



HAL
open science

Negation in Guianese Lokono/Arawak

Marie-France Patte

► **To cite this version:**

| Marie-France Patte. Negation in Guianese Lokono/Arawak. 2011. halshs-00696066

HAL Id: halshs-00696066

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00696066>

Preprint submitted on 10 Jun 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

NEGATION IN GUIANESE LOKONO/ARAWAK

Guianese Lokono/Arawak is spoken in the lowlands of the Guianas, Guyana, Suriname, the French Overseas department of Guiana, and Venezuelan Guayana. Some speakers live also in Europe, mainly in the Netherlands and Great Britain. Along with Goahiro, Parauhano and Garifuna, this language belongs to the North-Caribbean group of the Arawakan languages.

As other Arawakan languages, Lokono/Arawak exhibits, apart from the negative particle *kho(ro)*, a privative marker, *ma-*, labelled « privative ». In this particular language, the privative marker has developed functions as negative operator.

The language can be classified as "active/stative", since the subject of a stative verb and the object of a transitive active verb occupy the same position, and "pro-drop", since this same position can be left empty.

The verbal morphology of Arawak shows that there are different verb bases. One of them distinguishes two different verbal themes that differ in the final vowel. The final vowel of the first verbal theme, dictated by vocalic harmony and thus predictable, can be any vowel but *a*; it is to be found in the infinitive form (*aithin* 'know', *dukhun* 'see', *ósun* 'go') and in the prospective. The second verb theme exhibits *a*: it covers past and present events. This TAM contrast between realized and to be realized events maps realis vs. irrealis category.

As many other Arawakan languages, the nouns belong to different classes, according to the "alienability" criterion. The "relative" nouns are obligatorily possessed or dependent; the "absolute" nouns are independent in that they are not related to another noun.

The gender/number category displays a paradigm of three elements: the masculine encodes the male human beings, the plural the human beings, male and female; the feminine, the rest of the objects of the world.

Three paradigms of person markers are registered: i.) the pronouns are independent words and are a special class of nominals; ii.) a series of prefixes encode the subject with active verbs and the "possessor" with relative nouns; iii.) a series of clitics encode the object of the active transitive verbs and the subject of the stative verbs; they always follow the predicate. The list of these person markers is given at the end of the paper.

Typically, the predicate, be it a verb or a noun, occupies the first position in the sentence; similarly, the modifier is followed by the noun it modifies in the noun phrase.

An active verb, called "dummy verb" plays an important role in discourse. This light verb, both semantically and phonically, can stand alone as nuclear predicate: with no specific meaning, its semantic value depends then on the context and can be translated diversely ('to be', 'to say', 'to do'). But it is more often registered as an auxiliary: bearing the TAM and person markers, it helps connecting an adjunct complement fronted in a focus structure and it occurs also in a specific negative pattern as we shall see below. It forms a complex nucleus with the lexical verb which in turn, in a non-finite form and marked as such by *-n*, may, or not, receive the person markers.

The writing system used here has been adopted by the French Overseas Department of Guiana's Arawak community since 2006. The examples taken from other sources have been adapted here to this system, in order to standardize the presentation.

I want to thank the Lokono/Arawak speakers of this community, and especially Mrs. Ursula Visser Biswane, who helped providing some additional examples.

A. THE NEGATIVE PARTICLE.

The negative particle has two forms, *kho* and *khoro*. It may be connected with Kurripako negative marker *kuri* (T. Granadillo:46), but it is also probably related to the Lokono/Arawak diminutive particle *khan*, which means 'a little', a 'small quantity'.

Kho is predominantly a negative marker, but as we shall see in further examples, it conveys sometimes a restrictive or attenuative meaning, for example in a polite request. It may also be added to a pronoun or a conjunction to narrow the scope of the element with which it is associated.

Whenever it has appeared suitable in the following examples, the positive counterpart is given (as b.) after the negative (a.).

1. *Position and scope.*

This section will study the distribution in terms of position and scope of the particle *kho* and show that the negation it generates can be qualified as typologically "symmetric" as defined in Miestamo (Standard Negation:1973).

1.1. *Second position.*

The position of the negator shows to be indicative of the scope: an element, be it a single word, a phrase or a clause, preceding the negative particle is under its scope.

