

Asymmetry within and across functional domains with special reference to yes-no questions, commands, negation and tense-aspect-mood

Matti Miestamo
University of Helsinki
<matti.miestamo@ling.helsinki.fi>

1 Introduction

1.1 Symmetric vs. asymmetric negation

Standard negation can be characterized as the basic way(s) a language has for negating declarative verbal main clauses, e.g. English (1b).

(1) English

- a. the linguist has come to leipzig b. the linguist has not come to leipzig

Miestamo (2003)

- A typological study of standard negation.
- Based on a sample of 297 languages.
- Typological classification: symmetric and asymmetric negation, and subtypes of asymmetric negation.

Symmetric vs. asymmetric negation

- In symmetric negation, negatives do not differ structurally from affirmatives except for the presence of the negative marker(s).
- In asymmetric negation, there are structural differences, i.e. asymmetry, between affirmatives and negatives in addition to the presence of the negative marker(s).

Symmetry/asymmetry can be found in constructions or paradigms

- Symmetric constructions: negative marker(s) added to the corresponding affirmative with no further structural changes.
- Asymmetric constructions: negative marker(s) (usually) added to the corresponding affirmative together with some further structural changes.
- Symmetric paradigms: the correspondences between the members of affirmative and negative paradigms are one-to-one.
- Asymmetric paradigms: the correspondences between the members of affirmative and negative paradigms are not one-to-one. (Often grammatical distinctions are neutralized).

Examples: symmetric constructions

(2) Mosestén (Jeanette Sakel, p.c.)

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

(3) Kobon (Davies 1989: 152)

- a. hane ihariŋ ñiŋ-ag-mið-un hane lau ñiŋ-mið-un
1PL just eat-NEG-HAB-PST.1PL 1PL cook eat-HAB-PST.1PL
'We don't eat it raw, we eat it cooked.'

Examples: symmetric paradigms

(4) German (personal knowledge)
singen 'to sing'

a. PRESENT			b. PAST		
	AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE		AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
1SG	ich singe	ich singe nicht		ich sang	ich sang nicht
2SG	du singst	du singst nicht		du sangst	du sangst nicht
3SG	er/sie singt	er/sie singt nicht		er/sie sang	er/sie sang nicht
1PL	wir singen	wir singen nicht		wir sangen	wir sangen nicht
2PL	ihr singt	ihr singt nicht		ihr sangt	ihr sangt nicht
3PL	sie singen	sie singen nicht		sie sangen	sie sangen nicht

(5) Finnish (personal knowledge)
laulaa 'to sing'

a. PRESENT			b. PAST		
	AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE		AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
1SG	(minä) laulan	(minä) en laula		(minä) lauloin	(minä) en laulanut
2SG	(sinä) laulat	(sinä) et laula		(sinä) lauloit	(sinä) et laulanut
3SG	hän laulaa	hän ei laula		hän lauloi	hän ei laulanut
1PL	(me) laulamme	(me) emme laula		(me) lauloimme	(me) emme laulaneet
2PL	(te) laulatte	(te) ette laula		(te) lauloitte	(te) ette laulaneet
3PL	he laulavat	he eivät laula		he lauloivat	he eivät laulaneet

Examples: asymmetric constructions

(6) Hixkaryana (Derbyshire 1979: 48)

- a. ki-amryeki-no b. amryeki-hira w-ah-ko
1.SUBJ-hunt-IMPST hunt-NEG 1.SUBJ-be-IMPST
'I went hunting.' 'I did not go hunting.'

(7) West Greenlandic (Fortescue 1984: 138, 280)

- a. ullaa-kkut pujurta-lir-sar-pu-q
morning-PROS smoke-begin-HAB-IND-3SG
'He starts smoking in the morning.'
- b. akulikitsumik tikit-ta-nngi-la-q
often come-HAB-NEG-IND-3SG
'He often didn't come / didn't come often.'

