



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Vlada V. Baranova

NEGATION MARKERS IN KALMYK

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: LINGUISTICS

WP BRP 24/LNG/2015

NEGATION MARKERS IN KALMYK²

Focusing on changes to the system of negation in Kalmyk, this paper will discuss the diachronic development of the expression of negation and will examine the results of grammaticalization process in negation system on synchronous level with special attention to innovations occur in colloquial speech. The goal of this paper is to report on a corpus-based study comparing the syntactic form, scope and pragmatic use of negative markers in Kalmyk. I will try to describe patterns of pragmatic language use of negative affixes or full negative copulas in written and spoken Kalmyk and to find explanations to both synchronic variation and to changes in a diachronic perspective.

The paper deals with semantic, pragmatic, and morphosyntactic properties of all these negative markers, however, it focuses on the competition of two main markers of sentential negation and its contracted variants in Kalmyk used both in nominal clauses and in declarative sentences. I argue that there is new cycle of development in Kalmyk and the process of specialization goes through ambiguity of new negative marker to the pragmatic and semantic differentiation depending on the scope of negation and the information structure of sentence.

JEL Classification: Z

Keywords: negation, diachronic development of negation, Jespersen's cycle, Kalmyk

1. Introduction

Kalmyk is a Mongolic language spoken in the steppe regions adjacent to the northwest shore of the Caspian Sea (Republic of Kalmykia, Russian Federation). In the 17th century it split off from other Oirat varieties (Inner Mongolia, China. Major dialects of Kalmyk (Derbet, Torghut and Buzava) are close to each other, except for small lexical variations.

¹ National Research University Higher School of Economics. St. Petersburg School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Department of Sociology. E-mail: vbaranova@hse.ru

² The part of this article was prepared within the framework of the Academic Fund Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE) in 2015- 2016 (grant № 15-01-0123) and supported within the framework of a subsidy granted to the HSE by the Government of the Russian Federation for the implementation of the Global Competitiveness Program.

Kalmyk is an agglutinative language and it includes nominative-accusative case system suffixes. Kalmyk has complex morphology with a rich system of suffixes both for nouns and verbs. It uses both affixes and periphrastic constructions consisting of auxiliary verbs and various participles and converbs to express TAM categories. Syntactically, it is a head-final language with SOV word.

There is a variety of negative markers (particles, auxiliaries and affix-like markers) in Kalmyk language, with different semantic and morphosyntactic features conditioned by factors including TAM characteristics and forms of predicate, clause type, as well as pragmatics of clause. A variation of negative marker has a result both historical development and discourse specialization of new grammaticalized forms. The paper deals with semantic, pragmatic, and morphosyntactic properties of all these negative markers, however, it focuses on the competition of two main markers of sentential negation and its contracted variants in Kalmyk used both in nominal clauses and in declarative sentences. I argue that there is new cycle of development in Kalmyk and the process of specialization goes through ambiguity of new negative marker to the pragmatic and semantic differentiation depending on the scope of negation and the information structure of sentence.

This paper is based on the data collected in the villages of the Ketchenerovsky region, Republic of Kalmykia, between 2006 and 2008 and in 2014. The data were obtained from oral narratives (small spoken corpus includes approx. 15000 words) and by the means of translations between Russian and Kalmyk (both directions) during elicitation. A small Kalmyk corpus by A. Vankaeva (KNC, 800,000 words, <http://web-corpora.net/KalmykCorpus>) is used as an additional source of data. Additionally, I will use modern translations of the New Testament (142,000 words) and the National Corpus of Kalmyk Language (NCKL) <http://kalmcorporu.ru/> The latter is still in test mode and searching in this corpus is restricted³.

The paper is structured as follows. After noting grammatical information and data for this paper I will describe the inventory negative markers in Kalmyk (in Section 2), then discuss the historical development of Mongolian negation through the Jespersen's cycle (3). Section 4 deals with the function and semantic context of the most frequent form (*uga*) and its competition with negative marker *bišə*. Final remarks follow in Section 5.

³ I am grateful to to Viktoria Kukanova for giving me the opportunity to search in the test version of National Corpus of Kalmyk Language. I acknowledge Sergey Say and other participants of the expeditions for the helpful discussions. Finally, and most of all, I would like to thank my informants.

