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1 Introduction

This chapter describes negative elements and constructions in Nanti, an Arawak language of the Kampan branch, including negation in main clauses and clause-linking constructions, as well as existential negation, negative indefinites, and a number of morphologically complex negation particles. Like the other chapters in this volume, these phenomena are approached from a functional-typological perspective, and comparisons are drawn between Nanti negation phenomena and similar ones found in other Arawak languages.

Nanti exhibits several distinct main clause negation constructions, which are distinguished by a number of semantic, pragmatic, and syntactic features. Nanti exhibits a typologically rare distinction between ‘standard’ or ‘descriptive’ negation and metalinguistic negation constructions (Carston 1996, Geurts 1998, Horn 1985), where the latter exclusively serves to deny utterances that have surfaced in, or are implied by, preceding discourse. Descriptive negation constructions in Nanti are further distinguished into three major construction types, involving two distinct negation particles and complicated interactions with clausal reality status (Elliott 2000). Nanti also exhibits a distinct existential negation construction which employs a defective negative verb, and a structurally-related ‘exhaustive negation’ construction. The five principal types of main clause negation I discuss in this paper are summarized in Table 1. In addition to these principal types of negation, Nanti also exhibits a number of morphologically complex negative elements, discussed in §6. The complex forms arise either productively, when negative particles serve as clitic hosts, or as lexicalized forms.

Descriptive negation in Nanti clause-linking constructions is broadly similar to main clause descriptive negation, except that there is a tendency for the phonologically reduced forms of negation particles to be appear, which serve as clitic hosts for second-position clitics marking inter-clausal relations. Also discussed in this section are restrictions on negation exhibited by deranked subordinate clauses.

Negative indefinites, which are mainly formed with some of the same negation particles used in...
Table 1: Principal Nanti main clause negation elements and their morphosyntactic and pragmatic restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEGATION TYPE</th>
<th>NEG FORM</th>
<th>MORPHOSYNTACTIC RESTRICTIONS</th>
<th>PRAGMATIC RESTRICTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTIVE</td>
<td>te(ra)</td>
<td>applies to notionally realis clauses only</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha(ra)</td>
<td>applies to notionally irrealis clauses only</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METALINGUISTIC</td>
<td>matsi</td>
<td>no interaction with reality status</td>
<td>‘echoic’ use only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTENTIAL</td>
<td>mameri</td>
<td>no lexical verb</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXHAUSTIVE</td>
<td>mameri</td>
<td>applies to notionally realis clauses only</td>
<td>‘exhaustive’ sense only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

descriptive main clause negation are described, and finally, comparative observations relating Nanti main clause negation particles to those in the other Kampan languages, and to those in Terêna, are presented, and observations relating the metalinguistic and existential negation particles to the Proto-Arawak privative *ma are given.

2 Sociolinguistic, comparative, and typological background

Nanti is a language of the Kampan family, a group of closely-related Arawak languages spoken in the Andean foothills region of southeastern Peru, and in the adjacent lowland regions of Peru and Brazil. Apart from Nanti, the Kampan family includes six commonly recognized varieties: Asháninka, Ashéninka, Kakinte, Matsigenka, and Nomatsigenga. Linguists differ on the number of distinct languages they recognize in this family, from three (Kaufman 1990, Campbell 1997), to four (Solís 2003), to six (Aikhenvald 1999). Since Nanti speakers avoided contact with non-Nantis until the early 1990s (Michael 2008), only more recent classifications of the Kampan family mention them (e.g. Gordon 2005).

Nanti is spoken by some 450 individuals who live in the headwaters regions of the Camisea River and Timpia River of southeastern Peruvian Amazonia. Until the mid-1990s, Nantis were entirely monolingual, but now several young men have acquired a thorough knowledge of Matsigenka, the most closely-related of the other Kampan varieties, and more recently still, a few young men have also acquired a basic knowledge of Spanish.

Nanti is a polysynthetic agglutinative head-marking language with extensive, principally suffixal verb morphology. Apart from reality status, aspect is the only other obligatory verbal inflectional category. Nanti mainly displays nominative-accusative alignment, but exhibits traces of the split intransitivity characteristic of the Ashéninka branch of the family (Payne and Payne 2005). Arguments are realized either as person marker clitics, or much less frequently, as free NPs. Basic constituent order is arguably SVO, although at most a single verbal argument is realized as a free

---

1 This family is also referred to as ‘Pre-Andine Arawak’, a label I avoid because of ambiguities regarding the membership of the grouping denoted by this name (Michael 2008: 212).
NP in any clause. Inflectional nominal morphology is minimal, consisting of optional plural marking and a single general locative case marker/postposition. See Michael (2008) for a more detailed description of the language.

I gathered the data on which this chapter is based in the Nanti community of Montetoni during some 20 months of fieldwork between 1997 and 2005. All the data presented in this chapter is drawn from non-elicited, naturally-occurring discourse.

3 Descriptive main clause negation

In this section I discuss Nanti main clause negation constructions and the interaction between clausal polarity, reality status, and aspect exhibited by these constructions. I begin with descriptive negation constructions, which exhibit two distinct negation particles: tera and hara (and their related reduced forms te and ha, see §6). These two negative particles are identical in their semantic content and pragmatic properties, and their distribution is conditioned by semantics and morphosyntactic properties of the clauses that they negate. We consider these issues now.

In main clauses, the distribution of the two negative particles is determined by the notional reality status of the clauses undergoing negation, with tera serving to negate realis clauses, as in (1), and hara negating irrealis clauses, as in (2). The negation particle normally appears immediately preverbally, although a NP focus position intervenes between negation and the verb.

(1) a. Iporohi.

\[
i = \text{poroh} \quad \emptyset \quad -i
\]

3m$S$ = clear.\text{land} -IMP \quad -REAL.I

‘He is clearing land.’ (REALIS)

b. Tera imporohe.

\[
tera \quad i = \text{N-} \quad \text{poroh} \quad -e
\]

NEG-REAL 3m$S$ = IRREAL- \text{clear.\text{land}} -IRREAL.I

‘He is not clearing land

(2) a. Imporohe.

\[
i = \text{N-} \quad \text{poroh} \quad \emptyset \quad -e
\]

3m$S$ = IRREAL- \text{clear.\text{land}} -IMP \quad -IRREAL.I

‘He will clear land.’ (IRREALIS)

