QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR DESCRIBING THE NEGATION SYSTEM OF A LANGUAGE
by Matti Miestamo
[revised August 2016, small corrections August 2018]
[February 2019, revisions done together with Ljuba Veselinova]

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. To keep the length of the questionnaire in reasonable proportions, the questionnaire itself does not explain very deeply the typology of the different subdomains of negation, or give examples, and typological literature is meant to be consulted while working with the questionnaire. Some pointers to relevant literature are given in the questionnaire, but this is not done systematically, and the user of the questionnaire is advised to make use of typological overviews such as Miestamo 2007, 2017, and further typological literature cited in these.

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. Clausal negation and 3. Non-clausal negation, 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 (discontinous), or even more…
- Structural differences between positives vs. negatives (see Miestamo 2005a: 51ff, 2007, 2017)
    - 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. Please, provide also the ISO and Glottolog codes identifying the language.

[For the papers proceeding from the SWL8 Negation workshop in Paris in September 2018, the length of this section should be 1-1.5 pages, i.e. up to 750 words.]

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 Spanish (1), SN is expressed by a construction in which the negative marker *no* precedes the verb. 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).

(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.*   d. *El   perro   no   ladró.*
     DEF   dog   bark.PST.3SG   DEF   dog   NEG   bark.PST.3SG
     'The dog barked.'   'The dog did not bark.'

(2) Finnish (constructed examples)

   a. *Koira   haukku-u*   b. *Koira ei   hauku*
      dog   bark-3SG   dog NEG.3SG bark.CNG.PRES
      'The dog is barking.'   'The dog is not barking.'

   c. *Koira   haukku-i*   d. *Koira ei   haukku-nut*
      dog   bark-PST.3SG   dog NEG.3SG bark-PST.PTCP.SG
      'The dog barked.'   '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? For the relationship between aspectual categories and negation, see also Miestamo & van der Auwera 2011.

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. *śet-ẹ*   b. *o-z   śet*
      give-3SG.PRES   NEG-3   give
      '(s)he gives.'   '(s)he does not give.'

   c. *śet-i-s*   d. *e-z   śet*
      give-PRET-3SG   NEG.PRET-3 give
      '(s)he gave.'   '(s)he did not give.'

   e. *śet-ẹm-a*   f. *abu śet-ẹm-a*
      give-PERF-3SG   NEG   give-PERF-3SG
      '(s)he has given.'   '(s)he has not given.'

   g. *śet-ẹm-a   vẹli*   h. *abu śet-ẹm-a   vẹli*
      give-PERF-3SG be.PRET.3SG   NEG   give-PERF-3SG be.PRET.3SG
      '(s)he had given.'   '(s)he had not given.'

Describe all the different constructions used in different standard negation environments (declarative verbal main clauses). One temporal meaning that very often has its own dedicated negative construction are the so-called 'not yet' or *nondum* tenses (Comrie 1985: 54; Veselinova 2017), and special attention should be paid to the existence of such negative tenses.

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 2.2-2.4 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, giving also an illustrative example.

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); for differences between negative and positive imperatives, see also Miestamo & van der Auwera 2007 and Aikhenvald 2010.

What about other non-declaratives (questions, (other) non-declarative mood categories)? If there are any special constructions, describe them here, too. For negative questions, it is especially interesting to comment on their function/use – e.g., is there an expectation of a positive or negative answer or are they neutral in this respect?

2.3. Negation in stative predications

Stative predications (aka non-verbal predications) can be divided into different types following Payne (1997: 111ff, see also Veselinova 2014):
  • equation, e.g., *She is my mother. – She is not my mother.*
  • proper inclusion, e.g., *Kurumaku is a hunter. – Kurumaku is not a hunter.*
  • attribution, e.g, *She is intelligent. – She is not intelligent.*
  • locative predication, e.g., *The cat is on the mat. – The cat is not on the mat.*
  • existential predication, e.g., *There are wild cats. – There are no wild cats.*
  • possessive predication, e.g., *Tom has a car. – Tom doesn't have a car.*
As Veselinova (2015) notes, attribution can be further divided into permanent and temporary property assignment: *Luna is tall* vs. *Luna is happy*, and under existential predication, we can further identify locative-presentative constructions such as *There are wild cats in Africa*.

