

Kovylin S. V.

ON NEGATION OF INTERROGATIVE AND INDEFINITE PRONOUNS AND ADVERBS IN VAKH AND VASYUGAN DIALECTS OF KHANTY

The given article addresses the problem of negation of interrogative and negative pronouns and adverbs in Vakh and Vasyugan dialects of Khanty.

The thesis that in these dialects of the Khanty language there are no independent negative pronouns and adverbs, and there are only functional equivalents in the form of negative structures is put forward. The article also gives a brief description of similar phenomena in other eastern dialects of the Khanty language. At the end of the discussion, the functional equivalents of negative pronouns and adverbs¹ are considered from the point of symmetry/asymmetry, as well as from the perspective of typology of denial.

Key words: *pronouns, adverbs, negation, grammaticalization, Siberian endangered languages, typology.*

The given article is devoted to the problem of grammaticalization of negative pronouns and adverbs in eastern dialects of Khanty. For the purposes of the analysis the data of Vakh and Vasyugan dialects were taken. Also, for an additional illustration of the given phenomenon materials from other eastern dialects were used.

At the beginning of the discussion general background information on Khanty is presented and the theoretical basis used for argumentation of the proposed thesis is described. According to the proposed thesis there are no independent negative pronouns/adverbs in the given dialects but only their functional equivalents – negative polarity items used with negation markers. According to the proposed analysis the formation of negative pronouns and adverbs occurred with the help of the emphatic clitic [-pə] within the Jespersen cycle as a private case of the grammaticalization process.

Empirical materials for the analysis of this phenomenon are language materials from the field archives of the department of indigenous languages of Siberia TSPU, own field investigations and also published materials on Khanty as monographs, sketches, articles and dictionaries.

General Information

Khanty belongs to the Ob-Ugric brunch, Finno-Ugric group of the Uralic language family (Janhunen, 2003: 326; Prokofjeva, 1966: 319). Khanty are one of the indigenous peoples of the Siberian north.

Their dwelling region is the basin territory of Ob and Irtysh tributaries and is also Ob in lower and middle course (Tereshkin, 1981: 3). Khanty is an agglutinative language with the dominant word order of the basic elements in the sentence SOV (Filchenko, 2010). Different scholars were and are occupied with the study of eastern dialects of Khanty (Eastern Khanty group of dialects) such as W. Steinitz, L. Honti, N. I. Tereshkin, J. Gulya, M. Csepregi, A. Y. Filchenko and others.

Among modern classifications of the dialects of Khanty the classification by E. A. Nemysova can be presented as a chart (Didenko, 2006: 42–43).

	Western, Khanty group of dialects (Западное, хантыйское наречие)		Eastern, Khanty group of dialects (Восточное, кантыйское наречие)
1	Obdorsk group: – Ust-Poluj dialect; – Ust-Sob dialect.	1	Surgut group: – Salym dialect; – Trom-Jugan dialect – Upper-Tromagan; – Lower- Tromagan; – Agan dialect; – Lower-Agan; – Pim local dialect; – Jugan dialect; – Malo-Jugan local dialect; – Bolshe-Jugan local dialect;

¹ Or, otherwise, functional equivalents of negative pronouns/adverbs – negative pronominal/adverbial constructions.

	Western, Khanty group of dialects (Западное, хантыйское наречие)		Eastern, Khanty group of dialects (Восточное, кантыйское наречие)
2	<u>Priobskaja group:</u> – Shuryshkar dialect; – Pitljarsk local dialect; – Shuryshkar local dialect; – Synja local dialect; – Berezovo dialect; – Kazym dialect; – Ust-Kazym local dialect; – Middle-Kazym local dialect; – Upper-Kazym local dialect; – Middle-Ob dialect.	2	<u>Vakh-Vasjugan group:</u> – Vakh dialect; – Vasjugan dialect.
Transitional, south, <u>Trans-Irtysh group:</u> – Irtysh dialect; – Konda dialect; – Demjanka dialect.			

It is worth pointing out that Vakh and Vasjugan dialects (Vakh-Vasjugan group) of Khanty are on the verge of extinction. It makes their study highly important. Also, it is worth mentioning intensive contact influence of Russian on Khanty. For example, L. A. Iljina points out that already for four hundred years languages of the peoples of Siberia with increasing intensity interact with Russian at sociolinguistic as well as at structural levels. Mass bilingualism conditions the manifestation of interference not only at lexical but also at other levels of the language structure. This influence can be observed in Ket and Evenki (Galjamina, 2012), Khanty and Selkup (Kovylin, 2013) as well as in other Siberian languages.

Theoretical background

Before analyzing corresponding pronouns and adverbs, we need to discuss some key notions, such as negative pronouns, clitics, negative polarity items, the Jespersen cycle and grammaticalization.

Under the term negative pronouns we consider those which indicate the absence of a person, thing or their features (Rozenal, 1976).

Under negative polarity items will be understood those expressions which can only appear felicitously within the scope of negation (or semantically related operator) (Horn, 1989: 49). So these items are not negative but also do not appear in positive context, for example the word – *hardly*: «*He is hardly a linguist*» (Horn, 1989: 49).

