



10.15446/fyf.v36n1.100005

Artículos

## NEGATION IN THE HUARPEAN LANGUAGES: MILLCAYAC AND ALLENTIAC\*

---

## NEGACIÓN EN LAS LENGUAS HUARPES: MILLCAYAC Y ALLENTIAC

---

*Felipe Hasler*<sup>1</sup>

*Ricardo Pineda*<sup>2</sup>

*Daniela Aristegui*<sup>3</sup>

*Mariana Poblete*<sup>4</sup>

*Consuelo Sandoval*<sup>5</sup>

### **Cómo citar este artículo:**

Hasler, F., Pineda, R., Aristegui, D., Poblete, M., & Sandoval, C. (2023). Negation in the Huarpean Languages: Millcayac and Allentiac. *Forma y Función*, 36(1). <https://doi.org/10.15446/fyf.v36n1.100005>

Este es un artículo publicado en acceso abierto bajo una licencia Creative Commons.

Recibido: 2021-12-08, aceptado: 2022-07-25

- 
- \* This work was supported by the Chilean National Fund for Scientific and Technological Development (ANID) through the FONDECYT project N° 11180078 that financially supported the conduct of this research and preparation of the article.
- 1 ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2050-248> Universidad de Chile, Santiago de Chile, Chile. [phasler@uchile.cl](mailto:phasler@uchile.cl)
  - 2 ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5989-2961> Universidad de La Frontera, Temuco, Chile. [ricardo.pineda@ufrontera.cl](mailto:ricardo.pineda@ufrontera.cl)
  - 3 ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4662-4161> Universidad de Chile, Santiago de Chile, Chile. [daniela.aristegui@ug.uchile.cl](mailto:daniela.aristegui@ug.uchile.cl)
  - 4 ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0253-712X> Universidad de Chile, Santiago de Chile, Chile. [mariana.poblete@ug.uchile.cl](mailto:mariana.poblete@ug.uchile.cl)
  - 5 ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0693-5435> Universidad de Chile, Santiago de Chile, Chile. [consuelo.sandoval.b@ug.uchile.cl](mailto:consuelo.sandoval.b@ug.uchile.cl)

## Abstract

This study describes and compares standard negation in the Huarpean languages, Millcayac and Allentiac. Furthermore, it proposes possible diachronic paths that led to the synchronic stage described herein and identifies possible contact-induced changes. This synchronic description is based on the revision and analysis of the grammars, vocabularies, and religious texts written by Luis de Valdivia. The features considered are (1) type of negative marker, (2) order of negative marker and verb, (3) structure of the negative construction, and (4) type of prohibitive constructions. The analysis shows that standard negation in Allentiac is expressed by a preverbal particle and has a symmetric structure. In Millcayac, standard negation is expressed by suffixation and has an asymmetric structure. In terms of diachrony, it is proposed that Allentiac is more conservative, and Millcayac's divergence could have been accelerated by contact with Mapudungun. This study is a contribution to the description of these under-studied languages.

**Keywords:** *Negation; linguistic typology; historical linguistics; Huarpean; Millcayac; Allentiac.*

## Resumen

El presente estudio describe y compara la negación estándar en las lenguas huarpes, millcayac y allentiac. Además, se proponen los posibles caminos diacrónicos que dieron lugar al estadio sincrónico descrito y se identifican posibles cambios por contacto. Esta descripción sincrónica se basa en la revisión y análisis de las gramáticas, vocabularios y textos religiosos escritos por Luis de Valdivia. Los rasgos considerados son (1) tipo de marcador de negación, (2) orden del marcador negativo y el verbo, (3) estructura de la construcción negativa y (4) tipo de construcciones prohibitivas. El análisis muestra que la negación estándar en allentiac se expresa por una partícula preverbal y tiene una estructura simétrica. En milcayac, la negación estándar se expresa a través de sufijación y tiene una estructura asimétrica. Con respecto a la diacronía, se propone que el allentiac es más conservador y que la divergencia del millcayac se podría haber visto acelerada por el contacto con el mapudungun. Este estudio representa una contribución a la descripción de estas lenguas poco estudiadas.

**Palabras claves:** *negación; tipología lingüística; lingüística histórica; huarpe; milcayac; allentiac.*

## 1. Introduction

Negation is a function that has been stated to be present in all world languages and is considered a universal in human language (Horn, 2001). Despite its apparent simplicity, the expression of negation in world languages is complex and diverse and can appear in a variety of forms, having different scopes and complex relations with a variety of other functional domains (Miestamo, 2005a; Hengeveld & Mackenzie, 2018). It is a domain that has been studied from a wide variety of perspectives, and in the last few decades it has seen an increase both in interest and in the number of works published from a typological perspective.

In the languages of South America, negation has been described separately in different studies, with most of the data coming from reference grammars, but there are also studies focused specifically on negation, such as Michael and Granadillo (2014). In the case of the Andean languages, some studies on negation are those for Quechuan languages (Pineda-Bernuy, 2016) and Mapudungun (Olate, Zúñiga & Becerra, 2020). In the case of the Huarpean languages, there are several studies that include negation; however, they are general studies that cover many other different grammatical categories (Zwartjes, 2000; Ridruejo, 2009; Díaz-Fernández, 2014) or include other languages (Torero, 2002). As far as we know there are no detailed studies describing and comparing the negative constructions found in Millcayac and Allentiac from a typological perspective.

Considering the lack of detailed description of this domain in the Huarpean languages, this work aims to describe the negative constructions in Millcayac and Allentiac and account for their similarities and differences. It also aims to propose possible diachronic paths that led to the synchronic stage described in Valdivia and identify possible contact-induced changes. The types of negative constructions included in this work are (1) type of negative marker, (2) order of negative marker and verb, (3) structure of negative constructions, and (4) type of prohibitive constructions. The first three features are focused on standard negation.

