

GETTING NEGATIVES IN ARIZONA TEWA: ON THE RELEVANCE OF ETHNOPRAGMATICS AND LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES TO UNDERSTANDING A CASE OF GRAMMATICALIZATION

Paul V. Kroskrity

Abstract

This article explores the process of grammaticalization that has led to the innovation of a distinct form of negation in Arizona Tewa, a Kiowa-Tanoan language spoken in the U. S. southwest. After reviewing comparative linguistic evidence that clearly establishes the innovative form of the Arizona Tewa negative, the analysis proceeds to examine ethnographic data as a means of understanding an apparent reanalysis of a subordinate clause marker as an obligatory part of negative constructions. Such data provide strong evidence for viewing the powerful role of discourse and language ideological factors in accounting for how this grammatical reanalysis both emerged and ultimately came to be the “preferred” form. Comparative data from Australian languages provides additional evidence for viewing larger discourses as highly influential contexts for grammatical change.

Keywords: Negation; Grammaticalization; Ethnopragmatics; Language ideologies; Kiowa-Tanoan Languages; Australian aboriginal languages.

1. Introduction

In this article, I examine the intersection of grammar, ethnopragmatics, and linguistic ideologies in an attempt to understand the formal affinity of negation and subordination in Arizona Tewa and to argue for an expansion of the methods and models conventionally used in studies of grammaticalization. Though the concept of grammaticalization was introduced by Meillet (1912) almost a century ago, it has only recently attracted widespread scholarly attention (e.g. Hopper and Traugott 1992; Ramat and Hopper 1998; Seoane and Lopez-Couso 2008). My purpose here is not to address such contemporary issues as the unidirectionality of grammaticalization, possible restrictions on the concept’s definitional scope, or argue its status as a phenomenon distinct from other grammatical phenomena (Lopez-Couso and Seoane 2008). I will use the term not merely in its most restrictive sense of recruiting lexical items in the service of grammar (Lehmann 1995: 9), but rather as a more inclusive label that also encompasses processes of grammatical reanalysis leading to grammatical renovation. My explicit goal here is to argue for the relevance of ethnopragmatic and language ideological factors in accounting for the evolution of the negative construction in Arizona Tewa.

Arizona Tewa is one of the Tewa Languages (including Rio Grande Tewa and

Santa Clara Tewa) of the Kiowa-Tanoan language family (Kroskrity 2005). It is spoken in the Village of Tewa, on First Mesa of the Hopi Reservation, by a community of about 700 individuals who are the descendents of the only post-Pueblo Revolt (1696) group to abandon its original villages yet retain its distinctive language for three centuries (Kroskrity 1993). Based on three years of linguistic, sociolinguistic, and ethnographic research in that community, I have identified linkages between the syntactic structures of predicate negation in Arizona Tewa, local norms of “doing negation” including cultural notions of polite speech and language users’ contextualization of grammatical negatives, as well as local ideologies that index the forms to prestigious elites within the Tewa community. These levels of analysis contribute to a comprehensive account of grammatical innovation in which pragmatic and ideological factors inform the grammaticalization of negation.

To both demystify and preview what this article is about, we should consider Arizona Tewa examples (1) and (2).¹

- (1) *sen kwiyó we-mán-mun-di*
 man woman NEG₁-3/3.AC-see-NEG₂
 ‘The man did not see the woman.’
- (2) *he’i sen na-men-di ‘o-yohk’o*
 (that man 3.STA-go-SUB 1.STA-be asleep)
 ‘When that man went, I was asleep.’

Examples (1) illustrates a typical negative construction while (2) exemplifies a representative subordinate construction. Example (1) exhibits the usual discontinuous negative morpheme *we-V-di*. All negatives in Arizona Tewa involve the following verbal morphology: Negative prefix, pronominal prefix, verb stem, tense/aspect (where marked), and negative suffix

Both display a formal affinity in clause final *-di*. The second element (NEG₂) of the discontinuous negative in (1) is phonologically identical to the dependent clause-final subordinator in (2). I will argue that this similarity is not an accident but rather a linguistic reanalysis of the subordinator when used in negative constructions as an obligatory second element of a discontinuous NEGATIVE morpheme. Comparative evidence from Australian Aboriginal Languages such as Dyirbal (Dixon 1972) and the

¹ All Arizona Tewa examples appear in a modified form of the orthography I used in (Kroskrity 1993). The current orthography, based on the earlier, follows a system of writing I have recommended to the Arizona Tewa community and which is being considered for official adoption. In this orthography double vowels (e.g. [aa]) replace [a:], [c, c’] are rewritten as [ts, ts’], and superscripted secondary articulations (e.g. /p^h/) are written as digraphs (e.g. /ph/). Other Kiowa-Tanoan and Australian language examples appear in the orthographies used by the authors cited.

Grammatical morphemes that are abbreviated in the linguistic glosses are: 1, 2, 3 = First, second or third person; 1/3 = First person agent/ third person patient; AC = ACTIVE/TRANSITIVE Verb Prefix; CONT = continuative aspect; DUB = Dubitative, EMPH = emphatic; FUT = future tense; IMP = imperative verb prefix; IND = independent clause marker; INT = intransitive; NEG = Negative; NEG₁, NEG₂ = discontinuous Negative; NOM = nominalizer; OBLIG = Obligative aspect; PAS = passive; PERF = perfective aspect; POS = possessive verb prefix; PRES = present; tense; PROG = progressive aspect; REL = relative clause marker; sg = singular; number; STA = stative verb prefix; SUB = subordinate clause marker; TR = transitive.

