

CHAPTER NINE

NEGATION IN NANTI*

LEV MICHAEL

1. *Introduction*

This chapter describes negation constructions in Nanti, a Kampan Arawak language. Negation constructions discussed in this chapter include negation in main and subordinate declarative clauses, 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 different main clause negation constructions, which are distinguished by their semantic, pragmatic, and/or syntactic properties. Nanti exhibits an unusual distinction between standard/descriptive negation, described in §3, and metalinguistic negation constructions (Carston 1996, Geurts 1998, Horn 1985), discussed in §4, where the latter exclusively serve to deny propositions that have surfaced in, or are implied by, the preceding discourse. Nanti descriptive main clause negation is also typologically unusual, as it involves three different constructions, which make use of two distinct negation particles which exhibit complicated interactions with clausal reality status (Elliott 2000). Nanti exhibits a distinct existential negation construction, described in §5, which employs a defective negative verb, which also surfaces in an ‘exhaustive negation’ construction. These five types of declarative main clause negation are summarized in Table 1. In addition to these major constructions, which involve morphologically simplex negation elements, Nanti also exhibits a number of

* I am grateful to the residents of the Nanti community of Montetoni for their good will and their patience in teaching me about their language and their lives. I owe special thanks to †Migero, Bikotoro, and Tekori for the additional interest they took in me and my work. Christine Beier has been my research partner in the Nanti communities since the beginning, and in innumerable conversations has contributed much to my understanding of the Nanti language. Part of this work was carried out in affiliation with the *Centro de Investigación de Lingüística Aplicada* (CILA), at the *Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos* (Lima, Perú), and I thank Gustavo Solís and Elsa Vilchez, the center’s directors, for their support. The fieldwork on which this is based was funded in part by an NSF GRF Fellowship, a Fulbright-Hays DDRA Fellowship, and an NSF DDRI Grant.

morphologically complex negative elements, discussed in §6. The complex negation elements are employed in ‘extreme degree’, non-immediate, deontic, and durational negation constructions.

Table 1. *Principal Nanti main clause negation elements and their morphosyntactic and pragmatic restrictions*

NEGATION TYPE	NEG FORM	MORPHOSYNTACTIC PROPERTIES	PRAGMATIC RESTRICTIONS
DESCRIPTIVE	<i>te(ra)</i> <i>ha(ra)</i>	negates notionally realis clauses only negates notionally irrealis clauses only	none none
METALINGUISTIC	<i>matsi</i>	no interaction with reality status	‘echoic’ use only
EXISTENTIAL	<i>mameri</i>	morphosyntactically defective	none
EXHAUSTIVE	<i>mameri</i>	negates notionally realis clauses only	‘exhaustive’ sense only

Negation constructions in subordinate clauses, discussed in §7, differ from main clause ones in their tendency to employ phonologically reduced forms of negation particles, which often serve as clitic hosts for the second-position clitics that mark the semantic relationship between the main and subordinate clause. Both the complex negation elements that surface in subordinate clauses and the restrictions on negation exhibited by the subordinate clauses are discussed in that section.

Negative indefinite constructions, which are mainly formed with the negation particles found in descriptive main clause negation, are described in §8. Finally, comparative observations relating Nanti main clause negation constructions to those in the other Arawak languages are presented in §9, as are observations relating the metalinguistic and existential negation elements to the Proto-Arawak privative **ma-*.

2. Sociolinguistic, Comparative, and Typological Background

Nanti is a language of the Kampan group,¹ a set 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 group includes five commonly recognized varieties:

¹ This group 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).

Asháninka, Asháninka, Kakinte, Matsigenka, and Nomatsigenga. Linguists differ on the number of distinct languages they recognize in this group, 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 group 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 group (Payne and Payne 2005). Arguments are realized either as person markers (or cross-reference markers), 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 NP in any clause. Inflectional nominal morphology is minimal, consisting of optional plural marking and a single general locative 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 are drawn from non-elicited, naturally-occurring discourse.

3. *Descriptive Main Clause Negation*

In this section I describe Nanti descriptive main clause negation constructions and discuss the interaction between clausal polarity, reality status, and aspect exhibited by these constructions. These constructions exhibit two distinct negation elements, *tera* and *hara* (and their related reduced forms *te* and *ha*; see §6), whose distribution is conditioned by the semantics and morphosyntactic properties of the clauses that they negate. We consider these issues now.

The distribution of the two negative particles is determined by the notional reality status of the clauses undergoing negation, with *tera*

serving to negate notionally realis clauses, as in (1), and *hara* negating notionally irrealis clauses, as in (2). As these examples illustrate, the negation elements normally appear immediately preverbally.

