The use of a negative element in the derivational expression of attributive-evaluative oppositions such as English *wise: unwise* has been noted for a number of European languages. Discussions by Zimmer, and more recently by Horn, under the heading of affixal negation, include summaries of the literature and offer fresh insights into the rather remarkable association of negative form and affirmative sense in the antithetic relation. The same association turns up in some of the indigenous languages of the Americas, notably in Chimariko, in Tunica, and in the languages of the Tupí-Guaraní family. In all these languages the negative element, in its surface manifestations, is formally identical with the predicative negator, but (in Chimariko and Tunica at least) it has no tactic function, being etymologically embedded in a lexicalization.

Languages that make use of negative elements in the creation of antithetic terms differ in the depth and extent of their utilization of the device. Russian, for example, in many of its lexically expressed primary oppositions, derives an attenuated counterpart for each of the two terms of the opposition, and thereby creates a fully realized attenuated grade of the primary opposition. English does so only sparingly, normally deriving an attenuated partner for just one of the terms, so that no more than a partially realized attenuated grade is created. Chimariko derives only one term, but uses it to express the opposition itself rather than its attenuation, in this respect placing the derivational on a par with lexical expression. Thus the values of the "wisdom" parameter for Russian are, in the primary grade, *mudryj: glupiyj* 'wise: foolish', and in the attenuated grade, *neglupij* 'fairly wise' (< not-foolish) and *nemudryj* 'rather foolish' (< not-wise), while English has attenuated *unwise* (< not-wise) standing alone in a cross-grade opposition to *wise*, without a corresponding *un-foolish to flesh out its grade*. The Chimariko values *ikišem: ektikišem* parallel those of the English cross-grade opposition *wise: unwise* in form, but in semantic function they are analogous to the values of the English primary grade, *wise: foolish*.

The sense of deficiency typically associated in the European languages with the derivative term (*neglupij* suggesting a deficit of foolishness, and *nemudryj* and *unwise* a deficit of wisdom) is also detectable in the American languages. In the case of Chimariko and Tunica, which are no longer spoken, it is clearly not possible to probe the cognitive/semantic implications of this observation with any degree of confidence. But
the data are suggestive and for Chimariko I make the assumption that the sense of deficiency is integral in the underlying semantics of the derived term, and formalize it by associating it with the cogneme of PRIVATION which is manifested in overt morphological form in other areas of the lexicon. Hence the designation "prative" for the derived term and, by extension, for its lexically expressed analogs in pairs not formed by derivation. The term which serves as the base for the derivation is then "plenative"; it refers to cognemic ENDOWMENT. In the evaluative domain, these two cognemes are manifested only as the active pairing of opposed terms in the recorded materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLENATIVE</th>
<th>PRIVATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE-GOOD ph</td>
<td>eye?w ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-GOOD p3i</td>
<td>eʔa p3i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¹BE-LONG</td>
<td>iʔhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²BE-LONG</td>
<td>iʔhun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-TALL</td>
<td>iʔhu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-WEALTHY</td>
<td>ahata?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-GENEROUS</td>
<td>ewa?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-CLEVER</td>
<td>ikišem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-APT</td>
<td>ošem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-HUNT-SKILLED</td>
<td>akho?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-COOKED</td>
<td>ipima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-SAVORY</td>
<td>ik'uy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-SATIATED</td>
<td>imiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-LACTESCENT</td>
<td>ac'am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-HARDWORKING</td>
<td>učhe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIVATIVE</th>
<th>PLENATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE-BAD ph</td>
<td>exʔeye?w ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-BAD p3i</td>
<td>exʔeʔa p3i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¹BE-SHORT</td>
<td>exʔiʔhulāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²BE-SHORT</td>
<td>exʔiʔhun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-SQUAT</td>
<td>exʔiʔhu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-POOR</td>
<td>exʔahata?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-STINGY</td>
<td>exʔewa?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-STUPID</td>
<td>exʔikišem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-INEPT</td>
<td>exʔošem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-HUNT-UNSKILLED</td>
<td>exʔakho?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-RAW</td>
<td>exʔipima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-UNSAVORY</td>
<td>exʔik'uy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-STARVING</td>
<td>exʔimiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-NONLACTESCENT</td>
<td>exʔac'am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-LAZY</td>
<td>exʔučhe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1**
Surface-marked, etymologically transparent prative themes and their antithetic partners.
"Surface marking" is a descriptive label and has no structural significance. It refers to the synchronic transparency of the lexicalized derivative term with its attendant potential for back formation and nonce creations. In Chimariko, the derivative term is necessarily inflected pronominally in its surface forms, and it is the inflectional pattern that constitutes the surface marking of the term. This circumstance is registered in the morphophonemic representation of the theme, and the theme, though not a surface form itself, may therefore also be said to be surface marked.

