

Affirmative Negations and Related Features in Enets Morphosyntax

Michael Katzschmann (Germany)*

Abstract

This article deals with diverse morphological and syntactical aspects of the clitic $m\tilde{}$ ($\sim v\tilde{}$ $\sim u\tilde{}$) (? < * $m\tilde{}$) present in Enets and Nenets. In combination with the $\acute{n}e/\acute{n}i$ -stem used as aorist form of the negating auxiliary it follows the verbal suffixes (VX) directly changing a formally negated into an affirmative statement (cf. the 3rd persons $\acute{n}iu^N$ sometimes $\acute{n}iv^N$ or $\acute{n}im^N$ ‘obviously / ведь’). The appropriate negated statements are provoked by $bu\text{-}\acute{n}i$ ‘obviously doesn’t / ведь не’ the prefixed aorist form $\acute{n}e\text{-}/\acute{n}i\text{-}$.

Combined facultatively with the interrogative suffix(es) sa/si or generally with the a doubt expressing suffix $-ta-$ ($-ta-u^N$) the clitic can be used with any verb ($d'ago\text{-}sa-u^N$ ‘maybe not being / ли не было’, $koma\text{-}ta-u^N$ ‘may liked / хочет ли’) or auxiliary (cf. $\acute{e}\text{-}sa-u^N$, $\acute{e}\text{-}ta-u^N$ from \acute{e} - ‘be’). The negation is formed using the suppletive modal stem i - ‘doesn’t / не’ ($i\text{-}sa\text{-}v^N$ / $i\text{-}si\text{-}v^N$, $i\text{-}ubi\text{-}ta-u^N$) abrogating usually its negating semantic as well (cf. $\acute{e}\text{-}sa-u^N$ - $i\text{-}si-u^N$ ‘maybe - or not / возможно - а может нет’).

Syntactically and in similar interrogative narrative context like sa/si appear the suffix(es) $\eta a/\eta i$ but obviously connected - as expected - with the i -stem of the negating auxiliary: $i\text{-}\eta a/i\text{-}\eta i$ [i ηa /i ηi]! A negating statement is definitely not evident anymore translating it with ‘of course / конечно’ but can be empathised with the translation ‘how can not / разве не мочь’ as done by Labanauskas and Castrén.

The affirmative feature of Enets negation

There is a common feature in narrative texts of Nenets and Enets using the negating auxiliary (NEGAUX) to provoke an affirmative (positive) statement (AFF.NEGAUX) or as Siegl (2011: 254) utters “to back up an information source” using the term assertative in this connection. This function resembles to Turkish $m\acute{i}\check{s}$ -forms for trusted but non-verified narrations, e.g. fairy tales or reports. This feature will be discussed here mainly on the background of Forest Enets (FE) (Bay = ^b in the source) though some of the arguments have to be supported by examples of Tundra Enets (TE) (Maddu = ^m in the source). Enets is in this case more interesting than Nenets because it possesses (preserved) other than the latter even two different stems for the NEGAUX. So $\acute{n}i$ - ($\acute{n}e\text{-}$) is only used as aorist - including of course clitic \check{s} -preterite forms – and in imperative and optative forms (cf. Castrén XIV, l. 95, 178). The suppletive i -stem is used in all other cases, i.e. moods (i.e. inter alia the prohibitive forms) and verbalnouns. This feature abrogates quasi its negating meaning (semantic) and is connected in

* A firstly given commitment of publication in FUM was countermanded with up to now to me not made known reasons via or by Prof. Dr. Beáta Boglárka Wagner-Nagy et. an. [sic!] So I'm bound to publish this contribution for two reasons on my net pages. On the one hand it contains up to now unknown or otherwise interpreted facts, features and materials which should be - even if containing possibly not sustainable conclusions - at least available to or at best even discussed by experts. On the other hand to prevent a possibly continuing a bad habit introduced by a current member of the Institute in Hamburg to use unpublished texts unauthorized. As far as I'm informed about the reasons of and by the unknown peerers I'll take them of course into consideration and work them into this contribution. (23.10.13)

current Enets with an assumed cliticized element *m* or its phonetic variants *v* or *u* plus a nasal (^N*r̃*) mostly omitted in the sources.

Morphological features

To my knowledge this feature was first described in Tereščenko (1973: 86f.) for Nenets as combination of the personal markers with a clitic *-ṽ* (cf. *ни-в' Vx3s*, *ни-пу-в' Vx2s*). Enets and Nganasan were compared alike though the Nganasan example doesn't fit really because it is not connected with a clitic but an own particle *tə"* 'ведь / ж' <NgD:1851236/257>, cf.

- (1) *t̃ŋgü"mü-ntə mə-nə ní-ndi-ŋ tə" d'engə-ptu-"*
 PPRON.2-DER-OBJ.2S PPRON-1S not- AOR.PFT-2S ADV betray-DENOM.DER-CN

'You betrayed me obviously / Ты ведь меня обманул = Меня не ведь обманул.'

The feature has been picked up later by Salminen (1998: 531) for Tundra Nenets (TN), and by Shluinskiy (2010) for TE, the first claiming *-wə̃* (*-w^oh*) the later *-m?* for this clitic. Shluinskiy was the first one offering a full cliticized paradigm for all persons and all kinds of conjugation in combination with the the interrogative suffix *-sa-*! He introduced furthermore the term contrastive for these forms.

So it becomes obvious, that the clitic does not consists just of a labial *m* or its variants *u/v* – as usually found in the sources - but an additive glottis stop (GS) as well, which can be identified referring to Tereščenko and Salminen as the voiced GS which could be marked as *~* (here substituted by ^N documenting its absence). Most of the sources don't differ between voiced (*~*) and non-voiced GS transcribed with *"* or (nowadays rather) *?* preferring the latter even for both GS not differing them at all. The Finnic types *h* and *q* (cf. Salminen) are not really spread.

There exist just one apparently contradicting source - the 1910 born H. N. Kaplin [as source "d"]. But other differing forms create doubts about the correctness of the transcription. In Labanauskas [2005] the forms *ńi-v"* <S:84,15;299-4118.m=D9> and *ńi-v^N* <S:84,102;301-4210.m=D9> can be found instead of (supposed) *ńi-ṽ* and *ńie-do-u"* instead of *ńiedou~* (cf. the alternating data in Labanauskas (2002)), cf.