Discussing indefinite pronouns development in diachronical perspective, at least three types of indefinite pronouns can be suggested: 1) positive polarity indefinite pronouns – simple indefinite pronouns; 2) negative polarity indefinite pronouns; 3) negative indefinite pronouns (Van der Auwera, 2011: 6). It is supposed that negative polarity indefinite pronouns can appear out of positive polarity indefinite pronouns; and then negative indefinite pronouns can appear out of negative polarity indefinite pronouns. This diachronic process in Vakh and Vasjugan dialects of Khanty can be traced through this article.

Negative polarity indefinite pronouns in Vakh and Vasjugan dialects of Khanty, as will be shown, are formed with the help of the clitic according to the Jespersen cycle. So, a clitic (enclitic) is understood as an element attaching to the host word and possessing the functions of a separate word and that of a suffix at the same time (Anderson, 2003: 325–326).

The Jespersen cycle (private case of the grammaticalization process), first mentioned by Dahl (Dahl, 1979: 88) is a process of development from the strategy of a single negation marker in the sentence to the strategy with two markers of negation and then again to the strategy with a single marker (but with the loss of the original marker of negation).

There are several explanations of this phenomenon. We support the explanation by Meillet (1912) (Devos, 2013: 2) in accordance with which neutral (non-weak) negation is often reinforced for pragmatic reasons – it is made emphatic with the help of an emphatic marker. Then this emphatic marker is bleached, loses its emphatic function and becomes an additional exponent of the standard negation. Then this additional marker takes over as the only standard exponent of negation. This diachronic process can be observed in the following hypothetical examples from English.

- a. *I did **not** see him.*
- b. *I did **not** see him **at all**.*

c. *I saw him at all.*

In general, the notion of the Jespersen cycle can be considerably widened and treated as a process of formation of new markers and strategies of negation (often with the help of emphatic elements).

In order to discuss the given phenomenon W. Croft introduces the notions of hyperanalysis, hypoanalysis and metanalysis (Croft, 2000: 121, 126, 130). Hyperanalysis – reanalysis of inherent semantic/functional property of a syntactic unit as a contextual property so the syntactic unit in question loses some of its meaning or function. Hiperanalysis is a major source of semantic bleaching and/or loss in general. Hypoanalysis – reanalysis of contextual semantic/functional property as an inherent property of the syntactic unit. Syntactic unit in question gains a new meaning or function. Metanalysis – simultaneous occurrence of hiperanalysis and hypoanalysis. The listener swaps contextual and inherent semantic values of a syntactic unit.

Discussing French emphatic units *[pas]* and *[personne]* W. Croft points out that the process of turning emphatic forms into negative one's is caused by metanalysis. Following Schwegler (1988: 36) and Givón (1979: ch. 3) W. Croft argues that negative utterances are more likely to be emphatic in actual use than positive ones. That is why there is a high degree of correlation between negation and emphasis. This correlation sets the condition for metanalysis: since the emphatic element is found frequently in negative contexts, and negative contexts are frequently emphatic, there is a swapping of the two functions – the negative function is attributed to the emphatic element, while the emphatic function is attributed to the non linguistic context. The actualization of the metanalysis is the use of the formerly emphatic element in nonemphatic negative context. The final stage in this cycle is caused by hiperanalysis (Croft, 2000: 130–131). The inherent negative value is attributed to the former emphatic element, the newly acquired negative function overlaps with that of the preverbal (standard) particle; and the preverbal particle is dropped. But W. Croft (Croft, 2000: 131) points out that the theory does not predict which of the two units will undergo hyperanalysis. So, if the etymologically emphatic marker underwent hyperanalysis and disappeared then the result would not have been a change of the grammatical structure.

In the case our analysis of Vakh and Vasjugan dialects of Khanty the Jespersen cycle will be treated as a part of the grammaticalization process. So, the grammaticalization process – is the process of gradual development of new grammatical morphemes out of lexical morphemes or combination of lexical morphemes with lexical or grammatical morphemes (Bybee, 1994: 4). The grammaticalization theory does support to account for most grammatical change, perhaps all grammatical change depending on whether the theorist considers other processes such as reanalysis and analogical change to be part of grammaticalization or not (Croft, 2000: 62).

Interrogative and indefinite pronouns and adverbs, and their negative equivalents in Vakh and Vasjugan dialects.

In Vakh and Vasjugan dialects of Khanty the equivalents of negative pronouns/adverbs are formed from the corresponding interrogative and indefinite pronouns/adverbs. In our analysis all pronouns and adverbs will be presented in binary opposition: positive/negative.

In both dialects basic pronouns can be pointed out: interrogative *[qóji]* – ‘who’, *[möyöli]* ‘what’ and their negative equivalents *[qóji-pə əntə]* ‘nobody (not)’, *[mətäli-pə əntə]* ‘nothing (not)’.

- 01 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 5: 86).

qóji tat árəγ-wəl?
 who there sing-PRS.3SG
 Who sings there?

- 02 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan № 141 (Filchenko, 2010: 99).

no iwän-ä muyuli mas-wəl?
 but Ivan-ILL what need-PRS.3SG
 And what does Ivan need?

- 03 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 1: 41).

qoji-p əntə qoj-a-p əntə
 who-NEG.POL NEG who-ILL-NEG.POL NEG

mətäli-p əntə ärn-əγ.
 something-NEG.POL NEG debt-ADJ
 Anybody does not owe anybody anything.

