

Chapter 1

Negation in Tacana (Amazonian Bolivia): Synchronic description and diachronic reconstruction

Antoine Guillaume

Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage (CNRS & Université Lumière Lyon 2)

The goal of this paper is to provide, for the first time, a synchronic description and diachronic reconstruction of negation in Tacana, a critically endangered language of the small Takanan family in the Amazonian lowlands of Bolivia and Peru. One significant contribution of the paper is the reconstruction, for a standard negation marker, of an etymology (stand-alone negation word ‘no’) and type of Jespersen Cycle (from the right of the verb to the left of the verb) that are not commonly reported in general studies on negation. The proposed reconstruction also contributes to current studies on the interactions between standard negation and the Negative Existential Cycle (the general theme of the volume) in arguing that the Tacana stand-alone negation word ‘no’ originated in a negative existential predicate. In so doing, the paper adds to the diachronic literature on languages where a negative existential breaks into the verbal domain through a stand-alone negation stage.

Keywords: Takanan languages, negation, Jespersen Cycle, Negative Existential Cycle

1 Introduction

Tacana is one of the five extant languages of the small Takanan family from the Amazonian lowlands of Bolivia and Peru (together with Araona, Cavineña, Ese Ejja, and Reyesano). The language is critically endangered, being only spoken by a few dozens of essentially elderly people, and basically undescribed, except in the form of a tagmemic grammar (Ottaviano & de Ottaviano 1965, 1967).

This paper is the first study of negation in this language. It is mostly based on a corpus of firsthand data (texts and elicitations) from the Tumupasa dialect that I collected during four months of fieldwork conducted on four field trips between 2009 and 2013. The data are complemented by second-hand materials published by the Summer Institute of Linguistics, consisting of a number of texts (de Ottaviano 1980) and sentences that illustrate their dictionary entries (Ottaviano & de Ottaviano 1989). Ultimately, some data from the mid-19th century are also presented in the section on diachrony (Lafone Quevedo 1902). Note that no controlled elicitation with native speakers was conducted specifically on the topic of negation, which means that the study relies exclusively on my own interpretation of the available corpus.

The goals of this paper are twofold: (1) to provide a detailed description of a wide range of negation constructions in Tacana and (2) to attempt a historical reconstruction of some of the negation markers and patterns. One significant contribution to the field of diachronic typologies of negation is the reconstruction for one of the Standard Negation (hereafter SN) markers of an etymology (stand-alone negation word ‘no’) and type of Jespersen Cycle (from the right of the verb to the left of the verb), which are not commonly reported in general studies on negation. The proposed reconstruction also contributes to the current studies on the interactions between SN and the Negative Existential Cycle (the general theme of the volume) in arguing that the Tacana stand-alone negation word ‘no’ originated in a negative existential predicate. In doing so, the paper adds to the diachronic literature on languages where a negative existential breaks into the verbal domain through a stand-alone negation stage (Croft 1991: 10, 13–14, Veselinova 2013: 127ff, 2016: 155–156).

In the literature, the grammaticalization of stand-alone negation words (also known as “absolute negators,” “pro-sentence words no!,” “negative replies to polarity questions,” “short answers no!,” “negative interjections,” etc.) as SN markers through a reinforcement/strengthening process (Jespersen Cycle) is well documented. The phenomenon is attested, for instance, in languages such as Brazilian Portuguese, Caribbean Spanish dialects, northern Italian dialects, Dutch, Africans, Swedish and Sino-Russian (see, among others, Schwegler 1988, van der Auwera 2009: 49, Veselinova 2013: 127ff, 2016: 155–156). As illustrated, for instance, in Brazilian Portuguese (1), a word meaning ‘no,’ originally used outside of a negative clause (stage 2), ends up replacing the original SN marker inside of the clause (stage 5).

- (1) Brazilian Portuguese (evolutionary path based on discussion in [Creissels 2006](#): 149–150)

- stage 1 *Não sei.*
- stage 2 *Não sei, (não!)*
- stage 3 *Não sei não.*
- stage 4 *(Nã) sei não.*
- stage 5 *Sei não.*

In all these languages, however, the cycle operates from the left of the verb to the right of the verb, in other words from a preverbal to postverbal SN marker. In Tacana, as I argue here, the same type of etymology and grammaticalization pathway holds, but the direction of the cycle is the opposite. Here, a postverbal SN marker is in the process of being replaced by a negative stand-alone word in preverbal position. This results in the phenomenon called a Jespersen Cycle “in reverse” by [van der Auwera & Vossen \(2016\)](#) and [Vossen \(2016\)](#); according to these authors, it appears to be common in South American languages.

The paper is organized in two main parts. The first part is descriptive, with a short introduction on Tacana clause structure and verbal predication (§2) and a presentation of six negation constructions: (1) Standard Negation (SN), which applies, by definition, to declarative main clauses with a finite verb predicate ([Miestamo 2005](#)) (§3) but also, in Tacana, to non-verbal clauses expressing equation, proper inclusion, attribution relations (§4) and (in rare cases) existence or location (§5); (2) negation of existential/locative adjective predicates; (3) negation of declarative clauses with a non-finite predicate with two subtypes (§6); (4) non-clausal stand-alone negation (§7); (5) non-clausal constituent negation with two subtypes (§7); and (6) negation of command (hortative and imperative) clauses with two subtypes (§8).¹ A summary table of all the constructions is provided in section §9. The second part of the paper is diachronic, engaging in a reconstruction of the declarative clause negation markers and patterns: SN and negation of declarative clauses with a non-finite predicate (§10). A summary and a conclusion are provided in §11.

¹Essentially, two other types of negation are not discussed in the paper: negation of indefinites and quantifiers and negation in dependent clauses.

2 Basic facts on Tacana clause structure and verbal predication

Main clauses in Tacana consist of an obligatory predicate² and optional arguments and/or obliques and/or adjuncts. When overtly expressed, the arguments, whether NPs or pronouns, display a (split)³ ergative case-marking system, as illustrated in (2a), with an ergative marked A NP and absolutive (unmarked) O NP, and (2b), with an absolutive (unmarked) S NP.⁴

(2) transitive and intransitive declarative main clauses

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|----------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------|
| | O | A | | V | |
| a. | Jiawe =da | id'eti biwa=ja | | y-abu-ta-(a)ni. | |
| | now | =PRT sun | spider_monkey=ERG | IPFV-carry-3A-IPFV(.SITTING) | |
| | 'Ahora lo está cargando el marimono.' so007 | | | | |
| | 'Now the spider monkey is carrying the sun.' | | | | |
| | S | | | | V |
| b. | Biwa | =da | kema | [tsakwa echa=su] | bade-ti-a. |
| | spider_monkey | =PRT | 1SG.DAT | mapajo(tree) branch=LOC | hang-GO-PST |
| | 'Mi marimono se colgó en gajo de mapajo.' (elicited) | | | | |
| | 'The spider monkey (that I shot) went to hang on the branch of a mapajo (Ceiba pentandra) tree.' | | | | |

The arguments, especially when expressed by NPs, do not have strict ordering restrictions and can appear in any position in the clause depending on their discourse-pragmatic status. Pronominal arguments, on the other hand, tend to occur either in first position in the clause (when contrastive) or second position (when referring to continuing topics).

²Note that the term “predicate” used here does not make reference to any participant of the clause.

³The case system is conditioned by the type of referent: strictly ergative with 1SG/2SG pronouns, optionally ergative with 3SG pronouns and NPs, and neutral with all non-singular pronouns (Guillaume 2016, forthcoming).

⁴The Tacana consonant phonemes are *p*, *b*, *t*, *d* [d], *d'* [d̥], *dh* [ð], *ts* [tʃ], *ch* [tʃ], *s* [s], *sh* [ʃ], *k*, *kw* [kʷ], *r* [r], *m*, *n*, *j* [h], *w* [w/β] and *y* [j]. The vowel phonemes are *a*, *e*, *i* [i/j] and *u* [u/w]. Stress falls on the 3rd mora (i.e., vowel or semi-vowel [j] or [w]) counting from the left). Note that the illustrative examples include the free translation in local Bolivian Spanish that was given by the native speakers who helped me transcribe and translate the texts. The codes that follow the translation lines (e.g., so007) correspond to the place of the example in my (Toolbox) database. Unless explicitly specified, the examples come from texts.

