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Negation in Mongolic

This paper attempts to give a functional overview of negation in the Mongolic language family. In Early Middle Mongol, standard, prohibitive and perhaps ascriptive negation were coded by the preverbal negators *ese* for perfective/past, *üü* for imperfective/non-past and *büü* for most moods including imperatives. It contrasted with the locative-existential-possessive negator *ügei*, which could also negate results and constituents. In most modern Mongolic languages, *ügei* made inroads into standard and ascriptive negation, competing with *busi* ‘other’ for ascriptive negation starting from Late Middle Mongol. Possessive constructions, while always based on *ügei*, are expressed through a range of different syntactic patterns, and a new locative-existential negator *alga* developed in one area. Newly developed verbal negators include the broadly used former resultative verbal negator *-üüdei*, and *-sh*, a more restricted reflex of *busi*. The change of negator position had consequences for its scope and interaction with other categories, which are discussed in some detail for Khalkha. While prohibitives always remained preverbal, preventives emerged from declaratives, acquiring modal characteristics.

In this paper, I intend to present a sketch of the development of negation in Mongolic. In contrast to previous research, I will not structure the investigation around cognates, but rather explore how different functions are expressed in the individual languages. Following the line of (then-ongoing) research by Ljuba Veselinova (2013), the functional categories to be investigated include verbal declarative negation, existential, locative and possessive negation, the ascriptive negation of adjectives and nouns and, additionally, verbal preventives and prohibitives.

Previous research on the various Mongolic varieties is not abundant, and most resources used in this study are reference grammars. All specialized studies on individual languages that I am aware of focus on standard Mongolian, either in the Mongolian state or in Inner Mongolia. General overviews in this field are Fufubătoru (1992), Üjüme (2006) and Byambasan (2001), the latter with an excellent coverage of derivation. Bat-Ireedüi (2009) gives particular consideration to pragmatically conventionalized collocations. Mönh-Amgalan (1999) and Umetani (2004) focus on the locational negator *alga*, while Hashimoto (2007)’s study concerns formal symmetry between positive and negative paradigms. Comparative studies that focus on all of Mongolic are Yu (1991), Sarangγuu-a (2007), Sengge (1987) and Urancimeg (2009). The first two investigate the reflexes of particular negators across Mongolic, while the latter two restrict themselves to declarative verbal negation. Bese (1974) and Hsiao (2007) are more properly diachronic studies: the former tries to reconstruct the negators of Pre-Proto-Mongolic, whereas the latter attempts to explain the development from preverbal negation in Middle Mongol to post-verbal negation in standard Mongolian from a typological perspective.
This paper is structured as follows: In Section 1, I will give a short overview of Mongolic as a language family, which situates all varieties discussed in this paper. Section 2 starts out with verbal standard negation. Section 3 deals with locational/existential and Section 4 with the closely related possessive negation. Section 5 takes a look at ascriptive negation of nominals, and Section 6 addresses prohibitives and preventives. The development of negation in Mongolic is discussed in Section 7. Section 8 provides a conclusion.

I. The Mongolic language family

Mongolic is to be understood as an unaffiliated language family. A common origin with Turkic and Tungusic or even Korean and Japanese, as proposed by the Altaic theory (Poppe 1960, Miller 1971, 1996; Starostin et al. 2003, Robbeets 2005), has not been demonstrated satisfactorily (Doerfer 1963–1975; Georg 2004, 2009, Vovin 2005, 2009).

No agreed-upon internal classification of Mongolic exists, as areal contact makes it difficult to assess the difference between cognates and inter-variety loans (for some literature, see Rybatzki 2003a). Therefore, a sketch of both the historical and areal situation is in order here.

Middle Mongol (MM), in spite of its somewhat misleading name, is the oldest known variety of what is commonly termed as Mongolic. There are two older related varieties, which will not be dealt with in this paper: Khitan was written from the 10th to 14th century, but is only partly deciphered. It must have been a sister of MM (Janhunen 2012). Tabghach was spoken in the 4th to 6th century. It is preserved in only 14 words found in Chinese texts (Vovin 2007), and no taxonomic classification or phonological analysis has so far been attempted based on this sparse material. MM can roughly be divided into early MM of the 13th century and late MM of the 14th century. Proto-Mongolic is the language that emerged from tribal federations of the 12th century. It is thus very close to MM, but contains a few additional reconstructions. Reconstructions that predate the 12th century are termed Pre-Proto-Mongolic here.

According to Janhunen (2006), modern Mongolic branches into Central Mongolic, Southern Mongolic, Moghol and Dagur. Central Mongolic branches into Oirat (including Kalmyk) in the west, Buryat in the north, as well as Central (Khalkha, Shilingol, Chakhar, Ordos) and Eastern Mongolian (including Khorchin, Khüree, Naiman and Tümet) (Luvsanvandan 1959).\(^1\) Khalkha, the standard language of the Mongolian state, is exerting influence on neighboring Buryat and Oirat varieties, leading to their gradual Khalkhazation. This doesn’t hold to the same degree for Buryat in the North-West of Lake Baikhal, and the Oirats of Kalmykia have not

---

1. Janhunen (2005: 10–11) claims Khamnigan to be a separate subgroup of Central Mongolic. As he didn’t publish his materials and rarely went beyond morphophonemics in his own research, this is hard to assess. Judging from Janhunen’s (1990: 48, 84–6) word-length examples of negation, Khamnigan might resemble Khalkha.
been in contact with other Mongols since the early 17th century. Janhunen (2006: 232) considers Ordos to be a separate branch, perhaps due to its conservative phonology, but while influences from Chakhar, Oirat and perhaps Western Tümet render it somewhat heterogeneous, there don’t seem to be many distinctive innovations. Buryat and Khorchin are in contact mutually and with Dagur. Moghol in Afghanistan has been isolated from the rest of Mongolic since the MM period. Southern Mongolic consists of the Shirongolic group and Shira Yugur. The latter is perhaps an Oirat or southern Central Mongolian dialect that came under strong influence of languages spoken in the Amdo (North-Eastern Tibetan) area. Shirongolic itself is fully part of this area. It consists of Huzhu Mongghul and Minhe Mangghuer (together making up Monguor) and Santa (=Dongxiang), Kangjia and Bonan (=Baoan). It is possible that these varieties originated independently and only acquired their particular common features in a sprachbund that formed later.

2. Standard negation

In this section, we shall take a look at regular verbal negation or “standard negation” in Mongolic. Standard Negation (SN) is a conventionalized term for the negation of verbal declarative predicates. In this paper, I will follow Miestamo (2005: 42) in defining that

A SN construction is a construction whose function is to modify a verbal declarative main clause expressing a proposition p in such a way that the modified clause expresses the proposition with the opposite truth value to p, i.e. ~p, or the proposition used as the closest equivalent to ~p in case the clause expressing ~p cannot be formed in a language, and that is (one of) the productive and general means the language has for performing this function.

Productive means that the pattern of negation is not restricted to a small number of verbs, and general means that if two ways of negation are possible in a given environment and one is clearly less frequent or secondary to the other, it will not be called SN.

In the following, we shall first take a look at SN in Mongolic in 2.1 and then focus on particular issues such as the position of the negator in MM and Khalkha in 2.2, symmetry between positive and negative paradigms in Khalkha in 2.3, and the question of whether the negator ese came to form a negative verb in 2.4. A short overview of what has been excluded from discussion is given in 2.5.
2.1. SN in different Mongolic languages

SN in Mongolic can roughly be divided into three systems that to some degree coincide with generic or areal groups, either based on preverbal negators, a post-verbal negator or a mix of both. An overview of standard negators in Mongolic is provided in Table 1. The forms in the first row are the immediate Proto-forms to the modern languages, not the forms that can be arrived at with internal reconstruction. Blank squares can mean that a form is either not attested for the variety in question (e.g. CONVERB + ügei for MM) or that it is not used for SN (e.g. MM busi ‘other’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto-forms</th>
<th>*üülü</th>
<th>*ese</th>
<th>*þedüi + ügei</th>
<th>*PARTICLE + ügei</th>
<th>*CONVERB + ügei</th>
<th>*busi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>ülü</td>
<td>ese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moghol</td>
<td>ulá ~ la</td>
<td>esá ~ isá</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Mongolic</td>
<td>uliɔ</td>
<td>əsə</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa</td>
<td>lai ~ ai</td>
<td>sai</td>
<td>gu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangghuer</td>
<td>li: ~ i:</td>
<td>se/sii</td>
<td>gu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongghul</td>
<td>ne (?)</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>us-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangjia</td>
<td>elə</td>
<td>əsə</td>
<td>'gi-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ç</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonan</td>
<td>ło</td>
<td>əsə</td>
<td>ugwei</td>
<td>-ʃ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shira</td>
<td>elə</td>
<td>əsə</td>
<td>ugwei</td>
<td>-ʃ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugur</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td>utien =we:</td>
<td>uwe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagur</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td>=ute</td>
<td>=gue</td>
<td>uge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Mongolic</td>
<td>=ute</td>
<td>=gue</td>
<td>uge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khorchin</td>
<td>=adei</td>
<td>=gü</td>
<td>=go, uga</td>
<td>uga</td>
<td>-ʃ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordos</td>
<td>=adei</td>
<td>=gü</td>
<td>=go, uga</td>
<td>uga</td>
<td>-ʃ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oirat</td>
<td>=gü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalkhha</td>
<td>=gü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buryat</td>
<td>=gü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Standard Negation in Mongolic

The system of MM that relies on the preverbal negators ülü and ese will be discussed in 2.1.1, with shorter notes on the structurally conservative languages Moghol and Santa. The Central Mongolic systems, characterized by the extension of the locational-existential-possessive negator ügei, are discussed in 2.1.2. The other Southern Mongolic languages, which mostly make use of both strategies, are discussed in 2.1.3, and the similarly mixed Dagur is discussed in 2.1.4.
2.1.1. Standard Negation in Middle Mongol

MM differentiated between the negation of past/perfective forms, which were negated by *ese*, and non-past/imperfective forms, which were negated by *üli*. Relevant for the choice of the negative adverb was the morphology of the verb that the negator directly preceded. For instance, the finite factual past tense suffix -*ba* is negated by *ese*, as shown in (1), while the future participle is negated by *üli*, as in (2).

(1) Middle Mongol, SH §24

\[\text{qubi } \text{ese } \text{ög-be} \]
\[\text{share } \text{PFV.NEG } \text{give-FACT.PST} \]
\[\text{‘They (...) didn’t give him his share.’}^3\]

(2) Middle Mongol, SH §82

\[\text{üli } \text{jaa-qu } \text{bi} \]
\[\text{IPFV.NEG } \text{show-FUT.P} \text{ 1SG} \]
\[\text{‘I will not show them [your hiding place].’} \]

In addition to verbs in finite usage, the modified element can be an attributive participle, as in (3), or an adverbially used converb, as in (4):

(3) Middle Mongol, SH §82 (de Rachewiltz 2004: 24)

\[\text{mün mün mör-iér-en } \text{ese } \text{üje-gsen qajar-iyan} \]
\[\text{same same track-INS-REFL.POSS } \text{PFV.NEG see-PF.P place-REFL.POSS} \]
\[\text{üje-ed qari-n } \text{bedere-ye} \]
\[\text{see-PF.C return-IPFV.C search-VOL} \]
\[\text{‘Let’s go back each on his own way and search, looking at the places which we have not yet looked at.’} \]

(4) Middle Mongol, SH §149 (de Rachewiltz 2004: 70)

\[\text{cima-ye (…) ese teki ala-asu (…) kee-n ala-qu} \]
\[\text{2SG-ACC PFV.NEG FOC kill-COND.C say-IPFV.C kill-FUT.P} \]
\[\text{‘even if [1] don’t kill you (…), they will kill [me] saying that (…)’} \]

2. The transcription of the primary source “Secret history of the Mongols” used here is John Street’s version 23g with slight modifications. Version 24 can be found at <http://altaica.ru/SECRET/e_street.htm> (retrieved 15 September 2015).

3. This paper follows the Leipzig Glossing Rules. Original glosses (e.g. of Chuluu 1994–1994d, Sf içхаokөгү 1999 and Slater 2003) have been standardized. Most quoted sources did not provide any glossing, though, so that many glosses are entirely new. Translations in examples from Mongolian sources are new, while translations in sources in third languages have been adapted into English with corrections. Transcriptions from English sources have been left unchanged except if noted specifically.
Historically speaking, the converb -asu < -basu in (4) contains the past suffix -ba and is accordingly negated by ese. The imperfective converb -n would be negated by üli. For a full list of morphological forms, corresponding negators and some discussion, see Yu (1991: 46). Example (4) also illustrates the only element that can occur between the verb and the negator, namely, focus particles such as teki ‘even’ (from Uyghur taqii, see Rybatzki in preparation) or gu ‘even’ as in SH §179.

In addition to üli and ese, MM also had the negator üdügüi, which always co-occurred with the resultative participle -gai > -ai. It can take case (as in SH §7 and §118) and must therefore be of nominal origin (Yu 1991: 119–21). One might try to analyze üdügüi as a gendered form of edüi ‘gerade noch; soviel’ (Rybatzki in preparation) analogous to forms of ügei (see Section 3). However, as gender does not seem to be a factor that can explain its distribution, it is more plausible to assume that edüi merged with ügei ‘not present, not existent’ into edügei > üdügüi.5 The form does not appear in sentence-final position, but only adverbially, as in (5) and attributively, as in (6), thus excluding it from SN in MM.

(5) Middle Mongol, SH §149
nam-a-yi ala-ay üdüüy-e öter qari-dqun.
1sg-acc kill-res.p neg.yet-dat quick return-imp.pl
‘Quickly return (i.e. leave) while [he] has not yet killed me (i.e. as his hostage).’

(6) Middle Mongol, SH §7
alan_ qoa nere-tey güü-ne ber ög-te-ey üdüüy
name name-poss.sg person-dat foc give-pass-res.p neg.yet
ökin a-juu.
girl cop-indir.pst
‘There was a ... girl with the name Alan Gua who had not yet been given (i.e. as a wife) to anybody.’

In Moghol, present and future finite verbs are negated by ulá ~ la, as in (7a), while past finite verbs are negated by esá ~ isá, which is sometimes cliticized to the verb, as in (7b) (Weiers 1972: 140–142). Apart from this, ulá is used for polar alternative questions of the type ... jo (u)lá “(is it so) or not” (Urankimeg 2009: 50 with examples from Weiers 1972: 39, 48).

(7) Moghol (Weiers 1972: 140, 142)
a) ulá medá-na-mbi
ipfv.neg know-progressive-1sg
‘I don’t know.’

4. ‘just, that much’
5. The commonly held position. Another candidate instead of edüi would be edüge ‘now’, for if a merger had really occurred, only the stem edü- (which can also be established through edüir ‘day’) would have survived.
b) \textit{koun-i bi s=álá-ja-mbi}\smallskip
child\text{-ACC} \ 1SG \ PFV.NEG=kill\text{-?INDIR.PST-1SG}\smallskip
‘I didn’t kill the child.’

A similar system still exists in Santa. Field (1997: 5.3.2.2) favors a realis distinction between \textit{əsə} and \textit{uliə}, but notes that the difference between this and a perfective/imperfective distinction is slim. It hinges on whether verbs with the suffix \textit{-dʐiwo} that are negated by \textit{əsə}, as in (8), are interpreted as progressive or perfect (which Field could not decide on the basis of his corpus in which this type of construction is too rare).

\begin{enumerate}(8) \textit{Santa} (Field 1997: section 5.3.2.2.1)  
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
\textit{tsi-ni} & \textit{lɑudʑigɑ} & \textit{mi-ni} & \textit{dʐɑŋ-ni} & \textit{dɑu} & \textit{ori} \\
\textit{2SG-GEN} & \textit{old.man} & \textit{1SG-GEN} & \textit{debt-ACC} & \textit{still} & \textit{debt} \\
\end{tabular}\smallskip
\textit{əsə} \ \textit{g i ə -dʐiwo}\smallskip
NEG.? \ pay\text{-PROG}\smallskip
‘Your old man still has not repaid my debt.’ \smallskip
[or: ‘Your old man is still not repaying my debt.’]
\end{enumerate}

\subsection*{2.1.2. Standard Negation in Mongolian}

While SN in MM was based on analogy with the positive forms, this analogy was gradually abandoned during the Classical Mongolian period. The existential negator of MM \textit{ügei} was generalized into the only verbal negator. As a nominal element, \textit{ügei} only combined with participles, preventing morphologically finite verbs from undergoing negation, thus neutralizing the MM future/present and direct/indirect evidence distinctions in positive sentences involving finite forms. Table 2 (with data taken from Toγtambayar 2004: 70–71) shows how the use of negators changed over time in four Mongolian sources both in absolute tokens and in percentage of occurrence within four sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>üli/ese</th>
<th>ügei</th>
<th>busu/bisi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erdeni-yin tobcı (1662, chronicle)</td>
<td>206 (96%)</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
<td>14 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolur erike (1775, chronicle)</td>
<td>660 (55%)</td>
<td>513 (42%)</td>
<td>45 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köke sudur (second half of 19th century, novel)</td>
<td>608 (41%)</td>
<td>863 (57%)</td>
<td>33 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qabur-un naran begejing-ece (1957, novel)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>213 (94%)</td>
<td>12 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Table 2. Pre- and post-verbal negation in Mongolian over time}

If one were to judge from Table 2, the replacement of \textit{üli/ese} by \textit{ügei} would seem to have started no earlier than in the late 17th century and to have come to a close no
later than in the middle of the 20th century. However, there’s reason to be cautious: 1. Köke sudur, the first Mongolian novel, is most likely to feature a somewhat archaizing style, and the stylistic and areal properties of Erdeni-yin tobci are hard to evaluate without a corpus that somehow represents the diversity of 17th century sources.\(^6\)

2. Kalmyk, as we shall see below, has fully grammaticalized ügei, but it broke off its contact with the rest of Central Mongolic in the early 17th century. 3. The innovation of post-verbal negation in Jurchen and Manchu (see Hölzl 2015: 129–132) is quite likely due to Mongolic influence (Ikegami 1999 [1978]: 348–9), and it is already attested for the Ming period (1368–1644) (Hölzl, p.c., 9 September 2015) well before Manchu influence on eastern Central Mongolic started.\(^7\) However the precise development took place, ügei in due course changed into the bounded morpheme =güi, exemplified in (9) and (10).

\[(9)\] Khalkha\(^8\)
\[ügüi \ bi \ tusl(a)-h=güi=ee\]
\[no \ 1SG\ help-NPST=NEG=EMPH\]
‘No, I won’t help!’

\[(10)\] Buryat (Poppe 1960a: 66)
\[jaba-han=gyi=š\]
\[go-PRF.P=NEG-1SG\]
‘Thou didst not go.’

The morpho-syntactic status of =güi is somewhat tricky. For most Khalkha speakers, the sound change üi [ui] > üü [uː] has taken place, but next to =güi [gu] sometimes even its vowel-harmonic variant =guu [ɢʊː] occurs. In a small spoken corpus of Khalkha, about 10% of instances of =güi are realized as =guu, which, if the negated words were to be evenly distributed between the two vowel-harmonic classes, would

---

\(^6\) While sources for these so-called “Classical Mongolian” period are available in abundance, existing electronical corpora leave aside all kinds of relics (such as letters, orders and contracts) and even the vast body of mostly Tibetan-based (and sometimes originally Mongolian) religious literature and Manchu-based historical literature (with translations that vary from morpheme-by-morpheme to entirely free), focusing instead almost entirely on one single nationally particularly interesting source type, namely, indigenous chronicles. Their number is too small to cover even areal variation in any meaningful way, something that (early, not yet formulaic) administrative sources could easily accomplish.

\(^7\) An internal development within Tungusic is possible, though (Hölzl 2015: 137), and scenarios under which this might have influenced Mongolic are not totally out of the question. Investigating this issue further would first require an areally stratified corpus of 17th century Mongolian writing.

