



Title	Contrastive Negation in Ainu (アイヌ語における対比的否定)
Author(s)	NURMI, Jussi
Citation	言語科学研究, 1, 57-80
Issue Date	2024-03-29
DOI	https://doi.org/10.14943/110403
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/91818
Type	journal article
File Information	1_06-NURMI.pdf



Contrastive Negation in Ainu (アイヌ語における対比的否定)

Jussi NURMI

1. Introduction

This study examines the yet unexplored *contrastive negation* and *contrast* as a discourse-pragmatic function of negation in Ainu. First, this paper attempts to provide a syntactic description of how contrastive negation can be expressed in Ainu. Additionally, this paper attempts to examine how contrast is used in Ainu oral literature texts. Negation and its discourse-pragmatics have been examined in various languages, such as English (Labov and Waletzky 1967; Labov 1972; Tottie 1982; Hwang 1992; Pagano 1994; Hidalgo Downing 2000), Japanese (Yamada 2003, 2007, 2010, 2013, 2023; Maynard 2007) and Korean (Hwang 1992). A general description of negation in Hokkaido Ainu (Nurmi 2023) has been provided, but the pragmatic side has been less focused. Negation is said to possess various discourse-pragmatic functions, such as *denying* textual or/and contextual expectations, expressing evaluation (expressing the speaker's attitude towards the utterance), and contrast between two elements (Yamada 2003: 175).¹ When functioning as a contrast, negation marks a contrast between the expected event and the real event (ibid.). Expressions such as (1) are the focus of this paper.

- (1) *eani anakne yayan aynu sani ka some e-ne.*
you TOP be.normal human descendant even NEG 2.SG-COP
payekakamuy sanrirkese e-ne
smallpox.god descendant 2.SG-COP

'You're not a mere human. You're the descendant of the smallpox god.'

(National Ainu Museum Ainu Archive: C0008OS_30010B/34195A)²

¹ Denials can be categorized into explicit denials and implicit denials. Explicit denials deny a proposition which has been explicitly asserted (for instance, X saying "That dress must have been very expensive", to which Y replies "It wasn't, in fact I bought it at a sale", denying the explicitly asserted proposition [dress being expensive]), and implicit denials deny a proposition which may have been expected or which may be contextually inferred but has not been asserted by the interlocutors (for instance, X saying "John's wife is a teacher." to which Y replies "John isn't even married." denying the presupposition that John would have a wife) (Tottie 1991: 21).

² All glosses and English translations of examples from Tamura (1984, 1985, 1988, 1989) and the National Ainu Museum Ainu Archive are by the writer. The following abbreviations were employed: 1/2/3/4 = first/second/third/fourth person, A = transitive verb subject, ADE = adessive, CON = conjunctive, COP = copula, EVID = evidential, FCND = future conditional, GEN = genitive, IMP = imperative, INE = inessive,

The construction in (1) is one way of expressing contrastive negation in Ainu. In (1), negation is uttered first, followed by an affirmative sentence – creating a contrastive relationship between them; as in English one might say “X is not A, but B”. Despite the absence of explicit topic marking in the affirmative sentence, the copula carries the second person singular affix *e-*, indicating that the focus of the contrast is still *eani* ‘you’, as in the negative sentence. However, even though the sentences lack explicit conjunctive marking, the contrastive interpretation persists. The conjunctive marking in contrastive expressions (as in English “not A, *but* B”) is understood as a *corrective*³ marker, signalling the replacive relation between sentences that refer to the same state of affairs.

This paper examines contrastive negation and the discourse-pragmatic function of contrast in negation in Hokkaidō Ainu (hereinafter *Ainu*), an isolate in the northern island of modern Japan Hokkaidō. Formerly the Ainu inhabited Hokkaidō, the southern part of Sakhalin, the Kuril Islands, the southern part of Kamchatka and even northern parts of Honshū, the largest island of modern Japan (e.g., Bugaeva 2012: 461, 2022: 23). Ainu is said to be a language isolate, and the origins of the language are unknown (Bugaeva 2012: 461). This paper uses material from Saru and Shizunai dialects. Especially Saru is well recorded and documented, and the material is easily accessible. However, despite being well-documented, a vast majority of the documentation is folklore texts (oral literature), with only a few conversational texts available (Bugaeva 2012: 464). Therefore, the analysis of folklore texts may not be completely applicable to wider generalisations about contrastive negation in conversational Ainu.

Since previous research on negation in Ainu is scarce, one goal of this paper is to survey how contrast can be expressed with negation in Ainu in the first place. While there has been an attempt to provide a general overview of negation in (Hokkaidō) Ainu (Nurmi 2023), some aspects of negation still remain unexplored.⁴ However, this study not only focuses on cases of overt contrasts (instances where not only negation but affirmation are expressed, as in “not A, but B” or “not A. B.” and so on) but also on covert contrasts (where only the negation is present, and the affirmative is pragmatically presupposed). The structure of this paper is as follows. In 2., I will review previous studies on contrast as a discourse-pragmatic function of negation and provide a definition for contrast that is used in this paper. In 3., I present the research material and methods that were utilised. In 4., I present an overview of negation in Ainu, and in 5., I present the findings of this research. In 6., I discuss the implications of my findings.

INFR = inferential, INTRJ = interjection, LOC = locative, NEG = negative, NMLZ = nominalizer, OBJ = object, PAR = partitive, PAST = past tense, PL = plural, POL = polite, PPTC = past participle, PROH = prohibitive, S = intransitive verb subject, SG = singular, SFP = sentence final particle, TOP = topic, VIS = visual, Q = question, QUOT = quotative.

³ Following Silvennoinen (2020: 46), correctivity is understood as the relation that holds between the two elements in contrastive negation. A *corrective* replaces one element by another (ibid.).

⁴ However, contrastive expressions (*taihi hyōgen*) are mentioned in Nurmi (2023), but the subject is not discussed further.

2. Review on literature

First, a few words about *contrastive negation*, expressions that include a negation and an affirmation that are alternatives to each other (McCawley 1991, Silvennoinen 2020). Silvennoinen (2020) examines contrastive constructions in English and Finnish, particularly focusing on the so-called bipartite constructions where both the negative and the affirmative are present. An important question dwells in the use of negation; if the affirmed part is what remains asserted, why does the negated part need to be expressed in the first place (Silvennoinen 2020: 48)? Thus, the use of negation in contrastive constructions must be pragmatically motivated (Silvennoinen 2020: 48). Silvennoinen (2020) defines contrastive constructions as follows:

(-) [E]xpressions which are combinations of affirmation and negation in which the focus of negation is replaced in the affirmative part of the expression. The relationship between the affirmed and the negated part of the expression is not causal, concessive or conditional, and the negation must have overt scope.

(Silvennoinen 2020: 49)

According to this, contrastive negation is regarded as the co-occurrence of grammaticalized negation and affirmation, regardless of the order they take, to eliminate the focus of negation and to replace it affirmatively (Silvennoinen 2020: 49). However, Silvennoinen only works with overt contrasts (expressions in which both negation and affirmation are present) (Silvennoinen 2020: 66) and does not regard conditional constructions as contrastive, unlike Yamada (2003) for example. Though one objective of this paper is to describe the syntactic ways of expressing contrastive negation in Ainu, further analysis is needed to determine the frequency of various contrastive strategies.⁵ Contrastive negation can be divided into two groups concerning their syntactic properties as the following. 1) *asyndetic* constructions that have no linking element (a conjunctive) between negation and affirmation, and 2) *syndetic* constructions that have a conjunctive between the negation and affirmation (as in the English “not A, *but* B”, or an identical construction in Finnish “ei A, *vaan* B”) (Silvennoinen 2020). In this paper I adopt this classification for contrastive negation.

