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Berber languages

28-35 languages
Number of dialects unknown
Table 1. Blažek’s (2010) classification of Berber based on Starostin’s calibrated glottochronology based on minimal values [language names slightly adapted]
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1. Variation in Negative markers

• Preverbal negator: \( wər/ur/u/ul/wəl \ldots \) # ak # la :

  – Origin of \( wər/ur/u/ul/wəl \)
    • Loubignac (1924:177): \( \sqrt{R\ ut} \) (cf â† TMZ ‘be empty/desert’)
    • Marcy (1936: 56-7): \( \sqrt{WR} ‘not exist, not be’ \) SHI
    • Basset (1940:220-2): \( \sqrt{WR} \)
    • Evidence:
      – \( // \war+N \) : ‘without N’ (KAB war-ism: ‘anonymous’)
      – verbal behavior in Tuareg, Ghadamsi, Zenaga, in negative relative clauses
• Galand (1994): \( wər = u + < \text{ara} \) ‘thing’
• Brugnatelli (2006): \( wər = u + < \text{ar} \) ‘until’
• Galand (2010): \( wər = u + < \text{ara} = a \) (« support de détermination ») + verb iri ‘want’
• Brugnatelli (2011): \( wər = u + < \text{verb r} \) (attested in Chenwi CHN, cf Laoust 1912 texts)
• Galand (2011): \( wər = u + < \text{verb iri} \) ‘want’

– Origin of \text{la}:
  • Arabic ?

– Origin of \text{ak} : adverb \text{ak}^{\text{w}} ‘totally’, ‘all’ (Galand 2010: 280)
• Postverbal element with preverbal negator: ara in Kabyle, ʃa in Tarifit, Tamazight, Tashawit, ʃ in Zwara...
  – Additional marking in all languages that have a preverbal negator: no discontinuous morpheme
  – Conditions of absence for Kabyle (Mettouchi 2000, 2001, 2009) 48% of negations
    • Ur only
      – negative polarity items (indefinite nouns)
      – oaths or polemical statements
      – negative coordination
      – negative subordination
      – negative restrictive relativization
    • Ara obligatory
      – negative conditional clause
      – negative informative answers
• **Ur only**
  – negative polarity items (indefinite nouns)
    • ur  j-ddi  jiwn
    • NEG  3M.SG-accompany:NEG.PFV one:ANN
    • ‘no one came’

  – oaths or polemical statements
    • wəlləh  ur  swi-ɣ
    • by_God  NEG  drink:NEG.PFV-1SG
    • ‘I swear I didn’t drink!’

  – negative coordination
    • ur  uli-n  jxxamən  ur  t-rbiḥ  tfəllaḥt
    • NEG  go_up:NEG.PFV-3M.PL  house:ANN.PL
    • NEG  improve:NEG.PFV-3M.PL  cultivation:ANN.SG
    • ‘neither were the houses built nor was cultivation improved’
– negative subordination
  • \texttt{ttməslaj-ɣ ur faq-ɣ} \\
  • talk:\texttt{IPFV-1SG NEG realize:PFV-1SG} \\
  • ‘I talked without realizing (what I was doing)’ (unawares)

– negative restrictive relativization
  • n-wala argaz \texttt{ur n-ssin} \\
  • 1\texttt{PL-see:PFV man:ABS NEG 1\texttt{PL-know:NEG.PFV}} \\
  • ‘We saw a man we didn’t know’ (unknown)

• Ara obligatory
  – negative conditional clause
    • ma \texttt{ur n-țuh ara s axxam ad=ɣ tʃʃ-n ləw乎ʃ} \\
    • IF NEG 1\texttt{PL-go:PFV POSTNEG to home:ABS} \\
      POT=\texttt{ACC1\texttt{PL-3M.PL beast:ANN.PL}} \\
    • ‘if we don’t go home the wild beasts will eat us ’
– negative informative answers
  • anda=t ? ‘where is it ?’
  • where=ACC3M.SG ?
  • ur=t=id j-ufi ara. ‘He didn’t find it’
  • NEG=ACC3M.SG=PROX 3M.SG-find:NEG.PFV POSTNEG.

