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1. Martinican
Martinican

- Regional language of France
  - Martinique, Lesser Antilles
  - Creole language
  - Main lexifier: French
  - 600,000 speakers (APiCS)
  - SVO language
Predication (1/3)

- TAM variation encoding

- TAM markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAM Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective (stative predicates)</td>
<td>No marker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective (dynamic predicates)</td>
<td>No marker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective (dynamic predicates)</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>té</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futur</td>
<td>ké</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>té ké</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Predication (2/3)

➢ No TAM markers (Colot et Ludwig 2013)
  • Dynamic predicates: perfective interpretation

(1) a. man té ka vwéyé anlo
  1SG PST IPFV send lots.of
  baay anlè
  thing in.the.air
  'I used to throw lots of things in the air'

TON Descrip  017

b. man vwéyé anlo baay anlè
  1SG send many thing in.the.air
  'I threw lots of things in the air'
Predication (3/3)

- No TAM markers (Colot et Ludwig 2013)
  - Stative predicates: imperfective interpretation

(2) a. épi  
  and  
  1PL  PST  have  
  \textit{an}  
  \textit{stok}  \textit{tuil}  
  DET.INDF.SG  stock  tile  
  'and we had a stock of tiles'

b. \textit{nou}  
  \textit{ni}  
  \textit{an}  
  \textit{stok}  \textit{tuil}  
  1PL  have  DET.INDF.SG  stock  tile  
  'we have a stock of tiles'
What can function as a predicate? (1/2)

Verbs

(3) man té ka vwéyé anlo
1SG PST IPFV send lots.of

baay anlè
thing in.the.air

'I used to throw lots of things in the air'

TON Descrip 017

Nouns

(4) man té tibolonm
1SG PST child

'I was a child'

TON Descrip 020
What can function as a predicate? (2/2)

**Adverbs**

(5) \( \text{épi} \quad \text{sa} \quad \text{bel} \quad \text{menm} \)

and PR.DEM beautiful definitely

'and this is definitely amazing'

LUI Descrip_part1 040

**Adjectives**

(6) \( \text{kilti} \quad \text{nou} \quad \text{ki} \quad \text{la} \)

FOC culture 1PL REL here

'lit. It is our culture which is here'

LUI Descrip_part1 021
2. Standard negation
Standard negation

‘the (basic) way(s) a language has for negating declarative verbal main clauses’

(Miestamo 2016, 2)

➢ No syntactic changes
  - same word order
  - same TAM markers

➢ No difference between dynamic vs. stative predication

➢ 2 negative markers: *pa, pé*
**Pa negative marker (1/2)**

- Morphological status: standard negation marker
  - Encodes the negative polarity of the predication
  - Is preposed to (TAM) + P
  - No TAM value

(7) *men pa ni kouw*

But NEG have class

'but there is no class'

(lit.'but has not class')

Narr HAT   006

(8) *yo pa jouré*

3PL NEG swear

'they did not swear'

Narr MUR   040
**Pa negative marker (2/2)**

(9) yo pa ka wè
3PL NEG IPFV see
'they do not see'
Narr AUG 079

(10) man pa té ka palé kréyol
1SG NEG PST IPFV speak Creole
'I did not speak Creole'
Narr AUG 075

(11) man pa té ké fè-'y
1SG NEG PST FUT do-3SG
'I would not do it'
Descrip BEL 062

(12) nou di jounen-an i
1PL say day-DET.DEF 3SG
'we said: "the day, it will not be beautiful"
Narr MUR 035
Pa negative with pé ‘can’ (1/3)

14

No TAM marker (IPFV interpretation)

Pa is postposed to pé
(11 occurrences out of 12)

(13) a. nou pé pa fè dé bizutaj
    1PL can NEG do DET.INDF.PL hazing
    'lit. we can not do hazings'

Narr HAT 061

b. *nou pa pé fè dé bizutaj
    1PL NEG can do DET.INDF.PL hazing
Pa negative with pé ‘can’ (2/3)

No TAM marker (IPFV interpretation)

1 exception: pa + forséman + pé

Because of
- the code-mixed context?
- the modifier forséman?