Tables 1 and 2 list the evaluative antithetic pairs which have turned up in the Chimariko materials with surface marking on the privative term. In Table 1 the privative is quite obviously derived from its partner in the opposition. In Table 2, however, the partners are unrelated in form, and two of the privatives shown there are in fact isolated terms, with no identifiable lexical partner. In both tables the privative themes are lexicalized forms which function tactically as minimal units. A token English "be-phrase" is used to represent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLENATIVE</th>
<th>PRIVATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE-GOOD</td>
<td>BE-BAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-BIG</td>
<td>BE-LITTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-BIG_pj</td>
<td>BE-LITTLE_p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-BIG_p</td>
<td>BE-LITTLE_p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-FIERCE</td>
<td>BE-GENTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-FLEET</td>
<td>BE-SLOWFOOTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE-ABUNDANT</td>
<td>?amepa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2**

Surface-marked, etymologically opaque privative themes, paired with antithetic partners, or unpaired.
the lexeme. The token is not intended as a gloss, but it does suggest something of the sense underlying the lexeme. The morphemic representation of the lexeme is written morphophonemic-ally. A lexeme which is a portmanteau representation of a core sememe modified by one or more categorial sememes has its token marked with subscript tags to reflect those categories which are critical for its definition. The categories reflected in the tables are:  

- p = plural thematic reference;  
- 3 = third person reference exclusively;  
- h = human referent;  
- i = inanimate referent.  

Superscript numerals preceding the lexicemal token serve to distinguish those homophonous tokens for which categorial distinctions are unknown.

All the forms listed in the tables are verbal themes, and all of them, with the possible exception of úche, are stative. Not listed are related nominal themes which are lexicalized from the third person surface form of the verbal themes. These (etymologically) derived nominals retain the antithetic character of the original verb themes: hisik 'a good one'; xulik 'a bad one' reflects the opposition isik 'be good'; axulik 'be bad' of Table 2. Morphologically the verbal themes fall into two distinct inflectional classes, the prefixed class and the suffixed class, reflecting the positioning of pronominal elements in relation to the theme. Vowel-initial themes and those beginning in pseudovocalic ə are inflectable by prefixed pronominal element:

- eyéʔw ' (sev. pers.) to be good', čhʷ-eyéʔw 'we be good'  
- axʷeyéʔw ' (sev. pers.) to be bad', čhʷ-axʷeyéʔw 'we be bad'

Consonant-initial themes are inflectable by pronominal elements suffixed to the thematic core:  

- ž'e..ok 'to be sick', ž'e-či-ok 'I be sick'  
- ţew 'to be big', ţew-ču 'I be big'  
- luʔre 'to be swift', luʔre-ʔi 'I be swift'

Partners in an antithetic opposition tend to be of the same broad morphotactic class. Thus both themes in each pair in Table 1 are of the prefixed class. But the themes in Table 2 show some heterogeneity: three pairs have divergent class affiliations, their plenative themes being of the suffixed class and their privative themes of the prefixed class. The partners in these pairs are nevertheless well matched in their categorial implications and largely so in their semantic ranges: in BE-BIG: BE-LITTLE and in BE-FLEET: BE-SLOWFOOTED both terms are categorically unrestricted, and in BE-ABUNDANT: BE-SCARCE both are limited to third person inanimate and have a distributive reference. None are likely to be perfectly matched, however. The degree to which one term implies the
other probably varies from pair to pair, and some terms are known to participate in more than one opposition. But the tables do not reflect these possibilities. They focus on surface-marked oppositions only and only on the most central semantic parameter if more than one is attested. An instance of multiple contrariety would be the opposition of BE-SAVORY ik’uy to BE-UNSAVORY əx”ik’uy (Table 1) and to BE-BITTER yekhay (not listed).

Because the surface-marked privative themes derive from negated themes, a brief overview of negative formulation will be given at this point, before we discuss the privatives in greater detail.

Negation is expressed in either of two ways in Chimariko: inflectionally by affix within the predicate word, or lexically by postposition. What differentiates the two formulations semantically is, for the moment, unclear, but it may well have to do with focus. The morphemes and morpheme combinations used in negation are listed in Table 3. Prefixed-class themes with vocalic, but not pseudovocalic, initial take the prefixed negative form or forms, usually as a discontinuous combination of elements. Prefixed-class themes with initial pseudovocalic a, and all the suffixed-class (consonant-initial) themes, take the suffixed negative, usually as a combination of contiguous elements. All thematic types can be negated by postposition instead of by affix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MORPHEMES</th>
<th>THEME TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREFIXED</td>
<td>əx”(...na) \ ək’(...na)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFFIXED</td>
<td>k’ü(\na)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTPOSED</td>
<td>k’u(\na)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3**
Principal negative morphemes and morpheme combinations.

The most common form of the prefixed negative is the discontinuous complex əx”(...na), which frames the themes. For most
verbs, active as well as stative, the caudal element na is necessarily present (I infer this from the materials; the status of na was not explicitly investigated by any of the field workers), and constitutes the closing element of the negated theme: (active) ama 'eat', ex'-ama-na 'not eat'; (stative) axawin 'be old', ex'-axawin-na 'not be old'. With a few themes, na is occasionally omitted, and with any theme in the passive voice, na is generally omitted. The significance of such omission is not clear; the underlying semantics are probably too subtle to have been registered in the materials. It is also not clear whether the occasional omission of na is an option available to all themes or only to a particular set of themes. In the asseverative mode, though, na is obligatorily excluded; its position in the surface form of the predicate is occupied by the clause-final negative asseverative postfix ɨk'í 'not' at all, (not) ever'. The coda-free shape ex' appears as a substructural element in the privatives of Table 1, and somewhat less transparently in those of Table 2.

The superscript " is a morphophonemic operator which induces labioretraction in a following front vowel: i, e are realized as P/y, 0 respectively when preceded by ". The pseudovowel e is an operator which induces translatory vocalic replication in an intricate choreography that we need not go into here, but that results, generally, in vocalic harmony: ñn'-ex'-ixu-na, P/ñhurukuna 'I not be fat'.

