The purpose of this study is to discover the ways which negation is expressed in the Lakota dialect of Sioux, and to determine the scope of the various negative forms. The scope, or extent of influence, of a negative in a sentence, might be defined as that portion of the underlying tree structure of a sentence which is commanded by the negative.¹ Most of the expressions used as examples were elicited from three native speakers of the Lakota dialect. Those expressions which were culled from readings on Sioux grammar have been checked with several of the Sioux speakers before being inserted as examples.
In Lakota Sioux, negation is most commonly expressed in the form of the morpheme -sni, and sni occurs most commonly in sentence-final position. Below are some examples of common negative sentences, including lower predicates\(^2\) of many types: transitive verb, intransitive verb, identifier, and qualifier.

1.a. 'šuka ki i'ktomi ki na'pcešni
dog the spider the gobble-not

1.b. ma'hixpaye ſni
I - fall - not

1.c. mi'sųkala 'wožu wi'čaša 'hečašni
my-brother-younger farming man that-one-not

1.d. wi'čaša ki t'a't'ake ſni
man the clumsy-not

In example 1.a. the negative morpheme -sni dominates the entire expression "The dog gobbled the spider", thus saying that this proposition is not true. Perhaps it will be easier to see how the negative commands the rest of the expression in its entirety by positing underlying structures for each of the examples given above.

\[
\text{1.a'}. \quad \text{PROP} \quad \text{PROP} \quad \text{P} \\
\quad \text{PROP} \quad \text{AG} \quad \text{O} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{sni} \\
\quad \text{šuka } i'ktomi na'pce
\]

\[
\text{1.b'}. \quad \text{PROP} \quad \text{PROP} \quad \text{P} \\
\quad \text{PROP} \quad \text{AG} \quad \text{P} \quad \text{sni} \\
\quad [1 \text{ pers.}] \quad \text{'hixpaye}
\]
In the case of a compound or complex sentence, -šni may command either or both of the clauses. However, the morpheme must appear separately, commanding its own part of the complex sentence.

2. 'ukte ki slo'waynešni
   he comes det. I know not

Sentence 2 is ambiguous in the sense that it is appropriate to describe these two situations:

1) "I didn't know he was coming."
2) "I don't know if he is coming."

2a. ukte ki nayiš uktešni ki slowaynešni
    he comes det. or he comes not det. I know not

   "I don't know if he is (or isn't) coming."

The underlying structure for 2a. would be:

2a'. [see the following page]
The above structure would also account for meaning(2) of sentence 2. Sentence 2 can also be represented in this way:

\[
2'.
\]

To derive sentence 2 from 2' or to derive sentence 2a. from 2a' would not seem to involve unusual transformations. However, in the case where the second meaning of sentence 2 is required, the mapping from underlying structure 2a to the surface (2) is more complicated. Some kind of transformation would be required to delete the negative part of the subordinate structure (circled).

It is interesting to note that the determiner \( \text{ki} \) appears in the surface structure following a subordinate predicate; this suggests that the embedded clause is a noun phrase in surface structure.
2b. 'uktešni    ki slo'waye
    he comes-not det. I know

"I know he is not coming."

Underlying this we have:

2b'.

(tense ignored)

\[
\text{PROP} \quad \text{PROP [1 pers.] SLOYE} \\
\text{PROP} \quad \text{P} \\
\text{AG} \quad \text{PROP P ŠNI} \\
[3 \text{ pers.}] \quad \text{U}
\]

In this case the scope of the negative is restricted to the
dependent clause, and commands only the lower proposition.

2c. 'uktešni    ki slo'wayešni
    he comes-not det. I know-not

'I didn't know he wasn't coming.'

Here we see a negative dominating both propositions of a com­
plex sentence. A possible underlying structure is:

2c'.

\[
\text{PROP} \quad \text{PROP [1 pers.] SLOYE} \\
\text{PROP} \quad \text{P} \\
\text{O} \quad \text{EXP P ŠNI} \\
\text{PROP} \quad \text{PROP P ŠNI} \\
[3 \text{ pers.}] \quad \text{U}
\]

The derivation of surface structure from 2b'. and 2c'. would
involve transformational rules to raise the predicates\(^3\), and
the insertion of the determiner ki to show the dependent rel­
When the negative is used with compound predicates, we encounter certain connectives which seem to limit the scope of a negative in surface structure. Consider the following examples:

3a. mni ki 'k'ate na'yiš snišni water the hot either/or cold-not

'The water is neither cold nor hot.'