\(^8\) [http://biznetwork.mn/topic/show/6589/2], 1 August 2009, retrieved 4 June 2015

\(^9\) Khalkha was transcribed from Cyrillic following the way it has conventionally come to be written in Latin letters on the internet, except that ў <ő>, є <ő> and є <ő>.
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account for 20% in words without advanced tongue root. Apart from this, we find the contractions -dag=güi [tɑ̄gguː ~ tguː], -h=güi [xguː ~ kʰuː] and -san=güi [sɑ̄ŋguː ~ sguː] for habitual, future and perfect participle under negation. The reason Khalkha =güi is still treated as a clitic here is that the focus clitic =č (often translatable as ‘even’ or ‘also’) can still be inserted between participle and negator:

(11) Khalkha, spoken corpus

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ter}=č\text{in} & \quad \text{soht-oo}=č=güi=ee. \\
\text{DEM.DIST}=\text{STC} & \quad \text{become.drunk-RES.P}=\text{NEG}=\text{EMPH}
\end{align*}
\]

[A: ‘I remember, you were really a bit drunk, actually. You went outside and were crying.’]

B: ‘That was not even becoming drunk!’

[C: ‘You were just happy, right?’ B: ‘I felt moved ...’]

Similar contractions take place in Oirat, Khorchin and Khalkha, e.g. Kalmyk kel-dg uga ~ kel-dgo ‘he [habitually] doesn’t talk’ (Benzig 1985: 166) and Khorchin -sgue (Bayancogt 2002: 306). Vowel harmony is reported to obtain for the negated Khorchin non-past marker -xʊɛ ~ -xuɛ (< -x=guɛ) (Bayancoytu 2002: 55–6, 304).

The development in Buryat has gone further than elsewhere. In contrast to the rest of Mongolic, =gyi has here become compatible with finite forms, while the future, which has developed from a former preventive discussed in 6.2, is negated like an imperative (Skribnik 2003: 113–5). It thus seems that whatever temporal and evidential oppositions in positive Buryat sentences are left intact under negation.

(12) Buryat (Poppe 1960a: 57–59)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a) } & \quad \text{jaba-na/ba=}\text{gyi}=b & \text{b) } & \quad \text{by} & \quad \text{jab-uuža}=b \\
\text{go-PRES/PST}=\text{NEG}=\text{1SG} & \text{NEG.IMP} & \text{go-FUT-1SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I do/did not go.’ ‘I shall not go.’

While Khalkha, Chakhar and Buryat don’t use reflexes of ügei as free existential negators and instead negate the positive auxiliary verb bai- with =güi, Khorchin, Ordos and Oirat use free reflexes of ügei as a negative auxiliary, which is used instead of the positive auxiliary in present-tense contexts even when it controls a converb:

---

10. This unpublished, ca. 60,000-word corpus by Baasanjaviin Zoljargal and Benjamin Brosig consists of informal TV conversation (ca. 60%), informal conversation (20%) and other TV materials (20%). This means that its overall pronunciation is still somewhat more normative than in regular casual conversation, possibly favoring the orthographic pronunciation =güu or =güü. As this phenomenon was not of particular interest when preparing this corpus, it is conceivable that the transcriber underreported instances of =guu.

11. This is in itself a bit strange, as Bayancoytu also writes that /ʊ/ is restricted to the first syllables of words. Judging from his examples, this is also true of /ʊɛ/. The only straightforward explanation I could suggest would be to take güi as a full word and analyze its attachment to the future participle, morpho-phonemically speaking, as compounding.
(13) Kalmyk Oirat\textsuperscript{12}
\begin{align*}
\text{Doәn-ә} & \text{ oln} \quad \text{aam'gә} \quad \text{zovlʉ} \quad \text{üz-sn} \quad \text{kүn,} \quad \text{әndә} \quad \text{ńdr} \\
\text{war-gen} & \text{ many} \quad \text{awful} \quad \text{suffering} \quad \text{see-prf.p} \quad \text{person} \quad \text{high} \quad \text{day}
\end{align*}

\text{kürtl} \quad \text{mart-ad} \quad \text{uga.}

until \text{ forget-pfv.c} \quad \text{ex.neg-1sg}

‘A person who has seen the awful sufferings of war doesn’t forget them even with high age.’

(14) Ordos (unpublished transcription of own material)
\begin{align*}
\text{ölös-či=güi} & \quad \text{bolhoor} \quad \text{ide-hű} \quad \text{sanaa=güe} \quad \text{lee} \\
\text{hunger-ipvfc=} \text{neg} & \text{because eat} \quad \text{intention=} \text{neg} \quad \text{sp}
\end{align*}

‘I’m not hungry, so I don’t intend to eat.’

In (14), the positive form would be the progressive \text{ölös-či} \text{bai-hu} \text{bolhoor} ‘because I am feeling hungry’ with the non-past auxiliary \text{bai-}. For Khorchin, Fufubâtoru (1992: 120) notes that examples like (14) with the imperfective converb are possible, while Urancimeg (p.c.)\textsuperscript{13} rejects examples such as (13) with the perfective converb. For Proto-Ordos, it is hard to decide whether *\text{-aad=güi} can be reconstructed, as \text{-aa} is widely used INSTEAD OF \text{-aad}, so that the former might either be taken to be a reduced form of the latter or to directly derive from the MM resultative participle \text{-ya(i)}, which is used in Khalkha \text{-aa=güi} (the most common negation of a past event). Semantically, \text{-aad=güi} and \text{-aa=güi} don’t seem to differ to Ordos speakers, and \text{-aad} \text{< -γad} might go back to a (highly speculative) form \text{*-ya-da} \text{-res.p-dat}. Two additional strategies of SN have developed, one based on \text{edüi} and the other on \text{busi}. In Khorchin, MM /\text{i/dügei/} [\text{*utugei}] developed (perhaps along the path \text{*etui ugei > utugei > *utei > *ute > -ute}) into a full-blown standard negator. While non-past forms are negated by \text{=gue}, there is a contrast between \text{-gue} and \text{-ute} in the past. While (15) refers to an event that has not or not yet taken place at the time of speech and in this case even gets gets an experiential reading, (16) refers to a certain point in the past at which a certain event didn’t take place. Finer nuances have not been explored, though \text{-ute} seems to be the more frequent.\textsuperscript{14}

(15) Khorchin (Bayancoγtu 2002: 305)
\begin{align*}
\text{pi:} & \quad \text{pә:tsɨŋ-t} \quad \text{of-tf} \quad \text{ʊbәe-t} \quad \text{of-ute} \\
1sg & \text{place-dat} \quad \text{go.to-pst}\textsuperscript{15} \text{place-dat} \quad \text{go.to-neg.yet}
\end{align*}

‘I’ve been to Beijing, but I haven’t been to Udaï yet.’

\textsuperscript{12} Ivan Soldačenko: Dәәnә baatrmud ‘War heroes’, Xal’ng ünn 1978 № 64 (1st of April), page 4.
\textsuperscript{13} Urancimeg (“Uranchimeg Ujeeed”), department of social anthropology, University of Cambridge, is not the same researcher as Urancimeg (2009), department for Mongolian language and literature, Qinghai Nationalities University.
\textsuperscript{14} In my Khorchin corpus (here defined as transcriptions of the sound files 5, 17, 43, 45, 48, 50–52, 54–55, 57–58, 76–80, 84–86, 88, 92, 95, 98–100, 102, 105), the relative frequencies are 37 (\text{-ute}) vs. 8 (\text{-s-gue}).
\textsuperscript{15} As the converb \text{-tf} in Khorchin is restricted to complex predicates (Brosig 2014b: 16), this suffix cannot be analyzed as a converb in this context, but must be analyzed as a past-tense suffix.
(16) Khorchin (own unpublished corpus, 2011)

\[\text{chetət pəl-le bəkərt-s-gue}\]

Chinese \(\text{become-CVB, when talk-PST-EX,NEG}\)

‘Because they turned out to be Chinese, we didn’t talk.’

An etymologically distinct variant of this form is Ordos -\(\text{a}:\text{dəi}\), which probably goes back to *-\(\gamma\)a edüi, as illustrated in (17). Sarangγuu-a (2007: 45) gives (18) as an example of two negators expressing a single negation.\(^{16}\) She doesn’t properly specify to which Inner Mongolian dialect this example belongs, but the orthographic rendering is similar to -\(\text{a}:\text{dəi}\). Example (18) is structurally equivalent to (11) and suggests that the structure in (17) might have come into existence via a Jesperson cycle: The original negator \(*\text{ügei}\) was lost in the course of historical development and ceded its function to the emphatic element *e\(\text{dəi}\). The original negator, in turn, then seems to be “resurrected” when the focus clitic requires that a sentence-final element be added. Obviously, additional research to confirm this point would be useful.

(17) Ordos (Secen et al. 2003: 245)

\[\text{gadʒir xɵld-ɵːdʉi}\]

ground freeze-NEG,yet

‘The ground did not freeze (yet).’

(18) probably Ordos (Sarangγuu-a 2007: 45)

\[\text{ene učir-i sonusu(y)-adui=ču ügei}\]

DEM,PROX matter-ACC hear-NEG,yet=FOC EX,NEG

‘I haven’t even heard of that matter yet.’

In Oirat, the ascriptive negator \(\text{biš} < \text{MM busi}\) became a verbal negator -\(\text{s}\) that can only be used in its shortened form. This development can probably be traced back until the early 18th century: Toytambayar (2004: 70–1) counted 8% \(\text{busu/biši}\) among all negators in \(\text{Arban jüg-iün ejen geser qarən-u təɾu̯ji orusiba}\) (1716), a source in Mongolian script with clear Oirat characteristics, while his other pre-20th-century sources (cf. Table 2 above) had no more than 3%. Among the participles, -\(\text{s}\) combines only with the non-past form -\(\text{h}\) and then negates a present state, while -\(\text{go}\) attaching to the same participle would negate a future event (Grigorij Pjurbeev, p.c., 2010). A habit, disposition or generic property, in contrast, can be negated either by -\(\text{h-go}\) (taking a future perspective) or by -\(\text{d-go}\) (negating the habit directly) (Yu. Cendee, p.c., November 2011).

(19) Oirat, Kalmyk variety (Pjurbeev 1977: 17/18; p.c./constructed)

\[\text{Övgn yum kel-\text{h-š}. / kel-\text{h-go}. / kel-\text{d-go}.}\]

old.man thing say-NPST,P-NEG / say-FUT,P-EX,NEG / say-HAB,P-EX,NEG

‘The old man doesn’t speak [now] / won’t speak / doesn’t speak [in general].’

16. Sarangγuu-a (2007) also gives an example of \(\text{ese}\) and \(\text{ülü}\) co-occurring, which she restricts to the genre of oral literature, but her discussion is not sufficiently detailed to make proper sense of it.
One might try to explain this distribution by suggesting that reflexes of *busi* ‘other’ are particularly suited for denial. Denying a present state appears to be a more salient act than denying the future, thus leading to a particularly high frequency of -š in present-tense contexts. Later, -š might have been narrowed down to such contexts, while -go might in the same process have become confined to future reference. Given the available sources, a diachronic study to test this thesis would be possible. Collocations of reflexes of -*QU* plus *busi* can also be found, in low frequency, in Dagur (Yamada 2010: 231), Khalkha and MM, and here their function might actually be to contest the truth of a given assumption:

(20) Middle Mongol *(The twelve deeds of Buddha 63a)*

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{šiłuγun} & \quad \text{jilmayan-dur} & \quad \text{qurica-qui} & \quad \text{ügei} & \quad \text{širigün} & \quad \text{qataγu-dur} \\
\text{honest} & \quad \text{composed?} & \quad \text{lust-fut.p} & \quad \text{ex.neg} & \quad \text{cool} & \quad \text{hard-dat} \\
\text{kilinge-kü} & \quad \text{ügei} & \quad \text{üli} & \quad \text{mungqayura-γul-da-qu} & \quad \text{be.angry-fut.p} & \quad \text{ex.neg} & \quad \text{ipfv.neg} & \quad \text{be_stupid-caus-pass-fut.p} \\
\text{bilig-tü-yin} & \quad \text{tulada} & \quad \text{öcügükên} & \quad \text{ken-e} & \quad \text{ber} & \quad \text{wisdom-poss-gen} & \quad \text{because} & \quad \text{a_bit} & \quad \text{who-dat} & \quad \text{foc} \\
\text{ködel-ge-n} & \quad \text{cida-γda-qu} & \quad \text{busu} & \quad \text{bu-i} \\
\text{move-caus-cvb} & \quad \text{can-pass-fut.p} & \quad \text{id.neg} & \quad \text{cop-pres}?
\end{align*}
\]

‘As, being without lusting in his honesty and composure, and without feeling anger in his coolness and firmness, he possesses an intellect which cannot be stultified, it is not at all the case that he could be moved by anyone who is insignificant.’

2.1.3. Standard Negation in Southern Mongolic

Most Southern Mongolic languages retained cognates of both üli and ese, which can (along with the prohibitive particle *boo*) be assimilated to verbs, e.g. *siï orova* → *soorova* ‘didn’t rain’ (Zhàonàsìtú 1981: 12). The adverbial negators are usually presumed to preserve the distinction in question as tense-aspect-related (Slater 2003: 146, Fried 2010: 224–227), as illustrated in (21).

(21) Bonan *(Fried 2010: 224, 226)*

a) *eongisa ateŋla ølø oδo-m*

‘They don’t usually go.’

17. Poppe (1967: 160) originally translated this sentence as follows: ‘He does not feel lust, in his honesty and composure; he does not feel angry, in his coolness and firmness. And he cannot be moved by anyone who is insignificant, because he possesses an intellect which will not be stultified.’ His translation differs in the following respects: 1. He translates the verbal phrases with *ügei* as finite, but if so, this sentence would not be MM; 2. He translates *busu* as a neutral negator, but this would fit neither MM nor even Classical Mongolian.
b) *nonwarhten po silaŋ-da əsə o-to*
  
  this.morning 1SG Xining=LOC PFV.NEG go-ALPFV
  
  ‘I didn’t go to Xining this morning.’

However, Slater (2003: 146) notes for Mangghuer that in 5 out of 48 tokens in his corpus, the perfective suffix is negated by *lai* and not *sai*, as in (22). In Shira Yugur, the cognate of *ültė* has taken over the function of *ese* entirely, as illustrated in (23).

(22) Mangghuer (Slater 2003: 146)

\[
\text{Ni kong gan \textit{lai} chengrengla-jiang.} \\
\text{this person 3SG NEG consent-ALPFV}
\]

‘This man, he didn’t consent.’

(23) Shira Yugur (Chuluu 1994b: 19–20)

\[
\text{bu ... nege səːnə \textit{lə} ser-βe} \\
\text{1SG ... one night NEG wake-PST}
\]

‘I ... didn’t wake all night.’

Mangghuer and apparently Bonan may use *gu*- and ‘*gi*-’, respectively, for negating the perfect participle *-san*; the role of these constructs within the overall TAME system is, however, not clear.

(24) Mangghuer (Slater 2003: 145)

\[
\text{Huer qige-sang \textit{gu-ang}.} \\
\text{monkey see-PREF.P EX.NEG-NAI}
\]

‘(so) Monkey did not see (her).’

(25) Bonan (Chuluu 1994d: 16)

\[
\text{əmtəg sartɕin gəːgə-saŋ ‘gi-wə} \\
\text{this_kind strange hear-PFV.P EX.NEG-NAI}
\]

‘I have never heard such a strange thing.’

The use of reflexes of *ügen* as negative auxiliaries together with converbs seems quite common in Southern Mongolic, even though it appears not to be documented for Santa. The converb involved in these constructions is usually a reflex of *-*ju, which is older than *-aad* as used in some varieties of Central Mongolic (see 2.1.3). Xiāo’s (2007: 506) suggestion that Mongghul si: ... -va and -dʒə *gu-i* might be functionally equivalent, with the latter form displacing the first one, is interesting, but in need of hard evidence.

(26) Shira Yugur (Chuluu 1994b: 23)

\[
\text{muna ene məsəq qəqə-ðə dʒə-ðə \textit{ugwəi}} \\
\text{1SG.GEN DEM.PROX clothing body-DAT fit-CVB EX.NEG}
\]

‘Now these clothes don’t fit me.’
In the Dānmá dialect of Mongghul, the preceding verb can take the forms -n, -ji and -ja, but all of these combine with both gu-i and gu-a. According to Kakudō (2008: 143), speaker control is usually given with -ji or -n and absent with -ja, and this is independent of whether gu-i or gu-a is used. As Kakudō (p.c., January 2012) pointed out, word-final -m became -n in the dialects of Dānmá and Dōngshān, so that -n here might not only go back to the MM converb -n, but may instead resemble the historically somewhat obscure finite suffix -m attested by Todaeva (1973: 184) and Faehndrich (2007: 195):

(28) Mongghul, Dānmá dialect (Todaeva 1973: 184, translation Kakudō p.c.)

ажи-са  ажи-гу-на         мүде-м  гу-ā
be.afraid-COND.C be.afraid-IPFV.P-3POSS  know-PRES EX.NEG-NAI
‘Even if one is afraid, he does not know fear.’

The use of -ʃ/ç together with the future participle in Shira Yugur and Bonan formally resembles Oirat. However, in contrast to Oirat it seems to be the sole negator of this participle in finite verbs. Consequently, its meaning is restricted to future in Bonan (29), while it is non-past in Shira Yugur, as illustrated by its future reference in (30) and by its reference to a present state in (31). This functional difference makes at least a more recent borrowing less likely and in the case of Shira Yugur might point to a common origin from the Oirat sub-branch of Central Mongolic.

(29) Bonan (Fried 2010: 229–230)

a) нэцэлэг  рэ  о-гэ  ç-i
this.evening lSG go-FUT.P ID.NEG-NAI
‘I will not go this evening.’

b) нэцэлэг  тэяси  о-гэ  ç-o
this.evening Jiashi lSG go-FUT.P ID.NEG-NAI
‘Jiashi will not go this evening.’

(30) Shira Yugur (Chuluu 1994b: 10)

тʃə  ɔrɔi  kʊr-ʃə-f  β-ai,  dagqə  hərtə  βa-m-naːɕ
2SG late arrive-NPST.P-NEG COP-NAI still early COP-NPST-“particle”? 
‘You will not be late, it is still early.’

---

18. Shira Yugur negates the sentence-final habitual participle -dag with ule (Altansubud, p.c.), so its meaning vis-à-vis -kə-f when referring to present events requires further research.
(31) Shira Yugur (Altansubud, p.c.)
\[\text{ergen} \ jɔғɔр \ lɑr \ med-eg-f \ β-ai\]
3sg yugur word? know-NPST.P-NEG COP-NAI
’S/He doesn’t know the Shira Yugur language.’

In Bonan, even the participle -\textit{saŋ}, which is used either to indicate past tense (Hugjiltu 2003: 342) or to mark epistemic possibility and even the reduction of illocutionary force for reasons of politeness (Fried 2010: 183–5), can in its future-like epistemic use be negated by ç or, as in (32), its non-contracted from çə-wa.

(32) Bonan (Fried 2010: 290)
\[\text{kʰətʰə} \ tʰa-\textit{sa} \ kʰətʰə=\text{ku} \ \text{aku}=\text{la} \]
home.loc sleep-COND.C home.loc=IPFV.NMLZ girl=PL
\[\text{wi}-\text{sa} \ \text{sauma} \ \text{wi-saŋ} \ \text{çə-wa}\]
COP-COND.C ceremonially.clean COP-POSIBILITY ID.NEG-NAI
‘If (they) sleep at home, if there are girls at home, (they) will not be ceremonially clean.’

