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### Introduction

- **Overview**
  - 1. Typological aspects of negation
    - Overview of existing typological studies (cf. Miestamo 2007)
      - Standard negation
      - Negation in imperatives
      - Negation in existential clauses
      - Negative indefinite pronouns
      - Towards a typological questionnaire on negation
  - 2. Uralic languages
  - 3. Conclusions
- Issues of explanation not addressed, focus is on taxonomies and structural features observed in typological literature.

---

### Standard negation

- **The negation of declarative verbal main clauses**
- **Parameters in typological studies:**
  - Type of negative marker (Dahl 1979; Payne 1985, Dryer 2005)
  - Position of negative marker (Dahl 1979; Dryer 1988, 1992)
  - Symmetric vs. asymmetric negation, subtypes of asymmetric negation (Miestamo 2005).

---

### Type of negative marker: affix

- Lezgian (Haspelmath 1993: 245)
  - xürta-wal-ja / ada-waj meslül-ar qayt-u-zwa-ê
  - villager-PRES(ERG) he-ADV claim-PRES-IMP-Neg
  - ‘The villagers do not take advice from him.’
- Lutvian (Lazanja 1966: 22)
  - es ne-tev
  - I NEG-believe
  - ‘I don’t believe.’
- Chukchi (Kampé and Vobodin 1995: 68)
  - a-sto-ka
  - (ito-musa)
  - NEG-go.out-Neg be-DUR
  - ‘(S)he does not go out.’

---

### Type of negative marker: particle

- Indonesian (Sneddon 1996: 195; David Gil, p.c.)
  - mereka tidak menolong kami
  - they NEG help us,EXCL
  - ‘They didn’t help us.’
- Sawu (Walker 1982: 13)
  - wie d’o Ø roo Ø q’ô ’ri woo
  - give NEG ABS 3PL ABS FOOD ERG 3SG
  - ‘He did not give them food.’
- French (constructed examples)
  - je ne chante pas
  - 1SG NEG sing.PRES 1SG NEG
  - ‘I do not sing.’

---

### Type of negative marker: verb

- Evenki (Nedjalkov 1994: 2)
  - nunar min-du putar-va e-che-n be-re
  - he 1SG-DAT knife-ACC NEG-PST-3SG give-PTCP
  - ‘He did not give me the knife.’
- Selknam (Najlis 1973: 58)
  - xe-si sô-we-an
come-SURF NEG-GND-CERT.M
  - ‘He is not coming.’
- Tongan (Churchward 1953: 56)
  - ma’e tikai ke ’alu ’a siale
  - PST NEG SHUN go ABS Statle
  - ‘Siale did not go.’
Negation

1. Typological aspects

Negative markers (Dryer 2005)

- Jespersen (1917): Neg-First
- Dahl (1979): Tendency to occur close to finite element
- Dryer (1992): Negative particles tend to be preposed, negative auxiliaries show correlation with basic word order
- Preposed: Latvian, Indonesian, Evenki, Tongan
- Postposed: Lezgian, Sawu, Selknam
- Circumposed: Chukchi, French

Position of negative marker

- Jespersen (1917): Neg-First
- Dahl (1979): Tendency to occur close to finite element
- Dryer (1992): Negative particles tend to be preposed, negative auxiliaries show correlation with basic word order
- Preposed: Latvian, Indonesian, Evenki, Tongan
- Postposed: Lezgian, Sawu, Selknam
- Circumposed: Chukchi, French

Position of negative marker: Clause-peripheral examples

- These are not frequent.

Tera (Newman 1970: 128)
- ali nò mura gorò ba
  Ali PEV buy a kola NEG
  ‘Ali didn’t buy kola.’

Ngįmbua (Donaldson 1980: 239)
- wagay wizar manabi-ŋjį
  NEG woman.ABS hunt.PST
  ‘The woman didn’t go hunting.’

Symmetric and asymmetric negation (Miestamo 2005)

- In symmetric negation, negatives do not differ structurally from affirmatives except for the presence of the negative marker(s).
- In asymmetric negation, there are structural differences, i.e. asymmetry, between affirmatives and negatives in addition to the presence of the negative marker(s).
- Symmetry and asymmetry can be observed in constructions and paradigms.
- Asymmetric negation can be further divided into subtypes.