- (2) *toδo^N lèdèδo~ [*l'edèδo~*] ańi^N. keδe-da ńiedou~ [*ńie-do-u"*] d'eδa-"*
toδo^N lèdè-δo~ ańi^N # keδe-da ńie-do-u~ d'eδa-"
 then shoot-IMP2S again.ADV # wild.reindeer-OBJ.ACC.3S NEG-2S-EMPH shoot-CN
 'Then shoot at it. You will probably shoot (kill) the wild reindeer / Тогда он выстрелил по оленю [sic!]', <S:84,86;301-4192.m=D9>

- (3) *mano-" ní-ṽ [*ńi-v"*]*
 say-CN- NEG-EMPH.CL
 'He said/says / говорит.', <S:84,15;299-4118.m=D9>

- (4) *oδori kuda-do-" ńie-na-u~ [sic!]*
 (?) sleep-DER?-CN NEG-1P-EMPH.CL

‘Let us-3 sleep / Хоть так посним.’ <L:8:117-186.m=D9> [cf. the same sentence and source in Labanauskas [2005] without GS: *ńie-na-u* [sic!] <S:84,22;299-4126.m=D9>

There is a conclusive example demonstrating the combination of the clitic with Vx in Nenets by Tereščenko (1965) not influencing the GS of the VX as it is supposed for Enets below:

(5) *ненэсяда" ηэ" ни-ся-да"-ăм*

ńene-śa-da" ηe-" ńi-śa-da"-ăm
truth-DER-2P be-CN NEG-INTRG-O2P-EMPH.CL

‘You were probably right / Ведь вы были правы ~ ведь вы оказались правы.’ (T65: 300a).

The interrogative *sa* can be neglected in this case (cf. the Enets forms with *i-sa-/i-si-* below). In Enets the final GS of Vx seem to influence (assimilate) the clitics as the following finds clearly document (cf. the similar VX-table and paradigms in Shluinskiy (2010: 282ff.)):

Table of the aorist forms of the affirmative negative auxiliary

The Formes of Subjective Conjugation (SK) with <i>ńi-</i> in Enets			
SK	(Standard) Vx	Aff. NegAux	
		Forest Enets	Tundra Enets
1s	$\delta(o) \sim (*tV-m)$	<i>ńi-đu-m^N</i>	
		<i>ńe-đu-u^N</i>	
		<i>ńe-đu-v^N</i>	
2s	$d (*n-tV)$	<i>ńe-đu-v^N</i>	
		<i>ńe-đu-u^N</i>	<i>ńie-do-u^{~*}</i>
		<i>ńi-đu-u^N</i>	
3s	∅	<i>ńi-m^N</i>	
		<i>ńi-u^N</i>	<i>ńi-u^N</i>
		<i>ńi-v^N</i>	
		<i>ńi-v^N</i>	<i>ńi-v^N</i>
		<i>ńi-v[~]</i>	<i>ńi-v^{~*}</i>
1d	$j \sim b^r$	<i>ńe-bi-m^N</i>	
2d	$ri \sim$	<i>ńe-ri-m^N</i>	
3d	$hi \sim$	<i>ńe-hi-m^N</i>	
		<i>ńi-hi-m^N</i>	
1p	$ba"/\bar{a}"$	<i>ńe-ba-m^N</i>	
3p	"	<i>ńi-m^N</i>	<i>ńi-m^N</i>
		<i>ńi-v^N</i>	<i>ńi-v^N</i>
		<i>ńi-v[~]</i>	<i>ńi-v^{~*}</i>

* unvoiced GS (") in Labanauskas [2005] = Sorokina (2005)

A comparison of preterite *š-* and forms with affirmative *m*^N-clitic (in texts mostly *m*^N) is limited to the fact that both appear in Enets/Nenets and assimilate with the finals of the VX (cf. *š*-preterite ^V-*š*, ^N-*d'*, ^C-*č*). So *m*^N usually seems to change to *u*^N or *v*^N after VX ending in a vowel (cf. SK *ńe-du-u*^N, OKs *ńe-ru-u*^N) but all others seem to be preserved after any GS alike (cf. the tables of standard and cliticized VX in Shluinkiy 2010: 282). There is a slight deviance in the VX3S and VX3P of the SK. Both are partly homonymous changing at least *m*^N and *v*^N. But the VX3S of the TE shows a clear differentiation. This might be due to a somewhat problematic singular vs. plural marking or use in Enets.

This observation can be roughly confirmed by the OK-forms as well:

The Forms of Objective Conjugation (OK) with <i>ńi-</i> in Enets ⁺			
OKs	VX	AFF.NEGAUX	
		Forest Enets	Tundra Enets
O1S	<i>b ~ u</i>	<i>ńi-m</i> ^N	
		<i>ńe-v</i> ^N	
		<i>ńe-bu-u</i> ^N	
O3S?!	?	<i>ńi-bo-u</i> ^{N**}	
O2S	<i>r (*tV)</i>	<i>ńe-ru-u</i> ^N	
O3S	<i>δa</i>	<i>ńe-δa-u</i> ^N	<i>ńie-δo-u</i> ^{*~}
		<i>ńi-δa-u</i> ^N	
		<i>ńe-δa-v</i> ^N	
		<i>ńi-δa-v</i> ^N	
O1D	<i>j~/b^r~</i>	<i>ńe-bi-m</i> ^N	
O3D	<i>δi^r~</i>	<i>ńe-δi-m</i> ^N	
O3P	<i>δu^r~</i>	<i>ńe-δu-m</i> ^N	
OKP	VX	AFF.NEGAUX	
P1S	<i>ń (OBL +*mV)</i>	<i>ńi-ńu-u</i> ^N	
P3P	<i>na"</i>		<i>ńie-na-u</i> ^N
			<i>ńie-na-u</i> [~]
P3P	<i>δu^r~</i>	<i>ńe-δu-u</i> ^N	

⁺ cf. <http://www.nganasanica.de/katzschmann_material_conf4.pdf>

* unvoiced GS (") in Labanauskas [2005] = Sorokina (2005)

** <S:62,2;237-3199.b=G1>

The following examples demonstrate the difference between the emphasized (OKs *δu-m*^N) and the standard VX3P (OKP *δu^r~*):

