SHORT REPORT

Negative grammatical functions in Skou

MARK DONOHUE

Monash University

Negation is known to correlate with changes of word order, agreement, or case marking in the clause. I present data from Skou, a language of north-central New Guinea, which show obliques and adjuncts appearing postverbally in the SOV positive clause and preverbally in negative clauses. Moreover, in addition to these changes in the order of constituents, the grammatical functions assigned in the negated clause are not the same as in a positive clause, with obliques and adjuncts assuming object properties in the negated clause, as well as object positions. This results in otherwise unattested trivalent constructions in the language.

1. NEGATION AND CHANGES IN THE CLAUSE. It is well known that the positive and negative forms of the same sentence may show significantly different structures. In Skou, a language of north-central New Guinea, negating a clause initiates a change in grammatical functions, in that obliques or adjuncts in positive clauses take on the properties of objects in negated clauses.[1] Differences between positive and negative clauses can be illustrated in 1a,b with examples from Kru, a language of West Africa, in which the SVO order of positive clauses becomes verb-final in negated clauses, resulting in S NEG OV order (Payne 1997:290).

(1) a. ɔ   tē   kɔ́.
        he.COMPLETIVE buy rice
          'He bought rice.'
    b. ɔ   se kɔ̀ tē.
        he.COMPLETIVE NEG rice buy
          'He didn't buy rice.'

Other negation-related changes are found with *do*-support in English: *She ate my lollies* versus *She did not eat my lollies*, showing that in addition to the negative morpheme we also find the auxiliary verb *do*, which inflects for tense to the exclusion of marking on the (lexical) head of the clause. Numerous other examples of negation affecting inflection or word order can be found in the literature, with Payne 1997 providing a useful short survey and Koopman 1984 a formal treatment of the word-order issues in West African languages. Further, many languages show different aspectual possibilities in negated clauses; this is also true of Skou, but is not discussed here.

In Skou, negative clauses differ from positive clauses in more than simply the addition of a negating word, just as English and Kru (among others) show substantial differences between positive and negative clauses. In Skou, positive and negative clauses show no morphological differences other than the addition of *ka* 'negative'. Examples 2 and 3 illustrate nominal and (monovalent) verbal clauses with and without negation. The negator is an invariant free particle which can constitute a complete utterance (*ka* 'no', '(That's) not (so)'), and it is postverbal (if there is a verb in the clause), a pattern

---

[1] Skou is the westernmost member of the Macro-Skou family (Cowan 1952, Voorhoeve 1971, and Donohue 2002, 2003a, Donohue & San Roque 2004). It displays many features typical of a language of New Guinea, including SOV basic order. There are seven hundred speakers of the language, living in three villages sited along the coast east of Jayapura, Skou Yambe, Skou Mabo, and Skou Sai, and about one hundred second-language speakers in Wutung, the nearest village in Papua New Guinea.

common in this part of New Guinea (Reesink 2002).[2] In clauses in which the negator appears together with an auxiliary, which is possible only for clauses with motion verbs, the negative morpheme precedes the auxiliary, showing that the negator is not strictly at the right edge of the clause. The form of the agreement marking on the verb in 3b is the same as in the nonnegated clause (3a).[3]

(2) Nominal predicate
   a. Pe = inga   è-ne-nì = ne.
      3SG.F = the wife-1SG.DAT-1SG.GEN = 1SG.DAT
         'She's my wife.'
   b. Pe = inga   è-ne-nì = ne   **ka.**
      3SG.F = the wife-1SG.DAT-1SG.GEN = 1SG.DAT NEG
         'She's not my wife.'

(3) Verbal predicate
   a. Féung   nì = re-re   li.
      tomorrow 1SG = go-RED do
         'I want to go tomorrow.'
   b. Féung   nì = re-re   **ka** li.
      tomorrow 1SG = go-RED NEG do
         'I don't want to go tomorrow.'

The same pattern is found with bivalent predicates, in which the ergative may optionally be marked by an NP-final pronoun. In 4 the clause takes two arguments, and when negated the only difference is the addition of a clause-final negator.

(4) Bivalent verbal predicate
   a. Ke = inga   (ke)   kóe   ke = k-ang.
      3SG.NF = the 3SG.NF.ERG sago.cake 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF-eat
         'He ate the sago pancake.'
   b. Ke = inga   (ke)   kóe   ke = k-ang   **ka.**
      3SG.NF = the 3SG.NF.ERG sago.cake 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF-eat NEG
         'He didn't eat the sago pancake.'

Complications arise when we consider a clause with a locative adjunct. The normal position for an adjunct location is following the verb (locations appear as bare NPs). When negated, however, the location appears before the verb, as can be seen in 5.

(5) a. Ke = moeng   **fújéng.**
       3SG.NF = sit/stay chair
          'He stayed in the chair.'
    b. **Fújéng** ke = moeng   **ka.**
       chair   3SG.NF = sit/stay NEG
          'He didn't stay in the chair.'

---

[2] This runs counter to Horn's claim that 'the fact remains that both affixal negation and sentential negation display a strong leftist bent ... [a] tendency ... I shall dub NEG FIRST' (1989:292–93), though he later qualifies the claim: 'free particle negation is overwhelmingly likely to precede the verb in SVO, VSO, and VOS languages, and may do so in SOV languages as well' (1989:452).

[3] Skou examples are presented in orthography: nasalization is indicated by -*ng*, /ʉ/ and /ø/ are written with the digraphs *ue* and *oe*, high pitch is shown with ´, falling pitch with `, and low pitch is unmarked (see Donohue 2003b for the phonology of tone in Skou). The representation of the other vowels and the consonants follows IPA conventions, except that *y* represents [j (~ ʑ ~ dz ~ dzj)], and *j* represents ɟ ~ ʝ ~ gʲ]. The following abbreviations are used: APPL: applicative, DAT: dative; ERG: ergative; F: feminine; GEN: genitive; INSTR: instrumental, NEG: negative, NF: nonfeminine, RED: reduplication, SUBJ: subject. There is often multiple exponence for subject agreement in Skou, the historical basis of which involves cycles of cliticization (Donohue 2003c).