A second discontinuous complex, ak'(..na), appears as an optional variant on many prefixed-class themes which have u as their initial vowel: um '(several go)', ak'--um-na ~ ex'-um-na '(several) not go'. The significance of this variation is unknown; its highly restricted occurrence suggests a vestigial phenomenon. The shape ak' is discernible in the privative theme BE-LAZY ak'uنه in Table 1.

The suffixed negative k'ũ(na) is also a complex form, containing the caudal na found in the prefixes. The breve in the first syllable indicates that the vowel is syncopated when an immediately preceding syllable ends in a realizable vowel. Thus in the speech of Sally Noble, as recorded by J.P. Harrington, k'ũna is realized as P/k'una after consonants and P/?na after realizable vowels. In the speech of Polly Dyer, as recorded by R.B. Dixon, the postvocalic form is apparently P/kna (based on an evaluation of his transcriptions of the form). The discrepancy in postvocalic realization indicates that there were two different ways of reducing the articulatory complexity of a glottalized consonant which has come to stand in syllable final, a position which does not tolerate complex articulations. As with the prefixed negative, the final element na may be omitted on occasion, is normally omitted in the passive, and is totally excluded in an asseverative context.

The suffixed negative is positioned immediately after the pronominal element in the case of simple themes such as lu? 'to drink': lu?--m1-k'ũ-na, P/lu?i'na "he not drink", and phala
'be strong': phalaʔ-mkha-kū-na, P/phalaʔ-khakna\textsuperscript{a2} 'ye be strong'. But with a discontinuous thematic complex such as po-μū 'to sleep' the negative is positioned after the caudal element of the complex: po-μū-kū-na, P/pohmuʔ-na 'he not sleep'.

To confuse matters a bit, s-initial prefixed-class privatives require the suffixed-class formulation of the negative: εxusammu-kū-na 'not be blind' (Table 2), exʰ-eʔa-kū-na 'not be bad' (Table 1). The suffixed negative also appears to be an option (rarely invoked) available to other prefixed-class themes. I have only one unequivocal example: ilihta-kū-na 'not to play' in the vetative predicate P/nipimtaʔ-na marʔi 'don't you play!' (H/SN-634T).\textsuperscript{a3} (There may be other, unrecoverable instances in the ambiguous circumstances which I describe under postpositive negation further below.) The significance of a suffixal formulation with a nonprivative prefixed-class theme is not clear; perhaps it adds some degree of emphasis. In its obligatory use with surface-marked privatives the constraint is defined morphotactically, keyed to this thematic subset and incidentally contributing to the definition of the subset.

A striking feature of affixal negation is its suppression of overt third person reference in the lexeme-to-morpheme realization. This does not happen with lexical (postpositive) negation. The suppression is obligatory for prefixed-class themes and optional for suffixed-class themes. Those themes which exhibit third person suppression in the context of affixal negation do show an overt third person element in their affirmative state unless the suppression is inherent in the theme. For example, the prefixed-class stative theme i xu 'to be fat' takes the third person prefix h in the affirmative, but lacks it in the negative:

\begin{align*}
  h\text{-}i xu & \quad P/hixu \quad 'he be fat' \\
  exʰ\text{-}i xu\text{-}na & \quad P/xuxuna \quad 'he not be fat'
\end{align*}

Compare this third person negative form with that of the second person, where suppression does not occur:

\begin{align*}
  m\text{-}exʰ\text{-}i xu\text{-}na & \quad P/muxuxuna \quad 'you not be fat'
\end{align*}

Similarly, but not obligatorily, the suffixed-class theme k'ε 'to die' can suppress the third person suffix Mī in the negative:

\begin{align*}
  k'ε\text{-}Mī & \quad P/k'εh \quad 'he die' \\
  k'ε\text{-}kū-na & \quad P/k'εʔ\text{-}na \quad 'he not die'
\end{align*}

Exercise of the option not to suppress is not easily illustrated for this theme. Although it does appear with an overt
third person in the negative (as P/k'ehk'una), the status of the negative element in the surface form — is it suffix or postposition? — is ambiguous. The theme po..mü 'to sleep', however, clearly differentiates the two formulations, and shows that overt representation of third person need not be suppressed by the negative suffix: 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{po-mü P/pohmu} & \quad \text{'he sleep'} \\
\text{po-mü-k'ü-na P/pohmu?na} & \quad \text{'he not sleep'} \text{ (suffix)} \\
\text{po-mü k'ü-na P/pohmu k'una} & \quad \text{'he not sleep'} \text{ (postp.)}
\end{align*}
\]

Morphologically, the negated theme with covert third person reference is a portmanteau representation of a core lexeme (such as BE-FAT) and the appropriate third person lexeme (3a for statives). There are some themes, however, for which overt third person reference is inherently suppressed in any context, affirmative or negative. These include the surface-marked privatives of Tables 1 and 2, and certain suffixed-class themes, for example lu're 'to be swift', četk'a '(several) to perish', ?amepa '(harvestable foods) to be plentiful'. From the synchronic standpoint, the motivation underlying third person suppression seems not to be semantic, nor does it seem to stem from the tactics at any level. Whatever its history, the phenomenon now seems to arise entirely within the lexeme-to-morpheme portion of the realizational system.

