

## NEGATION IN DIEGUEÑO\*

Simple negation

The simplest of negative sentences in Diegueño is formed on the pattern

- (1) Verb + x ma:w

Ma:w is a verb meaning "no" or "it is not so".<sup>1</sup> The -x morpheme is a verbal affix marking a non-accomplished action or non-fact. It marks an event to take place in the future and also appears on verbs having future implication with respect to some point in the past, roughly translatable as "was going to". It appears as well on the verbs of certain "if" and "when" clauses and with the complements of such verbs as "want", "fear", etc., which imply an action that is projected but has not yet occurred. In negative sentences, it indicates that the action in question is not actual fact; it predicts, in a sense, the negation contained in ma:w. A straightforward case of sentence negation can be seen in

- (2) a. ña: u:yaw.  
I know (it).  
  
b. ña: u:yawx ma:w  
I don't know.

That ma:w is itself a verb is evident from the number of verbal inflections it can take.<sup>2</sup>

- (3) ma:č i:pay ñi + mə -ma:w č mə + xənu: + x.  
You Indian when + you + not + subject you + be-sick + future.<sup>3</sup>  
Since you're not an Indian, you'll get sick.  
  
(4) ma:č i:pay mə + ma:w + x.  
You Indian you + not + future.  
You won't be an Indian.

As these sentences also show, ma:w may stand alone as the only verb in its clause. An uninflected ma:w appears as the only overt verb in certain conjunct constructions where some sort of deletion phenomenon has occurred:

- (5) 'ənta:t wiyiw 'ənta:lʔ ma:w.  
My-father come my-mother not.  
My father came but my mother didn't.  
  
(6) timixan tapa: ñipily ma:w.  
beautiful aux (was) now no.  
She used to be beautiful, but now she's not.

In negative imperatives, both ma:w and what would be the main verb in English are inflected for the command, but the formula given in (1) holds for the negation:

- (7) kəsa:wx kəma:w kəsix kəma:w.<sup>4</sup>  
Don't eat and drink.

It should be noted that the -x here is a function of the negative rather than of any future implications of the semantics of the imperative. In general the imperative marker cannot co-occur with -x:

- (8) a. kəsa:w!  
Eat!  
  
b. \*kəsa:wx!

In negative imperatives, however, -x is obligatory:

- (9) a. kəsa:wx kəma:w!  
Don't eat!  
  
b. \*kəsa:w kəma:w!

As is predictable from (8), -x occurs on imperative verbs other than ma:w only; \*kəma:wx is ungrammatical.

Additional particles may be appended to negative sentences. May occurs only in negatives, preceding the verb to be negated. It does not obviate the necessity for ma:w but rather co-occurs with it, forming a disjunctive negative, somewhat like the French "ne...pas".

- (10) xakwa:l xənu: apsiw may wəsa:wx warx ma:w.<sup>5</sup>  
The child is very sick and doesn't want to eat.

This particular formation occurred quite frequently in Rosalie's speech; she used it in almost all negatives, whereas Florence used it much more rarely.<sup>6</sup> Florence was willing to accept may in sentence where she didn't actually produce it herself, seemed to feel that its presence did not change the meaning in any way; apparently for her the construction is simply optional, and perhaps somewhat redundant.

There is a negative intensifier, ñi:, which precedes the verb to be negated. It appears to make the negative equivalent to the English "not at all".

- (11) wa: kur apsiw ñi: wumx ma:w  
The house is very far away; he just can't see it.

It always co-occurs with ma:w (\*ñi: wumx) and may co-occur with may as well:

- (12) ñi: may wəsa:wx warx ma:w.  
He just doesn't want to eat.

### Uses of negation in complex sentences

We have already discussed cases of simple negation, produced by the negative verb ma:w and affixation of -x to the verb to deny its reality. So the negation of

- (15) a. ña: i:ma:  
I am (was) dancing.  
is  
(15) b. ña: i:ma:x ma:w  
I am (was) not dancing.

A sentence containing a double occurrence of -x is one step farther removed from reality. Such a sentence is

- (16) ña: i:ma:x ma:wx.  
I won't (ie. am not going to) dance.

Here the first occurrence of -x, as in the preceding, denies the event of dancing; the second places that negation in future time. The two types of sentences can be distinguished by the underlying forms (it is not the case (that S)) and (it will not be the case (that S)), for (15 b) and (16) respectively.

I have said that certain verbs such as "want" impose the -x morpheme on the verbs embedded in lower sentences. In (17) the only accomplished fact is the wanting; since the dancing itself is only an unrealized wish, it is so marked:

- (17) ña: i:ma:x 'ar  
I want to dance.

When this sentence is negated, the only change is in the truth value of the wanting; the negation is marked on that verb, and the rest of the sentence remains the same:

- (18) ña: i:ma:x 'arx ma:w  
I don't want to dance.

