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Berber languages

The borders presented on this map are approximate and have no legal value.

- verbal negative marker
  - preverbal negative marker (wər/ur/u/ul/ud/wəl... # ak # la), with often a postverbal element (in a few varieties, only the postverbal negator remains)
  - mood-aspect asymmetries
  - negative subject relativization forms
  - clitic climbing
  - etc.

- non-verbal negative markers
  - existence / location
  - ascriptive
Variation in Mood-Aspect oppositions

- Aspect-Mood base forms in Berber

W. Kabyle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Negative perfective</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ddu-</td>
<td>-dda-</td>
<td>-ddi-</td>
<td>-ṭṭəddu-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-krəz-</td>
<td>-krəz-</td>
<td>-kriz-</td>
<td>-kərrəz-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Âïr Tuareg aspectual stems (roots RTK, ‘fall’, and G, ‘do’)¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Neg. PFV</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Neg. IPFV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ṛτək-</td>
<td>-ṛṭak-</td>
<td>-ṛτaat-</td>
<td>-ṛtek-</td>
<td>-ṛaattək-</td>
<td>-ṛəttək-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-g(u)²</td>
<td>-ge/a/ə-</td>
<td>-gee/aa-</td>
<td>-ge/a/ə-</td>
<td>-taagg(u)-</td>
<td>-təgg(u)-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Bound pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperative/Hortative (K)</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>xdm</td>
<td>n-xdm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m</td>
<td>xdm-t</td>
<td>t-xdm-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>xdm-nt</td>
<td>xdm-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>xdm</td>
<td>t-xdm-m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Standard (K)

2m: t-xdm-d²
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### Western Kabyle & Tuareg (Tamashek): A-Cat-TAM asymmetry

#### W. Kabyle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PNG paradigm</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>standard</td>
<td>Aorist or Imperfective (imperative)</td>
<td>Awər + aorist (negative optative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>Ad + Aorist (hortative)</td>
<td>Ur + imperfective (prohibitive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative and standard</td>
<td>Ad + Aorist</td>
<td>Ur + imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standard</td>
<td>Ad + Imperfective</td>
<td>Ur + Negative Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Aspectual oppositions in Aïr Tuareg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aorist or imperfective imperative</td>
<td>wər ze/he + aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad + aorist</td>
<td>wər + negative imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad + imperfective</td>
<td>wər + negative perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resultative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For sources concerning data other than Kabyle, see references in Mettouchi (2009a & b)
Non-verbal negations

- Verbal vs non-verbal negators
  - ascriptive/attributive negation ‘it is not X’
  - existential negation ‘there is no X’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Existential</th>
<th>Attributive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kabyle</td>
<td>ur (+ara)</td>
<td>ulaʃ</td>
<td>matʃʃi d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tashawit</td>
<td>ud (+ʃa)</td>
<td>ud-illi, ullʃ</td>
<td>lʃid, ixʃa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarifit</td>
<td>ur (+ʃa)</td>
<td>u-din ʃa</td>
<td>ur-id, ulid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuara</td>
<td>w ... ʃ</td>
<td>wɛliliʃ</td>
<td>wɛtʃa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wə ... ʃ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... ʃ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghadamsi</td>
<td>ak / wəl</td>
<td>wəl d</td>
<td>a-d / awas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siwa</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>la-di</td>
<td>qatʃʃi / ātʃʃi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuareg (Ahaggar)</td>
<td>wər</td>
<td>aba</td>
<td>wər giy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuareg (Aīr)</td>
<td>wər</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>wər ge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For sources concerning data other than Kabyle, see references in Mettouchi (2009a & b)
Kabyle (Western-Central)

The administrative boundaries presented on this map are approximate and have no legal value.
Kabyle (Ait Idjer variety)
Structure of the clause

- Clitic-climbing

\[ j-əfka=jas=t=idd \]
\[ 3SG.M\text{-give:PFV}=DAT3SG=ABSV3SG.M=PROX \]
‘he gave it to her/him’

\[ ad=as=t=idd \]
\[ 3SG.M\text{-give:AOR} \]
‘he will give it to her/him’

\[ ur=as=t=idd \]
\[ 3SG.M\text{-give:NEGPFV} \]
‘he did not give it to her/him’

\[ aɣrum \]
\[ 3SG.M\text{-give:PFV} \]
‘the bread that he gave to her/him’