- (6) *d'oa*^N *kamer*^N *ńe-đu-m*^N *oo-do*^{-C} #
 Dyo-OBL.GEN corpse-OBL.ACC NEG-S3P-EMPH.CL eat-FUT-CN[#]
d'oa-du^N *kare*^{-N} *čiri*^{-C} *oo-dj.đu*[~]
 Dyo-OBL.GEN.3P fish-OBL.GEN roe-OBL.ACC.PL eat-FUT.P3P

‘They probably will eat Dyo's corpse. They will probably eat their Dyo / Деу покойника будут есть. Деину рыбью икру съедят.’ <S:6,43;34-277.b=A3>

So the underlying form of *m*^N should have been not at least because of phonotactic rules probably *mV[~] (maybe *mǣ[~], cf. Salminen TN -wǣ[~]). Similar to the vowelizing of *m* (>o) in Enets *m*-stems the clitic *m* could have been assimilated or vowelized after vowels via *v*[~] to *u*[~] (*u*[~]?) but remained after any GS.

Syntactical features

1. *ńi-u*^N as clitic

As a rule the the NEGAUX precede the negated verbs which take special connegative (CN) forms. Especially in connection with cliticized forms this word order may change, as the following two even directly succeeding sentences demonstrate:

- (7) *onse ńo, ńudj đa ńiguj ńiu*^N *ńa*^C. *d'a* | *ńuugo oka ńa*^C *ńiu*^N
ńudj-đa *ńigu-j* *ńi-u*^N *ńa*^{-C} #
 grass-3S pull.out-PTCLPFT NEG-EMPH.CL be-CN #
d'a^{-N} *ńuu-go* *oka* *ńa*^C *ńi-u*^N
 earth-OBL.GEN grass-DIM much be-CN NEG-EMPH.CL

‘She was one, pulling grass. There was a lot of Earth.grass / Травы она нарвала. На земле травы много ведь.’ <S:12,68;58-677.b=A2>

One explanation for the apparently facultative (but obviously preferred final) position might give a look at features which are usually not part of a grammar, the suprasegmentals as for example prosody or intonation, with other words the sentence accents. This can be done best by field researchers but was never reported or documented by them yet. Though there is often a focus discussion about the finally irrelevant word order (WO) nobody ever investigated the influence of or by these suprasegmentals.

The use of this feature in the narrative genre makes at least the genre comparable to other special ones like sung texts with partly different morphonology (cf. e.g. the Ng. *камлание*, i.e. Shaman songs).

Sorokina (2010: 388f.) takes *ńiu*^N (in paragraph (1)) for a reinforcing particle (*частица*, cf. *ńiu*^N ‘ведь’ <D:273-5941.1>). Furthermore she considers all other NEGAUX and even the non-existential *d'agu* as different particles (cf. paragraph (7), 2010: 391f.) as well. There might be some doubt concerning *d'agu* which might have been a particle verbalized later by its combination with an auxiliar equal to Latin ESSE. But generally the NEGAUX should be treated as verbs, regardless of their here used notation of the emphatic NEGAUX as NEG-EMPH.CL just symbolising the non-negation in contrast to ‘not-EMPH.CL’ for a (real) negation.

Because mainly third persons are common in narrative texts *ńiu^N*, *ńiv^N*, *ńim^N* are most frequent. Astonishingly the *ńe*-stem is not documented for 3rd persons of the SK (cf. *ńe-u*, *ńe-v* ‘I don't ... sth.’ = O1S). As mentioned it is not quite clear why there is no real distinction between VX3S and VX3P. So *ńim^N* is attested for both – whether erroneous or not:

- (8) *mogahan kajakuða ad^C | ńim^N*
moga-han kaja-ku-ða ad^C ńi-m^N
 forest-DAT sun-DIM-3S sit-CN NEG-3S.EMPH.CL
 ‘The sun was setting in the forest / В лесу солнце село ведь.’ <S:12,41;58-650.b=A2>

- (9) *alke pu^C tonè^C ńi-m^N*
big.OBL stone-PL being.there-CN NEG-3P.EMPH.CL
 ‘There were big stones / Большие камни ведь бывают.’ <S:9,72;47-504.b=A1>

Though the final position (cf. i.e. Siegl 2011: 254) is often reclaimed and observed for these constructions, it is obviously not forcing. The common final positions of CN are in these cases not unusual as well:

- (10) *sěj-na^C ńi-m^N tonè^C*
eye-P.1P NEG-EMPH.CL being.there-CN
 ‘We have eyes (there are our eyes) / Глаза есть ведь у нас.’ <S:71,94;261-3614.b=F1>

But first and second persons can be found as well:

- (11) *mod' todčida ńeon èðnoju [<èðnoju] toda^C | ńiðum. èðnoju [<èðnoju] todajb'*
mo-d' todči-da ńe-on èð-noju toda^C ńi-ðu-m^N #
 PPRON.1-DER stairs-PTCIPF along-PROS up-DER go-CN NEG-1S-EMPH.CL #

èð-noju toda-j-b'
up-DER betake-RK-1S

‘I went obviously up the stairs. I betook (myself) upstairs / Я по лестнице наверх поднялся. Я поднялся наверх.’ <S:8,16;247-331.b=A2>

In some case even the ОКР.VX1S and ОКР.VX1P are homonymous:

- (12) *tèða od^C | ńinuu^N èkið^N. (...) peðid^C | ńinuu^N [<peðidńinuu]*
tèða o-d^C ńi-nu-u^N èki-ð^C #
 now eat-FUT-CN NEG-P1S-EMPH.CL this.DEMPR-OBL.ACC.PL #

peði-d^C ńi-nu-u^N
 cook-FUT-CN NEG-P1S-EMPH.CL

‘Now I obviously will eat them / Сейчас съем ведь этих (...) в котел опушу.’ <S:9,18;46-450.b=A1>

- (13) *čiki^C poludu-hun ńi-nu-u^N tèri-d^C*
this.DEMPR-OBL.ACC.PL awl-DAT NEG-P1P-EMPH.CL mend-FUT-CN

‘We will obviously mend them with an awl / Этим шилом свяжем ведь.’ <S:12,122;60-731.b=A2>