Preverbal positions are associated with subjects and objects (as in 3, 4), not with adjuncts, yet under negation a location appears preverbally. I examine here the syntax of negation, including the syntactic consequences of this change in position and the range of participants that participate in this 'negative alternation'.

I should note that the most common way for locations to be 'expressed' in negated clauses is by omission. While 5b is an accurate translation of 'He didn't stay in the chair', by far the most common way informants will translate such a clause is without a location, either overt or implied, as in 6.

(6) Ke = moeng   **ka.**
     3SG.NF = sit/stay NEG
         'He didn't stay'. *not* 'He didn't stay (there/at that place).'

Clauses such as 5b are grammatical and are attested in naturalistic discourse, but they are not pragmatically neutral. A location in a negative clause carries a degree of informational focus that is not necessarily present in a positive clause such as 5a. As such, negated clauses with locations such as 5b are less frequent than clauses without, such as 6. I return to this point about pragmatic salience in §4.

2. The position of the locative. We have seen that an overt location must appear in a preverbal position in a negated clause. Compare the grammatical clause in 5b with the two alternative attempts to encode the sense 'He didn't stay in the chair' in 7 and 8, negative clauses in which the location appears in a postverbal position.

(7) *Ke moeng **fújéng ka.**

(8) *Ke moeng **ka fújéng.**

First, we can see that a postverbal location cannot cooccur with negation regardless of the relative order of the two elements. Second, a location adjunct appears following an auxiliary, as in 9a, which is the same position occupied by negation in the clause (3b). A location may not precede an auxiliary, as shown in 9b.

(9) a.   Ke = inga   kóe   ke = k-ang   i li pá = fuea.
          3SG.NF = the sago.cake 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF-eat be do house = that
              'He's eating the sago pancake in that house.'
     b. *Ke = inga   kóe   ke = k-ang   pá = fuea i   li.
          3SG.NF = the sago.cake 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF-eat house = that be do

This might suggest an analysis in which there is 'competition' for the postverbal, postauxiliary position, since while the location typically occupies the final position in the clause (as shown in the clausal template in 10a), negation is also found there. Competition between the two elements results in the negation taking the clause-final position, and the location being displaced to a preverbal position.

This account is attractive precisely because it makes use of the very templatic nature of clause structure in Skou, an areal feature found in many languages of north-central New Guinea. The clause can be described with the structure shown in 10; all elements are strictly ordered (barring topicalization), with only instruments showing variation in position (see also 14–17) (see Donohue 2000, 2006 for a discussion of similar facts in One, an unrelated Torricelli language).[4]

---

[4] It is probably not coincidental that only instruments are morphologically marked for their role in the clause in both Skou and One. I do not address this point further here.

(10) a. IP $\rightarrow$ NP$_{\text{SUBJ}}$ VP NP$_{\text{LOC}}$
    b. VP $\rightarrow$ NP$_{\text{OBJ}}$ V$'$ NP$_{\text{GOAL}+}$
    c. V$'$ $\rightarrow$ (N^0)   V
        Instrument: in the NP$_{\text{GOAL}+}$ position, or else left-adjoined to either V$'$
                or VP.
        Time: left-adjoined to IP.
        N^0:   the nominal component in a complex N + V predicate

Each of the named NP 'positions' may be filled maximally once, and each broad functional 'type' can be realized only once: there is maximally one subject, one object, and one nonterm per predicate.[5] Interestingly, although NPgoal+ and NPloc are found in different positions, exemplified in 11 and 12, they may not readily cooccur in the same clause. An example is shown in 13, licensed only by the overt presence of the auxiliary complex *e tue* intervening between the location and the goal.[6]

(11) Clause with a goal
    Pe = angku   pe = w-atà   te   **báng** e   tue.
    3SG.F = child 3SG.F = 3SG.F-run 3SG.F.go beach 3SG.F.be 3SG.F.do
      'The girl is running away to the beach.'

(12) Clause with a location
    Pe = angku   pe = w-atà   te   e   tue   **báng.**
    3SG.F = child 3SG.F = 3SG.F-run 3SG.F.go 3SG.F.be 3SG.F.do beach
      'The girl is running away on the beach.'

(13) Clause with a goal and a location
    #Pe = angku   pe = w-atà   te   **tang** e   tue   **báng.**
    3SG.F = child 3SG.F = 3SG.F-run 3SG.F.go canoe 3SG.F.be 3SG.F.do beach
      'The girl is running to the canoe, on the beach.'

The goal+ label refers to all nonterms other than locations and sources. Sources can be expressed only in serial verb constructions, as shown in 14, and instruments, the only overtly marked adjuncts, may appear in a variety of positions, as in 16 and 17. The goal+ position is also the position in which goals of motion, recipients of the predicate 'give', and beneficiaries are found, as well as instruments. The location position is only ever occupied by locations.[7]

(14) Source coded in a serial verb construction
    Nì = há   Te Óeti re.
    1SG = come.from Wutung go
      'I went from Wutung.'

---

[5] I use TERM to refer to either a subject or an object argument. A NONTERM is, therefore, an oblique or adjunct.

[6] For most speakers this clause is unacceptable. A tense/aspect that does not call for an auxiliary disallows the cooccurrence of goal and location in the same clause for all speakers; thus, for 'The girl ran to the canoe on the beach' in a past tense no speakers allow *Pe angku pe watà te tang báng*. Similarly, beneficiaries, recipients, and instrumentals may occur in the same clause as a location (for some speakers) if and only if there is an overt auxiliary between them. This applies only to clauses with motion verbs. Even those speakers that allow a goal and a location in the same clause do not allow them to appear together in a negated clause.

[7] Agents of passive clauses appear postverbally, but since the passive is incompatible with aspects involving auxiliaries (basically, ongoing progressives and 'wanting' predicates, as in 3), we cannot empirically determine whether they appear in the goal+ position or in the location position.

