Benjamin Brosig (Stockholm)

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, *ülü* 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 Fufubātoru (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.

1.   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 Khalkhaization. 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 some-what 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 varie-ties 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 defin-ing that

> A SN construction is a construction whose function is to modify a verbal dec-larative 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 environ-ment 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 over-view 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').

	Proto-forms	*ülü	*ese	*edüi + *ügei*	*PARTICIPLE + *ügei*	*CONVERB + *ügei*	*busi
Historical	Early MM	*ülü*	*ese*				
Moghol	Moghol	*ulá ~ la*	*esá ~ isá*				
Southern Mongolic	Santa	*uliə*	*əsə*				
	Mangghuer	*lai ~ ai*	*sai*		*gu-*		
	Mongghul	*li: ~ i:*	*se/sii*			*gu-*	
	Kangjia	*ne* (?)	*se*			*ик-*	
	Bonan	*elə*	*esə*		*'gi-*		*ç*
	Shira Yugur	*lə*				*игwei*	*-ʃ*
Dagur	Dagur	*ul*		*utien*	*=we:*	*uwe:*	
Central Mongolic	Khorchin			*=utɛ*	*=guɛ*	*uguɛ*	
	Ordos			*=a:dɔi*	*=güi*		
	Oirat				*=go, uga*	*uga*	*-š*
	Khalkha				*=güi*		
	Buryat				*=gʷui*		

Table 1. Standard Negation in Mongolic

The system of MM that relies on the preverbal negators *ülü* amd *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 *ülü*. 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 *ülü*, as in (2).

(1) Middle Mongol, SH §24[2]
    qubi   *ese*   *ög-be*
    share   PFV.NEG   give-FACT.PST
    'They (...) didn't give him his share.'[3]

(2) Middle Mongol, SH §82
    ülü   *jaa-qu*   *bi*
    IPFV.NEG   show-FUT.P   1SG
    '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)
    mün mün mör-ier-en **ese üje-gsen qajar-iyan**
    same same track-INS-REFL.POSS PFV.NEG see-PRF.P place-REFL.POSS

    üje-ed qari-n   *bedere-ye*
    see-PFV.C return-IPFV.C   search-VOL
    '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)
    cima-yi (...) **ese teki ala-asu** (...) *kee-n*   *ala-qu*
    2SG-ACC   PFV.NEG FOC kill-COND.C   say-IPFV.C kill-FUT.P
    'even if [I] 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, Sīqīcháokètú 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 *ülü*. 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 *taqï*, see Rybatzki in preparation) or *gu* 'even' as in SH §179.

In addition to *ülü* 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 *edü* 'gerade noch; soviel'[4] (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
     *nama-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" (Urancimeg 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 *edür* 'day') would have survived.

b) *koun-í   bi   s=ála-ja-mbi*
child-ACC   1SG   PFV.NEG=kill-?INDIR.PST-1SG
'I didn't kill the child.'

A similar system still exists in Santa. Field (1997: 5.3.2.2) favors a realis distinction between *əsə* and *uliə*, but notes that the difference between this and a perfective/imperfective distinction is slim. It hinges on whether verbs with the suffix -*dʑiwo* that are negated by *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).

(8)   Santa (Field 1997: section 5.3.2.2.1)
tʂi-ni   laudʑiga   mi-ni   dʑaŋ-ni   dau   ori
2SG-GEN   old.man   1SG-GEN   debt-ACC   still   debt

əsə   giə-dʑiwo
NEG.?   pay-PROG
'Your old man still has not repaid my debt.'

[or: 'Your old man is still not repaying my debt.']

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 *ügei* was generalized into the only verbal negator. As a nominal element, *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 Toɣtambayar 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:

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

Table 2. Pre- and post-verbal negation in Mongolian over time

If one were to judge from Table 2, the replacement of *ülü*/*ese* by *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[9]
    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* [guː] 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 nationalistically 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 *u* <c>, *γ* <ü> and *θ* <ö>.

account for 20% in words without advanced tongue root.[10] Apart from this, we find the contractions *-dag=güi* [tɑˇggu: ~ tgu:], *-h=güi* [xgu: ~ kʰu:] and *-san=güi* [sɑˇŋgu: ~ sgu:] 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
   ter=čin   *soht-oo=č=güi=ee.*
   DEM.DIST=STC   become.drunk-RES.P=FOC=NEG=EMPH
   [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 *-sguɛ* (Bayancogt 2002: 306). Vowel harmony is reported to obtain for the negated Khorchin non-past marker *-xʊɛ ~ -xuɛ* (< *-x=guɛ*) (Bayancoɣtu 2002: 55–6, 304).[11]

   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)
   a)   *jaba-na/ba=**gyi**=b*   b)   ***by***   *jab-uuža=b*
         go-PRES/PST=NEG=1SG   NEG.IMP   go-FUT-1SG
         '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 *=güi* 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 Bayancoɣtu 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[12]

Dəən-ə   oln   əəmšgtə zovlņ   üz-sn   kün,   əndr   ödr
war-GEN many awful   suffering see-PRF.P person high day

   *kürtl   mart-**ad**   **uga**.*
   until   forget- PFV.C 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)
   ölös-či=güi   *bolhoor ide-hü sanaa=güe   lee*
hunger-IPFV.C=NEG because eat   intention=NEG   SP
'I'm not hungry, so I don't intend to eat.'

In (14), the positive form would be the progressive *ölös-či bai-hu bolhoor* 'because I am feeling hungry' with the non-past auxiliary *bai-*. For Khorchin, Fufubātoru (1992: 120) notes that examples like (14) with the imperfective converb are possible, while Urancimeg (p.c.)[13] rejects examples such as (13) with the perfective converb. For Proto-Ordos, it is hard to decide whether *-aad=güi can be reconstructed, as *-aa* is widely used INSTEAD OF *-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 *-γa(i)*, which is used in Khalkha *-aa=güi* (the most common negation of a past event). Semantically, *-aad=güi* and *-aa=güi* don't seem to differ to Ordos speakers, and *-aad* < *-γad* might go back to a (highly speculative) form *-γa-da -RES.P-DAT.

    Two additional strategies of SN have developed, one based on *edüi* and the other on *busi*. In Khorchin, MM /*üdügei*/ [*utugei] developed (perhaps along the path *etui *ugei* > *utugei* > *utuei > *utei > *-utɛ*) into a full-blown standard negator. While non-past forms are negated by *=guɛ*, there is a contrast between *-guɛ* and *-utɛ* 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 *-utɛ* seems to be the more frequent.[14]

(15) Khorchin (Bayancoγtu 2002: 305)
   *pi: pəːtʃiŋ-t   ɔʃ-tʃ   ʊʰtɛ-t   ɔʃ-**utɛ***
   1SG   PLACE-DAT go.to-PST[15] PLACE-DAT go.to-NEG.yet
   'I've been to Beijing, but I haven't been to Udai yet.'

12.   Ivan Soldačenko: Dəənə baatrmud 'War heroes', Xal'mg ünn 1978 № 64 (1st of April), page 4.
13.   Urancimeg ("Uranchimeg Ujeed"), department of social anthropology, University of Cambridge, is not the same researcher as Urancimeg (2009), department for Mongolian language and literature, Qinghai Nationalities Univerisity.
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 (*-utɛ*) vs. 8 (*-s-guɛ*).
15.   As the converb *-tʃ* 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)
   xɛtʰət   pɔl-lɛ   lɔkəːrt-s-guɛ
   Chinese   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 *-aːdʋi*, which probably goes back to *-ɣa edüi, as illustrated in (17). Sarangɣuu-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 *-aːdʋi*. 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 *ügei was lost in the course of historical development and ceded its function to the emphatic element *edüi. 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)
   gadʒir   xʋld-ʋːdʉi
   ground   freeze-NEG.yet
   'The ground did not freeze (yet).'

(18) probably Ordos (Sarangɣuu-a 2007: 45)
   ene   učir-i   sonusu(ɣ)-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 *biš* (< MM *busi*) became a verbal negator *-š* that can only be used in its shortened form. This development can probably be traced back until the early 18th century: Toɣtambayar (2004: 70–1) counted 8% *busu/bisi* among all negators in *Arban jüg-ün ejen geser qaɣan-u tuɣuji 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, *-š* combines only with the non-past form *-h* and then negates a present state, while *-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 *-h-go* (taking a future perspective) or by *-d-go* (negating the habit directly) (Yu. Cendee, p.c., November 2011).

(19) Oirat, Kalmyk variety (Pjurbeev 1977: 17/18; p.c./constructed)
   *Övgn   yum   kel-**h-š**.   / kel-**h-go**.   / kel-**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.   Sarangɣuu-a (2007) also gives an example of *ese* and *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)
    šiluɣun *jilmaɣan-dur*   *qurica-qui* *ügei* *širigün* *qataɣu-dur*
    honest   composed?-DAT lust-FUT.P   EX.NEG cool   hard-DAT

    kilingle-kü   *ügei*   *ülü*   *mungqaɣura-ɣul-da-qu*
    be.angry-FUT.P EX.NEG   IPFV.NEG be_stupid-CAUS-PASS-FUT.P

    bilig-tü-yin   *tulada* *öcügüken* *ken-e* *ber*
    wisdom-POSS-GEN   because a_bit   who-DAT FOC

    ködel-ge-n   *cida-ɣda-qu* **busu** *bu-i*.
    move-CAUS-CVB can-PASS-FUT.P   ID.NEG   COP-PRES?
    'As, being without lusting in his honesty and composure, and without feeling anger in his coolness and firmness, he possesses an intellect which can not be stultified, it is not at all the case that he could be moved by anyone who is insignificant.'[17]

2.1.3. Standard Negation in Southern Mongolic

Most Southern Mongolic languages retained cognates of both *ülü* and *ese*, which can (along with the prohibitive particle *boo*) be assimilated to verbs, e.g. *sii orova* → *soorova* 'didn't rain' (Zhàonāsītú 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)   *ɕoŋjisa* *atɕaŋla* *ələ*   *odə-**m***
    originally 3PL   IPFV.NEG go-NARRATIVE
    '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) *noŋʁarhte   pə   silaŋ=da   əsə   o-**to***
   this.morning 1SG Xining=LOC PFV.NEG go-AI.PFV
   '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 *ülü* has taken over the function of *ese* entirely, as illustrated in (23).

