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Abstract

Tariana is the only North Arawak language currently spoken within the multilingual linguistic area of the Vaupés River Basin. Long-term interaction based on institutionalized multilingualism between East Tucanoan languages and Tariana has resulted in the rampant diffusion of grammatical and semantic patterns (rather than forms). A complex system of negation in Tariana reflects a combination of genetically inherited and areally diffused patterns. Tariana preserves the Proto-Arawak negative prefix in derivational and nominal negation. Some inherently negative lexemes and the distinction between future and non-future negation in declarative clauses are most likely to have resulted from impact of East Tucanoan languages. I discuss each of the Tariana negators, and then draw a comparison with negation patterns found in related North Arawak languages of the Rio Negro and the adjacent areas. These include the Baniwa of Ña-Kurripako dialect continuum, Piapoco, Guareflecta, Warekena of Xié (and its dialects Baniwa of Guainia and the now extinct Yavitero), Resigaro, Achagua, Yucuna, Bahwana and Baré (both extinct). The Appendix contains an overview of negative forms in these North Arawak languages, accompanied by a list of sources.

1 Preamble

Markers of negation, and negative constructions, vary substantially even between closely related Arawak languages. Patterns of negation marking are particularly susceptible to contact-induced change. Tariana, a well-documented North Arawak language influenced by East Tucanoan languages, is a case in point.

Tariana is the only North Arawak language currently spoken within the multilingual linguistic area of the Vaupés River Basin, dominated by East Tucanoan languages, and characterized by obligatory societal multilingualism which follows the principle of linguistic exogamy: ‘those who speak the same language as us are our brothers, and we do not marry our sisters’. A striking feature of the Vaupés linguistic area is a cultural inhibition against language mixing viewed
in terms of borrowing forms. Long-term interaction based on institutionalized multilingualism between East Tucanoan languages and Tariana has resulted in the rampant diffusion of grammatical and semantic patterns (rather than forms) and calquing of categories (discussed in detail in my previous work, e.g. Aikhenvald 2002, 2003). A complex interaction of areal diffusion, genetic inheritance and independent innovation—whose net result goes beyond mere intertranslatability between languages in contact—accounts for the complexity of the Tariana grammar. Negation is a particularly complex area of the grammar; forms and patterns vary across dialects. This is what we address here.\footnote{This chapter, as all my previous work, is based upon information obtained through my immersion fieldwork with speakers of all existing dialects of Tariana (mostly the WamiariKune of Santa Rosa and of Periquitos, with about 100 speakers in all). Tariana is highly endangered: no children are learning the language in the village of Santa Rosa, and just a few speak it in the village of Periquitos (more detail in Aikhenvald 2003: 18–24, 2002: 213–221). I have also worked with the dialect of the Kumandene subgroup of Tariana spoken by about thirty people in the village of Santa Terezinha on the Iauarí river, and analyzed all the existing materials on other dialects (see the survey in the Appendix to Aikhenvald 2003). The Kumandene dialect is not mutually intelligible with the WamiariKune dialect. Speakers communicate with each other in Tucano. An overview of previous work on Tariana is in Aikhenvald (2003).}

I start, in section 2, with a brief outline of the typological properties, and the verb structure, in Tariana, focussing on the Modern Tariana of Santa Rosa. In section 3, I discuss Tariana negation in declarative clauses. In section 4, I turn to the negative imperative. Derivational negation is discussed in section 5, while section 6 focuses on the inherently negative lexemes and a negative particle. The ways of saying ‘no’, as a pro-clause, are addressed in section 7. In section 8, I discuss dialectal variation in Tariana negation, and the negative forms attested in early sources on Tariana.\footnote{I am grateful to all my teachers of Tariana, the Britos of Santa Rosa and the Muniz of Periquitos, and to the Lopez and Martins families from Santa Terezinha, for teaching me their remarkable language. Thanks are equally due to R.M.W. Dixon, and Kris Stenzel for helpful comments and insights, and to W.F.H. Adelaar for sharing and discussing Natterer’s materials with me.}

Negation patterns and negative forms in Tariana are then compared to those in closely related North Arawak languages from the Wapuí subgroup (Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako, Guarequena and Piapoco), and in other North Arawak languages of the Rio Negro area. We then contrast Tariana negation with that in the neighbouring East Tucanoan languages (section 9). The Appendix contains a list of negative forms in North Arawak languages in the Rio Negro and adjacent areas, and a list of sources on these.
2 Verb Classes, Verb Structure and Predicate Types in Tariana

Tariana is a polysynthetic agglutinating language with some fusion. Its head marking properties are inherited from the proto-language, while dependent marking has been acquired by areal diffusion from East Tucanoan languages (see Aikhenvald 2002). For instance, unlike in most other Arawak languages, grammatical relations in Tariana are marked by cases on a nominative-oblique basis, calquing an East Tucanoan pattern. Constituent order depends on discourse. Word order within some constituents is fixed and within others depends on which constituent is in focus.

Constituent negation in Tariana is limited (we return to it in section 6): this is in contrast to a few other Arawak languages of the area, such as Guarequena, Warekena of Xié and Baré. Most frequently, only the predicate is negated. To understand the principles of negation marking, we first address (2.1) verb classes, (2.2) verb structure, and (2.3) predicate types.

2.1 Verb Classes

Every verbal root in Tariana is either prefixed or prefixless. Prefixed verbs can be transitive, ambitransitive (A = S\textsubscript{a} or O = S\textsubscript{a}) or active intransitive (S\textsubscript{a}). Prefixless verbs are typically stative intransitive (of S\textsubscript{o} type); some are A = S\textsubscript{o} ambitransitives. A prefixed transitive verb is shown in (1), and a prefixed active intransitive verb is in (2).\footnote{This is ultimately the reflection of the Proto-Arawak split-S system: see Aikhenvald (1999, 2003)}

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{Hema ipe} \textit{nu-hña-ka}.
      tapir INDEFINITE+meat 1SGA-eat-REC.PAS.VIS
      ‘I have eaten tapir’s meat.’

  \item \textit{Nu-nu} \textit{nu-maa-ka}.
      1SG\textsubscript{a}-come 1SG\textsubscript{a}-arrive.ashore-REC.PAS.VIS
      ‘I have come arriving ashore.’
\end{enumerate}

A prefixless stative S\textsubscript{o} verb is shown in (3). Its subject, ‘I’, takes the subject case. (A, S\textsubscript{a} and S\textsubscript{o} in Tariana require the same case marking).

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{Kau-pu-mahka} \textit{nuha}.
      be.scared-aug-REC.PAS.NONVIS I(subject)
      ‘I am very scared.’
\end{enumerate}
Transitivity classes show correlations with the presence or absence of prefixes. All transitive, most ambitransitive and the few ditransitive verbs are prefixed. All active verbs (for instance, verbs of motion) are prefixed. All verbs denoting states are prefixless. A few prefixless verbs are ambitransitive, e.g. *hui* ‘like (food)’, *nhesii* ‘like (not food)’. Each verb belongs to just one class—either prefixless or prefixed.

2.2 Verb Structure

The structure of a verbal word in Tariana is fairly complex. A simple predicate has one prefix position, up to nine suffix positions and over ten clitic positions. Most enclitics are ‘floating’, that is, they attach either to the predicate or to any constituent which is in focus (see Aikhenvald 2003: 57–60, 253–254).

A verbal word in Tariana can take only one prefix. This can be either a personal cross-referencing prefix, or the negator *ma-* or the relativizing prefix *ka-* (the few words that contain two prefixes are mentioned in section 5). If a prefixed verb is negated, cross-referencing prefixes are omitted and gender, number and person distinctions neutralized. (4) is the negated variant of (1). A personal pronoun can be added to disambiguate such a sentence. The negative markers are underlined.

(4)  
**Hema ipe ma-hña-kade-ka.**

*tapir indefinite+meat neg-eat-neg-rec.pas.vis*

‘(I) have not eaten tapir’s meat.’