• Ara anchors the negative statement in situation, ‘common ground’ marker.
• Postverbal negator: ká/kîra in Awjila, š/ʃi in Sened, š in Zvara

  – Origin of ká/kîra: < kra/ʃra, ara (Brugnatelli). Jespersen

  \[
  \text{afīwa t-nə-d=dik} \quad \text{ká} \quad (or: ur=t-nə-d=dik) \quad \text{żlan=ɪya} \quad u=nək}
  \]
  why 2s-say:pf.-2s=10.1s neg. neg.=2s-say:pf.-2s=10.1s words-prox.:p and=I
  \[
  \text{nni-x} \quad \text{ar=utə?}
  \]
  be(loc.):pf.-1s to=below
  Why did you not tell me these words when (litt. and) I was still below?” [PT:VI]

  – shown by the rare remaining postverbal ká with preverbal

  \[
  \text{ur=n-à=k=a} \quad \text{ká} \quad \text{bəʃəd a=t-qimâ-t} \quad \text{iddu t-əʃəddi-t} \quad \text{ká?}
  \]
  neg.=say:res.-1s=10.2sm=res. neg. when fut.-2s-stay:fut.-2s with-1s 2s-go-impf.-2s neg.
  ‘Did I not tell you that when you stay with me not to go (anywhere?)’ [PT:XIII]

  – Origin of š/ʃi: convergence Berber/Arabic (Brugnatelli & Galand)
• Brugnatelli (1987) claims that all forms can be derived from a common Berber form *kara(t):
  - “Da un punto di vista fonetico, quindi, nulla esclude la possibilità di una derivazione anche di –š(a/i) da una base berbera *kara(t) (o sim.) ‘qualche cosa’, che sarebbe così stata usata in tutta la fascia settentrionale dei parlari come particella negativa postverbale” (1987:56).

• The grammaticalization of this postverbal particle in Berber may have been reinforced by the existence of ma...š discontinuous negations in Arabic, as is suggested by Galand (1994)
  - “on pourrait être ici en présence d’un phénomène de convergence entre une donnée du fond berbère et un élément arabe; le cas ne serait pas unique” (1994:177).
Verbal negators

28-35 languages
Number of dialects unknown
Preverbal negators may vary in form

• According to the syntactic or pragmatic status of the clause
  – dependency
• According to the modal status of the clause
  – negative optative (awər in Kabyle)
  – prohibitive (la in Tashawit)
  – oaths (ma in Kabyle, amk in Tashelhit...)
• Dependency : Ghadamsi

  - *ak* in main and independent clauses / *wāl* in dependent clauses (subordinated or not) (Mettouchi 2012)
  - *ak* ‘for non-subordinated and non-prohibitive clauses’ (Kossmann 2011)

    ![Language text](image1)

    - *wāl*: ‘1. in subordinated clauses (...) 2. as a sequential, marking that the different clauses are temporarily and informationally connected (...) 3. as a prohibitive’ (KossmannXX: 178-9)

    ![Language text](image2)

  - *wāl*: ‘flies do not enter a shut mouth’ [48/78]
  - *wāl*: ‘if your greeting had not preceded mine’ [22/40]
  - *wāl*: ‘they quarreled every day and she did not find what she could do to them’ [5/8]
  - *wāl*: ‘do not throw away the words of the ancestors!’ [44/74]
• Modal status of the clause:
  – prohibitive in Tashawit
    \[ \text{la hən-dd-ttuʔat} \]
    \[ \text{NEG OBJ3M.PL-PROX-bring\textbackslash{}IPFV:2PL} \]
    'Don't bring them back' (Tashawit, Penchoen 1967:56)

  – optative in Kabyle
    \[ \text{awər=dd j-u̯yal !} \]
    \[ \text{NEG=PROX 3M.SG-change\textbackslash{}AOR} \]
    'Pray he doesn't come back!' (Kabyle)

  – oaths in Kabyle
    \[ \text{wələh ma nni-ɣ=as !} \]
    \[ \text{By-God NEG say\textbackslash{}PFV-1SG=DAT3SG} \]
    'I swear I didn't tell him!' (Kabyle)
Non-verbal negators