Lexical negation is expressed by the postposition k'ü(na), which is morphemically complex and has the same form as the suffix except that the vowel of its core morpheme is nonsyncopating. The final element na, here as in the affixes, is excluded in the context of asseverative negation. The postposition follows the predicate word or phrase immediately, but it is probably not phonologically bound to the word that precedes it. It is possible that the spoken language maintained a prosodic distinction between suffix and postposition, which would have been critical in circumstances of segmental ambiguity, and that this distinction was not perceived by any of the field workers. In any case segmental ambiguity exists. It arises when the predicate theme ends in a consonant: syncope is not induced in the suffix k'ü-na postconsonantly, so the segmental realizations of suffix and postposition are identical in that context. Thus, as matters stand at present (in the analysis), either formulation could be invoked in the interpretation of constructions such as P/čhaxawink'una tinta 'I am not old' (axawin 'to be old')(D/F-5.44) and P/fečokk'unat 'I am not sick' (k'eu...ok 'to be sick')(H/SN-654T). 

Now I turn to a few remarks on the synchronic structure of the privatives in Tables 1 and 2, and on the etymological derivation that underlies this structure.

In their pronominal inflection, the surface-marked privatives are exactly like negated themes except for the absence of
the caudal negative element na. Table 4 provides an illustration. It shows the pronominal inflection of a typical nonprivative prefixed-class stative theme awi 'be afraid' and its negative form ex"-awi-na 'not be afraid', and the pronominal inflection of the surface-marked privative themes exaye 'be little' (from Table 2) and ex"ičhu? 'be short (in stature)' (from Table 1). For brevity, the paradigms display only the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFFIRMATIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANTITHESIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLENATIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME: ičhu? 'be tall'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4**

Boxed paradigms counterpose the negative inflection of a typical nonprivative stative theme and the (affirmative) inflections of two surface-marked privative stative themes.
anumerative (nonplural) inflection. Third person marking is
suppressed in both negative and privative; the vocalic replica
induced by the pseudovocalic operator a remains unrealized when
it comes to stand in word initial in the absence of a personal
element.

Scanning down the boxed paradigms, the surface similari-
ties of the negative and privative inflections are readily
apparent: a harmonic vocalism in first and second person; a
consonant ə enveloped by this vocalism; and the lack of an
overt third person element. The underlying structural differ-
ence, as indicated in the thematic shapes, is that the negated
theme is a tactic combination of morphemes, while the priva-
tives are monomorphic.

The similarity of the two inflections is hardly accidental.
We can reconstruct an originally complex form for the privative
theme aɣəye and the other privatives of Table 2. A labioetra-
ctive component must have been present in the etymological form,
because the first true vowel in all these themes is either a
rounded back vowel ə, u or the neutral vowel a; front vowels
are conspicuously absent. This points to the etymological
identity of the initial segment with that of the Table 1 themes
and with the core element of the negative prefix. We can assume
that the residual aye represents the etymological thematic core.
But we cannot fully reconstruct the core of a theme which has ə
or u as its first vowel, because modern ə could reflect either
*e or *o in the context of labioetraction, and modern u could
reflect either *i or *u. For example, exulik 'be bad' could
derive from *ex'-ilik or from *ex'-ulik.

Synchronously aɣəye is not analyzable, and ex"iču? is
only substructurally analyzable. In substructural analysis,
the segments make use of existing morpheme shapes as empty
morphs, i.e. without tapping into the semological connection or
the morphological valence of any of the shapes. A form such as
ex"iču? utilizes the shapes of the morphemes ex" and iču? with-
out their connections. It constitutes a hypermorpheme, motivat-
ed semologically in its own right and recognized by the morpho-
tactics as a minimal tactic unit. Its composition is defined
entirely in the realizational system.

We may now attempt to interpret historically the synchron-
ic facts of surface-marked antithesis, with the help of some
speculative reasoning. Tables 1 and 2 represent two successive
stages late in the life history of the surface-marked privative
form. In both stages the privative sense is a given, one that
has been introduced into each of the evaluative parameters
represented in the tables at some earlier stage, in response to
cognitive or semological pressures and developments. Table 1
shows the stage in which the privative sense has appropriated
for its morphemic expression the form (but not the sense) of
the negated evaluative theme. This process has not disabled
the negatability of the (now plenative) original theme, as the
discussion under Table 5 will demonstrate, but negation is now
sparingly used with such themes — a contrary opposition seems
to be preferred in circumstances in which either contradiction or contrarility would adequately render the desired sense. The ambivalence in such a situation emerges clearly when an English prompt is responded to in both ways: Dixon's prompt 'I'm not fat' yielded the unmarked privative theme $\text{ðkun}\text{š'kal} \ 'be thin, wasted' from one speaker (D/SN-2.21) and the negated theme $\text{ax'-ixu-na} \ 'not be fat' from another (D/FD-1.57).

The forms of Table 2 have passed through and beyond the hypermorphemic stage of Table 1 and in the process have lost all substructural identification with the morphs of the originally negated themes. The process may have been as follows. In response to ongoing cognitive or semological pressures, the original lexeme functioning as the plenative term in a Table 2 pair was replaced by an approximate synonym with a morphemic representation unrelated to that of the privative term, or had dropped out of use without replacement. Its disappearance led to a fading of the hypermorphemic configuration of the privative in the realizational system and to its transformation into an unanalyzable, simple morpheme. Nevertheless a subliminal association of the surface manifestations of the them-initial sequence $\text{ax-}$ with those of the productive negative may still be accessible to individual speakers, though I have no evidence of such awareness, for example in the form of back formations based on Table 2 privative themes.

