#### NEGATION:

AN INSIGHT INTO THE STRUCTURE OF MAIN CLAUSES IN WOODS CREE

#### Donna Starks

#### University of Manitoba

#### **ABSTRACT**

Two distinct types of verbs occur in Woods Cree: the Independent and the Conjunct. Independent verbs occur in main clauses; Conjunct verbs occur in both main and subordinate clauses. Woods Cree has a number of distinct negative particles. Descriptions of Cree dialects indicate that the distinction between two of these negative particles is dependent on the inflection of the verb.  $\underline{mwac}$  negates clauses with Independent verbs,  $\underline{Ika}$  clauses with Conjunct verbs. This paper demonstrates that in fact, the negative morphemes are independent of verb inflection. Presupposed clauses are negated with the negative particle  $\underline{Ika}$ , asserted clauses with the negative particle  $\underline{mwac}$ .

### 1. <u>Introduction</u>

Descriptions of the various Cree dialects only briefly mention the topic of negation. A few statements in the published works indicate there are two negative morphemes: an Independent verb negator and a Conjunct verb negator (Ellis 1983:29,426, Wolfart 1973:41). All Cree dialects distinguish two main types of verbs: an Independent verb used in main clauses and a Conjunct verb used in subordinate clauses. It would be then logical to assume that the Independent verb negator negates main clauses and the Conjunct verb negator negates subordinate clauses. However, scholars such as Ellis 1983 do not make that overt deduction for I believe, the logical reason: the situation is far more complex.

There are three basic problems. First, main clauses can occur with both Independent and Conjunct inflections. In narrative texts, Independent verb inflections are often a minority. There are however more Independent verbs than Conjunct verbs in the main clauses of conversational texts. The use of the Conjunct in main clauses creates the following two problems. I) The Independent verb negator can occur in a main clause with a Conjunct verb, and II) A Conjunct verb negator can occur in a main clause.

Cree scholars have failed to mention these irregularities. As a result, scholars working on North Shore (Quebec) Montagnais have assumed that Montagnais main clause negation is radically different from Cree negation, since the verb in a negated main clause in North Shore Montagnais must be marked with a Conjunct inflection (MacKenzie and Clarke 1981:143).

In this paper I will outline the various types of negative clauses in Woods Cree, a dialect spoken in north-western Manitoba, 1 focussing on the problems discussed above. I will demonstrate how these irregularities can be neatly incorporated into the grammar as a whole. As a result, not only will the analysis of negation be more detailed and precise, but also it will add insights into the problem of why main clauses can occur with a Conjunct verb, a topic too broad to cover in any detail in this paper (see Rogers 1979 for one analysis of Ojibwa). The analysis will also de-mystify the origin of Montagnais negative clauses, clauses where the verb always occurs with a Conjunct.

Before I discuss negation, I will provide a very brief synopsis of the structure of Woods Cree. Then, the various negative morphemes in Woods Cree will be outlined. Syntactic and semantic distinctions between the various morphemes will be discussed. Finally, an attempt will be made to explain the function of conjunct verbs in negative main clauses.

#### 2. <u>Verbal Structure of Woods Cree</u>

There are four types of verb stems, divided on the basis of the transitivity of the verb and on the animacy of the noun. There are two sets of intransitive verb stems, one for intransitive animate subjects (AI), and one for intransitive inanimate subjects (II). There are also two transitive verb stems, both with animate subjects. The transitive verb stems differ in respect to the animacy of the object. A Transitive Animate verb (TA) is a verb with an animate subject and an animate object, while a Transitive Inanimate verb (TI) is a verb with a animate subject and an inanimate object. The four verb stems are inflected with four distinct sets of inflectional endings. The following illustrate the four types of verb stems in Woods Cree. Independent verb forms will be used here for illustration.

1)	'hard/strong'	ΑI	he is strong	maskawisiw
		II	it is hard	maskawāw
		TA	he hardens him	maskawisihīw
		TI	he hardens it	maskawisiht <del>a</del> w

There are three types of verb paradigms for each of the four verb stems discussed above. They are the <u>Independent</u>, the <u>Conjunct</u> and the <u>Imperative</u>. The following illustrate these, using the 3sg. form of each verb stem.

# 2) 'hard/strong'

	AI	II	TA	TI
Independent	maskawisiw	maskawāw	maskawisih $\overline{\mathtt{a}}\mathtt{w}$	maskawisiht $\overline{a}$ w
Conjunct	ī-maskawisit	ī-maskawāyāk	ī-maskawihāt	T-maskawihtat
Imperative	maskawisi	[ ]	maskawihi	maskawiht $\overline{\overline{a}}$

The function of an Imperative verb is clear. Imperative verbs only occur in Imperative and Hortative structures.

- 3) <u>atoskī</u> 2sg.Imp.-work 'Work.'
- 4) <u>atoskītān</u> 12.Imp.-work 'Let's work.'

