Open Library of Humanities

Diagnosing negation in Polynesian

John Middleton, University of Auckland, NZ; University of the South Pacific, FJ, john.middleton@usp.ac.fj

Polynesian languages exhibit the rare phenomenon of predicate negation, in which a negative word is a matrix predicate that selects a positive declarative clause as its complement. However, there are claims that there is particle negation in many Polynesian languages in addition to, or instead of, predicate negation. Evidence to support particle negation is lacking; usually the absence of any data supporting predicate negation is taken to indicate particle negation. This article rejects this methodology as inconclusive and instead presents a novel diagnostic that clearly illuminates predicate negation or systematically rules it out. Apparent raising, the process by which an argument in a subordinate clause may raise to a matrix clause, serves this purpose in two Polynesian languages, Tokelauan and Samoan. It is proposed that this diagnostic may be used across the Polynesian language family, allowing us to better establish the properties of predicate and non-predicate negation.

Keywords: negation; predicate negation; Polynesian; apparent raising; Tokelauan; Samoan

1 Introduction

Every language has a way to negate a declarative sentence (Dahl 1979, Payne 1985, and Dryer 2005). For sentential negation, three main types are attested: morphological negatives, negative particles, and negative verbs (auxiliary or matrix).[1] Negative particles are understood as being within a negative phrase, or NegP, and can be heads or adverbs (Pollock 1989 and Zanuttini 1997). NegP appears in the clausal spine and selects either a TP or VP complement (Ouhalla 1990). In contrast, negative verbs are themselves predicates, have their own tense/aspect markers, and take a sentential complement (Zanuttini 2001).

It has been argued that Polynesian languages have predicate negation, with a negative predicate followed by a subordinate declarative clause. Most famously detailed by Chung 1970, this analysis has been adopted for Māori (Hohepa 1969, Chung 1978, Waite 1987, and Chung 2021), Niuean (Clemens 2018), Tongan (Broschart 1999, Custis 2004, and Ball 2008), Tahitian (Lazard & Peltzer 1999, Potsdam & Polinsky 2012, and Potsdam & Polinsky 2017), East Futunan (Moyse-Faurie 1999), Tokelauan (Hooper 1993 and Vonen 1999), and Samoan (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992). Examples of negation from these languages are the following.[2]

(1)   Māori negation
   Kaahore *taatou*   *e*   *haere*   *ana*   *aapoopoo.*
   NEG   1PL.INCL   TAM   move   TAM   tomorrow
   'We are not going tomorrow.'
   (Bauer 2005: 139, (605a))

(2)   Niuean negation
   Ai   *kia* *kitia* *e*   *koe* *e*   *lā*   *kua* *tokoluga?*
   NEG   Q   see   ERG   2SG   ABS   sun   PRF   high
   'Didn't you see the sun high up?'
   (Seiter 1980: 26, (69))

---

[1] As we are not examining morphological negatives or auxiliary negatives in this article, I will not discuss them any further. I will refer to matrix negative verbs simply as negative verbs.

[2] In this article, some original glossing has been altered to follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules. Additional abbreviations used in glosses: ANP = anaphoric particle; ASP = aspect; CIA = agentive verbal suffix; CONJ = conjunction; DIR = directional particle; INACP = unaccomplished aspect; INT = intensifier; MID = middle object marker; PERS = person marker; TAM = tense/aspect/modal particle.

(3)　　Tongan negation
　　　　*Naʻe **ʻikai** ke　　ʻalu ʻa　　Siale.*
　　　　PST　**NEG**　COMP　go　ABS　Charlie
　　　　'Charlie did not go.'
　　　　(Churchward 1953: 56, my glosses)

(4)　　Tahitian negation
　　　　*'**Aita** ʼoe　i　　taiʼo　ʼi　　terā　puta.*
　　　　NEG　2SG　ASP　read　ACC　DEM　book
　　　　'You didn't read that book.'
　　　　(Potsdam & Polinsky 2012: 69, (37b))

(5)　　East Futunan negation
　　　　*E　　**se**　lalama　　　　　a　　ia.*
　　　　INACP　**NEG**　torch.fish.at.night　ABS　3SG
　　　　'She doesn't torch-fish at night.'
　　　　(Henderson 2022: 21, (7))

(6)　　Tokelauan negation
　　　　*E　　**hē**　ko　tana　　　　　gāluega tēnā.*
　　　　NPST　**NEG**　PRED　DEF.SG.3SG.GEN　work　DEM
　　　　'That is not his work.'
　　　　(Hooper 1993: 103, (291))

(7)　　Samoan negation
　　　　*ʻOu　te　**lē**　ʻo　　alu.*
　　　　1SG　TAM　**NEG**　PROG　go
　　　　'I am not going.'
　　　　(Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 376, (7.245))

However, there are also claims that Polynesian languages exhibit particle negation instead. Some authors suggest that some Polynesian languages contain both predicate and non-predicate negation (e.g., Hooper 1993, Hovdhaugen & Mosel 1999, Vonen 1999, Custis 2004, and Ball 2008) while others argue for exclusively particle negation (Collins 2017 and Middleton 2023). For some languages, there are conflicting claims on the category of certain negative words, such as Niuean *nākai*

(Clemens 2018 vs. Massam 2020), Tongan *'ikai* (Broschart 1999 vs. Custis 2004), and Samoan *lē* and *le'i* (Chung 1970 vs. Collins 2017).[3] It is clear from this that negative structures in Polynesian languages continue to be debated. Consequently, diagnostics that can differentiate between particle and predicate negation are vital for a fuller understanding of negation strategies in these languages and for a comprehensive description of the negative predicate category proposed by Payne 1985.

There are several diagnostics that have been employed to determine whether a language has predicate negation, including secondary tense/aspect/modal (TAM) particles, a subordinating complementizer, the presence of predicate modifiers next to the negative, and raising of an argument from the verb to the negative (Hohepa 1969, Chung 1970, Chung 1978, Bauer 1997, Pearce 1997, Custis 2004, Ball 2008, Potsdam & Polinsky 2012, Potsdam & Polinsky 2017, Clemens 2018, and Chung 2021). These are briefly illustrated below.

In Māori, as shown in (8), negatives are followed by a second TAM particle, in addition to the preceding one. Note that in this article, square brackets always denote clause boundaries.