If a prefixless verb is negated, just the suffix *-kade* is used, as in (5), the negative counterpart of (3):

(5)  
**Karu-kade-pu-mahka nuha.**

*be.scared-NEG-aug-rec.pas.nonvis I(subject)*

‘I was well and truly not scared.’

To form a relative clause, the prefix *ka-* replaces the cross-referencing prefixes:

(6)  
**kawhi ka-ira.**

*manioc.flour rel-drink*

‘(someone) drinking manioc flour’

2.3 Predicate Types

In addition to simple verbs, Tariana has a variety of complex predicates which include passive, admirative, and a few more structures with modal meanings.
(see Aikhenvald 2003: 458–459). Only some of these can be negated. There is a complex set of contiguous serial verb constructions consisting of several grammatical and phonological words. Each has to have the same subject marking. An example of a positive serial verb with a directional meaning is in (2).

As expected, each serial verb has one polarity value: one cannot negate components of a serial verb separately (this is one of definitional properties of serial verbs: see Aikhenvald 2003: 423–430). Importantly for our discussion here, the negative prefix *ma-* and the concomitant suffix *-kade* attach to the first verb in the serial verb construction imparting negative value to the whole construction: (7) is the negated counterpart of (2). The personal prefix appears only on the second verb.

(7) **Ma-nu-kade nu-maa-ka.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEG-come-NEG</th>
<th>iSGS, -arrive.ashore-rec.pas.vis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘I have not come arriving ashore.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A member of any word class can occupy the predicate slot in Tariana (Aikhenvald 2003: 81). Verbs express many more categories than non-verbs when used as predicates (and have to be nominalized if used as arguments). Members of word classes other than verbs cannot be used in commands.

### 3 Negation in Tariana Declarative Clauses

Three patterns of negation in declarative clauses are to be distinguished:

- negating a non-future declarative clause with a verbal or non-verbal predicate (3.1),
- negating a future declarative clause with a verbal predicate (3.2),

and

- negating a copula clause (3.3).

Clauses with non-verbal predicates cast in future cannot take negative morphology: they have to be rephrased to be negated. Some prefixless verbs cannot be negated. Among these are *ira* 'need, must', *khewa* 'be accustomed to', and a few predicates with deprecatory meaning, e.g. *puthepu* 'be in a bad way, do in vain'.
3.1 **Negating a Non-Future Declarative Clause**

To negate a simple verbal word in Tariana, a prefix *ma*- and a suffix *-kade* attaches to the root of any prefixed verb: see (4), in section 2. Any prefixless verb takes just the suffix *-kade*: see (5), in section 2. So does a member of any other word class in the predicate slot. In (8), a noun *nawiki* ‘person, Indian’ appears in the predicate slot:

(8) *Duha nawiki*-kade-pidana ñamu-pidana duha.
    she person-NEG-REM.PAS.REPD evil.spirit-REM.PAS.REPD she
    ‘She was not a person, she was an evil spirit.’

Serial verb constructions take only one marker of negation (this is similar to Kurripako: see Granadillo this volume, and for Baniwa Hohôdene: Taylor 1991, Bezerra 2005.) Since cross-referencing prefixes cannot take the negative prefix *ma-* , and the prefix *ma-* appears on the first verb in a serial construction, this verb ‘loses’ its cross-referencing prefixes (as in (7)).

Thus, the components of a negated serial verb do not get identical cross-referencing, unlike positive serial verbs. Since the components cannot be negated separately, ambiguity may arise. Example (9) contains a negated causative serial verb construction (‘order-kill’). It can mean either ‘he did not order (them) to kill many (fish)’, or ‘he ordered (them) not to kill many fish (i.e. to kill only a few)’. In the context of the story, the second reading turns out to be more appropriate: there was an explicit order to kill some fish, but not to kill too many. Outside this context either reading would be acceptable. The serial verb construction is in brackets.

(9) *Hanupe-se [maa-kade-ka dinu].*
    many-CONTRAST NEG+order-NEG-REC.PAS.VIS 3SGNF+kill
    ‘He did not order (them) to kill many (fish).’ or ‘He ordered not to kill many (just a few).’

If a complex predicate (different from a serial verb) is negated, the negator usually goes onto the first verb in the predicate, just like with serial verbs. A negated complex predicate containing the complementizer *kwe* ‘that, how’ is illustrated in (10). No constituent can intervene between the components, and the order of components is fixed:

(10) *Kwe ma-dia-kade-pidana na-yeka.*
    that/how NEG-return-NEG-REM.PAS.REPD 3PL-can/be.able
    ‘They did not know how to return.’
A complex predicate with the meaning of ‘do a little bit’ consists of the same verb repeated twice, the first one taking the tense and evidentiality markers, and the second one accompanied by the suffix -kawya. If it is negated, the negative marker goes onto the first occurrence of the verb:

(11) *Ketemi-kade-naka ketemi-kawya.*  
remain-NEG-PRES.VIS remain-SMALL.EXTENT  
‘Nothing remains, not one little bit.’

An epistemic complex predicate meaning ‘maybe’ consists of two verbs repeated twice, whereby only the second verb takes the tense-evidentiality specifications. The predicate is strictly contiguous, and the order of words is fixed. If it is negated, the negator goes onto each verb. This is a rare instance of marking negation twice in Tariana:

(12) *Ma-nu-kade ma-nu-kade-sika.*  
NEG-come-NEG NEG-come-NEG-REC.PAS.INFERRED  
‘He is not coming (we infer).’

A negated verb can be nominalized with classifiers in their derivational function (see further discussion, with different examples, in Aikhenvald 2003: 96):

(13) *ma-mia-kade-pua*  
NEG-float-NEG-DER.CL:WATERWAY  
‘river on which nothing floats’

A negative nominalization created this way offers an option of negating an argument without negating the whole clause.

3.2 *Negating a Future Declarative Clause with a Verbal Predicate*  
Similarly to neighbouring East Tucanoan languages, Tariana has two positive future forms, -mhade ‘uncertain future’ and -de ‘certain future’ (restricted to first person subjects), in addition to the intentional modality marked with the suffix -kasu. Future negative clauses show neutralization for the two futures and for the intentional; that is, (14) is the negative counterpart of the positive forms in (15), (16) and (17):

(14) *(Nuha) ma-nu-kásu.*  
 I NEG-come-FUT.NEG  
‘I won’t/shall not come, am not about to come.’
(15) \textit{Nu-nu-kasú}.
\textsc{1sg-come-in\textsc{tn}}
'I am about to come, I intend to come.'

(16) \textit{Nu-nu-de}.
\textsc{1sg-come-fut.cert}
'I will come (definitely).'  

(17) \textit{Nu-nu-mhade}.
\textsc{1sg-come-fut.uncert}
'Maybe I will come.'

The paradigmatic relationship between negation, future and the intentional modality is shown in Table 1. That fewer categories are expressed in negative than in positive clauses is congruent with predictions in Aikhenvald and Dixon (1998).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marking in positive clauses</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Marking in negative clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{-de}</td>
<td>definite future (1st person)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{-mhade}</td>
<td>uncertain future (1st person)</td>
<td>\textit{ma-...-ksu}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{-kasú}</td>
<td>any future (non-1st person)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intentional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When a future form of a prefixless verb is negated it takes the suffix \textit{-kásu}, distinct from the intentional marker \textit{-kasú} (an enclitic). The negative future form of a prefixless verb \textit{putfa} ‘be wet, make wet’ is in (18):

(18) \textit{Wha iya putfa-kásu}.
\textsc{we rain be.wet/make.wet-fut.neg}
'Rain won't make us wet.'
In my corpus, about 90% of occurrences of the negative future of prefixless verbs are accompanied with the emphatic negative particle ne (see section 6). The prefixless verb hamiya ‘be heavy’ appears in the future negative form in (19), accompanied by ne ‘emphatic negator’ which strengthens the negative meaning and can be translated as ‘not at all, not one bit’:

(19) Yausi sede-ka itawhya ne hamiya-kásu.