Examples: asymmetric paradigms

(8) Maung (Capell & Hinch 1970: 67)

- | | |
|---|--|
| a. η i-udba
1SG.3-put
'I put.' | b. η i-wan-udba
1SG.3-FUT-put
'I shall put.' |
| c. ni-udba-ji
1SG.3-put-IRR.NPST
'I can put.' | d. marig ni-udba-ji
NEG 1SG.3-put-IRR.NPST
'I do/shall not put.' |

(9) Meithei (Chelliah 1997: 133, 228)

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| a. təw-í
do-NHYP
'(She) does.' | b. təw-e
do-ASS
'(Yes, she) has.' | c. əy fotostat təw-tə-e
I photostat do-NEG-ASS
'I haven't made copies.' |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|

(10) Somali (Saeed 1987: 79)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| a. kèen 'to bring' SIMPLE PAST | |
| | AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE |
| 1SG | keenay |
| 2SG | keentay |
| 3SG.M | keenay |
| 3SG.F | keentay keenín (ALL PERSONS) |
| 1PL | keennay |
| 2PL | keenteen |
| 3PL | keeneen |

Subtypes of asymmetric negation (some of these can be further divided into subtypes)

- A/Fin: asymmetry in the finiteness of verbal elements. The lexical verb loses its finiteness, becomes dependent, and a new finite element is usually added in the negative. (Hixkaryana, Finnish)
- A/NonReal: negatives differ from affirmatives in that they are marked for a category that denotes non-realized states of affairs. (Maung)
- A/Emph: negatives differ from affirmatives in that they are marked for a category that expresses emphasis in non-negatives. (Meithei)
- A/Cat: the marking of grammatical categories in the negative differs from their marking in the affirmative in other ways. (West Greenlandic, Somali)

Frequencies, correlations, areal distribution.

Functional motivations

- Symmetric negation is based on language-internal analogy: the structure of the negative copies the structure of the affirmative. It is motivated by pressure for cohesion in the system.
- Asymmetric negation is based on language-external analogy: the structure of the negative copies (grammaticalizes) (aspects of) the asymmetry found on the functional level (stativity, reality, discourse context).
- The different subtypes of asymmetric negation are motivated by different aspects of the functional asymmetry.

1.2 Some Background

How can the symmetry/asymmetry distinction be applied to other domains, such as polar interrogatives, commands or TAM-systems?

Reference point for symmetry/asymmetry: markedness patterns.

Functionally and formally (cross-linguistically) unmarked vs. marked categories.

Cf. affirmative/negative, declarative/interrogative, declarative/imperative vs. TAM-systems.

Default category vs. marked category (Dahl 1985).

Cf. affirmative/negative, declarative/interrogative vs. declarative/imperative.

1.3 Sample

Practical sampling method for small samples (for pilot studies etc.)

- Division into macro areas: Afr, EuA, SAO, ANG, NAm, SAm
- A number of languages from each macro area: here four
- Three principal criteria for choosing languages within the macro areas:
 - Genealogical unrelatedness
 - Avoidance of geographical adjacency
 - Availability of sources

Macroarea	Phylum	Language	Source
Africa	Khoisan	Nama	Hagman 1977
	Niger-Congo	Supyire	Carlson 1994
	Nilo-Saharan	Ma'di	Blackings & Fabb 2003
	Afro-Asiatic	Somali	Saeed 1987
Eurasia	Indo-European	Welsh (Colloquial)	King 2003
	Yukaghir	Yukaghir	Maslova 1999
	North Caucasian	Lezgian	Haspelmath 1993
	Dravidian	Malayalam	Asher & Kumari 1997
SE Asia & Oceania	Austro-Asiatic	Semelai	Kruspe 1999
	Sino-Tibetan	Meithei	Chelliah 1997
	Hmong-Mien	Hmong Njua	Harriehausen 1990
	Austronesian	Kambera	Klamer 1998
Australia & New Guinea	Trans-New Guinea	Kobon	Davies 1989
	West Papuan	Maybrat	DoI 1999
	East-Papuan	Lavukaleve	Terrill 1999
	Australian	Kayardild	Evans 1995
North America	Eskimo-Aleut	Greenlandic (West)	Fortescue 1984
	Salishan	Halkomelem (Upriver)	Galloway 1993
	Hokan	Maricopa	Gordon 1986
	Tarascan	Tarascan	Chamoreau 2000
South America	Barbacoan	Awa Pit	Curnow 1997
	Araucanian	Mapuche	Smeets 1989, Zúñiga 2000
	Trumai	Trumai	Guirardello 1999
	Mosetenan	Mosetén	Sakel 2003