Symmetric constructions

Negatives differ from their corresponding affirmative by the mere presence of negative markers.

Taba (Bowden 1997: 388)
- n-han ak-la
  3SG go ALL-SEA
  ‘She’s going seawards.’
- n-han ak-la te
  3SG go ALL-SEA NEG
  ‘She’s not going seawards.’

Washo (Jacobsen 1964: 603, 604–605)
- t-ineči-hu-i
  1-DRINK-PL.INCL-IMPF
  ‘We are drinking.’
- t-ineči-es-hu-i
  1-DRINK-NEG-PL.INCL-IMPF
  ‘We are not drinking.’

Symmetric paradigms

The correspondences between the members of the paradigms used in affirmatives and negatives are one-to-one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romanian (constructed examples)</th>
<th>a. (a) cânta 'to sing' PRES</th>
<th>b. (a) cânta 'to sing' IMPF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG cântă nu cântă cântam nu cântăm</td>
<td>AFF NEG AFF NEG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG cântă nu cântă cântă nu cântă</td>
<td>AFF AFF AFF AFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG cântă nu cântă cântă nu cântă</td>
<td>AFF AFF AFF AFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL cântăm nu cântăm cântăm nu cântăm</td>
<td>AFF AFF AFF AFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL cântați nu cântați cântați nu cântați</td>
<td>AFF AFF AFF AFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL cântă nu cântă cântați nu cântați</td>
<td>AFF AFF AFF AFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asymmetric constructions

Diola Fogny (Sapir 1965: 33)

a. pan-i-mag b. let-i-mag
FUT-1SG-want FUT-NEG-1SG-want
‘I will want.’ ‘I won’t want.’

Makah (Matthew Davidson, p.c.)

a. weRi-(b)ju-i hryuk-3q
sleeping-PST-IND.3SG man-ART
‘The man was sleeping.’

b. wiki-(b)ju-i weRi hryuk-3q
NEG-PST-IND.3SG sleeping man-ART
‘The man was not sleeping.’

Asymmetric paradigms

The correspondences between the members of the paradigms used in affirmatives and negatives are not one-to-one.

Burmese (Cornya 1944: 12–13)

a. ðwã-ðè  b. ðwã-më  c. ðwã-bí
go-ACT go-POT go-PERF
‘goes, went’ ‘will go’ ‘has gone’

d. ma-ðwã-bë
NEG-go-NEG
‘does/did/will not go, has not gone’

Symmetric and asymmetric negation

NB! The maps concerning standard negation are based on an areally and genealogically balanced subsample (179/297 languages).

Subtype A/Fin

Negatives differ from affirmatives in that the lexical verb (LV) loses its finiteness, in one or more of the following ways: i) it becomes syntactically dependent on a finite element (FE) added in the negative, ii) it is in a form primarily used as a syntactically dependent verb in the language, iii) it has nominal characteristics.

Subtype A/Fin/Neg-LV

The lexical verb loses its finiteness and the negative marker attaches to the lexical verb.

Apalai (Koehn & Koehn 1986: 64)

a. isapokara [0]-ece-no
jakuruu.lizard [1 > 3]-see-IM PST
‘I saw a jakuruu lizard.’

b. isapokara un-ece-pyra a-ken
jakuruu.lizard 3-see-NEG 1-be-IM PST
‘I did not see a jakuruu lizard.’
Subtype A/Fin/Neg-FE

The lexical verb loses its finiteness and the negative marker attaches to the added finite element.

Korean (Ramsdell 1997 [1939]: 104, 184)

a. kan-do
   go-DECL
   ‘I go.’

b. ka-ni
   go-INV NEG AUX-DECL
   ‘I do not go.’

Subtype A/Fin/NegVerb

The lexical verb loses its finiteness and the negative marker is the finite element of the negative clause.


a. caq ta-ka
   eat 3SG.R.PST/PRES-3N
   ‘He ate meat.’

b. ‘caq caq’ ca-ka-ca
   NEG N.R.PST/PRES eat 3SG.M-3N-animal
   ‘He did not eat meat.’

Comrie’s hierarchy (1981)

imperative
   > {tense / person / number}
   > mood
      > aspect
         > voice

Revisited in Miestamo (2004)

Valid for non-Uralic languages as well.
With the exception of the imperative, this hierarchy conforms to what is marked on finite auxiliaries and dependent (lexical) verbs more generally in the world’s languages.

