

Negation in nDrapa —A morphosyntactic description—

SHIRAI Satoko

The University of Tokyo

Summary

This study describes the multiple-negation morphology in the Mätro dialect of the nDrapa language. nDrapa has six negative markers: three prefixes (*mə-* “NEG₁”, which shows vowel assimilation to the verb stem, *ma-* “NEG₂”, and <DIR>-*a-* “<DIR>.PROH”, that is, a directional prefix whose vowel is replaced with *-a*); two auxiliaries (*ma* “NEG₃” and *thaŋgi3* “PROH”); and the negative copula verb (*mε2* “COP.NEG”). I identified the prefix *mə-* “NEG₁” as the default negative marker since it exists in different types of clauses: a declarative main clause in the perfective or far future situation, an interrogative main clause, or a part of subordinate clauses. The prefix *ma-* “NEG₂” signifies the negative of an imperfective declarative main clause. The interrogative and subordinate clauses do not use *ma-* “NEG₂” even if the clause is in the imperfective. The prefix <DIR>-*a-* “<DIR>.PROH” (the prohibitive form of a directional prefix) negates the imperative, optative, and hortative main clause and part of subordinate clauses. However, this morphology is less productive in the Mätro dialect. Instead, the auxiliary *thaŋgi3* “PROH” may be used as a productive counterpart. The auxiliary *thaŋgi3* “PROH” is used in the same situations as <DIR>-*a-* “<DIR>.PROH”. The auxiliary *ma* “NEG₃” is less frequent but may indicate a negative of the main clause in both the imperfective and remote future contexts. The negative copula *mε2* “COP.NEG” is used in a dubitative or uncertain situation, though simple negation in a copula sentence uses the prefix *ma-* “NEG₂”.

Key words: negative, tense/aspect, mood, subordinate clause, nDrapa

关键词：否定词、时态、语气、从属子句、扎坝语

1. Introduction

1.1 Aims of this study

The nDrapa language (扎壩/Zhaba, ISO 639-3 zhb) expresses the negative in multiple forms. In some cases, the behaviors of these forms are unexpected from the basic functions described in previous studies. First, this study examines each negation form's structure and function based on typological frameworks. Next, it will discuss their properties focusing on morphosyntactic condition. This paper will not discuss rhetorical devices that indirectly express negation, such as rhetorical questions.

1.2 Language profile

nDrapa belongs to the Qiangic group of the Tibeto-Burman subfamily of the Sino-Tibetan language family.¹ Recent studies have found that an estimated 10,000 speakers (HUANG Yang p.c., 2020) use the language in regions along the Xianshui River, which flows in western Sichuan, China. These regions are in a multiethnic area of Southwestern China called the Western Sichuan Ethnic Corridor (Fei 1980, Sun 1983), the Tibet(-Qiang)-Yi Corridor (Shi 2009, Zhang and Huang 2015), or the Eastern Tibetosphere (Rosche and Suzuki 2018).

This study highlights the Mätro dialect, which is nDrapa's northernmost variety. I gathered the language data in this study from my fieldwork on Mätro nDrapa unless mentioned otherwise.

The following phonemes can be attributed to Mätro nDrapa: (i) consonants: /ph [p^h], th [t^h], ʈh [ʈ^h], ch [ç^h], kh [k^h]; p, t, ʈ, c, k; b, d, ɖ, ʝ, g; tsh [ts^h], tɕh, [tɕ^h]; ts, tɕ; dz, dʒ; m, n, ɳ, ŋ; m̥ [m̥m], ŋ̥ [ŋ̥n], ɲ̥ [ɲ̥ɳ], ɲ̥̊ [ɲ̥̊ŋ]; fh [f^h], sh [s^h], çh [ç^h]; f, s, ç, x, h; v, z, ʒ, ʏ, fi; w, j; l, r [ɾ]; ɿ [ʅ]; ɿ̥ [ʅ̥]; (ii) vowels: /i, i, ɤ, u, e [ɪ], ɐ, o, ɛ, ʌ, ə, a; ei/; and (iii) word tones (marked at the end of a phonological word): 1 (high-level), 2 (high-falling), 3 (low-rising), and 4 (low-rising-falling).