2. The inventory of negative markers in Kalmyk and the asymmetry of negation

The objective of this section is to briefly describe the diversity of negation markers in Kalmyk and to show that it may be divided into two groups depending on their position and symmetry/asymmetry of relation between affirmative and negative syntactic structure. According to Miestamo, “in addition to the presence of a negative marker (or negative markers) in the negative clause, *symmetric negative* structures show no further differences in comparison to the corresponding affirmative structure” (2005: 61), whereas asymmetric negation assumes structural differences between affirmatives and negatives.

There are 4 full non-related negative markers and 2 additional affixes of grammaticalized (or clitized) full forms displaying a range of semantic and morphosyntactic characteristics: prohibitive particle *bičä*, negative particle *esə*, negative existential auxiliary *uga* (and homonymous negative word *uga*) with contracted version *-go*, negative auxiliary *bišə* and negative affix *-šə* (from *<bišə*).

2.1. Negative preverbal particles

Negative particle *esə* and prohibitive particle *bičä* are placed in contact preposition to negated word or clause. Preverbal negators are uninflected particles. Prohibitive particle *bičä* always precedes both singular and plural forms of the imperative of a lexical verb (1).

- (1) *tiimə jumə bičä kelə-Ø*
 such thing NEG.IMP say-IMP
 ‘Don’t say such a thing’.

Preverbal particle *esə* is used for negating the different types of subordinate clauses. It may negate a participle as part of relative clauses: *əpk-чигə эс уучи күн* ‘non drinking man’ and nominalizations (examples (2) from Natalia Perkova):

- (2) *Očir-in zaka es medə-lə-n terü-gə muur-ulə-v*
 Ochir(name) -GEN rule NEG know-NMLZ-EXT that-ACC get.tired-CAUS-PST
 ‘Ochir’s ignorance of the rules leads to problem’.

⁴ Here and below I used transcription system based on the International Phonetic Alphabet for texts (glossed in Toolbox) and questionnaires and standard Cyrillic Orthography for written texts. Most glosses are the same as those in Leipzig glossing rules (<http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php>) and others are in Abbreviations list.

Preverbal particle *esə* negates both realis and irrealis conditional clauses and concessive clauses.

The conditional clause is formed by the conditional converb ending on affix *-xla/xlarn*:

- (3) *ärkə es uu-xla-n^j bi bär-žə av-čk-ad (...)*
 vodka NEG drink-CV.SUCC-P.3 1SG.NOM hold-CV.IPFV take-COMPL-CV.ANT
 ‘As far as (she) doesn’t drink vodka I hold (her)’.

The negative particle *esə* may occur with imperfective converb ending on *-ž*, however, searching in corpus shows that it occurs only with verb *gi-* ‘say’ in lexicalization *esə gi-ž* NEG say-CV.IPFV ‘in other word’, that is not a productive model. It seems to occur with non-productive constructions that has resulted of the grammaticalization or lexicalization process during the historical development. For example, the verb *gi-* ‘say’ cannot fall within the scope of negation. When grammaticalized form of converb of verb *gi-* ‘say’ occur with finite form of utterance verb it has a function of complementizers within the construction of verbal complementation. The complementizer cannot be negated. However, other pattern of the clause-linkage in Kalmyk includes lexicalization of verb *gi-* with negation *es* (and this combination is not productive nowadays). There are synonymic correlative conjunctions *es gi-žə... es gi-žə ...* and *es gi-xlä... es gi-xlä* ‘either... or’ (lit. ‘not saying’).

Constructions with negative particles *esə* and *bičä* can be considered as symmetric structures with the affirmative.

2.2. Negative copulas

The most interesting negative markers in Kalmyk are *bišə* (4) and *uga* (5).

- (4) *tiig-žə naad-də-m bišə*
 do.so-CV.IPFV play-PC.HAB-COP.AFF NEG
- küü-n-ä amə-n-də odekolon ke-d-ü*
 man-EXT-GEN mouth-EXT-DAT perfume pour-PC.HAB-Q
- ‘This is unfair play! Is it possible to pour a perfume in somebody’s mouth?’