3b. mni 'snišni (k')ayeš 'k'ate water cold-not but hot

'The water isn't cold, but hot.'

3c. mni ki 'k'atesni na 'snišni water the hot-not and cold-not

'The water is not cold and not hot.'

Although 3a. and 3c. have different surface realizations both in Sioux and in translation, it could very well be that their underlying structures are basically the same. The connective nayiš seems to mean "either/or", while na is coordinate, meaning "and".

Proposed underlying structure for 3a. and for 3c.:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{MNI} \\
\text{K'ATE} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\end{array}
\]

To arrive at the two differing surface structures the following procedures would apply:
1) First, a T-rule would raise the two lowest predicates.

3d.

2) A co-referential role deletion rule would then delete the second object.

3e.

3) Predicate raising would now apply again, and the connector must be moved.

3f.

4) An affix [+ def.] must be joined as sister to MNI.

3g.

Up to this point, the transformational process has been the same for sentences containing either of the two connectives. If the connective is NA, we are now ready to insert the proper
3h. mni ki 'k^atešni na 'snišni

However, if the sentence being transformed contains NA'YIŠ, one more rule must apply to remove the first negative.

3i.

Formative insertion will now yield sentence 3a.

3a. mni ki 'k^ate na'yiš 'snišni

The underlying structure of sentence 3b is different from that of the other two in that (K^ο)AYEŠ will dominate only one negated proposition.

3b'.

Procedures for deriving sentence 3b would be similar to those used in deriving 3c. The meaning of (K^ο)AYEŠ is "but". This connector implies some kind of contrast, so a negative may appear on either predicate, but not on both.

This use of the negative with the connectors (K^ο)AYEŠ, NA'YIŠ, and NA is one of the less common uses of -ŠNI.

There are instances in Sioux when the negative dominates
an indefinite pronoun, a numeral, or an adverb. The special form used in such cases is NI. Some examples of these are;

4a. 'tohini "never" from tohi "time" + ni "not"
'tokiyani "nowhere" from place + no
'takuni "nothing"
tu'weni "no one" (Boas and Deloria 1941, 165)

Franz Boas in his "Dakota Grammar" stated pairs of expressions which would seem to indicate that the presence of a negated indefinite pronoun or numeral intensifies the negation (or rather, generalizes the negation) of the predicate.

4b.1 {tu'we ki w'blakesni" 'I did not see who it was.'
{tu'weni w'blakesni" 'I did not see anyone.'

2 {u'ma w'blakesni" 'I did not see the one, but the other.'
{u'mani w'blakesni" 'I saw neither the one nor the other.'

3 w'ži šni 'It is not one, (but another one).'
w'žini šni 'It is not one (of that group).'

{ toki 'mnıktešni 'I am not going to some particular place.'
{tokiyani 'mnıktešni" 'I'm not going anywhere at all.'

5 {taku w'čišni" 'I have no wants.'
{takuni w'čišni" 'I don't want anything at all.'

(Boas and Deloria 1941, 105)

These pairs of sentences, and more, which I have not cited here, were checked for meaning with several Lakota speakers. Their reactions to these sentence pairs were quite interesting. It seems that the age of the speaker roughly correlates with his ability to recognize a difference in meaning between the members of a pair. The older speaker would more readily recognize a difference between the first and second members of each pair. The younger speakers had more of a tendency to attribute the same meaning to both members of a pair, or, sometimes to
reject the first as ungrammatical. Since the data available was very limited, and since there was very little time to fully check my observations, the ideas above are very tentative. I might add a hypothesis which I drew from my observation of the Sioux speakers' reaction to the sentence pairs above and to others like it. It appears that the first member of pairs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 may have been more common at one time, but may have become archaic, and may have dropped out of use since Boas made his analysis. It might be noted that all speakers made a distinction in meaning for pair number 2. Perhaps the difference lies not so much in the speaker's age, but in the extent of his exposure to and use of his own language.