Morphologically, nDrapa uses both prefixes and suffixes, and case enclitics mark most of its grammatical relations. The case-marking system is mostly nominative-accusative, with the nominative having no overt markers. Other cases, such as the accusative-dative marker, may also be omitted if the context conveys a clear grammatical relation. The basic constituent order is SOV. In a noun phrase, the head noun is preceded by a demonstrative but followed by adjectives and numerals.

1.3 Verbal affixes in nDrapa

Prefixation is a main negative-marking strategy. Here, I survey the nDrapa verbal affixes found in the declarative main clause's predicate, which includes the following affixes:

¹ The genealogical status of the Qiangic group remains under discussion. See Shirai (2020: 366–367) for details.

- A directional prefix of either upward (UPW), downward (DWN), inward (INW), outward (OUT), or neutral (NTL) that occupies the first slot to indicate the direction of motion and/or telicity.
- A negative prefix falling into the prehead slot, that is, directly before the stem of the main verb (VS) or the auxiliary.
- An aspect suffix falling into the posthead slot to indicate the perfective or imperfective and the factual or nonegophoric. If the sentence is egophoric, the slot remains empty.

The main predicate's morphosyntactic head is either a verb or an auxiliary. In the verb-headed predicate, affixes are aligned as DIR- NEG- VS -ASPECT as in (1) whereas in the auxiliary-headed predicate, they are aligned as DIR- VS | NEG- AUX -ASPECT as in (2), with the vertical line '|' indicating a word boundary. A negative prefix is attached to the verb stem in the former pattern but to the auxiliary in the latter pattern.

(1) DIR- NEG- VS -ASPECT

ŋΛ- mΛ- hçΛ -a1.
OUT-NEG-remain-FAC₁.PFV

‘(Anything else) has not remained.’

(2) DIR- VS | NEG- AUX -ASPECT

kə- mmei3 mi- w(u) -a1.
INW-get.ripe NEG-PFV-FAC₁.PFV

‘(It) is not ripe enough (to eat).’

1.4 Previous studies

No studies have thoroughly examined the nDrapa negation forms. Huang (1990, 1991, 2009) and Shirai (2013) briefly describe these negation patterns in accordance with predicate types. Meanwhile, Gong (2007: 109–111) simply states that the Waduo dialect uses both forms for the “general negative” (ma⁵⁵ and mə⁵⁵) and the “prohibitive/negative” (tha³¹, ka⁵⁵, and xa³¹gr³⁵) albeit without a detailed description or analysis.

Several typological studies have been conducted on negation, such as Payne (1985), Miestamo (2007), and Dahl (2011), who typically distinguish “standard negation” from others. Concurrently, some other studies on Qiangic languages differentiate the “general/default/最常用的 (most-often-used)” negator from others (e.g., Jacques 2008: 294–295 on Japhug [茶堡嘉绒]; Ding 2014: 206–207 on Prinmi [普米]; Lai 2017: 334–335 on Khroskyabs [绰斯甲/拉坞戎]).

2. nDrapa negation forms

2.1 A list of negation forms

nDrapa has six morphemes that negate a predicate, the first two of which are productive prefixes, the third is a fossilized prefix, and the latter three are words: [iv] and [v] are auxiliaries while [vi] is a copula. The following section shows examples of each.