(15) Alternative positions for instruments
Pe = ueme = inga   rí   pe = r-u.
3SG.F = woman = the wood 3SG.F = 3SG.F-F.chop
   'The woman chopped wood.'

(16) Pe = ueme = inga   **anábí = pa**   rí   pe = r-u.
3SG.F = woman = the machete = INSTR wood 3SG.F = 3SG.F-F.chop
   'The woman chopped wood with a machete.'

(17) a.   Pe = ueme = inga rí **anábí = pa** pe = ru.
    b.   Pe = ueme = inga rí pe = ru **anábí = pa.**

A nonterm participant with any of these semantic roles must appear preverbally when it occurs in a negated clause. We have already seen the behavior of locations in negated clauses in 5. Example 18 shows clauses with a goal, 19 illustrates a beneficiary, and 20 shows the agentive 'by'-phrase in a passive. The behavior of beneficiaries is complicated by the existence of multiple beneficiary-coding constructions, which are suppletive for the simple postverbal construction under negation. A source, when appearing in a serial verb construction, shows similar 'fronting' behavior; compare 14 with 21.

(18) Clause with a goal
    a. Pe = angku   pe = te   **báng.**
       3SG.F = child 3SG.F = 3SG.F.go beach
         'The girl went to the beach.'
    b. Pe = angku   **báng** pe = te   **ka.**
       3SG.F = child beach 3SG.F = 3SG.F.go NEG
         'The girl didn't go to the beach.'

(19) Clause with a beneficiary
    a. Móe = inga nì = ké   **ke = ke.**
       fish = the   1SG = get 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.DAT
         'I fetched the fish for him.'
    b. **Ke = ke**   móe = inga nì = ké   **ka.**
       3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.DAT fish = the   1SG = get NEG
         'I didn't fetch the fish for him.'

(20) Clause with an agentive 'by'-phrase
    a. Pe = ueme   mòng pe = wí   **ke.**
       3SG.F = woman wound 3SG.F = get 3SG.NF
         'The woman was hit by him.'
    b. Pe = ueme   **ke**   mòng pe = wí   **ka.**
       3SG.F = woman 3SG.NF wound 3SG.F = get NEG
         'The woman wasn't hit by him.'

(21) Source in a negative clause
   Te Óeti nì = há   re **ka.**
   Wutung 1SG = come.from go NEG
      'I didn't go from Wutung.'

Recipients are complex in their behavior. A close translation of a three-place predicate, such as 'give', can be formed only with a serial verb construction; there are no trivalent verb roots in Skou. Even with two verbs in the clause, the predicate may not add to the template seen in 10. Only one object, the theme, may appear preverbally, and the recipient of *leng* 'give' must appear in the goal+ position.

(22) Pe = ueme = inga   kóe   pe = w-é   r-ung   **nì.**
      3SG.F = woman = the sago.cake 3SG.F = 3SG.F-get 3SG.F-F.give 1SG
            'The woman gave me a sago pancake.'

(23) a.   *Pe = ueme = inga **nì** kóe pe = wé rung.
     b.   *Pe = ueme = inga kóe **nì** pe = wé rung.
     c.   *Pe = ueme = inga kóe pe = wé **nì** rung.

Under negation, the postverbal recipient object appears preverbally, as in 24. The recipient may either precede or follow the theme object when the clause is negated.

(24) Pe = ueme = inga   **nì**   kóe   pe = w-é   r-ung   **ka.**
      3SG.F = woman = the 1SG sago.cake 3SG.F = 3SG.F-get 3SG.F-give.F NEG
            'The woman didn't give me a sago pancake.'

(25) Pe = ueme = inga kóe **nì** pe = wé rung **ka.**

Proof for the object status of *nì* in 22 is presented in §3.[8] The fact that *nì* in 22 occupies the preauxiliary goal+ position, and not the postauxiliary locative position, is shown in 26a, with an auxiliary and a preceding *nì*.

(26) a.   Pe   kóe   pe = w-é-wé   r-ung   **nì** tue.
          3SG.F sago.cake 3SG.F = 3SG.F-get 3SG.F-give.F 1SG 3SG.F.do
              'She wants to give me a sago pancake.'
     b.   *Pe   kóe   pe = w-é-wé   r-ung   tue **nì.**
          3SG.F sago.cake 3SG.F = 3SG.F-get 3SG.F-give.F 3SG.F.do 1SG

We have seen instruments in positive clauses in 16 and 17. The fact that a postverbal instrument must appear with overt instrumental marking, and can occupy only the preauxiliary goal+ position, is shown in 27. When negated an instrumental retains its overt marking, but is restricted to preverbal positions, as shown in 28.

(27) a.   *Pe = ueme = inga rí pe = ruru **anábí** tue.
     b.   *Pe = ueme = inga rí pe = ruru tue **anábí(= pa).**

(28) a.   Pe = ueme = inga   **anábí = pa**   rí   pe = r-u   **ka.**
          3SG.F = woman = the machete = INSTR wood 3SG.F = 3SG.F-F.chop NEG
              'The woman didn't chop wood with a machete.'
     b.   Pe = ueme = inga rí **anábí = pa** pe = ru **ka.**
     c.   *Pe = ueme = inga rí pe = ru **anábí = pa ka.**
     d.   *Pe = ueme = inga rí pe = ru **ka anábí = pa.**

We have seen that no nominal may appear postverbally in a negated clause, regardless of its position in a nonnegated clause, and that adjuncts are treated identically to oblique arguments under negation. In the following section I present tests for the functional status of these participants in negated clauses, showing that this is another respect in which all nonterms are treated alike and in which they show variation in negated clauses.

3. THE STATUS OF A NEGATIVE-SHIFTED ELEMENT. We can distinguish different kinds of participants of the Skou clause through a range of morphosyntactic tests.[9] We have seen in 10 that the position a participant occupies is a good indicator of the grammatical function it bears in a clause. I examine here two tests that show that the participants

---

[8] Certain other verbs code their object in postverbal position, some in the goal+ position and some in the location position. These are not illustrated here; suffice it to remark that the syntactic tests that demonstrate the objecthood of the recipient in 22 similarly show the grammatical status of these objects, including postverbal applicative objects.

