

# Chapter 7

## Negation in Lule Saami

Jussi Ylikoski<sup>a</sup> & Olle Kejonen<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>University of Turku, Sámi University of Applied Sciences <sup>b</sup>Uppsala University

This chapter surveys negation in Lule Saami, a Uralic language of northern Norway and Sweden. In standard negation, a negative auxiliary verb is inflected for person, number and tense, and the lexical verb is in a non-finite connegative form. In the past tense, several competing constructions are used, encoding tense on the auxiliary or the lexical verb, or sometimes both. The negative auxiliary also has dedicated imperative forms inflected for person and number. The negation of the copula, used in stative predications, is irregular. Remnants of the former abessive case are seen in a number of derivations expressing absence, as well as in a post-position with the meaning ‘without’. The chapter further addresses other issues related to the morphology and syntax of negation, including negative indefinites and a negative converb.

**Keywords:** Negation, Lule Saami, negative auxiliary verb, negative derivation.

### 1 The language

Lule Saami (*julevsámegiella* or *julevsábme*, also *sámegiella* or *sábme*; ISO: smj, Glottocode: lule1254) is one of the westernmost languages of the westernmost branch of the Uralic language family, spoken by approximately 700 (mostly L1) speakers in a relatively large area in the northern regions of Norway and Sweden. Within the Saami languages, Lule Saami is geographically and genealogically located between North Saami in the northeast and Pite Saami in the southwest. As the language has been spoken in the vicinity of Scandinavian languages for centuries, most speakers have been bilingual in Norwegian or Swedish for generations. In the northern and eastern parts of the area, the language has also been in contact with Meänkieli, a Uralic language previously treated as a variety of



Finnish, but since the year 2000 recognized as a national minority language of Sweden.

Despite being the second most spoken Saami language, Lule Saami is relatively little known outside Saami linguistics. One of the reasons is the closeness between Lule Saami and North Saami, the best known representative of the Saami branch. The language is however even more closely related to the critically endangered Pite Saami, to the degree that many of the most prominent experts on Lule Saami have regarded the significantly smaller Pite Saami as a dialect of “Lule Saami in the wide sense” (cf. Rydving 2013: 41–43ff. for a detailed discussion). Today, however, both Lule Saami and Pite Saami have officially recognized orthographies and are acknowledged as Saami languages of Norway and Sweden along with North Saami, Ume Saami and South Saami; in Norway, Skolt Saami was also officially recognized by the Saami Parliament in 2022. Despite the low number of speakers, some children learn Lule Saami in the home, and the language is used in modern media as well as in various other domains of society, including higher education in which master’s theses on Saami issues are written in the language (e.g., Mikkelsen 2011).

The first descriptions of Lule Saami grammar were published in the late 1800s and early 1900s (see, in particular, Wiklund 1891 and 1915, first edition 1901), but the only modern general descriptions of the language are the school grammars by Spiik in Swedish (1989, first edition 1977) and Nystø and Johnsen in Norwegian (2011); for a grammar sketch in English, see Ylikoski (2022). Negation in Lule Saami has not been a subject of special research earlier, but the observations presented here share many features with negation in South Saami (Blokland & Inaba 2015) and Skolt Saami (Miestamo & Koponen 2015). In the big picture, Lule Saami is structurally – as well as taxonomically and geographically – intermediate between these two languages on the Saami dialect continuum (see Sammallahti 1998: 6–38 on the classification of the Saami languages).

Main typological traits of the language include a medium-sized phoneme inventory, nominative-accusative alignment and a relatively free word order featuring both (S)VO and (S)OV. Inflectional morphology is characterized by extensive use of stem-internal morphophonological processes (consonant gradation and vowel alternations) in addition to suffixes. A cross-linguistically rare feature of the language, shared with several other Saami varieties, is a ternary length distinction for consonants: *biese* /piesie/ ‘nests’ vs. *biesse* /piessie/ ‘nest’ vs. *biesse* /pies:sie/ ‘birch bark’; note however that the standard orthography does not distinguish between long /CC/ and overlong /C:C/ consonants.

This survey of negation in Lule Saami concentrates on the contemporary literary standard language, adopted in 1983 and based on the so-called central di-

alects spoken in the municipalities of Jåhkåmåhkke/Jokkmokk (Sweden), Hábmer/Hamarøy and Áhkánjårgga/Narvik (Norway); for a brief overview of Lule Saami dialects, see Sammallahti (1998: 21–22) and Ylikoski (2022: 130–132). Unless otherwise stated, examples come from the multigenre texts of Lule Saami made available by the SIKOR corpus at UiT – The Arctic University of Norway (SIKOR 2021, about 1,810,000 words). The corpus contains texts originally written in Lule Saami, as well as translations from Norwegian, Swedish and North Saami, including a full translation of the New Testament; examples from the latter are further indicated by book, chapter and verse number. Additional examples (20–21, 23–25, 38) have been constructed for the present discussion and confirmed by native speakers, while examples (5, 28–29) stem from a spoken corpus of the Lule Saami Forest dialect (Kejonen forthcoming).

The overview of derivation in §3.3 draws on Kintel (1991), as well as on the dictionaries Spiik (1994), Korhonen (2005) and Kintel (2012), in addition to the sources mentioned above. The graphemes <æ> and <ä>, used for /æ:/ in Norway and Sweden respectively, have been retained in example clauses; in paradigms and the main text, the former is used. Due to the largely fusional nature of Lule Saami inflection, morphemes have not been segmented in tables and examples. For reasons of space, the indicative mood and present tense of verbs are not explicitly glossed in example clauses. Similarly, nominative case and singular number are not explicitly glossed for nominals (with the exception of personal pronouns where number is always indicated). The description of negation in Lule Saami in this chapter is based on the questionnaire provided by the editors (Miestamo 2025 [this volume]) and the structure of the chapter follows the model given in the questionnaire.

## 2 Clausal negation

### 2.1 Standard negation

In Lule Saami, standard negation is expressed by constructions consisting of the negative auxiliary and the lexical verb in a non-finite form known as the connegative. The negative auxiliary has only finite indicative and imperative forms. Disregarding the imperative mood(s) used in prohibitive sentences (§2.2), the negative auxiliary in declarative sentences does not express mood, but the three other categories usually coded in the Lule Saami finite verb occur on the auxiliary: person, number (singular, dual and plural) and tense (past and present). Standard negation is thus asymmetric in the sense of Miestamo (2005), with

negation affecting the finiteness of verbal elements, and the negative marker being an auxiliary verb.

The finite verbs can be divided into inflectional classes based on the number of syllables and the vowel quality of the final syllable. A sample of two verbs in the affirmative indicative is presented in Table 1 in which *oahppat* ‘learn’ represents the most common type, the verbs undergoing consonant gradation (e.g., *-hpp-* : *-hp-*) and often also vowel alternation (e.g., *oa-* : *å-*). The so-called tri-syllabic verbs such as *åhpadit* ‘teach’ (causative derivation from *oahppat* ‘learn’) have little stem-internal alternation, but somewhat different inflectional suffixes. Throughout this chapter, these two representative verbs are used in all tables.

Table 1: Indicative paradigms of the verbs *oahppat* ‘learn’ and *åhpadit* ‘teach’

	<i>oahppat</i> ‘learn’		<i>åhpadit</i> ‘teach’	
	Present	Past	Present	Past
1SG	<i>åhpav</i>	<i>oahppiv</i>	1SG <i>åhpav</i>	<i>åhpadiv</i>
2SG	<i>åhpa</i>	<i>oahppi</i>	2SG <i>åhpada</i>	<i>åhpadi</i>
3SG	<i>oahppá</i>	<i>åhpaj</i>	3SG <i>åhpat</i>	<i>åhpadij</i>
1DU	<i>oahppin</i>	<i>åhpajma</i>	1DU <i>åhpadin</i>	<i>åhpadijma</i>
2DU	<i>oahppabihtte</i>	<i>åhpajda</i>	2DU <i>åhpadihpppe</i>	<i>åhpadijda</i>
3DU	<i>oahppaba</i>	<i>åhpajga</i>	3DU <i>åhpadibá</i>	<i>åhpadijga</i>
1PL	<i>oahppap</i>	<i>åhpajma</i>	1PL <i>åhpadip</i>	<i>åhpadijma</i>
2PL	<i>oahppabihtit</i>	<i>åhpajda</i>	2PL <i>åhpadihpit</i>	<i>åhpadijda</i>
3PL	<i>oahppi</i>	<i>oahppin</i>	3PL <i>åhpadi</i>	<i>åhpadin</i>

The negative counterparts of the affirmative verb forms in Table 1 are formed by using the negative auxiliary followed by the connegative forms *åhpa* [learn.CNG] and *åhpada* [teach.CNG], e.g. *iv åhpa* ‘I’m not learning’ and *ejga åhpada* ‘They (two) didn’t teach’ (Table 2).<sup>1</sup> Further examples are given in (1–4) below.

For *oahppat* ‘learn’ and *åhpadit* ‘teach’, the connegatives *åhpa* and *åhpada* are identical to the 2SG present forms (Table 1), but for still another class of verbs such as *mujttet* ‘remember’ the two forms are not identical: the connegative is

<sup>1</sup>As seen in this and the following section, connegative forms like *åhpa* could, strictly speaking, be characterized and glossed as indicative-cum-imperative connegatives or alternatively as non-potential connegatives, cf. *åhpatja* [learn.POT.CNG].