Western Desert Language (Douglass 1964) suggests that negatives in these languages also display grammaticalization of materials in a required second affirmative clause though we have less information of the role of ethnopragmatic and ideological processes in these developments. This study concludes by offering a more complete and integrated model of how language ideologies and ethnopragmatics mediate between language use and linguistic structure in processes of grammaticalization. As such it offers a refinement of existing models of how considerations of “face” and local ideologies impact grammar (e.g. Brown and Levinson 1987) and adds an ideological dimension to recent attempts to “rethink” grammaticalization as a process (e.g. Lopez-Couso and Seoane 2008).

In the following sections, then, I will first review the structures of negation inherited by the Tewa language from its Kiowa-Tanoan linguistic family lineage. Then I will suggest the importance of ethnopragmatic considerations and move on to the related realm of language ideologies (Kroskrity 2004). After considering some analogous data from Australian aboriginal languages, I will conclude by proposing a general model for grammatical change.

2. Tewa negation in Kiowa-Tanoan perspective

Comparative evidence from other Tanoan languages reveals that while an association of the grammatical processes of negation and subordination is a subfamily trait, Arizona Tewa has realized it in non-cognate form. In an attempt to explain this innovation, I analyze the synchronic form of Arizona Tewa negatives as the grammaticalization of discourse-pragmatic associations with subordination. Lacking detailed historical documentation, the present account proceeds by inference from the contemporary structure and use of negatives in Arizona Tewa and other Tanoan languages.

A Tewa language, one of members of the Kiowa-Tanoan languages, Arizona Tewa is currently spoken on First Mesa of the Hopi Reservation in northeastern Arizona by about 300 speakers. All other dialects of Tewa and all other Tanoan languages except Kiowa are spoken in New Mexico in various pueblos in the Rio Grande Valley. Geographically isolated from other Tanoan languages for almost 300 years. Arizona Tewa displays a fair number of grammatical innovations amid a basic pattern of retention of inherited Tanoan grammatical traits. Negation in Arizona Tewa effectively demonstrates this tendency, since it generally conforms to various nearly pan-Tanoan subfamily regularities, yet Arizona Tewa has innovated a negative suffix that differs markedly from those in the remainder of the family. What I propose to demonstrate is that this similarity is not accidental: The Arizona Tewa negative suffix represents a reinterpretation of the subordinator. Toward this end, it is instructive to survey the form of negation in other Tanoan languages in order to gauge the extent of grammatical innovation and retention.

Available data permit two nearly pan-Tanoan generalizations. One, in all Kiowa-Tanoan languages except Jemez the negative is a discontinuous constituent involving both a prefix and a suffix on the verb. Two, in all languages which have a negative suffix, this suffix and its allomorphs have an initial labial (e.g., Isletan Tiwa /-mi/ and /-ba/ [Leap 1975], Picuris Tiwa /-me/ and /-po/ (Zaharlick 1977: 237}, Taos Tiwa /-me/, /-puol/, and /-pu/ [Trager 1946: 200-211], and Rio Grande Tewa /-pí/ [Spiers 1966: 143]) or can have one plausibly reconstructed, as in the case of Kiowa (Laurel Watkins,

personal communication). The variation among these languages in the number of negative suffixes reflects the extent to which the morpheme also carries tense/aspect information. In Taos Tiwa, for example, the suffixes distinguish present, preterit, and future, while in Rio Grande and Arizona Tewa the negative suffix includes no tense/aspect information. Thus, while Arizona Tewa negatives resemble those of other Tanoan languages, they employ a negative suffix that is clearly not cognate with Tanoan analogues.

Another subfamily trait involving negation, and the critical focus here, is the formal association of negation and subordination. All of the Tiwa languages for which data are available display a negative suffix that is identical in the subordinating morpheme. Thus for Picuris Tiwa, examples (3) and (4) illustrate affirmative and negative versions of the same proposition:

(3) *'u-wəle-hu*
 they-go-IND:PRES
 'They are going'. (Zaharlick 1977: 238)

(4) *'u-wa-wəle-me*
 they-NEG-go-SUB:PRES
 'They are not going'.

The negative differs from the affirmative in two morphological details. One, a negative prefix is inserted between the pronominal prefix and the verb stem. Two, the independent clause suffix is replaced by a subordinate suffix of the same tense. This subordinator can be observed in a typical nonnegative context in example (5).

(5) *ho piwene 'an-t'ay-wia- 'e i'-om-mia-me-henyo*
 this:way corpse his-people-be-REL they-tell-PAS-SUB.PRES-then
'ithappe k'owen ·i-pine-mi-hu
 they.live.to good they-feeling.go-IND.PRES
 'As the dead person's people are told thus, they all go to their houses with good feeling' (Zaharlick 1977: 278-79)

This example illustrates the subordinator's role in marking the first clause as dependent in relation to the main clause that follows. Like Taos Tiwa, Picuris's Northern Tiwa sister, Picuris has subordinate suffixes that are employed in temporal and relative constructions (Trager 1946: 200, 211). In these constructions, as in (5), additional affixation is required. It should also be observed that, in Taos, negation is not invariably associated with the subordinating suffixes (Randall H. Speirs, personal communication). In the present tense of Taos stative verbs, */-hu/*--cognate with the Picuris IND suffix of (3) and (5) above--is employed in both negatives and affirmatives (Trager 1946: 210). But despite this imperfection, the pattern of a grammatical association of negation and subordination clearly emerges from this examination of Northern Tiwa languages. The pattern is, of course, analogous to the Arizona Tewa data of (1) and (2), though not homologous--the subordinate suffixes are not cognate.