The pronoun |*möyöli* ‘what? whose?’| is formed from the pronoun |*möyi* – ‘what? how?’| + suf. |*-li*|. In Vasjugan dialect one more form can be pointed out |*möyöläli* ‘what? whose?’|, where the suf. |*-li*| is probably added for the second time.

- 04 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 1: 95).

muyi toyi-j-á mən-s-en?
 what place-EP-ILL go-PST2–2SG
 To what place did you go?

- 05 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 3: 21).

muyul'i-yəm ari-j-ayı.
 what-INDEF break-EP-PST0.3SG
 Something broke down.

- 06 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 5: 17).

müyöläli – what (an example is not found in the sentence).

To form indefinite pronouns and adverbs the special indefinite postfix is used – |*-qam*| |*qóji-qam* ‘somebody’|, |*möyöli-qam* ‘something’|, |*qó-qam* – ‘somewhere’| and so on. Indefinite pronouns and adverbs also can be formed with the help of the postfix |*-ta/-to*| (probably of Russian origin, Rus. |*-mo*|). The given constructions are translated in Russian with the help of Russian postfixes (these postfixes can also be regarded, in both languages, as particles or clitics) |*-mo*, – *либо*, – *никуда*|.

- 07 Eastern.Khanty.Vakh (Tereshkin, 1961: 72).

čiməl wəl-m-a, qoji-qəm lulpən-əqətə-γal.
 a.little be-PP-ILL who-INDEF sing-INCH-PST1.3SG
 A little later, somebody started singing.

- 08 Eastern.Khanty.Vakh (Gulya, 1966: 87).

quntə-kam mä wač-pa mən-əm.
 when-INDEF 1SG town-ALL go-PST0.1SG
 Once upon a time I went to the town.

- 09 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 2: 84).

qol-qam-pa (qol-pa-to) pórəylə-wel wájqa-t.
 where-INDEF-ALL where-ALL–INDEF fly-PRS.3SG beast-PL
 The birds do fly away somewhere?!

Interrogative and indefinite pronouns are declined according to cases as well as personal pronouns and nouns.

- 10 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 8: 88).

qoj-na jüγ jöyə-wəl?
 who-COM 3SG swear-PRS.3SG
 Whom is he swearing with?

- 11 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 12: 89).

mətáli-na-ti qırq-a-l äł-l-etä.
 something-COM-PRP sack-EP-3SG.POSS carry-PRS-3SG/SG
 He goes (carries) with something in his sack.

The pronoun |*mətáli* – *something*|, as opposed to the previous pronouns, originally is indefinite and it is formed out of the pronoun |*mətá* – *who? which? some*|.

- 12 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 26: 24).
mätä onəl-ta-l qəsi tol'qo män-wəl.
 who know-IMPP-3SG man only go-PRS.3SG
 Who knows, only that man go through.

- 13 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 9: 29).
nüj, wə-j-ä mätäli.
 2SG take-EP-IMPR.2SG something
 You, take something.

We can argue that in Vakh and Vasjugan dialects of Khanty, as presumably in some other dialects, there are no special negative pronouns and adverbs and negation is expressed by constructions composed of a corresponding pronoun or adverb + the «emphatic» marker/negative polarity item $[-pe]$ and the marker of negation (standard $|\dot{a}ntä|$, imperative $|\dot{a}l|$ or existential $|\dot{a}ntim|$).

The negative equivalent of the pronoun $|\dot{q}óji|$ ‘who? whose?’ is $|\dot{q}óji-pə \dot{a}ntä'$ ‘nobody, no one’s’. The pronouns, used to indicate the presence or absence of a thing or its features, are different pronouns – $|\dot{m}öyöli|$ ‘what?’, $|\dot{m}ätäli-pə + \dot{a}ntä'$ ‘nothing, no one’s’. In both dialects negative equivalents of pronouns are declined according to cases as well as corresponding indefinite pronouns.

- 14 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 19: 90).
a tʃi mätäli-qa-p äntä jə-y-äyi.
 and this.PROX something-TRL-NEG.POL NEG become-EP-PST0.3SG
 And this one did not become anybody (anything).

- 15 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 3: 57).
qoji-pə äł wə-j-äti qul.
 who-NEG.POL NEG.IMPR take-EP-IMPR.3SG fish
 Let anybody do not take any fish.

- 16 Eastern.Khanty.Vasjugan (KhNeg № 10: 88).
jüy qój-na-p äntim.
 3SG who-COM-NEG.POL NEG.EX
 He is not with anybody.

Considering Vakh dialect, J. Gulya claims that interrogative pronouns and the adverb $|\dot{q}ot|$ ‘where’ have 3 grammatical numbers – singular, dual and plural (Gulya, 1966: 82, 85). The author of the article did not find any «good enough» examples of dual or plural number with interrogative pronouns and the adverb $|\dot{q}ot|$ ‘where’ in Vasjugan dialect.

Neither N. I. Tereshkin nor J. Gulya mention anything concerning corresponding equivalents of negative pronouns, negative equivalent of the adverb – $|\dot{w}here|$ in their grammars. The author of the article did not find any corresponding examples in dual and plural number with negation in both dialects.