Table 2: Indicative paradigm of the negative auxiliary, combined with connegative forms of *oahppat* ‘learn’ and *åhpadit* ‘teach’

	Present	Past	+	learn.CNG / teach.CNG
1SG	<i>iv</i>	<i>ittjiv</i>		<i>åhpa / åhpada</i>
2SG	<i>i</i>	<i>ittji</i>		<i>åhpa / åhpada</i>
3SG	<i>ij</i>	<i>ittjij</i>		<i>åhpa / åhpada</i>
1DU	<i>en</i>	<i>ejma</i>		<i>åhpa / åhpada</i>
2DU	<i>æhppe</i>	<i>ejda</i>		<i>åhpa / åhpada</i>
3DU	<i>æbá</i>	<i>ejga</i>		<i>åhpa / åhpada</i>
1PL	<i>ep</i>	<i>ejma</i>		<i>åhpa / åhpada</i>
2PL	<i>ehpit</i>	<i>ejda</i>		<i>åhpa / åhpada</i>
3PL	<i>e</i>	<i>ettjin</i>		<i>åhpa / åhpada</i>

*mujte* whereas the 2SG present is *mujtá*. However, for all verbs except the copula the connegative is identical to the IMP.2SG forms (see §2.2).

Although the language has a relatively free word order (Mikkelsen 2011), the negative auxiliary always precedes the verb in the connegative. The two verb forms often occur side by side (1–2), but for purposes of information structuring they can be disconnected by virtually all kinds of words and phrases (3–4). Coordinated verbs usually share the negative auxiliary (4).

- (1) *Mån iv mujte suv.*  
1SG NEG.1SG remember.CNG 3SG.ACC  
‘I don’t remember him/her.’ (SIKOR 2021)
- (2) *Madin oajvvefágajn barggiv, de ittjiv åhpada*  
while master’s.degree.COM work.PST.1SG then NEG.PST.1SG teach.CNG  
*soames jagev.*  
some year.ACC  
‘When I was doing my master’s degree, I didn’t teach for a year or so.’  
(SIKOR 2021)
- (3) *Æjgáda e gielajt åhpada sæmmi láhkáj degu*  
parent.PL NEG.3PL language.PL.ACC teach.CNG same in.manner as  
*åhpadiddje skávlån dahki.*  
teacher.PL school.INE do.3PL  
‘Parents don’t teach languages the way the teachers at school do.’ (SIKOR 2021)

- (4) *Ij aktak tjále jalik sáhkada ávtáláhkáj iellemájgenis.*  
NEG.3SG one.NPM write.CNG NOR speak.CNG similarly lifetime.INE.3SG  
'No one writes or speaks the same way all their life.' (SIKOR 2021)

Reality is, however, more complex than the picture suggested by the data in (1–4) and Tables 1–2, which follow the existing modern descriptions of the language (Spiik 1989, Nystø & Johnsen 2011). The formation of past negatives has been described exclusively as combinations of the negative auxiliary in the past tense and the tense-neutral connegative form (Table 2). While Lule Saami shares this feature with all Saami languages to its south, its sister languages in the north lack all traces of a tense-inflected auxiliary. For example, North Saami as the immediate neighbor of Lule Saami resorts to the use of the past participle as a kind of past-tense connegative instead.<sup>2</sup>

However, past tense forms of the negative auxiliary appear to have fallen out of use also in the northern variety of Lule Saami spoken in the Unna Tjerusj reindeer herding district (Helena Omma, p.c.) and in the Forest dialect of the Jiellvárre district (Kejonen forthcoming), both in Sweden (for a map of the Lule Saami area, see Ylikoski 2022: 131). Instead, these dialects favor the same strategy as in North Saami, i.e. marking tense on the lexical verb rather than on the negative auxiliary. An example from the Forest dialect is given in (5).

- (5) *Mån iv máhttám mavge dárogielav.*  
1SG NEG.1SG know.PST.PTCP any.ACC.NPM Swedish.ACC  
'I didn't know any Swedish (when starting school).' (Kejonen forthcoming, transcription adapted)

In this clause, the present-tense form *iv* occurs with the past participle (or past connegative) *máhttám* for a past tense reading. In the standard language, past tense would rather be encoded on the negative auxiliary, which would then occur with the lexical verb in the connegative, as in (6).

---

<sup>2</sup>Within Saami linguistics and Uralic linguistics in general, the existence or lack of past-tense forms of the negative auxiliary is considered one of the most significant morphosyntactic differences that divide the Saami branch in two. The tense distinction can be regarded as inheritance from Proto-Saami and even Proto-Uralic or at least a common ancestor of Saami and Finnic, and the loss of it in the varieties northeast of Lule Saami can be considered an innovation, possibly influenced by similar development in the neighboring Finnic languages (Sammallahti 1998: 76–77, 80, 224–225).

- (6) *Vájku ittjiv máhte muohtá ja mága lunna árrot,*  
 although NEG.PST.1SG can.CNG aunt.GEN and uncle.GEN at live.INF  
*de sunnuv álu guossidav.*  
 then 3DU.ACC often visit.1SG  
 ‘Although I couldn’t live with my aunt and her husband, I often visit them.’ (SIKOR 2021)

Constructions of the kind seen in (5) are however by no means limited to the Unna tjerusj and Forest dialects, but occur also in the more central dialects of the language, where they coexist with tense-inflected forms of the negative auxiliary. Consider Example (7) from the first major novel published in Lule Saami by Lars Matto Tuolja (1987), a speaker of the central dialect of Lule Saami spoken in Jáhkkámáhkke/Jokkmokk. This example contains two verb phrases with past tense interpretation, using both of the strategies described above.

- (7) *Ieddnervkke giehtoj Árjakluoven lij boadnjásj mij*  
 deceased.mother tell.PST.3SG Árjepluovve.INE be.PST.3SG old.man REL  
*ittjij sidá hiejtet noajdástallamis ja ij*  
 NEG.PST.3SG want.CNG quit.INF practice.sorcery.INF and NEG.3SG  
*miededam sãn lij mejdek boasstot dahkam [...]*  
 admit.PST.PTCP 3SG be.PST.3SG any.ACC.NPM wrong do.PST.PTCP  
 ‘My late mother told that in Árjepluovve/Arjeplog there was an old man who didn’t want to quit sorcery and didn’t admit to having done anything wrong.’ (SIKOR 2021)

What is more, expressions of past negatives are not confined to the two alternatives seen above, but there are also constructions in which the “southern” strategy (NEG.PST + CNG) and the “northern” strategy (NEG + PST.PTCP) are mixed into a hybrid where the past tense is coded both in the auxiliary and the lexical main verb (NEG.PST + PST.PTCP), see (8).

- (8) *Gå ejga diehtám mij jali ma bãhtin, de*  
 as NEG.PST.3DU know.PST.PTCP REL OR REL.PL come.PST.3PL then  
*balos tjehkádijga suojnij sisi.*  
 fear.ELA hide.PST.3DU hay.PL.GEN into  
 ‘As they didn’t know what was or were coming, they hid themselves in the hay in fear.’ (SIKOR 2021)

While hybrid constructions such as the one in (8) are not very common in the corpus, they are evidently used by some speakers, and are even sporadically

attested in data on the language from more than a century ago (Kejonen forthcoming; cf. Wiklund 1891: 273).

Lule Saami also makes use of analytic perfect and pluperfect tenses consisting of an auxiliary copula (inflected for present and past, respectively) and the lexical main verb in the past participle. When negated, it is the copula that appears in the connegative form while the lexical verb remains in the past participle. For example, the negative counterpart of *lav oahppam* [be.1SG learn.PST.PTCP] ‘I have learned’ is *iv la oahppam* [NEG.1SG be.CNG learn.PST.PTCP] ‘I have not learned’. However, formation of the pluperfect as well as 2SG and 3PL perfect forms is different from that of the general picture presented above. As the reason for this lies in the exceptional inflection of the copula verb, these forms will be described in §2.3 on stative predications.

After the above forms it is worthwhile to pay attention to another morphological category. As argued by Ylikoski (2016b), the so-called potential mood in Lule Saami differs from its cognates and namesakes in other Saami languages in having many semantic features in common with a future tense, rather than with an epistemic mood, as it is traditionally described. The potential forms in *-(t)tj- : -sj* seldom depict merely “potential” events, but a more decisive feature of these forms is that they refer to future states of affairs, even in contexts where there is no question about the certainty of these events (9).

- (9) *De J̄ubmel javlaj:      “Guodo,      guodo,      i      d̄an*  
 then God    say.PST.3SG graze.IMP.2SG graze.IMP.2SG NEG.2SG 2SG  
*huoma      gallánittja.”*  
 nevertheless get.full.POT.CNG  
 ‘Then God said: “Graze, graze, but you nevertheless won’t get full.”’  
 (SIKOR 2021, cf. Grundström 1926: 141)

As seen in the negated potential clause (9), the negative auxiliary is in the present tense indicative, and the potential is encoded only on the lexical verb, which is in a dedicated potential connegative form. Table 3 provides affirmative and negative potential forms of the verbs *oahppat* ‘learn’ and *åhpadit* ‘teach’.

Additional examples of negated potential forms are given in (10–11), using the verbs *boahtet* ‘come’ and *dahkat* ‘do’.

