

Workshop

Negation in Clause Combining: Typological and usage-based perspectives

Abstracts

Negation in subordinate clauses in Kalmyk and Chuvash Baranova, Vlada	2
Negation in Yana Hamari, Arja	4
<i>Unhappy words</i> : A typological study of morphologically negated antonyms Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria ¹ , Miestamo, Matti ² & Börstell, Carl ³	6
Negation in Western Tukanoan: A closer look at diachrony Krasnoukhova, Olga ^{1,2} , Bruil, Martine ¹ & van der Auwera, Johan ²	8
Variability in the position of the negation in Swedish dependent clauses Lindström, Jan	10
Towards a typology of anticircumstantial clauses Mauri, Caterina ¹ & Sansò, Andrea ²	11
Negation in clause combining: Typological and usage-based perspectives – Introduction and project update Miestamo, Matti	14
Dependent clause negation in Uralic and Turkic Shagal, Ksenia ^{1,2} & Blinova, Alena ³	15
Polemic and metalinguistic negation revisited Silvennoinen, Olli O.	17
Negative existential indefinite constructions, biclausal and monoclausal van der Auwera, Johan	19
Are asymmetries in imperative negation based in usage? Van Olmen, Daniël	20
Negative existentials and their interaction with Standard Negation Veselinova, Ljuba	22

Negation in subordinate clauses in Kalmyk and Chuvash

Baranova, Vlada

St. Petersburg

The study aims at discussing negation in subordinate clauses in Kalmyk or Oirat (Mongolian) and Chuvash (Turkic). Typologically, there are differences between negation in main and subordinate clauses (Payne 1985; Bond 2011; Hansen 2018). Payne (1985: 240) mentions such features as the type of negator, the number of negators, and the positioning of the negator. The paper focuses on the type of negator, the origin of a negator and syntactic differences between the negators in main and subordinate clause.

The negation marker *esə* develops from a perfective standard negator in Middle Mongolian to particle being used in Modern Kalmyk predominantly in subordinate clauses (adverbial and relative) with non-finite predicates irrespective of aspect (Baranova 2019). It should be noted, that the preservation of the former main negation marker *esə* in subordinate clauses co-occurs with the shift from the usage with finite verbs to non-finite forms (this is because the predicate of subordinate clauses in Kalmyk is always a non-finite form), as in (1).

- (1) *ark-čiga esə uu-sən kun* (Kalmyk)
vodka NEG drink-PC.PST man
'a man who hasn't drunk any alcohol'

The Chuvash negation marker *mar* has functions of astrictive negation conveying the meanings of identification and attribute of an object. It also occurs with some non-finite forms (the future participle on *-as-*, the infinitive ending on *-ma-* and the form on *-malla*), as in (2).

- (2) *vëren-me kër-eş-şën mar=dək şkol-an an εøre* (Chuvash, Poskart variety)
learn-INF enter-PC_FUT_CSL NEG=COND school-OBJ PROH come
'If you do not want to go {to university}, don't go to the school'.

Thus, the paper discusses two ways of a possible origin of a negator in subordinate clauses: 1) the retain of the original negation marker in the dependent clause after the transformation of the negative system and the adoption of a new form of standard negation (as in Kalmyk), and 2) the extension of noun negator to co-occurrence with a non-verbal form in subordinate clauses (the negation marker *mar* in Chuvash).

Abbreviations

COND conditional, INF infinitive, NEG negation, NPST non-past, PC participle, PROH prohibitive, OBJ objective case (accusative + dative/directive)

References

- Baranova, V. (2019). The preverbal Negation Particle *esə* in Kalmyk: Historical Development and Typological Context of Negators in Subordinate clause. *International Journal of Eurasian Linguistics* 1 (2019), 21–45
- Baranova, V.V., Fedotov, M.L., Oskolskaya, S.A. (2021). Expressing absence in the Turkic languages of the Volga-Kama Sprachbund: Chuvash and Bashkir. *Томский журнал лингвистических и антропологических исследований* (Tomsk Journal of Linguistics and Anthropology). 4 (34): 9-31.

Bond, O. (2011). Negation in clause linkages. In: Julia Sallabank (ed.). *Language Documentation and Description* 9. 77–120. London: SOAS.

Payne, J.R. 1985. Negation. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*. Vol. 1: Clause Structure, 197-242. Cambridge – New York: CUP.

Hansen, C. Subordinate and interrogative clause negation in Iquito. *Linguistic Typology* 2018; 22(1): 119–163

Negation in Yana

Hamari, Arja

University of Helsinki

Yana is an extinct language of the putative Hokan stock in Northern California. Before its extinction, it was relatively well documented by mainly Edward Sapir in the beginning of the 20th century. He worked with all the dialectal varieties of the language surviving at that time: Northern Yana, Central Yana and Yahi (which was probably a variant of Southern Yana).

Yana is a verb-initial language with extensive polysynthesis. The predicate verb is in a central role in the clause and the morphological pattern is mostly suffixal. The morphological structure of the verb is summarized in Feature 1.

Feature 1. The template of Yana verbal morphology (Hinton 1988: 8–9).

1	2	3	4	5	6
primary stem prefix	/secondary stem verb stem	- derivational suffixes - incorporated nouns	TAM: - aspect - evidentials - mode - tense	person-number	clitics
Verb theme			Inflection		

There are some studies about the linguistic features of Yana but no comprehensive descriptions of its grammar exist. The negative patterns have not been studied previously, and only some notes about their characteristics can be found in the footnotes of Sapir's text collections. My study is based on the analysis of data collected from Sapir (1910) that only includes material from Northern and Central Yana. Sapir's Yahi material has not been published, except for the relatively short text samples in Sapir (1923) and Yahi data were, therefore, not collected. In this presentation, I will present my preliminary findings of the analysis. I will look at especially three aspects of Yana negation: 1) standard negation, 2) negation of existential clauses, and 3) negation and clause combining.