2The orthography is phonemic and largely self explanatory; N represents a underspecified nasal that acquires its place of articulation from a following voiceless stop. Glossing conventions and abbreviations: The first line of interlinearized examples shows surface morphophonological changes; in this line, sans-serif $t$ and $a$ represent epenthetic segments; they are not segmented or glossed in other lines. The following morpheme abbreviations are used: 1S, 1st person subject; 1O, 1st person object; 2S, 2nd person subject; 2O, 2nd person object; 3m$S$, 3rd person masculine subject; 3m$O$, 3rd person masculine object; 3m$\overline{S}$, 3rd person non-masculine subject; 3m$\overline{O}$, 3rd person non-masculine object; 1P, 1st person possessor; 2P, 2nd person possessor; 3mP, 3rd person masculine possessor; 3m$\overline{P}$, 3rd person non-masculine possessor; $\overline{A}BL$, ablative; $\overline{ADL}$, adlative; $\overline{APPL}$, purpurative applicative; $\overline{CAUS}$, causative; $\overline{CL}$, classifier; $\overline{CNTF}$, counterfactual; $\overline{COND}$, conditional; $\overline{DEONT}$, deontic; $\overline{DST}$, distributive; $\overline{FRUS}$, frustrative; $\overline{HAB}$, habitual; $\overline{IMP}$, imperfective; $\overline{IRREAL}$, irrealis, -class verb; $\overline{IRREAL.I}$, irrealis, i-class verb; $\overline{LOC}$, locative; $\overline{MAL.REP}$, malefactive repetitive; $\overline{NEG.IRREAL}$, irrealis negation; $\overline{NEG.REAL}$, realis negation; $\overline{PASS.IRREAL}$, irrealis passive; $\overline{PASS.REAL}$, realis passive; $\overline{PERF}$, perfective; $\overline{PL}$, verbal plural; $\overline{REAL}$, realis, -class verb; $\overline{REAL.I}$, realis, i-class verb; $\overline{REG}$, regressive; $\overline{SUB}$, subordinator.
3.1 An interlude: Reality status in Nanti

Reality status is based on a notional distinction between realized eventualities and unrealized ones (Palmer 2001). In Nanti, the morphological realis/irrealis distinction aligns with semantic distinctions in temporal reference, mood, and polarity in typologically expected ways (e.g., Elliot 2001, Mithun 1995). As exemplified in (3), positive polarity indicative clauses with non-future temporal reference exhibit realis marking, while those with future temporal reference or non-indicative modalities exhibit irrealis marking, as in (4a–c). Reality status marking in positive polarity clauses is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Semantic parameter values and reality status marking in positive polarity clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMANTIC PARAMETER</th>
<th>REALIS MARKING</th>
<th>IRREALIS MARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporal reference</td>
<td>Non-future</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheticality</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Hypothetical, (Conditional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factuality</td>
<td>Factual</td>
<td>Counterfactual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker-Oriented Modality</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>Imperative, Polite Directive/Exhortative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent-Oriented Modality</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>Obligation, Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospectiveness</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>Purposive, Prospective complement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Opoiki maika.

\[ o= \textit{pok} \; \emptyset \; -i \; \textit{maika} \]

\[ 3\text{NM} = \text{come} \; \text{IMP} \; \text{REAL} \; \text{now} \]

‘She is coming now.’ (non-future temporal reference; indicative modality)

(4) a. Ompoke kamani.

\[ o= \textit{pok} \; \emptyset \; -e \; \textit{kamani} \]

\[ 3\text{NM} = \text{IRREAL} \; \text{come} \; \text{IMP} \; \text{IRREAL} \; \text{tomorrow} \]

‘She will come tomorrow.’ (future temporal reference)
b. Ompokakeme chapi.

\[
o= \text{N-} \text{pok} \ -ak\ -e \ =me \ \text{chapi}
3\text{NMS=} \text{IRREAL-} \ \text{come} \ -\text{PERF} \ -\text{IRREAL} \ =\text{DEON} \ \text{yesterday.}
\]

‘She should have come yesterday.’ (deontic modality)

c. Pena!

\[
p\ -e \ =na
give \ -\text{IRREAL} \ =1O
\]

‘Give (it) to me!’ (imperative modality)

Note that realis is marked by a suffix, while irrealis is marked by a circumfix. The reality status suffixes exhibit lexically-conditioned allomorphy based on the division of Nanti verbs into two semantically arbitrary verb classes, the \textit{i}-class and \textit{a}-class verbs, as summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Reality status affix allomorphy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>\textbf{I-CLASS STEM}</th>
<th>\textbf{A-CLASS STEM}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{REALIS}</td>
<td>-\textit{i}</td>
<td>-\textit{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{IRREALIS}</td>
<td>N--\textit{e}</td>
<td>N--\textit{empa}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Negation and reality status

If we conceive of negation as an operator applying to a clause, as schematized in (5), then the distribution of \textit{tera} and \textit{hara} can be schematized as in (6a) and (7a), where the alternation between the two forms of negation is conditioned by the \textit{notional} reality status of the clause to which they apply, with the ‘realis negation’ \textit{tera} used to negate notionally realis clauses and the ‘irrealis negation’ \textit{hara} being used to negate notionally irrealis clauses. Sentences exemplifying this pattern are given in (6c) and (7c).

(5) a. Neg(Cl)

b. I will not eat the pie = not (I will eat the pie)

(6) a. \textbf{tera (Cl}_{realis})

b. Opoki

\[
o= \text{pok} \ .await\ -i
3\text{NMS=} \ \text{come} \ -\text{IMPF} \ -\text{REAL} \ =\text{Cl}_{realis}
\]

‘She is coming.’ = Cl\textit{realis}

c. Tera ompoke

\[
tera \ \ \ o= \ \text{N-} \ \text{poke} \ -e
\text{NEG.IRREAL} \ 3\text{mmS=} \ \text{IRREAL-} \ \text{come} \ -\text{IRREAL} \ =\text{DEON}
\]

‘She did not come’ = not (she came) = Neg (Cl\textit{realis})
a. hara (Cl_irrealis)

b. Ompoke.

\[
\begin{align*}
o= & \quad N^3_{\text{IRREAL}} \quad \text{pok} \quad -\emptyset \\
3\text{NMS} = & \quad \text{come} \quad -\text{IMPF} \quad -\text{IRREAL.1}
\end{align*}
\]

‘She will come.’ = Cl_{irrealis}

c. Hara opoki.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hara} & \quad o= \quad \text{pok} \quad -i \\
\text{NEG.IRREAL} & \quad 3\text{mS} = \quad \text{come} \quad -\text{REAL.1}
\end{align*}
\]

‘She will not come’ = not (she will come) = Neg (Cl_{irrealis})

Note, however, that the reality status marking borne by the verb in negated indicates the reality status of the total clause, including negation, and not solely the reality status of the clause to which the negation operator applies. As a result, notionally realis clauses which have undergone negation, as in (6c), are – as a whole sentences – notionally irrealis (since the clause denotes an unrealized state of affairs), and consequently take irrealis marking.

The negated counterparts of already notionally irrealis clauses, as in (7b), present a more complicated situation. Clauses of this type are notionally irrealis prior to negation, and negating them results in a notionally ‘doubly-irrealis’ clause. As already noted, these constructions exhibit a distinct form of negation, hara, and surprisingly, verbs in this construction take the erstwhile realis marker -i ~ -a. All doubly irrealis clauses in the language exhibit this combination of the irrealis negation and the realis marker, including the negative deontic, as in (8), and the negative conditional and negative counterfactual, described in §7, below.

(8) Hame opoki.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hame} & \quad =\text{me} \quad o= \quad \text{pok} \quad -i \\
\text{NEG.IRREAL} & \quad =\text{DEONT} \quad 3\text{mS} = \quad \text{come} \quad -\text{REAL.1}
\end{align*}
\]

‘She should not have come.’