(8)　　Māori negation with two TAM particles
　　　a.　… [***kua kore*** te wānanga [***e*** mahi-a ki ngā waka]] …
　　　　　　TAM NEG the sacred.vessel **TAM** make-PASS to the.PL canoe
　　　'… a sacred vessel was no longer made for canoes …'
　　　b.　[***Kāore*** anō [***kia*** whiti te rā]].
　　　　　TAM.NEG yet **TAM** shine DEF sun
　　　　　'The sun hasn't risen yet.'
　　　(Chung 2021: 156, (17), (16b))

It is argued that the first TAM particle is for the negative predicate while the second is for the subordinate verbal clause. In fact, only some TAM particles are ever used to introduce subordinate clauses, and it is only these TAM particles that are ever seen following negatives (Chung 2021).

---

[3] The proposed location of particle negation is also varied; Massam 2020 proposes a NegP above TP for Niuean, while Collins 2017 argues for a NegP below TP for Samoan.

Instead of a secondary TAM particle, Tongan has a complementizer particle, *ke*, that follows certain negative particles, as in (9b). Like in Māori, this indicates that the negative is followed by a subordinate clause.

(9)   Tongan negation with a complementizer
    a. [*Naʻe ʻalu ʻa   Sione*].
        PST go   ABS John
        'John went.'[4]
    b. [*Naʻe ʻikai* [**ke**   *ʻalu ʻa   Sione*]].
        PST NEG **COMP** go   ABS John
        'John didn't go.'
    (Custis 2004: 82, (6), 112, (38))

Māori negatives may also be followed by verbal particles, indicating that they are verbal predicates. For example, a negative can be followed by manner and directional particles, such as *noa* 'freely' and *ake* 'away,' as in (10a). These are not simply modifying the verb to the right, since the verb itself can be concurrently modified by such particles, as in (10b).

(10)   Māori negation with verbal particles
    a. [*Kīhai*   **noa   ake**   [*i   rongo*]].
        PST.NEG **freely away** TAM hear
        'They were never heard of again.'

    b. [*Kāhore*   **kau** *he tangata o te iwi   nei* [*i   noho noa*]].
        TAM.NEG **EXCL** a person of the tribe this TAM sit   **freely**
        'Not a single one of the men of the tribe just sat.'
    (Chung 2021: 156, (18a), 157, (19))

In Tahitian, negative predicates are raising verbs. The subject of a verb must obligatorily raise to the negative predicate, raising above the verb's TAM particle and into the higher clause. This can be observed with the second person singular pronoun in (11b).

---

[4] The original gloss appears to be erroneous. It has been corrected.

(11) Tahitian negation is a raising verb
a. ['*Ua tai'o **'oe** 'i terā puta*].
       PFV read **2SG** ACC DEM book
       'You read that book.'

b. ['*Aita **'oe**$_i$ [*i tai'o* ___$_i$ *'i terā puta*]].
       NEG **2SG** ASP read ACC DEM book
       'You didn't read that book.'
   (Potsdam & Polinsky 2012: 69, (37a), (37b))

An additional example, from Māori, is seen in (10b), with the subject *he tangata o te iwi nei* 'a man of the tribe' raising from the verb *noho* 'sit.'

   Together, these pieces of evidence support the analysis of negatives in these languages as predicates. However, these diagnostics are unidirectional; the presence of these particles/processes provides evidence for negative predicates, but the absence of them does not provide evidence against predicate negation. In spite of this, the absence of these particles/processes has often been taken as evidence for particle negation in Polynesian (e.g., Massam 2000 and Custis 2004).

   It is clear that we do not have adequate diagnostics for negation in Polynesian languages and that there is a need for diagnostics that argue for *or against* predicate negation. This article proposes that **apparent raising** (Otsuka 2000, Polinsky 2016, Otsuka 2018, and Otsuka 2021) can be employed to identify predicate negation or rule it out. To illustrate this diagnostic, I turn to Tokelauan and Samoan (both Polynesian, Samoic).[5] Raising verbs in these two languages allow an argument from a subordinate clause to raise up to the matrix clause. Only certain verbs allow this movement; non-raising verbs do not. An example of apparent raising, from Tokelauan, is the following.

(12) Raising in Tokelauan
a. [*E mafai* [*oi olo uma **nā** **tamaiti** ki Fenuafala*]].
       NPST possible COMP go.PL all **DEF.PL** **child** to Fenuafala
       'All the children can go to Fenuafala.'

---

b. [*E   mafai **e**   **nā**   **tamaiti**ᵢ [*oi   olo   uma* __ᵢ *ki*
  NPST possible **ERG DEF.PL child**   COMP go.PL   all   to
Fenuafala]].
Fenuafala
'All the children can go to Fenuafala.'
(Hooper 1993: 303, (160b), 304, (161))

A string of raising verbs allows long distance raising of an argument from the lowest clause to the highest:

(13) Tokelauan long distance raising
Ko   au   ka   fano fakatau, [*vaganā **ki tātou**ᵢ [e   mafai* [*ke*
TOP 1SG FUT go.SG buy   unless   **1PL.INCL** NPST able   COMP
mātamata __ᵢ *ki   te   TV*]]].
watch   MID DEF TV
'I will go shopping, unless we are able to watch the TV.'

However, if a non-raising verb intervenes in this string of raising verbs, the argument is blocked from raising past it. In (14), although *vaganā* 'unless' is a raising verb, the non-raising verb *lea* 'say' blocks raising from that clause.

(14) Tokelauan non-raising verb blocking raising to the matrix clause
a. [*e   vaganā* [*e   lea mai te   tino*   [*kua teka **te**   **vaka**]]]
  NPST unless   NPST say DIR DEF person PRF depart **DEF boat**
'unless the man tells me that the boat has left'

b. *[*e   vaganā **te**   **vaka**ᵢ [e   lea mai te   tino*   [*kua*
  NPST unless **DEF boat** NPST say DIR DEF person PRF
teka   __ᵢ]]]
depart
Intended: 'unless the man tells me that the boat has left'
(Hooper 1993: 306, (167))

I argue that if negation is a predicate, it will either be a raising predicate and therefore allow raising to it or will be a non-raising predicate and therefore block raising past it. If negation neither allows raising nor blocks it, as I illustrate is the case in Tokelauan and Samoan, it cannot logically be a predicate and therefore must be a particle instead.

This article is ordered as follows. Section 2 introduces Tokelauan and Samoan morphosyntax. Section 3 discusses negation in Polynesian and in particular the absence of diagnostics for particle negation. Apparent raising is discussed in section 4, where the pattern of long distance raising is illustrated in more detail along with the blocking of long distance raising by an intervening non-raising predicate. Section 5 demonstrates that apparent raising can be employed as a diagnostic for particle negation: this diagnostic shows that Tokelauan and Samoan negatives can neither be raising predicates nor non-raising predicates. Section 6 concludes.