(22) Mangghuer (Slater 2003: 146)
   *Ni   kong   gan   **lai**   chengrengla-jiang.*
   this   person 3SG   NEG   consent-AI.PFV
   'This man, he didn't consent.'

(23) Shira Yugur (Chuluu 1994b: 19–20)
   *bu   ...   nege   sø:nə   **lə**   ser-ße*
   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)
   *Huer   qige**-sang** **gu-ang***.
   monkey   see-PRF.P   EX.NEG-NAI
   '(so) Monkey did not see (her).'

(25) Bonan (Chuluu 1994d: 16)
   *əmtəg   sartɛin   gø:gə-saŋ   **'gi-wə***
   this_kind strange   hear-PFV.P   EX.NEG-NAI
   'I have never heard such a strange thing.'

The use of reflexes of *ügei* 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)
   *munə   ene   məsgə   qɔqɔ-də   dʒɔGə**-dʒ**   **ugwei***
   1SG.GEN DEM.PROX clothing body-DAT   fit-CVB   EX.NEG
   'Now these clothes don't fit me.'

(27) Kangjia (Sīqīncháokètú 1999: 149)

 urʉ   sa-**dʒi**   uʁ-ua
3SG   sit-CVB   EX.NEG-NAI
'He is not sitting.'

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.)

aji-ca   aji-гу-на   муде-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).[18] 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)   nəçəlaŋ   pə   o-gə   ç-i
this.evening   1SG   go-FUT.P   ID.NEG-AI
'I will not go this evening.'

b)   nəçəlaŋ   tɕiaɕi   o-gə   ç-o
this.evening   Jiashi   1SG   go-FUT.P   ID.NEG-NAI
'Jiashi will not go this evening.'

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

tʃə   ɔrɔi   kʉr-kə-**ʃ**   β-ai,   dagqə   hərtə   βa-m-naːɛ
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 *ʉle* (Altansubud, p.c.), so its meaning vis-à-vis -*kə-ʃ* when referring to present events requires further research.

(31) Shira Yugur (Altansubud, p.c.)

ergen   jɔGɔr   lar   med-eg-ʃ   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 *-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)

kʰətʰə   tʰa-sa   kʰətʰə=ku   aku=la
home.LOC   sleep-COND.C   home.LOC=IPFV.NMLZ   girl=PL

*wi-sa   sauma   wi-**saŋ**   **çə-wa***
COP-COND.C   ceremonially.clean   COP-POSSIBILITY   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 *-w*, present *-yibei*, past *-sen* and past continuous *-iyas-en*.[19] The future *-bei* (cognate with the MM factual past marker *-bA(i)*) is negated by the adverbial *ul* in combination with the non-declarative suffix *-en* (MM progressive *-nam* > Khorchin *-na* generic-habitual-future):

(33) Dagur, Hailar dialect (Yamada 2010: 5 citing Shiotani 1991: 90)

ənə   ǰiešigən-ii-mini   yaulgaa-ǰ   ul   uk-ən-ši   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 *-en* is not restricted to the negated non-progressive with *ul*, but can also be used with the polar interrogative particle *jə:*, with the word *juɔ:* 'what', and with the modal particle *gɔ:*, which expresses doubt (Namcarai & Qaserdeni 1983: 249). It might thus have a particular distribution in interrogative contexts.

The forms in *-sen* are directly negated by attaching *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: *ul məd(ə)-ǰ-aa-wəi* 知りません 'doesn't know' [< *ülü mede-jü a-bai, with a negator that by MM standards is aspectually disharmonic with both *-jü* and *-ba*, though it is harmonic with the new non-past meaning of *-bei*], and *-ǰaa-gu-uwei* [< *-ju a-qu ügei; Hailar *-ǰaa-* and Qiqihaer *-iya-* 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 *-uw-* is used instead of *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 ügei (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)

ʃiː	utʰiʃ	tʰatɛʰoko-t	itɛʰi-tɛ	aː-gə-ʃi-jə
2SG	yesterday	school-DAT	go-CVB	COP-NPST.P-2SG-Q

aː	itɛʰi-**tɛ**	**uweː**
oh	go-CVB	EX.NEG

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

The particle *ʉdeːn* (cognate with Khorchin *-utɛ*, 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 *ʉdeːn* 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)

ʃinʲ	akaː-ʃinʲ	dutʃin	nas	kur-**ɣu**
2SG.GEN	elder_brother-2POSS	forty	year	reach-NPST.P

ʉdeːn,	dʒuɣʲ-bəi	jəːʔ
NEG	right-NPST	Q

'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.[20] This happens with all complex predicates irrespective of whether the old copular auxiliary *bü-*, as in (36), or its more recent counterpart *a-*, as in (37), is used:

(36) Middle Mongol: SH §208

seŋgüm-i	*ese*	*širqa-qsa n*	*bö-esü*
NAME-ACC	NEG.PFV	wound-PFV.P	COP-COND.C

'If we hadn't wounded Senggüm, ...'[21]

(37) Middle Mongol: SH §255

uruq-tur	*niken=üü*	*sayin*	*ülü*	*töre-gü*	*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?'[22]

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-gü*	*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: Subhāṣitaratnanidhi VIII:20b

...keme-besü	*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-ɣu-tʃinʲ*	*a-sa*:
rain	NEG	enter-IPFV-STC?	be-COND.C

'if it hadn't rained'.

Lesser auxiliaries are directly preceded by the negator:

əmsə-dʒ	*ul*	*ʃadə-n*
put.on+wear-CVB	NEG	enable-NPST

'cannot wear' (examples from Chuluu 1994: 26, 29).

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-juɣu* 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-ül-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)
ci   qubilay   cerig-ün   üyile   bügüde-yi   aqala-ju
2SG   NAME   soldier-GEN   event   all-GEN   preside.over-PRF.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)
*edöe   tan-u-an   sayi   üje-sü   kee-n   **sedki-jü***
now   2PL-GEN-POSS   good   see-VOL say-CVB emote-PRF.C

ese=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 homophonous 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, d[23]
a) *ter   bič-(i)ž   bai-na*[24]   / *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.'

---

23.   Comment (<http://factnews.mn/dwf>, 30 December 2013, retrieved 21 September 2015) within the discussion about the article Duučin T. Ariuanaagiin dagavar hüü Aldar hoid eeždee gomdon, huviin am'draliin nuucaa anh udaa delgelee. The entire comment reads: "Ene mangar batsaan ni yum uyeegui hudlaa uruvduuleh gesen teneg yum bichij baihgui yu .Haraajiin l sagsuu bandi bainshdee"

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-na***[25]
      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   tüün-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 *-ž 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 poem[26])
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 ganc-aar   **biči-ž   bai-(g)aa=güi***
      1SG   when=FOC 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.

---

25.   <http://www.shuud.mn/content/read/276474.htm>, 5 September 2013, retrieved 4 June 2015
26.   <http://zoljargal.blog.gogo.mn/read/entry173479>, 15 November 2010, retrieved 4 June 2015

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:

	Perfect	Future	Habitual	Resultative
Finite positive	*-san*	*(-h)*	*-dag*	*(-aa)*
Finite negative	*(-san=güi)*	*-h=güi*	*-dag=güi*	*-aa=güi*
Attributive	*-san*	*-h*	*-dag*	*(-aa)*
Attributive negative	-	*-h=güi*	*-dag=güi*	*-aa=güi*

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, üzehgüi, yalahgüi* (constructed) 'I won't come, see or win'), while *-na* is more inclined to do so (*irne, üzne, yalna*[27] '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 *-žee*, 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 hol-bogd-son=güi* DEM.DIST 1SG-COM contact-PRF.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-PRF.P but come-RES.P=NEG

'彼は来なければなりませんでしたが、来ませんでした' '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. Attributive -*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 attributive -*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.

31.   <http://www.cosmopolitan.mn/news/show/1720>, 20 June 2012, retrieved 8 August 2015. Headline.

(48) *Až_törö-h=üü,*   **esvel**   *orši-h=uu?* (int)[32]
     make.a.living-FUT.P=Q,   or   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 *ese-besü*, consisting of the perfective negative particle and the conditional converbal suffix. If we assume that the old conditional converb was replaced by the modern form *-val* (< *-bala* < *-ba* FACTUAL PAST + *la* DELIMITED FOCUS) in all contexts, this form is equivalent to *esvel*.