Since the combination of the irrealis negation hara and the erstwhile realis suffix -i ~ -a systematically appear in notionally doubly-irrealis clauses, I consider the combination hara . . . -i to be a non-compositional doubly irrealis construction, in which the normal reality status marker does not express realisness as it otherwise does, but rather, together with hara, indicates the doubly irrealis nature of the clause.

Note that Nanti does not exhibit a distinct prohibitive construction, and that Nantis simply employ irrealis sentences with second-subjects and a directive intonation to issue prohibitive directives, as in (9), which without intonation is ambiguous between declarative and prohibitive interpretations. Note that this sentence does not correspond to the negated form of an imperative clause, as subjects are omitted in imperatives.

(9) Hara poogaro.
`hara` `pi= oog -a =ro`  
NEG.IRREAL 2S= consume -REAL.A =3nmO  
‘Don’t eat it!’ or ‘You will not eat it.’

The interaction of negation and reality status marking discussed so far is summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Summary: Negation and reality status marking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REALIS</th>
<th>IRREALIS</th>
<th>DOUBLY IRREALIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSITIVE POLARITY</strong></td>
<td>V -i ~ -a</td>
<td>N- V -e ~ -empa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEGATIVE POLARITY</strong></td>
<td>NEG(REALIS) = IRREALIS tera N- V -e ~ -empa</td>
<td>NEG(IRREALIS) = DOUBLY IRREALIS <code>hara</code> V -i ~ -a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted in passing that the adverb *pahentya* ‘almost’ triggers irrealis marking in exactly the same way as the negative particle *tera*, as in (10). Given that states of affairs that can described using this adverb are necessarily ones that failed to be realized, like those denoted by negated clauses, it is unsurprising that it triggers the same reality status marking as the negative particle *tera*.

(10) *Pahentya inkame.*

  `pahentya` `i=` `N-` `kam` `-e`  
  almost 3ms=`IRREALIS` die `-IRREALIS.1`  
  ‘He almost died.’

### 3.3 Aspect in negative polarity clauses

Positive polarity clauses are obligatorily marked for aspect, bearing either the null imperfective, as in (11a), or the perfective `-ak`, as in (11b).

(11) a. *Inihi.*

  `i=` `nih` `-∅` `-i`  
  3mS=`speak` `-IMPF` `-REALIS.1`  
  ‘He is/was speaking’

b. *Inihake.*

  `i=` `nih` `-ak` `-i`  
  3mS=`speak` `-PERF` `-REAL.1`  
  ‘He spoke.’

This obligatory perfective/imperfective contrast is neutralized in negated clauses, however, and overt perfective marking is in fact unattested, as evident in (12b&d).
(12)  a. Tera irinihe.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tera} & \quad i \quad = \quad \text{ri-} \quad \text{nih} \quad -e \\
\text{NEG.REAL} & \quad 3\text{mS=} \quad \text{IRREAL-} \quad \text{Speak} \quad \text{-IRREAL.I}
\end{align*}
\]
‘He doesn’t/didn’t speak.’

b. *Tera irinihake

c. Hara inih.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hara} & \quad i \quad = \quad \text{nih} \quad -i \\
\text{NEG.IRREAL} & \quad 3\text{mS=} \quad \text{Speak} \quad \text{-REAL.I}
\end{align*}
\]
‘He will not speak.’

d. *Hara inihake.

Since the perfective/imperfective contrast in neutralized in negated clauses, Nanti exhibits paradigmatic asymmetry, in Miestamo’s (2005) terms. As discussed above, Nanti also exhibits constructional asymmetry, making it one of an apparently small number of languages to exhibit both constructional and paradigmatic asymmetry. Note that perfective/imperfective contrast is preserved in positive polarity irrealis constructions, as in (13), and consequently the aspectual neutralization we see in Nanti negative clauses is not a ‘derived asymmetry’ resulting from the irrealis status of these clauses (see Miestamo (2005: 157) for a discussion of derived asymmetries).

(13)  a. Irinihe.

\[
\begin{align*}
i & \quad = \quad \text{ri-} \quad \text{nih} \quad -\emptyset \quad -e \\
3\text{mS=} & \quad \text{IRREAL-} \quad \text{Speak} \quad \text{-IMPF-IRREAL.I}
\end{align*}
\]
‘He will speak.’

b. Irinihake.

\[
\begin{align*}
i & \quad = \quad \text{ri-} \quad \text{nih} \quad -ak \quad -e \\
3\text{mS=} & \quad \text{IRREAL-} \quad \text{Speak} \quad \text{-PERF-IRREAL.I}
\end{align*}
\]
‘He will speak.’

4 Metalinguistic negation

Nanti is one of an apparently small number of languages that exhibit a distinct negative particle employed exclusively for metalinguistic negation.3,4 In particular, Nanti exhibits a distinct form of negation for what Geurts (1998) call ‘proposition denial’, the negation of a proposition that has previously surfaced in discourse, either explicitly or as an implicature.

Consider the following interaction, in which Migero, the leader of the Nanti community of Montetoni, is arguing with the leader of the Matsigenka community of Tayakome regarding a trip a

---

3Kahrel (1996: 19-20) mentions Vietnamese and Navajo as languages with distinct metalinguistic negation markers.

4This form of negation has also been called external negation (Horn 1985), propositional negation (Kahrel 1996), modality negation (Lyons 1977), and radical negation (Seuren 1976).
Nanti man made to Tayakome. The leader from Tayakome, unhappy with the man’s visit, has accused Migero of having given him permission to make the trip, to which Migero responds with the utterance in (14), a clear example of proposition denial.

(14) Matsi nopakeri maika peremisa.

\[
\text{matsi} \quad \text{no= p} \quad \text{-ak} \quad \text{-i} \quad =\text{ri} \quad \text{maika} \quad \text{peremisa}
\]

\text{NEG.META} \quad 1\text{S= give} \quad \text{-PERF} \quad \text{-REAL.i} \quad =\text{3mO now permission}

‘It is not the case that I gave him permission at that time.’

Metalinguistic negation is also often employed in partial rejections of a prior proposition, as in (15).

(15) Matsi iryo gaatiro, naro gaatiro.

\[
\text{matsi} \quad \text{iryo} \quad \text{og} \quad \text{-aa} \quad \text{-i} \quad =\text{ro} \quad \text{naro} \quad \text{og}
\]

\text{NEG.META} \quad 3\text{nm.FOC.PRO put} \quad \text{-TRNSLOC.IMPF} \quad \text{-REAL.i} \quad =\text{3mO 1.FOC.PRO put}

\text{-aa} \quad \text{-i} \quad =\text{ro}

\text{-TRNSLOC.IMPF} \quad \text{-REAL.i} \quad =\text{3mO}

‘It is not the case that he took her back, I took her back.’

Metalinguistic negation is sometimes called ‘external negation’ because it may not interact with morphosyntactic elements in the same way as standard clausal negation. For example, in languages that do not otherwise permit double negation, the combination of metalinguistic and simple negation is usually the sole means by which a single clause may exhibit two clausal negation elements, as in the English example in (16) (see also Mughazy (2003) for a discussion of metalinguistic double negation in Egyptian Arabic). This is also the case for Nanti, which generally does not permit two clausal negation elements in a single clause. But as (17) demonstrates, the language does permit the combination of metalinguistic negation with simple negation, as in (17).