The negative marker occupies the second position, in such a way that it follows the element under scope. This can be

a verb *thudukha* (1):

- (1) a. *Thu-dukha khoro to.*
3.F.AG-see NEG DEM.F
'She does not see this.'
- b. *Thu-dukha to.*
3.F.AG-see DEM.F
'She sees this.'

a noun *wayo* (2):

- (2) a. *Wa-yo khoro to hiyaro.*
1.PL.POSS-mother NEG DEM.F woman
'This woman is not our mother.'
- b. *Wa-yo to hiyaro.*
1.PL.POSS-mother DEM.F woman
'This woman is our mother.'

a nominal in a predicative position *kidoantho* (3):

- (3) a. *Kidoan-tho kho to.*
true-NL.F NEG DEM.F
'This is not true.'
- b. *Kidoan-tho to.*
true-NL.F DEM.F
'This is true.'

In these nominal predicates, the nominal feminine marker *-tho* in *kidoan-tho* agrees with the feminine demonstrative *to*, which occupies the subject position.

We have seen so far the negative marker in second position, following immediately the predicate, typically in first position, be it a verb (1a), a noun (2a) or a nominal (3a).

But the element negated does not always occupy the first position in the sentence. Hereunder, the element under scope is

a modifier in a complement position *hibiro* (4):

- (4) a. *Lu-dukha hibiro kho usehu.*
3.M.AG-see small NEG worm
'He sees big worms.' (lit. 'not small')
- b. *Lu-dukha hibiro usehu.*
3.M.AG-see small worm
'He sees small worms.'

As (4a) shows, the negative operator follows the modifier *hibiro* 'small'. As a consequence, it separates the modifier from *usehu*, the noun it modifies.

The very common utterances given below convey some misgiving or some reluctance to fully assent, they are built upon *tha* 'it is', the dummy verb inflected in person, the 3rd feminine, and the dubitative particle *baha* 'maybe'.

- (5) a. *Th-a kho baha.*
3.F.AG-DV NEG maybe
Maybe not. (I don't think so.)
- b. *Th-a baha.*
3.F.AG-DV NEG maybe
'Maybe.' (I should think so.)

1.2. "Symmetric negation".

In the examples shown above, the particle alone conveys the negative meaning; it does not bring any other modification in the sentence. This negation can thus be classified as "symmetric" in Miestamo's terms.

However, in the pair of examples given below (6), the presence of the negative particle associated to a person marker, the pronoun 1st person *dai*, creates the well-formed sentence (6a):

- (6) a. *Dai khor.*
1.SG.PRO NEG
'It is not me.'

We notice that in the positive counterpart, the demonstrative is needed to form this equative-type utterance:

- (6) b. *Dai to.*
1.SG.PRO DEM.F
'It is me.'

This does not invalidate, in our view, the previous remark which classifies this negation with *kho* as symmetric, since Miestamo's typological classification only applies to "standard negation" (1973-39:45).

1.3. The "reportative".

The mood particle, reportative (RPT) *tha*¹, 'it says', 'they say', belongs to the epistemic domain and indicates that the speaker distances himself from his own assertion, and consequently does not fully validate it.

In all the examples above, we noticed that the negative particle follows the element under scope, which is generally a single word. We shall see now that the reportative *tha* falls under the scope of the negation and thus precedes the negative particle. As a result, the validation force of the negation is reduced.

In the following example, the verbal form *laitha*, 'he knows' forms a complex predicate with the reportative *tha*; this combination as a whole is affected by the negative operator. In this complex sentence, the question marker *halika* 'how?', 'which?', introduces the complement of the matrix verb contained in the main clause. No conjunction is registered between the clauses, and the negative operator has no consequence over the complement clause:

- (7) *L-aitha tha kho halika l-a-ma dia-n tora hiyaro oma.*
 3.M.AG-know RPT NEG QM 3.M.AG-DV-POT speak-INF
 DEM.NPROX.F woman with
 'He does not know, they say, how he can speak to that woman.'

In the following example, it is a nominal, the demonstrative *tora*, together with the reportative *tha*, that is under scope. It is to be noticed that both the reportative and the negation split the adjunct phrase, separating the postposition *khona* and its object *tora*:

- (8) *Tora tha kho khonan thu-dukha.*
 DEM.NPROX.F RPT NEG about 3.F.AG-see
 'She does not, they say, see about THAT.'

This example gives us the opportunity to observe that the language allows that the main piece of information in the sentence to be focused by the fronting of the constituent that contains it. In this case, the most informative component of the sentence is the adjunct complement *tora khonan*, 'about that'; it is moved to the initial position by fronting². In the translation the capitals express the intensity stress registered in oral English in a similar context.

1.4. Negative quantifiers.

The negative quantifiers corresponding to English 'nothing', 'nobody', and the negative time adverb 'never', are all developed out of the negative particle *kho*. The former two associate it with a question word: *hamâ* 'what?' in the case of 'nothing' (9), and *halikan* 'who?' in the case of 'nobody' (10). As for 'never', it originates from *abahan*, which means 'once' (11).

