

Negative declaratives and negative imperatives: similarities and differences

Abstract

This contribution examines, on the basis of a pilot sample of 30 languages, how imperative negatives differ from declarative negatives. Following a typological classification proposed in earlier literature, declarative negatives are classified into two basic types, symmetric and asymmetric, according to whether and how their structure differs from the structure of corresponding affirmatives. It is shown that imperative negatives may also be typologized in these terms; symmetric and asymmetric imperative negatives are exemplified and discussed. The question whether the same subtypes of asymmetric negation can be identified in imperatives as in declaratives is then addressed, and cross-linguistic frequencies of different types in declaratives and imperatives are compared. Attention is also paid to how the analogy-based functional motivations proposed for symmetric and asymmetric declarative negatives may be applied to imperative negatives.

1. Introduction

In this paper we look at the similarities and differences between the negation of imperatives and declaratives from a typological point of view.¹ We compare declarative and imperative negatives with their positive counterparts to see what structural differences negative marking causes in declaratives and imperatives, and then we compare them to see whether and how they differ from each other in this respect. Our general focus is on verbal main clauses, and with imperatives, on commands directed at second person addressees. To be as clear as possible about the different functional domains involved, we will speak about positives and negatives, on the one hand, and declaratives and imperatives, on the other. So we will speak about positive declaratives (rather than affirmatives or affirmative declaratives) and positive imperatives, as well as negative declaratives and negative imperatives (rather than prohibitives). In general, we use “negative”, “declarative” etc. for linguistic forms/utterances and “negation”, “declaration” etc. for the functions / functional domains that these forms/utterances code.


The discussion is based on an areally and genealogically stratified pilot sample of 30 languages. We follow the classification by DRYER (2005), where the world’s languages are divided areally into six macro-areas (Africa, Eurasia, Southeast Asia & Oceania, Australia

¹ This paper was written while Miestamo was a research fellow at the Antwerp Center for Grammar, Cognition, and Typology (November 2005 – April 2006). The financial help of the Research Council of the University of Antwerp is gratefully acknowledged, as well as the support of the University of Helsinki and the Academy of Finland. We would like to thank the audience at the Linguistics Festival in Bremen, May 2006, for their feedback on the paper.

& New Guinea, North America and South America) and genealogically into 458 genera, i.e. genealogical groupings with an approximate time depth of no more than 3500–4000 years (excluding creoles and pidgins and sign languages, which are not genealogical or areal groupings in the same sense). All sample languages come from different genera and as far as possible also from different higher-level families. Following the principle introduced in MIESTAMO (2005: 35–36), the sampling procedure also pays attention to the genealogical diversity in each macro-area so that the number of languages taken from each macro-area is proportional to its share of the total number of genera. For example, Africa has 64 genera which is 14 % of the total of 458, thus the number of African languages in the 30-language sample is 14 % of 30, i.e. 4. Table 1 shows the sample languages by macro-area and gives the genus of each language in parentheses (for further information on the genealogical status of these languages, see DRYER 2005). Map 1 shows the overall areal distribution of the sample languages.

Macroarea	N. of languages	Language (Genus)
Africa	4	Khoekhoe (Central Khoisan), Supyire (Gur), Ngiti (Lendu), Egyptian Arabic (Semitic)
Eurasia	3	Basque (Basque), Evenki (Tungusic), Lezgian (Lezgian)
Southeast Asia & Oceania	3	Khmer (Khmer), Meithei (Kuki-Chin-Naga), Karo Batak (Sundic)
Australia & New Guinea	8	Una (Mek), Daga (Dagan), Imonda (Border), Maybrat (North-Central Bird's Head), Yimas (Lower Sepik), Nasioi (East Bougainville), Lavukaleve (Solomons East Papuan), Gooniyandi (Bunuban)
North America	6	Plains Cree (Algonquian), Slave (Athapaskan), Koasati (Muskogean), Maricopa (Yuman), Chalcatongo Mixtec (Mixtecan), Purépecha (Tarascan)
South America	6	Rama (Rama), Jaqaru (Aymaran), Mapudungun (Araucanian), Trumai (Trumai), Wayampi (Tupi-Guaraní), Mosestén (Mosestenan)

Table 1. Sample languages



Map 1. Geographical distribution of the sample languages.²

This is a pilot sample, and in future work sample size will be increased. The typology of declarative negatives presented in the following section (2) is based on a much larger sample, but when comparing negation in imperatives and declaratives in Section 3, the numbers concerning declarative negatives will also be based on the 30-language pilot sample.

Section 2 will introduce the typology of negation in declaratives. Section 3 briefly discusses a typology of negative imperatives proposed in earlier literature. Symmetry and asymmetry between negatives and positives in the imperative is discussed in Section 4, and imperative negation is compared to declarative negation in Section 5., where the functional motivations of the observed cross-linguistic variation are also given some attention. Section 6 offers a brief conclusion.