(16) A: You don’t like Joe.

B: I don’t not like him, I just find him boring.

(17) Matsi te pishinetemparo oka.

\[
\text{matsi} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{pi=} \quad \text{N-} \quad \text{shine} \quad \text{-empa} \quad =\text{ro} \quad \text{o-} \quad \text{oka}
\]

\text{NEG.META} \quad \text{NEG.REAL} \quad 2\text{S=} \quad \text{IRREAL- like} \quad \text{-irreal.i} \quad =\text{3nmO 3nm- this}

‘It is not the case that you don’t like this.’

Perhaps the most striking way in which metalinguistic negation exhibits its ‘external’ nature in Nanti, however, is that it does not restrict reality status or aspect marking in the way that descriptive clausal negation with \textit{tera} or \textit{hara} does. First, the presence of external negation does not affect reality status marking on the verb. Consider (15), which exhibits realis marking, despite being the negated counterpart of a notionally realis clause, which would exhibit irrealis marking if negative particle employed were the descriptive negation \textit{tera} instead of the metalinguistic negation.
matsi. Likewise, consider (17), which exhibits irrealis marking despite being the negated counterpart of a notionally irrealis clause, which would exhibit realis marking if the negative element were the descriptive negation negation hara. As these examples demonstrate, the metalinguistic negation element matsi does not affect or restrict the reality status marking of the clauses under its scope.

Similarly, the metalinguistic negation particle does not affect aspect marking on the verb. Recall that in clauses under the scope of either of the two descriptive negations particles, the verbal imperfective/perfective contrast is neutralized. But as is evident (14), aspectual marking is retained in clauses negated with matsi. In terms of Miestamo’s (2005) typology, then, metalinguistic negation, unlike simple negation, is symmetric in Nanti.

In summary, Nanti metalinguistic negation does not interact with or restrict either the reality status or aspectual marking of clauses under its scope, or with simple negation itself, as evidenced by cases of otherwise prohibited double negation. In these respects, Nanti metalinguistic negation behaves like negation in the matrix clause of reported speech complements, as discussed in §??). This behavior is perhaps unsurprising, since it has been suggested that metalinguistic negation is intrinsically ‘echoic’ of previous utterances (Carston 1996).

Finally, we can observe that the form of the metalinguistic negation matsi suggests a relationship with the negative or privative morpheme ma, found in many Arawak languages and reconstructed by Payne (1991) as the form of negation in Proto-Arawak.

5 Existential negation

Nanti positive polarity existential constructions employ one of two morphologically defective verbs, depending on the animacy of the associated nominal argument, as illustrated in (18a&b). Despite the fact the existential verb typically takes no verbal morphology, its status as a verb is confirmed by the fact that it may be derived with the verbal frustrative -be, upon which it obligatorily takes standard verbal inflectional morphology, as in (19).

(18) a. Aityo oburoki.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{aityo} & \text{oburoki} \\
\text{EXIST.NAN} & \text{manioc.beer}
\end{array}
\]

‘There is manioc beer.’

b. Ainyo shintori.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ainyo} & \text{shintori} \\
\text{EXIST.ANIM} & \text{peccary}
\end{array}
\]

‘There are peccaries.’

(19) Aityobetaka seri.

\[
\text{aityo} \text{oburoki}
\]

\[
\text{ainyo} \text{shintori}
\]

\[\text{This fact, combined with the fact that the clearly related existential negation mamerti appears to be a defective verb, raises the interesting possibility that historically ma may have had verbal predicative properties at some point in the development of Southern Arawak.}\]
Existential negation is expressed by replacing the existential verb aityo ~ ainyo with the negative existential predicate mameri, as in (20). Since all Nanti clauses otherwise require a verb, it is likely that mameri is a defective verb, like its positive polarity counterparts. Note, however, that mameri never takes any verbal morphology.

(20) Mameri ibatsa.

    mameri  i-     batsa
    NEG.EXT  3mP-  meat

‘There is no meat.’

Since the negative existential predicate takes no reality status or aspectual morphology, the resulting clause is temporally ambiguous between present and past temporal reference readings, as in (21). This is also true of the positive polarity counterparts of these negative existential clauses. Note, however, that future temporal reference interpretations are not available for either positive or negative polarity existential constructions.  

(21) Mameri saburi, mameri oga hacha.

    mameri  saburi  mameri  o-     oga  hacha.
    NEG.EXT  machete  NEG.EXT  3nm-  that  axe

‘There were no machetes, there were none of those axes.’ (reading in actual discourse context)
‘There are no machetes, there are none of those axes.’ (available reading in other contexts)
BUT NOT: ‘There will be no machetes, there will be none of those axes.’

5.1 Exhaustive negation

The negative existential element mameri also appears in an ‘exhaustive negation’ construction together with lexical verbs, which expresses that the state of affairs described by the clause was not realized even to the smallest degree, as in (22) and (23). As with standard descriptive negation, this use of mameri triggers irrealis marking on the verb. Note that the exhaustive negation construction is only available for clauses which, prior to negation with mameri, are realis clauses. As such, exhaustive negation is not possible with counterfactual, deontic, or hypothetical clauses, or those with future temporal reference.

(22) Mameri inehakotero saburi, kotsiro.

    mameri  i=     nehako  -e     =ro  saburi  kotsiro
    NEG.EXT  3mS=  be.familiar.with  -IRREAL.1  3nmO  machete  knife

‘He had no familiarity with machetes or knives at all.’

In order to express an existential predication with future temporal reference it is necessary to employ the lexical verb tim ‘live’.
(23) Mame iritsamaite... onti yoogakara posuro.

mame  i=  ri-  tsamae -e  onti  i=  oog  -ak  -a
NEG.EXT 3mS= IRREAL- farm -IRREAL.I FOC 3mS= consume -PERF -REAL.A
=ra  posuro
=TEMP wild.plantain
‘He did not farm at all, rather he ate wild plantains.’

6 Morphologically complex negation in simple sentences

I examine in this section a number of morphologically complex negative elements attested in Nanti, beginning with lexicalized forms, and then turning to forms that arise productively from cliticization. I conclude with a discussion of the relationship between the long form of the descriptive negation particles _tera_ and _hara_, and their reduced forms, _te_ and _ha_.

6.1 Lexicalized complex negation forms

6.1.1 Extreme degree negation

Nanti exhibits a number of constructions that qualify or specify the degree to which the negation holds for the clause in question. One construction involves the distinct realis and irrealis negative particles _tesakona_ and _hasakona_. These particles indicate the negation of a construal of the clause in which the state of affairs denoted by the clause holds to a high or extreme degree, as in (24) and (25). The extreme degree negation particles restrict reality status and aspectual marking on verbs under their scope in the same way as the standard descriptive negation particles.

(24) Tesakona onkatsite.

tesakona  o=  N  katsi -e
NEG.REAL.XTRM 3mS= IRREAL- hurt -IRREAL.I
‘It does not hurt very much.’

(25) Hasakona nobiika.

hasakona  no=  obiik -a
NEG.IRREAL.XTRM IS= drink -REAL.A
‘I will not drink very much.’

