PÉTER SIMONCSICS (Budapest)

NEGATION IN SELKUP
AS RELATED TO NEGATION IN OTHER SAMOYEDIC AS WELL AS
IN NEIGHBOURING COGNATE AND NON-COGNATE LANGUAGES

The majority of Samoyedic languages (namely, Nenets, Enets, Nganasan and Kamassian) uses negative and prohibitive auxiliaries for expressing negation and prohibition. The only exception is Selkup which has negative and prohibitive words or particles instead of verbs. Putting aside the problem, for the time being, whether these negative and prohibitive particles are genetically affiliated to the negative and prohibitive auxiliaries of other Samoyedic languages or not, from a spatial-geographical viewpoint I find it most intriguing that Selkup simply cuts through the belt of Samoyedic negation and prohibition that spreads along from North to South separating Northern Samoyedic (Nenets, Enets, Nganasan) from Kamassian. The role of Selkup is all the more enigmatic since based on what we know of Uralic negation and prohibition in general, the primate of negative and prohibitive auxiliaries in relation to negative and prohibitive particles in Samoyedic can hardly be doubted.

Since Northern Selkup (Taz) is the best documented dialect of all, I have chosen it for demonstrating how the system works. The negative word in Taz-dialect of Selkup is *ašša* and the prohibitive is *įkį*. Both are used as prepositives to the main verbs expressing negation and prohibition this way, respectively e.g.:

Negation	Prohibition
mat ašša mi-sa-p 'I did not give it'	*naččetį įkį tü=ŋä=ši=k*[1] 'don't come here!'
mat ašša qälį=ŋa=k 'I am not Nenets'	*įkį qɘn-äši-k* 'don't go [away]'

The negative word *ašša* is used also for general negation, i.e. (a) either negation as an answer (like a dialogue) or (b) negating a phrase. E.g.:

General negation

(a) Question: *tälį mäkkä tünnantį?* 'do you come to me tomorrow?'
    Answer: *ašša...*   'no...'
(b) *ašša tü=pįl' qup* 'the man who has not come' ~ "not come [past part.] man"[2]

---

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, all examples are taken from Erdélyi 1969; - separates inflectional suffixes from stem, = separates derivational suffixes from stem.
[2] "..." literal translation.

In addition to these negative words or particles, there is yet another linguistic form in Selkup, *čäŋki=qo* expressing negation with the meaning 'there is not..., is missing' which can be rightly considered a verb since it inflects in person, tense and mood. We would call it privation. The corresponding forms with the same meaning and with the same genetical background are well known from other Samoyedic languages, v. Nenets *jaŋko(ś)*, Enets (Castrén) *jaggua, jiggua,* Nganasan (Castrén) *jaŋku,* Kamassian (Donner) *nara.* E.g.:

Privation

tįmtį mat čäŋkį-sa-k 'I was not there'
mån-mi čäŋka 'I have no tent'
mat mē=ptä-mi čäŋkį 'I did not do it' ~ "my doing-PxSg1 is missing"

Generally speaking, the distinction between negating action and existence, i.e. negation and privation, on the one hand, and between non-imperative and imperative negation, i.e. negation and prohibition, on the other characterizes every and all Samoyedic languages, including Selkup. Moreover, these two distinctions also seem to give the larger framework for negation/prohibition/privation of many other languages beside Samoyedic, and inside as well as outside Uralic. The specificity of Selkup negation in relation to that of other Samoyedic languages lies in the fact that, contrary to the rest of the Samoyedic languages where means of negation and prohibition tend to be more of verbal nature, while means of negating existence are less so, this language has it the other way round.

