Andrey Shluinsky

Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology & Institute of Linguistics RAS

'Contrastive series' in Forest Enets: a case study of recently formed paradigms¹

Enets is a Northern Samoyedic language represented by two dialects, Forest Enets (FE) and Tundra Enets (TE). The presentation deals with data of FE in comparison with relevant features of TE.

Northern Samoyedic languages share a number of specific features relevant to this presentation. One of them is an interrogative verbal marker with past reference. The other one is expressing verbal negation with a negative auxiliary verb combined with the connegative, a special converblike form of the main verb. This negative verbal construction also has 'positive' uses expressing some kind of intensification, see (1).

n^je-bi? kane-do-? (1)lapka-d shop-DAT.SG NEG-1DU.S leave-FUT-CONN 'We will go to the shop, after all'.

ΤE

1. 'Contrastive endings series' in Forest Enets

FE in its contemporary state has three series of cross-reference endings: basic series, past tense series, plus one more (underdescribed earlier) that I call 'contrastive', see Table 1². Both past tense and 'contrastive' series are derived from the basic series by adding the postfixes - \int and - u^2 respectively, but the morphophonology is not completely clear.

	Table 1. Three series of cross-				
	1SG	3SG	2PL	3PL	
basic	-z?	-Ø	-ra?	-?	
past	-zut∫	-∫	-rat∫	-t∫	
'contrastive'	-zu?	-u?	-ram?	-m?	

s-reference endings in FE

The 'contrastive' series can only be combined with two forms of the negative auxiliary verb, the 'indefinite tense' and the interrogative, and two verbal forms outside the negative construction, the interrogative and probabilitive.

Most typically, the 'contrastive' series is combined with the 'indefinite tense' of the negative verb. These forms express the same meaning of intensification as 'positive' uses of the negative construction in TE and in other Northern Samoyedic languages with present or future temporal reference, see (2). Note that such 'positive' uses are lacking in FE.

nol^ju baza-an n^je-bam? (2)d^jorir-? word-PROL.SG speak-CONN one NEG-1PL.S.CONT 'We speak the same language, after all'.

FE

If the 'contrastive' series is combined with the interrogative form of the negative verb, the construction has the same meaning of intensification, but with past temporal reference.

Combined with the simple interrogative, the 'contrastive' series provides a meaning of supposition, see (3). Like the standard interrogative, this form is used with past temporal reference.

FE (3) n^je-kutſa-j? oo-ma-d koma-sa-u? child-DIM-1SG eat-NMLZ-DAT.SG want-Q-3SG.S.CONT 'My child, probably, was hungry'.

¹ This research was conducted as a part of the project «Documentation of Enets: digitization and analysis of legacy field materials and fieldwork with last speakers» supported by the Endangered Languages Documentation

Programme, SOAS, University of London. ² Like other Northern Samoyedic languages, Enets has three cross-reference paradigms: 'subjective', 'objective' and 'reflexive'. In Tables 1-2 only partial 'subjective' paradigms are presented, but the phenomenon in question is relevant for all the conjugation system.

Finally, the probabilitive form, which has present or future temporal reference, is also used to express the meaning of supposition. It is always used with the 'contrastive' series and cannot be combined with other endings.

2. Relevant features of more conservative Tundra Enets

The data of TE shows three ways of expressing the meaning of intensification, corresponding to (2) from FE. First, a plain negative construction can be used, as in (1). Second, interrogative forms of the negative verb can be combined with the postfix $-u^2$. Third, there is a particle $n^{j}u^{2}$ which is combined with finite forms.

The meaning of supposition as in (3) with present or future reference can be expressed by the probabilitive marker cognate to that of FE with the basic endings series. The past temporal reference of the supposition is expressed by the combination of the probabilitive marker with the interrogative.

3. Formation of the 'contrastive' series

Possible diachronic scenarios of the formation of the 'contrastive' series in FE will be discussed in the talk.

Most probably, it developed through the following stages.

Stage 1. The situation is the same as in modern TE. Plain negative forms can have the meaning of 'positive' intensification. There is a particle $n^{j}iu$? that also has this meaning. There is a clitic *-u? that can be attached to different kinds of constituents, but most frequently is attached to the interrogative forms of the negative verb; this construction also has the same meaning. The meaning of supposition with reference to the present is expressed by the probabilitive form, and with reference to the past by the combination of the probabilitive with the interrogative.

Stage 2. The combination of the personal endings with $*-u^2$ in the interrogative forms of the negative verbs undergo irregular morphophonemic changes creating a new 'contrastive' series of endings (cf. 1-2 in Table 2).

Stage 3. Influenced by the interrogative 'contrastive' forms of the negative verb and due to the near-identity of form to the stem of the negative verb, the particle $n^{J}iu^{2}$ is reinterpreted as the form of the 3^{rd} singular of the 'contrastive' 'indefinite tense' of the negative verb. The other person-number forms of the 'contrastive' 'indefinite tense' are created (cf. 1-2 and 3-4 in Table 2). The 'positive' uses of the plain negative construction are forced out by the 'contrastive' forms of the negative verb.

Stage 4. Influenced by the interrogative 'contrastive' forms of the negative verb, the 'contrastive' forms of the interrogative of lexical verbs are developed (cf. 1-2 and 5-6 in Table 2).

Stage 5. The 'contrastive' interrogative forms of the lexical verbs (6 in Table 2) take the meaning of supposition with past temporal reference and force out the combination of the probabilitive with the interrogative (8 in Table 2) from this functional slot.

Stage 6. The 'contrastive' interrogative forms (6 in Table 2) of lexical verbs influence the probabilitive forms (7 in Table 2), which start taking the 'contrastive' series by analogy (9 in Table 2).

1SG 3SG 2PL 3PL 1 negative verb: i-si-z? i-si-Ø i-si-ra? i-si-? basic 2 interrogative i-si-zu? i-si-u? i-si-ram? i-si-m? 'contrastive^{*} 3 negative verb: n^je-z? n^ji-Ø n^je-ra? n^ji-? basic 'indefinite tense' 4 'contrastive' √ n^je-zu? n^ji-u? √ n^je-ram? √ n^ji-m? -sa-z? -sa-? 5 lexical verbs: -sa-Ø -sa-ra? basic √-sa-u? $\sqrt{-\text{sa-ram}}$ 6 interrogative 'contrastive' √-sa-zu? $\sqrt{-\text{sa-m}^2}$ old probabilitive simple *-ta-z? *-ta-Ø *-ta-ra? *-ta-? 7 8 forms *-ta-sa-z? *-ta-sa-Ø *-ta-sa-ra? *-ta-sa-? + interrogative 9 probabilitive 'contrastive' $\sqrt{-ta-zu}$? √-ta-u? $\sqrt{-\text{ta-ram}}$ $\sqrt{-\text{ta-m}}$

Stage 7. The attested state of modern FE (see paragraph 1).

Table 2. Partial paradigms of the forms involved in the formation of the 'contrastive series'.