Data from Isleta, a representative of the Southern Tiwa languages, conform to the pattern observed for the Northern Tiwa languages. Leap (1975) has reported this

association in a paper in which he considered the deep structural implications of this convergence of negation and subordination in surface structure. Examples (6)-(8) provide relevant data here:

- (6) *tiwran iw-*napab-se-ya* altar'ag* (Isletan Tiwa)
 women they-flowers-put-IND:PRES altar.on
 'The women put flowers on the altar'.
- (7) *tiwran iw-e-*napab-se-mi* altar'ag*
 women they-NEG-flowers-put-SUB:PRES altar.on
 'The women are not putting flowers on the altar'.
- (8) *thumdayoya tiwran namisa-tu'ay iw-wehi iw-*napab-se-mi* 'i altar'ag*
 tomorrow women church-at they-be they-flowers-put-SUB.PRES REL altar.on
 'The women who put flowers on the altar will be at church tomorrow'.

Examples (6) and (7) illustrate Isletan affirmative and negative sentences, respectively. The latter demonstrates that the Isletan negative is signaled by the co-occurrence of a negative prefix and a subordinating suffix. Example (8) illustrates this suffix in a nonnegative subordinating function. Though this example illustrates the use of the subordinator in relative clause, subordinate suffixes occur in all non-independent, or embedded, clauses (Leap 1975).

While Isletan Tiwa conforms to a pattern observed in other Tanoan languages insofar as negation and subordination are concerned, it is reported to deviate from them in the morphology and semantics of the negative prefix. Unlike Tewa and other Tiwa languages where the negative prefix either precedes or follows the pronominal prefix, Isletan negative prefixes may do either. Examples (9) and (10), from Leap (1975), illustrate this apparent Isletan innovation:

- (9) *we-im-fe-mi* (Isletan Tiwa)
 NEG-1.POS-burn-SUB.PRES
 '(Some other fire may be but) my fire is not burning'.
- (10) *im-e-fe-mi*
 1.POS-NEG-burn-SUB.PRES
 '(I had a fire but) my fire is not burning (now)'.

The alternation of the negative prefix in the examples is semantically motivated. The verb-initial negative prefix /we-/ includes the subject-topic within its scope, while /e-/ restricts the scope to the action or state signified by the predicate (Leap 1975). Such considerations of the negative prefix suggest the importance of semantics in any attempt to unravel the interwoven processes of negation and subordination in Arizona Tewa.

Having compared Arizona Tewa negatives to those of the Tiwa languages, let me turn to Rio Grande Tewa for additional comparative evidence. Rio Grande Tewa negatives do not follow the pattern of a formal relationship between negation and subordination. In a typical Rio Grande Tewa negative, such as example (11), we find a familiar pattern involving the discontinuous negative and a labial-initial negative suffix:

- (11) *wí-na-mae:-pí* (Rio Grande Tewa)
 NEG₁-3.STA-go-NEG₂
 'He didn't go'. (Speirs 1966: 143)

Like the negative suffixes of the Tiwa languages, /-pí/ is an obligatory element in negation. But unlike those same Tiwa suffixes, the Rio Grande Tewa cognate encodes neither tense/aspect nor clause status information. It is simply a generalized negative suffix that displays no necessary association with subordination. Only in negated subordinate clauses, such as that in (12), is there even an "accidental" association subordination.

- (12) *na-mae:-pí-ri-bo ró-mu'* (Rio Grande Tewa)
 3.STA-go-NEG-SUB-EMPH 1/3:AC-see
 'I saw him before he went'.

In this example we find the Rio Grande Tewa subordinator /-ri/ that is cognate with the Arizona Tewa /-di/ in (2) above. In both languages, these subordinators occur in both affirmatives and negatives. This fact strongly suggests that Arizona Tewa has innovated its anomalous negative suffix through a reinterpretation of the subordinator. What became of the "old" negative in Arizona Tewa? It survives as /-pí/--a dubitative modal restricted to negative conditionals and hypotheticals (Yegerlehner 1957: 49). This more circumscribed function of Arizona Tewa /-pí/ is exemplified in the following example:

- (13) *we-dó-ha'-pí-díwe-'o-he-di* (AT)
 NEG₁-1/3.AC-eat-DUB-NEG₂ NEG₁-1.STA-sick-NEG₂
 'If only I hadn't eaten it, I wouldn't be sick'.

Thus /-pí/, the ordinary negative suffix of Rio Grande Tewa and the inherited Tanoan form, has assumed a more specialized function in Arizona Tewa-one which complements the generalized negation of the innovated Arizona Tewa negative suffix.

A consideration of Kiowa completes this survey of related languages. As example (14) below shows, Kiowa does attest a discontinuous negative (*hɔn* V-ɔ:) but it does not display any affinity between negation and subordination. Kiowa negation is anomalous within Kiowa-Tanoan both by its not linking these processes and by its linkage of clause organization (including subordination) to an innovated set of switch-reference marking suffixes (Watkins 1984: 236).

- (14) *á-k'í: hɔn hólde θ-cá:n-ɔ-t'ɔ: tó:-kya* (Watkins 1984: 178)
 your-husband NEG₁ soon [3.sg]-arrive-NEG₂-FUT house-at
 'Your husband won't be coming home soon.'

This survey of negation in Tanoan establishes the blend of anomalous innovation and adherence to inherited grammatical pattern that characterizes the Arizona Tewa negative. In so doing it provides a partial overview of the structural

resources available to Tewa speakers. Though the suffix itself is anomalous, the pattern of association between negation and subordination constitutes a genuine subfamily trait.