Verbal main clauses can be headed by two types of predicates without semantic differences: a finite verb predicate, where the verb takes the inflectional morphology, as illustrated in (2), and a non-finite verb predicate, where the verb does not take the inflectional morphology, which is optionally carried by a generic auxiliary (light verb). Both types are illustrated in (3) with the same verb root *tutua* ‘spill,’ used in the finite verb construction in the first clause and in the non-finite verb construction in the second.

- (3) Dapia =da etse beu se e-tutua. E-jemi-tsua =da etse beu
 there =PRT 1DU PRT fish FUT-spill FUT-take_out-go.up =PRT 1DU PRT
tutua =da etse y-a.
 spill =PRT 1DU FUT-do
 ‘Ahí ya lo vamos a vaciar los peces. Lo vamos a alzar (la trampa para peces) entre los dos y lo vamos a vaciar.’ em044–045
 ‘There we are going to spill the fish (on the ground). We are going to lift (the fish trap) up and then spill them (on the ground).’

There is no difference in (at least propositional) meaning between finite verb constructions and non-finite verb constructions. The reasons motivating the use of one construction or the other is not fully understood yet, although it might have to do with the discourse status of the event or some specific discourse genres.⁵

Finally, both types of predicates do not have any impact on the way the arguments are expressed. When negated, however, they require distinct constructions. The construction used to negate finite verbal main clauses is also used to negate a number of non-verbal clauses. It will be called Standard Negation (SN) and discussed first, as it applies to verbal clauses (§3) and non-verbal clauses (§4 and §5). The construction used to negate non-finite verbal main clauses will be discussed in a separate section (§6).

3 Negation of declarative clauses with a finite verb predicate (Standard Negation)

In clauses with a finite verb predicate, the lexical verb stem, with or without derivational morphology, directly and obligatorily bears the inflectional mor-

⁵I noticed, for instance, that non-finite verb constructions are often used when an event is repeated, as is the case in two consecutive sentences from the same text in (4). I also found that non-finite verb constructions are used more often in informal style and hardly ever in elicited material.

- a. Dapia =da etse beu se e-tutua.
 there =PRT 1DU PRT fish FUT-spill
 ‘Ahí ya lo vamos a vaciar los peces.’ em044
 ‘There we are going to spill the fish (on the ground).’
 V S
- b. Beu =pa ja-mesia-ti-(i)dha jida deja, mawi
 PRT =RPRT MID-let_go_of-MID-REM.PST that man almendrillo
 echa=jenetia.
 branch=ABL
 ‘Ya dice se largó del gajo del alamendrillo.’ ch083
 ‘He let go of himself from the almendrillo branch.’

-3	<u>TAM</u>
-2	valency change
-1	compounded/incorporated noun
0	verb root
+1	compounded/incorporated verb
+2	valency change
+3	“adverbial-like”
+4	<u>3rd person indexation</u>
+5	<u>temporal distance -iti-</u>
+6	<u>“back” -iba-</u>
+7	“adverbial-like”
+8	<u>TAM</u>
+9	iterative -yu

Draft of March 1, 2022, 07:50

volving two particles: the preverbal independent *aimue* [ajmue] ~ [ajmwe]⁶ and the postverbal enclitic =*mawe* [maʃe] (with a variant =*mue* [mue] ~ [mwe]). The construction is illustrated in (5a) with a transitive predicate, and in (5b) with an intransitive clause.

- (5) O A
a. *Aimue* ejije=kwana yama
NEG jungle=PL 1SG.ERG
V
e-shanapa-eni-(i)nia=mawe.
IPFV-know-well-IPFV(.SITTING).1/2A=NEG
‘Ya no conozco estos montes bien.’ ch132
‘I don’t know these jungles well anymore.’
 S V
b. *Aimue* =da ema e-siapati-yu=mue.
NEG =PRT 1SG FUT-come_back-ITER=NEG
‘Ya no voy a regresar.’ na191
‘I’m not going to come back again anymore.’

The preverbal particle *aimue* is phonologically stressed and syntactically free, occurring anywhere before the verb. It is often the first word of the clause, as in (5a,b); see also (7a,b) further below. But this is not an absolute requirement, as in (6a,b), where *aimue* is preceded by several clausal constituents. The exact motivations for placing *aimue* in different positions before the verb remain to be investigated.

- (6) A
a. Jade, [ye=base=ja] =mu *aimue*, sai-da
let’s_see this=DEPR=ERG =CNTR NEG well-ASF
V
y-a-ta-(a)ni=mawe.
IPFV-affect-3A-IPFV(.SITTING)=NEG
‘A ver, este no lo hace bien.’ bu092
‘Let’s see, this damned one doesn’t do it well.’

⁶As will be seen later, *aimue* is a contracted variant of *aimawe* [ajmaʃe] which shows up in some examples of the SN construction when applied to non-verbal clauses.

- S
b. [Piada deja] =pa, [mesa, d'aki=neje], **aimue** sai-da
one man =RPRT 3SG.GEN brother_in_law=ASSOC NEG well-ASF
V
jadusuti-(i)na=**mawe**.
get_along-HAB.PST=NEG
'Un hombre, dice, que con su cuñado no se llevaba bien.' ch003
'There were a man and his brother-in-law who did not get along well.'

The postverbal particle =*mawe*, by contrast, is a phonologically unstressed enclitic with a rigid position. It can only attach to the verb. If the verb of the negated clause is followed by one or more clausal constituents, =*mawe* necessarily remains on the verb, as in (7a,b).

- (7) a. **Aimue** $\overset{V}{\underline{e}}$ -juseute- $\overset{A}{\underline{ta}}$ =mawe, beni=ja.
 NEG FUT-fell-3A=NEG wind=ERG
 ‘No los va a tumbar el viento.’ bu072
 ‘The wind will not fell (the trees).’
 b. Bute-ke! $\overset{V}{\text{Aimue}}$ =da $\overset{S}{\underline{e}}$ -kwinana=mawe, dukei.
 go_down-IMP NEG =PRT FUT-go_out=NEG deer
 ‘¡Bájate! No va salir el venado.’ du018
 ‘Go down! The deer will not go out.’

In my corpus, very few examples of negation of interrogative clauses can be found. The ones that are available, such as (8), suggest nevertheless that they are negated by means of the same pattern as in declarative clauses.

- (8) Jukwajasu =da aimue dasu e-nubi-ani=mawe [yaw
 why =PRT NEG then IPFV-enter-IPFV(.SITTING)=NEG water
 tipa=su]?
 bottom=LOC
 ‘¿Porque pues no entra debajo de agua?’ bo080
 ‘Why does it (the caiman) not go underneath the water?’

In the available corpus, *aimue* is never omitted. As for *=mawe*, I found a couple of examples where it is left out, as in (9) and (10), which suggests that *=mawe* might not be obligatory. It is reminded that no controlled elicitation with native speakers was conducted on negation constructions.

- (9) [Ena dume=su] aimue e-nubi-ti-ani.
 stream inside=LOC NEG IPFV-enter-GO-IPFV(.SITTING)
 ‘No entra dentro del agua.’ bo081
 ‘(The caiman) does not enter into the water.’
- (10) Aimue e-kwina-yu.
 NEG PST-arrive-ITER
 ‘No llegó.’ ch037
 ‘He didn’t arrive.’

From the perspective of Miestamo’s (2005, 2007) typology of negative constructions, the Tacana negative construction under discussion is symmetric. Apart from the addition of the negative markers, there do not appear to be any obvious morphosyntactic differences, with the same argument-coding system (split ergative case-marking and constituent order flexibility) and same morphological possibilities on the verbal predicate (derivational and inflectional).

4 Negation of non-verbal clauses (1): equation, proper inclusion, attribution

The SN construction is also used for negating non-verbal clauses. The negation of equation, proper inclusion and attribution clauses is discussed in this section. The negation of existential and locative predication is discussed in the next.

In affirmative equation, proper inclusion and attribution clauses, the predicate consists of an NP or an adjective optionally followed by the inflected copula verb *pu* ‘be,’ as illustrated in (11a-d). The S NP is expressed like the S NP of any other intransitive verbal clauses, being optional and, when expressed, not subject to any ordering restrictions.