⁵ For example, Silvennoinen (2020) presents four parameters for different strategies to create contrastive negation. The first parameter concerns the number of contrasted elements; either two, or more than two (Silvennoinen 2020: 50). The second one is concerned with the order of contrasted elements; mainly negative-first (negative + affirmative) or negative-second (affirmative + negative), or a tripartite expression (negative + affirmative + negative, or affirmative + negative + affirmative) (ibid.). The third parameter contains the nature of linking the sentences: *asyndetic*, for constructions which do not contain a linking element, and *syndetic* for expressions that contain a linking element between the phrases (ibid.). And finally, the fourth parameter concerns the syntactic rank of contrasted elements; are the contrasted elements both clausal or sub-clausal, or mixed (containing both) (ibid.).

However, I also follow Yamada (2003), in the sense that, for example, conditional constructions including negation may also express contrast. Furthermore, I partly adopt Silvennoinen's (2020) definition of contrastive negation, as in a situation where two (or more) elements are contrasted using negation and affirmation, and where the focus of negation is replaced by the affirmative part either by using a corrective conjunctive or not. Contrast, on the other hand, I define as a discourse-pragmatic function of negation, where the negation is contrasted with affirmation, but the focus is not necessary overtly replaced. In other words, the contrast between negation and affirmation may be implicit, meaning that negation is contrasted with an affirmation that is an expectation based on background information.

Contrast has been regarded as one of the basic pragmatic functions of negation (Labov 1972, Givón 1978, Yamada 2003).⁶ Labov (1972) classifies the use of negation as one of the *evaluative* linguistic means, which he calls *comparators*. In his words, the comparators “compare the events which did occur to those which did not occur” and thus “provide a way of evaluating events by placing them against the background of other events which might have happened but did not” (ibid. 381). Related to this, Grimes (1975: 64–65) presents the notion of *collateral information* — information that conveys what did not happen. It relates non-events to events by providing a range of non-events that might take place, thus heightening the significance of real events (ibid.). Collateral information can be created not only by negation but also using interrogatives and imperatives, and future tense among others (ibid.).

Givón (1978) sees that negation is to be viewed in terms of a pragmatic contrast between *figure* and *ground*. This is closely related to the idea of markedness of negation – negation is the marked category in affirmation-negation opposition (e.g., Yamada 2003: 27); negation is overtly marked in languages, while affirmation need not be. Usually, the *unmarked* is seen as *ground*, and the *marked* as the *figure*. Ironically, negation is often the unmentioned ground, especially if one argues that negation is uninformative. However, the distinction between what is considered ground and what is considered figure depends on the context, and occasionally, they are reversed. Ōta (1980: 275) explains ground-figure reversal with an airline advertisement: usually, the cities an airline flies to are highlighted (*figure*) and all the rest of the cities of the world form the ground. However, this is reversed: “The few scattered spots where Swissair doesn't fly to” (ibid. 275–276). Thus, the cities covered, the information that is not mentioned explicitly, forms the ground, and the cities that are not covered (which is highlighted explicitly) form now the figure (Yamada 2003: 32). Yamada (2003: 34) therefore argues, that negation is used only when “the normal figure/ground relation is reversed”. Givón (1984) also claims that such reversal of figure and ground creates pragmatic contrast between them.

Pagano (1994) suggests four basic discourse functions for negation: (1) denials of background information, (2) denials of text-processed information, (3) unfulfilled expectations, and (4)

⁶ Other functions include for example *denial*, *evaluation*, and *problem-indication* (e.g., Yamada 2003: 7). When indicating a problem, a negative utterance is expressing problematic aspect in a narrative causing trouble, difficulty, harm, pain, sickness, controversy, quarrel, fight, anything that makes one feel uncomfortable or upset (Yamada 2003: 350).

contrasts.⁷ In his analysis of narratives of personal histories, Yamada (2003) takes Pagano's conclusion further, claiming that all negation is inherently more or less contrastive. Denial, another fundamental aspect of negation, is often considered one of its most important functions (van Dijk 1977, Leech 1981, Horn 1989, Roitman 2017). Even though this paper concentrates on the contrastive function, denial is important in the analysis of contrast, since denials deny statements or expectations which derive from either text or context (including various levels of context). At the same time, negation expresses “*a contrast between what is expected to happen and what is really the case or what actually happens*” (Yamada 2003: 175). Yamada (2013) investigates discourse functions of negative utterances in Japanese song lyrics, claiming that overt contrasts – constructions where both negation and affirmation are present, such as “not A, but B” are the most common contrastive constructions in Japanese song lyrics. According to him, in such constructions A and B are contrasted, where A is negated, and B is declared as the state of affairs (Yamada 2013: 25). He continues, that in such constructions, the A part is regarded as old information in the context as B brings new information to the context; the information that A provides is expected from the context (ibid.).

Maynard (2007) argues against the famous idea of negation being uninformative. In her study, she examines the use of negation in novels. For example, instances of negation in the initial segment of the novel, where the characters are introduced. Maynard (2007: 215) maintains that since it is the initial segment of the novel, where the writer is creating the new discourse world, there is no specific reason to contrast one thing with other assumptions, so one would expect that negatives are less likely to appear.

- (2) *sore o tsukatteiru hito wa,*
 it OBJ use.PROG person TOP
*sazokashi fukushoku no sensu no ii josei **dewa nai ka***
 certainly attire GEN sense GEN good woman COP NEG Q
to itta soozoo o karitateru mono dearu.
 QUOT say.PAST imagination OBJ impel person COP
 ‘(-) Such that a woman who has chosen a purple tent perhaps has a great sense of fashion’
 (lit. ‘A person using that, is a person who makes one imagine that (she) might have a
 good sense of fashion’)⁸

(Maynard 2007: 215)

⁷ According to Pagano (1994: 258), in her analysis of written English, denials of background information are used when the writer assumes that the reader has mistaken ideas from their previous background knowledge. Denials of text-processed information are used when the writer assumes that the reader could derive a wrong idea from the text (ibid.). Negation expressing unfulfilled expectations is used when the writer wants to express an unfulfilled expectation of which they make the reader coparticipant (ibid.). Contrasts, then, Pagano (1994: 258) regards as denials that compare or contrast two or more items.

⁸ Bolded in original. Gloss and literal translation by the writer. Otherwise as in Maynard (2007: 215).

This is a part of the introduction of the main character in a story found in Maynard's research material. According to Maynard the negation *josei dewa nai ka* reflects the writer's doubt, and thus does not negate the information presented (Maynard 2007: 215). In other words, the writer is wondering on their own that the woman perhaps has good sense for fashion. In English, expressing such does not seem to be possible with negation (ibid.). With this example in mind, Maynard suggests that, even though negatives can be used to enhance contrast, it is contrast that serves most usefully as a context for negation (ibid.).

Considering these studies, one could confidently assert that the use of negation does not necessarily imply 'not introducing new information': in other words, the proposition that is denied is the new information. Also, concerning covert contrast, especially when the notion of presuppositionality is considered—meaning that the use of negation requires a presupposed affirmative counterpart—negation creates a contrast between what is expected and what really is the case. However, this implies that not only overt comparisons, but in theory, any instance of negation may be considered contrastive (as Yamada 2003, for example, claims).

3. Method and material

Considering the dire situation of Ainu, collecting new material in the field is virtually impossible, one needs to rely on material collected by previous researchers. Moreover, since conversational data is extremely limited, this research will concentrate on oral literature texts. In this study I make use of texts from the National Ainu Museum's Ainu Archive (国立アイヌ民族博物館アイヌ語アーカイブ *kokuritsu ainuminzoku hakubutsukan ainugo aakaibu*), and Ainu Speech Material (アイヌ語音声資料 *ainugo onsei shiryō*) by Suzuko Tamura. The National Ainu Museum's data is collected roughly between the late 1970s and early 1990s, whereas Tamura's material is older – collected from the end of the 1950s throughout the 1960s, though published from 1984 onwards.⁹ Since the goal of this study is to map what strategies and constructions can be seen in Ainu for contrastive negation, the tendency of different kinds of contrastive constructions is out of the scope of this research.