‘If there are no goods, a canoe won’t be heavy at all.’

That the emphatic negative ne is so pervasive in future negative clauses involving prefixless verbs may be motivated by phonological reasons. The intentional marker -kásù is a clitic, and it carries a secondary stress which is weaker than the primary stress falling on the root and affixes (see Aikhenvald 2003:37–39, on stress in Tariana). Stress is the only means of distinguishing a positive hamiya-kásù ‘is going to be heavy’ and a negative hamiya-kásu ‘won’t be heavy’. The emphatic negative ne serves to ensure the negative meaning is expressed with clarity. We will see in section 9.1 that the emphatic negative ne is shared by a number of languages in the area. Its use in Tariana may have been enhanced by its occurrence in Tucano.

Negation of future clauses shows further complexity. The future marker -mhade—uncertain future with 1st person and the only future with nonfirst person (Aikhenvald 2003:320–321)—can occur with a verb negated with a nonfuture negative suffix -kade to indicate deontic modality (‘obligation’) in future. This use agrees with the ‘deontic’ meaning for -mhade. This is illustrated in (20).

(20) Karu-kade-mhade nhumeta.

‘I should not feel scared (but I do).’

In contrast, karu-kásu nhumeta (be.scared-NEG-FUT 1SG+feel) ‘I will not feel scared’, with the negative future -kásu, has a future meaning. The sequence -kade-mhade with a prefixed verb ‘work’ has a deontic meaning ‘you should not be working’:

(21) Phía ikasu-nuku mehpáni-kade-mhade.

‘You should not be working today (since today is Good Friday).’

---

4 The corpus of Wamiarikune Tariana (Santa Rosa and Periquitos) contains c. 200,000 words.
The deontic -kade-mhade and the negative future -kásu are reminiscent of a similar distinction in Tucano (Aikhenvald 2002: 134) and may have developed in Tariana as a result of intensive language contact (see section 9.2).

Clauses with non-verbal predicates can take positive future markers but cannot be negated. If a negative meaning is to be expressed, they have to be rephrased. The negative equivalent of non-verbal identity clauses in (22) and (23) is a verbal clause in (24), with the verb -a ‘become’:

(22) Nawiki-mhade diha.
    person-FUT  he
    ‘He will be a person.’

(23) Nawiki-kasu diha.
    person-INTN he
    ‘He intends/is going to be a person.’

(24) Nawiki ma:-ksu.
    person  NEG+become-NEG.FUT
    ‘He is not going to become a person/won’t be a person.’

Verbless clauses, with a noun, adjective, adverb, or demonstrative in the predicate slot, can express identity, equation, and a number of other meanings (Aikhenvald 2003: 497–498). Existential, locational, and especially possessive meanings are expressed with a prefixless copula.

3.3 **Negating a Copula Clause**

Prefixless copula alia ‘be’ in Tariana is used for marking existence, location and possession. Its negative counterpart is sede. Other copulas are either prefixed verbs (e.g. -a ‘become’, -dia ‘become again’), or prefixless verbs, e.g. hiku ‘be similar’. They are negated in the same way as other verbs of these classes (see sections 3.1–3.2).

The positive prefixless verb alia ‘be, exist’ is illustrated in (25), and its negative counterpart sede is shown in (26) (also see the first clause in (19)).

(25) Nese-nuku itʃiri hanupe alia-pidana.
    then-TOP.NON.A/S  game many  EXI-REM.PAS.REPD
    ‘Then there was (said to be) a lot of game.’
A clause containing *sede* can be nominalized. For instance, *dithi sede* (3SGNF+ eye NEG.EXI) ‘his eye does not exist’ can be nominalized with -ite ‘animate classifier’ as *dithi sedite* ‘the one whose eye does not exist, eyeless person’. Such a nominalized form is a way of negating a constituent without negating the whole clause. An example is in (27): this is from a story about an evil spirit who used to steal people's eyes (widespread in the area, and, in all likelihood, of Tucanoan origin):

(27) *Di-thi-sedite-pasi di-wa-kha*

    3SGNF-eye-NEG.EXI+CL:ANIM-AUG 3SGNF-enter.jungle-AWAY
di-a-pidana.
    SGNF-go-REM.PAS.REPD

    ‘The big eyeless (man) went away (into the jungle) (it is said).’

The copulas *alia* and *sede* are somewhat atypical compared to other prefixless verbs. They do not occur in serial verb constructions. Neither can they be used in commands.

The form *alia* in Tariana does not have any cognates in Arawak languages, and bears a segmental similarity to Desano *ár* copula ‘be’, ‘have’ (Miller 1999, Aikhenvald 2002: 156). The etymology of *sede* is unclear. We will see in section 9.2 that most East Tucanoan languages have a negative existential and possessive verb. We hypothesize that the presence of a suppletive negative copula in Tariana could be the result of Tucanoan influence. This is corroborated by the fact that inherently negative existential verbs are absent from two of Tariana’s closest relatives in the Wapuí subgroup, Baniwa-Kurripako and Guarequena. Piapoco has an inherently negative existential verb; however, unlike Tariana, it is partially similar to the declarative negator (see section 9.1 and Table 3 in the Appendix).

East Tucanoan languages have two inherently negative verbs, e.g. Tucano *marí* ‘not exist’ and *moó* ‘not have’. The two verbs are derived from the same underlying root *bãá-marí* has an underlying form *bãá-di* (not.be-MEDIAL) while *moó* has an underlying form *bãá-o* (not.be-CAUS) (see Ramirez 1997: 168–169). In Tariana *sede* is used in both senses: ‘not be’ and ‘not have’ (see section 9.2).
4 Negative Imperative

Negative imperative (or prohibitive)\(^5\) is marked with the adverb *mhaĩda* (occasionally pronounced as *mhe*)\(_{da}* by younger speakers). This form was grammaticalized from the quantifier *mhaiĩda* ‘few’. It is used with imperative verbs with second person, as in (28), and with first person plural, as in (29):

(28) *Mhaĩda* pi-ni!

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{PROH} & 2\text{SG}-\text{do} \\
\text{proh} & \text{2sg-do} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Don’t do (this)!’

(29) *Mhaĩda* wa wehpani ikasu-nuku!

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{PROH} & 1\text{PL}+\text{go} & 1\text{PL}+\text{work} & \text{today-top.non.a/s} \\
\text{proh} & 1pl+go & 1pl+work & \text{today-top.non.a/s} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Let’s not go work today!’

Prefixless verbs cannot occur in a positive imperative construction. However, all of them—with the exception of the copulas *alia* ‘exist’ and *sede* ‘not exist’—can occur in negative commands. Example (30) illustrates a negative command with the verb *munumeni* ‘mutter, speak indistinctly’:

(30) *Mhaĩda* munumeni!

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{PROH} & \text{mutter} \\
\text{proh} & \text{mutter} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Don’t mutter!’

Prohibitive clauses can be considered ‘impoverished’ compared with their positive imperative counterparts. Positive imperatives distinguish distance in space and time. No such distinctions are found in prohibitives. But, similarly to the positive imperative, prohibitives occur with -pida, a marker of a command ‘by proxy’. The late Cândido, the most traditional speaker of the language, told us not to try and eat a flower I found at the road side. His command was relayed to me by his son Jovino:

(31) *Mhaĩda*-pida pi-ňha-kau.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{PROH-IMP.SEC} & 2\text{SG}-\text{eat-purp.vis} \\
\text{proh-imp.sec} & 2sg-eat-purp.vis \\
\end{array}
\]

‘This is not for you to eat (I am saying this Cândido told us so).’