Placing this in the future, then, we get

- (19) ña: i:ma:x 'arx ma:wx.  
I won't want to dance.

In each case the same process is going on. A higher verb (be it ma:w or some other) whose semantic content imposes an aspect of unreality or

non-accomplishment on verbs of the next lower S triggers a rule attaching the morpheme -x to the embedded verb.

Occasionally a sentence may have implications beyond the surface statement whose meaning is also altered by the affixation of an additional -x;

- (20) ña: 'ənsiñ ximalx ma:w.  
My wife is not young.

This sentence, of course, presupposes that I have a wife. However, in the sentence

- (21) ña: 'insiñ ximalx ma:wx.

this presupposition is lost with the removal of ma:w from present reality. It means not only that my wife will not be young (in another ten years) but also that I am not now married, but when I do marry, the woman I marry will not be young.

#### Movement

Certain restrictions on the position of ma:w might seem to indicate that there is no rule in Diegueño equivalent to English not- transportation. Thus,

- (22) a. ña: payča: xačan timixan.  
I think the girl is pretty.  
(22) b. ña: payča: xačan timixanx ma:w.  
I don't think the girl is pretty.

are both fine, but

- (23) \*ña: payča:x ma:w xačan timixan.

is out. The situation is complicated, however, by the fact that a slightly different word order produces a grammatical sentence:

- (24) xačan timixan (...ña: payča:x ma:w)  
The girl is pretty, but I don't think so.

This sentence is a bit bizarre semantically in both Diegueño and English, but a context could be devised in which it might be used.

The question here appears to be one of scope. The presence of ma:w in a sentence results in the negation of the immediately lower verb. In linear surface order, ma:w must follow this verb. Ma:w must be constrained not to move from its position of origin; for it to do so would change its scope and therefore the meaning of the sentence. In (22 b) I am denying that the girl is pretty, not that I think; therefore "think"

must not be within the scope of *ma:w*. In (24) I am not denying the assertion that she is pretty, but merely expressing a negative opinion about the matter; what is involved here is a case of two sentences loosely conjoined, rather than an embedding. In both cases, however, a single verb falls within the scope of *ma:w*; where this is not the case (eg. in 23) and ungrammatical sentence results.

#### Negative Implications of Auxiliaries

In a number of cases, a verb bearing the *-x* marker is followed by an auxiliary; implying that an action which was to have happened did not happen:

- (25) *ñā: 'am+x tipa:.*  
 I go+fut was (going)  
 I was going to go (implied: but I didn't).
- (26) *siñ pla:t a:Lxwasx tapa:*  
 The woman was going to wash the dishes (but didn't).
- (27) *wemiyx takwa:.*  
 He was going to cry (but didn't).

In English, too, the implication of "I was going to do X" is usually that the action, X, was not completed. If it was, we would say "I did X". Much the same thing is happening here. The *-x* on the verb indicated that the action is projected, or in some sense unrealized. The auxiliary, (*tipa:*, *tapa:*, *takwa:*, etc)<sup>7</sup> serves to pinpoint the action in place and time; the prefix *t-* indicates that the event is non-present. Since it does not itself bear the marker for being non-realized, it must be past time rather than future. The above sentences, then, involve a non-accomplished event, embedded in an actuality, or a future within a past. They are in some sense not completed; if the action was realized, either it would be so stated or there would be no reason to mention the projection (or intention). In the above sentences, the non-auxiliary verbs appear in their non-accomplished form, and it is therefore assumed that the intended actions were never realized.

Likewise, if the projected event is negative, the auxiliary implies a negation of the negation:

- (28) *wa:x ma:wx tu:yu:*  
 He wasn't going to go (but he did).
- (29) *siñ mespa:x ma:wx tu:yu:.*  
 The woman wasn't going to die (but she did).

Such sentences can be embedded in others, making them contingent on yet other actions:

- (30) kusiyay ña:m pa:+pik siñ mespa:+x ma:w+x tu:yu:.  
 Doctor sooner arrive+if woman die+x not+x aux.  
 If the doctor had come sooner, the woman wouldn't  
 have died (but she did).

The implications that the opposite happened, can of course be expressed overtly:

- (31) k<sup>wi</sup>:x ma:wx bis k<sup>wi</sup>:  
 It wasn't going to rain but it did.
- (32) wiyiwx tu:yu: (bis ma:w).  
 He was going to come but he didn't.

but as long as an unmarked auxiliary follows the verb marked for non-accomplishment (this condition is not met in (31) since there is no auxiliary) such a statement is not necessary.

