

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DESCRIBING THE NEGATION SYSTEM OF A LANGUAGE

by Matti Miestamo

[revised August 2016]

General remarks and instructions

This questionnaire explicates the different aspects of negation that should be covered in the description of the domain of negation in a language. The questionnaire itself does not explain very deeply the typology of the different subdomains of negation or give examples. The questionnaire meant to be used together with typological literature (e.g. Miestamo 2007, in press).

The questionnaire starts from function and asks what the formal constructions expressing these functions are in each language.

Note that depending on the language, some forms and constructions may fall under more than one subsections.

In sections 2-3, describe all the different constructions used to express negation in the language, paying attention to:

- Negative marker(s) (see Dahl 1979, Payne 1985, Dryer 2005, 2011a,b):
 - type: particle, clitic, affix, verb, noun, ...
 - position: pre-verbal, postverbal, clause-initial, clause-final...
 - number: one marker, two markers (discontinuous), ...
- Structural differences between positives vs. negatives (see Miestamo 2005a: 51ff, 2007, in press)
 - Are negative markers simply added to a corresponding positive, or does the structure of the clause differ from the affirmative in other ways, too? (constructional asymmetry) Describe the structural differences.
 - Are the same grammatical categories available in the negative as well, or are some distinctions made in the affirmative lost in the negative? (paradigmatic asymmetry) Describe the differences in the paradigms available in the negative vs. affirmative.
- What are the more specific functions of these negative constructions – which environments are they used in, i.e. what do they negate?
 - Note specifically which categories/environments use the same negative construction.

Languages often have different negative constructions for negation in different environments (clausal negation, different clause types, constituent negation, negative indefinites etc.). In Sections 2 and 3 the different negative constructions should be described, clausal negation in Section 2 and non-clausal negation in section 3. The subsections deal with different clause types and environments, in which negation may show dedicated constructions, different from the negation of other clause types / environments.

In the description of each negative construction, please take into account the points discussed above (negative markers, structural (a)symmetry, functions). Please also give illustrative examples (both the negative and its non-negative counterpart whenever possible).

1. The language

Give a general characterization of the language in terms of geography, genealogy, contacts, sociolinguistic status, dialectal variation etc.

2. Clausal negation

2.1. Standard negation

Standard negation (SN) refers to the (basic) way(s) a language has for negating declarative verbal main clauses (see especially Payne 1985, Miestamo 2005a). E.g., in French (1), SN is expressed by a construction in which the negative marker *not* follows the finite auxiliary. In Finnish (2), standard negation is expressed by a construction in which the negative auxiliary *e-* appears as the finite element of the sentence, carrying the verbal person-number markers, and the lexical verb is in a non-finite form (uninflected present connegative in the present and past participle in the past tense) (example 1).

(1) Spanish

- a. *El perro está ladrando.*
DEF dog be.3SG bark.PTCP
'The dog is barking.'
- b. *El perro no está ladrando.*
DEF dog NEG be.3SG bark.PTCP
'The dog is not barking.'
- c. *El perro ladró.*
DEF dog bark.PST.3SG
'The dog barked.'
- d. *El perro no ladró.*
DEF dog NEG bark.PST.3SG
'The dog did not bark.'

(2) Finnish (constructed examples)

- a. *Koira haukku-u*
dog bark-3SG
'The dog is barking.'
- b. *Koira ei hauku*
dog NEG.3SG bark.CNG.PRES
'The dog is not barking.'
- c. *Koira haukku-i*
dog bark-PST.3SG
'The dog barked.'
- d. *Koira ei haukku-nut*
dog NEG.3SG bark-PST.PTCP.SG
'The dog did not bark.'

As explained above, pay attention to the type and position of the negative marker(s) as well as to any structural differences between the negatives and the corresponding affirmatives. Are negative markers simply added to a corresponding positive, or does the structure of the clause differ from the affirmative in other ways, too (constructional asymmetry)? Are the same

grammatical categories available in the negative as well, or are some distinctions made in the affirmative lost in the negative (paradigmatic asymmetry)? Which types of asymmetry identified by Miestamo (2005a) do these differences instantiate?

