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0 Introduction

Chinook Jargon (CJ) is a pidgin that arose out of contact of several American Indian languages of Oregon around the beginning of the 19th century (Thomason 1983, Hajda, Zenk and Boyd 1988). It was widely used as a lingua franca in the course of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century in Oregon, Washington, British Columbia and southern Alaska in Indian-Indian and white-Indian communication.

The purpose of this paper is to lay out the syntactic properties of sentential negation in CJ. It specifically addresses the issue of the positioning of the negative marker, its categorial status and the relationship of the negative marker with negative NPs within the clause. Subsequently, these features are compared to the characteristics of sentential negation in the source languages, in particular, Lower Chinook (Chinookan) and Chehalis (Salishan) which are chosen as most relevant models. It is concluded that the negative construction and negative words in CJ and the two source languages have close structural parallels, suggesting that properties of negation in the pidgin could be explained as contact influence. The paper ends with short preliminary suggestions on how these findings about syntax of CJ reflect on the process of pidgin/creole genesis and the issue of linguistic constraints on contact influence.

1 Syntactic properties of CJ sentential negation

1.1 Positioning of the negative marker

The examples in (1) below show that the negative marker Weak precedes the pronominal subject which is in turn followed by the verb and the object (in 1a), or the non-verbal predicate (in 1b). This word order has no exception, i.e., there are no examples in the data where the negative marker Weak follows the pronominal subject.

(1) a. Pi weak msika nanich yaka?
   and NEG 1pl see 3sg
   'And we didn't see him.'

   b. Weak yaka kwash
   NEG 3sg afraid
   'He was not afraid.'

   Examples in (2) below show that the same word order holds for embedded sentences. In (2a) Weak is followed by a pronominal subject which is in turn followed by the verbal predicate. In (2b) the negative marker is followed by a pronominal subject and a non-verbal predicate.

(2) a. Ilaa ala yaka m moments manta pu weak msika kopat m moments machi
   what now 1sg make PREP 2pl C NEG 2pl finish make sin
   'What did he do to you so that you do not stop doing bad things?'

   b. Tiaa msika kwenseem ilaa nanich pu weak msika taspe.
   good 2pl always good see C NEG 2pl mistaken
   'You should always watch that you are not mistaken.'

   The fact that pronominal subjects are outside the VP is confirmed in (3) below where the pronominal subject is separated from the verb by a VP-adverb (in bold).

(3) Weak kata msika ayak kul
   NEG how 1pl fast go
   'We couldn't go fast.'

   Based on the data presented in (1), (2) and (3), word order pattern for both matrix and embedded clauses containing pronominal subjects is as in (4) below.

(4) (C) NEG S_nom (Adverb) V (O) AP

2 The syntactic analysis of CJ negation is based on a corpus of texts that I have compiled, transcribed from Duployan shorthand and translated. The texts were originally published in a publication Klamath Wawa at the turn of the century in British Columbia (see Vrzić 1999, Vrzić forthcoming).

3 The following abbreviations will be used in glossing the examples and in the text:

1sg, etc. 'first person singular'
1pl, etc. 'first person plural'
NEG 'negation'
C 'complementizer'
PREP 'preposition'
DEM 'demonstrative'
S_nom 'nominal subject'
S_mid 'pronominal subject'
Mpc 'modal particle'
Qppl 'question particle'
Examples including nominal subjects are discussed next. Note that a nominal subject, either precedes or follows the negative marker wek as in (5a) and (5b) respectively.  

(5)  
a. [Kopet the Now kanamokst yaka (t)amans] wek memlus  
only one Noah with 1sg child NEG die  
'Noah alone, and his children didn't die.'  
b. Pi wek [ST mash kombaks Nae]  
but NEG God leave know Noah  
'But God didn't forget Noah.'  

This is also holds for nominal subjects in embedded sentences: in (6a) the nominal subject follows wek and in (6b) the nominal subject precedes it.  

(6)  
a. Yaka momak midilat ith lekbach kapa ukuk then elae yaka parte pus wek  
be make stay one angel PREP DEM good land 3sg door C NEG  
[Adam pi Ev] wekii kilapai kopa yaka  
Adam and Eve again return PREP 1sg  
'The angel set the Heaven's door so that Adam and Eve don't return to it again.'  
b. Awt naa lele momak pus [matsach] wek tolo naika  
much 1sg make C NEG win 1sg  
'I try hard so that sin does not win over me.'  