It is worth mentioning two cases of use of the pronoun $|\dot{m}öyöli|$ ‘what’ (in Vasjugan dialect) in construction as the negative/negative polarity pronoun. But these cases, as well as in the example № 6, are introduced only in the elicitation data, in the isolated wordlists. Examples of the natural context (in sentences) are missing, that does not allow us, now, to draw any following conclusions: $|\dot{m}öyöli-pə \dot{a}ntä'$ – ‘neither’, $|\dot{m}öyöli-pə \dot{a}ntim|$ ‘no way’.

In both dialects we can point out spatio-temporal adverbs and their negative equivalents, also registered as the forms inflected according to the cases.

1) $|\dot{q}üntä|$ ‘when’; $|\dot{q}ot|$ ($|\dot{q}o|$) ‘where’; $|\dot{q}olpá|$ ‘where to’; $|\dot{q}olíál|$ ‘where from’.

2) $|\dot{q}üntä-pə \dot{a}ntä|$ ‘never’; $|\dot{q}o-pə \dot{a}ntä|$ ‘nowhere’; $|\dot{q}ol-pə \dot{a}ntä|$ ($|\dot{q}olpá-pə \dot{a}ntä|$) ‘nowhere (to)’; $|\dot{q}ol-pə \dot{a}ntä|$ ‘from nowhere’.

- 17 Eastern. Khanty. Vakh, (Gulya, 1966: 85).
noň kunt-oy tə wäl-w-əñ?
 2SG when-PROL here live-PRS-2SG
 Since when do you live here?

- 18 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 8: 2).
tem ämp quntə-p əntə u-wəl
 this.PROX dog when-NEG.POL NEG bark-PRS.3SG
 This dog never barks.
- 19 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 10: 78).
qot alá-wəl pótʃkän?
 where lie-PRS.3SG rifle
 Where lies a rifle?
- 20 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 5: 21).
qo nüŋ wəl-s-ən?
 where 2SG be-PST2–2SG
 Where were you?
- 21 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 7: 22).
jüŋ qo-p əntim.
 3SG where-NEG.POL NEG.EX
 He is not anywhere.
- 22 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 3a: 72).
qol-pá mən-äyi jüŋ, qol-pá?
 where-ALL go-PST0.3SG 3SG where-ALL
 Where did he go, where?
- 23 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 9: 22).
mä qol'-p əntə mən-l-əm.
 1SG where-NEG.POL NEG идти-PRS-1SG
 I do not go anywhere.
- 24 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 17: 78).
qol-pá-p əntə mən-l-əm.
 where-ALL-NEG.POL NEG go-PRS-1SG
 I will not go anywhere.
- 25 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 10: 22).
qol'-al nüŋ jü-wən?
 where-EL 2SG come-PRS.2SG
 Where do you come from?
- 26 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 11: 22).
mä qol'-p əntə jəl-l-əm.
 1SG where.from-NEG.POL NEG go-PRS-1SG
 I do not go from anywhere.

Also we can point out binary oppositions of the following pronouns/adverbs (positive/negative): |*mətkurá* (*mətá-kurá*) ‘how many/much’|, |*mətkurá-pə əntə* ‘none’|; |*muyá-ləŋ* ‘what’ (*muyá-áləŋ*) |, |*muyá-ləŋ-pə əntim* ‘there is no one’|.

- 27 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 4a: 77).
mətkurá nü-əŋ ləŋki?
 how.many 2SG-LOC squirrel
 How many squirrels do you have?

- 28 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 6: 77).
mă-nə mətăkură-p əntim.
 1SG-LOC how.many-NEG.POL NEG.EX
 I have none.
- 29 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 32: 79).
muyăləŋ qátŋəmjəŋk jəŋqáwəŋ nüŋ.
 what soup love-PRS.2SG 2SG
 What soup do you love?
- 30 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 33б: 80).
mă-nə muyăləŋ qátŋəmjəŋk-p əntim.
 1SG-LOC what soup-NEG.POL NEG.EX
 I have no soup.
- 31 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 33в: 80).
mă-nə muyăləŋ-p əntim qátŋəmjəŋk.
 1SG-LOC what-NEG.POL NEG.EX soup
 I have no soup.

For Vasjugan dialect the following forms were registered: |*muyinə* 'how, what', |*muyinə-p əntim* 'in no way, neither'; |*mətánəl-p əntim* 'not for anything, in no way' – there is no example of the opposition (positive counterpart).

- 32 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 14: 22).
muyinə wer-tă tŋi alan.
 how do-INF this.PROX deal
 How can one do this?
- 33 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 26: 79).
muyinə-p əntə onl-áyi.
 how-NEG.POL NEG know-PST0.3SG
 (He) did not know (could not) at all.
- 34 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 37: 80).
mətánəl-p əntə jəŋqá-l-im jüŋ-a.
 (how) – NEG.POL NEG love-PRS-1SG/SG 3SG-ILL
 I do not love you in any way (at all).