Languages may have different standard negation constructions, e.g., in different TAM categories, in different person/number/gender categories etc. For example in Komi, the present and the past use negative verb constructions with a different stem of the negative verb (3a-d), and the perfect and the pluperfect use a completely different construction with a negative particle (3e-h).

(3) Komi-Zyrian (Rédei 1978: 105–109)

- | | |
|--|--|
| a. <i>šet-ę</i>
give-3SG.PRES
'(s)he gives.' | b. <i>o-z šet</i>
NEG-3 give
'(s)he does not give.' |
| c. <i>šet-i-s</i>
give-PRET-3SG
'(s)he gave.' | d. <i>e-z šet</i>
NEG.PRET-3 give
'(s)he did not give.' |
| e. <i>šet-ęm-a</i>
give-PERF-3SG
'(s)he has given.' | f. <i>abu šet-ęm-a</i>
NEG give-PERF-3SG
'(s)he has not given.' |
| g. <i>šet-ęm-a vęli</i>
give-PERF-3SG be.PRET.3SG
'(s)he had given.' | h. <i>abu šet-ęm-a vęli</i>
NEG give-PERF-3SG be.PRET.3SG
'(s)he had not given.' |

Describe all the different constructions used in different standard negation environments (declarative verbal main clauses).

Languages may have clausal negation constructions differing from standard negation in different clause types. There may be a dedicated negative construction for imperatives, non-verbal clauses, etc. Sections 2.2-2.5 should describe negation in each of these clause types. In case a clause type does not have a dedicated negative construction, it should be briefly noted which negative construction, already described, is used to negate it (perhaps giving an illustrative example if needed and if space permits).

2.2. Negation in non-declaratives

Do imperatives have a dedicated negative construction different from standard negation (or show special behaviour with respect to standard negation in some way at least)? Describe the dedicated construction (special behaviour) according to the instruction given above (neg-markers, (a)symmetry, functions) and give examples. You may also characterize negative imperatives in terms of the typological classification proposed by van der Auwera and Lejeune (2005).

What about other non-declaratives (questions, (other) non-declarative mood categories)? If there are any special constructions, describe them here, too.

2.3. Negation in non-verbal clauses

Non-verbal clauses can be divided into different types as follows (Payne 1997: 111ff):

- equation, e.g., *She is my mother.*
- proper inclusion, e.g., *Kurumaku is a hunter.*
- attribution, e.g., *She is intelligent.*
- locative predication, e.g., *The cat is on the mat.*
- existential predication, e.g., *There are wild cats. There are wild cats in Africa.*
- possessive predication, e.g., *Tom has a car.*

How are these clause types negated? Do any of these clause types have a dedicated negative construction different from standard negation or from the other non-verbal clause types (or show special behaviour with respect to standard negation or the other non-verbal clause types in some way at least)? Which types are negated similarly and which ones differently? Describe the dedicated construction (special behaviour) according to the instruction given above (neg-markers, (a)symmetry, functions) and give examples.

2.4. Negation in non-main clauses

How is negation in dependent/subordinate clauses expressed – standard negation or dedicated constructions? Describe the constructions according to the above instructions. Pay attention to both finite and non-finite dependent clauses. Can non-finite clauses be negated? Are they negated with the standard negator, a special negator or are there special negative non-finite forms?

In Finnish, for example (4), finite subordinate clauses are negated by standard negation but non-finite dependent clauses such as (4c) cannot be negated. In English, on the other hand, the equivalent of (4d) 'I saw her/him not come.' would be grammatical.

(4) Finnish (constructed examples)

- Näin että hän tule-e*
see.PST.1SG that 3SG come-3SG
'I saw that (s)he's coming.'
- Näin että hän ei tule*
see.PST.1SG that 3SG NEG.3SG come.CNG.PRES
'I saw that (s)he's not coming.'
- Näin häne-n tule-va-n*
see.PST.1SG 3SG-GEN come-PTCP.PRES-GEN
'I saw her/him come.'
- *Näin häne-n ei tule-va-n*
see.PST.1SG 3SG-GEN NEG come-PTCP.PRES-GEN
'I saw her/him not come.'