- (10) *Ij      ḡajt      boargál      uddni b̄aditja.*  
 NEG.3SG anyway shopkeeper today come.POT.CNG  
 ‘Surely the shopkeeper won’t come today, anyway.’ (SIKOR 2021)

Table 3: Affirmative and negative potential forms of *oahppat* ‘learn’ and *åhpadit* ‘teach’

Affirmative		Negative	
	‘learn’	‘teach’	
			NEG learn.POT.CNG / teach.POT.CNG
1SG	<i>åhpatjav</i>	<i>åhpadittjav</i>	<i>iv</i> <i>åhpatja</i> / <i>åhpadittja</i>
2SG	<i>åhpatja</i>	<i>åhpadittja</i>	<i>i</i> <i>åhpatja</i> / <i>åhpadittja</i>
3SG	<i>åhpasj</i>	<i>åhpadisj</i>	<i>ij</i> <i>åhpatja</i> / <i>åhpadittja</i>
1DU	<i>åhpatjin</i>	<i>åhpadittjin</i>	<i>en</i> <i>åhpatja</i> / <i>åhpadittja</i>
2DU	<i>åhpatjihppe</i>	<i>åhpadittjabihhte</i>	<i>æhppe</i> <i>åhpatja</i> / <i>åhpadittja</i>
3DU	<i>åhpatjibá</i>	<i>åhpadittjaba</i>	<i>æbá</i> <i>åhpatja</i> / <i>åhpadittja</i>
1PL	<i>åhpatjip</i>	<i>åhpadittjap</i>	<i>ep</i> <i>åhpatja</i> / <i>åhpadittja</i>
2PL	<i>åhpatjihpit</i>	<i>åhpadittjabihhtit</i>	<i>ehpit</i> <i>åhpatja</i> / <i>åhpadittja</i>
3PL	<i>åhpatji</i>	<i>åhpadittji</i>	<i>e</i> <i>åhpatja</i> / <i>åhpadittja</i>

- (11) *Ij dal biernna midjij majdik dagátja, javlaj*  
 NEG.3SG now bear 1PL.ILL any.ACC.NPM do.POT.CNG say.PST.3SG  
*Máddjá.*  
*Máddjá*

‘Surely the bear won’t do anything to us, Máddjá said.’ (SIKOR 2021)

Regardless of whether the potential is labeled as a mood without tense distinctions or a tense in itself, this category is functionally in complementary distribution with the present and past indicative, as well as with the imperative.

## 2.2 Negation in non-declaratives

One of the most interesting – yet most poorly described – areas of Lule Saami grammar is the use of imperative forms. Traditional descriptions of the language posit two distinct imperative moods, labeled as the first and second imperative. The former of these inflectional categories is typically described as conveying commands or requests, whereas the second imperative (characterized by the stem-final vowel *-u-*) is referred to as more polite or modest than the imperative proper (Wiklund 1891: 279; 1915: 114; Grundström 1946–1954: 1851; Spiik 1989: 103). The actual use and functions of these categories, however, has not been subject to detailed study, and today it may well be that the second imperative is not a productive mood for some speakers of the language (Ylikoski 2022: 139). For

the purposes of this paper, the second imperative is glossed with the admittedly simplified label *polite imperative* (IMP.POL).

The negative imperatives consist of specialized prohibitive forms of the negative auxiliary (corresponding to a suppletive stem \**alle-*) followed by the common connegative form or, in the second imperative, a dedicated connegative in *-u*. As seen in Tables 4–5, both connegatives are identical to their corresponding 2SG form, e.g. *âhpada* [teach.IMP.2SG = teach.IMP.CNG]. In the typology of van der Auwera & Lejeune (2013), Lule Saami second person singular prohibitives belong to Type 2, which uses a form of the negated verb which is identical to the affirmative imperative and a sentential negative strategy that is not found in declaratives.

Table 4: Affirmative and negative imperative I forms of *oahppat* ‘learn’ and *âhpadit* ‘teach’

	Affirmative		Negative	
	‘learn’	‘teach’	NEG.IMP	learn.CNG / teach.CNG
1SG	–	–	–	–
2SG	<i>âhpa</i>	<i>âhpada</i>	<i>ale</i>	<i>âhpa</i> / <i>âhpada</i>
3SG	<i>oahppis</i>	<i>âhpadis</i>	<i>allis</i>	<i>âhpa</i> / <i>âhpada</i>
1DU	<i>oahppon</i>	<i>âhpadinno</i>	<i>allon</i>	<i>âhpa</i> / <i>âhpada</i>
2DU	<i>oahppe</i>	<i>âhpadihtte</i>	<i>alle</i>	<i>âhpa</i> / <i>âhpada</i>
3DU	<i>oahppiska</i>	<i>âhpadiska</i>	<i>alliska</i>	<i>âhpa</i> / <i>âhpada</i>
1PL	<i>oahppop</i>	<i>âhpadip</i>	<i>allop</i>	<i>âhpa</i> / <i>âhpada</i>
2PL	<i>oahppit</i>	<i>âhpadit</i>	<i>allit</i>	<i>âhpa</i> / <i>âhpada</i>
3PL	<i>oahppisa</i>	<i>âhpadisá</i>	<i>allisa</i>	<i>âhpa</i> / <i>âhpada</i>

The imperative is mostly used for second person, as in the command *ale duoh-tada* ‘don’t touch’ (12). The second imperative forms in *allu-* may be used for warnings, requests or wishes, as in (13).

- (12) **Ale**            *duoh-tada* *tjalmijt*,    *njunjev* *jali* *njálmev*.  
 NEG.IMP.2SG touch.CNG eye.PL.ACC nose.ACC or mouth.ACC  
 ‘Don’t touch your eyes, nose or mouth.’ (SIKOR 2021)

- (13) **Allu**            *niejddam* *oadde*            *mánáv*    **duoh-tadu!**  
 NEG.IMP.POL.2SG girl.1SG sleep.PRS.PTCP child.ACC touch.IMP.POL.CNG  
 ‘Please don’t touch the sleeping child, my girl!’ (SIKOR 2021, originally from Qvigstad 1929: 530)

Table 5: Affirmative and negative imperative II forms of *oahppat* ‘learn’ and *âhpadiit* ‘teach’

	Affirmative		Negative	
	‘learn’	‘teach’	NEG.IMP.POL	learn.IMP.POL.CNG/ teach.IMP.POL.CNG
1SG	–	–	–	–
2SG	<i>oahppu</i>	<i>âhpadu</i>	<i>allu</i>	<i>oahppu / âhpadu</i>
3SG	<i>oahppus</i>	<i>âhpadus</i>	<i>allus</i>	<i>oahppu / âhpadu</i>
1DU	<i>oahppun</i>	<i>âhpadunno</i>	<i>allun</i>	<i>oahppu / âhpadu</i>
2DU	<i>oahppuda</i>	<i>âhpaduhtu</i>	<i>alluda</i>	<i>oahppu / âhpadu</i>
3DU	<i>oahppuska</i>	<i>âhpaduska</i>	<i>alluska</i>	<i>oahppu / âhpadu</i>
1PL	<i>oahppup</i>	<i>âhpadup</i>	<i>allup</i>	<i>oahppu / âhpadu</i>
2PL	<i>oahpput</i>	<i>âhpaduhtut</i>	<i>allut</i>	<i>oahppu / âhpadu</i>
3PL	<i>oahppusa</i>	<i>âhpadusá</i>	<i>allusa</i>	<i>oahppu / âhpadu</i>

In addition to imperatives in the second person, Lule Saami also has first- and third-person imperative forms (except for the first person singular).<sup>3</sup> First person imperatives typically have a hortative function, whereas third person imperatives may have a concessive reading (cf. Wiklund 1915: 114). In the present corpus, however, first- and third-person prohibitives are only attested in the markedly elevated style of Bible translations (14–15).

- (14) *Allup vájbbu buorev dahkamis.*  
 NEG.IMP.POL.1PL get.tired.IMP.POL.CNG good.ACC do.INF  
 ‘Let us not grow weary in doing good.’ (SIKOR 2021, Gal. 6:9)

- (15) *Guhti ittijj birratjuohpaduvá, allus*  
 who NEG.PST.3SG be.circumcised.CNG NEG.IMP.POL.3SG  
*birratjuohpaduvvu.*  
 be.circumcised.IMP.POL.CNG  
 ‘Whoever was not circumcised, let him not be circumcised.’ (SIKOR 2021, 1 Cor. 7:18)

<sup>3</sup>Older descriptions of the language feature a few tokens of first person singular forms in the second imperative, including a prohibitive *alluv* [NEG.IMP.POL.1SG] (Wiklund 1915: 79); such forms are lacking in modern data.

Unlike lexical verbs such as *oahppat* ‘learn’ and *åhpadit* ‘teach’, the copula has distinct connegative forms both in the first imperative (*liege* ~ *áro*) and in the second imperative (*lehku* ~ *árru*), cf. the negation of the copula in the indicative and potential (§2.3). The forms *liege* and *lehku* are more common in Norway, whereas the suppletive forms *áro* and *árru* (from *árrot* ‘live, reside’) are preferred in Sweden (cf. Spiik 1989: 69). Examples of the use of the connegative forms *liege* and *lehku* are given in (16) and (17).

- (16) *Ale liege hájen.*  
 NEG.IMP.2SG be.IMP.CNG sad  
 ‘Don’t be sad.’ (SIKOR 2021)

- (17) *Lábtjtje l mieskas; allu gievrra lehku!*  
 rein be.3SG rotten NEG.IMP.POL.2SG strong be.IMP.POL.CNG  
 ‘The rein is rotten; please don’t be strong!’ (SIKOR 2021, originally from Qvigstad 1929: 544)

Polar questions are usually marked by the question particle (or clitic) *gus* (~ *gu* ~ *=k*) following the initial word of a polar interrogative clause (18). However, at times the mere inverted word order is enough to make the verb-initial clause appear as a question (19). On a more general level, both features are identical to the way how affirmative polar questions are formed in Lule Saami (cf. Spiik 1989: 95; Ylikoski 2022: 145), and therefore negative polar question do not substantially differ from affirmative ones (cf. Miestamo & Koponen 2015: 373 for the analogous clause types in Skolt Saami).