Prefixes:

[i] *mə-* (*mi-* ~ *mə-* ~ *mo-* ~ *mʌ-*) ‘NEG₁’

[ii] *ma-* ‘NEG₂’

[iii] <DIR>-a- ‘<DIR>.PROH’

Auxiliaries:

[iv] *ma* ‘NEG₃’

[v] *thəŋgi3* ‘PROH’

Copula:

[vi] *mɛ2* ‘COP.NEG’

The perfective predicate of a declarative main clause uses [i] *mə-* ‘NEG₁’, which shows vowel alternation and is also found in other places such as the negative interrogative. Conversely, the imperfective predicate of a declarative main clause employs another prefix, [ii] *ma-* ‘NEG₂’. Meanwhile, [iii] is typically characterized as a vowel alternation of a directional prefix, which is found in the prohibitive and other situations including a subordinate clause. In addition, [iv] *ma* ‘NEG₃’ is an auxiliary with the same form as the prefix *ma-* ‘NEG₂’, mostly found with a sentence-final particle, *re* ‘FAC₂’ or *pa* ‘IFR’. Moreover, [v] *thəŋgi3* ‘PROH’ likely consists of the prohibitive prefix *tha-* and the auxiliary *ŋgi3*, despite being a fossilized combination, since *tha-* is no longer productive in nDrapa. Its function is similar to that of [iii] <DIR>-a- ‘<DIR>.PROH’, both of which are found in prohibitive sentences and subordinate clauses. Finally, [vi] *mɛ2* ‘COP.NEG’ is found in the copula position in dubitative situations.

2.2 Functions of negative markers

2.2.1 Negating declarative verbal main clauses

According to Miestamo (2007: 553), the basic means to negate declarative verbal main clauses is through “standard negation.” Under this category, nDrapa has three negation forms: The perfective uses the prefix *mə-* ‘NEG₁’ as in (1)–(3) whereas the imperfective employs the prefix *ma-* ‘NEG₂’ as in (4). Meanwhile, the auxiliary *ma* ‘NEG₃’ follows the main verb or auxiliary and occurs in combination with a sentence-final particle as in (5).

- (3) **zei3** **tΛ-mi-khe-a1** **re3**
 daughter OUT-NEG₁-give-FAC₁.PFV FAC₂

‘(He) did not give the daughter (in marriage to the frog).’ [FT]

- (4) **ŋa = je2** **ma-si3**.
 1SG=also NEG₂-know

‘I don’t know either.’

- (5) **swi = wu2** **ʃhΛ3** **ne = tɕu = jantɕhi3** **ɕi = ʃi1** **ma = re3**.
 human=ACDT leg two=CLF=only exist₂=IPFV NEG₃=FAC₂

‘Mankind has no more than two legs.’

Here I describe the two prefixes’ detailed positions in standard negation. First, the prefix *mə-* ‘NEG₁’ is broadly found in the standard negation of the perfective. It can be attached to a verb with a directional prefix, as in (1) and (3); a verb without a directional prefix, as in (6); an auxiliary, as in (2) and (7); and an existential verb (in the simple past in a folk-tale), as in (8).

- (6) **fidu-zɛ3** **mo-ro2**.
 meet-NMLZ NEG₁-get.1

‘(I wanted to see him yesterday, but) I failed to see him.’

- (7) **nda1** **mahtsa3** **khonkhei3** **zi3** **tɕi~tɕi1** **a-tɛ3**
 before absolutely like.this snow big~NMLZ DWN-come

mΛ-n-a2.
 NEG-EXP-FAC₁.PFV

‘We have never had this much snow before.’ (Lit. ‘Completely, this big snow has not come before.’)

- (8) **hpei2** **tɕi~tɕi = la1** **pΛfiʃΛ3** **mo-po3** **sa3**
 local.lord big~NMLZ=LOC child NEG1-exist₁ ADM

‘The great lord did not have a child.’ [FT]

Second, the prefix *ma-* ‘NEG₂’ broadly exists in the standard negation of the imperfective but is never attached to a verb with a directional prefix, which is optional in the imperfective (Shirai 2018). It is used with a verb that has no directional prefix, as in (4) and (9);

an auxiliary, as in (10); an existential verb, as in (11); a copula, as in (12); and an adjective, as in (13).

- (9) *nima3 tɕʌti1 ma-ndw-ɛ3.*
 PSN letter NEG₂-can.do-FAC₁.PFV

‘Nima is/was illiterate. (Lit: Nima cannot do letters.)’