There will be a wrinkle or two in my grammatical and lexical description of Chimariko which will impact my presentation of privative forms. For lexicographic purposes, I have found it useful to resolve any theme-internal morphophonemics that may come into play in the citation form of structurally or substructurally composite themes. This treatment implies something like a performance model of description rather than an analytical model. Consequently the otherwise transparent privatives of Table 1 will, in their morphophonemically resolved citation form, approach the opacity of the privatives of Table 2. To maintain the distinction between the two types in the dictionary entry, a citation form with internally resolved morphophonemics will be followed by the morphophonemic form proper to the analytical model. A typical dictionary entry for a privative theme from each table would therefore be:

$\text{aŋye\text{²w}}$ (aŋ$\text{x\text{²eye\text{²w}}}$) s.imm. (IBx) pers. pl. to be bad.
Opp. eye\text{²w}.

$\text{aŋye}$ s.imm. (IBx) to be small, little; not fully grown, hence occasionally transl. as 'young'. This is the categorically unrestricted privative term of the semantic cluster based on the parameter of bigness. See also $\text{aŋyočiye}$, $\text{aŋoče}$.
Opp. $\text{tew\text{²}}$. 
Getting back to the paradigms of Table 4: privative themes in general are capable of being negated, though for the surface-marked set in particular, negation is sparingly attested in the materials, and only for a few themes in that set. As mentioned earlier, when negation by affix does occur, it is the suffix that is used, in spite of the prefixed-class affiliation of these themes: (Table 1) ek'ũče 'be lazy, shiftless, reluctant' is negated as ek'ũčẹ-k'ũ-na 'not be lazy' in the text occurrence P/k'ũčẹ-nat 'she's not lazy' (H/SN-277T); (Table 2) axusamnu 'be blind' is negated suffixally as axsusamnu-k'ũ-na 'not be blind' (and also postpositively as axsusamnu-k'ũ-na) in the course of a paradigmatic elicitation (D/SN-2.2). An attempted probe of the possibility of prefixal negation was rejected for the privative themes axome 'be tame, gentle' (H/SN-154F verso) and ax*ač'am 'be dry, nonlactescent' (H/SN-226R).

The plenitary term of an antithetic pair is also capable of being negated, though again, for plenatives opposing a surface-marked privative, a negative form is rarely attested and only for a few themes: eʔa '(sev. inanim.) be good', ik'ũy 'be tasty', ac'am 'be lactescent', away 'be cross', and possibly tew 'be big'. Normal negative formulation is used: ax*...na for prefixed-class themes, and the postpositive k'ũ-na for the possible suffixed-class instance. On occasion, perhaps when the negative seemed inappropriate for the context the speaker may have had in mind, a reluctance to accept its validity was noted: after producing the privative form P/muxukišemta 'you have no sense' (ax*ikišem 'be stupid'), Sally Noble felt uncomfortable with the suggested form P/muxukišemmat (i.e. with the addition of caudal na) which was offered probatively by Harrington, presumably for the same context; the entry is annotated "does not sound normal to informant" (H/SN-268R). This form, taken at face value, would represent the negated plenative theme *ax*ikišem-na (not attested but conforming to pattern) 'not be smart', have no sense'. But SN may have responded to it as an attempt to negate the privative theme ax*ikišem by means of caudal na, which would be incorrect. However, she apparently did not then offer the expectable suffixed formulation using k'ũ-na, so there may have been some other reason for the expressed reluctance.

As for the plenitary themes of the suffixed class which are listed in Table 2, Harrington attempted to obtain negative forms for tew 'be big' and ʔamepa 'be abundant (of harvestable foods)' without success; only the antithetic forms were offered in response. Interestingly, the following negative form turned up in a series of sentences elicited elsewhere: P/tewu k'unanta 'it is not big (yet)' (said of the moon) (H/SN-292F). But the instance is inconclusive: P/tewu in this sentence could be the derived predicate nominal theme tewu rather than the third person form tewu-Ł of the stative verb. In some contexts it is not possible to determine which is being used.34

For the paired terms of an antithetic opposition, then,
there is, in effect, a parallel pairing of negative terms. However, these terms are only indirectly opposed to each other, in potential "neither nor" expressions for example (there are no instances in the materials). The configuration of an antithetic pair and its negations is illustrated for four pairs of themes in Table 5. The first set of forms is based on the unmarked antithetic pair BE-VISCOUS t’an; BE-FLUID č’ol. The second happens to be the only fully attested surface-marked set, and is based on BE-GOOD ṑji’ (Table 1). The remaining sets are incompletely attested, and are based on BE-BIG ḋew (Table 2) and BE-HARDWORKING učhe (Table 1). The negative of ḋew is enclosed in parentheses in view of the uncertainty pointed out above.