Ainu has rich oral literature, which has been quite well documented. Oral literature was not, in general, created by some certain author(s) or professional (unlike modern prose), but rather the stories were told, listened to, and passed down in communities and households (Endō 2022: 363). The Ainu oral tradition consists of a variety of genres, from songs to incantations, word play and chants, but also different kinds of narratives. Ainu "narratives" are usually divided into three genres: prose tales (*uwepeker*), divine epics (*kamuy yukar*), and heroic epics (*yukar*). According to Endō (2022: 375), the stories are in principle told "in the form of a first-person narrative, from the viewpoint of the protagonist" and in the end of the story a formulaic phrase "...and so-and-so told the story" lets the listener to know who the character

⁹ The National Ainu Museum's Ainu Archive's material used in this paper was uploaded before May 2023. On May 15, 2023, around 160 hours of material was uploaded, including the *Biratorichō shiryō* (Biratori materials) collected by Kayano Shigeru in 1969.

(that was referred to as “I” in the story) was.¹⁰ Naturally, other characters also are present in stories, and conversations between the characters may also take place.

Prose tales can be divided further into four subcategories of “human prose tales”, “*kamuy* prose tales”, “Japanese prose tales” and so-called “*Pananpe–Penanpe* tales” (Endō 2022: 376). The majority of recorded prose tales are human prose tales, in which the main characters are humans (Ainu); the protagonist’s name is usually left out, merely presented as “the person of (place name)” (ibid.). Such prose tales often follow a certain pattern, and at least the beginning and ending tend to have a set pattern (ibid.). In the beginning, the main character’s background (family structure and lifestyle) is presented, but then one day he/she is involved in some incident but manages to solve it using his/her own means and help from the gods (*kamuy*) (ibid.). After that he/she is blessed with children and lives happily ever after (ibid.). Then, as the main character is getting old, he/she tells his/her story of his/her experience to his/her children before he/she dies (ibid.). It is said that the story of a prose tale is an actual event that has taken place in the past, but the prose tale does not necessarily relate to the land or people that are directly related to the narrator (= the one who is speaking, re-telling the tale) (ibid.). From a contemporary perspective, prose tales may possibly be regarded as fictional narratives.

4. Negation in Ainu

Here, I briefly discuss negation in Ainu and explain the types of negative elements within the scope of this research. First, I will begin with standard negation, which in Ainu is formed with the negative adverb *somo*. Generally, this is placed before the verb phrase.

- (3) *somo k-arpa wa*
 NEG 1.SG-go.SG SFP
 ‘I won’t go.’

(Bugaeva 2012: 496)

- (4) *k-arpa wa*
 1.SG-go.SG SFP
 ‘I will go.’

As seen above, the adverb is placed before the verb phrase (VP) to negate it. However, there is also another construction using *somo* that falls under the scope of this research, as in (5).

- (5) *ku-iruska ka somo ki wa*
 1.SG-be.angry even NEG do SFP
 ‘(No,) I am not mad (or anything).’

(Tamura 2000: 239)

¹⁰ Usually, though, in the beginning of an *uwepeker* the protagonist tells who he/she is and where he/she lives.

In (5), the VP *ku-iruska* is followed by another particle *ka*, which is commonly used in negative contexts. This VP functions as an object for the dummy verb *ki*, which is then negated by *somo*. This construction is sometimes considered emphatic (e.g. Bugaeva 2012). Regarding *ka somo ki* as emphatic could be relevant especially when examining the contrastive function of negation. For example, in (5), one could say that *ka somo ki* denies the expectation of the speaker being angry, contrasting the real event (of not being angry) with the expected non-event (of being angry). However, a comprehensive study on the frequency, semantics, and pragmatics of *ka somo ki* is needed before determining whether it is emphatic or merely a periphrastic construction of *somo* VP.¹¹

The scope of this study includes prohibition (negative imperatives) as well. In Ainu, prohibition is typically formed with the prohibitive adverb placed before the VP, where the verb is in imperative mood. The verb does not take subject personal markings. However, it is possible for the verb to take object personal markings in imperative mood.

- (6) *iteki cis*
PROH cry
 ‘Don’t cry.’

(Tamura 2000: 28)

In addition, there are alternative ways of expressing negative meaning. One way is by using independent verbs with inherent negative meaning, where some actions have distinct words for affirmation and negation. The most commonly used examples include words conveying the meanings of existence (affirmative *an/okay* vs. negative *isam*) and possession (affirmative *kor* vs. negative *sak*) among others. These negative verbs tend to be used instead of *somo* VP construction. However, there are some instances where speakers may use constructions such as *somo kor*.¹² It is noteworthy that, although these *negative verbs* convey a negative meaning, it may not be the case that, for instance, *isam* is the direct negation of *an*. Rather, *isam* could be argued to express a state of *non-existence*, while syntactically being affirmative.¹³ Given the relatively widespread use of these negative verbs, they have been treated as examples of sentential negation in this paper.

¹¹ For example, in Tamura’s Ainu Language Audio Material 1–6 (1984–1989), there are 268 instances of *somo*. Among these, 111 are VP *ka somo ki* constructions and 15 VP *somo ki* constructions, making it a total of 126 instances, or 47.01% of all instances of *somo*. In Nurmi (2023), it was suggested that *ka somo ki* is possibly emphatic, but for instance, Dal Corso (2022: 57) maintains that *ka somo ki* is periphrastic – supposedly implying that the meaning is not different that of *somo* VP constructions. Since *(ka) somo ki* is used almost as frequently as *somo* V, it is possible that it is not necessarily emphatic. Further research is needed on this part.

¹² It is possible that such uses are pragmatically more emphatic than the simple use of a negative verb. However, this claim requires further research to be confirmed.

¹³ Not including the negative adverb *somo*.

Now, there is not much research on contrastive constructions in Ainu, especially not that of contrastive negation. However, several examples containing contrast are found in previous research. For instance, example (7) of Hokkaido Chitose dialect, a contrast is created by first expressing affirmation, and then negation.

(7) *tanpe ku-kor pe tanpe somo a p*
 this 1.SG-possess NMLZ this NEG PAST NMLZ

‘This was mine and that was not. (lit. This I have had, this have not [had].)’¹⁴

(Bugaeva 2004: 82)

Bugaeva (2004: 82) notes that the verb negated may be left out if it is the same as the verb in the preceding affirmative phrase. She does not, however, mention about the contrastive nature of this construction. Nevertheless, this is an instance where affirmation is uttered first and negation second. In this sentence, however, the target (expressed with *tanpe*) refers to different things in affirmation and negation. In other words, what is contrasted is the nature of said object of being the property of the speaker. This is just one way of expressing contrast in Ainu. This paper explores constructions where both the negative and (possible) affirmative refer to the same object.

5. Contrastive negation in Ainu

Here, I present the findings of the analysis. First, in 5.1, I will discuss syntactic side of contrastive negation. Since there has not been previous description of how contrastive negation is formed in Ainu, this is an attempt to provide one. Syntactic side includes for example constructions such as “not A but B” or “A, not B”, where both affirmation and negation are present. Similar to English, in Ainu, both negation-first and affirmation-first contrastive constructions are possible (negation-first can be observed in (8), and affirmation first in (10)). In 5.1.3, I discuss conditional constructions in Ainu, and present how it is possible to regard them as contrastive as well. Finally, in 5.2, I discuss the discourse-pragmatic function of contrast, providing examples of implicit denials. Such instances do not contrast the negation with previously uttered context nor the context uttered afterwards, but with expectations that are created based on some background knowledge. Such examples can be regarded as context-oriented pragmatic contrasts.

5.1 Syntactic contrastive negation

This section discusses contrastive negation from the syntactic point of view, strictly speaking constructions where both negation and affirmation are present to express a contrastive relationship. First, asyndetic constructions are discussed, followed by syndetic constructions. Finally, a mention of conditional constructions where negation and affirmation form a sense of contrast.