The only remaining sources for the Huarpean languages are the texts compiled by the Jesuit priest Luis de Valdivia in 1607 (for a detailed discussion about Valdivia and the production context of its work see, for example, Cancino [2017]). This work analyzes all of Valdivia's grammatical and evangelical works, including catholic catechisms and confessional litanies in both languages. For this work, the versions of Valdivia's works are the texts edited by Medina (1894) for Allentiac, and the text edited by Bárcena (2011) for Millcayac. To do so, the texts were transcribed and morphologically analyzed using the Fieldworks Language Explorer (FLEX) software. This analysis facilitated a description of the Huarpean languages with updated linguistic terminology.

This work is organized as follows: After this introduction, in section 2, the Huarpean peoples and languages are briefly introduced; in section 3, we present the theoretical framework where the research is grounded; in section 4, we show the main analysis of negation in the Millcayac and Allentiac languages; in section 5, we elaborate a discussion of these analysis, with special attention to the possible internal diachronic processes and contact relations involved; finally, in section 6, we discuss the main conclusions of the research.

### **1.1. The Huarpean peoples and their languages**

In general terms, the territory inhabited by Huarpean peoples has been called the central-western Argentinian sub-area in Andean archaeology. The geographical borders of this region are the Jáchal Zanjón river in the north, the Diamante River in the south, and the Andes mountains in the west (Bárcena, 2001, p. 561). Thus, it is possible to consider that this region is at the southern end of the Andean Area. The geography of this region is characterized by its lakes and the presence of the Andes mountains in the west, where there are different crossing points that allowed contact between the different human populations that inhabited the area. (Bárcena, 2001, p. 563).

There are two languages in the Huarpean family: Allentiac and Millcayac. Allentiac speakers inhabited the marshy region of highlands on the margins of the Guanacache and Del Rosario lagoons in southern San Juan and northwestern San Luis. Millcayac speakers inhabited the region south of the forementioned lagoons, in the north of the Santa Rosa, La Paz, Rivadavia, and General Alvear districts (Rusconi, 1962, p. 79). Nowadays, both languages are sleeping languages and the only available bibliographical sources about them are, as far as we know, the grammars and texts documented by Luis de Valdivia.

Regarding their social life, Schobinger (2009) suggests that the Huarpes were sedentary people with social distinction, textile production, engraving, erect tabular deformations, and the use of tembetá and semi-underground rooms in their social practices. In historical terms, according to Schobinger (2009, p. 17), the adaptation to the lacustrine environment of northern Mendoza dates to pre-ceramic times. However, cultural advances such as agriculture and ceramics date from approximately 800 to 300 BCE, that could have been influences from the central west, in what is now Chile, the Argentine northwest, and the central Andes. Thus, it is possible to consider that the relationships between the peoples that inhabited central-western Argentina and neighboring regions existed from the earliest archeological periods up until Spanish colonization began to restrict contact between different groups. The European colonization was accompanied by the gradual reduction of the indigenous population as

a product of European settlement. Thus, for example, Canals-Frau (1942) points out that it is probable that some Huarpes spoke the Mapuche language and an unidentified Quechuan language that reached central-western Argentina. In this sense, Rusconi (1962) raises the idea of “indigenous cosmopolitanism” as a reflection of the diversity of materials found in the archaeological sites, that Bárcena suggests could indicate a complementarity of habitats (Bárcena, 2001, p. 581). For example, the exchange of mollusks, whether from the Atlantic or the Pacific coasts, with the peoples of Cuyo, including the Huarpes, was not unusual (Bárcena, 2001, p. 478).



Figure 1. Approximate distribution of the Huarpean languages in the 16<sup>th</sup> century (Adelaar & Muysken, 2004, p. 503)

## 2. Theoretical framework

### 2.1. Negation from a typological perspective

In general terms, negation is an operator that changes the truth value of a proposition from affirmative to negative. Negation and affirmation are the two poles of the grammatical category of polarity. Negation has been studied from a wide range of perspectives which has resulted in considerable variation in the terms used for its description. This work studies negation from a typological perspective, thus the terminology used here is that found in works such as the World Atlas of Language Structures (Dryer, 2005, 2013; Miestamo, 2005b), Miestamo (2005a), and Van der Auwera and Krasnoukhova (2020), among others. For a generative framework see Haegeman (1995), for an Optimality Theory framework see De Swart (2010), for a Functional Discourse Grammar perspective see Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2018), and for a more general perspective on negation see Horn (2001).

The features considered in this work are: (1) type of negative marker used in standard negation, (2) order of negative marker and verb, (3) structure of the negative construction, and (4) type of prohibitive constructions. These features were selected according to the following criteria:

- Features that can be found in and for which there is adequate data in the available sources.
- Features that have been described in previous typological and descriptive studies on negation in other languages and for which typologies have been proposed (Dryer, 2005, 2013; Miestamo, 2005b; Van der Auwera & Lejeune, 2005), allowing their comparison in a wider typological and areal context.

### 2.2. Negative constructions

#### *2.2.1. Type of negative marker*

The concept of standard negation proposed by Payne (1985) refers to the basic means in a language for negating declarative verbal main clauses with a verbal predicate. This definition excludes clausal negative constructions such as imperatives, existential, non-verbal, copular, and subordinate clauses. In many languages these kinds of negative constructions can use non-standard negation strategies to express negation (Miestamo, 2005a).