So, while there are verbal forms, no truly verbal paradigm seems to have existed. One possible explanation is that *esvel* is not actually based on a negative verb stem, but that it modified an auxiliary verb which was lost, such as in **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: *tehgüüvel* 'if not' < *te(ge)-h=güi bol* do_like_that-FUT.P=NEG if 'if SUBJECT doesn't do like that'. The conjunction *bol*, in turn, is derived from *bol-bol* < *bol-bala* become-COND.C via haplology. Modern forms like *es-sen* would then not be ancient at all, but rather indicative of a reanalysis of *eseh* and *esvel* into **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 *ül too-* 'disrespect' (< *too-* 'respect') or *es tusah* 'intransitive' (cf. *tusah* 'transitive' < *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 *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 *esə* 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 *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 *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 ese negating

---

32.   Most internet sources were first retrieved in 2010/2011 without noting down the URL. If the material was still online, the URL was added in 2015, otherwise the old source information "(int)" was left in place.

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 *əs*, 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 out-rightly denies the existence of its referent without locating it, while a locational nega-tion 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)
    *alan.qoa ere   **üge-üy** bö-ed   qurban köü:-d töre-ül-bi*
    NAME   male EX.NEG-f COP-PFV.C three   son-PL be.born-CAUS-FACT.PST.
    FEMALE
    'Alan Go'a, although she had no husband, bore three sons'

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

(50) Middle Mongol: SH §214 (Rachewiltz 2004: 147)
    *mani   **ügei**   bö-'esü*
    1PL.ACC   EX.NEG   COP-COND.C
    '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)
qasar-i   ese   nende-'esü   mede'e
NAME-ACC NEG   attack_by_surprise-COND.C information

ügei   *bu-i*   *je*
EX.NEG   COP-PRES?   SP
'If you don't strike at Qasar by surprise, there is no knowing [what will happen].'

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)
xūcn-a   üg-d   xudl **uga**, *xob-t   ünn* **uga**
old-GEN   word-DAT lie   EX.NEG slander-DAT truth EX.NEG
'There is no lie in the tales of yore. There is no truth in slander.'

(53) Dagur (Yu et al. 2008: 84, 191)
ənt   ajə-kə   jo: tɕʰ **uweː**
here   fear-NPST.P what   FOC   EX.NEG
'There is nothing to worry about.'

(54) Moghol (Weiers 1972: 142)
kóun-i   **géibe**
son-3POSS³⁴   EX.NEG.NPST
'There is no son.'

(55) Shira Yugur (Bolucilaɣu and Jalsan 1988: 67)
jimar-tʃə   gørøːsən   htɔrɔ   da   namiːn   ɔrɢɔsɔn   seigqan
what-FOC beast   within   FOC 1SG.GEN   equal?   beautiful

eβer-tə   gørøːsən **ugui**.
horn-having beast   EX.NEG
'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.'

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

ʂgɜ   go-dɘ   ɕdzeː-dal **gu=a,**   ʂdɜ ɢal-dɘ   ɕeː-dal **gu=a.**
big   word-DAT load-V>N   NEG=NAI big fire-DAT pee-V>N EX.NEG=NAI
'In big words, there is no weight. On a big fire, there is no peeing.'[35]

(57) Bonan (Cen 1987a: 89)

tərə-sa   χan jama nəgə amtətə dzi **'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   **uʁi-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 uzə-lə
2SG EX.NEG-FUT.P because 1SG movie-ACC   see-CVB.in_order_to

əsə   ətʂɯ-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 nəgə   wiləgə-**dzi** **gi**
1SG now thing one   do-CVB   EX.NEG
'Now I am doing nothing.'

---

35. 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 deverbal 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 *ʁʁi-*. Examples (62) and (63) show how the conditional converb and and an imperfective participle attach to *'gi-* in Bonan:

(62)   Bonan (Cen 1987a: 102)

    tɕi   *dʐⱡma-ngə* *da*   *mənə*   *səb-da*   **gi-sa**   *mənə*
    2SG   little-SG   FOC   1SG.GEN side-DAT EX.NEG-COND.C 1SG.GEN

    namɛi-nə *jaχa-saŋ-nə*   *daɢaːna*
    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.'[36]

(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-saŋ*
    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. Cinggeltei 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 assertor involvement and subsequent reanalysis of *-i* in *gu-i* as an assertor involvement marker.

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

tɛɞ	*tendɞ*	*ɢar-na:*	*ɛyæda-dzɞ*	***gu-i-sam***	***ba***,
2SG	3SG-DAT	hand-REFL	shake-CVB	EX.NEG-PST.P	TAG

te	*tɕimɞ*	*sge-gu-a-nu:?*
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 *u*, as in (65), or the negative possessive verb *wəi-* is used, as in (66), and it is also attested with the "imperfective nominalizer" *-ku* (cf. Field 1997: 5.3.2.2.6). The possessive construction in (65) coincides with the existential construction (67). For locational negation, *u* is used as well (68). Here, however, we see a suffix *-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 *u*, supporting Liú's claim that there is a verb *u(i)-*. Given that stress falls on the ultimate syllable (Field 1997: 4.3), this should leave intact the dichotomy between *u wo* and *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)

mi-ni	*idziə-sə*	*tʂi-ni*	*ʂiduŋ*	*dʐawa-də*	*niə*
1SG-ACC	eat-COND.C	2SG-GEN	tooth	crevice-DAT	one

kuru-ku-ni ***u***		*wo*		*ma*.
be_enough-NPST.P-3POSS[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)

tʂima-də	*biəri*	***wəi-sə***	*biəri*	*daŋ-la-jə*
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)

udʐə-ʁa-ku	*oroŋ*	***u***	*wo*.
see-CAUS-IPFV.P	place	EX.NEG	COP

'We did not have a place to be seen (by a doctor).'[39]

---

38. Field glossed this as an accusative, but he is probably wrong. Judging from Central Mongolic, *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.

39. One could easily imagine the interpretation "There was no place to be seen (by a doctor)."

(68) Santa (Liú 1981: 102)

tʂu **ui-ku** *dula* *bi* *dziənjin-ni* *uʐə-lə*
2SG EX.NEG-NPST.P because 1SG movie-ACC see-CVB.in_order_to

əsə *ətʂu-wo*
NEG.? go-PST
'Because you were not (here), I didn't go to see the movie.'

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.)[40]

min-i *ʃiɔ_* *tʰərəg* *pɛ:-s=***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 **uguɛ** *pɛ:-tʃ*
DEM.DIST NEG COP-PST
'S/he was not there.'

(71) Khorchin (Urancimeg, p.c.)

tʃərʐəg *mʊːr* *gə-sən* *jim* **ugɛ**
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 =*güi* was extended even to the copular auxiliary in its aspectually and temporally most neutral form, *bai-h=güi*, as in (73). This meant the complete replacement of *ügei* as an independent negative existential.

(72) Khalkha, Mörön, Hövsgöl (elicited)

Luu *bai-dag=***güi***
dragon COP-IPFV.P=NEG
'Dragons don't exist.'

(73) Khalkha, Mörön, Hövsgöl (elicited)

Ter *end* *bai-h=***güi***
DEM.DIST here COP-EX.NEG
'He isn't here.' cf. *tʰər ənt* **ugɛ** (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 Bayancoɣtu (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 bai-san* 'it was missing'. 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*   *möngö=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 öör=öö*   *šüü dee.*
      democracy-ACC   NEG.LOC   DO-PRF.P person=2POSS   name   SELF=REFL.POSS SP   SP
      'The person who did away with democracy was [prime minister] Elbegdorj himself!'

<http://archive.olloo.mn/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=1135151>, 9 September 2008, retrieved 8 August 2015. From a comment on the interview C. Elbegdorž: Ard tümnii harah nariig algaa hiilüüleed halhalčihsantai adil üil yavdal bolž baina published in Ödriin sonin.

42. <https://groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/tsahim_urtuu/conversations/messages/15663>, 13 June 2005, retrieved 8 August 2015. From an essay-long comment on the post Nudnees dalduur yavaa Mongolčuud at Tsahimurtuu by Mongol_xvv_2004.

(77) *ah=n'*   *čam-tai   herelde-h   hüsel   **alga**.*[43]*
elder.brother=3POSS 2SG-COM quarrel-NPST.P wish(noun) NEG.LOC
'I don't want to quarrel with you.'[44]

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]

(78) *hün-ii   sanal.bodl-iig hülee-h-ees   öör   arga   **alga**   daa*[46]
person-GEN opinion-ACC   accept-FUT.P-ABL other means NEG.LOC SP
lit. 'There is no other means except accepting the opinions of other people.'

'You must accept the opinions of other people.'

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:

(79) Buryat, Dashbalbar sum, Dornod (elicited)
xuʐisiːtə,   dɔrʒə=mnə   əndə   aʐăɢ=ıʐda
excuse.me, D.=1SG.POSS here   NEG.LOC=COP?[47]
'Excuse me, Dorj is not here.'

(80) Eastern Mongolian, Khüree (overheard)
*6   sar-as   əxʐ-ət   atʃiʐ   **alăg**   pɔʐ-tʃʰix-sɔn*
six month-ABL begin-PRF.C work NEG.LOC become-BOU-PRF.P
'I don't have any work from the beginning of June [→ so I can finally relax].'