The function of the Independent and the Conjunct is however less clear. Both Independent and Conjunct verbs can occur in most types of main clauses, as the following examples illustrate:

- 5) <u>kT-nipāw</u>
  past.3sg.Ind.-sleep
  'He slept.'
- 6) <u>T-kT-nipat</u>
  past.3sg.Conj-sleep
  'He slept.'

The distinction between the two inflections is then not based on clause type. The distinction is also not based on the 'speech act' since the verbs in both yes-no questions and in declaratives can be inflected with both Independent and Conjunct inflections.

7) <u>nipāw pīpī</u>
3sg.Ind-sleep.baby

T-nipat pTpT
3sg.Conj-sleep baby

'The baby is asleep.'

8) <u>nipāw na pīpī</u>
3sg.Ind-sleep Q baby

<u>T-nīpāt na pīpī</u>
3sg.Conj-sleep Q baby

'Is the baby asleep?'

Finally, the use of the Independent and the Conjunct is not directly related to negation. The negative can occur with either type of verb.

9) <u>moða nipaw</u> neg 3sg.Ind-sleep

> moða T-nipat neg 3sg.Conj-sleep

'He is not sleeping.'

The choice of inflection in a declarative main clause is therefore not that simple. Both Independent and Conjunct verbs can occur in most main clauses. The function of the Conjunct in a main clause appears to be based on a combination of factors, too complex to cover in any detail here. Only the inter-relationship between Conjunct and Independent verbs in negative clauses will be discussed in any detail.<sup>5</sup>

There are however a few instances where the verb is predictable. They are as follows.

- I. Most verbs in Wh-questions occur with Conjunct verbs.
- 10) awina a-nipat?
  who 3sg.Conj-sleep
  'Who is sleeping?'
- 11) tantI I-nipat?
  where 3sg.Conj-sleep
  'Where is she/he sleeping?'

- II. When however, the verb in the main clause is an evidential type construction, the verb must occur with an Independent inflection, even if the verb occurs in a wh-question. Contrast the following two wh-questions:
- 12) <u>tansi totam?</u>
  how 3sg.Ind-do it
  'What is he doing?' (check out the baby)
- 13) tansi totah?
  How 3sg.Conj-do it
  'What is he doing (right now)?'
- III. The verb in a Jussive is always inflected with an Independent.
- 14) <u>ta-nipāw</u> fut-3sg.Ind-sleep 'Let him sleep.'
- IV. A few particles dictate the inflection of the verb. These particles must always precede the verb they modify. Two such particles are <u>wīsa</u> and <u>ohci</u>, both meaning 'because.' <u>wīsa</u> must precede either a NP or an Independent verb. <u>ohci</u> can only be followed by a Conjunct verb.
- 15) wīsa atim
  because dog
  'Because of the dog.'

wīsa sipwīhtīw because 3sg.Ind-leave 'Because he left.'

- 16) ohci T-sipwThtIt
   because 3sg.Conj-leave
   'Because he left.' (Answer to question).
- V. Finally, the only verb that can occur in any type of subordinate clause is a Conjunct verb.
- 17) oma nipāt, kwāni T-ayamihkwāmit
  When 3sg.Conj-sleep, then 3sg.Conj-talk in sleep
  'When he sleeps, he talks.'

18) <u>Tkā oponapīnihk kī-itohtīyahki, kwān po Thompson</u> <u>ta-ayāyahk</u>

neg SIL-loc able-12 Subj-go, then only Thompson fut-12 Conj-be.

'If we don't reach South Indian Lake, we will have to stay in Thompson.'

The verb in a declarative negated main clause is not directly affected by any of the above factors. As a result, a declarative negated main clause can occur with either an Independent or a Conjunct inflection. The forms and functions of the various negative particles in Woods Cree will be discussed in the following section.

### 3. Negative Forms

There are five distinct negative morphemes in Woods Cree. Three of these negative morphemes have been labelled as stylistic variants in descriptions of other Cree dialects (cf. Ellis 1983:183). These three negative morphemes are  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}\underline{c}$ ,  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}$  and  $\underline{m}\underline{o}\underline{\delta}\underline{a}$ . The three forms are all main clause negative morphemes. They cannot occur in a subordinate clause.

The two other negative particles are  $\overline{1k}\overline{a}$  and  $\overline{k}\overline{a}\delta a$ . I have labelled the negative particle  $\overline{1k}\overline{a}$  as the 'subordinate negator,' even though it can occur in a main clause.  $\overline{1k}\overline{a}$  is the only negative morpheme that can occur in a subordinate clause. Finally,  $\overline{k}\overline{a}\delta a$  is the Imperative negator. It negates Imperatives, Hortatives and Jussives.

I have classified the negative morphemes on the basis of syntax since the morphological criteria presented in other descriptions is inadequate. Eg.,  $k\overline{a}\underline{\delta}a$  negates an Independent verb in a Jussive construction and an Imperative verb in an Imperative construction.