A good starting point to describe and classify standard negation in the languages is the type of negative marker used in these constructions. In this respect, Dryer (2005, pp. 454-455) proposes the existence of six types of negative morphemes, or negative markers, used to express clausal negation, summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. Marking strategies for standard negation**

Value	Type of marking strategy
Affixes	Affix attached to the verb, as in example 1
Particles	Uninflected negative word, as in example 2
Negative auxiliary verbs	Negative word that inflects as a verb, typically must accompany another verb, as in example 3
Negative word, unclear if particle or auxiliary verb	Negative word that cannot be easily classified, when the language has little or no inflectional morphology or if the inflectional morphology that does occur on verbs is not semantically appropriate for a negative word even if that negative word is a verb, as in example 4
Variation between negative word and affix	More than one type of negative construction, typically one in which the negative is a separate word, and one in which it is an affix, as in example 5
Double negation	Two different elements that mark negation when appearing together but cannot individually mark negation, as in example 6

(1) Kolyma Yukaghir

met            numō-ge            el-jaqa-te-je  
 1SG            house-LOC            NEG-achieve-FUT-INTR.1SG  
 ‘I will not reach the house.’ (Dryer, 2005, p. 454)

(2) Musgu

à            sādā            cécébè            pày  
 3SG.M            know            jackal            NEG  
 ‘He did not see the jackal.’ (Dryer, 2005, p. 454)

(3) Finnish

e-n            syö-nyt            omena-a  
 NEG-1SG            eat-PTCP            apple-PART  
 ‘I did not eat an apple.’ (Dryer, 2005, p. 454)

(4) Maori

kaahore            taatou            e            haere            ana            aapoopoo  
 NEG            1.PL.INCL            t/a            move            t/a            tomorrow  
 ‘We are not going tomorrow.’ (Dryer, 2005, p. 454)

- (5) Rama  
 (5a) nkiikna-lut uut aa kain-i  
 man-PL dory NEG make-TNS  
 ‘The men do not make a dory.’ (Dryer, 2005, p. 454)  
 (5b) i-sik-taama  
 3-arrive-NEG  
 ‘He did not arrive.’ (Dryer, 2005, p. 454)
- (6) French  
 Je ne vois pas la lune  
 1SG NEG see.1SG NEG the moon  
 ‘I do not see the moon.’ (Dryer, 2005, p. 454)

### 2.2.2. Order of standard negation and verb

Regarding the order in which the negative markers appear in the clause in relation to the main verb, Dryer (2013) proposes several types of order.

**Table 2. Order of standard negation and verb**

Value	Order of negative marker and main verb
Preverbal word	Negative word that precedes the verb, not necessarily immediately adjacent, as in example 7
Postverbal word	Negative word that follows the verb, not necessarily immediately adjacent, as in example 8
Prefixation	Negative prefix on the verb, as in example 9
Suffixation	Negative suffix on the verb, as in example 10
Negative tone	A distinctive tone on the verb, as in example 11
Mixed types	More than one type of the previously stated orders but not co-occurring, as in example 12
Double negation	Two simultaneous negative morphemes, usually, though not always, one before and the other after the verb. In some languages this value may be obligatory and in others optional as in Izi in example 13. There may even be languages with triple negation. Negative morphemes in double negation order may appear in at least 15 different order combinations



- (7) Kutenai  
 ʔat=u                      qa                      ʔiknuquk-ni  
 HABIT=1SUBJ            NEG                      smoke-IND  
 ‘I do not smoke.’ (Dryer, 2013)
- 8) Kresh  
 Kôkó            ãmbá            gôkó            ‘dĩ  
 Koko            he.hit            Goko            NEG  
 ‘Koko did not hit Goko.’ (Dryer, 2013)
- (9) Pilagá  
 sa-n-čo’ot-a    haga’            yawo-’  
 NEG-3SUBJ-tell-SG.OBJ            CLSFR            woman-PAUC  
 ‘He did not tell about the women.’ (Dryer, 2013)
- (10) Rao  
 gu            mǝ-ndǝ  
 1SG            eat-NEG  
 ‘I am not eating.’ (Dryer, 2013)
- (11) Mano  
 (11a)    ñ            yídò            (11b)    ñ̃            yídò  
           1SG            know    1SG.NEG            know  
           ‘I know.’    ‘I do not know.’ (Dryer, 2013)
- (12) Maasai  
 (12a)    eltú            a-rany            (12b)    m-a-rany  
           NEG            1SG-sing    NEG-1SG-sing  
           ‘I did not sing.’    ‘I do not sing.’ (Dryer, 2013)
- (13) Izi  
 nwó!ké            té            è-pfú-du            í!yá  
 man            NEG            3SG-speak-NEG            3SG  
 ‘The man is not speaking it.’ (Dryer, 2013)

**2.2.3. Structure of standard negation constructions**

Another relevant feature of negative constructions is their constructional structure. According to Miestamo (2005a, 2005b), there are two different basic structures of negative constructions according to their relation to their affirmative counterparts. He proposes a distinction between symmetric and asymmetric negation.

**Table 3. Structure of standard negation constructions**

Value	Structure
Symmetric	It is the same as in its affirmative counterpart except for the presence of the negative marker(s) as in example 14
Asymmetric	It is different from the affirmative, there are further changes apart from the addition of the negative marker(s) as in example 15

(14) German

(14a)	Ich	singe	(14b)	ich	singe	nicht
	I	sing.1SG		I	sing.1SG	NEG
	‘I sing.’			‘I do not sing.’ (Miestamo, 2005b, p. 458)		

(15) Finas

(15a)	tule-n	(15b)	e-n	tule
	come-1SG		NEG-1SG	come.CONNEG
	‘I am coming.’		‘I am not coming.’ (Miestamo, 2005b, p. 458)	

According to Miestamo (2005b) affirmative and negative structures can be symmetric or asymmetric in two different ways. In constructional (a)symmetry, the (a) symmetry is between the affirmative and negative constructions. In paradigmatic (a) symmetry, the (a)symmetry is between affirmative and negative paradigms. Because of the availability of data, only constructional symmetry will be considered in this work. Confirming paradigmatic (a)symmetry would require more data, and this study examines sleeping languages with insufficient data. Miestamo (2005c) also proposes three subtypes of asymmetric negative constructions according to the nature of the asymmetry.