Table 1. Sample languages

2 Symmetric and asymmetric polar interrogatives — towards a typology

2.1 Introduction

Domain of inquiry: neutral polar interrogation of verbal main clauses (PI), e.g. English (11b).

(11) English

- a. the linguist has come to leipzig b. has the linguist come to leipzig?

Terminological variants: yes-no/closed/nexus/truth questions/interrogatives.

Earlier typological observations about PIs

- Ultan (1978), Sadock & Zwicky (1985), Siemund (2001).
- Marking types identified: intonation, interrogative particles, disjunction (A-not-A), order of constituents, verbal inflection.

Application of the symmetry/asymmetry distinction to the domain:

Symmetric vs. asymmetric PIs

- In symmetric interrogation, interrogatives do not differ structurally from declaratives except for the presence of the interrogative marker(s).
- In asymmetric interrogation, there are structural differences, i.e. asymmetry, between declaratives and interrogatives in addition to the presence of the interrogative marker(s).

Symmetry/asymmetry in constructions and paradigms

- Symmetric constructions: interrogative marker(s) added to the corresponding declarative with no further structural changes.
- Asymmetric constructions: interrogative marker(s) added to the corresponding declarative together with some further structural changes.
- Symmetric paradigms: the correspondences between the members of declarative and interrogative paradigms are one-to-one.
- Asymmetric paradigms: the correspondences between the members of declarative and interrogative paradigms are not one-to-one.

Subtypes of asymmetric PIs?

2.2 Types of polar interrogatives

Symmetric polar interrogative constructions

(12) Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 8)

- | | |
|---|---|
| a. ava varum
she come.FUT
'She will come.' | b. ava varum-oo?
she come.FUT-Q
'Will she come?' |
| c. avan vannu
he come.PST
'He came.' | d. avan vann-oo?
he come.PST-Q
'Did he come?' |

(13) Hmong Njua (Harriehausen 1990: 118, 205)

- a. kuv puv kuv tug pooj yeg tug miv b. kuv puas puv tug miv?
1SG see 1SG CL friend CL cat 1SG Q see CL cat
'I see my friends cat.'

(14) Ma'di (Blackings&Fabb 2003: 632)

- a. ɲí `mū rá b. ɲí `mū rá ' ?
2SG NPST.go AFF 2SG NPST.go AFF Q
'You will definitely go.'

(15) Kobon (Davies 1989: 5, 94)

- a. yad kaj mɪd-öp
1SG pig be-PERF.3SG
'I have a pig / pigs.'
- b. ne kaj ap mɪd-öp (aka) mɪd-ag-öp?
2SG pig INDEF be-PERF.3SG (or) be-NEG-PERF.3SG
'Have you any meat?'

Asymmetry in polar interrogative structures

Subtype I: Focus marking in PIs

(16) Lavukaleve (Terril 1999: 35, 288, 408)

- a. "tuna-Ø mi?" hide a-e-re-ge
be.really-SG.N 3SG.N.Q.FOC thus 3SG.M.OBJ.SBRD-say-ANT
'"Is it really true?" he said.'
- b. legis e-kae-e o-mi tuna-Ø fi
kite(N) 3SG.N.OBJ-put.up-NMLZ 3SG.POSS-special.thing(N) be.really-SG.N 3SG.N.FOC
'That's the special thing for kite-flying.'
- c. o-na o-re-a tuna-a la
3SG.F.OBJ-INCL 3SG.SUBJ-say-SG.F be.really-SG.F SG.F.ART
'(He took the coconut) To the one she had really said.'