2 Tokelauan and Samoan morphosyntax

This article will examine Tokelauan and Samoan, both of which fall in the Samoic subgroup of Polynesian (Hovdhaugen et al. 1989). Tokelauan has 3,900 speakers, while Samoan is spoken by 400,000 people (Simons & Fennig 2017).

Both languages are predicate-initial and have an unmarked VSO word order, with a VOS order also possible for both (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992 and Middleton 2024).[6] They have ergative–absolutive case alignment and the same case markers; *e* is obligatory for ergative arguments while absolutive arguments are unmarked, except R-expressions, which are preceded by the absolutive marker *ia*. These facts are illustrated in (15) and (16).

(15)   VSO order
    a.   Tokelauan
       Na tuki e John ia Rangi.
       PST hit ERG John ABS Rangi
       'John hit Rangi.'

    b.   Samoan
       Sā ʻai e le tamaloa le iʻa.
       PST eat ERG DEF man DEF fish
       'The man was eating the fish.'
       (Collins 2014: 95, (3a))

---

[6] There is little research about the difference between the two orders in these languages; however, for Tongan it has been argued that the VSO–VOS choice is determined by pragmatic factors (see Custis 2004, Otsuka 2005a, Otsuka 2005b, and Polinsky & Potsdam 2021).

(16) VOS order

    a. Tokelauan
      Na tuki ia Rangi e   John.
      PST hit ABS Rangi ERG John
      'John hit Rangi.'

    b. Samoan
      Sā 'ai le i'a e   le tamaloa.
      PST eat DEF fish ERG DEF man
      'The man was eating the fish.'
      (Collins 2014: 95, (3b))

Verbs are usually preceded by a TAM particle, as (17) illustrates, although complementizers can replace the TAM in subordinate clauses, as in (18). Imperatives, as (19) illustrates, have no TAM or complementizer. Pre-verbal pronoun clitics are sometimes seen preceding verbs, as in (17b).

(17) TAM particle preceding verb

    a. Tokelauan
      E   manatua *nei te faigatā …*
      NPST remember now DEF difficult.thing
      'We know how difficult it is …'
      (Simona 1986: 216, my glosses)

    b. Samoan
      'Ou **te   manatua** *ai pea   'oe.*
      1SG **TAM remember** ANP continually 2SG
      'Then I will still remember you.'
      (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 389, (7.339))

(18) Complementizer preceding verb

    a. Tokelauan
      Kua fai e ni   tino nā   fakatuha o   tagata takutakua
      PRF make ERG INDF.PL people DEF.PL statue   GEN man   famous
      o   nā   aho kua mavae **ke   manatua** *ai.*
      GEN DEF.PL day PRF pass **COMP remember** ANP
      'Some people have made statues of famous men of the past to remember them by.'
      (Simona 1986: 106, my glosses)

b. Samoan
'Ua siliga **ona taunu'u** *mai le tama.*
PRF too.late **COMP arrive** DIR DET man
'The man was overdue coming back.' (Lit. 'It was too late that the man came back.')
(Collins 2017: 30, (53a))

(19) Imperatives have no TAM/complementizer
  a. Tokelauan
  Manatua *ke lafo taku tuhi.*
  remember COMP send DEF.SG.1SG.GEN letter
  'Remember to post my letter.'
  (Simona 1986: 216, my glosses)

  b. Samoan
  Manatua *le fuia ma le lupe* 'ua 'ai e Tuiatamai.
  remember DEF starling and DEF pigeon PRF eat ERG Tuiatamai
  'Remember the starling and the pigeon that Tuiatamai has eaten.'[7]
  (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 592, (15.24))

Negatives in Tokelauan differ depending on aspectual distinctions; *hēki* is used for events and *hē* for states. Negatives follow the TAM particle and precede the main predicate constituent, as in (20). Negation triggers the -CIA suffix on transitive verbs, as (20a) illustrates.

(20) Tokelauan negation
  a. *E* **hēki** *velo-a e ia te ika.*
     NPST **NEG** spear-CIA ERG 3SG DEF fish
     'He didn't spear the fish.'

  b. *Kua* **hē** *ata tele te tavale.*
     PRF **NEG** can move DEF car
     'The car can't move.'[8]

---

[7] The original translation, 'Remember Tuiatamai had eaten the starling and the pigeon,' appears to be erroneous. It has been corrected based on a native Samoan speaker's translation.

[8] In this example, I consider *ata* 'can' an auxiliary verb (Seiter 1980 and Sperlich 1997) or a vP layer pre-verb (Massam 2020), rather than a matrix predicate.

As (21) shows, Samoan also has two negative particles, which precede the verb: *lē* (which has an allomorph *le*) 'not' and *le'i* 'not yet' (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 142).

(21) Samoan negation
    a. *'Ua **lē** fiafia le tama.*
        PRF **NEG** happy DEF boy
        'The boy is not happy.'[9]

    b. *E **le'i** maua ni o lā suafa.*
        TAM **NEG** get INDF.PL GEN 2DU name
        'They had not yet gotten any names.'
    (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 477, (10.127), 263, (6.65))

Both languages exhibit apparent raising (Otsuka 2000, Polinsky 2016, Otsuka 2018, and Otsuka 2021), a process where an argument from a subordinate clause may optionally raise to the matrix clause, sometimes (though not always) exhibiting a different morphological case marking:

(22) Tokelauan apparent raising[10]
    a. [*E mahani* [*ona kakai **ia fafine** i te piho*]].
        NPST customary COMP eat.PL **ABS woman** MID DEF head
        'Women usually eat the head.'

    b. [*E mahani **ia fafine**$_i$* [*oi kakai __$_i$ i te piho*]].
        NPST customary **ABS woman** COMP eat.PL MID DEF head
        'Women usually eat the head.'
    (Hooper 1993: 304, (163))

(23) Samoan apparent raising
    a. [*E mafai* [*ona tautala **le pepe***]].
        TAM can COMP talk **DEF baby**
        'The baby can talk.'

---

[9] The original English translation, 'The boy is unhappy,' appears to be imprecise. A Samoan native speaker provided the translation shown, which seems to more accurately reflect the sentence meaning.