**Table 4. Types of asymmetric negative constructions**

Value	Definition
A/Fin	The asymmetry is related to the finiteness of verbal elements. Typically, the negative construction adds a new finite element (finite verb) to the clause, and the lexical verb becomes nonfinite and/or subordinate to the added finite element as in example 16
A/NonReal	The asymmetry is related to the marking of an event’s reality status and the negative clause is obligatorily marked by a non-realized category, such as interrogative, imperative, or conditional as in example 17
A/Cat.	The asymmetry is related to changes in the marking of grammatical categories (such as tense, aspect, mood, person, number, etc.) under negation as in example 18

(16) Hixkaryana

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(16a) ki-amryeki-no<br/>1.SUBJ-hunt-RECPST<br/><br/>‘I went hunting.’</p> | <p>(16b) amryeki-hira w-ah-ko<br/>hunt-NEG 1.SUBJ-be-RE-CPST<br/><br/>‘I did not go hunting.’ (Miestamo, 2005c, p. 462)</p> |
|--|---|

(17) Imbabura Quechua

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(17a) Juzi iskay Kaballu-ta<br/>José two horse-ACC<br/>‘José has two horses.’</p> | <p>Chari-n<br/>have-3</p>  |
| <p>(17b) ñukawawki <b>mana</b><br/>my brother NEG</p>                                | <p>jatun wasi-ta chari-n-<b>chu</b><br/>big house- have-3-NEG/INTR<br/>ACC<br/>‘My brother does not have a big house.’ (Miestamo, 2005c, p. 462)</p> |

(18) Karok

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(18a) kun-iykár-at<br/>3PL&gt;3SG-kill-PST<br/><br/>‘They killed [him/her].’</p> | <p>(18b) pu-wiykar-áp-at<br/>NEG-kill-3PL&gt;3SG-<br/>PST<br/>‘They did not kill [him/her].’ (Miestamo, 2005c, p. 462)</p> |
|---|--|

**2.2.4. Prohibitive constructions**

Prohibitive constructions are negative imperative constructions in the second person singular. Kahrel (1996) and Van der Auwera and Lejeune (2005) show that there is a strong tendency in the languages of the world to use negation strategies in prohibitive constructions that are different from declaratives. According to Van der Auwera (2011), a possible explanation for this is that prohibitive constructions are used in speech acts that are completely different from declaratives. Van der Auwera and Lejeune (2005) distinguish four types of prohibitive constructions according to their negative markers and verbal structures.

**Table 5. Types of prohibitive constructions**

Value	Definition
Type 1	The prohibitive uses the verbal construction of the second person singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives as in example 19
Type 2	The prohibitive uses the verbal construction of the second person singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives as in example 20
Type 3	The prohibitive uses a verbal construction other than the second person singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives as in example 21
Type 4	The prohibitive uses a verbal construction other than the second person singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives as in example 22

(19) Turkish

(19a) Okul-a git!  
 school-DAT go.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Go to school!’

(19b) Okul-a git-me!  
 school-DAT go.IMP.2SG-NEG  
 ‘Do not go to school!’ (Van der Auwera & Lejeune, 2005, p. 290)

(20) Vietnamese

(20a) Chó uông ruou! (20b) Uông ruou!  
 NEG drink alcoholic Drink alcoholic  
 ‘Do not drink alcohol!’ Drink alcohol!’

(20c) Không uông ruou  
 NEG drink alcoholic  
 ‘I/you/he/etc. is/are not drinking alcohol.’ (Van der Auwera & Lejeune, 2005, p. 290)

(21) Spanish

(21a) Pedro no canta  
 Pedro NEG SING.IND.PRES.3SG  
 ‘Pedro does not sing.’

(21b) No cantes!  
 NEG SING.SBJV.PRES.2SG  
 ‘Do not sing!’

(21c) Canta!  
 sing.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Sing!’ (Van der Auwera & Lejeune, 2005, p. 290)

(22) Zulu

(22a) Shay-a inja!  
 hit-IMP.2SG dog  
 ‘Hit the dog!’

(22b) Mus-a uku-shay-a inga!  
 NEG.IMP.AUX- INF-HIT-INF dog  
 2SG  
 ‘Do not hit the dog!’

(22c) A-wu-shay-I inja  
 NEG.IND.PRES-2SG-hit-NEG.IND.PRES dog  
 ‘You do not hit the dog.’ (Van der Auwera & Lejeune, 2005, p. 290)

### 3. Analysis

#### 3.1. Standard negation: marking strategies, order, and constructional structure

In Millcayac, standard negation is expressed by means of affixation, attaching the suffix «-na» to the main verb ([V-NEG]). This suffix appears before the person and number suffixes. As stated by Valdivia:

The negative verb is made in this language by attaching this particle («na») to all the affirmative verbs and has to be put immediately before the particles that form tenses and persons, that we put at the end of the fifth chapter. The first thing is that in the indicative, for present and past tense, there is no more than one negative, which is the one that negates the imperfect past. (Valdivia, 2011 [1607], Arte, p. 16r)<sup>1</sup>

Our interpretation of Valdivia’s statement is that the imperfect past suffix «-eye», and its allomorphs, are obligatorily required in standard negation. Because of that, it loses its imperfective meaning in these constructions as in the following example:

- (23) ewi poyup ma-na-eye-napen yekem ltau.ltam  
this sin say-NEG-PST.IPFV-2.SG how.many year  
ñom-eye-ye?  
conceal-PST.IPFV-INTR.2.SG  
‘How many years did you conceal this sin that you did not say’ (Valdivia,  
2011 [1607], Confessionario, p. 22v)

The same author states that in the future tenses in Millcayac, instead of «-eye», the suffix «-e» is required, as seen in the following example:

- (24) chekem poyup alte-na-e-pai-na  
from.now.on sin do-NEG-PST.IPFV-FUT-1SG  
‘From now on, I will not do sins’ (Valdivia, 2011 [1607], Doctrina, p. 20v)

