

Research article

Uldanay Jumabay*

Negation in clause combining in Kazakh

<https://doi.org/10.33063/os.v73.572>

Abstract: This paper examines the function of negation in discourse units containing more than one clause in Kazakh. When clauses are combined through coordination or subordination, negation can be formally marked in all linked clauses to deny the proposition described in the given clauses. The verbal predicates are negated by the bound morpheme *-MA*. The non-verbal predicates are negated either with the negative particle *emes*, ‘not’, or with the existential negation *žoq*, ‘non-existent’. As for the distinction between these three negations, I argue that *-MA* is an internal negative expressing a weak denial, whereas *emes* and *žoq* are external negatives expressing a strong denial and absolute non-existence respectively, in terms of their pragmatic function in discourse. With regard to the scope of negation in clause combining, the coordinate and subordinate clauses have a narrow negative scope, whereas chain clauses tend to have a wide negative scope.

Keywords: negation, clause combining, coordinate clauses, subordinate clauses, clause chaining, negative scope, Kazakh

1 Introduction

Negation is a universal category, and it has received much attention because it is closely related to the domain of language universals. As a result, many studies have been devoted to negation, mainly using empirical approaches. Taking the functions of negation and clause-combining as a case in point, the present paper provides a functional overview of negation in clause combining in Kazakh. Extending the negation of simple main sentences to complex sentences, our aim is four-fold: first, to describe the expression of negation in simple declarative clauses with verbal and non-verbal predicates; second, to examine negation in coordinate clauses, where the predicates of the joined clauses are finite; third, to explore negation in subordinate clauses in which each pair of the complex sentence is joined by non-finite forms, with a special focus on non-finite adverbial clauses; and finally, to test the negation in the third type of clause combining, clausal chaining, in which the scope of negation is an attractive research topic. A brief description of the negation in these types of clauses is outlined below.

In Kazakh, standard negation of the verb is expressed by the bound marker *-MA*¹, which directly follows the lexical verb stem. Nouns, on the other hand, are negated with the negative particle *emes*, ‘not’, inflected with personal markers. Non-existence is expressed with the existential negation *žoq*, literally meaning ‘non-existent’.

Broadly speaking, clause combining refers to a combination of more than one clause joined by some formal mechanism and containing at least one predication. In Kazakh, complex sentences consisting of at least two clauses are joined by coordination or subordination. In coordination, depending on the verbal or non-verbal categories of the predicate, the verbal negator *-MA*, the negative particle

¹ The following abbreviations are used in notations of the morphophonemic suffix alternations: A = *a, e*; D = *d, t*; G = *g, γ, k, q*; I = *i, i̇*; K = *k, q*; M = *m, b, p*.

* Department of Linguistics, Languages and Literature, Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan, E-mail: wulidanayi.jumabay@nu.edu.kz

emes and the existential negation *žoq* can independently attach to the predicates of the coordinate clauses, cf. (1a, b).

- (1a) Čäy *al-a-mïn*, *bïraq sût* *al-ma-y-mïn*.
 tea buy-PRES-1SG but milk buy-NEG-PRES-1SG
 ‘I buy tea, but I do not buy milk.’
- (1b) Čäy *al-ma-y-mïn*, *bïraq sût* *al-a-mïn*.
 tea buy-NEG-PRES-1SG but milk buy-PRES-1SG
 ‘I don’t buy tea, but I buy milk.’

As for negation in subordinate clauses, the non-finite verb forms, such as participles, verbal nouns and converbs, are negated with the verbal negation *-MA*, while nominal predicates take either the negative particle *emes* or the existential negation *žoq*; compare (2a) and (2b):

- (2a) *Kel-me-ytin-i-n* *bil-e-min*.
 come-NEG-PTCP-POSS3-ACC know-PRES-1SG
 ‘I know that s/he will not come.’
- (2b) *Kel-etin-i-n* *bil-me-y-min*.
 come-PTCP-POSS3-ACC know-NEG-PRES-1SG
 ‘I don’t know that s/he will come.’

Nonetheless, negation in subordinate clauses differs slightly from that in main clauses. Certain non-finite forms cannot take an independent negator due to full nominalisation. Moreover, negation in adverbial clauses is a complicated issue, since some converbs have no one-to-one corresponding negative forms, and the affirmative and negative counterparts of these converbs therefore exhibit structural or paradigmatic differences. Negative marking on the dependent predicates of adverbial clauses is one of the main strategies for expressing certain adverbial relations, e.g. the temporal posteriority relation *before*.

In the third type of clause linkage, clause chaining, only the final verbs are capable of taking finite verb categories, while juxtaposed verbs depend on the final verb. In Kazakh, sequenced verbs are usually inflected with the converb marker *-(I)p*, and represent roughly analogous events or a linear succession. Apparently, this distinction has been made with respect to the morpho-syntactic nature of the clause linkage. Generally, the negation on the final verb can cover the entire scope of the clause chaining, in which case the formal marking and the semantic scope of the negation do not correspond. Nonetheless, in certain chain clauses, the scope of the negation is limited to the main clause.

Leaving out negation in auxiliary verb constructions, where both the lexical verbs and the auxiliary verbs can be negated differently, the current study will concentrate exclusively on negation in mono-verbal predicates. Furthermore, finite subordinate clauses that are introduced by the quotation particle *dep* <say-CONV>, ‘saying’, derived from the verb *de-*, ‘to say’, are excluded from the scope of the investigation. Only subordinate clauses expressed through non-finite verb forms are considered. The analysis will be based on written and spoken data collected from Kazakh varieties used in Kazakhstan and China. Some spoken Kazakh data are provided by the author.

The present article is organised as follows: negation in simple declarative sentences will be analysed in Section 2; negation in coordinate clauses, subordinate clauses and clause chaining is described in Sections 3, 4 and 5, respectively; concluding remarks are made in Section 6.

2 Negation in simple declarative sentences

Affirmation and negation are the two poles of a binary system, and formally the affirmative is an unmarked category. Negation, on the other hand, is formally marked with certain special markers. Logically, the intrinsic function of negation is to deny the truth-value of a proposition (see Givón 2001: 369). From a cross-linguistic perspective, three main types of negation have been identified: morphological or affixal negation, negative particles, and negative verbs (see Dahl 1979, 2010; Payne 1985; Horn 2001; Miestamo 2005; van der Auwera & Krannoukhova 2020). With respect to the categorial status of the predication, Kazakh distinguishes three types of negation: verbal negation *-MA*; nominal negation or the negative particle *emes*, ‘not’; and existential negation *žoq*, ‘non-existent’. The verbal negator *-MA* is placed after the negated verb. The negative particle *emes* and the existential negation *žoq* often occupy the sentence-final position. In this section, the functional properties of these three negators in simple declarative sentences will be briefly described.

2.1 Verbal negation *-MA*

Syntactically, *-MA* can function as the marker of standard negation. The verbal negation is conventionalised as standard negation. Standard negation refers to the negative expression of a simple declarative sentence with a verbal predicate and is a prototypical way of expressing negation in languages (cf. Miestamo 2005). In Kazakh, standard negation is explicitly marked with the bound morpheme *-MA*, which follows the verb stem. The tense-aspect, mood and person-number agreement markers follow the inflectional negation *-MA*. The verbal negator *-MA* can negate almost all types of tense-aspect and mood markers in independent predicate position. See:

- | | | | |
|------|---|------|--|
| (3a) | <i>Kör-di-m.</i>
see-PST-1SG
‘I saw.’ | (3b) | <i>Kör-me-di-m.²</i>
see-NEG-PST-1SG
‘I did not see.’ |
|------|---|------|--|

The expression of standard negation in Kazakh is mostly symmetrical³, where the negation is characterised by the simple addition of the negator *-MA* to the corresponding affirmative form, cf. (3b). However, there is not always a structural correspondence between an affirmative and its negative equivalent. Certain negative constructions manifest asymmetry, where an additional element may occur in addition to the bound negator *-MA*. This asymmetry can be seen in both the structure and the paradigm of the verbal inflections. Specifically, the aorist marker *-(A)r*, which behaves like both finite and non-finite, has a special negative counterpart, *-MA*s⁴, which consists of the bound morpheme *-MA* and an unvoiced sibilant /s/ (see also Mamanov 2014 [1966]; KG 2002; Jumabay 2022; Ótött-Kovács 2023). See:

- 2 All examples for which no explicit source is indicated were provided by the author and confirmed by many native speakers of Kazakh in Kazakhstan and China.
- 3 Miestamo (2005) proposed the notions of “symmetry” and “asymmetry” in standard negation, in which symmetry indicates that the negative and affirmative structures are identical, except for the presence of the negative markers, e.g. Kazakh *bar-dī* <go-PST3> ‘s/he went’ vs. *bar-ma-dī* <go-NEG-PST3> ‘s/he did not go’. Asymmetry refers to the presence of structural or paradigmatic differences between the affirmative and negative in addition to the negative marker, e.g. *bar-ar* <go-AOR3> ‘s/he may go’ vs. *bar-mas* <go-NEG.AOR3> ‘s/he won’t go’.
- 4 Diachronically, the Modern Kazakh negative aorist suffix *-MA*s corresponds to the Old Turkic negative suffix *-MA*z. There is a formal alternation between the sounds /z/ and /r/; namely, /z/ occurs at the end of a stem, while /r/ precedes a vowel, as in Ottoman *yaldiz* ‘star’ vs. Old Turkic *yaltri-* ‘to glimmer’, *yaviz* ‘bad’ vs. *yavri-* ‘to be/come weak’ (cf. Erdal 2004: 84). As a result, /r/ can be primary and /z/ is secondary. The alternation between /r/ and /z/ can be applied to the negative aorist *-MA*z and its affirmative *-r*, where the affirmative *-r* is shifted to /z/ after the negation *-MA*. Synchronically, however, the alternation between /r/ and /z/ is no longer productive, either in word formation or in morphology, and we must therefore treat it as an asymmetrical phenomenon.

- (4a) *Kör-er-min.*
see-AOR-1SG
'I might see.'
- (4b) *Kör-mes-pin.*
see-NEG.AOR-1SG
'I won't see.'

According to Frawley (1992: 399), the scope of negation is determined by two principal factors, “the range of scope and the interaction of negative scope with other scope-bearing items” (Frawley 1992: 399). The term “range of scope” indicates that the negation may deny all or part of the proposition, and thus it has a variable scope. “Interaction of negative scope with other scope-bearing items” refers to the fact that the scope of the negation can be affected by some scope-bearing elements, e.g. *some, any*. The range of negative scope can be interpreted “as a scale of values between the parameters of *wide* and *narrow*” (Frawley 1992: 400). In other words, a propositional negation has a wide scope and applies to more parts of an expression; a negation with narrow scope, on the other hand, affects only part of an expression; for example, *he doesn't run frequently* vs. *he runs infrequently*, where the negative *not* has a wide scope while the affixal negative *infrequently* has a narrow scope. Structurally, if a negative operator has a wide scope and denies the sentence as a whole, it can be considered a *sentential negation*. If, by contrast, a negative marker has a narrow scope and only negates some structural item of a sentence, it is a *constituent negation*, e.g. *there are many foods but no drinks*. Semantically, a negative marker that functions as a sentential negation is understood as an *external* negative operator. A negative operator that gives constituent negation is understood as *internal* negation. In philosophical work on reference and presupposition, the terms external and internal scope, are rough equivalents of wide and narrow scope (for more details, see Frawley 1992). In short, *wide* and *narrow* refer to *the range of effect* of negation; *external* and *internal* refer to the semantic or logical scope of negation; *sentential* and *constituent* refer to the syntactic structure of negation. Following Frawley (1992), these terms are adopted throughout the paper to distinguish the different negative operators and to test the scope of negation in Kazakh.