ANTITHETIC OPPOSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLENATIVE</th>
<th>PRIVATIVE</th>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFFIRM.</td>
<td>t’an</td>
<td>č’ol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.</td>
<td>t’an..k’ū-na</td>
<td>č’ol..kū-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFIRM.</td>
<td>ḋa</td>
<td>ḋa’e’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.</td>
<td>ḋe’-e’a-na</td>
<td>ḋe’-e’a-k’ū-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFIRM.</td>
<td>ḋew</td>
<td>ḋaye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.</td>
<td>(浈ew k’u-na)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFIRM.</td>
<td>učhe</td>
<td>ak’učhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>ak’učhe-k’ū-na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5

Illustrating the intersection of antithetic and negatory oppositions.

A cross relation expressing a degree of semantic equivalence exists between diagonally opposed terms in the configurations depicted in the table, for example between the affirmative plenative t’an and the negative privative č’ol..k’ū-na. Sometimes the equivalence is displayed in a spontaneous close textual sequencing of the two terms, for example (for ak’učhe-
k'ū-na ≈ uče):

P/k'ūčhe?nat, hisi?ta, hučhet phunsarot. (H/SN-277T)
She's-not-lazy, she's-O.K., she's-hardworking that-woman.

Examples from elicited materials are of unmarked antithetics.
For č'ol..k'ū-na ≈ t'an,

P/č'olhi?nat, t'anhit. (H/SN-806F)
It's-not-thin, it's-thick (of acorn soup).

For čało?..k'ū-na ≈ lamre,

P/čało?i?nanta, lamret. (H/SN-607R)
It's-not-stiff, it's-soft (pliant; of dressed skin).

Nonsequential elicited forms also attest to cross equivalence:
the approximate equivalence of oč'umę'al 'be thin, wasted' and
ęx'-išu-na 'not be fat' mentioned earlier is an instance.

Implicit in the analysis outlined in this paper is an under-
standing that the structural relation between parametrically
congruent terms of an opposition (or of an equation for that
matter) is capable of being manifested in the expressive func-
tion of language. It is in fact vividly manifested in the
recurrent pairing of lexical forms in the narrative flow. But
it can also come to the surface in artificial contexts such as
linguistic elicitation or word association inquiries. The
Chimariko materials provide a number of instances of textual
pairing of antithetic terms, marked and unmarked, some prompted
by elicitation, others spontaneous. For example, the anti-
thetic pairing of the lexemes BE-GOOD is'i? and BE-BAD ęx'ulį? is
textually realized in the interplay of the third person forms
P/is'i? and P/ęx'ulį? in the following passage from Sally Noble's
simulation of a chief's discourse on the disruptive incursions
of the Americans (H/SN-351T):

P/ęx'ulį xaši?ar hin,  Who knows how it will be:
           hisi?xaši?ar,
           maybe it will be good,
           ęx'ulį xaši?ar.   maybe it will be bad.

The same pair appears again in a passage from a text on child-
birth, this time in concert with a second pair, ęBE-LONG iš'ü:
1BE-SHORT ęx'ičulisla. The focus in this passage is on where
to tie and cut the umbilical cord (H/SN-174R):

P/ęščhulla ęxli? tinta,  Short is no good;
           hišchu niča?y hisi?xaši. make it long and it'll be good.
The themes phala? 'be strong, sturdy' and (unmarked privative) law...puk 'be weak, frail' are textually paired in a line from the theft-of-fire myth (D/PD-3.11, also in Dixon 350 lines 16-17):

P/phalaʔčisun, lawmipukni. I am strong, you are weak.

Antithetic pairings were also produced in response to attempts to obtain comparative forms. In response to the prompt, "that one is heavier than this one," the antithetic pair imita 'be heavy': čxal 'be light' was resorted to:

P/p'un himitat, p'un čxalit (H/SN-1014F)
on one it's-heavy one it's-light

And the prompt "he does it better than I do" yielded the antithetic pair ošem 'be good at': æx'ošem 'be no good at':

P/phæmot hošemta, no'ot čnoxošemta (H/SN-1014F)
that-one he's-good=at=it, me I'm-no=good=at=it

The response to "one stick is longer than the other" reinforces the pairing of ičhu 'be long' and æx'ičhulälä 'be short' noted above:

P/p'un hičhut, p'un xučhullat (H/SN-1000F)
on one it's-long one it's-short

And finally, some odds and ends, with a peek under the rug and elsewhere.

There is some uncertainty about which table the privative theme BE-LAZY æk'uchë is most appropriately placed in. Its plenative counterpart BE-HARDWORKING ûchë has an active intransitive form in the first person: P/no'ot yučhet (< 2'-učhe) 'I ain't lazy' (Sally Noble's wording; lit. 'I am hardworking') (H/SN-643T). This is the only first person occurrence of ûchë in the corpus. If this is indeed an active theme, it would be aberrant in either table. But it may in fact be one of those bivalent themes in which the first person may, for some reason, be expressed either by the active pronominal element or by the stative one. A stative first person form P/*čhučhe (< *čh'-) 'I be hardworking' would have to be attested to assure that a bivalent theme is involved. There are a few documented themes of this type: itahu 'to know'; ino'k 'to recover (from illness, surprise, shock)'; inahta 'to be lame; to limp'; jasxni 'to cough; to be hoarse'; im anxu 'to fall off'. In these themes, the bivalence can be manifested only in the first person anumerative, because this is the only person that is diagnostic for the stative/active distinction in prefixed-class
themes. The phenomenon was noted by Dixon (325) in connection
with isarni; his observation was actually based on a differ-
ence between speakers (D/PD-1.53 for the active instance, and
D/F-5.51 for the stative) rather than on variants produced by a
single speaker. An entry in the Curtin ms. (C/T-189) agrees
with the stative form of D/F, while H/SN occurrences are strict-
ly active, in agreement with D/PD. But H/SN data for the other
themes do show the fluctuation in the speech of a single speak-
er. A comparable phenomenon has been noted for other lan-
guages. Bright (59) found a similar, exclusively first person fluctua-
tion in Karok to be systemic and used it to define the set of
stative verb themes for that language. For Tunica, Haas (1940:
59) noted a fluctuation of transpersonal and intransitive
inflections of themes denoting involuntary action such as
breathing or coughing, but this fluctuation is overtly mani-
fested in all persons. Swadesh (326) observed a fluctuation
between objective and subjective inflections exclusively in the
first person, in a restricted set of "deponent" verbs referring
to bodily states and reactions, such as getting tired, feeling
pain, tasting, sleeping, shivering. In view of the Karok in-
stance, but in part also arbitrarily, I have place uone in
Table 1, with the understanding that it may represent a special
case.

