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1. Introduction to the language

Basic data
- Mapuche language = Mapudungun (alternative spellings: Mapuzugun, Mapuzungun)
- ISO code: arn; Glottolog code: mapu1245
- Some 250,000 speakers in south-central Chile and Argentina (Ethnologue 2015)
- Unclassified; some contact with Quechuan, extensive contact with Spanish

Typological profile (selection)
- Morphology:
  - synthetic to polysynthetic (simple nominal morphology; verbal complexity: numerous templatic slots, NP incorporation, multi-radical verb stems, very limited lexical affixation)
  - suffixing and “agglutinative” (= no flexivity, concatenative, mostly simple exponence)
- Syntax: nominal and verbal clauses; remapping inverse (= two kinds of transitive clauses); originally mostly VSO, now increasingly SVO

2. Negation basics

Table 1. Overview of Negators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Nonverbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finite</td>
<td>Nonfinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>-la</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td></td>
<td>-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1a)</td>
<td>(2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1b) = SN</td>
<td>(2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3a-c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1)  a. *Langüm-ki-fi-nge* tüfa-chi üñüm!
    kill-NEG-3OBJ-2SG.IMP this-ATTR bird
    ‘Don’t kill this bird!’ (finite verb, imperative)

b. *La-le-la-i* tüfa-chi üñüm.
    die-RES-NEG-IND[3SG] this-ATTR bird
    ‘This bird has not died.’ (finite verb, indicative)

(2)  a. *Feyengün*  *aku-nu-fu-le!*
    3PL arrive-NEG-RI-3.SBJV
    ‘If only they (PL) would not arrive!’ (finite verb, subjunctive; Smeets 2008: 184)

b. *Ngilla-la-a-i* kofke nie-nu-lu plata.
    buy-NEG-FUT-IND[3SG] bread have-NEG-NFIN money
    ‘He who has no money will not buy bread.’ (nonfinite verb; Smeets 2008: 189)
3. Necessary and interesting details

3.1 Variation in the form of the imperative negator (cf. Moesbach 1962: 124f)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperative (=CG)</td>
<td>(CG) Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>cant-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>cant-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>cant-e-mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL/3PL</td>
<td>cant-e-n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Anomalous mood marking (4f) for all persons and numbers
- Nowadays increasingly reduced, e.g. kon-nu-lnge!
- Possibly contact-induced, cf. Spanish forms:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Kon-i-m-i.} \\
\text{Kon-la-i-m-i.}
\end{array}
\]

3.2 Usage with indefinite pronouns (Smeets 2008: 244)

(5)  a. iney rume ‘whomever’ :: iney nu rume ‘nobody’
   b. chem rume ‘whatever’ :: chem nu rume ‘nothing’
   c. chew rume ‘wherever’ :: chew nu rume ‘nowhere’

(6)  a. Doy chem rume nie-ke-La-fu-i-i-n.
    more what ever have-HAB-NEG-RI-IND-1-PL
    ‘We (PL) did not have anything more.’
   b. Doy chem nu rume nie-ke-fu-i-i-n.
    more what NEG ever have-HAB-RI-IND-1-PL
    ‘We (PL) had nothing more.’
3.3 Verbal clauses: Selected stative constructions (Payne 2007: 111f)

There are two ‘be/exist’-verbs:
- *ngen* ‘be/exist1’ (individual level = permanent; Sp. *ser*), and
- *mülen* ‘be/exist2’ (stage-level = temporary; Sp. *estar*).

3.3.1 Proper inclusion
Proper inclusion is typically expressed via verbalization with *-nge* (but see 3.4 below):

(7)  a. *Witrán-ngē(-la)-i*.  
    visitor- be1-NEG-IND[3SG]  
    ‘S/he is (not) a visitor.’  
    (Smeets 2008: 171)

    visitor-be1-PROG-NEG-CIS-IND[3SG]  
    ‘S/he is (not) being a visitor.’  
    (Smeets 2008: 171)

(8)  *Mūnā-tremo-pichi-we-che-ngē(-la)-i-m-i.*  
    very-beautiful-little-young-person-be1-NEG-IND-2-SG  
    ‘You (SG) are (not) a very beautiful boy.’  
    (Moebach 1962: 54)

3.3.2 Attribution
Adjectival stems (which are invariably also inchoative verbal stems) are used with *-nge* and *-le* (< *müle*); individual-level forms were originally with *-nge*, now they appear increasingly on their own:

(9)  a. *Kurū-ngē(-la)-i*  
    blacken-be1-NEG-IND[3SG]  
    ‘The house is (not) [always] black.’  
    (Sp. *ser*)

b. *Kurū-le(-la)-i*  
    blacken-RES-NEG-IND[3SG]  
    ‘The house is (not) [now] black.’  
    (Sp. *estar*)

c. *Kurū(-la)-i*  
    black(en)-NEG-IND[3SG]  
    ‘The house blackened (did not blacken) / is (not) black.’  
    (Sp. *ser*)

3.3.3 Location
Basically: *mülen* (> *-le*), -*kūnu* (< *kūnu-* ‘leave’), -*nie* (< *nie-* ‘have’, cf. 3.3.5)…

(10)  *Mūlē-ka(-la)-i*  
    be2-CONT-NEG-IND[3SG]  
    house POSP  
    ‘S/he is (not) still in the house.’  
    (Sp. *estar*)

(11)  *Kisu chi wentru payla-kūnu-tu-ROKE-fi*  
    DPART ART man get.on.one’s.back-leave-REST-REP-3P[3SG]  
    PART ART woman  
    ‘The man left the woman on her back again, they say.’  
    (Salas 2006: 267)