A few other sentences contain similar negative implications, present in the semantics of the verb. We have shown that the verb "want" implies something not yet attained, an action not yet completed. If, instead of an action, a state is desired, non-existence of that state in fact is implied:

- (33) ña: 'ənta:t periwi:x 'ar.  
 I want to be like my father, (but I'm not).

Again, the same implications are present in the English "want".

Finally, consider (34):

- (34) i:pač wemitəč ša:wi wesa:wx.  
 The man expected to eat acorn mush.

In English, the sentence is ambiguous. "Expected" may be factive or non-factive; that is it may or may not presuppose that he did eat. In Diegueño, the implication is negative; since the eating (wesa:w) is marked for non-reality, it is assumed that he did not actually eat.

### Antonymy

Certain sets of antonyms in Diegueño are expressed simply by the distinction X and not-X, rather than by separate lexical items. Examples of this are

- |               |                   |
|---------------|-------------------|
| (35) want: ar | refuse: arx ma:w  |
| strong: sapir | weak: sapirx ma:w |
| sharp: wuřaw  | dull: wuřawx ma:w |

One set that gave particular trouble, probably because the words involved are loan-words, was:

- (36) a. i:pač ři:k apsiw.  
The man is rich.
- b. i:pač dinař inwicx ma:w.  
The man is poor (has no money).

Rosalie gave these sentences, and when I asked Florence to translate the English, she said she didn't know how. However, she accepted the Diegueño sentences when I suggested them. Apparently the words involved in these sentences, as well as the pairs in (35), are infrequently used, and it is probably for this reason that separate lexical items do not exist. I was completely unable to get any response to requests for forms such as "not dull", or "do not refuse"; she simply didn't know what to say.

#### Inherent negation

There are a number of Diegueño verbs which contain a sense of negation in their meaning and can be used without other overt markers such as ma:w, may, nyi:, to express notions handled by negative particles in English.

uiway is a verb denoting non-existence or non-presence. It occurs without ma:w in sentences such as

- (37) piyi uiway.  
There is nothing here.  
It is not over here.
- (38) wa+L<sup>y</sup> uiway  
house+locative non-exist.  
There is nothing in the house.
- (39) wa: uiway  
The house is not there.

nisu:m means "empty" or "all gone". It is occasionally used in sentences with the meaning "not any more":

- (40) k<sup>wi</sup>: nisu:m  
rain all gone: It isn't raining anymore.

ñiwat, to finish, also means "no longer" or "no more" when used in conjunction with another verb:

(41) i:pač šəma: ñiwat.

The man isn't sleeping anymore (has finished sleeping).

umlay is the verb 'not to know'. It can be negated by ma:w to give an affirmative, synonymous with u:yaw.

(42) a. ña: umlay = ña: u:yawx ma:w  
I don't know.

b. ña: umlayx ma:w = ña: u:yaw.  
I know.

puwar means 'to be unable'. Like umlay its syntactic negative becomes a semantic affirmative:

(43) a. ña: puwar.  
I can't.

b. ña: puwarx ma:w  
I can.

In certain negative contexts, we find xəmir, usually in sentences containing the English 'not yet'. Ma:w is never present in such cases.

(44) 'ənčačañ pa:x xəmir.  
My sister hasn't gotten here yet.

(45) xumay ša:wi: wesa:w(x) xəmir.  
The boy hasn't eaten acorn mush yet.

In the above sentence, the affixation of -x to the verb appears to be optional.<sup>8</sup> There is however, a subtle semantic distinction according to whether or not -x is present. Consider for example the following two sentences:

(46) a. xak<sup>w</sup>a:l skwe:l na:x xəmir.

b. xakwa:l skwe:l na: xəmir.

(46a) translates as "The children don't go to school yet", meaning they are too young to go; but (46b) means that those who do attend school haven't left yet.

Xəmir also appears to be somewhat more restricted than ma:w. For example, consider the following sentences:



- (47) a. The man doesn't want to go yet.  
 b. i:pač ñipil wa:mx warx {ma:w } .  
 c. { \*xəmir } .

The literal meaning of (47b) is

- (48) [ [ The man [ now go ] want ] not ] .

It is impossible to replace "not" by what we have translated as "not yet". This translation is, however, inaccurate. In English the negative element is overtly present in the expression "not yet". What we have in Diegueño is not a true negative, except insofar as it is associated with the non-reality marker, *-x*. Rather it means something like "be about to X", and only implicitly "not yet".<sup>9</sup> Thus the unacceptability of (47c) arises from the semantic deviance of the notion "be about to want to go now".