- (1) a. Iporohi.
i=poroh- ϕ -i
 3MS=clear.land-IMPF-REA.I
 ‘He is clearing land.’ (REALIS)
- b. Tera imporohe.
tera i=N-poroh-e
 NEG.REA 3MS=IRR-clear.land-IRR.I
 ‘He is not clearing land.’
- (2) a. Imporohe.
i=N-poroh- ϕ -e
 3MS= IRR-clear.land-IMPF-IRR.I
 ‘He will clear land.’ (IRREALIS)
- b. Hara iporohi.
hara i=poroh-i
 NEG.IRR 3MS=clear.land-REA.I
 ‘He will not clear land.’

These examples illustrate that the choice of negation element is determined by the notional reality status of the corresponding positive polarity clause, and that in turn, negation affects the marking of reality status of the whole, now negated, clause. In order to better understand these related phenomena, we now briefly review the semantics and morphosyntax of reality status marking in Nanti. Note that a comparison of the preceding positive polarity sentences and their negative counterparts shows that they differ in reality status marking, and that these constructions therefore exhibit a paradigmatic asymmetry of the A/NonReal type, in Miestamo’s (2005) typology.

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

declarative 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*

SEMANTIC PARAMETER	REALIS MARKING	IRREALIS MARKING
TEMPORAL REFERENCE	Non-future	Future
HYPOTHETICALITY	Actual	Hypothetical, (Conditional)
FACTUALITY	Factual	Counterfactual
SPEAKER-ORIENTED MODALITY	∅	Imperative, Polite Directive/Exhortative
AGENT-ORIENTED MODALITY	∅	Obligation, Need
PROSPECTIVENESS	∅	Purposive, Prospective complement

(3) Opoki maika.

o=pok-∅-i *maika*

3NMS=come-IMPF-REA.I now

‘She is coming now.’

(non-future temporal reference; indicative modality)

(4) a. Ompoke kamani.

o=N-pok-∅-e *kamani*

3NMS=IRR-come-IMPF-IRR.I tomorrow

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

b. Ompokakeme chapi.

o=N-pok-ak-e=me *chapi*

3NMS=IRR-come-PERF-IRR.I=DEO yesterday

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

c. Pena!

p-∅-e=na

give-IMPF-IRR.I=1O

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

Note that realis is marked by a suffix, while irrealis is marked by a circumfix.² The reality status suffixes exhibit lexically-conditioned allomorphy based on the division of Nanti verbs into two semantically arbitrary verb classes, the I-class and A-class verbs, as summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. *Reality status affix allomorphy*

	I-CLASS STEM	A-CLASS STEM
REALIS	-i	-a
IRREALIS	N- -e	N- -eNpa

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 *tera* and *hara* can be schematized as in (6a) and (7a), where the alternation between the two forms of negation is conditioned by the *notional* reality status of the clause to which they apply, with the ‘realis negation’ *tera* used to negate notionally realis clauses, and the ‘irrealis negation’ *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. *tera* (Cl_{realis})

b. Opoki.

o=pok-φ-i

3NMS=come-IMPF-REA.I

‘She is coming.’ = Cl_{realis}

² Note also that there are a number of morphophonological processes which result in the deletion of the leftmost element of the irrealis circumfix. This element is an underspecified nasal, and it acquires its place of articulation features from voiceless stops or affricates to its right. It deletes when no appropriate voiceless stop or affricate is available, (as in (17)). This first element of the circumfix also deletes when the verb is stripped of its subject prefix, as in the imperative, since such stripping results in a forbidden complex word-initial onset (e.g. *mp*, as in (4c)), which is resolved by the deletion of the nasal stop.

c. Tera ompoke.

tera *o=N-pok-e*

NEG.REA 3NMS=IRR-come-IRR.I

‘She did not come.’ = not (she came) = Neg (Cl_{realis})

(7) a. hara (Cl_{irrealis})

b. Ompoke.

o=N-pok-ø-e

3NMS=IRR-come-IMP-IRR.I

‘She will come.’ = Cl_{irrealis}

c. Hara opoki.

hara *o=pok-i*

NEG.IRR 3NMS=come-REA.I

‘She will not come’ = not (she will come) = Neg

(Cl_{irrealis})

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

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 (8). Given that the states of affairs which can be 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*.

(8) Pahentya inkame.

pahentya *i=N-kam-e*

almost 3MS=IRR-die-IRR.I

‘He almost died.’

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 (9), and the negative conditional and negative counterfactual, described in §7, below.

- (9) Hame opoki.
ha=me o=pok-i
 NEG.IRR=DEO 3NMS=come-REA.I
 ‘She should not have come.’

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

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

Table 4. *Summary: Negation and reality status marking*

	REALIS	IRREALIS	DOUBLY IRREALIS
POSITIVE POLARITY	V <i>-i ~ -a</i>	N- V <i>-e ~ -eNpa</i>	
NEGATIVE POLARITY		NEG (REALIS) = IRREALIS <i>tera N- V -e ~ -eNpa</i>	NEG (IRREALIS) = DOUBLY IRREALIS <i>hara V -i ~ -a</i>

Note that Nanti does not exhibit a distinct prohibitive construction; rather, Nantis simply employ irrealis sentences with second-person subjects and a directive intonation to issue prohibitive directives, as in (10), 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.