Subtype A/NonReal

The negative differs from the corresponding affirmative in that it is marked for a category that denotes non-realized states of affairs.

Maung (Capell and Hinch 1970: 67)

a. nj-talba
   1SG>3-pug
   ‘I put.’

b. nj-talba-ji
   1SG>3-pug-IRR.NPST
   ‘I can put.’

c. ma-nj- nj-ja
   NEG 1SG>3-pug-IRR.NPST
   ‘I do not put.’
1. Typological aspects

**Subtype A/NonReal**

The negative differs from the corresponding affirmative in that it is marked for a category that denotes non-realized states of affairs.

**Subtype A/Emph**

The negative differs from the corresponding affirmative in that it is marked for a category that expresses emphasis in non-negatives.

**Subtype A/Emph**

The negative differs from the corresponding affirmative in that it is marked for a category that expresses emphasis in non-negatives.

**Subtype A/Cat**

Negatives differ from affirmatives in how grammatical categories are marked, but no generalizations can be made about how the categories are affected (as is done in the other three subtypes). Grammatical distinctions made in the affirmative are often lost in the negative.

**Subtype A/Cat/TAM**

A/Cat asymmetry affecting the marking of tense-aspect-mood.

Central Siberian Yupik (Jacobson 1990: 24, 68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'He is sleeping'</td>
<td>'He is not sleeping'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bagirmi (Stevenson 1969: 83, 91, 130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'I have come.'</td>
<td>'I did not come.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subtype A/Cat/PNG

A/Cat asymmetry affecting the marking of person-number-gender.

Karok (Bright: 1957: 67, 138)

a. *kuu-$\nu$-kâ-r-er* 3PL/3SG-kill-PST NEG-kill-3PL/3SG-PST
   ‘They killed [him/her].’

b. *pu-$\nu$-kâ-r-er* 3PL/3SG-kill-PST NEG-kill-3PL/3SG-PST
   ‘They did not kill [him/her].’

c. *pu-$\nu$-kâ-r-er* 3PL/3SG-kill-PST NEG-kill-3PL/3SG-PST
   ‘He doesn’t arrive.’

d. *pu-$\nu$-kâ-r-er* 3PL/3SG-kill-PST NEG-kill-3PL/3SG-PST
   ‘He doesn’t arrive.’

Harar Oromo (Owens 1985: 66)

a. ‘go’, PST, AFF: 1SG deem-e, 2SG deem-t-e, 3SG,EM, 2SG deem-t-e
   1PL, deem-n-e, 2PL, deem-n-an, 3PL, deem-an

b. ‘go’, PST, NEG: ALL PERSONS hin-deem-n-e

---

Variation in the marking of negation

- Certain grammatical environments are more likely than others to have negative constructions different from standard negation.
- In Kahrel’s (1996: 70–71) 40-language sample, imperatives, existentials and nonverbal clauses were the most common environments for nonstandard negative constructions:
  - Imperatives showed nonstandard negatives in 17 languages.
  - Existentials in nine languages.
  - Nonverbal clauses in eight languages.
- In addition to these three clause types, different environments, e.g., different TAM categories, may show different negative constructions, even within SN, but no typological generalizations can be made over these environments.

---

Negative imperatives: Type I (van der Auwera & Lejeune 2005)

The prohibitive uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives.

Bagirmi (Stevenson 1969: 91, 93, 95)

- ab ‘be’
- ab eli ‘Don’t go!’
- je j-ab eli ‘We did not go.’

---

Negative imperatives: Type II (van der Auwera & Lejeune 2005)

The prohibitive uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives.

Purépecha (Chamoué 2000: 112, 242)

- ab ‘be’
- ab eli ‘Don’t go!’
- je j-ab eli ‘We did not go.’

---

Negative imperatives: Type III (van der Auwera & Lejeune 2005)

The prohibitive uses a verbal construction other than the second singular positive imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives.

Italian (constructed examples)

- canta ‘sing’
- non canta ‘Don’t sing!’

---
Negative imperatives: Type IV (van der Auwera & Lejeune 2005)

The prohibitive uses a verbal construction other than the second singular positive imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives.

Koasati (Kimball 1991: 38, 270)

a. iy
b. is-g-so
c. ci-g-so

cat 2SG-cat-NEG.IMP 2SG-NEG-gather-NEG

‘Eat!’ ‘Don’t eat!’ ‘You don’t gather.’