Ways of expressing negation of pronouns and adverbs

Considering the data, concerning eastern dialects of Khanty, we can propose that at this stage there are two ways of analyzing negation of pronouns and adverbs:

1) A. Y. Filchenko argues that negation of pronouns can occur within the strategy of common negation, the use of the basic (standard) form of a pronoun in a construction with a negation element (without clitic/negative polarity item |-pə|).

- 35 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan, № 49 (Filchenko, 2013).
müyülinə wer-ta əntə onol-l-əm.
 something do-INF NEG know-PRS-1SG
 I can not (do not know how to) do anything.
- 36 Eastern. Khanty. Vakh, № 51 (Tereshkin, 1981: 276) – (Filchenko, 2013).
mă mətă kōl əntə at-qas-əm.
 1SG some word NEG say-PST3-1SG
 I did not say any word.

There are other examples of this kind but, nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that the given strategy of negation occurs relatively quite seldom. The author of the article put a question to the informant P. M. Milimov, a competent native speaker of Vasjugan dialect of Khanty, how he perceives, for example, the construction *|qoji antə* ‘nobody’ and other similar constructions as negative ones. The informant replied that this kind of constructions is not quite understandable, completed, and instead of this he proposed negative constructions with the element *|-pə|*, for example – *|qoji-pə antə* ‘nobody’.

2) N. I. Tereshkin (Vakh dialect) (Tereshkin, 1961: 73), J. Gulya (Vakh dialect) (Gulya, 1966: 87). and the author of the given article hold to the idea that negation of pronouns/adverbs occurs by adding to an interrogative/negative pronoun/adverb the «emphatic» clitic/negative polarity item together with the negative particle/predicate in the sentence *|qoji-pə antə* ‘nobody not’, *|mətäli-pə äntä* ‘nothing not’ (the given strategy can be traced through the crucial number of examples).

In accordance with our hypothesis, equivalents of the negative pronouns/adverbs in the given dialects were formed with the help of the emphatic clitic *|-pə|*, which makes the word/phrase, to which it is added, emphatically marked, pragmatically stressed in the sentence. Distribution of the clitic *|-pə|* is quite wide. Different examples of the use of this clitic with such elements as a noun, pronoun, adverb verb and even the marker of standard negation were registered.

- 37 Eastern. Khanty. Vakh, № 14 (Tereshkin, 1961: 100).

<i>äñki-m-pə</i>	<i>läy-ä</i>	<i>kəč</i>	<i>at-wəl.</i>
mother-1SG-EMPH	3SG-ILL	almost	say-PRS.3SG

Even mother tells him.

- 38 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan, № 59 (Filchenko, 2013).

<i>töyət</i>	<i>wəf'-imt-γən</i>	<i>tʃ'u</i>	<i>rayəw</i>
fire	flame.up-MMNT-PST0.3S	DET	at.once

<i>jüy-näm-pə</i>	<i>wəf'-imt-äyən</i>
3SG-RFL-Emph	flame.up-MMNT-PST0.3SG

... the fire flamed up (and this one) himself flamed up at once.

- 39 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan, № 57 (Filchenko, 2013).

<i>mərəm-pə</i>	<i>təyə-j-nə</i>	<i>mən-wəl-t</i>	<i>wont oyt</i>	<i>sayi.</i>
only-Emph	place-EP-LOC	go-PRS.3SG-PL	forest top	along.

Ontly in some places (people) went along the forest top.

- 40 Eastern. Khanty. Vakh (Gulya, 1966: 95).

<i>man-nə</i>	<i>təy</i>	<i>tuy-a-s-i-pə.</i>
1SG-LOC	here	carry-EP-PST2-PS.3SG-Emph

It would have been brought here by me.

- 41 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan, № 60 (Filchenko, 2013).

<i>əntə-pə</i>	<i>söyön</i>	<i>təylä-äyən...</i>
NEG-FOC	bag	touch-PST0.3SG

(He) did not even touch the bag.

On the basis of the reviewed data, we can assume that initially negation of pronouns/adverbs took place by adding a negative particle/predicate to an interrogative or indefinite pronoun/adverb, for example, *|qoji + antə* – ‘nobody’, *|mətäli + äntä* ‘nothing’, so, according to the strategy mentioned by A. Y. Filchenko (Filchenko, 2013). Then, in order to reinforce negation (the Jespersen cycle), for pragmatic reasons, the emphatic clitic *|-pə|* began to be joined to a pronoun/adverb, and in the process of grammaticalization bleaches, losses its emphatic power, fixes in this environment and the whole construction began to be perceived as the equivalent of a negative pronoun/adverb *|qoji-pə + antə* ‘nobody’, *|mətäli-pə + äntä* ‘nothing’.

The element *|-pə|*, in the given constructions, has already grammaticalized and lost its emphatic/pragmatic meaning. That means that this element can no more be treated as a clitic or topic. It does not mark the word it is attached to from the pragmatic point of view. That is why this element can be conventionally named an element of negative polarity, which being joined to a corresponding pronoun/adverb, turns it into a corresponding negative polarity pronoun/adverb which cannot be used without a negation marker. The construction *|qoji-pə*

əntə], as well as other similar constructions, is perceived as a whole unity. The independent use will be as following, for example, at answers to the questions: *Who is it? – Nobody!* (*qojt-pə əntə*); *Where is it? Nowhere!* (*qo-pə əntə*); and so on.