2.1.4. Standard Negation in Dagur

The TAM system of Dagur as spoken in Qiqihaer has been described by Wang (1993: 101) as consisting of future -\textit{w}, present -\textit{yibei}, past -\textit{sen} and past continuous -\textit{iyas-en}. The future -\textit{bei} (cognate with the MM factual past marker -\textit{bA(i)}) is negated by the adverbial \textit{ul} in combination with the non-declarative suffix -\textit{en} (MM progressive -\textit{nam} > Khorchin -\textit{na} generic-habitual-future):

(33) Dagur, Hailar dialect (Yamada 2010: 5 citing Shiotani 1991: 90)
\[\text{ənə} \ \text{ǰiešigən-ii-mini} \ \text{yaulgaa-ǰ} \ \text{ul} \ \text{uk-ən-ši} \ \text{yəə}\]
DEM.PROX letter-ACC-1SG.Poss send-CVB NEG give-FUT-2SG Q
‘Didn’t you send off that letter of mine?’

At least in some varieties, the suffix -\textit{en} is not restricted to the negated non-progressive with \textit{ul}, but can also be used with the polar interrogative particle \textit{joɛ}, with the word \textit{juə}: ‘what’, and with the modal particle \textit{gə}, which expresses doubt (Namcarai & Qaserdeni 1983: 249). It might thus have a particular distribution in interrogative contexts.

The forms in -\textit{sen} are directly negated by attaching \textit{uwei} (Wang 1993: 111). The non-past progressive is more problematic. For the Hailar dialect, Yamada (2010: 227) mentions two forms that look functionally equivalent: \textit{ul məd(ə)-ǰ-aa-wəi} 知りません ‘doesn’t know’ [< *عطي mede-jū a-bai, with a negator that by MM standards is aspe-
\textit{c}tually disharmonic with both -\textit{jū} and -\textit{ba}, though it is harmonic with the new non-
\textit{past meaning of -bei}], and -\textit{ǰaa-gu-uwei} [< *-ju a-qu ügei; Hailar -\textit{ja}- and Qiqihaer
-\textit{iy}- seem to be equivalents, and are possibly cognates]. Wang (1993: 111) mentions

19. All forms cited are third person singular. For other persons, the stem -\textit{uw}- is used instead of \textit{uwei}.
yet another form, -uwei [perhaps < *-gu uwei], which under negation apparently dispenses with progressive marking. The construction in which uwei functions as an auxiliary, and which goes back to *-ju igei (cf. Central Mongolic (14) and Southern Mongolic (27)), is attested for the Hailar dialect, too, though its aspecto-temporal meaning requires clarification:

(34) Dagur, Hailar dialect (Yu et al. 2008: 84)

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{fi: } u^\text{hi} & & \text{tate^oko-t } & & \text{ite^hi-te } & & \text{a:-gə-fi:-jo} \\
&\text{2sg } & & \text{yesterday } & & \text{school-DAT } & & \text{go-CVB } & & \text{cop-NPST.P-2SG-Q} \\
&\text{a: } & & \text{ite^hi-te } & & \text{uwe}: \\
&\text{oh } & & \text{go-CVB } & & \text{EX.NEG} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘You didn’t go to school yesterday, did you? - Oh, I didn’t go.’

The particle ude:n (cognate with Khorchin -ute, though the origin of the n is unclear) is only mentioned by Namcarai and Qaserdeni (1983: 347) without direct reference to a dialect, but it is found in materials of the Butkha dialect, which is spoken in Hulunbuir and thus in contact with Khorchin. They note that ude:n combines only with a reflex of the MM future participle -qu. This is somewhat puzzling as it is thus structurally dissimilar to the construction in both MM (where the resultative participle -ga was used) and Khorchin (where it attaches directly to the verb stem).

(35) Butkha dialect (Chuluu 1994: 15)

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{fin/ } & & \text{aka:-fin/ } & & \text{dutfin } & & \text{nas } & & \text{kur-γu} \\
&\text{2SG.GEN } & & \text{elder_brother-2POSS } & & \text{forty } & & \text{year } & & \text{reach-NPST.P} \\
&\text{ude:n, } & & \text{dʒur-i-bəi } & & \text{ja:?} \\
&\text{NEG } & & \text{right-NPST } & & \text{Q} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Your elder brother has not reached forty yet, has he?’

2.2. Position of the negation marker in complex predicates in MM and Khalkha

While Dryer (1988, 2013) relates the position of the negator to that of the main verb, Dahl (1979) relates it to the position of the finite verb. As auxiliaries tend to develop from full verbs, it might be that the position of the negator is only reoriented towards the entire verbal complex after the auxiliary has been grammaticalized to a sufficiently high degree (Dahl 2010: 25). Pre-main-verbal negation tends to be crosslinguistically more common by a ratio of 1.8:1 (686: 303), while at the same time, suffixed negators are slightly more common than prefixed ones by a ratio of 1.2:1 (202: 162), disregarding languages that employ double negation or a few other strategies that cannot be classified neatly (Dryer 2013).

As detailed data for complex predications is lacking for most of Mongolic, this discussion will focus on my own analysis of MM and Khalkha. To begin with, in MM, if no interrogative clitic is attached to the negator adverb, it precedes the entire
verb phrase. This happens with all complex predicates irrespective of whether the old copular auxiliary bö-, as in (36), or its more recent counterpart a-, as in (37), is used:

(36) Middle Mongol: SH §208

```
seŋgüm-i ese širqa-qaša n bö-esū
```

NAME-ACC NEG.PFV wound-PFV.P COP-COND.C

‘If we hadn’t wounded Senggüm, ...’

(37) Middle Mongol: SH §255

```
uruq-tur niken=üü sayin ülü täre-gū a-juu
```

offspring-DAT one=q good IPFV.NEG be.born-FUT.P COP-INDIR.PST

‘..., wouldn’t there have been born at least one good among [my] descendants?’

Complex predicates very often co-occur with rhetorical questions, and in unmarked questions (as opposed to (37) where niken ‘one’ is focused), the interrogative clitic is attached to the negator (Street 2008a: 62–65). Like with declarative complex predicates, the negator plus clitic can precede the verb phrase in all constellations. In these cases, the main verb can be a future participle in -qu (38), an imperfective converb in -n (39) or a resultative converb in -ju.

(38) Middle Mongol: SH §214 (de Rachewiltz 2004: 147)

```
köün-ü amin-tur qor ülü=ü gür-ge-gū bü-lee
```

son-GEN life-DAT harm IPFV.NEG=q reach-CAUS-FUT.P COP-DIR.PST

‘..., wouldn’t he have done harm to the child’s life ...?’

(39) Middle Mongol: Subhāṣitaratnānidhi VIII:20b

```
...keme-besū urida toli-yi ülü gü arci-n bu-i
```

… say-COND.C before mirror-ACC IPFV.NEG Q wipe-CVB COP-PRES?

‘If one [wishes to wipe and adjust one’s face,] does one not first wipe the mirror?’

---

20. This order is also attested for Dagur, though I cannot tell whether it is the only possible order:

```
xʷar ul war-gu-tʃin² a-sa:
```

rain NEG enter-IPFV-STC? be-COND.C

‘if it hadn’t rained’.

21. This example is non-finite, but there are no cases (in the SH) where ese preceded a final complex predication. Given the overall low frequency of such complex predications, this gap is probably accidental.

22. The pattern -qu a-juγu usually expresses a future in the past (Brosig 2014a: 21–23), but in this case it refers to a reference point in the future, thus fulfilling the function of a past in the future.
In predications based on -qu and -ju, but not in those based on -n, the negator can also occupy the position between the main verb and the finite auxiliary. This can perhaps be explained by the fact that n plus copular auxiliary forms progressives, which refer to one single state, while -qu and -ju plus a-/bü- refer to two temporal situations. For -qu, this can easily be shown by a paraphrase that negates the copular auxiliary separately, as in (40). The five tokens attested with -ju, on the other hand, apparently don’t contain telic predicates and don’t directly lend themselves to this explanation. In (41), for instance, reading aqa-la- (aqa - elder.brother, -la- suffix deriving transitive verbs from nominals) as ‘take command over’ instead of ‘be in command over’ would do the trick (‘Wouldn’t you be there, having taken command over ...’ or ‘Wouldn’t you be in a state of having taken command over’), but it feels improbable that verbs in -la- would develop such inchoative meanings.

(40) Middle Mongol: SH §277 (John Street, p.c.)

‘olon ayu-ul-i; gün ükü-ul-i’ kee-gü ese=ü bü-lee?
many fear-CAUS-PRES? person die-CAUS-PRES? SAY-FUT.P PFV.NEG=Q COP-DIR.PST
‘Wasn’t [Chinggis Qaan] accustomed to say “Multitude[s of people] make [one] afraid; deep [waters] make [one] die”.

or: ‘Wasn’t it so that [Chinggis Qaan] would say ...’

(41) Middle Mongol: SH §209 (de Rachewiltz 2004: 142)

2sg name soldier-GEN event all-GEN preside.over-PRES.C

ülü=ü a-qu
IPFV.NEG=Q COP-FUT.P
‘Qubilai, will you not be in charge of all military affairs?’

If the main verb and the finite auxiliary assume forms that would require different negators, the negator will be chosen according to the morphology of the main verb if it directly precedes it, as is illustrated in (37). If it occupies the position in-between main verb and auxiliary, agreement with both auxiliary (41) and main verb (42) are attested. I don’t have evidence on whether this is due to conceptualization – (41) perhaps with two states, (42) with one –, some morphological property of the suffix on the finite auxiliary, or to any other factor.

(42) Middle Mongol: SH §254 (de Rachewiltz 2004: 186)

now 2PL-GEN-POSS good see-VOL say-CVB emote-PRES.C

esе=ü a-mu-i
PFV.NEG=Q COP-NPST-PL
‘And [even] now, does she [=the queen] not wish to see the happiness of you, her [sons]?’
In Khalkha Mongolian, SN has shifted from a preverbal adverbial to a post-clitic. In complex predicates, its position is defined by the scope of negation. The claim made by a direct present progressive or established past, as in (43a), for instance, can be negated in two ways. First, a speaker might want to simply deny (43a) and then construe it as an event that has not (yet) taken place, as in (43b), using the most neutral past tense negation. Alternatively, the speaker might rather think of a situation in which an event is expected to take place, but doesn’t. In this case, it could be construed as a present or past state in which a potential event doesn’t (historically speaking: won’t) happen, as in (43c) and (44). In this case, the marking of tense and evidentiality stays outside the scope of negation.

It is not possible to negate the final direct present suffix at the end of the positive construction (43a) analogously to how it would be negated in its use as a potential/future suffix (bič-ne ‘will write’ > bič-(i)h=güi ‘won’t write’). The string -ž baihgüi as such is attested, but it contains different morphemes. Namely, -ž is not a converb, but the indirect past -ž(ee), which is homophonic with the converb if followed by a stance particle. It is used in its inferential future use, e.g. ter evder-č(ee) could in a fitting context mean ‘he must certainly go’ (see Brosig forthcoming). baihgüiyüü, in turn, is a stance particle that developed from the existential negator plus question particle bai-h=güi=(y)üü cop-fut.p=NEG=Q. It is used to claim that the viewpoint of the speaker cannot really be contested, cf. (43d) and (45).

(43) Khalkha, a-c constructed, d23

a) ter bič-(i)ž bai-na24 / bai-san.
   DEM.DIST write-cvb cop-dir.pres / cop-est.pst
   ‘She is / was writing.’

b) ügüi, ter bič-ee=güi.
   no DEM.DIST write-res.p=NEG
   ‘No, she isn’t writing!’ (lit. ‘No, she didn’t write ~ hasn’t written!’)

c) ter bič-(i)h=güi bai-na. / bai-san.
   DEM.DIST write-fut.p=NEG cop-dir.pres / cop-est.pst
   ‘[Even though I am/was telling her to write,] she is / was not writing.’

d) ene mangar bacaan=n’ (...) teneg yum
   DEM.PROX moron annoying.boy=3poss stupid thing

   bič-(i)ž baihgüiyüü?
   write-indir.pst sp=q
   ‘This stupid tyke is just writing stupid things.’


24. In spoken language usually contracted to [jɑw-tʃi-n] go-prog-dir.pres
(44) bi huul’ zörč-sn=öö hüleen_zövšöör-(ö)h=güi bai-na²⁵
1sg law infringe-prf.p=refl.poss accept-fut.p=neg cop-dir.pres
‘I don’t accept [the claim] that I broke the law.’

(45) odoo či tūün-ii av’yas-iig hüleen_zövšöör-č baihgüiyüü
now 2sg dem.dist-gen talent-acc accept-indir.pst sp=q
‘Now don’t you recognize his talent? [What an envious person you are!]’
(Thompson 2011)
or: ‘You see, now you recognize his talent!’

The past progressive -z bai-san, in contrast, is not restricted to situations in progress, but can also be used with experiential meaning (Brosig forthcoming). In this latter sense, the negator must occur in final position, as shown in (46). The most common negation for -san is -aa=güi (see Section 2.3).

(46) Khalkha ((a) constructed, (b) title of a poem²⁶)
b) bi šüleg gancaar biči-ž bai-san
1sg poem alone-ins write-cvb cop-est.pst
‘I have written a poem / poems alone.’
a) bi hezee=č šüleg gancaar biči-ž bai-(g)aa=güi
1sg when=fof poem alone-ins write-cvb cop-res.p=neg
‘I have never written poems alone.’

2.3. (A)symmetry in Khalkha

The symmetry or asymmetry of negated constructions, thus whether negative constructions differ from their positive counterparts only by the presence of a negative marker or also in some other respect, is another relevant distinction in Mongolic. (A)symmetry can pertain to paradigms, which is why its analysis requires a fairly detailed knowledge about the functions of both positive and negative forms. For this reason, we shall focus on Khalkha only.

According to Miestamo (2005), symmetric negation is motivated by formal analogy to positive sentences, which facilitates processing. Asymmetry may be due to loss of finiteness and TAM[E] distinctions, among other things. The use of non-finite verb forms is due to the affinity of negatives to stativity: under negation, both stative and dynamic predications refer to a stative situation or fact. Stative concepts are prototypically expressed by nouns, and non-finite verbs become gradually more nouny than finite ones. The loss of temporal distinctions is not unexpected for an event that never took place and is thus more difficult to locate in time. Alternatively, information on time is often already present in the wider context in case of denials and can thus be taken as redundant.

In MM, negated sentences differed from positive sentences only by the presence of adverbial negators. Verbal negation was thus symmetric. In Buryat, which like all of Central Mongolic adapted a post-verbal negation pattern based on *ügei, symmetry was by and large re-established when the use of =gyi was extended to the finite declarative suffixes -na and -ba. Neither language retains strict paradigmatic symmetry due to the use of ügei for negating resultant states in MM and the use of -uuža, negated as a mood, for future time reference in Buryat (for examples, see 2.1).

In Khalkha, as is approximately true also for the other Central Mongolic varieties besides Buryat, the only verbal morphological form that can be negated is participles. There are four participial suffixes that express temporal and aspectual meanings. Table 3 shows how verbs in different syntactic positions can combine with constructions consisting of a participle and a negator. Forms that are for some reason peripheral are in parentheses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Habitual</th>
<th>Resultative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finite positive</td>
<td>-san</td>
<td>(-h)</td>
<td>-dag</td>
<td>(-aa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite negative</td>
<td>(-san=güi)</td>
<td>-h=güi</td>
<td>-dag=güi</td>
<td>-aa=güi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributive</td>
<td>-san</td>
<td>-h</td>
<td>-dag</td>
<td>(-aa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributive negative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-h=güi</td>
<td>-dag=güi</td>
<td>-aa=güi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Participle-based verbal negation in Khalkha

In finite positive sentences, -san is the most frequent past tense suffix used for the established past. Other finite past tense suffixes are the direct past -laa, the indirect past -žee and the rare modal past -v, which in past declaratives expresses speaker surprise (Brosig forthcoming). Apart from their evidential meanings, -san as a participle is more salient in enumerations, while -laa and -žee have a stronger tendency to propel a narrative.

The participle -dag marks habituality-genericity and divergence from the normal course of events. In its aspectual use, it contrasts with -na, which expresses aspectual notions such as potential developments when suffixed to regular verbs, and with complex aspectual constructions that express different forms of perfect, resultative and progressive notions including the progressive -j bai-na / -(g)aa. The participle -aa is common as a marker of indirect present evidence together with the auxiliary bai-, contrasting with the finite direct present evidence marker -na. It combines only with regular verbs in the presence of modal particles that express low probability. In this combination, it apparently expresses incredulity. By contrast, -h is only used in a few peripheral, enumerative functions (Brosig 2015).

All finitely used participles also occur in negated form, but their correspondence to their positive counterparts is not straightforward:
• -dag=güi corresponds to -dag in its habitual and generic uses, which is basically symmetric.

• -h=güi is essentially a new way of negating the historical MM future suffix of -qu (Brosig 2014a) which in its positive use was replaced by the former progressive -na. First and foremost, this process is indicative of the loss of narrow present-tense orientation (Johanson 2000: 85–102, especially 99–101) and thus not primarily an issue connected to stativity. However, -h=güi shares with its positive counterpart -h that is does not easily establish temporal orders between events (irehgüi, üzechgüi, yalahgüi (constructed) ‘I won’t come, see or win’), while -na is more inclined to do so (irne, üzne, yalna27 ‘I will come, see and win’).

• -aa=güi is the regular past negator. It thus corresponds to the established past -san, the direct past -laa and the indirect past -zee, neutralizing their evidential differences and leading to paradigmatic asymmetry. The restriction to participles and abandonment of the more discourse-propulsive finite forms also indicates a loss of dynamicity (as already argued in Miestamo 2005: 87–88, 242; see also Hsiao 2007, who conceives of this as the loss of tense and the retention of aspect forms). However, the indirect evidential copular auxiliary bai-(g)aa is never negated in simple forms by -aa=güi, but rather by the simple, non-evidential bai-h=güi. It is then possible, though apparently optional, to put bai-h=güi into the scope of the evidentiality markers bai-(g)aa and bai-na.

• -san=güi as a past negator has been sidelined by -aa=güi, which in all given contexts seems to be able to replace it. If this form is used, it conveys nuances such as counterexpectation and completedness. For instance, ter nad-tai holbogd-son=güi DEM.DIST 1SG-COM contact-PREF.P=NEG ‘She didn’t contact me’ could felicitously be uttered in a situation in which the speaker expected to be contacted by her at a point in the past, but the opportunity passed, so that it wouldn’t change anything if the third-person referent contacted the speaker now (Güntsetseg p.c. 20 September 2015). It is not clear how it corresponds to positive forms, but it might be similar to -v.28

27. Name of a radio show, mentioned at <http://radio1.mnb.mn/i/18811> and a number of related webpages listed by Google, none of which could be directly accessed on 22 September 2015.

28. Hashimoto (2007) drew a different distinction between -san=güi and -aa=güi. For regular verbs, he describes the function of -aa=güi as “[n]onperformance of an event lasting until utterance-time (possibly including an implication of disappointment)” and -san=güi as 1. “nonperformance of past continuous / past experiential act” and 2. “nonperformance of a past act”. However, one of his own examples,

Ter ir(e)-h heregtei bai-san, xarin ir-ee=güi
DEM.DIST come-NPST.P necessity.COM COP-PREF.P but come-RES.P=NEG

‘彼は来なければならませんでしたが、来てませんでした’ ‘He had to come, but didn’t come’ is in conflict with this interpretation, as it shows -aagüi in reference to an event that cannot felicitously take place anymore. His analysis thus underestimates the extent to which -sangüi has already fallen out of use.
In their attributive uses,\(^{29}\) -\(h\) covers potential, future and characterizing events, while -\(dag\) covers habituality. The exact expression of attributive genericity might thus require some additional research. The negators -\(h=güi\) and -\(dag=güi\) seem to faithfully retain those meanings. Attributional -\(san\) functions as an evidentially neutral perfect, while positive -\(aa\) attaches only to \(bai\)-, \(yav\)- ‘go’ and a few positional verbs, marking ongoing and resultant states. However, as attributional -\(san=güi\) is entirely impossible, it has to be negated by -\(aa=güi\), neutralizing this aspectual/modal opposition.