- (18) *I gus dasti mujte?*  
 NEG.2SG Q anymore remember.CNG  
 ‘Don’t you remember anymore?’ (SIKOR 2021)

- (19) *Ähppe la dáj vuoddjám?*  
 NEG.2DU be.CNG 2DU drive.off.PST.PTCP  
 ‘Haven’t you driven off yet?’ (SIKOR 2021)

### 2.3 Negation in stative predications

In Lule Saami, stative predications show a syntactic structure similar to the verbal clauses described in the preceding sections. The all-purpose verb for stative clauses is *liehket* ‘be’ (also with a suppletive infinitive *árrot*), the most frequent

but also the most irregular verb of the language. The most remarkable exceptions to regular conjugation are seen in the negative forms this verb. There is no common connegative for present and past, but instead, the present-tense forms of the negative auxiliary are followed by *la*, which must be labeled as a specifically present-tense connegative of the copula, whereas the past-tense forms of the negative auxiliary are combined with *lim*, a specific past-tense connegative. As a result, the present vs. past distinction is marked on both parts of the predicate, but only in the dual (all persons) and plural (first and second person); for 1SG and 3SG, the present-tense forms *iv* and *ij* are used instead of *ittjiv* and *ittjij* (see Table 2 above).

What is more, in the second person singular and third person plural, the present forms of the negative auxiliary have fused with the connegative into amalgamated forms, such as *illa* ‘(you) aren’t’, from *i la* ‘(you) are not’ (bolded in Table 6).<sup>4</sup> Potentially, such forms could be treated as general stative negators (cf. Miestamo & Koponen 2015: 362–363 on similar forms in Skolt Saami), but seeing that they are transparently composed of the negative auxiliary and the connegative, and that they occur in the same paradigm as non-fused forms, they are treated here as functionally identical to their non-amalgamated counterparts.

Examples of positive and negative predications of class inclusion and identity are given in (20–21).

- (20) a. *Tjáhppa l bena.*  
 Tjáhppa be.3SG dog  
 ‘Tjáhppa is a dog.’
- b. *Tjáhppa ij la bena.*  
 Tjáhppa NEG.3SG be.CNG dog  
 ‘Tjáhppa isn’t a dog.’ (constructed examples)
- (21) a. *Bena l Tjáhppa.*  
 dog be.3SG Tjáhppa  
 ‘The dog is Tjáhppa.’
- b. *Bena ij la Tjáhppa.*  
 dog NEG.3SG be.CNG Tjáhppa  
 ‘The dog isn’t Tjáhppa.’ (constructed examples)

<sup>4</sup>The 3SG form *l* ‘is’ in Table 6 is a postvocalic counterpart of *la*. The copula also has parallel forms in *le- : læ-*, such as *lev* ‘I am’ (Spiik 1989: 70). Note further that the prescribed 3PL potential negative *ællittja* is also written *ællitja* in the corpus (cf. Ylikoski 2016b: 218).

Table 6: Inflectional paradigm of the copula in the present, past and potential

	Present indicative		Past indicative		Potential	
	Affirmative	Negative	Affirmative	Negative	Affirmative	Negative
1SG	<i>lav</i>	<i>iv la</i>	<i>lidjiv</i>	<i>iv lim</i>	<i>littjav</i>	<i>iv littja</i>
2SG	<i>la</i>	<b><i>illa</i></b>	<i>lidji</i>	<b><i>illim</i></b>	<i>littja</i>	<b><i>illittja</i></b>
3SG	<i>la, l</i>	<i>ij la</i>	<i>lij</i>	<i>ij lim</i>	<i>lisj</i>	<i>ij littja</i>
1DU	<i>lin</i>	<i>en la</i>	<i>lijma</i>	<i>ejma lim</i>	<i>littjin</i>	<i>en littja</i>
2DU	<i>lihppe</i>	<i>æhppe la</i>	<i>lijda</i>	<i>ejda lim</i>	<i>littjahihte</i>	<i>æhppe littja</i>
3DU	<i>libá</i>	<i>æbá la</i>	<i>lijga</i>	<i>ejga lim</i>	<i>littjaba</i>	<i>æbá littja</i>
1PL	<i>lip</i>	<i>ep la</i>	<i>lijma</i>	<i>ejma lim</i>	<i>littjap</i>	<i>ep littja</i>
2PL	<i>lihpit</i>	<i>ehpit la</i>	<i>lijda</i>	<i>ejda lim</i>	<i>littjahihtit</i>	<i>ehpit littja</i>
3PL	<i>li</i>	<b><i>ælla</i></b>	<i>lidjin</i>	<b><i>ællim</i></b>	<i>littji</i>	<b><i>ællittja</i></b>

As regards the past-tense connegative *lim*, it is worth noting that although Examples (5), (7) and (8) in §2.1 demonstrated the use of the past participle in non-standard past-tense predicates, *lim* is a specialized past-tense connegative that is different from the past participle *læhkám* (~ *árrum*) – the only of its kind in the language. In (22), the negated pluperfect contains both forms at the same time.

- (22) *Jávnni ij lim goassak nav ávon læhkám.*  
*Jávnni NEG.3SG BE.PST.CNG WHEN.NPM SO joy.INE BE.PST.PTCF*  
 ‘Jávnni had never been so happy.’ (SIKOR 2021)

The verb *liehket* ‘be’ is used in all major types of stative clauses, such as those of locational (23), existential (24) and possessive predication (25). These types of clauses are identical in terms of argument marking, although they may differ from each other as regards word order. As seen in these examples, locations and possessors are in the inessive case, while themes and possesseses that function as subject arguments are in the nominative.

- (23) a. *Bena l sjaljon.*  
 dog be.3SG yard.INE  
 ‘The dog is in the yard.’  
 b. *Bena ij la sjaljon.*  
 dog NEG.3SG BE.CNG yard.INE  
 ‘The dog isn’t in the yard.’ (constructed examples)

- (24) a. *Sjaljon la bena.*  
 yard.INE be.3SG dog  
 ‘There’s a dog in the yard.’  
 b. *Sjaljon ij la bena.*  
 yard.INE NEG.3SG be.CNG dog  
 ‘There isn’t a dog in the yard.’ (constructed examples)
- (25) a. *Sikkán la bena.*  
 Siggá.INE be.3SG dog  
 ‘Siggá has a dog.’  
 b. *Sikkán ij la bena.*  
 Siggá.INE NEG.3SG be.CNG dog  
 ‘Siggá doesn’t have a dog.’ (constructed examples)

As was mentioned in §2.1, the exceptional inflection of the copula verb also affects the formation of negated perfect and pluperfect forms of other predicates: instead of the expected negative auxiliary such as *i* [NEG.2SG] and the following copula in the connegative such as *la* [be.CNG] (cf. *i áhpa* ‘you don’t learn’ in Table 2), the lexical main verb is preceded by the amalgamated form *illa* (26).

- (26) “*Jus dân illa mannam, iv la mån mannam danna,*”  
 if 2SG be.NEG.2SG go.PST.PTCP NEG.1SG be.CNG 1SG go.PST.PTCP there  
*javllá riebij.*  
 say.3SG fox  
 ‘“If you haven’t been there, I haven’t been there,” the fox says.’ (SIKOR 2021, originally from Qvigstad 1929: 472)

The fusion between the negative auxiliary and the copula is also reflected in the fact that the copula seems to be the only verb that may appear between the negative auxiliary and the question particle *gus* (27); for other verbs, the question particle occurs in second position, immediately after the negative auxiliary (cf. (18) in §2.2).

- (27) *Ij la gus geldulasj?*  
 NEG.3SG be.CNG Q exciting  
 ‘Isn’t it exciting?’ (SIKOR 2021)

Finally, it can be mentioned that in the critically endangered Lule Saami Forest dialect, amalgamated forms of the negative auxiliary and the copula can in the

plural take regular person suffixes, effectively resulting in what resembles a negative copula. Examples of this phenomenon are given in (28), where the suffix *-bit* encodes 2PL present, and in (29), where *-n* encodes 3PL past.

- (28) *Dij allebit skihpasa.*  
 2PL be.NEG.2PL sick.PL  
 ‘You aren’t sick.’ (Kejonen forthcoming, transcription adapted)
- (29) *Da ellin boatjojhoajdon.*  
 that.PL be.NEG.PST.3PL reindeer.herding.INF  
 ‘They weren’t in reindeer herding.’ (Kejonen forthcoming, transcription adapted)

Forms as the ones given in (28) and (29) are however not attested in other varieties of Lule Saami, and from the point of view of the standard language, they remain an interesting but local exception in the negation of the copula.

## 2.4 Negation in non-main clauses

When combining clauses, Lule Saami makes use of both finite and non-finite subordinate clauses. Finite subordinate clauses are more frequent and more variegated than non-finite ones, and the functions of finite dependent clauses are expressed by a number of subordinating conjunctions and complementizers as well as relative pronouns introducing relative clauses. The internal structure of such finite clauses does not differ from that of main clauses, and negation works the same way in finite subordinate clauses as it does in finite main clauses. Examples are given in (30–31), where subordinate clauses are introduced by the relative pronoun *gut* ‘who’ and the conjunction *vaj* ‘so that’, respectively.

- (30) *Mån lav dässju sahte ulmusj gut iv majdik máhte*  
 1SG be.1SG only ordinary person who NEG.1SG any.ACC.NPM can.CNG  
*divvot.*  
 fix.INF  
 ‘I am but a simple man who cannot improve anything.’ (SIKOR 2021)
- (31) *Na manen de æddnáj tsabmi, vaj māj Jåvvåjn*  
 well why then mother.ILL whisper.PST.2SG so.that 1DU Jåvvå.COM  
*ejma galga gullat.*  
 NEG.PST.1DU will.CNG hear.INF  
 ‘Well why then did you whisper to mom, so that Jåvvå and I would not hear?’ (SIKOR 2021)

However, the language also has about ten non-finite verb forms that can be characterized as infinitives, participles and converbs. One of them is the non-finite in *-k* (~ *-dak*), traditionally called the “verb abessive” in Saami linguistics, but better labeled as a negative converb. This form is most often used as an adverbial non-finite with the vague meaning that can be characterized as negative concomitance, often preceded by the preposition-like particle *váni* ‘without’ (32); this particle is however not obligatory (33). As many distinctions between affirmative categories are often neutralized in negation, the Lule Saami negative converb is an example of this cross-linguistically common phenomenon; the converb in question can be used to negate the meanings expressed with the instrumental-concomitant and temporal converbs in the language (cf. Ylikoski 2009: 38ff. for North Saami).

