Verbal negation in Ulch:
The limits of instability

Natalia Stoynova
stoynova@yandex.ru
RAS, Moscow

03-05.2018, SWL, Paris
0. Introduction: the Ulch language

- Ulch ~ Ulchi ~ Ulcha (ulc)
- Southern Tungusic (Nanaic languages)
- Russia:
  - Khabarovsk Krai, Ulchsky district.
- Endangered:
  - 154 speakers (Census 2010 – overestimated);
  - not younger than 55-60 years old;
  - all bilingual with Russian;
  - very restricted use, cf. Gerasimova (2002); Kazama (2010); Sumbatova, Gusev (2016).
0. Introduction: the Ulch language

- Under-described:
  - brief grammatical sketches in Petrova (1936); Sunik (1985); Kazama (2010).

- An ongoing documentation project (with focus on language shift):
0. Introduction: Negation in Tungusic languages

- Cf. a crosslinguistically oriented overview in Hölzl (2015).

- **Northern type:**
  - Uralic-type negative auxiliary verb constructions \textsc{NEG.AUX + CONNEG} (=the dedicated nonfinite form)
  
  Cf. Miestamo et al. (2015) on Uralic systems.

- **Southern type:**
  - frozen items (particles and affixes) which go back to the same negative verb.

- **The Ulch system:**
  - somewhere in between…
0. Introduction: Negation in Tungusic languages

• NORTHERN: Evenki, (Nedjalkov 1997: 96)
  – *ə-pst + conneg

  (1) Beyetken e-che-n girki-l-nun-mi suru-mu-re
      boy neg.aux-pst-3sg friend-pl-com-refl go.away-vol-conneg
      ‘The boy did not want to go with his friends’

• SOUTHERN: Nanai, (our field data)
  – əčiə (pst.neg) < *ə-pst

  (2) Bajan mapa xaj-wa=da əčiə wā-ra
      rich oldman what-acc=emph neg.pst kill-conneg
      ‘The rich oldman kill no animals (lit. nothing)’.
0. Introduction: Negation in Tungusic languages

• Southern Tungusic (including Ulch):
  – quite rich negation systems;
  – very heterogeneous systems (negators with different degree of grammaticalization in different parts of paradigm);
  – very unstable systems;
  – a great variation across languages / dialects.
0. Introduction: Data. Questions

• **The data of Ulch:**
  – texts of different time periods: early XX-early XXI:
    • Petrova 1936 (10 short texts, 1930s);
    • Sunik 1985 (19 texts, 2753 cl., 1960s);
    • Sem’s collection (1 h., 1970s);
    • Kalinina et al.’s collection (16 h., 2005-2009);
    • Oskolskaya & Stoynova’s collection (6,5 h., 2017-2018).

• **In focus: instability in negation system**
  – resulting from non-uniform restructuring of the former system with the negative auxiliary verb;
  – recent innovations resulting from language shift.
0. Introduction: Structure of presentation

An overview of the Ulch negation system (Section 1);
Comparative data on other Southern Tungusic varieties (Section 2);
Grammaticalization paths (Section 3);
Recent contact-induced innovations (Section 4).
1. Negation in Ulch

• Asymmetric (Miestamo 2005):
  – no one-to-one correspondence between (some) negative vs. affirmative forms:
    \[jaja-xa-ni \sim jaja-m \ kəwə-ni\] ‘sang ~ didn’t sing’
    sing-pst-3sg \sim\ sing-cvb.sim \ NE-3sg

  – no one-to-one correspondence between negative vs. affirmative paradigms:
    3 or more past tense negative forms \sim\ one affirmative form (NB not vice versa)
1. Negation in Ulch

• Two sources of grammaticalization:
  – the negative auxiliary verb *ə-;  
  – the negative existential kəweə (‘there is no’).