- Asymmetry between negative and positive imperatives addressed by Miestamo & van der Auwera (2007).

Negative imperatives (van der Auwera & Lejeune 2005)

Negative existentials: Type A (Croft 1991)

The ordinary existential predicate is negated by the verbal negator.

Tzuni (Dayley 1985: 242, 245)

a. m-i-x
NEG-2PL.ABS good IRR
‘You all aren’t good.’

b. mi k-o t-a j-a-y
NEG EX IRR house
‘There aren’t any houses.’

Negative existentials: Type B (Croft 1991)

Turkish (van Schaik 1994: 38, 44)

a. gel-me-yec
come-NEG-FUT
“(S)he will not come.”

b. su var
water EX
‘There is water.’

c. su yok
water-NEG.EX
‘There is no water.’

There is a negative existential predicate different from the verbal negator.

Negative existentials: Type C (Croft 1991)

The negative existential is identical to the verbal negator.

Tongan (Churchward 1953: 56-57)

a. na'e ika ke 'ahu a siale
PST NEG SBIN go ABS Siale
‘Siale did not go.’

b. 'oku ika hu latiko i he ni
PRES NEG.EX ART teacher at here
‘There is not a teacher here.’

- Nonverbal and existential negation also studied by Eriksen (2005) and Veselinova (2006).

Negative indefinites: Type I (Kahrel 1996)

Standard negation is found with ordinary (positive) indefinites.

Evenki (Nedyalkov 1994: 25)

a. okun-su
something-CLT become-NFUT-3SG
‘Something happened.’

b. okun-su
something-CLT NEG-PST become-PTCP
‘Nothing happened.’
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Negative indefinites: Type II (Kahrel 1996)

Standard negation appears with a special indefinite different from the one used in corresponding positives.

English (constructed examples)
- a. I see something
- b. I don’t see anything

Negative indefinites: Type III (Kahrel 1996)

There is an inherently negative indefinite pronoun without standard negation.

Swedish (constructed examples)
- a. jag ser något
  ISG sec.PRES something
  ‘I see something.’
- b. jag ser ingenting
  ISG sec.PRES nothing
  ‘I don’t see anything.’

Negative indefinites: Type IV (Kahrel 1996)

An inherently negative indefinite pronoun is accompanied by standard negation.

Middle Atlas Berber (Penchoen 1973: 87)
- a. bna(a)g ur as traga fiyya walu
  in.order NEG to.him do.3SG.F snake nothing
  ‘so that the snake wouldn’t do anything to him.’

Negative indefinites: Type V (Kahrel 1996)

There is no indefinite pronoun at all, and the equivalent function is expressed with an existential construction.

Nadeb (Weir 1994: 301)
- a. doko hawab p/ib
  NEG RS-cat.IND NREF
  ‘No-one is eating’
  (lit. ‘One who is eating is something non-existent.’)

Negative indefinites: Haspelmath’s (1997) semantic map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>question</th>
<th>indirect negation</th>
<th>direct negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>non-specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>conditional</td>
<td>comparative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>free</td>
<td>choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative indefinites: Type NV-NI
(Haspelmath 1997, 2005)

Evenki (Nedyalkov 1994: 25)
- a. ekur-da e-cite δ-ra
  something-CLT NEG-PST become-PICP
  ‘Nothing happened.’
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Negative indefinites: Type V-NI (Haspelmath 1997, 2005)

Swedish (constructed examples)

a. jag ser ingen
   ISG look PRES something
   ‘I don’t see anything.’

b. ingen är vänlig
   ING look FOC polite
   ‘No one is nice.’

1. Typological aspects

Negative indefinites: Type (N)V-NI (Haspelmath 1997, 2005)

Italian (constructed examples)

a. non è venuto nessuno
   NEG come.PST.PTCP nobody
   ‘Nobody came.’

b. nessuno è venuto
   nobody come.PST.PTCP
   ‘Nobody came.’

1. Typological aspects

Towards a typological questionnaire of negation

Clausal negation
- Describe the different constructions used to express negation.
- Negative marker(s): type, position, number (single, double?)
- Structural differences between affirmatives vs. negatives?
- Constructional asymmetry? any paradigmatic asymmetry involved?
- note the details specific to the subtypes found.
- Which environments are they used in (e.g., different TAM categories, different clause types, main vs. dependent clauses, etc.)? Note specifically which categories/environments use the same construction.