Another source of influence outside of Kiowa-Tanoan family is, of course, Hopi. The Arizona Tewa community has spoken this language for two and half centuries and its members are well acquainted not only with Hopi lexicon and grammar but with the norms of Hopi discourse as well. Indeed an areal linguistic analysis of Arizona Tewa negation on the model of Hopi might be especially plausible except for two irrefutable facts. One, the flexible morphosyntax of Hopi negation is strikingly dissimilar to the Arizona Tewa and, two, there is no phonological resemblance between the Hopi negative particle (*qa* in non-future tense and *so'on* in future) (Hopi Dictionary Project 1998) and Arizona Tewa *we-__-di*). Not only is the grammar of negation different; there also appears to be no comparable association of negation with either subordination or with constructions involving either syntactic complexity or paratactic organization. No areal, or diffusional, account can therefore explain or contribute significantly to the understanding of the evolution of Arizona Tewa negation.² But this tracing of continuities and discontinuities offers only an implicit account of how and why this reanalysis was effected. To examine such questions, we need a further analysis of contemporary patterns of use and the role of negation in actual ethnopragmatic practices and in the local language ideologies of Arizona Tewa speakers.

3. The Ethnopragmatics of Arizona Tewa negation

While inherited structural forms provide the resources that speakers must use, those forms do not determine such outcomes as grammaticalization and language change more generally. While many models of grammaticalization emphasize the code rather than the speaker, considerations of the communicative projects of speakers and their actual discourse begin to redirect our focus to a language user who is more than merely a syntactic animal. As Givón (1979: 107) has stated, “human languages keep renovating their syntax via the grammaticalization of discourse.” Though discourse is the site of linguistic change, the imagery of renovation may inappropriately suggest a singular “plan” and a coordinated implementation as in the remodeling of homes and offices. But most change, as we know from such diverse fields as sociolinguistics, sociocultural anthropology, and evolutionary biology emerges from variation. The key challenge is not so much attempting to find the constraints on grammaticalization as a linguistic

² I am indebted to an anonymous reviewer for suggesting the possibility of an areal account involving either Hopi or Navajo. As mentioned in the text, Hopi definitely lacks sufficient similarity to be a factor in the analysis here. The negative Hopi particle *qa* precedes the word it negates (Hopi Dictionary Project 1998: 870) and therefore displays a comparatively free syntactic placement in comparison to the Arizona Tewa. Similarly though Hopi politeness norms have been observed, there are no studies that associate negation with either politeness or with subordination. Though the relevance of Hopi data to the analysis here can definitely be refuted there is also the possibility of a Navajo areal connection. In contrast to Arizona Tewa societal multilingualism in Hopi prior to the present generation, there is only a pattern of individual multilingualism in Navajo limited to the older generations and those members that had direct contact with Navajos while growing up. Navajo does display a discontinuous negative though it has no demonstrated formal affinity to subordination. Obviously further attention to the possible influence between Tewa and Navajo requires further comparative Athapaskan inquiry that is beyond the scope of the present article.

process but rather to understand how innovated forms emerge and how they “acquire” more speakers and more contexts of use. Why did most speakers of Arizona Tewa find it appropriate to reanalyze the subordinator *-di* as an obligatory part of the discontinuous Negative morpheme when speakers of all other Tewa dialects chose a different grammatical strategy?

Possible answers to this question emerge from the consideration of ethnopragmatic practices and members’ language ideological perspectives. In what contexts would negation become associated with subordination in actual practice? What factors might promote such a positive response to this grammatical innovation that it becomes the socially “preferred” form? Based on my field research in the Village of Tewa, I would say there are three discourse contexts in which speakers’ practices routinely associated these structures.

The first context is one of polite and elite speech associated with practices of *senóó-bi hiili* (elder-‘s talk) or (respected) ‘elder language’. I encountered this local discourse when I first began field research in the Tewa community in the mid-1970s. At that time, this discourse was exhibited by many in the oldest generation and especially by those who held elite ceremonial offices. *Senóó-bi hiili* consisted of a variety of practices that were viewed as indexical of their high standing in the social and moral order of Arizona Tewa society. In interviews with a variety of members, I learned that these practices included the use of older words (*heye tu*), elaborate greetings (*sengi-tu*), mitigated commands, and various grammatical practices that were regarded as displaying exemplary politeness. Though Tewa metalanguage referred to this practice as *sigi-tu* (kind words), this term probably conveys a local language ideological bias that overly acknowledges the lexical-referential aspect of language rather than its grammatical contribution. Some examples that are especially relevant to this presentation appear in examples (15 and 16). These examples illustrate the way negative imperatives are used preceding a positive imperative and are typical of a “polite imperative”. Local language ideologies valorize elder talk for its consideration of others and for its understated display of power. While in everyday speech, negative imperatives are common, those imperatives are viewed as much more face-threatening (Brown and Levinson 1987: 61-5) because of the restraint on others that they verbally impose. Though it is certainly possible to see the formation of a pairing of imperatives as twice as imposing, this is not the Tewa view. Some speakers state that the negative imperative is somehow either qualified or explained by the positive imperative that follows and that this produces a “softening” of the imperative force that is viewed as appropriate for elders. While talking strongly (*keledi*) is routinely done and not overtly devalued, most speakers see the ideal norms associated with *senóó-bi hiili* as exemplifying the highest order of human conduct and a means of wielding power and displaying authority in the least offensive manner.