1) The standard negation of Yana is expressed by a preverbal negator *k^hu-* (or *k^hu:-*, see below). The negative construction can be regarded as asymmetrical negation of type A/Fin (following Miestamo 2005), as the negative marker carries the inflectional finite marking (TAM- and person-number-marking) that are associated with the lexical verb in affirmative clauses. The lexical verb, on the other hand, appears in a simplified form that Sapir (1923: 270 [footnote 31]) refers to as infinitive, see (1).

2) In existential constructions, Central Yana and Yahi mostly use *k^hu:-* (2) (cf. Sapir 1923: 294 [footnote 222]), that is, a variant of the negation marker with a long vowel. Since Yana has a copula verb *u-* (3a-b), we can make a tentative assumption that the copula was attached to the negative marker, producing the long vowel. If this assumption was correct, the situation would represent another instance of the Negative Existential Cycle, according to which existential markers often arise from the amalgamation of the standard negation marker and the positive existential (often a copula) (cf. Croft 1991; Veselina 2014). In Northern Yana, the long vowel variant *k^hu:-* is almost exclusively used in both standard and existential negation (Sapir 1923: 294 [footnote 222]).

3) In clause combining, the person-number-markers are often attached to the clause-initial conjunction (5) instead of the negator. In these constructions, both the negative marker and the lexical verb are simplified: the bare stem of the negative marker and the infinitive of the lexical verb.

Examples:

(1) Central Yana (Sapir 1910: 10)

k^hu-si^o:ʔ ni:yusa-ʔ
NEG-FUT.1SG go.far.off-INF
'I shall not go far off.'

(2) Central Yana (Sapir 1910: 75)

k^hu:ʔ aič ina gi iye:mairiku
NEG the sticks at center
'There were no sticks in the center.'

(3) Northern Yana

a) (Sapir 1910: 131)

u: ai gi:nau [< *gi:n-xau* 'next.house-on.east.side']
be.3SG 3SG next.house.on.east
'He is/lives in the next house on the east.'

b) (Sapir 1910: 148)

u-ʔnič gi:maʔ-mau-ya: u-ʔnič baʒa1-mau-ya:
be-1SG sensible-one.who.is-person be-1SG great-one.who.is-person
'I am a sensible person, I am a great person.'

(4) Northern Yana (Sapir 1910: 139)

k^hu:-si^o: aduwul-ʔ zi wawi-nʒ
NEG-FUT.1SG go.back.into.house-INF the house-1SG
'I shall not again enter my house.'

(5) Northern Yana (Sapir 1910: 192)

k^hu:-sinč de:ʒiba-ʔ nagu-nč k^hu nik^hi-ʔ
NEG-PRS.3SG know-INF therefore-1SG NEG come-INF
'I did not know about it, that is why I did not come'

References:

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

Hinton, Leanne. 1988. Yana Morphology: a Thumbnail Sketch. In Redden, James E. (ed.) *Papers from the 1987 Hokan-Penutian Languages Workshop and Friends of Uto-Aztecan Workshop*. Occasional Papers on Linguistics 14. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University. 7–16.

Miestamo, Matti. 2005. *Standard negation: The negation of declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sapir, Edward. 1910. *Yana Texts*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. 9, No 1. 1–235.

Sapir, Edward. 1923. *Text Analyses of Three Yana Dialects*. University of California Press.

Veselinova, Ljuba. 2014. The negative existential cycle revisited. *Linguistics* 52(6). 1327–1389.

Unhappy words: A typological study of morphologically negated antonyms

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria¹, Miestamo, Matti² & Börstell, Carl³

¹ Stockholm University, ² University of Helsinki, ³ Bergen University

Antonymy is a semantic relation well-known in linguistic literature (see e.g. Horn 1989). It may be realized by different lexical items (*good* vs. *bad*) or by items that are related to each other derivationally, e.g., by morphological negation (*happy* vs. *un-happy*). The two types – lexical and morphological antonyms – may, however, co-occur within the same “antonym set”. For such overlapping cases, the different types may be associated with different semantics and/or connotations (e.g., *unwise* vs. *stupid* as the antonym of *wise*).

The overarching issue addressed in this study is to what extent antonymy can be expressed by distinct lexical items (both are *plain*, in our terms), or by pairs in which at least one of the members contains a derivational element that has the meaning of negation in a broad sense (is *negative-constructed*, in our terms). Rather than zooming in one particular language, we explore this question across languages. To date, cross-linguistic studies on derivational negation have been limited in scope (cf. Zimmer 1964); our current study is therefore the first systematic typological survey on lexical vs. derived antonymy.

We have designed a questionnaire containing 41 antonym pairs, <Ant1, Ant2> representative of different types of property concepts, e.g. the different adjective classes identified in (Dixon & Aikhenvald 2004): *core* (e.g. DIMENSION, AGE); *peripheral* (e.g. PHYSICAL PROPERTY, SPEED); and *other* (e.g. DIFFICULTY, SIMILARITY). Experts of languages from different families and geographical areas have filled in the questionnaire, providing the corresponding property words in their language of expertise. Currently, our database contains information on 51 languages from 19 families (see Table 2).

A variety of research questions can be addressed on the basis of these data. In this talk, we focus on the formal expression of antonymy, paying attention to whether the members of antonymic pairs are expressed with what we call plain vs. negative-constructed lexical forms. We then ask how the plain and negative-constructed forms are distributed between the members of the antonym pairs, across antonym pairs and across languages, more specifically,

1. Which types of property words are typically targeted by negative-constructed vs. lexical antonymy, and why?
2. How prominent is negative-constructed vs. lexical expression of antonymy across the individual languages in our sample?

Our results show that there is a great deal of variation in both respects. For instance, the expression of three meanings (‘unimportant’, ‘impossible’, and ‘unhappy’) involve overt negation in the majority of the sample languages. Two pairs – ‘black vs. white’ and ‘right vs. left’ – involve plain forms in all the languages in our sample.

We will test several hypotheses that may influence the distribution of negative-constructed vs. lexical antonymy across types of property concepts:

- Hypothesis 1: Ant2 should be more likely to accept neg-constructed expression than Ant1.
- Hypothesis 2: evaluatively negative terms should be more likely to accept neg-constructed expression than evaluatively positive terms.
- Hypothesis 3: terms denoting smaller magnitude should be more likely to accept neg-constructed expression than terms denoting greater magnitude.
- Hypothesis 4: core oppositions should be more likely expressed with plain forms whereas neg-constructed forms would be more likely found in the category other; peripheral pairs would be situated between core and other in this respect.