[9] This section recapitulates some of the relevant discussion in Donohue 2003a.

that normally appear postverbally, but that are preverbal in negated clauses, are better taken as objects. These tests are:

- The ability for ERGATIVE MARKING to appear in the clause: only bivalent clauses allow ergative proclitics on nominal subjects, seen earlier in 4; a clause that has the option for ergative marking is therefore one that contains an object.
- RAISING: only terms may appear raised in complement constructions; if raising is possible with a participant, then it must be either subject or object (this secondary question can be trivially solved by examining the obligatory subject agreement on the verb).

At least one additional test, the ability to launch floating quantifiers, is useful because of its restriction to absolutive terms, but it is not illustrated here (see Donohue 2003a). I demonstrate the ergative-marking and raising tests for nonnegated clauses first and then examine them with negated clauses.

3.1. ERGATIVE CASE. The possibility of ergative case marking appearing on the subject of a bivalent clause is shown in 29 (see also 4); the inability of this marker to appear on a monovalent clause is shown in 30b.[10]

(29) Bivalent clause
    a. Ke = angku   kóe   ke = k-ang.
        3SG.NF = child sago.cake 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF-eat
         'The boy ate the sago pancake.'
    Optional ergative
    b. Ke = angku **ke**   kóe   ke = k-ang.
        3SG.NF = child 3SG.NF.ERG sago.cake 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF-eat

(30) Monovalent clause: no ergative possible
    a. Ke = angku   ke = moeng   fújéng.
        3SG.NF = child 3SG.NF = sit/stay chair
         'The boy stayed in the chair.'
    b. *Ke = angku   ke   ke = moeng   fújéng.
        3SG.NF = child 3SG.NF.ERG 3SG.NF = sit/stay chair

A monovalent clause, even if it has two preverbal nominals (a subject and an instrument, or a subject and the nominal component of a complex predicate), may not employ ergative marking on the subject. Similarly, the presence of a postverbal oblique or adjunct does not license the use of ergative forms in clauses with no object.[11]

(31) Monovalent clause with instrumental but no object: no ergative possible
    a. Ke = balèng tanghápa = pa   ke = ti   Nofé.
       3SG.NF = man motorbike = INSTR 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.go Jayapura
        'The man went to Jayapura by motorbike.'
    b. *Ke = balèng   ke   tanghápa = pa   ke = ti
       3SG.NF = man 3SG.NF.ERG motorbike = INSTR 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.go
         Nofé.
         Jayapura

---

[10] The conditions under which the ergative pronominal marker appears or does not appear are not well understood, but involve some extra degree of identificational focus and lack of presupposition. This is a common feature of case marking in the languages of New Guinea (Donohue 2005).

[11] Verbs that subcategorize for a postverbal object, such as *fí* 'bump into someone', do not license an optional ergative: *Ke = balèng ke = fí pe = ueme* ('The man bumped into the woman.') with no ergative is grammatical, but **Ke = balèng **ke** ke = fí pe = ueme* with a 3SG.NF.ERG is not.

(32) Monovalent clause with complex predicate involving a nominal but no object:
no ergative possible
   a.   Pe = ueme   ku   pe = tue.
        3SG.NF = man child 3SG.F = 3SG.F.do
          'The woman gave birth.'
   b.   *Pe = ueme   pe   ku   pe = tue.
        3SG.NF = man 3SG.NF.ERG child 3SG.F = 3SG.F.do

(33) Monovalent clause with adjunct but no object: no ergative possible
   a.   Ke = balèng   ke = moeng   Nofé.
        3SG.NF = man 3SG.NF = sit/stay Jayapura
          'The man stayed in Jayapura.'
   b.   *Ke = balèng   ke   ke = moeng   Nofé.
        3SG.NF = man 3SG.NF.ERG 3SG.NF = sit/stay Jayapura

(34) Monovalent clause with oblique but no object: no ergative possible
   a.   Ke = balèng   ke = ti   Nofé.
        3SG.NF = man 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.go Jayapura
          'The man went to Jayapura.'
   b.   *Ke = balèng   ke   ke = ti   Nofé.
        3SG.NF = man 3SG.NF.ERG 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.go Jayapura

The potential for a clause to employ the ergative marking is found only with bivalent clauses and so is clearly a test for the presence of an object in the clause.

3.2. RAISING. Another test for the term or nonterm status of a participant involves its behavior in a raising construction formed with perception predicates. Consider the following alternative codings of the same event, using the same lexical choices. In 35 the main clause consists of an overt subject, a verb, and a complement, *pe = angku pe = te* 'The girl went'. Alternatively, the subject of the complement clause may be coded as the object of the main clause, as shown in 36. Apart from the position of the nominal preceding the verb *ke = fu*, the fact that the verb is coded for feminine agreement shows that *pe = angku* is indeed a term in the matrix clause, and that this is not simply an instance of scrambling.

(35) Ke = angku   ke = fue   [pe = angku   pe = te].
     3SG.NF = child 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child 3SG.F = 3SG.F.go
       'The boy saw the girl go.'

(36) Ke = angku   pe = angku   ke = fu   [pe = te].
     3SG.NF = child 3SG.F = child 3SG.NF = see.F   3SG.F = 3SG.F.go
       'The boy saw the girl go.'

With bivalent clauses not only the subject but also the object may participate in raising. Example 37 presents a sentence with a bivalent complement with no raising. In 38 and 39 the verb shows the same agreement with a feminine object that was seen in 36, since it is agreeing with the object, *pe = angku* or *hòe* (*hòe* 'sago porridge' is a feminine noun, and so requires the same agreement as 'girl'). Only one argument of the embedded clause may appear raised as the object of the main clause.

(37) Ke = angku   ke = fue   [pe = angku   hòe   pe = p-ang].
     3SG.NF = child 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child sago.porridge 3SG.F = 3SG.F-eat
       'The boy saw the girl eat the sago porridge.'

