial positions.

The case is not so in ED. It is the variant ‘éè’ that has a wider occurrence than ‘kò’ in the dialect. ‘Éè’ can occur at both initial and medial positions, while ‘kò’ can only feature at the medial position irrespective of the type of NP subject that precedes it. The occurrence of the variant ‘éè’ in the medial position is also morphologically conditioned because it can only feature after a noun phrase ending with a high tone vowel ‘é’ unlike ‘ò’ that can occur after any type of NP subject in SY.

In terms of features, the negative marker ‘kò’ in ED becomes ‘éè’ at the initial position when the NP subject is silent or got deleted. What we observed here is being referred to in the field of Linguistics as replacive. This morphological or syntactic process is described by Crystal, (2008:413) as a term sometimes used in morphology to refer to a morph postulated to account for such problematic internal alternations. According to his examples, man ~ men, take ~ took, etc. The ‘replacive morph’ here would be stated as $a \rightarrow e$, $a \rightarrow o$. The same morphological rule that has changed ‘a’ to ‘e’ and ‘a’ to ‘o’ in man/men and take/took has changed the negative marker ‘kò’ in ED to ‘éè’ when it occurs at the initial position or after a NP ending with a high tone vowel ‘é’ in the medial position of a negative constructions, as seen in (17) above and (19) below:

(19)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NEGP} & \rightarrow \text{Spec NEG' NEG IP NP Spec I VP Tns V NP [+] PRES N PP} \\
\Ø & \rightarrow Éè yà mí lí ënu \\
\text{NEG} & \rightarrow \text{open me in mouth} \\
\text{‘I am not surprised.’}
\end{align*}
\]
5.2 Imperative sentence negation.

In our everyday language use, we express commands. The command sentences (of the simple type) could be mild, or harsh. Commands are also called imperative sentence. The subject of this sentence is always a second person. If the subject is singular, it becomes deleted at the surface level, but if the subject is plural, it must surface and take position at the surface level of the sentence. For example:

(20)

SY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Jáde (SG. subject)</td>
<td>Má jáde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go out.'</td>
<td>‘Don’t go out.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Jókóó (SG. subject)</td>
<td>Má jókóó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘sit down.’</td>
<td>‘Don’t sit down.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. E jáde (PL subject)</td>
<td>E má jáde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL go out</td>
<td>2PL NEG go out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘go out.’</td>
<td>‘Don’t go out.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. E dijú yín</td>
<td>E má dijú yín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL close eye your</td>
<td>2PL NEG close eye your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘close your eyes.’</td>
<td>‘Don’t close your eyes.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The negative marker ‘má’ negates imperative sentence in SY, as seen in (20a-e). It is mandatory for the subject of this sentence to appear at the surface level if the subject is plural. It is at the back of this subject that the negative marker will occur. This means that the negative marker here is occurring at the medial position of the sentence. But once the subject is singular and got deleted, the negative marker will occur at the initial position, as seen in (10a-b).

Data collected for this work revealed that ‘má’ is not attested as a negative marker in ED but rather, as a progressive marker. Whenever the marker ‘má’ is used in ED, the meaning is usually that of positive, meaning that the addressee should start or continue with the action he is about to initiate or that he has just
initiated unlike its negative meaning in SY, that will compel the addressee to stop or deny the action that we are talking about. For example, (21) below shows the use of the marker ‘má’ in ED sentences.

(21) a. Má lọ. ‘Be going’
    b. Má sun orun rè. ‘Be sleeping /Continue your sleeping’
    c. Má lọ sójà lí kiá. ‘Be going to the market’

By what we have in data (21), the marker is an auxiliary that act exactly like the primary auxiliary verb ‘be’ in English Language. In Yorùbá Language, auxiliaries can either occur before or after the main lexical verb. Those that can occur before the main verb are further classified into four groups; those acting as negators, modal auxiliaries, and tense and aspect markers. ‘má’ in SY comes under negators because of its negative meaning in the language while it comes under tense marker in ẸD because of its meaning as a progressive marker. ‘má’ in ED has been discovered in this work to have the same meaning and features with ‘máă’ which is also a progressive marker, when it occurs and stands alone in a sentence without any other marker in SY. Compare (22) and (23) below to have further insight to our explanations.

(22) a. Túnjí má bò lîbi. ‘Túnjí be coming here.’
    b. Olú má faṣọ rè lí kiá. ‘Olú be washing your cloth now.’
    c. Má lọ. ‘Be going.’
    d. Má lọ sójà lí kiá. ‘Be going to the market now.’

(23) a. Túnjí máa bò nibí. ‘Túnjí be coming here’
    b. Olú máa foṣọ rè ní kiá. ‘Olú be washing your cloth now.’
    c. Máa lọ. ‘Be going.’
    d. Máa lọ sójà ní kiá. ‘Be going to the market now.’