- (10) Hara poogaro.
hara pi=oog-a=ro
 NEG.IRR 2S=consume-REA.A=3NMO
 ‘Don’t eat it!’ or ‘You will not eat it.’

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- \emptyset -i
 3MS=speak-IMPF-REA.I
 ‘He is/was speaking.’
- b. Inihake.
i=nih-ak-i³
 3MS=speak-PERF-REA.I
 ‘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.
tera i=ri-⁴nih-e
 NEG.REA 3MS= IRR-speak-IRR.I
 ‘He doesn’t/didn’t speak.’
- b. *Tera irinihake
- c. Hara inihi.
hara i=nih-i
 NEG.IRR 3MS= speak-REA.I
 ‘He will not speak.’
- d. *Hara inihake

Since the perfective/imperfective contrast is neutralized in negated clauses, Nanti exhibits paradigmatic neutralization asymmetry, in Miestamo’s (2005) terms. Note that the perfective/imperfective contrast is preserved in positive polarity irrealis constructions, as in (13), and consequently the aspectual neutralization we see in Nanti negative

³ In most cases, the realis *-i* neutralizes to *-e* following the perfective *-ak* (Michael 2008: 253).

⁴ The irrealis prefix *N-* irregularly surfaces as *ri-* following the third person masculine subject marker *i=*.

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.
i=ri-nih-ø-e
 3MS=IRR-speak-IMP-IRR.I
 ‘He will speak.’
- b. Irinihake.
i=ri-nih-ak-e
 3MS=IRR-speak-PERF-IRR.I
 ‘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,^{5,6} expressing what Geurts (1998) call ‘proposition denial’, i.e. 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 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.
matsi no=p-ak-i=ri maika
 NEG.META 1S=give-PERF-REA.I=3MO now
peremisa
 permission
 ‘It is not the case that I gave him permission at that time.’

⁵ Kahrel (1996: 19-20) mentions Vietnamese and Navajo as languages with distinct metalinguistic negation markers.

⁶ This form of negation has also been called *external negation* (Horn 1985), *propositional negation* (Kahrel 1996), *modality negation* (Lyons 1977), and *radical negation* (Seuren 1976).

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

- (15) Matsi iryo gaatiro, naro gaatiro.⁷
matsi iryo
 NEG.META 3NM.FOC.PRO
og-aa-i=ro naro
 put-ASSOC.MOT-REA.I=3NMO 1.FOC.PRO
og-aa-i=ro
 put-ASSOC.MOT-REA.I=3NMO
 ‘It is not the case that *he* took her back, *I* took her back.’

Metalinguistic negation is often called ‘external negation’ because it sometimes fails to interact with other morphosyntactic elements in the same way as standard clausal negation. For example, in languages that do not allow double negation using descriptive negation elements alone, the combination of metalinguistic and descriptive 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 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.

- (16) A: You don’t like Joe.
 B: I don’t not like him, I just find him boring.
- (17) Matsi te pishinetemparo oka.
matsi te pi=N-shine-eNpa=ro
 NEG.META NEG.REA 2S=IRR-like-IRR.I=3NMO
o-oka
 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 aspectual marking in the way that descriptive clausal negation

⁷ The sans serif **a** and **t** that appear in the first lines of examples are epenthetic segments that break up heteromorphemic consonant and vowel clusters, respectively (Michael 2008: 239-241).

with *tera* or *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. Such a clause would exhibit irrealis marking if the negative particle employed were the descriptive negation element *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 *hara*. The metalinguistic negation element *matsi* simply does not restrict the reality status marking on verbs that fall under its scope.

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

In summary, Nanti metalinguistic negation does not interact with or restrict the reality status or aspectual marking of clauses under its scope, nor does it interact with simple negation itself, as evidenced by cases of otherwise prohibited double negation. In these respects, Nanti metalinguistic negation interacts with the propositions it negates in the same manner that descriptive negation in the matrix clauses of reported speech constructions interacts with reported speech complements, as discussed below. This behavior is perhaps unsurprising, since it has been suggested that metalinguistic negation is intrinsically 'echoic' of previous utterances (Carston 1996).⁸

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

5. Existential Negation

5.1. Basic Existential Negation

Nanti positive polarity existential constructions employ one of two

⁸ This fact, combined with the fact that the clearly related existential negation *mameri* 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.

morphologically defective verbs, depending on the animacy of the associated nominal argument, as illustrated in (18a&b). Despite the fact that 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.
aityo oburoki
 EXI.INAN manioc.beer
 ‘There is manioc beer.’
- b. Ainyo shintori.
ainyo shintori
 EXI.ANIM peccary
 ‘There are peccaries.’
- (19) Aityobetaka seri.
aityo-be-ak-a seri
 EXI.INAN-FRU-PERF-REA.A tobacco
 ‘There previously was tobacco.’