The negative quantifier 'nothing' is built upon the question marker *hamâ* 'what?' and the negative operator *khoro*:

- (9) *Hamâ khoro l-ani-ka wa-mun.*
 what? NEG 3.M.AG-do-PF 1.PL.POSS-DAT

¹ We suggest the reportative *tha* to be connected with the dummy verb and analyze the reportative as a petrified form of the dummy verb.

² See in this respect: W. Harbert, W. J. A. Pet. 1988 (op. cit.)

'He hasn't done a thing for us.' 'He does not do anything for us.'
'He does nothing for us.'

These negative quantifiers are often associated with *diaro*, a particle which usually establishes a comparison, translated by 'likely'. In this combination, *diaro* gives more illocutionary force to the negative meaning of the phrase:

- (10) *Hamâ diaro kho thu-shiroko tho-khonâ-ka.*
what? likely NEG 3.F.POSS-flesh 3.F.POSS-on/about-PF
'It remained absolutely no flesh on it[*'s* body].'

The negative quantifier referring to person, 'nobody', combines the question marker *halikan* (who?) and *khoro*:

- (11) *Halikan khoro andâ-the yaha.*
who? NEG come-CPT here.
'Nobody came here.'

The following example illustrates the negative indefinite *halikan kho* associated with *diaro*:

- (12) *Na-dukha halikan diaro kho.*
3.PL.AG-see who? likely NEG
'They don't/didn't see anybody (at all).'

It may be interesting to notice that this negative quantifier is not the only way to indicate an indefinite negative referring to person. Hereunder, we see that *khoro* negates *kakuthi* 'living (creature)', 'human being':

- (13) *Kakuthi khoro na-dukha.*
living NEG 3.PL.AG-see
'They don't see any living (creatures).'

The negative indefinite referring to time combines the negative particle *kho(ro)* and *abahan* (a time adverb meaning 'once'). It is usually associated with *diaro*, 'likely'. This complex formation acts as an adverbial phrase and requires, when fronted, the presence of the dummy verb, inflected in person, hereunder 3.F.AG *th-*:

- (14) *Abahan diaro th-a kho andu-n wa-shikoa-nro.*
once likely 3.F.AG-DV NEG come-INF 1.PL.POSS-house-ALL
'She never comes to our house.'

2. The negative particle in understatements.

We register a specific use of the negation *kho* in a rhetoric figure, the litotes, or understatement, which "says less to mean much". A previous example of this very frequent use of the negative operator can be found in (6a), but some others are given below.

2.1. The negative particle in quantifiers.

A series of quantifiers are understatements and contain the negator *kho*. Some of them are set phrases. This is the case, for example, of *abaro kho*: lit. 'not one' meaning 'many'; *aba lokhodi kho* : lit. 'not one kind, not in a single way' meaning

'many kinds, in many ways'; *mi*...*kho*: lit. 'not a minimum, not a small quantity' meaning 'much', 'very much'.

- (15) *Abaro kho*: 'many' (lit. 'not one').
Abaro kho bokhorona thu-thukuda.
 one NEG vine.sp. 3.F.AG-uproot
 She uprooted many *bokhorona* vines. (lit. 'not one *bokhorona* vine')

Aba lokhodi kho : 'many kinds, in many ways' (lit. 'not one kind, not in a single way').

- (16) *Atako-tho aba lokhodi kho tibokili abo da kia horhoro.*
 covered-NL.F one kind NEG scrub with ASS that earth
 'That [piece of] earth was indeed covered with all kinds of scrub.'
 (lit. 'not one kind of scrub')

Mi...*kho*: 'much, very much' (lit. 'not a minimum, not a small quantity').

The quantifier *mi* has always been found with the negative particle *kho*. The complex quantifier formed with the dummy verb occupies the first position in the sentence; it is a predicate. It is related with the rest of the sentence in two different ways: parataxis or subordination.

In parataxis, the quantifier and the item that it quantifies are both predicates; no overt conjunction is registered between the two clauses (17):

- (17) *Mi th-a kho th-imatea.*
 minimum 3.F.AG-DV NEG 3.F.AG-be.angry
 (It is much; she is angry.)
 'She is/was very furious.' (lit. 'not a little angry')

In subordination, the complex quantifier acts as the main clause; it is followed by a non-finite form of the lexical verb, *halekheben*, marked as subordinate by the absence of TAM marker and by the final morpheme *-n*.