¹⁴ Gloss has been slightly changed for simplicity, but the translations are as in original.

5.1.1 Asyndetic contrastive negation

Asyndetic constructions, where negation and affirmation are not linked with a conjunctive, can be observed in Ainu. For example, let us examine example (1) again, presented below as (8). Here negation is uttered first and is followed by affirmation.

- (8) *eani anakne yayan aynu sani ka somo e-ne.*
 you TOP be.normal human descendant even NEG 2.SG-COP
payekakamuy sanrirkese e-ne
 smallpox.god descendant 2.SG-COP

'You're not a mere human. You're the descendant of the smallpox god.'

(National Ainu Museum Ainu Archive: C0008OS_30010B/34195A)

In this example, the speaker first denies the expectation that the hearer is a descendent of "normal" human beings. The second-person pronoun *eani* is used and is topicalized with *anakne*.¹⁵ Following the topic marker, the statement about *eani* is presented: *yayan aynu sani ka somo e-ne*. Since the copula has subject personal marking *e*, the pronoun can usually be emitted. However, here *eani* is present, possibly functioning as emphasis. The topic marker may be seen further emphasizing the contrast between *eani* and some other hypothetical target. Having expressed what *eani* is not, the god who is speaking to the main character continues to explain that the main character is a descendant of the smallpox god: *payekakamuy sanrirkese e-ne*. Therefore, the meaning conveyed here is similar to the construction "X is not A. X is B", while no comparative/contrastive conjunctive is present, but simply two declarative clauses uttered one after another. With the personal marking *e* present in the second sentence, it is clear the main character is still the topic, and the affirmation is contrasted with the previous negated utterance. What is seen here can be regarded as an example of a *matching relationship*, in which first property A is denied, and after that, property B is asserted about the target (e.g. Yamada 2003).

In another example of a similar context, we can observe the speaker this time denying themselves being a "mere human".

- (9) *asinuma anakne nep aynuhu a-ne wa an-an ruwe somo ne.*

¹⁵ However, in some cases, a topic marker is used to emphasize the target of the contrast. In Ainu, this is expressed with the topic marker *anak* or *anakne*. This can be used in contrastive expressions (e.g., Satō 2008: 62), such as "A is X, but B is Y" or "A is X, X is not B". It is observed that *anak* is commonly used in "normally continuing speech" while *anakne* is used when wanting to emphasize (Tamura 2000: 135) When used with negation, the topic marker can be seen as emphasizing that it is the topic that does not do or cannot do or is prohibited from doing. Also, according to Tamura (2000) this is the case with Saru dialect of Ainu. In turn, Chitose dialect seems to use *anakne* twice as much as *anak*, leaving the important question whether they differ in some way yet unsolved (Satō 2008: 63).

I TOP what human 4.A-COP CON exist.SG-4.S INFR.EVID NEG COP
a-onaha a-unuhu kapacir tonone wa
 4.A-father 4.A-mother eagle god COP CON
rikunkanto ta oka wa kapacir eepakki a-ne.
 heavens LOC exist.PL CON eagle descendant 4.A-COP

'It is not that I am a mere human. My father, my mother are eagle gods, and they live in the heavens, and I am the descendant of eagle gods.'

(National Ainu Museum Ainu Archive: C0159KM_34683ABP)

Here, the speaker is telling a girl (= the main character), that he (the speaker) is not a normal human, but that in fact, his parents were eagle gods, and therefore he is the descendant of eagle gods. In the first line the speaker explains about himself, *asinuma anakne*, that it is not the fact (*ruwe somone*), that he is a normal human-being (*nep aynuhu a-ne wa an-an*). As in (8), here too the topic marker may be used here to emphasize that it is the speaker himself who is not a normal human-being. The speaker denies this feature about himself, but the proposition "I am a normal human-being" is not asserted in the previous context, rather, since the speaker and hearer are married in the prose tale, the girl merely assumes that her partner is a human-being. Therefore, one can argue that the utterance in the first line is an *implicit denial*, which denies the expectation that the man would be a normal human-being. Thus, following Yamada's (2003) theory, one can say that this denial creates contrast with the hypothetical situation of the speaker being a normal human-being (the expectation) and the reality of not being one. However, this is not the only contrast that is present in this passage. Following the negative sentence, the speaker continues to explain that his parents are eagle gods, making him a descendant of them (as stated in the last line, "*kapacir eepakki a-ne*"). Now we have an overt assertion that is contrasted with the negative statement or denial. Despite the absence of a conjunctive between the negative and affirmative, this can still be understood as a contrastive expression.

In (10) we can observe contrast in imperative sentences. In the following passage affirmation precedes negation, making it an affirmation-first construction.

- (10) "(-) *a-poho utar pirka kane sinen ne uymam kusu*
 4.A-child PL be.good while one.person COP trade in.order.to
itekke payeka yan. uymam eci-uymam ciki
 PROH go.PL IMP.POL trade 2.PL-trade if
tun ren ne wa uymam eci-ki nankor.
 two.persons three.persons COP CON trade 2.PL-do probably
sinen ne anak itekke payeka yan" ari an pe a-korsi-utar an-epakasnu.
 one.person COP TOP PROH go.PL IMP.POL QUOT exist NMLZ 4.A-children 4.A-teach
 '(-) "My children, be good and do not go to trade alone. Should you go to trade, go together in two or in three. Do not go alone", I taught my children.'

(National Ainu Museum Ainu Archive: C0001OS_34119A/30006AB)

This passage takes place in the very end of the tale, where the main character, having endured hardships, seeks to teach his children a valuable life lesson about the dangers of going trading alone. At the beginning of this passage, the main character uses a negative imperative, marked with *itekke*, which is used to prohibit the children from going to trade on their own: *sinen ne uymam kusu itekke payeka yan*. This prohibition is reiterated in the last line, but this time, the topic marker is introduced: *sinen ne anak itekke payeka yan*. Prior to this, the main character advises his children to go in groups of two or three, if they choose to go to trade: *eci-uymam ciki tun ren ne wa uymam eci-ki nankor*. What is occurring here is a contrast between an affirmative and negative command. However, the affirmative command can be seen as an indirect imperative, which Tamura (2000) considers as an *instruction*.¹⁶ Thus, one can argue that the negation in the form of a prohibitive in the last line creates contrast with this earlier utterance and the desired event (of going to trade in groups of two or three). The use of the topic marker *anak* further emphasizes the contrast of the size of the group — *not alone*.

In (11), a concessive element *yakka*, which expresses hypotheticality, is used. Negation and affirmation are not connected here using a conjunctive, so therefore it can be viewed as asyndetic.

- (11) *tasiro etaye wa etamtarara kane, somo e-as yakka a-e-rayke,*
 sword pull.out CON raise.a.sword CON NEG 2.SG-stand.up even.if 4.A-2.SG.OBJ-kill
e-as yakka a-e-rayke p ne na hetak tunas as hetak tunas as!
 2.SG-stand even.if 4.A-2.SG.O-kill NMLZ COP SFP INTRJ be.fast stand INTRJ be.fast stand
 '(He) took out his sword, and raised it (saying): Even if you do not stand up, I'll kill you,
 (and) even if you do stand up, I'll (still) kill you! So, stand up, fast! So, stand up, fast!
 (Tamura1985: 30)

In (11), *yakka* is used in both negative and affirmative sentences. The speaker tells the other character, who is lying on the ground, that whether he stood up or not, he would be killed regardless. Here, negation comes first and affirmation second, even though the speaker could use only one affirmation “even if you lied down there, I would kill you”. The use of *yakka* conveys two possibilities to the hearer in the story: to stand up or not. *Yakka* could be considered to create additional emphasis to the contrast between negation and affirmation, or possibly to make the contrast more explicit. However, neither option changes the result for the target of this utterance since the speaker will kill the hearer regardless of his decision. Logically, this utterance could also be in the form of *somo e-as yakka e-as yakka a-e-rayke*, with only one instance of ‘I kill you’. However, possibly to emphasize them as two separate events, *rayke* is used twice. Additionally, (11) is an example of contrast, where replacement does not occur, unlike in (9) where the focus of negation is replaced by affirmation. Therefore, while

¹⁶ While often having the meaning ‘probably’, *nankor* can also be used to express the speaker’s conviction and belief, and in some contexts an implicit request (Tamura 2000: 243).

negation and affirmation are contrasted in (11), it is also a comparison of two actions.