Like pronominal subjects (see (3) above), the nominal subject following wek can be separated from the verb by an adverb. One example of this is (6a) above where the adverb wek 'again' is given in bold. Another example follows in (7) below where the subject NP is separated from the verb by the adverb dilet (in bold).  

(7)  
Yaka ukuk pus wek ST dilet mas naika  
3sg DEM C NEG God truly leave 1pl  
'This is so because God didn't truly abandon us.'  

If the nominal subject is accompanied by a pleonastic pronominal subject1, the nominal subject precedes wek as shown in (8a) containing a verbal predicate, and in (8b), which has a non-verbal predicate.  

(8)  
a. Pi [Mak] wek yaka lole yaka kiitam klaasaka laink kapa yaka lema  
but Mike NEG 3ps carry 1sg horse 3ps reins PREP 1sg hands  
b. Wek wek kasitih wek kita (weh) elo  

4 There were 109 negative sentences with negative marker wek in the corpus. This is the distribution relative to the subject type:  

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
S_{wek} & NP \ S_{wek} & NP \\
56 & 2 & 11
\end{array}
\]

The total number of negative sentences is 181, with 13 out of those involving a negative adverb wek kasitih (weh) 'never (again)', 46 a negative 1 modal particle wek kita (weh), and 13 another negative marker elo that will not be discussed in this paper. The following table summarizes this:  

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{wek} & \text{wek kasitih} & \text{wek kita (weh)} \\
109 & 13 & 46 \\
\end{array}
\]

5 Pleonastic subjects have been claimed to be quite common in the Oregon variety of CI (see Jacobs 1936, Thomason 1981, Zenk 1984). This feature is less dramatically present in the British Columbia variety under consideration here (see Vrzic 1999). Only a couple examples exist of pleonastic subjects in negative clauses, see note 4 above.  

(9)  
NEG S_{wek} Predicate  
NEG S_{wek} Predicate  
NEG S_{wek} Predicate  
NEG S_{wek} Predicate  

NEG S_{wek} Predicate  

The positioning of the adverb with respect to the pronominal subjects (which always follow the negative marker wek) and the nominal subjects (when they follow wek) shows that the position of overt subjects in CI is outside of VP (see examples (6a) and (7) above), presumably, in the canonical surface position of derived subjects—Spec of AgrSP (see Chomsky 1993). It follows that the negative marker wek is in a pre-IP position, more precisely, in a position between the left edge of the AgrSP and the position of the complementizer pus, presumably CP. This is schematized in (10) below.  

(10)  
[cp pus [wek [S_{wek} S_{wek}]] [Adv [vp ...]]]  

It follows that when the (nominal) subject precedes wek, as in (5a), (6b), and (8a, b) above, it must be in the Spec of one of the functional projections of the CP. Assuming the expanded, articulated structure of the CP proposed recently by Rizzi (1997:297), see schema (11) below, these nominal subjects could be in either a Top(ic)P(hrase) or in a Focus(ic)P(hrase).  

(11)  
[ForceP Top*P FocP Top*P FinP [w ...]]  

Expanded CP

With the usual syntactic facts about topic and focus NPs in mind (see Rizzi 1997, and references within), the topic analysis is plausible for examples in which a nominal subject is combined with a pleonastic pronominal subject (as in (8a,b)), and the focus analysis may be applicable to the proposed nominal subjects not followed by pleonastic pronouns (as in (5a)).  

6 While this paper will not discuss such structures, note that the topic and focus analysis of the nominals preceding wek seems plausible. The interpretation of the nominal subjects followed by pleonastic pronominal subjects such as in (8a) may be indeed related to the change in discourse topic.  

On the other hand, the proposed subject nominals (without pleonastic subjects) are likely to be focused NPs. The possibility of such analysis of the variation between the two patterns repeated in (i) below is desirable since it promises to explain an alternation that would otherwise remain an unexplained variation.  

(i)  
a. S_{wek}(week) S_{wek} V (O)  
b. S_{wek}(week) V (O)  

The plausibility of this analysis is illustrated in the following example from the Bible History (K.W. III 9:154). The relevant sentence involving NP proposed for focus is in italics.  

ii. Kakwa kanawe telikom memlus kanamokst kanawwe hloima mawich: ber, [...], kanawe kalakala pi kanawe ikiti kula kopa ukuk elehe.  