Existential negation is expressed by replacing the existential verbs *aityo* or *ainyo* with the negative existential predicate *mameri* ~ *mame*, 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.

- (19) Mameri ibatsa.
mameri i-batsa
 NEG.EXI 3MPS-meat
 ‘There is no meat.’

Since the negative existential predicate takes no reality status or aspectual morphology, the resulting clause is ambiguous in terms of its temporal reference, permitting present and past temporal reference readings, but not future ones, as in (21). This is also true of the positive polarity counterparts of these negative existential clauses.⁹

⁹ In order to express an existential predication with future temporal reference it is necessary to employ the lexical verb *tim* ‘live’.

- (21) Mameri saburi, mameri oga hacha.
mameri saburi mameri o-oga hacha
 NEG.EXI machete NEG.EXI 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.’

5.2. Exhaustive Negation

The negative existential element *mameri* also appears in ‘exhaustive negation’ constructions, where it precedes a lexical verb, and indicates 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 notionally realis. 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=N-nehako-e=ro
 NEG.EXI 3MS=IRR-be.familiar.with -IRR.I=3NMO
saburi kotsiro
 machete knife
 ‘He had no familiarity with machetes or knives at all.’
- (23) Mame iritsamaite ... onti yoogakara posuro.
mame i=ri-tsamai-e onti
 NEG.EXI 3MS=IRR-farm-IRR.I PRED.FOC
i=¹⁰oog-ak-a=ra posuro
 3MS=consume-PERF-REA.A=SUB wild.plantain
 ‘He did not farm at all, rather he ate wild plantains.’

6. Morphologically Complex Negation in Simple Sentences

In this section I examine a number of morphologically complex negative elements attested in Nanti, beginning with lexicalized forms, and then

¹⁰ Note that the 3MS clitic *i=* surfaces as *y=* before *o*-initial verbs.

turning to forms that arise productively from cliticization. I conclude with a discussion of the relationship between the long forms of the descriptive negation particles *tera* and *hara*, and their reduced forms, *te* and *ha*.

6.1. Grammaticalized Complex Negation Forms

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 such construction involves the realis and irrealis negative elements *tesakona* and *hasakona*. These particles negate 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 elements restrict reality status and aspectual marking on verbs under their scope in the same way as the standard descriptive negation particles do.

- (24) *Tesakona onkatsite.*
tesakona *o=N-katsi-e*
 NEG.REA.XTRM 3NMS=IRR-hurt-IRR.I
 ‘It does not hurt very much.’

- (25) *Hasakona nobiika.*
hasakona *no=obiik-a*
 NEG.IRR.XTRM 1S=drink-REA.A
 ‘I will not drink very much.’

It is possible to analyze these extreme degree negation elements as composed of the negative ‘roots’ *te* and *ha* (see §6.3), and a second element *-sakona*. The latter element does not appear synchronically as a productive morpheme elsewhere in the language, but it is probably a lexicalized concatenation of the suffixes *-sano* ‘truly’ and *-kona* ‘a little bit’.

Non-Immediate Negation. Another pair of lexicalized complex negative elements, *tetana* and *haratana* ~ *hatatana*, serve to indicate that the state of affairs denoted by some clause did not, or will not, obtain immediately after some salient temporal reference point, as in (26) and (27).

- (26) Tetana onti nopokashite.
tetana *onti* *no=pok-ashi-e*
 NEG.REA.IMMED PRED.FOC 1S=come-PURP-IRR.I
 ‘I did not come right away (with some purpose in mind).’
- (27) Hatatana nopokahi.
haratana *no=pok-ah-i*
 NEG.IRR.IMMED 1S=come-REG-REA.I
 ‘I will not return right away.’

The forms *tetana* and *haratana* ~ *hatatana* (note the free variation in the irrealis form) are probably grammaticalized 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’, a 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* ~ *hatatana*.

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).

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) Nonkihakeme sekatsi.
no=N-kih-ak-e=me *sekatsi*
 1S=IRR-carry-PERF-IRR=DEO *yuca*
 ‘I should have carried (i.e. brought) *yuca*.’

- (29) Birome pahigahero.
biro=me p-hig-ah-e=ro
 2.FOC.PRO=DEO give-PL-REG-IRR.I=3NMO
 ‘You should have given them back.’
- (30) Hame pitsosenatiro.
ha=me
 NEG.IRR=DEO
pi=tsot¹¹-se-na-i=ro
 2S=slurp.up-CL:mass-MAL.REP-REA.I=3NMO
 ‘You shouldn’t slurp it up.’

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, it is the short form *te* that serves as the clitic host, rather than the long form *tera*.