(38) Ke = angku   **pe = angku**   ke = fu   [hòe   pe = p-ang].
    3SG.NF = child 3SG.F = child 3SG.NF = see.F sago.porridge 3SG.F = 3SG.F-eat
      'The boy saw the girl eat the sago porridge.'

(39) Ke = angku   **hòe**   ke = fu   [pe = angku   pe = p-ang].
    3SG.NF = child sago.porridge 3SG.NF = see.F 3SG.F = child 3SG.F = 3SG.F-eat
      'The boy saw the girl eat the sago porridge.'

It is not possible for an oblique or an adjunct to be raised. This is shown with a goal oblique *báng* 'beach' in 40 and 41, and with a locative adjunct *fújéng* in 42 and 43.

  (40)   Ke = angku   ke = fue   [pe = angku   pe = te   báng].
       3SG.NF = child 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child 3SG.F = 3SG.F.go beach
        'The boy saw the girl go to the beach.'

  (41) *Ke = angku   **báng** ke = fue   [pe = angku   pe = te].
     3SG.NF = child beach 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child 3SG.F = 3SG.F.go

  (42)   Ke = angku   ke = fue   [pe = angku   pe = mong   fújéng].
     3SG.NF = child 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child 3SG.F = F.sit/stay chair
       'The boy saw the girl stay in the chair.'

  (43) *Ke = angku   **fújéng** ke = fue   [pe = angku pe = mong].
     3SG.NF = child chair   3SG.NF = see SG.F = child 3SG.F = F.sit/stay

Raising can apply to either the preverbal theme object or the postverbal recipient object of the complex 'give' predicate, as well as to the subject, as seen in 44 and 45, proving that the restriction of the raising is not simply to preverbal elements, but to a particular range of grammatical functions, subject and object. In 44 none of the elements of the embedded clause appear raised, while 45a–c (which have the same translation as 44) show that either the subject, the object, or the second object of the embedded clause may appear as the object of the main clause.

  (44) Nì = fue   [pe = ueme = inga   kóe   pe = w-é   r-ung
     1SG = see   3SG.F = woman = the sago.cake 3SG.F = 3SG.F-get 3SG.F-give.F
      ke].
       3SG.NF
    'I saw the woman give him a sago pancake.'

  (45) a. **Pe = ueme = inga** nì = fu   [kóe pe = wé rung ke].
      b. **Kóe**   nì = fue [pe = ueme = inga   pe = wé rung ke].
      c. **Ke**   nì = fue [pe = ueme = inga kóe pe = wé rung   ].

The inability of the instrument in 46 to show raising confirms the fact that it is the function, not the position, that determines the ability of an element to show raising.

  (46) a.   Nì = fue   ke = balèng   tanghápa = pa   ke = ti.
       1SG = see 3SG.NF = man motorbike = INSTR 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.go
        'I saw the man go by motorbike.'

      b.   **Ke = balèng** ni = fue   [tanghápa = pa   ke = ti].
       3SG.NF = man 1SG = see   motorbike = INSTR 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.go

      c.   *Tanghápa = pa**   nì = fue   [ke = balèng   ke = ti].
       motorbike = INSTR 1SG = see   3SG.NF = man 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.go

In sum, raising applies only to subjects and objects of the subordinate clause, and not to obliques or adjuncts. It cannot distinguish between a subject and an object, since both are equally eligible to appear raised, but it can distinguish terms from nonterms. The raised argument is treated as an object of the main clause, regardless of its original function in the subordinate clause. Evidence that the raised argument is really an object,

and not simply displaced from its position in the subordinate clause, is given in 47–49 (compare with 37–39). It is not grammatical for ergative marking to appear with 47, but in 48 and 49, which have a raised object, the ergative may appear.

(47) *Ke = angku   ke   ke = fue   pe = angku   hòe
     3SG.NF = child   3SG.NF.ERG 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child sago.porridge
      pe = p-ang.
      3SG.F = 3SG.F-eat
     'The boy saw the girl eat the sago porridge.'

(48) Ke = angku   ke   **pe = angku** ke = fu   hòe
     3SG.NF = child   3SG.NF.ERG 3SG.F = child 3SG.NF = see.F sago.porridge
      pe = p-ang.
      3SG.F = 3SG.F-eat

(49) Ke = angku   ke   **hòe**   ke = fu   pe = angku
     3SG.NF = child   3SG.NF.ERG sago.porridge 3SG.NF = see.F 3SG.F = child
      pe = p-ang.
      3SG.F = 3SG.F-eat

In sum, we have clear tests for the status and number of term arguments in a clause. Raising applies only to the term arguments of a clause and thus is a test for subject or object status. Ergative marking is possible only on the subject of clauses with an object. The inability of raising to be found with obliques or adjuncts and of ergative case to occur with a subject in a clause that lacks an object show that we have testable means for evaluating the termhood of participants in a sentence.[12] The following two sections examine the behavior of these two tests in negated clauses of different types.

3.3. ERGATIVE CASE IN NEGATIVE CLAUSES. We have seen that ergative case is found only in clauses with two arguments. When a monovalent clause with a location NP is negated, however, the ergative is possible. Compare 50 with 30.

(50) a. Ke = angku   fújéng ke = moeng **ka.**
       3SG.NF = child chair   3SG.NF = sit NEG
       'The boy didn't stay in the chair.'
    b. Ke = angku   **ke**   fújéng ke = moeng   **ka.**
       3SG.NF = child 3SG.NF.ERG chair   3SG.NF = sit/stay NEG

Similar behavior is found with clauses containing goals or even agentive 'by'-phrases.

(51) Ergative case possible with a negated clause containing a goal
    a. Ke = balèng   Nofé   ke = ti   **ka.**
       3SG.NF = man Jayapura 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.go NEG
       'The man didn't go to Jayapura.'
    b. Ke = balèng   **ke**   Nofé   ke = ti   **ka.**
       3SG.NF = man 3SG.NF.ERG Jayapura 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.go NEG

---

[12] Other morphosyntactic tests yield the same distinctions: we have seen that prefixal and proclitic agreement on the verb is controlled by the subject. A switch-reference system monitors the category same or different subject/event. Subjects represent the left boundary of the area in which instruments may appear, though this is probably best viewed as a phrase-structure constraint, not a grammatical-function constraint.