2.4. Negative verbs derived from ese?

In this section, we shall review some diachronic evidence on whether it is possible to reconstruct a verb stem *ese- from the particle ese for Post-Proto-Mongolic, ultimately preferring the explanation that forms that point to such a conclusion arose as univerbalized conjunctions. The reader may notice that evidence on Southern Mongolic, for which I do assume a verb form based on üge(i) and bus(i), could be explained in a similar fashion, but the evidence reviewed is too scarce to be conclusive. This discussion will not yet touch upon the question of whether reconstructing a verb stem *e- for Pre-Proto-Mongolic is appropriate.

In modern Khalkha, there are two possible reflexes of a verb *ese-: first, there is the form eseh ‘or not’ at the end of subordinate clauses as in (47). It could be analyzed as the future participle form es-(e)h. For a verb es-, one would expect it to assume the same aspectual form as the negated main verb, e.g. es-sen instead of es-(e)h in (47). However, in a 33-million-word internet corpus,\(^{30}\) there are only two attestations of a perfect participle essen and none at all of a habitual participle *esdeg, compared to around 4000 instances of eseh with case and an even larger number of forms without case. Secondly, there is the conjunction esvel ‘or’, which could be analyzed as es-vel, so that -val is the conditional converb. It is used between simple noun phrases (hutga esvel haič ‘knife or scissors’), between nominal or participial clauses, and as a junctor at the beginning of the second of two sentences if the first sentence ends in a question clitic, as in (48).

(47) Gerle-sen eseh-iig=n’ yaa-ž mede-h=ve\(^{31}\)
marry-prf.p or.not-acc=3poss do.what-cvb come.to.know+know-fut.p=q
‘How can you come to know whether or not s/he’s married?’

\(^{29}\) Attributive positive forms in Khalkha have not yet been investigated in sufficient detail. For some pioneering research, see Song 1997. My own descriptions in the following are mainly based on my own intuition in combination with some purely quantitative corpus analysis. A detailed quantitative study of a large corpus would constitute a study in its own right and require considerable attention to individual constructions. This is why I am not providing any quantitative data here.

\(^{30}\) This corpus was cropped from .mn webpages by a bot of Robert Östling.

(48) $\text{Až}_\text{törö-h}=üü, \quad \text{esvel} \quad \text{orši-h}=uu? \quad \text{(int)}$

$m\text{ake.a.living-FUT.P}=-q, \quad \text{or} \quad \text{exist-FUT.P}=-q$

‘Should one make a living [by talking English], or persist [by using one’s mother tongue]?’

Now, these two forms could be the sole survivors of a full verb paradigm. However, in MM the only thing we find is a few instances of $\text{ese}-\text{besü}$, consisting of the per- fective negative particle and the conditional converbal suffix. If we assume that the old conditional converb was replaced by the modern form $-\text{val} (< -\text{bala} < -\text{ba} \text{ FACTUAL PAST + } la \text{ DELIMITED FOCUS})$ in all contexts, this form is equivalent to $\text{esvel}$.

So, while there are verbal forms, no truly verbal paradigm seems to have existed. One possible explanation is that $\text{esvel}$ is not actually based on a negative verb stem, but that it modified an auxiliary verb which was lost, such as in $\ast\text{ese a-basu}$ (cf. Yu 1991: 170 for a similar explanation of the negative verb form in Santa discussed in 3). Spontaneous contractions in modern Khalkha illustrate a similar process: $\text{teh-güüvel} \text{ ‘if not’ } < \text{te(ge)-h}=güi \text{ bol do-like-that-FUT.P}=-\text{neg} \text{ if ‘if subject doesn’t do like that’}$. The conjunction $\text{bol}$, in turn, is derived from $\text{bol-bol} < \text{bol-bala}$ become-$\text{COND.C}$ via haplology. Modern forms like $\text{es-sen}$ would then not be ancient at all, but rather indicative of a reanalysis of $\text{eseh}$ and $\text{esvel}$ into $\ast\text{es}$- by a few modern speakers. If this line of thought is correct, we would be dealing with a general tendency of common collocations to contract and lexicalize rather than with a “[possible] general tendency for negative verbs to fossilize” (Dahl 2010: 21).

2.5. Forms excluded from discussion

In Mongolian, forms like Khalkha $\ddot{\text{u}}\ddot{l}$ too- ‘disrespect’ (< $\ddot{\text{too}}$- ‘respect’) or $\text{es tusah}$ ‘intransitive’ (cf. $\text{tusah}$ ‘transitive’ < $\text{tus}$- ‘reflect’) exist, but the negation markers here have lost their affinity to tense and aspect and become lexicalized (cf. Yu 1991: 43). That is, they are no longer a form of SN.

The extent to which Oirat $\text{es}$ is still used is hard to evaluate. Benzing (1985: 40–41) states that it is used with converbs and attributive participles, but also with two finite verbal suffixes if these are followed by the interrogative particle. It therefore fails the criterion that it should be applied in declarative sentences. Baranova (2015) notes for Kalmyk that $\text{es}$ is very rare in her spoken data (word frequency 0.04%, n=4/10,000) and less frequent than in the Kalmyk National Corpus (word frequency 0.15%, n=1254/800,000), observing that it is becoming restricted to conditionals. For the Oirat variety spoken in Hoboksar, Ayusi (2010: 25) states that $\text{ese}$ is used very broadly. Unfortunately, the form and quality of the evidence he presents are not suitable for drawing any further conclusions. Urancimeg (2009: 48–9) details the use of $\text{ese}$ in the oral literature of Deed Mongol, the Oirat spoken in western Qinghai (presenting data in Mongolian orthography), but fails to relate this use to the use of other negators in any detail. However, as she even gives a few examples of $\text{ese}$ negating
adjectives, it seems to be quite widespread. The use of *es with the voluntative (Sengge 1987, using data from the Chinese survey of the 1950s without further specifying it) points into the same direction.

Dagur *as, which is attested only in some rare instances (Namcarai & Qaserdeni 1983: 346, Engkebatu 1988: 438) lacks generality. In legalese Khalkha,33 SN is done using *ül, while *es has been replaced and =*güi has not been introduced.

3. Locational and existential negation

An existential negation construction is understood here as a construction that outrightly denies the existence of its referent without locating it, while a locational negation construction denies that its referent is located at a location that is either specified or at least presupposed contextually. This contrast often correlates with indefinite [or generic] referents of existential and definite referents of locational constructions (Stassen 1997: 10). Identical coding of the negation of existence and location is very common, second only to identical coding of existential and possessive negation (Veselinova 2013: 118–119).

In most of Mongolic, existential negation is marked by reflexes of *ügei. In its early attestations in MM, this negator was an adjective, as is apparent from gender agreement: in addition to *ügei, we find the forms *ügegü, *ügegüi, *ügegün in Mongolian script and the corresponding forms *üge(i)'ü, etc. in the SH. The suffixes -*ü, -*üi and -*ün meant male singular (or neutral), female singular, and plural, respectively, as is also sporadically attested for a small number of other adjectives in the SH.

(49) Middle Mongol: SH §17 (de Rachewiltz 2004: 3)

\[
\text{alan.goa ere *üge-üy bö-ed qurban köü:-d töre-ül-bi}
\]

\begin{tabular}{l}
NAME & male \\
EX.neg-f & \text{cop-PFV.c} \\
three & \text{son-PL} \\
be.born-CAUS-FACT.PST. & \\
FEMALE & \\
\end{tabular}

‘Alan Go’a, although she had no husband, bore three sons’

Along with its function as a constituent negator when indicating absence in adverbials, as in (20), and the expression *ügei bol- EX.NEG become- ‘die’, *ügei was used predicatively to negate possession (49), presence (50) and existence (51).

(50) Middle Mongol: SH §214 (Rachewiltz 2004: 147)

\[
\text{mani *ügei bö-’esü}
\]

\begin{tabular}{l}
1PL.ACC & \text{EX.NEG} \\
COP-COND.C & \\
\end{tabular}

‘If we had not been there’

33. The following generalizations are drawn from penal law only.
(51) **Middle Mongol:** SH §244 (de Rachewiltz 2004: 168, including bracketed words)

\[
\begin{align*}
qasar-i & \quad ese & \quad nende-\text{esü} & \quad mede'e \\
\text{NAME-ACC} & \quad \text{NEG} & \quad \text{attack_by_surprise-COND.C} & \quad \text{information}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ügei} & \quad bu-i & \quad je \\
\text{EX.NEG} & \quad \text{COP-PRES?} & \quad \text{SP}
\end{align*}
\]

‘If you don’t strike at Qasar by surprise, there is no knowing [what will happen].’

\(\text{ügei}\) has been retained as locational negator in Khorchin, Oirat, Moghol, Dagur and all of Southern Mongolic. The same seems to hold for existence, but given that most existential negation may be interpreted as locational and there are no syntactic differences, this is sometimes not that easy to state. (52) to (57) are sentences that might be taken to have actual existential meaning.

(52) **Oirat, Kalmyk variety** (Benzig 1985: 165)

\[
\begin{align*}
xūcn-a & \quad üg-d & \quad xudl & \quad uga, & \quad xob-t & \quad ünn & \quad uga \\
\text{old-GEN} & \quad \text{word-DAT} & \quad \text{lie} & \quad \text{EX.NEG} & \quad \text{slander-DAT} & \quad \text{truth} & \quad \text{EX.NEG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘There is no lie in the tales of yore. There is no truth in slander.’

(53) **Dagur** (Yu et al. 2008: 84, 191)

\[
\begin{align*}
ənt & \quad ajə-kə & \quad jo: & \quad te^h & \quad uwe: \\
\text{here} & \quad \text{fear-NPST,P} & \quad \text{what} & \quad \text{FOC} & \quad \text{EX.NEG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘There is nothing to worry about.’

(54) **Moghol** (Weiers 1972: 142)

\[
\begin{align*}
kóun-i & \quad géibe \\
\text{son-3POSS}^3 & \quad \text{EX.NEG,NPST}
\end{align*}
\]

‘There is no son.’

(55) **Shira Yugur** (Bolucilaγu and Jalsan 1988: 67)

\[
\begin{align*}
jimar-tʃə & \quad gorø:šən & \quad htorc & \quad da & \quad namin & \quad gorø:šən & \quad seiggan \\
\text{what-FOC} & \quad \text{beast within} & \quad \text{FOC} & \quad \text{ISG.GEN} & \quad \text{equal}? & \quad \text{beautiful}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
eβer-tə & \quad gorø:šən & \quad ugui. \\
\text{horn-having} & \quad \text{beast} & \quad \text{EX.NEG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Among the wild beasts, there are no beasts with such a beautiful horn as mine.’

---

34. Weiers (1972: 123) claims (analogously to what can be said of Khalkha, cf. Hammar 1983) that -i in existential sentences is used without person reference and thus translates ‘Einen Sohn gibt es nicht’. However, another option is to understand i more literally as ‘her/his’, in which case this sentence would better be understood as a possessive construction: ‘She doesn’t have a son.’
Negation in Mongolic

(56) Mongghul (Cinggeltei et al. 1988: 535)

ʂgɜ go-dɘ ɕdʑeː-dal gu=a, şdʒ ɢal-dɘ ɕeː-dal gu=a.
big word-DAT load-v>NEG big fire-DAT pee-v>NEG EX.NEG=NAI
‘In big words, there is no weight. On a big fire, there is no peeing.’

(57) Bonan (Cen 1987a: 89)

tərə-sɑ ɑn jɑmɑ nəgə ɑmtətə ɗi gi-na
dem.DIST-ABL also thing one tasty TOPIC EX.NEG-NPST
‘There is nothing tastier than this.’

For the remaining languages, locative examples are given:

(58) Kangjia (Sīqīncháokètú 1999: 163)

bi ui-guda tʃi re-v-ʉ
1sg EX.NEG-CVB.while 2sg come-pst-Q
‘Did you arrive when I was absent?’

(59) Mangghuer (Slater 2003: 128)

ti shu zhuozi diere (u)gu-ang
that book table on EX.NEG-COP.NAI
‘That book is not on the table.’

(60) Santa (Liú 1981: 102)

tʂɯ ui-ku dula bi dziənjin-ni uʐə-lə
2sg EX.NEG-FUT.P because 1sg movie-ACC see-CVB.in_order_to
əɡə ətsɯ-wo
NEG.? go-pst
‘Because you were not (here), I didn’t go to see the movie.’

In Oirat, Ordos, Khorchin, Shira Yugur, Bonan, Monguor, Kangjia and probably also Dagur, ügei came to function as a negative auxiliary together with a converb (see also (13) and (14) above):

(61) Bonan (Chuluu 1994d: 21)

bə ede jama nəɡə wilaga-dzi gi
1sg now thing one do-CVB EX.NEG
‘Now I am doing nothing.’

---

The original Chinese translation 说大话的人不知羞, 弄成大火不能烤 ‘a person who speaks big words has no shame. If one lights a big fire, one cannot roast something on it’ seems to be very free, featuring a different syntax and, if I am not mistaken, different lexical items. It is of course not granted that my new translation is correct, both lexically and with respect to meaning and function of the de-verbal noun-forming suffix -dal.
In Bonan and Santa, and apparently also in Kangjia and Mongghul (for which only a few conditional converbal, possibly fossilized forms are attested), this development has gone a step further, and ügei seems to have acquired a number of verbal characteristics. Such a development clearly did not take place in Shira Yugur. In (58) above, a converb diachronically consisting of the future participle and the dative has attached to Kangjia ʉʁi-. Examples (62) and (63) show how the conditional converb and an imperfective participle attach to ‘gi-’ in Bonan:

(62) Bonan (Cen 1987a: 102)
\[ tɕi \ dʐʅmɑ-ngə  da \ mənə \ səb-da \ gi-sə \ mənə \]
\[ 2sg \ little-sg \ foc \ 1sg.gen \ side-dat \ ex.neg-cond.c \ 1sg.gen \]

\[ namei-nə \ jaya-saq-nə \ dɑɡɑːnə \]
\[ soul.acc \ lose-pfv.p-gen \ like? \]
‘When you’re not at my side at all, it is as if I have lost my soul.’

(63) Bonan (Fried 2010: 231)
\[ kʰətʰə \ χəpgə-ʁa-tɕə=ku \ tɕawa \ jama \]
\[ home.loc \ come.hon-caus-ipfv=ipfv.nmlz \ fortune \ stuff \]
\[ ki=ku \ tɕar-tɕi-səŋ \]
\[ ex.neg=ipfv.nmlz \ do-ipfv.ai-possibility \]
‘(one) invites (the shaman) to come to (one’s) home and avoids misfortune.’

However, finite forms are limited to the marking of assertor (non-)involvement marking\(^{37}\) ki-ki-we vs. ki-na (Fried 2010: 232), and at least in Mongghul these suffixes can also combine with non-verbal predicates (Kakudō, p.c., December 2011). In Mongghul, sentence-final existential negation is done using a pair of particles gu-i (assertor involvement) and gu-a (assertor non-involvement), as in (56). In non-final predication, however, the stem used is not gu-, but gui-. This might indicate that the

---

36. The cognate-oriented Mongolian translation gives daγan-a, which I cannot identify. The Chinese translation, however, is pretty clear, 你一不在我的身旁，我就好象丢了魂似的. The Mongolic syntax supports this interpretation.

37. A notion encoded by many languages spoken in the Tibetosphere is participatory evidence, which can perhaps best be defined as the grammatical marking of voluntary (Haller 2004) or active, conscious participation (Rule 1977: 71) of the assertor (i.e. the speaker in declaratives and the addressee in questions, cf. Creissels 2008: 12) in the action so marked. It often results in a pattern that differentiates between the speaker and everyone else in declaratives and the addressee and everyone else in questions. Currently, no terminology for this notion has gained currency, so that different linguists use different labels such as “conjunct vs. disjunct” (Hale 1980), “subjective vs. objective” (Slater 2003, cf. Cinggelti 1988), “personal” (Tournadre 1998), “egophoric” (San Roque et al. 2014, citing Tournadre 1996) or “assertor involvement” (Creissels 2008). The label “conjunct” is inaccurate (Tournadre 2008), and the labels “subjective”, “personal” and “egophoric” are too unspecific, particularly when compared to a descriptive and sufficiently specific label like “endophatic” (Tournadre 2008) for evidence about the speaker’s inner state. I shall therefore adapt Creissel’s descriptively accurate, but unwieldy terminology. A detailed description of this phenomenon in Mangghuer is provided by Slater (2003: 194–220) and Fried (forthcoming) in combination, and Slater (forthcoming) gives an overview of its occurrence in Southern Mongolic.
reanalysis of gui- into a verb in non-finite clauses preceded the introduction of assessor involvement and subsequent reanalysis of -i in gu-i as an assessor involvement marker.

(64) Mongghul (Cinggeltei et al. 1988: 39)

\texttt{tc9 tend3 aar-na: eyeda-dz3 gu-i-sam ba.}

\texttt{2SG 3SG-DAT hand-REFL shake-CVB EX-NEG-PST.P TAG}

\texttt{te teim3 sge-gu-a-nu?}

\texttt{3SG 2SG-ACC see-IPFV.P-NAI-Q}

‘You didn’t wave your hand to him, right? Does he [even] see you?’

The situation in Santa is more complex. The possessive construction is negated by \textit{u}, as in (65), or the negative possessive verb \textit{wəi}- is used, as in (66), and it is also attested with the “imperfective nominalizer” -\textit{ku} (cf. Field 1997: 5.3.2.2.6). The possessive construction in (65) coincides with the existential construction (67). For locational negation, \textit{u} is used as well (68). Here, however, we see a suffix -\textit{ku} added to it that is identical to the future participle. It is not restricted to this suffix, but allows for other non-finite forms (Liú 1981: 72–4). It is also not restricted to locatives, but also possible with possessives (cf. Chuluu 1994a: 26). I am inclined to add (66) to this list, so there is a complete verbal paradigm for \textit{u}, supporting Liú’s claim that there is a verb \textit{u}(i)-. Given that stress falls on the ultimate syllable (Field 1997: 4.3), this should leave intact the dichotomy between \textit{u wo} and \textit{ui-wo} as claimed by Field. The particle is more frequent than the verb (Bao Saren, p.c., 2010).

(65) Santa (Field 1997: 5.3.2.2.4)

\texttt{mi-ni idzi3-sə tə3-ni ɕiduŋ d3awa-də niº}

\texttt{1SG-ACC eat-COND.C 2SG-GEN tooth crevice-DAT one}

\texttt{kuru-ku-ni u wo ma.}

\texttt{be_enough-NPST.P-3POSS\textsuperscript{38} EX-NEG COP SP}

‘If you eat me, your stomach (tooth crevice) will not have enough.’

(66) Santa (Field 1997: 5.3.2.2.6)

\texttt{tsima-da biəri wai-sə biəri daŋ-la-jo}

\texttt{2SG-DAT wife EX-NEG.COP-PST wife serve?-N>V-VOL}

‘If you don’t have a wife, I will serve as your wife.’

(67) Santa (Field 1997: 5.3.2.2.4)

\texttt{udʒə-sə-ku oron u wo.}

\texttt{see-CAUS-IPFV.P place EX-NEG COP}

‘We did not have a place to be seen (by a doctor).\textsuperscript{39}’

\textsuperscript{38} Field glossed this as an accusative, but he is probably wrong. Judging from Central Mongolic, \textit{ni} should be the third person possessive turned into a device for marking definiteness or of nominalization. Field (7.2.6.4.1) notes a third person use, glossing it as a genitive, which has the same form as an accusative.

\textsuperscript{39} One could easily imagine the interpretation “There was no place to be seen (by a doctor).”
In Eastern Mongolian, ügei in a tensed negation can either attach to the copular auxiliary as in (69) or precede it as in (70). In aspecto-temporally default (i.e. non-progressive present) contexts, the copula is absent as in (71):

(69) Khorchin (Urancimeg, p.c.)
min-i tʰərəg pɛː=guɛ.
1sg-gen car COP-pst.ex.neg
1. ‘I didn’t have a car.’ 2. ‘My car wasn’t there.’