We can suppose that according to W. Croft (Croft, 2000) hyperanalysis occurred here. The emphatic function of the clitic *|-pə|* was attributed to the context; the clitic semantically bleached and lost its emphatic function. Afterwards, hypoanalysis can take place. It is supposed that out of the common negative context of the negative construction with negation marker a pronoun/adverb with the negative polarity item *|-pə|* can undergo hypoanalysis and assuming the function of negation from the context, further, can appear as an independent negative pronoun/adverb.

We can presuppose that reanalysis of the emphatic clitic *|-pə|* (hyperanalysis, metanalysis) can manifest in absolutely different ways in different dialects and different native speakers.

A problem of emphatic negation with equivalents of negative pronouns/adverbs, at the present stage, occupies a special place in our discussion. In the same position the emphatic clitic *|-pə|* and the negative polarity item *|-pə|* must appear.

We assume that initially (the first stage), as was mentioned above, in order to reinforce negation, the emphatic element *|-pə|* was added to a pronoun/adverb, turning the negative construction into more pragmatically marked. Gradually, this pragmatically marked construction turned into pragmatically not marked (the second stage), the clitic as a part of the construction loses its emphatic power. We can assume that at this stage, in emphatic constructions, the element *|-pə|* can present two functions: the function of negative polarity and that of the emphatic clitic. The last investigations (the third stage) show that under the influence of predominant Russian² the emphatic clitic *|-pə|*, in non negative sentences, begins to occur more seldom, and the pragmatically marked word, which is emphasized by logical stress, as in Russian, begins to occur more often (we have no data whether a pragmatically marked word was emphasized by logical stress (without clitic) at more early stages).

In its turn, the use of equivalents of negative pronouns/adverbs remains stable.

42 Eastern. Khanty. Vasyugan (KhNeg № 3: 84).

muɣuli-ɣəm qol-aɣi?!
what-INDEF die-PST0.3SG

Something did lose (die)?! (pronounced with the corresponding intonation, the first word is stressed).

Hence, at emphatic negation of pronouns/adverbs, under the influence of Russian, the element *|-pə|* shows only negative polarity meaning and the pragmatic sense is marked by logical stress.

We consider that different informants, in accordance with a level of the Russian influence, perceive this phenomenon pragmatically at the second-third stages.

Besides the pronouns and adverbs, the negative polarity item *|-pə|* is joined to the other words composing negative emphatic constructions, for example – nouns: *not (even) a drop, not (even) a word, not (even) a sound* and so on. We suppose that the given phenomenon, element *|-pə|*, which appears in such negative constructions, is due to the analogical change in accordance with equivalents of negative pronouns and adverbs of the discussed Khanty dialects. The clitic *|-pə|*, when attached to the word, converts it into negative polarity word (only in observed emphatic constructions) while emphasis is marked not explicitly by logical stress³.

43 Eastern. Khanty. Vasyugan (KhNeg № 3: 98).

tem qotl mə əj tōɣər-pə əntə wəl-qás-əm.
this.PROX day 1SG one hare-NEG.POL NEG get-PST3-1SG

Today I did not get (even) a hare.

44 Eastern. Khanty. Vasyugan (KhNeg № 5: 98).

mä járeɣ-pə əntə áreqqásəm.
1SG song-NEG.POL NEG sing-PST3-1SG

I did not sing a single song.

² Mass bilingualism conditions interferences from Russian; hence native speakers of Khanty often apply Russian-like constructions and strategies. Also, in languages, which are on the verge of extinction, system changes/shifts occur with higher speed than in languages which are in normal conditions.

³ We tend to analyse the clitic *|-pə|* as negative polarity item in such emphatic constructions. Sometimes, it is hard to elicitate the emphatic clitic *|-pə|* in positive emphatic constructions, instead of it we just often find Russian-like constructions accompanying Russian-like intonation patterns without the clitic *|-pə|*. Never the less, the clitic *|-pə|*, in such emphatic constructions, can be also considered as emphasis. This question remains to be open for the discussion.

In addition to all above mentioned we can add that sometimes the same meaning of negative constructions (with pronouns) in a sentence can be expressed in several ways, by different pronouns.

- 45 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 24: 24 (2012)).

mā-nə əntə falqo qolla.
1SG-LOC NEG pity all
I do not feel pity for anybody.

- 46 Eastern. Khanty. Vasjugan (KhNeg № 8: 99 (2013)).

mānə qóji-p əntə fálko.
1SG-LOC who-NEG.POL NEG pity
I do not feel pity for anybody.

Similar phenomena in other eastern dialects

Besides Vakh and Vasjugan dialects of Khanty similar phenomena can be found in other eastern dialects.

For example, in Trom-Jugan dialect of Surgut group of Khanty (according to the examples) negation of pronouns can appear both with the clitic/negative polarity item as well as without it.

- 47 Eastern. Khanty. Trom-Jugan (Tereshkin, 1981: 277).

əj mətali əntəm.
one something NEG.EX
There is nothing.

- 48 Eastern. Khanty. Trom-Jugan (Tereshkin, 1981: 277).

əj mətali-pə əntə wu-l-əm.
one something-NEG.POL NEG see-PRS-1SG.
I do not see anything.