(52) Ergative case possible with a negated clause containing an agentive 'by'-
     phrase
  a. Pe = ueme   ke   mòng pe = wí   **ka.**
     3SG.F = woman 3SG.NF wound 3SG.F = get NEG
         'The woman wasn't hit by him.'
  b. Pe = ueme   **pe**   ke   mòng pe = wí   **ka.**
     3SG.F = woman 3SG.F.ERG 3SG.NF wound 3SG.F = get NEG

Just as it is not possible for an instrument to lose its instrumental marking, even in
negated clauses, it is also not possible for ergative case to appear on the subjects of
monovalent clauses with instruments, even when negated.

(53) Ergative case not possible with a negated clause containing an instrument
  a. Ke = balèng   tanghápa = pa   ke = ti   ka.
      3SG.NF = man motorbike = INSTR 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.go NEG
          'The man didn't go by motorbike.'
  b. *Ke = balèng ke   tanghápa = pa   ke = ti   ka.
      3SG.NF = man 3SG.NF.ERG motorbike = INSTR 3SG.NF = 3SG.NF.go NEG

The optional ergative case provides data that indicate that the presence of preverbal
goals, locations, and so forth in negated clauses is sufficient to license the appearance
of ergative case, suggesting that the clauses contain two terms. This implies that the
goals, locations, and so forth that were obliques and adjuncts in positive clauses are
objects in the negative clauses.

3.4. RAISING FROM NEGATED CLAUSES. We have seen that raising to appear as the
object of particular complement-taking verbs is an option available for terms, but not
for obliques or adjuncts.

When a clause is negated, however, it is possible for certain participants that were
defined as nonterms in §§3.1 and 3.2 to appear in a raising construction. In 54 we see
a sentence that is roughly analogous to 35, but that differs in that the embedded clause
is negated. As a result of negation the oblique goal, *pá* 'house', appears preverbally,
following the patterns seen in 18. Example 55 shows the expected option of having
the subject of the embedded clause appear as the object of the main clause; 56 shows
that this raising option is also available for the goal, something that is not expected on
the basis of earlier clauses such as 41 (*pá* 'house' is not feminine and so the form of
the verb does not change from the root form).

(54) Ke = angku   ke = fue   [pe = angku pá   pe = te   ka].
     3SG.NF = child 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child house 3SG.F = 3SG.F.go NEG
         'The boy saw that the girl didn't go to the house.'
(55) Ke = angku   pe = angku [ke = fu   [pá   pe = te   ka].
     3SG.NF = child 3SG.F = child 3SG.NF = see.F house 3SG.F = 3SG.F.go NEG
         'The boy saw that the girl didn't go to the house.'
(56) Ke = angku   pá   ke = fue   [pe = angku   pe = te   ka].
     3SG.NF = child house 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child 3SG.F = 3SG.F.go NEG
         'The boy saw that the girl didn't go to the house.'

With a location, similar facts are found. Example 57 shows a clause with a negated
embedded complement, and thus a preverbal location. In 58 we can see that *fújéng*
'chair' may appear raised as the object of *nì = fue*, which is not predicted from earlier
examples such as 43.[13]

---

[13] It is also possible for the subject of *pe = mong*, *pe = angku* 'the girl', to appear raised, but this has not
been shown here. Similarly the base object *kóe* of *pe = p-ang* in 59, or its subject *pe = angku*, may unexception-
ally appear raised.

(57) Nì = fue [pe = angku fújéng pe = mong   ka].
    1SG = see 3SGf = child chair 3SG.F = F.sit/stay NEG
       'I saw that the girl didn't stay in the chair.'

(58) Fújéng nì = fue [pe = angku pe = mong   ka].
    chair   1SG = see 3SG.F = child 3SG.F = F.sit/stay NEG
       'I saw that the girl didn't stay in the chair.'

A location that is unquestionably an adjunct in a root-bivalent clause is shown in 59, and an equivalent clause with a raised location is shown in 60.

(59) Ke = angku   ke = fue   [pe = angku pá   kóe
    3SG.NF = child   3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child house sago.cake
        pe = p-ang   ka].
        3SG.F = 3SG.F-eat NEG
       'The boy saw that the girl didn't eat the sago pancake in the house.'

(60) Ke = angku   pá   ke = fue   [pe = angku kóe
    3SG.NF = child   house 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child sago.cake
        pe = p-ang   ka].
        3SG.F = 3SG.F-eat NEG
       'The boy saw that the girl didn't eat the sago pancake in the house.'

Raising constructions with beneficiary and (passive) agents are shown in 61 and 62, showing the same behavior as locations and goals.

(61) Ke = angku   nì   ke = fue   [pe = angku kóe   pe = tue
    3SG.NF = child 1SG 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child sago.cake 3SG.F = 3SG.F.do
        ka].
        NEG
       'The boy saw that the girl didn't make the sago pancake for me.'

(62) Ke = angku   nì   ke = fue   [pe = angku mòng pe = wí ka].
    3SG.NF = child 1SG 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child wound 3SG.F = get NEG
       'The boy saw that the girl wasn't hit by me.'

The goals, locations, and so forth that are raised from negated clauses create an environment in which ergative case may appear on the subject of the main clause. Compare the sentences in 63 and 64, modeled on 59 and 60, with 47–49 from §3.2.

(63) *Ke = angku   ke   ke = fue   [pe = angku pá   kóe
    3SG.NF = child   3SG.NF.ERG 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child house sago.cake
        pe = p-ang   ka].
        3SG.F = 3SG.F-eat NEG
       'The boy saw that the girl didn't eat the sago pancake in the house.'

(64) Ke = angku   ke   pá   ke = fue   [pe = angku kóe
    3SG.NF = child   3SG.NF.ERG house 3SG.NF = see 3SG.F = child sago.cake
        pe = p-ang   ka].
        3SG.F = 3SG.F-eat NEG
       'The boy saw that the girl didn't eat the sago pancake in the house.'