(70) Khorchin (Urancimeg, p.c.)
tʰər uge pɛː-tʃ
DEM.DIST NEG COP-PST
‘S/he was not there.’

(71) Khorchin (Urancimeg, p.c.)
tʃərɮəg mʊːr gə-sən jim uge
wild cat COMP-pst.p thing EX.NEG
‘There is no such thing as wild cats.’

In Central Mongolian, ügei has basically ceased to function as an existential negator. It is no longer followed by a copula as in MM (49) and Khorchin, but rather cliticizes to it if the expression of tense and aspect is required as in (72). The use of =gũi was extended even to the copular auxiliary in its aspectually and temporally most neutral form, bai-h=gũi, as in (73). This meant the complete replacement of ügei as an independent negative existential.

(72) Khalkha, Mörön, Hövsgöl (elicited)
Luu bai-dag=gũi
dragon COP-IPFV,P=NEG
‘Dragons don’t exist.’

(73) Khalkha, Mörön, Hövsgöl (elicited)
Ter end bai-h=gũi
DEM.DIST here COP-EX.NEG
‘He isn’t here.’ cf. tʰər ənt uge (Khorchin; Urancimeg, p.c.)

40. These examples were received via instant messaging in a Latin transcription, and I rendered them into IPA following a revised version of the phonemic analysis of Bayancoytu (2002).
The materials I elicited from a Buryat speaker from the Mongolian state basically resemble Khalkha, while the materials elicited from a Russian Buryat speaker are close to Khorchin with constructions such as ugui bæi-na NEG.LOC COP-NPST ‘he isn’t here’. Notably, Central Mongolian and Mongolian Buryat innovated the new locative negator alga (of unclear etymology). Khalkha alga mostly has a quite similar distribution to baihgüi in predicates and can be used alone or in combination with a copula, but it cannot be nominalized or be used attributively [or function as a copula]. It can combine with the verb bol- ‘become’, and, rarely but undeniably, with the full verb hii- ‘do’41 (Mönh-Amgalan 1999). It can combine with negative polarity items such as yuu=č what + additive focus ‘nothing’. Based on the results of a Google search, it does not combine with negated past tense copulas, e.g. alga bai-gaa=güi ‘(intended) it was not missing’ is unattested, while alga baihgüi as in ted alga baihgüi bol ‘if they are absent’ is just an infrequent synonymous compound. It does freely combine with a copula for aspect and tense marking, e.g. alga baihgüi as in ted alga baihgüi bol ‘if they are absent’. Predicative alga indicates that something is absent in spite of the expectation or the wish of the speaker [as in (74) and (75)], that something is temporarily absent [as in (76)] or that an intention is absent [as in (77)] (Umetani 2004).

(74) today arsenal-iig gar-g(a)-h tv mongol-d alga
today NAME-ACC exit-CAUS-NPST.P tv Mongolia-DAT NEG.LOC
gene dee (int)
HEARSAY SP
‘There is no TV in Mongolia today that will broadcast Arsenal [London].’

(75) Teg(e)-h mõngö=č nadad alga‘42
do.SO-NPST.P money =FOC 1SG.DAT NEG.LOC
‘I don’t even have the money to do so.’

(76) X al’_hediin ger-t-ee=yüü? – Bi ger-t alga.
X already home-DAT-REFL.POSS=Q? 1SG home-DAT NEG.LOC
Y-aas asuu-Ø! (SMS)
Y-ABL ask-IMP!
‘(Brosig:) Is X already home? – (Z:) I’m not at home. Ask Y!’

41. Ardčilal-iig alga hii-sen hün=čin’ Elbegdorž döör=őo šüü dee.
democracy-ACC NEG.LOC DO-PREP PERSON=2POSS name SELF=REFL.POSS SP SP
‘The person who did away with democracy was [prime minister] Elbegdorj himself!’

The first use that Umetani enumerated should be understood to include the unpleasant absence of immaterial entities, as illustrated in (78). In this specific example, arga alga might be replaced by simple, highly conventionalized arga=güi as well as with arga baihgüi. It indicates that other means are simply non-available, though one might conceive of developing them. The categorical denial of the existence of an entity cannot be expressed by alga, and (72) with alga would be understood as referring to the unexpected absence of the (e.g. wooden) dragon, but not to its non-existence.45

I have not seen a similarly detailed analysis of alga in Buryat, although its use e.g. in (79) might well resemble Khalkha. An informant from Khüree (Eastern Mongolian) who stated that they don’t use alga in their dialect nevertheless produced (80) just before the elicitation session. This may either indicate misreporting or a clear presence of alga at least in Standard Southern Mongolian:

(78) hün-ii sanal.bodl-iig hülee-h-ees öör arga alga daa

lit. ‘There is no other means except accepting the opinions of other people.’

‘You must accept the opinions of other people.’

(79) Buryat, Dashbalbar sum, Dornod (elicited)

xuɮisiːtə,  dɔrʒə=mnə  əndə  ɑɮɑ̆ ɢ=ɪɮdɑ

‘Excuse me, Dorj is not here.’

(80) Eastern Mongolian, Khüree (overheard)

6  sɑr-as  əxɮ-ət  atʃɪɮ  alɑ̆g  pɔɮ-tʃʰɪx-sɔn

‘I don’t have any work from the beginning of June [→ so I can finally relax].’

44.  Looking at (71) and (73), it becomes clear that alga can also be interpreted as expressing possession, that no clear dividing line is drawn, and that both possessive patterns to be discussed for Khalkha in Section 4 are possible.
45.  The idiomatic alga bol- ‘disappear’ can be used in relation to overweight body fat and thus may not have to obey the same restrictions as alga on its own. This is also illustrated by (76).
47.  In Khalkha, l is a delimiting focus particle and daa is an interlocutionary particle indicating that the proposition has to be accepted for objective reasons not under the control of the speaker. In Buryat, these two seem to have merged and become a kind of copula.
4. Possessive negation

Possessive negation is used to refer to the negation of possession in sentence-final predicates. It is mainly used for denial. While locational and existential negation don’t differ syntactically in Mongolic, possession negation can both require a different coding of the possessor and allow for a wider range of predicative forms. Assuming a locational idea as the underlying concept (see Stassen 2009: 277–355), the possessor would be expected to be coded by a case that can mark the location of an object, but this does not hold for all of Mongolic. Most noticeably, MM employs a different strategy:

(81) Middle Mongol: SH §11
\[
\text{duwa}_soqor \ aqa \ inu \ dörben \ köü-\text{ tü} \ bű-\text{lee.}
\]
\[\text{Name} \ \text{elder\_brother} \ 3\text{SG\_GEN} \ \text{four} \ \text{son\_poss\_SG} \ \text{COP\_DIR\_PST}\]
‘Du’a Soqor, his elder brother, had four sons.’

(82) Middle Mongol: SH §76
\[
ta \ se’üder-\text{ece} \ busu \ nökör \ ügei
\]
\[\text{2PL} \ \text{shadow\_ABL} \ \text{other} \ \text{friend} \ \text{EX\_NEG}\]
‘You have no friend but your shadow’

The possessor is marked by a nominative, while the possessum receives the possessive suffix -tü in positive sentences such as (81) or is followed by the negative existential particle ügei as in (82) and (49). In Stassen’s classification (2009: 38–69), this variant morpho-syntactically patterns with the with-possessive. However, even though the construction employed here lacks a transitive verb, it is semantically restricted to possession, whereas the MM comitative case is still -lUGA. A pattern structurally similar to MM has been retained in Dagur, Buryat, Ordos and Khalkha:

(83) Dagur (Chuluu 1994: 29)
\[
in \ fol \ uwəi
\]
\[\text{3SG} \ \text{time} \ \text{EX\_NEG}\]
‘He doesn’t have time.’

(84) Buryat, Dashbalbar sum, Dornod (elicited)
\[
dɔrʒə \ maʃin-\text{g}^{\text{*ui}}=ɮda
\]
\[\text{Name} \ \text{car\_NEG=COP}\]
‘Dorj doesn’t have a car (right now).’

(85) Khalkha, Mörön, Hövsgöl (elicited)
\[
Dorž \ maʃin=güi / maʃin-tai.
\]
\[\text{Name} \ \text{car=NEG} / \ \text{car\_COM}\]
‘Dorj doesn’t have a car. / ‘Dorj has a car.’
Example (83) morphologically resembles MM, whereas ügei has become a clitic in Buryat (84) and Khalkha (85). As in MM, the positive forms Dagur -tii and Buryat/Khalkha -tAi are used as the parallel positive forms, as illustrated in (85). However, the loss of the MM comitative case has let to the extension of these forms to comitative functions, resulting in genuine with-possessives. Janhunen (2003: 27) and Sechenbaatar (2003: 43–46) actually went as far as considering analyzing =güi as a privative case, in spite of its morphologically divergent status of not being subject to vowel harmony.

The more common construction for expressing possession in Mongolic is the locative pattern, marking the possessor with the dative and leaving the possessum unmarked, while negation is indicated by a (possibly cliticized) reflex of ügei. This construction type is used in Oirat, where -go can be used both as a free form or suffixed to the possessum as in (86). The positive equivalent of this sentence would contain the present tense form of the existential verb, bəə-n, instead of uga. Irrespective of the presence of the existential verb, a nominative bi instead of nand would be ungrammatical. The head of an attributive construction as in (87) can take any case, and in this environment (Benzig 1985: 158–159) ugo even contrasts with a reflex of the old possessive -tai. In Southern Mongolic, the possessor is always coded by a dative irrespective of whether ügei has become a verb as in (88) or remains a clitic as in (89). Buryat and Khalkha attach =güi to the existential verb, but still use a dative possessor. The presence of aspect marking in (90) leads to an overall more specific meaning than that of (84), which lacks such marking. Ordos (Erdenimöngke, p.c.) seems to allow for the structural equivalents of both (86) and (90).

(86) Oirat, Kalmyk variety (Pjurbeev, p.c., cf. Benzig 1985: 165)

\[
\text{nand usn uga / usn-go}
\]

\[
1\text{SG.DAT water EX.NEG / water-EX.NEG}
\]

‘I don’t have water’

(87) Oirat, Kalmyk variety (Benzig 1985: 165)

\[
ger uga kün
\]

\[
\text{house EX.NEG person}
\]

‘a person without house’

(88) Santa (Field 1997: 5.3.2.2.6)

\[
\text{nama-do nudun wai-wo}
\]

\[
1\text{SG-DAT eye EX.NEG,COP-PST}
\]

‘I did not have eyes.’

(89) Shira Yugur (Chuluu 1994b: 9)

\[
\text{uguı β-e, nan-da xara fkor uguı β-e, tʃgan fkor}
\]

\[
\text{EX.NEG COP-AI 1SG-DAT black sugar EX.NEG COP-AI white sugar}
\]

\[
\text{la b-əi}
\]

\[
\text{FOC COP-?}
\]

‘No, I don’t have [black sugar], I have white sugar.’
Negation in Mongolic

(90) Buryat, Dashbalbar sum, Dornod (elicited)

dɔrʒi-də \text{ name-dat } mafin \text{ car } bæi-däg-gʷui \text{ cop-hab.p-neg}

‘Dorj does not have a car (now and at other times).’

For those varieties that have innovated \text{ alga}, which functions similarly to the non-past form of the copular auxiliary \text{ bæi-x-gʷui}, a construction along locative possession patterns is common as well. Thus, paraphrasing (90) with \text{ alga} would result in a grammatical sentence with a somewhat different aspectual meaning. However, (91) indicates that \text{ alga} might even be usable within the with-possessive pattern. It was confirmed with its speaker as acceptable, while some other informants reject it.

(91) Khalkha, Mörön, Hövsgöl (overheard)

bi diüü nar-t ter tal-aar medegd(e)-h hüsel alga

1sg younger_sibling pl-dat dem.dist side-ins inform-npst.p wish neg.loc

‘I don’t have (any) wish to inform my younger siblings about that.’

An interesting, well-known conflation of the two patterns discussed above can be found in Ordos. The negated version of (92) is identical with the clitic version of (86) from Oirat and could thus still be understood as merely cliticizing the negator to a subject. However, its positive version indicates the absence of any structural subject construction, using case in a purely semantic way: the dative codes the possessor, while the comitative marks the possessum. Accordingly, even the negative variant can be taken to lack a grammatical subject.

(92) Ordos (Erdenimöngke, p.c.)

Dorži-d tereg=gue / tereg-tei.

NAME-DAT car=ex.neg / car-com

‘Dorj does not have a car.’ / ‘Dorj has a horse.’

Genitive-based types of possessive marking are represented by Khorchin and Moghol. Khorchin uses a possessive construction in which the possessor is marked by a genitive used attributively to the possessum. Otherwise, the construction follows the pattern of MM in using reflexes of ügei for negative possession, as in (93a), and reflexes of -tAi for positive possession, as in (93b). As the possessor is usually only expressed once, we are not dealing with a form of mere “possessor indexing on the possessee” of a with-possessive (cf. Stassen 2009: 77–78), but with a conflation of with-possessive and genitive possessives. This being said, Khorchin is situated in a dialect continuum with other Mongolian dialects and also allows for a locational possessive construction along the lines of (86). The negative construction of (93a) is still semantically ambiguous between a locative and a possessive reading, which can be disambiguated by the blend of both constructions illustrated in (93c).
In Moghol, the possessor is coded as a pronominal clitic to the possessum, while a possessor noun phrase may be absent, as in (94a), or be overtly expressed with a dative case, as in (94b). The negator is a reflex of ügei merged with a copula verb. In contrast to Khorchin, the positive form is based on an existential verb, as in (94c), resulting in a canonical genitive possessive:

(94) Moghol (Weiers 1972: 143, 65, 123)

a)  **altó-mini géibila**
    money-1POSS EX.NEG.PST
    ‘I didn’t have money.’

b)  **nandú tolokú-mni ugéibi ke qutú xı̆ša-sá ukin bari-sú**
    1SG.DAT money-1POSS EX.NEG.NPST to  great relatives-ABL girl  grab-VOL
    ‘I don’t have the money to take a woman from an important family.’

c)  **tabón méiš=mini be**
    five sheep=1POSS COP.NPST
    ‘I have five sheep.’

On the other hand, Stassen’s (2009: 112) own evidence for genitive possessives (he calls them “adnominal possessives”) in Mongolic is problematic. He cites the following examples (2009: 301–302):

(95) Classical Mongolian (Grønbech & Krueger 1955: 21)

    **qayan-u yurban köbegün bü-lüge**
    king-GEN three son COP-DIR.PST
    ‘The king had three sons’

---

48. In the grammatical part, Weiers uses a broad transcription, while he uses a phonetic transcription for the text material. For the sake of consistency, I have transcribed those latter examples phonemically as well.
Negation in Mongolic

(96) Khalkha (Poppe 1951: 102)

Min-i xüüxed gurwa bol-wo

1sg-gen child three become-pst

‘Ich habe jetzt drei Kinder’ (wörtl. [lit.] ‘Meiner Kinder sind drei geworden’).

‘I have three children’ (Stassen 2009: 301)

(97) Mangghuer (Slater 2003: 176, 178)

Dao=du=ni han mula nughuai yi-ge bang

younger.sibling-dat-poss also small dog one-classifier nal.cop

‘His younger brother also had a small dog’

Example (95) is suggestive, but ‘There were the three sons of the king’ might be a feasible translation as well, pending further research into the grammar of this author. Then again, “Classical Mongolian” is a term for texts written in Mongolian script between the late 16th and perhaps early 20th century in all of its territory, thus including authors from Khalkha, Ordos, Khorchin and Oirat. The provenience of a given “classical” text is thus of utmost importance. Example (96) does not indicate possession at all, but acquisition or change-of-state: ‘My children have become three’. Poppe’s literal German translation is perfectly clear about that, and his use of jetzt ‘now’ in his obligatory translation hints at it. Stassen’s own attempt at simplifying Poppe’s translation, on the other hand, is simply wrong. Example (97) is another piece of non-evidence: in Mangghuer, the accusative case, genitive case and third person possessive marking have all assumed the form =ni, but the non-reflexive possessive assumes the position after case suffixes. Changing the glossing of =ni from poss to gen, which Stassen did, is therefore morphologically not justifiable. Even as far as the translation is concerned, =ni relates the younger sibling to a third party and not at all to his possessum. Based on such evidence, one thus cannot suggest the existence of genitive possessives beyond Khorchin and Moghol.

In addition to a regular locational possessive construction, Kangjia also uses a transitive verb of non-possession nuli-, which according to Sīqīncháokètú (1999: 144, 280) is derived from the negator adverb ne plus the verb uli- 成, 得到 ‘accomplish, obtain’:

(98) Kangjia (Sīqīncháokètú 1999: 144)

tʃi bʉde hɔrla-Ø, ʉsɯ ɢala tʃɵlɵ nuli-na

2sg neg.imp be.angry-imp because two free neg.poss-npst

‘Don’t be angry because the two have no time.’
5. Ascriptive negation

In this section, ‘ascriptive negation’ shall be understood as ‘the negation strategy used in sentences with a nominal or adjectival predicate’ and which in turn can be subdivided into the negation of identity and class inclusion with nouns and the negation of an ascribed temporal or permanent quality with adjectives (Veselinova 2013: 110). Eriksen (2006, 2011) suggests a particular status for the negation of nouns, the prototypical arguments and topics of which are claimed to exhibit an inherently positive value not conducive to direct negation. This, he argues, can be circumvented by strategies such as negated verification (i.e. ‘it is not true that X is a Y’), negated existence (‘There is no such thing as X being a Y’), negated constituent focus, sub-phrasal negation or even the entire avoidance of negation by using words like ‘be different’. This latter strategy, perhaps via a grammaticalization path through denial, is central in Mongolic. In the following, we shall first take a look at MM in 5.1, then give an overview of modern Mongolic in 5.2, and continue on to a discussion of similar or connected languages in 5.3 to 5.5.

5.1. Ascriptive negation in Middle Mongol

In early MM, the negation of nouns and adjectives seems to have started out as the SN of an existential copula verb. The Secret History contains about six instances of nominal negations in interrogative sentences where a copula is preceded by a verbal negator to which a question marker is cliticized, as in (99). All six questions are rhetorical, as holds true for most questions in the SH, and are meant to imply a positive answer. As no declarative sentences of this type and thus no actual instances of asserted ascriptive negation survive, there is no telling whether the negator could have been used in this way without the interrogative particle.

(99) Middle Mongol: SH §255 (Rachewiltz 2004: 186)

Kö‘ü-d-ün min-u aqa Joci ülä-‘ü bu-i.
son-pl-gen 1sg-gen elder_brother name ipfv.neg=q cop-pres?
‘Isn’t Joci the eldest of my sons?’

Yet already in late MM, the ascriptive negation strategy started to change. To be sure, there are some instances of adjectives negated in a way akin to (99), e.g. ülä-gü sayin bu-i NEG-Q good COP-PRES? (Twelve deeds of the Buddha 55a) ‘but isn’t it better’. Moreover, the apparently imperfective form bol-ai of the verb bol- ‘become’ started to exhibit a rather stative-like meaning in late MM (Secen 1989: 33, 37–8), e.g. öljei-tü ülä bol-oi (Subhāṣitaratnanidhi I, 7b) luck-having NEG COP-PRES? ‘does not have luck’. On the other hand, a new strategy of negation first attested in a text from 1335 (Yu 1991: 135, Xiao 2007: 499) makes use of the word busu / busi. While the difference between these two words is not entirely transparent (see Yu 1991: 127–135 and Weiers 1985 for discussion), busu ‘other’ is used attributively, following an ablative and in the...
idiomatic formula *busu ese bol*-γa- ‘not let (an order) become something different’, i.e. ‘adhere to (an order)’. From 1335 onwards, however, *busu* directly follows nouns (100), adjectives and participles (20) in the nominative.

