SUFFIX NEGATIVES OF BANJARA LANGUAGE

Sunder Bukya*

Research scholar (Ph.D.), Centre for Neural and Cognitive Sciences (CNCS), University of Hyderabad, Gachibowli, Hyderabad – 500046. *Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT This paper presents an overview of negation and how negation works in Banjara language. It is noted that negatives in Banjara are suffixes and they cannot occur independently. Negative particle, identified as ni in Banjara, always occurs with a verb/verb complex as an affix. In this study, the negation in Banjara has been tested with all the paradigms such as tense, phi-features (person, number, and gender), interrogatives etc. with both affirmative and negative sentences. Yes-No interrogative test in Banjara also shows that there is no occurrence of any independent negative form as an answer and a verb must occur with the negation. This behavior is different, compared to the languages of the same family. Banjara belongs to Indo-Aryan language family and though negatives in most languages from this family can occur independently without the support of the verbs/auxiliaries, Banjara is an exception as negation cannot occur independently in it. Types of negatives and negative principles are discussed in details. Standard principles of negation have also been applied and thoroughly tested to find out the negation system in Banjara language for the first time.

KEYWORDS : Negation/negatives, Banjara Language, affixation.

INTRODUCTION

According to Grierson (1967), Banjara is a Rajasthani language spoken by nomadic Banjara people across India. The Banjara language is known by various other names, including Lamani, Lambadi, Lambani, Labhani, Lemadi, Lamalade, and Banjara, Banjari, Bangala, Banjori, Banjuri, Vanjuri, Vanji etc. The Banjara tribe primarily belong to the Gypsy tribe of South Africa. Banjara language belongs to the Indo-European, Indo-Iranian, Indo-Aryan, Central zone Rajsthani unclassified. The unmarked word order in Banjara is Subject Object Verb (SOV), verb final language as can be seen from the following example.

1.   u-n kutra pasand
            She-pos the dog likes
            'She likes the dog'

Regional dialects of Banjara are divided between the Banjara of Telangana and Andhra Pradesh which is written in Telugu script, Banjara of Karnataka written in Kannada script, and that of Maharashtra written in Devanagari script. In other words, Banjara speakers are bilinguals of either Telugu, Kannada, or Marathi (besides their mother tongue), according to the states they are settled in.

Types Of Negatives And Principles Of Negation

In simple propositional logic, negation is an operator that reverses the truth value of proposition(unclear). Thus, when 'p' is true, not 'p' is false and vice versa (Miestamo 2003). In this section, we look at the literature pertaining to definition of negation, standard negation and types of negatives which will be elaborated accordingly with the help of suitable examples.

If we look into standard negation, language complexity can provide us with identification about negation. According to Miestamo (2007), the term standard negation originates from Payne (1985). Negation can be characterized as a basic means that languages have for negating declarative verbal main clauses. Thus negation can be identified on the basis of the complexity of a language. The criteria for cross-Linguistics comparison are found in McWhorter (2001) and Kusters (2003). McWhorter and Kusters both proposed criteria for identifying language complexity. Further language complexity can be viewed from two different points of views, (i) absolute and (ii) relative (Miestamo; 2003). The absolute view looks at language complexity in terms of the number of parts in a system or in information. The relative point of view pays attention to the users of the language and defines as complex what makes processing acquisition or learning more difficult. Then two proposals for measuring or identification of language complexity by McWhorter (2001) and Kusters (2003), both have different strategies for measuring a language complexity.

Miestamo (2003-2007) and McWhorter (2001) propose a metric for measuring the overall grammatical complexity of languages, paying attention to the different levels of languages. A grammar is more complex than another to the extent that; (i) its phonemic inventory has more marked members and (ii) its syntax requires the processing of

more rules etc. McWhorter states that his metric for measuring grammatical complexity is ultimately about the length of the descriptions that grammars require, thus intended to be based on as absolute definition of complexity. Further, Miestamo (2007), points out some of the problems with McWhorter's (2001) metric system. He suggested that it is very difficult to study the overall complexity from a general typological perspective. One must concentrate on the complexity of specific grammatical domains.

