

## Negation in Mapudungun

Fernando Zúñiga  
 University of Bern  
 fernando.zuniga@isw.unibe.ch

### 1. Introduction to the language

#### Basic data

- Mapuche language = Mapudungun (alternative spellings: *Mapuzugun*, *Mapuzungun*)
- ISO code: arn; Glottolog code: mapu1245
- Some 250,000 speakers in south-central Chile and Argentina (Ethnologue 2015)
- Unclassified; some contact with Quechuan, extensive contact with Spanish

#### Typological profile (selection)

- Morphology:
  - synthetic to polysynthetic (simple nominal morphology; verbal complexity: numerous templatic slots, NP incorporation, multi-radical verb stems, very limited lexical affixation)
  - suffixing and “agglutinative” (= no flexibility, concatenative, mostly simple exponence)
- Syntax: nominal and verbal clauses; remapping inverse (= two kinds of transitive clauses); originally mostly VSO, now increasingly SVO

### 2. Negation basics

Table 1. Overview of Negators

Verbal			Nonverbal
Finite		Nonfinite	
Imperative	Indicative	Subjunctive	
<i>-ki</i>	<i>-la</i>	<i>-nu</i>	<i>nu</i>
(1a)	(1b) = SN	(2a)	(2b)
			(3a-c)

- (1) a. *Langüm-ki-fi-nge        tüfa-chi        üñüm!*  
 kill-NEG-3OBJ-2SG.IMP    this-ATTR    bird  
 ‘Don’t kill this bird!’ (finite verb, imperative)
- b. *La-le-la-i                    tüfa-chi        üñüm.*  
 die-RES-NEG-IND[3SG]    this-ATTR    bird  
 ‘This bird has not died.’ (finite verb, indicative)
- (2) a. *Feyengün        aku-nu-fu-le!*  
 3PL                    arrive-NEG-RI-3.SBJV  
 ‘If only they (PL) would not arrive!’ (finite verb, subjunctive; Smeets 2008: 184)
- b. *Ngilla-la-a-i        kofke        nie-nu-lu        plata.*  
 buy-NEG-FUT-IND[3SG]    bread        have-NEG-NFIN    money  
 ‘He who has no money will not buy bread.’ (nonfinite verb; Smeets 2008: 189)

- (3) a. *Feyti ruka nu.*  
DEM house NEG  
‘That is not a house.’ (nominal clause; Smeets 2008: 244)
- b. *chem rume* [what ever] ‘whatever’ vs. *chem nu rume* [what NEG ever] ‘nothing’
- c. *Dewma mari tripantu nie-el tripa-n*  
already ten year have-NFIN exit-1SG.IND  
*ñi kündaw-a-el, welu müte kamapu nu.*  
1SG.PSR work-FUT-NFIN but very far.away NEG  
‘When I was already ten years old, I went away to work, but not very far away.’  
(Smeets 2008: 245)

### 3. Necessary and interesting details

#### 3.1 Variation in the form of the imperative negator (cf. Moesbach 1962: 124f)

- (4) a. *Kon-i-m-i.*  
enter-IND-2-SG  
‘You (SG) entered’
- b. *Kon-la-i-m-i.*  
enter-NEG-IND-2-SG  
‘You (SG) did not enter.’
- c. *Kon-l-m-i...*  
enter-SBJV-2-SG  
‘If you (SG) enter...’
- d. *Kon-nu-l-m-i...*  
enter-NEG-SBJV-2-SG  
‘If you (SG) do not enter...’
- e. *Kon-nge!*  
enter-2SG.IMP<sub>1</sub>  
‘Enter (SG)!’
- f. *Kon-ki(-nu)-Inge!*  
enter-NEG-NEG-2SG.IMP<sub>2</sub>  
‘Do (SG) not enter!’