Here we have observed that contrastive negation in Ainu can be employed using negation-first strategy, and while not using a binding element between the negation and the affirmation. In addition, as can be observed in (8) and (9), contrast can be conveyed by placing two assertions following each other (“I am not X. I am Y”). Furthermore, in (10), we observed how commands can also be in a contrastive relation (“Do X. Do not do Y”). In (10), this was taken a step further, as a negative command was followed by an affirmative command that was followed by a negative command.

5.1.2 Syndetic contrastive negation

Here, I present examples of syndetic contrast – contrastive constructions where the negative clause is connected to the affirmative clause with a conjunctive element. One could argue that there is one canonical way of expressing contrast, using a special conjunctive *no* between verb phrases. This conjunctive is mostly used in negative contexts.¹⁷

- (12) *a-antemaci, a-sokarmaci, a-osura kuni a-ramu ka somo ki awa*
 4.A-real.wife 4.A-real.wife 4.A-divorce QUOT 4.A-think even NEG do then
ene ikesuy wa a-ruska kusu orowano anakne,
 like.this run.away.from.home CON 4.A-become.angry because from.then TOP
Iskar etoko, a-koapkas ka somo ki no,
 Ishikari.river source.of.river 4.A-walk.towards even NEG do CON
hemuymuye-an wa an-an ruwe ne a
 sulk.in.bed-4.S CON exist-4.S INFREVID COP PAST
 ‘My wife, my spouse, I did not even think of divorcing her, but, as she left home like that,
 I got angry and therefore, I did not go to the source of Ishikari-river, but sulked in bed.’
 (Tamura 1984: 40)

In the passage above, there are two instances of negation, though I shall concentrate on the latter one, since the first one does not appear with a conjunctive. However, one could say that the use of negation in the first one creates contrast with an affirmative expectation. In (12), the speaker’s wife has run away from home, which causes the speaker to not go towards the source of the river *Iskar* for some business of his, but instead, he sulks in bed: *Iskar etoko, a-koapkas ka somo ki no, hemuymuye-an wa an-an*. This use of *no* could be understood as adverbial use, as in “without going towards the source of the river, I sulked in bed”. However, this can also be understood as a corrective – “I did not do X, rather Y”, hence the negation contrasts the non-event to the event that really has taken place.

¹⁷ For example, in Tamura’s Ainu speech material, a total of 160 instances of conjunctive *no* are present. Out of these, 83 (or 78.75%) are used in negative sentences, including declarative sentences with *somo*, imperative sentences with *iteki*, and sentences with other lexical negative verbs (verbs that carry negative meaning). In affirmative contexts, the *no* is often seen as an adverbial marker.

With negative imperatives, *no* can form a parallel between action A, which is prohibited, and action B, which is preferred. In other words, *no* can be used when contrasting a negative command to an affirmative command that follow each other. Here too, one can argue that *no* functions as a *corrective*.

- (13) *e-tura sinot kuni pon seta a-ahupkar wa*
 2.SG-together play in.order.to be.small dog 4.A-adopt CON
ek-an siri ne wa. e-akkari pon pe ne na.
 come.SG-4.S VIS.EVID COP SFP 2.SG-than be.small NMLZ COP SFP
iteki sitoma no tura sinot
 PROH fear CON accompany play
 ‘I adopted a small dog for you to play with. (It’s) smaller than you. Don’t fear (it), but play with (it).’

(National Ainu Museum Ainu Archive: C0160KM_34688ABP)

In (13), we can observe how *iteki sitoma* and *tura sinot* are connected with the conjunctive *no*, which typically is considered as an adverbial marker in affirmative sentences but with negatives it expresses the meaning “without (doing)” (e.g. Tamura 2000: 169). Whether *without* signifies an action or a state is another topic for another study. In many instances, though, negation is regarded as a state rather than action, or moreover a “static state of the action not taking place” (e.g. Nakagawa 2022: 479). However, Takahashi (2016: 75; 2022: 620) argues that *no* can be used in negative constructions to indicate a temporal relation (first X, then Y). Returning to the example at hand, in (13), a negative command – “*don’t fear*” – is present. It is arguable that in (13), a negative command and an affirmative command follow each other as separate commands. For instance, if the negation here was standard negation, *somo sitoma no tura sinot*, one could say that [*somo sitoma no*] is an adverbial clause meaning “without fearing”. At the same time, though, the meaning could be that the action of “fearing” does not take place, but the action of “playing with” does. Thus, even in standard negation, it is arguable that the context lets the hearer know whether the interpretation should be of an adverbial rather than a corrective. Now, let us compare this with an example of a similar situation in Finnish (Ugric).

- (14) *Hän ei syönyt omenaa. [vaan lähti lenkille]*
 he/she NEG.3.SG eat.PPTC apple.PAR but go.PAST jog.ALL
 ‘(S)he didn’t eat an apple(, but went jogging).’

(VISK § 1618)

In Finnish, with the corrective conjunctive *vaan*, one can express contrast between a hypothetical event and a real (different) event. In (14), the action of ‘eating an apple’ is denied, followed by the corrective clause ‘rather, (he) went for a jog’. This is a canonical example of the use of corrective conjunctive *vaan* to express contrast between the denied action or element and the one which actually is present or has really happened. (14) is an example of standard negation, but this corrective conjunctive can be used with imperatives as well, as seen in the

example (15).

- (15) *ihan ensiksi: älä leiki kissan kanssa paljaalla kädellä*
 just at.first PROH play.IMP cat.GEN with bare.ADE hand.ADE
vaan pidä aina lelu kädessäsi, kun leikit!
 but keep.IMP always toy hand.INE.2.SG when play.2.SG
 ‘First of all, do not play with the cat with bare hands; rather, always keep a toy in your hand when you play.’¹⁸

The prohibitive in Finnish is formed with a negative verb *äl-* which takes personal endings (e.g. VISK § 108). The sentence in (14) is a part of a conversation on a Finnish online forum, where the conversation starter usually asks a question about the problem they’re facing, here, concerning a cat that keeps biting its owner. The writer in (14), proceeds to give advice to the questioner: the action “to play with the cat with bare hands” is prohibited, since the cat will assume that it is acceptable to bite and scratch the hands of its owner. Therefore, the writer commands, or recommends, that *instead of* this, the reader should always keep a toy in their hands when playing with the cat. Thus, in Finnish the *vaan* conjunctive can express the meaning ‘instead of’ or ‘rather’, functioning as a corrective. Should this same cognitive process apply to Ainu, in examples such as (13), one could say that at least in the case of negative imperatives, *no* can also contrast the hypothetical action that has not taken place and the other action that the speaker wants to take place.¹⁹

In example (16), *no* is used to connect a negative clause and an affirmative clause. This use can be seen as contrasting two different actions: “changing one’s clothes”, which does not occur, and “wearing the same clothes all the time”.

- (16) *mipihi yakka somo ki no ramma uneno kane mipihi an pe ne*
 clothing though NEG do CON always same.as somewhat clothing exist.SG NMLZ COP
 ‘He never changed his clothes, and always wore the same things.’