Another proposal was made by Kusters (2003). In his view, he pointed out the complexity of negation in relative terms taking the difficulties experienced by adult learners of languages. Central to his view are the following principles: (i) Economy (restrictions of the number of overtly signaled categories), (ii) Transparency (clarity of the relation between meaning and form) or (one meaning-one form) and (iii) Isomorphy (identity of the order of elements in different domains). These three principles are explained by Miestamo (2007) as follow: The principle of Economy is relevant when addressing questions such as whether the verbal inflection overtly signals agreement or are like tense, aspect, or mood categories. The principle of Transparency is evoked when dealing with phenomena like allomorphy, when ordering of inflectional affixes expressing given verbal categories.

Using the standard negation definition and two proposals of complexity of language we now turn to explain standard negation and its strategy. Miestamo (2003) defines the standard negation strategy in English with the help of the example given in (2) 'In English, we can identify the constructions that adds 'not' after the first auxiliary verb as the standard negation strategy'' (Miestamo; 2003).

2.   (a) Affirmative sentence
                John went to school
                Pro N verb P   N
                'John went to school'

            (b) Negative sentence
                John did not go to school
                Pro N Aux NEG V P   N
                'John did not go to the school'

The above examples (a) is an affirmative sentence and (b) is a negative sentence in English. The negating strategy here is, simply adding 'not' to an affirmative sentence.

The complexity of standard negation is another topic in negation. Miestamo (2003), explains this complexity with the help of examples from Swedish and Finnish languages. On the basis of sample of 297 Languages, he proposes a classification of standard negation in the world's languages. The basic definition in the classification is 'symmetric' and 'asymmetric' negation.

According to Miestamo (2003-2004), for symmetric negative constructions, there are no structural differences in comparison to the corresponding affirmatives in addition to the presence of (a) negative

marker (s). In other words, symmetric negative constructions, simply add a negative marker to an affirmative sentence. As can be seen from the Swedish example in (3) below.

3.   [2](a) An affirmative sentence
              Fred fyll-er 60 ar
              Fred fill-PRES 60 year PL
              'Fred is turning 60'

        (b) Negative sentence
              Fred   fyll – er   inte   59 ar
              Fred   fill-PRES   NEG   59 year PL
              'Fred is not turning 59'

As we can see symmetric negatives simply adds a negative maker to an affirmative sentence. In the Swedish example 3 (b) above, the negative marker is *inte* 'not'.

Miestamo also discusses symmetric negative constructions and according to him, additional structural differences can be found in the asymmetric negative construction compared to the symmetric negative constructions. He explained these negative contractions with the help of examples from Finnish represented in the following.

4.   (a) An affirmative sentence
              Fred tayt-ta-a 60 vuot-ta
              Fred fill-PRES-3SG   60 year-PART
              'Fred is turning 60'

        (b) Negative sentence
              Fred ei tay -ta 59 vuotta
              Fred   NEG   3SG fill-CNG 59 year-PART
              'Fred is not turning 59'

In the Finnish sentence above, 4(a) is an affirmative sentence and 4(b) negative. As we can see in asymmetric negative constructions we find additional structural differences compared to the symmetric negative constructions. In an affirmative sentence we have *ta* 'PRES' and a '3SG', and an additionally *ta* 'PART' added at the end of the sentence 4 (b) in which a negative sentence, *ei* which is a 'NEG+3SG' is prefixed before the verb *tay* and the verb carries CNG suffix 'a'.

On the basis of symmetric and asymmetric negative constructions, elaborated above we will now discuss negative constructions in terms of Kusters' (2003) proposed 3 principles to these whether symmetric and asymmetric negative constructions follow or violate the principles. Symmetric negative constructions explained with the help of Swedish example 3(b), simply adds a negative marker to an affirmative sentence. According to Kusters' principles, the principle of Economy (principle-1) says that the numbers of overtly signaled categories that can occur are restricted. In 3(b) we can see that since only *inte* 'not' has been added, therefore can be claimed to follow this principle. The Transparency principle (principle-2) deals with the clarity of the relation between meaning and form. In 3(b) since there is a clear-cut distinction of meaning to the form, we can say that this principle is also followed. The principle of Isomorphy (principle-3) deals with the identity of the order of elements in different domains. In 3(b), there is no fusion (joining two or more entities from a single entity) or allomorphy (a unit of meaning can vary in sound without changing the meaning) that would constitute violations of this principle. Thus, we can conclude that symmetric negative constructions do not violate any principles proposed by Kusters.