(100) Middle Mongol: Twelve deeds of the Buddha 40b (Poppe 1967: 141)

\begin{verbatim}
ene mör ber jobalang-i mayad yar-γa-n cida-qu
\end{verbatim}

DEM.PROX path FOC suffering-ACC certain exit-CAUS-CVB can- NPST.P

\begin{verbatim}
mör *busu* bu-i.
\end{verbatim}

path ASC.NEG COP-PRES?

‘This part is not the part that can save from suffering.’

One might thus argue that late MM is avoiding nominal negation entirely by using the word ‘other’, but given the different syntax, this is not so clear.

5.2. Inventory of ascriptive negation in modern Mongolic languages

In the subsequent subsections, we shall take a look at how ascriptive negation is achieved in contemporary Mongolic languages. A first overview is given in Table 4 and 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shira Yugur</th>
<th>Santa</th>
<th>Mangghuer</th>
<th>Mongghul</th>
<th>Bonan</th>
<th>Kangjia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td><em>puʃa</em> cop</td>
<td><em>puʃi</em> cop</td>
<td><em>puʃh-i</em></td>
<td><em>puč-i</em></td>
<td>čo-</td>
<td>mari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj</td>
<td><em>uŋui</em> cop</td>
<td><em>u</em> cop</td>
<td>(u)gu-i</td>
<td>gu-i</td>
<td>‘gi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. Ascriptive negation in Southern Mongolic*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oirat</th>
<th>Buryat</th>
<th>Khalkha</th>
<th>Khorchin</th>
<th>Dagur</th>
<th>Moghol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td><em>biš</em></td>
<td><em>boʃa</em></td>
<td><em>biš</em></td>
<td>piʃe</td>
<td><em>biʃin</em></td>
<td>(u)geibi(le)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj</td>
<td><em>biš, =uŋui</em></td>
<td><em>piʃe, -guc</em></td>
<td><em>biʃin, uwu</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5. Ascriptive negation in Mongolian, Dagur and Moghol*

All Mongolic languages except Moghol have retained cognates of *busi* for nominal negation. In Southern Mongolic, with the exception of Kangjia, *ügei* is used for adjectival negation. Kangjia, then, uses either *busi* or the Tibetan loan *mari* for all forms of ascriptive negation. Moghol, in turn, has generalized *ügei* to both functions, fusing it with the forms of the copular auxiliary *bui* for present and *bülüge* for past tense marking. In the west and north, Oirat and Buryat seem to use reflexes of *busi* as the only strategy for ascriptive negation. In contrast, Khorchins, Dagurs and some Khalkhas use both *busi* and *ügei* for different nuances of adjectival negation.
5.3. Ascriptive negation in Southern Mongolic

Adjectives in Southern Mongolic, with the exception of Kangjia, are negated by the existential negator. Thus, it is the existence of a certain quality in a given entity that is negated. It is not clear whether a heightened degree as in ‘not just good, but excellent’ (also see 5.5) could be negated in the same way.

(101) Shira Yugur (Bolucilayu and Jalsan 1991: 300)\(^{49}\)
\[dʒun \ namør \ dzerge \ sein \ ugui \ β-e\]
‘Summer is not as good as autumn.’

(102) Santa (Chuluu 1994a: 17)
\[dzijan \ idzi-o-so \ mini \ şentei \ gau \ u \ wo\]
‘Smoking is bad for my health.’

(103) Mongghul (Chuluu 1994c: 13)
\[nda: \ ndoře-sa \ xoło \ gu=i \ mula:\]
\[busdzən-g3-\ r350 \ toro-va\]
‘I was born in the small town not far from here.’

(104) Mangghuer (Slater 2003: 127)
\[gan \ wunduer \ (u)gu-ang\]
‘S/he is not tall.’

(105) Bonan (Chuluu 1994d: 21)
\[ede \ mənə \ enə \ məsgu \ mən-da \ təɣsi \ ‘gi-na\]
‘Now this clothing doesn’t fit me.’

The negation of identity is done by reflexes of *busi* in five of six Southern Mongolic varieties. As the entity to be equated or not equated is still presumed to exist, an extension of *ügei* to this use seemed less feasible, so that the MM word *busi* ‘other’, which started its grammaticalization process in late MM became established here. It is used together with the copula in Santa (106) and Shira Yugur (107). In Shira Yugur, it is the copula that takes assertor involvement marking, while it is marked on the

\(^{49}\) In attributive position, negation of adjectives is attested in Shira Yugur (cf. Bolucilayu and Jalsan 1988: 14).

\(^{50}\) -re amended to -r3.
negator in Mangghuer (108). While this marking is analyzed as a verbal category by Slater (2003: 194: *puzhi/puzhang*), at least in Mongghul this cannot hold, as subjective =i can even attach to a predicative person name (Kakudō Masayoshi, p.c., December 2011). Still, a converb *puxii-sa* ‘if it is not’ is attested, while the marker of assertor non-involvement =a (vs. =i for assertor involvement) in (110) resembles Mangghuer and attaches to the stem *pux*-.

In (111), from Bonan, a possibly verbal *çɵ-* (cf. Yu 1991: 144) combines with the non-involvement marker -wa.

(106) Santa (Field 1997: 5.3.2.2.5)

\[
\text{bi dziaus} \, \text{*pu} \, \text{si} \, \text{wo}. \\
\text{1sg professor} \, \text{ID.NEG cop} \\
\text{‘I am not a professor.’}
\]

(107) Shira Yugur (Chuluu 1994b: 7)

\[
\text{pu} \, \text{ʃə, mun} \, \text{pu} \, \text{ʃ} \, \beta \text{-ai, tere tfəni β-a} \\
\text{ID.NEG 1sg.gen ID.NEG cop-nai dem.dist 2sg.gen cop-nai} \\
\text{(Is that your book?) ‘No, not mine, yours.’}
\]

(108) Mangghuer (Slater 2003: 127)

\[
\text{qi ti ningger=ni kao pu} \, \text{zhang}. \\
\text{2sg that old.woman=Gen son ID.NEG-NAI} \\
\text{‘You aren’t that old lady’s son.’}
\]

(109) Mongghul (LI 1988: 430, translation Kakudō, p.c.)

\[
\text{Mongghul} \, \text{puxii-sa tewer=} \, \text{wa}. \\
\text{Monguor ID.NEG-COND,C Tibetan=NAI} \\
\text{‘If (he) is not Monguor, (he) is Tibetan.’}
\]

(110) Mongghul (Chuluu 1994c: 9)

\[
\text{te bagaci pu} \, \text{e=} \, \text{a} \\
\text{DEM.PROX teacher ID.NEG=NAI} \\
\text{‘He is not a teacher.’}
\]

(111) Bonan (Chuluu 1994d: 7)

\[
\text{mba, o} \, \text{dzan} \, \text{gerə-ŋə çə-wa. tərə} \\
\text{yes 3sg teacher-sg ID.NEG-NAI 51 dem.dist} \\
\text{da gerə-ŋə çə.} \\
\text{FOC teacher-sg NEG} \\
\text{‘You are right, he is not a teacher and neither is she.’}
\]

51. *Chuluu* glossed as *pst*, but see Fried (2004: 94)!
5.4. Ascriptive negation in Moghol and Kangjia

In Moghol, existential negation has been extended to both kinds of ascriptive negation:

(112) Moghol (Weiers 1972: 142)
\[
\text{éna ukín géibi béba be}
\]
DEM.PROX girl EX.NEG.NPST widow COP
‘She is not a girl, but a widow.’

(113) Moghol (Weiers 1972: 142)
\[
gér-mini qoló géibe
\]
house-1poss far EX.NEG
‘My house is not far.’

These two kinds of negation are also combined in Kangjia, which mainly uses mari, though a form buʃi ~ bəʃi is attested at least for nominal negation (Siqîncháokētu 1999: 196, 231). Little is known of the language-internal properties of this word, but it is a borrowing from Tibetan ma re, consisting of the negator ma and the copula re. In Tibetan, it is used to negate non-stative verbal predicates and ascriptive negation, while existential negation is based on a particular existential verb that is negated directly (Suzuki Hiroyuki, p.c., 24 December 2011).

(114) Kangjia (Siqîncháokētu 1999: 165)
\[
te kun asun dzari-sun kun mari
\]
DEM.DIST person livestock slaughter-PRF.P person ASC.NEG
‘That person is not a person who has slaughtered livestock.’

(115) Kangjia (Siqîncháokētu 1999: 190)
\[
teme niye gundu mari
\]
so one heavy ASC.NEG
‘It’s not that heavy.’

5.5 Ascriptive negation in Mongolian and Dagur

Ascriptive negation in Oirat and Buryat seems to be based entirely on busi, and no differences between nominal and adjectival negation are apparent, e.g.:

(116) Buryat, Dashbalbar sum, Dornod (elicited)
\[
dɔrʒə=ʃɪn bagʃə bəʃə=ɮdɑ, xarĩŋ dɔːktɔr(ɪ)=ɮdɑ
\]
NAME=STC teacher ASC.NEG=COP?52 but doctor=COP?
‘Dorj is not a teacher, but a doctor.’

52. This informant made a very extensive use of =ɮdɑ, originally consisting of the focus clitic =ɮ ‘only’ and the stance particle da [it’s not a question of whether we like the proposition or not, but you have to accept it on objective grounds]. In Khalkha, (116) would indicate that she speaker admits to a proposition originally proclaimed by someone else, but at the same time points out that some implications that one could try to deduce from this proposition shouldn’t be drawn. But as this informant also translated Tuyaa likes movies into toja: ki:no-(n)j dər̩təei=ɮdɑ, this relativizing function is absent for her.
Negation in Mongolic

(117) Buryat, Dashbalbar sum, Dornod (elicited)

*dorʒə=fin  ondər  bəʃə,  naməxane:
NAME=STC  large  ASC.NEG  small
‘Dorj is not large, but small.’

Khorchin, Khalkha, Ordos and Dagur still have to negate all nouns with cognates of *busi, e.g.:

(118) Khorchin (Bayancoγtu 2002: 403)

*thər=fin  min-i  fəxəi  pɨfe.
that=STC  lSG-GEN  shoe  ASC.NEG
‘These are not my shoes.’

In Khalkha, property negation is normally done by biš, too, though some counterexamples can be found online. Informants sometimes reject them. But for speakers of Ordos and Khorchin, property negation both with the existential negator =gūi and the identity negator biš are clearly possible. As noted by Sarangγuu-a (2007: 43) for Standard Southern Mongolian, =gūi can only indicate that the property (or number, when applied to numerals) is present to a lesser degree, while biš can indicate either as a lesser or a stronger degree:

(119) Standard Southern Mongolian (Sarangγuu-a 2007: 43)

a)  ulaγan ügei.   baya  ulaγan=siγ  bol  da
red  EX.NEG  small  red=like  if  SP
‘It’s not red. Maybe [it’s OK if one says that] it’s a bit reddish.’

b)  ulaγaγan  bisi.   ulaγa-btur=siγ
red  ASC.NEG  red-DIMINUTIVE(somewhat)=like
‘It’s not red. It’s reddish-like.’

c)  ulaγan  bisi  e.  γas  ulaγan  a
red  ASC.NEG  EMPH  INTENSIFIER  red  EMPH
‘No, it’s not red, it’s fire-red!’

This is compatible with the position of Fufubātoru (1992: 119–120), a speaker of a Shilingol dialect and thus very close to Khalkha, that ügei seems to be the unmarked way to negate adjectives and differs from bisi in that it negates the [degree of] the quality, while bisi negates the existence [of that quality], e.g. sayin ügei よくない ‘not good’ vs. sayin bisi よくない (よいものではない) ‘not good (there’s nothing good)’. Coyijongjab (p.c., summer 2010), a speaker of Khorchin, agreed with this position, and examples from Ordos confirm it as well:
I have not been able to elicit a congruent account of Khalkha, but it appears that those Khalkha speakers who use the construct \textit{ADJECTIVE}=\textit{güi} conform to a similar pattern as in (121). Unfortunately, the variation of \textit{biš} in Khalkha cannot be investigated with an unstratified corpus as it would contain a great number of speakers who never negate adjectives with \textit{=}\textit{güi}.

The situation of Dagur is somewhat unclear, too. Namcarai & Qaserdeni (1983: 347) state that \textit{biʃin} is used after nouns, pronouns, numerals and adjectives, but they give no examples for numerals and adjectives, and I have not come across any. Still, they are probably right, but what they fail to point out is that \textit{ügei} can exert this function as well, as illustrated in (122).

In Central Mongolic and in Dagur, peripheral uses of the adjective \textit{busi} ‘other’ tend to be preserved, \textit{biš hün} ‘another person’ being a common example. However, this is not common in Khalkha where \textit{öör hün} ‘another person’ and \textit{busad hümüüs} ‘other people’ (\textit{busad} being a fossilized plural of \textit{busu}) are more common expressions. In denials, \textit{biš} ‘no, it is not this one’ is considered to be the antonym of confirmative \textit{mön} ‘yes, it is exactly this one’, though \textit{mön biš} ‘(no, it is) not the same’ is possible either as an answer or sentence-internally. Moreover, \textit{biš} is used as a constituent negator as in (123) and, together with the ablative, forms a conjunctive construction as in (124).
(123) Khalkha\textsuperscript{53}

\begin{verbatim}
Ter čam-tai bish “utas”-tai=(g)aa bolz-ood bai-val ...
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
DEM,DIS 2SG=COM ASC.NEG phone=COM=REFL.POSS date-CVB COP-COND.C
\end{verbatim}

‘If s/he is not dating with you, but with her/his phone’

(124) Khalkha (line from the song Niigem by Apabt, 2011)\textsuperscript{54}

\begin{verbatim}
Hel-(e)h-ees biš hii-deg=güi hümüüs dendüü zalhuu.
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
say-FUT.P-ABL ASC.NEG do-HAB,P=EX.NEG person too lazy
\end{verbatim}

‘People who don’t go beyond saying it and don’t do it are too lazy.’

As an interjection, biš is more prone to introduce a different version of the proposition, while güi or ügüi can also be used to deny a presumption in answers to polar questions that don’t seek information but rather confirmation, while information-seeking questions are answered by the full (positive or negated) verb form (Binnick 2012: 94–95).

(125) Khalkha (line from a love poem)\textsuperscript{55}

\begin{verbatim}
namaig zürh=güi gež bod-dog yum=uu? ügüi,
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
1SG.ACC heart=NEG.POSS COMP think-HAB,P SP=Q EX.NEG
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
bi šanal-dag.
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
1SG suffer-HAB,P
\end{verbatim}

‘Do you really think I’m heartless? No, I suffer!’

6. Prohibitives and preventives

This section will address negative forms with immediate illocutionary force. In 6.1, forms will be discussed that can express prohibitions, while 6.2 focuses on forms specialized on preventing events for the addressee’s sake such as warnings and apprehensions.

6.1. Prohibitives

“Prohibitive” is used here to mean negated imperatives (cf. van der Auwera 2009). In most Mongolic languages, they are built from a negation adverb followed by an imperative form. These adverbs are peculiar to prohibitives. They are usually cognate with the MM words \textit{bu} / \textit{büügei}:

\textsuperscript{55} <http://enguunchimeg.blogspot.de/2011/04/blog-post_8203.html>, 7 April 2011, retrieved 9 August 2015.
Table 6. Prohibitive adverbs in Mongolic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>Oirat</th>
<th>Ordos</th>
<th>Khalkha</th>
<th>Buryat</th>
<th>Khorchin</th>
<th>Dagur</th>
<th>Moghol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bu</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(büü) (^{56})</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>pu:</td>
<td>pu:</td>
<td>bi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bütügei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bica (^{57})</td>
<td>bitgii</td>
<td>bitgii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Shira Yugur</th>
<th>Kangjia</th>
<th>Bonan</th>
<th>Santa</th>
<th>Mangghuer</th>
<th>Mongghul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bu</td>
<td>(bə)</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td>bao, bai</td>
<td>bi: (~ l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bütügei</td>
<td>putə</td>
<td>buda</td>
<td>tege</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other?</td>
<td>ne?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MM *bu* was retained in the north-east (Buryat, Khorchin, Dagur), in part of Southern Mongolic (Santa, Mongguor, perhaps as the only form in the Guómārì-dialect of Bonan (Čen 1987: 302) and in Moghol, while the western, south-western and central area (Central Mongolian, Oirat) and the other half of Southern Mongolic (Shira Yugur, Kangjia, Bonan) grammaticalised MM *bütügei* into a new imperative negator. In Khalkha, *bitgii* and *büü* are interchangeable in most environments (Yu 1991: 72–74), but *bitgii* is much more frequent, so it might be worth investigating whether a minority of north-eastern Khalkha dialects uses *büü* more extensively. Shira Yugur *putə* might have been the original form, but if it was borrowed from Oirat or Ordos, this must have happened before the first-syllable *i* was regressively assimilated to *ü* in this word in Central/Western Mongolian. The prefixing process in Moghol can only be understood in the remoteness of Afghanistan, as prefixing is almost absent in any other variety of Mongolic.

Prohibitive constructions in Mongolic are always structurally symmetric. In (126)–(130) it would always be possible to drop the negator and get a perfectly well-formed positive command.

(126) Middle Mongol, SH §170 (Rachewiltz 2004: 91)

*anda bu ayu-Ø*

sworn_friend NEG.IMP fear-IMP

‘Sworn friend, do not be afraid’

(127) Oirat, Kalmyk variety (Benzig 1985: 18)

*bicä sū-Ø-t¹n!*

NEG.IMP sit-IMP-2PL

‘Don’t sit down!’

(128) Shira Yugur (Chuluu 1994b: 28)

*tʃə nanda sad putə gaɾ-ga-Ø*

2SG 1SG.DAT hindrance NEG.IMP come_up-CAUS-IMP \(^{58}\)

‘Please don’t disturb me’

---

56. *bitgii* and *büü* are interchangeable in most environments (Yu 1991: 72–74), but *bitgii* is much more frequent.

57. In the Oirat of Mönkhhairhan sum, Khovd province, the conservative [bitxə] is used (O. Sambuudorž, p.c.).

58. Note that my glossing of this particular example differs substantially from Chululu’s.
Negation in Mongolic

(129) Mongghul (Cinggeltei 1988: 299)
\[
\text{tenə \ go-nə \ bi: \ sunosə-Ø !}
\]
DEM.DIST.GEN \ word-ACC \ NEG.IMP \ hear-IMP
‘Don’t listen to his words!’

(130) Moghol (Weiers 1972: 143)
\[
\text{ukmay \ bi-bol-ga-Ø}
\]
bread \ NEG.IMP-become-caus-IMP
‘Don’t make bread!’

6.1.1. Paradigmatic symmetry

In all Mongolic languages, imperative negation is structurally symmetric. It is also paradigmatically symmetric in a loose sense, as there are no categories such as irreals that are neutralized in the presence of the prohibitive adverb. It is not clear whether there are any co-occurrence restrictions between non-finite aspect markers and negated imperatives, but the phenomenon itself is under-documented. Khalkha in any case allows for non-finite aspect markers to combine with the imperative as in (131), and bitgii always precedes the main verb. If an imperative of the resultative-continuative -aad bai- is negated, the starting point of the action is included into the proposition, so the order is to desist, as illustrated in (132). If the imperative of the progressive -ž bai- is negated, this does not necessarily presume that such an action has already taken place, but makes up a simple order not to repeatedly engage in such actions, as illustrated in (133).

(131) \text{man-ai-d \ ir-eed \ bai-Ø! (overheard)}
\[
1\text{PL-GEN-DAT \ come-CVB.PRF \ COP-IMP}
\]
‘Come to visit us from time to time!’

(132) \text{či \ tšün-ii \ hoin-oos \ bitgii \ güi(g)-eed \ bai-Ø (int)}
\[
2\text{SG \ DEM.DIST-GEN \ behind-ABL \ NEG.IMP \ run-PFV.C \ COP-IMP}
\]
‘Don’t keep running after him/her!’