- (18) *Mi th-a kho halekhebe-n.*
 minimum 3.F.AG-DV RPT NEG happy-INF
 It is much that she [is] happy.
 She is/was, very happy. (lit. 'not a little happy')

2.2. Understatement in other contexts.

This rhetorical figure can also be found in less petrified contexts. It is very common in spontaneous speech. Two examples taken from traditional oral literature are given below:

- (19) *Á! Akharo kho li omádoa koba da-dokothi [...]*
 EXCL now NEG PRO.3.M die REM.PAST 1.SG.POSS-
 grandfather,
 'Ah! This one did not die recently, Grandfather!'
 (ALD.161:24)

- (20) *Bu-dukha, tanohoke-ya kho b-oma hibin da de.*
 2.SG.AG-see, today-VER NEG 2.SG.POSS-SOC already ASS
 1.SG.SJ

'Look, it's not just since yesterday that I have been with you.'
(DT.107:51)

3. Restrictive or attenuative value.

The negative particle has also a restrictive or attenuative value.

3.1. *With the first person markers: exclusive person.*

When associated with the person pronouns, it generates an exclusive person marker. It appears to apply only to the 1st persons, singular *dai* and plural *wai*. In the words of J-P Bennett (1995:14): "*Whenever kho is added to 'dai' making 'daikho' or to 'wai' making 'waikho' it makes the word mean: I for one, or I of this group or I of this place and the plural would be: we for that matter or we of this group or we of this place.*"

3.2. *With a conjunction: restrictive value.*

In addition, the negation *kho* is often associated with the conjunction *ken* 'and', resulting in a combination which closes in on the immediate context, and can be translated by: 'and then', 'and so':

- (21) *Ken kho aba loko na-kora lokhodi-ka da ye.*
CONJ NEG one in 3.PL.POSS-hammock inside-PF ASS 3.PL.O
'And then, in one of their hammocks they indeed [stayed] inside.'

3.3. *Attenuative value.*

We connect this restrictive value with another use of the negative particle when it occurs, as an attenuation, in polite requests:

- (22) *Da-khoyabu-ya da bo,*
1.SG.AG-pray-VER ASS 2.SG.O
bu-shika-n kho to da-duna-wa da-mun
2.SG.AG-give-INF NEG DEM.F 1-wing-REFL 1.SG.POSS-DAT
'Indeed I implore you, won't you give me my (own) wings.'
(DT.101:36)

B. THE PRIVATIVE.

Apart from the negative particle *kho*, Guianese Lokono/Arawak exhibits, as other Arawakan languages, a morpheme *ma-* labelled « privative » which is the negative counterpart of attributive *ka-*. Between lexicon and grammar (derivation vs. inflection) Guianese Arawak/Lokono *ma-* has cognates in many Arawakan languages. *Ma-* as well as *ka-* have been retained in the reconstruction of proto-Arawakan (Matteson:1972; Payne:1991; Dixon & Aikhenvald:1998).

In this particular language, the privative marker has developed uses independently from the attributive. Thus, attributive and privative cannot be said to be symmetrical or homologous in the language.

On the one hand, privative *ma-* plays a role in derivation. On the other hand, it acts as a negative operator: in this case, the privative marker triggers a specific pattern which associates the non finite form of the lexical verb with the dummy verb. We assume this predicative pattern to be due to the affinity of negation with stativity.

In part 1., are given examples (23) to (26) of privative *ma-* as the negative counterpart of attributive *ka-*; the part 2. shows the derivational properties of *ma-* which are not shared with *ka-*, exemplified in (27) to (29); the part 3. gives examples of *ma-* as a negative operator in minimal predicates (30), (32a.), (33a.) and in complex sentences (34) to (37).

1. *Privative as the negative counterpart of attributive.*

The Guianese Lokono/Arawak privative marker conveys the general meaning « to lack », « to be deprived of ». It is a prefix, *ma-*, and it is the negative counterpart of attributive *ka-* in, for example, *ma-lokhodo*, 'without load, unloaded', *ka-lokhodo*, 'with load, loaded'.

Hereunder from (23) to (26) the a. examples give the privative form, and thus exhibit the *ma-* morpheme, and the b. examples the attributive form marked as such with *ka-*.

In terms of distribution, both privative *ma-* and attributive *ka-* combine with a stative root or a relative noun.

The stative root *mana* 'sharp, cutting edge' combines with the privative and the attributive (23):

- (23) a. *Ma-mana dayadoalan.*
 PRIV-cutting.edge my-knife
 'My knife is without cutting edge, my knife is blunt.'
- b. *Ka-mana dayadoalan.*
 ATTR-cutting.edge my-knife
 'My knife is with cutting edge, my knife is sharp.'