2. Negation in declaratives: Symmetric and asymmetric

Standard negation refers to the basic strategies languages use for negating declarative verbal main clauses. MIESTAMO (2005) classifies the standard negation structures found in a genealogically and areally representative variety sample of 297 languages into symmetric and asymmetric negatives according to whether or not the structure of the negative differs from that of the corresponding positive. This division is made from the point of view of constructions, on the one hand, and paradigms, on the other. In clauses containing symmetric negative constructions, the only difference from the corresponding positives is the presence of (a) negative marker(s) (e.g. in Mosetén 1), but in asymmetric constructions further differences – i.e., asymmetries – are found as well (e.g. in Evenki 2). When the members of the paradigms used in positives and negatives show a one-to-one correspondence (e.g. in Dutch 3), the paradigms are symmetric, but when the correspondences are not one-to-one (e.g. in Maung 4 and Burmese 5), we are dealing with

² The map has been generated using the Interactive Reference Tool of the *World Atlas of Language Structures* (Haspelmath & al. [eds.] 2005), developed by Hans-Jörg Bibiko.

asymmetric paradigms; paradigmatic asymmetry most often consists of neutralization of grammatical distinctions (note that in the Dutch and Maung examples the constructions are symmetric whereas in Burmese the construction is asymmetric, see below for more detailed analyses).

(1) Mosestén (Jeanette Sakel, p.c.)³

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| a. <i>yäe chhi-ye-'</i> | b. <i>jam yäe chhi-ye-'</i> |
| I know-VBLZ-3F.OBJ | NEG I know-VBLZ-3F.OBJ |
| 'I know her/it.' | 'I don't know her/it.' |

(2) Evenki (Nedjalkov 1994: 2)

- | |
|--|
| a. <i>nuḡan min-du purta-va b̄u-che-n</i> |
| he 1SG-DAT knife-ACC give-PST-3SG |
| 'He gave me the knife.' |
| b. <i>nuḡan min-du purta-va e-che-n b̄u-re</i> |
| he 1SG-DAT knife-ACC NEG-PST-3SG give-PTCP |
| 'He did not give me the knife.' |

(3) Dutch (Indo-European, Germanic)

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| a. <i>zingen</i> 'sing' | POS | NEG |
| 1SG PRES | <i>ik zing</i> | <i>ik zing niet</i> |
| | PST | <i>ik zong niet</i> |
| | PERF | <i>ik heb gezongen</i> |
| | PLUPERF | <i>ik had gezongen</i> |
| b. <i>zingen</i> 'sing' | POS | NEG |
| 2SG PRES | <i>jij zingt</i> | <i>jij zingt niet</i> |
| | PST | <i>jij zong niet</i> |
| | PERF | <i>jij hebt gezongen</i> |
| | PLUPERF | <i>jij had gezongen</i> |
| c. <i>zingen</i> 'sing' | POS | NEG |
| 3SG PRES | <i>hij/zij zingt</i> | <i>hij/zij zingt niet</i> |
| | PST | [etc.] |

(4) Maung (Australian, Iwaidjan) (Capell and Hinch 1970: 67)

- | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| a. <i>ni-udba</i> | b. <i>ni-udba-ji</i> | c. <i>marig ni-udba-ji</i> |
| 1SG.3-put | 1SG.3-put-IRR.NPST | NEG 1SG.3-put-IRR.NPST |
| 'I put.' | 'I can put.' | 'I do not [/cannot] put.' |

³ The examples for which no reference source is given are based on the personal knowledge of these languages by the authors. Genealogical affiliation is given for languages not included in the sample. The abbreviations used in the glosses are as follows: 1 first person, 2 second person, 3 third person, ACC accusative, ACT actual, AMN admonitive, COND conditional, DAT dative, DECL declarative, DUR durative, F feminine, FOC focus, HAB habitual, IM immediate, IMP imperative, INF infinitive, IRR irrealis, M masculine, N neuter, NEG negative, NPST nonpast, OBJ object, PERF perfect, PL plural, PLUPERF pluperfect, PNCT punctual, POS positive, POT potential, PRES present, PST past, PTCP participle, R realis, SG singular, SMLF semelfactive, VBLZ verbalizer.