For abbreviations and notes on categories see List of Glosses
idrimən i=s j-əfka / idrimən i=s i-tʦak / idrimən ara=s i-tʦak / idrimən ara=s j-əfk

money:ABS.PL.M REL.REAL=DAT3SG 3SG.M-give:PFV
money:ABS.PL.M REL.REAL=DAT3SG 3SG.M-give:IPFV
money:ABS.PL.M REL.IRR=DAT3SG 3SG.M-give:IPFV
money:ABS.PL.M REL.IRR=DAT3SG 3SG.M-give:AOR

‘The money that he gave (/is giving, usually gives) (/will be giving) (will give) to her/him’

idrimən ur=s j-əfki / idrimən ur=s i-tʦak

money:ABS.SG.M NEG=DAT3SG 3SG.M-give:NEGPFV
money:ABS.SG.M NEG=DAT3SG 3SG.M-give:IPFV

‘The money that he didn’t give (/won’t give / won’t be giving /isn’t giving…) to her/him’

argaz i=s j-əfka-n idrimən / argaz i=s i-tʦak-n idrimən / argaz ara=s i-tʦak-n idrimən / argaz ara=s j-əfk-n idrimən

man:ABS.SG.M REL.REAL=DAT3SG RELSBJ.POS-give:PFV-RELSBJ.POS money:ABS.PL.M
man:ABS.SG.M REL.REAL=DAT3SG RELSBJ.POS-give:IPFV-RELSBJ.POS money:ABS.PL.M
man:ABS.SG.M REL.IRR=DAT3SG RELSBJ.POS-give:IPFV-RELSBJ.POS money:ABS.PL.M
man:ABS.SG.M REL.IRR=DAT3SG RELSBJ.POS-give:AOR-RELSBJ.POS money:ABS.PL.M

‘The man who gave (/is giving, usually gives) (/will be giving) (will give) money to her/him’

argaz ur=s n-əfki idrimən / argaz ur=s n-tʦak idrimən

man:ABS.SG.M NEG=DAT3SG RELSBJ.NEG-give:NEGPFV money:ABS.PL.M
man:ABS.SG.M NEG=DAT3SG RELSBJ.NEG-give:IPFV money:ABS.PL.M

‘The man who didn’t give (/won’t give / won’t be giving /isn’t giving…) money to her/him’
Negative asymmetries (Miestamo 2005)

• Constructional asymmetry
  – « Symmetric negative constructions add (a) negative marker(s) to the corresponding affirmative with no further structural changes, whereas in asymmetric negative constructions the introduction of (a) negative marker(s) is accompanied by further structural changes. » (Miestamo 2005: 52)

• Paradigmatic asymmetry
  – « In symmetric paradigms one finds a one-to-one correspondence between the members of affirmative and negative paradigms, whereas in asymmetric paradigms there is no such one-to-one correspondence. » (Miestamo 2005: 52)

• Types of asymmetry
  – in the finiteness of verbal elements: Type A/Fin
  – in the marking of reality status: Type A/NonReal
  – in the marking of emphasis: Type A/Emph
  – in the marking of grammatical categories: Type A/Cat
    • A/Cat/TAM
    • A/Cat/PNG
    • other A/Cat
A-Cat-TAM asymmetry in W. Kabyle

- MAN forms in negative contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PNG paradigm</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>standard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Awər + aorist (negative optative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>Aorist or Imperfective (imperative)</td>
<td>Ur + imperfective (prohibitive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative and standard</td>
<td>Ad + Aorist (hortative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standard</td>
<td>Ad + Aorist</td>
<td>Ur + imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad + Imperfective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>Ur + Negative Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Almost no aorist in the negative domain
- No preverbs, only the standard negator ur, or a special negator in the negative optative
The negative MA domain in W.Kabyle

- **Awər + [SA+AOR]**: negative optative. (<1%)
- **Ur + [IA + IPFV]**: prohibitive. (<5%) (positive imperative 2.5%)
- **Ur + [SA + IPFV]**: negative hortative, oath, negated habitual, future, potential, progressive. (30-40%) (positive imperfective 10-16%; ad+aorist 15-30%)
- **Ur + [SA + NEG.PFV]**: negative statement (stative or dynamic), oath. (60-70%) (positive perfective 50-70%)
- **wəllˤəɦ ma + [SA + PFV]**: oath (<1%)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PNG paradigm</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aorist or Imperfective (imperative)</td>
<td>Awar + aorist (negative optative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad + Aorist (hortative)</td>
<td>Ur + imperfective (prohibitive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad + Imperfective Ad + Imperfective</td>
<td>Ur + imperfective (prohibitive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>Ur + Negative Perfective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages above are from various spoken corpora, in various genres, and are meant to give indications as to the frequency of the forms and their interpretation. In **pink**: % within negative utterances

In **orange**: % within positive utterances of the *corresponding* positive forms.