Furthermore, all five negative morphemes can occur in clauses without verbs. So although the position of the verb is syntactically important, the inflection on the verb does not determine which negative particle will occur. When however a verb does occur in a negative clause, the negative particle must precede it. However, the verb may be separated from the negative by an NP or a particle.

- 19) moða cīskwa nipaw neg yet 3sg.Ind-sleep 'He's not asleep yet.'
- 20) mistahi itowItaniwan Ika atim kita-tahcIt a lot indf.Ind-care neg dog fut-3sg.Conj-let loose 'Care was taken not to have the dog loose.'

Cross-linguistic data suggest that languages with two negative morphemes often divide the negative into main and subordinate negators, with semantic nuances in the direction to be outlined below (Horne 1985:127-128). Since semantic differences are less clear than syntactic differences I will attempt to classify the five negative morphemes on the basis of syntax, before I present any semantic evidence. Only when there is more than one negative morpheme per syntactic category will I resort solely to a semantic analysis. Such an analysis is necessary to differentiate the three main clause negators.

### 4. Semantics of Main Clause Negators

The three main clause negators  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\overline{a}c$ ,  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\overline{a}$  and  $\underline{m}\overline{o}\underline{\delta}a$  appear to differ only at a semantic level.

 $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}\underline{c}$  is the general negator. It occurs three times as often in texts as either of the other two negatives,  $\underline{m}\underline{o}\underline{\delta}\underline{a}$  or  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}\underline{c}$  is used as the general word for 'no.' In constructions with a verb,  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}\underline{c}$  marks the negative as a factive.

21) <a href="mailto:kwani maka mwac wista ohci-miskawiw">kwani maka mwac wista ohci-miskawiw</a>
then but neg he too past-3sg.TA.Ind-find him 'But he too didn't find her.'

<u>mwac</u> is sometimes used to express the speaker's belief that the statement is a fact.

22) mwac ahpo nakI-kiskTyihtah Tkosi
neg or fut-able-lsg.Pret-know it thus
ta-kI-wIcihisowan
fut-able-lsg.Conj.refl-help
'I would not have learned how to help myself.'

mwac is used in conjunction with the indefinite pronouns awina
'someone' and kikwan 'something.'

- 23) mwac awina T-ohci-itohtIt
  neg s.one 3sg.Conj-go
  'Nobody went there.'
- 24) mwac kikwan i-ikiskah
  neg s.thing 3sg.Conj-wear it
  'She had nothing on.'

Finally  $\underline{mwac}$  occurs in conjunction with  $\underline{k\overline{l}kwan}$  to indicate the non-existence of an NP. The following example illustrates this.

25) <u>mwac kikwan omatowa waskahikan</u> neg s.thing like-this house 'There were no houses like this.'

The phrase <u>mwac kikwan</u> is used to negate the existence of an animate noun phrase.

26) <u>mwac kikwan wimistikosiw kayas</u> neg s.thing whiteman long ago 'There were no whitemen long ago.'

In contrast,  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\overline{a}$  is used when the speaker wishes to express an opinion. The distinction between  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\overline{a}\underline{c}$  and  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\overline{a}$  is best exemplified by the following sentences:

- 27) mwac itokT nitohtan
  neg prob. 1sg.Ind-go
  'I'll think I'll not go.'
- 28) mwa paham nitohtan
  neg poss. lsg.Ind-go.
  'I don't think I'll go.'

The first sentence with  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}\underline{c}$  is probable, whereas the second sentence with  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}$  is only possible.

 $\underline{mwa}$  is used to indicate a non-factive. It most often occurs with 1st person verbs used to express an opinion.

29) anohc po mwa tapwi nimiowioihtinan now only neg really 13.Ind-like it 'Now we really don't like it.'

 $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{\overline{a}}$  is also used to express a temporary lack of ability.  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{\overline{a}}$  is often translated as 'can't.'

30) <u>mwā nikī-otihtinīn nicīmāninān</u> neg able-lsg.Ind-hold it 13 poss.boat 'I couldn't get hold of our boat.'

Finally,  $m\bar{o}\delta a$  is a contrastive negator. It is used when an individual wants to modify or correct a previous utterance.

31) moda nipatacimon Tkota
No. lsg.Ind-miss-tell there.
'No. I missed part of my story.'

moða is also used to contradict someone else's statement.

32) <u>Tkā mā ana Donna</u>? <u>moða mā ana Donna</u>
neg Top. 3sg. Donna neg Top. 3sg. Donna.
'Doesn't that look like Donna?' 'No, that's not Donna.'

When moda negates a verb, it functions as a restrictive negator.

- 33) moða n-oh-misikitin neg past-lsg.Ind-big 'I wasn't that big.'
- 34) moða kinwīsk asay ka-kīsisoci neg long already 3pl.II.Ind-cook 'It doesn't take that long before they are done.'

The following excerpt in used to illustrate how this restrictive negation is used in discourse.