With regard to asymmetric negative construction, explained with the help of Finnish examples in 4(a) and (b) above, we can see that for the description of negation, one must also take in to account the change in the finiteness of the lexical verb. Applying Kusters' principles, we find that in example 4(b), there is only one morphological overtly signaled category which signals both negation and agreement which can be said to violate the economy principle. The relationship between *ei* which is a NEG+3SG and the verb *tayta* which is verb+CNG- *ei* is prefixed before the verb *tayta*. According to principle-2 (clarity of the relation between meaning and form), we can see that in 4(b), there are no relation between form and meaning, thus violating the principle. Further, in 4(b), there is no clear-cut separation of the order of elements in different domains which is a violation of principle-3. Therefore, we can conclude that asymmetric negative constructions violate all the principles which Kusters proposed. Moreover, we can say that, since

asymmetric negative constructions are more complex than symmetric negative constructions, they violate the principles while symmetric negative constructions follow the principles.

Another important aspect of negation is the types of negatives. Dahl (1979), Payne (1985), Dryer (2005) independently proposed the classification of negative contractions which are largely overlapping with a shared focus on the status of the negative marker only. There are three negative types as identified by Dahl (1979), Payne (1985) and Dryer (2005), although the terminology varies to some extent. The following are the types of negatives.

1.   Morphological or Affixal negatives
2.   Negative particles
3.   Negative verbs

All these types are summarized in the following paragraphs with the help of examples.

If we look into Morphological or Affixal negation, according to Dahl (1979), in morphological negation, negation expressed morphologically most often as an affix (suffix, prefix, or infix), normally on a verb or auxiliary. For the explanation Dahl (1979) have taken an example from Turkish as shown in the following.

5.   [4](a) Affirmative sentence
              oku – your- um
              Read -PROG -1SG
              'I am reading'

        (b) Negative sentence
              oku - mu-your -um
              Read –NEG-PROG -1SG
              'I am not reading'

In the Turkish sentences above, 5(a) is an affirmative sentence and 5(b) a negative construction. As we can see, negation is affiliated with the negator affix mu 'not', this kind of negator affix is called 'Affixal negation', in other words, we can also say that the negator affix mu in Turkish is morphological. Thus, the above example comes under the morphological or affixal negation.

According to Dahl (1979), morphological or affixal negation is further divided into 5 types. They are (i) priffixal negation, (ii) suffixal negation, (iii) circumfixal negation, (iv) prosodic negation, (v) reduplicative negation. These sub-types of morphological or affixal negation are explained with the help of examples.

The second types of negatives are negative particles, according to Dahl (1979), negative particles are characterized by two features, (i) they are independent words rather than affixes and (ii) they are not inflected. These two features of negative particles are explained with the help of examples from Indonesian as can be seen in the following.

6.   [5]Negative sentence
              Saya - tidak - tidur
              I - NEG- asleep
              'I am not asleep'

In sentence 6 above, the negative particle is an independent word rather than affix and is not inflected. Thus, we can say that the negator tidak 'not' is a negative particle in Indonesian.

The third type of negatives is negative verbs, according to Dahl (1979). Negative verbs are of two types: (i) higher negative verbs (in which negation is expressed by a verb with a sentential compliment), and (ii) auxiliary negative verbs (are more common types but less frequent than the negative particles).

Higher negative verbs are explained with the help of the following examples from Tongan taken from Payne (1985).

7.   [6](a) Affirmative sentence
              Na'e'alu'-'a Siale
              ASP   go-ABSOLUTE Charlie
              'Charlie went'

        (b) Negative sentence
              Na'e ikaike 'alu - a'

ASP NEG ASP go -ABSOLUTE
'Charlie did not go'

In the Tongan sentence (7) (b) above, ke is an 'aspect' marker which shows up subordinate clause only. Therefore, we can say that the aspect marker ke expresses a verb with a sentential complement.

For auxiliary negative verbs, Dahl (1979), uses an example from Tongan.

8.   (a) Affirmative sentence
                pekka lukee
                PRO read-PRES-3SG
                'Pekka is reading'

              (b) Negative sentence
                 Pekka ei-lu-e
                 PRO NEG-3SG read
                 'Pekka is not reading'

In examples, 8(b) above, ei is a negative auxiliary which agrees with the subject, but it does not have more than one tense, and lue 'read' is the verb stem. Therefore, we can conclude that ei is an auxiliary negative verb, which agrees with the subject in Tongan.