(17) Nama (Hagman 1977: 54, 143–144)

- a. //ʔĩp ke 'áop-à kè ≠ aí
3SG.M DECL man-SBRD RMPST call
'He called the man.'
- b. //ʔĩp-a //ań-'è kè ≠ 'ũũ
3SG.M-SBRD meat-SBRD RMPST eat
'Did he eat the meat?'
- c. //ań-'e-p //ʔĩp-à kè ≠ 'ũũ
meat-SBRD-3SG.M 3SG.M-SBRD RMPST eat
'Did he eat the meat?'
- d. ≠ 'ũũ-p kè //ʔĩp-à //ań-'è
eat-3SG.M RMPST 3SG.M-SBRD meat-SBRD
'Did he eat the meat?'
- e. //ʔĩp-a ≠ 'ũũ-p kè //ań-'è
3SG.M-SBRD eat-3SG.M RMPST meat-SBRD
'Did he eat the meat?'

(18) Mosetén (Sakel 2003: 278, 304, 309–310)

- a. anik raej mö'-yä' saeks-e-dye-s, jeb-a-k-dye'-in
 EMPH all 3.F-ADE eat-VBLZ-BEN-F.SUBJ eat-VBLZ-MDL-NMLZ-PL
 'Certainly all was here to eat, animals.'
- b. anik-dyaj mi'in bis-te sheshejwintyi'?'
 EMPH-Q 2PL wait-VBLZ.3.M.OBJ creator
 'Are you waiting for the creator?'
- c. mi rai's-e-' khösh-i-'
 2SG want-VBLZ-3.F.OBJ sleep-VBLZ-F.SUBJ
 'You want to sleep.'
- d. me'-dyaj mi rai's-e-' khösh-i-?'
 so-Q 2SG want-VBLZ-3.F.OBJ sleep-VBLZ-F.SUBJ
 'Do you want to sleep?'
- e. rai's-e-'-dyaj khösh-i-'-mi?
 want-VBLZ-3.F.OBJ-Q sleep-VBLZ-F.SUBJ-2SG
 'Do you want to sleep?'
- f. jam-dyaj mi näi-tye-' elena?
 NEG-Q 2SG see-APPL-3.F.OBJ Elena
 'Haven't you seen Elena?'

Subtype II: Non-finite form of lexical verb in PIs (and addition of finite auxiliary in some cases)

(19) Upriver Halkomelem (Galloway 1993: 176, 355)

- a. lém-cəx^w go-2SG
 'You go.'
- b. lí-cx^w yáyəs? Q-2SG work
 'Are you working?'

(20) Awa Pit (Curnow 1997: 190, 324)

- a. (nu=na) pala ku-mtu-y
 (2SG.(NOM)=TOP) plantain eat-IMPV-NLCT
 'You are eating plantains.'
- b. tɪlawə a-n ki-s?
 tomorrow come-INF Q-LCT
 'Are you coming tomorrow?'

(21) Meithei (Chelliah 1997: 139–140, 231, 240)

- a. mə-hák lak-lə-e
 3-here come-PERF-ASS
 'He came.'
- b. sém-thok-lə-pə-lə-o?
 correct-OUT-PERF-NMLZ-Q-SOLCT
 'Did they complete the corrections?'
- c. nóŋ ču-loj
 rain fall-NPOT
 'It will not rain.'
- d. mə-hák čət-loj-lə?
 3-here go-NPOT-Q
 'He said he wouldn't go?'

Subtype III: Asymmetry in the marking of grammatical categories, not further specified

(22) Tarascan (Chamoreau 2000: 113)

- a. 'pedru i'se-š-ti-Ø 'pablu-ni
 Pedro see-AOR-ASS-3SG Pablo-OBJ
 'Pedro saw Pablo.'
- b. 'pedru i'se-š-ki-Ø 'pablu-ni?
 Pedro see-AOR-Q-3SG Pablo-OBJ
 'Did Pedro see Pablo?'