- Anomalous mood marking (4f) for all persons and numbers
- Nowadays increasingly reduced, e.g. *kon-nu-Inge!*
- Possibly contact-induced, cf. Spanish forms:

Table 2. Chilean Spanish Imperative and Present Subjunctive (*a*-class)

	Affirmative		Negative	
	Imperative(=CG)	(CG=)Subjunctive	(CG=)Imperative	(CG=)Subjunctive
2SG	<i>cant-a</i>	<i>cant-e-s</i>		<i>no cant-e-s</i>
3SG		<i>cant-e</i>		<i>no cant-e</i>
1PL		<i>cant-e-mos</i>		<i>no cant-e-mos</i>
2PL/3PL		<i>cant-e-n</i>		<i>no cant-e-n</i>

#### 3.2 Usage with indefinite pronouns (Smeets 2008: 244)

- (5) a. *iney rume* ‘whomever’ :: *iney nu rume* ‘nobody’  
b. *chem rume* ‘whatever’ :: *chem nu rume* ‘nothing’  
c. *chew rume* ‘wherever’ :: *chew nu rume* ‘nowhere’
- (6) a. *Doy chem rume nie-ke-la-fu-i-i-n.*  
more what ever have-HAB-NEG-RI-IND-1-PL  
‘We (PL) did not have anything more.’
- b. *Doy chem nu rume nie-ke-fu-i-i-n.*  
more what NEG ever have-HAB-RI-IND-1-PL  
‘We (PL) had nothing more.’

### 3.3 Verbal clauses: Selected stative constructions (Payne 2007: 111f)

There are two ‘be/exist’-verbs:

- *ngen* ‘be/exist<sub>1</sub>’ (individual level = permanent; Sp. *ser*), and
- *mülen* ‘be/exist<sub>2</sub>’ (stage-level = temporary; Sp. *estar*).

#### 3.3.1 Proper inclusion

Proper inclusion is typically expressed via verbalization with *-nge* (but see 3.4 below):

- (7) a. *Witran-nge(-la)-i.* ‘S/he is (not) a visitor.’  
visitor- be<sub>1</sub>-NEG-IND[3SG]
- b. *Witran-nge-le(-la)-pa-i.* ‘S/he is (not) being a visitor.’  
visitor-be<sub>1</sub>-PROG-NEG-CIS-IND[3SG] (Smeets 2008: 171)
- (8) *Müina-tremo-pichi-we-che-nge(-la)-i-m-i.* ‘You (SG) are (not) a very beautiful boy.’  
very-beautiful-little-young-person-be<sub>1</sub>-NEG-IND-2-SG (Moesbach 1962: 54)

#### 3.3.2 Attribution

Adjectival stems (which are invariably also inchoative verbal stems) are used with *-nge* and *-le* (< *müle*-); individual-level forms were originally with *-nge*, now they appear increasingly on their own:

- (9) a. *Kuriü-nge(-la)-i*      *ti ruka.* ‘The house is (not) [always] black.’ (Sp. *ser*)  
blacken-be<sub>1</sub>-NEG-IND[3SG] ART house
- b. *Kuriü-le(-la)-i*      *ti ruka.* ‘The house is (not) [now] black.’ (Sp. *estar*)  
blacken-RES-NEG-IND[3SG] ART house
- c. *Kuriü(-la)-i*      *ti ruka.* ‘The house blackened (did not blacken) /  
black(en)-NEG-IND[3SG] ART house is (not) black.’ (Sp. *ser*)

#### 3.3.3 Location

Basically: *mülen* (> *-le*), *-künu* (< *kiinu*- ‘leave’), *-nie* (< *nie*- ‘have’, cf. 3.3.5)...