However, the suffix «-e» does not only occur in combination with the future tenses, as seen in this present tense example:

- (25) dios te-na-e-tke  
god be-NEG-PST.IPFV-3SG  
‘It is not god’ (Valdivia, 2011 [1607], Doctrina, p. 17v)

Previous studies have analyzed the «-eye» and «-e» occurrence with some differences. Regarding its general form, Ridruejo (2009, p. 146) suggests that the imperfect past suffix «-eye» is so like the interrogative «-ye» that they are difficult to distinguish (as seen in example 27. Diaz-Fernández (2014) considers the past tense suffix to only have the form «-e», without mentioning the form «-eye». On the other hand, Tornello et al. (2011) considers that the first and third persons use the form «-eye» and the second person the form «-e». Even though we do not agree with this distribution, since, as can be seen in examples 24 and 25, the form «-e» can occur with the forms assigned to «-eye». The fact is that «-eye» and «-e» seem to behave as allomorphs. While their specific distribution and their specific meaning is beyond the scope of this work, what is relevant for this investigation is to present the asymmetry of the negation<sup>2</sup>. Furthermore, the same meaning is expressed by means of the suffix «-i» when occurring in negative constructions along with the third person «-nap», as seen in the following example.

- (26) ñochum terita xap-e-nap, ma-na dios terita xap-na-i -nap  
 man as die-PST.IPFV-3 be-3.IND god as die-NEG-PST.IPFV-3  
 ‘He did not die as a god, he died as a man’. (Valdivia, 2011 [1607], Doctrina,  
 p. 18r)

It is also noticeable that the forms «-eye/-e/-i» are not obligatory in all negative contexts. These suffixes are not required in nominalized forms, as seen in the following examples, that clarifies doubts about the independence of both suffixes and establishes the limits of the asymmetry of the construction.

- (27) axey killenem-na-yu ka-ch man-mue-yu  
 woman want-NEG-NMLZ 2-GEN punish-¿?-NMLZ  
 pu-eye-mi-ye?  
 3.SG.OBJ-fornicate-VERB-INTR.2.SG  
 ‘Have you forced a woman? [have you fornicated with a woman as a punishment without her wanting to?]’ (Valdivia, 2011 [1607], Confessionario,  
 p. 30r)

In sum, apart from the negative «-na», negative constructions require the occurrence of the suffix «-eye/-e/-i», described by Valdivia (2011 [1607]) as imperfect past (*preterito imperfecto*), so the structure of the negative constructions is asymmetric, as is seen in the contrasting examples 28 and 29. Furthermore, the type of asymmetry is A/Cat since the changes in the structure are related to the marking of a grammatical category, in this case tense-aspect.

- (28) chekem poyup alte-na-e-pai-na  
 from.now.on sin do-NEG-PST.IPFV-FUT-1SG  
 ‘From now on I will not commit sins’ (Valdivia, 2011 [1607], Doctrina, p.  
 20v)
- (29) padre xama ke-che-pa-teke ku-ch poyup tamari alte-pa-na  
 priest word 1SG.OBJ-give-FUT- 1SG.GEN sin CAUS do-FUT-  
 3SG 1SG  
 ‘I will do the word the priest gives me because of my sins [I will do as the  
 priest says]’ (Valdivia, 2011 [1607], Confessionario, p. 23v)

On the other hand, in Allentiac, according to Valdivia's grammar, standard negation is expressed by means of the particle «naha» or its reduced form «na» in preverbal position (NEG V). However, this particle appears in its reduced form «na» in most of the analyzed texts.

(30)        anima    naha            xap-ti-na  
               soul     NEG            die-FREQ-3.SG.IND  
               'The soul does not die' (Valdivia, 1894 [1607], Doctrina, p.11r)

(31)        Hay                poyup    na        elp-a-nen  
               from.now.on    sin        NEG    do-TV-1.SG.IND  
               'From now on I will not do/commit sins' (Valdivia, 1894 [1607], Confes-  
               sionario, p. 20v)

A possible way to evaluate whether the negative marker in Allentiac is a prefix or a preverbal word is the use of negative words in negative polar answers. In Millcayac, polar questions are answered negatively with «naha peche» or the word «pechewe», according to the grammar by Valdivia, even though it is «pechewe» that is used in all the available texts. Due to its similarity to the word «peche», which means 'negate', it can be argued that it is derived from this word. In contrast, polar questions in Allentiac are answered negatively by means of the negative particle «naha», the same used in standard negation. In the case of negative polar answers, the reduced form «na» is not found in the texts. It is therefore possible to suggest that while «naha» is a preverbal particle, the reduced form «na» seems to be on the path to become a prefix. Since more evidence is necessary to confirm the syntactic independence of «na», in the present investigation we consider that Allentiac presents a preverbal particle in the domain of negation.

(32)        Millcayac  
               (32a)        prri                    hia        ti-te?  
                       father                son        be-INTR.3SG  
                       'The father is the son?'  
               (32b)        pechewe  
                       'no' (Valdivia, 2011 [1607], Confessionario, p. 17r)



(33) Allentiac

(33a) pia            llawe        ma-nte?  
 father        son        be-3.SG.INTR  
 ‘The father is the son?’

(33b) Naha

‘no’ (Valdivia, 1894 [1607], *Doctrina*, p. 10v)

The structure of the negative constructions in Allentiac is symmetric since apart from the addition of «na(ha)» no other differences with the affirmative can be found, as seen when comparing examples 34 and 35.