- Hypothesis 5: Based on the principle of economy, there should be a trade-off between lexical and derivational expression, i.e., there should be an inverse correlation between the frequency of plain vs. neg-constructed expression in each antonym pair member/antonymy pair

We also observe that our sampled languages differ as to how prominent neg-constructional vs. lexical expression of antonymy is in the language. While Lithuanian and Russian are able to use morphological negation for many of the meanings in the list, other languages (Amharic, or Yucatec Maya) do not make use of this strategy at all.

References

Dixon, R. M. W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. 2004. *Adjective classes: A cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horn, Laurence R. 1989. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zimmer, Karl E. 1964. *Affixal negation in English and other languages: An investigation of restricted productivity*. New York, NY: The Linguistic Circle of New York.

Negation in Western Tukanoan: A closer look at diachrony

Krasnoukhova, Olga^{1,2}, Bruil, Martine¹ & van der Auwera, Johan²

¹Leiden University, ²University of Antwerp

This paper deals with negation in Tukanoan languages, with a focus on the Western Tukanoan branch. It was shown in Krasnoukhova & van der Auwera (submitted) that next to the Pano-Takanan languages, the Tukanoan languages – particularly the Western Tukanoan ones – profoundly make use of a negator *ma*. Unlike Pano-Takanan in which the negator *ma* is typically found at the verb-periphery, Western Tukanoan languages have their negator inside the verbal complex. More specifically, the negator occurs directly after the verbal root and is followed by other morphology. In most cases, the verb-final morphology involves gender/number markers which also have a nominalizing function, thus turning the negated verb into a non-finite or, rather, a nominal entity. In this paper we explore the variation in the way negation is encoded among closely related Western Tukanoan languages, in order to better understand the origin and development of the verb-internal negation in this language family. We explore further the following observations presented in Krasnoukhova & van der Auwera (submitted):

- The negation marker *-ma* is best considered synchronically as a derivational-like marker (rather than inflectional) in the Western Tukanoan branch.
- A negation construction in Ecuadorian Siona (1) closely resembles negation in relative clauses and ascriptive negation in Máhĩkì (2). A difference is that in (1) the required copula is syntactically free, whereas in a negated relative clause (2a) and ascriptive negation construction (2b), it is a portmanteau morpheme and is morphologically bound.

(1) Ecuadorian Siona (Bruil 2014: 214)

kwi-ma'-ki *ba-ha'i* *ji'* *jĩhkw-i*.
swim-NEG-CLF:AN.M be-3SG.M.PST.NASS 1SG grandparent-CLF:AN.M
'My granddad couldn't swim' (Lit. 'My granddad was a non-swimmer')

(2) Máhĩkì (Stephanie Farmer, p.c.)

(a) *ĩĩ* *óté-má-ki-agi*
he dance-NEG-CLF.M-COP.AN.M
'He's the one who doesn't dance/isn't dancing'

(b) *ĩĩ* *háí-má-ki-agi*
he big-NEG-CLF.M-COP.AN.M
'He isn't big' (Lit. 'he isn't (the) one who's big' or (our hypothesis) 'he is the one who is not big/non-big')

- The classifier suffixes which are found in ascriptive negation (e.g. *-ki* 'masculine singular/inanimate' in (2)) are related to subject markers found in dependent clauses. Thus, formally ascriptive negation with an adjectival predicate has a subordinate clause structure (just like this is the case in a relative clause construction (2a)).
- Besides Máhĩkì, the association of negation and dependent clause structure is observed for some other Western Tukanoan languages (i.e., Secoya and Siona).
- Finally, we pull available evidence together to examine a hypothesis that the synchronically bound negator *-ma* could originally have been a negative verb, that started out in a negative construction as part of a verb compounding or verb serialization process.

Abbreviations

AN animate, CLF classifier, COP copula, M masculine, NASS non-assertive, SG singular, PST past.

References

Bruil, Martine. 2014. Clause-typing and evidentiality in Ecuadorian Siona. Doctoral dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.

Krasnoukhova, Olga & Johan van der Auwera. Submitted. Negative ma in South America with a focus on its standard negative postverbal ma in Panoan, Takanan and Tukanoan. In Mily Crevels, Hein van der Voort & Matti Miestamo (eds.) *Negation in Amazonian Languages*. [Studies in Diversity Linguistics series]. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Variability in the position of the negation in Swedish dependent clauses

Lindström, Jan

University of Helsinki

This paper addresses variability in the position of the negating adverb *inte* ‘not’ in spoken Swedish, with a special focus on Finland-Swedish use. Different from declarative main clauses, which allow the fronting of almost any constituent in a “topic position”, Swedish dependent clauses follow a fixed straight SV pattern. When the negating adverb is present, the pattern is SNegV, i.e. the negator is placed between the subject and the finite verb (comparable to German dependent clauses). As noted by standard grammars, there are some rather infrequent and well-defined cases that deviate from this fixed pattern, allowing the negator to stand as the first constituent, directly after the subordinator, thus yielding the pattern NegSV. This seems to happen mostly in conditional clauses (*om inte programmet slutar snart* ‘if NEG the program won’t end soon’) and complement clauses (*att inte nya oväder stör räddningsarbetet* ‘that NEG new storms hamper the rescue operation’). Such variations occur especially if the subject is complex and emphasized.

Data from spoken Finland-Swedish reveals that the conditions for the alternative NegSV pattern in dependent clauses can be much more relaxed than what has been recorded in standard Swedish grammars. The word order occurs with several kinds of subordinators and with subjects which are simple and non-emphasized, e.g. personal pronouns: *du blir stämplad fast int du gör nånting* ‘you become stigmatized although NEG you do anything’.