---

\(^5\) See the typological discussion in Aikhenvald (2010). The analysis of the Tariana imperatives and their origins is in Aikhenvald (2008).
The prohibitive *mhaĩda* can also be used with the future -*mhade* in deontic meaning 'one shouldn't do so and so', as in (32):

(32) \[ \text{Mhaǐda phia hĩ kalisi-nuku } \text{pi-kalite-mhade.} \]
\[ \text{PROH you this story-TOP.NON.A/S 2SG-tell-FUT} \]
\[ \text{‘You should not tell this story.’} \]

The construction *mhaǐda-pida* is also used to negate a command to a third person:

(33) \[ \text{Mhaǐda-pida du-kalite!} \]
\[ \text{PROH-IMP.SEC 3SGF-tell} \]
\[ \text{‘She is not to tell (the secret story)’} \]

In addition, *mhaǐda-pida* is used in the meaning of negative purposive, ‘so that something does not happen’, as in (34).

(34) \[ \text{Diha-da-nuku dhita-pidana dhinuu-se} \]
\[ \text{ART-CL:ROUND-TOP.NON.A/S 3SGNF+take-REM.PAS.RPT 3SGNF+neck-LOC} \]
\[ \text{mhaǐda-pida nîwhā-niki diha adaita.} \]
\[ \text{PROH-IMP.SEC 3SGNF+bite-COMP he snake} \]
\[ \text{‘He put the (finger) into its throat, in such a way that the snake couldn't bite it off.’} \]

This use of prohibitive and secondhand imperative is reminiscent of Tucano (see Ramirez 1997: 147, and discussion in Aikhenvald 2002: 165), and is most likely a calque from Tucano.

*Mhaǐda* is the only prohibitive form in traditional Tariana. Some innovative speakers occasionally use the Tucano-influenced imperative -*ya* with a non-future negative form to mark prohibitive or negative obligation (see Aikhenvald 2008). This usage is rejected by all the traditional speakers.

5 Derivational Negation

The negative prefix *ma*- is a widespread derivational negator in Tariana. Etymologically, it goes back to Proto-Arawak *ma-, the negative counterpart of the Proto-Arawak relative-attributive *ka- (see Aikhenvald 2002: 305).

Most prefixed—that is, obligatorily possessed—nouns denoting body parts, and a few kinship nouns, can take *ka*- ‘relative, attributive’ and *ma*- ‘negative’ to
express possession of a body part or of a kinship relation, or the lack of it. They are nominalized with a classifier, e.g. (35), from *du-sa-niɾi* (3SGF-spouse-M) ‘her husband’:

(35) ka-sa-niite \hspace{1cm} ma-sa-niite  
REL-spouse-M+CL:ANIM \hspace{2cm} NEG-spouse-M+CL:ANIM  
’a married (woman)’ \hspace{1cm} ‘an unmarried (woman)’

And from *di-sa-do* (with a variant *di-sa-du*) (3SGNF-spouse-FEM) ‘his wife’:

(36) ka-sa-du-ite \hspace{1cm} ma-sa-du-ite  
REL-spouse-F+CL:ANIM \hspace{2cm} NEG-spouse-F+CL:ANIM  
’a married (man)’ \hspace{1cm} ‘an unmarried (man)’

Similar examples with body part nouns include:

(37) ne:ɾi ka-sawite \hspace{1cm} ne:ɾi ma-sawite  
deer REL-horn+NCL:ANIM \hspace{2cm} deer NEG-horn+NCL:ANIM  
‘deer with horns’ \hspace{1cm} ‘deer without horns’

kepite \hspace{1cm} mepite  
REL+flesh+NCL:ANIM \hspace{2cm} NEG+flesh+NCL:ANIM  
‘fat, fleshy’ \hspace{1cm} ‘thin, emaciated’

A number of stative verbs which do not take any personal prefixes have counterparts with derivational prefixes *ka-* and *ma-* e.g. (38):

(38) a. ſnapu \hspace{0.5cm} khewaka-puna  
spring REL+*deep-CL:RIVER  
’a shallow spring’

b. ſnapu \hspace{0.5cm} mhewaka-puna  
spring NEG+*deep-CL:RIVER  
’a deep spring’

Generally, a verbal word in Tariana can take only one prefix. In just two instances, this is not the case. The root -wĩta, likely to have been borrowed from Portuguese *vender* ‘sell’, appears in two prefixed transitive verbs—*ka-wĩta* ‘pay’ and *ma-wĩta* ‘borrow’. The derivational negator *ma-* and its positive counterpart *ka-* have effectively fused with the root, and the root containing these
prefixes takes cross-referencing prefixes before them, e.g. *di-kawĩta* ‘he pays’, *di-mawĩta* ‘he owes’.

The derivational negator *ma*- appears with a few roots with negative meanings which do not have a counterpart with the attributive *ka*-; e.g. *meri* (NEG+blood) ‘get weak, emaciated’, and *ma-kare* (NEG-breath) ‘breathless, tired’. It also derives a number of inherently negative predicates where the root does not occur in any other context, e.g. *mahyuna, manhina* ‘be difficult’, *mapi* ‘(physically) tired, exhausted’.

The prefix *ma*- is also used to negate participles whose positive form contains the prefix *ka*-; A pair of examples, with a positive participle marked with *ka*- and its negative counterpart with *ma*-; is in (39):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(39)</th>
<th><em>itfiri ka-inu</em></th>
<th><em>itfiri ma-inu</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>game rel-kill</td>
<td>game rel.NEG-kill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the one who kills game’</td>
<td>‘the one who does not kill game’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participles are used as predicates of relative clauses (Aikhenvald 2003: 185, 460–461). They have a number of nominal properties (such as gender, and nominal tense), and can be considered a subclass of nouns.

6 **Inherently Negative Lexemes and a Negative Particle**

Inherently negative lexemes in Tariana are mostly predicates. None of them can take personal prefixes. Just one, *hãida* ‘I don’t know’, can be used as a clause on its own, and constitutes a separate word class. Inherently negative lexemes which contain no overt negator are the negative existential/possessive copula *sede* (discussed in section 3.3), and *hãida* ‘I don’t know’. Other inherently negative lexemes contain negative morphemes. These are: *hyu-kade* ‘not be; not appear’ (containing the declarative negative suffix *-kade* discussed in section 3.1) with a future counterpart *hyukásu*; *makwa* ‘without talking, quietly’; *ma:kuya* ‘shut up!’ (containing the negative prefix *ma*- discussed in section 5); *masakade* ‘not be enough’ (containing the negative prefix *ma*- and the negative suffix *-kade*; see section 3.1); *pukasu* ‘not at all’ (containing the future negative suffix *-kásu* discussed in section 3.2), and also *kuipua* ‘(there is) nothing, not at all’.

The form *ma:kuya* is etymologically cognate to Baniwa of Içana *ma:ku-dza* (NEG+siSpeak-IMP) ‘do not talk, shut up’ (note that *dz* in some Baniwa dialects, such as Hohôdene, regularly corresponds to Tariana *y*, e.g. Baniwa *dzawi*, Tariana *yawi* ‘jaguar’). The combination of a prefix *ma*- and a suffix *-dza* is a normal
way of forming prohibitives in Baniwa and in Kurripako (see Granadillo, this volume, Bezerra 2005, Aikhenvald 2008, Taylor 1991). The Tariana form *makuya* could be either a loan from a dialect of Baniwa in which Tariana *y* corresponds to *y* (and not to *dz*), for instance, Kumandene Kurripaco, or an archaic expression. Some speakers of Tariana (e.g. the late Cândido Brito) dismiss this form as a Baniwa loan.

The form *kuipua* consists of the negator *kuri* attested in varieties of Kurripako (see an overview in Bezerra 2012: 69, and Granadillo, this volume) and an archaic emphatic *-pua* (*pu* in Modern Tariana).

The negative particle proclitic *ne* is used in a number of contexts: as a constituent negator, as the only negator in a clause, and also in an emphatic double negative construction. This use of this particle mirrors the Tucano patterns.

In clauses with a negated predicate, *ne* negates pronouns such as *kwana* ‘who’ and *kwaka* ‘what’, and number word ‘one’ (which is often used in an indefinite meaning). This is a strategy for negative pronouns in Tariana. In (40), *ne-kwana* is used on its own as a response to a question:

(40) **Question:** Kwana-nihka   di-nu?
    who-PAS.VIS.INT 3SGNF-come
    ‘Who has come?’

