Lancaster University

(A)symmetries in imperative negation
Finiteness ~~and specialization~~

Daniël Van Olmen

International Workshop on Negation – October 7, 2021
University of the Basque Country – Vitoria-Gasteiz

Lancaster University

Introduction

Introduction

Methodology & analytical framework

Results

Conclusions

(A)symmetry

Lancaster University

- as introduced by Miestamo (2005)

  the constructions/paradigms of domain f(X) differ from those of X (not) only in the presence of the f() marker

- applied to, inter alia
  - (non-)verbal predicates (Turunen 2011)
  - declaratives vs polar interrogatives (Miestamo et al. 2007)
  - and, most thoroughly, standard negation (SN) (Miestamo 2005, 2013a, 2013b)

(A)symmetry in SN

Lancaster University

- paradigmatic asymmetry: neg distinctions ≠ pos ones

  I did sleep. vs *I slept.*
  I did not sleep. but **I slept not.*

A/Emph

- constructional asymmetry: neg cx - NEG ≠ a pos cx

  Finnish (Finnic, Finland; Miestamo 2013a)

  a. *tule-n*
     come-1SG
     'I am coming.'

  b. *e-n* *tule*
     NEG-1SG come.CONNEG.PRS
     'I am not coming.'

A/Fin

Asymmetry in finiteness

Lancaster University

- what? (Miestamo 2005: 73-96)
  - lexical verb (LV) loses finiteness – broadly defined – in neg as compared to pos
  - possibly new finite element (FE) in neg

- why in SN? (Miestamo 2005: 206-208, as well as Givón 1978, 2001)
  - neg expresses less change than pos (e.g. *they're (not) dancing*)
  - nouns convey more time-stable concepts than verbs
  - LV losing finiteness ≈ becoming more noun-like and time-stable

Asymmetry in finiteness

- in imperative negation (IN) too

Yuhup (Nadahup, Colombia; Ospina Bozzi 2002: 166, 173)

a.	*wĕd*^{n}		
	eat.IMP		
	‘Eat!’		
b.	˷*dɨ́d*^{n}*-˜dɨ̀h*	*dĭh*	
	speak.CONC-NEG	be.IMP	
	‘Don’t speak!’		

- Miestamo & van der Auwera (2007)
  - less frequent in IN than in SN
  - because of “illocutionary dynamicity”
  - BUT sample of only 30 languages…

RQ1: how does A/Fin fare in IN vs SN in a larger sample?

A problem of comparanda

Lancaster University

- Lower Chehalis (Tsamosan, USA; Robertson 2014: 108, 110)

a. *vyəl-áʔ-əc*
help-IMP-1SG.OBJ.PFV
'Help me!'

b. *vhílu-Ø* *ʔə-s-vləč̓-án*
NEG-3.SBJ.PFV 2SG.POSS-NMLZ-fill-3.OBJ.PRF
'Don't fill it!' or 'You do not fill it.

- problem
  - looks like NegVerb, or rather Neg-LV
  - BUT (b) = indicative used directively
  - so (a) vs (b) is actually I(N) cx vs SN cx and doesn't reveal much about A/Fin in IN

(A)symmetry in specialization

Lancaster University

- lack of specialized pos and/or neg cxs
  - not really found in SN
  - observed before for IN (e.g. Aikhenvald 2010: 7)
  - but no studies of its frequency and distribution

Ritharngu (Western Pama-Nyungan, Australia; Heath 1980: 76)

a. *ḻuk-I ṉi:*
   eat-FUT 2SG
   'Eat!' or 'You will eat.'

b. *yaka ṉi: baŋguḻʔ-yu-ru*
   PROH 2SG return-THEM-FUT
   'Don't speak!'