[10] These sentences show a middle verb in the subordinate clause, with an absolutive-marked subject and an *i*-marked object. The term *middle verb* is used in the Polynesianist sense, meaning a transitive verb without the ergative–absolutive pattern usually found in these languages (Chung 1978 and Seiter 1978a). This contrasts with another use of the term *middle verb*, for intransitive variants of transitive verbs (Williams 1981).

b. [*E*   *mafai* **e**   **le**   **pepe**_i [*ona*   *tautala* ___i]].
   TAM can   **ERG DEF baby** COMP talk
   'The baby can talk.'
(Cook 1991: 89)

Apparent raising will be discussed in detail in section 4.

3 Negation in Polynesian

There is much evidence to support a predicate analysis of negation in Polynesian languages. Among the diagnostics are the presence of two TAM particles in the sentence, the presence of a subordinating complementizer following the negative, verbal modifiers on the negative, and the ability of an argument to raise from the verbal clause to the negative clause (Hohepa 1969, Chung 1970, Chung 1978, Chung 2021, Bauer 1997, Pearce 1997, Custis 2004, Ball 2008, Potsdam & Polinsky 2012, Potsdam & Polinsky 2017, and Clemens 2018). Examples were given in the introduction (8–11).

However, there is an absence of empirical support for a non-predicative analysis of Polynesian negation, despite the many authors who propose just that (Hooper 1993, Hovdhaugen & Mosel 1999, Vonen 1999, Massam 2000, Custis 2004, Ball 2008, Collins 2017, and Massam 2020). The evidence presented for particle negation has usually been a lack of evidence for predicate negation: if a negative word does not exhibit clear signs of being predicative, it is assumed that this negative word is a particle in NegP.

For example, Tongan has both negation followed by a complementizer *ke*, as in (24a), and negation followed directly by the verb with no complementizer, as in (24b).

(24)   Two types of negation in Tongan
   a. *Na'e* ***'ikai*** [***ke***   *'alu* *'a*   *Sione*].
      PST **NEG** **COMP** go   ABS John
      'John didn't go.'

   b. *Na'e* ***'ikai*** *'alu* *'a*   *Sione.*
      PST **NEG** go   ABS John
      'John didn't go.'
   (Custis 2004: 112, (38), (37))

Custis 2004 proposes that these are different forms of negation: that the former is a predicate while the latter is a non-predicative particle. This is based predominantly on the lack of the complementizer in (24b). Ball 2008 takes an opposing view and claims that both forms are predicates but that the first selects a TP complement while the second takes a vP complement.[11] I suggest that both proposals are fundamentally the same: (24a) contains a matrix negative predicate with a subordinate verbal clause, while (24b) has something more akin to a negative auxiliary or NegP, which slots into the clause below TP and above vP. Crucially for this article, the diagnostic for the latter is simply the absence of lexical material, rather than anything more substantial.

Massam 2000 proposes that the Niuean negative *nākai* is a particle (cf. Clemens 2018), but the reasons are equally unsatisfactory. Massam claims that the complement of *nākai* takes what appears to be a VP complement, not a CP complement, as it is not followed by either a complementizer or TAM particle. In addition, *nākai* cannot host a full range of post-verbal particles as would be expected of a verb. Both of these diagnostics are simply the absence of certain things expected with predicate negation.

In order to gain a better understanding of negation in Polynesian, clear diagnostics are needed that can determine the syntactic category of negation. This article employs apparent raising as a diagnostic for both predicate negation and non-predicate negation.

4 Apparent raising

Apparent raising is a process where an argument in a subordinate clause is optionally raised to the matrix clause (Chung 1978, Seiter 1978b, Chung & Seiter 1980, Besnier 1988, Otsuka 2000, Polinsky 2016, Otsuka 2018, and Otsuka 2021). The verb of the higher clause is called a raising verb. Raising verbs are often (but not always) intransitive, and only certain verbs can trigger raising. Apparent raising differs from true raising (in the sense of Postal 1974) in that non-subjects can undergo raising and raised arguments can "skip" a clause and raise to the highest clause of a multi-clause sentence (Polinsky 2016).[12]

---

[11] Clemens 2018 adopts the same proposal for *nākai* in Niuean.

[12] Apparent raising has also been observed in many Polynesian languages besides Tokelauan and Samoan, including Māori (Bauer 2005), Cook Islands Māori (Nicholas 2016), Tuvaluan (Besnier 1988), Pukapukan (Salisbury 2002), Niuean (Chung & Seiter 1980), Tongan (Otsuka 2000), and Rapa Nui (Kieviet 2017).

In both Tokelauan and Samoan, apparent raising appears to be Ā-movement, allowing unbounded movement across multiple clauses, as long as each higher clause contains a raising verb. In (25), the Tokelauan verbs *vaganā* 'unless' and *mafai* 'to be able' are raising predicates.[13] Consequently, the subject of the verb *mātamata* 'watch,' namely *ki tātou* 'we (INCL),' is able to raise from its position in the lowest clause, seen in (25a), to the second clause, as in (25b), and then again to the third clause, as in (25c). The interpretation of all three sentences is identical. In each case, *ki tātou* 'we (INCL)' moves to a position above the complementizer or TAM particle.

(25) Tokelauan raising across clauses

a. *Ko au ka fano fakatau,* [*vaganā* [*e mafai* [*ke mātamata*
TOP 1SG FUT go.SG buy   unless NPST able COMP watch
***ki tātou** ki te TV*]]].
1PL.INCL MID DEF TV
'I will go shopping, unless we are able to watch the TV.'

b. *Ko au ka fano fakatau,* [*vaganā* [*e mafai **ki tātou**ᵢ* [*ke*
TOP 1SG FUT go.SG buy   unless NPST able **1PL.INCL** COMP
matamata __ᵢ ki te TV]]].
watch   MID DEF TV
'I will go shopping, unless we are able to watch the TV.'

c. *Ko au ka fano fakatau,* [*vaganā **ki tātou**ᵢ* [*e mafai* [*ke*
TOP 1SG FUT go.SG buy   unless **1PL.INCL** NPST able COMP
mātamata __ᵢ ki te TV]]].
watch   MID DEF TV
'I will go shopping, unless we are able to watch the TV.'

In a similar fashion, *mānatua* 'remember' and *masani* 'to be usual' are raising verbs in Samoan, which allows the subject of the verb *tagi* 'cry' in (26), namely *le pepe* 'the baby,' to raise from the lowest clause, where it is found in (26a), to the second clause, as in (26b), as well as to the highest clause, as in (26c).[14] Again, interpretations are identical.