- (15) *wó-‘o-c’uuwabε-di ‘o-c’iika-kya-mí*
 NEG-IMP.2.sg-enter-NEG2 IMP.2.sg.-wait-stay-OBLIG
 ‘Don’t enter, you should (just) stay and wait.’
- (16) *naa-bi p’aade wu-‘u-wíí-mí-di ‘o-sooge*
 I-‘s front NEG₁-2.sg.STA-stand-OBLIG-NEG₂ 2.sg.IMP-sit

‘Don’t stand in front of me, (just) sit!’

- (17) *we-bí-hwii-‘a-di-di bí-su-‘o*
 NEG₁-2.pl.IMP-eat-CONT-NEG₂-SUB 2.pl.IMP-drink-PROG
 ‘Don’t eat, just drink!’

What is interesting about these constructions in terms of the discourse-syntax interface is the way a simple discursive sequence deploys the syntactic resources associated with subordination, thus promoting a partial convergence of negation and subordination. Note also that these forms attest an intermediate stage in which *-di* is ambiguously a negative and a subordinating marker. As mentioned earlier this register is not practiced today and there is no established routine of imperative pairing in a complex sentence. Speakers today appear to analyze such a sequence not as a cultural convention but rather as two distinct imperatives - one negative, the other affirmative. In those rare instances where speakers do produce a complex sentence involving two imperatives, the initial negative imperative, ending in the discontinuous NEG₂ *-di-* must be followed by the subordinator */-di /* thus disclosing the complete reanalysis of the first *-di* as only a Negative. As Arizona Tewa speakers were reanalyzing the inherited negative */-pí/* as a more specialized emphatic dubitative, they also replaced it with a subordinating marker that was at first only “accidentally” associated with negation in discourse contexts but later reanalyzed as an obligatory part of negation.

Note also that these forms attest an intermediate stage in which *-di* exists ambiguously as both a negative and a subordinating marker. As mentioned earlier this register is not practiced today but it is of course possible to sequence a negative and a positive imperative within a single utterance. However when this occurs, as in (17) below the negative and subordinator both occur, indicating a later stage in which speakers have reanalyzed the negative and subordinator as distinct, though phonologically identical, grammatical morphemes.

- (17) *we-bí-hwíí-‘a-di-di bí-su-‘o*
 NEG₁-2.pl.IMP-eat-CONT-NEG₂-SUB 2.p.IMP-drink-PROG
 ‘Don’t eat, just drink!’

A second discourse context in which negation and subordination is routinely linked are the ritual contexts associated with *te’e hiili*, or ‘Kiva Speech.’ Though the conditions of my field research require me to not cite any examples of actual ritual speech, I am permitted to provide a simulated example to get my point across. In a variety of ceremonies, particularly those sacred ceremonies in which altars have been erected, there is considerable discourse about the creation and the significance of ritual objects like fetishes. These discourses occur both during the altar construction - a time in which the audience consists only of other elite ceremonial practitioners - and also during demonstrations of the altar that occur during the kiva portion of the ritual.³ These demonstrations occur before an audience of members of the clans associated with the kiva and are thus witnessed by a larger adult audience. Example (18) is representative of this type of discourse.

³ For a detailed discussion of Arizona Tewa kiva speech see (Kroskrity 1998).

- (18) *dó-mun, íí-mun p'okwε we-na-mu-di pheén na-mu*
 1.sg/3.AC-see 1.pl/3.AC-see salamander NEG₁-3sg-be-NEG₂ frog 3.sg.STA-be
 'I see, we all see, that it is not the salamander but it is the frog.'
dó-mun, 'íí-mun khuuyo we-na-mu-di khen na-mu.
 1.sg/3.AC-see 1.pl/3.AC-see wolf NEG₁-3.sg.STA-be-NEG₂ bobcat 3.sg.STA-be
 I see, we all see, that it is not the gray wolf but it is the bobcat.

In this simulated example we find another discourse sequence in which negatives are immediately followed by affirmative sentences and another context in which the subordinator would accidentally be associated with this ritual form of emphatic negation.

As with the *senóó-bi-hiili* register, these ritual forms preserve an older structure in which *-di* can be interpreted as performing either or both a negative and subordinating function.

A third discourse context for the association of negation and subordination, and one that is both contemporary and colloquial rather than encoded in a special register, is that of clarifying negatives in which the indeterminate scope of the negative is made retrospectively determinate by the following affirmative sentence as in example (19-20).

- (19) *Kada we-mán-mun-di-di dó-mun*
 Kada NEG₁-3.sg/ 3.AC-see-NEG₂-SUB 1.sg/3.AC-see
 'Kada did not see her/him/it, I did'.
- (20) *Sε' éwe we-dó-kuup'e-wan-di-di t'ummele dó-kuup'e-wan*
 pottery NEG₁-1.sg/ 3.AC-sell-PERF-NEG₂-SUB plaque 1.sg/3.AC-sell-PERF
 'I didn't sell pottery, I sold a (wicker) plaque'

To understand these examples and their productivity in everyday discourse (*t'owa-bi hiili* or 'people's talk'), we can first note the paucity of negative grammatical devices in Arizona Tewa. Aside from a sentence-introducing negative particle *yoo*, 'no', and the discontinuous negative *we-V-di* described above, Arizona Tewa possesses no segmental means of negating specific arguments and no suprasegmental devices (such as stress placement) to permit greater semantic precision. The scope of an Arizona Tewa negative, unlike that of an Isletan Tiwa one as described in section 1., is thus structurally indeterminate. In *vacuo*, one cannot distinguish, in the case of a negated transitive verb, whether the agent, the patient, or the verb itself is being negated. All three semantic possibilities are realized in identical morphosyntactic form and examples 19-20 illustrate the first two of these possibilities.