In the literature review of negation, there are some more sub-topics in negation, which I have not discussed in this paper, they are: negated quantifiers, inherently negated quantifiers, negated adverbials, inherently negated adverbials. For these definitions and examples one can refer to Payne (1985), page no 212-237.

Negation In Banjara Language

In this section, I would like to discuss negation in Banjara language with the help of examples. According to Miestamo (2003), 'negation is a simple propositional logic and it reverses the truth value (when 'p' is true, then 'not p' is false vice versa). Now let us consider this definition of negation in Banjara.

9.   (a) Affirmative sentence
                chori – en kutra pasand
                The girl-NOM the dog likes
                'The girl likes the dog'

              (b) Negative sentence
                 chori – en kutra pasand che-ni
                 The girl-NOM the dog like   NEG
                 'The girl did not like the dog'

The above example (9) (a) in Banjara, is an affirmative sentence. According to negation definition, it contains a 'p' truth value the girl likes the dog; according to propositional logic, an affirmative sentence must be true. Let us mark it as 'p'.9(b) is a negative sentence. According to propositional logic, it contains a false value and a negative sentence must be false. Therefore let us mark it as 'not p'. By these two examples 9(a) is an affirmative sentence, and 9(b) is a negative. Therefore, we can say that the definition of negation works in Banjara language.

Another important topic in Negation is standard negation. The following are the examples of standard negation in Banjara.

10.   (a) Affirmative sentence
                man kutr- e kato dar
                I dog-PL of scared
                'I am scared of dogs'

              (b) Negative sentence
                 Man kutr- e kato dar- ce-ni
                 I dog-PL of scared NEG
                 'I am not scared of dogs'

As we can see in the above examples in Banjara, standard negation is achieved by just adding a negative marker ni 'NEG' to an affirmative sentence.

Table 1. Negation Test In Tenses In Banjara Language.

S No	Word	Gloss	Present –Neg	Past -Neg	Future -Neg
1	dhans	Run	dhas-ro-koni	dhans-o-koni	dhans-u-ni
2	bhaDak	Chase	bhaDak-ro-koni	bhaDk-o-koni	bhaDak-u-ni
3	kho	Eat	kha-ro-koni	khad-o-koni	kha-u-ni
4	So	Sleep	so-ro-koni	sut-o-koni	so-u-ni
5	kuudh	Jump	kud-ro-koni	kud-o-koni	kud-u-ni
6	phar	Travel	phar-ro-koni	phar-o-koni	phar-u-ni
7	chaal	Drive	chala-ro-koni	chalay-o-koni	chala-u-ni
8	teer	Swim	ter-ro-koni	ter-o-koni	ter-u-ni
9	dekh	See	dekh-ro-koni	dekh-o-koni	dekh-u-ni
10	lakh	Write	lakh-ro-koni	lakh-o-koni	lakh-u-ni

Observations: The data in above table 1 in Banjara shows that,
1. ni –Neg occurs accompanied with {ko/che} preceding it.
2. Wherever koni precedes ro it is a negative present tense sentence in Banjara.
3. Whenever koni precedes o it is negative past tense sentence in Banjara.
4. Whenever ni preceding u it is a negative future tense sentence in Banjara.

If we see person, number, gender negation in Banjara below in the table.

Table 2. Person, Number Negation Test In Banjara Language

S No	PNG	Word	Gloss	Present -Neg	Past -Neg	Future –Neg
1	1st P	dhans	Run	dhas-ro-koni	dhans-o-koni	dhans-u-ni
2	2nd P	dhans	Run	dhas-ro-koni	dhas-o-koni	dhas-u-koni
3	3rd P	dhans	Run	dhas-re-koni	dhas-ye-koni	dhas-ye-koni

Observations: The data in above table 2 in Banjara shows
1. For the 1st and 2nd person, tenses are not changing when applied Negation in the sentence.
2. For 3rd person, ro becomes re in present tense, o becomes ye in paste tense, and u becomes ye in future tense.

In Banjara, only negative particle ni is found and it has to occur with verb(not clear, prob. occur with a verb). It cannot occur independently. V –neg is the only expression of negation in Banjara. In Banjara, negation occurs as inflection on the verb. It has not evolved into an independent word. Banjara has only morphological/ affix negatives.