- needed to exclude languages to answer RQ1 properly

Lancaster University

Methodology & analytical framework

Introduction

Methodology & analytical framework

Results

Conclusions

Sample Principles

Lancaster University

- genus-macroarea sampling with a predetermined sample size
  - developed by Miestamo et al. (2016)
  - variety sample, with additional geographical balancing
  - allowing some quantification
- against genealogical bias
  - never more than 1 language per genus
  - i.e. 521 fairly uncontroversial sets of related languages with a 3500-to-4000-year time-depth (Dryer 1989, Dryer 2013)
  - e.g. Slavic (Indo-European), Mayan (= language family), Basque (isolate)
  - also from different language families as much as possible

Sample Principles

Lancaster University

- against geographical bias
  - Dryer's (1989) 6 macro-areas (cf. 10 in Nichols et al. 2013)
  - i.e. Africa (AFR), Eurasia (EA), SE Asia & Oceania (SEA&O), Australia & New Guinea (A&NG), North America (NA), South America (SA)
  - % genera of macro-area in sample = % genera of macroarea in world
  - also no adjacent languages to the extent possible

	AFR	EA	SEA&O	A&NG	NA	SA
# genera	74	43	66	140	92	106
% genera	14.20	8.25	12.67	26.87	17.66	20.35
200 languages	28	17	25	54	35	41

Sample Languages

Lancaster University

AFR	Bagiro, Busa, Degema, Egyptian Arabic, Ewe, Fur, Ghomara Berber, Hausa, Jalkunan, Ju|'hoan, Krongo, Kanuri, Komo, Koyraboro Senni, Kresh, Kunuz Nubian, Lango, Maba, Mankanya, Nama, Northern Gumuz, Penange, Sandawe, Shangaci, So, Somali, Wolaitta, Yoruba
EA	Albanian, Basque (Western), Brahui, Burushaski, Evenki, Georgian, Icelandic, Itelmen, Japanese, Kannada, Ket, Kolyma Yukaghir, Lezgian, Nahali, Nivkh, Pite Saami, Western Farsi
SEA&O	Agta, Batak Karo, Begak, Burmese, Cantonese, Chamorro, Daai Chin, Eastern Kayah Li, Great Andamanese, Kambera, Khasi, Khmer, Kurtöp, Lao, Pacoh, Paiwan, Puma, Qiang, Semelai, Taba, Tukang Besi, Vitu, Wa, White Hmong, Zoulei
A&NG	Abun, Adang, Alamblak, Arapesh, Asmat, Barupu, Daga, Djingili, Edolo, Emmi, Gaagudju, Garrwa, Gooniyandi, Gunin, Gurr-goni, Imonda, Inanwatan, Kaki Ae, Kalamang, Kamasau, Karawari, Kayardild, Kimaghama, Kobon, Komnzo, Korowai, Kuot, Laragia, Lavukaleve, Makalero, Manambu, Mangarrayi, Mara, Marind, Maung, Menggwa, Meyah, Miriwung, Nasioi, Ngiyambaa, Nunggubuyu, Nungon, Nyulnyul, Ritharngu ,Savosavo, Sentani, Suena, Sulka, Tidore, Tiwi, Wagiman, Wambaya, Yareba, Yidiny
NA	(Hare) Slave, Acoma, Barbareno Chumash, Chinantec Lealao, Haida, Huave, Huehuetla Tepehua, Kiowa, Klamath, Koasati, Kutenai, Lakota, Lower Chehalis, Mam, Maricopa, Mixtec Chalcatongo, Nahuatl Tetelcingo, Nez Perce, Northern Paiute, Nuuchahnulth, Oneida, Pima Bajo, Plains Cree, Purépecha, Shuswap, Southern Pomo, Tonkawa, Wappo, West Greenlandic, Wichita, Wintu, Yuchi, Zenzontepec Chatino, Zoque (Copainalá), Zuni
SA	Aguaruna, Andoke, Arawak, Ashaninka Satipo, Awa Pit, Bororo, Canamarí, Canela-Krahô, Chipaya, Chorote, Cuiba, Emerillon, Epena Pedee, Ese Ejja, Gününa Küne, Jaqaru, Jebero, Kwazá, Mako, Mapudungun, Matsés, Mocoví, Mosetén, Murui, Páez, Paumarí, Pech, Pirahã, Quecha Imbabura, Rama, Sanuma, Trio, Trumai, Tuyuca, Waorani, Warao, Wari', Yagua, Yaruro, Yuhup, Yuracare

Operationalization of RQ1 Definition

Lancaster University

- loss of finiteness (see Miestamo 2005: 75)
  - LV acquires nominal features (e.g. case)
  - LV takes a form typically employed when a verb is syntactically dependent (e.g. infinitive, converb)
  - and/or LV becomes syntactically dependent on a new FE
- often accompanied by deverbalization (see Miestamo 2005: 73)
  - less marking of tense-aspect-mood
  - and/or less marking of person-number-gender agreement

Operationalization of RQ1
Neg-LV type (see Miestamo 2005: 75-80)

Lancaster University

Matsés (Panoan, Brazil & Peru; Fleck 2003: 161, 997)

a. *kapú-e-k*
walk-NPST-IND
'He is walking.'

b. *nid-en-quio tc-e-c*
go-NEG-ADJZ AUX-NPST-IND
'He isn't going.'