35) kinwīsk nocihtaniwan nosisim kā-osihtaniwik pahkīkin long indf. Ind-work at lsg.poss.grandchild indf. Conj-do hide moða wīða aciðaw piko neg he little-time only 'It takes a long time my grandchild to tan a hide. It doesn't take a short time.'

Finally moda is used for contrast or emphasis.

- 36) moða nīða piko, kwani kahkiðaw napīwak neg I only, then all man-pl 'Not only myself, but all the other guys.'
- 37) moða ata mistahiwaw ka-patiskaman oma nicīmaninan neg although many-times lsg.Conj-miss it this 13.poss.boat 'It is not often I missed our boat.'

In summary,  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}\underline{c}$  negates a factive,  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}$  negates an opinion or a temporary inability and finally,  $\underline{m}\underline{o}\underline{\delta}\underline{a}$  is used for restrictive negation and for contrast.<sup>7</sup>

Since the distinction between the three main clause negators is purely semantic, these morphemes will be discussed together as a single form for the remainder of this paper. Examples however will be taken from contexts, and not regularized.

## 5. <u>Verbal Inflection</u>

These three negative particles  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}$ ,  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}$  and  $\underline{m}\underline{o}\underline{\delta}\underline{a}$  occur only in main clauses. However, main clause verbs can occur with either

Independent or Conjunct inflections. So when a main clause verb with a Conjunct inflection is negated, it can be negated with either a main clause negator or the subordinate clause negator  $\overline{1ka}$ . The following examples illustrate this.

- 38) <u>kwāni mwāc wīkāc ī-ohci-wanāhtākīðimowahk nohtawīpan</u> then neg ever 3sg.Conj-resolve lsg.poss.father-late 'And my late father never felt comfortable.'
- 39) <u>akwa nipāpā īkā Ī-apit</u> and lsg.father neg 3sg.Conj-be at home 'And my father wasn't at home.'

The relationship between these negative morphemes and verbal inflection will be outlined following a discussion of the syntactic constraints on main and subordinator clause negators.

# 6. Syntactic Constraints on Main Clause Negators

There are only a few constraints that apply to main clause negators. For example, all three main clause negative particles must precede the verb.

- 40) mwac mioomacihow
  neg 3sg.Ind.mdle.rflx-feel good
  'He didn't feel well.'
- 41) mwa nokosiw
  neg 3sg.AI.appear
  'He is not seen.'
- 42) moða asamīw
  neg 3sg.TA.feed
  'He wasn't fed.'

There are however three important syntactic constraints. First, the main clause negative morphemes can negate only main clauses. Second, if the main clause is a polar or yes-no question, then the main clause negator must precede the question clitic,  $\underline{c}\bar{t}$  or  $\underline{n}a$ . The following examples illustrate this:

- 43) mwa na cIskwa takosin?
  neg Q yet 3sg.Ind-arrive
  'Hasn't he come yet?'
- 44) mwac cī nipaw?
  neg Q 3sg.Ind.-sleep
  'He doesn't sleep?'

The fact that  $\underline{mwac}$ ,  $\underline{mwa}$  and  $\underline{mo\delta a}$  can only precede a polar clitic is important, since only one constituent in a polar question can precede a polar question particle. That constituent is always the focus of the polar question. The following polar questions provide illustrations.

- 45) <u>oko na nisto nāpīsisak kī-itohtīwak?</u>
  3pl. Q 3 boy-pl. past-3pl.Ind-go
  'Did these three boys go?'
- 46) <u>nisto na ōko nāpīsisak kī-itohtīwak?</u>
  3 Q 3pl. boy-pl. past-3pl.Ind-go
  'Did three of these boys go?'
- 47) <u>napīsisak na nisto oko kī-itohtīwak?</u>
  boy-pl. Q 3 3pl. past-3pl.Ind-go
  'These boys, did three of them go?'
- 48) <u>nāpīsisak na oko nisto kī-itohtīwak?</u>
  boy-pl Q 3pl. 3 past-3pl.Ind-go
  'These three boys, did they go?'

If a main clause negative particle can only occur in initial position in a polar question, a main clause negator must be able to be focussed.

Third, the main clause negative particles can negate any main clause with two exceptions: the wh-question and the Jussive. In most wh-questions, the wh-particle is the only element focussed. All other information in a wh-question is normally presupposed (Huddleston 1971:9), including a negative. If a main clause negative morpheme must be focussed, it is not normally presupposed. It is logical therefore that a main clause negative morpheme would not occur in a wh-question.

Not all wh-questions presuppose the entire clause (Huddleston 1971:9, Givon 1984:259-260). One type of wh-question that allows a main clause negative morpheme is a structure resembling an Evidential. An Evidential is not presupposed, it is asserted (Givon 1984:307-308).

49) <u>tansi mwac totam</u>?
How neg 3sg.Ind-do it
'What isn't he doing?'

All focussed clauses are assertions. Most declarative main clauses and polar questions, and all Evidentials are assertions.

All three main clause negators seem only to occur in asserted declarative clauses.