In these to identify the in these negation particles the negative ‘roots’ _te_ and and _ha_, and a second element _-sakona_. The latter element does not appear synchronically as a productive morpheme elsewhere in the language, but is probably a lexicalized concatenation of the suffixes _-sano_ ‘truly’ and _-kona_ ‘a little bit’.
6.1.2 Non-immediate negation

Another pair of lexicalized morphologically complex negative particles, *tetana* and *haratana* ∼ *hatatana*, serve to indicate that the negated state of affairs denoted by some clause did not, or will not, obtain immediately after some salient reference point, as in (26) and (27).

(26) Tetana onti nopokashite.

```
tetana  onti    no=  pok    -ashi   -e
NEG.REAL.IMMED  PRED.FOC  1S=  come   -PURP  -IRREAL.1
```

‘I did not come right away (with some purpose in mind).’

(27) Hatatana nopokahi.

```
haratana  no=  pok    -ah     -i
NEG.IRREAL.IMMED  1S=  come   -REG  -REAL.1
```

‘I will not return right away.’

The forms *tetana* and *haratana* ∼ *hatatana* (note the free variation in the irrealis form) are probably lexicalized forms of the expressions *te tahena* and *hara tahena* ‘not right away’. The word *tahena* has a number of uses synchronically in Nanti, including a spatial adverb ‘near to one another’, the temporal adverb ‘soon, right away’, an interjection ‘hurry up!’, and a suppletive imperative ‘come’. The first two of these uses, with their senses of spatial and temporal proximity, are plausible sources for the non-immediate negation meanings of *tetana* and *haratana*.

6.2 Negative particles as clitic hosts

Morphologically complex negative forms also result from the fact that the short forms of the descriptive negation particles *te* and *ha* can serve as hosts for second-position clitics, including the deontic clitic =me and the durational clitic =tya. Morphologically complex negation forms also arise in clause-linking constructions, where second-position clitics such as the counterfactual conditional =me, the possible conditional =rika, and the purposive =ni attach to negation elements (see §7).

6.2.1 Deontic negation

Deontic modality is expressed by the deontic clitic =me, as exemplified in positive polarity clause in (28). The deontic marker is a second position clitic, as can be seen by comparing (28) and (29). In negative polarity deontic clauses, the deontic marker cliticizes to the short form of the sentence-initial irrealis negation particle *ha*, resulting in the negative deontic element *hame*, as in (30).

(28) Nonkiahakeme sekatsi.

```
no=  N-   kih    -ak    -e    =me    sekatsi
1S=  IRREAL-  carry  -PERF  -IRREAL  =DEONT  yuca
```

‘I should have carried (i.e. brought) yuca.’
(29) Birome pahigahero.

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{biro} & \text{=} & \text{me} & \text{p} & \text{-hig} & \text{-ah} & \text{-e} & \text{=} & \text{ro} \\
\text{2.PRO} & \text{=} & \text{DEONT} & \text{give} & \text{-PL} & \text{-REG} & \text{-IRREAL.I} & \text{=} & \text{3nmO}
\end{array}
\]

“You should have given them back.”

(30) Hame pitsosena.<p></p>ha

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{ha} & \text{=} & \text{me} & \text{pi=} & \text{tsot} & \text{-se} & \text{-na} & \text{-i} & \text{=} & \text{ro} \\
\text{NEG.IRREAL} & \text{=} & \text{DEONT} & \text{2S=} & \text{shlp.up} & \text{-CL:mass} & \text{-MAL.REP} & \text{-REAL.I} & \text{=} & \text{3nmO}
\end{array}
\]

“You shouldn’t slurp it up.”

6.2.2 Durational negation

A second complex negative form results from cliticization of the second position clitic =tya, which indicates that the state of affairs described by the clause endures up to some relevant temporal reference point, often the moment of speaking, as in (31). The same clitic will attach to negative particles if they occupy clause-initial position, as they typically do, resulting in morphologically complex negation forms, as in (32) and (33). Note that in cases of realis negation, the short form te

(31) Aityotya oburoki.

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{aityo} & \text{=} & \text{tya} & \text{oburoki} \\
\text{EXIST.INAN} & \text{=} & \text{STILL} & \text{manioc. beer}
\end{array}
\]

‘There is still manioc beer (to drink).’

(32) te 

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{te} & \text{=} & \text{tya} & \text{o=} & \text{N} & \text{- pok} & \text{-ah} & \text{-e} \\
\text{NEG.REAL} & \text{=} & \text{STILL} & \text{3nmS=} & \text{come} & \text{-REG} & \text{-IRREAL.I}
\end{array}
\]

‘She has not come back yet.’

(33) Haratya nokanti.

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{hara} & \text{=} & \text{tya} & \text{no=} & \text{kant} & \text{-i} \\
\text{NEG.IRREAL} & \text{=} & \text{STILL} & \text{1S=} & \text{say} & \text{-REAL.I}
\end{array}
\]

‘I will not yet say.’

6.3 Analyzing tera and hara

The morphologically complex forms described in the previous section suggest that in addition to the long forms of the negation particles tera and hara, there are corresponding short forms te and ha that appear in forms such as tesakona and hasakona ‘not very much’. This notion is supported by the fact that the forms te and ha are attested in spoken Nanti as unstressed proclitic forms, as in (34) and (35).

(34) Te nonkamante. [tenòŋkamánte]
te  no=  N-  kamant  -e
NEG.REAL  1S=  IRREAL-  tell  -IRREAL.1
'I did not tell.'

(35) Ha pagi. [hapágsí]

ha  pi=  ag  -i
NEG.IRREAL  2S=  get  -REAL.1
'You won’t get (it).'

This suggests the possibility that we should analyze *tera* and *hara* as morphologically complex elements, a proposal which gains some plausibility from the fact that there exists a polyfunctional clitic =ra, which appears on purposive clauses, as in (41), and in temporal overlap clause-linking constructions (Michael, 2008: 429-430). Several converging pieces of evidence suggest that this idea is ultimately incorrect, however, and that the pairs of long and short forms developed through a process of analogical change, with their current distribution being governed by prosodic factors, and secondarily, information structural concerns.

First, comparison of Nanti negation particles with those found in the other five Kampan languages (see §9) indicates that Nanti is the only language, other than the closely related Matsigenka, to exhibit both short and long forms for the realis and irrealis negation particles. All other Kampan languages exhibit a monosyllabic form for the realis negation particle (i.e. cognates to *te*) and a disyllabic form for the irrealis negation particle (i.e. cognates to *hara*). This fact suggests Nanti historically likewise exhibited a ‘short’ realis negation particle and a ‘long’ irrealis one, and that long and short counterparts were developed by analogy, resulting in full sets of short and long negation particles for both realis and irrealis.

Evidence in favor of this analysis can be found in certain lexicalized forms such as *haratya* ‘not yet (irrealis)’, which exhibit the long form of the irrealis negation particle, when we would expect, based on the realis counterpart *tetya*, the unattested *hatya*. The pairs *tetana* ‘not soon (realis)’ and *haratana* ‘not soon (irrealis)’ (not *hatana*) exhibit the same pattern. The existence of lexicalized forms like *haratya* and *haratana* is readily explained if the short form *ha* were a later historical development.