Another unusual use of -šni, pointed out again by Boas, was the double negative. When these were checked out with several Sioux speakers, it was interesting to note that the youngest informant rejected all double negation as silly and impossible to say. The oldest speaker, however, said that these were grammatical, but not often used. There were just a few expressions cited by Boas which all speakers rejected. Here are some of Boas' examples:

4c. 1) 'o'ma ʔanišnišni 'Why don't you not walk about?'
   2) kiš wa'la wašnišni 'Why don't you not read?'
   3) wa'yatešnišni 'Why do you not eat?'
   4) ečišnišniya 'wrong'
   5) ityšnišniya 'falsely'
   6) niyašnišni 'all out of breath'
do not usually neutralize each other as they do in standard English. Instead, they augment each other, and thus intensify the meaning. It seems that this type of double negation may be falling out of use.

Another very interesting concept which seems to influence the scope of negation is the idea of focus, or highlighting. In Essentials of English Grammar, Langendoen pointed out the fact that the negative element in English "occurs syntactically as an adverb which is placed in front of the main predicate in the clause which is its argument." Because of this, negative sentences in English are often simple on the surface, but complex in the underlying structure. As an example he used:

5. Brutus didn't kill a tyrant.

Expressed in logical notation sentence 5 looks like this:

5a. Not [Brutus (x). Tyrant (y). Killed (x,y)]

Because the not in surface structure always is placed in front of the predicate, we cannot tell which of the assertions in the sentence is being negated.

5b. Not [Brutus (x)] or Not [Tyrant (y)] or Not [Killed (x,y)]

To help clarify sentence 5, an English speaker would raise the pitch of his voice on the accented syllable of the predicate he wishes to highlight. (Langendoen 1970, 161-162)

In Sioux the negative element normally occurs with the main predicate in the form of a suffix. When the Sioux wish to highlight a certain part of a sentence other than the main
predicate, the positive morpheme 'eča "--emphasis", or the negative morpheme 'ešni "--neg. emphasis" may be placed after the word (or article following the word) that they wish to highlight. 'eča and 'ešni seem to dominate roles.

6a. le a'petu a'te 'wotešni
this day Dad eat-not
'Dad didn't eat today.'

6b. *le a'petu šni a'te 'wote
this day not Dad eat
'It's not today Dad ate.'

6c. le a'petu a'te 'eča 'wotešni
this day Dad eat-not
'Dad didn't eat today.'

6d. *le a'petu a'te 'ešni 'wote (šni)
this day Dad neg. eat (not)
'It's not Dad who didn't eat today.'

The underlying structure of 6a. and 6c. would be:

6a'.

```
PROP
  /
PROP    P

PROP
  /
PROP    ŠNI

AG    P    LE a'PETU

A'TE    'WOTE
```

6c'.

```
ID
  /
PROP

PROP
  /
PROP    P

ESS    P    'EČA

I    A'TE

PROP
  /
PROP    P

PROP
  /
PROP    ŠNI

AG    P    LE a'PETU

Y    'WOTE
```

In both sentences the negative remains the highest predicate, and in 6c'. the highlighter 'eča directly dominates the role.
that is being emphasized i.e. the agent A'TE. It was interesting to find that the negative cannot occur anywhere on the surface structure of this sentence except at the end of the main verb. In order to highlight the time expression le a'petu one would probably find it necessary to add another clause or phrase to the sentence that would make it clear exactly when it was that Dad didn't eat. Note also that it was perfectly acceptable for the positive highlighter to appear after the agent, but the same construction with 'ešni in the same slot was rejected as unacceptable.

Now, let us consider some transitive constructions, noting some of the effects of highlighting on these.

7a. 'šųka ki i'ktomi ki na'pcešni
dog the spider the gobble-not
'The dog did not gobble the spider!' Here again the position of šni, fixed to the main verb, leaves room for ambiguity. Does the speaker mean:

šni [šųka (x)] or šni [iktomi (y)] or šni [na'pce (x,y)]?

Once again, the highlighters 'eša and 'ešni can help to erase ambiguity. Here are some possibilities.

7b. he šųka ki 'ešni i'ktomi ya'tešni na'pce
that dog the -neg. spider chew-not gobble
'It wasn't that dog that gobbled the spider without chewing.'