- (5) Burmese (Sino-Tibetan, Burmese-Lolo) (Cornyn 1944: 12–13)
- | | | | |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| a. <i>θwâ-dé</i> | b. <i>θwâ-mé</i> | c. <i>θwâ-bí</i> | d. <i>ma-θwâ-bû</i> |
| go-ACT | go-POT | go-PERF | NEG-go-NEG |
| ‘goes, went’ | ‘will go’ | ‘has gone’ | ‘does/did/will not go, has not gone’ |

Furthermore, asymmetric negation can be divided into subtypes according to the nature of the asymmetry found; this can be constructional or paradigmatic in the different subtypes – these are cross-cutting parameters. In subtype A/Fin, the finiteness of the lexical verb is reduced or lost and a new finite element (most commonly an auxiliary verb) is usually added in the negative; in the Evenki negative construction (2), the negative verb *e-* appears as the finite element of the clause carrying verbal inflections and the lexical verb is in a participial form. In subtype A/NonReal, negatives contain marking that refers to non-realized states of affairs; in Maung negation is marked with *marig* (4c), and the construction is symmetric with the positive irrealis (4b), but there is paradigmatic asymmetry since verbs must have the irrealis form in the negative and the distinction between realis and irrealis made in the positive (4a,b) is lost in the negative (4c). There is a marginal subtype A/Emph, defined by the presence of marking that expresses emphasis in non-negatives (not exemplified here for reasons of space). In subtype A/Cat negatives, the marking of grammatical categories differs from their marking in positives in other ways; the categories most commonly affected are tense-aspect-mood (TAM) and person-number-gender (PNG); in Burmese (5) positives distinguish between actual, potential and perfect, the negative construction is asymmetric since the postverbal part of the discontinuous negative marker replaces the TAM markers, and there is also paradigmatic asymmetry since these TAM distinctions are thereby neutralized.

Before illustrating the model of explanation by showing how it works for the typology of standard negation, we will take a brief look at the functional (semantic and pragmatic) asymmetry between affirmation and negation. There are various ways in which affirmation and negation differ on the functional level; the following aspects of this asymmetry are relevant here (Miestamo 2005: 195–200; see also Givón 1978, 2001: 369–398): A. Stativity vs. dynamicity: Affirmatives may report both stative (*Chris likes coffee*) and dynamic situations (*Chris drank the coffee*), but negative sentences prototypically only report stative situations in the sense that there is no change in the universe in the situations they report – both *Chris does not like coffee* and *Chris did not drink the coffee* report situations with no change in the universe. B. Reality-status: semantically, affirmatives belong to the realm of the realized whereas negatives belong to the non-realized. C. Discourse context: negatives are prototypically used in contexts where the corresponding affirmative is supposed or at least somehow present, i.e., as denials, whereas the typical contexts of affirmatives are not restricted in this way; uttering the sentence *Oh, my wife is not pregnant* (to quote Givón’s [1978: 80] famous example) would be odd if the speaker’s wife’s pregnancy had not been previously mentioned, supposed by the hearer or present in the context in some other way.

The following model was proposed in Miestamo (2005: 195–235) for explaining the different types of standard negation: Symmetric negatives copy the linguistic structure of the affirmative; they are thus language-internally analogous to their affirmative counterparts, and ultimately motivated by pressure for system cohesion. Asymmetric negatives copy aspects of the functional-level asymmetry between affirmation and negation; they are thus language-externally analogous to these aspects of the functional

asymmetry. The different subtypes of asymmetric negation have conventionalized different aspects of the functional asymmetry as structural asymmetry in grammar: The stativity of negation motivates subtype A/Fin; prototypical A/Fin negatives where the lexical verb loses its finiteness are stative predications ('there is no V-ing') – if not synchronically, a stative predication may be found at an earlier historical stage of many of these constructions. Subtype A/NonReal is motivated by the semantic connection between negation and other conceptualizations of the non-realized. As to A/Emph, negatives as denials of semantic contents that are implicitly or explicitly present in the context constitute somewhat abrupt speech acts, and therefore need emphasis on the negativity. The prototypical discourse context of negatives also motivates those subtype A/Cat structures where grammatical distinctions are neutralized – as the corresponding affirmative content is already present in the context, its temporal, aspectual etc. properties need not all be explicitly coded in the negative and some languages have conventionalized this as an obligatory grammatical restriction.

The same principles of classification and explanation can be applied to other functional domains as well, see MIESTAMO (submitted) for more discussion. In this paper we will look at negation in imperatives and examine the asymmetries between negative and positive imperatives. Before going to these asymmetries, we will take a brief look at a related typology of negative imperatives and see how it can be analysed in terms of the symmetry–asymmetry distinction. This will also help in clarifying the focus of the present paper.

3. A typology of negative imperatives

In studies of second person singular imperatives, VAN DER AUWERA & LEJEUNE (2005) and VAN DER AUWERA (2006) propose the following typology of negative imperatives (the numbers in parentheses indicate how many languages of each type are found in VAN DER AUWERA & LEJEUNE's 495-language sample):

- Type 1: The negative imperative uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives. (113)
- Type 2: The negative imperative uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives. (183)
- Type 3: The negative imperative uses a verbal construction other than the second singular positive imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives. (55)
- Type 4: The negative imperative uses a verbal construction other than the second singular positive imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives. (144)

It is noteworthy that it is very common in negative imperatives for both the marking of negation to differ from standard negation and the marking of imperation⁴ to differ from its marking in positive imperatives.