- (10) *figefige3 tɕuu2 tsheri = ta1 ɕettɕu1 ma-ʈ-ɛ.*
 teacher now PSN=MAL be.angry NEG2-IPFV-FAC₁.IPFV

‘The teacher is not angry at Tseri now.’

- (11) *tʌ3 ma-tɕi-ɛ3.*
 water NEG₂-exist₆-FAC₁.IPFV

‘There is/was no water.’

- (12) *ŋa1 hja1 {ma-rɛ3/ ma-jʌ3}.*
 1SG Han.Chinese NEG₂-COP₄/NEG₂-COP₁

‘I am/was not Han Chinese.’

- (13) *ma-ndza = rɛ3.*
 NEG₂-good=FAC₂

‘It is/was not good.’

2.2.2 Negation of future situations

The previous section describe’d the nDrapa standard negation using examples from present and past situations. While it is apparent that the perfective employs *mə-* ‘NEG₁’, the imperfective uses *ma-* ‘NEG₂’ or *ma* ‘NEG₃’. Future situations, however, may take different patterns depending on the speaker’s attitude.

For instance, the near-future situation is expressed by the imperfective if the speaker is conscious of its connection to the present. Such a construction would employ *ma-* ‘NEG₂’ for the negative, as in (14).

- (14) *somunɪ3 ŋa1 no = rʌ3 jekə1 ji1 ma-ʈʌ3.*
 tomorrow 1SG 2SG=GEN house go NEG₂-IPFV

‘I will not go to your house tomorrow.’

Moreover, *mə-* ‘NEG₁’ is also found in a future situation, as in (15), which is tentatively regarded as an effect of remote time: if the future is expressed as an event that is irrelevant to the present, the sentence would tend to use a nonegophoric form and/or the perfective form.

(15) *somuŋi3 mokku3 a-mi-tə-a3 pa3.*
 tomorrow rain DWN-NEG₁-come-PFT IFR

‘I guess rain will not fall tomorrow.’

In a remote-time context, *ma* ‘NEG₃’ may also negate the predicate; in such cases, it takes the perfect suffix *-a* ‘PFT’ and is followed by a sentence-final particle, *rɛ* ‘FAC₂’ or *pa* ‘IFR’, as in (16).

(16) *ŋa1 tshi = wo1 tshəpi = rə3 no1 mo1/to-mo1*
 1SG ten=CLF later=GEN 2SG forget/NTL-forget
ma-a3 rɛ3.
 NEG.IPFV-PFT FAC₂

‘I will not forget you even after ten years.’

2.2.3 The negative interrogative

The negative interrogative, which includes A-not-A-type questions, does not use the suffix *ma-* ‘NEG₂’ even if the predicate is the imperfective; instead, it uses *mə-* ‘NEG₁’. Examples (17) and (18) are a simple negative interrogative and a A-not-A-type interrogative, respectively; both are the imperfective but use *mə-* ‘NEG₁’. This suggests that *mə-* ‘NEG₁’ is the default negative marker while *ma-* ‘NEG₂’ occurs in limited circumstances.

(17) *shΛ = rΛ1 jekə1 mi-tɛ1 tʃi = ra3.*
 who=GEN house NEG₁-far IPFV=Q

‘Whose house is not far (from here)?’

(18) *no1 o-cchu1 tΛ = me2 mΛ-t-a1.*
 2SG UPW-open IPFV=Q NEG₁-IPFV-Q

‘Do you open (the gate) or not?’

2.2.4 The negative imperative (or prohibitive)

The nDrapa negation forms for the imperative is different from those for the declarative, which is consistent with Dahl’s (2011: 26) point: “It is quite common—in the case of

imperatives one should perhaps even say ‘normal’—for negation in other constructions to deviate more or less completely from standard negation.”