- (5) *ter küükə-n-də taas-gd-sən uga*
 that girl-EXT-DAT favour-PASS-PC.PST NEG.COP
 ‘The girl disliked him’

Kalmyk negation with negative copula *uga* or *bišə* is an asymmetric system that assumes structural differences between the affirmatives and negatives despite the appearance of a negative marker. In Miestamo’s classification (Miestamo 2000; 2005), Kalmyk can be attributed to type A / FIN when the finite verb loses its finiteness in negatives. In Kalmyk negative constructions the lexical verb is in the non-finite form of a past, future or habitual participle, or imperfective or anterior converb. Person affixes are exposed on the negative copula (see example 6) which can be separated from the participle or converb only by clitics. The negated verb and negative auxiliary usually occur in the end of a clause or in the absolute end (as word order SOV rules).

- (6) *du ä kar-sən uga-v*
 voice sound go.out-PC.PST NEG.COP-1SG/PST
 ‘I said nothing’ [lit. ‘voice didn’t sound’].

Negative copula *uga* (or *bišə*) functions as a negative existential. In negative sentence it correlates with auxiliary verb ‘be’ carrying the verbal markers in existential affirmative clauses:

- (7a) *nandə maashə-n bää-nä*
 1SG.DAT car-EXT be-PRS
 ‘I have a car’

- (7b) *nandə mash-in uga*
 1SG.DAT car-EXT NEG.COP
 ‘I have no car’.

2.3. Negative suffixes

There are two additional markers of negation representing a contracted version of negative auxiliary: affixes *šə* and *-go* sourced from *bišə* and *uga* respectively. Negative affix in lexeme is placed after aspectual markers (progressive *-žə-* and perfectivator *-čkə-*), but before person /number markers:

- (8) *Badma, ĩ tasə songs-ča-x-šə-č!*
 (proper name) 2.SG almost listen-PROG-PC.FUT-NEG-2SG
 ‘Badma (name), you are not listening to me at all!’

- (9) *Kekshenova Sveta ter vnučk-an ög-xär bää-d-go-č*
 (surname and name) that granddaughter-P.REFL give-CV.PURP be-PC.HAB-NEG.COP-
 COP.MIR

‘Sveta Kekshenova doesn’t send her granddaughter (to school; surprisingly)’.

There is a question about a degree of grammaticalization negative copula. Affix *-go* has no front counterpart under the rules of vowel harmony that may be an evidence to its clitic status (however, vowel *o* has a special status in the system of vowel harmony in Kalmyk). The two negative variants, full negative auxiliary and affix, are not only variant with full and speed pronunciation: the corpus data show a tendency to use the affix and auxiliary in different morphological contexts.

To sum up, the negative forms in Kalmyk can be grouped into 3 types: 1) invariable negative particles *esə* and *bičä* as preverbal markers in symmetrical negative-affirmative structures with semantic specialization; 2) postpositive negative auxiliaries *uga* and *bišə* with a wide range of collocations, and 3) affixes *šə* and *-go* derived from these copulas. The next section provides a historical explanation for this diversity both from context of related language and from typological perspectives.

3. Historical Development of Negation in Mongolic Languages in Typological Context

3.1. The cycle of negation in Mongolian

Diachronically, there is a change of negation system in most of Mongolic languages. The main process in the history of negation in Mongolian is the reanalysis of the negative marker into a negative existential (postverbal) copula. This process of widening functions of noun negative marker at first stage occurred in nominal clauses and after a time the negative marker can substitute the preverbal negative particles.

The assumption about negation in the pre-classical period (Middle Mongolian) is based on the «Secret History of the Mongols» (13th c. AD), which narrates the life of Chingghis Khan. There were preverbal particle *ülü* with finite forms in presence, with participles and converbs, and particle *ese* with past tense. In modern Mongolian languages, they are (partly) substituted postpositive marker *-gwai* (Janhunen 2012) derived from *ügüj /güi* (Sanjeev 1962) that was originally used to negate nouns.

From the typological point of view, such a development of negation may be considered as *Jespersen's Cycle* ('a cycle of sentential negation such that the preverbal negative loses substance and is adjoined by a postverbal reinforcement that ends up as a sole expression of negation' (Larrivéé 2011: 1); see revised version in (Larrivéé, Ingham 2011 and particularly (Hansen & Visconti 2014) and references therein. The well-known example is a development of French negation *ne... (pas)*. Nevertheless, the *Jespersen's Cycle* itself with the idea of reinforced negation where negative marking is bipartite may not be the optimal model for an explanation for changes in the Mongolian which has no stage of co-occurrence two negative markers in one clause.