I will present NegSV-variations in Swedish dependent clauses as they are found in Finland-Swedish conversational language and scrutinize the syntactic and sequential environments for the actual cases. I will also reflect on in which manner we can see the word order as a contact-induced phenomenon influenced by Finnish, a language where amalgamations between subordinators and negation are common, e.g. *ett-ei* ‘that-NEG’, *vaikk-ei* ‘although-NEG’.

Towards a typology of anticircumstantial clauses

Mauri, Caterina¹ & Sansò, Andrea²

¹ University of Bologna, ² University of Insubria

In this paper we aim to provide a typology of what we call *anticircumstantial clauses*. Anticircumstantial clauses (henceforth ACs) can be defined as the negative counterpart of circumstantial clauses: they are a sub-type of adverbial clauses that negate a state of affairs (SoA) connected to the SoA described in the main clause. An example of an AC is the bold part in example (1). ACs include negated temporal clauses, encoding either a simultaneous or a sequential relation between two SoAs A and non-B (as in (2b) and (3b) respectively), negated conditional clauses (as in (3c)), and negated reason clauses (as in (4)).

ACs have received little if any attention in typological studies. This is in striking contrast with (i) the interest in negated coordination (see Haspelmath 2007: 17ff.; Bond 2011) and in other types of negated subordinate clauses (e.g. precautionary or ‘lest’ clauses, cf. Lichtenberk 1995; Schmidtke-Bode 2009: 129ff.), and (ii) the interest in the negative counterpart of the coordination/accompaniment relation in the nominal domain (called ‘abessive’ or ‘privative’, cf. Stolz et al. 2007, among others), which happens to be crucially intertwined with ACs across languages (see below).

The aim of this paper is thus to fill such a gap, based on a sample of 150 languages. ACs vary along the following parameters across languages:

- a. **the relation with the nominal domain:** there are languages in which the connective encoding the AC is the same used to encode a privative (‘without’) relation in the nominal domain (cf. (2)), and languages that employ different strategies in the nominal and the clausal domain (cf. (3));
- b. **the morphosyntactic properties of the AC,** in terms of morphosyntactic reduction (e.g. elimination of TAM or agreement inflection from the dependent verb; cf. Cristofaro 2003) with respect to their positive counterpart: there are languages in which ACs can only be non-finite and/or do not carry the TAM markers that are possible with their positive counterparts, and languages in which ACs take finite inflection and/or allow the full or a partial range of the TAM markers of their positive counterparts. Example (2b) is an instance of the first type, whereas (3c-d) are instances of the second type;
- c. **the possibility of being used with different subjects:** in some languages, ACs are only possible if their subject is the same as the main clause (cf. (5)); in other languages, this restriction does not hold (cf. (6)).

We will show that the three parameters above are not in free variation. First, we observe a general tendency for ACs to display non-finite verb forms. In particular, ACs with inflectional reduction and ACs with restrictions on same-subject clauses frequently correlate with AC markers that are also used to encode a privative relation in the nominal domain. Second, we observe a tendency towards a general, semantically underspecified AC for all negated circumstantials, i.e. negated reason, conditional and temporal relations. When in a given language the AC does not cover all circumstantial relations, a tendency can be identified whereby temporal and conditional clauses are more frequently negated by means of the same AC, while reason clauses require a distinct strategy. Third, a tendency can be identified whereby if in a language the AC construction shows a privative marker coming from the nominal domain for any relation along the following scale, then it will be used also for all the relations to the right: negated reason > negated conditional > negated temporal posteriority > negated temporal simultaneity. We will conclude by sketching some pragmatic developments of ACs in discourse, based on corpus data from Italian (Mauri 2021).

Examples

(1) *People lost in the wild have survived for long periods without eating.*

(2) Murui (Huitotoan; Wojtylak 2017: 315-316): the ‘privative’ marker *-no* can occur on both nouns (cf. (2a)) and verbs (cf. (2b))

- a. *kue ei-ni-no bi-ya=za*
 1SG mother-NEG.ATT-PRIV come-NMLZ=UNCERT
 ‘(He) came without my mother.’
- b. *maiĵi-ñe-no bi-ti-kue*
 work-NEG-PRIV come-LK-1SG
 ‘I came without having worked.’

(3) Hamar (South Omotic; Petrollino 2016: 261, 264, 263): the ‘without’ relation in the nominal domain is encoded by the postposition *qólma* (cf. (3a)), whereas ACs are marked by the verbal negative markers *-íma* (for negated simultaneous and sequential relations), *-ámma* (for negated conditional relations), and *-mónna* (for negated reason clauses). In the two latter cases, the verb in the subordinate clause gets obligatory pronominal subject marking.

- a. *ínta kurí qólma búno-n i=wuc’á-de*
 1SG honey without coffee-F.OBL 1SG=drink-PFV
 ‘I’ve drunk the coffee without honey.’
- b. *raat-íma waadíma-n ashká-ti dáa-de*
 sleep-NEG.SUB1 work-F.OBL do-SE.1SG exist-PFV
 ‘I am working without having slept.’
- c. *ha=eel-ámma kó-te ni?-atóne*
 2SG=call-NEG.COND PRX.NSP-LOC come-PRS.NEG.1PL
 ‘If you don’t call we won’t come.’
- d. *mugá parsí kin=wuc’a-mónna wodí kí=na qarrabó im-idí-ne*
 Muga beer 3=drink-NEG.SUB2 1PL 2M=DAT qarrabó give-PFV-COP
 ‘Since Muga does not drink parsí beer, we gave him qarrabó.’

(4) Kambaata (Highland East Cushitic; Treis 2008: 196): the negated reason clause is marked by *-tannée*, the feminine dative form of the nominalizer, and by the negative relative morpheme *-umb-*, different from the negators found in main clauses (*-ba’a* and *-im*).

- oonn-áta mar-úmb-o-tannée min-í mánn-u*
 mourning-F.ACC go-1SG.NREL-F.OBL-BEC house-M.GEN people-M.NOM
amu’rr-ée-’e
 become.angry-3M.PFV-1SG.OBJ
 ‘My family is angry with me, because I do not go to funerals.’