Accordingly, *-MA* is an internal negation operator that denies the truth-value of a whole proposition or some part of it, so that it has a wide or a narrow scope. In example (5), *-MA* has a wide scope, denying the whole proposition.

- (5) *Qonaq-tar köz-der-i-n Botagöz-den bir ayir-ma-di.* (Muqanov 2014: 673)
guest-PL eye-PL-POSS3-ACC Botagoz-ABL one separate-NEG-PST3
'The guests did not take their eyes off Botagoz for a moment.'

On the other hand, the negator *-MA* is not able to cover the scope of a whole proposition, since its scope can be affected by quantifiers. See:

- (6) *Aybala-niñ key minez-der-i Asqar-ya una-ma-di.* (Muqanov 2014: 19)
Aybala-GEN some character-PL-POSS3 Asqar-DAT like-NEG-PST3
'Asqar didn't like some parts of Aybala's character.'
Lit.: 'To Asqar, certain personality traits of Aybala were not likable.'

Logically, in (6), the scope of the negation is limited to the quantitative entity *key* 'some', and so the proposition 'Asqar likes the rest of Aybala's personality traits' remains affirmed. In consequence, in this context, *-MA* is an internal negation operator.

2.2 The negative particle *emes*

Diachronically, the Kazakh negative particle *emes* developed from the Old Turkic negative form of the copular verb *är-mäz* <be-NEG.AOR> 'is not', which consists of the copular verb *är-* 'to be' and the negative aorist *-mäz* (see Johanson 2021: 570; Erdal 2004: 324). Erdal (2004: 324) notes that in Old Turkic,

ärmaz is used to negate the verbal sentence, representing a proposition that has no truth-value. Paradigmatically, the Kazakh negative particle *emes* has no affirmative counterpart. It is used to negate non-verbal sentences. It has four different functions: (i) a sentential negation negating a nominal sentence; (ii) a negation of nominalised verbs; (iii) a constituent negation; (iv) and the formation of a tag question combined with the question particle *MA*.

1) Sentential negation of non-verbal declarative clauses. *Emes* serves as a sentential negation in non-verbal declarative sentences to deny the truth-value of a whole proposition. In this usage, *emes* can be followed by thematic operators, for instance tense, aspect and modal operators, and personal-number markers reflecting the subject of the clause. The following examples compare an affirmative nominal sentence with its negative counterpart. The negative sentence in (7b) conveys the negation of location in the present; (8b) renders the negation of location in the past, where *emes* is followed by the past tense-marked copular verb *edi*.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(7a) <i>Murat üy-de.</i>
Murat house-LOC
'Murat is at home.'</p> | <p>(7b) <i>Murat üy-de emes.</i>
Murat house-LOC not
'Murat is not at home.'</p> |
| <p>(8a) <i>Murat üy-de e-di.</i>
Murat house-LOC COP-PST3
'Murat was at home.'</p> | <p>(8b) <i>Murat üy-de emes e-di.</i>
Murat house-LOC not COP-PST3
'Murat was not at home.'</p> |

Regarding the aspecto-temporal semantics of negative clauses generated by *emes*, they can have present and past time reference. A future or habitual event, however, cannot be constructed by *emes*. In order to negate a future-oriented or habitual event, the copular verb *bol-* 'to be/come' should be used, inflected with the negator *-MA* instead of the particle *emes*. Compare the following examples:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(9a) <i>Murat üy-de bol-a-dï.</i>
Murat house-LOC COP-PRES-3
'Murat will be at home.'
'Murat is used to being at home.'</p> | <p>(9b) <i>Murat üy-de bol-ma-y-dï.</i>
Murat house-LOC COP-NEG-PRES-3
'Murat won't be at home.'
'Murat is not used to being at home.'</p> |
|--|--|

Arguably, the use of *emes* only with past and present time reference illustrates that it conveys a firm denial, representing certainty about the falsity of the proposition, since the past and present actions have factive meaning.

2) Negation of nominalised verb forms. Heading dependent predicates of subordinate clauses and taking nominal suffixes are intrinsic characteristics of the participle and aorist markers, signalling that the subordinate clauses are embedded in and dependent on the superordinate clauses. However, over the course of language development, these non-finite forms have undergone a process of function-shifting from non-finite to finite, and as a result, in later stages, they start to appear in the predicates of main clauses as well (cf. Johanson 2021: 731). The nominalised verb forms *-GAN* and *-AtIn/-ytIn* occur in the main predicate position functioning as perfect and habitual aspect operators, respectively. The aorist marker *-(A)r* occurs in the independent predicate position to refer to modality content of epistemic possibility. The nominalised verbal operator *-MAK* appears in the main predicate position to indicate intention. The locative-marked verbal noun marker *-Uwda* can code the finite predicates of main clauses, signalling a present progressive event. Despite their ability to mark the verbal predicates of the main clauses, they have preserved certain nominal features in the finite predicate position by means of their compatibility with the non-verbal negators *emes* and *žoq*. The nominalised verb forms that can take the negative particle *emes* and their semantics are discussed below.

When the negative particle *emes* appears after the nominalised form *-GAn*, the clause expresses the negative perfect aspect, i.e. an action that has not been performed before (see Zhang 2004; Mohamedowa 2006). Furthermore, the subject decisively denies the realisation of the action, claiming s/he has no previous experience of performing the given action, so that the form *-GAn emes* can be construed as a firm denial, cf. (10) and (11). The personal markers must be attached to the particle *emes*, and cannot be added to *-GAn*.

- (10) *Ekew-i üy-de ne tüz-de bir-biri-nen eki*
 two.together-POSS3 house-LOC or outside-LOC each.other-ABL two
eli ayır-il-ïp kör-gen emes. (KZ CNR: 2023.09.14)⁵
 finger-width separate-PASS-CONV see.AUX-PTCP not
 ‘They have never been separated from each other at all, either at home or outside.’
- (11) *Kim-kim-niñ de tabıs-ï žep-ženil qol-in-a qon-a*
 who-who-GEN PTCL success-POSS3 very.light hand-POSS3-DAT land-CONV
qal-yan emes. (KZ CNR: 2021.09.01)
 remain.AUX-PTCP not
 ‘Success doesn’t come easily to anyone.’
 Lit.: ‘No one’s success has come so easily into their hands.’

The modal particle *DA* can be inserted between the *-GAn*-marked main predicate and the negative particle *emes* to highlight an absolute denial, i.e. that the action has never been experienced before, cf. (12).

- (12) *Payda tüsir-üw-di men oyla-yan da emes-pin.* (Zhang 2004: 654)
 profit gain-VN-ACC I think-PTCP PTCL not-1SG
 ‘I have never thought of gaining profit.’

The nominalised form *-AtIn//ytIn* usually appears in independent predicates to convey habitual or regular events in the past, as (13) shows. Intriguingly, if *emes* appears after the nominalised form *-AtIn//ytIn* in the main predicate position, it refers to a prospective event with negative meaning, emphasising that the action is beyond the subject’s control due to objective causes and that the subject therefore has no choice or is unable to perform the action (cf. Zhang 2004: 259), see (14) and (15).

- (13) *Men burin roman oq-uw-dï žaqsi kör-me-ytin-min.* (Geng 1989: 143)
 I before novel read-VN-ACC like-NEG-PTCP-1SG
 ‘I used to not like reading novels.’
- (14) *Žumis iste-w-ge küy-im kel-etin emes.* (Zhang 2004: 259)
 work do-VN-DAT physical.strength-POSS1SG come-PTCP not
 ‘I am physically incapable of working.’
- (15) *Ne ayt-sa-m da, ol mayan sen-etin emes.*
 what say-COND-1SG PTCL s/he I.DAT believe-PTCP not
 ‘No matter what I say, s/he would not believe me.’

5 This example is taken from a Kazakh radio broadcast of China National Radio (CNR). Link to source: <http://www.kazakcnr.com>

In Section 2.1, we mentioned that the aorist marker *-(A)r* has its irregular negative counterpart *-MAs*. In addition to negating the finite verbal predicate based on *-(A)r* with the negator *-MAs*, *emes* can occur after the finite verb marked by the aorist *-(A)r*, denoting prospectivity with a solid presupposition. There is not even the slightest contingent possibility that a certain action will be performed; i.e. it cannot be counted on at all, cf. (16).

- (16) *Žurt žol bosat-ar emes.* (KZ CNR: 2023.03.15)
 public road set.free-AOR not
 ‘The masses wouldn’t free up the road.’

According to Zhang (2004: 655), the subtle difference between the negative constructions *-MAs* and *-(A)r emes* lies in the likelihood of the action in question occurring. Specifically, the *-(A)r emes* construction has a higher possibility than the *-MAs* construction. Example (17a) means that despite being highly unlikely, there is still a possibility of performing the action. Example (17b), however, means that it is not possible to perform the action.

- (17a) *Saqta-l-yan astiq eki žil-da taws-il-mas.* (Zhang 2004: 655)
 save-PASS-PTCP grain two year-LOC finish-PASS-NEG.AOR
 ‘The grain that has been stored will probably not be eaten in two years.’
- (17b) *Saqta-l-yan astiq eki žil-da taws-il-ar emes.* (Zhang 2004: 655)
 save-PASS-PTCP grain two year-LOC finish-PASS-AOR not
 ‘The grain that has been stored will not be eaten in two years.’

The negative particle *emes* can follow the nominalised verb form *-MAK* in the independent predicate position to express negative intention; i.e. the subject has no intention to perform an action. See:

- (18) *Siz-diŋ qažirli ruwx-iŋiz-di es-im-nen är qašan šiyar-maq*
 you-GEN diligent spirit-POSS2SG-ACC mind-POSS1SG-ABL never let.out-VN
emes-pin. (KZ CNR: 2020.11.04)
 not-1SG
 ‘I will never forget your hardworking spirit.’

3) A constituent negation. The negative particle *emes* can solely negate a constituent of a sentence immediately following the given constituent. See:

- (19) *Maqala-si-n kör-di-m, žaman emes žaz-il-ip-ti.*
 article-POSS3-ACC see-PST-1SG good not write-PASS-EVID-3
 ‘I have seen his/her article; apparently it is not badly written.’

4) Forming a tag question. The negative particle *emes* and the question particle *MA* can be combined to form a tag question, asking for confirmation or verification of information. See:

- (20) *Žaŋa yana qizmet-ke šiq-ti-ŋ emes pe?* (KZ CNR: 2023.08.17)
 new just work-DAT go.out-PST-2SG not Q
 ‘You just started your job, didn’t you?’

In Kazakh, as in other Turkic languages, the focused element immediately precedes the predicate. Negation can interact with focus, and thus in focus constructions the negation tends to behave in a particular way. In declarative negative clauses, the focused element can be moved before the predi-

cate, which is in the negator *-MA*, cf. (21b). Alternatively, the focused constituent can be relativised, in which case the head noun, i.e. the focused constituent of the underlying clause, should be negated with the negative particle *emes* instead of *-MA*, cf. (21c). Furthermore, when a focused constituent appears before the negation, its negative is often narrowed; i.e. only the focused element is within in the scope of negation.