In the terms of W. Croft's model (Croft 1991), in Central Mongolic languages negation may be defined as a shift from type *b* to *c*: from the constructions with special existential negation predicate to the marker of standard negation both for verbal and nominal negation (see also Brosig 2011).

Hsiao considered the negation with markers *ülü/ese* and *ügei* in Khalkha from the perspective of an *analytic-synthetic cycle* (Hsiao 2012, 2013):

At the reconstructed Stage I, *ülü/ese* and *ügei* were in complementary distribution and there was a verbal-nominal asymmetry in negative constructions. At Stage II, the functions of *ügei* and *ülü/ese* were overlapping. They were competing for the function of negating verbal nouns. At Stage III, *ülü* and *ese* were replaced by *ügei/-güi* and an affirmative-negative asymmetry in the temporal system emerged. Indicative verbs are used in affirmative sentences, but verbal nouns are used in negative sentences. At Stage IV, past affirmatives tend to be expressed by perfective verbal nouns plus omissible copula verb by analogy to their negative counterparts (Hsiao 2012: 375).

In (Hsiao 2012) and in other related work about Middle Mongolian no consideration has been given to questions of negative marker *bišə*. The process of grammaticalization word *bišə* 'other' in negative marker may be considered through Jespersen's Cycle model: the system is renewed by another element (see about possibility several Jespersen Cycles with triple and more negative element (van der Auwera 2009, Hansen & Visconti 2014) or from another point of view, see section 4.

In synchronic level, some Mongolic languages have preverbal negation markers although its functions changed: particle *ül* is used in Khalkha (Standard Modern Mongolic language) (Janhunen 2012) and Buryat (Sanjeev 1962: 273), but not in Kalmyk. For example, Bao'an Tu (also known as 'Tongren Monguor') in China has a two preverbal particles, *əɮə* and *əsə*, as markers of standard negation (in declarative sentences) (Fried 2010: 224-225).

3.2. Kalmyk negation as a result of negation cycle

One of the objectives of this section is to examine the results of development negation system on synchronous level in Kalmyk with special attention to innovations that occur in colloquial speech.

First, as noted above (in section 2.1), in Kalmyk there is no a particle *ül* but preverbal particle *esə* occurs in subordinate clauses which are more conservative than the main sentence from typological point of view. As Givón (1979: 259—61) argued, the innovation of word order emerges in main clause, and Bybee showed that it is also true for grammaticalization process (Bybee 2001). This paper deals with the main clause primarily and not with embedded units. Nevertheless, it is also important to note that preverbal particle *esə* is very seldom used in colloquial speech, but rather in written texts. Remarkably enough, there are only 4 examples (i.e. frequency in oral corpus with 10000 is 0,04%) and plenty examples in written texts in Kalmyk National Corpus (1,254, i.e. 0,15 percent in 800,000 words), and this difference is significant ($\chi^2 = 8.66$, p-value of 0.05). It may be explained as a result of (comparative) rarity of nominalization, relative and conditional clauses with negations in colloquial Kalmyk in contrast to the literary language. On the other hand, it connects with further development of Jespersen's Cycle and the whole disappearance of preverbal particle (and in colloquial speech this process goes faster). It is impossible to answer these questions on the basis of frequency data alone. Therefore, I compared the functions of negative particle *esə* in colloquial Kalmyk (based on the questionnaires) and the written texts (in Kalmyk National Corpus and in 'New Testament' in modern translation). In elicitation materials negative particle *esə* covers the field of conditional clause, relative and nominalization but often speakers choose other syntactic structures with postpositive negative marker. Negative particle *esə* is not a first variant of translation (except for negating conditional clauses). In KNC there are a lot of examples of negative particle *esə* in the relative and conditional clause and with nominalization. And in the New Testament (with orientation to archaic style) negative particle *esə* occurs not only in conditional and relative subordinate clauses but in various types of subordinate clauses and optionally in the main clause. Thus, there is a process of restriction and reduction of negative particle *esə* in modern Kalmyk, especially in colloquial speech.

