

INTERACTION OF NEGATION AND MODALITY IN KANIEN'KÉHA



KATYA MORGUNOVA
katya.morgunova@mail.mcgill.ca
McGill University



INTRODUCTION

- Negation in Kanien'kéha (Northern Iroquoian) is bipartite; it obligatorily involves the particle *iah* and the negative prefix *te-/th-* on the verb.
- In the Iroquoianist literature (Koenig & Michelson 2020), negation is reported to be incompatible with **factual** and **future** modal prefixes. To express negative statements for these forms, negative versions of predicates with different TAM markers are used.

- (1) a. **iah th-wa'-w-atawen-'* (2) a. **iah th-en-w-atawen-'*
NEG NEG-FACT-FZ.SG.A-swim-PFV NEG NEG-FUT-FZ.SG.A-swim-PFV
Int.: 'She didn't swim.' Int.: 'She won't swim.'
- b. *iah te-io-atawen* b. *iah th-a-w-atawen-'*
NEG NEG-FZ.SG.P-swim.PERF NEG NEG-OPT-FZ.SG.A-swim-PFV
'She didn't swim.' 'She won't swim.'

EMPIRICAL CONTRIBUTION

- I present the data that shows that this generalization is **not accurate**.
- Instead, I argue that negation is incompatible with **factual forms with past perfective interpretation and future forms**.

THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION

- I show that this incompatibility must arise **semantically**, rather than morphologically.
- This incompatibility could stem from the semantics of **certainty** associated with both past perfective and future forms.

BACKGROUND

- Kanien'kéha verbs generally exhibit a three-way aspectual contrast between perfective, imperfective and perfect aspects.

- (3) a. *wa'-ra-rast-'* b. *ra-rast-ha'* c. *ro-rast-on*
FACT-M.SG.A-draw-PFV M.SG.A-draw-IPFV M.SG.P-draw-PERF
'He drew.' 'He draws.' 'He draws.'

- Unlike imperfective and perfect aspects, perfective **requires** the presence of one of the modal prefixes: factual, future or habitual.

- (4) a. **ra-rast-e'* c. *en-ra-rast-e'*
M.SG.A-draw-PFV FUT-M.SG.A-draw-PFV
Int.: 'He draws.'
- b. *wa'-ra-rast-e'* d. *a-ra-rast-e'*
FACT-M.SG.A-draw-PFV OPT-M.SG.A-draw-PFV
'He drew it.' 'He should draw it.'

AGAINST MORPHOLOGICAL INCOMPATIBILITY

- The prefix *th-* is also used in **contrastive** contexts without the particle *iah*.

- (5) *kheh thi-io-kare'tsher-a-hnin-on* ne Jessica
just NEG-FZ.SG.P-cookie-LK-buy-PERF NE Jessica
(Without thinking) 'Jessica just bought cookies.'

- Crucially, both factual and future prefixes are compatible with the negative prefixes when used in contrastive contexts.

- (6) *kheh th-wa'-ha-atawen-'* (7) *kheh th-en-ha-atawen-'*
just NEG-FACT-M.SG.A-swim-PFV just NEG-FUT-M.SG.A-swim-PFV
'He just swam.' 'He will just swim.'

Generalisation 1.

Negative morphology is in principle compatible with factual and future prefixes. They do not compete for the same slot.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Niawenhkó:wa to Akwiratékha' Martin, Katerí Deer, Konwaronhiá:wi Helen Norton and Mary Onwá:ri Tekahawáhkwen McDonald for sharing your knowledge of Kanien'kéha with me.

REFERENCES

Iatridou, S., & Zeijlstra, H. (2013). Negation, polarity, and deontic modals. • Koenig, J.-P. & Michelson, K. (2020). Negation in Oneida (Iroquoian). • Lukaniec, M. (2018). The elaboration of verbal structure: Wendat (Huron) verb morphology. • Michelson, K., & Doxtator, M. (2002). Oneida-English/English-Oneida dictionary. • Michelson, K., & Price, C. (2011). Native languages: A support document for the teaching of language patterns: Oneida, Cayuga, and Mohawk resource guide. • Woodbury, H. (2018). A reference grammar of the Onondaga language.

NEGATION AND FACTUAL FORMS

- The factual modal prefix is generally only compatible with the perfective aspect. However, it also occurs with the **intensive aspect** on **purposive** verbs (see Michelson & Doxtator 2002; Lukaniec 2018; Woodbury 2018).
- Intensive forms are typically recognized by their ongoing interpretation, as they are often homophonous with punctual forms; however, there are exceptions like in (8)-(9).

- (8) a. *wa'-k-atorat-h-e'* • Crucially, it is possible to negate factual-intensive forms (8b), but not factual-punctual forms (9b).
FACT-1SG.A-hunt-PURP-INT 'I am going to hunt.'
- b. *iah th-wa'-k-atorat-h-e'* • Note that neither past tense interpretation nor perfective aspect of (9) cannot individually cause incompatibility with negation (cf. with (1b) and (2b) accordingly).
NEG NEG-FACT-1SG.A-hunt-PURP-INT 'I am not going to hunt.'
- (9) a. *wa'-k-atorat-h-a'*
FACT-1SG.A-hunt-PURP-PFV 'I went hunting.'
- b. **iah th-wa'-k-atorat-h-a'*
NEG NEG-FACT-1SG.A-hunt-PURP-PFV
Int.: 'I did not go hunting.'

Generalisation 2.

Negation is incompatible specifically with factual-punctual forms with past perfective interpretation.

NEGATION AND FUTURE FORMS

Generalisation 3.

Future is incompatible with negation regardless of the form's aspect.

- (10) a. **iah th-en-ke-khonni-hse-ke'* (11) a. **iah th-en-wak-atshokw-en*
NEG NEG-FUT-1SG.A-cook-IPFV-CONT NEG NEG-FUT-1SG.P-smoke-PERF
'I will always cook.' Int.: 'I won't be smoking.'
- b. *iah th-a-ke-khonni-hse-ke'* b. *iah th-a-wak-atshokw-en*
NEG NEG-OPT-1SG.A-cook-IPFV-CONT NEG NEG-OPT-1SG.P-smoke-PERF
'I won't cook again.' 'I won't be smoking.'

NEGATION AND SCOPE

- Across languages, we find that modals can behave both as NPIs and as PPIs (Iatridou & Zeijlstra 2013).
- If modal prefixes in general can only exhibit one scope with respect to negation, the ungrammaticality of (1a) and (2a) could simply stem from their NPI/PPI nature.

- (12) *iah th-a-ra-tori-'* • However, optative prefixes exhibit both scopes relative to negation.
NEG NEG-OPT-M.SG.A-drive-PFV
1. 'He won't drive.'
 2. 'He shouldn't drive'
 3. 'He doesn't have to drive.'

DISCUSSION

Takeaway.

Negation is semantically incompatible with certain forms in Kanien'kéha. This is not expected under the assumption that it is a simple logical truth-conditional operator \neg .

- What semantic property of motivates this incompatibility?
- Future and past perfective factual forms are reportedly associated with high degree of **certainty**.
 - "The factual [...] mode describes an event that is considered an **established fact**." (Michelson & Price 2011, p. 56)
 - "The future mode is used [...] to convey a **high degree of probability** with regard to its occurrence." (Michelson & Price 2011, p. 58)
- If the certainty of factual and future forms is presupposed, it would contradict the negative assertion.