- (21a) *Murat бүгін жиіін-ға кел-ме-у-ди.*
Murat today meeting-DAT come-NEG-PRES-3
'Murat will not come to the meeting today.' (unmarked focus)
- (21b) *Бүгін жиіін-ға Мурат кел-ме-у-ди.*
today meeting-DAT Murat come-NEG-PRES-3
'Murat will not come to the meeting today.' (focus on subject)
- (21c) *Бүгін жиіін-ға кел-етін Мурат емес.*
today meeting-DAT come-PTCP Murat not
'It isn't Murat who will come to the meeting today.' (focus on relativised subject)

In addition, contrastively focused elements can be negated by *emes*. See:

- (22) *Алматы-ға емес, Астана-ға бар-а-мін.*
Almaty-DAT not Astana-DAT go-PRES-1SG
'I am going to Astana, not Almaty.'

2.3 The existential negation *žoq*

Syntactically, the existential negation *žoq*, 'non-existent', appears in the predicative position of non-verbal clauses and bears the person-number agreement markers to indicate the subject of the clauses. Paradigmatically, its affirmative equivalent is *bar*, 'existent'. Semantically, existential negation emphasises the absence of an entity that is presupposed to exist, rather than negating its existence. Therefore, in some literature (Veselinova 2013), existential negation is also called the "domain of absence". From a pragmatic viewpoint, *žoq* behaves like an external negation in terms of its scope, which covers the whole proposition, and is therefore used as a sentential negation. Veselinova (2013: 118–119) summarises the functions of existential negation, identifying a total of 26 functions of existential negation that are valid across languages. The Kazakh existential negation *žoq* has the following functions:

1) Negation of existence, possession and location. In Kazakh, the existential negation *žoq* can function as negation of existence, location and possession, indicating the absence of an entity. In (23a), (23b) and (23c), *žoq* is used to convey negation of existence, possession and location, respectively.

- (23a) *Men-de kitap žoq.*
I-LOC book non-existent
'I have no book.'
- (23b) *Meniñ kitab-im žoq.*
I.GEN book-POSS1SG non-existent
'I do not have a book.'
Lit.: 'My book does not exist.'

- (23c) *Kitap s̄mke-de žoq.*
 book bag-LOC non-existent
 ‘The book is not in the bag.’

Analogous to *emes*, the existential negation *žoq* is only compatible with the present and past tense operators; future or habitual non-existence should be expressed by the copular verb *bol-* ‘to be/come’ taking the bound negation *-MA*⁶. In example (24a), the bare form *žoq* expresses the present absence of an event. If the past tense-marked copular verb *edi* appears after *žoq*, the construction refers to non-existence in the past, as (24b) demonstrates. Future non-existence is signalled by the negative-marked copular verb *bol-ma-*, cf. (24c).

- (24a) *Suw-da baliq žoq.*
 water-LOC fish non-existent
 ‘There is no fish in the water.’
- (24b) *Suw-da baliq žoq e-di.*
 water-LOC fish non-existent COP-PST3
 ‘There was no fish in the water.’
- (24c) *Suw-da baliq bol-ma-y-d̄i.*
 water-LOC fish COP-NEG-PRES-3
 ‘There won’t be fish in the water.’
 ‘There used to be no fish in the water.’

2) **A short ‘no’ answer.** The existential negation *žoq* can be used as a short ‘no’ answer in response to a yes/no question. See:

- (25) – *Ūy-ge qayt-t̄i-ŋ ba?*
 house-DAT return-PST-2SG Q
 ‘Did you return home?’
Žoq.
 Non-existent
 ‘No.’

3) **Negation of nominalised verb forms.** The existential negation *žoq* can appear in the independent verbal predicate position that is marked by the perfect participle marker *-GAN*, expressing the absolute non-existence of the proposition. Zhang (2004: 256) calls the existential negation *žoq* ‘argumentative negation’ and claims that it is used when the speaker has no relevant experience of the actual situation. When negating with *žoq* in order to dispel someone’s misunderstanding, the speaker is in a more impulsive and uneven state of mind, arguing that a certain action or behaviour has not been carried out. Moreover, the form *-GAN žoq* signals that an action is still far from achieving the expected results; i.e. the speaker does not have the capacity or experience to perform the action. In example (26a), the speaker is in a compulsive state of mind, claiming that s/he did not take the money, and s/he feels offended by the misunderstanding. Sentence (27a) indicates that the proposition is still far-reaching or that it does not correspond to the subject’s reality.

⁶ Existence clauses, which are expressed by the copular verb *bol-* ‘to be/come’, implying dynamic semantic domains, are outside the scope of the present analysis. See Karakoç (2017) for a typological study of existence and possessive clauses in Turkic.

It should be noted that in a *-GAn žoq* negative construction, either *žoq* takes the personal markers, or the possessive suffix should be added to *-GAn*, reflecting the subject of the clause; compare the sentence structures in (26a) and (26b), and in (27a) and (27b). As the English interpretations show, there is no difference in meaning between the sentences.

- (26a) *Men seniŋ aqša-ŋ-dī al-yan žoq-pīn.*
 I you.GEN money-POSS2SG-ACC take-PTCP non-existent-1SG
 ‘I have not taken your money.’
 Lit.: ‘My taking your money does not exist.’
- (26b) *Men seniŋ aqša-ŋ-dī al-yan-īm žoq.*
 I you.GEN money-POSS2SG-ACC take-PTCP-POSS1SG non-existent
 ‘I have not taken your money.’
 Lit.: ‘My taking your money does not exist.’
- (27a) *Awruw tizinde-l-gen žoq.* (Zhang 2004: 256)
 sickness control-PASS-PTCP non-existent
 ‘The illness is not under control.’
- (27b) *Awruw tizinde-l-gen-i žoq.*
 sickness control-PASS-PTCP-POSS3 non-existent
 ‘The illness is not under control.’

In auxiliary verb constructions where the lexical verb consists of the converbs *-(I)p* or *-A//y* plus the grammaticalised auxiliary verbs *otīr-*, ‘to sit’, *tur-*, ‘to stand’, *žatīr-*, ‘to lie’ or *žūr-*, ‘to move’, both the lexical verb and the auxiliary verb can be negated separately with distinguishable semantics. When the lexical verb is negated with the negative converb *-MAy*, the construction can express the reluctance or unwillingness of the subject to perform the action, cf. (28). On the other hand, it can indicate that the action is not currently ongoing, as (29) demonstrates. If the auxiliary verb is in the negative polarity, the construction similarly expresses a negative present progressive event. Adding the nominalised verb form *-GAn* after the auxiliary verb and applying the existential negation *žoq*, ‘non-existence’, is more natural and frequent than using the verbal negator *-MA*, cf. (30); see also Mamanov 2014: 79; Muhamedowa 2016: 187. Note that the negative present progressive aspect can be expressed either by *-MAy tur-* in (29) or by *-(I)p tur-yan žoq* in (30). It should be noted that negation in auxiliary verb constructions is a complex and important issue that should be studied in greater detail.

- (28) *Ol kisi qosil-ma-y tur.* (Zhang 2004: 667)
 that person agree-NEG-CONV stand.AUX3
 ‘S/he is reluctant to agree.’
- (29) *Sen meni tanī-ma-y tur-yan šiy-ar-siŋ.* (Muqanov 2014: 637)
 you I.ACC recognise-NEG-CONV stand.AUX-PTCP go.out-AOR-2SG
 ‘Probably, you do not recognize me.’
- (30) *Gubernator qazir kel-ip tur-yan žoq.* (Muqanov 2014: 99)
 governor now come-CONV stand.AUX-PTCP non-existent
 ‘The governor is not coming right now.’

4) **A coordinative conjunction.** In coordinative clauses where two linked clauses have equal syntactic status, the existential negation *žoq* can function as a disjunctive conjunction joining these two clauses. It functionally corresponds to the English disjunctive conjunction ‘or’. See:

- (31) *Qayta tur-ïp, tipti de žigerlen-di-ŋ be,*
 again stand-CONV even PTCL encouraged-PST-2SG Q
žoq küyire-p ket-ti-ŋ be eken? (KZ CNR: 2022.11.30)
 non-existent destroy-CONV leave.AUX-PST-2SG Q PTCL
 ‘Did you bounce back and get even more encouraged, or were you more devastated?’

2.4 Distinctions between the three negators

As our investigation above shows, in some independent verbal or non-verbal predicate positions, two or three negators are interchangeable. The choice of which one to use depends on the pragmatic function of the clauses. Following Frawley (1992), the pragmatic terms *weak* and *strong propositional negation* are proposed to distinguish the scalar value of the logical denials expressed by these three negators. Frawley (1992: 395) states that there are two factors motivating the status of negation, the degree of overtness of the negative and the degree of irrealis modality. He treats modality as epistemic deixis in terms of the relationship between the present world of reference and the actual world of expression, with irrealis modality occurring when there is a semantic mismatch between these two worlds. The degree of propositional negation is a function of the degree to which the form in question encodes irrealis modality. Consequently, he defines negation as “the mismatch of the expressed world and the reference world, so the strongest propositional negation should be induced by forms that encode the total mismatch. Conversely, those forms that encode less mismatch between the reference world and the expressed world should display fuzzy behaviour for propositional negation” (Frawley 1992: 396). For example, the English adverb *seldom* forms only partial divergence (e.g. *he seldom went home*), whereas *never* forms total divergence (e.g. *he never went home*). Thus, *seldom* only partially marks irrealis modality and can be characterised as a weak denial. *Never*, however, indicates a total mismatch between the reference world and the expressed world, so it is a strong denial of the proposition.

The differences between the three negators *-MA*, *emes* and *žoq* can be tested by applying the two different principal sources of scalar propositional negation. Firstly, as mentioned above, when the participle marker *-GAn* occurs in finite predicate position, the bound negator *-MA*, the negative particle *emes* and the existential negation *žoq* can be attached to *-GAn*. As far as the first principal degree of overtness of the negative is concerned, there is no overt semantic difference between the three, since all three forms are overt negatives, although they use different morphological resources. For example, *bar-ma-yan* <go-NEG-PTCP> ‘s/he has not gone’, *bar-yan emes* <go-PTCP not> ‘s/he had never gone’, *bar-yan žoq* <go-PTCP non-existent> ‘s/he did not go’ or ‘his/her having gone does not exist’.

The diagnostic tests of degree of irrealis modality, on the other hand, seem to provide overt evidence of distinguishing between the three negatives. We assume that the *-MAGAn* construction denies the truth-value of the proposition, correcting the listener’s false belief, so that in discourse it can be characterised as a relatively weak denial of the proposition, as seen in (32a). On the other hand, if the negative particle *emes* occurs after the nominalised form *-GAn*, the construction indicates a strong negation, emphasising that the subject has not yet performed the given action. In other words, the subject lacks experience in the given field or has never encountered the reported event, cf. (32b). When the verbal predicate based on *-GAn* is negated with the existential negation *žoq*, the sentence conveys absolute non-existence, emphasising the non-presence of the proposition without any further reference to its possible presence or existence in other situations. Moreover, as described above, the addresser speaks in a compulsive or uneven manner, arguing for the absence of the presupposi-

tion. Consequently, the *-GAN žoq* form highlights the absence of the proposition rather than negating its falsity; as (32c) shows. Moreover, the *-GAN žoq* form is the most common one, while *-MAGAn* is less common (cf. Mamanov 2014: 79; Muhamedowa 2006: 171).