(5) Jiwari (South-West Pama-Nyungan; Austin 2015: 49-50): the suffix *-yirra* can be used to derive stems meaning ‘lacking’ the property denoted by the nominal root (cf. (5a)), and can also combine with a verb inflected for imperfective same-subject dependent infection (encoding simultaneous clauses)

- a. *wiriny* ‘hair’ → *wirinyirra* ‘hairless’
- b. *paapaa-rri-ngu-yirra nhurra kumpa-ma*
 crazy-INCH-IPFV.SS-PRIV SG.NOM sit-IMP
 ‘Sit down without being crazy!’

(6) Yakkha (Mahakiranti; Schackow 2015: 441)

u-ppa=ŋa *tha* *men-dok-le* *nasa-lapmana=nuy* *phurluy*
 3SG.POSS-father=ERG knowledge NEG-get-CVB fish-rod=COM small_basket
khet-uks-u-ci=hoŋ *hoŋma=be* *khy-a-ma*.
 carry_off-PFV-3.P[PST]-3NSG.P=SEQ river=LOC go[3SG]-PST-PFV
 ‘Without his father noticing, he (the son) carried off the fishing net and the basket and went to the river.’

Abbreviations

ACC accusative, ATT attributive, bec reason clause, COND conditional, COP copula, CVB converb, DAT dative, ERG ergative, F feminine, GEN genitive, IMP imperative, INCH inchoative, IPFV imperfective, LK linker, LOC locative, NEG negation, NMLZ nominalization, NOM nominative, NREL negative relative, NSG non-singular, NSP non-specific, OBJ object, OBL oblique, P patient-like argument, PFV perfective/perfect tense, PL plural, POSS possessive, PRIV privative, PRS present, PRX proximal, PST past, SE same event converb, SEQ sequential, SG singular, SS same subject, SUB subordinator, UNCERT uncertainty marker.

References

- Austin, P. K. 2015. A reference grammar of the Mantharta languages, Western Australia. Manuscript. London, SOAS.
- Bond, O. 2011. Negation in clause linkages. In J. Sallabank (ed.), *Language Documentation and Description* 9, 77-120. London: SOAS.
- Cristofaro, S. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lichtenberk, F. 1995. Apprehensional Epistemics. In J. Bybee & S. Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*, 293–327. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Petrollino, S. 2016. *A grammar of Hamar: A South Omotic language of Ethiopia*. PhD Dissertation, University of Leiden.
- Schackow, D. 2015. *A grammar of Yakkha*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Schmidtke.Bode, K. 2009. *A typology of purpose clauses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stolz, Th., C. Stroh & A. Urdze. 2007. WITH(OUT): On the markedness relation between comitatives/instrumentals and abessives. *Word* 58: 63-122.
- Treis, Y. 2008. Relativization in Kambaata (Cushitic). In Z. Frajzyngier & E. Shay (eds.), *Interaction of morphology and syntax. Case studies in Afro-Asiatic*, 161-206. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wojtylak, K. I. 2017. *A grammar of Murui (Bue): A Witotoan language of Northwest Amazonia*. PhD Dissertation, James Cook University.

Negation in clause combining: Typological and usage-based perspectives – Introduction and project update

Miestamo, Matti

University of Helsinki

The project investigates negation in clause combining in a typological and usage-based perspective. Large-scale typological work on negation has thus far largely ignored negation in complex clauses (see Miestamo 2017), and cognitive and usage-based approaches (e.g. Langacker 1987; Goldberg 1995; Bybee 2010; Diessel 2019) have paid relatively little attention to negation. It is these research gaps that the project will address. The goals of the project include describing and understanding the world-wide cross-linguistic variation in the expression of negation in dependent clauses and clause-combination more generally, including a detailed investigation of conjunctions and other linking devices used with negative clauses. Special attention will be paid to the languages of Northern Eurasia, an area where it is particularly common that dependent clauses take non-finite forms, and properties of negative non-finite forms will be studied in depth, first in Eurasian languages and then expanding the scope to the whole world. An important perspective in accounting for the cross-linguistic variation is whether and how the negative shows structural differences (asymmetries) regarding the corresponding affirmative in addition to negative markers (Miestamo 2005). Explanations for such asymmetries can be sought in the functional properties of negation. The data for the typological comparisons will come from published descriptions, corpora and fieldwork. The project will employ both monolingual and parallel corpora to study the effect of language use on the shapes that grammars take in the domain of negation. The corpus-based and typological perspectives will complement each other in many ways and corpus work will allow for the testing of proposed explanations of cross-linguistic findings (see Hawkins 2004). The project will bridge important gaps in typological work on negation and makes theoretical and methodological contributions in bringing together typological and usage-based perspectives in the domain of negation and beyond. This talk will give a general introduction to the project and showcase currently ongoing studies in the project.

References

- Bybee, Joan. 2010. *Language, Usage and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diessel, Holger. 2019. *The Grammar Network: How Linguistic Structure is Shaped by Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hawkins, John A. 2004. *Efficiency and Complexity in Grammars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Volume 1: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2005. 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. 2017. Negation. In A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon, eds., *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology*, 405-439. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dependent clause negation in Uralic and Turkic

Shagal, Ksenia^{1,2} & Blinova, Alena³

¹ University of Helsinki, ² Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich, ³ Moscow

Both Uralic and Turkic languages make extensive use of deranked constructions in clause combining, that is, their dependent clause predicates often exhibit structural and behavioural differences from prototypical main clause predicates (see van Lier 2009: 103–104 for a definition of deranking). In most cases, deranking is manifested in the use of non-finite forms, such as participles, converbs, verbal nouns, and infinitives. This, in turn, has consequences for the expression of negation in dependent clauses. For instance, it can be expressed by specialized negative particles, such as *apak* in Moksha (1), abessive case markers, such as *-tek* in Udmurt (2), or inherently negative non-finite forms, such as the *-BAk:A* converb in Sakha (3):

- (1) Moksha (Uralic; Kozlov 2018: 382)
son aščə-s' apak šer'k-t / šer'k-əz'
he be.located-PST.3[SG] NEG.NFIN tremble-CN.NFIN / tremble-CVB.ATD
'He was sitting there without moving.'
- (2) Udmurt (Uralic; Edygarova 2015: 278)
mi viržili-tek puk-ko-m
1PL stir-ABE sit-PRS-1PL
'We are sitting without stirring.'
- (3) Sakha (Turkic; Petrova 2011: 30)
Maša ületin büterbekke jietiger barbüt
Masha work.POSS.3SG.ACC finish.CVB.NEG home.POSS.3SG.DAT go.PST.3SG
'Masha went home without finishing her work.'