Finally, it is important to note that I have been unable to discern any semantic or syntactic difference between the long and short forms of the negation particles. This fact likewise argues against *tera* and *hara* being morphologically complex, since we would expect the hypothetical morpheme *ra* to contribute either some semantic content or structural feature to the supposedly complex negation forms. Instead, the distribution of these forms appears to be governed by prosodic factors, and secondarily, information structural ones.

Long negation forms are obligatorily when constituting the only word in an utterance, suggesting that in this case the long forms are selected to satisfy the Nanti disyllabic minimum word requirement (Crowhurst and Michael 2005) – indeed, this factor may be responsible in part for the original analogical development of the long form of the realis negation particle. Long forms are also common in slow or careful speech, in which negative particles are stress-bearing, and likewise must satisfy
the disyllabic minimum word requirement. Similarly, constructions exhibiting constituent focus, as in (36), or predicate focus, as in (26), overwhelmingly bear stress and exhibit long negation forms.

(36) Yokari yoka hara iryo ikihi.

\[i-\text{oka} =\text{ri}\ i-\text{oka} \text{ hara} \text{ iryo} \ i=\text{kih} \ -i\]

3m- this =CNTRST 3m- this NEG.IRREAL 3m.FOC.PRO 3mS= enter -REAL.I

‘This one, he won’t enter.’

Short forms, in contrast, appear either when negation particles serve as clitic hosts, or in fast speech. In the former case the morphologically complex elements formed by the short negation particle and clitic satisfy the disyllabic minimum word requirement, licensing (but not requiring) the short forms. We must separately posit that clitics select for short negation particles. In the case of fast speech, short forms cliticize to phonological words to their right, suggesting that negation destresses in fast speech and then seeks a host phonological word in order to satisfy the minimum word requirement.

7 Negation in clause-linking constructions

Negation in Nanti clause-linking constructions behaves largely as it does in simple sentences. However, conditional and purposive constructions exhibit morphologically complex forms of negation not found in single clause sentences, and the presence of negation particles is restricted in deranked complement clauses. We consider these two issues now.

7.1 Negation in possible conditional constructions

The protasis of conditional constructions are formed with the second position conditional clitic =rika, as in (37). As this example illustrates, positive polarity protasis clauses take irrealis marking, with their negative polarity counterparts exhibiting doubly irrealis constructions that exhibit the irrealis negative particle ha, as in (38). Note that the negative particle serves as a host to the conditional clitic, resulting in a morphologically complex negation element.

(37) [No\text{porohakerika} ha\text{Nta} parikoti}_{\text{COND}}, [\text{iro\text{Npa} aka pokahena aka o\text{NKuta}}]_{\text{RESULT}}.

\[no= \text{N-} \text{poroh} \ -ak \ -e \ =\text{rika} \ ha\text{Nta} \ parikoti \ iro\text{Npa} \ aka\]

1S= IRREAL- clear.land -PERF IRREAL.I =COND there far.away suddenly here

\[pok \ -ah \ -e \ =\text{na} \ aka \ o\text{NKuta}\]

come -REG IRREAL.I =1O here next.day

‘If I were to clear land far away over there, I would promptly come back here the following day.’

(38) [Harika otimi ha\text{Npi}]_{\text{COND}}, [hara noka\text{NTi maika aka p\text{NTimake} aka}]_{\text{RESULT}}.
7.2 Negation in counterfactual conditional constructions

Counterfactual conditional constructions express a conditional relationship between two events that failed to be realized in the past. As is to be expected from the notionally irrealis nature of both events, positive polarity counterfactual clauses take irrealis marking, as in (39), while negative polarity counterfactual clauses exhibit doubly irrealis constructions, as in the protasis clause of (40). Both clauses bear the second position counterfactual clitic =me.

(39) Inkaharame nohate, nonTsombokerome.

‘Had I gone earlier, I would have finished it (clearing the garden).’

(40) Hame nokisaini matsontsori, nohatakeme Inkenishiku.

‘Had I not dreamed of a jaguar, I would have gone into the forest.’

7.3 Negation in purposive constructions

Purposive constructions exhibit an idiosyncratic polarity-sensitive alternation in the marking of the purpose clause, resulting in a structural asymmetry between positive and negative polarity purpose clauses. Positive polarity purpose clauses are marked with the verbal clitic =ra, and exhibit irrealis marking, as in (41). Negative polarity purposive clauses, however, exhibit a morphologically complex the negative purposive element hani and realis marking, as in (42). The latter element can be decomposed into two morphemes, the irrealis negation ha, and a purposive marker ni, leading us to conclude that such clauses are doubly irrealis, as we would expect, but that the form of the purposive marker changes from that found in positive polarity clauses =ra, to the special negative purposive form ni. Note that the latter element appears only when attached to the irrealis negation, rendering the second position clitic analysis we have advanced for other complex forms of negation in Nanti somewhat less attractive. It is unclear at this point, however, where we should treat hani as a lexicalized negative purposive element or consider ni a suffix to the negative particle.
It should be noted that cognates to =ni surface as second position clausal purposive clitics in both negative and positive polarity goal clauses in several other Kampan languages, such as Kakinte (Swift, 1988: 37-38), and in the closely related Matsigenka (Snell, 1998: 62). The morphological asymmetry we see in the case of Nanti is presumably a result of the expanding function of the subordinate clause marker, =ra at the expense of the former general purpose marker, =ni.

(41) Yagutake niha irobiikepara.

\[
\begin{align*}
i= & \text{agu} & -ak & -i & \text{niha} & -ri- & \text{obiik} & -\emptyset & -\text{en} \text{pa} \\
3\text{mS}= & \text{climb.down} & -\text{PERF} & -\text{REAL} & \text{i} & \text{water} & 3\text{mS}= & \text{IRREAL} & \text{drink} & -\text{IMPF} & -\text{IRREAL} & \text{A} \\
= & =\text{ra} \\
= & =\text{SUB} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘He (a howler monkey) climbed down to drink water.’

(42) Norobite hani omakasabiti.

\[
\begin{align*}
o= & \text{o[+voice]} & -\text{rog} & -\text{bi} & -\emptyset & -\text{e} & \text{ha} & =\text{ni} & o= \\
1\text{S}= & \text{CAUS} & \text{dry} & -\text{CL:1D.rigid} & -\text{IMPF} & -\text{IRREAL} & \text{i} & \text{NEG,IRREAL} & =\text{PURP} & 3\text{mS}= \\
makasa & -\text{bi} & -\text{i} & \text{decay} & -\text{CL:1D.rigid} & -\text{REAL} & \text{i} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘I will dry (the arrow cane) so that it does not decay.’

7.4 Negation in relative clauses

Relative clauses in Nanti are formed with a second position relativizing clitic =rira (Michael 2008: 402-414), as in (43) which is identical in form, though not distribution, to the deverbal nominalizing suffix -rira (Michael 2008: 303-304). Since the relativizer is a second position clitic, it is not surprising that negated relative clauses exhibit a morphologically complex negation element, consisting of the the short form of the negation particle, to which the relativizer cliticizes, as in (44).

(43) Aityo oburoki [birorira tinkiro]_{\text{RelCl}}?

\[
\begin{align*}
aityo & \text{oburoki} & \text{biro} & =\text{rira} & \text{tink} & -i & =\text{ro} \\
\text{exist} & \text{manioc.beer} & 2.\text{FOC.PRO} & =\text{REL} & \text{mash} & -\text{REAL} & =3\text{NM}\text{O} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Is there manioc beer that you mashed?’