Beata Wagner-Nagy, referring to the observations of Csepregi (1998: 41) in Surgut dialect of Khanty, claims that the clitic $[-pə]$ often appears in negative sentences. This clitic also appears in other dialects (Wagner-Nagy 2011: 77).

- 49 Eastern Khanty, Surgut Dialect (№ 61) (Csepregi, 1998: 41) – (Wagner-Nagy, 2011: 77).

qántək qo=pə əntə wuji-l-ə-təm.
Khanty man=CLIT NEG know-PRS-EP-1SG.Ob
I do not know anybody. ~ As for people, I do not know any of them.

The same clitic also forms negative counterparts for some modifiers and pronouns; these, however, must be accompanied by the negation particle in a negated sentence (Wagner-Nagy, 2011: 77).

- 50 Eastern Khanty, Surgut Dialect (№ 62) (Csepregi, 1998: 41) – (Wagner-Nagy, 2011: 77).

wiči=pə əntə ɛjkrəmtə-l.
always=CLIT NEG watch-PRS.3SG
(S) he never watches.

Also, M. Csepregi gives examples in which the negation particle is omitted and its role as negation marker is taken over by the originally non-negative emphatic clitic (Wagner-Nagy, 2011: 77–78). These examples do not represent standard negation. Probably, here, according to W. Croft [14], meta- and hyperanalysis took place when emphasis went into context, the clitic assumed the function of negation and the standard negative particle was dropped.

- 51 Eastern Khanty, Surgut Dialect (№ 63) (Csepregi, 1998: 41) – (Wagner-Nagy, 2011: 78).

qu-jə-t=pə h̄iwnam qət-nə wáll.
man-EP-2SGPX=CLIT his/her house-LOC be.3SG
She has no husband [“No (/The) husband of hers is in the house”].

Beata Wagner-Nagy also analyses such development of the emphatic marker into the marker of negation as the Jespersen cycle.

Reviewed data allow us to make conclusions that in other eastern dialects of Khanty similar processes of grammaticalization of negative pronouns and adverbs (the Jespersen cycle) occur. These data give us an opportunity to observe the ways of grammaticalization of the discussed pronouns and adverbs and also to predict the further direction of grammaticalization in Vakh and Vasjugan dialects of Khanty (see in conclusion).

Symmetry/asymmetry and typology of negation

Constructions using negation can be observed from the point of view of symmetry and asymmetry. At symmetric negation negative constructions do not differ from nonnegatives in any other way than by the presence of the negative marker (s). At asymmetric negation it is visa-versa, negative constructions differ from nonnegatives in structure (Miestamo, 2007: 556).

So, in Vakh and Vasjugan dialects, standard negative equivalents of pronouns and adverbs demonstrate asymmetry in comparison with their positive equivalents [*qoji* 'who' / *qoji-pə əntə* 'nobody']. And only in rare cases when negation of pronouns and adverbs occurs by adding only the marker of negation, symmetry is observed [*qoji* 'who' / *qoji əntə* 'nobody'].

Using a balanced sample of 40 languages, Kahrel (1996) investigates the ways in which languages express the negation of indefinite pronouns referring to persons and things, that is, the equivalents of English [*nobody*] and [*nothing*]. His classification distinguishes the following 5 types of constructions (Miestamo, 2007: 563–564).

- 1) Standard negation is found with ordinary (positive) indefinites.
- 2) Standard negation appears with a special indefinite different from the one used in corresponding positives.
- 3) There is an inherently negative indefinite pronoun without standard negation.
- 4) An inherently negative indefinite pronoun is accompanied by standard negation.
- 5) There is no indefinite pronoun at all, and the equivalent function is expressed with an existential construction.

Negation of indefinite (and interrogative) pronouns in eastern dialects of Khanty, according to the typology of Kahrel (1996), is of the second type. Standard negation appears with a special indefinite pronoun of negative polarity different from the one used in corresponding positives. Also there are rare cases of appearing standard negation together with simple interrogative (indefinite) pronouns, so the negation is according to the first type. Negation of the discussed adverbs is also can occur according to the 2 above mentioned types.

Conclusion

In the given article we discussed interrogative and indefinite pronouns and adverbs and also their negative equivalents in Vakh and Vasjugan dialects of Khanty. It was shown that at negation of these pronouns/adverbs the negative polarity item $|-pə|$ is used. It turns an indefinite or interrogative pronoun/adverb in question into a negative polarity item. The process of negative pronouns/adverbs formation is within the framework of the Jespersen cycle. Also, similar phenomena (the Jespersen cycle) were shortly observed in other eastern dialects of Khanty. The given process can appear with different speed and show different developments in different dialects as native speakers of different dialects live mainly dispersed, beyond the contact zone from each other. The next stage of negative polarity pronouns and adverbs grammaticalization supposes to be their reanalysis into independent negative pronouns and adverbs. Considering the given data one should not forget that dialects of Khanty have no compulsory fixed norm of grammatical phenomena of negation.

Archive data

KhNeg: Questionnaire "Negation" adapted and written August 2012, July 2013, river Vasjugan, S. V. Kovylin. Field archive, TSPU.