(34) killet-k-a-nen

want-VT-TV-1SG

‘I want/wanted’ (Valdivia, 1894 [1607], *Arte*, p. 3v)

(35) naha        killet-k-a-nen

neg        want-TV-VT-1SG

‘I do not want’ (Valdivia, 1894 [1607], *Arte*, p. 9r)

In sum, in Millcayac standard negation is expressed by means of affixation with the suffix «-na» and the negative constructions have an asymmetric structure since apart from «-na» it also requires the imperfective suffix «-eye» and its allomorphs. In Allentiac, SN is expressed by means of the preverbal particle «na(ha)» and the constructions have a symmetric structure. These values are summarized in Table 6.

**Table 6. Values of standard negation in Millcayac and Allentiac**

Feature	Millcayac	Allentiac
Marking strategy	Affix	Particle
Order of negative marker and verb	Suffixation ([V-NEG])	Preverbal (NEG V)
Structure	Asymmetric	Symmetric

### 3.2. Prohibitive constructions

In Millcayac, the paradigm of the imperative suffixes that also mark person and number is the following.

**Table 7. Paradigm of the imperative mood in Millcayac (Tornello et al., 2011, p. 292)**

Person	Number	
	Singular	Plural
First	«-pe/-pueh»	«-peka/-pueka»
Second	«-xek/-xke» «-e/-ep» «-pen»	«-xeka/-eka» «-epka/-ka»
Third	«-ten»	«-watene»

To negate the second person imperative, Valdivia (2011 [1607]) states that there are two possibilities: using the negative suffix «-na», along with the imperfective allomorph «-e», as is also required in the negative declaratives, combined with the corresponding imperative ending (example 36), or using a special prohibitive suffix «-te» (example 37). That is, this language has two different prohibitive constructions: the one in example 36 corresponds to type 1 and the one in 37 corresponds to type 4, according to Van der Auwera and Lejeune's (2005) typology. For further detail, see the contrast with example 38 that shows an example of the imperative.

(36)      che-na-e-xke  
             give-NEG-IMPF-2SG.IMP  
             'Do not give!' (Valdivia, 2011 [1607], Arte, p. 16v)

(37)      che-te  
             give-PROH  
             'Do not give!' (Valdivia, 2011 [1607], Arte, p. 16v)

(38)      ku-ch      poyup      ke-poschu-pen  
             1-GEN      sin      1.SG.OBJ-free-IMP.2.SG  
             'Forgive my sins!' (Valdivia, 2011 [1607], Confessionario, p. 24r)

In Allentiac, the imperative mood paradigm is detailed in Table 8:

**Table 8. Paradigm of the imperative mood in Allentiac (Valdivia, 1894 [1607], *Arte*, p. 4v)**

Person	Number	
	Singular	Plural
First	«-pech »	«-peke»
Second	«-wa/-xek/-te»	«-ke»
Third	«-ten»	«-nisten»

Like in Millcayac, Allentiac has two different possible constructions to express the prohibitive meaning: one that uses the corresponding form of the second person imperative paradigm and the negative marker used in the declaratives «na(ha)» (example 39), and another that uses a special prohibitive suffix «-che», «-eche», «-tche» (example 40 and 41). This suffix has different allomorphic variants, possibly depending on the conjugation of the verb. For a clearer picture compare them to example 42 where an example of the imperative can be seen.

- (39) ka-ye patati poyup elti-a-na echang-ta na ltertek-ta-wa  
 2-DAT any sin do-v.t.-3.IND this-ACC NEG think-¿?-2.  
 SG.IMP

‘Do not remember the sins committed against you! [Forgive anyone who sinned against you!]' (Valdivia, 1894 [1607], *Doctrina*, p. 6r)

- (40) mul-xku-kolum-tche poyup xetu-kix-a-tek-ep-yam  
 let-1PL.OBJ-let-PROH sin fall-1.OBJ.PL.OBJ-¿?-FUT-  
 NMLZ

‘Do not let us fall (into temptation)!’ (Valdivia, 1894 [1607], *Doctrina*, p. 2v)

- (41) horokoyam xam ma-na paypa aspay-eche  
 fifth commandment say-3 ¿? kill-PROH

‘The fifth commandment says, “do not kill!”’ (Valdivia, 1894 [1607], *Doctrina*, p. 4r)

- (42) chu xenek-ta ke-x-taynem-te  
 all evil-ABL 1.OBJ-PL.OBJ-free-IMP

‘Free us from all evil!’ (Valdivia, 1894 [1607], *Doctrina*, p. 2v)

In sum, both Millcayac and Allentiac have two different prohibitive constructions, type 1 and type 4.

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. Synthesis

A summary of the comparison between the considered features in Millcayac and Allentiac is presented in Table 9.

**Table 9. Comparison between Allentiac and Millcayac**

Feature	Millcayac	Allentiac
Negative marker	Suffix («-na»)	Particle («na(ha)»)
Order of negative marker and verb	Suffixation	Preverbal
Constructional structure	Asymmetric	Symmetric
Prohibitive constructions	1 and 4	1 and 4
Negative polar answers	«pechewe»	«naha»

Among the similarities between both languages, we first find the phonological similarity between the Millcayac suffix «-na» and Allentiac's particle «na(ha)», probably due to their common origin. Furthermore, regarding prohibitive constructions, both languages have two constructions to express this meaning: one of type 1, based on the paradigm of the imperative and declarative negation, and one of type 4 with a special prohibitive marker unrelated to the imperative or declarative negation markers.

On the other hand, both languages show a series of remarkable differences. While Millcayac marks negation by post-verbal suffixation, Allentiac marks negation by means of a pre-verbal particle. Moreover, Millcayac presents an asymmetric structure of standard negation in which the presence of the imperfective suffix «-eye/-e» is required along with the suffix «-na», while in Allentiac standard negation shows a symmetric structure in which only the negative marker «na(ha)» is necessary.