- (11) a. proper inclusion (with copula)
 S NP COP
 [Tueda edeje] [a’una deja] pu-ina.
 that youngster bear man be-HAB.PST
 ‘Ese joven era joven (lit. hombre) oso.’ au004a
 ‘That youngster was a bear-man.’
- b. equation (without copula)
 S NP
 [Mike ebakepuna] [kema kwara].
 2SG.GEN daughter 1SG.GEN mother
 ‘Tu hija es mi madre.’ au155
 ‘Your daughter is my mother.’

- c. attribution (with copula)
 S ADJ COP
 Id’eti =di tuche-da e-pu-eti.
 sun =PRT strong-ASF IPFV-be-IPFV(.STANDING)
 ‘El sol también estaba fuerte.’ lp078
 ‘The sun was very hot (lit. strong).’
- d. attribution (without copula)
 S ADJ
 Te =mu ai-da beju...
 garden =CNTR grande-ASF PRT
 ‘Ahora el chaco es grande...’ gu054
 ‘The garden is big...’

When negated, these non-verbal clauses require the SN construction through the discontinuous embracing construction with the predicate-preposed independent *aimue* and the predicate-postposed enclitic =*mawe*, as illustrated in (12). Both have the same properties as when applied to clauses with a finite verb: ordering flexibility for *aimue*, as long as it appears before the predicated NP or predicative adjective; strict position for =*mawe*, directly attached to the copula verb (if present) or to the predicated NP or predicative adjective (if the copula is absent). As can be seen in (12a), the predicate-preposed negation marker can show up in a longer (more conservative) form *aimawe* [ajmaʒe]. As for =*mawe*, I have too few examples of SN applied to non-verbal clauses to know if it displays the shorter variant =*mue* found in SN applied to verbal clauses.

- (12) a. proper inclusion (with copula)
 S NP COP
 [Tueda edeje] *aimawe* [kristianu eni] pu-ina=*mawe*.
 that child NEG person real be-HAB.PST=NEG
 ‘Ese joven no era humano.’ au003
 ‘That youngster was not human. [lit. ‘That youngster was not a real person’.]’
- b. equation (without copula)
 S NP
Aimue =jia maida [ye deja] [kema y-awe]=*mawe*?
 NEG =DUB PRT this man 1SG.GEN NPF-husband=NEG
 ‘¿No es mi marido este hombre?’ (Ottaviano & de Ottaviano 1989: 4)
 ‘Is this man not my husband?’

- c. attribution (with copula)
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| S | | ADJ | | COP |
| [Kea tata] | =mu | aimue | sai-da | pu-ina= mawe . |
| 1SG.GEN father | =CNTR NEG | well-ASF | be-HAB.PST=NEG | |
- ‘Mi papá no era tan bueno (renegaba / pegaba).’ ps058
 ‘My father wasn’t nice.’
- d. attribution (without copula)
- | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------|---------|-----------|
| | ADJ | | S |
| Aimue | sai-da= mawe | [mike | e-bakwa]. |
| NEG | well-ASF=NEG | 2SG.GEN | NPF-child |
- ‘No es bueno tu hijo.’ au222
 ‘Your child is not nice.’

Note finally that I do not have examples in the whole corpus where =*mawe* (or *aimawe* ~ *aimue* for that matter) are omitted. More research is, however, needed to confirm whether this is also a possibility, as in clauses with finite verbs, especially since I have very few examples of negation of non-verbal clauses in the current dataset.

5 Negation of non-verbal clauses (2): existential/locative predication

There is no clear formal distinction between existential and locative clauses, whether affirmative or negative. In affirmative existential and locative clauses, the predicate is normally one of four posture verbs, either *ani* ‘sit’ (13a-e), *neti* ‘stand’ (14), *sa* ‘lie’ (15) or *bade* ‘hang’ (16); less commonly, the predicate can also be the (copula) verb *pu* ‘be’ (see below). In this function, the posture verbs are inflected but with severe restrictions, with only a few possible TAM affixes: a prefix *e-/y-* ‘EX/LOC,’ the habitual past *-ina* ‘HAB.PST’ and the complex past tense *-iti-a* ‘TDM-PST’. A locative oblique (or, for that matter, another type of oblique) can be present with no rigid position in the clause. With a dative oblique, the same construction yields the semantics of possessive predication, as seen in (13e), with the possessor encoded by the 3SG dative pronoun *mesa*.

- (13) positive: posture verb ‘sit’
 LOC V S
 a. ... dapia **y-ani** dhududu.
 there EX/LOC-sit capybara
 ‘(En los lagos grandes,) ahí hay capihuara.’ mc004
 ‘There (in the big lakes,) there are capybaras (lit. sitting).’
 LOC LOC V
 b. Chue [enabaki maje=su] **y-ani**.
 there stream border=LOC EX/LOC-sit
 ‘Allá está (mi mamá) en la banda del arroyo.’ au164
 ‘(My mother) is there (lit. sitting) on the other side of the river.’
 S V LOC
 c. [Beinte familia] **ani-(i)na** Napashi=su [da mara=su].
 twenty family sit-HAB.PST Napashi=LOC that time=LOC
 ‘Veinte familia había en Napashi en ese año.’ na003
 ‘There were twenty families (lit. sitting) in Napashi at that time.’
 S V COM
 d. [Piada deja] **ani-(i)na** [mesa e-wane=sa kwara=neje].
 one man sit-HAB.PST 3SG.GEN NPF-wife=GEN mother=ASSOC
 ‘Había un hombre que vivía junto a su suegra.’ gu003
 ‘There was a man who was living with his mother-in-law.’
 S DAT V
 e. Ebakwa=chidi mesa **y-ani**.
 child=DIM 3SG.DAT EX/LOC-sit
 ‘Tenía dice su hijito.’ ye020
 ‘He had a small child.’ [lit. a small child was sitting to him]
- (14) positive: posture verb ‘stand’
 S V LOC
 Dukei=base **e-neti** **ena=su**
 deer=DEPR EX/LOC-stand stream=LOC
 e-(ja-)id’i-ti-neti.
 IPFV-MID-drink-MID-IPFV(.STANDING)
 ‘Ahí está el venado dentro del agua, está tomando.’ hv027
 ‘There is a deer /the deer is standing in the water and drinking (standing).’

- (15) positive: posture verb 'lie'
 LOCS V
 Ue dukei **e-sa**.
 here deer EX/LOC-lie
 'Aquí hay un venado echado.' du051
 'Here, there is a deer (lying).'
- (16) positive: posture verb 'hang'
 V LOC
 [Piada semana] =pa beu **e-bade** [rara dume=su].
 one week =RPRT PRT EXIST/LOC-hang hole inside=LOC
 'Así dice (el tigre) estuvo una semana dentro de la cueva.' bu056
 '(The jaguar) was (hanging) inside of the hole during a whole week.'

Instead of a posture verb, the predicate of an existential and locative clause can apparently also be the verb *pu* 'be,' discussed in its copula use in the preceding section. This is suggested by a couple of examples found in the corpus, such as those in (17a) (existential) and (17b) (locative).

- (17) positive: verb 'be'
- a. Juishu beju **pu-iti-a**.
 judgment PRT be-TDM-PST
 'Había juicio.' (in064_ott; de Ottaviano 1980: 62)
 'There was a judgment.'
- b. Tueda escuela=su **pu-ina**.
 3SG school=LOC be-HAB.PST
 'El estaba en la escuela.' na205
 'He was in the school.'

When negated, existential and locative clauses display two possible patterns. The first, illustrated in (18) and very scarcely attested in the corpus, is through the same discontinuous embracing SN construction with the preverbal independent *aimue* and the postverbal enclitic =*mawe*. This first pattern is illustrated with the posture verb *ani* 'sit' in (18a) and (18b) and with the copula verb *pu* 'be' in (18c). Note that due to a lack of sufficient examples, I am unable to say if the pattern is attested with the other posture verbs, 'stand', 'lie' and 'hang', and if *aimue* and/or =*mawe* display the variants they have in SN when applied to other clause types (*aimawe* [ajmaʃe], =*mue* [mue] ~ [mwe]).