- (10) *Müle-ka(-la)-i*      *ruka mew.* ‘S/he is (not) still in the house.’ (Sp. *estar*)  
be<sub>2</sub>-CONT-NEG-IND[3SG] house POSP
- (11) *Kisu chi wentru payla-künu-tu-rke-fi*      *ta chi domo.*  
DPART ART man get.on.one's.back-leave-REST-REP-3P[3SG] PART ART woman  
‘The man left the woman on her back again, they say.’ (Salas 2006: 267)

#### 3.3.4 Existence

The verbs *ngen* and *mülen* stand in a polarity-based opposition:

- (12) a. *Müle-i*      *chadi?* ‘Is there any salt?’  
exist<sub>2</sub>-IND[3SG] salt (Augusta 1916: 55)
- b. *Nge-la-i.*      ‘No, there isn't any.’  
exist<sub>1</sub>-NEG-IND[3SG] (Augusta 1916: 55)
- (13) a. *Nge-la-i*      *chadi.* ‘There is no salt.’  
exist<sub>1</sub>-NEG-IND[3SG] salt (Smeets 2008: 125)
- b. *Chadi-nge-la-i.*      ‘It is not salty / it does not have salt.’  
salt-have<sub>2</sub>-NEG-IND[3SG] (Smeets 2008: 126; cf. 3.3.5 below)

### 3.3.5 Possession (see also Olate et al. submitted)

Mirroring the two copular verbs, there are two ways to express possession in Mapudungun:

- *nien* ‘have<sub>1</sub>’ (individual level = permanent; Sp. *tener*), and
  - *-ngen* ‘have<sub>2</sub>’ (stage-level = temporary; Sp. *tener* / “*estar con*”).
- (14) a. *Nie-i epu kawell.* ‘S/he has two horses.’  
have<sub>1</sub>-IND[3SG] two horse (individual level: unmarked POSS)
- b. *Kawellu-nge-i.* ‘S/he has a horse [right now].’  
horse-have<sub>2</sub>-IND[3SG] (stage level; marked POSS, Sp. lit. *está con caballo*)
- (15) a. *kure-nge-n* wife-have<sub>2</sub>- ‘be married (to a woman)’  
b. *fūta-nge-n* husband-have<sub>2</sub>- ‘be married (to a man)’  
c. *epu-namun-nge-* two-foot-have<sub>2</sub>- ‘be two-footed/legged’
- (16) a. *Nie-i kiñe ruka.* have<sub>1</sub>-IND[3SG] one house ‘S/he has a house.’  
b. *Kiñe-ruka-nge-i.* one-house-have<sub>2</sub>- IND[3SG] ‘She has a house (and her husband has more than one wife).’ (Augusta 1903: 9)

### 3.4 Nominal clauses

- They are invariably used for equational constructions (i.e., ‘NP<sub>X</sub> ≡ NP<sub>Y</sub>’), and occasionally for proper-inclusion constructions (i.e., ‘NP<sub>X</sub> ∈ {NP<sub>Y</sub>}’).
- Nominal clauses as proper-inclusion constructions seem to have appeared (spread?) in the 20th century; they may have originated in elliptical constructions: NP<sub>X</sub> NP<sub>Y</sub>-nge-i > NP<sub>X</sub> NP<sub>Y</sub>
- They often include a particle/proclitic *ta*, especially when second NP is definite.
- Exact formal (wordhood-related) properties of *nu* in such constructions are still to be investigated.

- (17) a. [*Fey-chi domo*]<sub>X</sub> [*(ta) ñi ina-n lamngen*]<sub>Y</sub>.  
DEM-ATTR woman PART 1SG.PSR follow-NFIN sister  
‘That woman is my youngest sister.’ (default construction; Smeets 2008: 143)
- b. [*Iñche*]<sub>Y</sub> *nu*, [*ta ti*]<sub>X</sub>.  
1SG NEG PART ART  
‘That is not me/mine.’ (fronting alternative; Smeets 2008: 144)
- (18) a. [*Fey*]<sub>X</sub> [*wentru*]<sub>Y</sub> *nu*. (Also: *fey wentru-nge-la-i*, cf. 3.3.1)  
DEM man NEG  
‘He is not a man.’ (Smeets 2008: 144)
- b. [*Tüfa-chi pu che kom*]<sub>X</sub> [*mapuche*]<sub>Y</sub> *nu?*  
this-ATTR PL person all M. NEG  
‘Are these people not all Mapuche?’ (Smeets 2008: 144)
- c. *Tunte kulli-lle-li rume, [Ø]*<sub>X</sub> [*mütewe*]<sub>Y</sub> *nu*.  
how.much pay-AFF-1SG.SBJV ever much NEG  
‘No matter how much I paid, it was not much.’ (Smeets 2008: 144)