- (31) Aityotya oburoki.
aityo=tya oburoki
 EXI.INAN=still manioc.beer
 ‘There is still manioc beer (to drink).’
- (32) Tetya ompokahe.
te=tya o=N-pok-ah-e
 NEG.REA=STILL 3NMS=IRR-come-REG-IRR.I
 ‘She has not come back yet.’
- (33) Haratya nokanti.
hara=tya no=kant-i
 NEG.IRR=STILL 1S=say-REA.I
 ‘I will not yet say.’

¹¹ Particular combinations of roots and classifiers, like this one, exhibit irregular heteromorphemic consonant cluster resolution, where instead of insertion of an epenthetic **a** at the morpheme boundary, the final consonant of the root deletes. The same phenomenon is found in (42).

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 exist corresponding short forms *te* and *ha*. This conclusion 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.REA 1S=IRR-tell-IRR.I
 ‘I did not tell.’

- (35) *Ha pagi.* [hapágzi]
ha *pi=ag-i*
 NEG.IRR 2S=get-REA.I
 ‘You won’t get (it).’

This suggests the possibility that we should analyze *tera* and *hara* as morphologically complex elements, a proposal which is rendered somewhat plausible by 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 instead, the pairs of long and short negation forms developed through analogy, with their current distribution being governed by prosodic factors and information structural concerns.

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 (i.e. *te*) and a ‘long’ irrealis one (i.e. *hara*), 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 negation.

Evidence in favor of this analysis can be found in pairs of lexicalized forms such as *haratya* ‘not yet (irrealis)’ and *tetya* ‘not yet (realis)’, which preserve the original forms for the irrealis and realis negation elements, i.e. *hara* and *te*, rather than uniformly exhibiting short or long

negation forms. The pairs *tetana* ‘not soon (realis)’ and *haratana* ‘not soon (irrealis)’ (not **hatana*) exhibit the same pattern.

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 syntactic 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. We now consider these factors.

Long negation forms are obligatorily when constituting the only word in an utterance,¹² 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-oka=ri *i-oka* *hara* *iryō*
 3M-this=CNTRST 3m-this NEG.IRR 3M.FOC.PRO
i=kih-i
 3MS=enter-REA.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 which case short forms cliticize to phonological words to their right.

7. Negation in Clause-Linking Constructions

Negation in clause-linking constructions exhibits many of the same properties as in negation in mono-clausal sentences, on which we have focused thus far. Clause-linking construction differ in two ways, however: first, particular clause-linking constructions exhibit distinct

¹² Both *tera* and *hara* can serve as short form negative responses, depending on the reality status of the elided proposition.

morphologically complex negation elements; and second, subordinate clauses in clause-linking constructions tend to exhibit restrictions on the presence of negation elements.

We consider these two issues now, beginning with morphologically complex negation elements in conditional, counterfactual, and purposive constructions.

7.1. *Negation in Possible Conditional Constructions*

The condition clause of conditional constructions is formed with the second position conditional clitic =rika, as in (37). As this example illustrates, positive polarity condition clauses take irrealis marking. As would be expected, their negative polarity counterparts exhibit the doubly irrealis construction, exhibiting 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) [Nomporohakerika hanta parikoti]COND, [irompa aka pokahena aka onkuta]RESULT.
no=N-poroh-ak-e=rika *haNta*
 1S=IRR-clear.land-PERF-IRR.I=COND there
parikoti iroNpa aka pok-ah-e=na
 far.away suddenly here come-REG-IRR.I=1O
aka onkuta
 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 hampi]COND, [hara nokanti maika aka pintimake aka]RESULT.
ha=rika o=tim-i haNpi
 NEG.IRR =COND 3NMS=live-REA.I medicine
hara no=kaNt-i maika aka
 NEG.IRR 1S=say-REA.I now here
pi=N-tim-ak-e aka
 2S=IRR-live-PERF-IRR.I here
 ‘If there were no medicine, I would not say, “Please live here.”’

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 condition clause of (40). Both clauses bear the second position counterfactual clitic *=me*.

- (39) [Inkaharame nohate]COND, [nontsonkerome]RESULT.
inKahara=me no=N-ha- ϕ -e
 earlier=CNTF 1S=IRR-go-IMPf-IRR.I
no=N-tsonK- ϕ -e=ro=me
 1S=IRR-finish-IMPf-IRR.I=3NMO=CNTF
 ‘Had I gone earlier, I would have finished it (clearing
 the garden).’
- (40) [Hame nokisainiti matsontsori]COND, [nohatakeme
 inkenishiku]RESULT.
ha=me no=kisaini-i matsonTtsori
 NEG.IRR =CNTF 1S=dream-REA.I jaguar
no=ha-ak-e=me inkenishiku
 1S=go-PERF-IRR.I=CNTF forest
 ‘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 goal clause, resulting in a structural asymmetry between positive and negative polarity purpose clauses and a complex negation element in the latter case. Positive polarity goal clauses are marked with the verbal clitic *=ra*, and exhibit irrealis marking, as in (41). Negative polarity purposive clauses, however, exhibit the morphologically complex 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, given the irrealis marking on the positive polarity goal clause. At the same time, the form of the purposive marker changes from that found in positive polarity clauses *=ra*, to the special negative purposive form *=ni*.