- (18) a. S V
 [Da tiempo] **aimue** sapato ani-ina=**mawe**.
 that time NEG shoe sit-HAB.PST=NEG
 ‘En ese tiempo no había zapato.’ ci024
 ‘At that time, there were no shoes.’
V S
 b. **Aimue** ani-iti-a=**mawe** Rurrenabaque.
 NEG sit-TDM-PST=NEG Rurrenabaque
 ‘(En los tiempos antiguos), no había Rurrenabaque.’ tu002_ott,
 (de Ottaviano 1980: 8)
 ‘(In the old days) Rurrenabaque did not exist.’
LOC S V
 c. Upia =mu =da **aimue** ejude ekene pu-iti-a=**mawe**.
 here =CNTR =PRT NEG village first be-TDM-PST=NEG
 ‘Aquí no había nada/pueblo / no era pueblo todavía.’ hi020
 ‘Here at first there was no village.’

The second pattern, illustrated in (19a-e) and found in many examples in the corpus, consists of *aimawe* [ajmaʃe] or variant *aimue* [ajmue] ~ [ajmwe] used alone with a predicative function, with or without the inflected copula verb *pu* ‘be.’ In this use, I analyze *aimawe/aimue* as a lexical negative existential/locative adjective in an attributive clause construction, as described in §4. In the examples provided below, one can see negation of existence in (19a), (19b) and (19c), negation of location in (19d) and negation of possession in (19e) (possessor encoded by the 3SG dative pronoun *mesa*).

- (19) a. ADJ COP S
 [Biawa tiempo] =mu =da **aimue** pu-iti-a ejude=kwana.
 old time =CNTR =PRT nonexistent be-TDM-PST village=PL
 ‘En tiempos antiguos no habían pueblos.’ tu001_ott, (Ottaviano &
 de Ottaviano 1989: 8-9)
 ‘In the old days, there were no villages.’ [lit. villages were
 nonexistent]
S ADJ
 b. Kwati =mu **aimue** =tsu’u.
 firewood =CNTR nonexistent =STILL
 ‘La leña todavía no hay.’ ci104
 ‘There is no firewood yet.’ [lit. firewood was nonexistent]

- ADJ S ADJ
- c. **Aimue** beu se. **Aimue** beu.
 nonexistent PRT fish nonexistent PRT
 ‘Ya no hay pescado, ya no hay.’ em075
 ‘There were no fish. There were no (fish).’ [lit. fish were nonexistent]
- S ADJ LOC
- d. Ema =mu **aimawe** beu [kema tawi-jude=su].
 1SG =CNTR nonexistent PRT 1SG.GEN sleep-PLACE=LOC
 ‘(Me buscaron ya) yo no estaba en mi cama.’ du101
 ‘(They searched for me but) I wasn’t in my bed.’ [lit. I was nonexistent in my bed]
- ADJ DAT S
- e. **Aimue** mesa aicha...
 nonexistent 3SG.DAT meat
 ‘No tenía carne...’ ye006
 ‘He didn’t have meat.’ [lit. the meat was nonexistent to him]

6 Negation of declarative non-finite verbal main clauses

We now turn to the negation of main clauses with a non-finite verbal predicate. As noted in §3, main clauses with a non-finite verbal predicate express the same propositional content as those with a finite verbal predicate, but here the predicate has a different structure. The lexical verb stem, with or without derivational morphology, does not directly bear the inflectional morphology. The inflectional affixes (the same ones used in finite verb constructions and listed in Table 1—i.e., TAM and 3rd person indexation) are either carried by a generic auxiliary (light verb), which in this construction is specifically used for this (inflection-carrying) purpose or, more commonly, altogether absent.

The examples in (20a,b), based on the same transitive and intransitive verb stems *tutua* ‘spill’ and *ja-mesia-ti* ‘let go of oneself’ used in finite verb constructions in (4a,b), illustrate non-finite verb constructions with inflections carried by a generic auxiliary.

- (20) transitive and intransitive declarative main clauses with a non-finite verb and an overt auxiliary

- | | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| V | A | AUX |
| [tuʔtwa] | | |
- a. E-jemi-tsua =da etse, beu **tutua** =da etse y-a.
 FUT-remove-go_up =PRT 1DU PRT spill =PRT 1DU FUT-do
 ‘Lo vamos a alzar (la trampa para peces) entre los dos y lo vamos a vaciar.’ em045
 ‘We are going to lift (the fish trap) up and spill them (the fishes) (on the ground).’

V	S	AUX
[haʔmesjati]		
- b. Beu, **ja-mesia-ti** ema **pu-ana**.
 PRT MID-let_go_of-MID 1SG be-REC.PST
 ‘Ya me largué.’ lp033
 ‘Then I let go of myself.’

As one can see, there are two auxiliaries, the use of which depends on the transitivity of the predicate: *a* ‘do’ when the predicate is transitive (20a) and *pu* ‘be’ when the predicate is intransitive (20b). The auxiliaries are etymologically related, respectively, to the independent transitive lexical verbs *a* ‘affect, make, do (tr.), say (tr.),’ illustrated in (21a), and the intransitive verb *pu* ‘be/exist, be located, do (itr.), say (itr.),’ which can serve, among other things, as the copula predicate in equation, proper inclusion and attribution clauses (§4) and (less commonly) the predicate of existential/locative clauses (§5), as illustrated in (21b) (repeated).

- (21) a. Upia [mike ete], ekwanaju y-a.
 here 2SG.GEN house 1PL.EXCL FUT-do
 ‘Aquí te lo vamos a hacer tu casa.’ au313
 ‘Here we are going to build your house.’
 b. Tueda escuela=su **pu-ina**.
 3SG school=LOC be-HAB.PST
 ‘Él estaba en la escuela.’ na205
 ‘He was in the school.’

In the non-finite verb constructions, the auxiliary must follow the lexical verb, whether contiguously or not; in (20a,b), for instance, the auxiliary is not contiguous with the lexical verb, being separated from it by a pronoun in both examples, and also by a particle in (20a). As for the lexical verb in this construction,

whether the auxiliary is present or not, it receives a specific intonation contour, with a non-phonological prosodic glottal stop [ʔ] in 1st syllable coda position (see phonological inventory in Footnote 4) and apparently a different stress pattern.⁷

As stated above, the inflection-carrying auxiliary is not compulsory, and in fact it is left out most of the time; in this situation, the TAM and identity of 3rd person subjects have to be recovered from the context. This is illustrated with the transitive and intransitive verb stems *nubi-ame* ‘make enter’ in (22a) and *pue-yu* ‘come again/back’ in (22b).

- (22) transitive and intransitive declarative main clauses with a non-finite verb and no overt auxiliary

- | | | | | |
|--|---|--|------------|--|
| O | A | | V | |
| | | | [nuʔbjame] | |
| a. Beu etseju gringo=ja beu, cuarto=su nubi-ame . | | | | |
| PRT 1DU.EXCL gringo=ERG PRT room=LOC enter-CAUS | | | | |
| ‘Ya a nosotros el gringo al cuarto nos metió e hizo entrar.’ tm057 | | | | |
| ‘The gringo made us enter into the room.’ | | | | |
| S | | | V | |
| | | | [pweʔju] | |
| b. Pero, [mesa emetse] =mu, ekene pue-yu . | | | | |
| but 3SG.GEN owner =CNTR first come-ITER | | | | |
| ‘Pero su dueño primero se vino.’ ha017 | | | | |
| ‘But his owner came first.’ | | | | |

At the level of the clause, predicates with a non-finite verb and predicates with a finite verb do not require different clausal constructions: the argument-coding system remains the same, with an identical split ergative case-marking system and the same constituent order flexibility.

However, when it comes to negation, clauses with a non-finite verbal predicate are negated differently from clauses with a finite verbal predicate; the SN construction is not used for their negation. Here, two additional negation constructions are available, both of which only involve a single negation marker, which occurs before the verb. The form of the marker is what distinguishes the constructions, with all other properties being identical. In the first construction, the negation marker is the independent morpheme *aimue* (as in SN) while in the second it is the proclitic *mué=* (segmentally identical to one of the variants of *=mawe* in SN). Unlike in SN, here the lexical verb (or the inflection-carrying

⁷See Footnote 4 on the stress system in Tacana.

auxiliary, if expressed) is never followed or accompanied by a second negation marker.