- (32a) *Bala urlıq iste-w-di unat-ıp kör-me-gen.* (KZ CNR: 2021.02.27)
 child theft do-VN-ACC like-CONV see.AUX-NEG-PTCP3
 ‘The child doesn’t like stealing.’
- (32b) *Bala urlıq iste-w-di unat-ıp kör-gen emes.*
 child theft do-VN-ACC like-CONV see.AUX-PTCP not
 ‘The child never liked stealing.’
- (32c) *Bala urlıq iste-w-di unat-ıp kör-gen žoq.*
 child theft do-VN-ACC like-CONV see.AUX-PTCP non-existent
 ‘Children’s fondness of stealing does not exist at all.’

Furthermore, in order to examine the degree of certainty of the three negators, they can be inserted into an irreal context to test whether the untruthfulness of the propositions is still valid. Our hypothesis is that only the standard negation *-MA* is applicable to such irreal context, since it conveys a weak denial, while the other two cannot be used. Compare the following sentences in (33a), (33b) and (33c):

- (33a) *Ol Astana-ya bar-ma-yan bol-ar.*
 s/he Astana-DAT go-NEG-PTCP PTCL
 ‘Probably, s/he did not go to Astana.’
- (33b) **Ol Astana-ya bar-yan emes bol-ar.*
 s/he Astana-DAT go-PTCP not PTCL
- (33c) ?*Ol Astana-ya bar-yan žoq bol-ar.*
 s/he Astana-DAT go-PTCP non-existent PTCL
 ‘Probably, s/he did not go to Astana.’

As expected, when the modal particle *bol-ar*⁷ is used after the negative construction *-MAGAn* in order to indicate epistemic likelihood, the construction is valid and grammatical, since the negator *-MA* contains a low degree of negative certainty. However, the use of the negative particle *emes* in such an assumptive expression makes the construction ungrammatical. Although the construction expressed with the existential negation *žoq* is grammatically correct, it is not widely accepted. Most of my language informants think it sounds strange and unnatural. Furthermore, the incompatibility of the negators *emes* and *žoq* with non-factive future-oriented constructions – i.e. their inability to deny the future time reference, as shown in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 – is further evidence that these two negators express strong denial and absolute absence. A similar phenomenon was found with the Turkish verbal negator *-mA* and the negative particle *değil*, ‘not’ by Emeksiz 2010, where *-mA* indicates a weak denial, and *değil* expresses a strong denial.

Considering the differences in meaning between the constructions *-MAGAn*, *-GAN emes* and *-GAN žoq* in Kazakh grammars, Zhang (2004: 654) notes that the three forms differ slightly in their denotations. The *-MAGAn* form is a general negative statement, asserting that the subject lacks a certain ex-

7 According to Zhang (2004: 647), *bol-ar* is a copula that consists of the copular verb *bol-* ‘to be/come’ and the aorist marker *-(A)r*, signalling the meaning ‘it is probable’. *Bolar* expresses the speaker’s estimates and speculation.

perience, i.e. s/he has never done a certain action before; the analytical form *-GAn emes* has an emphatic argumentative and refutative connotation, as if the context is that someone has a contrary opinion; whereas the *-GAn žoq* form is used in an emphatic assertion, as if there is no doubt that a certain experience definitely does not exist.

Nonetheless, Mamanov (2014: 79) argues that the construction *-GAn žoq* makes a simple statement about the non-execution of the action, while the construction *-GAn emes* stresses the fact that a given action has never been performed before, rather than simply stating its non-execution. He further states that there is little semantic difference between *-MAGAn* and *-GAn žoq*, and that they are therefore interchangeable. He also notes that the negators *-MA*, *žoq* and *emes* are used at different levels. Specifically, *-MA* is compatible with most finite and non-finite forms, except the verbal noun *-MAK*; *emes* can negate all nominal forms; and *žoq* is only involved in the negation of the past participle marker *-GAn*. It should be noted that we do not deny that in some contexts *-MAGAn* and *-GAn žoq* forms do not produce obvious differences in meaning, and thus can be interchangeable, mostly in the colloquial register, e.g. *men bul filim-di kör-me-ge-m* <I this movie-ACC see-NEG-PTCP-1SG> ‘I have not seen this movie’ vs. *men bul filim-di kör-gen žoq-pin* <I this movie-ACC see-PTCP non-existent-1SG> ‘I have not seen this movie’. However, *-GAn žoq* is applicable to most constructions, while *-MAGAn* does not have such a capacity. In addition, their compatibility with a context of irrealis modality differs greatly, and therefore we argue that *-MAGAn* produces a weak denial, while *-GAn žoq* expresses a strong denial.

Note further that the distinctions between *-MAGAn*, *-GAn emes* and *-GAn žoq* can be seen in their ability to produce *metalinguistic* negation and *descriptive* negation, as described by Horn (1989). Descriptive negation negates the truth value of a proposition by emphasising the falsity of a state of affairs, so it is a semantic function of negation and can be considered truth-conditional. For instance, the Kazakh sentence, *Murat an ayt-pa-di* <Murat song tell-NEG-PST3> ‘Murat didn’t sing’ is a descriptive negation expressing the falsity of a statement: ‘it is false that Murat sang’. Metalinguistic negation does not express a falsity; instead it rejects the assertability of an utterance for conversational purposes, e.g. *Murat an ayt-pa-di, biyledi* <Murat sing-NEG-PST3 dance-PST3> ‘Murat didn’t sing, he danced’. This example is used to express a pragmatic contrast, not the falsity of a statement. In other words, the verb *an ayt-* ‘to sing’ is contradicted by a new verb *biyle-* ‘to dance’, so that the expression *biyledi* is used to reject the assertability of its first part *Murat an ayt-pa-di* and is not truth-conditional. Because, as our research above has shown, *emes* and *žoq* are strong denials, whereas *-MA* is a weak denial, we assume that *-MA* can produce metalinguistic negation, while *emes* and *žoq* cannot. See:

- (34a) *Murat aᅇgime žaz-ba-yan, öleᅇ žaz-yan.*
 Murat story write-NEG-PTCP3 poem write-PTCP3
 ‘Murat did not write a story; he wrote a poem.’
- (34b) **Murat aᅇgime žaz-yan emes, öleᅇ žaz-yan.*
 Murat story write-PTCP3 not poem write-PTCP3
- (34c) ?*Murat aᅇgime žaz-yan žoq, öleᅇ žaz-yan.*
 Murat story write-PTCP3 non-existent poem write-PTCP3
 ‘Murat did not write a story; he wrote a poem.’

As expected, only the expression in (34a) is grammatical and acceptable, since *-MA* can be used to express metalinguistic negation in addition to descriptive negation. Adding the negative particle *emes* to the construction makes the sentence grammatically incorrect, as shown in (34b). As in (33c), the expression in (34c) is grammatical but not generally accepted by the native speakers. Hence, the

negations *emes* and *žoq* tend to be used as descriptive negations, since they deny the truth of the propositional content and are truth-conditional.

In addition to the pragmatic nuances, there is a structural difference between the negative constructions *-MAGAn*, *-GAn emes* and *-GAn žoq*. If the construction is negated with the *-GAn žoq* form, either *-GAn* takes the possessive suffix, or *žoq* takes the personal ending to reflect the subject, with no difference in meaning, as shown in examples (26a, b) and (27a, b) in Section 2.3. In *-MAGAn* and *-GAn emes* constructions, however, personal endings only follow *-GAn* or *emes*. There is no possibility to add the personal or possessive suffix to other constituents, especially in the case of *-GAn emes* construction; i.e. the possessive suffix cannot be added to the participle *-GAn*, cf. (35a) and (35b).

(35a) **Men bul flim-di kör-me-gen-İM.*
I this movie-ACC see-NEG-PTCP-POSS1SG

(35b) **Men bul flim-di kör-gen-İM emes.*
I this movie-ACC see-PTCP-POSS1SG not

The second area where the negators are compatible with each other is finite predicates based on the prospective participle-maker *-AtIn/-ytIn*. Here, the verbal negation *-MA* and the negative particle *emes* can occur after the participle with distinguishable aspecto-temporal meanings. In particular, if such a clause is negated with *-MA*, the construction denotes a negative past habitual event that did not happen regularly in the past; see (36a). If, on the contrary, the negative particle *emes* occurs after the participle *-AtIn/-ytIn*, the construction indicates a negative prospective event that will not be the case in the future and that the subject is unable to perform a certain action for objective reasons, cf. (36b).

(36a) *Ol mayan sen-be-ytin.*
s/he I.DAT trust-NEG-PTCP3
'S/he used to not believe me.'

(36b) *Ol mayan sen-etin emes.*
s/he I.DAT trust-PTCP not
'S/he won't believe me.'

Finally, in non-verbal existence or copular clauses, the negators *emes* and *žoq* compete with each other. In such cases, the choice of the negative particle *emes* or the existential negation *žoq* is determined by the information structure of the given clause. If the topic of the clause is a locative-marked noun signalling location, the negative particle *emes* occurs in the predicative position. If, on the other hand, the topic is an unmarked noun that is modified by a locative-marked noun indicating location, the existential negation *žoq* should be chosen instead of *emes*. See:

(37a) *Kitap sömke-de emes.*
book bag-LOC not
'The book is not in the bag.'

(37b) *Sömke-de kitap žoq.*
bag-LOC book non-existent
'There is no book in the bag.'

However, the copular negation *žoq* can appear after a locative-marked noun to topicalise it. In this case, it is interchangeable with the negative particle *emes*, although they express different readings.

Pragmatically, the negative *emes* construction denies the affirmative presupposition *kitap üstel-de*, ‘the book is on the table’, as seen in (38a), whereas the negative construction *žoq* emphasises the absolute absence of the entity, i.e. *there was no book on the table*, rather than denying the proposition, as seen in (38b).

(38a) *Kitap üstel-de emes.*
 book table-LOC not
 ‘The book is not on the table [but may be somewhere else].’

(38b) *Kitap üstel-de žoq.*
 book table-LOC non-existent
 ‘There is no book on the table.’

3 Negation in coordinate clauses

In Kazakh, coordinate clauses are linked by conjunctions, for example: *DA* ‘and’, *äri* ‘and’ (additive); *ya/yäki/ne/nemese* ‘or’ (disjunctive); *sebebi* ‘reason’; *sondiqtan* ‘so’, *üytkeni* ‘because’ (causal or reason); *biraq* ‘but’; *degenmen* ‘but’; *alayda* ‘but’ (contrastive), etc., reflecting explicit additive, disjunctive, causal or contrastive relations. Because in coordination the two linked relations are independent with respect to the categorical status of the predicates, the predicates of the coordinate clauses can take independent negation. In example (39), the predicates of each coordinate clause bear the negative marker *-MA*, and the coordinative conjunction *DA* ‘and’ appears in the second pair of coordinate clauses to reinforce a reciprocal negative relation.