The only Samoyedic etymological dictionary Janhunen 1977 suggests that negative and prohibitive particles, *ašša* and *įkį* are genetically affiliated. It is true that alternation *a-* ~ *į-* is not at all uncommon in Selkup, while alternation *-š(š)-* ~ *-k-*, though phonetically not unrealistic, does not occur at all. It is only natural that negation and prohibition are conceived as belonging together. The more so, since paradigmatic vowel alternation (Ablaut) as means for differentiation between these two linguistic functions is widely used in cognate Samoyedic and Ob-Ugric languages. So I can understand Janhunen for including this etymology in his dictionary. Yet, in case of the pair *ašša : įkį* there is an unsurpassed obstacle in the way of the genetic affiliation and it is its consonantism: *-š-* can not be brought down to a common denominator with *-k-* of *įkį* which is, in its turn, certainly genuine Samoyedic material as an imperative formant, since contrary to the alternation in the vocalism, we have no knowledge of consonant-alternation of *-š-* ~ *-k-* (not mentioning consonant alternation *-šš-* ~ *-k-*!) with modal function (non-imperative vs. imperative) in Samoyedic. Even if we treat the geminate *-šš-* of the general negative particle of Selkup separately from the imperative formant *-k-*, we cannot derive it from any linguistic material occuring in negative auxiliaries and particles in Samoyedic either, since negative auxiliaries in other Samoyedic languages have (+high) vocalic endings everywhere (Nenets *ńi-*, Enets *ńi-*, Nganasan *ńi-*, Kamassian *i-*).

In order to crack the hard shell of this nut of negative particle of the North, *ašša* together with its dialectal counterparts *assa* in the South and *aha* along the rivers Narym and Vasjugan in the so-called Middle dialect, we have to make these forms transparent. It is common knowledge that both geminates *-šš-* and *-ss-* are the results of a consonant alternation of some sort (regressive assibilation) that take place at morpheme boundaries, *-t + š-* > *-šš-* as well as *-t + s-* > *-ss-*. Accordingly, *ašša* and *assa* come down as **at + ša* and **at + sa*, respectively. Concerning *-h-* of *aha* of the Middle dialect, it is apparently a dialectal variant of

-s- which equally assimilates the previous consonant, but contrary to its sibilant counterpart, also deletes it, *at + ha > a + ha. In connection with the three reconstructa, *at + ša, *at + sa and *at + ha my quessing is that the first part of the complex is most probably an Ob-Ugric loan, and etymologically it is connected with the negative particle at of Northern Vogul and with ĕntə, ĕnt of Vach-Vasjugan and Surgut dialect, ĕnt, ĕn of Southern dialects, ănt, ăn of Nizjam, Serkal and Kazym dialects, ăt of Synja and ăn of Obdorsk dialect of Ostyak. Phonetically, all forms of Vogul and Ostyak negative particles ending on simple -t or -n are acceptable as delivering partners with a special regard to the fact that in the potential recipient dialect of Selkup, in the Middle dialect final -t/-n emerges always as -t. Considering, however, the spatial-geographical circumstances, only the southern and eastern dialects of Ostyak are realistic enough to be deliverer dialects, since they are the ones that lie relatively close or next to Selkup dialects. There are two such dialects of Ostyak: Vach-Vasjugan and Surgut dialect with negative particles ĕnt, ĕt and the Southern dialect with its particles ănt, ă. Forms without homorganic -n- are better candidates than others and the form having a low vowel is just a perfect one for having been the delivering partner. So the most probable candidate is certainly ăt of the southern dialect of Ostyak. The second part of the complex is possibly a vocally harmonized variant of the instrumental suffix -sä/-hä of Selkup. As to the spatial-geographical distribution of -š-, -s- and -h-, the latter can be conceived as the center which is surrounded by two "sibilation"-semicircles, one with-š- in the North and another with -s- in the South. Historically, the -s- variant seems to be primordial and -h- and -š- are but innovations. Künnap thinks otherwise. According to his view the h- variant is the earliest (Künnap 1971 : 134). Anyway, the northern form with -š- is certainly the most recent one brought about by a relatively late hushing process which, however, remained very limited (I can cite only one more additional case, šütirqo 'to sew') and took place parallel with the hushing of the sequence *kš̆ (like in the etyma of 'two', 'serpent' and 'tongue' having the respective forms sitte ~ šitti, sü ~ šü and sē ~ šē). Although there are a few data collected by Donner and later also by Duľzon with -a and -ā, respectively, for the instrumental suffix, the standard form is still with -ä as in -sä of Taz-dialect and -hä of Narym and Vasjugan. Vowel harmony does not exist any more in Selkup, but sporadic traces of its earlier existence are known. For instance, the deverbal derivative suffix of nomen instrumenti and acti -psa/-psä ~ -sa/-sä do accidentally even rhyme with this suffix of ours (the suffix has, of course, also a third variant, -psi̧ ~ -si̧ which does not), v. čŏnti̧rsa 'blanket' (< čŏnti̧rqo 'to cover')/tüp-sä 'coming, arrival' (< tüqo 'to come'), respectively. Given the measure stick of the trinity *derivation — inflection — syntax* for measuring time in linguistic history, we can be sure that, in a sense, a derivative is generally older than an inflectional suffix, as it is shown by our case: the various forms of the derivative of nomen instrumenti and acti -psa/-psä/-psi̧ ~ -sa/-sä/si̧ reflect an older state than does the inflectional morpheme of the instrumental -sä/-hä and the tendency for vowel harmony revealed by the former can truly be held as archaic. Consequently, ašša, assa and aha are, in this respect, relicts of an earlier period of vowel harmony.