In negating an imperative sentence in ED, the dialect makes use of the negative marker ‘kò’ followed by the modal auxiliary ‘gbudọ’ which normally indicates necessity in terms of mood in the dialect. Unlike in SY where the subject of the sentence will be deleted at the surface structure of the affirmative and the negated construction of an imperative sentence if it is a second person singular, the case is not always so in ED. Whether the subject is singular or plural, it must take its position at the surface structure of the negative construction. The constructions in (24) below shows the negated form of an imperative sentence in ED

(24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Jáde (SG. subject) go out.’</td>
<td>O kò gbudọ jáde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2SG NEG MOD go out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘You must not go out.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Jókòó (SG. subject) ‘sit down.’</td>
<td>O kò gbudọ jókòó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2SG NEG MODA sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘You must not sit down.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Ẹ jáde (PL subject) : Ẹ kò gbudò jáde  
2PL go out 
‘go out.’  
‘You must not go out.’

d. Ẹ dijú yín  
2PL close eye your  
‘close your eyes.’  
: Ẹ kò gbudò dijú yín  
2PL NEG MODA close eye  
‘You must not close your eyes.’

e. 

The examples and the tree diagrams in (20), (21), (22), (23) and (24) clearly show that the marker ‘má’ is not attested as a negative marker in ED as it is in SY but rather a progressive marker. While ‘má’ negates an imperative sentence in SY, the negative marker ‘kò’ is employed in ED.

If we compare the negative construction of the two languages here, it is observed that the negative markers ‘má’ in SY and ‘kò’ in ED are what the languages use in negating imperative sentence. In terms of syntactic position, these negative markers occur in the same syntactic position in the two languages. Where the differences lie is that in SY, the negator will occur at the initial position, if the subject is a second person singular (the subject must be deleted) but in ED, whether the subject is singular or plural, it must occur before the negative marker, so the negative marker occurs after the subject.

It is also noted that it is possible to delete the singular subject in ED as seen in (25). If the construction takes this format, the negative marker ‘kò’ will feature as ‘éé’ and still be followed by the modal auxiliary ‘gbudọ’. The reason for the sudden change of ‘kò’ to ‘éé’ is that ‘kò’ cannot occur at the initial position of a negative construction in the dialect.

In terms of behaviour, the negative marker ‘kò’ and its variant ‘éé’ in ED cannot occur in these negative constructions without the support of the modal auxiliary ‘gbudọ’ which further shows the relationship of the negative marker and the lexical verb that is negate unlike in SY where the negative marker will occur directly before the NP.

(25) jáde (SG subject) : Éè gbudọ jáde  
2SG go out  
‘go out.’  
NEG MODA go out  
‘You must not go out.’
5.3 Negation and Focus Construction

Jackendoff (1972:230) observes that focus denotes the information in the sentence that is assumed by the speaker not to be shared by him and the hearer. Baker (1995) defines focus as ‘a construction that is specifically designed to serve an identificational function’. Focusing is a way of rendering a constituent of a sentence emphatic. When a constituent is focused, it is moved from its original position to the sentence initial position. This sentence initial position is what we refer to as the spec of FP.

When the Subject NP is focused, i.e. when the Subject NP is moved to the Spec of FP, it leaves behind a resumptive pronoun which heads the cleft of sentence, but when the Object NP of the Verb Phrase or Prepositional Phrase is focused, it leaves behind an empty category (i.e., a trace). The verb is focused through a nominalization process and leave a copy of the verb at the original position. The focus marker in SY is ‘ni’, while ‘re’ is the focus marker in ẸD.

Example of focus construction in SY and ẸD can be shown as in (26).

\[(26a)\] Adé je àgbádo (SY) (d- structure) Adé je ọkà (ẸD) (d- structure)

i. Adé, ni ó, je àgbádo ni Òkó Adé FM PRO eat corn in Lagos Adé FM PRO eat corn in Lagos ‘It is Adé that ate corn in Lagos.’ ‘It is Adé that ate corn in Lagos.’

ii. Jiże, ni Adé je, àgbádo ni Òkó Jiże, re Adé je, ọkà li Òkó Eating FM Adé eat corn in Lagos Eating FM Adé eat corn in Lagos ‘It was eating that Adé ate corn in Lagos.’ ‘It was eating that Adé ate corn in Lagos’

iii. Àgbádo, ni Adé je, tì ni Òkó Corn FM Adé eat corn in Lagos Corn FM Adé eat corn in Lagos ‘It is corn that Adé ate in Lagos.’ ‘It is corn that Adé ate in Lagos.’

iv. Òkó, ni Adé ti je àgbádo tì Lagos FM is Adé eats corn Lagos FM is Adé eats corn ‘It is in Lagos that Adé ate corn.’ ‘It is in Lagos that Adé ate corn.’