(39) *Men Murat-ti unat-pa-y-mın, ol da meni unat-pa-y-dı.*
 I Murat-ACC like-NEG-PRES-1SG he also I.ACC like-NEG-PRES-3
 ‘I don’t like Murat and he doesn’t like me either.’

Unlike the coordinate clause in (39), in discourse, when a speaker has uttered a negative sentence and another speaker agrees with the first speaker, then the second speaker’s utterance should be in the affirmative. The second speaker uses the coordinate conjunction *DA*. The constructed discourse between Asel and Anar in (40) illustrates this.

(40) Asel: *Men Murat-ti unat-pa-y-mın.*
 I Murat-ACC like-NEG-PRES-1SG
 ‘I don’t like Murat.’
 Anar: *Men de.*
 Me too
 ‘Me neither.’ Lit.: ‘Me too.’

In coordination, the scope of negation is restricted only to the clauses in which it is marked. Nevertheless, this section explores the disjunction *ne...ne/yä...yä* and double negations in coordinative clauses in order to show the differences between negations in simple and coordinate clauses.

3.1 The disjunction *ne...ne/yä...yä* ‘either...or’

In Kazakh, there is no so-called emphatic negative coordination which is “restricted to the position in the scope of negation” (cf. Haspelmath 2007: 17) and which functionally corresponds to the English particles *neither...nor*. On the contrary, such coordinative clauses must be negated independently with the help of the disjunctive *ne...ne*, ‘either...or’, or *yä...yä*, ‘either...or’. In other words, each verbal

predicate of the coordinate clauses takes the negation *-MA*, and the disjunctions *ne...ne* ‘or’ or *yä...yä* ‘or’ appear at the beginning of each clause to reinforce the negative reading, cf. Muhamedowa (2016: 66), Ótött-Kovács (2023: 22–28). From a functional point of view, the use of disjunctions is analogous to the use of indefinite pronouns, which only occur in negation. That is, when an indefinite pronoun occurs in a clause, the predicate must be in the negative form to reinforce the negative meaning, e.g. *eškim kel-me-di* <nobody come-NEG-PST3> ‘nobody came’, *ešteŋe žoq* <nothing non-existent> ‘nothing exists’. In examples (41a) and (41b), the disjunctive *ne...ne* appears in each clause. The independent predicates of both clauses in (41a) are in the affirmative form, whereas both predicates in (41b) take the negator *-MA*.

(41a) *Ne sen bar, ne men bar-ayın.*
 or you go.IMP2SG or I go-VOL1SG
 ‘Either you go, or I go.’

(41b) *Ne sen bar-ma-di-ŋ, ne men bar-ma-di-m.*
 or you go-NEG-PST-2SG or I go-NEG-PST-1SG
 ‘Neither you nor I go.’

A similar phenomenon is observed in Uyghur, where the disjunction *ne...ne* appears in each pair of coordinative clauses and each predicate is in the negative polarity. See:

(42) *Ne kündiz dem al-al-mi-di-m, ne kiči-si.* (Tömür 2003: 475)
 or day rest-ABIL-NEG-PST-1SG or night-POSS3
 ‘I could not rest during the day nor night.’

Interestingly, in Turkish, unlike Kazakh, the conjunction *ne...ne* functions as an emphatic negative coordination in its own right, without the negative operator on the predicate of each clause. This is because Turkish has preserved the original function of the Persian negative prefix *na* (نہ). Although both Kazakh and Uyghur *ne* derive from the same Persian element, it is integrated into the Turkic structure. The second clause can optionally be reinforced by using the particle *de* (for a detailed description, see Göksel and Kerslake 2006; Şener and İşsever 2003; Jeretić 2022).

3.2 Double negation in coordinative clauses

Double negative marking is possible in the predicates of the coordinated clauses. Specifically, the verbal predicates of preceding coordinated clauses can take the verbal negation *-MA*, while the negative particle *emes* follows the verbal predicate. Semantically, such coordinated clauses open up a new explanation, statement or argument for the following main clauses. In this combination, the speaker does not deny the proposition described in the non-main coordinated clause, but it is assumed that there is another reason for the listener’s misunderstanding (see also Zhang 2004: 261–262). It is noteworthy that in such a structure, the verbal inflections such as tense and personal markers are added to the verbal predicates of the coordinated non-main clauses, but not to the negative particle *emes*, cf. (43) and (44).

(43) *Men onıŋ ne ayt-qan-ı-n estı-me-di-m emes,*
 I s/he.GEN what say-PTCP-POSS3-ACC hear-NEG-PST-1SG not
žaqsi es-im-de qal-ma-p-ti.
 good memory-POSS1SG-LOC stay-NEG-EVID-3
 ‘It’s not that I didn’t hear what s/he said, it’s just that I didn’t quite remember.’

- (44) *Biz onı šaqır-ma-yan emes, šaqır-yan-biz, ol öz-i*
 we s/he.ACC invite-NEG-PTCP not invite-PTCP-1PL s/he self-POSS3
kel-me-di. (Zhang 2004: 262)
 come-NEG-PST3
 ‘It’s not that we didn’t invite him/her, we did; it’s just that s/he did not come.’

Moreover, in two non-verbal coordinate clauses, the existential negation *žoq* and the negative particle *emes* can co-occur in the predicates of coordinated non-main clauses, expressing a contrastive relation to the following main clause. In this double negative construction, the negative particle *emes* denies the absence of the entity expressed by *žoq*. In (45), *emes* denies the proposition *aqšam žoq* ‘I have no money’, and the main clause implies a new explanation or statement.

- (45) *Aqša-m žoq emes, al-yi-m kel-me-y tur.*
 money-POSS1SG non-existent not buy-PTCP-POSS1SG come-NEG-CONV stand.AUX.3
 ‘It’s not that I don’t have money, it’s just that I don’t want to buy [anything].’
 Lit.: ‘I am not without money; I don’t want to buy [anything].’

4 Negation in subordinate clauses

The negative polarity in subordinate clauses shares some similarities with that in declarative verbal clauses, but it differs in many ways from negation in main clauses. On the one hand, the verbal predicates of the subordinate clauses marked with the non-finite forms *-GAn*, *-AtIn//-ytIn*, *-Uw*, *-GAndA*, etc. are negated with the negator *-MA*, whereas some non-finite forms, e.g. *-MAKšI* and the nominal predicates, take the negators *emes* or *žoq*. On the other hand, in some subordinate clauses, especially adverbial clauses, the negation is very different from that of the main clauses due to the lack of one-to-one correspondence between the affirmative converb and its negative form. This lack of correspondence (also known as asymmetry) can be seen in both formal and semantic aspects of the subordinate clauses. Specifically, negation in subordinate clauses exhibits both formal and semantic asymmetry, lacking one-to-one structural and semantic correspondence between affirmatives and their negative counterparts (cf. Jumabay 2023)⁸. Negative marking of the dependent predicates of adverbial clauses is a main strategy for expressing certain adverbial relations; e.g. temporal posteriority clauses (*before*) are signalled by negative marking of their dependent predicates (see Jumabay 2022). In addition, certain subordinate clauses cannot be negated due to high or full nominalisation, e.g. the complement clauses based on verbal noun *-(I)s* (cf. Jumabay & Nevskaya 2021). This section aims to provide a functional overview of the negation in subordinate clauses.

4.1 Negation in complement and relative clauses

In Kazakh, complement clauses are mainly expressed with the participles *-GAn* and *-AtIn//-ytIn* and the verbal noun *-Uw*, and all forms take the verbal negator *-MA*. Relative clauses are mainly con-

⁸ Formal asymmetry of negation refers to structural or paradigmatic differences between the negated forms and the corresponding affirmative constructions. The formal asymmetries of negation in Kazakh subordination are seen in four different areas: (i) the absence of one-to-one paradigmatic or structural equivalence between the affirmative construction and its negative counterpart; (ii) the absence of affirmative forms; (iii) the absence of negative forms; (iv) the presence or absence of negation in a given non-finite form depending on usage. Semantic asymmetry of negation indicates that the negative clause is not always used only to deny the affirmative state of affairs; it can also receive new readings that cannot be expressed by its affirmative counterpart. It is observed that the affirmative construction and its corresponding negation can express (i) two different attitudes of the speaker towards the proposition expressed in the subordinate clauses, (ii) two different adverbial relations, or even (iii) identical semantics. For a detailed discussion, see Jumabay (2023).

structured with the participles *-GAn* and *-AtIn//ytIn* and precede the head noun that they modify. The main clauses and subordinate clauses can be negated separately, and the scope of negation is restricted to the clause that takes negative marking. In (46), the *-AtIn//ytIn*-based complement clause is in negative polarity, so it only negates the proposition in the given clause. Similarly, in sentence (47), the *-AtIn//ytIn*-based relative clauses *tüsin qoymaytın* and *sene qoymaytın* take the negator *-MA*. In both examples, the negative scope is limited to the propositions in the subordinate clauses.

- (46) *Žan-imiz-da žür-gen talay žan-di mülde*
 side-POSS1PL-LOC move-PTCP many person-ACC totally
tüsin-be-ytin-imiz-di key waqıyğa-lar-dan keyin yana
 understand-NEG-PTCP-POSS1PL-ACC some event-PL-ABL after only
sez-in-etin bol-di-m. (KZ CNR: 2023.09.19)
 feel-REF-PTCP COP-PST-1SG
 ‘It was only after some events [occurred] that I realised that we do not understand many people around us.’
- (47) *Qazaq äyel-der-i-niñ tiršilig-in-de tüsin-e*
 Kazakh woman-PL-POSS3-GEN life-POSS3-LOC understand-CONV
qoy-ma-ytın, sen-e de qoy-ma-ytın birneşe
 place.AUX-NEG-PTCP trust-CONV also place.AUX-NEG-PTCP a few
žäy-lar bar. (Müsirepov 2017: 327)
 situation-PL existent
 ‘There are a few things in Kazakh women’s life which you do not easily understand and even trust.’

As argued, *-MA* is an internal negative operator whose negative scope is restricted to the clause whose predicate is marked with *-MA*. In subordination, if the matrix predicate is negated, the scope of the negation cannot be extended to the subordinate clause, so that it solely negates the proposition described in the main clause, cf. (48) and (49).

- (48) *Är türlü qus-tar-dıñ mekende-w-i de tañ qal-ar-lıq*
 various bird-PL-GEN reside-VN-POSS3 also surprise-AOR-DER
emes. (Žanbolatov 2008: 65)
 not
 ‘It is also not surprising that various birds reside.’
- (49) *Ne bol-ıp žat-qan-ı-n kör-ıp bil-ıp*
 what become-CONV lie.AUX-PTCP-POSS3-ACC see-CONV know-CONV
žat-sa-m da ün šiyar-a al-ar
 lie.AUX-COND-1SG PTCL sound go.out-CONV take.AUX-AOR
emes-pin. (Müsirepov 2017: 314)
 not-1SG
 ‘I cannot make a sound even though I see and know what is happening.’

When the complement clauses contain nominal constituents, they should be negated with the negative particle *emes* or the existential negation *žoq*. In this case, the negators *emes* and *žoq* are either followed by the suffix *-LIK*, possessive and case markers, or they are supported by the non-finite

copular verb *eken*,⁹ which takes the nominal inflections. In example (50), the negative complement clause is negated by the negative particle *emes*, which takes the suffix *-LIK*¹⁰, possessive and accusative case. The negative complement clause in (51) can be negated with *žoq*, which takes nominal suffixes, or alternatively it can be supported by the copular verb *eken*, denoting absolute absence¹¹. Both expressions are acceptable.