Second, in Kalmyk, in Khalkha and in some other modern languages derived from the Old Mongolian there is a grammaticalization of word *bišə* 'other' in negative marker. Janhunen describes (about Modern Mongolian) "a marker *bish* 'not the one', which is directly derived from the selective pronoun *bish* 'other > 'other than'; it is a "marker of equative negation" in nominal

clauses and sometimes it may be negative copula with participle in declarative sentence (Janhunen 2012: 250-251). Detailed description this negative marker in Kalmyk will be in the next section.

Third, there are contracted forms of n-words *uga* and *bišə* (suffixes *-go* and *-š* respectively), which are not free variations of full negative markers. The negative affix *-š* is used in Kalmyk, but not exist in Khalkha-Mongolian or Buryat, whereas contracted form from n-word *uga* is used in different Mongolic languages, but affix *-gwai* in Khalkha is more frequent than the affix *-go* in Kalmyk. There is a tendency to distribute the full negative auxiliary and affixes in different morphological contexts. On the basis of limited data provided by the Kalmyk oral corpus, the following observations can be made: the frequency of affix *-go* is higher in Oral Corpus (i.e. in colloquial Kalmyk) than in written texts (see Table 1), and contracted version *-šə* prevails over full negative markers *bišə* (but this distribution is not significant on the basis of small corpus).

Tab. 1. The negative markers in different sources

	<i>uga</i>	<i>-go</i>	<i>bišə</i>	<i>-šə</i>
OC	81 (freq. 0.81%)	35 (freq. 0.35%)	6(freq. 0.06%)	16 (freq. 0.16%)
KNC	6390(freq. 0.79%)	537(freq. 0.067%)	1771 (0.22%)	(approx.) 0.027%

Notes: OC = oral corpus (10000 words;
KN = Kalmyk national Corpus (800 000).

Also there is a tendency of distribution of negative auxiliaries and contracted markers: affix *-go* occurs with habitual, perfect and future participles and with some verbal nouns and affix *-šə*, used with habitual participle only. Thus, there also exists a tendency to use suffixes with forms of habitual presence and future, although both variants (with affix or with full form) are acceptable by speakers with the comments like “*it’s the same*” or (about full forms) “*it’s more emphatic, stress on the negation*”. Now there is a period of variation and idiomatic pragmatic explanation of natives. On the basis of these data, it might be concluded that negation system derived from the Old and Middle Mongolic negation has a new round of transformation of polarity system included the distribution of affixes and full forms.

4. Functions and Context of Using Negative Markers *Uga* and *Bišə*

The use of different negative markers in Kalmyk is conditioned by the tense and the mood of the predicate in declarative clause, by the clause type and pragmatics. As it was mentioned above, the use of negative particle *esə* is restricted to subordinated clauses, and the prohibitive *bičä* has only one function. Here I describe the behavior of negative markers *uga* and *bišə* and define their functions distinguishing two negative markers. I argue that these two forms are pragmatically differentiated during the period of variations and competition between them.

4.1. Functions of negative marker *uga*

Most frequent in Kalmyk negation marker *uga* tend to take in its scope the whole clause but in a contact postposition can take different parts of the sentence in its scope (a constituent or a word). *Uga* is used in a rich variety of patterns to express negation and different functions. It is used:

- 1) as a negative auxiliary in nominal sentence;
- 2) as a standard negation for declarative verbal main clauses;
- 3) as a negator with indefinite pronouns;
- 4) as a noun negative marker;
- 5) to express a negative answer to a *yes/no* question;
- 6) as a part of an *al' uga* 'or not' construction, as a tag question;
- 7) as a word meaning 'absence'.

First I will briefly describe the specific uses of *uga* and then move on to its competitions with marker *bišə*.

In the last function (7) *uga* (but not *bišə*) has a nominal declination with a deficient paradigm of instrumental, ablative and unmarked accusative cases and possessive markers, though lacking other forms:

(10) *xar sana uga-qar*

black thought NEG.COP-INS
'without the least hidden motive';

(11) ^{OK}*uga-qasə ää-žä-nä-v*

NEG.COP-ABL fear-PROG-PRS-1SG
'I'm afraid that it's not the case'.

Uga as a nominal negation is placed after the negated word:

(12) *tegäd xovdəg emgə-n*

then greed old.women-EXT

törüc öndəg uga üld-nä

totally egg NEG.COP remain-PRS

‘So the greed old women is left without eggs’.