(133) \text{awtobus \ ohin \ hoyor-iin \ ar-aas \ hezee=č \ bitgii}
\[
\text{bus \ girl \ two-GEN \ back-ABL \ when=FOC \ NEG.IMP}
\]
\text{güi-ž \ bai-Ø59}
\[
\text{run-CVB \ COP-IMP}
\]
‘Never let yourself get caught running after either a bus or a girl!’

The negative adverb may even be placed before direct objects, locational and other adverbs or converbal phrases as in (134), as long as it doesn’t precede the subject. The pragmatic conditions under which this may take place cannot be explored here.

"Don’t let yourself fall in love when you see somebody for the first time!"

This holds true for most of Bonan as well, but in its Xiàzhuāng dialect the negator takes the position in-between a light verb and a noun (Cen 1987: 300):

\[
\text{(135) Bonan (Cen 1987: 300)} \\
\text{tei mənda dango-} \text{təgə-} \text{gə-} \text{-Ø (Xiàzhuāng dialect)} \\
\text{tei mənda təgə dango-} \text{gə-} \text{-Ø (other dialects)}
\]

‘Don’t disturb me!’

By and large, paradigmatic symmetry seems to hold in the strict sense that the entire paradigm of mood suffixes can be negated by the imperative negator. All Mongolic languages divide finite verbs into declaratives on the one and diverse moods on the other hand. For example, Khalkha has the five imperatives -Ø (plain), -aač (imploring), -aarai (invitations, polite downward commands), -gtun (commands to august people), -sugai (decrees of law), the third person imperative / permissive -g, the optatives -aasai (for plain wishes) and -tugai (ceremonial wishes), the voluntative -ii (first person singular intentions, first person plural suggestions) and the literary preventive -uuzai. Except for the already negative preventive, Önörbayan (2004: 297, 299) claims for all of these forms that they can be negated by bitgii and büü. However, negated instances of -tugai, -g and -ii seem non-existent for all ends and purposes, and the same almost holds for the exceedingly rare büü ... -sugai. This basically leaves the third person imperatives as well as the plain optative to be negated. A symmetric pattern is attested for MM and also provided by Poppe (1960a: 59–60) for Buryat, which would also have to be scrutinized in detail, and by Slater (2003: 147–148) for the small paradigm of Mangghuer. It is unclear how the etymological unclear ne in Kangjia fares, though Sīqīncháokétú (1999: 140) does provide a single negated voluntative.

6.1.2. The prohibitive negator in Mongghul conditionals

In Mongghul, the negator biː that is used for imperatives can also be applied to conditional and concessive converbs. According to Sengge (1987: 11), the meaning of this construct differs from a sentence with liː (or with the negative verb) in that the speaker emphasizes that she had hoped that the action of the subordinate clause would come about. Due to lack of context, (136) and (137) don’t directly demonstrate a semantic difference, but they illustrate the contrast in forms.

\[
\text{(136) Mongghul (Chuluu 1994c: 25)} \\
tɵŋgɜrɜ liː uro-samba bu dzigasə diudzile-la \\
\text{sky NEG fall-COND.C lsg fish catch-cvb.in_order}
\]

\[
cidzi-ja gə-dz-iː \\
go-VOL say-PFV-AI
\]

‘If it hadn’t rained, I was planning to go fishing.’
Negation in Mongolic

(137) Mongghul (Sengge 1987: 11)
\[
tɕə biː re-sada bu vara:da-ʋa\]
\(\text{2SG NEG.IMP come-CONCESSIVE.C 1SG finish-PST}\)
‘Even though you didn’t come, I finished it.’

6.1.3. Etymology

On the more lexical side, sources for prohibitive negators include words and constructions meaning ‘abstain’ (~ ‘don’t begin’), ‘stop’, ‘be taboo’, ‘be not good’, ‘you must not’, ‘is not wanted’ and ‘is not possible’ (van der Auwera 2010: 89–91). In (138), arret corresponds to French arrêter ‘stop’. The word yào in (139) originally means ‘want’ and is negated by bu, the typical negator of declaratives. In a secondary interpretation, this sentence could still be interpreted as ‘(I) don’t want to speak with ghosts!’:

\[
\text{Arret vol sitrô!}
\]
\(\text{NEG.IMP steal lemon}\)
‘Don’t steal lemons!’

(139) Mandarin61
\[
\text{bu=yào gēn guǐ shuōhuà}
\]
\(\text{NEG=want with ghost speak}\)
‘Don’t speak with ghosts!’

For MM, an etymology of bu / büütügei along the line of ‘stop’ is quite probable. First, the two forms are most likely related to each other through the MM suffix -tuγai, a third and occasional second person imperative (Rybatzki 2003: 74). Consequently, it is viable to analyze bu as bu-Ø, i.e. the plain imperative. bu-/bü- may then correspond with the verb bu- ‘exist, be located’ that was also used as a copula and auxiliary (Nasunurtu 1989: 90–96). The vowel of this verb varies between ü, ö, u, i, but the distribution is complementary with respect to the suffix it takes, e.g. bu-i vs. bü-lüge (Nasunurtu 1989: 96-99). This fairly unproblematic formal identification was already proposed by Ramstedt (1903: 72–73), but this account leaves two problems open, one syntactical and the other semantic. Semantically, the meaning ‘be’ is still quite remote from ‘let it be’. Yu (1991: 61, see also Sengge 1987: 5) speculates that bü- might have had similar semantics as the contemporary Mongolian copular auxiliary bai- < Early MM bayi- ‘stop+stand’ (Secen 1983: 39–40), an aktionsart shared by contemporary Khalkha zogs- ‘stop+stand’. The only historical evidence for such a meaning comes from the SH (§§76, 131, 174, 189, 242) where bü-tügei as a main verb is used with the meaning ‘desist!’ Apart from a lone entry in the dictionary Huayi Yiyu, büütügei is not attested anywhere else in MM. There is also areal evidence from neighboring Turkic languages, in which the verb ‘stand’ frequently grammaticalized into an

---

60. The original translation was the structurally almost identical ci biü üre-becü bi bara-ciqa-ba.
aspect-marking auxiliary (Johanson 1999). So bü- ‘be, exist’ < ‘stop+stand’ seems very plausible. This leaves us with the syntactic problem. The syntax of Mongolic usually strings together verbs by connecting them with converbal or sometimes participial suffixes, but it doesn’t juxtapose mood forms. Moreover, auxiliaries don’t precede, but rather follow the main verb in all attested stages of Mongolic. Given an apparent lack of evidence, only ad-hoc speculations about what happened are possible here:

• There was a two-sentence construction bu-Ø! V- Ø! ‘Desist! V (and you’ll see what will happen to you)!’ that grammaticalized into an imperative negator. Given the high degree of bleaching that characterizes bü- already in the earliest stages of MM, this would most likely have happened before the 12th century.

• Bese (1974) proposed verbal etymologies for ügei, ülï and ese. He analyzed both tügei and ülï as consisting of a verbal root ü- ‘be not’ plus either the [resultative] participle -(γ)ai or a verbal suffix -lu as in [firsthand past] -luγa, with -γa corresponding to the resultative particle. The reconstruction of *ü- is supported by Khitan iu ‘not to exist, to die’ (Kane 2009: 157–8) and its probable derived form eu.ui (Wu & Janhunen 2010: 77). Bese (1970, 1974) argues that not all modern Mongolic forms can go back to *-luya, but that some need to be constructed from *-lu and, thus, that -lu at some point was a finite verbal suffix. This is supported by the Khitan past tense suffix -lu.n (Kane 2009: 146–147). Reconstructions such as *ü-lü (past) and *ü-gei (resultative) are then perhaps best explained by ascribing a telic meaning such as ‘die’ or ‘leave’ to *ü-. For ese, Bese (1974) suggested e-se with e- as ‘be not’ in analogy to Proto-Mongolic a- ‘be’ and -se ‘perfecti’ as in -γ.sa.n (as segmented in Bese 1971). The analogy of e- and a- must probably be rejected, as a- is still sometimes attested with its original meaning ‘live’ (Secen 1983) in MM, but the segmentation of -γ.sa.n might be correct: *-n might just be a fossilized plural marker, the meaning of *-γ- is unclear, but it is probably a later addition at any rate not reconstructable from modern languages, so that Proto-Mongolic is probably *-san. Its meaning in MM was probably perfect (cf. Brosig 2014a: 30–33), and the same could hold for its proto-form *-sa. As both ülï and ese were used pre-verbally, there would thus have been a time when negative verbs took on the form of the verbs that they negated and appeared in the position before the main verb.

Explaining the presence of büügei in Banon and Kangjia is another problem. It might have been inherited from a variety of MM that already had it grammaticalized, but is not recorded, it might have been developed at a later stage at which these languages and Central Mongolian still formed a dialect continuum, or it might be a later borrowing from Central Mongolic to Southern Mongolic. This question seems to require further research.
6.2. Preventives

Short of directly prohibiting an addressee to commit a certain action, it is possible to warn the addressee of an adverse outcome of an activity “as a consequence of diminished control over the situation” (Nilsson 2013: 95). This is what we shall call preventive. Even more generally, one may apprehend an unwanted or deleterious future event that is not in the power of the addressee to prevent. Such meanings may be related on a grammaticalization chain postulated by Pakendorf & Schalley (2007, drawing from Caughley 1982: 102 and Bybee et al. 1994: 211–212) that sets out from possibility as a non-evaluative mode of prediction:

(140) possibility > apprehension > warning > prohibitive

In MM, the suffix -γ_ujai covers both apprehension of an adverse future event that is (already) beyond control as in (141) and warnings from future events that could still be prevented as in (142):

(141) Middle Mongol: SH §169 (translation de Rachewiltz 2004: 87)

Having thus pledged their word that they would surround and capture them, Altan’s younger cousin, Yeke Čeren, said when he came home, ‘We have decided to capture Temüǰin early tomorrow. What sort [of a reward] might be expected by someone who delivers a message with this news to Temüǰin?’ When he spoke in this way, his wife Alaq It said,

Tere deleme üge cin-u yaun bol-umuy.

DEM.DIST vain word 2SG-GEN what become-IPFV

Haran ba ünemšige-üjey

person FOC believe-PREV

‘What is this idle talk of yours? [Some] people [here] might take it seriously!’

(142) Middle Mongol: SH §190

edöe bi cima-da sere-ül-jū ile-be. ire-jū

now 1SG 2SG-DAT2 wake-CAUS-IPFV.C send-FACT.PST come-IPFV.C

qor-iyen ab-da-ujay

quiver-REFL.POSS take-PASS-PREV

lit.: ‘Now I sent to you [an envoy] letting [him] warn you. After [they] have come, [you] might be robbed your quivers.’

‘I’ve sent you this warning. If they come upon you, you might get subdued.’

In some instances, -γ_ujai is negated by the imperfective declarative negator ülü, which itself is in the scope of an interrogative particle that results in a rhetorical question. In (143), the speaker predicts that the enemy who is strong in number and feared by some in the council will rather flee than put up a valiant fight, thus suggesting to attack. The
idea that the enemy people will not be able to flee if they carry along their possessions might also reflect his hope, either that they will indeed fall behind (and thus be subdued or cut down easily) or that they will leave their precious possessions behind. So there seems to be a perhaps ironical shift from fear to hope, either ridiculing the enemy or the more cautious military commanders. Declarative negative preventives are not attested in the SH, but given no more than overall 13 occurrences, this is not indicative of their non-existence.

(143) Middle Mongol: SH §190

ordo ger in-u eüre-jü ülû=ü qocor-uujay. olon ulus
palace tent 3SG-GEN carry-PFV.C IPFV.NEG=Q be.late-PREV many people

an-u ündür etüge:d-tür qor-ura ülû=ü qar-uujay.
3PL-GEN high place.PL-DAT evade-in.order.to.C NEG=Q exit-PREV

‘Carrying their palatial tents, would they not fall behind? Might their many people not set out to high places to evade [our attack]?’

From Middle Mongol grammar, the meaning of -γujai in Proto-Mongol can be reconstructed with relative certainty: -γu is most likely a participle with future meaning including intentional, scheduled and predictive uses (Brosig 2014a: 18–21). This identification is supported by the use of the negator ülû as the correct negator for non-past/imperfective forms instead of the modal negator bu. ja is most likely a vowel-harmonic variant of the stance or modal particle je that indicates notions such as “presumption, probability, or hope” (Rybatzki in preparation). The expected combined meaning of -γu and je should be a guess about the future, so the development from Proto-Mongol to MM covers the first three parts of the development in the grammaticalization chain mentioned above. Simple predictive meaning is also most common to Buryat-uuža, which according to Skribnik (2003: 114) can only sometimes express preventive connotations in the third person: duul-uuža ‘I hope he does not hear.’

In Kalmyk Oirat, -vzâ can be used to express even positive guesses about the future for a third person subject as in (144) next to a perhaps more pervasive apprehensive meaning as in (145). Uses of the negated form -vz-go seem to resemble the predictive use (cf. Benzing 1985: 38). In the case of (146), a notable difference to (144) is that the potential development is evaluated negatively, though it is not clear whether

---

62. The Ming translators, translating this text 200 years after it was written, seem to have assumed that hocor-literally refers to the tents staying behind, and de Rachewiltz (2004: 113, 688–9) is taking their word for it.

63. The finer nuances of its use have not been explored, though it is sufficient to license a future interpretation of the suffix -mu, which otherwise marks present progressive/habitual meanings (Brosig 2014a: 13–16), developing into the suffixes -mz for uncertain, but possible future developments in [archaic] Khalkha (Poppe 1951: 78) and Oirat (Benzing 1985: 38).

64. It is not easy to account for -γ as the last segment. A homophonous segment marked gender or number at least with the variants of the past suffix -ba (neutral/male)-bi (female)-bai (plural) (Ozawa 1961, Tümenceçeg 1990, Street 2008b: 408–420), while the unclear difference between γu and γui cannot be explained along such lines (Street 1957: 18, Bayarmendü 1986). Overall, however, γ is a very common final segment in alternative variants of either mood or aspect-evidentiality suffixes in MM (see Rybatzki 2003: 74–77), so that its presence and subtle semantics in -γujay might be understood as part of a larger unsolved, but well-recognized problem.
any of this can be generalized. For the negated construction to arise, a reanalysis of the originally analytical and finite form into a complex and nominal form must already have taken place, though the truth conditions of ‘maybe’ and ‘maybe not’ are indeed very close.

(144) Kalmyk (Saj et al. 2009: 823)

After a while the old woman, caught by greed, thought:

\[en\] taka-غو xoτǝ-n'i ikǝɾ cac-ǝd ödǝɾ bolǝn öǝ-g-xlǝɡǝ
\[dem.prox\] hen-acc food-3poss very throw-cvb day every give-successive.c

\[nan-ǝ xošad bolnu òrv-ad öndǝg var-ǝ-ʒǝ öǝ-g-vzǝ\]
\[1sg-dat\] twice maybe three-distributive egg exit-caus-cvb give-prev

‘If I scatter a lot of grain for this hen every day, it will maybe lay 2 or 3 eggs for me.’

And with this greedy thought she feed her hen.

(145) Kalmyk (elicitation, Vlada Baranova)

\{The son went to the forest and mother is little bit nervous\}

gergǝ-n zalu-d-an kelǝ-v ter kövü-n
\[wife-3poss husband-dat-refl.poss tell-fact.pst\] DEM.DIST boy-3poss

tǝ̌ōrü-vzǝ
get.lost-prev

‘The wife said to her husband: “I’m afraid that that boy may get lost!”’

(146) Kalmyk (Saj et al. 2009: 790)

\{From a story about family conflicts. One woman had bestowed a curse: “If I am telling lies, let God punish me, or else let punishment strike my evil cousin!”\}

Not much later, the cousin indeed broke his leg. A third woman who knew about what had happened told to the narrator:}

\[nevčkǝ ad-ta bol-vz-go gi-ʒǝ-nǝ namagǝ\]
\[a.little\] madness-com become-prev-NEG say-prog-pres 1sg.acc

‘She is telling me: “He will probably become crazy.”’

The data situation for other Oirat dialects is worse. For Mongolian Oirat and perhaps particularly for its Dörbet dialect, Cendee (2011: 176) lists a single example with preventive meaning without further comment. An interesting case, however, is High Mongolian in Qinghai. Judging from a single overheard example, the use of -ʊzǝe might be extending from preventive towards prohibitive. Most examples in this section contain predicates that denote uncontrolled actions or feelings, and with the exception of (144) and arguably (143), the expected consequences are deleterious. In (147), however, the action of which the speaker warns the addressee was undertaken by the latter entirely voluntarily, and its negative consequences are non-intrinsic and
only suggested in a second sentence marked as future. While this example is not yet indicative of an imperative that can be uttered only for the benefit of the speaker, the focus is on preventing the addressee from executing an action instead of warning of its consequences. It is thus borderline between preventive and prohibitive.

(147) Oirat, High Mongolian, Haixi, Caka (overheard utterance, 9 April 2015)

When Brosig was trying to go down a steep, but not very deep slope to the water of Dawsan nuur in Caka to take a photo of little Buddhist pictures that people had cast there for ceremonial purposes, his guide (a young man who had graduated from Chinese school) said:

\[ tʰa \ jaw-ozæ, \ on-dʒi-na \ fu: \]

2SG.HON go-prev fall-proceed-fut SP

‘Don’t go, you will fall!’

In contemporary Khalkha Mongolian, -uuzai has by and large fallen out of productive use. The extent of its current usage is indicated by some of the most basic Khalkha verbs yielding zero hits in an internet corpus, and only the form mar-t-uuzai ‘you might forget!’ seems to be alive and well.\(^{65}\) However, it is part of school grammar, which means that is must have been present in some dialects of Khalkha as late as 1930.

Önörbayan (1987: 155) characterizes -uuzai as consistently used as a [preventive or apprehensive]\(^{66}\) warning to an addressee, so even a sentence like Bi unt-uuzai! ‘I might fall asleep on you, don’t let that happen!’ is related to the second person. He notes it cannot be negated by imperative negators, but claims at the same time that there are rare cases where it is negated by the [old] declarative negator es and ùl as in (148). As neither negator is still used productively for any other suffix in modern Khalkha and even the choice of negator in (148) is the wrong one by MM standards, the existence of such examples might either be indicative of the will to a very archaic literary style or of dialectal and particularly Oirat influence.

(148) Khalkha (from a work of D. Myagmar;\(^{67}\) cited in Önörbayan 1987: 156)

\[ Điūū=čin’ es oč-uuzai. \ Tegvel \ nad-ad \ medeg-d-eerei. \]

younger.sibling=2POSS NEG go.to-prev do.so-cond, c 1SG-DAT inform-imp

‘Careful, your younger sibling might fail to go there! If so, please tell me!’

---

\(^{65}\) In a 33-million-word internet corpus, 96 out of 121 instances of -uuzai occurred within the word mar-t-uuzai. At the same time, negated second person imperatives of mar-t- occurred merely in 130 unique sentences.

\(^{66}\) While Önörbayan gives stronger emphasis to the preventive aspect, he acknowledges a slight apprehensive nuance in his explication of the third person example ter unt-uuzai ‘S/he might fall asleep’, which can be used in the senses ‘Don’t let her sleep!’ or ‘Pay close attention as to whether she falls asleep or not’, i.e., ‘be prepared if it happens.’

\(^{67}\) According to the journalist Hürelbaatar Uržin, Dembeegiin Myagmar was born in the Barunburen sum of Selenge aimag in 1933 and lived there until the age of 12, and in Altanbulag until the age of 18. He later worked in the capital, but also in Sainshand and, for three years each, in Arhangai and Zavhan [a province with a substantial Oirat population]. <https://www.facebook.com/khurelbaatar.urjin/posts/34918909266251>, 20 September 2014, retrieved 13 September 2015.
Reflexes of -γujai are also reported for Mongur and Shira Yugur, but their meaning isn’t discussed. Now The translation of Mongur (149) is in line with a preventive, but the translation of Shira Yugur (150) is not, though the example itself, presented out of context as it is, could lend itself to a preventive interpretation.68

(149) Mongghul (Cinggeltei 1988: 223)

noxɔi     dzau-gudʑeː  
dog       bite-Prev
‘小心狗咬’ → ‘Careful, the dog bites.’