Uralic and Turkic languages are spread over a vast territory in Northern Eurasia, but there is a region where some of them have been in close contact for centuries, namely the Volga-Kama area between the great Volga Bend and the Ural Mountains. The main languages in contact there have been Permian, Mari and Mordvin from the Uralic family and Chuvash and North Kipchak (Tatar and Bashkir) from the Turkic family. Manzelli (2015) discusses several possible cases of interference between these languages in the domain of negation, but focuses only on standard negation and prohibitives. In our talk, we will provide a comprehensive overview of dependent clause negation in Uralic and Turkic with a special attention to non-finite dependent clauses. In particular, we will take a closer look at the strategies used in the Volga-Kama area and try to identify possible contact phenomena in this domain.

Abbreviations

1 1st person, 3 3rd person, ABE abessive, ACC accusative, ATD attendant circumstance, CN connegative, CVB converb, DAT dative, NEG negative, NFIN non-finite, PL plural, POSS possessive, PRS present, PST past, SG singular

References

- Edygarova, Svetlana. 2015. Negation in Udmurt. In Matti Miestamo, Anne Tamm & Beáta Wagner-Nagy (eds.), *Negation in Uralic languages* (Typological Studies in Language 108), 265–291. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kozlov, A. A. 2018. Morfologija glagola [Verbal morphology]. In S. Yu. Toldova & M. A. Kholodiliva (eds.), *Èlementy mokšanskogo jazyka v tipologičeskom osveščeenii* [Elements of the Moksha language from a typological perspective], 342–395. Moscow: Buki Vedi.

- Manzelli, Gianguido. 2015. Mutual influences in negative patterns between Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages in the Volga-Kama area. In Matti Miestamo, Anne Tamm & Beáta Wagner-Nagy (eds.), *Negation in Uralic languages* (Typological Studies in Language 108), 633–652. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Petrova, Nyurguyana. 2011. *Lexical and clause-linkage properties of the converbal constructions in Sakha (Yakut)*. Buffalo, NY: State University of New York doctoral dissertation.
- van Lier, Eva. 2009. *Parts of speech and dependent clauses: A typological study* (LOT dissertation series 221). Utrecht: LOT.

Polemic and metalinguistic negation revisited

Silvennoinen, Olli O.

University of Helsinki

Metalinguistic negation refers to the negation of non-at-issue content, i.e. presuppositions, implicatures and linguistic forms (Horn 1985; see also Geurts 1998; Horn 2002):

- (1) a. The King of France **isn't** bald—because there is no King of France.
- b. This tea **isn't** hot, it's scalding.
- c. He **didn't** call the [polis], he called the [polís].

In Relevance Theory, metalinguistic negation has been analysed as echoic use of linguistic material (Carston 1996). More recent accounts of metalinguistic negation have sought to reduce it to independently needed phenomena such as syntax (Martins 2014; 2020) or information structure (Larrivéé 2018). In contrast to these alternative accounts, this presentation defends a modified version of Ducrot's (1984) view that metalinguistic negation should be defined against descriptive but also polemic negation. Following Larrivéé and Perrin (2010), descriptive negation refers to negation that does not have a discourse-active alternative, while polemic negation refers to negation that does have such an alternative, whether through inference or contextual salience. Typical examples of polemic negation constructions are so-called non-canonical negation constructions in Romance languages (Schwenter 2005):

- (2) Brazilian Portuguese (Schwenter 2005: 1443)

A: O João já deixou de fumar.

‘J. has stopped smoking.’

B: Ele **não** deixou de fumar **não**, ele ainda fuma.

‘He hasn't stopped smoking, he still smokes.’

or contrastive negation constructions, in which negation is juxtaposed or coordinated with an affirmative alternative (McCawley 1991; Silvennoinen 2019):

- (3) a. This tea is not hot, it's cold.
- b. This tea is **cold, not hot**.
- c. This tea is **not hot but cold**.

Extending Schwenter's (2005) analysis of the information-structural properties of negation, this presentation treats metalinguisticity and polemicity as conceptually independent but interacting factors in the pragmatics of negation: the vast majority and possibly all of metalinguistic negations are also cases of polemic negation since, in order for the metalinguistic reading to arise, a polemic context seems to be necessary. This approach avoids the problems of alternative accounts that define metalinguistic negation in terms of non-necessary features such as polarity items and information structure, or in terms of non-sufficient features such as echoicity. It has empirical consequences in particular for constructions that have previously been analysed as conventionalised for metalinguistic negation. Most such constructions are shown to be conventionalised for polemic negation instead.

References

- Carston, Robyn. 1996. Metalinguistic negation and echoic use. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(3). 309–330. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(94)00109-X.
- Ducrot, Oswald. 1984. *Le dire et le dit*. Paris: Les éditions de minuit.
- Geurts, Bart. 1998. The mechanisms of denial. *Language* 74(2). 274–307. doi:10.2307/417868.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1985. Metalinguistic negation and pragmatic ambiguity. *Language* 61(1). 121–174. doi:10.2307/413423.
- Horn, Laurence R. 2002. Assertoric inertia and NPI licensing. *CLS* 38(2). 55–82.
- Larrivée, Pierre. 2018. Metalinguistic negation from an informational perspective. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 3(1). doi:10.5334/gjgl.403.
- Larrivée, Pierre & Laurent Perrin. 2010. Voix et points de vue de la négation. In Marion Colas-Blaise, Mohamed Kara, Laurent Perrin & André Petitjean (eds.), *La question polyphonique (ou dialogique) en sciences du langage* (Recherches Linguistiques 31), 175–199. Metz: Université Paul Verlaine.
- Martins, Ana Maria. 2014. How much syntax is there in metalinguistic negation? *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 32(2). 635–672. doi:10.1007/s11049-013-9221-9.
- Martins, Ana Maria. 2020. Metalinguistic negation. In Viviane Déprez & M. Teresa Espinal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Negation*, 349–368. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198830528.013.20.
- McCawley, James D. 1991. Contrastive negation and metalinguistic negation. *CLS* 27(2). 189–206.
- Schwenter, Scott A. 2005. The pragmatics of negation in Brazilian Portuguese. *Lingua* 115(10). 1427–1456. doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2004.06.006.
- Silvennoinen, Olli O. 2019. *Contrastive negation: Constructional variation within and across languages*. University of Helsinki doctoral dissertation. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-51-5527-6>.

