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Abstract

Over the years the typology of negation has been much described and discussed. However, focus has mainly been on standard negation. Studies on non-verbal negation in general and comparative studies covering the complete domain of non-verbal negation in particular are less common. The strategies to express non-verbal negation vary among languages. In some languages the negation strategy employed in standard negation is also used in non-verbal negation. Several researchers have argued that languages express negation of non-verbal predications using special constructions. This study examines and describes negation strategies in simple declarative sentences in 18 Dravidian languages. The results suggest that the majority of the Dravidian languages included in this study express standard negation by the use of a negative suffix while non-verbal negation is expressed by a negative verb. Further distinctions are made in the negation of non-verbal predications in that different negation markers are used for attributive and existential/possessive predications respectively.
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Sammanfattning

majoriteten av de Dravidiska språken inkluderade i denna studie uttrycker standardnegation med hjälp av negativa suffix medan icke-verbal negation uttrycks med negativa verb. Ytterligare distinktioner görs i negationen av icke-verbala predikationer i det att olika negationsmarkörer används för attributiv negation å ena sidan och för existentiella/possessiva predikationer å den andra.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>first person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>second person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVB</td>
<td>converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-</td>
<td>non- (e.g. NPST non-past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

Over the years the typology of negation has been much described and discussed. However, focus has mainly been on standard negation. Studies on non-verbal negation or negation in specific functional domains such as attribution, existence and possession are not very common. (The concept is further discussed in section 2.2.) In some languages the negation strategy employed in standard negation is also used to express non-verbal negation. In other languages different strategies are employed in standard negation and non-verbal negation. The strategies may also vary depending on type of non-verbal predication, i.e. attribution, existence and possession. Several researchers, e.g. Dahl (2010) and Veselinova (2013), have argued that negation of non-verbal predications tend to be expressed using special constructions. A typological description of the negation strategies used in a larger number of genealogically related languages, such as the Dravidian language family, could provide additional information on how negation strategies of non-verbal predications may vary.

2. Background

2.1 Standard negation

The typology and diachrony of negation has been much described and discussed in recent years, by e.g. Dahl (1979), Payne (1985), Miestamo (2005, 2011), van der Auwera (2009, 2010), and Dryer (2013a, b). Focus has mainly been on verbal negation or standard negation; a term introduced by Payne (1985), described as “that type of negation which has as one function the negation of the most minimal and basic sentences”. The term is commonly used. However, its definition varies over time. Miestamo (2005) defines standard negation as “the basic way (or ways) a language has for negating declarative verbal main clauses”. In Miestamo (2011) the term is redefined as “the negation of declarative main clauses with a verbal predicate”. Dahl (2010) discusses the term standard negation and argues that it is not a completely satisfactory choice. According to Dahl (2010:11) the term “standard negation” implies that negation of anything but simple indicative sentences should be considered “non-standard negation”.

An often mentioned work on the typology of negation is Dahl’s (1979) Typology of sentence negation. Dahl describes the typology of sentence negation in a 240 language sample, proposing a distinction between morphological and syntactic negation. In the former the negation marker is bound to its form and commonly is an affix. In the latter the negation marker is a free form, e.g. an uninflected particle or an auxiliary. Another well-known work is Miestamo (2005), in which the typology of standard negation in verbal main clauses is examined based on a 297 language sample. Miestamo proposes a symmetric versus asymmetric distinction, concluding that symmetric negation implies that the structural difference between the affirmative and the negative is restricted to the presence of a negative marker. In asymmetric negation the differences between the affirmative and the negative are characterized by several structural differences.

The distinction between various types of negation markers is examined and described by Dryer (2013a) who concludes that negative particles followed by negative affixes are the most common
negation markers among the languages included in the World Atlas of Language Structures (WALS). In addition, Dryer (2013b) makes a distinction between preverbal and postverbal position of the negation marker.

As discussed, cross-linguistic studies of negation are commonly descriptions of verbal negation. In cases where non-verbal negation (see section 2.2 for a definition) is described it is commonly only a side topic. In addition, standard and non-standard negation are often discussed as separate phenomena and commonly the time aspect is not covered at all. van der Auwera (2010) describes the diachrony and cyclicity of negation and argues that the two types are related and what is relevant for the diachrony of the former is also relevant for the diachrony of the latter. Hence there is need for studies covering both standard and non-standard negation.

2.2 Non-verbal negation

Non-verbal negation can be defined as negation of a simple declarative sentence (further discussed in section 2.3) in which the predicate is not a lexical verb. The predicate in a non-verbal predication may be e.g. a noun phrase (1a), an adjective (1b), or a locative construction (1c) (Dahl 2010:27). The notion of construction follows Croft’s definition (2001:18), i.e. constructions are symbolic units consisting of form and (conventional) meaning linked together by symbolic correspondence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Copula</th>
<th>Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>ill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The non-verbal predication may, or may not, be expressed by the use of a copula construction. In (2) (3) (4) a copula, a word linking the subject with the predicate, is used. In (5) a copula is lacking. Dahl (2010:27-28) argues that in constructions lacking a copula, negation is often expressed by the use of a special negation marker. In constructions with a copula, a special negative copula occasionally replaces the ordinary copula.

(2) **Brahui (Dravidian, North)**

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
I & \text{brā’ūāše} & \text{ut} \\
1\text{SG} & \text{Brahui.SG} & \text{be.PRS.1SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I am a Brahui.’ (Andronov 1980:92)

(3) **Telugu (Dravidian, South-Central)**

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Alasatagā} & \text{undī} \\
tired & \text{be.PRS.3SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘She is tired.’ (Lisker 1963:64)
The strategies to express non-verbal negation vary among languages. Some languages employ the same negation strategy in non-verbal predications as in standard negation while others use different strategies. In some languages the strategies vary depending on type of non-verbal predication. For instance, in French standard negation (6) as well as non-verbal negation (7) is expressed by the discontinuous negation marker *ne... pas*. In Indonesian standard negation and non-verbal negation are expressed using different strategies. Standard negation is expressed by the negation marker *tidak* (8) while non-verbal negation is expressed by *bukan* (9). An example of a language in which the strategies vary depending on predication is Parji. Standard negation is expressed by the negative suffix *-a* (10), negation of attribution by the negative verbal stem *er- ‘to be not’* (11) and negation of existence by the negative particle *cila* (12).

(4) Malayalam (Dravidian, South)  
Avan’  iviṭe  unṭu  
3SG  here  be-INF  
‘He is here.’ (George 1971:44)

(5) Pengo (Dravidian, South-Central)  
Avan  pant-an  
3SG  tall-3SG  
‘He is tall.’ (Burrow and Bhattacharya 1970:48)

(6) French (Romance, Oïl)  
Je  ne  mange  pas  
1SG  NEG  eat.PR S.1SG  NEG  
‘I do not eat.’ (constructed example)

(7) French (Romance, Oïl)  
Je  ne  suis  pas  fatigué  
1SG  NEG  be.PR S.1SG  NEG  tired  
‘I am not tired.’ (constructed example)

(8) Indonesian (Malayo-Polynesian, Malay)  
Mereka  tidak  menolong  kami  
3PL  NEG  help  1PL.EXCL  
‘They didn’t help us.’ (Sneddon 1996, cited in Eriksen 2011:276)

(9) Indonesian (Malayo-Polynesian, Malay)  
Dia  bukan  guru  
3SG  NEG  teacher.SG  
‘She is not a teacher.’ (Sneddon 1996, cited in Eriksen 2011:276)
Non-verbal negation and negation in predications of existence often exhibit similarities. The existential verb is often identical to the copula. Moreover, the negation marker used in standard negation may be identical to the negative existential. Parallels are also visible as regards the negative constructions, e.g. are suppletive negative verbs commonly used (Dahl 2010:28).

Comparative studies covering the complete domain of negation in non-verbal predications are few and none of them cover the aspects of this study. Kahrel and van den Berg (eds. 1994) present descriptions of all aspects of negation in 16 unrelated languages. Eriksen (2011) cover non-verbal negation in nominal and attributive predications. Based on cross-linguistic data, Veselinova (forthcoming a) investigates standard negation and non-verbal negation and tests the Negative existential cycle in Slavonic and Polynesian languages. Veselinova (forthcoming b) presents an overview of non-verbal negation across the complete domain of non-verbal negation in Uralic languages, while Veselinova (2013) examines negative existentials.

Eriksen (2011:277) suggests that non-verbal negation can be explained in terms of Direct Negation Avoidance. Direct Negation Avoidance could be described as a strategy divergent from the one used to express standard negation, with the purpose to avoid that the non-verbal predicate becomes focus of the negation (Eriksen 2011:275). Several different strategies are associated with Direct Negation Avoidance. One is the Negated existence strategy in which the state described by the predicate is negated, not the predicate itself (Eriksen 2011:281). An auxiliary, a particle or a bound morpheme, is positioned between the standard negator and the non-verbal predicate with the purpose to act as a mediator (Eriksen 2011:292). Eriksen puts forth the hypothesis that all copulas may act as mediators. In addition, Eriksen (2011:293) suggests that copulas may be in complementary distribution with e.g. special negators as regards the different Direct Negation Avoidance strategies. Eriksen concludes that sentences with non-verbal or existential predicates tend to employ special negative constructions different from the constructions used to express standard negation (Eriksen 2011:275-276). These negators are collectively referred to as special negators, a definition first used by Veselinova (forthcoming a).

Veselinova (forthcoming a) investigates standard negation as well as non-verbal negation in 13 Slavonic and 22 Polynesian languages. The study yields different results for the two language families.
In the Slavonic languages 8 out of 13 languages express negation of existence using a special negator, different from the one used to express standard negation. In a majority of the languages the use of the special negator is restricted to one tense, the present. Of the Polynesian languages, all except one employ a special negator to express negation of existence. Three of the languages employ the existential negator to express certain aspects of standard negation.

Veselinova (forthcoming b) presents an overview of non-verbal negation across the complete domain of non-verbal negation in Uralic languages. According to Veselinova the negative existentials in the Uralic language family exhibit a number of characteristics: (i) they have a tendency to behave as defective verbs, i.e. they lack a complete paradigm and only exist in a limited number of forms, (ii) they act as replacement for the affirmative existential, and (iii) they have a tendency to appear in certain types of constructions (Veselinova forthcoming b).

