Negation
Week 9 - 3/26 - 3/28
Linguistics 460/560: The structure of Itunyoso Triqui

(1) There are several negators in Itunyoso Triqui. These are sensitive to both phrasal type and information structure.

(2) Nominal negators can be used with verb phrases if a complementizer is used alongside them.

(3) | Word   | Meaning                                           | Context of use |
    |--------|--------------------------------------------------|----------------|
    | ni³taj² | negative existential, 'there are no...'          | nominal        |
    | ni³taj² si² | 'there are none that...'; 'it does not exist that...' | verbal        |
    | se⁴    | counterfactual, negative focus; 'not X but Y'     | nominal        |
    | se⁴ si² | 'it's not that..., but rather that...'            | verbal        |
    | nun³   | standard negator, 'not'                          | verbal        |
    | si³    | prohibitive, used only with potential reading    | verbal        |

(4) Nip'taj² ne³tan³
   NEG.exist bean
   'There are no beans'

(5) Nip'taj² si³-ka²toj⁵
   NEG.exist POSS'D-shirt.1S
   'I have no shirt' ~ 'My shirt does not exist.'

(6) Ta¹koj¹ ka³hanj²=sij³ nan² yu³be¹². Ta¹koj¹ si² ni³taj²
   by.foot PERF.go=3M DIR EVID.EXP by.foot because NEG.exist
   ka³min⁴³ k-a⁴chin⁴³ taj¹³ yu³mej³.
   car PERF-pass as.such EVID.NEG.EXP

   'By foot they went. By foot because there were no cars that passed by as such.'

(7) A small tangent on Triqui final particles...
   a. There are at least 40-50 of them and they are sensitive to negation.
   b. They encode evidentiality, focus, and many other pragmatic phenomena.
   c. We'll look at them specifically in a week or so.

(8) Se⁴ Juan ki³-ranj⁴ chu³che¹² sa³ni² ma³hanj⁶ ki³-ranj⁴.
    not Juan PERF-buy chicken but self.1S PERF-buy
    'Juan didn't buy the chicken, but I bought it.'
(9) It's possible to use both ni³taj² and se⁴ with a complementizer si² and then use them with verbal or adjectival phrases. These appear to be extended uses of these negators.

(10) Se⁴ si² cha¹kanj¹ ma²han²=reh¹ cheh³
not that be.tall.1S self=2S be.short
'It's not that I'm tall, you are short.'

(11) Ni³taj² si² ka³-bin³ nan³ nan² yu³mej³
NEG.exist that perf-be here DIR EVID.NEG.EXP
'Nothing happened here.' lit. 'there was nothing that was here'

(12) Nominal negation is fairly uncontroversial, but verbal negators nun³ and si³ interact in interesting ways with verbal aspect marking.

(13) First, typical uses of these negators.

(a) Nun³ ka²-hnah² nni⁴=reh¹ tu¹kwaj⁵
NEG PERF-come mother=2S house.1S
'Your mother did not come to my house.'

(b) Nun³ u³nun³=nej³ sta³hanj³ sti⁴la⁴³ nej³
NEG understand=3p language castellano also
'They also do not understand Spanish.'

(14) However, in many contexts with these negators it is necessary to flip the aspect of the verb marking completely. So, a negated perfective requires a potential aspect-marked verb, while a negated potential requires a perfective aspect-marked verb.

(15) This aspectual flip under negation also exists in Copala Triqui (Hollenbach 1976). It is shared across Triqui languages.

(16) Nun³ ka²hanj²=sij³ ni³kyanj³ Reporting a "completed event"
NEG POT.go=3M Tlaxiaco
'He did not go to Tlaxiaco.' / 'No fue a Tlaxiaco.'

(17) Nun³ ki³-ni³hinj³ nni⁴=reh¹ Reporting a "planned event"
NEG PERF-see.1S mother=2S
'I will not see your mother.' / 'No voy a ver a tu madre.'

(18) Ta³ sah¹ nun³ ki²-hyaj³ ka³nan⁴3=unj³ k-a²hbe³ ki³-chaj⁴kwij³=unj³
this well NEG PERF-do win=3F POT-be.able perf-help=3F
'Aunque no ganara, podria ayudarnos'
'Even if she doesn't win (the election), she would (still) be able to help (us).'

Line 96, El Partido Morena; 06/9/2015; Carmen López González and Nieves López Guzmán
It is not altogether clear to me the contexts which condition this aspectual flip in Triqui - it is not always required for every verb followed by nun³.