• In focus: verbal negation
  – included: standard negation; imperatives (prohibitives); some non-finite forms;
  – not included: negation in non-verbal predications (existential, possessive).
# 1. Negation in Ulch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>FORM(S)</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>AFFIRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>cvb.sim kəwə-(pers), ønda conneg dop-st, øčəl conneg-(pers) and oths</td>
<td>wəm kəwəni, ønda wəndə taxəni, øčəl wəndəni 'did not say'</td>
<td>synthetic pst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>V-conneg-prs.neg-pers</td>
<td>wəndəsini ‘does not say’</td>
<td>synthetic prs1, prs2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>=prs, ønda conneg do-fut1, øəs conneg</td>
<td>ønda wəndə tila=ma ‘he will not say’, øəs wəndə ‘you will not say’</td>
<td>synthetic fut1, fut2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>øʑi conneg-(pl)</td>
<td>øʑi wəndə</td>
<td>synthetic imp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>ønda conneg do-sbjv</td>
<td>ønda wəndə tamə ‘would not say’</td>
<td>synthetic cond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Ulch vs. other Southern Tungusic varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prohibitive conneg əǯi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synthetic prs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cvb.sim kəwə</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pst/prs kəwə</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əčəl-forms ‘not yet’</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Default</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əŋdə-forms</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No (similar constructions with əm)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduplication-construction</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Ulch vs. other Southern Tungusic varieties

• No clear correlation with areal and genetic factors:
  – Kur-Urm: a very similar system (why?);
  – Uilta (the closest sister of Ulch): the most dissimilar one.
3. Grammaticalization paths

• Markers that go back to *ə- (NEG.AUX):
  – an overview (3.1);
  – not-yet constructions with əčə (3.2);
  – future negative construction with əŋəs (3.3).

• Markers that go back to kəwə (negative existential) (3.3):
  – cvb.sim kəwə;
  – prs / pst kəwə.
### 3.1. Markers that go back to NEG.AUX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARKER</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>&lt;*ə- (NEG.AUX)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-conneg-(*ə)-prs.neg</td>
<td>ṃəndəsini ‘does not say’</td>
<td>AFFIX</td>
<td>&lt;*ə-PRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əč(i)ə~əčəl</td>
<td>əčəl ṃəndəni ‘did not say’</td>
<td>PTCL</td>
<td>&lt;*ə-PST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əţi(i)</td>
<td>əţi ṃəndə ‘don’t say’</td>
<td>PTCL</td>
<td>&lt;*ə-IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>əŋda</td>
<td>əŋda ṃəndə taxani ‘did not say’</td>
<td>PTCL</td>
<td>???&gt;&lt;*ə-CVB.NSIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣeŋsa</td>
<td>Ṣeŋsa ṃəndə ‘(you) will say’</td>
<td>PTCL/AUX</td>
<td>&lt;*ə-FUT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. Grammaticalization: əčəl

- Two not-yet constructions:
  1) CONNEG-construction əčəl conneg-(pers)
     əčəl taun-da-ni ‘has not read yet’
     not.yet read-conneg-3sg
  2) PRS-construction əčəl prs
     əčəl taun-di-ni ‘has not read yet’
     not.yet read-prs-3sg

(1) Gə, ți andaxa-sal əčəl pərg-ə-t biskə
    well that guest-pl neg try-conneg-3pl probably
    ‘Well, these guests have not tried yet’. (txt, Sunik 1985)

(2) ți ɲənə-mdi, χagdų-m=ban əčəl ıs-ı-n
    so go-cvb.dur.sg house-3sg=to not.yet reach-prs-3sg
    ‘So they are going and going and they haven’t reached home yet’.
    (txt, Sunik 1985)
3.2. Grammaticalization: əčəl

• **CONNNEG-construction:**
  – is mentioned in Petrova (1936); Sunik (1985) (as a past tense negator);
  – is attested in other Southern Tungusic (a default past tense negator in Naikhin Nanai and in Uilta);
  – < past tense AUX.NEG-construction.

• **PRS-construction:**
  – is not mentioned in existing descriptions;
  – is however used in texts, including those of Sunik (1985);
  – CONNEG-construction 22 uses vs. PRS-construction 5 uses;
  – < ???; no direct pathway from AUX.NEG-construction.
3.2. Grammaticalization: CONNEG-construction

- A probable path:
  **AUX.NEG-PST + CONNEG >**
  
  > frozen item ‘not yet’ + CONNEG

- Proposed for other Nanaic varieties (Avrorin 1961; Petrova 1967).