In a cross-linguistic study Veselinova (2013) examines the strategies employed to negate existential predications from a macro and a micro perspective respectively. The samples used consist of data from 95 unrelated languages as well as data from the three language families, Polynesian, Slavic and Uralic. Negative existentials are commonly described as special negators since they employ constructions different from the ones used to express standard negation (Veselinova forthcoming a). Veselinova (2013) puts forth a number of semantic and structural properties characteristic for the negative existentials. In light of the findings Veselinova discusses whether negative existentials should be described as special negators or if they constitute a separate functional domain, a “domain of absence” (Veselinova 2013:139).

### 2.3 Simple declarative sentences

A simple declarative sentence consists of a single main, or *independent*, clause in which a subject precedes a verb. It is typically used to make statements (Chalker and Weiner 1998).

Simple declarative sentences can be constructed with a lexical verb (13) and (14). Sentences (15) and (16) display a construction with a copula verb and predicate identity. Sentence (17) is constructed with a nominal predicate. In sentence (18) and (19) the predicate is an adjective. While (17) predicates inclusion in a certain class, (18) predicates a constant property and (19) a temporary property. In (20) the construction has a definite subject and a locative predicate. In (21) and (22) the locative-presentative construction predicates not only existence but also location. Sentences (23) and (24) are grammaticalized existential constructions with a dummy subject, i.e. *is*, and an indefinite non-referential subject. Sentence (25) also expresses existence but is an intransitive sentence lacking the dummy subject which is present in (23) and (24). Sentence (26) expresses negation of predicative possession.

(13) Mary does not smoke.

(14) Mary does not drink coffee.

(15) This is my friend Abbott.

(16) This is not Abbott, it’s Costello.

(17) Mary is a nurse.

(18) Mary is tall.
(19) Mary is happy.
(20) Mary is not here.
(21) There is some coffee in the coffee pot.
(22) There is no coffee in the coffee pot.
(23) There is no coffee.
(24) There is no God.
(25) God exists.
(26) Mary does not have a coffee maker.

2.4 Dravidian languages

For this study 18 Dravidian languages have been selected: Brahui, Chenchu (a dialect of Telugu), the Adilabad dialect of Gondi, Kannada, Kodava (Kodagu), Konda, Koya, Kui, Kurumba (Kurumba Kannada), Kuvi, Malayalam, Malto, Parji, Pengo, Tamil, Telugu, Toda and Tulu. The selection of the languages has been governed by two criteria. The first criterion is the languages genealogical and areal relatedness. The second is the fact that a majority of the Dravidian languages lack a written tradition (Steever 1998:4) Hence the selection has been governed by the availability of grammars.

The Dravidian language family is traditionally divided into four subgroups: North Dravidian, Central Dravidian, South-Central Dravidian and South Dravidian respectively (Steever 1998). The classification in the Ethnologue (Lewis, Simons and Fennig eds. 2013) has been adopted. Matters of classification lie outside the scope of this study.

Brahui and Malto are commonly classified as North Dravidian languages. Brahui is mainly spoken in Pakistan. Malto is spoken in East India. Parji is a Central Dravidian language and is, as the name suggests, spoken in the central parts of India. Chenchu, Gondi, Konda, Koya, Kui, Kuvi, Pengo and Telugu belong to the South-Central group and are spoken in the Central, South-central and South-eastern parts of India. Kannada, Kodava, Kurumba, Malayalam, Tamil Toda and Tulu are South Dravidian languages, spoken mainly in South India (Lewis, Simons and Fennig eds. 2013) (Map 1).
2.4.1 Negation in Dravidian languages

In the Dravidian languages the prevailing word order is subject-object-verb (SOV). The morphology is traditionally defined as agglutinating, which means that words are formed by affixing one or several morphemes to a stem. As a consequence, Dravidian verbs consist of a verbal stem to which suffixes expressing grammatical categories are attached (Andronov 2003:181). This is visible in e.g. Toda (27) where the verbal stem pōr- ‘to come’ is followed by the negative suffix -o-, the first person singular suffix -en- and the past tense suffix -i. Another example is Konda (28) where the verbal stem kork- ‘to bite’ in infinitive is followed by the negative suffix -e- and the third person singular suffix -en.

(27) Toda (Dravidian, South)

\textit{Pōr-o-en-i}
\textit{come-INF-NEG-1SG-PST}

‘I did not come.’ (Sakthivel 1977:115)

(28) Konda (Dravidian, South-Central)

\textit{Kork-e-en}
\textit{bite-INF-NEG-3SG}

‘He does not bite.’ (Krishnamurti 1969:209)
A common feature in the Dravidian languages is the distinction positive and negative forms. All the languages exhibit this distinction which has been verified in finite as well as non-finite forms (Andronov 2003:184). However, according to Andronov none of the Dravidian languages exhibits a complete parallelism between positive and negative paradigms, i.e. there is an asymmetry between the affirmative and the negative paradigm. In Table 1 the affirmative and negative paradigm respectively for the verb máḍu ‘to do’ in Kannada can be seen. In the affirmative a distinction between past, present and future tense is visible, in the negative there is no such distinction.

Table 1. The Kannada verb máḍu ‘to do’ in the affirmative and negative paradigm respectively (Hodson 1979:28-29).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>máḍidenu</td>
<td>máḍutténe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>máḍidi/-e</td>
<td>máḍutti/máḍuttíyé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd masc</td>
<td>máḍidanu</td>
<td>máḍuttāne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd fem</td>
<td>máḍidālu</td>
<td>máḍuttāle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd neut</td>
<td>máḍītu</td>
<td>máḍuttade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>máḍidevu</td>
<td>máḍuttéve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>máḍidiri</td>
<td>máḍuttiři</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd masc</td>
<td>máḍidarú</td>
<td>máḍuttáre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd fem</td>
<td>máḍidarú</td>
<td>máḍuttáre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd neut</td>
<td>máḍidavu</td>
<td>máḍuttave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Master (1946:140) negation in Dravidian languages comprises four different types: (i) the Neutralizer, (ii) the suffix -ā, and the infix -ā-, (iii) the negative particle, and (iv) the Zero negative.

Master argues that the two impersonal forms alla and illa, neuter forms of the verbs all- ‘to be not, to become not’ and ill- ‘to be not, to exist not, are the results of the first type, the Neutralizer. Through neutralization, grammatical distinctions present in the affirmative, e.g. tense and personal suffixes, are lost in the negative (Miestamo 2010:172). Forms such as alla and illa expand their domain of use to express negation in different contexts and become neutralized Sankoff (1998:153) concludes that neutralization is “the fundamental discursive mechanism of (nonphonological) variation and change”.

Master (1946:141) describes suffix -ā in the second type as an emphatic suffix, previously used to express notional negative, now used in e.g. Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil and Telugu to express interrogation. In Malayalam this suffix has developed to a negative infix, -ā-. 

The third type, the negative particle, is according to Master (1946:145) found in Malayalam and Tamil but not in the rest of the Dravidian languages.

The Dravidian zero negative (Master 1946), is described by Miestamo (2010:169) as negation lacking an overt negation marker. The only thing distinguishing the negative from its corresponding affirmative is the absence of a tense marker. An example of this is Old Kannada which displays a distinction between past (29) and future (30) tense in an affirmative sentence. The corresponding
negative sentence (31) lacks an overt marker. Instead the negation is expressed by the absence of the tense marker (Miestamo 2010:169-170).

(29) Old Kannada (Dravidian, South-Central)
No:ḍ-id-em
see-PST-1SG
‘I saw.’ (Pilot-Raichoor 2010:268)

(30) Old Kannada (Dravidian, South-Central)
No:ḍ-uv-em
see-FUT-1SG
‘I will see.’ (Pilot-Raichoor 2010:268)

(31) Old Kannada (Dravidian, South-Central)
No:ḍ-em
see-1SG
‘I do/did/will not see.’ (Pilot-Raichoor 2010:268)

Miestamo (2010:170) argues that the difference between the negative and the corresponding affirmative construction is not limited to the absence of a tense marker and therefore suggests the alternative term Subtracting Zero Negative Construction.

Miestamo (2005) examines standard negation in a sample of 297 languages of which three are Dravidian languages: Brahui, Kannada and Malayalam, but none of these languages exhibit a zero negative. However, Pilot-Raichoor (2010:271) argues that the zero negative still exists in several South and South-Central Dravidian languages, e.g. Kota, Toda and Gondi, but also in Brahui, which is a North Dravidian language.

Not only has the zero negative been much debated, the mere existence of a zero negative has been disputed by e.g. Krishnamurti (2003) who dismisses the Dravidian zero negative with the following words:

The negative allomorphs occurring in inflected verbs have abnormal phonology and are, therefore, of uncertain origin. The notion of a zero negative in Dravidian is a myth (Krishnamurti 2003:348)

Nevertheless, Pilot-Raichoor (2010) concludes, with reference to Miestamo (2010), that the zero negative is in fact a negation strategy which “does not require the presence of a true negator” (Pilot-Raichoor 2010:299).

Negation of attributive and existential predications in Dravidian languages is sparsely discussed in the literature. Murugaiyan (1997) examines existential utterances and the negation of existence in 15 Dravidian languages representing all the four sub-groups. Murugaiyan divides equational predications into two types: those which express a constant quality, in which the use of a copula is optional, and those expressing an inconstant quality, which requires a copula. In addition, Murugaiyan concludes that the use of copulas in equational predications is a consequence of the spread of existential copulas.
2.5 Aim of the study

This thesis is a descriptive typological study on verbal as well as non-verbal negation in 18 Dravidian languages, with the purpose to obtain a better overview of negation strategies in verbal as well as non-verbal declarative predications. This is done by examining and providing a comparison on the negation markers and the negation strategies used to express verbal and non-verbal negation in the selected languages. Motivation for the study is the lack of a good comparative study of negation in simple declarative sentences in Dravidian languages.

3. Method

To obtain the relevant information from the descriptive grammars the Negation-Questionnaire (Appendix I), constructed by Ljuba Veselinova at the University of Stockholm, has been used. The questionnaire consists of 24 questions covering affirmative as well as negative verbal and non-verbal predications. In the first step the negator(s) used to express standard negation were identified for each language. In the second step the negators used to negate the three types of predications, i.e. being, existence and possession, were identified for the same languages. The following types of non-verbal predications have been examined: equational, descriptive, locative, existential, and possessive.