- non-verbal negators (phrasal/clausal)
  - attributive negation ‘it is not X’
  - existential negation ‘there is no X’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Existential</th>
<th>Attributive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kabyle</td>
<td>ur (+ara)</td>
<td>ulaf</td>
<td>matfji d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tashawit</td>
<td>ud (+ja)</td>
<td>ud-illi, ullij</td>
<td>ljjid, ixda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarifit</td>
<td>ur (+ja)</td>
<td>u-din ja</td>
<td>ur-id, ulid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u-dzj-ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuara</td>
<td>w ... ṣ</td>
<td>wəllij</td>
<td>wətfjá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wə ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... ṣ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghadamsi</td>
<td>ak / wål</td>
<td>wål d</td>
<td>a-d / awas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siwa</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>la-di</td>
<td>qatfj / atfj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuareg (Ahaggar)</td>
<td>wər</td>
<td>aba</td>
<td>wər giy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuareg (Aïr)</td>
<td>wər̥</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>wər̥ ge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Proportions in Kabyle
  – 30mn conversation = 60 verbal / 32 Non-verbal (64.5% / 35.5%)
    • Non-verbal = 15 existential / 17 attributive (47%/53%)
• Proportions in Siwi (Schiattarella forthcoming)
  – 1 hour corpus = 76% verbal / 24% non-verbal
    • Non-verbal = 46% existential / 54% attributive
• Negative existentials typology (Veselinova 2013)
  – 1) Complete formal and constructional difference between SN and EXN : A- Tuareg B-Kabyle, Zwara, Tashawit-b
  – 2) SN and EXN are formally the same, but require different constructions: Tarifit, Tashawit-a, Ghadamsi, Siwi
  – 3) SN or a negative quantifier alternate for the negation of existence
  – 4) The same strategy is used for SN and EXN
Variation in Subject Relativization

- Most Berber languages have a special subject-relativization verbal form which has fewer PNG distinctions than standard verbal constructions.
- This form generally has a formally different corresponding negative.

Example:

```
əssáṛṭak-ān fell fadawatān ta wər n-ənwə,
make.fall:1-3P:M on courtiers DEF:S:F NEG PTC-be.ripe:PN
əssáṛṭak-ān fell ənmokal ta t-ənw-āt
'they threw the one (the date) that was not ripe on the courtiers, and they threw the one that was ripe on the chief' [C85:103/6]
```
Subject Relativization forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kabyle</td>
<td>j-stem-n</td>
<td>ur n-stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayr Tuareg (Niger)</td>
<td>M.SG</td>
<td>j-stem-ăn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.SG</td>
<td>t-stem-ăt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>stem-nin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adagh Tuareg (Mali)</td>
<td>M.SG</td>
<td>wăr ăn-stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.SG</td>
<td>wăr ăt-stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>wăr ăn-stem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variation in Mood-Aspect oppositions

- **PNG affixes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person-Gender</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>xədm-γ</td>
<td>n-xədm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2m</td>
<td>t-xədm-δ</td>
<td>t-xədm-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td>j-xədm</td>
<td>xədm-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>t-xədm</td>
<td>xədm-nt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Aspect-Mood base forms in Berber**

<p>|
| Taqbaylit aspectual stems (roots DD ‘come’, and KRZ, ‘plough’) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Negative perfective</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ddu-</td>
<td>-dda-</td>
<td>-ddi-</td>
<td>-ʔʔeddud-</td>
<td>-kərʔəz-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-krəz-</td>
<td>-krəz-</td>
<td>-kriz-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|
| Air Tuareg aspectual stems (roots RTK, ‘fall’, and G, ‘do’) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Neg. PFV</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Neg. IPFV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-rtək-</td>
<td>-rtak-</td>
<td>-rtaak-</td>
<td>-rtək-</td>
<td>-raattək-</td>
<td>-təttək-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-g(u)-</td>
<td>-ge/a/ə</td>
<td>-gee/aa</td>
<td>-ge/a/ə-</td>
<td>-taagg(u)-</td>
<td>-təgg(u)-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forms: base forms + PNG + preverbs

- **Bound pronouns (PNG affixes)**
  - With standard PNG:
    - all stems
  - With imperative PNG
    - Aorist and Imperfective
  - With hortative PNG
    - Aorist and Imperfective