(150) Shira Yugur (Bolucilaγu and Jalsan 1991: 246)

tʃə  mør-tə  da-ra-βadʑeː  
2sg    way-DAT   freeze-Prev
‘你在路上没冻着吧’ → ‘Did you freeze on the way?’

Khalkha, as well as Khorchin, have innovated new preventive forms. Modern Khalkha uses -v (see also Brosig forthcoming) to express warnings. It originates from MM -ba which was an evidentially unmarked past form (cf. Street 2009). It is retained in Khalkha in the form -v as a literary narrative past, a relatively rare mirative past as in (151), in questions as in (152) and, possibly indicating the expected surprise of the addressee about a detrimental future event, as a preventive as in (153) to (155). Apprehensive meanings cannot be expressed this way; instead the form -h vii=dee (which is perhaps based on a future in the present not attested in MM) illustrated in (156) and (157) can be used for this purpose:

(151) genet  min-ii  šüd  una-v=aa,  teg-snee  genet  
         suddenly  lsg-gen  tooth  fall-modal.pst=emph  do.so-just.after.c suddenly

ahiad  neg  una-v=aa  
again  one  fall-modal.pst=emph
‘(On a nice, sunny day I was being together with my friends.) Suddenly, (one of) my teeth fell out! And immediately afterwards, another one suddenly fell out!’

(152) Harin  či  yaa-(g)aad  hudlaa  hel-v=ee?  
but  2sg  do.what-cvb  untruth  say-modal.pst=emph
‘But why was it that you told me lies?’

68. The same holds for their other two examples: daḥta xura ẓrofiadʑe: ‘冬场下过雨了吧’ ‘Did it rain during winter camp?’, knees xui kaila ereβedʑe: ‘人民已经开会来了吧’ ‘Have the people already arrived for the conference?’ Alternative translations could be ‘It might rain during winter camp!’ and ‘The people might already have arrived at the conference!’
We shall now try to take a look at how the preventive use of a former non-evidential past suffix emerged. In this discussion, we have to leave out interrogative -v as it is not well understood how it differs from the interrogative that is based on the new non-evidential past marker, -san. We shall focus on the mirative use instead, claiming three different stages in the development of -v:

---

Negation in Mongolic

a) something happened (as in MM)
b) something happened that surprised the speaker
c) something undesirable (for speaker or addressee) might happen

At stage a), -ba was the most frequent and neutral past tense of MM. It was part of an evidential system also comprised of -luγa as a marker of direct perception and -juγu as a marker of inference and hearsay (Street 2009). Self-evidently, -juγu is not a beacon of reliability, but even -luγa did not express heightened certainty. Rather, it was apparently used with less obvious statements that required an explicit clarification about how the speaker knows (Brosig 2014a: 28–29). The marker of firsthand perception thus functioned as a means of separating the assertor from the assertion through providing the senses as a means of access (cf. Lazard 1999 on Persian, Johanson 2006 on Turkish). These senses could, after all, have failed the assertor, and this is for the addressee to judge. Within such a system, -ba would have carried a connotation of factuality. Later, -ba was replaced by -san as a marker of well-established information, while the firsthand and inferential-secondhand became markers of recent perception or inference. As -san explicitly refers to mentally well-established information, a meaning it could not easily cover was that of speaker surprise, so that -ν survived just in this context, replacing its previously factual connotation at stage a) with surprise as a meaning at stage b).

Probably following the lead of -luγa, which acquired future uses in all Central and Eastern Mongolian dialects, all past suffixes of Khalkha Mongolian developed future uses: the direct present marker marks a near future event that the speaker expects to take place on the basis of perceptual evidence, and the inferential infers a future event as a necessary consequence of a conditional action. The factual, which is exceedingly rarely used for future meanings, can express that a future development is unavoidable and certain (Brosig forthcoming). Identifying a plausible path of semantic change for -ν from stage b) to stage c) is tricky. Past surprise might mirror onto future surprises of which an addressee might have to be warned. The switch from speaker to addressee surprise is not straightforward, though speaker surprise can of course also be used as a bait to catch the attention of an addressee, perhaps allowing for an intermediate stage as a marker of general surprise that later focused in on the addressee in future contexts. Yet another possibility would be to correlate surprise with unpleasantness, which, after a switch to the future, could be apprehended.

In the Khorchin dialect, yet another marker emerged. The complex suffix -ɮə̆g̱gue appears to express a warning or an advice not to do something, with finer nuances depending on context and intonation. It corresponds to a positive form -ɮə̆g, a deverbal noun that expresses authoritative disapproval of a pending action.70

(158) Khorchin (Bayancoγtu 2002: 302)

ʃiː ən ʊʃr-i xəɮ-ɮə̆g(-)gue.
2SG DEM.PROX matter-ACC say-?-(-)EX.NEG
‘Better don’t tell this!’ / ‘You don’t have to tell this.’

70. -ɮə̆g has a variant form -ɮgə̆-n, which contains an unstable n typical of adjectives and nouns used as attributives.
Originally, -ɮəg seems to derive from a suffix that forms resultative deverbal nouns, cf. Khalkha *bar*- ‘grap, build’ > *barilga* ‘building’, or- ‘enter’ > *orlogo* ‘income’, *med-* ‘come.to.know+know’ > *medleg* ‘knowledge.’ It somehow acquired a reference point in the future, so that resultativity was reanalyzed as necessity. It also acquired an adverse connotation, so that necessity would be conceived of in terms of unavoidability. The existential negator =gue would then serve to negate precisely this unavoidability.

One problem in situating this form is its exact meaning in relation to the other forms in the inventory. The phonetician Haschimeg, a speaker of Naiman (Eastern Mongolian and thus close to Khorchin), provided a wide array of forms from her dialect:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>buu hel-Ø</td>
<td>NEG.IMP SAY-IMP</td>
<td>order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>buu hel-Ø=ee</td>
<td>NEG.IMP SAY-IMP=POL</td>
<td>order, but used by the elderly in a softer way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>buu hel-Ø aa</td>
<td>NEG.IMP SAY-IMP SP</td>
<td>counseling, but more decidedly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>buu hel-čig-Ø aa</td>
<td>NEG.IMP SAY-DISSATISF.-IMP SP</td>
<td>counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>hel-Ø aa či</td>
<td>SAY-IMP SP 2SG</td>
<td>somewhat threatening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>hel-ev aa</td>
<td>SAY-V SP</td>
<td>warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>hel-leg-gue</td>
<td>SAY-Λga-EX.NEG</td>
<td>order (but intonation can soften it; infrequent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7. Preventive-like forms in Naiman*

Items (a) to (d) are negated imperatives, i.e. prohibitives. Example (a) as a plain prohibitive is perceived as an order, while (b) contains the vowel-harmonic clitic =aa, which, perhaps akin to its use with Khalkha Direct Present Progressive and perhaps other Khalkha forms (Brosig 2015), is used to come across as more friendly. If this form is restricted to elderly speakers, this is due to the sentence-final loan particle *aa* used in (c) to (f), which is homophonous with *=ee* in words without advanced tongue root and, as it occupies the same syntactic position, suited to replace the former. This loan particle “is used to mark a discrepancy in knowledge, expectation or perspective regarding some state of affairs between the current speaker (i.e., the a user) and the prior speaker” (Wu 2004: 128). On its own, it turns a prohibitive into an insistent advice not to as in (c), while a more neutral negative advice as in (d) requires the suffix -čig-, which Brosig (2014b: 46–51) analyzed on the basis of indicative verb forms as denoting speaker dissatisfaction often paired with a cooperative, forgiving attitude.
Item (e) is a positive form through which the speaker dares the addressee to perform the action and suffer the consequences. Perhaps among other things, it differs from a regular imperative by the postverbal position of an overt subject (as would be the case in Khalkha). Item (f) as a preventive is similar to Khalkha, only that Khalkha speakers use =aa instead of aa. Finally, (g) was understood as another, but rare form of an order, perhaps due to its prevalence in other Eastern Mongolian dialects rather than in Naiman. Properly sorting out this data would require proper interactive corpora, which are lacking for any variety of Khorchin.

7. The development of negation in Mongolic: a summary

Negation in Pre-Proto-Mongolic might have been based on the verbal negators *ü-, perhaps ‘die’, *e- of unclear meaning and *bū-, quite likely ‘stop+stand’. They might have assumed the same morphological form as the main verb they preceded, but this was no longer true at least at the time that the verbal suffix *-lu-γa (negated by e-se, not by ü-üü) developed. For negative existential predicates, some form of *ü- was used as a main verb.

In Proto-Mongolic, *ügei functioned as existential and constituent negator. It was also used to negate results, as exemplified by its combinations with the perfect participle *(γ)san, the perfective/resultative converb *-ju (reflexes of which are attested in all of Mongolic except Moghol) and the resultative participle *-γa in combination with *edüi ‘yet’ (reflexes of which are attested in Central Mongolic and Dagur). Preverbal *ese and *üü negated perfective and imperfective regular predicates. Present tense ascriptive negation, in particular identity and property negation, was probably done by *üü in combination with the copular auxiliary *bū-. Imperatives were negated by using the zero imperative form of the verb *bū- in its original meaning ‘stand+stop’ in pre-verbal position, probably still instantiating a form of parataxis.

In all of Mongolic except Moghol and Santa, *-ju ügei and/or *(γ)san ügei entered into SN. In Central Mongolic and Dagur, even *-γa (edüi) ügei gained currency and became SN in varying forms such as Khalkha -aa=güi, Ordos -aːdʊi and Khorchin -ute ~ Dagur uudeen. The functional load of pre- and postverbal negators in most of Shirongolic remained in some form of equilibrium (which is not understood at all and requires further research) and the replacement of *üü with ne in Kangjia didn’t change the system either. But in Shira Yugur and Dagur, this development led to the replacement the perfective negator *ese. In Central Mongolic (perhaps with the exception of Qinghai Oirat), both negators were replaced by *ügei, which was perhaps facilitated by the reinterpretation of MM -qu ügei from an adverbial into a finite marker in this branch. This development was fully completed only in Buryat where ügei became compatible with finite verbal suffixes, while other varieties rather went for the crosslinguistically common conceptualization of negation as stative and the neutralization of evidential distinctions (cf. Miestamo 2005).
In accordance with Eriksen (2006)’s principle of Direct Negation Avoidance for nouns, the Proto-Mongolic strategy of extending SN to ascriptive negation wasn’t particularly stable and didn’t survive into any modern languages. The negator *ügei made its inroads by first expressing the absence of a property (Ordos, Khorchin), then extending to the negation of adjectives in general (Southern Mongolic) and ultimately extending to nouns as well (Moghol). Late Eastern MM, in turn, started to grammaticalize busi ‘other’ to deny identity. This development did not affect Moghol, which might have split off earlier, and it remained at this stage in Southern Mongolic. In Central Mongolic and Dagur, it extended to the denial of the precise applicability of adjectives, and extended to the regular negation of adjectives in Dagur, Oirat, Buryat and most of Khalkha. Oirat, Shira Yugur and Bonan also extended *busi to negate the participle *-qu (replacing MM üülü). Whether this somehow forms a common innovation or a borrowing from Oirat, and whether Proto-Central Mongolic *-x ügüi entered the Oirat system later remains a subject for future research. Kangjia later introduced Tibetan ma re for all forms of ascriptive negation, diverging from the division of labor between *ügei und *busi common in the other Southern Mongolic languages.

The negation of imperatives was unaffected by the loss of adverbial negators in some varieties of Mongolic. The MM negator bu (< bu-Ø) was either retained or exchanged with the functionally equivalent bûi-tügei, corresponding to another MM mood. The languages that adapted bütuğei are Central Mongolian, Oirat, Shira Yugur, Kangjia and Bonan. Kangjia and Bonan are both located to the west of the Shirongolic area, thus the most plausible explanation is an innovation that developed in Oirat and then spread to the territories under Oirat control. Crosslinguistically, languages that negate imperatives symmetrically are more likely (by a margin of 3:2) to use negators that are different from standard negation (van der Auwera et al. 2013), and preverbal SN is three times as common as post-verbal SN (Dryer 1988), a tendency that (as van der Auwera 2009 suggests) might by and large also hold true for negated imperatives. Thus, the retention of a preverbal prohibitive adverb might have been favored by its general typological unmarkedness.

The preventive, on the other hand, is the only area distinct from proper negation in all of Mongolic since late MM. It started out as MM -yujai (< -qu je, future participle plus modal particle) and was, in contrast to the imperative, negated as a finite form. This changed in Buryat where it acquired imperative negation, only to change back into a declarative form, namely, a future. It seems to have made some inroads into prohibition only in Qinghai Oirat. There are other paths leading up to preventives, including the reinterpretation of the past tense suffix -ba in Khalkha and the negation of obligation as in Khorchin -bʊg(-)què.

The development of Mongolic, excluding prohibitives and preventives, is summarized in the Tables 8 to 10. Note that while most larger semantic areas are covered, a few notions such as resultativity in general and a few constructions such as the more recent development *-γad ügei have not been included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early MM</th>
<th>Moghol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>ülu (adverb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>üla ~ la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascriptive</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>ese (adverb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>esui (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>ügei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>ügei (adjective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8. Development of negation in Moghol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Late MM</th>
<th>Shira Yugur</th>
<th>Santa</th>
<th>Bonan</th>
<th>Mangghuer</th>
<th>Mongghul</th>
<th>Kangjia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>ülu</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>ülie</td>
<td>ele</td>
<td>iai</td>
<td>li:</td>
<td>ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>ese</td>
<td>ese</td>
<td>esá</td>
<td>esá</td>
<td>sai</td>
<td>se</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(γ)san ügei</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>gi-</td>
<td>gi-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-ju ügei</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ügei</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>iug-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ügei</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
<td>gü-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gü-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>ese/ülu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ma re</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>ese/</td>
<td>bushe</td>
<td>bushi</td>
<td>bush-</td>
<td>boshi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ülu,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>busu,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>busi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT -qu</td>
<td>ülu/</td>
<td>-sh</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>boshi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>busu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9. Development of negation in Southern Mongolic**
Based on the description above, we can take a look at a cyclic theory of the development between standard and existential negators, as put forward by William Croft (1991). Croft suggested a possible cyclic development between negative existentials and verbal negation. From a stage where one negation strategy applies to all kinds of negation (A), a negative existential arises in a limited domain (A~B) and then takes over existential negation (B), makes inroads into verbal negation (B~C), takes over verbal negation, but does so either by using different constructions or not yet applying to the positive existential (C), starts to negate the positive existential in some limited or pragmatically marked contexts (C~A), and again becomes the one and only strategy of standard negation (A). Reconstructed and historical Mongolic, Dagur and most of Southern Mongolic all occupy stage B~C in that reflexes of the existential negator *ügei play a certain role in verbal negation, while other verbal negators are still somewhat more prominent. This “transitional” stage, which is only moderately represented in the samples of Veselinova (2014), thus prevails in Mongolic. Central Mongolic has progressed to stage C in that reflexes of *ügei took over SN. One has to note, though, that Buryat and Oirat at the same time acquired standard negators from elsewhere (from prohibitive and identity negation, respectively) and that the presence of *ügei in forms like Khorchin -ute became non-transparent to modern speakers. While stage C~A is not attested, it might have been intermediate for Khalkha, which progressed to stage A, negating even the positive existential with the standard negator =güi. One could argue (as Veselinova 2013: 137 does) that alga already is a new existential
negator with a somewhat restricted application, thus arriving at stage A–B. The more conservative approach would be to posit that *alga* is a pragmatically restricted device to express the absence of something at a particular location, which lends itself to the expression of possession, but still excludes existence proper (stage A). Another possible development, of course, is for the restricted adaption of the existential negator to verbal negation to be abandoned again in an attempt, for instance, to preserve structural symmetry between declarative and imperative negation. This “regression” from stage B–C to stage B is observed in Moghol and Bonan.

8. Conclusion

In this paper, we have traced the functions of negators across the Mongolic language family, witnessing from a distance developments such as the emergence of new standard negators from existential negators, ascriptive negators, morpheme fusions and Jesperson cycles. We also took a look at the emergence of identity and imperative negators from lexemes, at the early stages of a new locational-possessive negator and at the emergence of preventives from declaratives. Similarly, the domain of ascriptive negation was repopulated with new negators, and the syntax of possessive negation was in flux despite the consistent continuous use of a cognate negator that could go back to Proto-Mongolic-Khitian. This study, thus, took the step from the description of individual markers (Yu 1991, Sarangγuu-a 2007) to the investigation of functional domains within negation.

What directions could future research take? Instead of simply investigating a large domain such as standard negation over time, one could try to inventarize and investigate the development of all known Mongolic negation constructions over time. Such a study could limit itself to the domain of verbal and mostly declarative negation, but it would have to include negative interjections and pro-sentences, constituent negation and negation in dependent clauses. It would also have to draw on a refined knowledge of positive TAME systems. Such a study (or complex of studies) would lead to the description of entire negation systems. It would create a better basis for understanding and weighing the functional motivations (such as loss of dynamicity (Miestamo 2005: 87–88), the implementation of a more economical system with only one marker (Hsiao 2007: 505–512), general considerations of unmarked word order) of language change in Mongolic.\(^{71}\)

A bit more remote from the subject of this study, both the lexical manifestation of negation and its pragmatics (including the use of negation in individual Mongol societies) are currently just blank spots on the map.

---

\(^{71}\) Later studies would presumably have to rely on text analysis to a much greater extent than this one, using historical source documents of Central Mongolic, Moghol and Dagur, early 20th century records by western researchers for Mongghul, Khalkha and Ordos, and various published text collections from the second half of the 20th century. Modern (standard) varieties of Central Mongolic could perhaps by and large be covered by existing corpora, but for Central Mongolic regiolects and all of Southern Mongolic and Dagur, additional fieldwork would be required. A major practical problem for such a study would be the lack of annotated or electronic corpora for the large bulk of Central Mongolic varieties written between the late 16th and 19th century.
Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Bürinbatu, Igor de Rachewiltz (Middle Mongol), Yamada Yōhei (Dagur), Grigorii Tserenovič Pjurbeev, Yu. Cendee, Vlada Baranova (Oirat) and Sečenčoytu (Kangjia) for their helpful comments on individual languages, to Yu Wonsoo for tracking down one difficult reference, to Krisztina Teleki for her help with reading Hungarian, and to Ljuba Veselinova, Östen Dahl, Matti Miestamo, Bela Kempf and Andreas Hözl (in this temporal order) for their comments on different versions of the draft. Most of all, I want to thank Kakudō Masayoshi for his many insightful suggestions particularly on Southern Mongolic and John Street who not only tried to answer a lot of tricky questions on Middle Mongol, but also did part of the source-checking. None of this reduces the responsibility of the author for all mistakes that doubtlessly remain.

The first raw version of this paper grew out of a course paper for a course on negation taught by Ljuba Veselinova in 2010 at the Department of Linguistics of Stockholm University, which formed part of my regular PhD program. In 2011, the department allocated one month to me for improving it. It thus financed two months or more than half of the overall research time.

Abbreviations and glosses

MM - Middle Mongol, SH - Secret History of the Mongols, SN - standard negation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>assertor involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>ascriptive (negation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOU</td>
<td>boundedness marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative (voice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula / copular auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVB</td>
<td>linking converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>direct (evidentiality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>distal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>established (evidentiality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>existential (negation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>factual (evidentiality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>identity (negation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIR</td>
<td>indirect (evidentiality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N &gt; V</td>
<td>denominal verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>no assertor involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPST</td>
<td>nonpast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive (voice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Negation in Mongolic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRES</th>
<th>present</th>
<th>RES</th>
<th>resultative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREV</td>
<td>preventive / apprehensive</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>stance or modal particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>STC</td>
<td>postnominal stance marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>V&gt;N</td>
<td>deverbal noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question marker</td>
<td>VOL</td>
<td>voluntative / desiderative / hortative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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