Equational predication refers to a sentence used to state the identity of an object (32). Descriptive predications, also referred to as nominal predications (Stassen 2013b), can be further divided into class inclusion and property attribution. Class inclusion is used to include an object into a certain class while property attribution is used to provide an object with a certain attribute (33) or the ascription of properties, which in turn can be constant (34) or inconstant (35). Locative predication refers to a sentence with a locative predicate (36). In addition to locative predications there are locative-presentative predications (37): while the former has a definite subject, the latter have an indefinite, more general, subject. Existential predication refers to a sentence used to state the mere existence of an object (38). Existence is expressed in absolute general terms and the introduced by the speaker is unfamiliar to the listener. Regarding predicative possession, a distinction is made between alienable and inalienable possession respectively. Alienable possession (39), used to express ownership of tangible objects which can exist independent of the possessor, is considered to be the ‘prototypical’ case of possession since the “possessive relation between the possessor and the possessee is not seen as ‘inherent’ or ‘indissoluble’ (Stassen 2009:15). Inalienable possession express ownership of objects which existence are dependent of the possessor, e.g. body parts or relatives (Stassen 2013a). Possession can be encoded in different ways and using e.g. locative or existential constructions. The definitions of the different types of predications follow Hengeveld (1992). In addition, lexicalizations of negation were identified.

(32) This is not Tom, it’s Jake.

(33) Tom is not a teacher, he is a doctor.
In the third step, patterns, similarities and differences were identified by comparing the verbal negator(s) and the non-verbal negators. Verbal negators and negators of being, existence and possession exhibit both syntactical and morphological differences. The differences were defined according to the following criteria: (i) complete formal and constructional difference (40) and (41), and (ii) difference in morphological form (42) and (43) (Veselinova 2013). In Konda the negative suffix -ɂ- is used to express SN (40). Negation of existence is expressed by the negative verbal stem sil-'to be not' (41). Tamil exhibits difference in morphological form. The two forms -illai and illai differ only in that -illai (42) is a bound form, while illai (43) is a free form.

(40) Konda (Dravidian, South-Central)
Aṭk-ɂ-en
burn-NEG-3SG
‘He doesn’t burn (wood).’ (Krishnamurti 1969:209)

(41) Konda (Dravidian, South-Central)
‘Uṉa’ ḫirix ānam sil-ed
eat-INF if food.SG be.not-NPST-3SG
‘There is no food for me to eat.’ (Krishnamurti 1969:323)

(42) Tamil (Dravidian, South)
Naan viṭav-ill-ai
1SG leave-INF-be.not-3PL
‘I did not leave.’ (Lehmann 1993:70)
The majority of the sources used in this study do not include glossed examples. In the few sources where glossed examples are available, the glossings do not follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules, which is the non-official glossing standard. Consequently, to provide correctly glossed examples and to avoid inconsistencies related to the glossing, all examples have been glossed following Leipzig Glossing Rules. In addition, to avoid inconsistencies, the examples have been adapted to the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA).

3.1 Data

To collect data on negation strategies in Dravidian languages, the sources presented in Table 2 have been used. All the sources are descriptive grammars but vary in scope and extensiveness. Some provide vocabularies as a complement to the language descriptions, e.g. *The Pengo language* by Burrow and Bhattacharya (1970). Others provide not only descriptions of the language itself but also descriptions of the culture and the social life, e.g. *Linguistic study of the Chenchus of Andhra Pradesh* by Trivedi (1978). Some are very extensive while others are merely sketchy overviews or shallow descriptions of certain aspects of the language. In addition, a majority of the sources lack glossed examples.

The selection of the grammars has to a large extent been governed by availability; consequently the study has been based on data drawn from a limited number of sources. In addition, due to the limitations in sources, not all data is contemporary, e.g. *Introduction to the Malto language* by Droese was published already in 1884 while *A grammar of Malayalam* by Nair was published as recently as 2012 (Table 2).

Table 2. Author and year of publication for each source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Author and year of publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahui</td>
<td>Andronov 1980, Bray 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenchu</td>
<td>Trivedi 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gondi</td>
<td>Lincoln 1969, Subrahmanyam 1968, Trench 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>Hodson 1979, Schiffmann 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodava</td>
<td>Balakrishnan 1977, Ebert 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konda</td>
<td>Krishnamurti 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koya</td>
<td>Subrahmanyam 1968, Tyler 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kui</td>
<td>Winfield 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurumba</td>
<td>Kapp 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuvi</td>
<td>Israel 1979, Reddy 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayalam</td>
<td>George 1971, Nair 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Results

This section presents the negation strategies used in the languages included in the study. The initial section (4.1) contains a summary of the results.

4.1 Summary of results

Two of the languages, Gondi and Malto, employ one negation strategy, negative verbs, for all the non-verbal predications under study. In Gondi the verb is *sil-* and in Malto *mal-* (Table 3).

In nine languages a clear distinction as regards the negation in different predications can be made: Chenchu, Kodava, Konda, Kui, Kuvi, Kurumba, Parji, Pengo and Telugu. In these languages one strategy is used to negate attributive predications while negation in existential predications is expressed by a special strategy. Chenchu and Telugu employ the negative verbal stem *kā-* to negate attributive predications and *lē-* to negate existential predications. In Kodava and Kurumba attributive predications are negated by the negative particle *alla* and existential predications by *ille*. Konda and Kui both employ the negative particle *-r-* to negate attribution. To negate existential predications Konda employs the negative verb *sil-* and Kui the negative verb *sid-*. In Kuvi negation of attributive predications is expressed by the negative particle *ār(e)* while negation in existential predications is expressed by the negative verb *hil-* in combination with the negative suffixes used to express SN, i.e. *-za-* in past tense and *-zo-* or its allomorphs *-r/-rô-* in non-past tense. Parji and Pengo both employ negative verbs to negate attributive and existential predications. In Parji the negative verb *er-* expresses negation in attributive predications while the negative verb *cil-* negates existential predications. In Parji existence may also be negated by the negative particle *cil-. Pengo negates attributive predications by the negative verb *a-* or by the negative particle *akay*. To negate existence the negative verb *hil-* is used (Table 3).

Five of the languages employ one negation marker to express standard negation regardless of tense. In Kannada and Malayalam standard negation is expressed by the negative suffix *-illa*. Konda employs the negative suffix *-r-*. In Pengo standard negation is expressed by either of the negative suffixes *-v-* or *-u-. Toda expresses standard negation by the use of the negative suffix *-o-*.  

Twelve languages distinguish between past and present-future tense when employing negation marker to express standard negation, i.e. they employ one negation marker to express standard
negation in past tense and another to express standard negation in present-future tense. In Brahui standard negation in past tense is expressed by the negative suffix -t(a) -. To express standard negation in present-future tense Brahui employ the negative suffix -f(a) - or its allomorph -p(a) -. Malto expresses standard negation in past tense by the negative suffix -l(ē) - while standard negation in present-future tense by the negative suffix -mal- or its allomorph -mala. Standard negation in present-future tense may also be expressed by the negative particle mala. In Parji standard negation in past tense is expressed by the negative suffix -a or its allomorph -i. To express standard negation in present-future tense Parji employs the negative suffix -a-. In Pengo, attributive predications are negated either by the negative verbal stem kā- or its allomorph kāl- while negation in predications of identity is expressed using kāl(a). To express standard negation in present-future tense Chenchu employs the negative suffix -a-. In Telugu standard negation in past tense is expressed by the negative suffix -lēdu. Standard negation in present-future tense is expressed by the negative suffix -a-. In Gondi standard negation in past tense is expressed by the negative suffix -makī( a) -. Standard negation in present-future tense is expressed by the negative suffix -ūr- or its allomorph -v-. In Koya standard negation in past tense is expressed by the negative verb ill-. Standard negation in non-past tense is expressed by the negative suffix -o- or any of its allomorphs -ū-, -w-, -vũ-, -vũ- or -φ-. Kui expresses standard negation in past tense by the negative suffix -a-. While standard negation in non-past tense is expressed by the negative suffix -a-. Standard negation in non-past tense may also be expressed by the negative particle mala. In Kuvi standard negation in past tense is expressed by the negative suffix -mala. To express standard negation in non-past tense Kuvi employs the negative suffix -ro- or its allomorphs -r- or -ṛ-. In Kodava standard negation in past tense is expressed by either of the negative suffixes -le or -ille. Standard negation in non-past tense is expressed by the negative suffix -le. Kurumba employs either of the negative suffixes -la to express standard negation in past tense. Standard negation in non-past tense is expressed by the negative suffix -mātta-. Tamil employs either of the negative suffixes -ā- or -ill- to express standard negation in past tense. SN in present-future tense is expressed by the negative suffix -ā-. (Table 3).

Only one language employs three different negation markers to express standard negation in past, present and future tense: Tulu. Standard negation in past tense is expressed by the negative suffix -ir-, standard negation in present tense by the negative suffix -ur-, and standard negation in future tense by the negative suffix -ay-. (Table 3).

As regards negation in attributive predications, seven languages employ one strategy to negate all three types of predications under study, i.e. identity, class inclusion and property attribution. In Chenchu and Telugu the attributive predication is negated by the negative verbal stem kā-, in Kodava and Kurumba by the negative particle alla, in Kui by the negative suffix -r-, in Kuvi by the negative particle ār( e) and in Parji by the negative verbal stem er-. The same negation marker is used regardless of tense. Three languages employ two different strategies to express negation in attributive predications. In Kannada and Malayalam negation in predications of identity is expressed using one strategy, while negation in predications of class inclusion and property attribution is expressed by the use of a second strategy. Kannada employs the negative suffix -alla to negate predications of identity and the negative particle alla to negate predications of class inclusion and property attribution. Malayalam expresses negation in predications of identity either by the negative suffix -alla or by the negative particle alla. Negation in predications of class inclusion and property attribution is expressed by the negative particle alla. In Pengo, attributive predications are negated either by the negative verbal stem a- or by the negative particle akay. In Tamil, either of two negative verbs all- and ill- may be used to negate predications of identity and class inclusion. Negation of property attribution is expressed by the use of a third strategy, the negative suffix -ā-.
and Tulu, the data is incomplete as regards negation of attributive predications; hence no generalizations can be made (Table 3).