A stative verb translated as 'to be lonesome', which on
the basis of meaning could be expected to be associated with
privation, appears in two distinct inflectional renditions.
One gives the theme the shape of a surface-marked privative:
uk'utk'ot, with covert pronominal reference in the third person
surface form, P/uk'utk'ot- (H/SN-20R). The other treats the
theme as an ordinary stative theme: uk'utk'ot, with overt
third person in the surface form, P/huk'utk'ot- (H/SN-32OR).
There is no corresponding plenative theme, although an etymo-
logically related stative theme does exist in the form of
utk'otpi 'be left over, remain, survive', which is negatable by
either x̄-na or ak'-na. The apparent ambivalence in the
inflection may reflect uncertainty of recollection, or it may
be idiosyncratic, or it may reflect an established fluctuation.
If uk'utk'ot is a valid shape, it would belong in Table 2 as
one of the unopposed surface-marked privatives, alongside
ayusanmu 'be blind'.

A few lexicalized forms displaying an etymologically nega-
tive element in their hypomorphemic composition are found out-
side the set of antithetically paired stative themes of Tables
1 and 2. One of these is used predicatively, but I am not sure
whether it is nominal or verbal: tk'ipk'ina, '(ambience) to be
still, quiet, hushed' — or perhaps: 'a stillness to be there'.
In the etymologically transparent composition of this form the
negative suffix k'ina is recognizable: this is a variant of
the negative suffix k'una and it is used productively, though
rarely and selectively. The core element tk'ip is not found
elsewhere.
A quantifier xutalla 'few; a little bit of' seems to derive etymologically from the the affixal negation of a core element *ita which is also seen in the quantifier hita 'many'. The adverb xuwenila 'slightly, in a subdued manner; slowly', and the verb xuwe.nko 'to keep quiet' may reflect negation of an etymological core of indeterminate shape (*iwe or *uwe). And the adverb xanik'una P/xani'na 'already' derives from the affixal negation of xani 'soon', with the literal sense of 'not soon' narrowed down to one of 'no longer anticipatable, no longer future' in the lexicalization.

There is also a possibility that the form P/š'imark'una (š'imar 'person, human'), in addition to representing a simple identificational negative š'imar-k'una 'to not be a person' (with or without a pejorative sense), can in some instances represent a lexicalized nominal š'imark'una 'an unhuman', in predicative use 'to be an unhuman', (with obligatory pejorative connotations). (By 'unhuman' I mean something like German Unmensch, Russian neljudi, nečelovek.) However, I have not been able to establish that this lexicalization exists.

Lexicalized affixally negated forms with an antithetic rather than negatory sense may be found here and there in a number of lexicons. For example, in Biloxi, the negative affix ku..ni seems to be present in kudini 'to be soiled, blackened, ugly', but the residual (presumably thematic) element di seems to have no occurrence other than in this apparently lexicalized form. In Tunica, however, this type of lexicalization is extensively represented in the lexicon. Three of the four negative postfixes productively used in Tunica appear in lexicalized composite forms. The three postfixes are M/aha, M/ʔaha, and M/pʔaha; they are conditioned by word class and paradigmatic categories, and their vocalism is subject to morphophonemic processes. There are several lexicalized forms with transparent composition, some of which are:

lápʔa 'bad'; lápu 'good'
nisʔaha 'anciently'; nisa 'recently'
ʔírapʔaha 'naked'; ʔíra 'clothed'
-étipʔaha 'enemy'; -éti 'friend, kin'

There are also several morphemes in which the etymological core element is unique: štámarʔa 'to be impertinent'; pínʔaha 'uncut (of bull)'; wánthāha 'formerly'; yórumʔaha 'beast, wild animal'; tékaha 'orphaned, poor'; and many more. These forms — the transparent and the opaque — are all distinguished as derived adjectives in the dictionary, though the criteria for distinguishing the transparent forms from simple negation are not spelled out.

