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Methodology

- grammar of Nafsan (Thieberger, 2006)
- corpus of Nafsan archived in PARADISEC (Thieberger 1995-2018)

My fieldwork in 2017/18 (Krajinović, 2017):
- Perfect and Future questionnaire (Dahl, 2000)
- storyboards developed in the MelaTAMP project by Kilu von Prince, myself, and Totem Field Storyboards
- Iamitive and nondum questionnaire by Ljuba Veselinova, Olsson (2013)
- Negation questionnaire by Matti Miestamo
Preverbal complex in Nafsan

Table 1: The verbal complex in Nafsan adapted from Thieberger (2006:243)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBJ.AGR</th>
<th>TMA</th>
<th>NEG1</th>
<th>AUX</th>
<th>BEN</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>NEG2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>po PSP.REAL</td>
<td><em>ta(p)</em></td>
<td><em>to PROG</em></td>
<td>ga 3SG</td>
<td>mau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f/fla COND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>fo PSP.IRR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF.AGR</td>
<td>pe PRF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Negation in Nafsan

- standard negation with the discontinuous marker *ta...mau*
- no dedicated negative quantifiers and indefinites

(1)  *Naat  i=ta  mai  mau.*
    person 3SG.REAL=NEG1 come NEG2
    No one arrived.

- negative verbs
- negative TMA marker *kano* ‘cannot’
- duality effects with perfect
## Negative verbs

**Table 2: Positive and negative counterparts with frequencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Corpus occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>piatlak</em></td>
<td>have</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEG1</strong> <em>piatlak</em>* <strong>NEG2</strong></td>
<td>NEG have</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tik</em></td>
<td>not_have</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tae</em></td>
<td>know/can</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEG1</strong> <em>tae</em>* <strong>NEG2</strong></td>
<td>NEG know/can</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mak</em></td>
<td>not_known</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>supñeke</em></td>
<td>not_known</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kano</strong></td>
<td>cannot</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kano ‘cannot’ and tae ‘can’

(2) \(i=\text{tae} \quad \text{sef} \quad \text{pelpel} \quad \text{me} \quad \text{katom} \quad i=\text{kano}\)
3SG.REAL=know escape quickly and H.crab 3SG.REAL=unable
He can run away quickly, but the hermit crab can’t. (036.007)

(3) \(\text{ta}=\text{tae} \quad \text{kus} \quad \text{em̃rom} \quad \text{kes} \quad \text{nen} \quad \text{to}\)
1DU.INCL.REAL=can hide inside box DET stay
We can hide in that box (AK1-147-12, 00:01:45.746-00:01:49.520)

(4) \(\text{ta}=\text{kano} \quad \text{kus} \quad \text{em̃rom} \quad \text{kes}, \quad i=\text{ses̖al} \quad \text{toop}\)
1DU.INCL.REAL=cannot hide inside box 3SG.REAL=small big
We can’t hide in the box, it’s too small. (AK1-147-12, 00:02:02.493 - 00:02:08.771)
Semantic asymmetry: *kano* vs. *tae*

Past counterfactuals

(5) \[ ka=f \text{ mer pei } \varpi \text{ “bol” nanom, } ka=fo \text{ lom } \]
1SG.IRR=COND CF first kick ball:BI yesterday 1SG.IRR=PSP.IRR wet
usrek.”

completely
If I had played football yesterday I would have gotten wet.
(AK1-004-01, 00:01:57.691-00:02:13.145)

(6) \[ Ku=f \text{ mer pei } ta \text{ tai nkas ne mau } ka=fo \text{ kano } \]
2SG=COND CF first NEG1 cut wood that NEG2 1SG.IRR=PSP.IRR cannot
\ñel pak nauñ ale \ ka=fo \ kano \ lom. \]
fall to river then:BI 1SG.IRR=PSP.IRR cannot wet
If you hadn’t chopped that wood, I wouldn’t have fallen in the water, and I wouldn’t have gotten wet. (AK1-035-01, 00:02:41.616-00:02:50.190)
(7) *Meri, p nanoparticles* mer sat nrau pur, ntal ke=fo
Mary 2sg.irr=cond cf take leaf big taro 3sg.irr=pst.irr
kano malig pak ektem.
cannot spilled to outside
Mary, if you had taken a big leaf, the taro would not have spilled over. (AK1-151-02, 00:06:45.178 - 00:06:54.035)
Semantic asymmetry: *kano* vs. *tae*