Kopet the Now kanamokst yaka tanas wek memlus pi kanawe ikita midilat kapa yaka ayas knim wek memlus.
1.2. The categorial status of the negative marker wek

The discussion in 1.1. did not touch on the issue of the categorial status of wek. Namely, wek could be an adverb or an adverbial particle in an adjoined position, or it could be a functional element with its own projection, NegP. In the latter case, the issue is also whether wek is a head or a specifier of this projection. Each of these issues is taken up in the following discussion.

Since wek in CJ has a fixed position as discussed in 1.1., it seems justified to consider wek a particle, i.e. a free functional element within its own projection, rather than an adverb adjoining to other phrases. While the position of most adverbs in CJ is quite fixed, for instance, temporal adverbs (e.g., alta 'now', alke 'later, after', ankanle 'earlier, before') mostly precede the IP; these adverbs can also come in sentence-final position, or sentence-medially (i.e., between the subject and the verb). No such variation in the positioning of the negative marker wek is found, supporting the claim that wek has its own projection NegP. Such representation of negative particles in unsurprising and has become very common for many non-p/c languages since Pollock’s (1989) article on English and French word order. Other possible consequences of this assumption relative to CJ will be discussed later in this section.

Regarding the position of NegP, the facts discussed in 1.1. suggest that it is a functional category (FC) immediately dominating the IP, within the expanded CP (see [11] above). 1. Wek, therefore, is an element that has a complementizer-like status in CJ. This property of CJ negation is not unusual. There is ample evidence for the presence of negative constituents in this position in the clausal structure coming from the analysis of non-p/c languages (e.g., Latin, Celtic, Basque).4 Rizzi (1997) does not specifically address the issue of negation perhaps, because languages he discusses (mainly Italian) have IP-internal negation. He does mention, importantly, that negation, like mood, agreement, or tense, is one of the syntactic features, normally associated with and expressed within the IP-system, that can be “replicated” (i.e., also expressed, often redundantly) in the complementizer system (usually using free morphemes, rather than affixation).

In summary, based on the discussion above, the interm CJ clausal structure proposed in (10) can be further refined as in (12) below. The CP-system in CJ consists (minimally) out of three functional projections, CP (in the narrow sense), optionally projecting TopP or FocP (there are no examples involving both at the same time, or several topics), and NegP.

(12) CJ clause structure with the expanded CP
[CP [NegP [TopP [FocP [NegP [Exp [wek [NP] [VP [Adv [wek ...]]]]]]]]]

1.3. Lack of negative concord in CJ

In this section two issues will be discussed—whether wek is a head or a specifier of NegP, and the related issue of whether CJ has negative concord. The latter question will be addressed first. Negative concord is a phenomenon which requires that in the presence of a sentential negative marker in a sentence all indefinite elements in the sentence also be marked as negative. Hence, negative concord is a kind of “agreement” process (see Zanuttini 1991). The interpretation of the sentence does not, however, reflect the occurrence of multiple negative items, rather it is a simple negative statement. For example, Croatian/Serbian, among many other languages, has negative concord, and, as the English translation of the sentence in (11) shows, the meaning in such cases is simple negation.

(11) Niko nik ada nije mita nikome rekao
nobody never hasn’t nothing nobody ever said

‘Nobody has ever said anything to anybody.’

Standard English, on the other hand, as obvious from the translation above, does not have negative concord, and only one negative item per negative sentence is allowed if the interpretation of the clause is to be indeed negative. If, however, two negative elements are present in a clause, they “cancel” each other out, and the interpretation of the sentence is positive. Hence, (14a) and (14b) have two very different interpretations, and the second type of negation is called double (or canceled) negation. 9

(14)

a. I didn’t see anything. = I saw nothing

b. I didn’t see nobody. = I saw somebody.

CJ seems to be a language of the English type, namely, it does not have negative concord. The presence of the sentential negative marker wek is in complementary distribution with the occurrence of negative indefinites (i.e., negative quantifiers like elo ‘skta ‘nothing’, elo klaka ‘nobody’, etc.), as shown in (15) in contrast to (16) below. 10

(15)

ea. Elo klakla mamak kopa ukuk semmok salt n

NEG anybody work on DEM seven day

‘Nobody works on the seventh day.’

b. Elo skta musachi niaka mumak

NEG nothing bad Isg make

‘I did nothing bad.’

c. Elo skta yuka eskom

NEG anything bad Isg take

‘He took nothing.’