Of course, such structurally indeterminate meanings are often resolved in genuine conversations (as opposed to elicitation contexts). As Givón (1979: 107) has observed: "Negative assertions are used in language in contexts where the corresponding affirmative has been mentioned, deemed likely, or where the speaker assumes that the hearer – erroneously – holds to a belief in the truth of that affirmative." But while this may be statistically true, many instances occur in which the preceding discourse fails to disambiguate the scope of the negative. In such instances, I have observed that the habitual practice of Arizona Tewa speakers is to supply a clarifying

affirmative sentence in order to delimit the scope of the negative. In form, such utterances are composed of a subordinate clause containing the negative followed by a main affirmative clause. Examples (19)-(20) above provide sample sentences of this type. In addition to the habitual use of such forms in contexts where previous discourse fails to provide situational disambiguation, such sentences are also employed in disambiguating contexts as a preferred means of emphatic denial.

Examples 19 and 20 provide contemporary examples in which *-di* has been reanalyzed as NEG₂ thus necessitating use of the original source of this grammatical form - the subordinator. Note that these “elaborated” negatives provide a larger discourse context for when extralinguistic context seems not to provide the necessary pragmatic background information. But we can also observe, following Givón that the use of negatives cross-linguistically typically occurs in situations that would also promote the use of “elliptical” negatives - negatives in which the following affirmative can be erased because it provides no new information not already supplied by prior discourse and/or current extralinguistic context. The Arizona Tewa case may appear unusual in that so-called elliptical negatives would still be marked as dependent clauses yet as Nicholas Evans (2007) observes this pattern appears to be one of many examples cross linguistically of what he calls “insubordination” - when subordinate clauses perform as conventionalized main clauses. In such an analysis the elliptical negatives (complete with the subordinator) are grammaticalized into an “unmarked” negative main clause and the “elaborated” negative is retained but only as the “marked” negative indicating emphatic negation.

When these “ethnographic” observations of contemporary language use are combined with the structural analysis of (19)-(20), as represented in Figure 1, they suggest a pragmatic origin for the association of negation and subordination in Arizona Tewa:




FIGURE 1: the Elaborated Negative Source of NEG₂

If we understand Figure 1 as a representative of the preceding elaborated negatives, we can readily find in the subordinating postposition *-di* a structural source for the second element of the contemporary discontinuous negative *we-V-di*, a source that emerges from actual linguistic practice. Being contiguous to the sentence-final verb of the lower S, *-di*, through association with negation in such structures, would be readily reanalyzable as part of the verb--a “negative” verb suffix.

What ethnopragmatics does here then is to suggest actual discourse practices that created syntactic sequences in which grammaticalization in the form of reanalysis occurred. What language ideology provides is a recentering of models of language change that reposition speaker’s awareness not only of linguistic and discursive structure but also of the sociocultural indexicality of linguistic and discursive practices. As Silverstein (1985: 220) observes: “The total linguistic fact, the datum for a linguistic

science of language, is irreducibly dialectic in nature. It is an unstable mutual interaction of meaningful sign forms contextualized to situations of interested human use, mediated by the fact of cultural ideology.” Such linguistic ideologies not only rationalize aspects of some linguistic practices for some speakers, they also provide a sociocultural basis for understanding the indexical meanings of linguistic and discursive practice. In the Arizona Tewa data that I just briefly presented above, a language ideological approach permits us to understand the emergence of the grammatical re-analysis of *-di* as a preferred practice in two important ways. One, speakers rationalized the discursive form of some instances in which negation was associated with subordination as a preferred cultural strategy. Their awareness quite expectedly was focused more on appropriate communication than on awareness of modifications of structural forms. They viewed polite imperatives, for example, as better though they lacked discursive consciousness of the role of *-di* in these constructions. Two, this linkage of the discursive practices indexed to these forms is rather positive. Both the elder’s speech and kiva speech enjoy prestigious associations to religious and cultural authority - to what I have termed the dominant language ideologies of the Arizona Tewa community (Kroskrity 1998). Such sociocultural indexing would promote, paralleling Labov’s (1963) notion, a “social motivation” of a grammatical change and facilitate a positive social “evaluation” (Labov 1972) of these innovated forms that would enhance their preferability. Thus ideological approaches permit analysts to use the partial awareness of speakers - an awareness in which language, discourse, and culture are fused - to not only understand instances of grammaticalization as structural responses but also to begin to understand how some structural forms begin to be preferred by various speakers and by entire speech communities.

5. The grammaticalization of negation in some Australian languages

Some Australian language data seem to lend support to the preceding account. Walbiri, the Western Desert Language, and Dyirbal all exhibit interesting structural and pragmatic relationships between negatives and adjacent affirmative sentences. In Kenneth Hale’s unpublished notes on Walbiri, one observes that well-formed negative imperatives must be accompanied by an affirmative, or positive, imperative saying what to do instead (e.g., ‘Don’t spear the kangaroo, leave it!’). Similarly in the Western Desert Language described by Douglass (1964: 52): The negative occurs as the suffix *-ma:l* on a nominalized form of the verb. This suffix is followed by further suffix according to whether the positive verb stated or suggested by the context is transitive or intransitive.” These descriptive facts are illustrated in (21-2) below.