Non-clausal negation
- Negative indefinites: negativity of the indefinite (cf. semantic map), cooccurrence with clausal negation
- Constituent negation (e.g., Foc Neg-Verb vs. Neg-Foc Verb) (and scope-related questions more generally)
- Negative derivation
- Negative polarity
- Negative transport

1. Typological aspects

Uralic languages

Sources
- Grammars
- Native speakers
- Textbooks

The data from several languages are incomplete or inexact, thus the classification is not totally final

1. Uralic languages

Standard Negation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Further Subtypes</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>symmetric negation</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khanty, Hungarian, Kamas, Kom, Mansi, Mordvin, Selkup, Udmurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asymmetric negation</td>
<td>A/Fin</td>
<td>A/Fin/Neg-PE</td>
<td>Mari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A/Fin/Neg-Verb</td>
<td>Enets, Estonian, Finnish, Ingiari, Kamas, Kareljan, Khanty, Komi, Livonian, Mans, Mari, Mordvin, Nenets, Nganasan, Selkup, Saami, Udmurt, Yoga, Votic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A/Cat/TAM</td>
<td>Komi, Mari, Udmurt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Uralic languages
**Standard Negation**

- Symmetric vs. asymmetric negation
- There are languages where differences are found in structure or in negative markers in different tenses.
  - different negative marker:
    - Komi
  - structural differences:
    - Kamass, Selkup, Mari, Mordvin, Udmurt,

---

**Symmetric negation**

- Uralic languages: in all tenses
- Samoyed: Selkup and Kamass
  - Kamass: in past tense, participial and gerundial structures (secondary process)
  - Selkup
- Volgaic and Permic languages:
  - Mordvin: in present, future and in past tense
  - Permic languages: only in past tense

---

**Hungarian**

- \(\text{a. } \text{laner-em en-}t\text{ a ndit.} \text{know-1SG this ACC det woman-ACC}\)  
  - 'I know this woman.'

- \(\text{b. } \text{Nem laner-em en-}t\text{ a ndit.} \text{Neg know-1SG this ACC det woman-ACC}\)  
  - 'I don't know this woman.'

---

**Kamass**

- \(\text{a. } \text{man amor-bi-ni di \ 8oo-bi} \text{eat-Ger-1SG (a)she come-PST.3SG}\)  
  - '(S)he arrived when I was eating.'

- \(\text{b. } \text{man e}i\text{ -o-bi-am} \text{Neg come-PST.1SG}\)  
  - 'I did not come.'

---

**Asymmetric negation**

- Uralic languages most often use the structure A/Fin
  - A/Fin/Neg-FE: only in Mari
  - A/Fin/NegVerb: most frequently
- There are languages, where this structure's appearance depends on the tense
  - Kamass, Mordvin, Permic languages
- No occurrence in:
  - Hungarian

---

**Subtype: A/Fin/NegVerb**

- The negative verb can be an auxiliary or an other negative verb
- Most of the Uralic languages use an auxiliary
- Paradigm of negative auxiliary
  - Nganasan: full paradigms
  - Finnish: number is marked on the auxiliary, but tense on the lexical verb
  - Estonian: the negative auxiliary has lost all verbal inflections and looks like a particle; but the lexical verb does not carry any inflections
**Paradigm of negative Auxiliaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negarian</th>
<th>Finnish</th>
<th>Estonian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes (di-š)</td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes (díndi-š-n)</td>
<td>Inflection</td>
<td>yes (e-n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes (dí-dí-š-n)</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>no (en ošštš)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes (dí-miš-tš-n)</td>
<td>Deriv. suffix</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. Comrie’s hierarchy (1981)

---

**Negarian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finnish</th>
<th>Estonian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>she gave me a coat.</td>
<td>got-PST 3sg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Change of the negative marker**

- Depending on tense, the verb form can also change:
  - Komi: present o-, past e-

Komi (Rédei 1978: 105–109)

- a. *Set-a-n*  
  give-PST 2sg  
  ‘You give.’

- b. *O-n* set  
  Neg 2sg  
  give-CN  
  ‘You don’t give.’