### 4.2. Proposal for the reconstruction of standard negation in proto-Huarpean

The description of and comparison between Millcayac and Allentiac make it clear that negative constructions in both languages are strikingly different. If we consider the fact that both languages belong to the same family, their differences are even more remarkable. This leads us to look for diachronic developments in these languages that



However, despite the similarity, it must be considered that only Millcayac, the language geographically further south, and not Allentiac, more geographically close to Aymara, has this type of construction. Because of this, it is difficult to imagine a contact scenario between Millcayac and Aymaran where Allentiac would not have been at least similarly influenced. Another possibility is that contact between Millcayac and Mapudungun could have produced, or at least influenced, the development of suffixation as the means of expressing negation in Millcayac.

- (44) feyti      trewa      wangku-la-y  
      DET      dog      bark-NEG-IND [3SG]  
      ‘That dog did not bark’ (Olate, Zúñiga & Becerra, 2020)

All the same, interdisciplinary extensions of this research could further refine and elaborate the possible contact scenarios in which these diachronic changes could have taken place.

### 4.3. The prohibitive and its changes

In both Allentiac and Millcayac it is possible to observe two different prohibitive constructions: one with the same negative marker found in the indicative and the other with a special prohibitive marker. In this context it is possible to suggest, following Manczak (1958, cited in Campbell [1999, p. 265]), that the special form of the prohibitive could be the older one given that the forms of the indicative show a major trend to expand towards other moods. Meanwhile, regarding the special prohibitive form, it is remarkable that while in Millcayac this form is «-te», in Allentiac it is «-che». Considering the allomorphs found in Allentiac, it is possible that the original proto-Huarpe form was a disyllabic form \*«-teche » that derived to «-te» in Millcayac and to «-che», and its variants «-eche» and «-teche», in Allentiac.

To explore a possible explanation for this difference, it is important to note the similarity in form and function between «-che» and the prohibitive suffix «-cha» (example 45) from Kunza, a southern Andean language geographically close to Allentiac. This similarity, the geographic proximity between both languages, and the divergence with Millcayac all make it possible to consider that the prohibitive «-che» may have been reinforced in Allentiac because of the influence from Kunza’s form, producing an internal shift of the family in a divergent direction.

- (45) cum           deja-cha-calo  
 1.OBJ.PL       leave-PROH-IMP.2SG  
 ‘Do not leave us!’ (Adelaar & Muysken, 2004, p. 384)

## 5. Conclusions

This work has presented a characterization, based on typologically validated features, of negation in the two Huarpean languages, Millcayac and Allentiac, spoken in central-western Argentina and currently sleeping. In Millcayac, standard negation is expressed by the suffix «-na», that requires the presence of the imperfective suffix «-eye/-e». That is, Millcayac presents an asymmetric structure with an A/Cat type of asymmetry. In Allentiac, negation is expressed with the particle «naha» in pre-verbal position and its structure is symmetric. In prohibitive constructions, Millcayac and Allentiac have two constructions: (1) the same negator used in declarative clauses, and (2) a specific prohibitive suffix. Regarding the possible diachronic process, it is proposed that the oldest negation strategy would have been «naha», preserved in Allentiac, and that it could have been suffixed in Millcayac, possibly due to the influence of contact with Mapudungun. The asymmetry of the latter language seems to be an internal change.

Finally, it is proposed that the specific strategy of the prohibitive would be the oldest in this domain and that the negation of the indicative would have later expanded into the imperative mood. It is interesting to note the difference between Millcayac prohibitive «-te» and Allentiac «-che»: we suggest that this difference could have resulted from a convergence process due to contact between Allentiac and Kunza, a geographically close Andean language.

By providing a description of and comparative perspective on negation in the Huarpean languages, this work contributes to the study of the indigenous languages of the Andes and South America in general and provides valuable data for further contact and areal research in the domain.

## 6. References

- Adelaar, W., & Muysken, P. (2004). *The Languages of the Andes*. Cambridge University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486852>
- Bárcena, R. (2001). Prehistoria del centro-oeste argentino. In Berberían, E., & Nielsen, A. (Eds.), *Historia argentina prehispánica*. (vol. 2, pp. 561-634). Editorial Brujas.
- Bárcena, R. (2011). *La lengua de los huarpes de Mendoza: el Millcayac del Padre Luis de Valdivia*. Instituto de Ciencias Humanas, Sociales y Antropológicas (INCIHUSA).
- Campbell, L. (1999). *Historical Linguistics: an introduction*. MIT Press.

- Canals-Frau, S. (1942). La lengua de los huarpes de Mendoza. *Anales del Instituto de Etnografía Americana*, 3, 157-184.
- Cancino, N. (2017). Los tratados millcayac y allentiac (1607) de Luis de Valdivia. Noticia de un hallazgo bibliográfico, *Onomázein*, 37, 112-143. <https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.37.11>
- Coler, M. (2014). *A grammar of Muylaq' Aymara: Aymara as spoken in Southern Peru*. Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004284005>
- De Swart, H. (2010). *Expression and interpretation of negation*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-3162-4>
- Díaz-Fernández, A. (2014). Exploración tipológica de la morfología verbal en millcayac, allentiac y mapuzungun. In Malvestitti, M., & Dreidemie, P. (Comps), *III Encuentro de Lenguas Indígenas Americanas* (pp. 211-222). Universidad Nacional de Río Negro.
- Dryer, M. (2005). Negative morphemes. In Haspelmath, M., Dryer, M., Gil, D., & Comrie, B. (Eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures* (pp. 454-457). Oxford University Press.
- Dryer, M. (2013). Order of negative morpheme and verb. In Dryer, M., & Haspelmath, M. (Eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://wals.info/chapter/143>
- Givón, T. (1999). Linguistic reconstruction: as method, as theory. In Gildea, S. (Ed.), *Reconstructing Grammar. Comparative Linguistics and Grammaticalization* (pp. 107-159). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Haegeman, L. (1995). *The Syntax of Negation*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511519727>
- Hardman, M., Vasquez, J., & Yapita, J. (2001). *Aymara. compendio de estructura fonológica y gramatical*. Instituto de Lengua y Cultura Aymara.
- Hengeveld, K., & Mackenzie, L. (2018). Negation in functional discourse grammar. *Recent Developments in Functional Discourse Grammar*, 205(17), 17-45. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.205.02hen>
- Horn, L. (2001). *A Natural History of Negation*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kahrel, P. (1996). *Aspects of negation* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands].
- Medina, J. (1894). *Doctrina cristiana y catecismo con un confesionario, arte y vocabulario breves en la lengua allentiac por el Padre Luis de Valdivia de la Compañía de Jesús*.
- Michael, L., & Granadillo, T. (Eds.). (2014). *Negation in Arawak languages*. Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004257023>
- Miestamo, M. (2005a). *Standard Negation: The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective*. Mouton de Gruyter.



