Maia Lomia (Ph.D, Associate Professor)

 & **Ketevan Margiani** (Ph.D, Associate Professor)

The Institute of the Georgian Language

Faculty of Humanities, Tbilisi State University, Georgia

maia.lomia@tsu.ge ; ketevan_margiani@mail.ru

Why is not Double Negation Attested in Unwritten Kartvelian Languages?

Introduction

Negation is universal due to the fact that it is an essential process for comprehension alongside with an affirmative form. The term *single negation* appeared in Georgian linguistic works as an opposite of the previous term *double negation*. It would not be necessary to give it a special name as it had a neutral character if there had not been this term, *double negation*. *Double negation* means having two negative particles in one sentence. To express a negative form is often possible using only one particle but using another negative particle emphasizes the negation, it has a stylistic function. Putting emphasis on negation is a kind of psychological moment and can be considered to be a universal phenomenon although emphasizing negation and rendering it by means of various linguistic structures is characteristic not only for non-kindred but for kindred languages as well.

Definition of the Problem. Is double negation a common Kartvelian phenomenon as it is not attested in unwritten languages – Megrelian, Laz or Svan languages which are designed on oral (spontaneous) speech likewise other Georgian dialects? *Double negation* in Georgian

Language dialects is attested to the existing structure in literary language – having two negative particles.

The Aim of the Report. The aim of the report is to verify Academician Varlam Topuria's viewpoint expressed in Georgian Scholarly works according to the data of the unwritten Kartvelian Languages or discovering whether *Double Negation* was initially characteristic for Georgian dialects and later it became common for literary language as well or vice versa, first it originated in the literary Georgian Language of the transitional period having a stylistic function and then it widespread in Georgian Dialects too?

Empirical Material. Following data bases were used for empirical material:

- TITUSI - http://titus.Uni-frankfurt.de
- ARMAZI - http://www.Uni-frankfurt.de./armazi/
- GNC - http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/page

(The deadline of data availability is 31.08.2016);

- Megralian, Laz, Svan text publications;
- 2011-2016 expedition entries.

Definition of Terms. Academician Varlam Topuria was the first to introduce terms – *single negation*, *double negation*. He conducted a special research on these kinds of negations according to Georgian language data in the 1920s (a report read and published in 1923 was published again in V. Topuria's works, vol. 2, 2002). To render a *single negation* it is enough to use a construction with a negative particle (ar „not"…), or a negative pronoun (aravin „nobody"…), or a negative adverb (arsad „nowhere"…):

(1) saxlši ar. Neg.PTC c̣asula. *He has not gone home.*

(2) saxlši aravin. Neg. PRN iqo. *There was nobody at home.*

(3) arsad. Neg. ADV čanda. *He was seen nowhere.*

Double negation implies both a negative pronoun or a negative adverb and one of the negative particles (ar - *not*, ver - *could not*, aġar - *no longer*, veġar - *could never*....), e.g. aravin ar modis. *Nobody is not coming.*

History of the Issue. Until the 10ᵗʰ-11ᵗʰ cc. only single *negation* is attested in old Georgian original works and translations; the only exception is the Adishi Gospel with only one example of *double negative*:

(4) da aravin. Neg.PRN arġara. Neg.PTC ik̇adra k̇itxvad misa… *and nobody did not read it…)*
cf. the readings in the Jruchi, Parkhali, Tbeti Gospels:
(5) arġaravin. Neg. PTC ik̇adra k̇itxvad misa …*nobody read it…*

Therefore, it can be deduced that using *double negation* in the Adishi Gospel could be spontaneous (Topuria 2002:314). *Double negation* becomes widespread in the Georgian language of a transitional period, in modern Georgian, dialects of the in modern Georgian. In Varlam Topuria's opinion some forms of *double negation* might have existed in the dialects in the past and the literary language adopted them later.

Double Negative and the Issues of the Style of the Georgian Literary Language. The presentation deals with the stylistic function of the negative particle used with negative pronouns or negative adverbs that

are found in narrative sources – stressing negation, putting emphasis on it (*cf.* araperi mohqolia. *Nothing followed* - araperi ar mohqolia. *Nothing did not follow*).