The negative construction with *aimue* is illustrated in (23a,b) with an overt auxiliary and (24a–c) with no overt auxiliary. In both cases, examples of both transitive and intransitive clauses are provided. Note that unlike in the affirmative counterpart, the lexical verb does not receive a specific intonational contour (glottal stop in 1st syllable coda position), whether marked by *aimue*, as illustrated here, or *mué=*, as illustrated further below.

- (23) negative clauses with *aimue* and auxiliary
- | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | V | AUX |
| a. | Biame | <i>aimue</i> =da dia a-ta-ina. |
| | on_the_contrary NEG | =PRT eat do-3A-HAB.PST |
| | 'Pero no lo comió.' qu004 | |
| | 'But (the jaguar) would not eat it.' | |
| | V | AUX |
| b. | <i>Aimue</i> beu, kwinana-yu pu-idha. | |
| | NEG PRT emerge-ITER be-REM.PST | |
| | 'Ya no salió más.' qu033 | |
| | 'He didn't leave again.' | |

- (24) negative clauses with *aimue* without auxiliary
- | | | | |
|----|---|------------------------------|-----|
| | A | O | V |
| a. | <i>Aimue</i> yama | d'aki | ba. |
| | NEG 1SG.ERG brother_in_law | see | |
| | 'No le he visto al cuñado.' ch028 | | |
| | 'I didn't see my brother-in-law.' | | |
| | S | V | |
| b. | <i>Aimue</i> , ema kwinana-puda. | | |
| | NEG 1SG go_out-FAST | | |
| | 'No he salido rápido.' ch152 | | |
| | 'I didn't go out fast.' | | |
| | | V | |
| c. | Enekita =pa | <i>aimue</i> beu ja-tibi-ti. | |
| | really =RPRT NEG PRT MID-detach-MID | | |
| | 'En verdad dice que no se soltó.' ch082 | | |
| | 'Really, (the vine) didn't break.' | | |

The behavior of *aimue* here is the same as that of *aimue* in SN, being phonologically stressed and free to occur in any position as long as it is before the predicate.

The negative construction with *mué=* is illustrated in (25) with an overt auxiliary and (26a–c), with no overt auxiliary.

- (25) negative clause with **mué=** and auxiliary
- | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|---|--|
| | V | AUX | O | |
|--|---|-----|---|--|
- Mué=pa teje-ti-yu a-ta-idha** [jida mesa e-wane] beu.
 NEG=RPRT find-GO-ITER do-3A-REM.PST that 3SG.GEN NPF-wife PRT
 ‘Dice que no lo ha ido hallar ese su mujer.’ os043
 ‘He didn’t find his wife.’
- (26) negative clauses with **mué=** without auxiliary
- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | V | |
|---|---|--|
- [mwéshánapa]
- a. Yama =mu **mué=shanapa** [...] [mesa ebakwa] manu-iti-a.
 1SG.ERG =CNTR NEG=know 3SG.GEN child die-TDM-PST
 ‘Yo no me he dado cuenta que ha muerto su hijo.’ su130
 ‘I didn’t realize that his child had died.’
- | | |
|---|---|
| O | V |
|---|---|
- [mwéemahéutsu]
- b. **Mué=ema jeutsu.**
 NEG=1SG respond
 ‘No me contestó.’ ch033
 ‘He did not answer me.’
- | | |
|--|---|
| | V |
|--|---|
- [mwé:manu]
- c. ... rusu-ta-idha doctor=ja. **Mué=manu.**
 sew-3A-REM.PST doctor=ERG NEG=die
 ‘Se lo costuró el doctor (el cuero de su cabeza). No ha muerto.’
 ti041-42
 ‘The doctor stitched (the scalp of his head). He hasn’t died.’

As one can see from these examples, *mué=*, like *aimue*, does not have a specific position as long as it occurs before the predicate. It can attach to the predicate, as in (26a, c) or to any preverbal host, as in (25) and (26b); note that in (25), *mué=* attaches to a second position clitic, the reportative =*pa*. The two markers *mué=* and *aimue* only differ in their prosodic status, *mué=* being prosodically dependent while *aimue* has prosodic independence. Note that phonological words formed by *mué=* and its following host have a peculiar stress pattern where stress falls on *mué=*, as can be seen in the phonetic transcriptions in (26b–c).⁸

⁸ As already mentioned in Footnote 4, the rule in Tacanan is that stress falls on the 3rd mora (i.e., vowel or semi-vowel [j] or [w]) counting from the left. Evidence that the normal rule does not apply here can be seen in (26c), where one should obtain [mwemánu] and not [mwé:manu].

From a functional perspective, it is not fully clear what motivates the use of *aimue* versus *mué*=, although it is likely that they differ in encoding different degrees of emphasis; if so, the longer form, *aimue*, is the more emphatic of the two.

From the perspective of Miestamo's (2005, 2007) typology of negative constructions, negation of clauses with non-finite verbs, like the SN, is symmetrical, as it does not result in any obvious morphosyntactic differences. The argument-coding system and the morphological possibilities on the verbal predicate remain the same. The only difference that was noted is, in relation to the lexical verb, the absence of the prosodic glottal stop [ʔ] in 1st syllable coda position, which is otherwise characteristic of the lexical verb in affirmative non-finite verb constructions.

7 Non-clausal negation

In this section, I describe two types of non-clausal negation: stand-alone negation and constituent negation. Stand-alone negation is realized by way of *aimawe* or *mawe*, whether negation consists in answering a polar question, as in (27), or rectifying a false statement, as in (28) and (29).

(27) response to a polar question

Authority: Corregidor=ja =mi, e-kisaba-me-ta-(a)ni apa
judge=ERG =2SG IPFV-ask-CAUS-3A-IPFV(.SITTING) if
=mi acompaña a-kwa, misha, Semana_Santa
=2SG accompany do-POT church_service Holy_Week
misha=su, awa mawe?
church_service=LOC Q no
'El corregidor te hace preguntar si puedes acompañarles a la
misa de Semana Santa o no?' su026
'The corregidor asks whether or not you could accompany
them to the Holy Week Mass.'

Sub-prefect: Mawe! Aimue =da ema e-puti=mawe.
no NEG =PRT 1SG FUT-go=NEG
'No, no voy a ir.' su028
'No! I won't go!'

(28) rectification of a false statement

- Mother: Manuame-pe-ta-kwa tse ekwana.
kill-COMPL-3A-POT MAYBE 1PL
‘¡(Tu padre) nos puede matar a toditos!’ au064
‘(Your father) can kill us all!’
- Son: **Aimawe!** Ema ebiasu tuche-da.
no 1SG a_lot strong-ASF
‘No, yo tengo más fuerza que él.’ au066
‘No (he can’t kill us)! (Because) I’m stronger (than him).’

(29) rectification of a false statement

- Jaguar: Jiawe =mida yama e-dia.
now =2SG 1SG.ERG FUT-eat
‘Ahora te voy a comer.’ bu028
‘Now I’m going to eat you.’
- Fox: **Mawe** tiyu! Be =tsu ema dia-ji!
no uncle IMP.NEG =YET 1SG eat-IMP.NEG
‘No tío, no me comas todavía!’ bu029
‘No, Uncle! Don’t eat me yet!’

Constituent negation is realized by way of the enclitic =*mawe* or its variant =*mue*, which is attached to the constituent to be negated. It is attested as a derivation process with nouns (privative negation), as in (30), and adjectives (adjectival antonym negation), as in (31).

(30) privative negation

- a. Pero pisa=**mue** =da ema.
but gun=PRIV =PRT 1SG
‘No tengo arma.’ co046
‘I don’t have a gun (lit. I am without a gun / gun-less).’
- b. Dapia lugar=su kristianu=kwana escuela=**mawe**.
there place=LOC person=PL school=PRIV
‘En este lugar, no tiene escuela la gente.’ na073
‘There, in that place, the people don’t have schools.’ (Lit. are without a school / school-less)

- (31) adjectival antonym negation
 S ADJ S ADJ
 Tueda sai-da=**mawe**, ema =mu sai-da=kita.
 3SG nice-ASF=NEG 1SG =CNTR nice-ASF=INTS
 ‘El es malo y yo soy bueno.’ (Ottaviano & de Ottaviano 1989: 81)
 ‘He is bad (lit. not nice) and I am nice.’