This phenomenon is also tested with interrogatives or yes/no questions in Banjara. In the case of the answer to an interrogative question, the negation cannot stand on its own, and will always occur as an affix to the verb it is negating. This a very unusual case in Banjara language because, lot of Indo-Aryan languages has negation which can stand/occur on its own ex: Hindi, Punjabi, Gujarati, Marwari etc. Therefore once again we can say that Banjara is a very complex and very rich in morphology. If we can see the examples in Banjara.

Table 3. Interrogatives Test In Banjara Language

S No	Interrogative	Gloss	Negative
1	Dhas-o-ka/ga?	Did you run?	Dhans-o-ko-ni
2	Teer-o-ka/ga?	Did you swim?	Teer-o-ko-ni
3	Ram aay-o-ka/ga?	Did Ram came?	Aay-o-ko-ni

Table 3 shows that the negator in Banjara is ni. Where interrogative sentence occurs, the negator cannot stand on its own as the answer but it has to occur with an affix dhans-o-ko-ni, the structure of the word being V + GEN + PAST +NEG.

As discussed in section-2, the complexity of standard negation can be determined by the grammatical complexity of languages. According to Miestamo (2007), there are two types of negative constructions depending on the language complexity- symmetric and asymmetric negative constructions. Similarly, Kusters (2001), proposed 3 principles to determine the same. In the paragraphs that follow, we will test whether these principles hold or are violated in Banjara language. The following examples in (11) show the affirmative and negative constructions in Banjara according to the tense paradigm.

11.   (a) Present Tense:
                (i) Affirmative sentence
                    man   kutr-a   pasand- cha
                    For me   dog-PL   like-PRES
                    'I like dogs'
                (ii) Negative sentence
                    man   kutr-a   pasand - che-ni

For me dog-PL   like-PRES-NEG
'I do not like dogs'

  (b) Past Tense:
  (i) Affirmative sentence
    ma kutr-a-n   pasand ki-do PST-
    I   dog-PL-NOM like-do-PAST
    'I liked dogs'
  (ii) Negative sentence
    ma kutr-a-n   pasand ki-do-koni
    I   dog-PL-NOM like-do-PAST-NEG
    'I did not like dogs'

  (c) Future Tense:
  (i) Affirmative sentence
    ma kutr-a-n   pasand- kar-uchu
    I dog-PL-NOM   like-do-FUTR
    'I will like dogs'
  (ii) Negative sentence
    ma kutr-a-n   pasand-kar-u-ni
    I   dog-PL-NOM   like-do-FUTR-NEG
    'I will not like dogs'

According to Miestamo (2007), a symmetric negative construction is one which is achieved by just adding a negative marker to an affirmative sentence. If we can see the above examples 11(a) (b) (c) in Banjara. (a)(i) is present tense affirmative sentence, (a)(ii) is present tense negative sentence, (b)(i) is past tense an affirmative sentence, (b)(ii) is past tense negative sentence and (c)(i) is future tense affirmative sentence, (c)(ii) is a future tense negative sentence. It can be seen that negative constructions are complex, e.g., in the present tense (a)(ii), negation is marked with ni, in the past tense (b)(ii) with koni and for the future tense (c)(ii) with ni. That is, the negation is marked with the bound morpheme *ni* and therefore seems to change its form according to the tense of the sentence.

According to Miestamo's concepts, asymmetric negative constructions are complex in that they are not simple markers that specifically denote negation. In Banjara too, *ni* cannot stand on its own. It can only occur in a sentence when attached to the tense/aspect marker, thus making a complex of the tense/aspect and negation applying the complexity test we can say that the type of negation that Banjara has in terms of complexity is that of asymmetric negative constructions. The following are more examples to explain the asymmetry of negative constructions. These examples differ from those in (11) in terms of the type of predicate. Also, in (11), the subject is in the nominative, whereas in (12), it is a dative subject.