⁴ This term is introduced here to refer to the functional domain coded by imperatives, in accordance to the principle laid out in Section 1.

We may cast this typology in terms of the symmetry–asymmetry-distinction introduced above. Symmetry and asymmetry can be observed between negatives and their positive counterparts, on the one hand, and between imperatives and their declarative counterparts, on the other. Differences in the marking of negation are asymmetry between imperatives and declaratives, and differences in the marking of imperation are asymmetry between negatives and positives. In Type 1, there are no differences either way, and we can thus conclude that there is no asymmetry between negatives and positives or imperatives and declaratives with respect to the categories observed in the typology. In Type 2, the marking of negation differs between declaratives and imperatives, and the imperative thus shows asymmetry vis-à-vis declaratives, but no asymmetry is found between negatives and positives as regards the marking of imperation. In Type 3, negatives show asymmetry vis-à-vis positives as regards the marking of imperation, but imperatives are symmetric vis-à-vis declaratives with respect to the marking of negation. In Type 4, negatives show asymmetry vis-à-vis positives as regards the marking of imperation, and imperatives show asymmetry vis-à-vis declaratives as regards the marking of negation.

Naturally, these differences are only one aspect of the possible asymmetries between the respective categories – other structural differences can be found between negatives and positives as well as between imperatives and declaratives, but they are not in the scope of the typology of VAN DER AUWERA & LEJEUNE (2005) and VAN DER AUWERA (2006). In this section we have seen how this typology can be handled in the larger context of symmetry and asymmetry between negatives and positives, on the one hand, and imperatives and declaratives, on the other. This paper will only deal with asymmetries between negatives and positives in both declaratives and imperatives, not between imperatives and declaratives in either positives or negatives.

4. Symmetric and asymmetric negation in imperatives

We will now compare negative and positive imperatives, and address the question whether and how the structure of the negative imperative differs from the structure of the positive imperative in addition to the (simple) marking of negation. We use the same definitions of the two main types as was done for standard negation in Section 2 above with the sole difference that negation now means negation of imperatives, not standard negation. Looking at negation in imperatives from the point of view of symmetry and asymmetry is a step towards a more general typology of clausal negation along these lines.

First of all, it may be noted that symmetric and asymmetric constructions and paradigms can indeed be found in the negation of imperatives. In Purépecha, the negative marker *'aš'* is the only difference the negative imperative (6b) shows in comparison to the corresponding positive imperative (6a); this is a symmetric construction (note that the negative marker in [6a] is a reaction to an earlier utterance, not part of the clause we are interested in here).

(6) Purépecha (Chamoreau 2000: 112)

- | | | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a. | <i>'no</i> | <i>'xua-ϕ-rini</i> | <i>'sani</i> | | b. | <i>'aš'</i> | <i>'xua-ϕ-rini</i> | <i>'sani</i> |
| | NEG | bring-IMP-2>1 | little | | | NEG | bring-IMP-2>1 | little |
| | ‘No, bring me little!’ | | | | ‘Don’t bring me little!’ | | | |

(7) Daga (Murane 1974: 56)

- | | |
|--|---|
| a. <i>war-an</i>
get-2PL.IMP
'Get (it)!' | b. <i>ya war-an-e</i>
NEG get-2PL.IMP-NEG.IMP
'Don't get (it)!' |
|--|---|

In Daga, the negative imperative (7b) has the negator *ya*, also used for declarative negatives, and the specifically negative imperative *-e* is suffixed to the verb. In addition to the presence of these markers, there is no structural difference as compared to the positive imperative (7a), and the construction is thus symmetric.

Evenki shows a symmetric paradigm in imperative negation, all positive forms having their own unique negative counterparts (8).

(8) Evenki (Nedjalkov 1994: 18, 1997: 262; Igor Nedjalkov, p.c.)

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| a. <i>baka-</i> 'find' NEAR IMPERATIVE | |
| POS | NEG |
| 2SG <i>baka-kal</i> | <i>e-kel baka-ra</i> |
| 2PL <i>baka-kallu</i> | <i>e-kellu baka-ra</i> |
| b. <i>baka-</i> 'find' REMOTE IMPERATIVE | |
| POS | NEG |
| 2SG <i>baka-dā-vi</i> | <i>e-dē-vi baka-ra</i> |
| 2PL <i>baka-dā-ver</i> | <i>e-dē-ver baka-ra</i> |
| c. <i>baka-</i> 'find' MONITORY IMPERATIVE | |
| POS | NEG |
| 2SG <i>baka-na</i> | <i>e-ne baka-ra</i> |
| 2PL <i>baka-na-l</i> | <i>e-ne-l baka-ra</i> |

The negative construction, however, is asymmetric, since the structure of the negative imperative clause differs from the positive imperative not only by the presence of the negative marker – the negative marker is the negative auxiliary *e-* that carries finite verbal inflections and the lexical verb is in a participial form. This is the same negative construction as is found in declaratives in Evenki (see example 2 above).