2.6. Other clausal negation constructions

If there are other clausal negation constructions, not covered in sections 2.1-2.4, section 2.5. can be added to discuss them. These may include lexically idiosyncratic negatives such as special lexemes for 'not know' or 'not want' or pragmatically marked clausal negation constructions.

3. Non-clausal negation

This section deals with constructions/elements expressing negation other than clausal negation.

3.1. Negative replies

How are negative replies to polar questions expressed? Are there one-word negative replies like English *no*? Relate them to the corresponding affirmative replies.

What is the semantics of negative replies – does it disagree with the content or the polarity of the question?

Is the dog barking? – No!
Isn't the dog barking – No!

Do both of these replies mean that the dog is not barking or does the latter mean that the dog is barking? You may also comment on (the semantics of) affirmative replies to negative questions here or in Section 4.5.

3.2. Negative indefinites and quantifiers

Describe the negation of indefinite pronouns and adverbs in the language, e.g. *nobody, no-one, nowhere, never, none, no; anybody, anyone, anywhere, ever, one, any*.

- How are these related to indefinites in non-negatives? What is the range of use of these indefinites in non-negative contexts (e.g., English *nobody* is negative only but *anybody* has non-negative uses as well); these functions can be described in terms of the semantic map proposed by Haspelmath (1997).
- How are they used in clauses: Are they used together with clausal negation or not (English *I saw nobody* vs. *I didn't see anybody*)? (cf. Haspelmath 2005).
- In case the language does not have indefinites or cannot use them in negatives, how are the equivalent meanings expressed, e.g., 'I didn't see

anybody', 'Nobody came', 'The dog never barked', 'You didn't go anywhere.' ?

- Note that this subsection is related to negative polarity which is also a topic in Section 4 below. Try to find a balance between what is treated here and what in Section 4.

3.3. Negative derivation and case marking (abessives/caritives/privatives)

How are the meanings 'without', '-less', or 'un-' expressed, e.g., *without a book, bookless, unread, unreadable*.

- Do verbs and nouns behave similarly or do they have different markers?
- Are the markers adpositions, inflectional case markers, or derivation; if it is a primarily nominal marker, how does it combine with verbs?
- If the language has several of these, what is their division of labour, i.e. which functions does each marker express and what is its distribution?
- NB! If these markers are used in clausal negation constructions, these functions should be described in section 2.

3.4. Other negative constructions/expressions

Describe and illustrate any other negative constructions/expressions that are not covered above. E.g. negative coordinators such as English *neither... nor*.

4. Other aspects of negation

This section pays attention to various morphosyntactic, semantic and pragmatic phenomena that are not negative constructions/expressions themselves, but arise in connection with negation.

Note that some of the topics overlap with each other or with points raised in Sections 2-3. Please give careful thought to how to relate the topics in different sections to each other so that the same thing is not repeated but that the readers can easily see the connections.

4.1. The scope of negation

How is the scope of negation narrowed to a specific constituent (e.g., Foc Neg-Verb vs. Neg-Foc Verb)? What is the role of intonation and stress in coding the scope of negation? Prosodic prominence may be indicated by underlining.

Scope-related questions more generally? Note that examples discussed under different topics of the questionnaire may be discussed here in terms of their scope properties.

4.2. Negative polarity

List negative polarity items, their form/meaning/use (licencing conditions). Note that this overlaps to some extent with section 3.2.

4.3. Marking of NPs in the scope of negation.

Is case marking affected under negation (e.g., partitive/genitive objects or subjects)? Any other effects negation might have on the marking of NPs, such as change or loss of determiners, effects on the marking of focus, etc?

4.4. Reinforcing negation

Describe and illustrate the items used for reinforcing negation. To the extent that these are elements forming separate negative constructions/expressions, they can also be treated or at least mentioned at relevant points in Sections 2 or 3.