Itelmen (Southern Chukotko-Kamchatkan, Russia; Georg & Volodin 1999: 155, 200)

a. *q'-nu-(qzu-s)-xç*
2SG.IMP-eat-INCH-PRS-2SG
'Eat now!'

b. *zaq wetat-kaq (q-lq-qzu-s-xç)*
PROH work-ABE 2SG.IMP-AUX-INCH-PRS-2SG
'Don't work!'

Operationalization of RQ1
NegVerb type (see Miestamo 2005: 81-86)

Lancaster University

Komo (Koman, Ethiopia & South Sudan; Negash 2014: 129, 139)

a. *ʔàká* *bíʃí-nà* *téʃin*
1SG work-1SG always
'I always work.'

b. *hàp* *téʃin* *ɓaʃ-íp* *bíʃí*
3SG.F always NEG-3SG.F work
'She doesn't always work.'

Sulka (Sulka, Papua New Guinea; Tharp 1996: 124, 129)

a. *Ø-sap*
2SG.IMP-run
'Run!'

b. *Ø-or* *kam* *sap*
2SG.IMP-PROH INF run
'Don't run!'

Operationalization of RQ1
Additional considerations

Lancaster University

- A/Fin type not always clear
  - e.g. Neg-FE or Neg-Cl in Vitu IN
  - e.g. NegVerb or Neg-LV in one Awa Pit SN cx
- multiple SN or IN cxs in a language
  - e.g. symmetric cx for FUT but Neg-LV cx for NFUT in Yareba SN
  - e.g. interchangeable (?) symmetric cx and NegVerb cx in Kresh IN

Lancaster University

Results

Introduction

Methodology & analytical framework

Results

Conclusions

In general

Lancaster University

	[+A/Fin]	[-A/Fin]
SN	40 (20.00%)	160 (80%)
IN	34 (20.36%)	133 (79.64%)

- A/Fin equally frequent in SN and IN (pace Miestamo & van der Auwera 2007)
  - “despite” generally more SN cxs than IN cxs
  - so illocutionary dynamicity?
  - or stativity of neg as motivation for A/Fin?

- where does A/Fin in IN come from?

A/Fin types and [±A/Fin] in SN vs IN

Lancaster University

	Neg-LV	Neg-FE	Neg-Cl	NegVerb	unclear
SN	22	0	0	20	2
IN	11	1	2	18	3

⇒ somewhat more NegVerb / less Neg-LV in IN than in SN

	IN [+A/Fin]	IN [-A/Fin]
SN [+A/Fin]	18 (10.78%)	17 (10.18%)
SN [-A/Fin]	16 (9.58%)	116 (69.46%)

⇒ fairly strong mutual implications between SN and IN in [-A/Fin]

⇒ but no implicational relations between them in [+A/Fin]

IN [+A/Fin]: fully coherent with SN [+A/Fin]

- only 5/18 [SN +A/Fin, IN +A/Fin] languages

Warao (Warao, Venezuela; Romero-Figeroa 1997: 28, Robertson & Rybka 2020: 79)

a. *hi-rima* *nao-naka* *(ta-te)*
2SG.POSS-father come-NEG AUX-NPST
'Your father doesn't come.'

b. *murako* *ari-naka* *(ta-u)*
avocado pick-NEG AUX-2SG.IMP
'Don't pick any avocados!'

Nuuchahnulth (Southern Wakashan, Canada; Davidson 2002: 155, 297)

a. *wik='aλ=qu:=s* *weʔič ʔathi'*
NEG=TEMP=CON=1SG sleep night
'I didn't sleep nights.'

b. *wik='i·s* *ʔita·k*
NEG-2SG>1SG.IMP disbelieve
'Don't disbelieve me!'