(23) West Greenlandic (Fortescue 1984: 4, 160, 192, 215)

- a. immi-nut naalliut-sip-putit b. niri-riir-pit?
 self-ALL suffer-cause-2SG.IND eat-already-2SG.Q
 ‘You caused yourself suffering.’ ‘Have you already eaten?’
- c. savi-ni atur-nagu nanuq tuqup-paa
 knife-REFL.POSS use-SS.NEG.CNTMP.3SG.P polar.bear kill-3SG.A.3SG.P.IND
 ‘He killed the bear without (using) his knife.’
- d. piita-p takurnartaq tuqup-paa?
 Piitaq-ERG stranger kill-3SG.A.3SG.P.IND
 ‘Did Piitaq kill the stranger?’

(24) Awa Pit (Curnow 1997: 190, 199, 323–324, 327)

- a. nu=na juan=ta pyan-ti-zi b. anshik=na a-ma-s?
 2SG.(NOM)=TOP Juan=ACC hit-PST-NLCT yesterday=TOP come-Q.PST-LCT
 ‘You hit Juan.’ ‘Did you come yesterday?’
- c. (na=na) pala ku-mtu-s
 (1SG.(NOM)=TOP) plantain eat-IMPF-LCT
 ‘I am eating plantains.’
- d. min-a=ma (na=na) ashap-tu-y?
 who-ACC=Q (1SG.(NOM)=TOP) annoy-IMPF-NLCT
 ‘Whom am I annoying?’
- e. (us=na) atal ayna-mtu-y
 (3SG.(NOM)=TOP) chicken cook-IMPF-NLCT
 ‘(S)he is cooking chicken.’
- f. hugo=na pueblo=mal puz-ma?
 Hugo=TOP town=LOC go.out-Q.PST.(NLCT)
 ‘Did Hugo go out to the town?’

(25) Colloquial Welsh (King 2003: 21, 169)

- a. gaeth fred wobr b. gaeth fred wobr? c. gaeth fred ddim gwobr
 get.PST fred prize get.PST fred prize get.PST fred NEG prize
 ‘Fred got a prize.’ ‘Did Fred get a prize?’ ‘Fred didn’t get a prize.’
- d. mae-’r dyn ’na-’n darllen y daily telegraph
 be.PRES.3SG.DECL-DEF man there-PRT read.VN DEF Daily Telegraph
 ‘That man is reading / reads the Daily Telegraph.’
- e. ydy-’r dyn ’na-’n darllen y daily telegraph
 be.PRES.3SG.Q-DEF man there-PRT read.VN DEF Daily Telegraph
 ‘Is that man reading / does that man read the Daily Telegraph?’

(26) Maricopa (Gordon 1986: 332–334)

- a. m-mii? b. m-nmak-ii? c. m-mii-m? d. m-nmak-m?
 2-cry 2-leave-VINC 2-cry-R 2-leave-R
 ‘Did you cry?’ ‘Did you leave it?’ ‘Did you cry?’ ‘Did you leave it?’
- e. shay-k f. shay-m? g. hmii-k h. hmii-m?
 fat-R fat-Q.R tall-R tall-Q.R
 ‘He is fat.’ ‘Is he fat?’ ‘He is tall.’ ‘Is he tall?’
- i. hmii? j. naly-ii? k. m-yoq-k? l. m-yoq-m?
 tall fall-VINC 2-vomit-R 2-vomit-Q.R
 ‘Is he tall?’ ‘Did it fall?’ ‘Did you vomit?’ ‘Did you vomit?’