The data from eligibility for raising in complements (illustrated here with data from verbs of perception, but also true for complements of verbal manipulation such as *lóeng* 'tell, command') support the hypothesis that the preverbal goal or location is treated in the same way as an object of a bivalent clause.

These two tests, ergative marking and raising, indicate that the negated clause with an overt goal, location, beneficiary, or (passive) agent is at least bivalent, and that a

preverbal 'oblique' or 'adjunct' is treated as a term not just with regard to its position in the clause, but also with regard to its syntactic behavior and the case marking it licenses on the subject.

4. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION. The evidence of the past examples can be summarized as shown in 65, using subscripts to show identity between participants.[14]

(65) Positive clause   Negative clause

Positive clause	Negative clause
SUBJ$_i$ V	SUBJ$_i$ V NEG
SUBJ$_i$ V OBL$_j$	SUBJ$_i$ V NEG
	SUBJ$_i$ **OBJ$_j$** V NEG
SUBJ$_i$ V ADJUNCT$_j$	SUBJ$_i$ V NEG
	SUBJ$_i$ **OBJ$_j$** V NEG
SUBJ$_i$ OBJ$_j$ V	SUBJ$_i$ OBJ$_j$ V NEG
SUBJ$_i$ OBJ$_j$ V ADJUNCT$_k$	SUBJ$_i$ OBJ$_j$ V NEG
	SUBJ$_i$ OBJ$_j$ **OBJ$_k$** V NEG
	SUBJ$_i$ **OBJ$_k$** OBJ$_j$ V NEG
SUBJ$_i$ V OBJ$_j$	SUBJ$_i$ OBJ$_j$ V NEG
SUBJ$_i$ OBJ$_j$ V V OBL$_k$	SUBJ$_i$ OBJ$_j$ V V NEG
	SUBJ$_i$ OBJ$_j$ **OBJ$_k$** V V NEG
	SUBJ$_i$ **OBJ$_k$** OBJ$_j$ V V NEG
SUBJ$_i$ OBJ$_j$ V V OBJ$_k$	SUBJ$_i$ OBJ$_j$ **OBJ$_k$** V V NEG
	SUBJ$_i$ **OBJ$_k$** OBJ$_j$ V V NEG

It is not true that all clauses increase in valency when negated, but it is true that a participant that is coded as an oblique or adjunct in a positive clause is present as an object in a negative clause, appearing before the verb and showing the syntactic behavior of an object.

Three aspects of the negative construction need to be addressed concerning the behavior of the participant that is an oblique or adjunct in a positive clause.

- the fact that the participant is pragmatically marked, not pragmatically neutral
- the fact that the syntactic behavior of the participant is the same as an object, not an oblique or adjunct
- the preverbal, rather than postverbal, position of the participant

4.1. THE PRAGMATIC CONSIDERATIONS. We may assume that the grammatical function SUBJECT outranks participants in other grammatical functions in terms of some measure of pragmatic salience.[15] The discourse uses of applicatives, in languages in which they are dynamic and offer an alternative to oblique-coding for a participant, indicate clearly that both terms, SUBJECT and OBJECT, occupy a privileged position with respect to other participants. The choice of an applicative (and thus object) coding for an otherwise oblique or adjunct participant correlates strongly with discourse topicality (see, for instance, Donohue 2001 on Tukang Besi).

Note the obvious similarities to other hierarchies common in the literature, such as the accessibility hierarchy of Keenan & Comrie 1977, the term hierarchy in relational

[14] Adjuncts, whether locations or beneficiaries, have not been observed with trivalent predicates. I have not shown examples of predicates with a subject, object, and oblique, but *ké i* 'put' (literally, 'get + be.at') would fit this description.

[15] There are clear indications that 'subjects' are grammaticalized topics in many languages and are defined as displaying a uniquely privileged status of subjects in morphosyntactic terms (e.g. Cole et al. 1980, Shibatani 1991).

grammar (eg. Perlmutter 1983), role and reference grammar's hierarchies or relations from pivot to periphery (Foley & Van Valin 1984, Van Valin & LaPolla 1997), or the grammatical functions hierarchy of lexical-functional grammar (eg. Bresnan 2001). Such a hierarchy is also used in Aissen 1999 and is not incompatible with the idea of different structural positions being associated with different syntactic properties at different levels.

(66) Pragmatic salience/Topicality
      Subject » Object » Oblique, Adjunct

The hierarchy in 66, while showing increments in terms of grammatical functions, could for Skou equally well be calibrated in terms of position in the clause: in Skou the subject precedes the object, which precedes the verb. Obliques and adjuncts follow the verb, in turn.

It is reasonable to argue that adjuncts should not be treated as being on the same scale of saliency as arguments: while arguments are required by the predicate, an adjunct is not. Its very presence indicates a level of pragmatic salience or prominence, either topical or focal, that is sufficient to result in this extra information being coded in the clause.[16] Similarly, negation, by its presence, is also salient. However, while the scope of negation can range over different elements of the clause, the primary function of (clause-level) negation in a verbal clause is to negate a (verbal) predicate. In such a speech act the presence of any nonessential elements, namely adjuncts, must be even more marked than in nonnegative clauses, since it increases the range of ambiguous interpretations for the scope of the negator.

4.2. THE POSITIONAL VARIATION. Combined with an account of pragmatic conditioning such as that sketched above, a movement analysis might offer a simple account of the data. If we assume that the negative morpheme and the obliques and adjuncts are in competition for a postverbal position, we can motivate the movement of the oblique or adjunct to a preverbal position as a result of its losing the postverbal slot.[17]

This analysis is problematic. We have seen that while competition between a locative and the negative *ka* is plausible, the other adjunct and oblique participants occupy the preauxiliary position, and so a purely positional account will be harder to motivate for them. Given these facts, a movement analysis might be sustainable for elements in the goal+ position, but not for locations, which would have to lower into the VP.