---

[13] Hooper 1993 describes *vaganā* 'unless' as an adverbial predicate, which is not preceded by a TAM particle. Its predicative quality is shown by the possibility of modification by verbal intensifiers *lava* and *lā*, as well as its ability to trigger raising.

[14] Note that the complementizer *ga* is not recorded in Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992. However, my speaker uses it productively, and it appears to be used with various verbs.

(26)   Samoan raising across clauses
   a.   [*Mānatua* [*e*   *masani* [*ga*   *tagi* ***le***   ***pepe***]]].
         remember TAM usual   COMP cry   **DEF** **baby**
         'Remember that the baby usually cries.'

   b.   [*Mānatua* [*e*   *masani* ***le***   ***pepe**$_i$* [*ga*   *tagi* __$_i$]]].
         remember TAM usual   **DEF** **baby** COMP cry
         'Remember that the baby usually cries.'

   c.   [*Mānatua* ***le***   ***pepe**$_i$* [*e*   *masani* [*ga*   *tagi* __$_i$]]].
         remember **DEF** **baby** TAM usual   COMP cry
         'Remember that the baby usually cries.'

Note, however, that successive raising can only occur if all the higher verbs are raising verbs, such as in (25), where both *vaganā* 'unless' and *mafai* 'to be able' are raising verbs, and in (26), where *mānatua* 'remember' and *masani* 'to be usual' are raising verbs. In both Tokelauan and Samoan, a non-raising predicate will block raising, even if a higher raising verb dominates the non-raising verb. In Tokelauan, *mahani* 'to be usual' is a raising predicate, but *lea* 'say, tell' is not. In (27), the presence of the non-raising predicate *lea* 'say, tell' blocks the subject of the lowest clause (*te vaka* 'the boat') from raising to the highest clause, even though the highest clause has a raising predicate.

(27)   Tokelauan non-raising predicates block raising
   a.   [*E*   *mahani lava* [*oi*   *lea mai te*   *tino*   [*kua teka* ***te***
         NPST usually INT   COMP say DIR DEF person PRF depart **DEF**
         vaka]]].
         boat
         'It is usual that someone tells me the boat has departed.'

   b.   *[*E*   *mahani lava* ***te***   ***vaka**$_i$* [*oi*   *lea mai te*   *tino*   [*kua*
         NPST usually INT   **DEF** **boat**   COMP say DIR DEF person PRF
         teka   __$_i$]]].
         depart
         Intended: 'It is usual that someone tells me the boat has departed.'

Similarly, in Samoan, *mafai* 'to be able' is a raising predicate, but in (28) the non-raising predicate *ta'u* 'tell' blocks the subject of the lowest clause (*le pepe* 'the baby') from raising to the highest clause.

(28)   Samoan non-raising predicates block raising

a. [*E mafai* [*ga ta'u mai e sesi* [*pe tagi **le pepe***]]].
TAM able   COMP tell DIR ERG someone COMP cry **DEF baby**
'Someone is able to tell me that the baby is crying.'

b. *[*E mafai **le pepe**ᵢ* [*ga ta'u mai e sesi* [*pe*
TAM able **DEF baby** COMP tell DIR ERG someone COMP
tagi __ᵢ]]].
cry
Intended: 'Someone is able to tell me that the baby is crying.'

Raised arguments may have different case marking compared with the non-raised variant. Hooper 1993 observes that ergative, absolutive, and occasionally prepositional nominals can be raised in Tokelauan, with the raised argument taking ergative, absolutive, or oblique morphological case, not necessarily the same case as in the non-raised version. Similarly, Samoan exhibits S-to-A, A-to-A, S-to-O, and O-to-O raising, where S is an intransitive subject, A is a transitive subject, and O is a direct object (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992).[15] An example of ergative-to-absolutive (A-to-O) raising in Tokelauan is given in (29), and an example of S-to-A raising in Samoan is given in (30).

(29)   Tokelauan A-to-O raising

a. [*Kua tuku e au* [*ke tuli **e te maile** te puhi*]]].
PRF let   ERG 1SG COMP chase **ERG DEF dog**   DEF cat
'I will let the dog chase the cat.'

b. [*Kua tuku e au **te maile**ᵢ* [*ke tuli* __ᵢ *te puhi*]].
PRF let   ERG 1SG **DEF dog**   COMP chase   DEF cat
'I will let the dog chase the cat.'

(30)   Samoan S-to-A raising

a. [*E mafai* [*ona tautala **le pepe***]].
TAM can   CONJ talk **ART baby**
'The baby can talk.'

---

b. [*E*   *mafai* ***e***   ***le***   ***pepe***$_i$ [*ona*   *tautala*   __$_i$]].
      TAM can   **ERG ART baby** CONJ talk
      'The baby can talk.'
(Cook 1991: 89)

Apparent raising has been analyzed in two ways. In one model, advocated by Otsuka 2000 and Polinsky 2016, the raised argument is base-generated in the matrix clause and co-indexed with a null operator in the subordinate clause; this can explain the Ā-movement properties, such as long distance dependency (which true raising does not exhibit). The other analysis, advocated by Otsuka 2018 and Otsuka 2021, has the argument raised to the embedded specCP above the complementizer and assigned case from the matrix verb, with no null operator involved; when an argument raises to specCP, Otsuka proposes that the noun's previously assigned case value is erased and the matrix verb instead assigns case to the raised noun. I remain agnostic about an analysis of apparent raising.[16] In this article I use raising as a descriptive diagnostic, one that is therefore theory-neutral. Consequently, in what follows I will simply use the term *raising* to mean that there is apparent movement of a noun from a subordinate clause to the matrix clause, without committing to an analysis of how this occurs.

5 Apparent raising as a diagnostic for negation

Negation in many Polynesian languages has been argued to be predicative. If negation is a predicate, there are two options: negation is a raising predicate, or negation is not a raising predicate. The diagnostic discussed in this section hinges on proving that negation in Tokelauan and Samoan does not exhibit characteristics of raising predicates nor characteristics of non-raising predicates; it is thus proposed that negation is non-predicative and instead must be a particle found in the clausal spine.

---

[16] Evidence makes it clear that the raised noun either originates in the subordinate clause or is co-indexed with a null operator in the lower clause. For example, in Tokelauan, some intransitive verbs agree with their subject, such as *fano* 'go.SG' and *olo* 'go.PL.' A subordinate verb like this will agree with its subject, even if the subject is raised to the matrix clause. Additionally, Tokelauan exhibits quantifier float, in which the quantifier *uma* 'all' surfaces directly after the verb. A floated quantifier will remain adjacent to the subordinate verb, even if the associated noun is raised to the matrix clause. An example of both of these facts is the following.