SUBJECT	for <i>-m</i> verbs	for <i>-k</i> verbs
1 ST PERSON	<i>-m</i> or \emptyset (<i>-ii</i>)	<i>-m</i> or \emptyset (<i>-ii</i>)
2 ND PERSON	<i>-m</i> or \emptyset (<i>-ii</i>)	<i>-m</i> or <i>-k</i>
3 RD PERSON	<i>-m</i> or \emptyset (<i>-ii</i>)	<i>-m</i> or \emptyset (<i>-ii</i>)

Table 2. Verb suffixes in Maricopa realis interrogatives (Gordon 1986: 335)

(27) Somali (Saeed 1987: 219–220)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>a. waan kúu kéenayaa
DECL.1SG to.you bring.PRES.PROG
'I will bring it to you.'</p> <p>c. miyàan kúu kéenayaa
Q.1SG to.you bring.PRES.PROG
'Shall I bring it to you?'</p> <p>d. cáli bàa keenáy
Ali FOC bring.PST
'<u>Ali</u> brought it.'</p> <p>f. cáli ayàa keenáy
Ali FOC bring.PST
'<u>Ali</u> brought it.'</p> | <p>b. ma kúu kéenayaa
Q to.you bring.PRES.PROG
'Shall I bring it to you?'</p> <p>e. ma cáli bàa keenáy
Q Ali FOC bring.PST
'Did <u>Ali</u> bring it?'</p> <p>g. cáli miyàa keenáy
Ali Q.FOC bring.PST
'Did <u>Ali</u> bring it?'</p> |
|--|--|

2.3 Conclusion

The symmetry/asymmetry distinction can be fruitfully applied to the typology of polar interrogatives.

Preliminary typological classification

- Symmetric and asymmetric PIs.
- Constructional and paradigmatic asymmetry between declaratives and PIs.
- Subtypes of asymmetric PI:
 - Subtype I: asymmetry in focus marking, PIs marked for focus
 - Subtype II: asymmetry in finiteness, PIs use non-finite verb form
 - Subtype III: asymmetry in the marking of grammatical categories, not further specified

Additional finding: auxiliary verbs as markers of PI (these were not discussed by the earlier typologies).

Asymmetric PIs found in 11 of the 24 sample languages, constructional asymmetry in 10 and paradigmatic in 4 languages. Subtype I is found in 3 languages, Subtype II in 3 languages and Subtype III in 8 languages. Subtype I is paradigmatic in all cases, paradigmatic asymmetry of Subtype III is found in only one language, and Subtype II is only constructional.

Note that the sample languages did not show PI constructions where PI is marked by constituent order. This construction type, found in some European languages, e.g. in English (11) would form a further subtype of asymmetric PI (possibly connected to the focus marking subtype).

3 Future prospects

A study of PIs with a much larger sample.

Functional motivations for the typology of PIs?

Application of the symmetry/asymmetry distinction to other domains, e.g. commands and TAM-system, using the 24-language sample

Abbreviations

1 first person, 2 second person, 3 third person, A agent, ACC accusative, ADE adessive, AFF affirmative, ALL allative, ANT anterior, AOR aorist, APPL applicative, ART article, ASS assertive, BEN benefactive, CL classifier, CNTMP contemporative, DECL declarative, DEF definite, EMPH emphatic, ERG ergative, F feminine, FOC focus, FUT future, HAB habitual, HYP hypothetical, IMPF imperfective, IMPST immediate past, INCL inclusive, IND indicative, INDEF indefinite, INF infinitive, IRR irrealis, LCT locutor, LOC locative, M masculine, MDL middle, N neuter, N~ non~ (e.g. NPST=nonpast), NEG negative/negation, NMLZ nominalizer, NOM nominative, OBJ object, P patient, PERF perfect, PFV perfective, PL plural, POSS possessive, POT potential, PRES present, PROG progressive, PROS prosecutive, PRT particle, PST past, PTCP participle, Q question/interrogative, R realis, REFL reflexive, RMPST remote past, SBRD subordinate, SG singular, SOLCT solicitative, SS same subject, SUBJ subject, TOP topic, VBLZ verbalizer, VINC vocalic increment, VN verbal noun