- (41) Yagutake niha irobiikempara.
i=agu-ak-i *niha*
 3MS=climb.down-PERF-REA.I water
i=ri-obiik- ϕ -eNpa=ra
 3MS=IRR-drink-IMPF-IRR.A=SUB
 ‘He (a howler monkey) climbed down to drink water.’
- (42) Norobite hani omakasabiti.
no=ol[+VOICE]-rog-bi- ϕ -e
 1S=CAUS-dry-CL:1D.rigid-IMPF-IRR.I
ha=ni *o=makasa-bi-i*
 NEG.IRR =PURP 3NMS=decay-CL:1D.rigid-REA.I
 ‘I will dry (the arrow cane) so that it does not decay.’

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, including Kakinte (Swift, 1988: 37-38), and the closely related Matsigenka (Snell, 1998: 62). The asymmetry we see in the Nanti purposive construction with respect to negation is presumably a result of the expanding function of the subordinate clause marker =*ra* at the expense of the former general purpose marker =*ni* in affirmative, but not negative, clauses.

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]RelCl?
aityo *oburoki* *biro=rira*
 EXI.INAN manioc.beer 2.FOC.PRO=REL
tink-i=ro
 mash-REA.I=3NMO
 ‘Is there manioc beer that *you* mashed?’

- (44) Sharoni okigake sekatsi [terira nantabagete]RelCl.
sharoni o=kig-ak-i sekatsi
 agouti 3NMS=dig-PERF-REA.I manioc
te=rira no=aNtabaget-e
 NEG.REA=REL 1S=weed-IRR.I
 ‘An agouti dug up the manioc that I didn’t weed.’

7.5. Negation in Complement Clause Constructions

Nanti complement clauses restrict the presence of negation particles depending on whether they are deranked (i.e. exhibit inflectional restrictions due to their syntactic relationship to other clauses), or ranked (and do not exhibit such restrictions). Deranked complement clauses may also impose reality status restrictions if the complement clause is temporally ‘prospective’ with respect to the main clause, and this reality status marking may interact with negation elements in the main clause.

Ranked complement clauses in Nanti behave identically to main clauses with respect to negation. A reported speech complement, a prototypical ranked clause type, is shown in (45); we see that a negation element is permitted in the complement clause, that it occupies the same position that we would expect from main clause negation, and that the reality status marking on the verb is identical to main clause negation.

- (45) Ikanti hara pahigahiri saburi.
i=kaNt-i hara
 3MS=say-REA.I NEG.IRR
p-hig-ah-i=ri saburi
 give-PL-REG-REA.I=3MO machete
 ‘He said, ‘Don’t give him a machete again.’’

All ranked complement clauses in Nanti are morphosyntactically identical to reported speech complements, exhibiting the same deictic properties as reported speech complements (i.e. direct reported speech deixis), and even optionally take a complementizer that is lexicalized from the *verbum dicendi kant* ‘say’ (Michael 2008: 416-423). Other than verbs of communication, certain verbs of cognition, such as *pintsa* ‘decide’ and *sure* ‘think’, take ranked complements.

Deranked complements, in contrast, do not permit negation elements, as demonstrated by the ungrammatical (46c), although such complement constructions do, of course, permit negation in the matrix clause, as demonstrated by the grammatical (46b).

- (46) a. *Ikogake irihate.*
i=kog-ak-i *i=ri-ha-e*
 3MS= want-PERF-REA.I 3MS=IRR-go-IRR.I
 'He wanted to go.'
- b. *Tera inkoge irihate.*
tera *i=N-kog-e*
 NEG.REA 3MS=IRR-want-IRR.I
i=ri-ha-e
 3MS=IRR-go-IRR.I
 'He did not want to go.'
- c. **Ikogake/Inkoge tera/hara irihate.*
 INTENDED SENSE: 'He wanted not to go.'

Deranked complements can be further divided into two classes, prospective and non-prospective, depending on the way that their reality status and aspectual marking are restricted by their matrix clauses, which in turn affects how they interact with negation elements in the matrix clause. Prospective complements are those whose realization lies in the future of the state of affairs expressed by the main clause (regardless of whether the realization of the complement may lie in the past relative to the moment of utterance of the sentence). Complements of verbs of desire, as in (46), are prototypical prospective complements. The realization of non-prospective complements, on the other hand, does not necessarily lie in the future of the state of affairs denoted by the main clause, as in the case of complements of verbs of perception, given in (47), or phasal verbs, given in (48).