Negation in existential predications is expressed by a special strategy in nine languages. Chenchu and Telugu employ the negative verb lē- to negate existential predications. In Kodava and Kurumba existential predications are negated by the negative particle ille. Konda and Kui employ the negative verbs sil- and sid- respectively to negate existential predications. In Kuvi negation in existential predications is expressed by the negative verb hil- in combination with the negative suffixes used to express SN, i.e. -ɂa- in past tense and -ɂo- or its allomorphs -ɂ/ɂõ- in non-past tense. Parji and Pengo both employ negative verbs to negate existential predications. In Parji the negative verb cila- or the negative particle cila are used to negate existential predications. Pengo negates predications of existence by the negative verb hil-. Two languages, Kuvi and Parji, employ two different strategies to negate existential predications. In Kuvi the negative verb hil- is used in combination with the negative suffixes used to express standard negation, i.e. -ɂa- in past tense and -ɂo- or its allomorphs -ɂ/ɂõ- in non-past tense. In Parji the negative verb cila- is used in parallel with a negative particle cila (Table 3).

Two languages, Chenchu and Kannada, employ one strategy to negate three types of existential predications while the fourth is negated using a second strategy. Chenchu employs the negative verb lē- while Kannada employs the negative particle illa. In Chenchu the second strategy, the negative particle lē, is used to negate predications of existence, in Kannada the negative suffix -illa is used to negate predications of possession. Tamil also employs one strategy to negate three of the existential predications but unlike Chenchu and Kannada two different strategies are used to negate predications of existence: the negative particle -ā- or the negative verb ill_. One language, Malayalam, employs three different strategies to negate existential predications. Location is negated using either of the two negative particels alla and illa. Negation in predications of location is expressed by the negative suffix -illa. Predications of existence are negated either by the negative suffix -illa or by the negative particle illa. To negate predications of possession the negative particle illa is employed. In one language, Koya, the data is incomplete as regards negation in existential predications; hence no generalizations can be made (Table 3).
For the presentation of the results the following abbreviations are used: SN = standard negation, Id = identification, Desc = Descriptive, I = Class inclusion, Attr = Property attribution, Loc = Location, Pres = Locative-presentative, Ex = Existence, Poss = Possession. A dash indicates that no information has been obtained.

Table 3. Comparative data on negator(s) per language, language group, SN and type of predication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Language name</th>
<th>ISO code</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Negator</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>Attr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Brahui</td>
<td>brh</td>
<td></td>
<td>pst</td>
<td>-t(a)-</td>
<td>-a-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prs-fut</td>
<td>-f(a)-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malto</td>
<td>mjt</td>
<td></td>
<td>pst</td>
<td>-l(e)-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prs-fut</td>
<td>mal-/l-)mala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Parji</td>
<td>pci</td>
<td></td>
<td>pst</td>
<td>-al-i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prs-fut</td>
<td>-a-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Central</td>
<td>Chenchu</td>
<td>cde</td>
<td></td>
<td>pst</td>
<td>(-)lēdu</td>
<td>kā-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prs-fut</td>
<td>-a-lφ i</td>
<td>lē-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gondi</td>
<td>ggo</td>
<td></td>
<td>pst</td>
<td>-māķ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prs-fut</td>
<td>-ā-</td>
<td>-v-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Konda</td>
<td>kfc</td>
<td></td>
<td>pst, prs-fut</td>
<td>-z-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koya</td>
<td>kff</td>
<td></td>
<td>pst</td>
<td>ill-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prs-fut</td>
<td>-o-l-ū/l-v-ū-l-vā/l-vū-l-ā-l-φ-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ill-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kui</td>
<td>kxu</td>
<td></td>
<td>pst</td>
<td>-zā-</td>
<td>-z-</td>
<td>sid-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prs-fut</td>
<td>-z-</td>
<td>-z-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuvi</td>
<td>kxv</td>
<td></td>
<td>pst</td>
<td>-zā-</td>
<td>-z-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prs-fut</td>
<td>-20-l-2-l-zō-</td>
<td>-z-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pengo</td>
<td>peg</td>
<td></td>
<td>pst, prs, fut</td>
<td>-v-l-u-</td>
<td>-a-/akay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>tel</td>
<td></td>
<td>pst</td>
<td>-lēdu</td>
<td>kā-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lē-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>pst, prs-fut</td>
<td>-illa</td>
<td>-alla</td>
<td>alla</td>
<td>illa</td>
<td>-illa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodava</td>
<td>kfa</td>
<td>pst</td>
<td>-le/-ille</td>
<td>alla</td>
<td>alla</td>
<td>ille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prs-fut</td>
<td>-le</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurumba</td>
<td>kfi</td>
<td>pst</td>
<td>-la</td>
<td>alla</td>
<td>alla</td>
<td>ille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prs-fut</td>
<td>-māṭtā</td>
<td>alla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayalam</td>
<td>mal</td>
<td>pst, prs, fut</td>
<td>-illa</td>
<td>-alla/alla</td>
<td>alla</td>
<td>alla/illa</td>
<td>-illa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>tam</td>
<td>pst-prs-fut</td>
<td>-ill-, -ā-</td>
<td>all/-ill-</td>
<td>-ā-</td>
<td>ill-</td>
<td>-ā-, ill-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toda</td>
<td>tcx</td>
<td>pst, prs-fut</td>
<td>-o-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-rö-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulu</td>
<td>tcy</td>
<td>pst</td>
<td>-ir-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-(i)ddi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Results per language

The following subsections present the negation strategies used in individual languages. Glossed example sentences drawn from the sources are provided together with translations to illustrate the findings. The constructions and predications under study are presented in section 2.3 and 3 but are included in this section as well.

Simple declarative sentences can be constructed with a lexical verb (44) and (45). Sentences (46) and (47) display a construction with a copula verb and predicate identity. Sentence (48) is constructed with a nominal predicate. In sentence (49) and (50) the predicate is an adjective. While (48) predicates inclusion in a certain class, (49) predicates a constant property and (50) a temporary property. In (51) the construction has a definite subject and a locative predicate. In (52) and (53) the locative-presentative construction predicates not only existence but also location. The constructions in (53) and (54) both have a non-referential subject and predicate existence. Sentence (55) expresses negation of predicative possession.

(44) Mary does not smoke.
(45) Mary does not drink coffee.
(46) This is not my friend Abbott.
(47) This is not Abbott, it’s Costello.
(48) Mary is not a nurse.
(49) Mary is not tall.
(50) Mary is not happy.
(51) Mary is not here.
(52) There is no coffee in the coffee pot.
(53) There is no coffee.
(54) There is no God.
(55) Mary does not have a coffee maker.

4.2.1 Brahui

In Brahui standard negation is expressed by means of the negative suffixes -t(a)- in past tense, and -f(a)-/p(a)- in present-future tense (56) (Andronov 1980:70). To express negation in predications of identity, class inclusion (57), attribution (58), existence (59) and possession in present tense the negative suffix -f(a)- is attached to the verbal stem a- from the verb anning ‘to be’. In (56) and (58) the negative verbal stem ama- ‘to be not’ together with the negative suffix -f(a)- s employed to express negation. In (57) and (58) the positive verbal stem af- ‘to be’ together with the negative suffix -f(a)- is employed. The negative verbal stem ama- ‘to be not’ has no separate present form in indicative, merely a present-future form (Andronov 1980:88). Negation of non-verbal sentences in past tense is
expressed by attaching the negative suffix -a- to the suppletive stem all- of the verb anning (Andronov 1980:79).

(56) *Naneaṭ narring ama-f-ak*  
1PL.INS flee.INF be.not.NPST-NEG-3SG  
‘We cannot flee.’ (Andronov 1980:72)

(57) *Ī brāʾūas af-f-āt*  
1SG Brahui.SG be.PRS-NEG-1SG  
‘I am not a Brahui.’ (Andronov 1980:79)

(58) *Nanā sardār laghōr af-f-φ*  
our sirdar.SG cowardly be.PRS-NEG-3SG  
‘Our sirdar is not cowardly.’ (Andronov 1980:43)

(59) *Bey maccīṭān ṛullīnā guzrān ama-f-ak*  
grass little horse.SG bundle.SG be.not.NPST-NEG-3SG  
‘A horse cannot exist on a wisp of hay.’ (Andronov 1980:55)

**4.2.2 Chenchu**

Chenchu expresses standard negation in past tense by adding the negative uninflected particle lēdu to the infinitive stem (60) or by the use of the negative suffix -lēdu. The negative particle lēdu is employed regardless of gender, number and person (Trivedi 1978:73). In present-future tense standard negation is expressed by the negative suffix -a- (61) which in some cases is reduced to φ. Negation in predications of identification (62) and class inclusion (63) as well as attribution (64) is expressed by the use of the negative verb kā- ‘to not become’ (Trivedi 1978:80). Chenchu employs the negative verb lē- ‘to not be’, to express negation in predications of location, locative-presentative (65), existence (66) and possession (67). Negation in predications of existence may also be expressed by the use of the independent particle lē (66). In (57) possession is encoded by an existential construction.

(60) *Sārāyi kayipu tagga lēdu*  
arrack intoxification reduce.INF NEG.be  
‘Arrack intoxication did not reduce.’ (Trivedi 1978:74)

(61) *Ādoll ēṭ ād-a-ru*  
woman.PL do.INF hunt.PRS-NEG-3PL  
‘Women do not hunt.’ (Trivedi 1978:56)

(62) *Nā kālu kā-du*  
my leg.SG be.not-1SG  
‘My leg it is not.’ (Trivedi 1978:81)
Gondi employs the negative suffix -makī(-) to express standard negation in past tense (68) and -ō- (69) or its allomorph -v- to express standard negation in present-future tense. Negation in predications of identity (70), class inclusion, attribution (71), location (72), locative-presentative (73), existence and possession (74), is expressed by the negative verb sil- ‘to be not’. According to Lincoln (1969) the verbal stem is sil- while Subramanyam (1968) refers to it as sill-. In (74) possession is encoded by an existential construction.