As a negative word expressing ‘no’ in answers to *yes/no* questions, *uga* can be followed by either a positive or a negative answer. In alternative questions, it is used with conjunction *alʹ* borrowed from Russian *аль < али, или*.

As I pointed out above, originally n-word *uga* was used with nouns. In Kalmyk negative marker *uga* displays functions of negation of both nouns and verbs equally (2,892 with nouns, 2,906 with verbs, and 592 are examples of single use and other specific use (N=6390 from Kalmyk National Corpus). As an auxiliary, *uga* takes the whole proposition in its scope, whereas following noun it creates an adjective with privative meaning. As a negation of nouns, marker *uga* may be combined with different lexemes with meaning ‘without smth., in absence of smth.’ However, idiomatic constructions like *gem uga* ‘without problem, OK’ are most frequent in Kalmyk.

- (13) *ger-t-än tus uga jovačə*
home-DAT-P.REFL benefit NEG.COP traveler
‘useless man for home’.

It is interesting to compare Kalmyk marker *uga* with affix *-güj* in Buryat, which has a meaning of abessive (or caritive) case with nouns. In Kalmyk affix *-go* could not occurs with nouns.

There are some roots in Kalmyk that in combination with negative marker *bišə* express an attribute like *sän* ‘good’ vs *sän bišə* ‘bad’. It should be noted that, in Kalmyk, adjectives are morphologically similar to nouns.

- (14) *med-xə küündə oda xol bišə bää-nä.*
know-PC.FUT talk now far/distance NEG be-PRS
‘(...) there is a competent man not far from here’.

4.2. Negative markers *uga* or *bišə* and in declarative clause

As noted above, there is an asymmetry of affirmative and negative expression in Kalmyk. Negative markers *uga* or *bišə* as markers of standard negation (in declarative sentences) occur with non-finite forms (participles and converbs). The negative marker (*uga* or *bišə*) functions as copula. The use of negative markers *uga* or *bišə* is conditioned by the tense and the mood of the verb (see section 2).

Janhunen noted that marker *bišə* is relatively seldom used as a verbal negation in Mongolian (Janhunen 2012). In Kalmyk, this marker is less frequent than negative copula *uga* (see Table 1 above). Nevertheless, there are numerous examples in the corpus of combination of future particle –x with clitic *–mn* (derived from affirmative/emphatic copula *mon*) and negative marker *bišə*. (In colloquial speech an affix *–š* more often occur due to the fact that clitic/copula *–mn* is almost disappeared and there is a possibility to new cliticization).

4.3. Negation in nominal sentence and competition of two forms

In nominal sentences only full forms *uga* or *bišə* are used, depending on the semantic and pragmatic contexts. Negative marker *uga* means existential negation (examples 15 and 16).

- (15) *äm-d-än mini ekə oda uga*
 life-DAT-P.REFL 1SG.GEN mother now NEG.COP
 ‘My mother is not alive now’.

- (16) *ter övgə-n-də jumə-n uga ʋancəxən neg xö-n*
 that old.man-EXT-DAT thing-EXT NEG.COP single one sheep-EXT
 ‘This old man has nothing, there is only one sheep’.

The negative marker *bišə* occurs in the sentences of identification (17):

- (17) *Эй, шук! Бичə зул. Би чон бишүв. Би хөн бəнəлм*
 Hey, kid! Don’t run away! I’m not a wolf. I’m sheep (Хальмг унн, 2006-05-04, KNC)

The negative marker *bišə* has a function of a metalinguistic negation. According to (Horn 2001), it can be used to object to a previous utterance on any grounds whatever. In example (18) speaker A asks about number of cards, but speaker B negates the categorization of this object as a mobile phone (by that rejecting the previous utterance):

- (18) A: *enčən xojr siimk-tä-j, da?*
 this two simcard-ASSOC-Q yes (Russian particle)
 ‘Are there two SIM cards, yes?’

- B: *telefo-n bišə enčən diktofo-n že*
 telephone-EXT NEG this dictaphone-EXT EPTH.PARTICLE (Russian particle)
 ‘This is not a telephone, this is a recorder’.