(NINJAL: K7708242UP.2)

Here too, the negation is expressed first and the contrasted affirmation second. Also, the two sentences are linked with the conjunctive *no*. If *no* functions as a corrective, this sentence would carry a meaning of “A was not done, rather B was done”. Though, due to the nature of *no* being an adverbial marker, it can be interpreted as ‘without (doing)’. Therefore, (16) could be understood as ‘without changing his clothes, (he) always wore the same clothes’. However, as is seen, in the original translation, *no* is simply seen as ‘and’, expressing only a temporal relationship. It may be the case that the interpretation of *no* depends on both the context and

¹⁸ From a Finnish corpus: Aller Media Oy (2019). Suomi24 virkkeet -korpus 2001–2017, Korp-versio 1.2 [korpus]. Kielipankki. <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:lb-2020021803> Accessed 25.5.2023.

¹⁹ Or is hoped not to take place but has not taken place yet or ceasing an action under way.

the hearer.

5.1.3 Conditional constructions

In many languages, there are grammatic constructions which seem to emphasize or “bring out” contrast. For instance, in Japanese, there are so-called *unreal conditional constructions* that express a contrast between hypothetical conditions and reality (Yamada 2003: 183). According to Yamada (2003: 183), such constructions “enable us to suspend the world of reality and to imagine a make-believe world where the polarity of affirmation and negation is reversed”. In other words, a possible event that has not taken place but could is contrasted with the real event which has taken place. In Ainu, there are several different ways of expressing conditionality, and one of them is *yak*, which is often regarded as a future conditional marker (e.g., Tamura 2000: 163).

- (17) *eci-eniwcinne hene ki wa ne yakun, kanna a-eci-ipere*
 2.PL-drive.out or do CON COP if again 4.A-2.PL.O-feed
yakka, somo yak anakne, rika somo a-eci-ere
 but NEG FCND TOP fatty.meat NEG 4.A-2.PL.O-feed
kus ne, sekor kotan-kor-nispa ka wentarap
 reason COP QUOT village-possess-rich.man(=chieftain) also dream.of
 ‘If you drive out [the poor husband and wife out of the village], I will feed you again, but if you do not do [so], I will not feed you the fatty meat (whale meat), the village chieftain dreamt [that such was said to him in a dream].’

(Tamura 1989: 60)

First, a condition is presented to the chieftain in his dream: “*eci-eniwcinne hene ki wa ne yakun* (–) *a-eci-ipere*” – he will be fed whale meat, if he drives the poor couple out of the village. However, should he fail to do so, he would not be fed it, as expressed in the second line: *somo yak anakne, rika somo a-eci-ere*. Here, a phenomenon not restricted to Ainu occurs, as the negative adverb *somo* pragmatically functions as an entire negative verb phrase (“if you do not drive them away”). *Somo* is followed by the future conditional marker *yak*, creating an unreal conditional construction. A hypothetical situation, where the chieftain does not comply with the gods’ demands is presented, and after that, the hypothetical outcome of said situation is expressed with another negative: *rika somo a-eci-ere*. However, because this monologue takes place inside a dream, it implies that the reality is still the state of [poor people reside in the village], meaning that they have not been driven out by the time of the dream. Nevertheless, this passage can be seen as contrastive with the other hypothetical affirmative situation: “drive them out and I feed you again”, which is a possible outcome, if the chieftain does as he is commanded. In this instance, affirmation and negation are contrasted but it is not a contrastive construction where “A” would be replaced by “B”, unlike (8) for example.

Yak can also take the form *yakne*. In (18), a passage from a lullaby, the speaker encourages the hearer to stop crying, suggesting that by doing so they will become a “great person”.

- (18) *e-cis yakne okokko cikap e-kotokpa-tokpa (oho rr rr rr oho rr rr rr)*
 2.SG-cry FCND monster bird 2.SG.O-peck.and.peck²⁰ INTRJ <trill> INTRJ <trill>
somo e-cis yakne pirka aynu e-ne kus ne na
 NEG 2.SG-cry FCND be.good human 2.SG-COP reason COP SFP
 'If you cry a monster-bird will (come and) peck you over and over, (so) if you don't cry,
 you will become a marvelous person.'

(Tamura 1988: 43)

There are two instances of *yakne* future conditional phrases in this passage. First, in an affirmative sentence, claiming that if the baby keeps crying, a monster bird will peck at him/her. Next, the speaker presents conditions ("not cry") under which the baby will grow to become a good person. Different from for example (8), in (18) no correction takes place. Rather, two separate actions and their consequences are contrasted: if one cries, a monster bird will peck them. And, if one does not cry, they will (get to) grow up. One could say that while the two possible events of [crying] and [not crying] are contrasted, they are also being compared to each other.

At the same time, this implies that if the action [crying] does not happen, the monster bird will also not appear to peck the baby. One could also argue that this utterance implies that if the hearer keeps crying, he/she will not become a marvelous person. Hence, the contrast could also lie in the background information and expectations of what "being a marvelous person" means.

5.2 Contrast as a discourse-pragmatic function

Here I discuss contrast from a discourse-pragmatic point of view. Mostly this part observes contexts where there is no previous text before the negation, which means that the target of contrast is not explicit. In other words, the affirmative expectation deriving from background knowledge is contrasted with what is denied (or in the case of (20) is prohibited). Therefore, (19), (20), and (21) are considered as examples of contrast as a discourse-pragmatic function of a negative utterance. In (19), the main character is a girl who lives alone and does not remember how she learnt to make a fire or do other things.

- (19) *nen i-epakasnu ka somo ki korka, ape a-ari*
 who 4.OBJ-teach even NEG do but fire 4.A-light.up
 'Nobody really taught me, but I started a fire.'

(NINJAL: K7708242UP.1)

In (19), *somo* is used to negate the verb phrase *nen i-epakasnu* 'someone taught me' which formally is an object for the dummy verb *ki*. However, despite not being taught, the main

²⁰ The subject here is 3rd person singular, which is expressed with a zero morpheme in Ainu. I have left the zero morphemes unmarked, as it is evident who or what the subject is in the context.

character is able to make a fire, which is an essential skill. The situation is contradictory because it is illogical that one could have such skills without being taught. How can this be explained from the point of view of contrast? First, the negation here also functions as an implicit denial, for there is no earlier mention in the context about someone teaching the main character. This denies the expectation that someone would have taught her to make a fire, which possibly derives from a “parents teach children essential skills” schema.²¹ The use of negation creates contrast between the hypothetical event (being taught) and the reality (not being taught). The negation here cannot easily be seen as creating contrast with the latter affirmation *ape a-ari*, since *korka* is used to express a contradiction (e.g., Tamura 2000: 168) between the two statements – it is unlikely, if not even impossible, that one would be able to make a fire without having learnt this skill from someone. Thus, it is more likely that the contrast takes place in background information.

- (20) *cep̄koyki-an yakka itekke tek ari cep̄ kik yan*
 catch.fish-4.S even.if PROH hand INSTR fish hit IMP.POL
*i-ḡa-kik-ni*²² ari cep̄ anak a-kik konno
 thing-head-hit-wood INSTR fish TOP 4.A-hit if.done.then
kamuycep̄ ne yakka cep̄ ne yakka
 salmon COP even.if fish COP even.if
i-ḡa-kik-ni anak manḡuri ne kor wa
 thing-head-hit-wood TOP amulet as possess CON
too hosippa ruwe ne na
 far.away return.PL INFRE.EVID COP SFP
ari an ḡe a-ye kane aynu utar an-ep̄akasnu kane oka-an
 QUOT exist.SG NMLZ 4.A-say CON human PL 4.A-teach CON exist.PL-4.S

‘“Even if one catches a fish, do not hit it with (your) hand. Should one hit the fish with (the) head-hitting-stick, even salmon and even (other) fish, (because) the head-hitting-stick has an amulet, (the fish are able to) return to far away (to the land of gods)”, I said and taught the people.’