- (21) *wangka-ntja-ma:l-pa kanmarari*
talk-NOM-NEG-INT be quiet
‘Don’t talk, be quiet’.
- (22) *tjarpatju-nkutja-ma:l-tu yilala*
insert-NOM-NEG-TR pull
Don’t insert it, pull it’. (Douglass 1964: 53)

But in the Western Desert Language, this pattern is not merely characteristic of negative

imperatives but of general negation as well, as indicated in (21):

- (23) *ngayulu wangka-ntja-ma:l-pa kanmararingu*
 talk-NOM-NEG-INT be quiet
 'I didn't talk, but became quiet'. (Douglass 1964: 53)

Nicholas Evans (2006: 413) has more recently suggested that another Australian aboriginal language, Kaytetye - which he describes as not closely related to the Western Desert language - also seems to display similar historical processes wherein negative forms of the verb employ a privative nominalized form.⁴ He provides the following illustrative example (24) of a negative imperative.

- (24) *ape-nge-wanenyē*
 go-NOM-PRIV
 'not go' (Lit. 'without going')

In his analysis of these constructions Evans (2007: 422) concludes the following:

It seems likely that in all these languages the use of insubordinated verb forms in negative clauses arose in the way outlined by Kroskrity [1984]. At first subordinate negative verbs were conjoined with main clause affirmatives; then the affirmatives were ellipsed; then the originally elliptical negative was reanalysed as a free-standing main clause, and the subordinating morphology was reanalysed as negative morphology. The synchronic result is that one type of main clause, high in presuppositionality, shows morphological affinities with subordinate clauses.

To complete this brief overview of relevant Australian examples we can also observe that Dixon (1972: 112) reports that in Dyirbal the stereotypical affirmative, or positive, verb *galgal* 'leave it' has been reanalyzed as an obligatory constituent in general negation.

One could of course argue that these Australian data shed only indirect light on the Arizona Tewa phenomena under scrutiny here. Nowhere in these examples do we find an incorporation of the grammatical apparatus associated with subordination into the negative constructions. But while the analogy may be imperfect, provocative parallels exist at the levels of both language structure and language use. In both data sets we find elaborated negative sentences in which a negative S precedes an affirmative, or positive, one. Also, in both cases material from the affirmative S has been reanalyzed as an obligatory constituent in negation (e.g., the subordinating morpheme in Arizona Tewa, the verb in both the Western Desert Language and Dyirbal).

Turning to considerations of use, we find evidence in both cases that the habitual association of negatives and affirmatives in specific discourse and pragmatic contexts has been extended and grammaticalized in the current synchronic form of the negative. In the Australian case, speech norms requiring the speaker to employ an affirmative instruction after a negative imperative exhibit varying degrees of grammaticalization in a sample of languages. In Arizona Tewa, semantic considerations involving scope and

⁴ I understand the term privative (PRIV) as a grammatical particle or affix that negates or inverts the value of the word it modifies.

emphasis combine with similar politeness norms to associate the processes of negation and subordination. Thus these Australian data have provided an instructive demonstration of the plausibility of those diachronic processes that I have inferred from the Tewa data. As Evans (2007: 422) observes, negative clauses in Tewa and Western Desert move from needing an overt main clause explicitly expressing the contrasted positive to implicating some general positive state of affairs calculable from context.

6. Conclusions

In this final section I hope to accomplish several objectives regarding the interpretation of my findings. First, I want to summarize the stages in the grammaticalization of the Arizona Tewa Negative and add it to a series of case studies from a variety of languages in which negative constructions show both volatility and malleability. Quoting from Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994: 293): “Other well-known cases are the loss of emphatic value for pronouns and for markers of negation, e.g. English *nought* > *not* and French *ne ... pas*, both of which were formerly used for emphasis and are now the normal non-emphatic methods of negation.” The grammatical “volatility” of negatives cross-linguistically probably stems from the fact that the grammar of negation is deployed in such potentially culturally sensitive speech acts as refusals, refutations, denials, directives, etc. For such speech activities, which clearly include many “face-threatening” acts (Brown and Levinson 1987), the need to perform them in contexts requiring varying degrees of directness and mitigation and various other pragmatic loads invites important variation in their pragmatic and linguistic forms. By operating at such an interface of pragmatics and syntax, negatives may be viewed as providing especially interesting sites of cultural practice and linguistic ideologies.

Table 1
Stages in the Grammaticalization of Arizona Tewa –di (NEG₂)

-
1. Negatives, as in all Tewa languages, include an inherited form *we-V-pí* (the form still retained by Rio Grande Tewa).
 2. Negatives occur in a variety of discourse constructions in which they are accidentally associated with subordination. In these forms and other negatives, the old NEG₂ is reanalyzed as dubitative aspect - (if I had only not).
 3. The Negative occurs in complex constructions - as part of politeness routines, ritual, and everyday speech - involving subordination and replaces the old NEG₂ with the subordinator through such association. The subordinator is bleached of any former association with marking dependent clauses as these clauses assume the role of “unmarked” negative main clauses.
 4. Elaborated negatives perform the “marked” function of emphatic or special use negation.
 5. Negatives always occur with the reanalyzed NEG₂ and, when they now occur in subordinate clauses, they are marked by the former subordinator (which has retained its original grammatical function and phonological shape).
-

What is also remarkable about the Arizona Tewa case is that I have used both ethnography and historical linguistics to trace the evolution of negation in an unwritten language. This brings me to my second conclusion regarding the value of an approach that attends to the ethnography of communication and to ethnopragmatic considerations. Especially in the case of languages that do not have a tradition of literacy, ethnographic documentation of actual practices permits an understanding of the organized diversity of language use and how this variation provides resources for grammaticalization. Importantly, the ethnographic approach I endorse and embody does not merely consist of on-site observation but also requires the methodological skill of ethnographic interviewing. Interviews can provide critical information about whether speakers possess relevant discursive consciousness (Kroskrity 1998) and can rationalize their discursive preferences. This information may be interpretively critical for understanding the “social motivations” of grammatical changes and for supplying an account of the indexical meanings that often account for speakers’ preferences among alternative grammatical options. Just as ethnopragmatics reveals the larger discursive strategies that impact grammatical operations including change, so language ideologies can reveal members’ awareness - especially their partial awareness - and their reflexive capacity to both interpret and manipulate the communicative systems of which they are a critical part.

