NEGATION IN EASTERN KHANTY AND SOUTHERN SELKUP: AREAL AND TYPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Andrey Filchenko
(Pedagogical University of Tomsk)

With regard to existing typological generalizations concerning negation, both of the areally adjacent Eastern Khanty and Southern Selkup negative clauses demonstrate fairly regular features, both for the genetic affiliation and for the Ob river area.

Regarding the type of negative marker (Dryer 2005), negation in both languages is coded primarily by the negators of two types, a generic indicative/declarative negator and a specialized imperative negator. There are groups of examples, where the generic indicative negator appears to function as a negative existence predicate, furnished with participial-type markers, the predicator/adverbializer affixes.

In terms of the position of negative marker (Dryer 1992), both languages show consistent preference of preposing, in accord with the basic word-order patterns.

Concerning the morphosyntacic symmetry of negatives (Miestamo 2005), Eastern Khanty and Southern Selkup appear predominantly symmetrical, showing no morphosyntactic variation between affirmative and negative constructions, with the only variations concerning differential coding of the imperatives and existentials.

Based on the data at hand, both languages appear symmetrical in imperative constructions, apart from having a special imperative negator, etymologically different from the sentential negator, which corresponds to Type II negative imperatives by (van der Auwera & Lejeune 2005).

Eastern Khanty negative existentials show two main strategies: i) in the present-future and unaffixed past, bear negative existential * əntim* is used, obviously related to the verbal negator *əntə*; ii) for the non-present tense forms negative existence is coded by the combination of the negative existential *əntim* and the copula *wəl-ta* 'to be' acting as an auxiliary and bearing required TAM morphology. In this, Eastern Khanty existentials are not clearly definable into generalized Types A, B and C (Croft 1991).

Southern Selkup alternatively, uses the specialized negative existential *t͡ʃangwa* unrelated etymologically to the verbal negator.

While Eastern Khanty negative indefinites are coded by the regular indefinite pronouns combined with the negative existential in a variety of negative existential constructions, Southern Selkup enjoys a complete set of negative indefinite preforms

derived from the affirmative ones and affixed with the negative marker, most probably etymologically related to the ABES case marker.

Finally, Eastern Khanty makes quite limited use of negative lexical verbs, mainly of ability semantics, which aligns it typologically more with the northern Samoyedic languages rather then with areally adjacent southern Samoyedic or closely related Ugric.