Note 1: At this stage we do not discuss the issues of normalization of the Georgian literary language with respect to double negative (here we mean instances when double negation has not only a stylistic function but is a literary norm, accepted standard; e.g. He cannot do nothing is a norm but: He can do nothing – is wrong); the presentation does not deal with the peculiarities identified in the language of a poem.

- **Structural Analysis of Negative Pronouns in Megrelian language**

In Megrelian language negative pronouns are: mita *nobody*, muta *nothing*. Taking into account their original forms the segmentation of these forms is the following (Martirosov 1964:256):

(6) mi.QPRN-ti.PTC-va(r). Neg.PTC geo.*vinc ara/ar* > mita. Neg. PRN geo. vinme = *nobody*;
(7) mu.QPRN-tu(<ti).PTC-va(r).Neg.PTC geo. rac ara/ar > muta. Neg.PTC geo. araperi = *nothing*.

10 years before A. Martirosov, D. Imnaishvili noted that negative pronouns in Megrelian were comparatively new (Imnaishvili 1953); It seems that he must have meant transformation of these forms. It should be noted that in Megrelian negative pronouns are used with positive verbs (Kipshidze 1914). The reason for this could be the presence of a negative particle in the verb (see example (6), (7).

(8) skʰani met'i mitʰa p'unania do si xolo midinətia.. <u>Megrelian Texts ed. Qipshidze: IQ, ZS, XIII, 5 (31, 20)</u> . *We have nobody else but you and you are also leaving us.*

(9) bargi oko kəmķikune, muta goxvar meția <u>Megrelian-Georgian Dictionary Kajaia: Megr.Dict., b, barg-i, 1206</u> . *You should dress up properly, there is no other way out.*

Note 2: in Megrelian negative adverb „sota" repeats the structure of a negative pronoun:

(10) *so.PlADV-ti.PTC-va(r).Neg.PTC* geo. sadac ara/ar > *sota.Neg.ADV* geo. arsad *nowhere.*

Note 3: No negative pronouns or negative adverbs are attested in Laz.

- **Grammatical Model of Rendering Negation in Megrelian and Laz languages**

In Megrelian and Laz negative semantics can be expressed by not only negative pronouns but also by means of indefinite pronouns which have a complex structure. I. Kipshidze paid attention to this complex structure of the indefinite pronouns in Megrelian. He divided them into three groups:

I. mitini//mitine – *someone*, mutuni - *something*, namutini//namutine - *anyone, someone.*

II. migida//midga – *someone*, mugida//mudga - *something*, namugida//namudga -*one of them;*

III. migidareni//midgareni - *someone is that*, mugidareni//mudgareni - *something is that*, namugidareni//namudgareni - *one of them is that.*

The scholar noted that some pronouns had retained a complex structure while others were simplified. He did not develop the idea that simplified ones had also undergone the way of complex pronouns (Kipshidze 1914:049). Later G. Rogava studied the question and stated that all three groups of pronouns were complex by origin. Even the indefinite pronouns having a simple structure were supposed to have been complex initially (Rogava 1988:224). Namely **mit -i'i-ni** geo. *vinc ikneba rom = whoever will be that* > mitini geo. *vinme = someone* (The same applies to the indefinite pronouns *megr.mutuni = something* and *megr. namutini =someone*).

(11) čkimi žimalepi čkimde umosi ʒalieri rdes, inens **mitini** vameriebudu; Megrelian Texts ed.Qipshidze:IQ, ZS, IX, 15 (22, 16).
My brothers were stronger than me, nobody could defeat them.
(12) muš našromiš midmaġalari va'undə **mitini;** Megrelian Texts ed.Xubua: MX, 35, 153, 32 . *Nobody could deprive him of his earnings.*