- Problems:
  - l-ending, optional personal markers on CONNEG-forms.
    
    əčəl bu-də-i ‘I have not died yet’
    
    <*ə-čə-l bu-de-i
    
    aux.neg-pst-3pl die-conneg-1sg

- To skip details:
  - evidently not a recent process.
3.2. Grammaticalization: PRS-construction

- It cannot be traced directly to the same AUX.NEG-construction:
  - CONNEG, not PRS is expected.
- A probable path:
  - 1 step: ə-PST + CONNEG > əčəl + CONNEG
  - 2 step: (əčəl > not-yet frozen item); a symmetric not-yet construction emerges:
    \[
    \text{prs} \sim əčəl \text{ prs}
    \]
- But what is the reason to develop one more not-yet construction?
3.2. Grammaticalization: PRS-construction

• One more clarification: why two constructions?
  – 3 of 5 examples are in dependent clauses
  \[
  \text{xəsə-i əčəli tuk-i-du-ni} \quad \text{‘until my words fall out’}
  \]
  word-1sg not.yet fall-prs-dat-3sg (txt, Sunik 1985)

• Hypothesis:
  – PRS-construction in non-finite dependent clauses > in finite main clauses.

• The reason:
  – a lacune in paradigm: how to express ‘until V’?
  – CONNEG-form is not available for case-marking (=cannot be used in dependent clauses);
  – PRS-form is available; a good candidate.
3.3. Grammaticalization: əŋəs

- A future negative construction with əŋəs:
  - a recent trace of the former auxiliary verb construction (untypical of Southern Tungusic l-s).
- It is not mentioned in Petrova (1936) and Sunik (1985), but it is attested in their texts:
  halda əŋəsi puco-ro ‘you’ll never jump!’
  never neg.fut jump-conneg (txt, Petrova 1936)
- əŋəs(i) = ə-fut-2sg (a clear future form in modern Ulch)
- However on this stage it cannot be considered as a full verb form:
  - only 2sg, no other person-number forms attested.
3.4. Grammaticalization: kəwə

- A dedicated negative existential kəwə ‘there is no’
  ručka=da kəwə, karandaš=da kəwə
  pen=emph ne, pencil=emph ne
  ‘there is no pen, there is no pencil’ (txt)

- Cf. Croft (1991); Veselinova (2013; 2014; 2016) … on NE>SN.
2.4. Grammaticalization: \( kəwə \)

- Two types of such constructions in Ulch:
  - **Type 1**: CVB.SIM \( kəwə \)-PERS (ASYM)
    
    \( jaja-m \ kəwə-ni \) ‘didn’t sing’
    sing-cvb.sim NE-3sg
  - **Type 2**: PRS / PST \( kəwə \) (SYM)
    
    \( jaja-xa-ni \ kəwə \) ‘didn’t sing’
    sing-pst-3sg NE
    \( jaj-i-ni \ kəwə \) ‘doesn’t sing’
    sing-prs-3sg NE
2.4. Grammaticalization: \textit{kəwə}

- **Type 1**: CVB.SIM \textit{kəwə}-PERS
  - a default past negator;
  - is mentioned in Petrova 1936; Sunik 1985;
  - \textit{kəwə} is marked by person-number affixes (and by special markers in dependent clauses).

- **Type 2**: PRS / PST \textit{kəwə}
  - is not mentioned in previous descriptions, however attested in texts;
  - semantics: emphatic (≈‘after all’);
  - seems to be quite recent;
  - \textit{kəwə} acts as a frozen item with no inflection morphology.