In (15a,b,c) the presence of a negative quantifier insures that the interpretation of the sentence is a negative statement in the absence of the negative marker wek. In the examples in (16) there is a sentential negative marker wek instead, and the indefinite words show up in their positive form, and act as negative

There is a rich literature on the syntax of negation, see, e.g., Haegeman 1995 and Zanuttini 1997, and references given therein.

Several negative words use a different constituent negative marker — elo, e.g., elo skta, elo klakla, elo ayy. Used alone elo also means ‘none, nothing’, as in the idiomatic chako elo ‘become nothing, disappear’. In a few instances, elo also seems to be used to mark sentential negation, similar to wek as in (i).

(i) Kaka elo yaka mas pepa kupa maka

so NEG 3sg send paper PRP 2sg

‘So, he didn’t send a paper to you.’

The examples of negative sentences involving elo represent a small percentage of the total sample as noted earlier (see note 4). Most of these are occurrences of a negative indefinite like nobody and nothing. Note that elo in the function of a sentential negator is not known in Oregon CJ.
polarity items similar to *anybody, anything*, etc. in English.11

(16)

a. *Pi wek klara we wa ti ka le ka pa*
   and NEG 1p say anything PREP 3sg
   'And I didn't tell him anything.'

b. *Wek kata nsaka mawak ti ka*
   NEG anyhow 1p do anything
   'We couldn't do anything.'

c. *Wek kata wekt yaka stop kah*
   NEG anyhow again 3sg stop anywhere
   'Again, he couldn't stop anywhere.'

d. *Wek kata nsaka xalika kep keksta*
   NEG anyhow 1p angry PREP 3pl
   'I couldn't be angry with anybody.'

Having established that CJ does not have negative concord, the issue of whether wek is a head or a specifier of the NegP projection can be addressed. It has been proposed (Rizzi 1996 [1991], Zanuttini 1991, Haegeman and Zanuttini 1991 among others) that the behavior of negative elements can be likened to the behavior of wh-words. Namely, in one interpretation (proposed by Rizzi 1996 [1991], and further applied to NegP by Haegeman and Zanuttini 1991 [H&Z]), a wh phrase needs to enter into Spec-Head relation with a head carrying a [+wh] feature, and each wh-head must be in the Spec-Head relation with a wh-phrase. This condition on licensing of wh-phrases which assimilates the behavior of wh-phrases to referential NPs that move for agreement (expressed here informally, see Rizzi 1996 [1991] and H&Z for details) was named a WH-Criterion. This criterion was meant to provide a motivation for the occurrence of wh-movement and auxiliary raising/dominance in wh-questions in English. The WH-Criterion is taken to be satisfied at LF in the languages where wh-phrases occur in base-generated positions.

H&Z propose to extend the logic of this criterion to the behavior of negative words in languages with negative concord such as West Flemish. Hence, in West Flemish negative words (such as a negative object NP) must precede a negative marker in order for the sentence to be interpreted as a simple negative statement, see (17a) below. In contrast, (17b), where the negative word *niemand* has not been moved in front of *nie*, the reading is that of a double negative equivalent with the English translation.

(17)

a. *do Valere niemand nie kent*
   that Valere nobody not knows
   '... that Valere does not know anybody.'

b. *do Valere nie niemand kent*
   '... do Valere doesn't know nobody.'

Hence, H&Z propose that the negative word has moved into the Spec position of the NegP headed by *nie*, where it is licensed through Spec-Head agreement with the negative head and gets the interpretation of a negative polarity item. In this way, the negative constituent takes the same scope as the negative head, which enables the negative concord reading of the sentence (17a) (see H&Z and Haegeman 1993 for further details). Delgraff (1993:67), following Zanuttini (1991), applied this theory to Haitian in which negative sentences with two negative elements have a negative concord reading, as in (18).13

(18)

a. *Ptesnon pa vit*
   nobody pa come
   'Nobody has come.'

b. *kwen pas we ptesnon*
   1sg pa see nobody
   'I haven't seen anybody.'