(i) [*E*   *mafai*   ***e***   ***nā***   ***tamaiti***$_i$ [*oi*   ***olo***   ***uma*** __$_i$ *ki* *Fenuafala*]].
    TAM possible **ERG DEF.PL child**   COMP **go.PL all**   to Fenuafala
    'All the children can go to Fenuafala.'
    (Hooper 1993: 304, (161))

See Besnier 1988 for similar arguments in Tuvaluan.

The ability of an argument to raise up to the negative verb has been used as a diagnostic for predicate negation (Hohepa 1969, Chung 1970, Chung 1978, Bauer 1997, and Chung 2021). For example, in Cook Islands Māori, the subject of a negated stative verb can appear following the verb, as in (31a), or raise to the negative predicate, as in (31b) (see also (11) for a Tahitian example, as well as (10b) for a Māori example).[17]

(31) Cook Islands Māori raising to negative predicate
    a. [*Kāre* [*i   mātūtū* **te   reo   '*eā***]].
       NEG   TAM strong **DEF language** eh
      'The language was not strong, eh.'
      (Nicholas 2016: 373, (551a))

    b. [*Kāre* **a   Taipiro**$_i$ [*i   moe ana* __$_i$]].
       NEG **PERS Taipiro**   TAM sleep PFV
      'Taipiro didn't sleep.'
      (Simiona 1979: 34)

I propose that raising can also be used to *rule out* predicate negation. If negation is a predicate, it must either be a raising predicate or a non-raising predicate. If negation in Tokelauan and Samoan is a raising predicate, we would expect an argument to be able to raise from a position following the verb to a position directly following the negative. This is ungrammatical:

(32) Tokelauan negation cannot trigger raising
    a. [*E   mahani lava* [*oi   hē*   [*fano* **te   fafine** *ki tona*
       NPST usually INT   COMP NEG go.SG **DEF lady**   to DEF.SG.3SG.GEN
      faifeau]]].
      church.minister
      'The lady usually does not go to her Church Minister.'

    b. *[*E   mahani lava* [*oi   hē*   **te   fafine**$_i$ [*fano* __$_i$ *ki*
       NPST usually INT   COMP NEG **DEF lady**   go.SG   to
      tona   faifeau]]].
      DEF.SG.3SG.GEN church.minister
      Intended: 'The lady usually does not go to her Church Minister.'

---

[17] Similar evidence for Niuean is given by Seiter 1980.

(33)   Samoan negation cannot trigger raising

a.   [*E*   *mafai* [*ga*   *le*   [*tagi* **le**   **pepe**]]].
      TAM   able   COMP   NEG   cry   **DEF**   **baby**
      'The baby is not able to cry.'

b.   *[*E*   *mafai* [*ga*   *le*   **le**   **pepe**$_i$ [*tagi* __$_i$]]].
      TAM   able   COMP   NEG   **DEF**   **baby**   cry
      Intended: 'The baby is not able to cry.'

Consequently, we can categorically state that negation in these languages is not a raising predicate, if it is indeed predicative. Recall that in this article, square brackets denote clause boundaries; in (32, 33), the square brackets reflect the *assumption* that negatives are predicates.

  Having established that if negation is a predicate, it cannot be a raising predicate, we can now check whether negation is a non-raising predicate instead. Recall that in a three clause sentence, an argument from the lowest clause may be raised to the highest clause only if both higher verbs are raising verbs. A non-raising predicate, which we now assume negation to be, is expected to block movement of an argument from the lowest clause to a matrix clause with a raising predicate— but, as (34) demonstrates, this does not happen. In the Tokelauan example (34a), the subject of the lowest clause (*te fafine* 'the lady') is able to raise above the lowest verb *fano* 'to go' and the negative *hē* into the highest clause, which contains the raising predicate *mahani* 'to be usual.' Equivalently, in the Samoan example (34b), the subject of the lowest verb *tagi* 'to cry' (*le pepe* 'the baby') is able to raise above the verb and the negative *le* to the clause containing the raising predicate *mafai* 'to be able.'[18]

---

[18] It could be suggested that it is the presence of a subject in the middle clause with a non-raising verb that blocks the raising of the argument from the lowest clause; the sentences in (27b) and (28b) would thus only be ungrammatical due to the overt subject already in the middle clause. If we adopt this hypothesis, we cannot use raising above negation (34) as evidence that negation is a non-raising predicate; the difference between (27b, 28b) and (34) is just the presence/absence of an interven-ing argument. However, I reject this idea on the grounds that an argument already in a raising verb clause does not block raising. This is seen in (29), where the raising verb *tuku* 'to let' has the subject *au* 'I' but allows the raising of the subordinate subject *te maile* 'the dog' to the matrix clause.

(34) Raising above negation

    a. Tokelauan

      [*E*   *mahani lava **te fafine**_i* [*oi*   *hē*   *fano* __*_i* *ki*

       NPST usually INT **DEF** **lady**   COMP NEG go.SG   to

      tona   *faifeau*]].

      DEF.SG.3SG.GEN   church.minister

      'The lady usually does not go to her Church Minister.'

    b. Samoan

      [*E*   *mafai **le pepe**_i* [*ga*   *le*   *tagi* __*_i*]].

       TAM able   **DEF** **baby**   COMP NEG cry

      'The baby is not able to cry.'

This is evidence that if negation is a predicate, it does not act like a non-raising predicate, which would block raising past it. We now come to an impasse: negation does not behave like a raising predicate, nor does it behave like a non-raising predicate. Consequently, with no alternatives, negation cannot be a predicate. We may therefore conclude that Tokelauan and Samoan negation is a particle and that the NegP proposal, as in Custis 2004, Collins 2017, and Massam 2020, is more suitable for these two languages.[19]

6 Conclusion

This article provides a diagnostic that can be employed to identify predicate negation versus non-predicate negation (i.e., particle negation). While particle negation has been proposed for many Polynesian languages (Hooper 1993, Hovdhaugen & Mosel 1999, Vonen 1999, Massam 2000, Custis 2004, Ball 2008, Collins 2017, and Massam 2020), evidence for this analysis has been thin. The main argument provided is the absence of particles usually seen in predicate negation: for example, the lack of a TAM particle or complementizer following the negative word might be taken to indicate non-predicate negation. Unlike those diagnostics, this article proposes a diagnostic that either supports a negative predicate analysis or systematically rules it out. With differences in how negation has been analyzed in many Polynesian languages,

---

[19] Note that our diagnostic does not exclude the possibility of a negative auxiliary (Dahl 1979). Negative auxiliaries are simple auxiliary verbs that dominate vP and take over all inflectional categories from the main verb. However, negative auxiliaries are an *X*P within the clausal spine, so I treat them as particle negation, as distinct from negative predicates.

diagnostics like these are vital for syntactic and typological research into negation in this family of languages.