- (47) *Nonehake Rerisuha gonketahi.*
no=neh-ak-i *Rerisuha*
 1S=see-PERF-REA.I personal.name
ogONke¹³-ah-i
 arrive-REG-REA.I
 'I saw Rerisuha arrive.'

¹³ Initial vowels of verb stems lacking a subject marker, as in this example, are deleted (Michael 2008: 243-245).

- (48) Itsonkatanake ipimantagetake.
i=tsonka-an-ak-i
 3MS=finish-ABL-PERF-REA.I
i=pimant-ge-ak-i
 3MS=give.gift-DSTR-PERF-REA.I
 ‘He finished giving gifts.’

Non-prospective deranked complement clauses exhibit the same reality status as their associated matrix clauses, as evident in comparing (47) and (49). In negated sentences, such complements cannot exhibit overt aspect marking, thus exhibiting the same paradigmatic neutralization characteristic of negated main clauses. This indicates that although they cannot bear their own negation elements, they clearly fall under the scope of the negation element in the matrix clause. And as demonstrated by the perfective complement verb in (48), there is no restriction on aspectual marking *per se* in deranked complements other than that imposed by negation in the matrix clause. Nanti non-prospective deranked complement clauses include verbs of perception, phasal verbs, and *ogo* ‘know how’.

- (49) Tera nonehe ompokera Rerisuha.
tera no=N-neh-e
 NEG.REA 1S=IRR-see-IRR.I
o=N-pok-e=ra Rerisuha
 3NMS=IRR- come-IRR.I=SUB personal.name
 ‘I did not see Rerisuha come.’

Prospective deranked complements, such as desiderative complements, present a slightly different situation, in that they obligatorily bear irrealis marking, whether the verb is affirmative realis, affirmative irrealis, or negative irrealis (i.e. negated with *tera*), as in (46a), (50), and (46b), respectively.

- (50) Inkoge irihate.
i=N-kog-e i=ri-ha-e
 3MS=IRR-want-IRR.I 3MS=IRR-go-IRR.I
 ‘He will want to go.’

Prospective deranked complements show realis marking only when the matrix clause is a doubly irrealis constructions, as in (51).

- (51) Hara ikogi ihati.
hara i=kog-i i=ha-i
 NEG.IRR 3MS=want-REA.I 3MS=go-REA.I
 ‘He will not want to go.’

8. *Negative Indefinites*

Nanti positive indefinite pronouns are based on interrogative words, either being identical to them, or optionally bearing the indefinite clitic =*ka*, as in (52b).

- (52) a. Tyani tentakeri?
tyani teNt-ak-i=ri
 which.one.ANIM accompany-PERF-REA.I=3MO
 ‘Who accompanied him?’
- b. Tyanika tentakeri.
tyani=ka
 which.one.ANIM=INDEF
teNt-ak-i=ri
 accompany-PERF-REA.I=3MO
 ‘Someone accompanied him.’

It is unclear if Nanti should be analyzed as exhibiting negative indefinite pronouns as such, since their function is filled by collocations of standard negation particles and interrogative words, as in (53b). 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 (53b), (54), and (55) 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 reality status of the clause, and as exemplified in (53) and (56), respectively.

- (53) a. Tsini pinehake?
tsini pi=neh-ak-i
 who 2S=see-PERF-REA.I
 ‘Whom did you see?’
- b. Tera tsini nonehe.
tera tsini no=neh-e
 NEG.REA who 1S=see-IRR.I
 ‘I didn’t see anyone.’
- (54) Tera tata noge.
tera tata no=og-e
 NEG.REA what 1S=do-IRR.I
 ‘I am not going to do anything.’
- (55) Tera tsini pakuhakagerime.
tera tsini
 NEG.REA who
pakuh-akag-e =ri=me
 discard-CAUS:INFL-IRR.I=3NMO=CNTP
 ‘No one convinced him to discard (his wife).’
- (56) Hara tya nohati.
hara tya no=ha-i
 NEG.IRR where 1S=go-REA.I
 ‘I will not go anywhere.’

9. Comparative Observations

In this section I discuss major similarities and divergences between negation in Nanti and negation 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 the one described here for Nanti, since the other modern Kampan languages 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 is 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.

Table 5. *Reality status suffixes and negation in the Kampan languages*

	I-CLASS	A-CLASS	REA.NEG	I-CLASS	A-CLASS	IRR.NEG
Asháninka	-i	-a	te	-e	-ia	eero
Ashéninka	-i	-a	te	-e	-ea	eiro
Kakinte	-i	-a	tee	-e	-eNpa	aato
Matsigenka	-i	-a	te(ra)	-e	-eNpa	ga(ra)
Nanti	-i	-a	te(ra)	-e	-eNpa	ha(ra)
Nomatsigenga	-i	-a	te	-e	-ema	kero

There are also indications of similar systems in more distantly related Southern Arawak languages. In particular, Terena, a language spoken in Brazil near the Paraguayan border, possesses a RS system strikingly similar to the Kampan ones.¹⁴ As in the Kampan languages, a realis/irrealis contrast is obligatorily marked on all Terena verbs, as in (57),¹⁵ and the language also distinguishes two negation particles that select for the notional reality status of the clauses they negate: a realis negation *ako*, as in (58a) and an irrealis negation *hyoko*, as in (58b) (Ekdahl and Grimes 1964, Butler 1978).¹⁶ 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.