12.   (a) Present Tense:
  (i) Affirmative sentence
    man   kutr-a   dar-cha
    For me dog-PL scared-PRES
    'I am scared of dogs'
  (ii) Negative sentence
    man   kutr-a   dar- che-ni
    For me dog-PL   scared-PRES-NEG
    'I am not scared of dogs'

  (b) Past Tense:
  (i) Affirmative sentence
    man kutr-a   dar- ra
    For me dog-PL scare-PAST
    'I was scared of dogs'
  (ii) Negative sentence
    man   kutr-a   dar-ra-koni
    For me dog-PL   scare-PAST-NEG
    'I was not scared of dogs'

  (c) Future Tense:
  (i) Affirmative sentence
    me kutr-a-n   dar-u-chu
    I   dog-PL-NOM   scare d-FUTR
    'I will be scared of dogs'
  (ii) Negative sentence
    me kutr-a-n   dar-u-ni
    I   dog-PL-NOM   scared-FUTR-NEG
    'I will not be scared of dogs'

As we can see in above sentences (a) (ii) *ni* is 'present+ not', (b) (ii) *koni* is 'past +not' and in (c) (ii) *u-ni* 'future+ not'. Since asymmetric negative constructions are very complex phenomenon as Miestamo has shown using examples from Finnish, in Banjara too, we can see the complex nature of a negative sentence. Therefore we can say that, in Banjara language we have asymmetric negative constructions. This is further supported by testing the data against Kusters' (2003) three principles (Economy, Transparency & Isomorphy) for explaining the complexity of negative constructions in Banjara.

Let us apply Kusters' three principles to examples (11) and (12)(a)(b) and (c), In 11&12(a)(ii) *che-ni* 'not' is a complex that include information about both negation and the present tense, (b)(ii) *ko-ni* 'not' is a complex for negation and past tense, and in (c)(ii) *u-ni* 'not' is a negation and future tense. Therefore even though it can be claimed that, there are no restrictions for the overtly signaled category (Tense+ Negation in this case), still the principle of Economy is violated because -*ni* being a bound morpheme cannot stand on its own. Kusters' Principle 2 talks about the clarity of the relation between meaning and form. In 11(a) (b) and (c) since there is a complex relation between meaning and form, we can say that the Transparency principle is not violated, because even though we have a complex formation, each bound morpheme can be split and the meaning of each is transparent. Principle 3 deals with the identity of the order of elements in different domains. If we apply this principle to negatives in Banjara, we see that there is both fusion and allomorphy due to the language complexity and therefore not a violation of the principle of Isomorphy.

Another important topic in negation is the types of negatives. There are three major types of negatives. In this section, we will discuss these types with reference to the Banjara language.

The type one of the negative is (i) morphological or affixal negation. Banjara has morphological negation, as can be seen them in the following examples.

13.   (a) Affirmative sentence
    u   keLa   khad – o
    He   banana   eat – PAST
    'He ate banana'

    (b) Negative sentence
    u   keLa   khad – o – ko-ni
    He   banana   eat-PAST-NEG
    'He did not eat banana'

In the above examples in the negative sentence 13(b), -*ni* is an affixal negation because the negative marker is affixed/attached to the verb. This negative marker cannot stand on its own. Therefore a proof that negation in Banjara is affixal.

The second type is negative particles. Banjara does not have negative particles because there are no independent negative particles that can occur and negated particles are not inflected for PNG. In the following, we can see why negative particles not applicable/work in Banjara with the help of examples.

14.   (a) An affirmative sentence
    kutra   mankyan   kat – o
    The dog   the man   bite-PAST
    'The dog bit the man'

    (b) Negative sentence
    kutra   mankyan kato – ko-ni
    The dog the man   bite-PAST-NEG
    'The dog did not bite the man'

According to negative particle definition, they should be independent words as a negative particle and have the possibility to be inflected. But in the above example 14(b), we can see there is no independent word as negative particle rather it is an affix, it attached to the main verb. And the negating category which attached to the main verb is not inflected. Thus, we can conclude that, in Banjara language, there are no negative particles are available.

The third type is the negative verbs. As we know, negative verbs are of two varieties/features- (i) higher negative verbs and (ii) auxiliary negative verbs. Both these varieties/features of negative verbs are not available in Banjara language. Because Banjara language does not

have a higher verb as a negative verb or auxiliary verb as a negative auxiliary verb.

Apart from these two types of negative verbs, there is another type of negative verb called prohibitive. The following is an example of the same in Banjara.

15.   Prohibitive Sentence:
        Beedi -pakder   eta   mana-kare
        Smoke-PROG   here   prohibit-PAST
        'Smoking is prohibited in this area'

The above example (15) in Banjara is a prohibitive sentence. Prohibitive are negative verbs which do not add 'not' in a sentence but still express negation. In the above sentence *'mana'* 'prohibit' is a negative verb. Therefore, we can conclude that Banjara language has prohibitive as well and like other languages of this languages family, this verb does not occur as an affix.