A relative noun (ie. a dependent item, or *relative* to another one, denoting a dependent or possessed entity) exhibits the same distribution. We take as example *usa*, 'child of someone', and its bound form *-sa* (24):

- (24) a. *ma-sa-tho*
 PRIV-child-NL.F
 'female without child, childless woman'
- b. *ka-sa-tho*
 ATTR-child-NL.F
 'female with child'

In the examples given in (24) the feminine gender marker, in the nominalizer (NL) – *tho*, apart from its essential function, that is reference tracking, enters in the word formation and triggers the grammatical category it belongs to, the nominal category.

This is also the case in the following examples, where the relative noun *shikoa*, 'house of someone, home' is combined with *ma-* (in 25a.) and with *ka-* (25b.) respectively, and the masculine (M) in the nominal marker *-thi*:

- (25) a. *ma-shikoa-thi*
 PRIV-home-NL.M
 'a homeless man'
- b. *ka-shikoa-thi*
 ATTR-home-NL.M
 'a man with home'

The examples given in (24) and (25) point out a permanent quality, or attribute.

Since the language i.) allows nominal predicates and ii.) allows that an argument position of a verb, particularly subject position, be left empty and thus can be classified as « pro-drop », in an appropriate context (where the referential identity is given unambiguously), (25a.) could also be translated 'He is a homeless man.' and (25b.) 'He is a man with home'. Similarly, in the same conditions, (24a.) could be translated 'She is a female without child, she is a childless woman.' and (24b.) 'She is a female with child.'

On the other hand, both attributive *ka-* and privative *ma-* in combination with a noun are compatible with a TAM marker, like aspectual perfect (PF) *-ka*. In the following example, X in the 3rd line stands for an entity referred to in the context:

- (26) a. *Ma-shikoa-ka.*
 PRIV-home-PF
 'X is *now* homeless.' (X has reached the state of being homeless)
- b. *Ka-shikoa-ka.*
 ATTR-home-PF
 'X is *now* with home.'

The difference between (25) and (26) may be compared with Spanish *ser* and *estar* in such a way that (25) could be translated (X) « *Es sin hogar* » and (26) (X) « *Está sin hogar* ».

2. The privative in derivation.

In Guianese Arawak/Lokono, privative *ma-* plays an important part in word formation, independently of attributive *ka-*. The productivity of the former goes thus beyond the latter's and *ka-* and *ma-* cannot be said to be symmetrical in the language.

2.1. Stative roots.

As seen previously in (23) above, *ma-* combines with stative roots. The stative root *seme* 'sweet, tasty', produces *ma-seme* 'not sweet, not tasty', but in this case, the positive counterpart of *maseme* is *seme*.

In (27a.) *seme* is associated with privative *ma-* and the nominal feminine marker *-tho* in order to form the word *masemetho*, a nominal predicate which agrees with the feminine demonstrative *to*, itself in the subject position, a predicative pattern to be compared with example (3), below.

- (27) a. *Ma-seme-tho to.*
 PRIV-sweet-NL.F DEM.F
 'This is not sweet.' (This [dish, beverage, fruit, person...] belongs to the un-sweet objects, an « essential », time-stable and permanent quality).

In this case, the positive assessment does not exhibit the attributive morpheme:

- (27) b. *Seme-tho to.*
 sweet-NL.F DEM.F
 'This is sweet.' (belongs to the category of the sweet objects, an « essential », time-stable and permanent quality)

Here again, as seen in (25), a stative root like *seme* combined with privative *ma-* allows the presence of a TAM marker, like aspectual perfect (PF) *-ka*:

- (28) a. *Ma-seme-ka no.*
 PRIV-sweet-PF 3.F.SJ
 'It is not sweet *now*!' (it has reached completely, fully, the state
 « un-sweet », a « contingent », changeable, alterable quality)

The gloss 3.F.SJ stands for the feminine 3rd person marker *no* in a stative predicative pattern. It is a clitic and it occurs always after the predicate.

Like in (27), *ma-* is not here in a paradigmatic relationship with *ka-*. The positive counterpart of (28a) is given below:

- (28) b. *Seme-ka no.*
 sweet-PF 3.F.SJ
 'It is sweet *now*.' (a « contingent », changeable, alterable quality)

Since the forms given in (27), privative *masemetho* and its positive counterpart *semetho*, belong to the nominal feminine category (NL.F), the item occupying the subject position, if instantiated, must belong to the same feminine category: this is the case of the feminine demonstrative *to*.