Present counterfactuals

(8) \textit{Ag k\textsuperscript{u}=f-\textit{mer} to talm\textsuperscript{\textipa{\textashape{n}}}at k\textsuperscript{a}=fo lek-a-k.}  
2SG 2SG=COND-CF stay garden 1SG.IRR=PSP.IRR look-TS-2SG  
If you were in the garden, I would be looking at you. (AK1-147-01)

(9) \textit{i=f-wel ku=to talm\textsuperscript{\textipa{\textashape{n}}}at malfane, k\textsuperscript{a}=fo kano}  
3SG=COND-like 2SG=stay garden now 1SG.IRR=PSP.IRR cannot  
skei to talm\textsuperscript{\textipa{\textashape{n}}}at to malfane.  
alone stay garden stay now  
If you were in the garden right now, I wouldn’t be alone in garden.  
(AK1-146-08, 00:00:09.076 - 00:00:18.320)
**Conditionals: kano vs. tae**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditional type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Kano</th>
<th>Ta(p)...mau</th>
<th>Negative verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past counterfactual</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present counterfactual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future counterfactual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Negation of the apodosis**
Perfect in Nafsan

**Perfect**
- Resultative
- Experiential
- Universal
- ‘Hot news’
- Adverb restrictions
- Anteriority

**Already**
- Change of state/inchoative state
- Earliness implication
- Duality

Iamitives and nondums

- Olsson (2013): iamitives as: resultative perfect + ‘already’ (earliness implication)
- Veselinova (2017): nondum ‘not yet’ markers (usually related to iamitives)
- both iamitives (or iamitive-like perfects) and nondums are found in Oceanic languages
Iamitive and *nondum* questionnaire

(Q7) (Imagine some fruit that is common in your area) You can eat this one. It BE RIPE.

(10)  
\[ ku=tae \quad paam \ tene, \ ki=pe \quad mam. \]
\[ 2\text{SG.REAL}=\text{can eat} \quad \text{that} \quad 3\text{SG.PRF}=\text{PRF ripe} \quad (AK1-156) \]

(Q45) (Imagine some fruit that is common in your area). You can’t eat this one. It NOT RIPE.

(11)  
\[ (*ki=pe) \quad i=ta \quad ta \quad mam \ mau. \]
\[ (*3\text{SG.PRF}=\text{PRF}) \quad 3\text{SG.REAL}=\text{still NEG1 ripe} \quad \text{NEG2} \quad (AK1-156) \]
Is Nafsan perfect a iamitive?

Nafsan perfect is a perfect whose iamitive-like functions arise pragmatically.

NOT iamitive-like:
(Q34) How strange, my uncle COME. (He wasn’t invited/I thought he wouldn’t come.)

(12) \textit{Kau, ga} \textit{ki=pe mai!} \\
Oh \textit{3SG 3SG.PRF=PRF come} \\
Oh, he came! (AK1-156)
Is Nafsan perfect a iamitive?

Perfect in Nafsan has a reading of being in posttime of the situation (event) time (Klein, 1994).

\[\neg \text{pretime} \quad \quad \quad \quad T\text{Sit} \quad \quad \quad \quad [TT=\text{posttime}] \quad \quad \quad \neg P \quad \quad \quad \neg [\text{change-of-state}] [P] \quad \quad \quad \]
‘Not yet’ in Nafsan

Nafsan does not have a dedicated *nondum* marker: it uses the construction \( \text{REAL=STILL NEG} \), but not perfect!

(13) \[ \text{Ale} \; \text{\textit{ki=pe}} \; \text{\textit{ptu-ki}} \; \text{\textit{nuan me tomat}} \; \text{\textit{i=ta}} \; \text{\textit{tap}} \]

then 3SG.PRF=PRF give-TR fruit but tomato 3SG.REAL=still NEG1

\[ \text{\textit{ptu-ki}} \; \text{\textit{nuan mau}.} \]
give-TR fruit NEG2

It [pumpkin] gave fruit, but tomato hasn’t given fruit yet.