Examples (19)–(22) illustrate inflections in nDrapa: declarative, imperative, and two types of negative imperative. As seen in (20), the verb stem’s vowel may alternate into /u/ in the imperative so that the vowel of the directional prefix assimilates to it. In the negative imperative, however, the directional prefixes themselves may alternate into the prohibitive form, such as *ka-* in (21). Moreover, they may employ the prohibitive auxiliary *thafgi3* ‘PROH’ to follow the verb.

(19) *ŋa1 ki-ttsi1 fiŋi3.* <Declarative>
 1SG INW-eat PST.1

‘I ate.’

(20) *no1 ko-ttsu2.* <Imperative>
 2SG INW-eat.IMP

‘(You) eat!’

(21) *no1 ka-ttsu2.* <Negative imperative 1>
 2SG INW.PROH-eat.IMP

‘(You) don’t eat!’

(22) *no1 ki-ttsi1 thafgi3.* <Negative imperative 2>
 2SG INW-eat PROH

‘(You) don’t eat!’

The prohibitive forms of directional prefixes demonstrate the downward, inward, and outward prefixes, as listed in Table 1. Blanks exist in the prohibitive column because this formation is less productive than the analytic expression with the prohibitive auxiliary, as seen in (22). The prohibitive forms of directional prefixes are typically characterized with vowel alternation into /a/ except the downward prefix *a-* alternates into *na-*. A provisional etymon of the negative marker /a/ of the imperative is the irrealis marker, which is a cognate of the Japhug irrealis prefix *a-* (Jacques 2008: 295).

Table 1 nDrapa directional prefixes

Plain	Prohibitive	Directive function
<i>ʌ-</i>	—	Upward (UPW)
<i>a-</i>	<i>na-</i>	Downward (DWN)
<i>ka-</i>	<i>ka-</i>	Inward/upstream (INW)
<i>ŋʌ-</i>	<i>ŋa-</i>	Outward/downstream (OUT)
<i>ɬʌ-</i>	—	Neutral/unspecified (NTL)

As mentioned in 2.1, it is highly possible that the prohibitive auxiliary *thaŋgi3* ‘PROH’ originally consists of the prohibitive prefix *tha-* and the auxiliary *ŋgi3*. The prefix *tha-* is found only in a few stereotyped expressions, such as (23); thus, it is no longer productive in nDrapa. However, *tha-* can be traced back to the Proto-Tibeto-Burman prohibitive morpheme **(t/d)a* ‘PROHIBITIVE’ (Matisoff 2015). We should assume that it merged with the irrealis marker *a-* since the Proto-Tibeto-Burman vowel /a/ corresponds to higher (or brighter) vowels in nDrapa through a process called brightening (Matisoff 2004).

(23) *no1 tha-çettçhu3.*
 2SG PROH-get.angry

‘Forgive me!’ (Lit. ‘You, don’t get angry!’)

2.2.5 Deontic negation

The previous section introduced two ways to negate the imperative, but these negative markers are also present in other sentence types including the optative, as in (24) and (25), and the hortative, as in (26). Moreover, as will be discussed in the next section, certain types of subordinate clauses use a prohibitive form. Parallel phenomena have been reported in another Qiangic language, Prinmi (Ding 2014). Ding (2014: 204–208) terms such a negative marker in Prinmi as “deontic negator” in contrast to general negator and perfective negator.

(24) *stso-pɛ3 na-tɛ3 çu3.*
 hail-DIM DWN.PROH-come need

‘May it not hail!’

(25) *ŋoro1 somunɪ3 tha-vo3 çu3.*
 3SG tomorrow PROH-come.here need

‘I hope he doesn’t come tomorrow.’