Each of these constituents that has been focused can be negated as seen in (27).

\[(27)\]

i. Adé, kó ni ó, je àgbádo Adé NEG FM PRO eat corn Adé NEG FM PRO eat corn ‘It is not Adé that ate corn.’ ‘It is not Adé that ate corn.’

ii. Jiże, kó ni Adé je, àgbádo Jiège, re Adé je, ọkà Eating NEG FM Adé eat corn Eating NEG FM Adé eat corn ‘It was not eating that Adé ate corn.’ ‘It was eating that Adé ate corn.’

iii. Àgbádo, kó ni Adé je, tì ni Òkó Corn NEG FM Adé eat in Lagos Corn NEG FM Adé eat in Lagos ‘It is not corn that Adé ate in Lagos.’ ‘It is not corn that Adé ate in Lagos.’
iv. Èkò, kó ni Adè ti jè àgbàdo tì, Lagos NEG FM is Adè eat corn Lagos NEG FM is Adè eat corn ‘It is not in Lagos that Adè ate corn.’ ‘It is not in Lagos that Adè ate corn.’

In SY and ED, the negative marker ‘kó’ is used in negating NP constituents. The NP can either be at the subject or object position. But in a situation whereby the NP is a pronoun, the NP will be replaced by a pronominal when focusing. When negating in this type of construction, the negative marker ‘kó’ is also employed in the two speech forms and it comes in the same syntactic position, as seen in (28)

(28) i. Émi, kó ni mo, mu ëmu/ Émi, kó ni ó, mu ëmu (SY)
    1sg NEG FM i drink palmwine
    ‘I am not the one who drank palm wine.’

    ii. Èwa, kó ni à, je àgbàdo (SY)
        3pl NEG FM eat corn
        ‘We are not the one that ate the corn.’

    iii. Èwa, kó ro e, je ókà (ED)
         3pl NEG FM eat corn
         ‘We are not the one that ate the corn.’

‘Kì i’ is another negative marker used as a negator in negating NP constituent in SY. Unlike ‘kó’ that will come after the NP, ‘Kì i’ usually occur before the NP, and must be followed by the auxiliary ‘ṣe’ before the surface of the NP that is negating. In this type of negative construction in ED, the negative marker ‘ééì’ which is a variant of ‘kó’ in the dialect as discussed in (12) is used, also followed by the auxiliary ‘ṣe’, as illustrated in (29)

(29) i. Kì i ìṣe Adè ni ó jè àgbàdo NEG is Adè FM PRO eat corn ‘Is not Adè that ate corn.’

    ii. Kì i ìṣe àgbàdo ni Adè je NEG is corn FM Adè eat ‘It was not corn that Adè ate.’

    iii. Kì i ìṣe jìjì ni Adè je àgbàdo NEG is eating FM Adè eat corn ‘It was not eating that Adè ate corn.’

    i. Ééì ìṣe Adè ro je kà NEG is Adè FM PRO eat corn ‘Is not Adè that ate corn.’

    ii. Ééì ìṣe ókà re Adè je NEG is corn FM Adè eat ‘It was not corn that Adè ate.’

    iii. Ééì ìṣe jìjì re Adè je ókà NEG is eating FM Adè eat corn ‘It was not eating that Adè ate corn.’

From data (26), (27), (28) and (29) it can be observed that ‘kó’ and ‘Kì i’ are the two major types of negative markers employed in negating NP constituents in focus constructions in SY while ED makes use of ‘kó’ and its variant ‘ééì’. Looking at the behaviour of these negative markers in the two languages, ‘kó’ will occur after the NP that is negating in both languages. Whenever the negative marker is to come before the NP to be negated, ‘Kì i’ is the negative marker to occur in this type of negative construction in SY, while ‘ééì’ the variant of ‘kó’ in ED will occur in this same type of negative construction in ED. The reason for the
occurrence of ‘éèì’ here is that ‘kò’ which ‘éèì’ is its variant cannot occur at word initial but at word medial in the language just as ‘kò’ cannot also occur as word initial in SY.

As observed, ‘éèì’ is not restricted to a specific type of NP that can come before it in a negative construction. This makes its behaviour different from that of ‘éèì’ and ‘éè n’ which are the variants of ‘kò’ and ‘kò n’ in ED negative constructions.

**Conclusion**

This paper has compared the negative constructions in SY and ED. The paper revealed that while the marker ‘má’ is attested as a negative marker in SY, it is attested as a progressive marker in ED. It was also revealed that the negative marker ‘kò’ is the only negative marker in SY that has variants ‘kò’ and ‘ò’; but all negative markers in ED except ‘ài’ and ‘tì’ have variants. The paper finally concluded that, despite the fact that Ògbà dialect is a dialect of Yorùbá, a lot of differences were seen in their negative constructions as a result of the differences in the syntactic positions and features of the negative markers attested in the two speech forms.
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