(63) Padigal ettaku nāgu pagarā-li-ni kā-nu
    hood.SG raise.INF cobra.SG enemy-NMLZ-1SG be.not-1SG
    ‘Hood don’t raise cobra enemy I am not.’ (Trivedi 1978:44)

(64) Guḍlu purumaku nāgu godra li-ni kā-nu
    eye.PL stare.INF cobra.SG barren NMLZ-1SG be.not-1SG
    ‘Eyes don’t stare cobra barren I am not.’ (Trivedi 1978:44)

(65) Ceuvu-lō nīl lē-wu
    tank.SG-LOC water.PL be.not-3PL
    ‘In the tank water there is not.’ (Trivedi 1978:26)

(66) Ėm pan lē, bongulu narku-t-unnām
    3PL work.PL NEG be bamboo.PL cut-PROG-be.3PL
    ‘There is no work, bamboos we are cutting.’ (Trivedi 1978:57)

(67) Āḍi daggara ḍabbu lē-du
    3SG near money be.not-3SG
    ‘Near him there is no money (he does not have money).’ (Trivedi 1978:36)

### 4.2.3 Gondi

Gondi employs the negative suffix -makī(-) to express standard negation in past tense (68) and -ō- (69) or its allomorph -v- to express standard negation in present-future tense. Negation in predications of identity (70), class inclusion, attribution (71), location (72), locative-presentative (73), existence and possession (74), is expressed by the negative verb sil- ‘to be not’. According to Lincoln (1969) the verbal stem is sil- while Subramanyam (1968) refers to it as sill-. In (74) possession is encoded by an existential construction.

(68) Veh-makī(n)
    tell.INF-NEG
    ‘[Subject] did not tell.’ (Lincoln 1968:69)

(69) Sūḍ-ō-ŋ
    see.PRS-NEG-3PL
    ‘They do not see.’ (Lincoln 1969:112)

(70) Av cokōṭ piṭēn sil-ēn
    3PL good bird.PL be.not-3PL
    ‘They are not good birds.’ (Lincoln 1969:170)
Kannada expresses standard negation in past tense by attaching the negative suffix -illa to the infinitive stem. In present-future tense standard negation is expressed by attaching the negative suffix -illa to the verbal noun (75) (Schiffmann 1983:114). Non-verbal negation in predications of identification (77) and attribution (78) is expressed by the use of the negative particle alla. Location (79), locative-presentative (80) and existence (81) are negated by the negative particle illa, while possession (82) is negated by the negative suffix -illa.

(71) Māvā sondvāl cokōṭ sill-ē
our going good be.not.3SG
‘Our going is not good.’ (Lincoln 1969:165)

(72) Vōr rōn sill-ōr
3SG house.LOC be.not.3SG
‘He is not in the house.’ (Subrahmanyam 1968:80)

(73) Kuhīṭ aggā ēr sill-ē
well.SG in water be.not.3SG
‘(There) is no water in the well.’ (Subrahmanyam 1968:80)

(74) Vōn aggā paysāṅ sill-ēn
3SG near money be.not.3PL
‘(There) is no money near him (he does not have money).’ (Subrahmanyam 1968:80)

4.2.4 Kannada

Kannada expresses standard negation in past tense by attaching the negative suffix -illa to the infinitive stem. In present-future tense standard negation is expressed by attaching the negative suffix -illa to the verbal noun (75) (Schiffmann 1983:114). Non-verbal negation in predications of identification (76) is expressed by the use of the negative suffix -alla. Negation in predications of class inclusion (77) and attribution (78) is expressed by the use of the negative particle alla. Location (79), locative-presentative (80) and existence (81) are negated by the negative particle illa, while possession (82) is negated by the negative suffix -illa.

(75) Hasu māmsa tinnōd-illa
cow.PL meat.SG eat.PRS-NEG.be
‘Cows don’t eat meat.’ Schiffman 1983:115)

(76) Adu paṭṇav-alla chikka úru
dem city.SG-NEG small be.PRS.3SG
‘This is not a city, but a small town.’ Hodson 1979:85)

(77) Avr mēṣṭr alla
3SG teacher.SG NEG.be
‘He is not a teacher.’ (Schiffmann 1983:113)

(78) Id hosd alla
dem new NEG.be
‘This is not (a) new (one).’ (Schiffmann 1983:113)
In Kodava standard negation in past tense can be expressed by two different constructions: either by adding the negative suffix -le to the simple past stem or by adding the negative suffix -ille to the perfect stem (83) (Ebert 1996:22). Standard negation in non-past tense is expressed by the use of the negative suffix -le. The negative particle alla is used to negate identity (84), class inclusion (85) and attribution. Negation in predications of location (86), locative-presentative (87), existence (88) and possession (89) is expressed by the negative particle ille.

(79) Avanu money-alli illa
3SG,M house,SG-LOC NEG.be
‘He is not at home.’ (Hodson 1979:84)

(80) Á tọtadalli bálé maragaḷu illa
DEM garden,SG-LOC grow,INF tree,PL NEG.be
‘There are no plantain trees in that garden.’ (Hodson 1979:84)

(81) Kudure-ya kombu illa
horse-GEN horn,SG NEG.be
‘There is no such thing as a horse’s horn.’ (Hodson 1979:84)

(82) Avan-ige hanav-illa
3SG=DAT money-NEG.be
‘He has no money.’ (Hodson 1979:84)

4.2.5 Kodava
In Kodava standard negation in past tense can be expressed by two different constructions: either by adding the negative suffix -le to the simple past stem or by adding the negative suffix -ille to the perfect stem (83) (Ebert 1996:22). Standard negation in non-past tense is expressed by the use of the negative suffix -le. The negative particle alla is used to negate identity (84), class inclusion (85) and attribution. Negation in predications of location (86), locative-presentative (87), existence (88) and possession (89) is expressed by the negative particle ille.

(83) Ava kéet-it-ille
3SG ask,PST-CVB-NEG.be
‘She didn’t ask.’ (Ebert 1996:22)

(84) Idī nānī elfidin-adi alla
DEM 1SG write,2SG-NMLZ NEG.be
‘This is not what I have written.’ (Ebert 1996:41)

(85) Avē mīnī-kārē alla
3SG fish,SG-man,SG NEG.be
‘He is not a fisherman.’ (Ebert 1996:41)

(86) Nāle nānī ofis-li ille
tomorrow 1SG office-LOC NEG.be
‘Tomorrow I will not be in the office.’ (Ebert 1996:40)

(87) Kodagī-li dār-ū bāri gariba stiti-li ille
Coorg-LOC who-even very poor situation,SG-LOC NEG.be
‘Nobody is very poor in Coorg.’ (Ebert 1996:40)
In Konda standard negation in non-past tense is expressed by adding the negative suffix -ɂ- to the verbal stem (90) (Krishnamurti 2003:351). In past tense -ɂ- is accompanied by the tense marker -t-. Attributive negation is expressed by the use of the negative suffix -ɂ- (91). Negation in predications of location (92), locative-presentative (93), existence (94) and possession (95) is expressed by the negative verb sil- ‘to be not’.

(90) *Koŋka*-en
bite.INF=NEG-3SG
‘He does not bite.’ (Krishnamurti 1969:209)

(91) *Panz*-ed
full-NEG-3SG
‘(stomach) is not full.’ (Krishnamurti 1969:210)

(92) *Vānṟu*  inro  sil-en
3SG  home  be.not-3SG
‘He is not home.’ (Krishnamurti 1969:289)

(93) *Kōva*  rāzu  paṭṭam(-i)  piṟu  sil-ed
Kova  king.SG  city.SG(-LOC)  rain  be.not-3SG
‘There is no rain in the city of the Kova King.’ (Krishnamurti 1969:260)

(94) ‘*Uṇa’*  īṟṟa  anam  sil-ed
eat.INF  if  food  be.not-3SG
‘There is no food for me to eat.’ (Krishnamurti 1969:323)

(95) *Maṭten*  kālku  sil-u.  asteṇ  kiku  sil-u
walk.INF  leg.PL  be_not-NPST.3PL  hold.INF  hand.PL  be.not-3PL
‘He has no legs to walk on, and no hand to hold with.’ (Krishnamurti 1969:282)
**4.2.7 Koya**

Koya employs the negative verb *ill- ‘to be not’* to express standard negation in past tense (96) (Subrahmanyam 1968:144). Standard negation in non-past tense is expressed by the negative suffix -*o-* and its allomorphs -ō-, -ū-, -v-, -vō-, -vū-, -φ- (97). Negation in predications of attribution and existence (98) is expressed by the negative verb *ill- ‘to not be’*.

(96)  
`ūḍa  ill-āṇa  
see_INF  be.not-1SG
‘I did not see.’ (Subrahmanyam 1968:144)

(97)  
`nor-vō-ṇḍu  
wash-INF-NEG-3SG
‘He will not wash.’ (Subrahmanyam 1968:144)

(98)  
`ille-e  
be.not-3SG
‘She is not.’ (Tyler 1969:96)

**4.2.8 Kui**

Winfield (1928:62-63) argues that Kui does not employ a specific negation marker to express standard negation or non-verbal negation. Instead standard negation (99), regardless of tense, as well as negation in identity, class inclusion (100) and attribution is expressed by a “momentary break in the pronunciation” (Winfield 1928:62), between the verbal stem and the personal ending. To signify the break Winfield (1928) places the sign ‘ over the vowel succeeding the break (99) and (100). According to Krishnamurti (2003:351) Kui employs the same negation marker as Konda and Kuvi, i.e. a glottal stop [ʔ] to express negation.

The negative suffix -ʔ- negates predications of identity, class inclusion and attribution, while the negative verb *sid- ‘to not be’* is used to negate predications of location, locative-presentative and existence.

(99)  
`ānu  tākātaka  
1SG  walk:NEG
‘I did/do/shall not walk.’ (Winfield 1928:97)

(100)  
`ānu  prēki  gāṭanu  āētenu  
1SG  theft.pl  do,NPST  become,NPST:NEG
‘I am not a thief.’ (Winfield 1928:87)
### 4.2.9 Kurumba

To express standard negation in past tense Kurumba uses the negative suffix -la; standard negation in non-past tense is expressed by the use of the suffix -mātta (Varma 1978:51). Predications of identification (101) and attribution are negated by the negative particle alla. Predications of location (102), locative-presentative, existence (103) and possession (104) are all negated using the negative particle ille. In (104) negation of possession is encoded by an existential construction.