---
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AM forms in positive utterances

- AOR
- Ad + AOR
- IPFV
- PFV

MAN FORMS in negative utterances

- $\text{Am}_\partial + [\text{SA} + \text{AOR}]$
- $\text{Ur} + [\text{IA} + \text{IPFV}]$
- $\text{Ur} + [\text{SA} + \text{IPFV}]$
- $\text{Ur} + [\text{SA} + \text{NEG.PFV}]$
- $\text{Am}_\partial \ell \text{m}\text{a} + [\text{SA} + \text{PFV}]$
• negative optative

(1) Awər=dd j-uyəl
NEG.OPT=PROX SBJ3.SG.M-come_back:AOR
May he not come back!

• prohibitive

(2) innajas nəkwiniw bbəyəsidd guxəm // 224 uṣsakara //
i-nna=as nəkk win-iw wwi-γ=as=dd
SBJ3.SG.M-say\PFV=DAT.3SG IDP1SG the_one\SG.M-POSS1.SG bring\PFV-SBJ.1SG=DAT.3SG=PROX
g wəxəm // ur =as ụtək ara //
LOC house\ANN.SG.M // NEG=DAT.3SG give\IPFV.IMP POSTNEG //
My mule I fed it myself. Don’t feed it.
(KAB_AM_NARR_02_Midget_352-353)

• negative hortative, oath, negated habitual, future, potential, progressive

(3) uzəggəadənara mədən i<lanərnat> /
ur zawwāγ-n ara mədən i <lanərnat> /
NEG marry\IPFV-SBJ.3PL.M POSTNEG people\ANN.PL.M LOC internet\ANN.SG.M /
People didn’t use to get married on the internet,
(KAB_AM_NARR_03_0556)

(4) a::: nnanas mknuntsədadara //
a::: nna-n=as nəkkəni ur n-ịaddu ara //
HESIT say\PFV-SBJ.3PL.M=DAT.3SG IDP.1PL NEG SBJ1.PL-come\IPFV POSTNEG //
Oh, they said, as for us we won’t go.
(KAB_AM_NARR_02_30)

• negative statement (stative or dynamic), oath

(5) čətfə urdəzmirəaraddəsadədə /
kači ur t-zəmir-ə /
IDP.2SG.M NEG SBJ2-be_able\NEGPFV-SBJ.2SG POSTNEG POT=PROX SBJ2-hunt\AOR-SBJ.2SG /
you are not able to hunt,
(KAB_AM_NARR_02_108)
Contini- Morava (1989:179)

“negative-affirmative asymmetry is a natural consequence of the pragmatic function of negative sentences in ordinary discourse. Because speakers generally try to avoid conveying superfluous information, negative sentences in natural discourse — unlike negative logical propositions — are used to refer only to events which a hearer might have expected to occur. Since negated events are always potential rather than actual, there is no reason to assume that speakers need to convey the same information about them as they would in reporting actual occurrences”
Analysis for W. Kabyle (Mettouchi 1995, 2009)

• Aspect-Mood forms have an abstract semantic value that is not the one they have in positive utterances, but a more general one, which is pragmatically actualized, differently, through their use in Positive or Negative contexts
  
  *NB: this is formally marked by the A-Cat-TAM asymmetry of Kabyle, but is generally true of the semantic-pragmatic interpretation of negative vs positive utterances in natural languages (cf Contini-Morava 1989)*

• Only some of the AM forms are compatible with the presuppositional dimension of negative contexts

• The negative particle is a modifier of AM forms in the negative domain in the same way as preverbs are in the positive domain
  
  – e.g. NEGPFV in positive = counterfactual hypotheticals; NEG+NEGPFV = acknowledge SITUation as contrary to expectations (reference-oriented)
  
  – IPFV in positive = not completed (progressive, habitual etc.) ; NEG + IPFV = non-coïncidence of characterization of SIT and actual situation (evaluation-oriented)
Zoom on the Prohibitive

• Type 1: The prohibitive uses the **verbal construction of the second singular imperative** and a **sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives**.

• Type 2. The prohibitive uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy **not** found in (indicative) declaratives.

• Type 3. The prohibitive uses a verbal construction **other** than the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives.