(44) Sharoni okigake sekatsi [teriria nantabagete]_{\text{RelCl}}.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sharoni} & \text{no}= & \text{kig} & -ak & -i & \text{sekatsi} & \text{te} & =\text{rira} & \text{no}= & \text{antabaget} \\
\text{agouti} & 3\text{nmS}= & \text{dig} & -\text{PERF} & -\text{REAL} & \text{i} & \text{manioc} & \text{NEG,REAL} & =\text{REL} & 1\text{S}= & \text{weed} \\
-e & -\text{IRREAL} & \text{i} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘An agouti dug up the manioc that I didn’t weed.’
7.5 Negation in complement clause constructions

In Nanti, complement clauses exhibit restrictions on the presence of negation particles depending on whether they are deranked, i.e. exhibit inflectional restrictions by virtue of their syntactic relation with other clauses, or ranked, and do not exhibit such restrictions. Specifically, negation particles cannot appear deranked complement clauses, but can appear in ranked ones. Deranked complements are further distinguished in terms of whether the complement is prospective or not, where prototypical examples of the former are desiderative complements (i.e. complements of kog ‘want’).

As indicated, sentences with deranked non-desiderative complements may exhibit negative particles in the matrix clause, but not in the complement clause, as demonstrated by the grammatical (45a) and the ungrammatical (45b). Note that non-prospective deranked complement clauses exhibit the same reality status as their associated matrix clauses, as evident in comparing (45a) and (45c), and that in negated sentences, such complements cannot exhibit overt aspect marking, as evident in (45d). Deranked complements of this type thus exhibit the morphological behavior of negated clauses, indicating that although they cannot exhibit their own negation particles, the are clearly fall under the scope of the negation particle in the matrix clause. And as demonstrated by the perfective complement verb in (46), there is no restriction on aspectual marking per se in deranked complements other than that imposed by negation in the matrix clause.

(45) a. Tera iragabehe iriha.

`tera i= ri- agabeh -e i= ri- ha -e`

NEG.REAL 3mS= IRREAL- be.able -IRREAL.1 3mS= IRREAL- go -IRREAL.1

‘He is unable to go.’

b. *Yagabehi tera iriha.

`i= agabeh -i i= tera i= ri- ha -e`

3mS= be.able -REAL.1 NEG.REAL 3mS= IRREAL- go -IRREAL.1

INTENDED: ‘He is able to not go.’

c. Yagabehi ihati.

`i= agabeh -i i= ha -i`

3mS= be.able -REAL.1 3mS= go REAL.1

‘He is able to go.’

d. *Tera iragabehe irihaftake.

`tera i= ri- agabeh -e i= ri- ha ak`

NEG.REAL 3mS= IRREAL- be.able -IRREAL.1 3mS= IRREAL- go -PERF -e -IRREAL.1

‘He is unable to go.’

(46) Iragabehe irimatikake.
Prospective complements, such as desiderative complements, present a slightly different situation, in that they exhibit irrealis marking even whether the matrix clause exhibits realis or irrealis marking, as evident in (47a) and (47b). Irrealis marking in the subordinate clause is maintained when matrix clause is negated, as in (47a’), and as in the case of non-prospective deranked complements, desiderative complements do not permit negation particles, as evident in (47a”). The sole case in which prospective deranked complements show realis marking when the matrix clause is a doubly irrealis constructions, as in (47b’). Note that such clauses exhibit the same restrictions on negation as their counterparts negated with the realis negation particles, as in evident in (47)

since they are obligatorily irrealis, regardless of the reality status of their matrix desiderative verb, as in (47a&amp;b), which exhibit realis and irrealis matrix clauses respectively. While negation particles can appear in the matrix clauses of these constructions, as in (47a’&b’), they cannot appear in the deranked complement clauses, as in the ungrammatical (47a”&b”&b”).

(47)  a. Ikogake irihate.

    i= ri- agabeh -e i= ri- matik -ak -e
    3mS= IRREAL- be.able -IRREAL.1 3mS= IRREAL- sing -PERF -IRREAL.1
    ‘He will be able to sing.’

    a’. Tera inkoge irihate.

    tera i= n- kog -e i= ri- ha -e.
    NEG.REAL 3mS= IRREAL- want -IRREAL.1 3mS= IRREAL- go -IRREAL.1
    ‘He did not want to go.’

    a”. *Ikogake/Inkoge tera/hara irihate.

    INTENDED SENSE: ‘He wanted to not go.’

b. Inkoge irihate.

    i= n- kog -e i= ri- ha -e
    3mS= IRREAL- want -IRREAL.1 3mS= IRREAL- go -IRREAL.1
    ‘He will want to go.’

    b’. Hara ikogi ihati.

    hara i= kog -i i= ri- ha -e
    NEG.IRREAL 3mS= want -REAL.1 3mS= go -REAL.1
    ‘He will not want to go.’

    b”. *Inkoge/ikogi tera/hara irihate.

    INTENDED SENSE: ‘He will want to not go.’

Nanti exhibits a relatively small number of verbs that take deranked complement clauses, including a small number of verbs of perception, including neh ‘see’, phasal/aspectuals verbs, such as tsonk ‘finish’ and matah ‘do again’, and modal ones such as agabeh ‘be able’.
Ranked complement clauses in Nanti, on the other hand, freely permit negation particles, as in the prototypical case of reported speech complements, given in (48).

(48) Ikanti hara pahigahiri saburi.

\[
\begin{align*}
&i= \text{kant} -i \text{ hara} p \text{ -hig} -\text{ah} -\text{i} =\text{ri} \text{ saburi} \\
&3\text{mS} \text{= say } -\text{REAL.1 NEG.REAL give } -\text{PL} -\text{REG -REAL.1 } =\text{3mO machete}
\end{align*}
\]

‘He said, “Don’t give him a machete again.”’

All ranked complement clauses in Nanti exhibit the morphosyntactic characteristics of reported speech complements (e.g. with regards to deixis), and certain non-communication verbs (e.g. pintsa ‘decide’) even optionally employ a complementizer, which is homophonous with the quotative evidential, and may be grammaticalizing from it (Michael, 2008: 416-417).

8 Negative indefinites

Nanti positive indefinite pronouns are based on interrogative words, either being identical to them, or optionally bearing the indefinite clitic =\text{ka}, as in (49b).

(49) a. Tyani tentakeri?

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{tyani} \text{ tent} -\text{ak} -\text{i} =\text{ri} \\
&\text{which.one.ANIM accompany } -\text{PERF } -\text{REAL.1 } =\text{3mO}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Who accompanied him?’

b. Tyanika tentakeri.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{tyani} =\text{ka} \text{ tent} -\text{ak} -\text{i} =\text{ri} \\
&\text{which.one.ANIM accompany } =\text{indef } -\text{PERF } -\text{REAL.1 } =\text{3mO}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Someone accompanied him.’