- (18) *tèðanda, d'ìdeðuda^C pèðibuń [<pèðibuń] sojða níu ña^C*
tèða-n-da, d'ìde-ðu-da^C pèði-bu-ń sojða ní-u^N ña^C
 now-DER-DET.3Skettle-BEN-2P cooke-GER-1S good-Ø=3S NEG-EMPH.CL be-CN
 'If I cooked your kettle (meal) now, it would be good obviously / Сейчас-то еду вам приготовить мне неплохо бы.' <S:8,113;41-427.b=A2>

c) Analytic tempora (participle predicate)

The analytic temporal type is far more interesting because the predicative noun is represented by a perfective participle (PTCPPT -j). These cases are not really rare and might represent the development of analytic tempora in Enets:

- (19) *obu-^N d'od'i-gon aga-ju ènči-l kasa-da*
 this-OBL.GEN time-LOC grown-up-DER man-2P companion-OBL.2S
pè-on kańi-j ní-u^N ña^C
 behind-PROS come-PTCPPT NEG-EMPH.CL be-CN

'Meanwhile the older man was obviously a his companion following one / Однажды старший человек за товарищем пошел ведь.' <S:22,53;120-1540.b=F4>

- (20) *ton-nè-da ènču-^C d'agu-j-^C ña-^C ní-m^N*
 then-LAT-3S people-PL absent-PTCPPT-PL be-CN NEG-3P.EMPH.CL

'Then the people were obviously absent / В то время людей не было ведь.' <S:61,1;231-3142.b=A2>

- (21) *obu-^N d'od'i-gon ènči^N modj-j ña-^C ní-u^N*
 this-OBL time-LOC man.NOM see-PTCPPT be-CN NEG-EMPH.CL

'Meanwhile the Enets was obviously a looking one / Вдруг, человека увидел ведь.' <S:22,17;120-1501.b=F4> (cf. *lokri^N obuho^N polðeda d'oha^N tahon modè^C | níu* 'Suddenly she saw something black in the river / Вдруг что-то черное за рекой увидела.' <S:24,18;130-1638.b=G1>)

The analytic structure can be clearly seen with the following HABEO-constructions (cf. the same in (36)) wiht *tonè-* as verbal form of the locative demonstrative pronoun *to-nè* 'there':

- (22) *iddu-ku-ða tonè-j ña-^C ní-u^N*
 arrow-DIM-3S being.there-PTCPPT be-CN NEG-EMPH.CL

'He obviously was one who owns arrows / Лучок у него имелся ведь.' <S:9,77;47-509.b=A1>

cf. the non-analytic form without *ña-^C* in the following example (cf. the form with *i-si-u^N* (39)).

- (23) *oddu-j tonè-^C ni-u^N*
 boat-1S being.there-CN NEG-EMPH.CL

'I obviously have a boat / Лодка-то есть ведь у меня.' <S:9,68;47-500.b=A1>

3. *buñi* as negation of the affirmative negation

Not really noticed (even by Siegl 2011: 275) up to now is the opposition between *ñi* and the prefixed (?) *bu-ñi* which clearly serves as negation of the former one! Even Sorokina separates them regarding *ñi* (together with particles for ‘even / даже’, ‘only / только’ etc.) as belonging to the reinforcing (*усилительно-ограничительные*) (2010: 388, paragraph (1)) but *buñi* as belonging to the negating particles (*отрицательные частицы*) (2010: 391, paragraph (7)):

- (24) *èko-n* *ɲo-t* *d'ire-š* *ɲu-li* *bu-ñi-j^N* *piris-^C*
 here-LOC at all-DER live-INF one-LIM CL-not-1D be.possible-CN
 здесь вместе жить совсем мы ведь не можем
 ‘We-2 can not live together at all here / Здесь вместе жить совсем ведь не можем.’
 <S:23,14;125-1574.b=A2>

- (25) *è-kké* *d'a-han* *diré-š* *ne-j^N* *pires-"*
 here-DER place-LOC live-INF not-1D be.possible-CN
 ‘We can not live in this place / На этой земле жить мы не можем.’ <L:3:96-510.b=A9>

It is all the more surprising that there exists nevertheless at least one cliticized form:

- (26) *d'aɖu-š* *bu-ñi.m^N* *to-ɖ-^C* #
 go.on.foot-INF CL-not.1D go-FUT-CN #
 èɖu-š *to-ɖ-^C* *ñe-bi-m^N*
 driving.sledge-INF go-FUT-CN NEG-1D-EMPH.CL

‘We won't go on foot. We will be driving with a sledge / Пешком ведь не придем. На оленях придем ведь.’ <S:61,18;232-3159.b=A2>

Here *bu-ñi.m^N* is obviously derived from **bu-ñi-j-m^N*, cf.

- (27) *mo-d'i-ñ^N* *mä-kon* *bu-ñi-j^N* *ɲa^C*
 PPRON.1-DER-1D tent-LOC CL-not-1D be-CN
 ‘We are not in the tent / Мы в чуме не находимся ведь.’ <S:8,25;39-339.b=A2>

This emphasis doesn't lead to an affirmation at the same time. All other reported forms show non-cliticized Vx.

4. Affirmation without emphatic clitics (contextual affirmation)

It has been mentioned, that rather suprasegmentals than the clitic *m^N* could be responsible for the affirmative statement. And indeed there are a few examples of an affirmative NEGAUX without a clitic. Here the closeness to an emphatic form in a related preceding or following sentence obviously causes an emphasis to a (aorist) negation form:

- (28) *ma^C* | *ñiu^N*: *mäku-d* *kada^C* | *ñir*
ma-^C *ñi-u^N* # *mä-ku-d* *kada-^C* *ñi-r*
 say-CN NEG.3S-EMPH.CL # tent-DAT-2S carry-CN NEG-S.2S
 ‘She said: You take it to your home / Сказала: Домой унесешь.’ <S:66,87;247-3357.b=G1>

In this and in the next example the change of standard word order of the (aorist) negation (cf. the final position of *ńir* and *ńira*^C) might underline the affirmative character of the statement. Even the connection of the later discussed form *i-ŋa* ‘of course’ to this constructions becomes obvious:

- (29) *uda*^C *ŋo* *to*^C | *ńira*^C *mäkuń* *mäððaud*'. *mod*' *adida* *ènči*^{δN} *ŋa*^C *ńe**δuu*^N. *ši**ð**a*^C
*mä**ð**al**ta*^š *i**ŋa*^{δN} *mä**ð**al**ta*^C *o**ta**ho*^š
u-*da*^C *ŋo* *to*^C *ńi*-*ra*^C *mä*-*kuń* *mä**ð**ðau*-*d*' #
 PPRON-2P ADV come-CN NEG-2P tent-DAT-1S be.guest-INF #
mod' *adi*-*da* *ènči*-*δ*^N *ŋa*^C *ńe*-*δu*-*u*^N #
 PPRON.1S sitting-PTCPIPF man-1S be-CN NEG-1S-EMPH.CL #
*ši**ð*-*ð**a*^C *mä**ð**al**ta*-*š* *i*-*ŋa*-*δ*^N *mä**ð**al**ta*-^C *o**ta**ho*-*š*
 PPRON-2P be.guest-INF NEG-INTRG.PRS-1S be.guest-CN
 nourish-INF

‘Yet you come to my tent being guests. Obviously I am a settled man. Don't you come being nourished as my guests? / Вы же тоже приходите в чум мой погостить. Я сидящий человек [оседлый]. вас угостить, конечно, угощу, накормить-то.’
 <S:8,102;41-416.b=A2>

5. *m*^N-clitic and non-auxiliars

There are some strange examples combined obviously with finite verbs. Though they can not explained or discussed here further, they should be at least mentioned:

- (30) *š**u**ð**bi*-*r* *o**ð**i*-*mo*-*u* # *o**ð**i**ma*
 giant-DER become.visible-DER-3S.EMPH.CL # become.visible-DER-3S.

‘The (woman) giant became obviously visible. She became visible. / Великанша появилась. появилась.’ <S:12,144;60-753.b=A2>

- (31) *n**o**b**i*-*ra*-*ð**o*-*u*^N # *n**o**b**i*-*ra*-*ð*^N
 hold-DER-IMP2S-EMPH.CL # hold-DER-IMP2S
 ‘Hold [her]! Hold [her]! / Держи ее! Держи ее!’ <S:22,58;121-1542.b=F4>

In some of them are GS marked:

- (32) *d*'*o**a* (...) *k**a**d**a**r**e**ð**o**u*[~]
d'*o**a* (...) *k**a**d**a*-*r**e*-*ð**o*-*u*[~]
 Dyoo (...) got-DER-3S-EMPH.CL
 ‘Dyoo (...) got ill / Дѣа (...) заболел.’ <S:6,29;34-263.b=A3>

cf. Maddu Enets as well:

- (33) *a**ń*^N *m**i*-*r**o* *k**u**a*-*d**o*-*u*[~]
 again.ADV what-2S find-2S-EMPH.CL
 ‘What did you find again / Что [ты] опять нашел?’ <S:84,93;301-4200.m=D9>

6. Interrogatives with *sa/si*

Interrogative suffixes with preterite connotation are *sa/si* whereby *si* is the most frequent one of both forms, maybe just because of its connection to the NEGAUX *i-si*. A distinction between both form is not described (cf. below *ŋa/ŋi*). They have to be mentioned here because of their affinity to the clitic *m̃* and their reference to an emphasized non-negating (affirmative) statement as well. In Siegl (2011: 257f.) they are just classified as modal. Combined with the NEGAUX it got an own entry as *isi* (*уцы*) ‘whether/ведь же’ ^{<D:147/266-2696.1>} in Sorokina (2009) mentioning its use in preterite analogue to *ŋe* (*не*) [III] in present tense whereas she (2010: 390) treated it even as undefined (неопределенный) particle (rather suffix) ‘whether/ли’ (cf. *bu tosq?* – *d’ohara to isi* [sic!] ‘Did he come? – I don’t know, whether he came? / Он приехал? – Не знаю, приехал ли?’, *koisi* [sic!] ‘Whether he found? / Нашел ли?’).

Siegl and Sorokina (2010: 290) misinterpret the form *ḍa-u* obviously as allomorpheme to *sa-u/da-u* (cf. the scanty and confusing entries in Sorokina concerning *sa-u/da-u/ḍa-u* ‘of course it may be / наверное, может быть’). But *ḍa-u* seems to be attested in the data only as O3S-EMPH (cf. *šerta-ḍa-u^N* ‘he buried him obviously / похоронил’ ^{<S:45.51;191-2591.b=A2>}). Even Siegl’s example (7-151) *ŋe-ḍau* as MOD.3S reflects this misinterpretation, because in Enets suffixes and derivations are attached regularly only to the *i*-stem auf the NEGAUX (***i-ḍa-u^N*, cf. *iḍa-u* ‘I hanged it [the flag] up / [Я] повесил [его]’ ^{<D:262-5645.s>} : INF *iḍa-š* ^{<D:144-2623.1>}). Actually following forms can be found:

- (34) *pu-hun* *sijra^C* *i-si-ḍa-u^N*
 stone-LOC drown-CN NEG-INTRG.PRT-O3P-EMPH.CL
 ‘Didn’t he drown her with a stone? / Камнем он же её утонул.’ ^{<S:8,78;40-392.b=A2>}

and the PTCIPF (*ḍa/da/ta*) as predicative noun (see the constituent negation below):

- (35) *ka.bi-d* *i-ḍa-rha-d* *a-"* # *d’iré-ḍa-rha-d*
 dead.DER-2S not-PTCIPF-SIM-2S be-CN # live-PTCIPF-SIM-2S
 ‘You are no dead body like one who died. You are like a living one / Не мертвый, а живой ты, кажется, не мертвый, а живой’ ^{<L:1:81-231.b=A9>}

The suffixes *sa/si* can be used with other verbs than the negations as well, cf. below *è-sa-u^N* (47) or the non-existential *d’ago-sa-u^N* ‘maybe not-being / ли не-было’ ^{<S:6,20;33-254.b=A3>}. Syntactically there are several overlappings with emphasized *ŋe/ŋi*-forms as can be seen in the following examples:

- (36) *ta-han* *tor-~* *d’ori^C* *i-sa-m^N*
 DEMPRON-LOC so.ADV-LAT talk-CN NEG-INTRG.PRT-3P.EMPH.CL
 ‘So they talked earlier / Ранее ведь оговаривали.’ ^{<S:61,47;233-3188.b=A2>}

- (37) *èsi-j* *i-si-u^N* *man^C*
 father-3S NEG-INTRG.PRT-3S.EMPH say-CN
 ‘My father said obviously / Отец ведь сказал.’ <S:12,58;58-667.b=A2>