Functionally, ašša and its companions are adverbial modifiers to the following verb which inflects in person, tense and mood. A negative phrase like [äsämi] ašša tinta '[my father] does not come' translates literally as "not-INSTRUMENTAL comes" ~ "with not comes". The prohibitive particle i̧ki̧ (according to Castrén always without final vowel ik, iek, ig, ek, eg) is, on the contrary, genuinely native consisting of the negative stem i̧- and the still produc-

tive imperative suffix -*k* followed by a possibly analogous final vowel -*i̦* in the Northern dialects. The prohibitive particle is followed by verbal forms in imperative Sg, Du, Pl 2, 3, e.g. *i̦-ki̦ nɛki̦r-äši̦=k* 'don't write!'. In spite of their different genetic affiliations there exists a kind of coherence between the negative and prohibitive particles of Selkup, *ašša* and *i̦ki̦* due to their phonetic build-up. This coherence is secured by two pseudo-alternations both of which fit well into the system of genuine alternations. The first one is the pseudo-Ablaut *a* ~ *i̦* and the other is the pseudo-consonant alternation -*š(ș̌)*- ~ -*k*-. The former is being also a part of genuine paradigmatic vowel alternations which serves here as a means for modal differentiation like in Vogul, while the latter is some kind of a reverse to an actual consonant alternation in Selkup (and South Samoyedic, in general) where the original *k*- becomes sibilant (*š*- or *s*-) before front vowels and here, as we could see above, the sibilants are followed by a back vowel, whereas -*k* occurs sometimes next to front ones.