For the si³ negator, the aspectual flip is required when it functions as a general negator.

(a) \text{Si³} \quad \text{ki³-ni³hya}^{43} \quad \text{nni³} = \text{reh}^{1} \quad \text{NEG.POT} \quad \text{PERF-see} .1s \quad \text{mother}=2s

'I will not see your mother.'

(b) \text{Si³} \quad \text{k-oh³} \quad \text{ku³man¹} \quad \text{NEG.POT} \quad \text{PERF-hit} \quad \text{rain}

'It will not rain.'

(c) \text{Nun³} \quad \text{k-oh¹} \quad \text{ku³man¹} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{POT-hit} \quad \text{rain}

'It did not rain.'

However, si³ has another use with potential verbs - as a prohibitive in commands. The potential aspect (and the 2nd person singular) are used together to indicate commands.

(a) \text{Si³} \quad \text{k-oh¹}= \text{reh}^{1} \quad \text{NEG.POT} \quad \text{POT-hit}=2s

'Don't hit!'

(b) \text{Si³} \quad \text{ka³hanj²} = \text{reh}^{1} \quad \text{rian}^{32} \quad \text{chrunj}^{5} \quad \text{ta³} \quad \text{NEG.POT} \quad \text{POT.go}=2s \quad \text{face} \quad \text{box} \quad \text{this/these}

'Don't go on top of those boxes.'

So, when used as a general negator, si³ requires the aspectual flip. When used as a prohibitive, the potential aspect must be used since prohibitives are commands.

For some reason, use of si³ is not permitted with a perfective form of a stative experiencer verb like ni³hin³ ‘know/see’, but it is grammatical with a perfective form of the active verb ni³hya² ‘see/watch.’

This suggests that there may be a more complex interaction between the choice of these two general negators and the lexical aspect of the verb. Hollenbach finds something similar for Copala Triqui (1976).

In Copala Triqui, the same pattern occurs, but the cognate form with nun³ – ne³ only occurs with progressive/unmarked verbs and potential verbs (where we’d expect the perfective).

The cognate form with si³ – se² only occurs with perfective verbs (where we’d expect the potential), just like in Itunyoso Triqui.
The use of nun³ with perfective verbs as well in Itunyoso Triqui is perhaps an innovation as a parallel with si³.

In Copala Triqui, pre-verbal adverbs block the aspectual flip (n.b. 5 is low, 1 is high)

(16) za²⁵ guçuh⁴ žini³ yuwe²¹ âh
    The boy will lay the palm mat down well.
(17) guçuh⁴ za²⁵ žini³ yuwe²¹ âh
    The boy will lay the palm mat down well.
(20) nê³ za²⁵ guçuh³⁴ žini³ yuwe²¹ âh
    The boy didn’t lay the palm mat down well.
(21) nê³ guçuh⁴ za²⁵ žini³ yuwe²¹ âh
    The boy didn’t lay the palm mat down well.

Only the first verb in andative/venitive constructions is affected.

(33) nê³ gaʾna²⁵ žini³ gaça⁴ žini³ âh
    The boy didn’t come to sing.
(34) ze⁴ gaʾna²³ žini³ gaça⁴ žini³ âh
    The boy won’t come to sing.

Whether it affects both verbs in complex verbal constructions is not clear. Note that 'learned to mend' has the flip on both verbs, but 'know how to mend' does not require the flip on the second verb (but it's a purposive construction and those are always potential aspect).

(39) ginari³² žini³ nanuwâ³² žini³ goto³² âh
    The boy learned how to mend the shirt.
(40) nê³ ginari²⁵ žini³ nanuwâ⁵ žini³ goto³² âh
    The boy didn’t learn how to mend the shirt.
(46) nê³ gene⁵³ žini³ nanuwâ⁵ žini³ goto³² âh
    The boy didn’t know how to mend the shirt.
(47) gene⁵³ žini³ nanuwâ⁵ žini³ goto³² âh
    The boy will know how to mend the shirt.
In Copala Triqui:

(a) The toggle of aspect has an adjacency restriction between the negator and the verb, as we see with adverbs.
(b) Certain verb + complement pairs involve a flip of both verb aspects, while others do not.

What about in Itunyoso Triqui?

(32) \text{nun}³ \text{k-a}²\text{ra}² \text{chi}³\text{hna}³²=\text{sij}³ \text{ka}³\text{hanj}² \text{na}²\text{kaj}²=sij³
\text{NEG POT-toss hunger=3M PERF.go POT.carry=3M}
'They didn't accept (toss hunger) going to take it.'