'because of the organization being more and more expensive,
they are not necessarily able to do that'

Descrip BEL 047
\textit{Pa} negative with \textit{pé} ‘can’ (3/3)

With TAM markers

\begin{align*}
(15) \text{ a.} & \quad \text{nou} & \quad \text{pa/ pé} & \quad \text{té/ ké/ té ké} & \quad \text{pé} \\
& \quad 1\text{PL} & \quad \text{NEG} & \quad \text{PST/ FUT/ PST} & \quad \text{can} \\
& \quad \text{fè} & \quad \text{dé} & \quad \text{bizutaj} \\
& \quad \text{DET.INDF.PL} & \quad \text{hazing} & \quad \text{DET.INDF.PL}
\end{align*}

\text{’we were/ will / would not be able to do hazing’}

Narr HAT 061

\begin{align*}
\text{ b.} & \quad *\text{nou} & \quad \text{té/ ké/ té ké} & \quad \text{pé} & \quad \text{pa/ pé} \\
& \quad 1\text{PL} & \quad \text{PST/ FUT/ PST} & \quad \text{can} & \quad \text{NEG} \\
& \quad \text{fè} & \quad \text{dé} & \quad \text{bizutaj} \\
& \quad \text{DET.INDF.PL} & \quad \text{hazing} & \quad \text{DET.INDF.PL}
\end{align*}
**Pé negative marker (1/2)**

- Occurs only in my elicited data

  !: in spontaneous speech, only one occurrence of the negation of a predicate in future tense

- **Pé** morphological status: lexical variation of the standard negation marker *pa*
  - Encodes the negative polarity of the predication
  - Is preposed to the TAM markers: *ké* ‘FUT’ or *té ké* ‘COND’

- Another hypothesis: vowel harmony triggered by specific morphemes (*ké* ‘FUT’ or *té ké* ‘COND’)
Pé negative marker (2/2)

- Pé is preposed to the TAM markers: ké (FUT) or té ké (COND)

(16) a. chien-an   pé   ké
    dog-DET.DEF  NEG  FUT
    bwè   dlo-a
    drink   water-DET.DEF
    'the dog won't drink the water'

Elic CLE

b. ?chien-an   pé   té
    dog-DET.DEF  NEG  PST
    ké   bwè   dlo-a
    FUT   drink   water-DET.DEF

' the dog did not drink the water'

Elic CLE

c. chien-an   pa   té
    dog-DET.DEF  NEG  PST
    bwè   dlo-a
    drink   water-DET.DEF

'd*the dog did not drink the water'

Elic CLE

d. *chien-an   pé   té
    dog-DET.DEF  NEG  PST
    bwè   dlo-a
    drink   water-DET.DEF
Negation in I/MCs is similar to negation in NICs

(17) men pa ni kouw
but NEG have class
'but there is no class'

Narr HAT 006

(18) men pou sa [ki
but for PR.DEM REL

pa té ni laradio]
NEG PST have radio

sé lè van-an rivé
FOC SUB.TEMP wind-DET.DEF arrive

anlè yo yo sav
on 3PL 3PL know

'but for those who did not have the radio, it is when the wind blew on them that they know' (lit. 'but for those who did not have the radio, it is when the wind came on them that they know')

TON Descrip 014
Another position of *pa* negative marker

(19) *pa* té rété [*pa* an fey]

NEG PST stay NEG one leaf

'there was not even one leave left' (lit. 'there was not left not one leave')

Descri OTA 1 073
3. *Not yet* constructions
‘Not yet tenses’

‘The meaning of this tense is that a certain situation (in the example given, our going) did not hold in the past and does not hold in the present, i.e. that it still is the case that a certain situation does not hold’ (Comrie 1985, 54)

(20) te-tu-nna-genda

NEG-we-NOT.YET-go

lit. 'we have not yet gone'

Luganda, Niger-Congo (Comrie 1985,54)
Not yet constructions

- In Martinican: grammaticalization of the value *not yet*

- *Poko ~ pòkò*
  - does not belong to the TAM markers paradigm
  - specific negative marker
  - specific semantic TAM value: *not yet*
  - preposed to (TAM) + P
  - 2 phonetic realizations in free variation in my corpus: [poko] ~ [pɔkò]