---

43.   <http://124.158.124.10:35555/message/public/14/chat-35865.html>, 25 November 2014, retrieved 8 August 2015. From a discussion in a chat room.
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).
46.   <http://markmail.org/message/yecj5g5odiin53gf>, 22 July 2008, retrieved 8 August 2015. From an argument presented by "munkhzul bekh-ochir" in "Re: Shine tester-iin sanaanuudaas".
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 notably, MM employs a different strategy:

(81)   Middle Mongol: SH §11
   *duwa_soqor   aqa   inu   dörben   köü-**tü**   bü-lee.*
   NAME   elder_brother 3SG.GEN   four   son-POSS.SG COP-DIR.PST
   'Du'a Soqor, his elder brother, had four sons.'

(82)   Middle Mongol: SH §76
   ta   se'üder-ece   busu   nökör   ügei
   2PL   shadow-ABL   other   friend   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   ʃol   **uwəi***
   3SG   time   EX.NEG
   'He doesn't have time.'

(84)   Buryat, Dashbalbar sum, Dornod (elicited)
   *dɔrʒə   maʃin-**gʷui**=ʒda*
   NAME   car-NEG=COP?
   'Dorj doesn't have a car (right now).'

(85)   Khalkha, Mörön, Hövsgöl (elicited)
   Dorž   mašin=güi   /   mašin-tai.
   NAME   car=NEG   /   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)
    *nand   usn **uga**   / usn-**go***
    1SG.DAT water EX.NEG / water-EX.NEG
    'I don't have water'

(87) Oirat, Kalmyk variety (Benzig 1985: 165)
    *ger   **uga**   kün*
    house   EX.NEG   person
    'a person without house'

(88) Santa (Field 1997: 5.3.2.2.6)
    *nama-də nuduŋ **wəi-wo***
    1SG-DAT   eye   EX.NEG.COP-PST
    'I did not have eyes.'

(89) Shira Yugur (Chuluu 1994b: 9)
    uɢui   β-e,   nan-da xara ʃkər   uɢui   β-e,   tʃəɢaːn ʃkər
    EX.NEG COP-AI 1SG-DAT black sugar   EX.NEG COP-AI white   sugar

    la   b-əi
    FOC   COP-?
    'No, I don't have [black sugar], I have white sugar.'

(90) Buryat, Dashbalbar sum, Dornod (elicited)
    dɔrʒɪ-də   *maʃin*   *bæi-dăg-**gʷui***
    NAME-DAT   car   COP-HAB.P-NEG
    'Dorj does not have a car (now and at other times).'

For those varieties that have innovated *alga*, which functions similarly to the non-past form of the copular auxiliary *bæi-x-gʷui*, a construction along locative possession patterns is common as well. Thus, paraphrasing (90) with *alga* would result in a grammatical sentence with a somewhat different aspectual meaning. However, (91) indicates that *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   *düü*   *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).

(93) Khorchin (Uranchimeg, p.c.)

a) *mini*   *ʃiɔ_tʰərəg*   **ugɛ**.
    1SG.GEN   car   EX.NEG
    1. 'I don't have a car.' 2. 'My car isn't there.' / 'I have a car.'

b) *mini*   *ʃiɔ.tʰərəg-tɛ*.
    1SG.GEN   car-COM
    'I have a car.'

c) *mini*   *ʃiɔ_tʰərəg*   *nat*   **ugɛ**
    1SG.GEN   car   1SG.DAT   EX.NEG
    'I don't have my car.'

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 xiša-sá*   *ukín bari-sú*[48]
    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)
    qaɣan-u   *ɣurban*   *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.

(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 NAI.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,   ʉsʉ   ɢala tʃʅlə   **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 agruments 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 **ülü-'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. *ülü-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 ülü 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, Xiāo 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-ɣa-* '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)

ene   mör ber jobalang-i   maɣad   ɣar-ɣa-n   cida-qu
DEM.PROX path FOC   suffering-ACC certain   exit-CAUS-CVB   can- NPST.P

mör   busu   bu-i.
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:

	Shira Yugur	Santa	Mangghuer	Mongghul	Bonan	Kangjia	
N	*puʃə* COP	*puʂi* COP	*puzh-i*	*puɛ-i*	*çɵ-*	*mari*	*buʃi*
Adj	*ʉgʉi* COP	*u* COP	*(u)gu-i*	*gu-i*	*'gi-*		

Table 4. Ascriptive negation in Southern Mongolic

	Oirat	Buryat	Khalkha	Khorchin	Dagur	Moghol
N	*biš*	*bəʃə*	*biš*	*piʃɛ*	*biʃin*	*(u)*
Adj			*biš, =güi*	*piʃɛ, -guɛ*	*biʃin, uwəi*	*géibi(le)*

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 (Bolucilaɣu and Jalsan 1991: 300)[49]

dʒun	na:mər	dʒerge	sein	**ugui**	β-e
summer	autumn	equally	good	EX.NEG	COP-AI

'Summer is not as good as autumn.'

(102) Santa (Chuluu 1994a: 17)

dʑijan	idziə-sə	mini	ʂəntɛi	gau	**u**	wo
cigarette	smoke-COND.C	1SG.GEN	body	good	EX.NEG	COP

'Smoking is bad for my health.'

(103) Mongghul (Chuluu 1994c: 13)

nda:	ndəre:-sa	xʊlo	**gu=i**	mula:
1SG.DAT/ACC	here-ABL	far	EX.NEG=AI	small

bu:dzən-gʒ- rʒ[50]	toro-va
town-SG-LOC	be_born-PST

'I was born in the small town not far from here.'

(104) Mangghuer (Slater 2003: 127)

gan	wunduer	**(u)gu-ang**
3SG	tall	EX.NEG-NAI

'S/he is not tall.'

(105) Bonan (Chuluu 1994d: 21)

ede	mənə	enə	məʂgu	mən-da tɕəgsi	**'gi-na**
now	1SG.GEN	DEM.PROX	clothing	1SG.DAT straight	EX.NEG-NPST

'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. Bolucilaɣu and Jalsan 1988: 14).
50. -*re* amended to -*rʒ*.

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)

bi	*dziauʂəu*	***puʂi***	*wo*.
1SG	professor	ID.NEG	COP

'I am not a professor.'

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

puʃə,	*munə*	***puʃ***	*β-ai,*	*tere*	*tʃəni*	*β-a*
ID.NEG	1SG.GEN	ID.NEG	COP-NAI	DEM.DIST	2SG.GEN	COP-NAI

(Is that your book?) 'No, not mine, yours.'

(108) Mangghuer (Slater 2003: 127)

qi	*ti*	*ningger=ni*	*kao*	***puzh-ang***.
2SG	that	old.woman=Gen	son	ID.NEG-NAI

'You aren't that old lady's son.'

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

Mongghul	***puxii-sa***	*tewer=wa*.
Monguor	ID.NEG-COND.C	Tibetan=NAI

'If (he) is not Monguor, (he) is Tibetan.'

(110) Mongghul (Chuluu 1994c: 9)

te	*baɢaɕi*	***puɕ=a***
DEM.PROX	teacher	ID.NEG=NAI

'He is not a teacher.'

(111) Bonan (Chuluu 1994d: 7)

mba,	*ɵdzaŋ*	*gergə-ngə*	***çɵ-wa***.	*tərə*
yes	3SG	teacher-SG	ID.NEG-NAI [51]	DEM.DIST

da	*gergə-nga*	***çɵ***.
FOC	teacher-SG	NEG

'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)

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.NPST

'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 (Sīqīncháokètú 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 (Sīqīncháokètú 1999: 165)

te	*kʉn*	*asun*	*dʒari-sʉn*	*kʉn*	***mari***
DEM.DIST	person	livestock	slaughter-PRF.P	person	ASC.NEG

'That person is not a person who has slaughtered livestock.'

(115) Kangjia (Sīqīncháokètú 1999: 190)

teme	*niɣe*	*gʉndʉ*	***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=ʃin	*bagʃə*	***bəʃə*=ʒda,**	*xariŋ*	*dɔːktɔr(ı)=ʒda*
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 =ʒda, originally consisting of the focus clitic =ʒ '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 implicatures that one could try to deduce from this proposition shouldn't be drawn. But as this informant also translated *Tuyaa likes movies* into *tʊja: ki:no-(n)d dʊrătæi=ʒda*, this relativizing function is absent for her.

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

    dɔrʒə=ʃin   * өndər*   **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 (Bayancoɣtu 2002: 403)

    tʰer=ʃin   *min-i*   *ʃaxai*   **piʃɛ.**
    that=STC   1SG-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 *=güi* and the identity negator *biš* are clearly possible. As noted by Sarangɣuu-a (2007: 43) for Standard Southern Mongolian, *=güi* 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 (Sarangɣuu-a 2007: 43)
a)   *ulaɣan*   **ügei**.   *baɣa*   *ulaɣan=siɣ*   *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)   *ulagɣan*   **bisi** .   *ulaɣa-btur=siɣ*
    red   ASC.NEG   red-DIMINUTIVE(somewhat)=like
    'It's not red. It's reddish-like.'

c)   *ulaɣan*   **bisi**   *e.*   *ɣas*   *ulaɣan*   *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:

(120) Ordos (Erdenimöngke, p.c.)

a) *bat   tere   eme-iig   ab-san-aas   hoe-ši   sain=**güi***
NAME DEM.DIST woman-ACC take-PRF.P-ABL after-ALL good=EX.NEG
'Bat is not well after he has married that woman.'

b) *ene   mori   hurdan=**güi***
DEM.PROX horse fast=EX.NEG
'This horse is not fast (i.e. un-fast, slow).'

c) *20   minüt   ende   ire-h=či̧n   hurdan   **biš***
20   minute   here   come-FUT.P=STC fast   ASC.NEG
'It is not fast to come here in 20 minutes (you cannot claim that).'