The prohibitive particle *at, ata, atan* of Ket can only be drawn into the colourful picture of linguistic sell and buy in Western Siberia if it is borrowed from Ostyak and its final -*t* goes back to Proto Ob-Ugric or even Proto Finno-Ugric -*l*, since the prohibitive stem in Finno-Ugric languages contains an -*l* everywhere (not in Samoyedic, though). Vogul cannot be a lending language as it is suggested by Dul'zon (Дульзон 1968 : 576), first of all, because of its geographically great distance from Ket and for being separated from it by several Ostyak dialects, not mentioning other idioms of Western Siberia. But Vogul cannot be a lending partner either because its prohibitive ends in -*l*, not in -*t* as it would have fitted to the borrowed form in Ket, unless we operate with a yet unattested correspondance between the Vogul -*l* and the Ket -*t*. There exists, on the other hand, a correspondance between the Ostyak -*t* as the deliverer and the Ket -*t* as a recipient partner as it is shown by the prohibitive particle *ät* (*ät tišta*! 'don't worry!' (Honti 1984 : 89)) of the southern Ostyak dialect spoken along the Upper Demjanka, an area one of the closest among the Ostyak dialects to the area where Ket is spoken. The -*t* of the prohibitive particle in this Ostyak dialect corresponds to -*l*, -*ʌ* as well as -*t* of other dialects, and is genetically derived from a Finno-Ugric *-*l* as it was expected. As to the difference in vocalism between the lending Ostyak and the borrowed Ket forms (the former has an *ä*, while the latter an *a*), it can probably be explained with the relative poverty of the lending Ostyak vocalism (only full vowels considered) and the complexity and richness of the borrowing Ket vocalism. Namely, Southern Ostyak has only two low vowels (*a* and *ä*) in a system of three grades; Ket, in its turn, has, at least, three vowels (short *ä̆, a, å*) and, at most, five vowels (the former three and long *ā̈* and *ā*) in a system of four grades. Phonetically, it is possible that an Ostyak *ä* could be perceived by the borrowers' ears as being the *a* of their system. From a functional point of view, I admit, it seems rather strange that one language (Selkup) borrows linguistic material for negation, and another which is accidentally its next door neighbour (Ket) borrows linguistic material from the very same source (Ostyak) for its twin function, prohibition, while keeping genuine material for the remaining functions, prohibition and negation, respectively.

If we throw a glance at the map of neighbouring cognate (and non-cognate) languages starting with Zyrien to the West of the Urals in the West and Ket to the West of Jenisej in the East and Nganasan in Northern Siberia and Kamassian in Southern Siberia and consider the types of negation and prohibition, we can see a "belt of negative and prohibitive particles" starting from Vogul and ending with Ket that splits the continuity of Samoyedic negative and prohibitive

auxiliaries by Selkup. The starting point of this "belt of negative particles" (as against the "zone of negative auxiliaries" represented by Northern and Southern Samoyedic) could most probably have been somewhere in the Ob-Ugric area, East of Zyrien behind the ranges of the Urals and spread over to the East as far as the Jenisej river. A. P. Okladnikov called our attention to ethnocultural contacts in the Bronze Age in Siberia where this period started approximately in the middle of the second millenium and lasted until the middle of the first millenium B. C. He expressed his opinion "that along with the southern East-West route across the steppe there was a parallel northern route across the taiga where ancient Ugro-Finns played an important role as far as the Baikal and even further" (Okladnikov 1980 : 335). This East-West route across the taiga can be, perhaps, identified with the above mentioned "belt of negative particles". But where should we look for the origin of this movement unfolding from West to East which swept through the Ob-Ugric languages and Selkup and spilled over also to Ket? (In connection with Ket it should be mentioned that most probably it had been a language with negative particles before it borrowed the prohibitive word *at* from Ostyak.) Since the languages situating West of Ob-Ugric (like Zyrien and Votyak) are, so to say, "uninfected by the plague of negative particles" and the Eastern neighbour Ket, though a language with negative particles, can be excluded as being, instead of a giving, rather an accepting partner in the process, we have to turn toward South, the only "gate" which is open toward the outer world. Exactly where was this gate and when was it used it is hard to say, but it must have been close to the ancient Ob-Ugric language community and it must have been working, at least simultaneously with, if not preceding to the opening of the northern East-West route across the Siberian taiga mentioned by Okladnikov, i.e. in the Bronze Age which began in this area approximately in the middle of the second millenium B. C. It is a commonly held view in the profession that the East-European and Siberian steppe, the area lying south of the Ob-Ugric settlements was inhabited by Iranian peoples whose exact identification is missing, but as far as negation is concerned their language(s) must have been, most probably of the "particle-type". The negative/prohibitive particle of Proto-Indo-European is reconstructed in various as *ne, *$n\bar{e}$ and *nei (cf. Nielsen 300). Actually, there is a cognate language which happens to have a prohibitive particle more than similar to one of the Indo-European reconstructa and it is Hungarian with its *ne* whose other negative forms like *nem* and *nincs ~ nincsen* fall not far from it either. Accidentally, Hungarian is an Ugric language which together with the other two Ugric languages, Vogul and Ostyak (especially the former) had been influenced deeply by ancient Iranian as the relatively large corpus of loanwords shows. In earlier papers of mine I tried to show the affinity of the Hungarian negation/prohibition with the verbal nature of these functions in the Uralic languages (Simoncsics 1981 : 69—76; 1990 : 144—147) and, at the same time, I expressed a view according to which the Hungarian prohibitive particle *ne* must be a loan from, then I believed, Slavic which, in its turn, served as a new base for developing the specifically Hungarian system of negation/prohibition. Looking back now at what I said then I have to revise my thesis only in one point: Slavic should be substitued by another Indo-European language, ancient Iranian. This change again let us push forward (back) in the conquest of time as well of space in respect of the emergence of the "belt of negative/prohibitive particles". Accordingly, the emergence of this belt should have probably started in an age when ancient Hungarian was situated