8 Negation of hortative and imperative clauses

Finally, to close the synchronic description of negation strategies in Tacana, we here provide a brief description of negation in commands. The first type is hortative clauses (1st and 3rd person imperative), which in the affirmative polarity are headed by a finite verb marked by a prefix *pa-* instead of TAM inflectional affixes, as illustrated in (32a). When negated, hortative clauses require a preverbal independent particle *be*, which is simply added to the positive construction without further morphosyntactic modifications (same 3rd person indexation, same hortative prefix, same argument-marking and constituent order flexibility).

- (32) a. positive
 O V A V
 Tueda **pa**-dia-ta señora=ja, **pa**-id’i-ta.
 that HORT-eat-3A wife=ERG HORT-drink-3A
 ‘¡Ese (caldo de gallina) que coma la señora! ¡Que tome!’ pa044
 ‘Let the woman eat this (chicken soup)! Let her drink it!’
 b. negative
 A V O
 Tueda =mu **be** **pa**-dia-ta [jida aicha]!
 3SG =CNTR NEG HORT-eat-3A that meat
 ‘¡Que él no coma esa carne!’ n2.0138 (elicited)
 ‘Don’t let him eat that meat!’

The second type of command clauses is 2nd person imperative clauses, which in affirmative polarity are headed by a finite verb marked by the suffix *-ke*, as in (33a). When negated, the same preverbal independent particle *be* must be used. However, the head verb cannot carry *-ke* anymore, which is now replaced by a suffix *-ji*, as in (33b). With regards to the other morphosyntactic properties of the clause, they are the same as in the affirmative.

- (33) a. positive
 “Dia-**ke** =tsu empanada, kupari!” ema a-ta-idha.
 eat-IMP =YET empanada compadre 1SG do-3A-REM.PST
 “¡Come todavía empanada, compadre!” me dijo (mi comadre).’ su057
 “Eat some more ‘empanada,’ compadre!,” (my comadre) said to me.’
 b. negative
 Mawe tiyu. **Be** =tsu ema dia-ji!
 NEG uncle IMP.NEG =YET 1SG eat-IMP.NEG
 ‘No tío, ¡No me comes todavía!’ bu029
 ‘No, uncle, don’t eat me yet!’

9 Summary of negation constructions

The negation constructions described above are summarized in Table 2 on the next page. For practical reasons, in the schematized constructions I provide the most commonly attested variants of the negation markers, *aimue* and *=mawe*.

10 Reconstructing the origin of negation markers and constructions

The goal of this section is to identify, on the basis of internal reconstruction, possible etymologies and evolutionary pathways for the rise of the different negative markers involved in the negation of declarative or interrogative clausal constructions: the SN construction (§3–5) and the construction (with its two subtypes) used to negate clauses with a non-finite verbal predicate (§6), repeated in Table 3.

The negative markers in these constructions are all formally very similar and therefore likely to be historically related; such is not the case with the negative markers involved in negation of command clauses (*be*, *-ji*), the reconstruction of which will not be attempted in this paper.⁹ The markers all consist of either *mawe* ~ *mue* used on its own or in combination with a preposed element *ai*, forming *aimawe* ~ *aimue*. Note that *ai* can be used independently of *mawe* ~ *mue*, as an indefinite noun “person/thing, someone/something” (34), suggesting

⁹One might speculate that *be* is related to *mawe*, which manifests reduced variants such as the clitics *=mue* and *mué=* that come closer to the form of *be*. I will leave this issue for further investigation.

Table 2: Summary of negation constructions in Tacana

Type	Construction	Symm.	Type
<u>Clausal</u>			
declarative finite verbal main clauses	[... <i>aimue</i> ... V-INFL(= <i>mawe</i>) ...]	yes	1
non-verbal clauses:			
equation, inclusion	[... <i>aimue</i> ... NP... (be-INFL)= <i>mawe</i> ...]	yes	
attribution	[... <i>aimue</i> ... ADJ... (be-INFL)= <i>mawe</i> ...]	yes	
existential/locative	[... <i>aimue</i> ... VPOST-INFL= <i>mawe</i> ...]	yes	
	[... <i>aimue</i> ... be-INFL= <i>mawe</i> ...]	yes	
<u>Clausal</u>			
non-verbal clauses: existential/locative	[... <i>aimue</i> ... (be-INFL)]	no	2
<u>Clausal</u>			
declarative non-finite verbal main clauses	[... <i>aimue</i> ... V ... (be/do-INFL) ...]	(yes)	3
	[... <i>mué</i> = ... V ... (be/do-INFL) ...]	(yes)	
<u>Non-clausal</u>			
stand-alone	[<i>aimawe</i>]	N/A	4
	[<i>mawe</i>]	N/A	
<u>Non-clausal</u>			
constituent negation:			
privative	[N= <i>mawe</i>]	yes	5
adjectival antonym	[ADJ= <i>mawe</i>]	yes	
<u>Clausal</u>			
hortative	[... <i>be</i> ... HORT-V ...]	yes	6
prohibitive	[... <i>be</i> ... V- <i>ji</i> ...]	no	

Table 3: Summary of negation constructions for verbal main clauses in Tacana

Type of negated constituent	Construction	Symmetrical
clauses with finite verbal predicate or with non-verbal predicates	... <i>aimue</i> ... predicate(= <i>mawe</i>) ...	yes
clauses with non-finite verbal predicate	... <i>aimue</i> ... V ... (be/do-INFL) <i>mué</i> = ... V ... (be/do-INFL) ...	yes yes

that *aimawe* ~ *aimue* may be an erstwhile univerbation of this indefinite pronoun and *mawe* (as in English ‘nothing,’ for example).

- (34) Enekita beu =pa ai=kwana ja-ba-ti-ana.
 really PRT =RPRT thing=PL MID-see-MID-REC.PST
 ‘En verdad dice se alistó sus cosas (para el viaje).’ co080
 ‘Really, he prepared his things (for the trip). (lit. saw for himself)’

Depending on the construction, the negation markers *mawe* or *aimue* have different degrees of grammatical or phonological freedom (e.g., *mawe* can be a clitic); they can occupy different positions in the clause (e.g., preposed or postposed to the negated constituent); they can be used alone or in combination with each other (forming an embracing negation construction); and possibly, in the case of the embracing construction, one marker can be optional.

If one looks for possible internal cognates, it is notable that *mawe* and/or *aimue* are also used in many other negative constructions described earlier in this chapter, such as the second existential/locative negation construction (§5), stand-alone negation (§7) and constituent negation (§7).

On the basis of these preliminary observations, we will now proceed to reconstruct at least parts of the history of the two negative constructions. We start with the SN construction in §10.1 and then move on to the reconstruction of negation of clauses with a non-finite verb in §10.2.

10.1 Evolutionary pathway: SN construction

The embracing preposed marker *aimue* and postposed marker =*mawe* that are used in SN have quite distinct grammatical and phonological properties, which suggest that =*mawe* is historically older than *aimue* in this construction. Evidence for the likely older status of =*mawe* is to be found in its shorter form (*mawe*

~ *mue*), phonological dependence (clitic status) and rigid position. These properties are all diagnostics of an advanced grammaticalization stage and they can be contrasted with the distinct properties of *aimue*, with its longer form (*aimawe* ~ *aimue*), phonological independence and free position (before the predicate).

One can therefore hypothesize that originally SN was expressed by a single marker, the postposed marker =*mawe*, and that the preposed marker *aimue* was introduced later for reinforcement. If we search for a likely etymology for this newly introduced marker *aimue*, the negative stand-alone word *aimawe* ‘no!’ (27), (28) and (29) – (28) is repeated in (35) below – and the negative existential/locative adjective *aimue* ‘nonexistent’ (19) – (19a) is repeated in (36) below – immediately come to mind, and there is little doubt that the three negation forms (new SN marker, stand-alone negation word and negative existential/locative adjective) are all historically related.

(35) Stand-alone negative ***aimawe***

Mother: Manuame-pe-ta-kwa tse ekwana.
 kill-COMPL-3A-POT MAYBE 1PL
 ‘_i(Tu padre) nos puede matar a toditos!’ au064
 ‘(Your father) can kill us all!’