- c. *Set-i-n*  
  give-PST 2sg  
  Neg-PST 2sg  
  give-CN  
  ‘You gave.’

- d. *E-n* set  
  Neg-PST 2sg  
  give-CN  
  ‘You did not give.’

---

**Subtype: A/Fin/Neg-FE**

a. Tol-š-na-n  
  come-PST 2sg  
  ‘I came.’

b. Tol-š-n om-šl  
  come-PST 2sg  
  Neg 1sg  
  ‘I did not come.’

*notice the word order: V Aux*

---

**Subtype: A/Cat/TAM**

- Not at all typical for Uralic languages, occurs in Udmurt (Past 2: etymologically a PtcpPast and PtcpPastNeg) and in Komi

**Udmurt (Kozmács 1998: 66–67)**

  go-PST 2sg  
  ‘I went.’

  go-PST 2sg  
  ‘I did not go.’

---

---

---
Position of negative marker in Uralic languages

- Negative particles tend to be pre-posed (Mansi, Khanty, Hungarian, Selkup, Mordvin)
- Word order of structures with auxiliaries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word order</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OV &amp; AuxV</td>
<td>Kamass, Romi, Enets, Mari, Mordvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV &amp; AuxV</td>
<td>Enets, Nenets, Nenets, Komi, Udmurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO &amp; AuxV</td>
<td>Estonian, Finnish, Karelian, Veps, Votic, Ingrain, Saami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-standard Negation

- Semantically not empty negative auxiliaries
  - In all North Samoyedic languages
    - Nganasan
      - *Mun lašt̩i ma hours?*
      - *I cannot find him.*
      - *Enets*
      - *šir ko ê laše oë*
      - *I cannot find him.*
    - Different word order, different form of lexical verb

Negative imperative

- Van der Auwera & Lejeune (2005) only deal with the imperative of the 2nd person singular, while several Uralic languages have a full paradigm (e.g. Northern Samoyedic languages, Hungarian)
- In many Uralic languages the imperative is treated differently.
- The Neg of the imperative can also be used in other moods (e.g. Enets: debitive)
- Aux is often not able to take up mood markers (e.g. Finnish, Veps)

Negative lexical verbs

- In all North Samoyedic languages
  - Nenets (Trevisienco 1985: 649–113)
    - *Aaš tola ano.*
    - *I know your uncle.*
    - *Enets*
    - *šir ko ê laše oë*
    - *I cannot find him.*

Type I: Normal imperative – normal negative

- only in Nganasan (in contrast to WALS (spec.—spec.))
  - *Mun 7*
  - *Cut it!*

Type II: Normal imperative – special negative

- Ugric and Samoyedic languages (except Nganasan); Mordvin, Finnish, Estonian, Mari
    - *At wi-γ-1-un*
    - *I don’t know.*
    - *Mansı e-nı!
    - *Get dressed!*
Type IV: Special imperative – special negative

Miestamo & Wagner-Nagy September 27, 2008
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Type IV: Special imperative – special negative

Mari (Beresszki 1990: 58)

a. O+t tol neg-imp2sg come-CN

‘You don’t come.’

b. Tol! c. I-t tol

come-imp2sg Neg-imp-2sg come-CN

‘Come!’ ‘Don’t come!’

cf. special negative, but normal imperative
d. Tol: b) e. an-še tol

come-imp3sg Neg-imp-3sg come-CN

‘Is he should come!’ ‘(s)he should not come!’

Negative existentials

In the Uralic languages Type B (special existential negation) is the most frequent

There can be divergencies between the marking of the different tenses, cf. Hungarian, Selkup.

Type A: Finnish, Estonian, Hungarian (Past and Future)

Type B: Enets, Hungarian (Present), Kamass, Khanty, Mansi Mordvin, Nenets, Nganasan (proform existential), Selkup

Type C: Mansi, Khanty, Selkup (Past)
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Type A: normal–normal (L Neg cop T)

Finnish, Estonian, Hungarian (Past and Future)

Estonian

a. Ma ei näe raamatut. ‘I don’t see a book.’

b. Laual on raamat. ‘There is a book on the table.’

c. Laual ei ole raamatut. ‘There is no book on the table.’

Hungarian (Past and Future)

a. Nem látok almát. ‘I don’t see any apples.’

b. Az asztalon van alma. ‘There are apples on the table.’

c. Az asztalon nem volt alma. ‘There were no apples on the table.’

d. Az asztalon nem lesz alma. ‘There will be no apples on the table.’