close both to ancient Iranian and to ancient Ob-Ugric and this period can be dated as being the middle of the second millenium B. C. when Hungarians had not yet separated themselves totally from the Ob-Ugrians. On the other hand, as present-day systems of negation/prohibition of these languages show, the separation from the Ugric, moreover, from the Ob-Ugric unity must have already taken place by then. The "belt of negative/prohibitive particles" can be thus extended in the direction of South. With this move we have also arrived at the source of this change: ancient Iranian. As possible routes for the northward progress of negative/prohibitive particles from the West-Siberian steppes I mention only the left side tributaries of Irtyš, like, for instance, Išim that take their sources in the Northern side of the watershed between the Kaspian Sea and the Arctic Ocean. The further progress toward north-east took place probably also along the rivers like the Ob and its left side estuaries, like, for instance, Vasjugan and further in the same direction through the right side estuaries of the Ob and over the watershed between the Ob and the Jenisej as far away as the Jenisej. This "particle belt" connects two distant, genetically different, but typologically similar languages, Iranian and Ket. With distance growing and time passing the progress has gradually lost some of its speed and energy as it is shown by the following little typology:

	Iranian	Hungarian	Ob-Ugric	Selkup	Ket
Prohibitive	*ne	ne	V ul/O ät <* äl	iki	at
Negative	?*ne?	nem	V at/O *ĕntä	ašša < at-ša	bań
Privative	*ne	nincsen < *nim=t-s-en	V at'im/O *ĕntäm	čänki=qo	bań

Historically, this comes down in the cognate languages as preservation of either the system or the elements of earlier Uralic auxiliaries. Thus, under the influence of Iranian Hungarian changed the elements, but tried to keep the system, under the influence of ancient Hungarian Ob-Ugric changed the system, but kept the elements, under the influence of Ob-Ugric (possibly Ostyak) Selkup partially changed both the system and the elements and finally, under the same influence Ket changed one element only, while keeping the system unchanged. The reality of such a "belt of negative/prohibitive particles" which unites Ostyak, Selkup and Ket is supported also by the non-indigenous ethnonyms of the latter two peoples that, in their turn, connect them with Ostyak. Perhaps it is not just an accident that Selkup and Ket were also called Ostyak-Samoyed and Jenisej-Ostyak, respectively by Russians and other foreigners.