The optionality of the *-x* marker can therefore be explained (if *xəmir* is not negative) by a difference in immediacy of the event about to occur. Thus in the pair (46) it is the reality of the children's school attendance that is in question. (46a) expresses both the notions that the children will attend school sometime (*xəmir*) and that they don't now (*-x*), while (45b) focuses on their immediate departure--their attendance is a reality.<sup>10</sup>

(a:L<sup>y</sup>k<sup>w</sup>i:) means "believe in a wishy-washy way", "half-believe" or "doubt". According to the context, it may be translated as either "believe" or "not believe":

- (49) ña: a:L<sup>y</sup>k<sup>w</sup>i:  
 I doubt it; I don't believe it; I believe it.

- (50) a. ka:L<sup>y</sup>k<sup>w</sup>i: !  
 Believe it !  
 b. kaL<sup>y</sup>k<sup>w</sup>i:x kəma:w !  
 Don't believe it !

- (51) k<sup>w</sup>a:L<sup>y</sup>k<sup>w</sup>i:  
 disbeliever.

A sentence of the form [ a:L<sup>y</sup>k<sup>w</sup>i: [ S ] ] may mean "I believe [not S]", or "I don't believe [S]".

A:L<sup>y</sup>k<sup>w</sup>i: may co-occur with *ma:w* when it is necessary to elaborate on whether the belief or disbelief is being emphasized. Where this is obvious from context, "a:L<sup>y</sup>k<sup>w</sup>i:" alone can mean "disbelieve". Thus both

the sentences of (52) are grammatical, and they mean the same thing:

- (52) a. xačan timixan apsiw bis ña: a:L<sup>y</sup><sub>k</sub><sup>w</sup>i:.  
 b. xačan timixan apsiw bis ña: a:L<sup>y</sup><sub>k</sub><sup>w</sup>i: ma:w.  
 The girl is very beautiful, but I don't believe it.

In (b) she was quite positive that there should be no -x present on the verb. Apparently, this verb is inherently marked for negation, but since the presence of ma:w in the sentence does not completely reverse its polarity (as is the case for puwar and umlay), the addition of the non-real marker to a verb already so marked is unacceptably redundant.

### Conclusion

This study has been an attempt to describe the form and use of the negative element in Diegueño. As usual, it has become obvious that the process is by no means simple and clear-cut. In most cases, NEG is quite clearly a higher predicate, but in others, such as those discussed in the last section, it must occur as a feature marking on other verbs. It is impossible to speak of a phenomenon of negation in and of itself, for any adequate treatment is inextricably linked with factors outside the realm of negation per se. It is striking that the distinction between syntax and semantics here is fuzzy at best, for even in this very limited area, the one cannot be described without recourse to the other. The very close interaction of ma:w with other syntactic and semantic features means that no analysis can even be begun without careful scrutiny of the messy problems of tense, aspect, and, indeed, the entire verbal system of Diegueño.

FOOTNOTES

\* I would like to thank Professor Margaret Langdon for her comments and suggestions on an earlier version/ of this paper. I am also extremely grateful to our informants, without whose patience in providing data and answering questions over a period of many months this study would have been utterly impossible. The principal informant was Mrs. Florence Barrett of the Baron Long reservation. In addition we had the opportunity of meeting a few times with Mrs. Rosalie Robertson, who was very helpful in corroborating data and providing in some cases insights into dialect variation. Except where otherwise indicated, all examples used in the text were elicited from Florence.

1. It is interesting to note in view of recent claims that English not is an underlying verb, that the corresponding Diegueño element is a verb in surface structure too.
2. The affix -x can occur only on verbs, and constitutes the only workable test that I know of for membership in the category. Other affixes such as mə, can occur on nouns as well, but with different meaning. For example, mə, when prefixed to verbs is a personal subject pronoun; when prefixed to nouns, it has a possessive meaning.
3. The subject marker -č indicates that the subject of the following verb, which need not be overtly stated, is the same as that of the verb on which it appears.
4. Kə is the imperative prefix.
5. For discussion of the occurrences of -x on both verbs, see the following section (page 3).
6. Sentence (10) is Florencé's.
7. For a detailed analysis of the auxiliaries see Carol Baker, Tense Nonsense in Diegueño, in this volume.
8. It was often difficult to determine in which cases -x appeared and in which it didn't, due to the identical segment beginning the next word, and the negligible meaning differences in most cases.
9. This is just the opposite of the English "not yet", where the negation is overt, and the futurity merely implied. It should also be noted that the English sentence is ambiguous between his wanting to go, but later and his not wanting to go, (with the implied expectation that he may change his mind). The two structures would be something like

- (i) [He want [he go not yet] ]  
 (ii) [He not yet want[he go ]]

This ambiguity is not present in (42b) where the structure is more like

- (iii) [He not want [he go yet (lit. now) ] ]

This non-ambiguity of scope of ma:w was discussed in the section on Movement, and follows from the facts discussed there.

10. Compare the English use of "I am leaving right away" for "I am going to leave. . . .", or French "Nous mangeons dans cinq minutes" (present tense, future meaning).