He concludes from this that Haitian *pa* (unlike French *par* but like French *ne*) has a head status. Namely, if negative concord is a type of agreement process as proposed by Zanuttini (1991), then the negative indefinite needs to raise to the Spec of NegP either at S-structure or LF.14 If the Spec, NegP were filled with the negative marker (which would then be an XP, rather than a head), the raising of the negative word would be blocked, and negative concord in a language like Haitian impossible. Consequently, if the same logic is applied to CJ, the fact that it lacks negative concord, as illustrated in examples under (15) and (16) above, suggests that the negative marker *wek* is located in the Spec of NegP, and hence it is a phrasal, XP constituent. Following this and other conclusions, the structure of the CJ clause given in (12) above can be further refined as follows (irrelevant structure is omitted):

(19)

| (CP) |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |
| \   |

11 CJ negative polarity items, such as *klaka* 'anybody', *ikt* 'anything', *kah* 'anywhere', etc., are also used as interrogatives (*e.g. klaka*? 'who') and indefinites (*e.g. klaka* 'somebody').

12 The use of the marker *wek kata* instead of only *wek* in this and other examples will be discussed below.

13 Note that the negative properties of *ptesnon* are confirmed by the fact that it means 'nobody' in isolation.

14 Judging from the word order in (18b), the raising of the negative quantifier is covert, that is, it happens at LF in Haitian, unlike West Flemish, see (17).
Unlike English *never*, for instance, CJ *wek kanish (weh)* `never (again)` is always found in the position preceding the sequence of the subject and the VP, just like the negative marker *wek*. With regard to *wek kanish (weh)*, a few additional remarks are needed. As the English translation suggests (see 20c, d), *wek kanish* is not a only a negative operator, but also a marker of modality. Since the functional category containing the negative marker in CJ can also contain modal elements, I propose to relabel the NegP in CJ as a PolP.1 This change is noted in (21) below with only relevant structure represented.

Finally, a comment is due on the negative expressions *wek kanish pas* and *wek ilus pas* in (20g) the issue of their status and positioning remains open at this point. Since these elements precede the general adverbial complementizer *pas* `if when/in order to, etc.` they could either be base-generated in the Spec of CP, or alternatively and perhaps more likely, they are adverbial/adjectival predicates of a superordinate clause containing an empty expletive subject. While one can translate them by the use of modal verbs in English, e.g. *wek kanish pas*, `it is impossible that XY can be translated as "X couldn't", that by itself, of course, says nothing about their status in CJ. Moreover, their status as negative operators affecting the interpretation of indefinite NPs (in which case they couldn't be superordinate predicates) cannot be confirmed since no relevant examples (containing both *wek ilus pas* and *wek kanish pas* and a negative indefinite NP) can be found.

1.5. Positioning of negative indefinites in CJ
Zanutti (1994, also see 1997) proposes that negative markers can be base-generated in different positions in the clause in different languages, and that languages (can) have several functional categories related to negation. One of the positions, the highest in the structure of a clause and obligatorily dominating the TenseP, is labeled PolP by Zanutti (1994) (or NegP-1 in Zanutti 1997). PolP is a position to which the negative marker moves (either overtly or covertly, depending on the strength of PolP features) in order that scopal relations be interpreted. Zanutti (1997:11) further proposes a typology of negative marking according to which ‘NegP-1’ [i.e., PolP] has ‘strong’ features in the languages that express sentential negation by means of a pre-verbal negative marker which by itself can negate the clause, and ‘weak’ features in the languages that express sentential negation by means of a negative marker of another kind. *

CJ, having a single, pre-verbal negative marker, is expected to have a PolP with strong features according to Zanutti’s typology. The strong features of PolP need to be “checked off” through overt syntactic movement. This checking requirement seems to be trivially satisfied in CJ in negative sentences containing negative marker *wek* (or others mentioned in 1.4. above) because it is, as argued for above, base-generated in PolP. However, when negative indefinites are present in a CJ clause, because the pidgin does not have negative concord and negative indefinites function as negative quantifiers, i.e. operators, the existence of the sentential negative marker *wek* is precluded. In this case, the expectation that PolP has strong features that need to be checked overtly by an appropriate element is confirmed by a look at the positioning of negative quantifiers, in particular, objects. Object normally follow verbs in CJ. However, as shown in (22), the negative quantifier serving as an object is preposed, presumably, raised to Spec of PolP position in satisfaction of the checking requirements of the negative head. This then results in the unusual (OSV) word order (22)

* Elo iktu masachi naika mamuk /.
  NEG what bad thing Ipl do
  ‘I did nothing wrong.’