7c. he 'šųka ki yat'ešni na'pce, he i'ktomi ki 'ešni
that dog the chew-not gobble, that spider the -not.
'That dog gobbled (something) without chewing, but it wasn't the spider.'
In 7b. we find the negative highlighter modifying the agent. It is not yet apparent why it is acceptable to use 'ešni in the case of 7b., but a similar construction was rejected in the case of 6d. There is a difference in transitivity of verbs, but it doesn't seem that transitivity should affect the use of the negative. It would have been interesting to discover more about highlighting and the scope of negation in Sioux, but time does not permit this.

In order to suggest the position which the negative morpheme takes in relation to other verbs and verb affixes, the following examples are appropriate:
8.a. 'wiblukčašni
I think-not

šni [wiblukca]
NEG [THINK (I)]
[1 pers.] WIBLUKČA

8.b. 'wiblukčaktešni
I think-will-not

NEG [FUT [THINK (I)]]
PROP P SNI
Exp. P [1 pers.]
KTE
[1 pers.] WIBLUKČA

8.c. 'wiblukčaktenčišni
I think-will-try-not
'I will not try to think.'

NEG [TRY [FUT [THINK (I)]]]
PROP AG P SNI
Exp. P [1 pers.]
KTE
[1 pers.] WIBLUKČA

8.d. wiblukča wačišni
I think I want-not
'I don't want to think.'

PROP P SNI
Exp. P [1 pers.]
WAČI
[1 pers.] WIBLUKČA

8.e. wiblukčakte wačišni
I think-will I want-not
'I don't want to think.'

PROP P SNI
Exp. P KTE
[1 pers.] WIBLUKČA
It appears that the negative morpheme must be affixed to the main predicate of the clause which it commands. All of the following were rated as unacceptable:

8.f. *wiblukčašnikte
   I think-not-will

8.g. *wiblukčaktešnixči
   I think-will-not-try

8.h. *wiblukčašni waci
   I think-not I want

8.i. *wiblukčaktešni waci
   I think-will-not I want

It appears to be true also that the negative affix must take final position in a string of verbal affixes.

As a final statement, here are some conclusions about the forms of the negative in Sioux and their use:

9. $P$ $PC$ $P$
   šNI PROP + P; __ šni $FI$
   $\{+verb\}$ [+$adj$
   $\{+noun(+article)\}$ __
   'ešni $\{+indef. pronoun\}$ __
   ni $\{+numeral$ $+$adverb $\}$ $+$

The scope of the two less common forms of the negative is quite limited. The scope of 'ešni covers one of the arguments of a proposition (see examples 7b. and 7c.). The scope of ni is limited to the indefinite pronoun, numeral, or adverb to which it is affixed.

9a. tu'weni wablakesni
   nobody I see-not
   (Boas and Deloria 1941, 105)

(with indef. pronoun)
The scope of the most common negative form -šni is larger in that it always commands a proposition with predicate and (optional) arguments.

9b. le i'šinupani e'cu šni yo (Buechel 1939, 353)
this 2nd time-not do not 'Don't do this again.' (with numeral)

"Don't do this again."
1. Definition of "command" is found in Langacker 1969, 167.

2. "Predicate" is used here in the logical sense, not in the traditional grammatical sense.

3. Predicate raising is one of the cyclic rules in a transformational grammar whereby a lower predicate in an underlying tree structure is raised and attached to the predicate node which commands it. Arguments of the predicate being moved are attached to the next highest PRO.

Example:

```
PROP
  \___ P
     \_ x

PROP
  \___ P
     \_ y
```

For a definition of predicate raising see McCawley 1968a, 75.

4. These could also be derived from logically equivalent underlying structures: \( (S_1 \lor S_2) \equiv \neg S_1 \cdot \neg S_2 \) (McCawley 1968b, 168.)

5. The absence of mni with subsequent predicates may be the Sioux equivalent of pronominalization.

6. In the model being used, predicates are abstract until after transformations are complete, when they are replaced by formatives from the lexicon. (Frantz 1970, 210)

7. Yatxešni has a complex structure which was not represented in the structural trees 7b' and 7c'. Perhaps the P node above yatxešni should be a PROP node instead, and this word, which seems to be used as an adverb on the surface, could be broken down in this way:

```
PROP
  \___ P
     \_ SNI
```

(Suka) (iktomi)