References

- Anderson R. S., Zwicky M. A.. *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics. Second Edition*. Volume 1. Editor in Chief: William J. Frawley. University of California, Los Angeles, Emeritus, 2003. 525 p.
- Bybee J. L., Perkins R., Pagliuca W. *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1994. 398 p.
- Croft W. *Explaining language change: an evolutionary approach*. London, Longman linguistics library Publ., 2000. 287 p.
- Dahl O. *Typology of sentence negation*. *Linguistics* 17. Mouton Publishers, 1979. Pp. 79–106.

- Devos M., Van der Auwera J. Jespersen cycles in Bantu: double and triple negation, *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*, 2013, 34, pp. 205–274. URL: <http://uahost.uantwerpen.be/vdauwera/Bantu%20Jespersen%20May%202012.pdf> (Accessed: 04.06.2014).
- Didenko A. V. *The category of imperative in Ugric languages*. Dis. cand. philol. sci. Tomsk, 2006. Pp. 42–43 (in Russian).
- Filchenko A. Yu. *A grammar of Eastern Khanty*. Tomsk, TSPU-Press Publ., 2010. 553 p.
- Filchenko A. Yu. *Annotated folklore texts of Ob-Yenisei language areal*. Tomsk, Veter Publ., 2010. 336 p.
- Filchenko A. Yu. Negation in Eastern Khanty and Southern Selkup dialects. *Ural-Altai studies*, № 1 (8) 2013, pp. 55–99 (in Russian).
- Galyamina U. E. Structural typology of code switching in the texts in endangered languages (on the Ket and Evenk data). *Tomsk State Pedagogical University Bulletin*, 2012, vol. 1 (116), pp. 96–100 (in Russian).
- Gulya J. *Eastern Ostyak Chrestomathy. Uralic and Altaic Series*. Indiana University, Mouton & Co, Bloomington, The Hague, 1966. 209 p.
- Horn R. Laurence. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. 637 p.
- Janhunen J. *Uralic languages. International Encyclopedia of Linguistics: 4-Volume Set (Volume 4)*, Second Edition, Editor in Chief William Frawley. Oxford: University Press, 2003. 547 p.
- Kovylin S. V. Existential negation Central-Selkup and Northern-Khanty languages. *Tomsk State Pedagogical University Bulletin*, 2013, vol. 3 (131), pp. 99–105 (in Russian).
- Miestamo M. Negation – an overview of typological research. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2007, vol. 1, issue 5, pp. 552–570. URL: <http://www.linguistics.berkeley.edu/~syntax-circle/syntax-group/spr08/miestamo.pdf> (Accessed 04.06.2014).
- Prokofyeva E. D. *Selkup language. Languages of the peoples of USSR III. Finno-ugric and Samoyedic languages*. Moscow, 1966, pp. 396–415 (in Russian).
- Rozental D. E., Telenkova M. A. *Dictionary-catalogue of linguistic terms*. Issue 2. Moscow, Prosveshchenie Publ., 1976 (in Russian).
- Tereshkin N. I. *Dialects sketches of Khanty (the first chapter). Vakh dialect*. Moscow; Leningrad: Izdatelstvo akademii nauk USSR, 1961. 205 p. (in Russian).
- Tereshkin N. I. *Dictionary of eastern Khanty dialects*. Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1981. 544 p. (in Russian).
- Van der Auwera J. & Van Alsenoy L. “Indefinite pronouns, synchrony and diachrony – comments on Willis”, *The evolution of negation: Beyond the Jespersen cycle*. Ed. by P. Larrivé & R. Ingham. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2011. Pp. 325–346. (25 p.) URL: http://uahost.uantwerpen.be/vdauwera/_13_%20Van%20der%20Auwera%20clean.pdf (Accessed 04.06.2014).
- Wagner-Nagy B. *On the Typology of Negation in Ob-Ugric and Samoyedic Languages*. Société Finno-Ougrienne. Helsinki, 2011. 336 p.

Kovylin S. V.

Tomsk State Pedagogical University.

Ul. Kievskaya, 60, Tomsk, Russia, 634061.

E-mail: sergey@scalpnet.ru

Материал поступил в редакцию 12.04.2014.

Ковылин С. В.

К ВОПРОСУ ОБ ОТРИЦАНИИ ПРИ ВОПРОСИТЕЛЬНЫХ И НЕОПРЕДЕЛЕННЫХ МЕСТОИМЕНИЯХ И НАРЕЧИЯХ В ВАХОВСКОМ И ВАСЮГАНСКОМ ДИАЛЕКТАХ ХАНТЫЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

Данная статья посвящена отрицанию при вопросительных и неопределенных местоимениях в ваховском и васюганском диалектах хантыйского языка. Выдвигается тезис, согласно которому в рассматриваемых диалектах хантыйского языка нет самостоятельных отрицательных местоимений и наречий, а существуют лишь их функциональные эквиваленты в виде отрицательных конструкций. Также в статье дается краткое описание схожих явлений в других восточных диалектах хантыйского языка. Функциональные эквиваленты отрицательных местоимений и наречий рассматриваются с позиции симметрии (асимметрии), а также с позиции типологии отрицания.

Ковылин С. В., аспирант.

Томский государственный педагогический университет.

Ул. Киевская, 60, Томск, Россия, 634061.

E-mail: sergey@scalpnet.ru