I have not been able to elicit a congruent account of Khalkha, but it appears that those Khalkha speakers who use the construct ADJECTIVE=*güi* conform to a similar pattern as in (121). Unfortunately, the variation of *biš* in Khalkha cannot be investigated with an unstratified corpus as it would contain a great number of speakers who never negate adjectives with =*güi*.

(121) Khalkha (int)
(*kazah hool č saihan daa, mahiig ug n yalz čanadag n' goyo l doo,*)
*daanč bainga   teg-ž   id(e)-h   bas   tiim=č   sain=**güi**   ge-sen*
just   frequently do.so-CVB eat-FUT.P also so=FOC good=NEG say-EST.PST
'(Kazakh food is very good, too. It IS nice to cook it so that it becomes very soft,) just if you frequently eat it like this, it's said to be not that good either.'

The situation of Dagur is somewhat unclear, too. Namcarai & Qaserdeni (1983: 347) state that *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 *ügei* can exert this function as well, as illustrated in (122).

(122) Dagur (Engkebatu et al. 1985: 51)
*ənə   xʷalʲaːsun dəːr jamd   araːn=ʧ   sain   **uwəi***
DEM.PROX friendship on   3SG.DAT hardly=FOC good   EX.NEG
'This friendship is hardly good for him.'

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

(123) Khalkha[53]

> *Ter   čam-tai   bish   "utas"-tai=(g)aa   bolz-ood bai-val ...*
> DEM.DIST 2SG-COM   ASC.NEG phone-COM=REFL.POSS date-CVB COP-COND.C
> 'If s/he is not dating with you, but with her/his phone ...'

(124) Khalkha (line from the song Niigem by Apabt, 2011)[54]

> *Hel-(e)h-ees biš   hii-deg=güi   hümüüs dendüü zalhuu.*
> say-FUT.P-ABL ASC.NEG do-HAB.P=EX.NEG person too   lazy
> '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)[55]

> *namaig   zürh=güi   gež   bod-dog   yum=uu?   ügüi,*
> 1SG.ACC   heart=NEG.POSS COMP   think-HAB.P   SP=Q   EX.NEG

> *bi   šanal-dag.*
> 1SG suffer-HAB.P
> '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 *bu* / *bütügei*:

---

53.   <http://goolingoo.mn/index.php?c=5857>, 17 December 2012, retrieved 9 August 2015. Headline of a lifehack article.
54.   <https://soundcloud.com/apabt/2011a>, 2011, retrieved 9 August 2015.
55.   <http://enguunchimeg.blogspot.de/2011/04/blog-post_8203.html>, 7 April 2011, retrieved 9 August 2015.

	MM	Oirat	Ordos	Khalkha	Buryat	Khorchin	Dagur	Moghol
bu	*bu*			(*büü*)[56]	*by*	*puː*	*puː*	*bi-*
bütügei		*bicä*[57]	*bitgii*	*bitgii*				

	Shira Yugur	Kangjia	Bonan	Santa	Mangghuer	Mongghul
bu			(*bə*)	*bu*	*bao, bai*	*biː* (~ *l*)
bütügei	*pʉtə*	*bʉdə*	*tege*			
other?		*ne*?				

Table 6. Prohibitive adverbs in Mongolic

MM *bu* was retained in the north-east (Buryat, Khorchin, Dagur), in part of Southern Mongolic (Santa, Monguor, 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) grammaticalized 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 *pʉtə* 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-tn!
 NEG.IMP sit-IMP-2PL
 'Don't sit down!'

(128) Shira Yugur (Chuluu 1994b: 28)
 tʃə nanda sad pʉtə ɢar-ɢa-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 Mönhhairhan sum, Khovd province, the conservative [bitxəː] is used (O. Sambuudorž, p.c.).
58. Note that my glossing of this particular example differs substantially from Chuluu's.

(129) Monghul (Cinggeltei 1988: 299)

    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)

    ukmaŋ   ***bí-bol-ġa-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 irrealis 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) *man-ai-d*   ***ir-eed***   ***bai- Ø**!* (overheard)

    1PL-GEN-DAT come-CVB.PRF COP-IMP

    'Come to visit us from time to time!'

(132) *či* *tüün-ii*   *hoin-oos*   ***bitgii***   ***güi(g)-eed*** ***bai-Ø*** (int)

    2SG DEM.DIST-GEN behind-ABL NEG.IMP run-PFV.C   COP-IMP

    'Don't keep running after him/her!'

(133) *awtobus* *ohin*   *hoyor-iin*   *ar-aas*   *hezee=č*   ***bitgii***

    bus   girl   two-GEN   back-ABL   when=FOC   NEG.IMP

    güi-ž   ***bai-Ø***[59]

    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.

---

59. <http://biznetwork.mn/topic/show/17891/2>, 2 August 2010, retrieved 8 August 2015. From a comment by R. Bayarmagnai on the article "Avtobusand suuhiin ashig tus".

(134) ***Bitgii*** *hün-iig* *har-aad* ***durla-ž*** ***bai- Ø***!
    NEG.IMP person-ACC see-PFV.C fall_in_love-CVB COP-IMP
    '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):

(135) Bonan (Cen 1987: 300)
    tɕi *mənda* *dangɵ-**təgə**-gə-**Ø*** (Xiàzhuāng dialect)
    2SG 1SG.ACC disturbance?-NEG.IMP-do-IMP
    tɕi *mənda* ***təgə*** *dangɵ-gə-**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 Sīqīncháokètú (1999: 140) does provide a single negated voluntative.

6.1.2. The prohibitive negator in Mongghul conditionals

In Mongghul, the negator *bi:* 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 *li:* (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.

(136) Mongghul (Chuluu 1994c: 25)
    təŋɡɜrɜ ***li:*** *uro-samba* *bu* *dziɢasɵ* *diudzile-la*
    sky NEG fall-COND.C 1SG fish catch-cvb.in_order

    ɕidzi-ja *gə-dz-i:*
    go-VOL say-PFV-AI
    'If it hadn't rained, I was planning to go fishing.'

(137) Mongghul (Sengge 1987: 11)

tɕə	***biː***	*re-sada*	*bu*	*varaːdə-va*[60]
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 construc-tions 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 interpreta-tion, this sentence could still be interpreted as '(I) don't want to speak with ghosts!':

(138) Seychelles Creole (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 284 based on Corne 1977: 184)

Arret	*vol*	*sitrô!*
NEG.IMP	steal	lemon

'Don't steal lemons!'

(139) Mandarin[61]

bu*=yào*	*gēn*	*guǐ*	*shuōhuà*
NEG=want	with	ghost	speak

'Don't speak with ghosts!'

For MM, an etymology of *bu / bütügei* along the line of 'stop' is quite probable. First, the two forms are most likely related to each other through the MM suffix *-tuɣai*, 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, *bütügei* is not attested anywhere else in MM. There is also areal evidence from neighbor-ing Turkic languages, in which the verb 'stand' frequently grammaticalized into an

---

60. The original translation was the structurally almost identical *ci büü ire-becü bi bara-ciqa-ba.*
61. <http://www.3gtiankong.com/3ginfo/49/49661.htm>, retrieved 2 October 2011

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*, *ülü* and *ese*. He analyzed both *ügei* and *ülü* 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 *-luγa, 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 *ülü* 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 *bütügei* in Bonan 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 -ɣujai 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-jü   ile-be.   ire-jü*
> now   1SG   2SG-DAT2 wake-CAUS-PFV.C send-FACT.PST come-PFV.C
>
> *qor-iyan   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, -ɣujai 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.[62] 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*	***ülü=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*	***ülü=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 *ülü* 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).[63] The expected combined meaning of *-γu* and *je* should be a guess about the future,[64] 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, *-vzä* 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 *-y* 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, Tümenceceg 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, *y* 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-gə xotə-nʲ*   *ikär cac-ad*   *ödər bolʁən ög-xlägə*
   DEM.PROX hen-ACC food-3POSS very throw-CVB day   every   give-SUCCESSIVE.C

   nan-də xošad bolnu ʁurv-ad   *öndəg ʁar-ʁ-ǯə*   ***ögə-vzä***
   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}
   gergə-n zalu-d-an   *kelə-v*   *ter*   *kövü-n*
   wife-3POSS husband-DAT-REFL.POSS tell-FACT.PST DEM.DIST boy-3POSS

   töörü-vzä
   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:}
   nevčkə   *ad-ta*   ***bol-vz-go***   *gi-ǯä-nä*   *namagə*
   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 *-ʋzæ* 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-ʊzæ,**	ʊn-dʒi-na	ʃu:
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 *mart-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 *ül* 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)

Düü=čin'	**es oč-uuzai**.	*Tegvel*	*nad-ad*	*medegd-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 *martuuzai*. At the same time, negated second person imperatives of *mart-* 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 Baruun-büren 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 Sainšand and, for three years each, in Arhangai and Zavhan [a province with a substantial Oirat population]. <https://www.facebook.com/khurelbaatar.urjin/posts/341918909266251>, 20 September 2014, retrieved 13 September 2015.

Reflexes of *-γujai* are also reported for Monguor 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)
    noxʊi   **dzau-gudze:**
    dog   bite-PREV
    '小心狗咬' → 'Careful, the dog bites.'