In Megrelian there is one group of indefinite pronouns having negative semantics: mitini "someone", mutuni "something", namutini "anyone". They are usually followed by a negative particle (Kipshidze 1914). Thus, semantics of a negative pronoun in Megrelian is rendered by means of the following grammar model: **indefinite pronoun + negative (var(i) particle: mitin var(i)=***nobody* (Kajaia, vol.II, 2002:265; Kobalia 2010:418; Geo-Megr-Laz-San-Eng dictionary 2015:16). If this model is inserted in the construction, then the negative particle shifts to the verb and becomes a prefix:

(13)   namtini.INDPRN   va.Neg.PTC-re.S3.SG.PRS   sipta-bereketi
… Megrelian-Georgian Dictionary Kajaia: Megr.Dict., b, bereketi, 1446.
None of them is not.

In Laz simplified forms of indefinite pronouns combined with interrogative pronouns are used in the function of negative pronouns: miti var *geo. someone not = nobody* and mutu var *geo. something not =nothing* together with the negative particle *var* = not.The grammatical model is the following: **indefinite pronoun+var** a negative particle.

(14) mit. **INDFPRN** var. **Neg. PTC** doskidu-doren (Dumezil, 72). *Nobody had not remained;*

(15) ma skan saġulishen baška mut. NDFPRN var. Neg.PTC   minon (Dumezil, 72). *I do not want nothing but your well-being.*

*Note 5: In Laz simplified form **soti** version of the indefinite adverb   **sotini** is used to render negative semantics. It contains an interrogative adverb and a negative particle **var** is also added to it.*
*Note 6: In Laz a Turkish negative particle **hich** is also used.*

(16) daha hič hamdoraškule va bidi him čioiša (Dumezil, 220). *After that I have never been to that village.*

Svan, as compared with Georgian, is richer in number of the negative pronouns,the areal of their using also differing not only in different dialects but in different modes of speech too. Many variations of negative particles in Svan correspond semantically to Georgianparticles *ar-no, ver- can't, nu -do not:*

ar=no : mā, mām(a), mōm(a), mād(e), mōd(e), madma, mad(e), mäd(e), mädm(a), mōdma, mode, mädʃ, ma/äjt^h, mäʃ, dēs(a), dēts^h(a), dēm(a), dēma(m), dēmis, deme(g), dem, dema, demis, bai…;

ver =can't : deʃ, deʃsa, deʃma, meʃmam, doʃ…;
nu=do not: no, nōs(a), nōm(a), nos(a), nom(a), nu/∂m(a), no/emeg, nem…

The majority of the mentioned particles reveal minor difference in some details, nevertheless it is often unproper to exchange them in texts; consequently, the pronouns, containing those particles show the similar situation in semantic viewpoint, e.g. negative pronouns cotaining negative particle *mam(a),* as compared with the pronouns containing *madma* ('*madma* 'particle, are less categoric and is used to express neutral negation; and as for negative pronouns with *madma*-particles they express negation more categorically, against some concrete fact. The causes of such semantic differences lay in the particles' structure: categoricalness ("strong language") is emphasized by the units, which simultaneously contain two different components of negation *(m,d)* *(mamagweʃ - no or nothing, madmgweʃ- nothing at all. **mām mak'u**- I don't want, **mād mak'u**- I don't want at all, not a bit (concrete fact or thing)* (SPT, 27). It is often impossible to deliver their exact meaning in Georgian.

Svan language uses the following grammatical models to express **the negative pronouns:**

I.   negative particle+interrogative pronoun: **där**- nobody = **de**- no + **jär** - who; **deʃjär**- no one = **deʃ**- can no+**jär**- who;**nōr**- let no one = **noma**- don't + **jär**+ who; **dē/esama**- nothing, no thing at all no+anything =**desa**- no +(h)esa+**mäj** - what/something;**deʃma** - nothing (can't anything) =**deʃ** - can't + **mäj** - what; **nō/osama**- let nothing= **nō/osa** - let it not + **mäj** - what, **dexeda**- no one = **de**- no + **xeda**- which, **deʃma**- can't anything (=noting) = **deʃ, doʃ** - can't+ **mä** - what, **xeda** - whichand so on;

(17) atʰcxē drojʒi **där** igem amʒi k'otōl kʰorōlars (SPT, IV, 49, 64, 5). In this time nobody build (sets) such small house.