It is unclear if Nanti exhibits distinct negative indefinite pronouns, as their function is filled by collocations of standard negation particles and positive polarity indefinite pronouns, as in (50b). Since clauses with these candidate negative indefinites exhibit reality status marking consistent with the negation particle having clausal scope, rather than simply negating the indefinite pronoun, analyzing these collocations of negation particles and indefinite pronouns as negative indefinite pronouns does not seem warranted. Rather, it is more consistent with the reality status marking facts to treat cases like (50b), (51), and (52) as negative polarity sentences with (positive) indefinite arguments. Note that these ‘negative indefinite’ constructions can be formed with both realis and irrealis negation particles, as appropriate to the overall RS of the clause, and exemplified in (50) and (53), respectively.

(50) a. Tsini pinehake?

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{tsini } pi= \text{ neh} -\text{ak} -\text{i} \\
&\text{who } 2\text{S= see } -\text{PERF } -\text{REAL.1}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Whom did you see?’
9 Comparative observations

In this section I discuss major similarities and divergences between negation in Nanti and that in other Arawak languages, focusing on the interaction between negation and reality status, and on the reflexes of the Proto-Arawak privative *ma in Nanti

As described in §3, the Nanti descriptive negation and reality status systems interact in a complex manner, and there is evidence that this system may be of considerable antiquity in Southern Arawak. First, it is clear that Proto-Kampa (PK) must have possessed a RS system very similar to that described here for Nanti, since the other modern Kampan language exhibit RS systems that appear to differ in only minor ways from the Nanti one (Kindberg 1980, Payne 1981, Shaver 1996, Snell 1998, Swift 1988). RS is a binary inflectional category in all the Kampan languages, and as evident in Table 5 (which suppresses details of allomorphy in specific languages), there is considerable similarity among the languages in terms of reality status morphology and the related forms of negation. As far as can be determined from published sources, the semantics of realis and irrealis marking in these languages appears to be quite similar to that of Nanti, and they also all exhibit doubly irrealis constructions in the prototypical case of negated clauses with future temporal reference.\footnote{It should be noted, however, that these sources leave many questions unanswered about the RS of the languages in question, and there will no doubt be interesting differences to be uncovered among the languages by future research.}

There are also indications of similar systems in more distantly related Southern Arawak languages. In particular, Terêna, a language spoken in Brazil near the Paraguayan border, possesses
Table 5: Reality status suffixes and negation in the Kampan languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>I-class</th>
<th>A-class</th>
<th>REAL.NEG</th>
<th>I-class</th>
<th>A-class</th>
<th>IRREAL.NEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashéninka</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-ea</td>
<td>eiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asháninka</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-ia</td>
<td>eero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakinte</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>-eNpa</td>
<td>-eNpa</td>
<td>aato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsigenka</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>te(ra)</td>
<td>-eNpa</td>
<td>-eNpa</td>
<td>ga(ra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanti</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>te(ra)</td>
<td>-eNpa</td>
<td>-eNpa</td>
<td>ha(ra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomatsigenga</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-ema</td>
<td>kero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

an RS system strikingly similar to the Kampan ones.\(^8\) As in the Kampan languages, a realis/irrealis contrast is obligatorily marked on all Terêna verbs, as in (54),\(^9\) and the language also distinguishes two negation particles that select for the notional reality status of the clauses they negate: a realis negation \textit{ako}, as in (55a) and an irrealis negation \textit{hyoko}, as in (55b) (Ekdahl and Grimes 1964, Butler 1978).\(^10\) Strikingly, the use of the irrealis negation triggers nominally ‘realis’ marking on the verb, producing a doubly irrealis construction like that found in the Kampan languages.

(54) a. \textit{pih} -áp -o  
\textit{go} -REG -REAL  
‘He went back (to where he came from).’

b. \textit{pîh} -áp -a  
\textit{go} -REG -IRREAL  
‘He will go back (to where he came from).’

(55) a. \textit{ako} \textit{pih} -áp -a  
\textit{NEG.REAL} \textit{go} -REG -IRREAL  
‘He did not go back (to where he came from).’

b. \textit{hyoko} \textit{pih} -áp -o  
\textit{NEG.IRREAL} \textit{go} -REG -REAL  
‘He will not go back (to where he came from).’

The remarkable formal similarities between the two systems suggest shared descent from an RS system in a common parent language, since systems like those displayed by the Kampan languages and Terêna appear to be typologically rare.\(^11\) And, although recent classifications place both the

\(^8\)My thanks to Sasha Aikhenvald for bringing the Terêna system to my attention.
\(^9\)Although the available descriptions are somewhat sketchy, the notional organization of the Terêna RS system appears to largely coincide with that of the Kampan languages. The one notable difference is that future temporal reference may take either realis or irrealis marking depending on the degree of certainty with which the speaker predicates the future event.
\(^10\)Note that Ekdahl and Grimes (1964) characterizes the inflectional contrast as between ‘actual’ and ‘potential’, and refer to the two negations as the ‘negation of actual mood’ and the ‘negation of potential mood’ respectively.
\(^11\)While Miestamo (2005) finds interaction between negation and reality status to be not that typologically rare, he apparently did not encounter any languages with ‘doubly irrealis’ marking like that found in Southern Arawak.
Kampan languages and Terêna in the Southern division of the Arawak family (Aikhenvald 1999, Campbell 1997), no one suggests a close relationship between the two language, suggesting that the RS system from which the Terêna and Kampan systems developed was present at some early stage in the diversification of Southern Arawak.

Turning to the Proto-Arawak privative marker *ma, we note that it is no longer morphologically productive in Nanti, nor apparently in any of the other Kampan varieties. There are, however, a number of lexical roots and two negation particles which appear to exhibit the privative in frozen form. For example, there are a small number of pairs of lexical roots such magempi ‘be deaf’,

gempita ‘ear’ and tsogampi ‘be sharp’, amatsogampi ‘be blunt’ which may be lexicalized remnants of a formerly productive privative derivation process. Likewise, further research may show that the negative existential verb mameri (see §5) and the metalinguistic negation particle matsi (see §4) are related to the PA privative.

The functions filled by the modern reflexes of *ma in other languages are filled by a number of mechanisms in Nanti. The common cross-Arawak function of this morpheme in deriving negative nominal-modifying predicates from nouns (see Aikhenvald, Munro, Patte, this volume) is handled largely by relative clauses or by standard negation of stative verbs that take the relevant noun as an argument. The function of the privative in some languages, such as Lokono (see Patte, this volume), of forming a denominal verb denoting the loss of a part from the pertinent whole is in Nanti filled by the reversative -reh (Michael, 2008: 275-275 & 289-290). From verbs the reversative derives a stem that denotes the reversal of some action, as in (56a), but it may also derive an intransitive verb from an inalienable noun, as in (56b).

(56) a. Okucharehanake.

\[
\begin{align*}
o &= kuch & -reh & -an & -ak & -i \\
3nmS &= snag & \text{-REV} & \text{-PERF} & \text{-REAL.1} \\
\text{‘It became un-snagged.’}
\end{align*}
\]

b. Ogitorehake.

\[
\begin{align*}
o &= gito & -reh & -ak & -i \\
3nmS &= head & \text{-REV} & \text{-PERF} & \text{-REAL.1} \\
\text{‘It’s head came off.’}
\end{align*}
\]
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