- (50) *Aqša tab-uw oñay emes-tig-i-n bil-e-miz.*
 money find-VN easy not-LIK-POSS3-ACC tell-PRES-1PL
 ‘We know that earning money is not easy.’

- (51) *Bala-m žoq-tiy-ï-n / žoq eken-(dig)i-n*
 child-POSS1SG non-existent-LIK-POSS3-ACC / non-existent COP-(LIK)-POSS3-ACC
ayt-ti-m.
 say-PST-1SG
 ‘I said that I do not have a child.’

In addition, complement clauses built with the verbal noun *-MAKŠI* should be negated with the negative particle *emes*, which takes the nominal inflections. See:

- (52) *Biz-ge qastïq žasa-maqšï emes-tig-i-n bildir-di.*
 we-DAT harm make-VN not-LIK-POSS3-ACC express-PST3
 ‘S/he implied that s/he does not intend to harm us.’

4.2 Negative raising in complementation and interrogative complementation

Negative raising (Noonan 1985), also known as negative transportation (Horn 1978), is the raising of the negation from a complement clause to the matrix clause with which it is logically associated. According to Noonan (1985: 101), negative raising occurs only with a limited number of matrix predicates, such as predicates of propositional attitude, desideration, and modality. In Kazakh, negative raising is observed with a restricted number of matrix predicates, where moving the negation from the complement predicate to the matrix predicate results in the same meaning without changing the truth-value of the given propositions. See:

- (53a) *Men onïñ žalyan ayt-pa-yan-ïn-a sen-e-min.*
 I s/he.GEN false tell-NEG-PTCP-POSS3-DAT believe-PRES-1SG
 ‘I believe that s/he did not lie.’

- (53b) *Men onïñ žalyan ayt-qan-ïn-a sen-be-y-min.*
 I s/he.GEN false tell-PTCP-POSS3-DAT believe-NEG-PRES-1SG
 ‘I don’t believe that s/he lied.’

Dependent verbal predicates that comprise affirmative and negative counterparts of a single verb can produce interrogative complement clauses. The non-verbal predicates, on the other hand, combine the existential negatives *bar* ‘existent’ and *žoq* ‘non-existent’ to denote interrogative comple-

⁹ The copular verb *eken* consists of the copular verb *e-* ‘to be’ and the participle marker *-ken*, which is often used in nominal complement clauses.

¹⁰ For a detailed description of the suffix *-LIK* in Kazakh and Uyghur, see Jumabay and Nevskaya 2022.

¹¹ The topic of existence and possession in subordination in Turkic languages has been investigated by Karakoç 2017.

mentation. The non-finite operators are attached to the negative marker *-MA* in the former case, cf. (54), or to *žoq* in the latter case, cf. (55).

- (54) *Oniñ bar-yan bar-ma-yan-i belgisiz.*
 s/he.GEN go-PTCP go-NEG-PTCP-POSS3 uncertain
 ‘It is uncertain whether s/he has gone.’
- (55) *Üy-de bar žoy-ï-n bil-me-y-min.*
 house-LOC existent non-existent-POSS3-ACC know-NEG-PRES-1SG
 ‘I don’t know if s/he is at home.’

4.3 Negation in adverbial clauses

Negation in adverbial clauses is an complicated matter due to the manifestation of paradigmatic or structural asymmetry. Some converbs have no clear one-to-one correspondence between affirmatives and their negative equivalents. Formally, the converb *-MAy* is the negation of both converbs *-(I)p* and *-A//y*. Some negative converbs, e.g. *-MAyInšA*, have no affirmative equivalent. Semantically, negative marking on the dependent predicates of adverbial clauses is the main way of expressing certain adverbial relations, e.g. temporal posteriority clauses. Moreover, the affirmative and negative counterparts of some converbs may indicate different adverbial meanings (see Jumabay 2023).

Adverbial clauses based on secondary converbs consisting of participles, verbal nouns, case markers and/or postpositions, e.g. *-GAndA*, *-Uw üšin* ‘for’, *-GAnnAn keyin* ‘after’, *-GAll*, and the conditional converb *-sA* should be negated with the bound morpheme *-MA*, see (56). The nominal dependent predicates of adverbial clauses are negated with the negative particle *emes* or existential negation *žoq*, as (57) illustrates.

- (56) *Sal bol-ïp qal-yan adam dene müše-si-n*
 paralyzed COP-CONV remain.AUX-PTCP person body organ-POSS3-ACC
sat-pa-sa da bari bir öl-er-i xaq. (Ili News: 23.03.2017)¹²
 sell-NEG-COND3 PTCL whatever die-AOR-POSS3 true
 ‘It is true that a paralysed person will still die, even if he does not sell an organ.’
- (57) *Bala-m žoq-ta sayan ayt-a al-ma-y*
 child-POSS1SG non-existent-LOC you.DAT tell-CONV take.AUX-NEG-CONV
žür-gen bir söz-im bar e-di, soni
 move.AUX-PTCP one word-POSS1SG existent COP-PST3 that.ACC
ayt-ayin. (KZ CNR: 2023.08.17)
 tell-VOL1SG
 ‘I have something that I could not tell you; when my son is not here, let me tell you that.’

Regarding the asymmetrical primary converbs, the affirmative converbs *-(I)p* and *-A//y* and their negative equivalent *-MAy* can denote different adverbial relations. The adverbial relations of simultaneity (‘when’, ‘while’), anteriority (‘after’), causality (‘because’), concession (‘although’, ‘even if’), manner (‘by’, ‘by means of’), instrumentality (‘with’) and concomitance (‘having done’) can be expressed by the converb *-(I)p*.¹³ The converb marker *-A//y* is used for predications of adverbial rela-

¹² A Kazakh newspaper that is published in China, official website link: <http://kazakh.ylxw.com.cn>

¹³ In this paper, adverbial clauses are divided into 18 sub-types following Kortmann (1997: 84–89): Simultaneity overlaps ‘when’, ‘while’; Anteriority ‘after’; Posteriority ‘before’; Immediate Anteriority ‘as soon as’; Abtemporality ‘since’; Termination ‘until’; Concession ‘although’, ‘even if’; Conditionality ‘if’; Negative conditionality ‘if not’; Causality ‘because’; Contrast ‘whereas’; Purpose ‘in order to’; Manner ‘by’; Instrumentality ‘with’; Addition ‘be-

tions of immediate anteriority ('as soon as'), manner ('by', 'by means of'), and instrumentality ('with'). The dependent predicates of clauses of posteriority ('before'), termination ('until'), causality ('because'), negative conditionality ('if not', 'unless'), substitution ('instead of') and negative concomitance ('without doing') can be coded with the negative converb *-MAy*.¹⁴

- (58) *Üy-di sat-ïp, bina al-ïp ber-se-k*
 house-ACC sell-CONV building buy-CONV give.AUX-COND-1PL
bol-di emes pe! (KZ CNR: 2023.08.17)
 COP-PST3 not Q
 'Shouldn't we buy a building [a new house] for him/her by selling the [old] house?'
- (59) *Muyalim kel-e sabaq basta-l-di.*
 teacher come-CONV class start-PASS-PST3
 'As soon as the teacher came, the class was begun.'
- (60) *Aldin-ala töle-ytin aqşa-si bol-ma-y mayan*
 in advance pay-PTCP money-POSS3 COP-NEG-CONV I.DAT
telefon žalya-p-ti. (KZ CNR: 2023.08.17)
 phone connect-EVID-3
 'Apparently, s/he has contacted me because s/he does not have money to pay up front.'

In (58), the adverbial clauses based on *-(I)p, üydi satïp* 'by selling', indicate a relation of manner. The adverbial clause *muyalim kele*, 'as soon as the teacher came' in (59) expresses immediate anteriority, whereas the adverbial clause *aqşasi bolmay*, 'because of not having money', in (60), which is expressed with the negative converb *-MAy*, denotes causality.

Adverbial clauses constructed with the negative converb form *-MAyInšA*¹⁵ have no affirmative equivalents, and dependent predicates based on them can indicate negative conditional meaning, as (61) shows. The negative converb *-MAstAn*, which comprises the negative aorist *-MA*s and the ablative case *-DAn*, appears in dependent predicates of adverbial clauses to convey relations of temporal posteriority or negative concomitance, as seen in (62).

- (61) *Oyïn ayaqta-l-mayinša ket-pe-y-miz.*
 game finish-PASS-NEG.CONV leave-NEG-PRES-1PL
 'We won't leave unless the game is over.'
- (62) *Esik-ten kir-mesten Maldibay-di bas sal-ïp quşaqta-p*
 door-ABL enter-NEG.CONV Maldibay-ACC start-CONV hug-CONV
žila-p žiber-di. (KZ CNR: 2023.08.17)
 cry-CONV send.AUX-PST3
 'Without/before entering the door, s/he threw her/himself into Maldibay, hugged him and burst into tears.'

sides', 'in addition to'; Substitution 'instead of', 'rather than'; Concomitance 'having done'; and Negative concomitance 'without'.

14 For a detailed study of the morpho-syntactic marking of adverbial clauses in Kazakh, see Jumabay (2022).

15 The etymology of the suffix *-MAyInšA* is still unknown. According to Johanson (2021: 754), most modern Turkic languages use the converb forms *-MAyIn* and *-MAy* to negate the converbs *-(I)p* and *-A/-y*, of which, *-MAyIn* and *-MAy* correspond to the Old Turkic negative converb *-MAyIn* or *-MAyin*, which is probably the negation of the Old Turkic converb marker *-IyIn* (this is found in East Old Turkic, e.g. *bul-u-yin* 'being', *käl-iyin* 'coming'). He further notes that the Old Turkic negative form *-MAyIn* is extended to *-MAyInčA* in some Turkic languages containing the equative marker *-čA*, e.g. Tatar *-mIyčA*, Bashkir *-mAyInšA*, Kazakh *-MAyInšA*.

In most cases, the scope of negation in adverbial subordination is limited to the clause containing the negator. For example, in most adverbial clauses whose dependent predicates are marked by the converb *-(I)p*, the negative scope of the main predicates cannot be extended to the adverbial clauses. The negative scope of *-(I)p*-based clauses is described in detail in Section 5.1.

The adverbial additive relation in the sense of ‘*not only...but also*’, which connects two balanced parallelisms, is expressed by the combination of the particle *yana* ‘only’ and the negative particle *emes* ‘not’. In other words, the particles *yana* and *emes* follow the dependent predicate of an additive clause, although its predicate is a nominal constituent or a non-finite verbal constituent. The particle *DA* appears in the main clause to reinforce the additive relation. See:

- (63) *Biz köbinde basqa-ni yana emes, öz tuw-yan*
 we often other-ACC PTCL not self birth-PTCP
urpay-imiz-di da duris tüsin-e
 generation-POSS1PL-ACC PTCL right understand-CONV
ber-me-y-miz. (KZ CNR: 2023.03.15)
 give.AUX-NEG-PRES-1PL
 ‘We often not only misunderstand others, but also our own generation.’
- (64) *Men kitap oq-uw-di yana emes, ölen žaz-uw-di*
 I book read-VN-ACC PTCL not poem write-VN-ACC
da unat-a-mın.
 PTCL like-PRES-1SG
 ‘I like not only reading books, but also writing poetry.’