However, some types of nominal sentences (possessive, locative and negation of age and number) have variant negation. There are two negative representations for locative sentence (19a) in

Kalmyk: the first express that kind of object cannot be found in that location (and might or might not exist, overall) (19b), whereas the second (19c) denies that location for an object that must still be located elsewhere.

(19a) *širä doorə mečik bää-nä*
 table under ball be-PRS
 ‘There is a/the ball under the table’

(19b) *Mečik širä doorə uga*
 table under ball NEG.COP
 ‘There is no ball under the table’

(19c) *Mečik širä doorə bišə*
 table under ball
 ‘The ball is not under the table’

Possessive sentence usually employs the same negation element as existential utterances (*uga*). However, marker *bišə* also may negate the possessive sentence taking an accent to possessor.

Finally, let us consider some examples that illustrate variation of negative markers in sentence concerning age. The first construction with negative marker *bišə* and associative case (like 21a) interprets age as a person’s attribute:

(20a) *Ajsa arvə-n nas-ta bišə*
 Ajsa(name) ten-EXT age-ASSOC NEG
 ‘Ajsa is not 10 yet’

(20b) *Ajsa-də arv-ən nas-ən uga*
 Ajsa-DAT ten-EXT age-EXT NEG.COP
 ‘Ajsa is not 10 years’ (There exists no 10 years).

4.4. Grammaticalization and pragmatic explanation for marker *bišə*

Functions of negative marker *bišə* are already partly clear from the above description. As it was noted, in Mongolian marker *bišə* performs the function of equative negation (Janhunen 2012). Similarly, in Kalmyk marker *bišə* negates a nominal sentence of identification. An extended use of marker *bišə* in possessive or locative sentence express the meaning of non-equivalent attribute; it has a focus on the possessor or locus. It also functions as a metalinguistic (external) negation, which

deals with the manner of speaking or other formal property of previous utterances but not operates over a proposition (as truth-functional negation).

I considered 100 examples of usage negative marker *bišə* in New Testament from the point of view informational structure of the sentence and combination with interrogative and exclamatory sentences (in comparison with 100 examples with other negative markers in Kalmyk from the same source). This paper mainly employs Lambrecht's approach (1994) to the informational structure. There are no significant differences between negative markers in Kalmyk in the interrogative and exclamatory sentences, but, upon closer inspection, a lot of examples show that negative marker *bišə* occurs in pragmatically conditioned readings. Negative copula *bišə* occurs in a correction or in a parallel structure (like ellipsis), where it is directly juxtaposed with another contrastive focus.

Also there are a few examples with double negative markers included marker *bišə*. Kalmyk is a language that not employs Negative Concord as a standard structure, i.e. there is normally only one n-word in one sentence, but there are very rare double negatives. An explanation of it may be lexical meaning of grammaticalized marker *bišə*. As it was already noted, negative marker *bišə* is the result of grammaticalization of the selective pronoun *bish* 'other' > 'other then'. Traces of the development of negative markers *bišə* from the word 'other' are in constructions 'not only ... but also' express *bišə* / -šə (22)

(22)	<i>ter</i>	<i>övg-n-ä</i>	<i>id-sən</i>	<i>xotə-n^j</i>	<i>üz-xə-šə</i>
	that	old.man-EXT-GEN	eat-PC.PST	food-P.3	see-PC.FUT-NEG.PRS
	<i>bi</i>	<i>küükə-n^j</i>	<i>bula-ž</i>	<i>av-x-u</i>	<i>gi-žä-nä</i>
	1SG.NOM	girl-P.3	wrest-CV.IPFV	take-PC.FUT-1SG	say-PROG-PRS

‘«I will not only see how this old man eats, but also take (to wife) his daughter», — (he) says’.

The word *bišə* grammaticalized to negative polarity item and now does not display the meaning of selective pronouns which represents a single element of a set. Nevertheless, there is an non-compositional semantic of combination *bišə* and interrogative affix *-ij*: a particle *biš-ij* < *bišə* with interrogative affix *-ij*) has a meaning the emphatic particle and functions as a focal element or scalar particle.

The marker *bišə* displays semantic ambiguity. In some utterances in which markers *bišə* may be interpreted as expressing denial (on the propositional level) or only as a focal marker. However, a research limitation of this paper is a data of modern Kalmyk without an evidence of behavior markers *bišə* in previous periods.