Table 3. Summary of Stative Predication Constructions (Verbal/Nonverbal)

	Individual-level (= unmarked)		Stage-level (= temporary)	
	Affirmative	Negative	Affirmative	Negative
Location			√-	√-{NEG}-
Attribution	√(-nge)-	√(-nge)-{NEG}-	√-le-	√-le-{NEG}-
Existence	nge-	nge-{NEG}-	müle-	nge-{NEG}-
Possession	nie-	nie-{NEG}-	NP-nge-	NP-nge-{NEG}-
Proper inclusion	NP-nge-	NP-nge-{NEG}-		
Equation	NP NP	NP NP nu		

#### 4. Further research

- (19) Spanish has several negators used in lexeme derivation:
- a. *de-* (e.g. *deforme* ‘deformed’, *deformar* ‘to deform’), *des-* (e.g. *desmesura* ‘excess’, *desprestigar* ‘to discredit’), *dis-* (e.g. *disculpa* ‘excuse’, *disculpar* ‘to excuse’)
  - b. *an-* (e.g. *analfabeto* ‘illiterate’), *iN-* (e.g. *irregular* ‘irregular’, *impalpable* ‘impalpable’, *intangible* ‘intangible’, *incapacitar* ‘disqualify, render unfit’)
  - c. *no* (e.g. *tratado de no proliferación (de armas nucleares)* ‘non-proliferation treaty (for nuclear weapons)’)
- (20) Mapudungun...
- a. ...does not seem to use any of these elements as loans
  - b. ...prefers to create lexical items using its own resources (including negation)
- (21) Mapudungun does not distinguish negators for existential and other verbal expressions (Croft’s Type A; see Croft 1991, Veselinova 2014) — but nothing is known about the negators’ origins and development.

#### Abbreviations

ART article, ATTR attributive, CG clitic group, CONT continuative, DEM demonstrative, DPART discourse particle, FUT future, IMP imperative, IND indicative, NEG negation, NFIN nonfinite, N noun, NP noun phrase, OBJ object, PART particle, PL plural, PSR possessor, RES resultative, REST restitutive, RI ruptured implicature, SBJV subjunctive SG singular, SN Standard Negator

#### References

- Augusta, Félix José de. 1903. *Gramática mapuche bilingüe*. Facsimilar ed. (1990). Santiago: Séneca.
- Augusta, Félix José de. 1916. *Diccionario araucano*. 4th, facsimilar ed. (2007). Santiago: Cerro Manquehue.
- Croft, William. 1991. The evolution of negation. *Journal of Linguistics* 27: 1-39.
- Moesbach, Erbesto Wilhelm de. 1962. *Idioma mapuche*. Padre Las Casas: San Francisco.
- Olate, Aldo; Becerra, Rodrigo; Zúñiga, Fernando & Camiguan, Jaqueline. Submitted. Construcciones posesivas del *mapuzugun*. Una aproximación tipológica. *Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada*.
- Payne, Thomas. 1997. *Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salas, Adalberto. 2006. *El mapuche o araucano*. 2nd, rev. ed. Santiago: Centro de Estudios Públicos.
- Smeets, Ineke. 2008. *A Grammar of Mapuche*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Veselinova, Ljuba. 2014. The negative existential cycle revisited. *Linguistics* 52.6: 1327-1369.