a. tsi  ts-əg-ən-da
    I 1-go-REAL-INCOMP
    ‘I was going.’ / ‘I used to go.’

b. tsi  wi   a-d-i-da
    I house make-1-PAST-INCOMP
    ‘I was making a house.’

c. tsi-agāi  pumba  ə-g-i-da  og^5-dzi
    1S-dog beat be-3-PAST-INCOMP die-TAM
    ‘He used to beat my dog, and he died.’

d. pinda  t-am-da  e-g-a;u-da,
    earlier 1-eat-PURP give-3-NEG:REAL-INCOMP
    yeodzi  t-am-da  e-g-i
    now 1-eat-PURP give-3-PAST
    ‘He didn’t used to let me eat, now he lets me.’

In the right context, the construction can also mean ‘while X was happening,’ as in
the following:

(181) tsi  ts-ip-ŋ-da   natī  aoda  dav-ən
    I 1-sleep-REAL-INCOMP who door knock-NEUT
    ‘While I was sleeping, someone knocked on the door.’

The same -da, used with irrealis, yields a reading of ‘would have,’ or ‘was about to,’
both senses compatible with non-fact modality. Following are examples:

(182) a. tok  ts-ip-dak-da
    we 1-sleep-PL:IRR-INCOMP
    ‘We would have slept.’

b. nu  e-n-u-da
    you give-2-SG:IRR-INCOMP
    ‘You would have given it.’

With a non-volitional verb like ‘fall,’ the interpretation is more often the latter sense
– ‘was about to,’ as in the following:

(183) gina  nu  bem-dzi-da
    that person fall-3:IRR-INCOMP
    ‘That person was about to fall.’

Other verbs that behave the same way are ip-dzi-da ‘was about to sleep,’ and
nuŋ-dzi-da ‘was about to get up.’ It is not clear how this form contrasts with the
“imminent” aspect illustrated in §5.5.3.5.

5.5.4. Negation

There are two negation patterns – one for realis and another for irrealis. In Class II
verbs the distinction between past and realis is neutralized in the negative, i.e. past does
not have a negation pattern distinct from realis. This lends support to our earlier
hypothesis that realis and irrealis are the original and basic distinctions in Kusunda,
while past is a later development.
It also becomes more clear under negation that the distinction between realis and irrealis is, in fact, not related to “real” and “not real,” but is more closely related to “actual” and “possible.” Thus realis affirmative statements assert something to be factual, and irrealis affirmative statements assert something to be possibly true. In the negative, “realis” asserts as true that something did not happen (or is not happening), while irrealis asserts that even possible truth is not likely to become fact.

5.5.4.1. Negative realis in Class II verbs

Negative realis-assertion is marked by a suffix \(-a:\'u\), with pharyngealization on the first vowel and falling–rising pitch on the full sequence.\(^{26}\) (See also §6.1.2.2 Negative existential.)

As in the affirmative, the affixation type of person markers (i.e. prefixing or suffixing) affects other affixation patterns as well. Thus, recall from (153–155) that with fully contrastive prefixed person markers in the affirmative (Class I verbs) the only distinction marked by suffixes is the number distinction. The suffix \(-du\), then, marks singular actant for first, second, and third persons, while \(-dak\) marks plural actants. In Class II verbs \(-d\) is separated off as a first person marker.

In Class II negative verbs, too, \(-d\) (along with \(-n\) and \(-g\)) belongs to the person marking system and not to the negative suffix. Note, too, that in the negative there is no marking in the verb to distinguish between singular and plural actants. Such information is signalled by the free pronoun. Following is a Class II negative–realis paradigm:

(184) CLASS II — NEGATIVE–REALIS:
   a. tsi e-d-a:\'u
      I give-1-NEG  ‘I did not give.’
   b. tok e-d-a:\'u
      we give-1-NEG  ‘We did not give.’
   c. nu e-n-a:\'u
      you give-2-NEG  ‘You did not give.’
   d. nok e-n-a:\'u
      you.pl give-2-NEG  ‘You [pl] did not give.’
   e. gina e-g-a:\'u
      he/she give-3-NEG  ‘He/she did not give.’

5.5.4.2. Negative realis in Class I verbs

As already alluded to, Class I verbs mark negative realis in all persons with the suffix \(-da:\'u\). In Class II verbs, of course, we have already seen repeatedly that \(-d\) is a person marker – first person negative is \(-d-a:\'u\), second person is \(-n-a:\'u\), and third person is \(-g-a:\'u\). In Class I verbs, the \(-d\) has become part of the negative suffix. Following is a Class I negative–realis paradigm:

\(^{26}\) This suggests that the original sequence is something like \(-agu\), which interestingly, is precisely the mutated form of \(-go\), the imperative marker. Recall that the mutated form is related to several marked structures – something also true of negation. (See §5.5.3.1 on Mutation.)
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CLASS I — NEGATIVE–REALIS:

a. tsi t-öm-da:"u
   I 1-eat-NEG:REAL
   'I did not eat.'

b. tok t-öm-da:"u
   we 1-eat-NEG:REAL
   'We did not eat.'

c. nu n-öm-da:"u
   you 2-eat-NEG:REAL
   'You did not eat.'

d. nok n-öm-da:"u
   you.pl 2-eat-NEG:REAL
   'You [pl] did not eat.'

e. gina g-öm-da:"u
   he/she 3-eat-NEG:REAL
   'He/she did not eat.'

f. gina männi g-öm-da:"u
   he many 3-eat-NEG:REAL
   'They did not eat.'