(101) *Adu cēdi alla, adu kođi*

DEM plant.SG NEG.be DEM creeper.SG

‘That is not a plant, it is a creeper.’ (Kapp 1982:172)

(102) *Ava illi (i)lle*

3SG here NEG.be

‘She is not here.’ (Kapp 1982:52)

(103) *Nīru ille*

water NEG.be

‘There is no water.’ (Kapp 1982:171)

(104) *Avagu makka ille*

3SG child.SG NEG.be

‘She had/has no children.’ (Kapp 1982:171)

### 4.2.10 Kuvi

Kuvi employs the negative suffix -za- together with the past tense marker -t- to express standard negation in past tense. In non-past tense standard negation is expressed by the negative suffix -za- and its allomorphs -ʔa- (105) and -ʔo-. Negation in predications of identity, class inclusion and attribution (106) is expressed by the negative particle ʔaʔ(e) ‘is not so’, consisting of the verbal stem ʔa- ‘to become’ together with the negative suffix -za-. It is used to negate existence of both qualities and things (Israel 1979:168) and consequently negates e.g. attribution (106). Negation in predications of location, locative-presentative, existence and possession is expressed by the negative verb hil- ‘to be not’ together with the negative suffix used to express standard negation, i.e. -za- and its allomorphs -ʔa- and -ʔo- (107).

(105) *Kaciʔ-ayi*

bite-INF=NEG=1PL

‘We will not bite.’ (Israel 1979:32)

(106) *Ēvasi kaja-si āve*

3SG great=SG NEG.be

‘He is not great.’ (Israel 1979:168)
4.2.11 Malayalam

In Malayalam standard negation is expressed by the use of the negative suffix -illa (108) regardless of tense. Non-verbal negation in predications such as identification (109), class inclusion (110) and attribution is expressed by the use of the negative particle alla. Negation in predications of identity may also be expressed by the use of the negative suffix -alla. According to Krishnamurti (2003:460) predications of class inclusion is negated by the negative particle alla and location by the negative particle illa. Nair (2012:69) on the other hand argues that negation in predications of location is expressed by alla (111). According to George (1971:44) aṇū ‘to be, to become’ (112) indicates being while unṭū ‘there is’ (113) indicates presence or possession. To negate predications of locative-presentative (114) the negative suffix -illa is used. Negation in predications of existence (115) is expressed either by the use of the negative suffix -illa or by the negative independent particle illa. Possession (116) is negated by the negative particle illa (George 1971:21-26).

(108)  Nānu  pōkkunn-illa
1SG  go.PRS-NEG.be
‘I do not go.’ (George 1971:53)

(109)  Itū  mūkkū-āṇū  cevi-alla
DEM  nose.SG-be.INF  ear.SG-NEG.be
‘This is nose not ear.’ (George 1971:55)

(110)  Sīta  adhyaapika  alla
Sita  teacher.SG  NEG.be
‘Sita is not (a) teacher.’ (Nair 2012:69)

(111)  Acchaṇ  ooffis-il  alla
father.SG  office.SG-LOC  NEG.be
‘Father is not in the office.’ (Nair 2012:69)

(112)  Avan’  en’tē  snehītān  āṇū
3SG  my friend.SG  be.INF
‘He is my friend.’ (George 1971:44)

(113)  Avan’  iviṭē  unṭū
3SG  here  be.INF
‘He is here.’ (George 1971:44)
In Malto standard negation is expressed by the use of the negative suffix -l(e) in past tense (117) and -mal-(-)mala in present-future tense (118) Non-verbal sentences are negated using the negative verb mal- ‘to be not’ (Droese 1884:77). Hence mal- negates predications of identity (119), class inclusion, attribution, location, locative-presentative (120), existence and possession.

(117) Ín ád-le-ken
1SG select.PST-NEG-1SG
‘I did not select.’ (Droese 1884:48)

(118) Ín áden-mala
1SG select.FUT-NEG
‘I will not select.’ (Droese 1884:48)

(119) Í chalareth órente mal-ath
DEM custom.SG beginning.SG be.not-3SG
‘This custom is not from the beginning.’ (Droese 1884:10)

(120) Qanjpeth man-no mal-ath
fruit.SG tree.SG-LOC be.not-3SG
‘Fruit is not on the tree.’ (Droese 1884:10)

In Parji standard negation in past tense is expressed by adding the negative conjugation -a or its allomorph -i to the verbal stem (Burrow 1953: 64). Standard negation in present-future tense is expressed by the suffix -a- (121). Negation in predications of identity, class inclusion and attribution
(122) is expressed by the negative verb er-. To negate predications of location, locative-presentative (123), existence (125) and possession (126) the negative verb cila(-) ‘do not exist’ is employed. The form cila(-) has an uninflected (123) as well as an inflected (124) form.

(121) Cûra-n-a
sec.NPST-1SG-NEG
‘I do/will not see.’ (Burrow 1953:64)

(122) Ōd viled erad
3sg white be.not.3sg
‘He is not white.’ (Burrow 1953:67)

(123) Ī polub-ti tulakul cila
DEM village.SG-LOC weaver.PL NEG.be
‘There are no weavers in this village.’ (Burrow 1953:67)

(124) Ī olek-ti manjakul cila-r
DEM house.SG-LOC man.PL exist.not-3PL
‘There are no men in this house.’ (Burrow 1953:67)

(125) Nir cila
water NEG.be
‘There is no water.’ (Burrow 1953:67)

(126) An ka gurrol cila
1SG near horse.SG NEG.be
‘I have no horse.’ (Burrow 1953:40)

4.2.14 Pengo

Pengo employs the negative suffix -v- (127) and its allomorph -u- to express standard negation in past, present and future tense. In past tense the negative suffix is complemented by the optional past tense marker -t/-ta-, in present by the present tense marker -ba and in future by the optional tense marker -de/da/-da-. Non-verbal predications such as identification (128), class inclusion (129) and attribution (130) are negated by the use of the negative verb a- ‘to be not’ or by the use of the negative uninflected particle akay (128) (129). Negation in predications of location, locative-presentative (131), existence (132) and possession (133) is expressed by the use of the negative verb hil- ‘to be not, to exist not’ (Burrow and Bhattacharya 1970:74).

(127) Āney rû-v-atanaj
1SG plough-NEG-PST.1SG
‘I have not ploughed.’ (Burrow and Bhattacharya 1970:73)
In Tamil standard negation in past-present tense is expressed by the use of the negative suffixes -ill- (134) and -ā- (135). Standard negation in future tense is expressed by the negative suffix -ā-. Non-verbal negation is expressed by the use of the negative verb ill- ‘to be not’ or by the negative suffix -ā- (Lehmann 1993:84). The negative verbs ill- and all- both ‘to be not, to exist not’ only have one form which is used regardless of tense, person, number and gender: illai and alla respectively (Lehmann 1993:83).

Krishnamurti (2003:460) argues that either the negative verb ill- or all- may be used to negate equational sentences. Negation in predications of class inclusion is expressed by the negative verb ill- (136) but may also be expressed by the negative verb all- (137). To negate predicates of attribution and locative-presentative the negative suffix -ā- is used. Negation in predications of location (138) and possession (141) is expressed using the negative verb ill-. Predication of existence is negated either by the negative finite form kiṭaiyātu, of the verb kiṭai ‘to be, to exist’ (139) or the negative verb ill- (140). The form kiṭaiyātu only exists in third person singular (Lehmann 1993:81).
4.2.16 Telugu

In Telugu standard negation in past tense is expressed by attaching the negative suffix \(-lēdu\) (142) to the infinitive (Krishnamurti and Sarma 1968:73). Negation of verbal sentences in present-future tense is expressed by attaching the suffix \(-a\) to the verbal stem (Krishnamurti and Sarma 1968:81). Negation in predications of identity, class inclusion (143) and attribution is expressed by the use of the negative verb \(kā\) ‘to not become’. To express negation in predications of location (144), locative-presentative (145), existence (146) and possession (147) the negative verb \(lē\) ‘to not be’ is used.

(134)  \(Nān \; vītav-ill-ai\)
1SG leave-INF-be.not-3PL
‘I did/do not leave.’ (Lehmann 1993:70)

(135)  \(Kumār-ukkat \; tano̱r \; vēnt-ā-m\)
Kumar-DAT water want-INF-NEG-3SG
‘Kumar does not want water.’ (Lehmann 1993:86)

(136)  \(Kumār \; vakkil \; ill-ai\)
Kumar lawyer-SG be.not-3PL
‘Kumar is not a lawyer.’ (Lehmann 1993:230)

(137)  \(Kumār \; vakkil \; all-ā\)
Kumar lawyer-SG be.not-3PL
‘Kumar is not a lawyer.’ (Lehmann 1993:230)

(138)  \(Kumār \; vīṭ-il \; ill-ai\)
Kumar house-SG-LOC be.not-3PL
‘Kumar is not at home.’ (Lehmann 1993:230)

(139)  \(Peey \; kitaivy-ā-tu\)
ghost-PL be-NEG-3SG
‘There are no ghosts.’ (Lehmann 1993:81)

(140)  \(Peey \; ill-ai\)
ghost-PL be.not-3PL
‘Ghosts do not exist.’ (Lehmann 1993:230)

(141)  \(Kumār-ukkup \; payam \; ill-ai\)
Kumar-DAT fear be.not-3PL
‘Kumar has no fear.’ (Lehmann 1993:188)
4.2.17 Toda

Toda expresses standard negation by the use of the negative suffix -o- in past, present and future tense (148). To express non-verbal negation in predications such as location (149), locative-presentative (150) and possession (151) Toda employs the negative verb ôrô- ‘to be not’.

(148)  Pôr-o-en-i
       come-NEG-1SG-PST
       ‘I did not come.’ (Sakthivel 1977:115)

(149)  Ao  ay  ās  ôrô-y
       3SG  DEM  house.SG  be.not-3SG
       ‘He is not in the house.’ (Sakthivel 1977:159)

(150)  Pāfy-š  nîr  ôrô-y
       well.SG-LOC  water  be.not-3SG
       ‘There is no water in the well.’ (Sakthivel 1977:221)
3.218 Tulu

In Tulu standard negation is expressed by the use of the negative suffix -ɨr- in past tense, -ur- in present tense (152) and -ay- in future tense. The negative suffix -(i)ddi negates predications of locative-presentative, existence (153) and possession (154).