(150) Shira Yugur (Bolucilaγu and Jalsan 1991: 246)
    tʃə   *mør-tə*   **da:ra-βadʒe:**
    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 1SG-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-MOD.PST=EMPH
    'But why was it that you told me lies?'

---

68.   The same holds for their other two examples: *dabtə xura ɔrɔβadʒe:* '冬场下过雨了吧' 'Did it rain during winter camp?', *kʉːs xui kaila ereβedʒe:* '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!'

(153) *Čšhhhhhhhhhh   namaig   Žambaa   ge-dg-iig*
INTERJECTION   1SG.ACC   NAME   COMP-IPFV.P-ACC

*hün-d   **hele-v=ee**.*
person-DAT   say-PREV=EMPH
'Psssssssssssssst ... don't let slip to anybody that I am Jambaa!'

(154) *Bolgoomž-toi   bai(g)-aarai,   doo-š   halitar-č   **una-v=aa**!*
care-COM   COP-IMP   below-ALL   slip-CVB   fall- PREV=EMPH
'Be careful, you might slip and fall down!'

(155) *Či   ööröö   dažgüi   höörhön   ohin   bol   čin-ii   hai-ž*
1SG   self   pleasant   nice   girl   if   2SG-GEN   search-CVB

bai-(g)aa   bandi=čin'   bi   yag   mön
COP-RES.P   boy=2POSS   1SG   exactly   same

*bai-na.   Harin   či   namaig   **gomdoo-v=oo**!*
COP-DIR.PRES   but   2SG   1SG.ACC   offend-CAUS- PREV=EMPH
'If you are a fair, beautiful girl yourself, then I am just the guy that you are looking for. But don't you offend me!'

(156) *Ted   tüün-d   itge-h vii=dee!* (D. Guntsetseg, p.c., 17 September 2015)
3PL.DIST   DEM.DIST-DAT   believe-NPST.P   MP=SP
'They might believe her/him (which would be bad)!'

(157) *Olon   gadaad   hel-tei,   čadvarlag   bolovson   hüč-nüüd=maan'*
many   foreign   language-COM   able   educated   force-PL=1PL.POSS

eh   hel-eer=ee   yar'-ž   čada-h=aa
mother   language-INS=REFL.POSS   speak-CVB   can-NPST.P=REFL.POSS

bol'-chi-h   vii=dee.[69]
cease-BOU-NPST.P   MP=SP
'Many able and educated social actors with a command of many foreign languages might [then] cease to be able to speak in their [Mongolian] mother tongue [perfectly].'

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*:

---

69.   O. Čancaldulam: Eh heleeree yar'ž čadahaa bol›čih vii dee. Niigmiin tol' (Newspaper) 7 February 2013. <http://news.gogo.mn/r/118236>, retrieved 17 September 2015.

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 *-v* 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 *-v* 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 *-ʥəgguɛ* 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 *-ʥə̆g*, a deverbal noun that expresses authoritative disapproval of a pending action.[70]

(158) Khorchin (Bayancoγtu 2002: 302)

    ʃiː   *ən*   *ʊʃr-i*   **xəʥ-ʥəg(-)guɛ.**
    2SG   DEM.PROX matter-ACC say-?(-)EX.NEG
    'Better don't tell this!' / 'You don't have to tell this.'

---

70. *-ʥə̆g* has a variant form *-ʥgə̆-n*, which contains an unstable *n* typical of adjectives and nouns used as attributives.

(159) Khorchin (Tedke, p.c., summer 2010 or 2011)

ʃiː   ɔtɔ   nəg   **it-ʐ̌ə̆g**   **pɛː-n**=ta.
2SG   now   one   eat-?   COP-NPST=SP
'So you're simply going to eat now!'

Originally, -ʐə̆g 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 =guɛ 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:

a	*buu hel-Ø*	NEG.IMP say-IMP	order
b	*buu hel-Ø=ee*	NEG.IMP say-IMP=POL	order, but used by the elderly in a softer way
c	*buu hel-Ø aa*	NEG.IMP say-IMP SP	counseling, but more decidedly
d	*buu hel-čig-Ø aa*	NEG.IMP say-DISSATISF.-IMP SP	counseling
e	*hel-Ø aa či*	say-IMP SP 2SG	somewhat threatening
f	*hel-ev aa*	say-V SP	warning
g	*hel-leg-gue*	say-*lga*-EX.NEG	order (but intonation can soften it; infrequent)

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 *bü-, 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-lü*) 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 (reflexies 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 *ülü negated perfective and imperfective regular predicates. Present tense ascriptive negation, in particular identity and property negation, was probably done by *ülü in combination with the copular auxiliary *bü-. Imperatives were negated by using the zero imperative form of the verb *bü- 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 -*aːdɔi* and Khorchin -*utɛ* ~ 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 *ülü 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 *ülü*). 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 *bü-tügei*, corresponding to another MM mood. The languages that adapted *bütügei* 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 *-γujai* (< *-qu je*, future particple 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 *-ʤəg(-)guɛ*.

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.

		Early MM	Moghol
Declarative	Imperfective	*ülü* (adverb)	*ulá ~ la*
	Perfective	*ese* (adverb)	*esá ~ isá*
Ascriptive	Identity	*ese/ülü* (?)	*géibe*
	Property	?	(*ügei + bui*)
	Intensity		
Existential	Existential	*ügei* (adjective)	
	Locative		
	Possessive		

Table 8. Development of negation in Moghol

	Late MM	Shira Yugur	Santa	Bonan	Mang-ghuer	Mong-ghul	Kangjia
Imperfective	*ülü*	*le*	*ülie*	*ele*	*lai*	*li:*	*ne*
Perfective	*ese*		*ese*		*sai*	*se*	
-(γ)san ügei	-	-		*gi-*	*gü-*	-	?
-ju ügei	-	*ügei*			-		*üg-*
Existential	*ügei*		*ui-, u*		*gü-*		
Locative							
Possessive							
Property	*ese/ülü*						*mari* ← Tib. *ma re*
Intensity	?						
Identity	*ese/ülü, busu/busi*	*bushe*	*bushi*	*ç(θ)-*	*bush-*		*bushi*
NOT *-qu*	*ülü/busu*	*-sh*	-		-		

Table 9. Development of negation in Southern Mongolic

	Late MM	Oirat	Buryat	Khalkha	Ordos	Khorchin	Dagur
Imperfective	*ülü* (adverb)	*=güi*					*ül*
Perfective	*ese* (adverb)						*ügüi*
Resultative	*üdügei*				*-aadui*	*-üdei*	*üdeen*
*-ju ügei	-	-			*ügüi*		
Not *-qu*	*ülü/ busu*	*=güi* *-š*					
Identity	*ese/ülü, busu/ busi*	*biš*					*bišin*
Property	*ese/ülü*						
Intensity	?			*=güi*			
Existential	*ügei*	*=güi, ügüi*	*=güi*		*=güi, ügüi*	*ügüi*	
Locative			*=güi, alga*		*=güi, ügüi, alga*		
Possessive							

Table 10. Development of negation in Mongolian and Dagur

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 -*utɛ* 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-Khitan. 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

Abbreviations and glosses

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

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

PRES	present	RES	resultative
PREV	preventive / apprehensive	SG	singular
PRF	perfect	SP	stance or modal particle
PROX	proximal	STC	postnominal stance marker
PST	past	V>N	deverbal noun
Q	question marker	VOL	voluntative / desiderative / hortative
REFL	reflexive		

Literature

Ayusi, G. 2010: Qubuγsayiri-yin torγud aman ayalγun-daki "ese" gekü üge-yin tuqai. – *Kele ba orciγulγ-a* 2010/1: 24–25.

Bayancoγtu 2002: *Qorčin aman ayalγun-u sudulul*. Kökeqota: Öbür mongγul-un yeke surγaγuli-yin keblel-ün qoriy-a.

Baranova, Vlada 2015: Negation markers in Kalmyk: pragmatic, historical, and corpus-based approaches. – Unpublished presentation (12 DIN A4), Caen University, France, May 19–20.

Bat-Ireedüi, Žancangiin 2009: Mongol helnii ügüisgeh har'caa ba tüünii ilreh helberüüd. – *Tōkyō gaikokugo daigaku ronshū* 78: 1–13.

Bayarmendü 1986: Dumdadu jaγun-u mongγul kelen-ü temdeg üile üge-yin kelberi-nügüd ba tegün-ü ularil kögjil. – *Öbür mongγul-un yeke surγaγuli* 1986/1: 49–81.

Benzing, Johannes 1985: *Kalmückische Grammatik zum Nachschlagen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Bese, Lajos 1970: Remarks on the Middle Mongol conjugation. – *Acta Orientalia Havniae* XXXII: 21–35.

Bese, Lajos 1971: Problémák a mongol igeragozás történetében. – *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* LXXIII: 217–222.

Bese, Lajos 1974: On the etymology of prohibition and negation in Mongolian. – *Central Asiatic Journal* 18: 3–8.

Binnick, Robert 2012: *The past tenses of the Mongolian verb*. Leiden: Brill.

Bolucilaγu & Jalsan 1988: *Dōngbù yùgùyù huàyǔ cáiliào*. Kökeqota: Öbür mongγul-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriya.

Bolucilaγu & Jalsan 1991: *Dōngbù yùgùyù hé ménggǔyù*. Kökeqota: Öbür mongγul-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriya.

Brosig, Benjamin 2014a: The aspect-evidentiality system of Middle Mongol. – *Ural-Altaic studies* 13.2: 7–38.