(18) ʒi **dexeda** tʃ'ikʰs ləmägoʃilli (SPT, III, 126, 116, 13). It turned out that he did not fill no glass.

(19) mitʃʰa jexws **deʃma** axmeqrālvne, de iʃgens ēs (SPT, IV,84, 123, 20). Could not explain anything to his (own) wife and to others.

II. negative particle + noun*gweʃ-job*: māmgweʃ/mamagweʃ/mādmagweʃ =mām/madma - no + gweʃ comp. Georgian no+color):
*madmagweʃ*choʃk'ena - he/she has eathen anything Sv-dict., A. Shgni, 1957;

(20) laid tʃʰu **nomoɣw** adgär I lerʃwnid eser dem xorʃwni demgwaʃwDon't kill me and I will never say a word about it to you (SPT, V.II, 316).

III. negative pronoun + possibility particle *moʃ/därmoʃ*- *let nobody can* comp. model (I): deʃjär.

- **Grammar Models Expressing Negation in Kartvelian Languages – Comparative Analysis and the Issue of Double Negation.**

Grammar models for rendering negation in the Georgian language and other unwritten Kartvelian languages are similar in terms of their structure; namely, they use interrogative words and particles although the order of words is different. The position of negative particles meaning "no" is definite: in Georgian and Svan the particle is put before the interrogative word and is spelt together with the interrogative word. In Megrelian and Laz it follows the interrogative word and is spelt separately. In the construction the same particle is the prefix of the verb in Megrelian with no final "r": var "ara=no" … va "ar-not", in Laz

its position is before the verb in a full form (var "ara-no") (see examples: (11), (12), (13), (14).

Absence of double negative in Megrelian and Laz can be explained by the following processes: the only particle of negation var "ara-no" (in this case we do not discuss negative particles borrowed from Georgian and Turkish!) is a segment of a grammatical model expressing negation in Megrelian and Laz and defines the negative semantics of both this construction and this model. In Megrelian and Laz negative pronouns and adverbs have a structurally different position in contrast to the Georgian language which enables the negative particle var "ara-no" to be placed in a sentence in any order. It can be split from the indefinite pronoun and linked with the verb. It is evident that the second negative particle which was necessary for double negation could not appear in Megrelian and Laz.

In this case Megrelian and Laz languages emphasize a different type of information. It should be noted that indefinite pronouns have a complex structure, a structure of a subordinate clause: mit. RELPRN - **i'i**. V.FUT - ni. SUB (that). *Whoever will be that*. The form of the verb "to be" and the conjunction "that" are used in stylistic-semantic function – it underlines that the subject is unknown (that is why the verb is in the future form!) although it is a concrete person.

Double negation is absolutely alien idea for **Svan**. There are no such forms as*nobody did not come* – the right form is: ***dǎr anqäd*** - *nobody came*, but also it is not proper to use negative pronoun and negative adverb in the same context, e.g. *nobody nowhere goes* in Svan will be

dărimtʰ'ēsxri (< dărimtʰe esxri), literally: – *nobody where goes; never no one came* but instead it: *deſomajäranɣ∂rda*; literally: *never who came*. The use of double negation in Svan reveals what was the archaic or Old Georgian language like.

Conclusion: Considering the evidence of unwritten Kartvelian languages, double negation is not a common Kartvelian phenomenon. In literary Georgian it initially appeared having a stylistic function – it stressed, emphasized negation; later it was spread in Georgian dialects as well. Gradually, standards of literary language were established – using a double negation in the construction was necessary (we are not discussing the latter phenomenon in this presentation!).

Perspective: As far as the category of negation is a universal language phenomenon and different types of data are attested in Kartvelian languages in this respect, it is important to carry on the research, study the mixing of speech codes, discover the semantic meanings of the negative particle.