(National Ainu Museum Ainu Archive: C0034OS_34144B/34157A)

This prose tale is a *Pananḡe-Penanḡe*, “up-stream man and lower-stream man”, story. In the beginning of the story the narrator explains how *Pananḡe* and *Penanḡe* lived off the land by killing deer and bears with their bare hands, cutting wood, and catching fish with their bare hands. However, the gods were angered by this incorrect way of catching prey, since the

²¹ Traditionally different work was divided by gender; for instance, men would perform the hunting, where as women would cook and clean and so on (Kubotera 2004: 183–184). Schema is understood in this paper as “background knowledge typically associated with particular situations” (Yamada 2013).

²² For example, in Saru dialect *i-saḡa-kik-ni* is used.

animals killed were also gods. Therefore, the gods send a bear to kill *Pananpe* and *Penanpe*. The enormous bear chased *Pananpe* and *Penanpe*, and they become separated. *Pananpe* manages to climb up to a high tree to escape the bear, and a god emerges to confront him of his wrongdoings. Thus, having learnt from his mistakes, *Pananpe* finds his way to a nearby village and decides to teach the people the correct way of hunting, using a negative imperative *iteki tek ari cep kik yan*, to prohibit the hearers from killing fish with their bare hands. Following the negative imperative, *Pananpe* continues and explains what happens when one hits the fish with the ceremonial euthanizing baton – the fish's, salmon's, or any others' soul is able to return to the land of gods. The baton itself is similar to a holy item called *inaw* – a wooden stick which has been carved to contain a thin curly flake-like structure. The above passage does not include an explicit contrast between negative and affirmative imperatives. Rather, the negative imperative is used to prohibit a hypothetical situation of “hitting a fish with one's bare hands”. This refers to *Pananpe's* own past – killing fish among other game with his bare hands. Therefore, it can be argued that *Pananpe* possesses an expectation that the villagers too are killing fish using their hands instead of the appropriate tool.²³ Thus the negation is contrasted to the expected affirmation.

- (21) *hine, matkor hine oka-an ruwe ne a p, easir,*
 CON acquire.a.wife CON exist.PL-4.S INFREVID COP PAST NMLZ really
yuptek menoko a-ne kusu, kinaharu hene,
 be.diligent woman 4.A-COP reason edible.grass or
nep hene a-e rusuy ka, somo ki no, sukup-an wa,
 what or 4.A-eat DES even NEG do CON live-4.S CON
a-poho a-resu hine oka-an pe ne a p,
 4.A-child 4.A-raise CON be.PL-4.S NMLZ COP PAST but
a-poho matkor hine orano, uheturaste-an wa oka-an a p,
 4.A-child acquire.a.wife CON then live.together-4.S CON exist.PL-4.S PAST but
hentomani wano, nisapno arsiknak-an
 recently from.ADV suddenly be.blind-4.A
 ‘Then, (my son) got married and we lived (together). I was a really diligent woman, so I didn't want to eat plants²⁴ or anything, but I lived and raised my son. However, my son got married, and then we lived together, but recently I've suddenly become blind.’

(Tamura 1985: 2)

²³ Since he had no knowledge of any other way of killing the fish, nor had he ever met other people, he expected that everyone kills fish the same way, until the gods told him the correct way.

²⁴ *Kinaharu* (*kina* ‘grass’ *haru* ‘food’) refers to consumable plants growing wild. In the original Japanese translation, the pragmatic meaning of this utterance goes further; “because I am a diligent woman, grass or whatever, I picked up and ate enough, I did not even think of wanting more than that, and I lived without any hardships.” (Original Japanese available at Tamura (1985: 3))

Here, as in many other prose tales, the phrase “I do not want to eat (anything)” appears. Placed at the narrative initial position, this can be interpreted to function as leading the hearer to expect that the main character is about to enter a period of hardships – such as this story, the main character loses her eyesight soon after. Since there is no earlier mention about “wanting to eat”, one might regard this as an implicit denial. This is a common phrase in many prose tales, particularly in contexts similar to this: an affirmative sentence explaining how successful the characters are in hunting or gathering food, and consequently, living in abundance – followed by a negative sentence denying or asserting that they do not want to eat anything, as it could be literally translated. The contrast here might occur between an expectation based on background knowledge that there would not be a situation where one could completely stop caring about their next meal. It may be the case that in the traditional communities of the past, individuals might not have had the freedom to stop caring about the next meal. Then again, as the previous context asserts that the main character is a “diligent woman”, the use of negation might function to emphasize the abundance of food. In other words, there was no *need* to even *think* about what one wants – that is how much abundance there is.²⁵ However, it should be noted that because this phrase is used frequently in prose tales, and even in different positions, it may merely be an idiomatic phrase.²⁶

6. Discussion and conclusion

One of the objectives of this study was to provide a detailed description of how contrastive negation is formed and how negation is used to express the discourse-pragmatic function of contrast in Ainu. These aspects have not been thoroughly examined before in Ainu. I demonstrated that contrastive negation can be realized through both negation-first and negation-second strategies, where the affirmation is also present. For example, in (8), a negative statement regarding the topic is stated first, followed by an affirmative statement which replaces the negated part. Additionally, I proposed that the adverbial marker *no*, a prevalent conjunctive in negative sentences (as seen in Bugaeva 2004: 82) could be interpreted as *corrective*. In other words, while *no* is typically viewed as a temporal or stative conjunctive forming an adverb (e.g., *without doing*), in some contexts where affirmation follows negation, the negative phrase signifies the non-event or the action that is not preferred to take place or continue. When this negative phrase is followed by an affirmative sentence, *no* expresses a correction – instead of the action that is negated in the negative phrase, the action in the affirmative sentence is preferred, or takes place in reality. The corrective interpretation of *no* appears particularly applicable to imperative constructions, although it may be observed in

²⁵ This sort of meaning may not be so farfetched; on many occasions of prose tales, the Japanese translations includes the verb *omou* ‘to think’.

²⁶ At least having observed various texts, one might say that in narrative final position, this phrase seems the main character has suffered enough, and the phrase expresses that better times are ahead. This instance is narrative initial, and nearing the end of this passage, the main character’s hardship is beginning.

declarative clauses as well. In instances where a negative imperative is followed by an affirmative imperative, *no* is used to express a shift of focus to the preferred action: *iteki V no, V (Don't V, but/rather/instead V)*.²⁷

This study did not only concentrate on a purely syntactic side of contrastive negation but also attempted to have a closer look at the discourse-pragmatic side. By drawing on frameworks established in previous research (e.g., Pagano 1994, Yamada 2003), I argued that some implicit denials in Ainu oral literature can function as contrast. For example, by creating contrast between an expectation and reality. Additionally, these uses of contrast (such as (11)) may also be regarded as an involvement strategy, especially when the negative utterance is in narrative-initial position (Yamada 2003: 332). In such cases, by defeating the audience's expectation (while contrasting it with the negation), the narrator can catch the audience's interest in the story from the start (*ibid.*).

Since this study was only a preliminary exploration of the contrastive negation in Ainu, future research could involve a comparative analysis of the frequencies of different strategies employed. Specifically, whether negation occurs first or second, and the use of a conjunctive between negation and affirmation should be investigated. In this study, I demonstrated instances where negation and affirmation are linked by a conjunctive, but also cases where no conjunctive is present, and situations where only the negation is overtly expressed. It could be that the choice of strategy to express contrast is context dependent. For example, in instances like (8) and (9), where a character in a prose tale reveals the true identity of either themselves or the main character, a construction of contrastive negation that includes both negation and affirmation may be used. It appears that in these instances the narrative structure benefits from first denying the expected identity and contrasting it with the affirmation to reveal the true identity of the speaker to the main character (and those listening to the story). Furthermore, in instances such as (19), the use of negation and contrasting it with the background knowledge in a narrative-initial position, the hearer may immediately understand that the main character is unique.²⁸

For a more comprehensive study of contrastive negation in Ainu, a wider research material consisting of various dialects is required. In addition, contrastive negation needs to be analyzed more systematically to map the frequencies of different strategies for forming contrastive negation – a quantitative analysis could prove useful for determining, for example, whether negation-first or affirmation-second is more typical in Ainu. Also, a more extensive comparison

²⁷ For example, in Saru dialect this appears to be the case, as Tamura (1977: 326) states that constructions like *iteki V no V*, one action is prohibited, whereas another is demanded (“*ip̄p̄ō no kōi wo kinshi shi, tahō no kōi wo yōkyū suru iikata*”).