- (26) *taja3* *to-nthwi1* *thafgi3* *ndza = rɛ3*.
 money NTL-lend PROH good=FAC₂

‘Let’s not lend money. (Lit. It’s better not to lend money)’

2.2.6 Negation in subordinate clauses

Subordinate clauses also use negative markers that are different from those in standard negation (Shirai 2012). A conditional clause constructed using the polysemic clause linkage marker *ta* ‘PCL’ mainly employs the prefix *mə-* ‘NEG₁’, as in (27), whereas a conditional clause formed with the conjunction *rΛ* ‘COND’ utilizes a prohibitive form, as in (28) and (29). While the meanings expressed by (27) and (28) are similar, both clause linkers and both negative markers take different forms. These examples suggest two types of subordinate clauses. I tentatively use ‘Subordinate-I’ for subordinate clauses negated by a prohibitive form and ‘Subordinate-II’ for subordinate clauses negated by *mə-* NEG₁.

- (27) *somuɲi3* *mokku3* *a-mə-tɛ = ta3*, *ʈhe-a2* *rɛ3*.
 tomorrow rain DWN-NEG₁-come=PCL pleasant-PFT FAC₂

‘It will be pleasant if it does not rain tomorrow.’

- (28) *somuɲi3* *mokku3* *na-tɛ = rΛ3*, *ʈhe-a2 rɛ3*.
 tomorrow rain DWN.PROH-come=COND pleasant-PFT FAC₂

‘It will be pleasant if it does not rain tomorrow.’

- (29) *ɲwɛ1* *ɲoro = pɛrΛ1* *ko-fido1* *thafgi = rΛ3*,
 2PL 3SG=NSUB INW-wait PROH=COND
- ɲoro1* *ɕettɕu1* *ndu3*.
 3SG get.angry probable

‘If you don’t wait for him, he will get angry.’

Moreover, the distribution of prohibitive forms is not limited to imperative or deontic situations. In (30), the prohibitive auxiliary *thafgi* ‘PROH’ negates the predicate of the first clause despite appearing to have no deontic implications.

- (30) anΛ1 lɛhka3 ji3 thafigi = ne3, nge + ttshΛnΛ3 kΛ-ŋa1
 day work go PROH=then door+behind INW-hide
- le = hce-a3 re3.
 put=PST-PFT FAC₂

‘He did not go for work in the daytime but keep hiding behind the door.’ [FT]

Nominalizations also show subordinate-type negation. Example (31) uses the prefix *mə-* ‘NEG₁’ to negate the predicate of a nominalized clause although its aspect is the imperfective. This example also indicates that only a declarative main clause may employ *ma-* ‘NEG₂’.

- (31) somun*i*3 ko3 zama3 tsi3 mi-[i-pi1
 tomorrow here meal eat NEG₁-IPFV-NMLZ
- ŋa = rΛ3 phe3 re3.
 1SG=GEN father COP₄

‘The person who will not have meal here tomorrow is my father.’

2.2.7 Negative dubitative copula

As we observed earlier, simple negation in a copula sentence uses the prefix *ma-* ‘NEG₂’, as in (12) (repeated below). However, if it is a dubitative or uncertain situation, the form *mɛ2* ‘COP.NEG’ is used in place of the copula verb, as shown in (32) and (33).

- (12) ŋa1 hja1 {ma-re3/ ma-jΛ3}.
 1SG Han.Chinese NEG₂-COP₄/NEG₂-COP₁

‘I am/was not Han Chinese.’

- (32) no1 hja1 mɛ2 mo3.
 2SG Han.Chinese COP.NEG CFM

‘You are not Han Chinese, are you?’

- (33) ŋoro1 aco3 mɛ = ra2.
 3SG PSN COP.NEG=Q

‘(To my surprise,) that is Akyo!’ (Lit. ‘Isn’t that Akyo?’)

Moreover, copula sentences form the negative interrogative using *mɛ2* ‘COP.NEG’. Example (34) uses an interrogative marker *ra* ‘Q’ with it whereas in (35), an interrogative/

dubitative particle *po3* is optional.

- (34) *ŋoɣɛ-kʌ1 shʌ1 pəpa3 mɛ = ra2.*
 3PL-inside who Tibetan.people COP.NEG=Q

‘Among them, who is not Tibetan?’