On the contrary, the TAM marker perfect *ka* allows the presence of the clitic, in (28) the feminine 3rd person *no*: we suggest that the aspectual marker, perfect *-ka*, gives the status of a verb to the stative root in (28) and (26).

To sum up the facts studied so far, attributive *ka-* as well as privative *ma-* generate a stative predicative pattern. Both combine with relative nouns as seen in (24), (25) and (26). This applies also to some lexical items belonging to the stative category as shown in (23), but most stative roots, like *seme* 'sweet', illustrated in (27) and (28), combine only with *ma-*.

2.2. Privative and causative in word formation.

Another case of asymmetry between *ka-* and *ma-* is registered in word formation. Associated with the causative *dV*, privative *ma-* allows the creation of active verbs with the general meaning 'to deprive something/someone of some of its attributes (specified by the lexical item)'.

For example, from the relative noun *bana* 'leaf', *ma-* in combination with the causative *dV*, forms the active verb given here in the infinitive and marked as such by *-n* (29):

- (29) *ma-bana-du-n*
 PRIV-leaf-CAU-INF
 'to take the leaves off', 'to cause X to be deprived of its leaves'

The same pattern is registered in for example *mabokorhodon* (from *bokorho*, 'clothes'), 'to take so's clothes off' and *makedin* (from *eke*, 'covering'), 'to take so's covering off'.

3. Privative *ma-* as a negative operator.

With active verbs, the privative marker acts as a negative operator at the syntactic level. A specific structure is registered.

3.1. The "dummy verb".

As negative operator, the privative triggers a construction where the lexical verb with the privative *ma-* in a non-finite form is followed by the dummy verb which

receives the appropriate inflection markers of the transitive active verbs, hereunder 1st person agent (1.SG.AG) *d-* and 3rd person object (3.F.O) *no*:

- (30) *M-aithi-n d-a no.*
 PRIV-know-INF 1.SG.A-DV 3.F.O
 'I don't know it.' ('I am without knowing it.')

It is suggested that the use of the dummy verb results from the interaction of rightward scope of the privative with the requirement that the clause should be verb initial.

The very common Arawak utterance given in (30) follows a pattern that can be analyzed in terms of *Role and reference grammar* as a *nuclear juncture* in which *two or more nuclei combine to form a single, complex nucleus* (van Valin:107-108).

It should be reminded that this is not the only way to negate a fact or an event. The negative particle is also available for this purpose, as shown in (31a):

- (31) a. *D-aitha kho no.*
 1.SG.AG-know NEG 3.F.O
 'I don't know it.'

to be compared with the affirmative:

- (31) b. *D-aitha no.*
 1.SG.AG-know 3.F.O
 'I know it.'

It is to be noted here that *no* stands for the 3rd person object which is its typical position in an active transitive predicative pattern while in (28) *no* is the subject of a stative clause. This is one of the characteristics that leads us to classify this particular language as active/stative.

3.2. *The prohibitive pattern.*

The prohibitive is built with the privative marker as negative operator. The prohibitive requires the complex verbal construction seen above with the privative acting, hereagain, as a negative operator. The pattern is similar to (30): the infinitive form of the lexical verb, bearing the privative, is followed by the dummy verb which receives the 2nd person marker *b-*:

- (32) a. *M-ôsu-n b-a!*
 PRIV-go-INF 2.SG.AG-DV
 'Don't go!' (without-going you-be)

The corresponding imperative is shown below for comparative purpose:

- (32) b. *B-ôsa!*
 2.SG.AG-go
 'Go!'

We assume that the privative fulfills different functions: a derivational function as seen in part 2., and a syntactic function as a negative operator discussed in this section. This allows the occurrence of a sequence that repeats the privative, the former being the negative operator and the latter the derivational item exemplified previously with the active privative verb *ma-bana-du-n* in (29). Here below the same verb is given in a prohibitive clause (33a):

- (33) a. *Ma-ma-bana-du-n ba no!*
 PRIV-PRIV-leaf-CAU-INF 2.SG.AG-DV 3.F.O
 'Don't take its leaves off!'

and the corresponding imperative:

- b. *Bu-ma-bana-da no!*
 2.SG.AG-PRIV-leaf-CAU 3.F.O
 'Take its leaves off!'

The examples (30), (32a) and (33a) show that the negation operated with the privative generates a complex nucleus, in which the lexical verb in a non finite form, marked as such by *-n*, associated with the dummy verb which receives the flexion, occur adjacent to one another and share the same core arguments.