23
Poko negative marker (1/3)

- TAM values combining with poko in my corpus
  - Tense : always semantically with the past tense
  - Aspect : sometimes with the imperfective marker
Poko negative marker (2/3)

(21) man pòkò té ni ventan

1SG NOT.YET PST have twenty.years

'lit. I was not 20 years yet'

FLU Narr 083

(22) lapli poko té ka tonbé

rain NOT.YET PST IPFV fall

'the rain was not falling yet'

TON Descrip 023
Poko negative marker (3/3)

- Morphological status: ‘not yet gram’ (Veselinova 2017, 10)

i. clear distinction from the standard negative marker *pa*

ii. mandatory use ‘for the expression of non-realized expectations for either actions or states’

iii. invariable morpheme

iv. « complementary distribution with other grams »: *poko* replaces the standard negative marker
4. Negative lexicalization: the case of *pa ... ankò*
Negative lexicalizations

‘Lexical meanings may combine with negation to form lexically idiosyncratic negatives’
(Miestamo 2016, 5)
‘Not anymore’

The predication does not hold at \( t \) but was true before \( t \) (Krifka 2000, 2)

- In Martinican: \( pa \) (standard negative marker) combine with \( ankò \)

\[
pa + (\text{TAM}) + P + ankò
\]

(23) \( \text{donk} \quad \text{atjelman} \quad \text{man} \quad \text{pa} \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{suiv} \)

so nowadays 1SG NEG… IPFV follow

\( \text{touw-la} \quad \text{ankò} \)

race-DET.DEF …again

'so nowadays I do not watch the race anymore'
pa … ankò ‘not anymore’ vs. ankò

 ankò occurs in isolation with clearly distinct meanings

(24) an  lot  fwa  ankò,  alò
  DET.INDF.SG  other  time  again  so

 taa  ankò  pli  bel
  PR.DEM  again  more  amazing

'another time again, so this one is all the more amazing'

Narr AUG  097
5. Negative indefinites and negative concord: the case of *ayen* and *pèsonn*
Ayen ‘nothing’ and pèsonn ‘nobody’

Negative indefinites (Creissels 2006, 2:155)

• Used in negative constructions containing an existential quantification
• Express by themselves a negative value

(25) yo pa jennen pèsonn
3PL NEG bother nobody
‘they bothered nobody’ (lit. ‘they did not bother nobody’)
Narr MUR 042

(26) - Ki moun ki vini isia ?
Q person REL come here
‘Who came here?’
Narr MUR 042

- Pèsonn.
nobody
‘Nobody.’
Negative concord

‘a semantically single negation is expressed both by a clause level negator and by a negative adverb, pronoun or determiner’ (Van der Auwera et Van Alsenoy 2016, 2)

(27) *I can-*t get no satisfaction

1SG can-NEG get NEG.DET.INDF.SG satisfaction

Non-standard English

(Van der Auwera et Van Alsenoy 2016, 2)
Negative concord with pèsonn

In my corpus pèsonn triggers systematically negative concord

- A semantically single negation: ‘nobody’
- A double negation
  - A negative marker (syntax)
  - A negative pronoun: pèsonn

(28)  yo  pa  jennen  pèsonn  
 3PL  NEG  bother  nobody
  'they bothered nobody' (lit. 'they did not bother nobody')

Narr MUR  042

(29)  nou  pa  ni  pèsonn  
1PL  NEG  have  nobody
  'we have nobody' (lit. 'we have not nobody')

Descri OTA 1  091
Negative concord and variation

Elicitations

- All speakers production negative concord constructions
- Some speakers judge negative concord not to be mandatory
Mèsi anpil !
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Negative concord with *ayen*

In my corpus *ayen* triggers systematically negative concord

- A semantically single negation: ‘nothing’
- A double negation
  - A negative marker (syntax)
  - A negative pronoun: *ayen*

(30) *i pa kité ayen ba nou*  
3SG NEG leave **nothing** for 3SG  
‘it left nothing for us’ (lit. ‘it did not leave nothing for us’)

(31) *enben pa té ni ayen*  
well NEG PST have **nothing**  
‘well there was nothing’ (lit. ‘well there was not nothing’)  

Descri OTA 1 131

TON Descrip 053