    **Answer:** ne   kwana
    NEG who
    ‘No one.’

*Ne* is used as the only predicate negator only if followed by an impersonal verb. The meaning is ‘impossible to VERB’, e.g. *ne pa-ka-niki* (*NEG IMPERS-see-COMP*) ‘impossible to see’, and the following expression in (41):

(41) **Hipa-nuku**   **ne**   pa-nu-niki.
    rapids-TOP.NON.A/S NEG IMPERS-come-COMP
    ‘It was impossible to come (near) the rapids.’

---

*Jovino Brito, a highly proficient but innovative speaker, used to apply assimilation and have an alternative pronunciation of *kuripua* as *kurupua* in the 1990s and early 2000s (Aikhenvald 2003: 413). At present, he tends to shorten the vowel sequence *ua* to a shifting stress to the last syllable and pronouncing the form as *kurupá* alongside more generally used *kuripua*.*
The particle *ne* can also be used as a negative response. That *ne* is used as the only negator in the clause in limited circumstances may be indicative of its recent origins: see section 9.1.

Negation can be marked twice in the same predicate, to make it sound more categorical. Then the negative proclitic *ne* appears in front of a negated predicate (or on the first component of a serial verb construction), as in (19) and in (42). Similarly to all the proclitics in Tariana, *ne* can form an independent phonological word, as in (19), if it is emphasized.

\[
\text{(42) } \text{Di-na } \text{du-wana-tha-pidana} \\
\text{3SGNF O3SGF-call-FRU-REM.PAS.REPD} \\
\text{ne-ma-dia-kade-pidana.} \\
\text{NEG.EMP-NEG-return-NEG-REM.PAS.REPD} \\
\text{‘She called him in vain, he did not come.’}
\]

This ‘double’ negative construction in Tariana is very similar to what we find in Tucano.

In East Tucanoan languages a clause can contain two negatives, to convey a strongly negative meaning. In (43), from Tucano, negative particle *neê* negates the pro-form ‘one’, and the verbal suffix -\text{ti}- negates the verb. Similarly, in (44), from Tariana, *ne* ‘negative’ negates \text{paita} ‘one’, and a combination of a negative prefix plus a negative suffix negates the verb.

**Tucano**

\[
\text{(43) } \text{Neê } \text{ni’kí } \text{eta-ti-ámí.} \\
\text{NEG } \text{one+CL:ANIM come-NEG-REC.PAS.VIS.3SGNF} \\
\text{‘No one came.’}
\]

**Tariana**

\[
\text{(44) } [\text{Ne } \text{paita} ] \text{ ma-nu-kade-ka.} \\
\text{NEG } \text{one+CL:ANIM NEG-come-NEG-REC.PAS.VIS} \\
\text{‘No-one came.’}
\]

The Tucano particle *neê* can co-occur with a negated verb, to express particularly strong negation, as in (45) (Ramirez 1997: 154). Tariana *ne* is rather similar (see (19) and (42)).
Tucano

(45) Neê ˈia-ti-sa.
    NEG want-NEG-PRES.NONVIS.nonthird.P
    ‘(I) do not want anything at all.’

This particle can be used as a one-word strong negative reply, both in Tariana and in Tucano:

Tucano

(46) Eta-á-ti? neê!
    arrive-REC.PAS.VIS-INT NEG
    ‘Are they coming? No, not at all!’

Tariana

(47) Na-nu-nihka? ne!
    3PL-come-REC.PAS.VIS.INT NEG
    ‘Are they coming? No, not at all!’

The origin of the particles neê (Tucano) and ne (Tariana) is unclear. However, given the similarity in form and in usage between Tariana and Tucano, and the absence of similar patterns in Baniwa-Kurripako and in Piapoco, we can hypothesize that Tucano has influenced these usages of the Tariana ne. A negative marker with a dental nasal is attested in many languages of the area (see section 9.1), and also in Nheêngatú nê and its variants (Stradelli 1929: 575). (Contrary to Ramirez 1997 Tomo I: 168, it is almost certainly coincidental that Portuguese has a negative marker of similar form nem ‘neither, nor, not even’.)

7 How to Say ‘No’ in Tariana

Tariana has a variety of ways of phrasing a negative answer to a question, or as a negative response to a command. The particle ne is one of these: this is an emphatic negator, ‘no, no way!’, as in (48). The inherently negative hyukade can be used as a general negative reaction or response.

7 The occasional occurrence of Portuguese nem in Tariana, is restricted to innovative and not very proficient speakers (Aikhenvald 2002: 182).
There is yet another strategy for negative answers to questions. To say something like ‘I am not really doing what you are asking me about’, the negative form of the verb ‘do’ is often used. Example (48) consists of a question: an evil spirit in disguise asks a man floating in a dangerous lake why he is doing so. The man answers in the negative:

(48) \textit{Kwe pi-ni pi-ahta-nha? Ma-ni-kade-naka.}

\begin{align*}
\text{how} & \quad \text{2sg-do} \quad \text{2sg-float-PRES.VIS.INT} \quad \text{NEG-do-NEG-PRES.VIS} \\
\text{‘Why are you floating?’} & \quad \text{(asked the spirit) ‘I am not (literally, I am not doing)’ (said the man) (in fact he was not floating: he was trying to drown himself).}
\end{align*}

Or a negated form of the verb used in the question can occur in the answer:

(49) \textit{Kwaka-nuku du-sape-nihka? Duha ma-sape-kade-ka.}

\begin{align*}
\text{what-TOP.NON.A/S} & \quad \text{3SGF-speak-PAS.VIS.INT} \quad \text{she} \\
\text{NEG-speak-NEG-REC.PAS.VIS} & \quad \text{‘What did she say? Nothing (lit. she did not say).’}
\end{align*}

Both techniques are shared with Tucano (see Aikhenvald 2002:135). No other Arawak language of the area has such pattern of negative response. This suggests that it is likely to result from areal diffusion.

If a question is asked in a negative form, a negative answer will be given to confirm the negation, as in (50). Here, \textit{ne} is also used as an emphatic negative response ‘no! not at all’:

(50) \textit{Tupialinuma-peni ma-nu-kade-nihka? Ne!}

\begin{align*}
\text{Periquitos-PL:ANIM} & \quad \text{3PL-come-PAS.VIS.INT} \quad \text{NEG} \\
\text{‘Have the people from Periquitos not arrived? Not at all!’}
\end{align*}

A positive answer would be:

(51) \textit{Na-nu-ka-sita.}

\begin{align*}
\text{3PL-come-REC.PAS.VIS-COMP} & \quad \text{‘They have arrived indeed.’}
\end{align*}

These techniques are also shared with Tucano.

A negative interjection \textit{aha} can be used as a negative response. Kumandene Tariana have a corresponding form \textit{a’a} while the Hohôdene Baniwa use \textit{ohô}
Negation in Tariana

Interestingly, the Tariana refer to the Baniwa as Ūhũ-nawiki (literally, people of Ūhũ) thus using the negative response in the exonym for the people.

8 Negation across Time and Space: The Dialects of Tariana, Past and Present

Tariana used to be a continuum of numerous dialects (one for each of several hierarchically organized clans: see Aikhenvald 2003, for a discussion). The major dialect still actively spoken is that of the Wamiarikune, traditionally one of the lowest ranking clans.8 The outline of negation presented this far reflects the variety of Wamiarikune of Santa Rosa as spoken nowadays. A combination of a suffix and a prefix widely used for negating prefixed verbs in Tariana is rather unusual in the context of other North Arawak languages (see section 9.1). This pattern is by no means pervasive in other dialectal varieties.

The dialect of Periquitos has the same set of negative forms and patterns used in that of Santa Rosa.9 In addition, there is a form of emphatic verbal negation 'not at all, really not' marked just with the suffix -maka, without replacing the cross-referencing prefixes with the negative prefix ma-, e.g. wa-kwisa-kamaka-nuka (1PL-scold-DECL-NEG-PRES.VIS) 'we are not at all scolding'; hanipamaka (big+CL:OPEN.SPACE-NEG) 'not much at all'.