The Jussive is also an assertion that marks the verb with an Independent. The Jussive however can only be negated with the Imperative negative morpheme  $k \overline{a} a$ .

50) <u>kāða kimiwan</u>.

Neg-Imp 3sg.II.Ind-rain
'Don't let it rain.'

The Imperative negative morpheme negates all Imperative Speech Acts. The main clause negators then can only occur in non-Imperative assertive clauses. Since subordinate clauses are not normally assertions, it is logical that main clause negators do not occur in subordinate clauses.

## 7. <u>Ikā as a Subordinate Clause Negator</u>

 $\overline{1k\overline{a}}$  is the subordinate clause negator. No other negative morpheme can occur in a proto-typical subordinate clause. The following examples illustrate the use of  $\overline{1k\overline{a}}$  in a subordinate clause.

- 51) <u>Tyako pō I-kiskThtamān īkā ta-mīcināniwahk atihk</u> that-one only lsg.Conj-know it neg fut-indf.Conj-eat caribou
  'That's all I can remember that isn't eaten on a caribou.'
- 52) wīhtikow īkā kwayask T-kī-ohci-mīcisocik ið iniwak wihtikow neg really past-neg.past-3pl.Conj-eat person-pl. 'A wihtikow is (one of a group of) people who doesn't eat right.'

 $\overline{1}k\overline{a}$  can also occur in unintroduced subordinate clauses. The primary clauses of this type are 'so' clauses, 'because' clauses, 'if only' clauses, 'what if' clauses, and 'as if' clauses, as in the following examples:

- 53) <u>Isa Ikā kā-kāpisocik</u> because/so neg 3pl.AI.Conj-stick 'So they wouldn't stick together.'
- 54) <u>Ikā I-wI-tōtah</u>
  neg want-3sg.Conj-do it
  'Because he doesn't want to.'

- 55) <u>tānika īkā itohtīyān</u>
  If only neg lsg.Conj-go
  'If only I wasn't going.'
- 56) <u>sipwThtTyani ma</u> lsg.Subj-leave Topic 'What if I leave?'
- 57) <u>Ikā mā I-sipwīhtīyān</u>
  neg Topic lsg.Conj-leave
  'As if I'm leaving.'<sup>8</sup>

 $\overline{\underline{t}k}\overline{\underline{a}}$  also negates subordinate clause sentence fragments, such as the following relative clause fragment.

58) <u>Tkā kā-mīcisot</u> neg 3sg.Conj-eat 'Those that don't eat.'

The verb in all of the above constructions is presupposed. The only type of subordinate clause that is not presupposed is the non-restrictive relative clause. A non-restrictive relative clause is also negated with the subordinate clause negator  $\overline{\underline{1}k}\overline{\underline{a}}$ . The following example illustrates this:

59) nimāmā īkā wīkāc ohci-āhkosit, āhkosīkamikohk lsg.-mother neg ever past-3sg.Conj-sick, hospital-loc a-kī-itohtīt past-3sg.Conj-go 'My mother who was never sick, had to go to the hospital.'

The negative particle  $\overline{1}k\overline{a}$  is the only negative particle that can occur in a subordinate clause. The use of  $\overline{1}k\overline{a}$  in a subordinate clause is purely grammatical.

It was noted above that  $\overline{1}k\overline{a}$  can also negate a wh-question and a main clause declarative.

- 60) <u>kTkwāðiw Tkā kā-kT-ohci-pTtohtTt?</u>
  What-obv. neg past-negpast-come
  'Why didn't he come?'
- 61) <u>nīyo kīsikāw īkā ī-ohci-nipāyān</u>
  Four day neg past-lsg-Conj-sleep
  'For four days I couldn't sleep.'

Since both  $\overline{1ka}$  and  $\underline{mwac}$  can occur in a main clause with a Conjunct verb, it is necessary to distinguish the two constructions.

In the following sections, the syntactic and semantic constraints on the use of  $\overline{1ka}$  in main clauses will be examined.

## 8. Syntactic Constraints on the Subordinate Clause Negator

It was noted above that the verb in a wh-question and in a subordinate clause is usually presupposed. The evidence suggests that presupposition directly affects the use of subordinate negator in main clauses.

Syntactically, three restrictions apply to  $\overline{1ka}$  in a main clause. First,  $\overline{1ka}$  must precede the verb in any clause it negates.

# 62) <u>Ikā ta-kĪ-ihkihk</u> neg fut-able-3sg.II.Conj-function '(It doesn't look like) it will work.'

Second,  $\overline{1ka}$  cannot occur in a clause with an Independent verb: a verb used exclusively in main clauses.

# 63) <u>\*īkā nipāw</u> \*neg 3sg.Ind.-sleep '\*It is not he is asleep.'

Third,  $\overline{1ka}$  usually does not precede the polar question clitics  $\underline{na}$  and  $\underline{cI}$ .  $\underline{1ka}$  can occur in a polar question, but usually only after the question clitic.