Son: ***Aimawe!*** Ema ebiasu tuche-da.
 no 1SG a_lot strong-ASF
 ‘No, yo tengo más fuerza que él.’ au066
 No (he can’t kill us)! (Because) I’m stronger (than him).’

(36) Negative existential/locative adjective in an attributive construction

[Biawa tiempo] =mu =da ***aimue*** pu-iti-a ejude=kwana.
 old time =CNTR =PRT nonexistent be-TDM-PST village=PL
 ‘En tiempos antiguos no habían pueblos.’ tu001_ott (Ottaviano &
 de Ottaviano 1989: 8-9)
 ‘In the old days, there were no villages.’ [lit. villages were nonexistent]

With regards to the evolution of their use, the hypothesis pursued here is that the negative existential/locative adjective is older, that it later extended its use to a stand-alone negation word, and that this use made it possible to develop a new SN marker. In other words, the immediate etymology of the SN marker *aimue* is a stand-alone negation word, *aimue*, which itself can be traced back to a negative existential/locative predicative adjective *aimue*. According to this scenario, which is schematized in Table 4 with the verb ‘go’ as an illustration in English, the evolutionary trajectory followed by the Tacana stand-alone *aimue*

Table 4: Evolutionary pathway of Tacana stand-alone negation *aimue* into the marking of SN

stage 1	predicate= <i>mawe</i>	‘I will not go’	hypothesized
stage 2	(<i>aimue</i>), predicate= <i>mawe</i>	‘(No,) I will not go’	hypothesized
stage 3	<i>aimue</i> (,) predicate= <i>mawe</i>	‘ No (,) I will not go’	synchronic use
stage 4	<i>aimue</i> predicate(= <i>mawe</i>)	‘ No I will (not) go’	(synchronic use)
stage 5	<i>aimue</i> predicate	‘ No I will go’ (= I will not go’)	hypothesized

would be similar to that of the Brazilian Portuguese stand-alone negator *não* illustrated in (1). A clause-external stand-alone negator, originally used to reinforce a clause-internal negator (stage 2), is reanalyzed as a second clause-internal negator, forming an embracing negation construction (stage 3). Over time, the original clause-internal negator becomes optional (stage 4) and ends up disappearing altogether (stage 5), with the result that it is replaced by the new reinforcing (external stand-alone) negator.

An alternative hypothesis would be that the immediate etymology for the new SN marker is not the stand-alone use of the negator *aimue* but its use as a negative existential/locative adjective. In the context of SN, this hypothesis is much less plausible, due to the lack of a conceivable source construction and evolutionary scenario. Had the direct etymology been the negative existential/locative adjective, the only source construction available in Tacana that I can think of is where *aimue* negates the existence of a nominal referent, as illustrated in (36) (‘there were no villages’ / ‘villages were nonexistent’).¹⁰

However, negating an event by way of this construction (e.g. ‘there is no going for me’ / ‘my going is nonexistent’) would require important structural changes in the verb form (for instance, the lack of finite morphology) and argument structure (for instance, a different case frame for the core arguments) which are absent in the negation of finite verb constructions. Moreover, the verb to be negated by way of a negative existential/locative adjective should display affirmative polarity; this is not the case, since the verb is marked by the enclitic negator =*mawe*.

As proposed above, it is of course very likely that the SN negator *aimue* and the negative existential/locative adjective *aimue* are historically related, but the

¹⁰ According to Veselinova (2016: 157), “the use of negative existentials with nominalized verb forms is cross-linguistically the most widespread pathway whereby they can be shown to expand into the domain of verbal negation.”

link is probably an indirect one, involving an intermediary stand-alone negation stage; cross-linguistically, the move from negated existential predicate to stand-alone negation is a well-attested pathway (Croft 1991: 10, 13–14, Veselinova 2013: 127ff, 2016: 155–156), and when there is synchronic polysemy between the two, the evidence generally points to the negated existential predicate being the source, not the other way around (Croft 1991: 8).

Reconstructing the diachronic development of *=mawe* in the SN construction (stage 1) is a more complex task, for which it will be necessary to resort to comparative data from other Takanan languages. That is beyond the scope of the current paper, and so here I will restrict myself to the observation that the most likely internal cognate is the negative enclitic *=mawe* used alone in constituent negation (privative derivation and adjectival antonym negation; §7).

10.2 Evolutionary pathway: negation of clauses with a non-finite verb

We now move to the discussion of the possible diachrony of the negation construction of clauses with a non-finite verb. As a reminder, here negation is realized by way of a single negation marker which is preposed to the lexical verb and which can be one of two morphemes, *aimue* or *mué=*, giving the following two constructions: [... *aimue* ... V ... (be/do-INFL) ...] and [... *mué=* ... V ... (be/do-INFLECTIONS) ...].

Following the same line of reasoning as above (i.e., taking into account the respective grammatical and phonological properties of *aimue* and *mué=*), it is reasonable to believe that *mué=* is older than *aimue*. This assumption is grounded in the observation that *mué=* displays a shorter form and less phonological independence (being a clitic) than *aimue*; note that in terms of their syntactic distribution, both are free to occur anywhere before the lexical verb. The hypothesis is also corroborated by philological evidence found in a Christian catechism in Tacana from the mid-19th century Lafone Quevedo 1902, which only displays a negation construction that corresponds to that with *mué=*. In the material available, which goes back about 150 years, we see that all the instances of negation of verbal main clauses¹¹ are realized by way of a preverbal marker *mawe* (spelled *mave*) that precedes a non-finite verb, as in the three examples in (37), and which look basically similar to our synchronic construction [... *mué=* ... V ... (be/do-INFL) ...].

¹¹ Note that in the affirmative polarity, the catechism shows examples of clauses with both finite and non-finite verbs.

(37) Old Tacana (mid-19th century)

S NEG V AUX

a. Quejutcua mara mi mave confesa pu?

how_many year 2SG NEG confess be

‘How many years have you not confessed?’ (Lafone Quevedo 1902: 297)

A NEG V

b. Jucuajasu ni mi mave ichegua.

why MAYBE 2SG NEG kill

‘¿Y por qué no lo mataste?’ (Lafone Quevedo 1902: 310)

‘Why didn’t you kill it?’

NEG V

c. Mave chanapa cuaja miada ema e-ba-nia.

NEG know why 2SG.ERG 1SG IPFV-see-IPFV(.SITTING).1/2A

‘No sé porqué me miráis.’ (Lafone Quevedo 1902: 310)

‘I don’t know why you are looking at me.’

On the basis of these synchronic observations and the historical data, it is possible to suggest that the negation pattern with *mué=* corresponds to the original construction and that the negation pattern with *aimue* is a more recent development.

Turning to the reconstruction of the development paths, since both patterns only differ in the formal and prosodic properties of their negation marker, it can be suggested that they arose in a similar way but at different times in the past. In terms of likely etymologies for *aimue* and *mué=*, the same candidates are available as those for the *aimue* and *=mawe* negators in SN: the negative stand-alone word *aimue* ‘no!’ (35) and negative existential/locative predicative adjective *aimue* (36), to which we can add the second negative stand-alone word *mawe* ‘no!’, illustrated in (38) (repeated from 27).

(38) Mawe! Aimue =da ema e-puti=mawe.

no NEG =PRT 1SG FUT-go=NEG

‘No, no voy a ir.’ su028

‘No! I won’t go!’

Although *mawe*, unlike *aimue*, is not attested as a negative existential/locative predicative adjective in present-day Tacana, it is plausible that it could have been used in such a way in the past, and that this function fell into disuse.

Although a scenario similar to that proposed for the reconstruction of SN – a Jespersen Cycle reinforcement process by way of a stand-alone negator replacing

a former negator in a clause with a non-finite verb – is not completely inconceivable, here there is no evidence available which would support it. That is, there is no possibility of having the two negative markers *aimue* and *mué=* co-occurring in the same construction.