²⁸ As long as the hearer is familiar with Ainu oral literature, hearing that the main character “was not taught by anyone, but regardless of that could (for example) make a fire” implies to the hearer that rest of the main character's village has died of a plague, the main character is the child of the village chief, and that a god is looking after the main character and that is why they are able to make a fire or cook and so on (Nakagawa 1997: 91).

to contrastive negation in other languages could prove useful during the analysis. In this paper, only limited comparison took place with Finnish.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by JST SPRING, Grant Number JPMJSP2119. I would also like to express my gratitude to the two anonymous reviewers whose valuable and insightful comments contributed to the quality and coherency of this paper. However, the author is responsible for any remaining errors in this article.

References

- Bugaeva, Anna (2004) *Grammar and Folklore Texts of the Chitose Dialect of Ainu: Idiolect of Ito Oda*. Endangered Languages of The Pacific Rim. Osaka Gakuin University.
- Bugaeva, Anna (2012) Southern Hokkaido Ainu. In: Nicolas Tranter (ed.) *The Languages of Japan and Korea*, 461–509. London and New York: Routledge.
- Dal Corso, Elia (2022) *Materials and Methods of Analysis for the Study of the Ainu Language – Southern Hokkaidō and Sakhalin Varieties*. Venezia: Edizioni Ca'Foscari.
- van Dijk, Teun (1977) *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London and New York: Longman.
- Endō, Shiho (2022) Ainu oral literature. In: Anna Bugaeva (ed.) *Handbook of the Ainu Language*, 363–392. Boston and Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Givón, Talmy (1978) Negation in Language: Pragmatics, Function, Ontology In: Cole, P (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics 9: Pragmatics*, 69–112. New York: Academic Press.
- Givón, Talmy (1984) *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction Vol. I*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Grimes, Joseph (1975) *The Thread of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Hidalgo-Downing, Laura (2000) *Negation, Text World, and Discourse: The Pragmatics of Fiction*. Stamford: Ablex.
- Horn, Laurence (1989) *A Natural History of Negation*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Hwang, Shin Ja (1992) The Functions of Negation in Narration. In: Shin Ja and William Merrifield (eds.) *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*, 321–337. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.
- Kubotera, Hitsuhiko (2004) *Ainu minzoku no bungaku to seikatsu* [The Literature and Lifestyle of the Ainu People]. Tokyo: Sōfukan.
- Labov, William (1972) The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In: William Labov (ed.) *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*, 354–396. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William and Waletzky, Joshua (1967) Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience. In: J. Helm (ed.) *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*, 12–44. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Leech, Geoffrey (1981) *Semantics: the study of meaning*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Maynard, Senko (2007) *Linguistic Creativity in Japanese Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John

- Benjamins Publishing Company.
- McCawley, James (1991) Contrastive negation and metalinguistic negation. *Chicago Linguistics Society* 27: 189–206.
- Nakagawa, Hiroshi (1997) *Ainu no monogatari sekai* [The Ainu Story World]. Tokyo: Heibonsha.
- Nakagawa, Hiroshi (2022) Parts of Speech – with a Focus on the Classification of Nouns. In: Anna Bugaeva (ed.) *Handbook of the Ainu Language*, 473–515. Boston and Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- National Ainu Museum Ainu Archive (国立アイヌ民族博物館アイヌ語アーカイブ *Kokuritsu Ainuminzoku Hakubutsukan Ainugo aakaibu*) <https://ainugo.nam.go.jp/> [Accessed 10.6.2023]
- NINJAL = Nakagawa, Hiroshi, Bugaeva, Anna, Kobayashi Miki, and Yoshikawa Yoshimi (2016–2021) *A Glossed Audio Corpus of Ainu Folklore*. National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics: Folklore. <https://ainu.ninjal.ac.jp/folklore/> [Accessed 10.6.2023]
- Nurmi, Jussi (2023) Ainugo no hiteihyōgen: ruikeironteki kanten kara [A Typological View on Negation in Ainu]. *Journal of Ainu and Indigenous Studies* 3: 83–115.
- Ōta, Akira (1980) *Hitei no imi* [The Meaning of Negation]. Tokyo: Taishūkan.
- Pagano, Adriana (1994) Negatives in Written Text. In: M. Coulthard (ed.) *Advances in Written Text Analysis*, 250–265. London: Routledge.
- Roitman, Malin (2017) Introduction. In: Malin Roitman (ed.) *The Pragmatics of Negation – Negative meanings, uses and discursive functions*, 1–14. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Satō, Tomomi (2008) *Ainugo bunpō no kiso* [Fundamentals of Ainu Grammar]. Tokyo: Daigaku Shorin.
- Silvennoinen, Olli (2020) From constructions to functions and back: Contrastive negation in English and Finnish. *Folia Linguistica* 54(1): 45–87.
- Tamura, Suzuko (1977) Ainugo saruhōgen no meireihyōgen [Imperative expressions in the Saru dialect of Ainu] *Asian and African Linguistics*, 5: 82–201. Reprinted in 2001, *Ainugo Kō* 5, 288–407. Tokyo: Yumani Shobō.
- Tamura, Suzuko (1984) *Ainugo onsei shiryō* 1 [Ainu language audio material 1]. Tokyo: Waseda University.
- Tamura, Suzuko (1985) *Ainugo onsei shiryō* 2 [Ainu language audio material 2]. Tokyo: Waseda University.
- Tamura, Suzuko (1988) *Ainugo onsei shiryō* 5 [Ainu language audio material 5]. Tokyo: Waseda University.
- Tamura, Suzuko (1989) *Ainugo onsei shiryō* 6 [Ainu language audio material 6]. Tokyo: Waseda University.
- Tamura, Suzuko (2000) *The Ainu Language*. Tokyo: Sansendo.
- Takahashi, Yasuhige (2016) Ainugo Tokachi hōgen no hitei kōzō ni tsuite [On the Negative Construction in Tokachi Dialect of Ainu]. *Northern Language Studies* 6: 73–79.
- Takahashi, Yasuhige (2022) Aspect and evidentiality. In: Anna Bugaeva (ed.) *Handbook of the Ainu Language*, 613–627. Boston and Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Tottie, Gunnel (1991) *Negation in English Speech and Writing: a Study in Variation*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- VISK = Auli Hakulinen, Maria Vilkkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen ja Irja Alho (2004) *Iso suomen kielioppi* [Comprehensive Grammar of Finnish]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen

Kirjallisuuden Seura. <http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk> [Accessed 19.6.2023]

Yamada, Masamichi (2003) *The Pragmatics of Negation – Its Functions in Narrative*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo Publisher.

Yamada, Masamichi (2007) Goyōron kara mita hitei no sekai: danwabunseki no shiten kara [The World of Negation seen from Pragmatics: A Discourse Analytic Approach]. *Takushoku Language Studies* 114: 37–58.

Yamada, Masamichi (2010) Hiteihyōgen no shosō: shōsetsu wo deeta toshite [Aspects of Negation: Novel as Data]. *Takushoku Language Studies* 122: 51–78.

Yamada, Masamichi (2013) Hiteihyōgen no danwabunseki: kashi wo deeta toshite [Discourse Analysis of Negative Expressions: Lyrics as Data]. *Takushoku Language Studies* 128: 13–48.

Yamada, Masamichi (2023) Hiteihyōgen no danwabunseki: eigo no kashi wo deeta toshite [Discourse Analysis of Negative Expressions: English Lyrics as Data]. *Takushoku Language Studies* 148: 189–222.

(ヌルミ ユッシ・北海道大学大学院文学院博士後期課程)