Asymmetric constructions expressing negation in imperatives can also be found in Una and Mapudungun. In Una, the negative imperative marker *mem* appears after the verb (9b), but it is not the only structural difference in comparison to the positive imperative (9a) since the regular imperative ending is not used but the verb appears in the infinitive.

(9) Una (Louwrese 1988: 36, 89)

- | | |
|--|--|
| a. <i>eb-rum</i>
speak-IM.IMP.2SG
'Speak!' | b. <i>uram e-na mem</i>
talk speak-INF NEG.IMP
'Don't talk!' |
|--|--|

In Mapudungun, negative commands may be expressed by using the negative imperative marker *-ki-*, which appears together with the conditional marker *-l-* (10b). The construction is asymmetric since there is no non-negative form that would differ from this negative by the mere absence of the negative marker; conditionals have different person-number markers, e.g. *i-l-m-i* (eat-COND-2-SG) (SMEETS 1989: 230), and no paradigmatic asymmetry is found since conditionals are negated differently.

(10) Mapudungun (Smeets 1989: 233)

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. <i>matukel-m-iin</i> | b. <i>wirar-ki-l-nge</i> |
| quick-IMP-2PL | shout-NEG-COND-IMP.2SG |
| 'Hurry up!' | 'Don't shout!' |

An asymmetric paradigm is illustrated by Lavukaleve, where positive imperatives can make a distinction between durative and punctual aspect (11a,b), but the distinction is lost in negative commands, which are expressed by the admonitive (11c).

(11) Lavukaleve (Terrill 1999: 308, 312)

- | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------|--------------|
| a. <i>iru-ma</i> | b. <i>iru-va</i> | | |
| sleep-DUR.IMP.SG | sleep-PNCT.IMP.SG | | |
| 'Sleep!' | 'Shut your eyes!' | | |
| c. <i>sevo me-iru-n</i> | <i>kosora fi</i> | <i>koro</i> | <i>o-fau</i> |
| tabu 2PL-sleep-AMN | soon 3SG.N.FOC | darkness | 3SG-happen |
| 'Don't go to sleep yet; it's still early.' | | | |

It can also be noted that the construction is asymmetric, the presence of the admonitive suffix not being the only difference between the negative and a corresponding non-negative.

In this section we have seen that all four logically possible types given by the symmetric–asymmetric and constructional–paradigmatic parameters can be found in imperative negation in a small sample of 30 languages. The next step is to try to identify possible subtypes of asymmetric negation in imperatives. A pilot sample of 30 languages is not large enough for answering this question in a satisfactory manner. What can be done on the basis of such a sample, however, is to look at the subtypes established for standard negation and see whether similar structures can be found in imperative negation. We cannot a priori expect that the subtypes of asymmetric negation would be the same for declarative and imperative negatives, but since we are basically dealing with the same functional domain, negation, albeit in connection with a different basic speech act, it is a plausible approach to start with such a comparison.

5. Symmetric and asymmetric negation in imperatives vs. declaratives

In this section we will compare negation in imperatives to negation in declaratives in terms of the typological classification introduced above. We have already seen that symmetric and asymmetric negatives are indeed found in imperatives, both in the constructional and in the paradigmatic sense. Here we will pay attention to the frequencies of the different types in declaratives vs. imperatives in the 30-language sample (for standard negation, quantitative data based on an extensive sample are available in

Miestamo 2005: Chapter 4). We will furthermore address the question whether there are subtypes, similar to the ones found in declarative negatives. We will also discuss how the analogy-based functional motivations briefly discussed in Section 2 can be used in explaining the observations made here.

Table 2 shows the frequencies of symmetric and asymmetric constructions and paradigms in declarative and imperative negation in the 30-language pilot sample.

type	standard negation (n. of languages)	imperative negation (n. of languages)
constructional asymmetry found	14	14
paradigmatic asymmetry found	6	14
negation always symmetric	15	8
both symmetric and asymmetric negation found	11	12
negation always asymmetric	4	10

Table 2. Symmetric and asymmetric constructions and paradigms in the sample (n=30)

As we can see, constructional asymmetry occurs in as many languages in imperatives as it does in declaratives, whereas paradigmatic asymmetry is much more common in imperative negation. Languages in which no asymmetry – neither constructional nor paradigmatic – is found in negation are much more common in declaratives. Languages in which both symmetric and asymmetric negation is found – i.e. where some asymmetry, either constructional or paradigmatic is found, but at least some symmetric constructions are found as well – are equally common in declaratives and imperatives. Finally, languages in which negation is always asymmetric – i.e. where all negative constructions are asymmetric – are found much more common in imperatives than in declaratives.⁵

Applying the analogy-based model of explanation to negation in imperatives, we may see all symmetric structures as motivated by language-internal analogy just like in declaratives. As to asymmetric structures, the hypothesis is that they are motivated by language-external analogy, again just like in declarative negation. When discussing the possible subtypes of asymmetric negation below, we will also address the relevant functional asymmetry between negation and non-negation to see what kinds of explanations can be proposed for asymmetry in imperative negation.

