

#### INTRODUCTION

- In Kanien'kéha, negation is **bipartite**; it obligatorily features the particle *iah* and the negative prefix *te-/th-* on the predicate.
- (1)\*(**Iah**) **te**hatá:wens. \*(iah) te-ra-atawen-s NEG NEG-M.SG.A-swim-HAB 'He doesn't swim'
  - (2)**Iah** \*(te)hatá:wens. iah \*(te)-ra-atawen-s NEG NEG-M.SG.A-swim-HAB 'He doesn't swim'
- **Puzzle:** while both *iah* and *te-/th-* have been descriptively labeled as negative, they express only **one** instance of negation.
- Proposal: *iah* is a regular negative operator, te-/th- mark backgrounded information. The necessity of the latter stems from more general pragmatic requirements of negation.

### **SEMANTICS OF** *iah*

- The negative semantics is contributed by the particle *iah*, as it can be used as a stand-alone negative answer particle.
- (3) Wa'shní:non' ken onón:ta? Iah, só:tsi kanó:ron. ken ononta? iah, sotsi ka-noron. wa'-s-hninon-' FACT-2.SG.A-buy-PUNC Q milk **NEG** too N.SG.A-expensive 'Did you buy the milk? No, it was too expensive '

#### **MORPHOSYNTAX OF NEGATION**

- The form of the negative prefix depends on the presence of certain other prepronominal prefixes on the verb.
- Here, I treat *te* and *th* as allomorphs of the same morpheme.

Prefix	TRANS COIN	Fact	Dupl	Fut Opt	Rep Cis	Pror pr
Negative prefix		th-				te-
<ul> <li>(4)Iah thiewakátie's.</li> <li>iah th-ie-wak-atie'-s</li> <li>NEG NEG-TR-1SG.P-throw-HAB</li> <li>'I don't throw it.'</li> </ul>			· · · · ·	NEG N	etkatá:v e-t-k-at IEG-CIS 't swim	awen- 5-1SG.

#### **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. I am also thankful to Luis Alonso-Ovalle, Chase Boles, Kanontienéntha Brass, Jessica Coon, Tsowén:te Cross, Shona'tsó:wane Diabo, Sophia Flaim, Terrance Gatchalian, Karin Michelson, Wishe Mittelstadt, Yanran Mou, Willie Myers, Martin Renard and Kanien'kehá:ka Onkwawén:na Raotitióhkwa Language and Cultural Center.

# **BIPARTITE NEGATION IN KANIEN'KÉHA**

## KATYA MORGUNOVA | katya.morgunova@mail.mcgill.ca | MCGILL UNIVERSITY

onominal orefixes

G.A-swim-HAB e.'

#### **NEGATION AND BACKGROUND**

• Negative utterances are rarely used 'out-of-the-blue' and require the positive counterpart to be presented in the context. a.Context 1: You are walking on a street where every other house b.Context 2: You are walking on a regular street with no signs has a sign 'Hotel' on it; it must be a touristy area. Among these around. Suddenly, on one of the buillings, you see the followbuildings, you see a house with the following sign: ing sign:

(6) 'This is **not** a hotel.'

#### **CONTRASTIVE USES OF** *th*-

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

- (7) Iah teiononhtonniónhon, kheh **thi**iokare'tsherahní:non Iah te-io-nonhtonnionh-on, kheh **thi**-io-kare'tsher-a-hnin-on NEG NEG-N.SG.P-think-STAT just NEG-N.SG.P-cookie-LK-buy-STAT
  - ne Jessica.
  - ne Jessica
  - NE Jessica

'Without thinking, Jessica just bought cookies.'

- These contexts are similar to English sentences with **indifference** marking exclusive particle *just*.
- a.Alfonso **just** grabbed whatever tool was handy. (Beltrama 2022) (8)

b.Presupposition: Alfonso grabbed whatever tool was handy.

c.Assertion: Alfonso did nothing else.

- Exclusive particles like *just* presuppose (obligatorily convey a background assumption) that the positive component of the sentence is true and assert that no other proposition is true.
- **Proposal:** *th* appears in contexts like (7) specifically to mark that the proposition is part of the background.

### SEMANTICS OF NEGATIVE MORPHOLOGY

- In some cases, the negative morphology on the verb in a negative sentence is **optional** and crucially affects its semantics.
- Context: On Tuesday, we had the only sprint workout of the week (9) scheduled, but we missed it.
  - a. #Iah **iosnó:re** tha'teionkwarahtá:ton. #Iah **io-snore** tha'-te-ionkw-arahtat-on NEG N.SG.P-fast NEG-DUP-1PL.P-run-STAT Int.: 'We didn't run sprints.' Lit.: 'We didn't run fast.'
  - tha'teionkwarahtá:ton. b.Iah **teiosnó:re** Iah **te-io-snore** tha'-te-ionkw-arahtat-on NEG **NEG-N.SG.P-fast** NEG-DUP-1PL.P-run-STAT 'We didn't run sprints.' Lit.: 'We didn't run fast.'
- **Proposal:** the difference between (9a) and (9b) lies in whether both predicates or only the main one is included in the background.

#'This is **not** a hotel.'

#### NARROW SCOPE NEGATION

- appear adjacent to it, as in (10).
- (10) Iah **Shawátis te**hoienawà:se. Shawatis te-ro-ienawa'se iah NEG John
- its use in (10) seems more motivated.
- Representation of (10) (11) a.Iah [Shawátis<sub>F</sub> [tehoienawà:se]<sub>BACKGROUND</sub>] b.Presupposition: Someone (male) helped. c.Assertion: John didn't help.
- (Chierchia 2013) must appear in this position.
- thé:nen tethotkáhton (12)Iah te-t-ro-atkaht-on iah thenen 'Paul didn't see anything'

### **BROAD SCOPE NEGATION**

- icate, as in this case the predicate is also focused.
- Representation of (1) (13)a.Iah [[tehatá:wens]<sub>F</sub>]<sub>BACKGROUND</sub>
  - b. [[ tehatá:wens ]]<sup>o</sup> =  $\lambda$ w.swim(he)(w)

  - dPresupposition: Some proposition is true.
  - e.Assertion: He didn't swim.
- matic requirements of negation.



(adapted from Tian & Breheny 2019)

• When *iah* takes narrow scope over one constituent, the latter must • Although the event express by the verb is not negated per se, the predicate must still be marked with the negative morphology. **NEG-**M.SG**>**M.SG**-**help.STAT 'It was **not John** who helped him' (, it was Mary who helped him.) • If the negative prefix is used to mark the background of the sentence, • I assume that constituents appearing between *iah* and the verb move out of the scope of negative prefix via focus movement. • This is supported by the fact that NPIs with inherent focal features ne Kó:r. ne Kor NEG anything NEG-CIS-M.SG.P-see-STAT NE Paul

• For (1), I propose that *te-/th-* presuppose the focus value of the pred-

c. [[tehatá:wens ]] $^{f} = \{\lambda w. y \text{ in } w \mid y \in D_{\langle s,t \rangle}\}$ • In this case, the presupposition is weak, but it still satisfies the prag-