- (32) *Danna sán lij juo váni oadek tjáhkkaám*  
 there 3SG be.PST.3SG already without sleep.NEG.CVB sit.PST.PTCP  
*gálmma jánnadura, bárák ja jugák.*  
 three.ACC day.and.night.GEN eat.NEG.CVB and drink.NEG.CVB  
 ‘There he had sat, without sleeping, three days and nights already,  
 without eating and drinking.’ (SIKOR 2021)

- (33) *Vehtsit nubbe nuppev njimmurik.*  
 be.hospitable.IMP.2PL RECP RECP.ACC complain.NEG.CVB  
 ‘Show hospitality to one another without complaining.’ (SIKOR 2021, 1  
 Peter 4:9)

As seen in (34), the negative converb may take an object, such as the accusative *mavga* ‘anything’. Notably, the agent of the converb may also be encoded by means of the genitive case, such as *Áhtjáda* ‘your Father’s’ in (35); see also Spiik (1989: 110).

- (34) *Gálmma tijma manjela bádiš áhkkaš sisi váni mavga*  
 three.ACC hour.GEN later come.PST wife.3SG in without any.ACC.NPM  
*diedek.*  
 know.NEG.CVB  
 ‘Three hours later his wife came in without knowing anything.’ (SIKOR  
 2021, Acts 5:7)

- (35) *Valla dajs aktak ij ednamij gahtja váni*  
 but that.PL.ELA one.NPM NEG.3SG earth.ILL fall.CNG without  
*Áhtjáda diedek.*  
 father.GEN.2PL know.NEG.CVB  
 ‘But none of them will fall to the ground without your Father’s knowing it.’ (SIKOR 2021, Matt. 10:29)

The same form is also used as a general negative participle comprising both present and past as well as active and passive functions. In phrases like *vállduk álmáj* ‘unmarried man’ (36) and *basák giedaj* ‘with unwashed hands’ (37), the non-finites can be analyzed as non-finite relative clauses (participials), and they can always be replaced by finite relative clauses.

- (36) *Sân lij vállduk álmáj, ja skávlân ároj.*  
 3SG be.PST.3SG marry.NEG.CVB man and school.INE live.PST.3SG  
 ‘He was an unmarried man, and he lived at the school.’ (SIKOR 2021)
- (37) *Bárrámus basák giedaj ij almatjav báde.*  
 meal wash.NEG.CVB hand.PL.COM NEG.3SG man.ACC soil.CNG  
 ‘Eating with unwashed hands does not defile a man.’ (SIKOR 2021, Matt. 15:20)

On the use of the so-called second infinitive in *-mis* with *váni* ‘without’, see (53) in §3.3.

### 3 Non-clausal negation

#### 3.1 Negative replies

When a polar question is followed by a negative reply, the reply may in principle consist of a full negated sentence (38a), but a more unmarked way is to reply with the negated verb only (38b), and the least marked reply consists of the mere negative auxiliary, which is inflected in person, number and tense (38c).

- (38) Q: *Vuojnij gus Siggá muv?*  
 see.PST.3SG Q Siggá 1SG.ACC  
 ‘Did Siggá see me?’
- a. *Siggá ittjij div vuojne.*  
 Siggá NEG.PST.3SG 2SG.ACC see.CNG  
 ‘Siggá didn’t see you.’

- b. *Ittjij*            *vuojne*.  
 NEG.PST.3SG see.CNG  
 ‘No, she didn’t.’
- c. *Ittjij*.  
 NEG.PST.3SG  
 ‘No.’ (constructed examples)

In colloquial discourse, however, the simplest type of reply is often the borrowed negative particle *næ* ‘no’ (cf. Norwegian *næ*, Swedish *nä* ‘no’). The meaning of a negative reply is independent from the polarity of the question, and therefore the replies in (38) would have the same interpretation even if the question was formulated with negation (e.g., *Ittjij gus Siggá vuojne muv?* ‘Didn’t Siggá see me?’).

Older descriptions of the language (Wiklund 1891: 185; Collinder 1938: 19) further mention an emphatic form *ihij* of the 3SG present negative auxiliary *ij*, which can be used in negative replies (cf. Finnish *ehei*, the emphatic analogue of *ei* NEG.3SG, Penttilä 1963: 658–659, as well as Swedish *nähä*, from the above-mentioned *nä* ‘no’). While *ihij* and similar emphatic disyllabic forms are used also in contemporary spoken Lule Saami (Torgny Hedström, p.c.), such forms are not attested in the corpus.

### 3.2 Negative indefinites and quantifiers

Lule Saami has no negative indefinites or quantifiers with negative force in themselves, but instead negative indefinites are composed of interrogative-relative and indefinite pronouns and adverbs followed by the clitic =*k*, which functions as a negative polarity marker (see §4.2); these forms then occur together with the negative auxiliary. For example, words like *akta* ‘one’, *goabbá* ‘which (of two)’ and *goassa* ‘when’ yield the third person singular forms *ij aktak* ‘no one’, *ij goabbák* ‘neither (of two)’ and *ij goassak* ‘never’. For monosyllabic words such as the accusative *mav* ‘what’, the negative polarity marker has a form =*ga* ~ =*ge*, yielding e.g. *ij mavga* ‘nothing’.

Third person singular forms as the ones above are however not the only possibility, but in clauses with an indefinite the negative auxiliary agrees with the subject in person and number, as seen in the first person dual *en* (39). The auxiliary is also inflected for mood and tense; an imperative *ale* is given in (40), and a past tense form *ittjij* is provided in (41). As seen in (42), the scope of negation expressed in a main clause is able to extend to a subordinate clause without overt marking of verbal negation.

- (39) *Måj en suv goassak gávna.*  
 1DU NEG.1DU 3SG.ACC when.NPM find.CNG  
 ‘We’ll never find her/him.’ (SIKOR 2021)
- (40) *Härrá, dunji dárvustaláv, ale muv goassak guode!*  
 master 2SG.ILL rely.1SG NEG.IMP.2SG 1SG.ACC when.NPM leave.CNG  
 ‘Lord, I put my faith in you, don’t ever leave me!’ (SIKOR 2021)
- (41) *Kátján ij lim aktak ráddna ja ittjij ga*  
 Kátjá.INE NEG.3SG be.PST.CNG one.NPM friend and NEG.PST.3SG NPM  
*háljida avtajnik stáhkát.*  
 want.CNG one.COM.NPM play.INF  
 ‘Kátjá didn’t have any friends and didn’t want to play with anyone either.’  
 (SIKOR 2021)
- (42) *Ij le galla goassak ávddála gullum aktak*  
 NEG.3SG be.CNG indeed when.NPM before be.heard.PST.PTCP one.NPM  
*tjalmijt rahpá gässtak guhti le tjalmedibmen*  
 eye.PL.ACC open.3SG who.ELA.NPM who be.3SG blind.ESS  
*riegádam.*  
 be.born.PST.PTCP  
 ‘Never earlier has it been heard that anyone opened the eyes of someone  
 who was born blind.’ (SIKOR 2021, John 10:32)

Generally, the negative auxiliary precedes an indefinite, as in (39–42). The opposite order of constituents is however also possible, although this appears to be most common in religious texts: consider the phrase *aktak ij* ‘no one’ in (43) and the synonymous *ij aktak* in (4) in §2.1; an additional example is found in (35) in §2.4.

- (43) *Aktak ij buvte guokta härrá dievnnut.*  
 one.NPM NEG.3SG can.CNG two.ACC master.GEN serve.INF  
 ‘No one can serve two masters.’ (SIKOR 2021, Matt. 6:24)

The first school grammar of Lule Saami mentions the possibility of a negative auxiliary in the present tense to occur twice in clauses with a negative indefinite, i.e. a case of negative concord (Wiklund 1915: 116; cf. Blokland 2022: 52–53). While this phenomenon is common in the neighboring North Saami language (cf. Svonni 2018: 207), the present corpus contains no clear instances of such constructions in Lule Saami.

### 3.3 Negative derivation

Lule Saami has a relatively rich morphology, and negation is also coded in derivation in many ways. In fact, a lexicalized instance of such morphology was seen in (42) above where the adjective *tjalmedibme* ‘blind’ is actually a morphologically transparent derivative in which the noun *tjalmme* ‘eye’ is followed by the derivative suffix *-dibme* ‘-less’. Just like the derivative for ‘eyeless’ is used for ‘blind’, *biellje* ‘ear’ has yielded *bieljedibme* ‘deaf’ (“earless”), and *giella* ‘language’ in turn *gieladibme* ‘mute’ (“languageless”). Semantically less opaque examples include *namádibme* ‘nameless; anonymous’ (← *namma* ‘name’) and *biebmodibme* ‘foodless’ (← *biebbmo* ‘food’).

The derivational suffix *-dibme* – and its attributive, adnominal counterpart *-dis* in phrases like *namádis tjálle* ‘anonymous writer’ – is attached to disyllabic nouns, the most common type of nouns in the language. So-called trisyllabic stems, such as *gahper* ‘hat’, may take an entirely different suffix, *-ahtes*, with the identical function of creating denominal negative adjectives like *gahperahtes* ‘hatless’, *jubmelahtes* ‘godless’ and *miejnigahtes* ‘meaningless’ (← *jubmel* ‘god’, *miejnik* ‘meaning’).