Let us now find out whether the subtypes of asymmetric negation established for standard negation can also be found in negation in imperatives. As noted above, we cannot assume this a priori, and the final subtypes must be based on a study of a much larger sample, but since we are operating within the same domain, we may well start our search for subtypes from such a comparison. In the 30-language sample, we found structures comparable with the three major subtypes, A/Fin, A/NonReal and A/Cat, but not with the minor subtype A/Emph. These will now be discussed in turn.

⁵ The status of constructions is crucial in the last two categories (cf. Miestamo 2005: 168, 170): Paradigms can be either completely symmetric, or have more or less asymmetry, but it does not make sense to say that a paradigm is completely asymmetric – there is always some correspondence (symmetry) between negatives and affirmatives (otherwise these could not even be identified as counterparts). Thus, negation is always asymmetric if all negative constructions are asymmetric, and symmetric negation is found in a language if at least some constructions are symmetric.

Structures resembling subtype A/Fin are found in imperative negation in 3 languages, whereas in declarative negation it was found in 8 of the 30 languages. Two examples have already been illustrated above: in Evenki (8), the lexical verb loses its finiteness becoming dependent on the finite negative verb and appearing in a participial form, and in Una (9) the lexical verb loses its finiteness appearing in an infinite form. The third case comes from Trumai, where intransitive imperatives use a nominal imperative marker in the negative, differing from positive imperatives only by the presence of the negative marker and thus being symmetric, but as the distinction between (intransitive) verbal predications and nominal predications is lost in negative imperatives, we are dealing with paradigmatic asymmetry of type A/Fin. The lower frequency of subtype A/Fin is understandable, since the effect of the stativity of negation that accounts for type A/Fin in declarative negation is somewhat decreased by the nature of the speech act that imperatives code. As VAN DER AUWERA (2006) has proposed, imperatives, both positives and negatives, are characterized by illocutionary dynamicity. Imperatives are requests to act and this also concerns negative imperatives: they require activity on the part of the addressees, either to stop what they are doing at the moment or to prevent some possible state of affairs.⁶

Since the imperative is itself a non-realized category, subtype A/NonReal is not applicable to imperative negation in the same sense as it is to declarative negation. We may still pay attention to cases where negative imperatives contain marking of a non-realized category other than the imperative – this is found in 4 languages in the 30-language sample, while type A/NonReal is found in 2 of the sample languages in standard negation (Imonda and Jaqaru). Mapudungun (see 10 above), where negative imperatives contain conditional marking, is one of the 4 languages, the other 3 being Jaqaru (where the asymmetry is constructional), and Imonda and Yimas (where the asymmetry is paradigmatic). In this paper, we do not have much to say about these cases, a larger sample would be needed to see what the actual cross-linguistic picture is. What is interesting to note here is that the pattern diametrically opposite to type A/NonReal is also found in negative imperatives – positives being marked for a non-realized category but negatives receiving realized marking. These will be discussed further below.

In the 30-language sample we can also find imperative negative structures parallel to subtype A/Cat in standard negation. In the 30-language sample, there are 19 languages in which such negatives are found in imperatives, whereas A/Cat asymmetry is found in standard negation in 12 sample languages. We have seen one example of paradigmatic asymmetry, viz. Lavukaleve (11), where the aspectual distinction between durative and punctual was lost in imperative negation, and as discussed above, imperative negation in Lavukaleve also shows constructional asymmetry parallel to A/Cat. The Rama negative imperative construction seen in (12) is asymmetric: the positive imperative does not have person prefixes (12a), but the negative does (12b), and this is not a case of simply adding the negative imperative marker to positive declaratives either, since these have tense markers (12c,d).

⁶ In some languages, A/Fin-type structures found in imperative negation are due to analogy with declarative negation, e.g. in Evenki, but in Daga standard negation is symmetric, so there are individual cases that go against the idea advocated here. However, as is the case in typology in general, the primary thing to explain is the overall cross-linguistic pattern.

command. In this A/Cat-type neutralization, more distinctions are available in the negative than in the positive. In 10 of the 30 sample languages negative imperatives show loss of grammatical distinctions made in the positive imperative, but in 5 languages positive imperatives show loss of grammatical distinctions made in the negative imperative. Loss of distinctions is thus clearly more common in negative than in positive imperatives, but it is worth noting that both exist. It seems that the imperative can induce a markedness reversal of the positive-negative pair.