IN [+A/Fin]: partly coherent with SN [+A/Fin]

- 11/18 [SN +A/Fin, IN +A/Fin] languages

Pite Saami (Saami, Norway & Sweden; Wilbur 2014: 158, 180, 229)

a. *ittji-n* *bårå*
NEG-3PL.PST eat.CONNEG
'They didn't eat.'

b. *ell-en* *tsábme*
PROH-2DU.IMP hit.CONNEG
'Don't you two hit!'

Yuhup (Nadahup, Colombia; Ospina Bozzi 2002: 172-173)

a. *~ăj_dĕh* *wédn-dɨ̀h* *ˉdɨ́hɨ́p*
women eat.CONC-NEG that
'The women didn't/don't/.. eat that.'

b. *˜dɨ́dⁿ-˜dɨ̀h* *dĭh*
speak.CONC-NEG be.IMP
'Don't speak!'

IN [+A/Fin]: ‘leave’ source for NEG.IMP

- *at least* 1/18 [SN +A/Fin, IN +A/Fin] language & 6/16 [SN -A/Fin, IN +A/Fin] ones

Sulka (Sulka, Papua New Guinea; Tharp 1996: 94, 124-125, 129)

a. *nera-sap*
3SG.FUT-run
‘He/she will not run.’

b. *ner-la-sap*
3SG.FUT-NEG.FUT-run
‘He/she will not run.’

c. *Ø-sap*
2SG.IMP-run
‘Run!’

d. *Ø-**or***
2SG.IMP-PROH
‘Don’t run!’

kam	*sap*
INF	run

more NegVerb in IN than in SN!

grammaticalized illocutionary dynamicity?

IN [+A/Fin]: other NEG.IMP-'specific' sources

Lancaster University

- role of diachrony
  - argued to be important factor behind asymmetries in (ir)realis marking in IN (see van der Auwera & Devos 2012)
  - NEG.IMP less stable diachronically than IMP (e.g. Van Olmen 2010: 495-496 on Latin, Devos & Van Olmen 2013 on Bantu, Grossman & Polis 2014 on Ancient Egyptian)
    - functionally and formally more complex
    - stronger replacement pressure for reasons of politeness
    - stronger NegFirst principle (see Horn 1989 but also Van Olmen 2021)
    - …

IN [+A/Fin]: other NEG.IMP-‘specific’ sources

- e.g. insubordination of whole clauses (cf. Evans 2007 on directivity as target)
  - at least 2/18 [SN +A/Fin, IN +A/Fin] languages & 1/16 [SN -A/Fin, IN +A/Fin] one

Chinantec Lealao (Chinantecan, Mexico; Rupp 1989: 93-94)

a. *ŋia*^{M} *la*^{M}
come.2SG.COMPL here
‘Come here (now)!’

b. *ʔi*^{M} *ha*^{LM}*i*
REL come.2SG.PROG
‘Come (sometime)!’

c. *ʔa*^{L}*-ʔiM* *ki*^{M}*i*
NEG-REL dream.2SG.PROG
‘Don’t dream!’

IN [+A/Fin]: other NEG.IMP-‘specific’ sources

- e.g. privative cxs (cf. Aikhenvald 2010: 171-172):
  - at least 1/18 [SN +A/Fin, IN +A/Fin] language & 2/16 [SN -A/Fin, IN +A/Fin] ones

Murui (Huitoto, Brazil et al.; Wojtylak 2017: 430, 459, 590)

a. *ɨ̱-dɨ-kue*
   swim-LK-1SG
   ‘I swim.’

b. *ɨ̱-ñe-dɨ-kue*
   swim-NEG-LK-1SG
   ‘I don’t swim.’

c. *maka-Ø*
   walk-IMP
   ‘Walk!’

d. *maka-ñe-no*
   walk-NEG-PRIV
   ‘Don’t walk!’