In (63), the additive clause whose predicate is an accusative-marked noun *basqa-ni*, ‘the other’ is followed by the particles *yana* and *emes*. In example (64), the predicate of the additive clause *oquwdi*, where the verb contains the verbal noun *-Uw* and the accusative case, is similarly postposed by the particles *yana* and *emes*. In both cases, the particle *DA* appears in the main clause to support the additive relation.

The negative particle *tügil* ‘not only...but’, which is extremely productive in some Kipchak languages (e.g. Noghay *tuwil* ‘not’, Bashkir *tügil* ‘not’) and functionally corresponds to Kazakh *emes* ‘not’, is restricted in Kazakh. It is used only to contrast or compare two states of affairs in terms of their degree of improbability, similar to English ‘let alone’. Specifically, the negative particle *tügil* occurs in predicates of the adverbial relation to emphasise the negativity of the proposition involving the subordinate clause by comparing it with the negativity of the subsequent event described in the main clause, which is regarded as intrinsically more realisable or easier to realise. In other words, *tügil* appears in the predicate of the adverbial clause, which is considered less likely to be actualised. The main clause event, which is more likely to be realised, follows the adverbial clause. The verbal predicates of adverbial clauses are based on the verbal nouns *-Uw* or *-MAk*, to which *tügil* is attached. Moreover, the predicates of main clauses tend to be in the negative. The evidence for this is given in the following examples.

- (65) *Semiya-si-n bay-uw tügil, öz-i-n bay-a*
 family-POSS3-ACC feed-VN not self-POSS3-ACC feed-CONV
al-ma-y žür.
 take.AUX-NEG-CONV move.AUX3
 ‘S/he can barely feed her/himself, let alone her/his family.’

- (66) *Televizor kör-mek tügil, tamaq iş-üw-ge waqit-im žoq.*
 TV watch-VN not food eat-VN-DAT time-POSS1SG non-existent
 ‘I don’t have time to eat, let alone watch TV.’

In addition, *tügil* can negate a nominal predicate of coordinated clauses, expressing the meaning ‘let alone’. See:

- (67) *Endi soniñ bär-i tügil bir-i awz-ım-a*
 now that.GEN all-POSS3 not one-POSS3 mouth-POSS1SG-DAT
tüs-pe-y otir. (Müsirepov 2017: 166)
 fall-NEG-CONV sit.AUX3
 ‘Now one of the words is not coming out of my mouth, let alone all of them.’

In spoken language, the negative particle *emes* can replace *tügil* to negate a nominal predicate, expressing the notion ‘let alone’ or ‘not to mention’. In this construction, the second clause is a concessive clause (cf. Zhang 2004: 656).

- (68) *Sen emes, patiša kel-se de qoriq-pa-y-miz.* (Zhang 2004: 656).
 you not king come-COND3 PTCL fear-NEG-PRES-1PL
 ‘We are not afraid of the king even if he comes, not to mention you.’

5 Negation in clause chaining

Apart from coordination and subordination, Kazakh distinguishes a third type of clause linkage: clause chaining. Clause chaining occurs when a clause is dependent on the main clause but not embedded in it, and several juxtaposed verbs are linked together in a sequence. In such types of linked clauses, only the final verbs are capable of taking finite verb categories, while juxtaposed verbs or medial verbs are non-finite, based on the converb marker *-(I)p*, and dependent on the final verb. Semantically, chained clauses present roughly analogous events or a linear succession, and they are often performed by a single agent (subject). See:

- (69) *Ol ot žay-ıp, šäy qaynat-ıp, tanyı as-ti dayında-di.*
 s/he fire light-CONV tea boil-CONV breakfast-ACC prepare-PST3
 ‘S/he lit the fire, made the tea and prepared the breakfast.’

According to Johanson (2021: 953), periodic chain sentences combined by the serial converb *-(I)p* are ideal for narrating thematically related events to avoid repetition of the subject, and thus, in writing, a single chained sentence can produce a whole paragraph. Alternatively, it can be broken up into several short sentences. The choice is one of style. It should be noted that in clause combining, the converb *-(I)p* covers a wide range of functions from the minimum level of combining two verbs to the maximum level of linking two sentences.¹⁶

In chain clauses, the formal marking of the negation does not always correspond to its semantic scope. In periodic chain clauses, the negation on the final head predicates can generally extend the scope of the negation to every member of the chain. In examples (70), (71) and (72), where the periodic chain clauses represent thematically equivalent events, the negation is attached to the final predicate, and its semantic scope extends to each linked predication. Although the preceding predicates are in the positive *-(I)p* form, they should be interpreted as negative.

¹⁶ For a detailed discussion of the functions and levels of converb *-(I)p* in Turkic languages, see Johanson 1995.

- (70) *Äke-m biz-ge ašuwlan-ïp, uris-ip kör-gen emes.*
 father-POSS1SG we-DAT be.angry-CONV scold-CONV see.AUX-PTCP not
 ‘My father never lost his temper with us and never scolded us.’
- (71) *Eñ žaqsi qasıyet-i eškım-men töbeles-ip,*
 most good quality-POSS3 nobody-INS fight-CONV
söz-ge kel-me-ytin-i e-di. (Ótott-Kovács 2015: 94)
 word-DAT come-NEG-PTCP-POSS3 COP-PST3
 ‘His/her best quality was that s/he would not fight or (would not) argue with anyone.’
- (72) *Asan sayan bol-a kel-ip, män-žäy-di*
 Asan you.DAT COP-CONV come-CONV situation-ACC
tüsindir-ip otır-ma-y-dı.
 explain-CONV sit.AUX-NEG-PRES-3
 ‘Asan would not come just for you and explain the situation.’

However, as stated above, in an adverbial subordination whose dependent predicate is constructed with the converb *-(I)p*, the scope of the negation is limited to the clauses that take the negator. In (73), the negative marker *-MA* appears in the independent predicate, so it only negates the proposition in the main clause. The action *Maldıbaydıñ betine qarap* ‘looking at Maldıbay’s face’ in the adverbial relation has actually taken place. A similar phenomenon, that the formal marking and its semantic scope of negation in subordination and clause chaining differ from each other, is also noted by Ótott-Kovács (2015: 92–97).

- (73) *Šämši šeše-y Maldıbay-dıñ bet-in-e qara-p ne*
 Shamshi mother-HON Maldıbay-GEN face-POSS3-DAT look-CONV what
de-r-i-n bil-me-di. (KZ CNR: 2023.08.17)
 say-AOR-POSS3-ACC know-NEG-PST3
 ‘Looking at Maldıbay’s face, Mother Šämši did not know what to say.’

Regarding the question of how to distinguish chain clauses from subordinate clauses whose dependent predicates are constructed with *-(I)p*, it can be done by looking at the pragmatic and linguistic context of the linked clauses. Pragmatically, a chain clause reports semantically related events or successive events, and thus provides new information. Adverbial subordination, on the other hand, identifies the various circumstances of the main clause and is a constituent of the main clause itself, so it provides background information about the main clause of which it is a part.

Furthermore, if there is a contrastive relation between two clauses linked by *-(I)p*, where the states of affairs described in the two clauses are semantically incompatible, the scope of the negation is narrowed to the main clause, cf. (74) and (75).

- (74) *Men onı izde-p tap-pa-dı-m.*
 I s/he.ACC search-CONV find-NEG-PST-1SG
 ‘I looked for him/her, but/and I couldn’t find [him/her].’
- (75) *Ol Astana-ya bar-ip Almatı-ya bar-ma-p-tı.*
 s/he Astana-DAT go-CONV Almaty-DAT go-NEG-EVID-3
 ‘Apparently, s/he went to Astana, but s/he did not go to Almaty.’

In clause chaining, if the main predicate is in the positive polarity, the non-finite predicates of the chain clauses should be negated separately by means of the negative converb *-MAy* in order to report negative sequences of simultaneous events, cf. (76).

- (76) *Qašan kör-se-ŋ žügir-is-i-nen tan-ba-y, žeke dara tiršilik*
 when see-COND-2SG run-VN-POSS3-ABL change-NEG-CONV individual life
kör-üw nisay-ï-nan žaz-ba-y, öz meken-i-nen atta-p
 see-VN goal-POSS3-ABL miss-NEG-CONV self place-POSS3-ABL step-CONV
aw-ma-y, urpaq žalya-p kel-e-di. (KZ CNR: 2023.01.29)
 collapse-NEG-CONV generation continue-CONV come.AUX-PRES-3
 ‘Whenever you see it, it does not change its move, it does not go beyond the goal of its independent existence, it does not leave its own homeland, it continues from generation to generation.’

However, the above-mentioned rules for having wide or narrow scopes of negation are not applicable to certain cases of clause chaining where the scope of negation is ambiguous, so that the clause may contain fuzzy meanings, for example:

- (77a) *Žel soy-ïp žawïn žaw-ma-dï.*
 wind blow-CONV rain fall-NEG-PST3
 i. ‘The wind didn’t blow and the rain didn’t fall.’
 ii. ‘The wind blew, but/and the rain did not fall.’

There are two ways to disambiguate this construction. First, by inserting the contrastive conjunction *biraq* ‘but’ after the non-finite predicate *soyïp*, ‘blowing’, one can disambiguate the negative scope; i.e. the scope of the negation remains with the main predicate *žawmadi*, ‘did not fall’, as (77b) shows. Secondly, the distinction can be made by accentuation. If the scope of the negation is restricted to the main clause, the last syllable of the medial verb *soyïp*, ‘blowing’, should be accompanied by a high pitch, followed by a short pause. If the negative scope extends to the chain clause, there is no significant high pitch on the medial verb *soyïp*, ‘blowing’, nor is there a pause.

- (77b) *Žel soy-ïp biraq žawïn žaw-ma-dï.*
 wind blow-CONV but rain fall-NEG-PST3
 ‘The wind blew, but the rain did not fall.’

Finally, it should be noted that adverbial manner clauses constructed with the converbs *-A//y* or *-(I)p* can have conjunct negative scope. That is, the scope of the negative marking on the main predicate can extend over both the main and the manner clause (about the distinction between depictive secondary predicates and adverbials of manner, see Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt 2005). See:

- (78a) *Ol aqsanġa-p/-y kel-di.*
 s/he limp-CONV come-PST3
 ‘S/he came limping.’
- (78b) *Ol aqsanġa-p/-y kel-me-di.*
 s/he limp-CONV come-PST3
 ‘S/he did not come limping.’

6 Conclusions

The main goal of this paper has been to examine the function of negation in complex sentences that contain more than one clause. In clause combining by means of coordination, subordination and medial-verb chaining, negation can be formally marked in all linked clauses to deny the proposition described in the given clauses. However, certain types of subordinate clauses, e.g. complement clauses based on the verbal noun marker *-(I)s*, cannot be negated independently due to their full nominalisation.

Standard negation, i.e. the negation of declarative verbal clauses, is expressed by the bound morpheme *-MA*. Non-verbal clauses, on the other hand, are negated either with the negative particle *emes*, or with the existential negation *žoq*. The distinction between these two nominal negatives should be understood in terms of semantics. Specifically, *emes* denies the truth-value of the proposition, whereas *žoq* highlights the absolute absence of what is presupposed rather than negating it. Furthermore, compared to the existential negation *žoq*, the negative particle *emes* has a wide range of uses and functions. For example, *emes* can occur with various nominalised verb forms expressing distinguishable semantics, whereas *žoq* is only compatible with the participle marker *-GAn*. Detailed functional descriptions of these two negative copulas in discourse are provided in Sections 2.2 and 2.3.