Brosig, Benjamin 2014b: The tense-aspect system of Khorchin Mongolian. – Pirkko Suihkonen & Lindsay Whaley (eds), *Typology of Languages of Europe and Northern and Central Asia*. Amsterdam: Benjamins: 3–65.

Brosig, Benjamin 2015: Aspect and epistemic notions in the present tense system of Khalkha Mongolian. – *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* XI (3): 46–127.

Brosig, Benjamin *forthcoming*: Factual vs. evidential? The past tense forms of spoken Khalkha Mongolian. – Ad Foolen, Helen de Hoop & Gijs Mulder (eds), *Empirical Approaches to Evidentiality*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Byambasan, Pagmiin 2001: Mongol helnii ügüisgeh har'caa ilerhiileh hereglüürüüd. – *Mongol sudlaliin erdem šinjilgeenii bičig* 18: 9–20.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca 1994: *The evolution of grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Caughley, Ross 1982: *The Syntax and Morphology of the Verb in Chepang*. Canberra: Australian National University. (non vidi)

Cen, Nai siyüng 1987: *Bǎoānyù hé ménggǔyù*. Kökeqota: Öbür mongɣul-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriya.

Cen, Nai siyüng 1987a: *Bǎoānyù huàyǔ cáiliào*. Kökeqota: Öbür mongɣul-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriya.

Cendee, Yungeriin 2011: *Oirad ayalguunii helzüi*. Ulaanbaatar.

Chuluu, Üjiyediin 1994: *Introduction, grammar, and sample sentences for Dagur*. Sino-Platonic Papers 56. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Chuluu, Üjiyediin 1994a: *Introduction, grammar, and sample sentences for Dongxiang*. Sino-Platonic Papers 55. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Chuluu, Üjiyediin 1994b: *Introduction, grammar, and sample sentences for Jegün Yogor*. Sino-Platonic Papers 54. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Chuluu, Üjiyediin 1994c: *Introduction, grammar, and sample sentences for Monguor*. Sino-Platonic Papers 57. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Chuluu, Üjiyediin 1994d: *Introduction, grammar, and sample sentences for Baoan*. Sino-Platonic Papers 58. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Cinggeltei 1988: *Tǔzúyù hé ménggǔyù*. Kökeqota: Öbür mongɣul-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriya.

Cinggeltei [,Qasbaɣatur, Jii Rüng & Bai jiün rüi] 1988: *Tǔzúyù huàyǔ cáiliào*. Kökeqota: Öbür mongɣul-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriya.

Corne, Chris 1977: *Seychelles Creole grammar. Elements for Indian Ocean Proto-Creole reconstruction*. Tübingen: Narr.

Creissels, Denis 2008: Person variations in Akhvakh verb morphology. – *Sprachtypolologie und Universalienforschung* 61(4): 309–325.

Croft, William 1991: The evolution of negation. – *Journal of Linguistics* 27: 1–27.

Dahl, Östen 1979: Typology of sentence negation. – *Linguistics* 17: 79–106.

Dahl, Östen 2010: Typology of negation. – Laurence Horn (ed.), *Expression of negation*. Berlin: de Gruyter: 9–38.

de Rachewiltz, Igor 2004: *The Secret history of the Mongols*. London: Brill.

Doerfer, Gerhard 1963–1975: *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Dryer, Matthew 1988: Universals of negative position. – Michael Hammond, Edith Moravcsik & Jessica Wirth (eds), *Studies in syntactic typology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins: 93–124.

Dryer, Matthew 2013. Order of negative morpheme and verb. – Matthew Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. – <http://wals.info/chapter/143> accessed on 16 September 2015.

Engkebatu 1985: *Daɣur kelen-ü üge kelelge-yin materiyal*. Kökeqota: Öbür mongɣul-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriya.

Engkebatu 1988: *Dáwò'ěryù hé ménggǔyù*. Kökeqota: Öbür mongɣul-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriya.

Eriksen, Pål 2006: *On the typology and the semantics of non-verbal predication*. Oslo: University of Oslo, Department of linguistics. Unpublished dissertation.

Eriksen, Pål 2011: 'To not be' or not 'to not be'. – *Studies in Language* 35(2): 275–310.

Faehndrich, Burgel 2007: *Sketch grammar of the Karlong variety of Mongghul, and dialectal survey of Mongghul*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i. Unpublished dissertation.

Field, Kenneth 1997: *A Grammatical Overview of Santa Mongolian*. Santa Barbara: University of California, Department of linguistics. Unpublished dissertation.

Fried, Robert 2010: *A grammar of Bao'an Tu, a Mongolic language of northwest China*. Amherst: University of Buffalo, Department of linguistics. Unpublished dissertation.

Fried, Robert *forthcoming*: Egophoricity in Mangghuer. In: Simeon Floyd, Elisabeth Norcliffe & Lila San Roque (eds), *Egophoricity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Fufubātoru [Kökebaɣatur] 1992: Mongorugo no hitei joji. *ügei* to *bisi* no tsukai-kata ni tsuite. – *ILT news* 91: 117–123.

Georg, Stefan 2004: Review of Etymological Dictionary of the Altaic Languages. – *Diachronica* 21(2): 445–450.

Georg, Stefan 2009. Review of Martine Robbeets: Is Japanese Related to Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic, and Turkic? – *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 33: 247–278.

Grønbech, Kaare & John Krueger 1955: An *Introduction to Classical (Literary) Mongolian*. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz.

Hale, Austin 1980: Person markers - finite conjunct and disjunct verb forms in Newari. – *Papers in South-East Asian Linguistics* 7: 95–106. (non vidi)

Haller, Felix 2004: *Dialekt und Erzählungen von Themchen*. Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Hashimoto, Kunihiko 2007: Hitei no rensa - mongorugo no hiteihyōgen no kinō. – *Ninchikagakukenkyuu* 5: 49–74.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva 2002: *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Hölzl, Andreas 2015: A typology of negation in Tungusic. *Studies in Language* 39(1): 117–157.

Hsiao, Su-ying [Xiāo, Sùyīng] 2007: Cíhuì jìngzhēng, búduìchèng yǔ yǔfǎ yǎnbiàn - ménggǔyǔ fǒudìng jiégòu yǔ shíjiān xìtǒngde lìshí yǎnbiàn. – *Yǔyán jì yǔyánxué* 8(2): 495–517.

[Hugjiltu] Wu, Hugjiltu 2003: Bonan. – Juha Janhunen (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. London: Routledge: 325–345.

Ikegami, Jirō 1999: *Manshūgo kenkyū*. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin.

Janhunen, Juha 1990: *Material on Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Janhunen, Juha 2003: Proto-Mongolic. – Juha Janhunen (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. London: Routledge: 1–29.

Janhunen, Juha 2005: *Khamnigan Mongol*. München: Lincom Europa: München.

Janhunen, Juha 2006: Mongolic languages. – Keith Brown (ed.), *The encyclopedia of language & linguistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier: 231–234.

Janhunen, Juha 2012: Khitan - Understanding the language behind the scripts. – *SCRIPTA* 4: 107–132.

Johanson, Lars 1999: Grenzbezogenheit in Aspekt und Lexik am Beispiel türkischer Postverbialkonstruktionen. – Walter Breu (ed.), *Probleme der Interaktion von Lexik und Aspekt (ILA)*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer: 129–139.

Johanson, Lars 2010: Viewpoint operators in European languages. – Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 27–187.

Johanson, Lars 2006: Indirective sentence types. – *Turkic Languages* 10: 73–89.

Kakudō, Masayoshi 2008: *Dozoku-go gojo-hōgen no kenkyū*. Kyōto: Shoukadoh shuppan.

Kane, Daniel 2009. *The Kitan language and script*. Leiden: Brill.

Lazard, Gilbert 1999: Mirativity, evidentiality, mediativity, or other? – *Linguistic Typology* 3(1): 91–110.

Lǐ, Kèyù 1988: *Tǔ-hàn cídiǎn*. Qīnghǎi rénmín chūbǎnshè.

Liú, Zhàoxióng 1981: *Dōngxiāngyǔ jiǎnzhì*. Beijing: Mínzú chūbǎnshè.

Luvsanvandan, Šadaviin 1959: Mongol hel ayalguunii učir. – *Studia Mongolica* 1.

Miestamo, Matti 2005: *Standard negation - The negation of declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Miller, Roy Andrew 1971: *Japanese and the other Altaic languages*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, Roy Andrew 1996: *Languages and History: Japanese, Korean and Altaic*. Oslo: Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture.

Mönh-Amgalan, Yumžiriin 1999: Mongol helnii ALGA hemeeh ügiin üüreg-utgazüin onclog. – *Mongol sudlaliin erdem šinžilgeenii bičig* XIV: 43–48.

Namcarai & Qaserdeni 1983: *Daγur kele mongγul kelen-ü qaricaγulul*. Kökeqota: Öbür mongγul-un arad-un keblel-ün γajar.

Nilsson, Nadezhda Zorikhina 2013: The negated imperative in Russian and other Slavic languages: Aspectual and modal meanings. – Folke Josephson & Ingmar Söhrman (eds), *Diachronic and typological perspectives on verbs*. Amsterdam: Benjamins: 79–106.

Ozawa, Shigeo 1961: Chūsei mōkogo no dōshigobi no taikei. – *Gengo kenkyū* 40: 33–80.