- Possible grammaticalization paths: for further discussion.
2.4. Grammaticalization: *kəweə*

- **PRS *kəweə***:
  
  `nat mimbe tunč-i-n=də kəweə`
  
  3pl 1sg.acc touch-prs-3sg=emph ne
  
  ‘{There are lot’s of animals here. I’m not afraid of them}, they will not touch me!’ (txt)

- **PST *kəweə***:
  
  `uj=də pansa-xa-n=də kəweə nambat`
  
  who=emph ask-pst-3sg ne 3pl.acc
  
  ‘Nobody asked them!’ (txt)’
4. Recent contact-influenced innovations

• Expected tendencies:
  – more similarity to Russian
    • a symmetric system
    • the same negative proclitic *ne* all over the paradigm
      
      \[\text{pišet} \sim \text{ne pišet} \text{ ‘writes ~ does not write’}\]
      
      \[\text{write.prs} \sim \text{neg write.prs}\]
  – more transparency;
  – more regularity;
  – less redundancy;
  – less number of grammatical oppositions.

Cf. e.g. Sasse 2001 on language shift.
4. Recent contact-influenced innovations

• Some innovations attested in modern data:
  – seem to be the result of language shift.

• Russian-type prohibitives (4.1)
• Loss of əŋdə-forms (4.2)
4.1. Recent innovations: Russian-type prohibitives

• The “old construction”:
  bū-ru ~ ə.CheckBox bū-rə
  give-imp ~ proh give-conneg
  ‘give ~ don’t give!’
  – elder, more competent speakers;
  – the same as in other Southern Tungusic l-s;
  – diachronically transparent:
    • < AUX.NEG-imp CONNEG.
4.1. Recent innovations: Russian-type prohibitives

• The “new construction”:
  bū-ru ~ ᥲ bū-ru
give-imp ~ proh give-imp
‘give ~ don’t give!’
  – younger, less competent speakers;
  – the same structure as in Russian:
davaj ~ ne davaj
give.imp ~ neg give.imp
‘give ~ don’t give!’
  – no possible diachronic path directly from AUX.NEG-construction.
4.2. Recent innovations: loss of əŋdə-constructeds

- The negator əŋdə < ?*ə-cvb.nsim
- 1) negative converb əŋdə CONNEG
- 2) a series of analytic negative constructions: əŋdə CONNEG ta-
- the auxiliary ta- (‘do’-) is marked by -TAM-pers

- Before shift (Petrova 1936; Sunik 1985):
  - PST-form – default
  - more peripheral forms (fut, purp, cond, hort, juss)
    - əŋdə aora ʻwithout sleepingʼ CVB
    - əŋdə aora taxani ʻsleptʼ PST
    - əŋdə aora țiila=ma ʻwill sleepʼ FUT1
4.2. Recent innovations: loss of əŋdəə-constructions

- Data from modern (semi)-speakers
- CVB-form: əŋdəə CONNEG ~ əŋdəə CVB.NSIM
  - reanalysis CONNEG ~ CVB.NSIM (very similar forms, probably with the same diachronic source)
- PST-form: > very marginal, emphatic
  - no uses in texts
    - Petrova 1936 – yes (2 of 5 pstneg-forms);
    - Sunik 1985 – no;
    - our texts – no;
  - still recognized by speakers (estimated as emphatic).

- More peripheral forms (elicitation):
  - əŋdəə CONNEG ta- > əŋdəə AFFIRM
4.2. Recent innovations: loss of əŋdə-CONSTRUCTIONS

- The old system: asymmetric, complex
  
jaja-ži-ni ~ əŋdə jaja ta-ži-ni ‘let him sing ~ let him not sing’
sing-juss-3sg ~ neg sing.conneg do-juss-3sg

- The new system: asymmetric > symmetric
  
jaja-ži-ni ~ əŋdə jaja-ži-ni ‘let him sing ~ let him not sing’
sing-juss-3sg ~ neg sing-juss-3sg

- Supported by:
  - direct Russian influence (əŋdə ~ Rus. ne);
  - a general simplification tendency;
  - reanalysis of negative CVB-construction.
4. Concluding remarks

• The Ulch negation system:
  – quite rich, heterogeneous, asymmetric.

• The main point:
  – diachronic instability of such systems.

• The case of Ulch:
  – “old” instability:
    • results from non-uniform restructuring of AUX.NEG-system;
  – recent contact-induced instability;
  – the same tendencies:
    • \textbf{asymmetry} > \textbf{symmetry} between forms;
    • \textbf{symmetry} > \textbf{asymmetry} within the paradigm.