- **Preverbs**
  - Without preverbs
    - all stems
  - With potential, future preverb (ad, ga...)
    - Aorist and Imperfective
  - With progressive preverb (la)
    - Imperfective

- **Standard negation**
  - not always with aorist
  - if negative imperfective then no NEG with IPFV
  - if negative perfective then no NEG with PFV
  - sometime replaces preverbs, sometimes in addition to them

- **A lot of variation among Berber languages**
Kabyle & Tamashek: asymmetrical

### Kabyle aspectual oppositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aorist or imperfective imperative</td>
<td>a wər + aorist (optative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad + aorist</td>
<td>ur + imperfective imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad + imperfective</td>
<td>ur+ imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperfective</td>
<td>ur+ negative perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aspectual oppositions in Aïr Tuareg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aorist or imperfective imperative</td>
<td>wər ze/he + aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad + aorist</td>
<td>war + negative imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad + imperfective</td>
<td>wər + negative perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resultative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shilha & Siwi: almost symmetrical

### Aspectual oppositions in Tashelhit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aorist or imperfective imperative</td>
<td>ad + aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad + aorist</td>
<td>ad ur + aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad + aorist</td>
<td>ur rad + aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ddad + aorist</td>
<td>ur ddad + aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar + imperfective</td>
<td>ur a + imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperfective</td>
<td>ur + imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfective</td>
<td>ur + perfective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Positive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aorist or imperfective imperative</td>
<td>la + imperfective imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ga + aorist</td>
<td>la ga + aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperfective</td>
<td>la + imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resultative</td>
<td>la + resultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfective</td>
<td>la + perfective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The negative MA domain in Kabyle

- **Awer + [SA+AOR]**: negative optative. (<1%)
- **Ur + [IA + IPFV]**: negated future or potential, prohibitive. (<5%) (positive imperative 2.5%)
- **Ur + [SA + IPFV]**: negative hortative, oath, negated habitual, future, potential, progressive. (30-40%) (positive imperfective 10-16%; ad+aorist 15-30%)
- **Ur + [SA + NEG.PFV]**: negative statement (stative or dynamic), oath. (60-70%) (positive perfective 50-70%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kabyle aspectual oppositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aorist or imperfective imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad + aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad + imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SA = Standard affixes**  **IA = Imperative affixes**
The negative MA domain in Shilha

- **Ad** ur + [SA + AOR] : prohibitive, negated potential.
- **Ur** rad/ddad + [SA + AOR] : negated future

- **Ur** + [SA + IPFV] : negated habitual, progressive.

- **Ur** + [SA + PFV] : negative statement (stative or dynamic)

SA = Standard affixes  
IA = Imperative affixes
The negative MA domain in Tamashek

- \( w\text{\~e}r + [e + [SA+AOR]] \) : negated future (relative), potential.
- \( w\text{\~e}r + [e + [SA+AI+AOR]] \) : negative hortative
- \( e + w\text{\~e}r + [SA+AOR] \) : negated future, potential.
- \( w\text{\~e}r + [SA + \text{NEG.IPFV}] \) : negated future, potential, negative habitual, progressive.
- \( w\text{\~e}r + [AI + \text{NEG.IPFV}] \) : prohibitive
- \( w\text{\~e}r + [SA + \text{NEG.PFV}] \) : prohibitive, negative statement (stative or dynamic)

\( SA = \) Standard affixes \hspace{1cm} \( IA = \) Imperative affixes
The negative MA domain in Siwi

- \( \text{La} + [\text{ga} + [\text{SA}+\text{AOR}]] \): negated future or potential, prohibitive
- \( \text{La} + [\text{ga} + [\text{SA}+\text{IA}+\text{AOR}]] \): negative hortative
- \( \text{La} + [\text{IA}+\text{IPFV}] \): prohibitive
- \( \text{La} + [\text{SA}+\text{PFV}] \): negative statement (stative or dynamic)
- \( \text{La} + [\text{SA}+\text{IPFV}] \): negative habitual, progressive.