IN [+A/Fin]: idiosyncratic IMP

- 2/16 [SN -A/Fin, IN +A/Fin] languages

Vitu (Oceanic, Papua New Guinea; van den Berg & Bachet 2006: 182, 203)

a. (*beta*) *hita* *ta(/na)* *hayi-li-a* *hiha* *katiu*
(NEG) 1PL.EXCL REAL.PL(/IRR.PL) catch-TR-3SG fish one
'We caught(/didn't catch) a fish.'

b. *taua* *miu* *na* *kuahi*
PROH 2PL IRR.PL fear
'Don't y'all be afraid!'

c. *miu* *pele-a*
2PL take-3SG
'Y'all take it!'

IN [-A/Fin]: coherent with ***a*** SN [-A/Fin]

- fully or partly in 5/17 [SN +A/Fin, IN -A/Fin] languages

Yareba (Yareban, Papua New Guinea; Weimer 1972: 62, 64-65, Weimer & Weimer 1975: 677)

a. *u-t-awa* *u-s-i-nu*
do-CL-NEG do-CL-RCPST-3SG
*‘*He will (not) do it.’

b. (*da*) *u-f-i-su*
NEG do-FUT-3SG-3SG
‘He didn’t do it.’

c. *ua*
do.2SG.IMP
‘Do it!’

d. *da* *ua*
NEG do.2SG.IMP
‘Don’t do it!’

IN [-A/Fin]: symmetric with IMP

- 5/17 [SN +A/Fin, IN -A/Fin] languages

Epena Pedee (Choco, Colombia; Harms 1994: 21, 103, 115, 136)

a. *tái* *wã-ru-tá*
   1PL go-PRS-PL
   'We are going.'

b. *wã-da-ʔé*
   go-PL-NEG
   'They are not going.'

c. *āyáa* *wã-tɨ*
   aside go-2PL.IMP
   'Y'all move aside!'

d. *pháta* *kʰo-náa-tɨ*
   plantain eat-PROH-2PL.IMP
   'Don't y'all eat plantains!'

IN [-A/Fin]: part of mood paradigm with IMP

- 4/17 [SN +A/Fin, IN -A/Fin] languages

Awa Pit (Barbacoan, Colombia & Ecuador; Curnow 1997: 244-247, 332, 334)

a. *santos-na shi ɨ-ma-y*
Santos-TOP NEG go-NEG-NLCT
'Santos did not go.'

b. *shi ayna-mtu ki-s*
NEG cook-IPFV.PTCP be.NEG-LCT
'I am not cooking.'

c. *tɨtizh-ti/tayŋ/zha/naka*
wait-IMP.SG/IMP.PL/IMP.1OBJ/POL.IMP
'Wait (y'all/for me/please)!'

d. *ki-mun/man*
move-PROH.SG/PROH.PL
'Don't (y'all) move!'

"idiosyncratic" NEG.IMPs in remaining languages – due to independent diachronies?

Lancaster University

Conclusions

Introduction

Methodology & analytical framework

Results

Conclusions

How does A/Fin fare in IN vs SN in a larger sample?

Lancaster University

- A/Fin equally frequent in SN and IN
  - so no appeal to illocutionary dynamicity needed for [+A/Fin] in IN (see also its grammaticalization in ‘leave’ and more NegVerb in IN)
  - or if IN is more dynamic than SN after all, stativity of neg simply not motivation for [+A/Fin] in either IN or SN?

- implication relations
  - fairly mutually strong between SN and IN in [-A/Fin]
  - non-existent between SN and IN in [+A/Fin]

A/Fin in IN vs SN
Factors at play

Lancaster University

- coherence across IN and SN
  - even if IN and SN markers are often different
  - but possibly also between NEG.IMP and ***a*** [-A/Fin] SN cx
- coherence in overall clause structure
  - but possibly with IMP as the (auxiliary-less) odd one out
- coherence within IN
  - symmetry in IN (but not necessarily in SN!)
  - IMP and NEG.IMP as part of a mood paradigm

A/Fin in IN vs SN
Factors at play

Lancaster University

- diachrony
  - stronger replacement pressure on NEG.IMP
  - some source cxs (e.g. ‘leave’, insubordination) give rise to [+A/Fin] in IN, regardless of [± A/Fin] in SN
  - while others do not, again regardless of [± A/Fin] in SN

Thank you for your attention!

Daniël Van Olmen
Lancaster University
Department of Linguistics and English Language
County South C68
Bailrigg
LA1 4YW
Lancaster, United Kingdom
d.vanolmen@lancaster.ac.uk