- (35) *no1 hja1 mɛ2 (po3).*
 2SG Han.Chinese COP.NEG DOUBT

‘Aren’t you Han Chinese?’

2.3 Summary

This paper described the negative forms in nDrapa in terms of both function and morpho-syntactic condition, summarized in Table 2. We conclude that *mə-* ‘NEG₁’ is the default negative marker whereas other negative forms are used sparingly. This marker is present in all types of clauses except the imperative/optative/hortative (i.e., both the declarative and the interrogative of main clauses and subordinate clauses). Etymologically, *mə-* ‘NEG₁’ can be traced back to the Proto-Tibeto-Burman negator **ma* ‘NEGATIVE’ (Matisoff 2015).

Table 2 Functional/morphosyntactic distribution of nDrapa negative forms

		Imperfective	Perfective
Main Clause	Declarative	<i>ma-</i> ‘NEG ₂ ’	<i>mə-</i> ‘NEG ₁ ’
		<i>ma</i> ‘NEG ₃ ’ (Copula)	
	Interrogative	<i>mɛ2</i> ‘COP.NEG’	
	Imperative/Optative/Hortative	<DIR>- <i>a-</i> ‘<DIR>.PROH’/ <i>thaŋgi3</i> ‘PROH’	
Subordinate Clause	Subordinate-I	<DIR>- <i>a-</i> ‘<DIR>.PROH’	
	Subordinate-II	<i>mə-</i> ‘NEG ₁ ’	

3. Conclusion

This study comprehensively described the following six negative forms in Mätro nDrapa:

Prefixes:

- [i] *mə-* (*mi-* ~ *mə-* ~ *mo-* ~ *mʌ-*) ‘NEG₁’
- [ii] *ma-* ‘NEG₂’
- [iii] <DIR>-*a-* ‘<DIR>.PROH’

Auxiliaries:

[iv] *ma* ‘NEG₃’[v] *thaŋgi3* ‘PROH’

Copula:

[vi] *mε2* ‘COP.NEG’

Each negative marker’s functions and morphosyntactic properties are as follows: [i] The prefix *mə-* ‘NEG₁’ is the default negative marker used by the perfective and interrogative of the main and subordinate clauses for negation. [ii] The prefix *ma-* ‘NEG₂’ signals the negative of an imperfective declarative main clause. [iii] The prohibitive form of a directional prefix <DIR>-a- ‘<DIR>.PROH’ is used to negate the imperative, optative, and hortative main clauses and part of subordinate clauses. [iv] The auxiliary *ma* ‘NEG₃’ may denote the negative of a main clause. [v] The auxiliary *thaŋgi3* ‘PROH’ is used in the same situation as [iii], and [v] is more productive than [iii]. [vi] The negative dubitative copula *mε2* ‘COP.NEG’ exists in the copula position in sentences that express dubitative situations.

Abbreviations

1	first person	LOC	locative
2	second person	MAL	malefactive
3	third person	NEG	negative
ACDT	accusative-dative	NMLZ	nominalizer
ADM	admirative	NTL	neutral directive
AUX	auxiliary	NSUB	non-subject
CFM	confirmative	O	object
CLF	classifier	OUT	outward directive
COND	conditional	PCL	polysemic clause linkage
COP	copula verb	PFT	perfect
DIM	diminutive	PFV	perfective
DIR	directive	PL	plural
DWN	downward directive	PROH	prohibitive
EXP	experiential	PSN	proper person name
FAC	factual	PST	past
FT	folktale	Q	question
GEN	genitive	S	subject
IFR	inferential	SG	singular
IMP	imperative	UPW	upward directive
IINW	inward directive	V	verb
IPFV	imperfective	VS	verb stem

Acknowledgments

I am extremely grateful to Laiji Namu and her relatives for their dedicated work as the language consultants in my fieldwork. Part of this study was presented at the 27th Annual Conference of International Association of Chinese Linguistics. I deeply appreciate the valuable comments from the participants. This work was supported by JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (Kakenhi) #18H03577 and #19K00543. I would like to thank Enago (www.enago.jp) for the English language review.