While the diagnostic in this article is only illustrated for two languages, other Polynesian languages exhibit many of the same properties, which should allow the diagnostic to be used further afield. For example, apparent raising is also attested in Māori (Bauer 2005), Cook Islands Māori (Nicholas 2016), Tuvaluan (Besnier 1988), Pukapukan (Salisbury 2002), Niuean (Chung & Seiter 1980), Tongan (Otsuka 2000), and Rapa Nui (Kieviet 2017). The category of negation is debated in several of these languages, including Niuean (Clemens 2018 and Massam 2020) and Tongan (Broschart 1999, Custis 2004, and Ball 2008), and is unanalyzed in several of the others. I therefore hope that the present diagnostic has use across the language family and is able to better illuminate the complexities of predicate and non-predicate negation.

In addition to presenting this diagnostic, I have also proposed that Tokelauan and Samoan do not have predicate negation. This itself is noteworthy, since Samoan was one of the earliest languages to be analyzed as having predicate negation (Chung 1970) and the results from this article indicate the opposite. Further development in this topic will clarify the extent of predicate negation, which may be restricted to fewer languages than first imagined.

The diagnostic set out in this article makes a typological prediction of three options. Firstly, negative predicates in some languages may license apparent raising. In these languages, the raising negative predicate allows an argument in a subordinate clause to raise to the negative predicate clause, as shown in (35). This occurs in Tahitian (see (11)), Cook Islands Māori (see (31)), Māori (see (10b)), and Niuean (Seiter 1980).

(35)   Negative is a raising predicate
        $[_{CP} [_{PredP} \text{NEG}_{raising} \text{ARGUMENT}_i [_{CP} [_{vP} \text{VERB} \_\_\__i]]]]$

Secondly, negation may be a particle, which will not interact with raising at all (as this article argues is the case for Tokelauan and Samoan). In these languages, an argument is able to raise above a negative to a clause containing a raising verb:

(36)   Negative is a particle
        $[_{CP} \text{VERB}_{raising} \text{ARGUMENT}_i [_{CP} \text{NEG} [_{vP} \text{VERB} \_\_\_i]]]$

A third theoretical possibility is that negation is a predicate but does not license raising. In such a language, an argument from a deeply embedded clause should not be able to raise to the negative predicate clause nor to a superordinate clause containing a raising verb:

(37)   Negative is a non-raising predicate
       $[_{CP}$ VERB$_{raising}$ (*ARGUMENT$_i$) $[_{CP}$ $[_{PredP}$ NEG$_{non\text{-}raising}$ (*ARGUMENT$_i$)
       $[_{CP}$ $[_{vP}$ VERB __$_i$]]]]]

While we have no examples of a language of this third type, the diagnostic from this article predicts that such a language should be able to occur in the set of natural languages. I leave this for further research.

Acknowledgments

Competing interests

The author has no competing interests to declare.

References

Ball, Douglas. 2008. *Clause structure and argument realization in Tongan*. Doctoral thesis. Stanford University.

Bauer, Winifred. 1997. *The Reed reference grammar of Māori*. Reed Publishing.

Bauer, Winifred. 2005. *Maori*. Routledge.

Besnier, Niko. 1988. Semantic and pragmatic constraints on Tuvaluan raising. *Linguistics* 26.5.747–778.

Broschart, Jürgen. 1999. Negation in Tongan. In: Hovdhaugen, Even & Mosel, Ulrike (editors). *Negation in Oceanic languages*. Lincom Europa. 96–114.

Chung, Sandra. 1970. *Negative verbs in Polynesian*. Doctoral thesis. Harvard University.

Chung, Sandra. 1978. *Case marking and grammatical relations in Polynesian*. University of Texas Press.

Chung, Sandra. 2021. Reaffirming Māori negatives as verbs. In: Clemens, Lauren & Massam, Diane (editors). *Polynesian syntax and its interfaces*. Oxford University Press. 147–167.

Chung, Sandra & Seiter, William. 1980. The history of raising and relativization in Polynesian. *Language* 56.3.622–638.

Churchward, Clerk Maxwell. 1953. *Tongan grammar*. Oxford University Press.

Clemens, Lauren. 2018. Niuean *nākai* as a negative verb: implications for the derivation of V1 order. In: Kalin, Laura & Paul, Ileana & Vander Klok, Jozina (editors). *Heading in the right direction: linguistic treats for Lisa Travis*. McGill Working Papers in Linguistics. 78–90.

Collins, James N. 2014. The distribution of unmarked cases in Samoan. In: Arka, I. Wayan & Indrawati, N. L. K. Mas (editors). *Argument realisations and related constructions in Austronesian languages*. Asia-Pacific Linguistics. 93–110.

Collins, James N. 2017. Samoan predicate initial word order and object positions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 35.1.1–59.

Cook, Kenneth. 1991. The search for subject in Samoan. In: Blust, Robert (editor). *Currents in Pacific linguistics: papers on Austronesian languages and ethnolinguistics in honor of George W. Grace*. Australian National University Press. 77–98.

Custis, Tonya. 2004. *Word order variation in Tongan: a syntactic analysis*. Doctoral thesis. University of Minnesota.

Dahl, Östen. 1979. Typology of sentence negation. *Linguistics* 17.1–2.79–106.

Dryer, Matthew S. 2005. Negative morphemes. In: Haspelmath, Martin & Dryer, Matthew & Gil, David & Comrie, Bernard (editors). *World atlas of language structures*. Oxford University Press. 454–457.

Henderson, Claire Emma. 2022. *Ergativity in East Futunan oral narratives*. Doctoral thesis. University of California, Davis.

Hohepa, Patrick. 1969. The accusative-to-ergative drift in Polynesian languages. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 78.3.295–329.

Hooper, Robin. 1993. *Studies in Tokelauan syntax*. Doctoral thesis. University of Auckland.

Hovdhaugen, Even & Hoem, Ingjerd & Iosefo, Consulata Mahina & Vonen, Arnfinn Muruvik. 1989. *A handbook of the Tokelau language*. Norwegian University Press.