This brings me to my third and final point regarding the importance of including members’ models. As Coupland and Jaworski (2004: 37) have powerfully stated: “The concept of language ideology is the final rejection of an innocent, behavioural account of language and the focus of the strongest claim that sociolinguistics must engage with metalinguistic processes in the most general sense.” Though these authors direct the thrust of their argument toward sociolinguists, I think it applies just as forcefully to so-called theoretical linguists who are more likely to identify themselves with cognitive science than with “behavioral” approaches yet just as likely to neglect native awareness, however partial and contingent, under the presumption of “linguistic innocence” (Coupland and Jaworski 2004: 16). In sum, language ideologies, both those of the academic researchers as well as the native speakers, are indeed relevant to understanding the process we call “grammaticalization.”

Acknowledgements.

This article was originally presented as a paper at the 11th International Pragmatics Conference in Melbourne, Australia on July 15, 2009. Much of the comparative Kiowa-Tanoan data presented here is drawn and expanded from a previous study (Kroskrity 1984). I want to thank the late Ken Hale for his interest in this topic and his suggestion to examine some comparable Australian data. I also want to thank Nicholas Evans for his generosity in sharing some of his pertinent data and for providing relevant studies from his own research. In addition, I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for useful comments and suggestions made on an earlier draft of this article. I alone, of course, am responsible for any errors of commission and omission that remain.

References

- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson (1987) *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca (1994) *The Evolution of Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Coupland, Nikolas, and Adam Jaworski (2004) Sociolinguistic perspectives on metalanguage: Reflexivity, evaluation, and ideology. In A. Jaworski, N. Coupland, & D. Galasinski (eds.), *Metalanguage: Social and Ideological Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 15-51.
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1972) *The Dyirbal Language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Douglass, W.H. (1964) *An Introduction to the Western Dessert Language*. Oceania Linguistic Monographs, no. 4. Sydney: University of Sydney.
- Evans, Nicholas (2007) Insubordination and its uses. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 366-431.
- Givón, Talmy (1979) *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hopi Dictionary Project (1998) *Hopi Dictionary/Hopiikwa Lavaytutuveni: A Hopi English Dictionary of the Third Mesa Dialect with an English Finder List and a Sketch of Hopi Grammar*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth Closs Traugott (1993) *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. (1993) *Language, History, and Identity: Ethnolinguistic Studies of the Arizona Tewa*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. (1998) Arizona Tewa Kiva speech as a manifestation of a dominant language ideology. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies, Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 103-22.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. (2005) Tewa and the Kiowa Tanoan languages. In Philipp Strazny (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, Volume 2. New York: Fitzroy-Dearborn, pp. 1091-4.
- Labov, William (1963) The social motivation of a sound change. *Word* 19: 273-309.
- Labov, William (1972) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Leap, William (1975) On negation (and what you can do with it). Paper presented at the Annual Friends of Uto-Aztecan Conference. Flagstaff, Arizona.
- Lehmann, Christian (1995) *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Lopez-Couso, Maria Jose, and Elena Seoane (2008) New perspectives on grammaticalization. In Maria Jose Lopez-Couso and Elena Seoane (eds.), *Rethinking Grammaticalization: New Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 1-13.
- Meillet, Antoine (1912) L'évolution des formes grammaticales. *Scientia (Rivista di Scienza)* 12.26: 6.
- Ramat, Anna Giacalone, and Paul Hopper (eds.) (1998) *The Limits of Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Seoane, Elena, and Maria Jose Lopez-Couso (eds.) (2008) *Theoretical and Empirical Issues in Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Silverstein, Michael (1985) Language and the culture of gender: At the intersection of structure, usage, and ideology. In Elizabeth Mertz and Richard J. Parmentier (eds.), *Semiotic Mediation*. Orlando, FL.: Academic Press, pp. 219-259.

Speirs, Randall H. (1966) Some aspects of the structure of Rio Grande Tewa. Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo.

Trager, George L. (1946) An outline of Taos grammar. In H. Hoijer (ed.), *Linguistic Structures of Native North America*. New York: Viking Fund, pp. 184-221.

Watkins, Laurel J. (1984) *A Grammar of Kiowa*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Yegerlehner, John F. (1957) Phonology and morphology of Hopi-Tewa. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.

Zaharlick, Anne Marie (1977) Picuris syntax. Ph.D. dissertation, American University.

PAUL V. KROSKRITY is a Professor of Anthropology at the University of California at Los Angeles. His research interests focus on language ideologies, language contact, language and identity, verbal art, language endangerment, linguistic revitalization, and the interface of grammar and discourse-pragmatics. He has conducted long-term and original research in two Native American communities: the Arizona Tewa of the Pueblo Southwest, and the Western Mono of Central California.

Address: Department of Anthropology, University of California at Los Angeles, 341 Haines Hall – Box 951553, Los Angeles, California 90095-1553, United States. E-mail: paulvk@ucla.edu