# 64) <u>Ikwāni na Ikā iskoliwīn?</u> then Q neg 2sg.Conj-go to school 'So, you're not going to school?'

<u>ika</u> can however occur in initial position in a polar question. The following example illustrates this:

# 65) <u>Tkā na T-nipāt</u>? neg Q 3sg.Conj-sleep 'You mean he's not sleeping?'

In the above example,  $\overline{1k}\overline{a}$  is in focussed position. However, it is not  $\overline{1k}\overline{a}$  that is asserted, but rather the presupposition 'you mean.'  $\overline{1k}\overline{a}$  does not negate a main clause assertion.

There is further evidence to support this hypothesis. In Woods Cree, topic questions are formed by adding the clitic  $m\overline{a}$  to the initial word in the topic question.

66) wiða ma?
he Topic
'What about him?'

Topicalized constituents preceded by  $\underline{ma}$  are usually either nouns or particles. Among the constituents that  $\underline{ma}$  can be cliticized to is the negative particle  $\underline{\overline{1}ka}$ .

67) <u>Tkā mā T-nipāt</u>
neg Topic 3sg.Conj-sleep
'As if he's sleeping.'

Topic markers represent backgrounded presupposed information (Haiman 1978, Reinhart 1982), not asserted or focussed information.

The only verbs that can precede the topic particle  $m\overline{a}$  are Conjunct verbs. The following examples illustrate this.

- 68) <u>kā-āhkosipaðit mā</u>?

  3sg.Conj-fall sick Topic
  'Did you hear of her sudden sickness?'
- 69) apici ma?
  3sg.Subj.-be-at-home Topic
  'What if he's home?'

Independent verbs cannot be followed by  $\underline{m}\overline{a}$ . Neither can the main clause negative morphemes.

It appears that main clauses are negated with the two distinct negative particles.  $\underline{mwac}$  negates main clause assertions,  $\underline{\overline{tka}}$  negates presuppositions. The distinction however has been grammaticalized in all subordinate clauses.

### 9. Semantic Distinctions

So although  $\overline{1k}\overline{a}$  occurs in both main and subordinate clauses, it appears  $\overline{1k}\overline{a}$  is an unmarked negator in a subordinate clause, but a marked negator in a main clause. The unmarked negative particle in a main clause is  $\underline{mw}\overline{a}c$ . The syntactic distinction between main clauses negated with  $\underline{mw}\overline{a}c$  and main clauses negated by  $\underline{\overline{1k}}a$  is supported by semantic data.

In most main clauses,  $\overline{1ka}$  has a specialized meaning, distinct from  $\underline{mwac}$ . Consider the following textual examples with  $\overline{1ka}$ .

- 70) <u>pahkaci īkā kā-nipāyān</u>
  Sometimes neg lst.conj-sleep
  'Sometimes I can't sleep [because I'm upset].'
- 71) <u>nīyow kīsikāw īkā ī-ohci-nipāyān</u> [worried] four day neg lsg.Conj-past-sleep 'For four days I couldn't sleep.'
- 72) <u>ota T-kT-minihkwiyan kapi-kisik ika ohci-nipayan mina</u> here lsg.Conj-drink all-day neg past-lst.Conj-sleep also <u>kapī-tipisk pātimā kihtwām T-ati-tipiskāk</u> all-night after again 3sg.Conj.II-be night 'I drank once and I didn't sleep all day and all night until the next night.'

All of the above examples have the same verb  $\underline{\text{nip}\overline{a}w}$  'sleep.' The above main clauses are negated with the particle  $\underline{\overline{\text{Tk}\overline{a}}}$ . They differ only in the type of Conjunct verb used. The first example occurs with a  $\underline{k}\overline{a}$ -Conjunct verb, the second with an  $\underline{\overline{\text{T}}}$ -Conjunct verb and the third example with an unchanged Conjunct form.

The text for all three examples indicates that the speaker is expressing a difficulty in sleeping. However the speaker always allows the option of dozing off. In effect, the above examples illustrate that  $\overline{1k}\overline{a}$  does not negate the clause but rather is used to negate a presupposition associated with the clause.  $\overline{1k}\overline{a}$  negates presuppositions.

Furthermore, when  $\overline{1k}\overline{a}$  occurs in conjunction with the topic particle  $\underline{m}\overline{a}$ , it also is not used to negate the proposition per se.  $\overline{1k}\overline{a}$  is used to question the hearer as to whether his/her impression is the same as the speaker's.

- 73) <u>Ikā mā tīhtapiwin</u>
  neg Top. table
  'Doesn't that look like a table?'
- 74) <u>Tkā mā apici</u>
  neg Top. 3sg.Subj-be at home
  'What if he's not home?'

So although  $\overline{1}k\overline{a}$  can negate both main and subordinate clauses, in a main clause  $\overline{1}k\overline{a}$  is marked.  $\overline{1}k\overline{a}$  in a main clause somehow seems to negate a proposition higher than that expressed by the verb in the main clause. It functions as if the main clause is semantically subordinate.