Hovdhaugen, Even & Mosel, Ulrike. 1999. *Negation in Oceanic languages: typological studies*. Lincom Europa.

Kieviet, Paulus. 2017. *A grammar of Rapa Nui*. (*Studies in Diversity Linguistics* 12.) Language Science Press.

Lazard, Gilbert & Peltzer, Louise. 1999. La negation en tahitien [Negation in Tahitian]. In: Hovdhaugen, Even & Mosel, Ulrike (editors). *Negation in Oceanic languages*. Lincom Europa. 141–162.

Massam, Diane. 2000. VSO and VOS: aspects of Niuean word order. In: Carnie, Andrew & Guilfoyle, Eithne (editors). *The syntax of verb initial languages*. Oxford University Press. 97–116.

Massam, Diane. 2020. *Niuean: predicates and arguments in an isolating language.* Oxford University Press.

Middleton, John. 2023. Two types of negation in Samoan and Tokelauan. In: Hohaus, Vera & Hopperdietzel, Jens & Weingartz, Siena (editors). *Proceedings of TripleAFLA.* Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association. 44–58.

Middleton, John. 2024. *Deriving word order in Tokelauan.* Doctoral thesis. University of Auckland.

Mosel, Ulrike & Hovdhaugen, Even. 1992. *Samoan reference grammar.* Oxford University Press.

Moyse-Faurie, Claire. 1999. Negation in East Futunan (Futuna, Wallis and Futuna Islands). In: Hovdhaugen, Even & Mosel, Ulrike (editors). *Negation in Oceanic languages.* Lincom Europa. 115–131.

Nicholas, Sally. 2016. *Ko te karāma o te Reo Māori o te Pae Tonga o te Kuki Airani: a grammar of Southern Cook Islands Māori.* Doctoral thesis. University of Auckland.

Otsuka, Yuko. 2000. *Ergativity in Tongan.* Doctoral thesis. University of Oxford.

Otsuka, Yuko. 2005a. Two derivations of VSO: a comparative study of Niuean and Tongan. In: Carnie, Andrew & Harley, Heidi & Dooley, Sheila (editors). *Verb first: on the syntax of verb-initial languages.* John Benjamins Publishing Company. 65–90.

Otsuka, Yuko. 2005b. Scrambling and information focus: VSO-VOS alternation in Tongan. In: Sabel, Joachim & Saito, Mamoru (editors). *The free word order phenomenon: its syntactic sources and diversity.* Mouton de Gruyter. 243–279.

Otsuka, Yuko. 2018. Apparent raising in Tongan. In: Kalin, Laura & Paul, Ileana & Vander Klok, Jozina (editors). *Heading in the right direction: linguistic treats for Lisa Travis.* McGill Working Papers in Linguistics. 314–323.

Otsuka, Yuko. 2021. Apparent raising in Tongan and its implications for multiple case valuation. In: Clemens, Lauren & Massam, Diane (editors). *Polynesian syntax and its interfaces.* Oxford University Press. 192–215.

Ouhalla, Jamal. 1990. Sentential negation, Relativised Minimality and the aspectual status of auxiliaries. *Linguistic Review* 7.2.183–231.

Payne, John R. 1985. Negation. In: Shopen, Timothy (editor). *Clause structure.* Volume 1 of *Language typology and syntactic description.* Cambridge University Press. 197–242.

Pearce, Elizabeth. 1997. Negation and indefinites in Maori. In: Forget, Danielle & Hirschbühler, Paul & Martineau, France & Rivero, María-Luisa (editors). *Negation and polarity: syntax and semantics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 271–288.

Polinsky, Maria. 2016. *Deconstructing ergativity: two types of ergative languages and their features*. Oxford University Press.

Polinsky, Maria & Potsdam, Eric. 2021. Deriving VOS from VSO in Tongan. In: Clemens, Lauren & Massam, Diane (editors). *Polynesian syntax and its interfaces*. Oxford University Press. 61–88.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20.3.365–424.

Postal, Paul. 1974. *On raising: one rule of English grammar and its theoretical implications*. MIT Press.

Potsdam, Eric & Polinsky, Maria. 2012. The syntax of the Tahitian actor emphatic construction. *Oceanic Linguistics* 51.1.58–85.

Potsdam, Eric & Polinsky, Maria. 2017. A preliminary look at exceptives in Tahitian. In: Ostrover, Jason & Kramer, Ruth & Sabbagh, Joseph (editors). *Asking the right questions: essays in honor of Sandra Chung*. Linguistics Research Center. 28–36.

Salisbury, Mary. 2002. *A grammar of Pukapukan*. Doctoral thesis. University of Auckland.

Seiter, William. 1978a. On the syntactic character of middle objects in Polynesian. In: Wurm, Stephen & Carrington, Lois (editors). *Proceedings of the second international conference on Austronesian linguistics*. Pacific Linguistics. 1289–1306.

Seiter, William. 1978b. Subject/direct object raising in Niuean. In: Jaeger, Jeri J. & Woodbury, Anthony C. & Ackerman, Farrell & Chiarello, Christine & Gensler, Orin D. & Kingston, John & Sweetser, Eve E. & Thompson, Henry & Whistler, Kenneth W. (editors). *Proceedings of the fourth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley Linguistics Society. 211–222.

Seiter, William. 1980. *Studies in Niuean syntax*. Garland Publishing.

Simiona, Tangata. 1979. *ʻE au tua taʻito nō te Kuki Airani*. University of the South Pacific.

Simona, Ropati. 1986. *Tokelau dictionary*. Office of Tokelau Affairs.

Simons, Gary F. & Fennig, Charles D. 2017. *Ethnologue*, 20th edition. SIL International.

Sperlich, Wolfgang B. 1997. *Tohi vagahau Niue: Niue language dictionary*. Government of Niue and University of Hawai'i Press.

Vonen, Arnfinn Muruvik. 1999. Negation in Tokelauan. In: Hovdhaugen, Even & Mosel, Ulrike (editors). *Negation in Oceanic languages*. Lincom Europa. 132–140.

Waite, Jeffrey. 1987. Negatives in Māori: a lexical-functional approach. *Te Reo* 30.79–100.

Williams, Edwin. 1981. Argument structure and morphology. *Linguistic Review* 1.1.81–114.

Zanuttini, Rafaella. 1997. *Negation and clausal structure: a comparative study of Romance languages*. Oxford University Press.

Zanuttini, Rafaella. 2001. Sentential negation. In: Baltin, Mark & Collins, Chris (editors). *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*. Blackwell Publishers. 511–535.