Önörbayan, Cedeviin 1987: Üil ügiin biyeer tögsgöh nöhcöl. – Šadaviin Luvsanvandan (ed.), *Orčin cagiin mongol helnii ügzüin baiguulalt*. Ulaanbaatar: Šinžleh uhaanii akademi: 146–57.

Önörbayan, Cedeviin 2004: *Orčin cagiin mongol helnii üg züi*. Ulaanbaatar. Mongol ulsiin bolovsroliin ih surguul'.

Pakendorf, Brigitte & Ewa Schalley 2007: From possibility to prohibition. – *Linguistic Typology* 11: 515–540.

Pjurbeev, Grigorii Tserenovic 1977: *Grammatika kalmitskogo yazika - sintaksis*. Elista: Kalmyckoje knižnoje izd-vo.

Poppe, Nicholas 1951: *Khalkha-Mongolische Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Poppe, Nicholas 1955: *Introduction to Mongolian comparative studies*. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Poppe, Nicholas 1960*: Vergleichende Grammatik der altaischen Sprachen. Teil I. Vergleichende Lautlehre*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Poppe, Nicholas 1960a: *Buriat grammar*. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Poppe, Nicholas 1967: *The twelve deeds of Buddha*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Rachewiltz, Igor de 2004: *The Secret history of the Mongols*. Brill: Leiden.

Ramstedt, Gustav John 1903: *Über die Konjunktion des Khalkha-Mongolischen*. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Robbeets, Martine 2005: *Is Japanese related to Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic?* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Rule, W. 1977: *A comparative study of the Foe, Huli and Pole languages of Papua New Guinea*. Sydney: University of Sydney.

Rybatzki, Volker 2003: Middle Mongol. – Juha Janhunen (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. London: Routledge: 47–82.

Rybatzki, Volker 2003a: Intra-Mongolic taxonomy. – Juha Janhunen (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. London: Routledge: 364–390.

Rybatzki, Volker *in preparation*: Dictionary of Middle Mongol.

Saj, Sergej S., Vlada V. Baranova & N. V. Serdobol'skaja (eds) 2009: Issledovanija po grammatike kalmyckogo jazyka – Teksti. – *Acta linguistica petropolitana* V,2: 730–856.

San Roque, Lila, Simeon Floyd & Elisabeth Norcliffe 2015: Evidentiality and interrogativity. – *Lingua* (2015) <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2014.11.003>.

Sarangγuu-a 2007: Mongγul kelen-ü ügeyiskel ba ügeyiskel-ün kelberi. – *Öbür mongγul-un baγsi-yin yeke surγaγuli* 2007/3: 42–46.

Secen, C. 1983: Dumda üye-yin mongγul kelen-ü "a-, bü-", "bai-, bol-" kiged tedeger-ün orulaju orulagdaγsan ucir siltaγan. – *Mongγul kele udq-a jokiyal* 1993/6: 35–48.

Secen, C. 1989: Mongγul bicig-ün kelen-ü "bolai" gedeg üge-yin bütügece irel-ün asaγudal-du. – *Mongγul kele bicig* 1989/8: 32–39.

Secen, C., M. Bagatur & Sengge 2003: *Ordos aman ayalγun-u sudulul*. Kökeqota: Öbür mongγul-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriya.

Sechenbaatar, Borjigin 2003: *The Chakhar dialect of Mongol*. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Sengge 1987: Mongγul törül kelen-ü üile üge-yin ügeyiskekü, qoriglaqu udq-a-yi iledkekü arγ-a ba oncaliγ. – *Öbür mongγul-un yeke surγaγuli* 1987/2: 1–17.

Shiotani, Shigeki. 1991. Dagūru-go hairare hōgen no kōgo shiryō - tekisuto to chūshaku. *Nihon mongoru gakkai kiyō* 21: 47–95. (non vidi)

Sīqīncháokètú 1999: *Kāngjiāyǔ yánjiù*. Shànghǎi: Shànghǎi yuǎndōng chūbǎnshè.

Skribnik, Elena 2003: Buryat. – Juha Janhunen (ed.), *The Mongolic languages*. London: Routledge: 102–128.

Slater, Keith 2003: *A grammar of Mangghuer*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.

Slater, Keith *forthcoming*: Morphological innovations in Mangghuer and Shirongolic: Reconstructing the emergence of the subjective vs. objective distinction. – Simeon Floyd, Elisabeth Norcliffe & Lila San Roque (eds), *Egophoricity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Song, Jae-mog 1997: *Tense, aspect and modality in Khalkha Mongolian*. London: University of London, SOAS. Unpublished doctoral thesis.

Starostin, Sergei Anatoljevič, Anna Vladimirovna Dybo & Oleg Alekseevič Mudrak 2003: *Etymological Dictionary of the Altaic Languages*. Leiden: Brill.

Stassen, Leon 1997: *Intransitive predication*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Stassen, Leon 2009: *Predicative possession*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Street, John 2008a: The interrogative particle in Early Middle Mongol. – *Mongolian Studies* 30: 43–82.

Street, John 2008b: Middle Mongolian past-tense -BA in the Secret History. – *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 128(3): 399–422.

Street, John 2009: On the three past tense endings of early Middle Mongol. – *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 23: 126–159.

Thompson, Mikael 2011: Editor's contractually-obligated introduction. – *SpecGram* CLXIII.3.

Todaeva, Buljaš Chejčievna 1973: *Mongorskij jazyk - Issledovanie, teksty, slovar'*. Moskva: NAUKA.

Toγtambayar, L. 2004: Mongγul kelen-ü üile-yin ügeyiskekü kelberi "ügei"-yin kele jüijigsen yabuca-yi sinjilekü ni. – *Öbür mongγul-un yeke surγaγuli* 2004/1: 68–79.

Tournadre, Nicolas 1996: L'ergativite en Tibetain. Approche morphosyntaxique de la langue parlee. Paris: Peeters. (non vidi)

Tournadre, Nicolas 2008: Arguments against the concept of 'conjunct'/'disjunct' in Tibetan. –Brigitte Huber, Marianne Volkart & Paul Widmer (eds), *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek*. Halle: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies: 281–308.

Tümenceceg 1990: Dumdadu jaγun-u mongγul kelen-ü toγacin ögü-lekü tölüb-ün kelberinügüd ba tegün-ü ularil kögjil. – *Öbür mongγul-un yeke surγaγuli* 1990/3: 102–120.

Üjüme 2006: Orcin cag-un mongɣul kelen-ü "ügei"-yin tuqai. – *Dumdadu ulus-un mongɣul sudulul* 2006/6: 11–17.

Umetani, Hiroyuki 2004: Mongorugo no *alga* "nai" ni tsuite. – *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 23: 203–232.

Urancimeg 2009: Mongɣul törül kelen-ü ügeyiskekü sula üge "ülü, ese"-yin tuqai ögülekü ni. – *Öbür mongɣul-un neyigem-ün sinjilekü uqaɣan* 2009/3: 46–52.

van der Auwera, Johan 2009: Prohibition - Constructions and Markers. – Dingfang Shu & Ken Turner (eds), *Contrasting Meanings in Languages of the East and West*. Bern: Peter Lang: 443–475.

van der Auwera, Johan 2010: On the diachrony of negation. – Laurence Horn (ed.), *The expression of negation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter: 73–110.

van der Auwera, Johan, Ludo Lejeune (with Valentin Goussev) 2013: The Prohibitive. – Matthew Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://wals. info/chapter/71>, accessed 28 August 2015.

Veselinova, Ljuba 2013: Negative existentials. – *Rivista di Linguistica* 25: 107–145.

Veselinova, Ljuba 2014: The negative existential cycle revisited. – *Linguistics* 52(6): 1327–1389.

Vovin, Alexander 2005: The end of the Altaic controversy. – *Central Asiatic Journal* 49(1): 71–132.

Vovin, Alexander 2009: 'Japanese, Korean, and Other Non-Altaic Languages'. – *Central Asiatic Journal* 53(1): 105–147.

Vovin, Alexander 2007: Once again on the Tabgač language. – *Mongolian Studies* XXIX: 191–206.

Wang, Penglin 1993: *Description of Dagur verb morphology*. Ann Arbor: University of Hawaii, Department of linguistics. Unpublished dissertation.

Weiers, Michael 1972: *Die Sprache der Moghol der Provinz Herat in Afghanistan*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Weiers, Michael 1985: Bemerkungen zum mongolischen Nomen *buši / biši* und seiner diasystematischen Differenzierung. – *Zentralasiatische Studien* 18: 68–89.

Wu, Ruey-Jiuan Regina 2004: *Stance in talk - a conversation analysis of Mandarin final particles*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Wu, Yingzhe & Juha Janhunen 2010. *New materials on the Khitan Small Script*. [Kent:] Global Oriental [Brill].

Yamada, Yōhei 2010: *Hairaru dagūrugo no bunpōkijū*. Tōkyō: Daikokugodaidaku. Unpublished master thesis.

Yu, Wonsoo 1991: *A study of Mongolian negation*. Bloomington: Indiana University, Department of Central Eurasian studies. Unpublished doctoral thesis.

Yu, Wonsoo, Jae-il Kwon, Moon-Jeong Choi, Yong-Kwon Shin, Borjigin Bayarmend & Luvsandorj Bold 2008: *A study of the Tacheng dialect of the Dagur language*. Seoul: Seoul National UP.

Zhàonāsītú 1981: *Tŭzúyŭ jiănzhì*. Běijīng: Mínzú chūbǎnshè.