The same in HABEO-function:

- (38) *torse* *tonè-j* *i-si-u^N* *ŋa-^C*
 such being.there-PTCPPT NEG-INTRG.PRT-3S.EMPH.CL be-CN
 ‘She had such (one) / Такое имелась ведь.’ <S:12,58;58-667.b=A2>

cf. the non-analytic form with *ni-u^N* in (23) and *i-si-u^N* in the following sentence:

- (39) *mod'-na^C* *èse-ba^C* *i-si-u^N* *tonè^C*
 PPRON-1P father-1P NEG-INTRG.PRT-3S.EMPH.CL being.there-CN
 ‘We had a father / У нас отец имелся.’ <S:12,58;58-667.b=A2>

Depending on the statement the clitic can be omitted with verbs (non-auxiliars) (cf. *komasa-u^N* ‘whether she liked / хотела ли.’ (48)):

- (40) *obu* *pagi-δu-da* *poŋi-da-sa* #
 what cloth-BEN.3S use-FUT-INTRG.PRT.3S #
 še *ènčī^N* *ŋode-da-sa*
 who man.OBL.ACC carry-FUT-INTRG.3S

‘What clothes for himself he would use? Who will carry a man? / Что бы в качестве одежды использовал? Кто бы человека возил?’ <S:52,50;208-2856.b=A1>

7. The use of *u^N* of with *-ta*

There is another suffix but always combined with *u^N* (*-ta-u^N*, cf. *è-ta-u^N* ‘maybe / (может) ли’ <S:8,98;41-412.b=A2>). Siegl (2011: 257, 260ff.) just classified it as modal (mood) as well and distinguishes it from *-sa-u* (2011: 261f.). There is only one form with NEGAUX in my files (and obviously non in Siegl) and in similar syntactical function as documented for *i-si-u^N* in (48). So it might be assumed, that it loses the negation semantic like *i-si-/i-sa-* (and *bu-ŋi*). Other than 3rd persons are not testified in my investigated texts. But other than *sa/si* it is testified with derived (suffixed) stems, cf.

- (41) *kodi-ubi-ta-u^N* *i-ubi-ta-u^N*
 sleep-HAB-SX-EMPH.CL Neg-HAB-SX-EMPH.CL
 ‘Did he usually sleep or not? / Спит ли, нет ли?’ <S:12,227;62-836.b=A2>

- (42) *kod-δu-da* *šeda-gu-ta-u^N* *aŋ^N* *obu-δu-da*
 sledge-OBL.BEN-3S make-DUR-SX-EMPH.CL again.ADV something-OBL.BEN-3S
 ‘Whether (maybe) he makes a sledge or something (else) for himself / Нарту ли себе мастерит или ещё что-нибудь.’ <S:13,191;82-1142.b=C2>

8. The interrogative (counterfactive) *īŋa/īŋi*

As shown above the forms *īŋa/īŋi* (in writing mostly shortened to *īŋa* or *īŋi*) occur in the environment of the emphasized (clitised) NEGAUX sentences (cf. (14), (29)). This and their connection with connegatives are reason enough to have a short look at them. This lexeme seems to be falsely mentioned as *īŋ* instead of *īŋi* in paragraph (6) among the stressing (утвердительные) particles in Sorokina (2010: 390f.) (cf. *aŋ īŋi* ‘А как же’) but is clearly documented in her dictionaries (cf. *īŋa* ‘of course / конечно’ <D:146-2657.l>). It is currently treated as counterfactive e.g. by Siegl (2011: 256).

But by definition **counterfactive** predicates should presuppose the **falsity** of their complements (cf. <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~jlawler/predtypes.pdf> <2.10.12>), the speech is in this case of a **pretention**. To my view this doesn't really agree with the mostly assumed translation as ‘конечно’. On the other hand we find hints of *ŋa ~ ŋi* as interrogative suffixes in Labanauskas (2002). There might be a connection to the Ng. aorist-interrogative suffix *ŋU/ŋA₁* and the negating prohibitive form *ŋuəli-* + Verb-CN ‘how could (I) not’ (cf. Katzschmann 2008: 476).

Although the examples in Labanauskas (2002: 60f.) belong to TE and include some inconsistencies they reflect without any doubt an interrogative character of this form. In non-negated forms it seems to be affixed to an oblique (GENPL ~ CN?) (verbal) stem in Labanauskas. In negated forms it appears as free morpheme with the NEGAUX *i*-stem precedes the CN (e.g. a derivation like the future tense marker *-da-* would have remained with the stem).

Non-negated forms

<i>mod'i d'u"-i-ŋā-bo</i>	‘How shall I lose it / Как мне потерять? / Разве я могу потерять’ [?>] <1:60-716.m>
<i>tod'i komèlo-j-ŋè-do</i>	‘How shall you wish it / Как тебе захотеть?’ <1:60-723.m>
<i>ŋitoda fun-i-ŋā-ḍa</i> [< <i>fumiŋāḍa</i>]	‘How shall you lay it / Как ему положить?’ <1:60-730.m>

As mentioned above there are some inconsistencies with these non-negated (positive) forms. At least *komèlo-* and *funi-* (cf. the negated form *funo-*) show actually their for CN-forms relevant consonant stems but lack the necessary final GS. That's why consequently *d'uso-* instead of *d'u"-* should have been expected, as it indeed appears in the

Negated forms

<i>mod'i i-ŋa-bo d'uso-</i>	‘How shall I not lose it / Как мне не потерять? / Разве я не могу потерять?’ <1:60-719.m>
<i>tod'i i-ŋè-do komèlo-</i>	‘How shall you not wish it / Как тебе не захотеть?’ <1:60-726.m>
<i>ŋitoda i-ŋa-ḍa funo-</i>	‘How shall he not lay it / Как тебе не положить?’ <1:60-733.m>

Non-negated analytic forms with *a-* ‘being’

<i>mod'i kanè-sī a-i-ηa-δo^N</i>	‘How can I go? / Как я мог пойти?’ <1:60-734.m>
<i>tod'i kanè-sī a-i-ηa-do</i>	‘How can you go? / Как ты мог пойти?’ <1:60-735.m>
<i>ñitoda kanè-sī a-i-ηa</i>	‘How can he go? / Как он мог пойти?’ <1:60-736.m>