Note that the distinction between existentials and locatives lies in that locatives have a definite subject and they do not introduce new participants in the discourse, whereas existentials do introduce new participants. The subjects of existential predications are generic; they typically appear in bare form or if marked, their marking will be different from that of subjects in other kinds of predications, cf. also Dryer 2007, Veselinova 2013a, McNally 2016.

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? Is there a difference between temporary and permanent property assignment as regards negation. Do generic vs. specific predicates behave differently as regards negation? 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)
   a. *Näin   että hän tule-e*
       see.PST.1SG that 3SG   come-3SG
       'I saw that (s)he's coming.'
   b. *Näin   että hän ei   tule*
       see.PST.1SG that 3SG   NEG.3SG come.CNG.PRS
       'I saw that (s)he's not coming.'
   c. *Näin   häne-n tule-va-n*
       see.PST.1SG 3SG-GEN come-PTCP.PRES-GEN
       'I saw her/him come.'
   d. **Näin   häne-n ei   tule-va-n*
       see.PST.1SG 3SG-GEN NEG   come-PTCP.PRS-GEN
       'I saw her/him not come.'

2.5. Negative lexicalizations

Lexical meanings may combine with negation to form lexically idiosyncratic negatives. Cross-linguistically common lexicalizations include 'not yet', 'not exist', 'not be of identity', 'not know', 'cannot, not be able to', 'not want', 'not talk', 'not need', 'not enough', 'not like', and 'not see' (cf. Veselinova 2013b). Describe the form and behaviour of any such items in the language.

Note that some of these may be better treated in other sections, e.g. 'not exist' and 'not be of identity' under stative predications, and 'not yet' under standard negation in case it can be seen as part of the tense system rather than as a more independent lexical item.

5

2.6. Other clausal negation constructions

If there are other clausal negation constructions, not covered in sections 2.1-2.5, section 2.6 can be added to discuss them. One possible example would be clausal negation constructions appearing in special pragmatic contexts or showing speacial pragmatic effects.

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 – do they disagree with the content or with the polarity of the question, i.e. do both of the following replies mean that the dog is not barking or does the latter mean that the dog is barking?

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

Particles that disagree with the polarity of the question are called polarity-reversing particles by Holmberg (2015). The Guaraní particle *tove* is a polarity-reversing particle that can occur as reply to both positive and negative questions, while French *si* or German *doch* can only function as positive answers to negative questions. Please comment also on (the semantics of) affirmative replies to negative questions.

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), cf. also Van Alsenoy 2014.

- 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 which positions can they occur in the clause?
- 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 meanings of absence, opposition and antonymy, such as 'without', '-less', or 'un-', expressed on the lexical/phrasal level, e.g., *without a book, bookless, unread, unreadable*.
- Do verbs, nouns and adjectives 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? Cf. Miestamo 2014.

4.4. Reinforcing negation

Describe and illustrate the means used for reinforcing negation. Prosody should also be paid attention to here. To the extent that emphatic negatives involve 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, coordination and complex clauses

How is the coordination of positive+negative clause or two negative clauses expressed? Are there special negative coordinators, such as *neither, nor* ? Are there special constructions for contrastive negation (e.g. *This is a dog, not a cat*; *This is not a cat but a dog*); this is also related to the scope of negation and can be taken up in Section 4.1 as well?

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

Here you can take up further aspects of negation to the extent that you have been able to find data on them. It is advisable to try to cover as many as possible of the phenomena that have been given a separate subsection below. Any other aspects of negation can also be addressed in case they are of special interest in the language described.

4.6.1. Negative transport
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?

4.6.2. Metalinguistic negation
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? How does metalinguistic negation relate to contrastive negation, which may or may not be metalinguistic.