4.3. THE CHANGE IN GRAMMATICAL FUNCTIONS. In §3 I described the behavior of nonterms in negated clauses as being the same as that of objects. It would be equally valid to say that their behavior is the same as that of nonsubject terms. This is not purely terminological, since it has implications for our understanding of the negation phenomenon. Rather than claiming that the locations and goals are being given object status, it would be less surprising to state that they are, by virtue of the pragmatic

---

[16] The partial exception to this seems to be instruments, which do not show any object-like properties in negated clauses. This is only one of the properties displayed by instruments that are atypical for adjuncts (see Donohue & Donohue 2004 for discussion).

[17] Since this postverbal position is the position in which adjuncts normally appear, it is not unreasonable to suppose that this is a position for marking sentential focus (though not pragmatic focus, which is in situ, or optionally immediately preverbal for terms). Since negation has greater scope than an oblique, it overrides the condition on postverbal obliques. Additional support for this hypothesis is found in the fact that floated quantifiers, which also appear postverbally preceding an auxiliary, are barred from appearing in the same sentence as a negative morpheme, an oblique, or an adjunct.

circumstances of the clause in which they appear, coded as being more salient than otherwise, though not as salient as the unique subject. In view of the robust generalization that negated clauses show fewer of the features typically associated with transitivity than positive clauses do (Hopper & Thompson 1980), this would perhaps be a more attractive analysis.

Another reason for supposing that the object-promotion analysis does not provide the complete answer is the fact that clauses such as 66, in which we have an agent, theme, and location in a negated clause with both the theme and the location showing 'object properties', is that Skou does not permit trivalent verb roots.[18] We have seen that three-place predicates such as 'give' require serial verb constructions (see 22); additionally, while there is an applicative, it is restricted to appearing on monovalent predicates, thus resulting in no more than two terms in a clause. All of the evidence indicates that trivalent predicates are not tolerated, yet to analyze the 'displaced' obliques and adjuncts as objects would be to license a trivalent predicate in the language.

The foregoing suggests that not all aspects of the functions of negated clauses in Skou are fully understood as yet, though progress has been made here.

REFERENCES

AISSEN, JUDITH. 1999. Markedness and subject choice in optimality theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17.4.673–711.

BRESNAN, JOAN. 2001. *Lexical functional syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell.

COLE, PETER; WAYNE HARBERT; GABRIELLA HERMON; and SHIKARIPUR SRIDHAR. 1980. The acquisition of subjecthood. *Language* 56.719–43.

COWAN, H. K. J. 1952. Een toon-taal in Nederlandsch Nieuw Guinea. *Tijdschrift Nieuw Guinea* 13.55–60.

DONOHUE, CATHRYN, and MARK DONOHUE. 2004. On the special status of instrumentals. *Proceedings of the LFG '04 Conference*, ed. by Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King, 209–25. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. Online: http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/site/ONLN.html.

DONOHUE, MARK. 2000. One phrase structure. *Proceedings of ALS2k, the 2000 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, ed. by Keith Allan and John Henderson. Melbourne: University of Melbourne. Online: http://www.arts.monash.edu.au/ling/archive/als2000/proceedings.html.

DONOHUE, MARK. 2001. Coding choices in argument structure: Austronesian applicatives in texts. *Studies in Language* 25.2.217–54.

DONOHUE, MARK. 2002. Which sounds change: Descent and borrowing in the Skou family. *Oceanic Linguistics* 41.1.157–207.

DONOHUE, MARK. 2003a. Negation and grammatical functions in Skou. *Proceedings of ALS2002, the 2002 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, ed. by Peter Collins and Mengistu Amberber. Sydney: University of New South Wales. Online: http://www.als.asn.au/.

DONOHUE, MARK. 2003b. The tonal system of Skou, New Guinea. *Proceedings of the symposium Cross-linguistic Studies of Tonal Phenomena: Historical development, phonetics of tone, and descriptive studies*, ed. by Shigeki Kaji, 329–55. Tokyo: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Research Institute for Language and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

DONOHUE, MARK. 2003c. Agreement in the Skou language: A historical account. *Oceanic Linguistics* 42.2.479–98.

DONOHUE, MARK. 2005. Configurationality in the languages of New Guinea. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 25.2.237–74.

DONOHUE, MARK. 2006. Argument structure and adjuncts: Perspectives from Northern New Guinea. Paper presented to BLS 32, Parasession on Argument Structure.

---

[18] Note that, regardless of whether these location (goal, beneficiary, etc.) participants are becoming objects in negated sentences or simply becoming 'more than obliques', they are clearly changing their grammatical-function status and becoming terms.

DONOHUE, MARK, and LILA SAN ROQUE. 2004. *I'saka: A sketch grammar of a language of north-central New Guinea*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

FOLEY, WILLIAM A., and ROBERT D. VAN VALIN, JR. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HOPPER, PAUL J., and SANDRA A. THOMPSON. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56.2.251–99.

HORN, LAURENCE R. 1989. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

KEENAN, ED, and BERNARD COMRIE. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.63–100.

KOOPMAN, HILDA. 1984. *The syntax of verbs*. Dordrecht: Foris.

PAYNE, THOMAS E. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

PERLMUTTER, DAVID M. (ed.) 1983. *Studies in relational grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

REESINK, GER P. 2002. Clause-final negation: Structure and interpretation. *Functions of Language* 9.2.239–68.

SHIBATANI, MASAYOSHI. 1991. Grammaticalization of topic into subject. *Approaches to grammaticalization, vol. 2,* ed. by Elizabeth C. Traugott and Bernd Heine, 93–133. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

VAN VALIN, ROBERT D., JR., and RANDY J. LAPOLLA. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

VOORHOEVE, C. L. 1971. Miscellaneous notes on languages in West Irian. *Papers in New Guinea linguistics* 14.47–114. (Pacific Linguistics A-28.) Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Linguistics Program
School of Languages, Cultures, and Linguistics
Monash University
Victoria 3800
Australia
[mark@donohue.cc]