See §10.1.2 for a second negation pattern found frequently on negated medial verbs of a clause chain. It is derived from the negative existential or locative copula kæa:"u or kæa:"i and may be a past negative as opposed to a realis negative.

5.5.4.3. Negative realis in mutating verbs

All mutating verbs belong to Class I, i.e. person marking indices are prefixed to the verb root. (But not all Class I verbs are mutating.) Significantly, negative realis in mutating verbs employs mutation as part of its marking strategy, and the negative suffix -u is added to the mutated root. Thus, both irrealis and negative are marked/mutated patterns.

(186)  
a. REALIS  b. IRREALIS  c. NEGATIVE
n-ög-ö  n-a:ö-an  n-a:ö-u > [n-a:ö-u]
2-go:REAL-IND 2-go:IRR-IND 2-go:IRR-NEG
'You went.' 'You are going.' 'You did not go.'

Here we encounter a few clues about the composition of the more elaborate negative suffixes. The most basic (and probably original) negative marker is a simple -u suffix added to the marked form of a mutating verb – yielding -a:ö-u (as in 187a, c) and phonetically yielding [-a:"u]. (See also Negative indefinite pronouns under §5.1.3.)

Next, in Class II verbs, the slightly elongated form -a:"i follows person markers yielding sequences like -d-a:"i for first person, -n-a:"i for second person, and -g-a:"i for third person. Finally, in non-mutating Class I verbs, the modern realis negative marker includes -d as part of the negative sequence – -da:"i for all persons (as in 185a–f). Mutation is part of the history of negation and occurs in both the simple and in the more elaborated forms of the morpheme.27

Following is a negative–realis paradigm for mutating verbs (illustrating the simplest of the negative suffixes):

27 See footnote 26.
Unlike the non-mutating verbs, here we see a distinction between the singular and plural forms of the negative – distinct plural forms occur in (187b) and (187d). Parsing the forms, however, is far from transparent. From (141) we saw that the plural forms for ‘go’ involve a vowel change in the verb root from $\ddot{a}$ to $i$. We also saw from (150–152) that plurality is regularly marked by -da. In (187b) and (187d) both processes occur – thus -id- is glossed as ‘go:PL’.

Note, too, that the negative in third person uses an -i suffix in place of the -u suffix. The negative -i occurs also in other persons, but it seems to be more prevalent in third person contexts. We do not know if there is an implied semantic distinction between -i and -u. This problem will require more study. One possibility that suggests itself is that -i and -u are somehow related to the existential and locative copulas (see §6.1). There may be evidential distinctions here.

5.5.4.4. Negative irrealis

Negative irrealis-assertion is marked by a suffix -wa, as in (188) and (189) below. This -wa is very likely related to the negative -u discussed immediately above. Negative irrealis-assertions can arise either from low probability or, in the case of first person, from refusal, as in the following examples:

(188) CLASS I:
   a. tsi ts-ip-wa
      I 1-sleep-NEG:IRR
      ‘I won’t sleep.’
   b. tsi t-øm-wa
      I 1-eat-NEG:IRR
      ‘I won’t eat it.’

(189) CLASS II:
   a. tsi a-d-u-wa
      I make-1-IRR-NEG
      ‘I won’t make it.’
b. **nu a-n-u-wa**
   you make-2-IRR-NEG
   ‘You won’t make it.’

It should be mentioned that the irrealis negative morpheme *-wa* is often contracted to *-u*, sometimes giving rise to potential ambiguities, as in:

(190) a. tsī ‡t-ug-u  
    1-come-IRR 
    ‘I will go.’

b. tsī ‡t-ug-wa  
    1-come-NEG:IRR  
    ‘I won’t go.’

There is also a possibility that *-wa* is a bimorphemic sequence (*-u-a*), with *-u* the negative, and *-a* some, as yet, undiscovered morpheme. Recall that historically *-u* has been posited as the negative morpheme in (187) (see the discussion surrounding those examples).

- **Refusal.** Negatives with a strong component of “refusal” sometimes mark the pronoun twice on the verb – the old prefixed form and a newer suffixed form, as in:

(191) tsī ‡t-ām-wa-tsi  
    1-eat-REAL:NEG:IRR-1 
    ‘I won’t eat it.’

5.5.4.5. **Negative perfect**

Another aspectual category is the negative perfect, translated as ‘not yet.’ It is formed by suffixing a pronominal copy at the end of the realis negative verb, as in:

(192) a. tsī ‡t-ām-da:⁶u-tsi  
    1-eat-REAL:NEG-1S 
    ‘I haven’t eaten yet.’

b. tok ‡t-ām-da:⁶u-tok  
    we 1-eat-REAL:NEG-1P 
    ‘We haven’t eaten yet.’

c. nu ‡n-ām-da:⁶u-nu  
    you 2-eat-REAL:NEG-2S 
    ‘You haven’t eaten yet.’

The same construction can also convey a sense of negative habitual:

(193) numba amba ‡t-ām-da:⁶u-tok  
    cow meat 1-eat-REAL:NEG-1P 
    ‘We don’t eat cow meat.’

5.5.5. **Imperatives**

There are a large number of irregular, suppletive forms for marking the imperative, especially in old, high frequency verbs (e.g. see (197)), and each has to be learned separately. Still, most verbs follow regular patterns and we will deal with those first.

5.5.5.1. **Intransitive imperative**

The regular marker for the imperative in intransitive verbs is the suffix *-to*, varying