Following Miestamo's terminology, if we compare with the corresponding positive assertions, this negative pattern is thus asymmetric and belongs to the type A/Fin ("Asymmetry in the finiteness") since "*the lexical verb loses its finiteness, and [...] a new finite element (auxiliary) is introduced into the negative clause to bear the finite verbal categories*" (Miestamo:73).

Previous works (Givón:1978; Miestamo:1973) have mentioned the connection existing between stativity and negation. We assume that the predicative strategies associated with the privative marker displayed in this particular language are due to the affinity of negation with stativity.

3.3. Complex sentences.

We shall now discuss the privative in complex sentences. Previous examples have already shown complex sentences where the negative *kho* operates in the main clause (6) or in the dependent, or subordinate, clause (21).

Hereunder are to be found a series of complex sentences where the privative acts as a negative operator.

Negation-transport, where an embedded sub-clause is negated, but the negator is attached to the verb of the higher clause, is only registered with the verb *anshin*, 'to want' (34):

- (34) *M-anshi da n-andu-n-the.*
 PRIV-WANT 1-DV 3.PL.AG-come-INF-CPT
 'I don't want them to come/ I wish they would not come.'

With perception verbs such as *dukhun* 'see', on the contrary, the main clause is in the affirmative, and the privative acts as negation operator in the embedded sub-clause (35):

- (35) *Da-dukha ma-bina-n n-a-n.*
 1.SG.AG-see PRIV-dance-INF-INF 3.PL.AG-DV-INF
 'I saw that they did not dance.'

With request verbs, for example *âdakhoton*, no transport is registered either. These verbs allow the embedded clause be negated with the privative morpheme (36):

- (36) *D-âdakhota ye ma-boka-n n-a-n-bia.*
 1.SG.AG-ask 3.PL.O PRIV-cook-INF 3.PL.AG-DV-INF-FIN
 'I asked them not to cook.'

But the following utterance, quoting direct speech and followed by an independent clause, is more natural and generally preferred (37):

- (37) *"Ma-boka-n h-a-li!" d-a na-mun.*
 PRIV-cook-INF 2.PL.AG-DV-DEO 1.SG.AG-say 3.PL.POSS-
 DAT
 "'Don't cook!' (lit. 'you must not cook'), I said to them.'

C. SOME OTHER ASPECTS OF NEGATION.

1. Double negation.

When double negation occurs, the general pattern is a sequence which combines the privative *ma-* and the negative particle *kho*. The following example gives another case of understatement, very frequent in spontaneous speech:

- (38) *Ma-seme-tho khoro kokorhiti wa-dukha.*
 PRIV-tasty-NL.F NEG maripa 1.PL.AG-see
 'We saw delicious (lit. 'not un-tasty') *maripa*³ fruits.'

We observe that the double negation results in a positive assertion.

2. Negative answers.

There are several ways of answering negatively to a yes-no question. The main procedures are given below.

2.1. Standard negative answer.

The standard negative answer is *bâkhor*, where it is easy to recognize the negative particle *khor* (39):

- (39) *B-adia-ko-ma Loko udiahu?*
 2.SG.AG-speak-PERF-POT Arawak language
 'Can you speak the Arawak language?' 'Do you speak Arawak?'
 – *Bâkhor*, *m-eithi-n d-a to Loko adia-n.*
 – No! PRIV-know-INF 1.SG.AG-DV DEM.F Arawak speak-INF
 'No! I can't speak the Arawak language.' 'No! I don't speak
 Arawak.'

2.2. The negative answer focusing on person.

To the question given in (39), another negative answer uses the privative *ma-* and focuses on the person, in this case, the 1st person, *manda* (40):

- (40) – *Manda.*
 – 'I don't.' (lit.: 'not me')

³ "Maripa" is a vernacular name of a palm tree and its fruit (*Maximiliana regia* Mart. or *Attalea maripa* (Aubl.) Mart.), found in lowland forests from Trinidad and Tobago in the north to Bolivia in the south. It is fairly common in the Guianas.

This negative answer, inflected in person, is in a paradigmatic relationship with *manba* 'not you' (2.SG); *mantha* 'not her/not it' (3.F.SG); *manla* 'not him' (3.M.SG); *manwa* 'not us' (1.PL); *manha* 'not you' (2.PL); *manna* 'not them' (3.PL).

2.3. *Emphatic negative answer.*

Finally, another negative answer, *manin*, also built from the privative, is an emphatic negation (41):

- (41) – *Manin!*
 – 'Not at all!'

3. *Negative existential*

Lokono/Arawak has no positive existential. However, a stative verb, *kawan*, meaning 'to lack', 'to be missing' can be analyzed as negative existential:

- (42) *Kawa-ka oniabo.*
 be.missing-PF water
 'There is no water.'