The suffix *-ahtes* is also used for other types of negative derivatives. The adjectives *ájlis* ‘holy’ and *rievtuk* ‘fair; honest’ yield the antonyms *ájlištahtes* ‘unholy’ and *rievtugahtes* ‘unfair; dishonest’. Verbs derived with this suffix include *ánssidahtes* ‘undeserved, unearned’ (← *ánssidit* ‘deserve, earn’) and *dádjadahtes* ‘uncomprehending’ (← *dádjadit* ‘understand’). There are also adjectives like *gállnâmahtes* ‘unwithering’ and *nâhkâmahtes* ‘never-ending, unending’, corresponding to the verbs *gállnât* ‘wither’ and *nâhkât* ‘end’ (or, rather, to the nominalizations *gállnâm* ‘withering’ and *nâhkâm* ‘ending’). When based on transitive verbs, such forms usually have a passive reading ‘un-V-able’, for example *tjielggimahtes* ‘unexplainable’ and *vuojttemahtes* ‘undefeatable’ (cf. *tjielggit* ‘explain’, *vuojttet* ‘win’). The suffix *-dihke* derives adjectives from verbs, e.g. *sárnodihke* ‘unspeakable’ (← *sárnnot* ‘say, tell’) and *sánardihke* ‘regretless’ (← *sánardit* ‘regret’).

Lule Saami also has a possibility to turn nouns to caritive verbs with the meaning ‘lose N’. The suffix *-duvva-* can be used to create verbs like *fámoduvvat* ‘lose one’s strength’ (← *fâbmo* ‘strength’) in (44) and *mieladuvvat* ‘lose one’s mind’ (← *miella* ‘mind’) in (45). The suffix *-duhtte-* yields analogous causative verbs such as *ráfeduhttet* ‘make lose one’s tranquility; unsettle’ (← *ráfe* ‘peace’) in (46).

- (44) *Dat rájes fámoduváj ja gahtjaj.*  
 that.ELA since lose.strength.PST.3SG and fall.PST.3SG  
 ‘From that on, he lost his strength and fell down.’ (SIKOR 2021)

- (45) *Peter iesj nav balláj váj mieladuváj.*  
 Peter REFL so get.scared.PST.3SG so.that lose.mind.PST.3SG  
 ‘Peter himself got so scared that he lost his mind.’ (SIKOR 2021)
- (46) *Vuojnnin juoga lij dav ráfeduhtám.*  
 see.PST.3PL something be.PST.3SG that.ACC unsettle.PST.PTCP  
 ‘They saw that something had unsettled it.’ (SIKOR 2021)

There are further a number of denominal adverbs with privative meaning. Their morphology is quite varied, which can be explained as a result of the relatively recent loss and restructuring of the abessive case, an ancient Uralic morphological case with the meaning ‘without’. Suffixes of abessive-like adverbs include *-ahtá*, *-ahti*, *-dak*, *-dagá* and *-dagi*, although the latter two forms are usually better analyzed as postpositions. On the other hand, *-ahtá* can sometimes be interpreted as an adverbial counterpart of the suffix *-ahtes* seen above: words like *gahperahtes* ‘hatless’ are often used in adnominal positions such as *gahperahtes máná* ‘hatless children’, whereas forms like *gahperahtá* ‘without hat’ (47) are used as adverbials.

- (47) *Ferasuollujn máná ettjin oattjo árrot*  
 Faroe.Islands.PL.INE child.PL NEG.PST.3PL be.allowed.CNG be.INF  
*gahperahtá, ietján de guovsagisá boalldin sijás vuobdajt.*  
 without.hat otherwise then aurora.PL burn.PST.3PL 3PL.ELA hair.PL.ACC  
 ‘In the Faroe Islands children were not allowed to be without hats, lest the northern lights burn their hair.’ (SIKOR 2021)

Adjectives like *namádibme* ‘nameless’, based on disyllabic nouns like *namma* ‘name’ may have adverbial counterparts like *namádak* (48), but these are more like exceptions from the normal situation in which sequences like *namá dagi* (49) are interpreted and written as postpositional phrases in which *dagi* ‘without’ governs the genitive (see below).

- (48) *Le gus namádak?*  
 be.3SG Q without.name  
 ‘Doesn’t she have a name?’ (SIKOR 2021)
- (49) *Andreassen almodij avijsav namá dagi, ja iesj*  
 Andreassen publish.PST.3SG newspaper.ACC name.GEN without and REFL  
*vargga gájkka artihkkalijt tjálij.*  
 almost all article.PL.ACC write.PST.3SG  
 ‘Andreassen published the newspaper anonymously, and wrote almost all articles by himself.’ (SIKOR 2021)

In addition to the relatively productive suffixal derivations described above, Lule Saami also has a somewhat productive derivational prefix, the borrowed *iehpe-* ‘un-, dis-’ (cf. Finnish/Meänkieli *epä-* id.). This morpheme can be added to adjectives and nouns, e.g. *iehpeluondulasj* ‘unnatural’ (← *luondulasj* ‘natural’), *iehpeformálalasj* ‘informal’ (← *formálalasj* ‘formal’) and *iehpejáhkkko* ‘disbelief’ (← *jáhkkko* ‘belief’). It can also be added to at least one non-finite verb form, the passive past participle in *-(d)um* (on this form, see Kejonen forthcoming), as in *iehpeorganiseridum* ‘unorganized’ (← *organiseridum* ‘organized’).

There is also a more marginal borrowed prefix *u-* ‘un-, dis-’ (cf. Swedish *o-*, Norwegian *u-* id.). This element occurs in a small number of borrowed adjectives, such as *urievtesferduk* ‘unrighteous’ (cf. Swedish *orättfärdig*, Norwegian *urettferdig* id.), but it is also attested with native stems, such as *ugullogis* ‘disobedient’ (← *gullogis* ‘obedient’); the latter word coexists with a synonym *gullogahtes*, derived with the above-mentioned suffix *-ahtes*. The prefix *u-* is also found on a few nouns, such as *urievtesvuohta* ‘misdeed’ and the plural form *umáná* ‘naughty children’ (lit. ‘unchildren’, Grundström 1946–1954 see entry *umānāh*).

The borrowed prefix *vádna-* ‘dis-’ (cf. Swedish/Norwegian *van-* id.) can be added to nouns and adjectives to form privatives such as *vádnajáhkkko* ‘disbelief’ (cf. the synonym *iehpejáhkkko* above) and *vádnagieres* ‘loveless’ (← *gieres* ‘beloved’), although such forms are not very common.

In recent neologisms, the least marked negative auxiliary form *ij* [NEG.3SG] is used as a prefix for ‘non-, in-’ added to adjectives or nouns, e.g. *ij-formálalasj* ‘informal’ (← *formálalasj* ‘formal’; cf. the synonym *iehpeformálalasj* above), *ij-gierddisvuohta* ‘intolerance’ (← *gierddisvuohta* ‘tolerance’). This prefix is also attested with the passive past participle, e.g. *ij-hiebadum* ‘non-adapted’ (← *hiebadum* ‘adapted’).

A summary of the derivations outlined above is given in Tables 7–8. As seen in these tables, derivations using suffixes often produce forms belonging to other parts of speech than the base from which they are derived. Derivations using prefixes, on the other hand, retain the word class of the base.

As mentioned above, *namá dagi* ‘without a name’ (49) is a postpositional phrase, and indeed, *dagi* (~ *dagá*) is the default Lule Saami adposition for ‘without’. From a diachronic perspective, the postposition is a rare instance of a former inflectional suffix – the Proto-Saami abessive case ending – which has been degrammaticalized into a postposition (Ylikoski 2016a). In other words, the morpheme is no longer suffixed to a preceding noun, but rather it occurs as a free word governing the genitive, the case typical of other complements of adpositions in the language. The non-suffixal nature of this former affix is perhaps most clearly seen in cases of conjunction reduction, as in (50).

Table 7: Negative derivations using suffixes

Suffix	Derives X from Y	Example	Base
<i>-ahtá, -ahti</i>	Adv ← N	<i>gahperahtá</i> ‘without hat’	← <i>gahper</i> ‘hat’
<i>-ahtes</i>	Adj ← N	<i>gahperahtes</i> ‘hatless’	← <i>gahper</i> ‘hat’
	Adj ← Adj	<i>ájlisahtes</i> ‘unholy’	← <i>ájlis</i> ‘holy’
	Adj ← V	<i>dádjadahtes</i> ‘uncompre- hending’	← <i>dádjadit</i> ‘understand’
<i>-dak, -dagá,</i> <i>-dagi</i>	Adv ← N	<i>namádak</i> ‘without name’	← <i>namma</i> ‘name’
<i>-dibme</i>	Adj ← N	<i>namádibme</i> ‘nameless’	← <i>namma</i> ‘name’
<i>-dihke</i>	Adj ← V	<i>sárnodihke</i> ‘unspeakable’	← <i>sárnnot</i> ‘say’
<i>-duhtte-</i>	V ← N	<i>ráfeduhttet</i> ‘unsettle’	← <i>ráfe</i> ‘peace’
<i>-duvva-</i>	V ← N	<i>mieladuvvat</i> ‘lose one’s mind’	← <i>miella</i> ‘mind’