75) <u>Tka T-mTcisot</u>
neg 3sg.Conj-eat
'He doesn't feel like eating.'

In contrast,  $\underline{mwac}$ ,  $\underline{mwa}$  and  $\underline{mo} \, \underline{\delta} \, \underline{a}$  are used to negate the truth-value of the clause. Consider the following examples with  $\underline{mwac}$ .

- 76) <u>kwāni mwāc pīyakwāw T-nipāyāh</u> then neg one-time 13.Conj-sleep 'Not once did we go to sleep.'
- 77) <u>mwac ka-nipayahk I-papamohtIt nohtawIpan</u> neg 13.Conj-sleep 3sg.Conj-walk-about 1sg.poss.father-late 'We didn't sleep because my late father was walking about.'
- 78) mwac n-ohci-nipan
  neg past lsg.Ind-sleep
  'I didn't sleep.'

The first two examples occur with  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}\underline{c}$  and a form of the Conjunct verb  $\underline{n}\underline{i}\underline{p}\underline{a}\underline{w}$  'sleep.' In the third example, the verb  $\underline{n}\underline{i}\underline{p}\underline{a}\underline{w}$  'sleep' is inflected with an Independent verb. The textual reference for each of the above clauses indicates the individual in question did not attempt to go to sleep for a specific reason (i.e., someone was lost, died etc.). When  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}\underline{c}$  is used in a main clause, the clause is always negated. The clauses are all negative assertions, independent of the type of verb in the clause.

#### 10. Conjunct vs. Independent Verbs

There is only one question left unanswered: Why does  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}\underline{c}$  occur in a main clause with a Conjunct verb, and how is this type of main clause distinct from when  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}\underline{c}$  occurs in a clause with an Independent verb? I think the distinction between the two negative structures is the same as the distinction between any two main clauses distinguished solely on the basis of an Independent or Conjunct inflection.

It is clear that the use of a Conjunct is not dependent on whether the clause is asserted or presupposed. Conjunct verbs can precede the polar question markers, as in:

79) <u>T-āhkosit na</u>? 3sg.Conj-sick Q

<u>T-āhkosit cT</u>?

3sg.Conj-sick Q

'Is he/she sick?'

Conjunct verbs also precede the topic marker  $m\bar{a}$ , as in:

80) <u>kā-sipwīpaðit mā</u>?

3sg.Conj-leave suddenly Topic
'Did you hear about his leaving?'

A Conjunct verb can be both presupposed and foregrounded.

The function of the Conjunct verb in a main clause negated with  $\underline{m}\underline{w}\underline{a}\underline{c}$  is partly related to aspect, partly modality. There are at least four factors involved. First, a Conjunct inflection is used to aspectually mark a main clause when the time reference for this clause is dependent on another event in the discourse. The following examples illustrate this:

- 81) mwac T-ayamit iðo T-wTsakThtahk oskTsik.
  neg 3sg.Conj-talk as-long-as 3sg.TI.Conj-hurt
  3sg.poss-eye
  'He couldn't talk as long as his eye hurt so.'
- 82) nisto kīsikāw īkota ā-kā-nipāt. mwā īnco ahpo nipīs
  3 day there past-3sg.Conj-sleep. neg [] or little-water

  <u>ī-kī-minihkwīt wawīs māyiða apisīs ta-mīcisot</u>

  past.3sg.Conj-drink at-all but a little fut-3sg.Conj-eat
  'He slept there for three days. He didn't drink any water
  at all or even eat a bit.'

Second, textual examples indicate that a Conjunct verb negated with a main clause negator is also used in discourse to restrict the clause such that it refers only to a specific group of people or specific time frame. The following examples illustrate this:

- mwac awina ta-nawatakosit

  neg someone fut.3sg.Conj-catch
  'Nobody was around. (referring to group of women who could deliver a baby).'
- 84) moða awina nitawTðimihkwaw
  neg someone 3.TA.Conj-want you
  'Nobody wants you (response to man entering delivery room).'

mwac osoma kiskThtaman
neg like-this lsg.Conj-know it
'I don't know anything (about that specific topic to talk
about right now).'

Third, a main clause negative occurs with a Conjunct verb when the speaker views the event as 'amazing.'

86) mwac Into I-nisiwaninakondik ita atimwa
neg [ ] 3sg.II.Conj.looktorn where dog-pl.
a-kI-sapotaskatihpIpitikot
past-TA.3.Conj-rip her head open
'You couldn't tell where the rip was, where the dogs ripped her head.'

Finally, when the speaker is expressing a possible opinion of another person, the verb always occurs in the Conjunct.

87) moða wīða T-kT-ohci-wapahtahk

neg he past.negpast.3sg.TI.Conj-see it

'He didn't see it (Her grandfather putting curses on people).'

In contrast, Independent verbs negated with a main clause negator are used to report facts and personal opinions. The following examples illustrate.