References

[Chinese]

- 费孝通 (Fei, Xiaotong)
1980 关于我国民族识别问题. 《中国社会科学》1980.1: 94–107.
- 龚群虎 (Gong, Qunhu)
2007 《扎坝语研究》(中国新发现语言研究丛书) 北京: 民族出版社.
- 黄布凡 (Huang, Bufan)
1990 扎坝语概况. 《中央民族学院学报》1990.4: 71–82.
1991 扎坝语. In: 戴庆厦, et al. 《藏缅语十五种》pp. 64–97. 北京: 北京燕山出版社.
2009 《川西藏区的语言》北京: 中国藏学出版社.
- 向柏霖 (Jacques, Guillaume)
2008 《嘉绒语研究》(中国新发现语言研究丛书) 北京: 民族出版社.
- 石硕 (主编) (Shi, Shuo (ed.))
2009 《藏彝走廊: 文明起源与民族源流》成都: 四川人民出版社.
- 孙宏开 (Sun, Hongkai)
1983 川西民族走廊地区的语言. In: 李锋铭 (编) 《西南民族研究》pp. 429–454. 成都: 四川民族出版社.
- 张曦、黄成龙 (主编) (Zhang, Xi and Huang, Chenglong (eds.))
2015 《地域棱镜: 藏羌彝走廊研究新视角》北京: 学苑出版社.

[Japanese]

- 白井聡子 (Shirai, Satoko)
2013 ダバ語における文の下位分類. In: 澤田英夫 (編) 『チベット=ビルマ系言語の文法現象2: 述語と発話行為のタイプからみた文の下位分類』pp. 391–421. 府中: 東京外国語大学アジア・アフリカ言語文化研究所.

[English]

- Dahl, Östen
2011 Typology of Negation. In: Laurence R. Horn (ed.), *The expression of negation*. pp. 9–38. Berlin/New York: Walter De Gruyter.
- Ding, Picus Sizhi (丁思志)
2014 *A Grammar of Prinmi: Based on the central dialect of northwest Yunnan*. China. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Lai, Yunfan (赖云帆)

- 2017 Grammaire du khroskyabs de Wobzi. Dissertation. Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3, <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-01571916>

Matisoff, James A.

- 2004 “Brightening” and the place of Xixia (Tangut) in the Qiangic branch of Tibeto-Burman. In: Y.-C. Lin et al. (eds.). *Studies on Sino-Tibetan languages: Papers in honor of Professor Hwang-Cherng Gong on his seventieth birthday*. pp. 327–352. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica. (Language and Linguistics Monograph Series No. W-4.)

- 2015 *The Sino-Tibetan etymological dictionary and thesaurus*. Berkeley: The Regents of the University of California.

Miestamo, Matti

- 2007 Negation—an overview of typological research. *Language and Linguistic Compass* 1: 522–570.

Payne, John R.

1985. Negation. In: Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description*. pp. 197–242. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roche, Gerald and Hiroyuki Suzuki

- 2018 Tibet’s minority languages: Diversity and endangerment. *Modern Asian Studies* 52.4: 1227–1278.

Shirai, Satoko (白井聡子)

- 2012 The polysemic enclitic =ta in nDrapa. *NINJAL Research Papers* (国立国語研究所論集) 3: 85–101.

- 2018 An analysis of the aspect-marking function of directional prefixes in nDrapa. In: Tooru Hayasi, Tomoyuki Kubo, Setsu Fujishiro, Noriko Ohasaki, Yasuhiro Kishida, and Mutsumi Sugahara (eds.) *Diversity and dynamics of Eurasian languages: The 20th Commemorative volume*. pp. 405–420. Kobe: Consortium of Studies of Eurasian Languages. (Contribution to the Studies for Eurasian Languages Series Vol. 20.)

- 2020 A geolinguistic study of directional prefixes in the Qiangic language area. *Himalayan Linguistics* 19(1): 365–392.