15 There is ample evidence for the existence of such a phrase (with either negative or modal properties) across languages. In addition to references mentioned earlier for negation, see also Durov’s work (1994), Rudin (1985a) and (1985b), Rivero (1994), among others, for its modal properties.
They examples in (22) above contrast with the closely parallel example given in (23) below where the negative marker wek is present and the positive indefinite NP object (i.e. the negative polarity item) ikra "anything" remains in its original position.16

(23) Pi wek klczca wawa ikra kupa yaka
And NEG 3pl say what PREP 3sg 'And they didn't tell him anything.'

In summary, a negative sentence with an indefinite NP object can be expressed in CJ either by a) preposing a negative quantifier eli ika (see (22)), or b) by using a negative polarity item ika in a sentence introduced by the negative marker wek (see (23)).

1.6. Summary of the section

Several syntactic properties of CJ negation have been established in this section. First, the negative marker wek is located in the pre-IP position in CJ, the position I label PoIP following much related work. CJ has no negative concord, and the negative marker wek is a Specifier of PoIP, the phrase it is generated in. CJ has other negative operators, e.g., wek konszth (wehth) and wek kata (weht), which are generated in the same position as wek. Both of these have the same distribution as wek alone. Wek kata also has an additional modal meaning. When wek (or other negative markers) are not present in the clause, the sentence can be negative by virtue of existence of a negative quantifier. This negative quantifier needs to raise overtly to check off the strong features of PoIP: when a negative quantifier is an object NP, this results in the non-canonical, non-SVO word order.

2. Negation in CJ source languages

2.0. In this section, basic properties of sentential negation found in two model source languages, Chinookan and Chehalis will be discussed. The positionalising of the negative marker in these languages can be made out with considerable certainty. As with regard to the other properties, since no detailed analyses are available, I can only suggest what these might be based on my own, cursory observations of the sources available. It should be noted that, in addition to the languages to be discussed here, Thomason (1983:355) gives examples from various other American Indian languages of the Pacific Northwest. She shows that all have "sentence-initial negatives" which can be either particles (e.g., Chinookan) or auxiliary verbs (e.g., Nootka).

2.1. Chinookan

In Lower Chinook the negation marker was nikit (neg[er] in Boas' (1910/11) spelling), a free morpheme. Boas classifies this negative marker as an adverb, and a particle, i.e. a non-inflected lexical form, see example (24a,b) below (p. 668).

(24) a. /] nikit/1/pb/aj[i]x.20
   not well someone
   makes him 'He is not made well.'

b. /] a'la nikit qara tla3g/aj[i]x.
   now not (any)how well someone
   makes him 'He cannot be made well at all.'

Boas does not discuss the properties of negation in Chinookan beyond this, including the structure (or function) of negative words in Chinookan. However, the example (24b) the negative operator nikit qara is made by combining the negative marker neg[er] with the question word qara\'t\'ix\'e' similar to CJ. In his discussion of Wichita (an Upper Chinook dialect), Dyk (1973) is equally brief on the negative particle(s). He mentions two of them—k'opa 'no' and naq\'i 'not', and gives the following example, see (25) below, where it is clear that the negative marker also precedes the V.

(25) 'K'opa, naq\'i a-m-d-a-x-a.
   'No, not thus you will do, make them.'20

2.2. Chehalis

As in Lower (and Upper) Chinook the negative particle precedes the verb and it occurs as the first element in a sentence or embedded clause' (Kinkade 1976:19), see (26a). There is some uncertainty with regard to the clause status of the negative marker. Kinkade (1963:345) classifies the Chehalis negative marker m\'ito among particles, the "only major morpheme class which does not have affixes". On the other hand, Thomason (1983) and Kinkade (p.c., 1999) note that the negative marker in all Salish languages, and in Chehalis specifically, is an intransitive verb with restricted inflectional properties. The negative marker is usually followed by a particular construction, a kind of nominalization,17 that is introduced by a prefix s- and can be preceded by indefinite particle z.21 Based on the examples found in Kinkade (1976), it can be concluded that the negative also precedes any free modal or tense markers that may occur in front of the verb, see (26b). On the other hand, the conditional particle ?d\'ma? if precedes the negative marker in (26c).