It has been noted in the paper that certain nominalised verb forms can be negated with more than one form in the independent predicative position. In particular, some of the nominalised forms, e.g. the prospective participle *-AtIn// -ytIn* and the aorist *-(A)r*, can take the negatives *-MA* and *emes*, while the perfect participle form *-GAn* can take all three negators, *-MA*, *emes* and *žoq*. The distinctions between them depend on the pragmatic content of the negated clauses. The bound negator *-MA* can be considered an internal negation and is characterised as a weak denial, so it can be cancelled. The negative particle *emes*, on the other hand, indicates a strong negation, signalling that the described action has not yet been performed. When the nominalised verb form is negated with the existential negation *žoq*, the clause conveys absolute non-existence, emphasising the non-presence of the proposition without any further reference to its possible presence or existence in other situations. It is also noted that *-MA* can be used as a metalinguistic negation, whereas *žoq* and *emes* are descriptive negations.

Concerning the nominalised verb forms, the perfect participle marker *-GAn* is more flexible than other participles and aorist markers, taking all three negators in the finite predicate position. Other nominalised forms, e.g. *-AtIn// -ytIn*, *-MAK* and *-(A)r*, however, are incapable of taking all three negators, and they take only one or at most two negators.

All coordinate clauses where the combined units are of equal rank can be negated separately and take different negators depending on the categorical status of the predications. Kazakh does not have an emphatic negative coordination that functionally corresponds to the English *neither...nor* conjunction. On the contrary, in Kazakh, each combined clause must be negated independently and the disjunction *ne...ne*, 'either...or', appears in each clause to reinforce the negative meaning. The use of double negation in coordinative clauses to express an adversative relation is a very special phenomenon. Of these two forms, either the verbal negator *-MA* and the negative particle *emes* can occur together, or the copulas *emes* and *žoq* can co-occur. Such a phenomenon does not exist in simple declarative sentences.

Two clauses linked by subordination can be negated separately, and the scope of the negation is limited to the clause in which it is marked. In contrast to the independent predicate position, where the nominalised verb forms can take two or three negatives, the relative and complement clauses constructed with the nominalised forms *-GAn*, *-AtIn// -ytIn*, *-Uw*, etc. only take the verbal negator *-MA*. Complement clauses whose dependent predicate is a nominal constituent can take *emes* or *žoq*, to which the suffix *-LIK* and the nominal suffixes are attached. Negative raising is observed in complement clauses, where the negation can be raised from a complement clause to its matrix clause, ex-

pressing a logically equivalent meaning. However, this phenomenon is restricted to a certain set of matrix predicates. Negation in adverbial clauses is a complex issue because there is no one-to-one correspondence between the affirmative converb and its negative counterpart, e.g. the affirmative converbs *-(I)p* and *-A//y* and their shared negation *-MAy*. Certain negative converbs, e.g. *-MAyInšA*, have no affirmative equivalent. More importantly, negative marking on the dependent predicates of adverbial clauses is a main strategy for indicating certain adverbial relations. This sort of negative marking is determined by the realisation and non-realisation distinctions in the state of affairs described in the adverbial clauses. For instance, temporal posterity clauses ('before') and negative conditional clauses ('unless') are expressed with the negative converbs *-MAy* and *-MAyInšA*. Moreover, the negative particle *emes* follows certain non-finite verbal predicates to express adverbial relations.

The scope of negation of chain clauses marked by the converb *-(I)p* is an intriguing object of investigation. Such negations tend to have a wide scope; i.e. the scope of negation of the final predicate can be extended to each linked member, whereas adverbial clauses whose dependent predicate is based on *-(I)p* tend to have a narrow negative scope, limited to the main clauses. As a result, negation has a wide scope in clause chaining, but in subordination the scope of negation is narrowed to the main clause.

To sum up, negation in clause combining differs from negation in simple declarative sentences, which can be summarised as follows:

- Double negation in coordination and the use of negation with both coordinated predicates with the help of some conjunctions are not applicable to simple declarative sentences;
- The participle markers *-GAn* and *-AtIn//yIn* can only be negated with *-MA* in subordinate clauses; however, they can be negated in various ways in simple declarative sentences;
- The inability of some subordinate clauses to take negation is different from that of the simple declarative sentence;
- Negative marking of the predicates of adverbial clauses is a major strategy for expressing the adverbial relation between dependent and independent clauses, unlike in simple declarative sentences, where negation is used to express logical denial;
- Negation in subordinate clauses exhibits formal and semantic asymmetries, and lacks one-to-one structural and semantic correspondences between affirmatives and their negative counterparts, which is sometimes not the case in simple declarative sentences;
- In clause chaining, negation tends to be marked on the final verb with a wide negative scope.

Abbreviations

1	first person	INS	instrumental case
2	second person	NEG	negation
3	third person	NEG.CONV	negative converb
ABL	ablative	PASS	passive
ACC	accusative	PL	plural
AOR	aoist	POSS	possessive
AUX	auxiliary verb	PRES	present tense
CONV	converb	PST	past tense
COP	copular	PTCL	particle
DAT	dative	PTCP	participle
DER	derivational suffix	REF	reflexive suffix
GEN	genitive	SG	singular
HON	honorific suffix	VN	verbal noun

References

- Bond, Oliver 2011. Negation in clause linkages. *Language Documentation and Description* 9, 77–120.
- Dahl, Östen 1979. Typology of sentence negation. *Linguistics* 17, 79–106.
- Dahl Östen 2010. Typology of negation. Horn, Laurence (ed.) *The expression of negation*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 9–38.
- Emeksiz, Zeynep 2010. Negation in Turkish. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları* 2, 2010. 45–56.
- Erdal, Marcel 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden. Boston: Brill.
- Foley, William and Van Valin, Robert. D 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frawley, William 1992. *Linguistic Semantics*. Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Geng, Shimin 耿氏民 1989. 'Xiàndài hāsākè yǔ yǔfǎ' 现代哈萨克语语法 [Modern Kazakh grammar]. Beijing: Zhongyang minzu daxue chubanshe 中央民族大学出版社.
- Givón, Talmy 2001. *Syntax 1. An Introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Göksel, Asli & Kerslake, Celia 2006. *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Himmelmänn, Nikolaus P. and Schultze-Berndt, Eva 2005. *Secondary predication and adverbial modification: the typology of depictives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin 2007. Coordination. In: Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description 2. Complex constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1–51.
- Horn, Laurence. 1978. Remarks on neg-raising. In: Peter Cole (ed.) *Syntax and semantics*, Vol. 9: *Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press. 129–220
- Horn, Laurence R 2001 [1989]. *A natural history of negation*. Stanford: CSLI publication.
- Jeretič, Paloma 2022. Exceptionally optional negative concord with Turkish neither... nor. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 2022, 41. 1147–1200.
- Johanson, Lars 1995. Johanson, Lars 1995. On Turkic converb clauses. In: Haspelmath, Martin & König, Ekkehard (eds.) *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective. Structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms—adverbial participles, gerunds*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 313–347.
- Johanson, Lars 2021. *Turkic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johanson, Lars and Csató, Éva Á. 2022. *The Turkic languages*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jumabay, Uldanay 2022. *Clause combining strategies in Kazakh as spoken in China in comparative perspectives*. PhD dissertation. Frankfurt: Goethe-Universität Frankfurt.
- Jumabay, Uldanay 2023. *The formal and semantic asymmetry of negation in Kazakh subordinate clauses*. A talk given at the 21st International Conferences on Turkic Linguistics, August 2–4, 2023. Mainz: Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz.
- Jumabay, Uldanay and Nevskaya, Irina 2021. Functional interpretation of the verbal noun marker -(l²)s in Kazakh. A talk given at the 20th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 2–4. Eskişehir, 2021.
- Jumabay, Uldanay & Nevskaya, Irina 2022. Functional interpretation of the suffix {-L³l²K} in complement clauses in Kazakh in comparative perspectives with Uyghur. In: Korkmaz, Feryal (ed.) *9. Milletlerarası Türkoloji Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı*. Istanbul: Istanbul University.
- Karakoç, Birsal 2017. Subordination of existence and possessive clauses in Oghuz and Kipchak Turkic languages. *Turkic Languages* 21, 199–233.
- KG = Қазақ грамматикасы [Kazakh grammar] 2002. Астана: Қазақстан республикасы білім және ғылым министрлігі & А. Байтұрсынұлы атындағы тіл білімі институты [Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan & Ahmet Baytursunuli Language Institute].
- Kortmann, Bernd. 1997. *Adverbial Subordination: A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages*. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Маманов, Ыбрауым Маманов Ыбырайым 2007. *Қазақ тіл білімінің мәселелері* [Problems in Kazakh linguistics]. Almaty: Арыс баспасы [Aris Publishing House].
- Muhamedowa, Raihan 2016. *Kazakh: A comprehensive grammar*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Kortmann, Bernd. 1997. *Adverbial Subordination: A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages*. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Miestamo, Matti 2005. *Standard negation: The negation of declarative verbal main clauses in typological perspective*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Миқанов, Сәбит Мұқанов Сәбит 2014 [1938]. *Ботарғөз* [Botagöz]. Beijing: Ұлттар баспасы [Ethnic Publishing House].
- Müsirepov, Gabit Мүсірепов Ғабит 2017 [1950]. *Қазақ солдаты* [the Kazakh soldier]. Beijing: Ұлттар баспасы [Ethnic Publishing House].
- Noonan, Michael 1985. Complementation. In: Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 52–150.
- Ótött-Kovács, Eszter 2015. *The syntax of non-finite clauses in Kazakh*. PhD dissertation. Szeged: University of Szeged.
- Ótött-Kovács, Eszter 2023. *Differential subject marking in Kazakh*. PhD dissertation. New York: Cornell University.
- Payne, J. R. 1985. Negation. In: Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description*, Vol. 1 (*Clause structure*). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 197–242.
- Şener, Serkan and İşsever, Selçuk 2003. The interaction of negation with focus: *ne...ne...* phrases in Turkish. *Lingua* 113 (11), 1089–1117.

- Tömür, Hämit 2003. *Modern Uyghur Grammar Morphology*. Istanbul: Yıldız.
- Van der Auwera, Johan & Krannoukhova, Olga 2020. The typology of negation. In: Déprez, Viviane & Espinal, Teresa (eds.) *The Oxford handbook of negation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 91–116.
- Veselinova, Ljuba 2013. Negation in Existential Sentences: A Cross-Linguistic Study. In: Delia Bentley and Francesco Maria Ciconte and Silvio Cruschina (eds.) [Special issue] *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 25(1),107–145.
- Zhang, Dingjing 张定京 2004. 'Xiàndài hāsàkè yǔ shíyòng yǔfǎ' 现代哈萨克语实用语法 [A practical grammar of Modern Kazakh]. Beijing: Zhongyang minzu daxue chubanshe 中央民族大学出版社.
- Žanbolatov Sultan Жанболатов Сұлтан 2008. *Біз [We]*. Beijing: Ұлттар баспасы [Ethnic Publishing House].