4.6.3. Non-negative uses of negatives and expletive negation
Are there any interesting non-negative uses of negative constructions or constructions resembling negative constructions in the language? One particular phenomenon to pay attention to here is the so-called expletive negation in complements to predicates such as 'fear' or 'doubt', e.g. in French *Je crains qu'elle **ne** vienne.* 'I'm afraid she will come.', or in subordinate clauses introudced by conjunctions meaning 'until' or before', e.g. in French *...avant qu'il **ne** vienne.* '...before he comes.' If this phenomenon is found in the language, which contexts trigger it?

4.6.4. Summary of what can be negated in the language
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?

4.6.5. Diachronic notes and observations
The questionnaire aims at a synchronic description of negation in a language. Notes on diachronic issues, such as Jespersen Cycles (van der Auwera 2009, 2010) or the Negative Existential Cycle (Croft 1991, Veselinova 2014, 2016), may be made here in this final section or in the relevant sections that they concern.

4.6.6. Any other phenomena
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? Anything that is of special interest in the negation system of the language but does not fit under any of the headings above.

REFERENCES:

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2010. *Imperatives and commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van der Auwera, Johan. 2009. The Jespersen cycles. In Elly van Gelderen (ed.), *Cyclical change*, 35-71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van der Auwera, Johan. 2010. On the diachrony of negation. In Laurence R. Horn (ed.), *The expression of negation* (The Expression of Cognitive Categories 4), 73–109.. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton

van der Auwera, Johan & 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 at http://wals.info/chapter/71]

van der Auwera, Johan & Lauren Van Alsenoy. 2018. More ado about nothing: On the typology of negative indefinites. In Ken Peter Turner & Laurence Horn (eds.), *Pragmatics, truth and underspecification. Towards an atlas of meaning* (Current Research in the Semantics / Pragmatics Interface 34), 107-146. Leiden : Brill.

Comrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense*. Cambridge: CUP.

Croft, William. 1991. The evolution of negation. *Journal of Linguistics* 27. 1-39.

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. 2007. Clause Types. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, 224-275. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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 at http://wals.info/chapter/115]

Holmberg, Anders. 2015. *The syntax of yes and no*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

McNally, Louise. 2016. Existential sentences crosslinguistically: Variations in form and meaning. *Annual Review of Linguistics* (2). 211-231.

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. 2017. Negation. In Alexandra Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (eds.), *Cambridge handbook of linguistic typology*, 405-439. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miestamo, Matti & Johan van der Auwera. 2007. Negative declaratives and negative imperatives: Similarities and differences. In Andreas Ammann (ed.), *Linguistics Festival, May 2006 Bremen* (Diversitas Linguarum 14), 59-77. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Miestamo, Matti and Johan van der Auwera. 2011. Negation and perfective vs. imperfective aspect. In Jesse Mortelmans, Tanja Mortelmans and Walter De Mulder (eds.), *From now to eternity* (Cahiers Chronos 22), 65–84. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Payne, John R. 1985. Negation. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description, vol I, Clause structure*, 197-242, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Payne, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univesity Press.

Veselinova, Ljuba. 2013a. Lexicalized negative senses: A cross-linguistic study. Paper presented at the 10th Bi-Annual Conference at of the Association for Linguistics Typology (ALT 10), Leipzig, Germany, August 15-18, 2013.

Veselinova, Ljuba. 2013b. Negative existentials: A cross linguistic study. *Italian Journal of Linguistics: Special Issue on Existential Constructions* 25 (1). 107-46.

Veselinova, Ljuba. 2014. The Negative Existential Cycle revisited. *Linguistics* 52 (6). 1327-1389.

Veselinova, L. 2016. The Negative Existential Cycle through the Lens of Comparative Data. In Elly van Gelderen (ed.), *The Linguistic Cycle Continued*, 139–87. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Veselinova, Ljuba. 2017. Expectations shaping grammar: Searching for the link between tense-aspect and negation. Paper presented at the 12th Bi-Annual Conference at of the Association for Linguistics Typology (ALT 12), Canberra, Australia, December 11-16, 2017.