Finally, we cannot avoid the question: what extralinguistic circumstances may have worked under the the facade of negation/prohibition/privation and caused this kind of domino-effect which brought down the strongholds of negative/prohibitive auxiliaries behind the Urals? Negation belongs to the logical foundation of language, while prohibition is part of the "social contract" underlying any human society. Consequently, negation has an important role in human communication and is indispensable in intralinguistic communication, as, for example, in trade between members of different language communities. In this connection the role of affirmation, the correlative of negation, also deserves a short detour. It seems to be a Samoyedic heritage of Selkup that its affirmative particle *a, ag*, etc. (see more in Erdélyi 1969 : 16) is genetically connected with both the substantive verbal stem *e-* and the stem of the prohibitive particle *i*. Affirmation in other Samoyedic languages differs from negation, first of all, by changing word-order (metathesis) as in Nenets and Kamassian, while Selkup differentiates by vowel-alternation which is, in general, not alien from other

Samoyedic languages either as Nenets examples show. Contrary to some means of negation/prohibition of Selkup, as we could see above, vowel alternation as a means for differentiation between affirmation and negation is indigenous.

Juha Janhunen's article "On early Indo-European — Samoyed contacts" contains precious information concerning the general problem underlying the question treated above (Janhunen 1983).

To approve or to disapprove the linguistic picture of negation/prohibition/privation above it would be desirable and necessary to know more about the way of life, trade, migration of different peoples in this vast area comprising the West-Siberian steppe until the river Jenisej in the second millenium B.C. It would be more than interesting to know what kind of gesture-languages were used in the said area and period. For aren't the vowel alternation and the change in word-order (metathesis) expressing the difference between affirmation and negation some kinds of gesture themselves?

Abbreviation

Nielsen — N. Å. N i e l s e n, Dansk Etymologisk Ordbok. Ordenes historie, 4. udgave, 2. oplag, København.

LITERATURE

E r d é l y i, I. 1969, Selkupisches Wörterverzeichnis. Tas-Dialekt, Budapest.
H o n t i, L. 1984, Chrestomathia Ostiacica, Budapest.
J a n h u n e n, J. 1977, Samojedischer Wortschatz. Gemeinsamojedische Etymologien, Helsinki (Castrenianumin toimitteita 17).
—— 1983, On early Indo-European-Samoyedic contacts. — Symposium saeculare Societatis Fenno-Ugricae, Helsinki (MSFOu 185), 115—127.
K ü n n a p, A. 1971, System und Ursprung der kamassischen Flexionssuffixe, I. Numeruszeichen und Nominalflexion, Helsinki (MSFOu 147).
O k l a d n i k o v, A. P. 1980, Ethno-Cultural Contacts in Siberia: Ugro-Finns in the Neolithic and the Bronze Age.
—— Congressus Quintus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum. Turku 20.-27. VIII 1980. Pars II. Summa dissertationum, Turku, 335.
S i m o n c s i c s, P. 1981, Unkarin kieltosanat *nem, ne* ja unkarilainen kieltoverbi. — Folia Hungarica 1, Helsinki, 69—76.
—— 1990, On the Verbal Nature of Negation in Hungarian. — CIFU VII 3A, 144—147.
Д у л ь з о н А. П. 1968, Кетский язык, Томск.

ПЕТЕР ШИМОНЧИЧ (Будапешт)

ОТРИЦАНИЕ В СЕЛЬКУПСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ В СВЯЗИ С ОТРИЦАНИЕМ В ДРУГИХ САМОДИЙСКИХ, А ТАКЖЕ В СОСЕДНИХ — КАК РОДСТВЕННЫХ, ТАК И НЕРОДСТВЕННЫХ ЯЗЫКАХ

В большинстве самодийских языков (ненецком, энецком, нганасанском, камасинском) для выражения отрицания используется специальный глагол, исключение составляет селькупский язык, в котором употребляются отрицательные частицы. Автор статьи сопоставляет выражение отрицания в селькупском языке с таковым в остальных самодийских языках, финно-угорских языках и других сибирских языках и обращает внимание на возможное иранское влияние.