The Lokono/Arawak language exhibits two negatives operators. In this study, I analyze their main distributional and semantical features. Even though the main body of examples presented in this paper come from my own study, I picked up some interesting ones for the purpose of this study, in other sources.

REFERENCES

- Bennett, John Peter, *Twenty-eight lessons in Loko (Arawak)*, Georgetown (Walter Roth Museum) 1995 (abbreviated J-P B in quoted examples)
- Dixon, Robert M.W., Alexandra Aikhenvald, eds., *The Amazonian Languages*, Cambridge (Cambridge University Press) 1998
- Givón, Talmy, Negation in language: pragmatics, function, ontology. In: P. Cole, (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics*. New York (Academic Press) 1978
- Granadillo, Tania, *An ethnographic account of language documentation among the Kurripako of Venezuela*, PHD Dissertation (Univ. of Arizona) 2006
- Harbert, Wayne, Willem J. A. Pet, "Movement and adjunct morphology in Arawak and other languages" in Chicago (*International Journal of American Linguistics* 54: 416-35) 1988
- Matteson, Esther, *Comparative studies in Amerindian languages*. Janua Linguarum, series practica, 127, The Hague (Mouton) 1972
- Miestamo, Matti, *Standard Negation*. Berlin/New York (Mouton de Gruyter) 1973
- Patte, Marie-France, *Structure de l'énoncé en Arawak des Guyanes*, Dr Thesis (Univ. Paris IV-Sorbonne) 2003
- Patte, Marie-France et al. "ka- et ma- et la relation d'appartenance en Arawak des Guyanes" in Paris (*Amerindia* 26/27:51-66) 2002
- Payne, Doris L. "A classification of Maipuran (Arawakan) languages based on shared lexical retentions." In Desmond C. Derbyshire and Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.), *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*, vol. 3, 355-499. Berlin (Mouton de Gruyter) 1991
- Taylor, Douglas, *Languages in the West Indies*. Baltimore/London (The John Hopkins University Press) 1977 (abbreviated DT in quoted examples)
- Van Baarle, P. et al., *Arhwaka Lokonong Djang*. Amsterdam/Haarlem (Instituut voor Algemene Taalwetenschap / Ikyoshie) 1989 (abbreviated ALD in quoted examples)
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr, "A Synopsis of Role and Reference Grammar". In Robert D. Van Valin Jr., ed., *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*, 1-164, Amsterdam/Philadelphia (John Benjamins) 1993

	<i>Pronouns</i>	<i>prefixes</i> ("A"/POSS)	<i>clitics</i> ("O/SJ")
1	<i>dai</i>	<i>d(a)-</i>	... <i>de</i>
2	<i>bui ~ bî</i>	<i>b(u)-</i>	... <i>bo</i>
3F	* <i>to</i>	<i>th(u)-</i>	... <i>no</i>
3M	* <i>li</i>	<i>l(u)-</i>	... <i>i</i>
1PL	<i>wei</i>	<i>w(a)-</i>	... <i>we</i>
2PL	<i>hui ~ hî</i>	<i>h(u)-</i>	... <i>hu</i>
3PL	<i>nei</i>	<i>n(a)-</i>	... <i>ye</i>

PERSON MARKERS

* 3F *to* is the demonstrative feminine (DEM.F) and 3M *li* the demonstrative masculine (DEM.M).

ABBREVIATIONS

AG agent	M masculine
ALL allative <i>nro</i>	NEG negation <i>khoro</i>
ASS asseverative <i>da</i>	NL nominal
CAU causative <i>dV</i>	NL.F nominal feminine <i>tho</i>
CONJ conjunction <i>ken</i>	NL.M nominal masculine <i>thi</i>
CPT centripetal <i>the</i>	O object in transitive active predicates
DAT dative <i>mun</i>	PF perfect <i>ka</i>
DEM.F demonstrative feminine <i>to</i>	PL plural
DEO deontic <i>li</i>	POT potential <i>ma</i>
DIM diminutive <i>khan</i>	PRIV privative <i>ma-</i>
DV dummy verb <i>a</i>	PRO pronoun
EXCL exclamative <i>ah!</i>	REFL reflexive <i>wa</i>
EXP expectative <i>na</i>	REM.PAST remote past <i>koba</i>
FACT factitive <i>kuta</i>	RPT reportative <i>tha</i>
F feminine <i>tho</i>	SJ subject in stative predicates
FIN final <i>bia</i>	VER veridical <i>ya</i>
INF infinitive <i>n</i>	

Key-words: particle, derivation, privative.