• Type 4. The prohibitive uses a verbal construction **other** than the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy **not** found in (indicative) declaratives

  – (AUWERA, VAN DER J. ET AL. 2005)
Quick overview across Berber

- Either the aspect-mood stem is different
- Or the order of negative and preverb is different
- And/or the person paradigm is different (standard vs imperative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Kabyle</th>
<th>Shilha</th>
<th>Tamashek</th>
<th>Siwi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stem</td>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>PFV &amp; IPFV</td>
<td>AOR &amp; IPFV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>STD &amp; IMP</td>
<td>STD &amp; IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preverb</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes &amp; no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order NEG-PREVERB</td>
<td>PVB &lt; NEG</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEG &lt; PVB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>Type 3 &amp; Type 1</td>
<td>Type 3 &amp; Type 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kabyle strategy for the Prohibitive

• Imperative: Aorist or Imperfective stem + imperative affixes

• Prohibitive: NEG + Imperfective stem + imperative affixes
Kabyle Prohibitive

• Aorist is excluded from prohibitive; prohibitive involves imperative PNG affixes.
  – Type 1: The prohibitive uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives.
  • But it is the IMPERFECTIVE imperative stem which is used (rare in positive imperatives)
Non-verbal negations

- **Verbal vs non-verbal negators**
  - ascriptive/attributive negation ‘it is not X’
  - existential negation ‘there is no X’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Existential</th>
<th>Attributive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kabyle</td>
<td>ur (+ara)</td>
<td>ulaʃ</td>
<td>mattʃi d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tashawit</td>
<td>ud (+ʃa)</td>
<td>ud-illi, ullah</td>
<td>liʃid, ixoʃa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarifit</td>
<td>ur (+ʃa)</td>
<td>u-din ʃa</td>
<td>ur-id, ulid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuara</td>
<td>w ... ʃ</td>
<td>wəlliʃ</td>
<td>wəʃa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghadamsi</td>
<td>ak / wəl</td>
<td>wəl d</td>
<td>a-d / awas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siwa</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>la-di</td>
<td>qatʃʃi / aṭṭfi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuareg (Ahaggar)</td>
<td>wər</td>
<td>aba</td>
<td>wər giy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuareg (Aïr)</td>
<td>wər</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>wər ge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existential negation

• ułaf > ur j-lli jra (NEG SBJ3.SG.M-exist:NEGPFV thing)
  – univerbation between Standard Negation and another word as in 27% of NEG.EXS in Veselinova (2013)’s sample

• No dedicated positive existential construction

• Existence and Location: different constructions

  – Existence: ułaf + noun in the absolute state
    
    (6) ułaf idrimən /
    NEG.EXS money\ABSL.PL.M /
    ‘There was no money’.

  – Location: ułaf + absolutive bound pronoun (+ noun in the absolute (before the predicate) or annexed state (after the predicate))

    (7) lkarlaʒ-agi zik / ułaf=it /
    floor-tile\ABSL.SG.M-DEM.PROX long_ago / NEG.EXS=ABS.3SG.M
    ‘This tiled floor, in the old days, it wasn’t there’
Mapping (cf Veselinova 2013)

Rather prototypical, except for the lack of NEG.POSS function
(instead: standard verbal construction (verb s’u, ‘possess’))

- TENSE
  - NEG.EX 33%
  - NEG.LOC 50%
- NEG.EMPHATIC 16%
- NONE 20%
- NEG.POSS 84%
Ascriptive/attributive negation

• typically rejects a presupposition concerning identity, class inclusion and property attribution, with a noun (or an adjective) in its scope

(8) ṣalāğija –nni / matftfi d jəmma-s
ṣalāğija-CNS / NEG.ATTR COP mother\ABSLSG.F-KIN.3SG
‘This Aldjiya, she was not his mother …’

• but also concerning the choice of a characterization in terms of quantity, time, manner...

(9) ṣfi-γ=dd atas matftfi fituḥ / QNT
remember\PFV-SBJ.1SG=PROX a_lot NEG.ATTR a_little /
‘I remember a lot of things, indeed’ (lit. I remember a lot, not a little)

(10) matftfi akk-agi zik-nni / ADV
NEG.ATTR thus-PROXb long_ago-CNS /
‘It wasn’t like this in the past’
• and rejects the association of a focus to a presupposition in negative clefts

(11) matťfi d baba ařli i=ți
NEG.ATTR COP father\ABS.L.SG.M Ařli REL.REAL=ABS.3SG.F
j-uy-an //
RELSBJ.POS-take\PFV-RELSBJ.POS // CLEFT
‘It’s not father Ali who married her’.