Negated analytic forms with *a-* ‘being’

<i>mod'i i-sī(-δo^N) a-i-ηa-δo^N kanè-</i> "	‘How can't I go? / Как я не мог пойти? / Разве я не мог пойти?’ <1:61-737.m>
<i>tod'i i-sī(-do) a-i-ηa-do kanè-</i> "	‘How can't you go? / Как ты не мог пойти?’ <1:61-738.m>
<i>ñitoda i-sī a-i-ηa kanè-</i> "	‘How can't he go? / Как он не мог пойти?’ <1:61-739.m>

There are a lot of features combined with *ηa-* ‘being’ (Maddu *a^C*) in Labanauskas (2002) obviously difficult to explain. In these TE paradigms other than in FE the word order seems to play an important role. So a negating value is combined with the position of *i-ηa-* in front of the CN. That concerns verbs and the negating copula phrases (i.e. COPULA-CN + NEGAUX) alike.

The copula is needed to negate predicative nouns as mentioned above (cf. e.g. the constituent negation of the PTCPIPF is: *i-da tara-da* ‘not-being necessary-being / ненужный’ <D:144-2608.s>, cf. (35)). The regular structure would be PRED.NOUN + NEGAUX + *ηa^C* though other constructions are testified (cf. inclusive construction *ĩña moga ña^C* ‘Should it not have been a forest? / Лесистый был, очевидно?’ <S:8,45;40-359.b=A2>). That's why we can regard the forms *kanè-sī* [< *kanè-sij*] or *i-sī* [< *i-sij*] as verbal nouns resp. as perfective participles (cf. the III INF-GER *isej abu mata*(") [‘not having been cutted’] for the negation and *ase abu* for the copula construction in Castrén (XIV, l. 95, 86)). The form of this participle differs from that described in Siegl (2011: 288) or Sorokina (2010: 248ff.) but resembles that of infinitives + *j* (cf. the PTCPPFT of the *n*-stem *fu-dje-j* ‘to put’, Castrén XIV, l. 144). Now the form *i-sī(-δo^N)* becomes explainable. The participle takes the forms of the SK congruent with the VX of the NEGAUX (cf. *i-ηa-δo^N*) in this case facultatively like any other negated noun. This fits to the pattern of the above mentioned use of the NEGAUX in analytic forms (cf. (19) – (22)). The originally underlying forms *a-i-ηa-* should be regarded as *a^C i-ηa-* [CN + NEGAUX-INTRG.PRS-]. So the word order CN + NEGAUX is preserved regardless of the fact, that in the shown cases the whole copula phrase precedes the negated noun.

Labanauskas's examples reflect furthermore a long (or geminated) *ii~ĩ* with the negation in these cases. This is asserted by Castrén's (XIV, l. 99) whose marking of geminated vowels is generally reliable:

AOR	<i>ii-nge-o</i>	[O1S]	<i>mota</i> "	[CN]	‘как не стану резать’
PRT	<i>ii-nge-o-si</i>	[O1S]	<i>mota</i> "		
PLQ	<i>ii-nge-bi-o</i>	[O1S]	<i>mota</i> "		
FUT	<i>ii-nge-tju-o</i>	[O1S]	<i>mota</i> "		

Castréns (Russ.!) interrogative-inchoative translation is extended by Labanauskas to a kind of possibility like ‘how can not / разве не мочь’.

It is furthermore striking that *ŋa/ŋi* are always connected to the NEGAUX *i-* as the only example found in my files underlines. It is a Maddu examples similar to them of Labanauskas:

- (43) *ud'e-d'i* # *bəgo-u-ŋu-ɔa-u^N* # *ud'e-d'i*
 listen-3S.PRT.CL # breath-CO-INTRG.PRS-O.3S-EMPH.CL # listen-3S.PRT.CL
 ‘He listened. Does he breath? He listened. / Слушает. Дышит ли. Слушает.’ <S:98,35;325-4611.m=h1> (cf. *bəgu-è* [Inf.] [*beguè*] ‘breathing / дышать’ <S:98,36;325-4612.m=h1>)

As we know now *bəgo-u-ŋu-ɔa-u^N* can be regarded as *bəgo^C i-ŋi-ɔa-u^N* with assimilation of *i > u*. But it seems as if in TE a free morpheme has been other than in FE developed to a bound one, i.e. suffix.

Last not least a look at the concerned FE sentences confirm the assumption of an interrogative value, cf. the illustratively and connected interrogative pronouns in the TE example:

- (44) *inè-ho-ni sōdè-ɔo^N* [*sōdèo*]
inè-ho-ni *sōdè-ɔo^N* # *mīro* *otè-iŋa-ɔo^{N*}*
 brother-DAT.1S sledge.drive-1S # what wait-INTRG.PRS-1S
 ‘I drove with the sledge to my brother? What (why) shall I wait / Я аргиишил к брату. Чего мне ждать?’ <1:61-753.m> [**otè^C | iŋa-ɔo^N*]

So there are sufficient reasons to assume an interrogative in FE as well. An adequate translation would not contradict the sense at all, but contradict a term like counterfactive:

- (45) *mod' adida ènči^N ŋa^C néduu^N. šiɔa^C mädaltaš iŋa^N mädalta otahoš*
mo-d' *adda* *ènči-ɔ^N* *ŋa^C* *né-du-u^N* #
 PPRON.1-DER.S settle-PTCIPF man-1S be-CN NEG-1S-EMPH.CL #
šiɔ-ɔa^C *mädalta-š* *i-ŋa-ɔ^N* *mädalta-^C* *o-ta-ho-š*
 PPRON.1-2P-ACC.2P being.guest-INF NEG-INTRG-1S being.guest supply-FACT-
 INDEF-INF

‘I am a obviously a settled man. You being (as) guests how can I not (~ of course I) supply you / Я сидящий человек. Вас угостить, конечно, угощу, накормить-то.’ <S:8,102-416.b=A2> [cf. *mod' adida ènči^N a" ní-du^N* <L:1:80-152.b=A9>]

9. *ní-u^N, i-si-u^N, -sa-u^N, i-ŋa/i-ŋi* in context

There might have been arisen doubts about a connection between *iŋa/iŋi* and emphasized formes. These can be abolished by the examples showing their referring character in (narrative) contexts. With the exception of *-ta-u^N* all forms can be found all in succeeding sentences (cf. (14) as well):