References

- Asher, R.E., and T.C. Kumari. 1997. *Malayalam*. Descriptive Grammars. London: Routledge.
- Blackings, Mairi, and Nigel Fabb. 2003. *A Grammar of Ma'di*. Mouton Grammar Library 32. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Capell, A., and H. E. Hinch. 1970. *Maung Grammar*. Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 98. The Hague: Mouton.
- Carlson, Robert. 1994. *A Grammar of Supyire*. Mouton Grammar Library 14. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chamoreau, Claudine. 2000. *Grammaire du purépecha*. Lincom Studies in Native American Linguistics 34. München: Lincom Europa.
- Chelliah, Shobhana L. 1997. *A Grammar of Meithei*. Mouton Grammar Library 17. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Curnow, Timothy Jowan. 1997. A Grammar of Awa Pit (Cuaiquer): An Indigenous Language of South-Western Colombia. Ph.D. Dissertation, Australian National University.
- Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Davies, John. 1989. *Kobon*. Croom Helm Descriptive Grammars. London: Routledge. [First Published by North-Holland Publishing Company 1981].
- Derbyshire, Desmond C. 1979. *Hixkaryana*. Lingua Descriptive Studies 1. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Dol, Philomena Hedwig. 1999. A Grammar of Maybrat, A Language of the Bird's Head, Irian Jaya, Indonesia. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Leiden.
- Evans, Nicholas D. 1995. *A Grammar of Kayardild, With Historical-Comparative Notes on Tangkic*. Mouton Grammar Library 15. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fortescue, Michael. 1984. *West Greenlandic*. Croom Helm Descriptive Grammars. London: Croom Helm.

- Galloway, Brent D. 1993. *A Grammar of Upriver Halkomelem*. University of California Publications in Linguistics 96. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gordon, Lynn. 1986. *Maricopa Morphology and Syntax*. University of California Publications in Linguistics 108. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Guirardello, Raquel. 1999. A Reference Grammar of Trumai. Ph.D. Dissertation, Rice University.
- Hagman, Roy S. 1977. *Nama Hottentot Grammar*. Indiana University Publications, Language Science Monographs 15. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Harriehausen, Bettina. 1990. *Hmong Njua*. Linguistische Arbeiten 245. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. *A Grammar of Lezgian*. Mouton Grammar Library 9. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- King, Gareth. 2003. *Modern Welsh: A Comprehensive Grammar, Second Edition*. Comprehensive Grammars. London: Routledge.
- Klamer, Marian. 1998. *A Grammar of Kambara*. Mouton Grammar Library 18. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kruspe, Nicole. 1999. *Semelai*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Melbourne.
- Maslova, Elena. 1999. *A Grammar of Kolyma Yukaghir*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Bielefeld.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2003. *Clausal Negation: A Typological Study*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Helsinki.
- Sadock, J.M., and A.M. Zwicky. 1985. Speech-act distinctions in syntax. In: Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. 1. Clause Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 155–196.
- Saeed, John Ibrahim. 1987. *Somali Reference Grammar*. Wheaton, Maryland: Dunwoody Press.
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2003. *A Grammar of Mosetén*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Nijmegen.
- Siemund, Peter. 2001. Interrogative Constructions. In: Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher and Wolfgang Raible, ed., *Language Typology and Language Universals, An International Handbook, Vol. 2*. HSK 20. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1010–1028.
- Smeets, Catharina. 1989. *A Mapuche Grammar*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Leiden.
- Terrill, Angela. 1999. *A Grammar of Lavukaleve: a Papuan Language of the Solomon Islands*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Australian National University.
- Ultan, Russell. 1978. Some general characteristics of interrogative systems. In: Joseph H. Greenberg, ed., *Universals of human language, Vol. 4*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 211–248.
- Zúñiga, Fernando. 2000. *Mapudungun*. Languages of the World/Materials 376. München: Lincom Europa.