In the Kumandene of Tariana, the suffix -kade or -de is the only means of marking negation on verbs of all types, e.g. Kumandene li-nu-kade (3SGNF-come-NEG), Santa Rosa ma-nu-kade (NEG-come-NEG) 'he does not come'. The future negator is -katse, e.g. nu-ma-katse (1SG-sleep-NEG.FUT) 'I won't sleep'. The prefix ma- does not occur on inflected verbs as a declarative negator. This is also the case in an archaic variety of Tariana spoken by Maria Sánchez, the wife of the late Cândido Brito.10

---

8 A comparison between various dialects suggests that the linguistic diversity within the Tariana continuum was comparable to the differences between various dialects of Portuguese, Spanish and Galician. The variety of Periquitos, also from the Wamiarikune, is mutually intelligible with that of Santa Rosa. In contrast, the variety of Santa Terezinha is not.

9 In the Periquitos variety, the morpheme -kade/-kede sometimes behaves as a floating clitic: for instance, in complex predicates of a 'quasi-serial verb construction' type (as in (9) above) the negation goes onto the subordinator, e.g. ne-kwe-kede di-ni di-yeka (NEG-how-NEG 3SGNF-do 3SGNF-can/be.able) 'he did not know what to do'.

10 Maria Sánchez is eighty-six years old, and highly proficient in Tariana. She was born in
The Kumandene Tariana of Santa Terezinha use the negator -de or -kade on nominal constituents, including indefinite-interrogative pronouns, which can be negated without negating the predicate, e.g. kwaka ‘what, something’, kwaka-de ‘nothing’. The same strategy is used for prohibitives and for declarative negative constructions. The language is heavily influenced by Hohôdene Baniwa; as a consequence most speakers also use negative particles ŋa and ŋame with positive verb forms in declarative negation (details are in Aikhenvald).

Negation expressed just with the suffix -kade appears to be a feature of two now extinct dialects, the Phiikawape (formerly spoken in the village of Dom Bosco, and Kabana (Kwenaka), and the Kabana (formely spoken in Itaiaçu), partially described in Giacone (1962), an eclectic sketch grammar based on a mixture of dialects. Negative forms are marked just with the suffix -kade (without prefix ma-), e.g. nohá nu-páni-kade (1sg-work-NEG) (Giacone 1962: 39) ‘I do not work’.

The Tariana language was first recorded by Johannes Natterer, who collected a relatively short list of words and sentences in 1831 (cf. Aikhenvald 2003: 18). The recorded variety, that of Ipanoré, is no longer spoken. A negative sentence (Item 97) translated as ‘no’ (Nein), contains a negative verb manakété, most likely the equivalent of the Santa Rosa Tariana ma-na-kade (NEG-want-NEG) ‘(I/you, etc.) do(es) not want’. Another remarkable feature of manakété is vowel assimilation in the negator whose alternative realization is -kade. Such assimilation is a feature of innovative speakers of the Wamiarikune dialect of Santa Rosa, and can be attributed to the influence of Tucano phonology. That such a form was attested by Natterer shows that the vowel assimilation process could be of considerable antiquity.

The second oldest source on Tariana is a word list recorded by Coudreau (1886: 474–476). It is not clear which Tariana dialect this comes from. The positive pair in the source is Nunámá ‘I want’ (‘Eu quero’ in the original) versus Nunàcademá ‘I don’t want’ (‘Não quero’). The morpheme-per-morpheme breakdown is most likely as follows:

(52) Coudreau: nunamá nunàcademá
   Analysis: nu-na-mha nu-na-kade-mha
   Gloss: 1sg-want-pres.vis 1sg-want-NEG-pres.vis
          ‘I want’ ‘I don’t want’

Teresita (Colombia). Her father was a Piratapuya; therefore she also counts as an ethnic Piratapuya. Her mother was Tariana.
The negative form contains just the negative suffix -kade and no negative prefix. The person distinctions are not neutralized.


All the dialects of Tariana (except the Kumandene dialect) employ a particle for negating commands. Its form varies: in the Periquitos variety the form corresponding to the Santa Rosa form mhaïda ‘prohibitive’ (section 4) is mhene. In his grammar sketch, Giacone (1962: 42) recorded prohibitive maánika. This same form appears in the sample sentences (p. 60), followed by an alternative form mehéna. According to Eliseu, Marino and Jorge Muniz, this was his rendering of the Periquitos mhene supplied by Marino’s uncle Anibal Muniz during the revision of the grammar in 1959.

We now turn to the etymology of Tariana negative markers, and the problem of the Tucanoan impact on Tariana negation.

9 Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance in Tariana Negation

Table 2 summarizes various techniques of marking negation in the extant varieties of Tariana. To streamline the presentation, inherently negative lexemes with an overt negator (section 6) have not been included in this Table. We then compare negation in Tariana with related languages (section 9.1), before focusing on the impact of East Tucanoan languages (section 9.2).

9.1 Negation in Tariana, and in Related Languages

Tariana forms a genetic subgroup with the Baniwa of Içana-Kurripako dialect continuum, Piapoco, Resigaro and Guarequena (see Aikhenvald 2001, 2003). Subgrouping of other Arawak languages north of the Amazon requires further investigation.

Negation markers in North Arawak languages of the Upper Rio Negro and surrounding areas are given in Table 3 in the Appendix, organized by type of morpheme—whether a prefix, a suffix, an independent particle or a combination of these. Unlike in other language families of the world, where negation can be a stable feature across the family, negation marking in Arawak

---

11 Shared vocabulary percentages between North Arawak languages (based on 100 and then 300 word counts) are discussed in Aikhenvald (2001) and (2002), alongside difficulties with reconstructing Proto-North-Arawak.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tariana dialect</th>
<th>Declarative non-future clause</th>
<th>Declarative future clause</th>
<th>Existential and possessive clause</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Derivational negation, inherently negative forms and particles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wamiarikune of Santa Rosa and Periquitos</td>
<td>prefixed verbs</td>
<td>prefixed verbs</td>
<td>prefixed verbs</td>
<td>prefixless verbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Terezinha variety</td>
<td>-de (also used in constituent negation)</td>
<td>-katse</td>
<td>tsede</td>
<td>-de</td>
<td>ma- ‘derivational negation’ ne ‘emphatic and constituent negation’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
languages varies, even between very close and mutually intelligible varieties. This can be seen from a comparison of negation in Baniwa of Guainia, Yavitero and Warekena of Xié—which are mutually intelligible, but differ in their negation marking.

The varieties of Baniwa of Íçana-Kurripako dialect continuum also vary in the ways they mark negation. This is so much so that dialectal varieties are usually identified by the way of marking negation: Oho-karro Kurripako are those who use oho for ‘yes’ and karro for ‘no’, and Oho-ña.me are those who say oho for ‘yes’ and ña.me for ‘no’ (Granadillo, this volume). The term Kurripako translates as ‘it is said Kurri’ (where kurri is a negator), and Karutana is a way of referring to a dialect where the negator is karu (or kazu).

A comparison between Tariana (see Table 3 in the Appendix) and other North Arawak languages of the area show how different the Tariana patterns and forms are from those in related languages, even the closest ones.

Just like most of its Arawak relatives, Tariana preserves the negative prefix ma- (see Aikhenvald 2002: 291) synchronically used for derivational and nominal negation. Table 3 shows that ma- is used in all the languages as a derivational device. Languages vary as to its productivity (for instance, in Warekena of Xié and in its dialects, Baniwa of Guainia and the now extinct Yavitero it is not fully productive). In some, but not others, ma- is used to derive negative verbs (as in Resígaro).

A major structural feature Tariana shares with many other Arawak languages is different markers for negating declarative and imperative clauses.

