

# Syntax and semantics of verbal negative markers in Buryat

## Petr Rossyaykin (petrrossyaykin@gmail.com) Lomonosov Moscow State University



## Buryat (Barguzin dialect)

- Altaic > Mongolic > Buryat > Barguzin
- SOV, strictly head-final, agglutinative, NOM-ACC-DAT case marking Data collected in Baraghan ulus (village), Kurumkan district, the Republic of Buryatia

## **Negation - overview**

Marker	Function
-gui	Standard negation (11), caritive case (7, 10)
bu=	Negation of non-indicative verb forms (1)
=b9/9	Constituent negation (13b, 14)
=ugi:	Negative answer, existential negation (5, 6)

## Non-indicative negation (bu=)

The only prepositive particle in Buryat, bu=1 is used for negation of imperative (prohibitive) and other non-indicative verb forms:

b. *b<del>u</del>=unta-Ø* unta- ${\mathscr O}$ (1) a. NEG=sleep-IMP sleep-IMP 'Sleep' 'Don't sleep'

It can be located on the left periphery of VP, being separated from the negated verb by lexical verb – object resultative participle in (3) – or adjuncts (4). Sometimes linear position in front of direct object or even subject is allowed but such sentences are not perfectly grammatical.

(2) zagahan ſar-a:-tai **bʉ=**bai-g fry-PST-COM **NEG=**be-JUSS fish **bʉ=**∫ar-a:-tai bai-g (3) zagahan **NEG**=fry-PST-COM be-JUSS fish 'Let the fish to be not fried'

**bʉ=**hong<sup>j</sup>ino-toi ∫ar-a:-tai (4) <sup>?</sup>zagahan bai-g **NEG**=onion-COM fry-PST-COM fish be-JUSS

'Let the fish to be not fried with onion'

## Existential negation (=ugi:)

Negative predicate =ugi: is used for existential, locative and possessive negation:

- s9s9g b<sup>j</sup>i:/bai-na flower EX / be-PRS 1. 'There is red flower'
  - s9s9g=<del>u</del>gi: flower=NEG.EX 1. 'There is no red flower'
  - 2. 'Red flower exists'

girl's')

In case of possessive and locative negation, dative adjunct is added denoting possessor or location:

(6) basagan-da ula:n s9s9g-<del>u</del>:d=<del>u</del>gi: girl-DAT red flower-PL=NEG.EX 'A/the girl has no red flowers' (Lit.: 'There are no red flowers at a/the

Caritive case marker -gui (diachroncally related to -ugi:) can be used instead. Possessor is in nominative. Syntactically this construction is nominal predication with either overt or zero copula:

basagan(?-da) (bai-na) ula:n səsəg-<del>u</del>:d-g<del>u</del>i girl(-DAT) red flower-PL-NEG (be-PRS) 'A/the girl has no red flowers' (Lit.: 'A/the girl is red-flowerless')

		NEG.EX	NEG.POSS, NEG.LOC		
	negated	possessor/location	negated	possessor/location	
=ugi:	NOM	0	NOM	DAT	
-g <del>u</del> i			CAR (-NEG)	NOM	

#### Nominal negation (=b9/9 and -gHi)

Constituent negation particle  $=b_9/9$  is used in proper inclusion (8) and attribution (9) sentences with nouns (8) and non-derived adjectives (9)

(8) a. *si doktor-os* b. *si doktor=b9s9(-s)* 2SG doctor-2SG 2SG doctor=NOT(-2SG) 'You are not a doctor' 'You are a doctor' t<del>u</del>rg១n=b១ʃ១ baabgai baabgai t<del>u</del>rg9n fast fast=NOT bear bear 'A/the bear is fast' 'A/the bear is not fast'

Caritive case is used with derived adjectives:

(10) a. ſ<del>u</del>l9n amta-tai ∫<del>u</del>l∍n amta-g<del>u</del>i soup taste-COM soup taste-NEG 'Soup is tasty' 'Soup is not tasty'

## Verbal negation (- $g\mu i$ and =b9/9)

Suffix -gui is used as a standard negator (11). Paradigmatic asymmetry of negation (A/Cat/TAM according to Miestamo (2005)) is attested: -gui is incompatible with several participles and all (except for one) converbs

Standard negation grammatical	Standard negation ungrammatical
future tense, habitual participles, simultaneity converb	object and subject resultatives, perfect, continuative, possibility participles, other converbs

Examples for finitely used future tense (11) and perfect (12) participles:

	•		•	•	. ,	•
(11)	a.	aba	j9r9-x9	b.	aba	j9r9-x9-g <del>u</del> i
		father	arrive-FUT		father	arrive-FUT-NEG
	'The father will arrive'				'The father will not arrive'	
(12)	a.	aldar	jərə-hən	b.	*aldar	jərə-hən-g <del>u</del> i
		Aldar	arrive-PFCT		Aldar	arrive-PFCT
		'Aldar has arrived'			'Aldar has not arrived'	
Past :	tense v	with <i>-a<del>u</del>i</i> or a	constituent negato	r = h9	e can be used	d instead (12b):

Past tense with -gain or constituent negator = b9/9 can be used instead (12b):

(13) a. aldar jər-ə:-g<del>u</del>i aldar jərə-hən=bəʃə Aldar arrive-PST-NEG Aldar arrive-PFCT=NOT 'Aldar has not arrived' 'Aldar has not arrived'

If the usage of -gui is grammatical =b99 cannot be used to negate verbs/clauses without an overt or implicit paired contrasting 'correction':

ab-a:=b9[9 (14) sonom bələg \*(gar-a:r-a: take-PST=NOT (hand-INSTR-REFL make-PST) Sonom present

'Sonom hasn't bought the present, but made it with his own hands' Given this and the more grammaticalized status of -gHi (its sensitivity to verb / form) we consider -gui to be the standard negator.

## Standard and sentential negation interaction

Both -gui and =b99 can be used to turn a proposition p into proposition p with opposite truth conditions (11, 13b). Differences appear when there are other scope-taking operators in the sentence:

(15) a. sajana səlməg-i:-jə gansa xar-a: Selmeg-GA-ACC see-PST Sayana 'Sayana saw only Selmeg'

xar-a:]-g<del>u</del>i [səlməg-i:-jə sajana Selmeg-GA-ACC see-PST-NEG Sayana

1. 'Sayana didn't saw only Selmeg' {only > NEG}

2. \*'Sayana saw not only Selmeg' {NEG > only} xar-a:]=b9∫9 səlməg-i:-jə Selmeg-GA-ACC see-PST=NOT

1. \*'Sayana didn't saw only Selmeg' {only > NEG}

2. 'Sayana saw not only Selmeg' {NEG > only}

=b9f9 takes scope over gansa 'only' (and presumably over the whole clause) thus resulting in true propositional negation (sentential negation in terms of Jackendoff (1969)). -gui corresponds to syntactic sentential negation (Klima 1964) which does not necessarily yield contradictory semantics. It occupies fixed position in syntactic structure – following (Zeijlstra 2004) we can suppose that it immediately dominates vP (i.e. the smallest domain containing all propositional arguments) which can be seen from the sentences with NPI-subjects (16) and objects (17).

x9n-∫j9 jaba-xa (16) a. <del>u</del>han d9:g<del>u</del>:r go-FUT who-NPI water 'Everybody can walk on the water'

14) with the scope over the whole clause (13b, 15c).

jaba-xa-g<del>u</del>i <del>u</del>han d9:g<del>u</del>:r go-FUT-NEG who-NPI water 'Nobody can walk on the water'

(17)  $b^{j}i$ x9n-i:-j9-∫ xar-a:-g<del>u</del>i-b who-GA-ACC-NPI see-PST-NEG-1 'I have seen nobody'

> I conclude that (at least in Buryat) standard negation is an internal (narrow-scope) operation that should be captured in terms of syntax. True (contradictory) propositional negation is in fact constituent negation (13b,

## List of glosses

1 – first person agreement, 1SG – first person singular, 2SG – second person singular, ACC – accusative, CAR – caritive, COM – comitative, DAT – dative, EX – existential predicate, FUT – future tense, GA – genitive/accusative, IMP – imperative, INSTR – instrumental, JUSS – jussive, NEG – negation, NEG.EX – existential negation, NOT – constituent negation, NPI – negative polarity item, PFCT – perfect, PL – plural, PRS – present tense, PST – past tense, REFL - reflexive

#### Literature

Jackendoff (1969) — Jackendoff, R.S. 'An Interpretive Theory of Negation.' In: Foundations of Language 5: 218-241.

Klima (1964) — Negation in English. In The structure of language; readings in the philosophy of language, Jerry A. Fodor and Jerrold J. Katz (eds.) 246–323. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Miestamo (2005) — Miestamo, Matti. Standard Negation: The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Zeijlstra (2004) — H. Zeijlstra. Sentential Negation and Negative Concord. PhD Dissertation University of Amsterdam. Utrecht: LOT Publications.