• it’s a contradictory judgement (in the sense that it involves competing viewpoints on a referent, situation, etc.)
Corpus-based sample study

• Proportions
  – 30mn conversation = 60 verbal / 32 non-verbal (64.5% / 35.5%)
    • Non-verbal = 15 existential / 17 attributive (47%/53%)
  – 40mn narratives = 85 verbal / 65 non-verbal (56.5% / 43.5%)
    • Non-verbal = 42 existential / 23 attributive (64.5% / 35.5%)
Negation Types in sample spoken corpus

Conversation
- Verbal
- Existential
- Ascriptive

Narrative
- Verbal
- Existential
- Ascriptive
Semantics of negative predication in Western Kabyle

- Verbal negation: binary opposition between NEGPFV and IPFV
- Non-verbal negation: binary opposition between EXS.NEG and ASCR.NEG
pre/post-verbal negators

Kabyle: UR ... (ARA)
Postverbal modulation of negation

• Conditions of absence for Kabyle: 48% of negations in corpus (Mettouchi 2001, 2009)
  – Ur only
    • negative polarity constructions (indefinite nouns)
    • oaths or polemical statements
    • negative coordination
    • negative subordination
    • negative restrictive relativization
  – Ara obligatory
    • negative conditional clause
    • negative informative answers/statements
• Ur only

— negative polarity constructions (indefinite nouns)

(12) ur j-ddi jiwn
    NEG SBJ.3M.SG-accompany:NEGPFV one:ANN
    ‘no one came’

— oaths or polemical statements

(13) wəlləɦ ur swi-ɣ
    by_God NEG drink:NEGPFV-SBJ1SG
    ‘I swear I didn’t drink!’

— negative coordination

(14) ur uli-n jxxamən ur t-rbiħ tfällaḥt
    NEG go_up:NEGPFV-SBJ.3M.PL house:ANN.PL.M
    NEG SBJ3.SG.F-improve:NEGPFV cultivation:ANN.SG.F
    ‘neither were houses built nor was cultivation improved’
– negative subordination
(15) ttməslaj-ɣ *ur* faq-ɣ
talk:IPFV-SBJ.1SG NEG realize:NEGPFV-SBJ.1SG
‘I talked without realizing (what I was doing)’ (unawares)

– negative restrictive relativization
(16) n-wala argaz *ur* n-ssin
SBJ.1PL-see:PFV man:ABS NEG SBJ.1PL-know:NEGPFV
‘We saw a man we didn’t know’ (unknown)

• Ara obligatory
– negative conditional clause
(17) ma *ur* n-ɾuḥ *ara* š axxam *a=ɣ tʃʃ-n ləwẖuʃ*
IF NEG SBJ.1PL-go:NEGPFV POSTNEG to house:ABS.SG.M
POT=ABSV1PL eat:AOR-SBJ.3M.PL beast:ANN.PL
‘if we don’t go home the wild beasts will eat us’
– negative informative answers, or statements

(18) - anda=t ?
where=ABSV.3SG.M ?
‘where is it?’

- ur=t=id j-ufi ara.
NEG=ABSV3M.SG=PROX SBJ.3M.SG-find:NEGPFV POSTNEG
‘He didn’t find it’

• Ara anchors the negative statement in interaction, it is a ‘common ground’ marker.
– ara > kara > harət, ‘thing’
– it is also the relativizer for potential/irrealis relative clauses (cf Mettouchi 2001 for grammaticalization)
Variation in Subject Relativization

• Many Berber languages have a special subject-relativization verbal form which has fewer PNG distinctions than standard verbal constructions.

• This form generally has a formally different corresponding negative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kabyle</td>
<td>j-stem-n</td>
<td>ur n-stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayr Tuareg (Niger)</td>
<td>M.SG j-stem-ǎn</td>
<td>wǎr n-stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.SG t-stem-ǎt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adagh Tuareg (Mali)</td>
<td>M.SG stem-ǎn</td>
<td>wǎr ǎn-stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.SG t-stem-ǎt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>wǎr ǎn-stem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject Relativization forms

A man who doesn’t work, just give him a distaff to spin (he’s not a real man)
Conclusion on Western Kabyle

• Typology of negation:
  – A-Cat-TAM asymmetry
  – Existential vs Ascriptive constructions
  – Type 1 prohibitive but with AM asymmetry (IPFV)
  – Constructional asymmetry in subject relativization

• Language-internal analysis: the negative domain in Western Kabyle is characterized by two types of predications, manifest in verbal as well as in non-verbal predications (Mettouchi (1995, 2009)):
  – non-occurrence of an event or situation (NEGPFV/Existential)
  – disagreement about/non-coincidence of the characterization of a referent or situation (IPFV/Ascriptive)
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