Some Tariana dialects have a rather unusual pattern of discontinuous negation (non-future ma-...-kade for prefixed verbs and -kade for prefixless verbs and other predicates; and future negation ma-...-kasu). Other varieties employ just the suffix -kade ‘non-future negative’ and -kásu ‘future negative’. It appears, from the analysis of older sources and archaic varieties of Tariana (see section 8) that both patterns are of considerable antiquity.

Neither pattern is widespread in any of the Arawak languages of the area. The Tariana negative suffix -kade/-kásu does not appear to have any straightforward cognates in Arawak languages. Piapoco, Yawarete-Tapuya, Baniwa Hohôdene and Siuci, and Kurripako varieties all have a negator containing a velar -k-, cf. Piapoco càmi-ta ‘declarative negator’ (the emphatic suffix -ta is also found in Tariana), Yawarete-Tapuya kazu ‘negator of subordinate clauses’ (Garcia Salazar 1991), Oho-karro Kurripako karro, occasionally contracted to ka (Granadillo, p.c. and this volume; an overview in Bezerra 2005, 2012), Baniwa Hohôdene kazu ‘clause negator’ (Taylor 1991: 75, own data). The declarative negator in modern Achagua is hoka (Wilson 1992, Meléndez Lozano 1989). A grammatical sketch by Neira and Ribeiro (1762) contains a number of seemingly inde-
ependent words translated as a negator (Spanish no), all with a velar k (coacayo, coquetaya, cui, cuimi ‘no’, queniu ‘there is not’ (no hay)). A negator containing a voiceless velar is found in other Arawak languages north of the Amazon, e.g. Palikur ka- ‘prohibitive’, ka-Inflected verb- ma ‘negative imperative’ (Green & Green 1972, Diana Green p.c.).

Person, number and gender distinctions are neutralized in Tariana declarative clauses (in the Santa Rosa variety) and in prohibitive clauses in Baniwa of Ícana-Kurripako continuum. This can be considered an independent innovation of the Tariana-Baniwa of Ícana-Kurripako not shared by any other North Arawak languages.

The segmental form and the morphological status of the prohibitive marker in Tariana is consistent across all dialects. The prohibitive particle mhaĩda is suspiciously similar to the particle mainda in Bahwana, used both as a declarative and as a prohibitive negator. The only existing grammar of Bahwana, by Ramirez (1992), was based on working with a somewhat obsolescent last speaker (who subsequently passed away), from the area of Middle Rio Negro (township of Santa Isabel do Rio Negro). Historically, it appears that Bahwana was spoken in the Middle Rio Negro area, a fair way away from the Middle Vaupés River Basin where the Tariana live now. However, the migration stories of the Wamiarikun show that at least some of their groups passed through the regions of the Japurá-Caquetá Rivers on their way to the Middle Vaupés and thus may have been in contact with the Bahwana. This, however, is nothing but speculation.

The origins of the negative copula sede ‘not exist, not have’ and of the inherently negative form hâida ‘I don’t know’ are equally obscure. The inherently negative kuripua ‘(there is) nothing, not at all’ is likely to contain a cognate of declarative negator kurri found a number of Kurripako varieties (Granadillo, this volume, Bezerra 2005, 2012, Valadares 1993). And we saw in section 6, the inherently negative command in Tariana, makuya ‘shut up!’ is likely to be a borrowing from a dialect of Baniwa of Ícana.

The emphatic ne in Tariana remains a puzzle. A number of North Arawak languages have a negative particle containing a nasal. These include Resigaro niú, nîkó, nîkhâmí ‘declarative negator’ (Allin 1976), Yucuna -niña/-niño

---

12 Kaišana, formerly spoken in the Middle Rio Negro area (Hanke 1960) appears to have had a negator with a velar consonant, eka ‘there is not, not have’ (Stefan Dienst, fieldnotes based on work with a rememberer of the language).

13 There are also partial segmental similarities with Resigaro prohibitive =maʔu, =má, -ma, and with Wapishana manaa (not included in Table 3).
‘prohibitive’, Bare *hena* ‘declarative negator’, and nasal formatives in Guarequena *nalé* ‘declarative negator’, Ehe Khenim Kurripako *khenim* or *ken*, Achagua (of 1761) *queniu* ‘there is not’. But this evidence is plainly not enough to establish cognacy.\(^{14}\)

Interestingly, Hup, a Makú language, has a particle marking ‘reinforced’ negation (Epps 2008: 736–737), *nœ́*, a borrowing from Tucano, identified as such by the speakers themselves. We saw in section 6 that the ways in which the particle *ne* is used in Tariana bear the impact of Tucano influence. Whether or not the particle itself is a Tucano borrowing remains an open question. No speaker of Tariana considers it a loan from Tucano.

### 9.2 The Impact of Language Contact on Tariana Negation

Negation in Tariana is marked rather differently from East Tucanoan languages. The predicate negator in East Tucanoan is a suffix, e.g. Tucano *-ti*, Desano *-biri*, Wanano *-era*, Tuyuca *-ri*. Another suffix occurs in negative imperatives, e.g. Tucano *baa-tika-ya* (do-proh-imp), Desano *ba-biri-kā-ke* (eat-NEG-proh-imp) ‘do not eat’.

There are no negative forms borrowed from any Tucanoan language (the only possible candidate could be the negative *ne*: see previous section). This is consistent with the major feature of the Vaupés River Basin linguistic area characterized by diffusion of patterns and not of segmental forms.

The development of suffixed negation in Tariana could have partially resulted from East Tucanoan influence, since—as we saw in the previous section—it is rarely found in other Arawak languages of the area.

We saw in section 6 that the ‘double negative’ construction in Tariana must have been developed under East Tucanoan influence. The patterns of negative response in Tariana discussed in section 7 also have a distinctly Tucanoan ‘feel’ to them. Further instances of East Tucanoan influence lie in (A) the development of different forms for marking future and non-future declarative negation; (B) the development of additional inherently negative verb stems, calquing those found in East Tucanoan; and (C) the development of two negative futures.

#### A Different Forms for Marking Future and Non-Future Negation

Many East Tucanoan languages have different marking for future and non-future declarative negation, e.g. Tucano *-ti* ‘declarative negator’, *-so-me* ‘future

\(^{14}\) Stefan Dienst, who worked with the last rememberer of Kaišana, recorded the form *enej* meaning ‘not exist, not have’.
negator’, Wanano --era- ‘non-future declarative’, -si ‘future negative’, Desano -biri/-bi ‘declarative negator’, future negator -sôbê (Ramirez 1997, Waltz 1976, Stenzel 2004, Miller 1999: 136). This distinction is absent from all the Arawak languages of the area—which makes it likely that the distinction in Tariana is the result of calquing from an East Tucanoan source.

B Development of Numerous Inherently Negative Verb Stems
Unlike other Arawak languages, Tariana has a number of inherently negative stems. These have an exact semantic equivalent in East Tucanoan languages; cf. Tucano ūûba’, Tariana hâida ‘I don’t know’; Tucano mari, Tariana sede ‘not exist’. The development may have been enhanced by the presence of an inherently negative stem with this same meaning in a contact language.

C Development of Two Negative Futures
We saw, in section 3.2, that Tariana has two negative futures: the deontic -kade-mhade and the negative future -kásu. This distinction is reminiscent of Tucano (Aikhenvald 2002: 134) and may have developed in Tariana, as a result of intensive language contact. The negative future is exemplified in (53) and (54):

Tucano (Ramirez 1997: 166)

(53) Apê-some.
    play-NEG.FUT
    ‘(I/you/he/she etc.) won’t play.’

Tariana

(54) Ma-manika-kasu.
    NEG-play-NEG.FUT
    ‘(I/you/he/she, etc.) won’t play.’

The deontic future is illustrated in (55) and (56) (also see (20) and (21)):

Tucano (Ramirez 1997: 166)

(55) Apê-ti-gô-sa-mi.
    play-NEG-M-FUT-3SGNF
    ‘(He) must not play.’
Tariana

(56) Ma-manika-kade-mhade.