16 There seems to be a third, much less common, way of expressing a similar meaning, see (ii) below.
17 The verb aj[i]x can be analyzed as follows:
   a- 'aorist'; q- 'subject SOME ONE'; L 'object IT'; -a- 'directive'; -a- 'stem TO DO'
18 This gloss is given by Dyk (1933). The meaning is likely to be 'You will not make them so in such a manner.'
19 The verb aj[i]x. is given by Dyk (1933).
20 The subject is possessive in these constructions which are always continuative and can be transitive.
21 See Kinkade (1963/64, 1976) for more details on the complexities of the constructions following the negative, and two alternative negation strategies less common than the one presented here. See also Boas (1934).
(26) a. Mika t nu 3-fa'a-ci
not indef. cont.-see-you
'I don't see you.'
b. Mika q'af s-yucd-y-it
not MOD IM-kill-TR-PASS
'He could not be killed.'
c. Alma?mika s-wi-ns lo 'a mo -u
if not indef. cont.-be-his stative-take-it
'If he doesn't take it...'

Kinkade (1976) provides a couple of examples involving negative quantifiers. In both cases these have, like those in Chinookan and CJ, a transparent structure and are formed with interrogative pronouns preceded by a negative marker, the latter being identical in form to the one used for sentential negation, see (27).

(27) a. Mika re nam 1 qal s-k"ax-s
not how indef. subj. cont.-arrive-his
'There's no way to get there.'
b. Mika pan doka 1 q'9-1-s t ilol
not time-where unrealized cont.-burn-its indef. trail
'A trail will never burn.'

2.3. Comparing CJ negation with the negation in source languages

As shown in the previous sections, CJ negation shows basic syntactic similarity with Chinookan and Chehalis, its source languages in terms of the positioning of the negative operator and the structure of negative words. In this section, further illustrative, as possible are provided from the three languages for several different constructions.

Examples (28) to (32) illustrate the issue of word ordering, in particular the ordering of the negative marker with respect to other clausal constituent. Further similarities between CJ and the two source languages, in particular Chinookan, are shown in these examples. A question particle follows the negative marker in both CJ and CI, see (28), (29), a wh-word precedes the negative marker in both CJ and CI, see (29), (29) and the conditional conjunction precedes the negative in Chi, Che and CJ, see (31), the negative marker precedes the verb in imperatives in Chi, Che and CJ, see (32).

(28) Yes-no questions and negation
a. Chi Nqet na lo? tixis?
NEG Opcl know-it
'Do I not know it?' (Boas 1910:11.650)
b. Che Na?wene we sy?x-te' c'
'Aren't you (sg.) working yet?' (Kinkade 1964:59)
c. CJ Wha na metsia komats nakia?
NEG Opcl 2pl know 1sg
'Don't you know me?'

(29) Wh-words and negation
a. Chi Q'd 'inaqo nafet t'ngqat' amoi?lam?
wh- why not long ago you told
'Why didn't you tell me long ago?' (Boas 1894:67)
b. CJ Klakotu wet mitsl kposal Na yaka yaks bism... 49
who NEG stay PREP Noah 3sg big boat
Whoever didn't stay in Noah's big boat...

c. CJ Tu? wet metsia krai kposal naika
good NEG 2pl cry PREP 1pl
'You shouldn't cry for me.'

(30) Modal particles and negation
a. Chi ptd nqetit d'ka asci t' lax.
Mpcl not thus be-us-direct-to do
'He wouldn't have done so to us.' (Boas 1910:650)
b. CJ T'us wet metsia krai kposal naika
good NEG 2pl cry PREP 1pl
'You shouldn't cry for me.'

(31) Conditional conjunction and negation
a. Chi Q'd nqetit matisa imblatako, ptd nqetit d'ka asci t' lax.
if not your badness [it] not thus he did to us
'If it had not been for your badness, he would not have done so to us.' (Boas 1910:650)
b. Che Alma?mika s-wi-ns lo 'a mo -u
if not indef. cont.-be-his stative-take-it
'If he doesn't take it...,' (Kinkade 1976:20)
c. CJ Pas wet metsia xikom abat naika wawa...
if NEG 2pl take DEM 1sg word
If you do not accept my words...