An alternative scenario that seems more probable would be one which possibly involved as the source construction for both patterns (that with *aimue* and that with *mué=*) not a clause with a non-finite verb, but a clause with a negative existential/locative predicative adjective of the clause type illustrated in (36) ('there were no villages' / 'villages were nonexistent'). As commented in Footnote 10, this evolutionary pathway is cross-linguistically very common. From this perspective, one could imagine that the transitive and intransitive SN constructions (e.g., in (24a) 'I didn't see my brother-in-law' and (24b) 'I didn't go out fast') come from the reanalysis of clauses with a nominalized verb as the S argument of a negative existential/locative predicate. These are translatable literally as 'the seeing of my brother-in-law is nonexistent to me' for (24a) and 'the fast going out is nonexistent to me' for (24b). An argument in favor of this hypothesis is that here, unlike in the SN construction with finite verbs, the verb does show some similarities with nominal referents in negative existential predicate constructions, in particular by being obligatorily non-finite and in an affirmative form.

Yet, there are several unresolved issues with this hypothesis; in particular, there are divergent properties between the hypothetical negative existential predicate source construction and the target negative construction with a non-finite verb which would remain to be explained. One such property is argument coding. In the negation construction with a non-finite verb, the argument coding is identical to that of basic declarative affirmative clauses (the same split ergative case-marking system). If the negation construction with a non-finite verb had originated in an existential predicate, one would expect a different coding pattern, one which should reflect how the arguments can be coded in nominal predicate construction. Notably, one would expect the S and the A of the SN construction to be marked like an experiencer argument in a nominal predicate construction, with dative(+purpose) case marking, as in (39a,b); note that (39a) is repeated from (19e).

- | | | | |
|------|---|-------------|-----------------|
| | ADJ | DAT | S |
| (39) | a. <i>Aimue</i> | <i>mesa</i> | <i>aicha...</i> |
| | nonexistent | 3SG.DAT | meat |
| | 'No tenía carne...' ye006 | | |
| | 'He didn't have meat.' [lit. meat was nonexistent to him] | | |

- b. **Aimue** beju dhidha kema=puji.
 nonexistent PRT night 1SG.DAT=PURP
 ‘Ya no había noche para mi.’
 ‘The was no night for me (because I could see at night as well as during the day).’

Another problematic property concerns the form and morphosyntactic characteristics of the auxiliaries that can be optionally used in both affirmative and negative clauses with a non-finite verb (to carry the inflectional affixes), namely *a* when it is transitive (e.g., 20a) and *pu* when the SN clause is intransitive (e.g., 20b). An important difference here is that in negative existential predicates, only the intransitive auxiliary *pu*—or better said, its etymological source *pu* ‘be/exist, be located, do (itr.), say (itr.)’—can be used; the transitive auxiliary *a*—or better said, its etymological source *a* ‘affect, make, do (tr.), say (tr.)’—is never found. Additional work is needed to investigate further whether this second scenario is supported by the data or if other hypotheses need to be sought.

11 Summary and conclusion

This paper presented for the first time a synchronic and diachronic study of negation markers and patterns in Tacana as applying to clauses (declarative/interrogative and commands) and constituents. The diachronic part focused on two major negation constructions: SN and negation of clauses with non-finite verbs.

Starting with SN, I argued that its embracing pattern likely arose out of a Jespersen Cycle process in which a stand-alone negator ‘no,’ originally used outside of a negative clause for pragmatic reinforcement, is in the process of replacing the original postverbal SN marker inside of the clause. Taking into account the actual polysemy between this stand-alone word and the negative existential/locative predicative adjective ‘nonexistent,’ I proposed to ultimately trace the origin of the new SN marker back to a negative existential predicate, thereby adding Tacana negation to the list of cases where the Jespersen and negative existential cycles intertwine.

The reconstructed grammaticalization path is also interesting from a diachronic typological perspective because it goes from the right of the verb to the left of the verb, unlike the more familiar direction from the left of the verb to the right of the verb. As such, the Tacana pattern corresponds to what **van der Auwera & Vossen (2016)** and **Vossen (2016)** call a Jespersen Cycle “in reverse”.

Continuing with the second construction, negation of clauses with non-finite verbs, I proposed that the two negation markers *aimue* and *mué=* directly arose, albeit at different times, out of a negative existential predicate construction where the original function of *aimue* and *mué=* was to negate the existence of a nominalized (non-finite) verb. However, if this hypothesis is correct, how the original intransitive negative existential predicate construction came to display all the synchronic properties of negated clauses with non-finite verbs, which are the same as in the SN construction (split-ergative case marking and alternation of transitivity-sensitive auxiliaries), remains largely unexplained and calls for further research.

Abbreviations

()	morpheme that does not appear on the surface (in morpheme line)	INFL	inflection
		INTS	intensifier
		MID	middle
[]	multiple-word constituent	NPF	noun prefix
		POST	posture
ASF	adjective suffix	POT	potential
ASSOC	associative	PRIV	privative
COM	comitative	REC.PST	recent past
CNTR	contrastive	REM.PST	remote past
DEPR	depreciative	RPRT	reportative
DUB	dubitative	TDM	temporal distance
HORT	hortative		marker

Acknowledgements

Part of the research reported in this paper has been presented at the following conferences: Amazonicas VI (Laetitia, Colombia, 24-28 May 2016), Syntax of the World's Languages VII (Mexico City, Mexico, 17-19 August 2016), Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea 50 (Zurich, Switzerland, 10-13 September 2017) and Syntax of the World's Languages VIII (Paris, 3-5 September 2018). I am grateful to the audiences of these meetings for useful feedback. The paper has also benefited from further valuable comments by Denis Creissels, Olga Krasnoukhova, Françoise Rose, Armin Schwegler, one anonymous reviewer, and Ljuba Veselinova and Arja Hamari as editors of the present volume. The ASLAN project (ANR-10-LABX-0081) of Université de Lyon is acknowledged for its financial support within the French program *Investments for the Future* operated

by the National Research Agency (ANR). Finally, I wish to warmly acknowledge the contribution of the Tacana speakers of the village of Tumupasa, who provided the data on which the paper is based, as well as their representatives in the CIPTA organisation, who provided their support during my fieldwork stays.

References

- Creissels, Denis. 2006. *Syntaxe générale: Une introduction typologique*. Paris: Hermès – Lavoisier.
- Croft, William. 1991. The evolution of negation. *Journal of Linguistics* 27(1). 1–27.
- de Ottaviano, Ida. 1980. *Textos tacana*. Riberalta: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Guillaume, Antoine. 2016. Split ergative marking in Tacana: Towards a historical reconstruction of a counter-universal pattern. Presented at the Laboratorio di Linguistica, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, Italia.
- Guillaume, Antoine. Forthcoming. Takanan languages. In Patience Epps & Lev Michael (eds.), *Amazonian languages: An international handbook*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Lafone Quevedo, Samuel. 1902. *Arte y vocabulario de la lengua tacana*: Manuscrito del R. P. Fray Nicolás Armentia con introducción, notas y apéndices por Samuel A. Lafone Quevedo. *Revista del Museo de La Plata* 10. 63–172.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2005. *Standard negation: The negation of declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2007. Negation: An overview of typological research. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1(5). 552–570.
- Ottaviano, John & Ida de Ottaviano. 1965. Tacana. In Esther Matteson (ed.), *Gramáticas estructurales de lenguas bolivianas*, 309–417. Riberalta: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Ottaviano, John & Ida de Ottaviano. 1967. Tacana. In Esther Matteson (ed.), *Bolivian Indian grammars*, 139–207. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma.
- Ottaviano, John & Ida de Ottaviano. 1989. *Diccionario tacana-castellano, castellano-tacana*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Schwegler, Armin. 1988. Word-order changes in predicate negation strategies in Romance languages. *Diachronica* 5(1–2). 21–58.
- van der Auwera, Johan. 2009. The Jespersen cycles. In Elly van Gelderen (ed.), *Cyclical change* (Linguistics Today 146), 35–71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- van der Auwera, Johan & Frens Vossen. 2016. Jespersen cycles in the Mayan, quechuan and maipurean languages. In Elly van Gelderen (ed.), *Cyclical change continued* (Linguistics Today 227), 189–218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Veselinova, Ljuba. 2013. Negative existentials: A cross-linguistic study. *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 25(1). 107–145.
- Veselinova, Ljuba. 2016. The negative existential cycle viewed through the lens of comparative data. In Elly van Gelderen (ed.), *Cyclical change continued* (Linguistics Today 227), 139–187. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Vossen, Frens. 2016. *On the typology of the Jespersen cycles*. University of Antwerp. (Doctoral dissertation).