(151) Akūds  ponm  őro-y
3SG.M-with  gold  be.not-3SG
‘He has no money.’ (Sakthivel 1977:44)

(152) Kolp-ur-ya
give.prs-NEG-2SG
‘You don’t give.’ (Bhat 1967:35)

(153) Illi-ɖi-ddi
house.sg-LOC-NEG.be
‘Does not exist in the house.’ (Bhat 1967:36)

(154) Duɖɖu-ddi
money-NEG.be
‘Don’t have money.’ (Bhat 1967:37)

5. Discussion

5.1 Negation strategies

The strategies to express non-verbal negation vary among languages. Some languages employ the same strategy to express standard negation as well as non-verbal negation while others employ different strategies. In some languages the strategies vary depending on type of non-verbal predication.

Eriksen (2011:275-276) argues that sentences with non-verbal or existential predicates tend to employ special negative constructions different from the constructions used to express standard negation. This is supported by Veselinova (2013) who concludes that it is very common for languages to negate existential predications using a special strategy. To some extent the use of a special strategy to express negation in predications of existence is supported by the results of this study. Only two of the languages under study express standard negation and negation in predications of existence using the same negation marker. In Koya standard negation in past tense is expressed by the use of the existential negator ill- ‘to not be’. In Tamil one of the strategies to express standard negation in future tense is by the use of the existential negator -ā-.
Nine languages exhibit a clear distinction as regards the negation in different predications: Chenchu, Kodava, Konda, Kui, Kuvi, Kurumba, Parji, Pengo and Telugu. In these languages negation in predications of existence is expressed by a special strategy. Four of the languages, i.e. Konda, Kui, Pengo and Telugu, employ a negative verb. A negative particle is employed by two languages: Kodava and Kurumba. Two languages, i.e. Parji and Chenchu, employ either a negative verb or a negative particle. One language employs double negation, i.e. a negative verb together with a negative particle: Kuvi.

Dryer (2013a) examines the negative morphemes used to express standard negation. Dryer distinguishes between six different types. In type 1 a negative affix is attached to the verb. In type 2 negation is expressed by the use of a negative particle. In type 3 a negative auxiliary verb is employed to express negation. In type 4 a negative word, unclear if verb or particle, is employed to express negation. In type 5 negation is expressed either by a negative word or a negative affix. In type 6 two negative morphemes are used to express negation. The most commonly used strategy is negative particle employed by 502/1157 languages followed by negative affix employed by 395/1157 languages and double negation employed by 119/1157 languages.

When comparing the standard negation types distinguished by Dryer (2013a) and the types employed by the languages under study to express both standard negation and negation in predications of existence a different pattern emerges. In the languages under study, the most common type to express standard negation is type 1, i.e. a negative affix. 15 out of 18 of the languages employ this strategy. The most common type to express negation in predications of existence is type 3, i.e. a negative auxiliary, followed by type 2, i.e. a negative particle. Moreover, the Dravidian languages employ three additional strategies besides the ones identified by dryer (2013a): type 7 variation between negative affix and particle, type 8 variation between negative affix and auxiliary and type 9 variation between negative particle and auxiliary (Table 4). The variation displayed in the three additional types suggests that there is an ongoing diachronic change as regards the existential negation markers in the Dravidian languages. These results support Eriksen (2011) and Veselinova (2013) in their claim that negation of non-verbal predications tend to be expressed using special constructions.

Table 4. The different standard negation (SN) types identified by Dryer (2013a) in WALS and in the Dravidian languages together with the existential negation types identified in the Dravidian languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>SN WALS</th>
<th>SN Dravidian</th>
<th>EX Dravidian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Negative affix</td>
<td>395/1157</td>
<td>15/18</td>
<td>2/17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Negative particle</td>
<td>502/1157</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3/17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Negative auxiliary</td>
<td>47/1157</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7/17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Negative word, unclear if verb or particle</td>
<td>73/1157</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Variation between negative word and affix</td>
<td>21/1157</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Double negation</td>
<td>119/1157</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Variation between negative affix and particle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>1/17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Variation between negative affix and auxiliary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/18</td>
<td>1/17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Variation between negative particle and auxiliary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information has only been obtained for 17 of 18 languages.
5.2 Tense and finiteness

The Dravidian morphology is traditionally defined as agglutinating, which means that words are formed by affixing one or several morphemes to a stem. The morphological structure of an affirmative sentence generally is verbal stem + tense marker + person-number suffix. In negation in non-past tense the negation marker commonly replaces the tense marker, consequently changing the morphological structure to verbal stem + negation marker + person-number suffix (Krishnamurti 2003:348). This lack of an overt tense marker has led to the discussion whether negation in Dravidian languages is tenseless or not. According to Andronov (2003:266) the Dravidian negative indicative is tenseless since it does not differentiate the tense by morphological means. Krishnamurti (2003:355-56) argues that negation in the Dravidian languages is not tenseless. Instead negation with tense is expressed by the structure tensed verbal stem + negation marker.

There is no clear definition of finiteness. The traditional view among descriptive grammarians is that finiteness is a property of the verb; finite verbs may be inflected for e.g. person, number and tense while non-finite verbs may not. In addition finiteness and subordination are closely related; whereas finite verbs may function as the only predicate in an independent clause, non-finite verbs may not (Nikolaeva 2007:1-2).

Four of the Dravidian languages under study, i.e. Kannada, Kodava, Kurumba and Malayalam, employ a negative independent particle to negate all or some of the non-verbal predications included in this study. In finite form the negative particles alla and illa/ille function as non-verbal negators. However, they do not show inflection and as a consequence the non-verbal predications that they negate are tenseless. This indicates that the tenseless negative indicative suggested by Andronov (2003) might be valid not only for standard negation but also for negation of non-verbal predications using a negative particle.

In the same four languages, non-finite constructions the forms -illa/ille function as an auxiliary. In Kannada the construction nominalized verb + -illa is used to express standard negation in past. To express standard negation in present-future tense Kannada uses an infinitive stem + -illa. In Kodava standard negation in past is expressed by a past stem + -ille. Standard negation in non-past is expressed by the construction non-past stem + ille. In Malayalam the construction past participle + -illa is used to express standard negation in past tense, while present participle + -illa is used to express standard negation in present tense. To express standard negation in future tense the infinitive stem + -illa is used (Krishnamurti 2003:355). No information about the non-finite constructions used in Kurumba has been retrieved.

A general feature in the Dravidian languages is the distinction positive and negative verbal stems (Andronov 2003:184). All the Dravidian languages exhibit the distinction which has been verified in finite as well as non-finite forms. In the Dravidian languages non-finite verbal forms are e.g. participles, infinitives and verbal nouns. The base of non-finite verbs is either a past or a non-past verbal stem (Krishnamurti 2003:330). George (1971:53) argues that the negative verb in the Dravidian languages in general is an aorist, i.e. it is not possible to determine its point in time.

Twelve Dravidian languages, i.e. Chenchu, Gondi, Konda, Koya, Kui, Kuvi, Malto, Parji, Pengo, Tamil, Telugu and Toda, employ negative verbs to negate all or some of the non-verbal predications included in this study (Table 5).
Table 5. Negative verbs used per language and negative existential type.
A dash indicates that no information has been obtained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Language name</th>
<th>Loc</th>
<th>Pres</th>
<th>Ex</th>
<th>Poss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Malto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mal-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Parji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cila-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Central</td>
<td>Chenchu (Telugu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lē-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gondi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sil-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Konda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sil-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ill-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sid-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          | Kuvi          |     |      |    | hil- + -n-  
|          |               |     |      |    | hil + -n- 
|          | Pengo         |     |      |    | hil- |
|          | Tamil         |     |      |    | ill- |
|          | Telugu        |     |      |    | lē-  |
|          | Toda          |     |      |    | ōro- |

In both Chenchu and Telugu the finite forms of the negative verbs kā- and lē- are used to negate being and existence in present and past tense (Trivedi 1978:80). In non-finite construction lē- functions as an auxiliary. The construction infinitive + lēdu is used to express standard negation in past tense. To express standard negation in present tense the construction action nominal + lēdu is used (Krishnamurti 2003:356). In Gondi the negative verbal stem sil- is used to express non-verbal negation in both past and present-future tense. To express non-verbal negation in past tense the construction preterite stem + sil- in present tense is used. In finite form sil- is inflected for both tense and number. In Konda the negative verb sil- cannot function as an auxiliary (Krishnamurti 2003:356). Consequently, it only exists in finite form, in which it is inflected for both tense and number. In Koya the negative verb ill- functions as both a main verb and an auxiliary. In finite form without tense it is used to negate existence. In Kui the periphrastic construction perfect participle + inflected form of sid- is used to express negation in past tense, while present participle + inflected form of sid- expresses negation in present tense. In Kuvi the function of the negative verb hil- is both main verb and auxiliary. In finite form hil- is not inflected for tense or number (Krishnamurti 2003:356). In Malto the negative verb mal- functions both as a main verb and as a copula. Inflected in present tense the negative verb mal- functions as a copula. Inflected for tense and number in past it is used to negate being (Droese 1884:77). In Parji the negative verb cila-only functions as a main verb. It only exists in third person singular and plural and is not inflected for tense (Burrow 1953:67). In Pengo the negative verb hil- only exist in finite form (Burrow and Bhattacharya 1953:74-75). In Tamil the negative verbs il- and al- are both referred to as defective verbs, i.e. they have an incomplete conjugation and can consequently not be used in all tenses. In finite form they are inflected in tense and number. Both il- and al- have copula functions. In Toda the negative verbal stem ōro- is an appellative verb, i.e. a verb which cannot be inflected for tense (Sakthivel 1977:157).
5.3 Genealogical and areal relatedness

As presented in section 2.6 the languages included in this study are genealogically related but belong to different branches of the Dravidian language family. In addition to their close genealogical relatedness the majority of the languages under study exhibit a close areal relatedness (Map 1). This section discusses whether the similarities as regards negation in predications of existence are genealogically or areally related.

The results show that twelve of the languages under study employ a negative verb to express negation in predications of existence: Malto employs *mal-*; Parji *cila-*, Chenchu and Telugu *lē-*, Gondi and Konda *sil-*, Kui *sid-*, Kuvi and Pengo *hil-*, Koya and Tamil *ill-*, and Toda *il-* (Table 6). In eleven of the languages, Malto excluded, the verbs are cognates and have the same etymological origin.