\( \text{SA} = \text{Standard affixes} \quad \text{IA} = \text{Imperative affixes} \)
Discussion

• Miestamo types of asymmetry (standard negation)
  – A/Fin: in finiteness of the verbal elements
  – A/NonReal: in the marking of reality status
  – A/Emph: in the marking of emphasis
  – A/Cat: in the marking of grammatical categories
    • A/Cat/TAM
Discussion

• Motivation for those asymmetries
  – Miestamo (2003): ‘In the languages where less distinctions are made in non-fact than fact, there is language external (vertical) analogy (i.e. iconicity) from ontology to linguistic form, whereas in languages where the same amount of distinctions can be made in fact and non-fact, there is language-internal (horizontal) analogy from the formal structure of fact to the formal structure of non-fact’.
• Contini-Morava (1989):  
  – ‘negative-affirmative asymmetry is a natural consequence of the pragmatic function of negative sentences in ordinary discourse. Because speakers generally try to avoid conveying superfluous information, negative sentences in natural discourse — unlike negative logical propositions — are used to refer only to events which a hearer might have expected to occur. Since negated events are always potential rather than actual, there is no reason to assume that speakers need to convey the same information about them as they would in reporting actual occurrences’
Discussion

• Mettouchi (1995, 2009): the negative domain is basically about two types of predications (cf in various frameworks Culioli, Horn, Tottie...) :
  – the non-realization of an event or situation
    • X does not exist
    • X is not the case ➝ Perfective
    • X did/will not happen
  – the disagreement about the status of a referent or situation
    • X is not A (but B)
    • I reject X (for Y) ➝ Imperfective
**Zoom on the Prohibitive**

- **Type 1:** The prohibitive uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives.

- **Type 2:** The prohibitive uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives.

- **Type 3:** The prohibitive uses a verbal construction other than the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives.

- **Type 4:** The prohibitive uses a verbal construction other than the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives

  - (AUWERA, VAN DER J. ET AL. 2005)
Berber strategies for the Prohibitive

• Kabyle
  – Imperative: Aorist or Imperfective stem + imperative affixes
  – Prohibitive: NEG + Imperfective stem + imperative affixes
    • Aorist is excluded from prohibitive; prohibitive shows imperative PNG affixes.

• Shilha (Tachelhit)
  – Imperative: Aorist or Imperfective stem + imperative affixes
  – Prohibitive: IRR+ NEG+ Aorist stem + standard 2nd person affixes
    • Aorist is used for prohibitive, with standard PNG affixes, and a preverb.

• Tamashek
  – Imperative: Aorist or Imperfective stem + imperative affixes
  – Prohibitive:
    • NEG+ Negative perfective stem + standard 2nd person affixes
    • NEG+ Negative imperfective + imperative affixes
      – Two types of prohibitive coexist (perfective+ standard PNG / imperfective+ imperative PNG).

• Siwi
  – Imperative: Aorist or Imperfective stem + imperative affixes
  – Prohibitive:
    • NEG+ Imperfective stem + imperative affixes.
    • NEG+ IRR + Aorist stem + standard 2nd person affixes
      – Two types of prohibitive coexist (aorist+ with standard PNG affixes, and a preverb/ imperfective+ imperative PNG).
Typology

• Type 1: The prohibitive uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives.
  – Kabyle, Tamashek, Siwi
    • But it is the IMPERFECTIVE imperative stem which is used (rare in positive imperatives)

• Type 3. The prohibitive uses a verbal construction other than the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives.
  – Shilha, Tamashek, Siwi
    • But those verbal constructions are varied.
A more detailed overview

- Either the aspect-mood stem is different
- Or the order of negative and preverb is different
- And/or the person paradigm is different (standard vs imperative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kabyle</td>
<td>Shilha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stem</td>
<td>IPFV AOR PFV &amp; IPFV AOR &amp; IPFV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affix</td>
<td>IMP STD STD &amp; IMP STD &amp; IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preverb</td>
<td>no yes no yes &amp; no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order NEG-PREVERB</td>
<td>PVB &lt; NEG NEG &lt; PVB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Type 1 Type 3 Type 3 &amp; Type 1 Type 3 &amp; Type 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

• Regarding markers, classic situation (cycles)

• Regarding asymmetry, a lot of variation:
  – Existential / Attributive negations
  – subject relativization
  – aspect-mood
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