- (46) *añ^N tèche* [*<tèhè>*] *ñi-u* | *ña^C. iñi-u tudulu^C*
añ^N tè-he ñi-u^N ña^C # i-ñi-u tudu-lu^C
 ADV this-DER NEG-EMPH.CL be-CN # NEG-INTRG.PRS-O1S kennen-INCH-CN
 ‘It is obviously here. How can’t (of course) I know it / Вон же ведь, конечно узнаю.’
 <S:66,70;247-3340.b=G1>

- (47) *d’oa et tuka-ða tonè^C è-sa-u^N #*
 Dyoo PRTCL axe-NOM.3S being.there-CN obviously=be-INTRG.PRT-EMPH.CL #
i-ña tonè- tuka-ða
 of course=NEG-INTRG.PRS being.there-CN axe
 ‘Dyoo obviously had an axe (Dyoo’s axe was there). Doesn’t exist his axe = Of course he had his axe / У дѣа топор имелся, видимо. Конечно, имелся топор.’ <S:9,50;47-482.b=A1>

In the following example a contrast or opposition in the statement is stylistically expressed by *-sa-u^N* and *-si-u^N* (cf. *è-sa-u^N* - *i-si-u^N* ‘maybe - or not / возможно - а может нет’ <S:12,191;61-800.b=A2>) in which *i-si-u^N* takes even an unexpected negating value (cf. (40)):

- (48) *to mensi-r i-ña #*
 this old.woman-DET.2P Neg-INTRG.PRS.3 #
koma-sa-u^N # i-si-u^N
 want-INTRG.PRT-EMPH.CL.3S # Neg-INTRG.PRT-EMPH.CL.3S
 ‘This is the old woman. Whether she liked (it) or not / Но старуха, конечно. Хотела ли и ли нет.’ <S:61,39;232-3180.b=A2>

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative
ADV	adverb
AOR	aorist
(AFF.)NEGAUX	affirmative negative auxiliary
BEN	benefactive
C	amended unvoiced glottal stop (GS)
CL	(any) clitic
CN	connegative
D/DU	dual (object/person)
DAT	dative
DENOM	denominal
DER	any kind of derivation
DET	determinative
DIM	diminutive
EMPH.CL	emphasized clitic
FACT	factitive
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
GER	gerund
INCH	inchoative
HAB	habitual
INDEF	indefinitive
INF	infinitive
INTRG	interrogative
IPF	imperfective
LAT	lative
LIM	limitative
N	amended voiced (nasal) glottal stop (GS)
NEGAUX	any negative auxiliary
NEG-EMPH.CL	emphasized negation
NOM	nominative (marked if distinguished)
O	singular (object/person)
OBL	any (not definable) oblique case
OBL.ACC	unmarked accusative (general oblique case)
OBL.GEN	unmarked genitive (general oblique case)
OK	objective conjugation
OKS	OK with singular object (glossed as O)
OKD	OK with dual object (glossed as D)
OKP	OK with plural object (glossed as P)
P/PL	plural (object/person)
PFT	perfective
PLQ	plusquamperfect
PPRON	personal pronoun
PROS	prosecutive
PRED	predicative
PRT	preterite
PRTCL	particle
PRS	present tense
PTCPIPF	imperfective participle

PTCPPFT	perfective participle
PX	(nominal) personal suffix
R	RK glossed as R
S/SG	singular (marked if distinguished)
SK	subjecitive conjugation (unmarked)
RK	reflexive conjugation
VX	verbal (personal) suffix
#	sentence separating marker
	word separator (<i>ad</i> ^C <i>ñim</i> ^N insted of original <i>adñim</i>)

References

- Castrén Manuskripte, Signatur: MS.MF.k.9 [Microfiche der Universitätsbibliothek Helsinki]: XIV = *Anteckningar öfver Chantaisko=Karasinska dialecten* (leaf 1-112), *Grammatikiska Anteckningar i Jeniseiska Samojed=dialecter* (leaf 113-191)
- Katzschmann, Michael 2008: *Chrestomathia Nganasanica* : Texte - Übersetzung - Glossar - Grammatik (...). (Nganasanica 1) Norderstedt: BoD.
- Labanauskas = Лабанаускас, Казис и. (сост./автор) 2002: *Родное слово* : энецкие песни, сказки, исторические предания, традиционные рассказы, мифы = керна" базаба" : онай энчу" бари", сюдобичу", дёречу". Санкт-Петербург: Просвещение [cited as <L: ...>]
- [2005] see his (re)published texts in Sorokina 2005 marked as <...9> in the citation.
- Salminen, Tapani (1998): Nenets. *The Uralic languages*. 516-547.
- Shluinskiy/Šluinskiy = Шлуинский, А. Б. 2010: «Контрастивные» глагольные окончания в лесном диалекте энецкого языка. *Материалы 3-й международной научной конференции по самодистике*. 279-291.
- Siegl, Florian (2011): *Materials of Forest Enets* : an indigenous language of Northern Siberia. (Dissertationes Philologicae Uralicae Universitatis Tartuensis 9) Tartu: Univ. Pr. [The author's preliminary distributive version]
- Sorokina-Bolina = Сорокина, Ирина Петровна & Болина, Дарья Спиридоновна 2005: *Энецкие тексты*. Санкт-Петербург: Наука [cited as <S: ...>] (Net-publ. <http://iling.spb.ru/nord/materia/ency_tit.html> [5.1.2013])
- & ----- Сорокина, Ирина Петровна & Болина, Дарья Спиридоновна 2009: *Энецкий словарь с кратким грамматическим очерком: около 8.000 слов*. Санкт-Петербург: Наука [cited as <D2: ...>]
- Sorokina = Сорокина, Ирина Петровна 2010: *Энецкий язык*. Санкт-Петербург: Наука.
- Tereščenko = Терещенко, Наталья Митрофановна 1965: *Ненецко-русский словарь: около 22.000 слов* ; с приложением краткого грамматического очерка ненецкого языка. Москва.
- 1973: *Синтаксис самодийских языков* : простое предложение. Ленинград.
- More material and details concerning the sources, transkription and others can be found in <<http://www.nganasanica.de/enets.html>> [10.7.2013]