¹⁴ My thanks to Sasha Aikhenvald for bringing the Terena system to my attention.

¹⁵ The semantics of the Terena RS realis/irrealis contrast appears similar to that found in the Kampan languages. One notable difference is that verbs in clauses with future temporal reference may take either realis or irrealis marking depending on the degree of certainty with which the speaker predicates the future event.

¹⁶ Ekdahl and Grimes (1964) characterize the inflectional contrast as between ‘actual’ and ‘potential’, and the two negations as the ‘negation of actual mood’ and the ‘negation of potential mood’ respectively.

- (57) a. *pih-óp-o*
 go-REG-REA
 ‘He went back (to where he came from).’
- b. *píh-áp-a*
 go-REG-IRR
 ‘He will go back (to where he came from).’
- (58) a. *ako* *pih-áp-a*
 NEG.REA go-REG-IRR
 ‘He did not go back (to where he came from).’
- b. *hyoko* *pih-óp-o*
 NEG.IRR go-REG-REA
 ‘He will not go back (to where he came from).’

Turning to reflexes of the Proto-Arawak privative marker **ma* in Nanti, we find 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 items, including function words, which appear to exhibit reflexes of the privative in frozen form. Lexical roots such as *magempi* ‘be deaf’¹⁷ (cf. *gempita* ‘ear’) and *amatsogampi* ‘be blunt’ (cf. *tsogampi* ‘be sharp’) are presumably lexicalized remnants of a formerly productive privative derivation process. Likewise, the negative existential verb *mameri* (see §4.1) and the metalinguistic negation particle *matsi* (see §3) are presumably 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 that denotes the loss of a part from the pertinent whole, is filled in Nanti by the reversative *-reh* (Michael, 2008: 275-275 & 289-290). When affixed to a verb root, as in (59a), the reversative derives a stem that denotes the reversal of some action, but when it is affixed to an inalienable noun, as in (59b), it derives an intransitive verb stem denoting the removal of that part.

¹⁷ My thanks to Mary Ruth Wise for bringing this root to my attention.

- (59) a. Okucharehanake.
o=kuch-reh-an-ak-i
 3NMS=snag-REV-ABL-PERF-REA.I
 ‘It became un-snagged.’
- b. Ogitorehake.
o=gito-reh-ak-i
 3NMS=head-REV-PERF-REA.I
 ‘It’s head came off.’

10. Conclusion

This chapter has described negation strategies in a variety of construction types in Nanti. Standard negation in main clauses reveals a complex interaction between negation and reality status marking, manifested as a paradigmatic asymmetry in reality status marking and the presence of two different standard negation particles, whose distribution is conditioned by the reality status of the positive-polarity clause. In addition to standard negation, Nanti exhibits a metalinguistic negation element which does not interact with reality status, and which can co-occur with standard negation particles, yielding double negation constructions. Other non-standard forms of negation described in the chapter include existential negation, which is expressed by a morphologically defective negative verb; that same verb is also used with lexical verbs to express ‘exhaustive negation’. Nanti does not exhibit a distinct prohibitive construction; rather a declarative doubly irrealis construction is used to express a negative directive. Nanti also exhibits a number of morphologically complex negation elements, some of which exhibit a degree of lexicalization, such as the ‘extreme degree’ and ‘non-immediate’ negation elements, while others, such as the deontic and durational negation elements, are clearly decomposable into a negation particle and a clitic. The chapter has also described negative indefinites in Nanti, which are formed by negating interrogative words used in content interrogatives.

Negation in clause-linking constructions such as conditional, counterfactual, and purposive clause constructions was also discussed. In general, negation in these constructions closely resembles main clause negation, once it is taken into account that most subordinate clauses are treated as intrinsically irrealis.

This chapter also examined Nanti negation in a comparative light, showing that the other Kampan languages appear to exhibit very similar

negation systems, down to the complex interaction between negation and reality status that is amply attested in the Nanti data. The negation system of a distantly related Southern Arawak language, Terena, was shown to exhibit significant structural similarities to those found in the Kampan languages, including the sensitivity of reality status marking to negation and a ‘doubly irrealis’ construction. Finally, reflexes of the Proto-Arawak privative in Nanti were discussed; although there are no productive reflexes of this morpheme in the language, frozen reflexes can be found in a small number of roots.