Appendix I Summary of polar interrogative structures

Symmetric interrogative constructions

Supyire, *Somali, Malayalam, Meithei*, Hmong Njua, Maybrat, *Awa Pit*, Trumai, *Mosetén* (Q-marker added); Lezgian, *Kayardild* (Q-marker added, Q-intonation); Ma'di, *Colloquial Welsh*, Yukaghir, *Malayalam*, Semelai, Kambara, *Kayardild*, *West Greenlandic*, *Maricopa*, Mapuche (Q-intonation); Kobon (disjunctive construction)

Asymmetric interrogative constructions

Type II *Meithei*, Upriver Halkomelem (QAux), *Awa Pit* (QAux)

Type III *Nama*, *Somali*, *Colloquial Welsh*, *Lavukaleve*, *West Greenlandic*, *Maricopa*, Tarascan, *Awa Pit*

Asymmetry in the paradigm

Type I *Nama*, *Lavukaleve*, *Mosetén*

Type III *Awa Pit*

(italics indicate the construction is not the only one found in the language)

Appendix II Polar interrogation in the sample languages

Language	Polar interrogative constructions and paradigmatic asymmetries
Nama	C1: DECL marker dropped, SBRD suffix with tone change on initial NP, Q-intonation (A:Subtype III) P1: FOC obligatory, distinction between FOC and NON-FOC lost (A:Subtype I)
Supyire	C1: final particle added (S)
Ma'di	C1: Q-intonation (S)
Somali	C1: Q-marker replaces DECL-marker (non-focused clause) (A:Subtype III) C2: Q-marker added (focused clauses) (S)
Welsh (Colloquial)	C1: Suppletive Q-form of auxiliary 'be' replaces DECL-form (A:Subtype III) C2: Q-intonation only in tenses where PRES of 'be' not used as auxiliary (S)
Yukaghir	C1: Q-intonation (S)
Lezgian	C1: interrogative suffix added, rise-fall intonation on finite verb (S)
Malayalam	C1: word-final Q-marker added (S) C2: Q-intonation (S)
Semelai	C1: Q-intonation (S)
Meithei	C1: verb nominalized and Q-suffix added (A:Subtype II) C2: Q-suffix added in inherently nominal forms (POT etc.) (S)
Hmong Njua	C1: preverbal particle added (S)
Kamera	C1: Q-intonation (S)
Kobon	C1: disjunctive: repetition of verb in negated form (S) C2: disjunctive: repetition of whole clause in negated form (S) C3: disjunctive: clause followed by 'or not' (S)
Maybrat	C1: Q-particle added (S)
Lavukaleve	C1: Q.FOC marker replaces DECL.FOC marker, Q-intonation (A:Subtype III) P1: FOC obligatory, distinction between FOC and NON-FOC lost (A:Subtype I)
Kayardild	C1: Q-intonation, optionally Q-particle added (S)
Greenlandic (West)	C1: IND-inflection replaced by Q-inflection, Q-intonation (A:Subtype III) C2: Q-intonation only where indicative and interrogative fall together (S)
Halkomelem (Upriver)	C1: Q-auxiliary added, subject inflection on Q-auxiliary instead of lexical verb (A:Subtype II)
Maricopa	C1: Q-intonation (non-R, R with <i>-m</i> verbs and 2 nd person <i>-k</i> verbs) (S) C2: Q-suffix replaces R.IND final suffix, Q-intonation (<i>-k</i> verbs) (A:Subtype III) C3: R.IND final suffix deleted, Q-intonation (vocalic increment <i>-ii</i> added in C-final stems) (<i>-m</i> verbs, 1 st and 3 rd person <i>-k</i> verbs) (A:Subtype III)
Tarascan	C1: Q-inflection replaces IND-inflection, Q-intonation (A:Subtype III)
Awa Pit	C1: Q-auxiliary added, lexical verb becomes non-finite (A:Subtype II) C2: PST.Q-suffix replaces tense-aspect marker (active verbs) (A:Subtype III) C3: PST.Q-suffix added (stative verbs) (S) P1: tense-aspect distinctions lost in past interrogatives (A:Subtype III) P2: flip-flop pattern in person marking (A:Subtype III)
Mapuche	C1: Q-intonation (S)
Trumai	C1: interrogative enclitic added (S)
Mosetén	C1: Q-marker added (S) P1: EMPH obligatory, distinction between EMPH and NON-EMPH lost (A:Subtype I)