Payne (1985) and Dahl (1979) also discuss negated quantifiers, inherently negated quantifiers, negated adverbials, and inherently negated adverbials. I have chosen not to discuss these in this work.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION
In this preliminary work on negation in Banjara, I have attempted to find out about negation and how negation works in Banjara language. As discussed in this paper, the negative construction in Banjara is *ni*, it precedes with auxiliary verbs. Adopted various points of views of Miestamo (2003, 2007), Payne (1985) and Dahl (1975) to find out about negation in Banjara language. I learned negation, standard negation, and types of negatives in the literature of negation. For Banjara language introduction I referred to Grierson's (1967) Linguistic Survey of India (LSI). At the end Kusters (2001) 3 principles are also used to test the language complexity of Banjara language. Finally, I conclude that I have found interesting findings, 1. There are only asymmetric constructions are there in Banjara. 2. Banjara has only morphological/affixal negatives such as *ni*. 3. Banjara also has negative verbs like preventives and prohibitive such as *mana.*

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE GLOSSES

1	ASP= aspect	11	PRO = pronoun
2	NEG= negation	12	CNG = conjunction
3	NOM= nominative	13	1SG= 1st person singular
4	PROG= progressive	14	POS = possessive
5	PAST= past tense	15	PRE = preposition
6	FUTR= future tense	16	V = verb
7	PL = plural	17	N = noun
8	SG = singular	18	ART = article
9	3SG= 3rd person singular	19	DET = determiner
10	PRES = present tense	20	ABSLT = absolute

REFERENCES
1. There are several other states (Gujrat, Tamilnadu, Kerala, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, and Goa) Banjara people spread across India, I only mentioned major popularity states where Banjara communities settled in.
2. Both the examples are taken from Miestamo (2003) Example no (2) (a), (b)
3. Both the examples taken from Miestamo (2003) Example no (3) (a), (b)
4. Both the examples taken from Dahl (1979) Example no (42) (a), (b)
5. This example taken from Dahl (1979) Example no (39)
6. Both the examples taken from Payne (1985) Example no (21) (a), (b)
7. Both the examples taken from Dahl (1979) Example no (23) (a), (b)

Journal article
1. Dryer, Matthew S. 1988. Universals of negative position. In Michael Hammond, Edith Moravcsik & Jessica Wirth (eds.), Studies in Syntactic Typology (Typological Studies in Language 17), 93–124. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
2. Jespersen, Otto. 1917. Negation in English and other languages. Konelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser I, 5. Copenhagen, Denmark: Høst.
3. McWhorter, J.H. 2001. The world's simplest grammars are creole grammars. Linguistic Typology 5: 125-166.
4. Payne, John. R. 1985. Negation. Language typology and syntactic description, volume I, Clause structure, ed. by Timothy Shopen, 197–242. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Journal article only by DOI
1. Miestamo, M. (2007), Negation – An Overview of Typological Research. Language and Linguistics Compass, 1: 552-570. doi:10.1111/j.1749-818X.2007.00026.x.

Book
1. Dahl, Ö. 2004. The Growth and Maintenance of Linguistic Complexity [Studies in Language Companion Series 71]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
2. Dahl, Ö. (1985). Tense and Aspect Systems, Oxford: Blackwell.

3. Miestamo, Matti. (2005) Standard Negation: The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 31. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
4. Grierson, G. A. (1967). Linguistic survey of India. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
5. Linguistic Survey of India, & Grierson, G. A. (1903). Linguistic survey of India. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of government printing, India.
6. Miestamo, M. 2005. Standard Negation: The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective [Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 31]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
7. McWhorter, J.H. Forthcoming. Language Interrupted: Signs of Non-native Acquisition in Standard Language Grammars. New York: Oxford University Press.

Online document (no DOI available)
1. Miestamo, M. (2006). On the complexity of standard negation. In A man of measure□: Festschrift in Honour of Fred Karlsson on His 60th Birthday (pp. 345–356). Turku: Linguistic Association of Finland. Retrieved from http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn: se:su: diva-81896
2. Accessed 24 January 2018

Dissertation
1. Kusters, Wouter (2003) Linguistic Complexity, the Influence of Social Change on Verbal Inflection. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Leiden. Utrecht: LOT.
2. Miestamo, Matti (2003) Clausal Negation: A Typological Study. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Helsinki.