In most cases, paradigmatic asymmetry means that the number of paradigmatic choices is restricted, i.e. some grammatical distinctions are lost (usually) in the negative. There are, however, some other types of paradigmatic asymmetry as well. In what Miestamo (2005: 54–55) calls “paradigmatic displacement”, one category uses the form of another category in the negative, but the distinction between these two is not lost since the negative constructions themselves are different. In Tunica (15), both the semelfactive and the habitual use the semelfactive as the basis for their negative verb forms; in both aspects, the negative constructions are symmetric, but a different negative marker is used. This paradigmatic displacement belongs to subtype A/Cat of asymmetric negation.

(15) Tunica (Tunica) (Haas 1940: 55)

- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| a. <i>lɔ'ta-wi</i> | b. <i>lɔ'ta-w-ehɛ</i> |
| run-3SG.M.SMLF | run-3SG.M.SMLF-NEG |
| 'He ran.' | 'He did not run.' |
| c. <i>lɔ'ta-ku</i> | d. <i>lɔ'ta-wi-kʔaha</i> |
| run-3SG.M.HAB | run-3SG.M.SMLF-NEG |
| 'He runs.' | 'He does not run.' |

In standard negation, such displacement asymmetry is not very common, but it is interesting to note that in our negative imperative data, 3 of the 30 languages show this type of asymmetry: Koasati (resembling A/Cat), Wayampi (resembling A/Cat) and Imonda (resembling A/NonReal); in standard negation only one of the 30 languages has it (Imonda, A/NonReal). The negative imperative in Koasati illustrates this type (16).

(16) Koasati (Kimball 1991: 58, 270)

- | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| a. <i>ís-m</i> | b. <i>cík-m-ɔ</i> |
| 2SG-gather | 2SG.NEG-gather-NEG |
| 'You gather.' | 'You don't gather.' |
| c. <i>íp</i> | d. <i>is-p-án</i> |
| eat | 2SG-eat-NEG.IMP |
| 'Eat!' | 'Don't eat.' |

In Koasati, the basic imperative (16c) is negated by adding the negative imperative suffix to the non-past indicative verb form; if we compare (16d) with (16a), we can see that the construction is symmetric, but there is no neutralization in the paradigm, since the indicative uses a different negative construction (16b). There is thus paradigmatic displacement asymmetry. When imperatives and declaratives use the same form in the negative, there is still some way of making the distinction overt so that the distinction

between declarative and imperative is not lost; this is understandable, since illocution has scope over negation, not vice versa.

The tendency towards realis-marking in imperative negation shown by Koasati is also found in the displacement asymmetry in Wayampi. Yimas, and possibly also Rama, shows the same tendency towards realis in negative imperatives, but in these two languages we are not dealing with displacement asymmetry. Outside the sample, an interesting example can be cited from Maung, where standard negation shows A/NonReal asymmetry (cf. example 4 above), i.e., declarative negatives are obligatorily irrealis-marked. In the negative imperative we find the opposite pattern, positive imperatives being irrealis-marked (17a) and negative imperatives realis-marked (17b). Maung thus shows a flip-flop of reality marking in positive vs. negative declaratives vs. imperatives.

(17) Maung (Australian, Iwaidjan) (Capell & Hinch 1970: 67)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>a. <i>g-udba-nji</i>
 2SG.3-put-IRR.PST
 ‘Put it!’</p> | <p>b. <i>juwunji g-udba</i>
 NEG.IMP 2SG.3-put(R)
 ‘Don’t put it!’</p> |
|---|--|

This is the exact opposite of type A/NonReal in standard negation. It seems to be a cross-linguistically recurrent pattern that negative imperatives are realis-marked while positive imperatives have non-realized (imperative) marking. The actual extent of this phenomenon needs to be determined in a larger sample, but we may tentatively propose a subtype of asymmetric negation in imperatives called “A/Real”, in which negatives have realized/indicative marking while the corresponding positive imperatives have non-realized/imperative marking. Note, however, that in 2 languages we find A/NonReal-type asymmetry in imperative negation where it is not found in standard negation (cf. above).

We may now proceed to showing an overall picture of the differences that declarative and imperative negatives show in terms of the (a)symmetry between positives and negatives. Table 3 shows the numbers of languages where imperative negatives have the same types as or a different type from declarative negatives in the 30-language pilot sample.

	same type(s) found in IMP as in DECL	different type(s) found in IMP from those in DECL
constructions	28	6
paradigms	17	16

Table 3. Overall comparison of (a)symmetry in declarative vs. imperative negatives (n=30 languages)

As to negative constructions, in 28 of the 30 languages imperative negatives show (sub)type(s) that are also found in declarative negatives in the respective languages (the same construction in 12 and a different one in 21 of these 28 languages); in 6 of these 28 languages declarative negatives show other (sub)types as well. In 6 of the 30 languages imperative negatives show (sub)type(s) not found in declarative negatives in these languages. As to paradigms, in 17 of the 30 languages imperative negatives show (sub)type(s) that are also found in declarative negatives in the respective languages, and in 16 of the 30 languages imperative negatives show (sub)type(s) not found in declarative negatives in these languages. Globally, in 10 of the 30 languages, the types found in imperative negatives in both constructions and paradigms are the same as are found in declarative negatives, and declarative negatives do not show other types either – thus in one

third of the sample languages the overall symmetry-asymmetry inventories are the same in imperative and declarative negatives.