In this paper I have not attempted to explain or speculate about the motivation in the cognitive/semological processes.
that might underlie the appropriation of negative forms for the expression of a privative sense, but have taken that phenomenon as a given. The paper deals with the mechanics of structural accommodation in the wake of the privative take-over of negative forms, as strikingly manifested in the Chimariko materials. The presence of a distinct subset of privatives marked only incidentally substructural cues (theme-initial morphophonemic sequences and their phonemic resolutions, which are identical with those of negated prefixed-class themes in their prethematic segments), as opposed to a broader, often more diffuse set of unmarked privatives in antithetic oppositions within the qualitative-evaluative domain of the lexicon, invites comparison with the expression of qualitative-evaluative privation in other languages.
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FOOTNOTES

1. In the Tupí-Guaraní materials consulted (Dietrich 303) it is not clear whether the element in question is used productively in word formation or nonproductively (i.e. found only in lexicalizations). If it is productive, the element would represent a structural unit (morpheme, lexeme) distinct from the predicative negative element, although homophonous with it.

2. Cited forms in this paper are in morphophonemic transcription unless specially marked. Underscoring of forms is interrupted for typographical reasons where subscript elements interfere, but should be understood as being continuous under
the form. Characters with subscript elements, when cited in isolation (as in fn. 13), are likewise to be read as underscored.

3. The combination of occlusive + h is a digraph, not a consonant cluster. I use this notation for typographical convenience only. In theory, a close sequence of occlusive and h should be possible, but it does not turn up in the materials.

4. The pronominal elements used with prefixed-class stative verbs are ḋh in the anumerative, and a distinctive second person ḍh in the plural. Second person imperative is n in the anumerative, ḍh in the plural.

11. Typically the suffixed-class stative theme takes the inflection či, mi, hi in the anumerative (slash indicates a deletable consonant — see fn. 21), and čhi, mkhi, hi in the plural. However, tew 'be big' takes a u-form of the inflection, a characteristic shared with only one other nonderived stative theme, čhew 'be pregnant': ču, mu, mu in the anumerative, and čchu, mku in the first and second person in the plural. In its dictionary form this theme is marked with a superscript u as a morphemic tag: tew. The tag is not a morphophoneme, and is not used in normal citations of the theme. A number of other statives take the syncopating inflection či, mi, hi in the anumerative (the breve marks a syncopating vowel), and čhi, mkhi, hi in the plural.

12. The symbol P/ indicates phonemic transcription. Its domain extends to the end of a citation, including a text segment of more than one line, and also to the entirety of a paradigm in the charts.

13. The phonemic symbol x is used for the velar fricative as opposed to postvelar x whenever it can be positively identified. The unmarked symbol x is intentionally ambiguous; it is used when the phonemic value cannot be reconstituted. Harrington did not distinguish the two positions in 1921, although in subsequent field work he learned to do so.

14. Dixon understood the Mrs. Dyer he worked with (Dixon, 363) to be Polly Dyer (D/PD-1-1; see fn. 23). Polly Dyer was Sally Noble's mother. There is evidence that he may actually have been working with Mary Dyer, who probably was not related to Polly Dyer but was the mother of Sally's half sister Martha. This may explain some of the striking differences between Sally's and "Polly's" speech. Be that as it may, in applying the investigator/native speaker code I use PD for the Mrs. Dyer Dixon worked with.

21. Note that syncope is effected sequentially, in the order of production, in a deletion pass which precedes the realization pass. The morphophoneme ħ is deleted postconsonantly and is realized as P/h postvocically.

22. The medial consonant in a triple cluster (here the m of ḍmku) is unrealized.
23. The investigator/native speaker codes appearing in this paper are H/SN = Harrington with Sally Noble; D/SN = Dixon with Sally Noble; D/PD = Dixon with Polly Dyer; D/F = Dixon with Friday; C/T = Curtin with Doctor Tom. Numerical and alphabetical symbols which follow these designations refer to location in the set of manuscripts: 634T is page 634 of Texts; F = First Notes, R = Rehearing (of the early notes). For the Dixon materials, l.1 = notebook 1, page 1.

24. The example is not entirely satisfactory either, because no instance of third person suppression has turned up with this particular theme.

31. When I know that P/k'una is a postposition, I write it as a separate word. Otherwise, as in the examples cited here, I allow it to join the preceding word.

32. Carol Eastman (235) has noted a similar constraint in Haida.

33. s.imm. = stative of immanence; (IBx) = prefixed-class inflectional subclass B (x = with inherently covert third person).

34. The predicate nominal, which I take to be a lexicalized form of the inflected verb (inflected for third person), is in every case a consonant-initial theme, whether it stems etymologically from a consonant-initial theme (as is the case with the predicate nominal tewu 'a big one', < *tew-ů 'he be big') or from a vowel-initial theme (as in hisi* 'a good one', < *h-isí* 'he be good'). Hence the predicate nominal accepts only suffixal negation and positive negation (the few attested instances are indeterminate as to which formulation is being applied); prefixal negation is excluded. Examples are:

\[ P/\text{hisi*}k'unaxananta. (< \text{hisi*}-k'ũ-na- or \text{hisi*} k'u-na-) \]
\[ 'They will not be good (ones).' \] (H/SN-351T)

\[ P/\text{hisi*}k'utk'i. (< \text{hisi*}-k'ũ-itk'i or \text{hisi*} k'u-itk'i) \]
\[ 'They can't be good (ones).' \] (H/SN-143T)

41. The selected examples cited here are for the most part in reconstituted or in phonemic transcription as per the sources from which they are drawn, and are not specially marked. But where the cited forms are rendered morphophonemically, they are preceded by the notation M/ to indicate this fact.

42. Literally "not clean" per Dorsey and Swanton (183, under de). For the transcription I follow Einaudi.

43. The Tunica forms are from Haas (1940;120-1, and 1953).
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