Negative existential indefinite constructions, biclausal and monoclausal

van der Auwera, Johan

University of Antwerp

Biclausal constructions can turn into monoclausal ones in which one of the two clauses yields an indefinite pronoun. In most cases the resulting pronoun can have both specific and non-specific uses and the source construction is a subordinate clause. This is well documented in Haspelmath (1997: 129-156). French *n'importe quoi*, as in (1), is a case in point.

- (1) J' accepte n' importe quoi.
1SG.NOM accept.PRS.1SG NEG matter INT.NHUM
'I accept anything'.

There may only be one scenario in which a former main clause turns into an indefinite pronoun, and then the pronoun is negative. This scenario, brought into the typological literature by Van Alsenoy (2014: 141-145), is illustrated with Russian *nečego* (2).

- (2) Nam nečego delat'.
1DAT.PL nothing.ACC do.INF.PFV
'There is nothing for us to do.'

The *nečego* pronoun derives from a negative existential construction 'there is nothing' (*ne e čego*), which was a main clause followed by an infinitival relative.

The talk will sketch some typological parameters both of the synchrony of the biclausal negative existential constructions that are the origin of the Russian *nečego* pronouns and of the diachrony of the resulting negative indefinite pronouns. Data will primarily come from South-East Asian and Eastern Oto-Manguean languages. I will show that there are reasons for hypothesizing 'Negative Existential Indefinite Cycles'.

References

Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. Indefinite pronouns. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Alsenoy, Lauren. 2014. The typology of indefinite pronouns, with a focus on negative indefinites. Doctoral dissertation, University of Antwerp.

Are asymmetries in imperative negation based in usage?

Van Olmen, Daniël

Lancaster University

This paper takes Miestamo's (2005) notion of (a)symmetry, developed for the study of standard negation, as its starting point and applies it to the domain of imperative negation. It argues, based on a balanced typological sample of 100 languages (building on Van Olmen 2019) and on an in-depth investigation of roughly 100 Eastern Bantu languages (see Van Olmen & Devos 2021), for the existence of certain cross-linguistic tendencies of asymmetry in (negative) imperatives (but see Aikhenvald 2010 too). As in Chinantec Lealao, for example, politeness distinctions in the positive – between the constructions in (1a) and (1b), are often neutralized in the negative – where only the symmetric counterpart of (1b) is possible. The opposite situation occurs as well (e.g. in Manambu) but is rarer.

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

- | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| a. ηja^M | la^M | b. ʔi^M | $ha^{LM}i$ |
| come.2SG.COMPL | here | REL | come.2SG.PROG |
| 'Come here.' | | 'Please come!' | |
| | | | |
| c. ʔaL-ʔi^M | ki^Mi | | |
| NEG-REL | dream.2SG.PROG | | |
| 'Don't dream!' | | | |

(2) Makwe (Bantoid, Niger-Congo; Mozambique, Tanzania; Devos p.c.)

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. (ka-)lal-e | b. u-(ka-)lal-e | |
| and-sleep-SBJV | 2SG-and-sleep-SBJV | |
| '(Go and) sleep!' | 'Please (go and) sleep!' | |
| | | |
| c. u-na-(*ka-)lal-e | | |
| 2SG-NEG-and-sleep-SBJV | | |
| 'Don't (*go and) sleep!' | | |

Similarly, like in Makwe in (2), motion- or location-based distinctions in the positive – andative *ka-* in (2a) and (2b) – tend to be neutralized in the negative – where, as (2c) shows, *ka-* is not acceptable. The reverse situation is not attested in the present data.

These asymmetries are examined from two perspectives. On the one hand, the paper explores potential functional explanations. The second type of asymmetry may, for instance, be due to the typical irrelevance of motion or location when a speaker tries to get an addressee not to do something. The first type, by contrast, appears to run counter to earlier proposals, which suggest that politeness (Devos & Van Olmen 2013) or (negative) emphasis (Grossman & Polis 2014) plays a more significant role in negative than in positive imperatives. On the other hand, the paper explores whether the asymmetries perhaps have a basis in usage by comparing the relative occurrence of expressions of politeness (e.g. 'please'), motion (e.g. 'go/come and') and location (e.g. 'here/there') in positive versus negative imperatives in corpora of two languages that do not exhibit such grammaticalized asymmetries, i.e. Dutch and English. Preliminary results present a muddled picture. There is some evidence for a usage asymmetry in politeness marking but the data for a usage asymmetry in motion marking is less clear, mainly because of relatively conventionalized (inter)subjective uses of (*don't*) *go!* in English.

References

- Aikhenvald, A.Y. 2010. *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Devos, M. & D. Van Olmen. 2013. Describing and explaining the variation of Bantu imperatives and prohibitives. *Studies in Language* 37, 1-57.
- Grossman, E. & S. Polis. 2014. *Prohibitive Strategies and Prohibitive Cycles in Ancient Egyptian*. Paper presented at Negation in Egyptian, December, Paris.
- Miestamo, M. 2005. *Standard Negation: The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Rupp, J.E. 1989. *Lealao Chinantec Syntax*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Van Olmen, D. 2019. *A(symmetry) in Imperative Negation: A Pilot Study of 60 languages*. Paper presented at Association for Linguistic Typology 13, September, Pavia.
- Van Olmen, D. & M. Devos. 2021. *(A)symmetries in Imperative Negation in Eastern Bantu*. Paper presented at Afrikanist*innentag 24, July, Frankfurt.