- 88) mwac awasimi nitawiomaw sokaw ikota neg more lsg.TA.Ind-want him sugar there 'So I don't need as much sugar in there.'
- 89) moða pīhtākosiðiwa neg 3obv.TA.Ind-hear him 'He couldn't hear them.'
- 90) <u>mwā kanakī ohci-pisiskīðihtam</u> neg well past-3sg.TI.Ind-check it 'He didn't bother to check.'

Main clauses negated with <u>Tkā</u> illustrate that Conjunct verbs also occur in syntactically main clauses, that function as if they were semantically subordinate, vis-a-vis presupposition. The problem is the various uses of the Conjunct verbs overlap. Other factors also influence the use of the choice of the main clause verb, but they are outside the scope of this paper. However, it is clear the functions of the Conjunct verb in a main clause outlined above supports the analysis presented above: negation is independent from verb inflection.

#### 11. Conclusion

There are five negative morphemes in Woods Cree.  $\underline{mwac}$ ,  $\underline{mwa}$  and  $\underline{moods}$  negate only main clauses,  $\underline{Tka}$  is the only negator that can negate subordinate clauses, and  $\underline{kaods}$  is the only negator that can negate Imperative clauses. All five negative particles have however a number of marked uses. For example, the subordinate clause negator can occur in a main clause. The distinction is, then, not purely syntactic. The distinction between a main clause negator and a subordinate clause negator is also semantically based. The main clause negator negates assertions, the subordinate clause negator, presuppositions.

Morphologically, there is a partial overlap between clause type and verb inflection. Proto-typically, a main clause verb occurs with Independent inflections, a subordinate clause verb with Conjunct inflections and an Imperative clause with Imperative inflections. However, a verb in a main clause can occur with a Conjunct inflection and a verb in an Imperative clause can occur with an Independent inflection.

This analysis of negation clarifies the issue of Conjunct verbs in main clauses. In negative clauses, the Conjunct/Independent distinction is dependent on several semantic factors, including aspect, modality and presupposition.

This analysis also demystifies the source of Montagnais negative main clauses with Conjunct verbs. Givon notes languages tend to reduce contrasts in marked structures, especially the negative (Givon 1977). In Montagnais, a contrast has simply been lost. The use of the Conjunct in main clause negative is not therefore a major change from Cree, but a minor one.

#### **FOOTNOTES**

<sup>1</sup>The material for this paper is based on data collected at South Indian Lake, Manitoba. Algonquianists will note three phonological processes evident from the orthography: the merger of  $*\underline{e}$  with  $*\underline{i}$ , the weakening and loss of /k/ word initially in the  $*\underline{k}\underline{a}$  conjunct marker, and the weakening of word final /hk/. The latter weakening is both grammatically and socially determined.

<sup>2</sup>Animate NPs are not totally iconic. A number of Inanimate objects are grammatically animate, e.g., <u>ðīwahikan</u> 'dried pounded meat,' <u>sōniyāw</u> 'money.'

<sup>3</sup>There are two types of TI verbs. The example below is inflected with AI inflections. A distinct set of inflections also exist for TI stems.

<sup>4</sup>An Imperative II verb is not grammatically possible. It is simply logically improbable.

<sup>5</sup>This discussion will not distinguish the various types of Conjunct verbs.

<sup>6</sup>These forms also appear with a <u>na</u>-prefix when emphatic.

<sup>7</sup>The scope of the negation does not appear to affect the choice of the negative morpheme. Generally the constituent which is the focus of the negation is closer to the negative morpheme.

8'As if' structures are introduced by the negative particle 1 Ika. This example literally translates as 'But I am not leaving;' 1 ma reverses the polarity of the negative.

#### REFERENCES

- ELLIS, C. Douglas. 1983. <u>Spoken Cree: West Coast of James Bay</u> [rev ed.]. Pica Pica Press.
- GIVON, Talmy. 1977. On Understanding Grammar. New York: Academic Press.
- ----- 1984. Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction. Volume 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- HAIMAN, John. 1978. 'Conditionals are topics.' <u>Language</u> 54.3:564-589.
- HORNE, Laurence R. 1985. 'Metalinguistic negation and pragmatic ambiguity.' <u>Language</u> 61:121-174.
- HUDDLESTON, Rodney D. 1971. <u>The Sentence in Written English: A Syntactic Study Based on an Analysis of Scientific Texts</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacKENZIE, M. and S. Clarke. 1981. 'Dialect relations in Cree/ Montagnais/Naskapi verb paradigms.' Montreal Working Papers in Linguistics 16:135-192.
- REINHART, Tanya. 1982. <u>Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics</u>. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

ROGERS, Jean H. 1979. 'Different focussing in Ojibwa conjunct verb: on circumstances, participants, or events.'

International Journal of American Linguistics 44:167-179.

WOLFART, H.C. 1973. <u>Plains Cree: A Grammatical Sketch.</u> Philadelphia: American Philosophical Association.