6. Conclusion

This paper has examined the structural similarities and differences between the expression of negation in declaratives vs. imperatives. Our special focus has been on the structural asymmetry between negatives and their positive counterparts, and we have addressed the question how the asymmetries between positive and negative imperatives differ from those found between positive and negative declaratives. We have shown that negative structures found in imperatives can be classified into symmetric and asymmetric types, both in the constructional and paradigmatic sense, just like declarative negatives. The 30-language pilot sample is not large enough to reveal a complete picture of the typology of imperative negatives, but it suggests that similar asymmetric structures as found in declarative negatives may be found in imperative negatives as well. Whether these allow us to define similar subtypes of asymmetric negation will have to wait for a study with a larger sample. The data examined also show some properties not found in declarative negation. Most notably, there are cases where the negative is marked for a realized (indicative) category while the positive imperative receives non-realized (imperative) marking, and these may constitute a subtype of asymmetric negation not found in declaratives. Further work with a larger sample is needed to verify these types and possible further subtypes, as well as their eventual functional motivations.

References

- CAPELL, ARTHUR & HINCH, H. E. (1970): *Maung Grammar*. The Hague: Mouton.
- CHAMOREAU, CLAUDINE (2000): *Grammaire du purépecha*. München: Lincom Europa.
- CORNYN, WILLIAM (1944): *Outline of Burmese Grammar*. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.
- DOL, PHILOMENA HEDWIG (1999): A Grammar of Maybrat, A Language of the Bird's Head, Irian Jaya, Indonesia. Ph.D. diss., University of Leiden.
- DRYER, MATTHEW S. (2005): Genealogical language list, in: HASPELMATH, MARTIN, DRYER, MATTHEW, GIL, DAVID & COMRIE, BERNARD (eds.), *World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 584–644.
- GIVÓN, TALMY (1978): Negation in Language: Pragmatics, Function, Ontology. In COLE, PETER (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics, vol. 9. Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, 69–112.
- GIVÓN, TALMY (2001): *Syntax: An Introduction*. Vol. I. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- GRINEVALD CRAIG, COLETTE (no date): A Grammar of Rama. Report to National Science Foundation BNS 8511156.
- HAAS, MARY R. (1940): *Tunica*. New York: J. J. Augustin.
- HASPELMATH, MARTIN, DRYER, MATTHEW, GIL, DAVID & COMRIE, BERNARD (eds.) (2005): *World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KIMBALL, GEOFFREY D. (1991): *Koasati Grammar*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- KUTSCH LOJENGA, CONSTANCE (1994): *Ngiti, A Central-Sudanic Language of Zaire*. Köln: Köppe.
- LOUWERSE, JOHN (1988): *The Morphosyntax of Una in Relation to Discourse Structure: A Descriptive Analysis*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- 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 (submitted): Symmetric and asymmetric encoding of functional domains, with remarks on typological markedness, in: MIESTAMO, MATTI & WÄLCHLI, BERNHARD (EDS.), *New Challenges in Typology: Broadening the Horizons and Redefining the Foundations*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- MURANE, ELIZABETH. 1974. *Daga Grammar: From Morpheme to Discourse*. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- NEDJALKOV, IGOR (1994): Evenki. In KAHREL, PETER & VAN DEN BERG, RENÉ (eds.), *Typological Studies in Negation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1–34.
- NEDJALKOV, IGOR (1997) *Evenki*. London: Routledge.
- SMEETS, CATHARINA (1989): *A Mapuche Grammar*. Ph.D. diss., University of Leiden.
- TERRILL, ANGELA (1999): *A Grammar of Lavukaleve: a Papuan Language of the Solomon Islands*. Ph.D. diss., Australian National University.
- VAN DER AUWERA, JOHAN (2006): Why languages prefer prohibitives?, in: *Journal of Foreign Languages* 2006 (1): 1–25.
- VAN DER AUWERA, JOHAN & LEJEUNE, LUDO (2005): The prohibitive, in: HASPELMATH, MARTIN, DRYER, MATTHEW, GIL, DAVID & COMRIE, BERNARD (eds.), *World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 290–293.

MATTI MIESTAMO
 Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies
 P.O. Box 4
 FI-00014 University of Helsinki
 Finland
 matti.miestamo@helsinki.fi

JOHAN VAN DER AUWERA
 University of Antwerp
 Center for Grammar, Cognition & Typology
 B-2610 Wilrijk
 Belgium
 johan.vanderauwera@ua.ac.be