Negative existentials and their interaction with Standard Negation

Veselinova, Ljuba

Stockholm University

Negative existentials, illustrated in (1b) are a typically lexical expressions used to indicate the absence of an entity. They are a stable cross-linguistic phenomenon; as argued in Veselinova (2013, 2016), they are better seen as separate functional domain; from a constructional perspective it can be also demonstrated that they constitute a well delimited construction. In this talk I will focus on the latter with a special focus on the use of the negative existential construction for the encoding of Standard/verbal negation (SN), cf. (1a) for an example and Miestamo (2005) for a currently most used definition.

The use of negative existential for the encoding of SN was first modelled by Croft (1991) and became known as the Negative Existential Cycle. Without going into details about the original model and its subsequent refinement, I will offer generalizations that emerge as most relevant for the role of negative existentials in the encoding of Standard Negation.

The most common pathways whereby negative existentials enter the domain of SN include (i) subordination processes and predicate concatenation; (ii) the reanalysis of an external negator into a negator internal to the proposition; (iii) a direct inheritance of a construction; (iv) the use of negative existentials with nominalized verb forms. However, negative existentials have greatest chance to change into general negators in languages where nominalization processes as well as predicate concatenations are productive.

A brief overview of the semantic and syntactic properties of negative existentials is in order. As mentioned above, they make statements about absence; they are commonly used as short answer ‘No’, as pro-sentences and in many languages they also encode negative indefinites. Syntactically, negative existentials typically replace their positive counterparts rather than being added to an affirmative predication as negators commonly do, cf. (1b) and (1c) below. Negative existentials come through as a stable linguistic feature in several other aspects as well: (i) they lexicalize easily; (ii) they are constantly renewed; (iii) in a situation of language contact, they are easily borrowed.

Their construction includes a nominal complement, so when used with actions or states, the latter too are perceived as entities and encoded appropriately. Thus we observe that in a number of languages negative existentials are used to negate verbal predications where the verb appears in a nominalized form. These uses show different degrees of conventionalization. For instance, in Turkish, cf. (2b), nominalized verb forms are used in highly marked contexts. In contrast in Gagauz, cf. (3a-b), the existential construction, both affirmative and negative, is the only means for encoding of the habitual past. Data similar to those shown for Turkic languages are cross-linguistically very common, cf. Lam (forthcoming) for Mandarin, Cantonese and related varieties as well as Oréal (forthcoming) for Ancient Egyptian, to name a few. Thus we can observe that negative existentials tend to take over very specific parts of verbal negation, that is they can be used as verbal negator for a specific TAM category or other well delimited context. In Miestamo’s (2005) perspective these partial take-overs are seen as different kinds of asymmetric negation. It has to be said that these partial take-overs of verbal negation tend to last for very long periods of time, so from a diachronic point of view they come to look like stable states. Conversely, a complete take-over of verbal negation by the negative existential occurs very seldom within the time span for reasonable reconstruction.

In addition, Oréal (forthcoming) suggests that the negative existential construction has, in fact, served as the basis for the remodelling of the entire verbal predication where nominalized verb forms are used together with either a positive or a negative existential. This is explained by their property to make a statement about absence—thus they enter the system not as negators but rather as positive predicators.

However, they are semantically coherent with negation and come to be interpreted as expressions of this domain.

Examples

(1) Turkish (Turkic) (van Schaaik 1994: 38, 44)

Standard/Verbal negator: suffix *-mVowel-*

Existential negator: *yok*

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. Gel-me-yecek
come-NEG-FUT
'(S)he will not come.' | b. Su yok-tu
water NEG.EX-PST
'There was no water.' | c. Su var-dı
water EX-PST
'There is water.' |
|---|---|---|

(2) Turkish (Turkic) (van Schaaik 1994: 46)

- a. Kadın Ali-ye bak-ma-dı
woman Ali-DAT look-NEG-PST
'The woman didn't look at Ali'
- b. Kadın-in Ali-ye bak-tığ-ı yok-tu
woman-GEN Ali-DAT look-PART.PST-AGR not.exist-PST
'The woman didn't look at Ali at all', lit. 'There was no 'woman's to Ali looking'

(3) Gagauz (Turkic, Common Turkic, Oghuz-Kipchak-Uyghur) [gag], (Pokrovskaja 1964: 154, 160)

- a. var-dır gör-düüm
exist-PST see-NMLZ.POSS
'I saw [everything]' (in a general way) lit. 'There is my vision'
- b. yok-tur al-du
not.exist-PST take-NMLZ.POSS
'He didn't take [anything whatsoever]' (in a general way) lit. 'There is not his taking'
- c. yaz-mæ-ær-ım
write-NEG-PROG-1SG
'I am not writing'

Abbreviations

AGR agreement, DAT dative, GEN genitive, NEG negative, NMLZ nominalization, PART participle, PL plural, POSS possessive, PST past, SG singular

References

- Croft, W. (1991). The Evolution of Negation. *Journal of Linguistics* 27.1-39.
- Lam, C. C. (forthcoming). Croft's Cycle in Mandarin and Cantonese throughout history and across varieties. In L. Veselinova & A. Hamari (Eds.), *The Negative Existential Cycle from a Comparative Perspective*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Miestamo, M. (2005). *Standard Negation: The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Oréal, E. (forthcoming). The negative existential cycle in Ancient Egyptian. In L. Veselinova & A. Hamari (Eds.), *The Negative Existential Cycle*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Pokrovskaja, L. A. (1964). *Grammatika gagauzskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Moskva: Akademija Nauk SSSR: Institut Jazykoznanija.

van Schaaik, G. (1994). Turkish. In P. Kahrel & R. van den Berg (Eds.), *Typological Studies in Negation* (pp. 35–50). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Veselinova, L. (2013). Negative existentials: A cross linguistic study. *Italian Journal of Linguistics: Special Issue on Existential Constructions*, 25(1), 107–146.

Veselinova, L. (2016). The Negative Existential Cycle through the lens of comparative data. *The Linguistic Cycle Continued*, ed. by E. van Gelderen, 139-87. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins Publishing Co.