(29) Wh-words and negation
a. Chi Q'd 'inaqo nafet t'ngqat' amoi?lam?
wh- why not long ago you told
'Why didn't you tell me long ago?' (Boas 1894:67)

b. CJ Klakotu wet mitsl kposal Na yaka yaks bism... 49
who NEG stay PREP Noah 3sg big boat
Whoever didn't stay in Noah's big boat...

c. CJ Tu? wet metsia krai kposal naika
good NEG 2pl cry PREP 1pl
'You shouldn't cry for me.'

(30) Modal particles and negation
a. Chi ptd nqetit d'ka asci t' lax.
Mpcl not thus be-us-direct-to do
'He wouldn't have done so to us.' (Boas 1910:650)

b. CJ T'us wet metsia krai kposal naika
good NEG 2pl cry PREP 1pl
'You shouldn't cry for me.'

(31) Conditional conjunction and negation
a. Chi Q'd nqetit matisa imblatako, ptd nqetit d'ka asci t' lax.
if not your badness [it] not thus he did to us
'If it had not been for your badness, he would not have done so to us.' (Boas 1910:650)

b. Che Alma?mika s-wi-ns lo 'a mo -u
if not indef. cont.-be-his stative-take-it
'If he doesn't take it...,' (Kinkade 1976:20)

23 Note that in the examples that follow Chinookan is abbreviated as 'Chi', Chehalis as 'Che'.

24 According to Kinkade (1964:59) -na is an interrogative suffix that can attach to various syntactic constituents including particles 'when no interrogative word [...] is present'. Hence, it is 'not strictly a verbal suffix,' and 'it goes on the word or words about which the question is being asked'. The interrogative marker in Chehalis does not seem to be necessarily in a 'word second' position, as in CJ and Chinookan (according to examples provided in Boas 1910:611). Kinkade (p.c. 1999) reports that the negative marker is never preceded by a wh-word in Chehalis.

26 Chehalis seems to be different in this respect. The modal marker normally follows the negative marker as in the following example:

(i) Milta q'af s-yucd-y-it
not MOD IM-kill-TR-PASS
'He could not be killed.'
The facts presented in (28) through (32) suggest the structure of CP of Chinookan and Chehalis might be quite similar to that of CJ (see (19) and (21) above). Additional syntactic properties of negation suggest that the properties of CJ negation might be explained by contact influence through conflation of structures in the source languages. Further examples are provided in (33) to show that the negative indefinites are formed in the parallel ways in all three languages—by combining the negative marker with the interrogative pronoun.

(33) Negative quantifiers in Chi, Che and CJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi</th>
<th>Che</th>
<th>CJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| nikit fikta 'nothing' | mila wak 'none'            | elo bllskta 'nobody'
| NEG what             | NEG who                    | NEG who        |
| nikit qitats 'not (any)how' | mila tom 'nothing'       | elo hita 'nothing'
| NEG (any)how         | NEG when                   | NEG what       |
|                      |                            | week kanish 'never'
|                      |                            | NEG when       |

In addition to this, in Chi and Che, as in CJ, only one negative operator per sentence is possible. Hence, the source languages, like CJ, lack negative concord, see examples in (34) below. Furthermore, these examples also show that, as in CJ, in Chinookan (and Chehalis) the object negative operator in (14a) (or adverbial negative operator in (14b)) has to be preposed. 30

(34) Negative quantifier position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Chi</th>
<th>Che</th>
<th>CJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q'wuq nikit fikta</td>
<td>Mila q'wuqFikta</td>
<td>Elo ilaqta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ax not anything find</td>
<td>ax did it</td>
<td>ax did it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| because I did not find anything | (Roos1894:75)         | (1997:1511).)

30 None of the sources give full paradigms of these items.

31 Unlike in languages discussed by Zanuttini (1997), the preposing of negative indefinites in CJ, Chi and Che seems to be obligatory.
relevant for the semantic interpretation of the sentence; and finally, it is base-generated in a structural position into which it would need to move at some point in the derivation for feature checking if it were not already in it. In such a way, the base-generation of the negative marker in this position is the most economic “move” from point of view of economy principles.
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