Type B: special existential negation

(I. NegExst T)

Enets, Hungarian (Present), Kamass, Khanty, Mansi Mordvin, Nenets, Nganasan (proform existential), Selkup

Hungarian

Az asztalon nincs alma. ‘There are no apples on the table.’ (I. NegExst T)

Mordvin

a. A sodasa te avatř. ‘I don’t know this woman.’

b. Tuvor langso umar. ‘There are apples on the table.’

c. Tuvor langso umar aras. ‘There are no apples on the table.’

Distinction between SN, EN and Nonverbal Negation

Estonian, Finnish

Hung., Mordvin, Nenets, Enets, Selkup

Komi, Khanty, Mansi

Nenets

Nganasan

N eighteen
No distinction between standard, existential and nonverbal negation

- Estonian, Finnish

Mikko ei laula. ‘Mikko doesn’t sing.’

Mikko ei ole lääkäri. ‘Mikko is not a doctor.’

Pöydällä ei ole omenoiita. ‘There are no apples on the table.’

Three way distinction

- only in Nganasan

SN: Aux Sataraj siit ŋañi komiñän?
‘Generally he doesn’t trap polar foxes.’

EN: ExPtc Mangotka koito daŋku.
‘There is no kind of sleigh.’

NN: Ptc Šiit ŋiintu liŋqoq.
‘He is not a decent man.’

SN and NN versus EN

- Hungarian, Mordvin, Nenets, Enets, Selkup

SN: Ptc

Nı ašj ciŋqop ašļa tis.
Neg what-AIg man Neg come-PST.3sg

EN: ExstV

Mıńa qoŋqoŋ šiŋq.
allNeg-no3p ‘Nobody came.’

NN: Ptc

Na ija ašļa weŋ ceyj.
this child Neg big COP-Prep.3sg

‘This child is not big.’

Komi, Khanty, Mansi

SN versus EN NN

- Komi, Khanty, Mansi

Khantry (Nikolaeva 1999:28–29)

SN: Ptc wě-tr an p-it

make-if Neg start-epost3sg

EN: NegEx jihup xul antum

fresh fish NegExist

‘There is no fresh fish.’

Negative indefinites: sources

- negative indefinite from non-negative scalar focus particles
  - Selkup  ámbá kuti ‘nobody’, Nganasan, Nenets, Enets
  - negative indefinite from negative scalar focus particles

Negative Indefinite and Verbal Negation

- Uralic languages: the negative indefinite always co-occurs with SN: verbal negation + negative indefinite (Type NV-NI)

Hungarian

sokt nem jëtt

nobody Neg come-PST.35g

‘Nobody came.’

Nganasan

šiŋqoŋ ciŋq siŋq

Neg-PST.35g come-EN

‘Nobody came.’
Conclusions

- Proposed typological parameters do not cover all relevant distinctions in the domain.
- To have full coverage of the domain of negation in Uralic languages, we have to go beyond what has been proposed in the typological literature so far.
- But this naturally applies to every functional domain to be included in the database.
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Abbreviations

1 first person, 2 second person, 3 third person, ABS absolute, ACC accusative, ACT actual, ADEL adverbial, AFF affirmative, AL allative, ART article, ASS assertive, AUX auxiliary, CAR catitative, CERT certifier, CLT cleft, CMP complex, CN connegative, CONT continuative, COP copula, CTV converb, DAT dative, DECL declarative, DEF definite, DUR durative, EL elative, ERG ergative, EX existential, EXCL exclusive, F feminine, FOC focus, FUT future, GER gerund, GND gender, HAB habitual, HYP hypothetical, IMP imperative, IMPF imperfective, IMPST imperfect, INCL inclusive, IND indicative, INDEF indefinite, INF infinitive, IRR intransitive, LOC locative, M masculine, N neuter, N non- (e.g. NPST nonpast), NEG negation/negative.

NOMCAT nominals, OR oblique conjunction, PART partitive, PERF perfect, PPV perfective, PL plural, POT potenital, PRE present, PROF proform, PST past, PTCP participle, R realis, RS relativised subject, SBJ subjunctive, SG singular, SUBJ subject, SURF surprise mood, T theme, V verb.