(20170807-AK-038, 00:01:28.459 - 00:01:39.486)
Negation: Duality

already (English)  
PERFECT  
NEG PERFECT  
‘not anymore’  
not anymore (English)

not yet (English)  
REAL=NEG still  
REAL=still  
still (English)

Note: Based on Krifka (2000)
‘Not yet’ in “Making laplap”

Have you tried laplap before?

No, I haven’t tried it yet.
‘Not yet’ in “Making laplap”

(14) Ag *kui=pe* paam kapu?
2SG 2SG.PRF=PRF eat laplap
Have you eaten laplap before? (AK1-151-02, 00:01:18.633 - 00:01:20.950)

(15) *a=ta ta paam-i mau*.
1SG.REAL=still NEG1 eat-3SG.OBJ NEG2
I haven’t eaten laplap yet. (AK1-151-02, 00:01:43.670 - 00:01:46.866)
Syntactic incompatibility with *ta* ‘still’

The perfect *pe* occupies the same slot as *ta* (Thieberger, 2006)

- no attested combinations of TMA markers and *ta* ‘still’

**Table 4:** Slots in verbal complex in Nafsan, based on Thieberger (2006:243)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBJ.AGR</th>
<th>TMA</th>
<th>NEG1</th>
<th>AUX</th>
<th>BEN</th>
<th>Verb=OBJ</th>
<th>NEG2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRF.AGR/REAL</td>
<td><em>pe</em> (PRF)</td>
<td><em>ta(p)</em></td>
<td><em>to</em> (PROG)</td>
<td><em>ga</em> (3SG)</td>
<td><em>mau</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL/IRR</td>
<td><em>po/fo</em> (PSP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL/IRR</td>
<td><em>f</em> (COND)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL/IRR</td>
<td><em>fia</em> (POT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL/IRR</td>
<td><em>ta</em> (‘still’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘Not anymore’ in “Haircuts”

My hair was red for two years.  

But it’s not red anymore.
‘Not anymore’ in “Haircuts”

(16) \textit{totur ntau i=rnu \ nalu-k \ ga \ i=miel \ me malfane}  
during year 3SG.REAL=two hair-1SG.DP 3SG 3SG.REAL=red but now  
\textit{ nalu-k \ ki=pe \ ta \ miel mau.}  
hair-1SG.DP 3SG.PRF=PRF NEG1 red NEG2  
During these two years my hair was red, but it’s not red anymore.  
(20180716-AK1-154-03, 00:03:36.645-00:03:52.483)
(17) *Malen p̃a=ler kai=pe ta mtir natus mau.*

When you come back I will not have written the letter. (by Lionel Emil, 19/06/2018)
‘Not anymore’: unbounded predicates

Positive perfect: \( \neg P \rightarrow [\text{change-of-state}][TT=P] \rightarrow \)

(18) \( ki=pe \quad \text{mam.} \)
\( 3SG.PR\text{F}=PR\text{F} \text{ ripe} \)
\( \text{It is ripe. (AK1-156)} \)

Negation of perfect: \( P \rightarrow [\text{change-of-state}][TT=\neg P] \rightarrow \)

(19) \( \text{Malen } \tilde{p}a=ler \quad kai=pe \quad ta \quad \text{to} \quad \text{mtir} \quad \text{natus mau.} \)
\( \text{when} \quad 2SG.IRR=\text{back} \quad 1SG.PR\text{F}=PR\text{F} \quad \text{NEG1 PROG write letter NEG2} \)
\( \text{When you come back I will not be writting the letter anymore. (by Lionel Emil, 19/06/2018)} \)
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the case of *kano* ‘cannot’ showed us how negative TMA markers can neutralize their TMA meanings in certain environments

negated perfect aspect and ‘already’ can have restricted meanings due to different factors:
- logical duality effects
- occupying the same syntactic slot
- as a result of interaction with other TMA meanings or processes

asymmetries in interaction of negation and TMA can be subtle and easily missed in elicitation and description

we should use targeted experimental materials such as storyboards (Krajinović 2017:AK1-166, von Prince 2017; TFS 2010)
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