- Miestamo, M. (2005b). Symmetric and asymmetric standard negation. In Dryer, M., & Haspelmath, M. (Eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures* (pp. 456-461). Oxford University Press.
- Miestamo, M. (2005c). Subtypes of asymmetric standard negation. In Dryer, M., & Haspelmath, M. (Eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://wals.info/chapter/114>
- Nercesian, V. (2008). La negación en wichí (mataco-mataguaya). In Messineo, C., Malvestitti, M., & Bien, R., *Estudios en lingüística y antropología* (pp. 167-179). Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Olate, A., Zúñiga, F., & Becerra, R. (2020). Las construcciones negativas en mapudungun. Una mirada tipológica. *Lexis*, 44(2), 659-698. <https://doi.org/10.18800/lexis.202002.008>
- Payne, J. (1985). Negation. In Shopen, T. (Ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. (vol. 1, pp. 197-242). Cambridge University Press.
- Pineda-Bernuy, E. (2016). The development of standard negation in Quechua: A reconstruction. In Mosegaard, M., & Visconti, J. (Eds.), *The diachrony of negation* (pp. 83-130). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.160.04pin>
- Ridruejo, E. (2009). Notas sobre el verbo millcayac según el “Arte” (1607) de Luis de Valdivia. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*, 7(1), 137-159.
- Rusconi, C. (1962). *Poblaciones pre y post hispánicas de Mendoza*. Mendoza Imprenta Oficial.
- Schobinger, J. (2009). *Arqueología de la Región Cuyana: Esbozo de su prehistoria y protohistoria*. Universidad Nacional de Cuyo.
- Torero, A. (2002). *Idiomas de los Andes: Lingüística e Historia*. Instituto Francés de Estudios Andinos & Editorial Horizonte.
- Tornello, P., Roig, A., Díaz, N., & Aguirre, L. (2011). *Introducción al millcayac idioma de los huarpes de Mendoza*. Zeta Editores.
- Valdivia, L. de. (1894 [1607]). *Doctrina cristiana y catecismo con un confesionario, arte y vocabulario breves en la lengua allentiac por el Padre Luis de Valdivia de la Compañía de Jesús*. E. Rasco.
- Valdivia, L. de (2011 [1607]). *Doctrina cristiana y catecismo, confesionario breve, arte y gramática, vocabulario breve en Lengua millcayac para la Ciudad de Mendoza y sus términos*. INCIHUSA, CONICET.
- Van der Auwera, J. (2011). On the diachrony of negation. In Horn, L. (Ed.), *The expression of Negation* (pp. 73-101). Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110219302.73>
- Van der Auwera, J., & Krasnoukhova, O. (2020). The typology of negation. In Déprez, V., & Espinal, M. (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of negation* (pp. 91-116). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198830528.013.3>

Van der Auwera, J., & Lejeune, L. (2005). The prohibitive. In Haspelmath, M., Dryer, M., Gil, D., & Comrie, B. (Eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures* (pp. 290-293). Oxford University Press.

Zwartjes, O. (2000). Modo, tiempo y aspecto en las gramáticas de las lenguas mapuche, milcayac y guaraní de Luis de Valdivia y Antonio Ruiz Montoya. In Zwartjes, O., (Ed.), *Las Gramáticas Misioneras de Tradición Hispánica (siglos XVI-XVII)* (pp. 205-256). Rodopi.  
[https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004488564\\_009](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004488564_009)

## 7. Abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ACC	accusative
ABL	ablative
AGT	agentive
ART	article
CONNNEG	connegative
DAT	dative
GEN	genitive
FREQ	frequentative
FUT	future
HAB	habitual
IMP	imperative
INCL	inclusive
IND	indicative
INDEF	indefinite
INF	infinitive
INTR	interrogative
IPFV	imperfective
IRR	irrealis
LOC	locative
M	masculine
NEG	negative
NMLZ	nominalization

OBJ	object
PAT	patient
PL	plural
PFV	perfective
PROH	prohibitive
PST	past
PTCP	participle
RECPST	recent past
SEMIREFL	semireflexive
SG	singular
STAT	stative
SUBJ	subject
SBJV	subjunctive
TNS	tense
TV	thematic vowel
VT	verbal topic

## NOTES

---

- 1 Translation of this citation and the examples taken from Valdivia (1607) are ours.
- 2 The meaning of «-eye», and its allomorphs, is a topic that still needs to be studied. Its possible combinations, occurrence, and relation to the interrogative, suggested pointed by Ridruejo (2009) allows us to doubt its condition as an imperfective marker as stated by Valdivia, or at least to doubt that this is its only meaning. As stated by reviewer 1, the possibility of combination to the future suffix may suggest a relation to mood, as well as its relation to the interrogative. This relation to mood does not seem to be uncommon in nearby languages, as it is also found in Quechuan languages (Pineda-Bernuy, 2016), Aymara (Hardman, Vasquez & Yapita, 2001), or Wichí (Nercesian, 2008). A projection of this research is analyzing the different meanings of the suffix «-eye», and its allomorphs, allowing to elucidate this. We thank reviewer 1 for their valuable comments on this matter.