3.3.4 Existence
The verbs *ngen* and *mülen* stand in a polarity-based opposition:

(12)  a. *Mūlē-i*  
    exist2-IND[3SG]  
    salt  
    ‘Is there any salt?’  
    (Augusta 1916: 55)

b. *Ngē-la-i*.  
    exist1-NEG-IND[3SG]  
    ‘No, there isn’t any.’  
    (Augusta 1916: 55)

(13)  a. *Ngē-la-i*  
    exist1-NEG-IND[3SG]  
    salt  
    ‘There is no salt.’  
    (Smeets 2008: 125)

b. *Chadi-ngē-la-i*.  
    salt-have2-NEG-IND[3SG]  
    ‘It is not salty / it does not have salt.’  
    (Smeets 2008: 126; cf. 3.3.5 below)
3.3.5 Possession (see also Olate et al. submitted)
Mirroring the two copular verbs, there are two ways to express possession in Mapudungun:

- *nien* ‘have₁’  (individual level = permanent; Sp. *tener*), and
- *-ngen* ‘have₂’  (stage-level = temporary; Sp. *tener* / “estar con”).

(14) a. *Nie-i epu kawell.*
    ‘S/he has two horses.’
    *have₁-IND[3SG] two horse*  (individual level: unmarked POSS)

b. *Kawellu-ngen-i.*
    ‘S/he has a horse [right now].’
    *horse-have₂-IND[3SG]*  (stage level; marked POSS, Sp. lit. *está con caballo*)

(15) a. *kure-ngen*  ‘be married (to a woman)’
    *wife-have₂-*

b. *fița-ngen*  ‘be married (to a man)’
    *husband-have₂-

c. *epu-namun-ngen-*  ‘be two-footed/legged’
    *two-foot-have₂-

(16) a. *Nie-i kiñe ruka.*
    ‘S/he has a house.’
    *have₁-IND[3SG] one house*  (default construction; Smeets 2008: 143)

    ‘She has a house (and her husband has more than one wife).’ (Augusta 1903: 9)
    *one-house-have₂- IND[3SG]*

3.4 Nominal clauses

- They are invariably used for equational constructions (i.e., ‘NPₓ ≡ NPᵧ’), and occasionally for proper-inclusion constructions (i.e., ‘NPₓ ∈ {NPᵧ}’).
- Nominal clauses as proper-inclusion constructions seem to have appeared (spread?) in the 20th century; they may have originated in elliptical constructions: NPₓ NPY-ngen-i > NPₓ NPY
- They often include a particle/proclitic *ta*, especially when second NP is definite.
- Exact formal (wordhood-related) properties of *nu* in such constructions are still to be investigated.

(17) a. [*Fey-chi domo]ₓ [ta] *ni* *ina-n* *lamngen*ᵧ.
    ‘That woman is my youngest sister.’ (default construction; Smeets 2008: 143)
    *DEM-ATTR woman PART 1SG.PSR follow-NFIN sister*

b. [*Iñche]ᵧ *nu,*  [*ta tī]*ₓ.
    ‘That is not me/mine.’ (fronting alternative; Smeets 2008: 144)
    *1SG NEG PART ART*

(18) a. [*Fey]ₓ [*wentru]ᵧ *nu.*
    ‘He is not a man.’ (Smeets 2008: 144)
    *DEM man NEG*

b. [*Tüfa-chi pu che kom]ₓ [*mapuche]ᵧ *nu?*
    ‘Are these people not all Mapuche?’ (Smeets 2008: 144)
    *this-ATTR PL person all M. NEG*

(Also: *fey wentru-ngen-la-i*, cf. 3.3.1)

    ‘No matter how much I paid, it was not much.’ (Smeets 2008: 144)
    *how.much pay-AFF-1SG.SBJV ever much NEG*
Table 3. Summary of Stative Predication Constructions (Verbal/Nonverbal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual-level (= unmarked)</th>
<th>Stage-level (= temporary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>√(−nge)-</td>
<td>nge-{NEG}-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>√(−n−g)−</td>
<td>nge-{NEG}-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nge-</td>
<td>nge-{NEG}-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nie-</td>
<td>nie-{NEG}-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP-nge-</td>
<td>NP-nge-{NEG}-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP NP</td>
<td>NP NP nu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Further research

(19) Spanish has several negators used in lexeme derivation:
   a. de- (e.g. deforme ‘deformed’, deformar ‘to deform’),
      des- (e.g. desmesura ‘excess’, desperstigar ‘to discredit’),
      dis- (e.g. disculpa ‘excuse’, disculpar ‘to excuse’)
   b. an- (e.g. analfabeto ‘illiterate’), iN- (e.g. irregular ‘irregular’,
      impalpable ‘impalpable’, intangible ‘intangible’,
      incapacitar ‘disqualify, render unfit’) 
   c. no (e.g. tratado de no proliferación (de armas nucleares) ‘non-proliferation treaty (for nuclear weapons)’)

(20) Mapudungun…
   a. …does not seem to use any of these elements as loans
   b. …prefers to create lexical items using its own resources (including negation)

(21) Mapudungun does not distinguish negators for existential and other verbal expressions (Croft’s Type A; see Croft 1991, Veselinova 2014) — but nothing is known about the negators’ origins and development.

Abbreviations
ART article, ATTR attributive, CG clitic group, CONT continuative, DEM demonstrative, DPART discourse particle, FUT future, IMP imperative, IND indicative, NEG negation, NFIN nonfinite, N noun, NP noun phrase, OBJ object, PART particle, PL plural, PSR possessor, RES resultative, REST restitutive, RI ruptured implicature, SBJV subjunctive SG singular, SN Standard Negator
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