References

1. Chikobava Arn., Grammatical Analysis of Chan, Tiflis, 1936.
2. Chrestomathy of Svan language. The texts gathered by A. Shanidze, M. Kaldani and Z. Chumburidze,Tbilisi State Univeresity Publishing house, Tbilisi, 1978.
3. Chumburidze Z., negative Particles in Georgian and Stylistic peculiarities of their usage: „Georgian Language and Literature in School", #2, Tbilisi, 1970, p.p. 41-46.
4. Georgian-Megrelian-Laz-San-English Dictionary, „Petiti", Tbilisi, 2015.
5. Dumezil G., *Laz Falk Tales and Legends*, Georgian version of text and the vocabulary compiled by Manana Bukia,"Meridiani", Tbilisi, 2009.
6. Imnaishvili D., Negative Pronouns and Negative Adverbs in Iberian-Caucasian Languages "Iberian-Caucasian Linguistics, v. IV, edited by I. Gigineishvili, Georgian Academy of Sviences Publishing House, 1953, Tbilisi, p.p. 53-73.

7. Jgharkava G., Grammatical model of negation in Megrelian Language (inder the guidance of Assoc. Prof. Maia lomia), Student's Scientific papers, TSU publishing, Tbilisi, 2015, p.p.49-55.

8. Kartozia G., Laz Texts, „Matsne" #4 (Academy of Sciences of Georgia), Edited by Al. Baramidze, „Science", Tbilisi, 1970, p.p. 219-232.

9. Kartozia G., Gersamia R., Lomia M., Tskhadaia T., Linguistic Analysis of Megrelian, „Meridiani", Tbilisi, 2010.

10. Kipshidze I., Grammar of Megrelian (Iberian) language with reading texts and dictionary, Imperial Academy of Sciences, S. Petersburg, 1914 (in Russian).

11. Kobalia A., Megrelian Dictionary, „Artanuji", Tbilisi, 2010.

12. Kurdadze R., Tvaltvadze D., Lomia M., Margiani-Subari K., Zekalashvili R., Linguistic Means of Negation in Kartvelian Languages, The Kartvelologist, #9, Tbilisi, 2016.

13. Lomia M., The principles of Functional Distribution of the Negation and Confirmation Participles in Megrelian: Problems of Linguiostics, Tbilisi State University Publishing House, Tbilisi, 2013, p.p. 221-231.

14. Margiani-Subari Q., Derivation of the Negative Forms in Svan and in Abkhaz-Adighe Languages (Diploma work, manuscript), Tbilisi, 1978.

Martirosov A., Pronoun in Kartvelian Languages, Georgian Academy of Sciences Publishing House, Tbilisi, 1964.

15. Rogava G. Trail of Zan conjunction - particle -(ni) in Chandialect: "Iberian-Caucasian Linguistics",v. XXVII, edited by K. Lomtatidze, "Mecniereba" Publishing House, Tbilisi, 1988, p.p. 221-226.

16. Sarjveladze Z.,*Old Georgian Language,* Tbilisi State Pedagogical Institute Publishing House, Tbilisi, 1997.

17. Shanidze A., *Basises of Georgian Grammar,* Collected works in 12 volumes, v. III. Tbilisi State University Publishing House, Tbilisi, 1980.

18. Shanidze A., *Old Georgian Grammar,* Tbilisi State University Publishing House, Tbilisi, 1976.

19. Sharadzenidze T., Negative particles in Svan: „Iberian-Caucasian Linguistics", v. I, ed. V. Topuria, Georgian Academy of Sciences Publishing House, Tbilisi, 1946, p.p. 289-328.

20. SPT- Svan Prosaic Texts, v.II, Lower-Bal dialect. The texts collected by A. Davitiani, V. Topuria and M. Kaldani, Georgian Academy of Sciences Publishing House, Tbilisi, 1957.

21. Tandilava A., Laz Dictionary, „Saari", Tbilisi, 2013.

22. Topuria V., *Collected Works,* v.II, „Georgian Language", Tbilisi, 2002.

23. Xubua M., Negative Particle va in Megrelian, in periodical „Sakartvelos Metsnierebata Akademiis Moambe", III, 7, Tbilisi, 1942.