(33) \text{Ma}²\text{han}³=\text{neh}⁴ \text{ni}² \text{nun}³ \text{k-a}²\text{nin}²+\text{ra}⁴³=\text{neh}⁴ \text{si}²
\text{self=}1\text{P.INCL} \text{and} \text{NEG POT-stop+DESID=}1\text{P.INCL} \text{that}
\text{ki}²\text{-cha}⁴\text{kwij}⁴=\text{neh}⁴=\text{unj}³
\text{POT-help=}1\text{P.INCL=}3\text{F}
'We ourselves did not think about helping her.'

(34) \text{Ni}² \text{nun}³ \text{ki}¹\text{-rih}¹+\text{ra}⁴³=\text{chuj}³ \text{taj}¹ \text{ki}²\text{-hyaj}³=\text{chuj}³
\text{and neg pot-get+want=}\text{anim how pot-do=}\text{anim}
'And the animal did not understand how it did it.'

Note that the sentence in (32) does not require the aspectual flip, but the ones in (33) and (34) do. Perhaps the use of the complementizer permits it to have scope over the entire clause?

Unlike Copala Triqui, adverbs do not seem to block the rule in Itunyoso Triqui.

\text{Be}⁴ \text{ta}³ \text{bin}³ \text{nun}³ \text{kwı}³ \text{k-a}¹\text{chi}¹\text{hi}¹ \text{te}⁴\text{lu}⁴³ \text{ngwi}³¹ \text{ka}²\text{na}²
\text{TOP this be NEG day/now POT-begin many person POT.weed.soil}
\text{ku}²\text{nun}²=\text{nej}³
\text{POT.sow=}3\text{P}
'It's that many people have not yet started to weed and sow.'

Why flip aspect? It may be related to the original realis/irrealis split in Mixtecan languages.

For most Mixtecan languages, the basic distinction is between a realis and an irrealis stem. Completive/Perfective morphology is marked separately.
Example from Southeastern Nochixtlán Mixtec (McKendry 2013, p.35).

Table 5. The verbal paradigm of four exemplary verbs in YM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irrealis</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Imperfective Causative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kāsiMH</td>
<td>lānā</td>
<td>sēsi MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat</td>
<td>child</td>
<td>IPFV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The child will eat. The child is eating. The child is feeding the animals.

The irrealis is usually unmarked in Mixtec languages, but it's the imperfective that is unmarked in Triqui languages.

Consider Yoloxóchitl Mixtec (Palancar et al. 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable structure</th>
<th>LEX</th>
<th>INCPL</th>
<th>CPL-1</th>
<th>INCPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>disyllabic</td>
<td>/1-1/</td>
<td>/4-1/</td>
<td>ni1-ki1-xi1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monosyllabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ni1-tu1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>disyllabic</td>
<td>/1-3/</td>
<td>/4-13/</td>
<td>ni1-ka1-ku3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monosyllabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ni1-ka1-an1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>disyllabic</td>
<td>/1-4/</td>
<td>/4-14/</td>
<td>ni1-ka1-xan4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monosyllabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ni1-k1-ku14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.1</td>
<td>disyllabic</td>
<td>/3-3/</td>
<td>/4-3/</td>
<td>ni1-ka1-ba3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monosyllabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ni1-nda1-ba3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.2</td>
<td>monosyllabic</td>
<td>/3-3/</td>
<td>/4-4/</td>
<td>ni1-ch1-i1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ni1-ka1-ʔa1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ni1-ku1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ni1-chi3-i3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.1</td>
<td>disyllabic</td>
<td>/3-4/</td>
<td>/4-4/</td>
<td>ni1-ku1-chi1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ni1-ka1-ba4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.2</td>
<td>monosyllabic</td>
<td>/3-4/</td>
<td>/4-24/</td>
<td>ni1-ka1-a1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ni1-ku1-un4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(43) What does this have to do with Triqui?

(44) The function of the aspectual prefixes in Mixtec is unique based on the *aktionsarten* for verbs. It may be that unique negators were reserved for certain lexical aspect and verb aspect combinations.

(45) This may have led to a particular arrangement that then got generalized as a pattern related to negation, not to aspect itself, i.e. always use "aspect form A" with negative perfectives.

(46) This is all completely speculative though. We still have little idea of how this pattern evolved. However, Hollenbach (1976) did not know either. She ended her paper with a 🤷.
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