5. Conclusion

Compared to other Mongolic languages, Kalmyk, especially its colloquial variant, is the advanced case of disappearance preverbal negative particle in indicative.

Kalmyk data, at first glance, seem to contradict to Jespersen's cycle model which consist the well known stage of doubling of the two negative markers. Nevertheless, the resent studies show that this model should be revised with special focus on evidence from non-Indo-European languages.

Historical development of negation system derived from the Old and Middle Mongolic leads to the distribution of negative variants. Simultaneously, the system of negation in Kalmyk includes two postpositive markers and creates a new contracted form (affix *-š* which doesn't exist in other Mongolian). There is a new round of transformation of polarity system included the distribution of affixes and full forms.

What is also important is to note that negation in Kalmyk includes the variation between two postverbal negative markers of negation, one of them occurs in different pragmatically conditioned context. The marker *bišə* expresses the negative identification and metalinguistic negation, however, in some contexts it displays semantic ambiguity. And furthermore, it may be interpreted in some context as syntactical instrument of parallelism or taking in contrastive focus.

Abbreviations

ASSOC associative and comitative; AUX *auxiliary*; CVB.ANT – anterior converb; CVB.MOD – modal converb or converb of manner; EXT extension (unstable consonant *-n* in nominative of some nouns which disappears in oblique cases); EVD evidential; NEG.COP negative copula; PCL.EMPH emphatic particle; PROG – progressive aspect; PRS present; P – possessive; PST past; REM remote past («past temporal frame»); SUCC and SUCC2 successive converb (in two different forms); TERM – terminative converb

References

Brosig, B 2011, „Negative markers in Mongolic“, Workshop on negation in Uralic languages. Stockholm, 24–25 November, 2011, p. 2-3, viewed 25 May 2015, < <http://uralicnegation.pbworks.com> >.

Bybee, J 2001, „Main clauses are innovative, subordinate clauses are conservative: Consequences for the nature of constructions. In: Complex Sentences in Grammar and Discourse: Essays in Honor of Sandra A. Thompson , J Bybee, J. and M Noonan (eds), John Benjamins, pp.1-17

Croft, W 1991, „The evolution of negation“, Journal of Linguistics, vol. 27, pp. 1-27

- Fried, RW 2010, A Grammar of Bao'an, a Mongolic language of northwest China. PHD thesis.
- Givón, T 1979, On understanding grammar, New York, Academic Press.
- Janhunen, JA. 2012, Mongolian, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Hansen, M-BM. & Visconti, J 2014, „The Diachrony of Negation: Introduction“, in The Diachrony of Negation. M-BM Hansen & J Visconti (eds), Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp.1-12
- Hsiao, S-Y 2012, „The Nominative/Genitive Alternation in Modern Inner Mongolian Relative Clauses: A Statistical Perspective“, Linguistic Research, vol. 29, no 2, pp. 351-380
- Hsiao, S-Y, 2013, „The Grammatical Temporal System from Middle Mongolian to Modern Mongolian“, Language and Linguistic, vol. 14, no 6, pp. 1075-1103.
- Horn, LR. 2001, A natural history of negation, (2nd ed.), Stanford CA, CSLI Publications.
- Lambrecht, K 1994, Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representation of discourse referents, Cambridge, CUP.
- Larrivée, P. „, Is there a Jespersen cycle? “, in: The Evolution of Negation. Beyond the Jespersen Cycle, in P Larrivée, R Ingham (eds.), De Greuter Mouton, pp. 1-22.
- Miestamo M. 2005 Standard Negation: The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sanzheev G. 1962, „K voprosu ob otricanii v mongolskikh jazykakh“ (Toward the problem of negation in Mongolic languages), Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, t. 15, fasc. 1/3, pp. 273-282
- van der Auwera, J 2009, „The Jespersen cycles“, in Cyclical change. Elly van Gelderen (ed.). Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 35-71.

Example of contact details and disclaimer:

Vlada V. Baranova
National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg, Russia).
St. Petersburg School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Department of Sociology, Associate
Professor; Laboratory of Sociology in Education and Science, Senior Research Fellow
E-mail: vbaranova@hse.ru, Tel. +7 (812) 560-05-90

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

© Baranova, 2015