Table 6. Negative verbs per sub group and language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Language name</th>
<th>Negative verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Malto</td>
<td><em>mal-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Parji</td>
<td><em>cila-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Central</td>
<td>Chenchu</td>
<td><em>lē-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td><em>lē-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gondi</td>
<td><em>sil-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Konda</td>
<td><em>sil-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koya</td>
<td><em>ill-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kui</td>
<td><em>sid-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuvi</td>
<td><em>hil-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pengo</td>
<td><em>hil-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td><em>ill-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toda</td>
<td><em>il-</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the languages belong to different subgroups. Whereas Malto is North Dravidian, Parji belongs to the Central Dravidian group. Chenchu, Telugu, Gondi, Konda, Koya, Kui, Kuvi and Pengo are all South-Central Dravidian languages. Tamil and Toda belong to the South Dravidian group. As can be seen, a majority of the languages are South-Central Dravidian.

Eleven of the languages, Malto excluded, exhibit language contact with one or several of their neighboring languages. The South-Central Dravidian languages Kui, Kuvi and Pengo have contact with Central Dravidian Parji and South-Central Konda. Parji in turn has contact with South-Central Gondi and Koya. Konda has contact with South-Central Dravidian Chenchu and Telugu, which in turn have contact with South Dravidian Tamil and Toda. As can be seen in Map 2 the languages constitute an isogloss stretching from Kui, Kuvi and Pengo in the north to Tamil in the south. The fact that all the languages, despite belonging to different subgroups, express negation in predications of existence using negative cognate verbs suggests that the strategy is areally rather than genealogically related.
Map 2. The isogloss of existential negation by the use of a negative verb in the languages under study.

The results also show that nine of the languages employ one negation marker to negate attributive predications while negation in existential predications is expressed by a special negation marker: Chenchu, Kodava, Konda, Kui, Kuvi, Kurumba, Parji, Pengo and Telugu.

Chenchu and Telugu employ the negative verbal stem kā- to negate attributive predications and lē- to negate existential predications. In Kodava and Kurumba attributive predications are negated by the negative particle alla and existential predications by ille. Konda and Kui both employ the negative particle -r- to negate attribution. To negate existential predications Konda employs the negative verb sil- and Kui the negative verb sid-. In Kuvi negation of attributive predications is expressed by the negative particle ār(e) while negation in existential predications is expressed by the negative verb hil- in combination with the negative suffixes used to express SN, i.e. -ra- in past tense and -ro- or its allomorphs -r/-ro- in non-past tense. Parji and Pengo both employ negative verbs to negate attributive and existential predications. In Parji the negative verb er- expresses negation in attributive predications while the negative verb cila- negates existential predications. In Parji existence may also be negated by the negative particle cila. Pengo negates attributive predications by the negative verb a- or by the negative particle akay. To negate existence the negative verb hil- is used.

As in the previous case these languages belong to different subgroups: Parji is Central Dravidian, Chenchu, Telugu, Konda, Kui, Kuvi and Pengo all belong to the South-Central Dravidian group. Kodava and Kurumba are South Dravidian languages. However, the majority of the languages are
South-Central Dravidian. As can be seen in Map 3 all the nine languages exhibit language contact with one or several of their neighboring languages.

Map 3. The isogloss of existential negation by the use of a special negative marker in the languages under study.

The South-Central Dravidian languages Kui, Kuvi and Pengo have contact with Central Dravidian Parji and South-Central Konda. Both Parji and Konda have contact with South-Central Dravidian Chenchu and Telugu. These two languages have contact with South Dravidian Kurumba, which in turn has contact with South Dravidian Kodava. The languages constitute an isogloss stretching from Kui, Kuvi and Pengo in the north to Kurumba in the south (Map 3). This suggests that the strategy to express negation in predications of existence using a special negation marker is areally rather than genealogically related. Since nine of the 18 languages under study employ a special negation marker in negation of existential predications the results also support Veselinova’s (2013) conclusion that it is very common for languages to negate existential predications using a special strategy.

6. Conclusion

This thesis has examined and described verbal as well as non-verbal negation in simple declarative sentences in 18 Dravidian languages.
The Dravidian morphology is traditionally defined as agglutinating. In an affirmative sentence the morphological structure generally is verbal stem + tense marker + person-number suffix. In negation in non-past tense the morphological structure changes to verbal stem + negation marker + person-number suffix (Krishnamurti 2003:348). The result is a lack of an overt tense marker in negation in non-past tense, which has led to discussions whether negation in Dravidian languages is tenseless or not. Andronov (2003:266) on the one hand suggests that the Dravidian negative indicative is tenseless since it does not differentiate the tense by morphological means. Krishnamurti (2003:355-56) on the other hand argues that negation in the Dravidian languages is not tenseless since tense is expressed by the structure tensed verbal stem + negation marker.

Four of the Dravidian languages under study, i.e. Kannada, Kodava, Kurumba and Malayalam, employ a negative independent particle to negate all or some of the non-verbal predications included in this study. In finite form the negative particles alla and illaltile function as non-verbal negators. However, they do not show inflection and as a consequence the non-verbal predications that they negate are tenseless. This indicates that the tenseless negative indicative suggested by Andronov (2003) might be valid not only for standard negation but also for negation of non-verbal predications using a negative particle.

The languages included in this study are genealogically related but belong to different branches of the Dravidian language family. In addition to their close genealogical relatedness the majority of the languages exhibit a close areal relatedness. The results show that eleven of 18 languages, despite belonging to different subgroups, express negation in predications of existence using negative cognate verbs. Nine of 18 languages employ a special negation marker in negation of existential predications. This suggests that the two strategies are areally rather than genealogically related. The results also support Veselinova’s (2013) conclusion that it is very common for languages to negate existential predications using a special strategy.

This study of verbal as well as non-verbal negation in simple declarative sentences in Dravidian languages is by no means exhaustive; there is an abundance of potential future research areas. Since this study has included only 18 languages, a potential research topic is to replicate this study with a larger number of Dravidian languages. Another potential approach is to further investigate the correlation between tense and negation strategy by examining and describing negation strategy for each tense. The distinction finite versus infinite verb in relation to negation strategy would also benefit from further studies.
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Appendix

Questionnaire used for collecting data on negation in verbal as well as non-verbal predications. The questionnaire is constructed by Ljuba Veselinova at the University of Stockholm.

The context descriptions are given in square brackets; further clarifications about the example sentences come in between parentheses. Neither the contexts, nor the clarifications are to be translated. Please translate only the bold face text.

Please provide a morpheme to morpheme translation for all of the translated examples below. Should it turn out that the English examples/situations are in any way culturally inappropriate, e.g. take up topics or objects that are tabooed or simply do not exist in your culture/language, feel free to substitute them with sentences that fit better into the reality of your language.

In case you are using a font different from Times New Roman or any other relatively common windows font, please send me that font too or give me a URL where I can download it.

If you can’t produce the translations yourself, please provide a pointer to a source(s) where I would find similar constructions.

1. Language info
   1.1. Language name
   1.2. Genealogical affiliation
   1.3. Where is it spoken? Or where did you study it?
   This question is especially important for smaller languages; the more specific the info, the better. If you can give me place names or geographical coordinates, or both, that will be great. If you can’t, I will make do with whatever information you can provide.

2. Are you a native speaker? If not, how did you gain knowledge of this language?

3. Verbal sentences
   Example
   Mary sings
   Example
   Mary does not sing
   Example
   Mary likes movies
   Example
   Mary does not like movies

The answers to 3.1 and sub-questions can be very short or just references to other sources.
   3.1. Can you think of any tense-aspect categories where the negator used in 0 through 0 cannot be used?
      If ‘yes’
      3.1.1. Please name these categories. It would be helpful to give examples too if possible (a pointer would be fine too, see above)
      3.1.1.1. What negator is used with them? Again, examples or references are welcome.

4. Non-verbal sentences
   4.1. Equational predicates
Example
[Introducing a guest to the family]: This is my friend Tom

Example
[A family gathering plus a guest]
Your mom [looking at the guest]: Is this Tom?
Speaker B: This is not Tom, it’s Jake.

4.2. Descriptive (property ascribing) predicates

Example
[Two people who met recently are talking about a common acquaintance]
Speaker A: What does Tom do?
Speaker B: Tom is a teacher

Example
[Same context as in 0]
Speaker A: Is Tom a teacher?
Speaker B: Tom is not a teacher, he is a doctor

Example
[Talking about the appearance of a somebody I just met]
Tom is tall

Example
[Same context as in 0]
Tom is not tall

Example
[Tom just heard some really good news]
Tom is happy

Example
[Tom is waiting for some news that’s long delayed]
Tom is not happy

4.3. Locative and locative-presentative predicates

Example
[Somebody comes to your house, looking for your brother]
(Yes, wait a minute), Tom/he is here

Example
[Same context as in 0]
(Sorry), Tom/he is not here

Example
[Same context as in 0]
(Sorry), Tom/he is not here, he is in town

Example
[Hearing trashing and noise, looking through the window]
There are some wild cats in the garden

Example
[Same context as in 0]
Speaker A: Do you think there are any wild cats in the garden?
Speaker B: There aren’t any wild cats in the garden.

4.4. Clauses where only existence is predicated
Example
[The teacher, in a zoology/natural sciences class]
   There are wild cats (in Africa or somewhere else; there is such a thing as wild cats)
Example
[Same context as in 0]
   There are no wild cats (in Africa or anywhere, there is no such thing as wild cats)
Example
[Same context as in 0]
   Wild cats exist (The sense is the same as for 4.15; this is basically to check whether the language
   has an intransitive existential verb as the English exist, French exister, Modern Greek ipárho, 
   Russian sushtestvovat’.)
Example
[Same context as in 0]
   Wild cats do not exist

4.5. Predicative possession
Example
[Talking about helping somebody to move]
   (Tom can help), Tom/he has a car
Example
[Same context as in 4.11]
   (Tom cannot help), Tom/he does not have a car

4.6. Are there any tense-aspect categories where the negators used in for the non-verb, locative
   and existential sentences (examples 0 through 0) above cannot be used?
4.6.1. Please name these categories and give examples if possible
4.6.2. What negators are used instead?

5. Are there any lexicalizations of negation other than ‘not.be’ and ‘not.exist’. Frequently occurring
   negative lexicalizations are senses such as ‘not.know’, ‘not.want’, ‘not.become’, ‘cannot’, ‘be
   unable’, ‘need not’, ‘must not’, ‘dare not’.