Table 8: Negative derivations using prefixes

Prefix	Part of speech	Example	Base
<i>iehpe-</i>	Adj	<i>iehpeluondulasj</i> ‘unnatural’	← <i>luondulasj</i> ‘natural’
	N	<i>iehpejáhko</i> ‘disbelief’	← <i>jáhko</i> ‘belief’
	V	<i>iehpeorganiseridum</i> ‘unorga- nized’	← <i>organiseridum</i> ‘organized’
<i>ij-</i>	Adj	<i>ij-formálalasj</i> ‘informal’	← <i>formálalasj</i> ‘formal’
	N	<i>ij-gierdisvuohta</i> ‘intolerance’	← <i>gierdisvuohta</i> ‘tolerance’
	V	<i>ij-hiebadum</i> ‘non-adapted’	← <i>hiebadum</i> ‘adapted’
<i>u-</i>	Adj	<i>ugullogis</i> ‘disobedient’	← <i>gullogis</i> ‘obedient’
	N	<i>urievtesvuohta</i> ‘misdeed’	← <i>rievtesvuohta</i> ‘right’
<i>vádna-</i>	Adj	<i>vádnagieres</i> ‘loveless’	← <i>gieres</i> ‘beloved’
	N	<i>vádnajáhko</i> ‘disbelief’	← <i>jáhko</i> ‘belief’

- (50) *Dievnastiddje galggá gåtsedit, gájkka dáhpáduvvá*  
 servant shall.3SG supervise.INF everything happen.3SG  
*ságastallama ja stuojme dagi báhttaj gaskan.*  
 discussion.GEN and fuss.GEN without boy.PL.GEN between  
 ‘The servant shall take care that everything is done without discussion or  
 fuss between the boys.’ (SIKOR 2021)

Postpositional phrases with *dagi* ‘without’ may often be preceded by the reinforcing preposition-like particle *váni* ‘without’ (51), see, for instance, the similar use of *váni* in non-finite negative clauses with the converb in *-k* (§2.4). Occasionally, however, *váni* also occurs as an undisputed preposition without *dagi* (52). Moreover, the so-called second infinitive in *-mis* (also known as the “action elative”) may also occur as a complement of *váni*, as seen in (53); unlike the negative converb, however, this form does not have an inherently negative reading, but can be used also in other functions.

- (51) *Ienemusát buorrán váhkon váni dálkudime dagi.*  
 mostly get.well.3SG week.INE without medication.GEN without  
 ‘Usually it gets better in a week without medication.’ (SIKOR 2021)
- (52) *Sån la mánájgárden barggam, ja áhpadiddjen váni*  
 3SG be.3SG kindergarten.INE work.PST.PTCP and teacher.ESS without  
*áhpaddjeoahpo.*  
 teacher.education.GEN  
 ‘She has worked in a kindergarten, and as a teacher without a degree.’  
 (SIKOR 2021)
- (53) *Gatjádav váni vásstádusáv vaddemis.*  
 ask.1SG without answer.ACC give.INF  
 ‘I’m asking without giving an answer.’ (SIKOR 2021)

In the Forest dialect, a borrowed preposition *ilman* ~ *ilmán* ‘without’ is also attested, cf. Finnish/Meänkieli *ilman* ‘without’ (Kejonen 2022: 121, 123; cf. Grundström 1946–1954 see entry *ilmā*).

## 4 Other aspects of negation

### 4.1 The scope of negation

Lule Saami has a relatively free word order. From a historical-geographical perspective, the language has an intermediate position between North Saami (SVO) and South Saami (SOV): both (S)OV and (S)VO are used to the extent that neither clearly dominates (Mikkelsen 2011). Even more variation is possible for focusing purposes, and this is one of the main means to narrow or emphasize the scope of negation. In spoken language, elements that are focused by giving them sentence-initial position also receive more prominent stress, as if to underline the focused constituent. Fronting like this simultaneously emphasizes the status of the constituent within the scope of negation (54).

- (54) *Goabddáj*                      *árvov*    *mij ep*    *uddni állásit*  
ceremonial.drum.PL.GEN value.ACC 1PL NEG.1PL today entirely  
*dádjada.*  
understand.CNG  
‘As regards ceremonial drums, we don’t entirely understand their value today.’ (SIKOR 2021)

The scope of negation can also be emphasized and narrowed to specific constituents by elements such as *valla* ‘but’ in contrastive constructions of the type “not A but B” (55).

- (55) *SOV sjaddá bissot,*    *ij*    *vuodobáhkogárggán valla*  
SOV will.3SG remain.INF NEG.3SG basic.word.order.ESS but  
*báhkogárggán gánná le*    *sierra dæddo værbba.*  
word.order.ESS where be.3SG special stress verb.ILL  
‘SOV will remain, not as the basic word order, but as a word order where the verb is emphasized.’ (SIKOR 2021)

Unfortunately, systematic descriptions of information structuring as well as discursal and focusing functions of prosody in Lule Saami are non-existent and must be left for future studies.

### 4.2 Negative polarity

As seen in §3.2, negative indefinites usually consist of interrogative and indefinite elements followed by the element =*k* (~ =*ga* ~ =*ge*), which functions as a negative

polarity marker. This element also occurs as a separately written particle *ga* (~*ge*) in negation clauses in the meaning ‘(n)either’ (56–57), yet without an explicit negative power in itself; see also §4.4 on the use of *ga* for reinforcing negation.

- (56) *Ittjiv ga diede jus iehtja dasi rat jáhkij.*  
 NEG.PST.1SG NPM know.CNG if REFL that.ILL really believe.PST.3SG  
 ‘Neither did I know whether he really believed in it himself.’ (SIKOR 2021)

- (57) *Mån iv máhte tjället ja iv ga láhkát máhte*  
 1SG NEG.1SG can.CNG write.INF and NEG.1SG NPM read.INF can.CNG  
*sámegiellaj [...]*  
 Saami.language.ILL  
 ‘I can’t write and I cannot read in Saami either.’ (SIKOR 2021)

Words like *ájn* ‘still’ and *vil* ~ *vilá* ‘still’ remain unchanged when occurring in negation clauses, where their meaning is ‘(not) yet’ – compare the affirmative (58) and the negative (59).

- (58) *Állosujtto le vilá ájnas sámé kultuvran.*  
 reindeer.herding be.3SG still important Saami culture.INE  
 ‘Reindeer herding is still important in Saami culture.’ (SIKOR 2021)

- (59) *Dárojduhttem ij la vilá jábmám.*  
 assimilation NEG.3SG be.CNG yet die.PST.PTCP  
 ‘The assimilation (Norwegianization/Swedification of the Saami people) has not yet died.’ (SIKOR 2021)

Lule Saami also has a number of words that appear to be restricted to negative clauses only. One of these words is *rat* ‘(not) really; (not) especially’ in (56) above; others include *dasti* (~ *desti*) ‘anymore; (no) longer (of time)’ (see (18) in §2.3), *heva* ‘(not) especially good, well’ and *vuojga* ‘(not) especially; (not) that much’.

### 4.3 Marking of NPs in the scope of negation

Negation does not affect marking of NPs in any way, see (23–25) in §2.3.

### 4.4 Reinforcing negation

Many negative polarity items mentioned in §3.2 and §4.2 may have a function of reinforcing negation. An example is given in (60), in which *ga* gives special

emphasis to the immediately preceding constituent. The reinforcing function of *ga* is even more apparent in (61), where the same element appears to be repeated superfluously.

- (60) *Ja ij la dal diedon, buhtastahttema diehti, nav hálbbe*  
 and NEG.3SG be.CNG now of.course comparison.GEN for so cheap

**Vuonan ga viessot.**

Norway.INE NPM live.INF

‘And for comparison, neither is it that inexpensive to live in Norway, of course.’ (SIKOR 2021)

- (61) *Ij lim rávga, ij lim ga hávga ga.*  
 NEG.3SG be.PST.CNG ghost NEG.3SG be.PST.CNG NPM pike NPM

‘It wasn’t a ghost, nor was it a pike, either.’ (SIKOR 2021)

Other negation-reinforcing elements not yet mentioned include the particles *ábbá* and *ávva* with the meaning ‘whole; wholly; entire(ly)’ in affirmative contexts, but ‘(not) even; (not) at all’ in negative clauses. The related forms *ábbánis* and *ávvánis* (62) as well as the particle *luoddnok* ‘under no circumstances’ (63) are used exclusively in negative clauses.

- (62) *Ælla vuojn dáppe ávvánis sierga jalik skierre.*

be.NEG.3PL you.see there at.all willow.PL nor dwarf.birch.PL

‘There are no willows or dwarf birches there at all, you see.’ (SIKOR 2021)

- (63) *Iv luoddnok dasi guorrasa.*

NEG.1SG under.no.circumstances that.ILL agree.CNG

‘By no means do I agree.’ (SIKOR 2021)

On the emphatic 3SG present form *ihij* of the negative auxiliary, see §3.1.

#### 4.5 Negation, coordination and complex clauses

In clause combining, negation does not differ from that in simple clauses, except for the negative converb described in §2.4. However, although the particle *ga* ‘(n)either’ discussed above (§4.2 and §4.4) may be interpreted as somewhat redundant if accompanied by the general coordinator *ja* ‘and’ (see (57) above), alternatively it may also occur without *ja* and has in fact a function of a coordinator (64).

- (64) *Indiánaj giela ælla almulasj giela e ga*  
 Indian.PL.GEN language.PL be.NEG.3PL official language.PL NEG.3PL NPM  
*oajválattja dajt goassak ane.*  
 authority.PL that.PL.ACC when.NPM use.CNG  
 ‘The languages of the Indians are not official languages, and authorities  
 never use them either.’ (SIKOR 2021)

Lule Saami also has a special corrective coordinator *ájnat* ‘but instead’ (65–66), which appears to be replaceable by the general adversative coordinator *valla* ‘but’ (see (55) in §4.1), but the former is used only in connection with contrastive negation, following a negative proposition expressed by the preceding clause (cf., e.g., German *sondern*, Swedish *utan* and Finnish *vaan*).