\text{NEG-play-NEG-FUT}

‘(He) must not play.’

9.3 To Conclude

We conclude that contact-induced morphological innovations in Tariana negation involve the development of a number of new forms, and new distinctions, following the East Tucanoan patterns. Areal diffusion contributes to the increase in overall complexity of the Tariana negation system, which shares only a few features with closely related languages.

All varieties of Tariana are characterised by the presence of a suffixed negator in declarative clauses, and the negative prefix \textit{ma}- in its derivational function (used with nouns and adjectives). Whether or not the negative prefix \textit{ma}- in declarative negative clauses found in the Wamairikune dialect is an innovation or an archaism remains an open question.
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## Appendix I

**TABLE 3**  
*Negation in North Arawak languages of the Upper Rio Negro and adjacent areas (arranged by type of morphemes marking negation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefix</td>
<td>Bare</td>
<td><em>ma-</em></td>
<td>privative forms of possessed nouns; verbs with inherently negative meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warekena of Xié</td>
<td><em>ma-</em></td>
<td>derivational prefix in a few verbs with inherently negative meanings; <em>ma-tse</em> 'lest'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yavitero</td>
<td><em>ma-</em></td>
<td>privative adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piapoco</td>
<td><em>ma-</em></td>
<td>privative prefix on adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achagua 1</td>
<td><em>ma-</em></td>
<td>negative adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achagua 1</td>
<td><em>o-2person-verb</em></td>
<td>negative imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bahwana</td>
<td><em>ma-</em></td>
<td>privative derivational marker (productive with adjectives, verbs, nouns and classifiers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako</td>
<td><em>ma-</em></td>
<td>privative derivational prefix with verbs and adjectives; prohibitive with verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guarequena</td>
<td><em>ma-</em></td>
<td>privative derivational prefix with verbs, nouns and adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resígaro</td>
<td><em>ma-</em></td>
<td>privative marker on verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particle/clitic/</td>
<td>Bare</td>
<td>hena, ne</td>
<td>negative response 'no'; negator in subordinate clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emphatic negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warekena of Xié</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>yahã</td>
<td>emphatic negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>negative response 'no'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavitero</td>
<td>hâta</td>
<td>hinta</td>
<td>declarative negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prohibitive negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piapoco</td>
<td>câmi-ta</td>
<td></td>
<td>declarative negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accompanied by -ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'emphatic'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achagua 1</td>
<td>hôka</td>
<td></td>
<td>declarative negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achagua 2</td>
<td>coacao, coacaya, coaquetaya, cuicuími, queniu</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘no’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘there is not’ ('no hay')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahwana</td>
<td>mainda</td>
<td></td>
<td>declarative and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prohibitive negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baniwa Hohŏdene Baniwa Siuci,</td>
<td>ſa, ſame (kažu)</td>
<td></td>
<td>declarative negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yawarete Tapuya, Kumandene/Ayanene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aha Kurri Kurripako</td>
<td>kurri contracted to ku</td>
<td></td>
<td>declarative negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehe-Khenim Kurripako</td>
<td>khenim, contracted to khen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohó-karro Kurripako</td>
<td>karro, contracted to ka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohó-ſame Kurripako</td>
<td>ſame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarequena</td>
<td>nalé</td>
<td></td>
<td>declarative negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pjéma</td>
<td></td>
<td>negator in clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-pidá-</td>
<td></td>
<td>expressing suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resígaro</td>
<td>nií, niíkó, niíkhámí</td>
<td></td>
<td>declarative negator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Negation in North Arawak languages of the Upper Rio Negro and adjacent areas (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suffix</strong></td>
<td>Yucuna</td>
<td>-niña/-niño</td>
<td>negative imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enclitic</strong></td>
<td>Resígaro</td>
<td>=ma/-má/-mar</td>
<td>prohibitive****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double marking:</strong></td>
<td>Bare</td>
<td>ba-Person-Root-ka</td>
<td>negative imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>prefix and suffix</strong></td>
<td>Baniwa of Içana/Kurripako</td>
<td>ma-VERB.ROOT-tsa**</td>
<td>negative imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double marking:</strong></td>
<td>Yucuna</td>
<td>unká Person-Root-ke</td>
<td>declarative negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>particle/clitic and suffix</strong></td>
<td>unká Person-Root-la</td>
<td>declarative negation (imperfective)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bare</strong></td>
<td>hena Person-Root-waka</td>
<td>declarative negation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double marking:</strong></td>
<td>Yucuna</td>
<td>unká NOMINAL kávé</td>
<td>non-verbal predicative negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>particles/clitics</strong></td>
<td>Warekena of Xié</td>
<td>ya=Person-Root=pia</td>
<td>declarative negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baniwa of Guainia</strong></td>
<td>ya=Person-Root=pià</td>
<td>da=Person-Root-pià</td>
<td>declarative negation prohibitive*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complex predicate</strong></td>
<td>Warekena of Xié</td>
<td>pida pi-VERB (2SG+see 2SG-VERB)</td>
<td>negative imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piapoco</strong></td>
<td>picá 2SG-VERB*</td>
<td></td>
<td>negative imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inherently negative forms (selection)</strong>*</td>
<td>Bare</td>
<td>bed’a-waka; ind’awaka</td>
<td>‘nothing’ (negative meaning on their own)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warekena of Xié</strong></td>
<td>beneji (bena-i’i)</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘nothing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piapoco</strong></td>
<td>caná</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘there is none’ (accompanied by affixes and clitics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achagua 1</strong></td>
<td>hiní</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘nothing, no-one’, ‘negative existential’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes to Table 3

*  *picà* can be interpreted as a grammaticalized form for meaning ‘2sg-see’ (cf. Piapoco root *icaca* ‘see’, Tariana *ka* ‘see’). The structural patterns of marking negation share some structural similarities. In Piapoco and in Warekena, the prohibitive construction probably goes back to ‘2person+see’ (Piapoco *pi-ca*, Warekena *pida*, from *pi-eda*).

**  The form of the suffix is *-tsa* in Aha-Kurripako (Granadillo 2006: 81), in Baniwa Hohódene (Taylor 1991: 49–50; my own fieldwork), and *-tʃa* in Kumandene/Ayanene (Valadares 1993). The form *-ya* is said to be used in the Baniwa variety in contact with the Tariana.

***  Just a selection of inherently negative forms is included here. Transparent forms, such as Guarequena *nale+ikáka* (neg.be.seen) ‘not exist’ (González-Ñáñez 1997: 102) are not included.

****  In Resígaro prohibitive is a suffix to the verb, possibly under the influence of Bora (see Aikhenvald 2001).

*****  In the absence of a full grammar of Baniwa of Guainia, it is impossible to make an informed decision about the status of *ya*, *da* - and *pià* as affixes or clitics. Their syntactic behaviour in the few examples given by the authors points towards their status as clitics, just like in Warekena of Xié (which can be considered a dialect of Baniwa of Guainia). Mosonyi et al. (2000: 209) considers *ya* a ‘particle’ and *-pià* a suffix (but no arguments are given).

### Appendix II: Sources on North Arawak Languages Included in Table 3

Achagua 2: Neira and Ribeiro (1762)
Bahwana: Ramírez (1992: 60–61)
Baniwa Siuci: Ramírez (2001), own fieldwork
Aha-Kurri Kurripako: Granadillo (2006)
Oho-Karro Kurripako: Granadillo (2006), this volume
Oho-Ñame Kurripako: Granadillo (2006), this volume
Kumandene/Ayanene Kurripako: Valadares (1993)
Yawareté-Tapuya (Baniwa of Içana): Garcia Salazar (1991)
Bare: Aikhenvald (1995, ms-a), Lopez Sanz (1972)
Resígaro: Allin (1976: 143, 216, 481)
Warekena of Xié: Aikhenvald (1998, ms-b)
Yavitero: Mosonyi (1987: 59)