4.5. Negation and complex clauses

How is the coordination of positive+negative or two negatives expressed? Are there special negative coordinators, such as *neither, nor* ?

What about subordination? Are there negative conjunctions, such as *lest* ? Note that this is related to section 2.4.

To the extent that the negative coordinators and conjunctions are elements forming separate negative constructions/expressions, they can also be treated or at least mentioned at relevant points in Sections 2 or 3.

4.6. Other aspects of negation

Negative questions are treated in 2.2, but more can be said about their Function/use here (expecting positive or negative answer or neutral?) How are they replied to?

Negative transport (neg-raising) means that a higher-clause negative is interpreted as negating a lower-clause predicate, e.g. *I don't think they're coming* meaning *I think they're not coming* (see Horn 1978, 1989). Does neg-transport occur? Which predicates allow it and which ones do not?

Metalinguistic negation: this means that that what is negated is not the content of the proposition but rather the way it is expressed – “a device for objecting to a previous utterance on any grounds whatever, including the conventional or conversational implicata it potentially induces, its morphology, its style or register, or its phonetic realization.” (Horn 1989: 363)

- Some examples of metalinguistic negation (from Horn 1989):
 - *He doesn't have three children, he has four.*
 - *Around here we don't like coffee – we love it.*
 - *He didn't call the [pólis], he called the [polís]*
 - *Phydeaux didn't shit the rug, he soiled the carpet.*
- Metalinguistic negation may lead to different behaviour of negative polarity items:
 - *John didn't manage to solve {some/*any} problems – they were quite easy for him to do.* (Horn 1985: 130)

How does the language treat metalinguistic negation. Does it show special behaviour different from ordinary (“descriptive”) negation?

According to the instructions in the beginning of this questionnaire, the description of each negative construction should pay attention to whether some grammatical categories are lost in the negative. Here, you can still come back to the question what is negatable in the language? Can, e.g., quantifiers be negated – which ones can and which ones cannot? What about clauses with indefinite subjects?

Are there any interesting non-negative uses of negative constructions or constructions resembling negative constructions in the language?

Any other phenomena that should be taken into account in describing the system of negation in your language but that has not been covered above?

REFERENCES:

- Auwera, Johan van der & Ludo Lejeune (with Valentin Goussev). 2005. The prohibitive. In Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *The word atlas of language structures*, 290-293. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [available online in the WALS Online 2011 edition at <http://wals.info/chapter/71>]
- Dahl, Östen 1979. Typology of sentence negation. *Linguistics* 17: 79-106.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2005. Negative morphemes. In Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *The word atlas of language structures*, 454-457. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [available online in the WALS Online 2011 edition at <http://wals.info/chapter/112>]
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2011a. Order of negative morpheme and verb. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, chapter 143. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. [available online at <http://wals.info/chapter/143>]
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2011b. Position of negative morpheme with respect to subject, object, and verb. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, chapter 144. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. [available online at <http://wals.info/chapter/144>]
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2005. Negative indefinite pronouns and predicate negation. In Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie

- (eds.), *The word atlas of language structures*, 466-469. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [available online in the WALS Online 2011 edition at <http://wals.info/chapter/115>]
- Horn, Laurence R. 1978. Remarks on neg-raising In Peter Cole (ed.), *Syntax and semantics vol. 9. Pragmatics*, 129–220. New York: Academic Press.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1989. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Miestamo, Matti. 2005a. *Standard negation: The negation of declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 31). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2007. Negation – an overview of typological research. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1 (5). 552-570. (DOI:10.1111/j.1749-818X.2007.00026.x)
- Miestamo, Matti. 2009. Negation. In Frank Brisard, Jan-Ola Östman & Jef Verschueren (eds.), *Grammar, meaning and pragmatics* (Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights 5), 208-229. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Miestamo, Matti. In press. Negation. In Alexandra Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Payne, John R. 1985. Negation. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description, vol I, Clause structure*, 197-242, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.