- (65) *Ale guoktálatta, ájnat jáhke!*  
 NEG.IMP.2SG doubt.CNG but.instead believe.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Don’t doubt, but believe instead!’ (SIKOR 2021, John 20:27)
- (66) *Mij ep sidá kultuvrramujtton árrot, ájnat oassen*  
 1PL NEG.1PL want.CNG cultural.heritage.ESS be.INF but.instead part.ESS  
*viesso kultuvras.*  
 live.PRS.PTCP culture.ELA  
 ‘We don’t want to be a cultural heritage, but a part of a living culture.’  
 (SIKOR 2021)

Moreover, the language also has a negative disjunctive conjunction, *jalik* ‘nor’, already seen in (4) and (62) above. This particle is transparently composed of *jali* ‘or’ and the element =*k* seen in negative indefinites and quantifiers (§3.2).

#### 4.6 Miscellaneous aspects of negation

Negative transport is possible with cognitive verbs such as *jáhkket* ‘believe’, but the semantic and pragmatic limits of the phenomenon have not been properly studied. In (67), the negation in the main clause is interpreted as negating the subordinate predicate *gájkki* ‘dry’.

- (67) *Iv jáhke de uddni gájkki.*  
 NEG.1SG believe.CNG then today dry.3PL  
 ‘I don’t believe that they will dry today.’ (= ‘I believe that they won’t dry today.’) (SIKOR 2021)

## 5 Summary

The above sections have provided a general description of negation in Lule Saami. Table 9 presents a synopsis of the main features of the phenomena discussed in this chapter.

Table 9: Summary of Lule Saami negation

Form	Morphosyntactic status	Function
<i>ij</i> etc.	negative auxiliary	Used with a connegative verb in standard negation (§2.1), polar questions (§2.2), stative predications (§2.3), finite subordinate clauses (§2.4) and used with or without a connegative verb in negative replies (§3.1)
<i>ij-</i>	derivational prefix	Derives negative adjectives, nouns and verbs (§3.3)
<i>ale</i> etc.	negative auxiliary	Used with a connegative verb in imperative (prohibitive) clauses (§2.2)
<i>-k, -dak</i>	negative converb	Used in non-finite subordinate clauses and as a negative participle (§2.4)
<i>næ</i>	negative particle ‘no’	Used in negative replies (§3.1)
<i>ga, ge</i>	negative polarity marker	Used in the meaning ‘(n)either’ (§4.2), as a negative reinforcer (§4.4) and as a negative coordinator (§4.5)
<i>=k, =ga, =ge</i>	negative polarity marker	Forms negative indefinites and quantifiers when used with the negative auxiliary (§3.2)
<i>-ahtá, -ahti</i>	derivational suffix	Derives negative adverbs from nouns (§3.3)
<i>-ahtes</i>	derivational suffix	Derives negative adjectives from nouns, adjectives and verbs (§3.3)
<i>dagi, dagá</i>	postposition ‘without’	Used with the genitive of nominals (§3.3)
<i>-dak, -dagá, -dagi</i>	derivational suffix	Derives negative adverbs from nouns (§3.3)
<i>-dibme</i>	derivational suffix	Derives negative adjectives from nouns (§3.3)
<i>-dihke</i>	derivational suffix	Derives negative adjectives from verbs (§3.3)
<i>-duhtte-</i>	derivational suffix	Derives negative verbs from nouns (§3.3)
<i>-duvva-</i>	derivational suffix	Derives negative verbs from nouns (§3.3)
<i>iehpe-</i>	derivational prefix	Derives negative adjectives, nouns and verbs (§3.3)
<i>u-</i>	derivational prefix	Derives negative adjectives and nouns (§3.3)
<i>vádna-</i>	derivational prefix	Derives negative adjectives and nouns (§3.3)
<i>váni</i>	preposition, particle ‘without’	Used with the genitive of nominals and second infinitive of verbs (§3.3)
<i>ájnat</i>	coordinator ‘but instead’	Used in adversative coordination (§4.5)
<i>jalik</i>	coordinator ‘nor’	Used in disjunctive coordination (§4.5)

## Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Torgny Hedström, Inga Lill Sigga Mikkelsen, Helena Omma and Siri Nystø Ráhka for enlightening discussions regarding Lule Saami in general and negation in particular. This research was partially funded by the Research Council of Finland (Ylikoski, Project 349818).

## Abbreviations

1	first person	INF	infinitive
2	second person	NEG	negative (auxiliary)
3	third person	NPM	negative polarity marker
ACC	accusative	PL	plural
CNG	connegative	POL	polite
COM	comitative	POT	potential
CVB	converb	PRS	present
DU	dual	PST	past
ELA	elative	PTCP	participle
ESS	essive	Q	question particle
GEN	genitive	RECP	reciprocal
ILL	illative	REFL	reflexive
IMP	imperative	REL	relative
INE	inessive	SG	singular

## References

- Blokland, Rogier. 2022. Notes on an obsolete tensed negative pronoun construction in Livonian. *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 13(1). 37–64. DOI: 10.12697/jeful.2022.13.1.02.
- Blokland, Rogier & Nobufumi Inaba. 2015. Negation in South Saami. In Matti Miestamo, Anne Tamm & Beáta Wagner-Nagy (eds.), *Negation in Uralic languages* (Typological Studies in Language 108), 377–398. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.108.14blo.
- Collinder, Björn. 1938. *Lautlehre des Waldlappischen Dialektes von Gällivare* (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 74). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Grundström, Harald. 1926. Sägner och folketro bland lappar och nybyggare i Jokkmokk. *Norrbotnen*. 127–141.

- Grundström, Harald. 1946–1954. *Lulelappsk ordbok. Lulelappisches Wörterbuch* (Skrifter utgivna genom Dialekt- och folkminnesarkivet i Uppsala. Ser. C 1). Uppsala: Lundequistska bokhandeln.
- Kejonen, Olle. 2022. Björn Collinder och den lulesamiska skogsdialekten. In Kerstin Andersson (ed.), *Vuovddesáme: Skogssamer i Flakaberg*, 118–124. Stockholm: Vulkan.
- Kejonen, Olle. Forthcoming. Verb inflection in Forest Lule Saami. In Rogier Blokland, Michael Rießler & Torbjörn Söder (eds.), *Saami linguistics in Uppsala*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Kintel, Anders. 1991. *Syntaks og ordavledningar i lulesamisk*. Samisk utdanningsråd.
- Kintel, Anders. 2012. Julevsáme-dá[r]o báhkogirjje. [http://gtweb.uit.no/webdict/ak/smj2nob/s\\_smj2nob.html](http://gtweb.uit.no/webdict/ak/smj2nob/s_smj2nob.html) (10 October, 2024).
- Korhonen, Olavi. 2005. *Báhkogirjje: Julevsámes dárruj, dáros julevsábmáj. Ordbok: lulesamisk svensk, svensk lulesamisk*. Jokkmokk: Samernas utbildningscentrum.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2005. *Standard negation: The negation of declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110197631.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2025. Questionnaire for describing the negation system of a language. In Matti Miestamo & Ljuba Veselinova (eds.), *Negation in the world's languages II: Eurasia*, 21–36. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17788121.
- Miestamo, Matti & Eino Koponen. 2015. Negation in Skolt Saami. In Matti Miestamo, Anne Tamm & Beáta Wagner-Nagy (eds.), *Negation in Uralic languages* (Typological Studies in Language 108), 353–375. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.108.13mie.
- Mikkelsen, Inga Lill Sigga. 2011. *Objevta sadje ja struktuvrra indikatijva gárgadisájn*. University of Tromsø. (MA thesis). <https://munin.uit.no/handle/10037/3649>.
- Nystø, Anders & Sigmund Johnsen. 2011. *Sámásta: Julevsáme giellakurssa: julevsámegiella álggijda. Lulesamisk språkkurs: lulesamisk for nybegynnere. 2, nuppát girjje*. Drag: Báhko.
- Penttilä, Aarni. 1963. *Suomen kielioppi*. 2nd edn. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Qvigstad, Just Knud. 1929. *Lappiske eventyr og sagn. 4. Lappiske eventyr og sagn fra Lyngen 2 og fra Nordland*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Rydving, Håkan. 2013. *Words and varieties: Lexical variation in Saami* (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 269). Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

- Sammallahti, Pekka. 1998. *The Saami languages: An introduction*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.
- SIKOR. 2021. *UiT – The Arctic University of Norway and the Norwegian Saami Parliament’s Saami text collection*. Version 01.12.2021. <http://gtweb.uit.no/korp/> (10 October, 2024).
- Spiik, Nils Eric. 1989. *Lulesamisk grammatik*. 2nd edn. Jokkmokk: Sameskolstyrelsen.
- Spiik, Nils Eric. 1994. *Lulesamisk ordbok: Svensk-samisk*. Jokkmokk: Sameskolstyrelsen.
- Svonni, Mikael. 2018. *Modern nordsamisk grammatik*. Kiruna: Ravda Lágádus.
- Tuolja, Lars Matto. 1987. *Tjaktjalasta*. Jokkmokk: Sámi Girjjit.
- van der Auwera, Johan & Ludo Lejeune. 2013. The prohibitive. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *WALS Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <https://wals.info/chapter/71>.
- Wiklund, K. B. 1891. *Laut- und Formenlehre der Lule-Lappischen Dialekte*. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner.
- Wiklund, K. B. 1915. *Lärobok i lappska språket*. 2nd edn. Stockholm: Björck & Börjesson.
- Ylikoski, Jussi. 2009. *Non-finites in North Saami* (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia 257). Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.
- Ylikoski, Jussi. 2016a. Degrammaticalization in North Saami: Development of adpositions, adverbs and a free lexical noun from inflectional and derivational suffixes. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 40. 113–173.
- Ylikoski, Jussi. 2016b. Future time reference in Lule Saami, with some remarks on Finnish. *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 7(2). 209–244. DOI: 10.12697/jeful.2016.7.2.09.
- Ylikoski, Jussi. 2022. Lule Saami. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy, Johanna Laakso & Elena Skribnik (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 130–146. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780198767664.003.0009.

