

Linguistic Means of Negation in Kartvelian Languages

Ramaz Kurdadze

*Full Professor, Head of the Institute of Georgian
Language at the Faculty of Humanities, TSU*

Darejan Tvaltvadze

Full Professor, Institute of Georgian Language, TSU

Maia Lomia

Associate Professor, TSU

Ketevan Margiani-Subari

Associate Professor, TSU

Rusudan Zekalashvili¹

Associate Professor, TSU

Abstract: This article is dedicated to one of the topical issues of linguistics –the means of linguistic expression of negation in the Kartvelian (Georgian, Megrelian, Laz, and Svan) languages. This type of research, from the typological point of view, is conducted for the first time; based on the data taken from old and modern Georgian and unwritten Kartvelian languages grammatical models of negative pronouns and adverbs are singled out and analysed with particular emphasis on the expression of the double negation and normalisation issues related to it in the modern literary (standard) Georgian language. The empirical material of the corpus-based and printed texts is processed in the diachronic and synchronic contexts, employing descriptive-statistical, historical and comparative methods. Frequency of the use of

¹Under the lead of the research worker staff of the Georgian Language Institute, the students of the different stages of the programme “Kartvelian Linguistics”, listed below, participated in the project: Maia Maduashvili, Nino Kiburia, Maguli Ghambashidze, Elene Kadagishvili, Tamar Chankseliani and Giorgi Jgharkava.

linguistic means expressing negation is also estimated. By comparison and collation of the research results, common Kartvelian consistent patterns and the specifics of each of the Kartvelian languages, in this regard, are revealed.

Key words: *Georgian, Megrelian, Svan, Laz, Negation, Category, particle, morphology, model, pronoun.*

In 2015, within the targeted grant project in Tbilisi State University, the linguistic means of negation in the Kartvelian languages was explored. The presented article is a part of the work performed. It introduces the grammatical models expressing negation on the ground of the linguistic data of Old Georgian, Modern Georgian and other Kartvelian languages not having alphabets. Additionally, on the synchronic level the questions related to the derivation of double negation are discussed; empiric material is supported by the language corpus. The data of TITUS, ARMAZI and GEKKO were used²as well as the Laz and Svan printed texts. The data of the Old Georgian languages were investigated according to the pre-Athenic and Athenic redactions of the Sinai Polycephalion and Tetraevangelium, and the Bible of Gelati. Comparing the data revealed common Kartvelian regularities and specific factors from each separate language of this family related to the issue under analysis.

Negation is a universal category though the means of its expression differs not only in the non-related but in the related languages as well. It is urgent to conduct research in this field in accordance with the diachronic and synchronic data of the Kartvelian languages. The results of such researches are very important, not only for investigating and defining the history and typology of the Kartvelian languages, but also from the standpoint of the general linguistics, cultural studies and practical use. The empirical material was processed in diachronical and

²<http://titus.Uni-frankfurt.de>; <http://www.Uni-frankfurt.de/armazi/>; <http://clarino.uib.no/gnc/document-element?session> - The last access date: 20.01.2016

synchronical views, using the *descriptive-statical*, *historical-comparative* and *distributional (syntagmatic)* methods. The results received are interesting and useful for linguists, psychologists and psycho-linguists and also for those concerned about the problems of Georgian language history and normalisation of standard Georgian. The complex researches were conducted taking into consideration specific issues.

The article consists of two parts: I. Grammar models expressing negation, II. The issues regarding double negation.

I. Grammar models expressing negation

- structure of the negative pronouns
- structure of the negative adverbs

Old Georgian shows the following grammar models of negative pronouns: *negative particle+interrogative pronoun*: *vin/ra -who/what*; negative particles may be represented by the following alternatives: *ar||ara||ara(ra)||arts^h(a)||arts^hara* approximately meaning: *not||not+||no more||neither||not anymore*; *ver||vera||verya(ra)||verts^h(a)* cannot- it is impossible)||cannot+||cannot anymore (at all)||cannot either; *nu||nura||nuya(ra)||nurst^h(a)||nurts^haya-do not||do not any||do not anymore*. The following negative pronouns are also evidenced: *aravin, vevin, nuvin, aryaravin, veryaravin, araraj, veraraj, nuraj, aryaraj, nuraraj- nobody, not anybody, nobody ever, not anybody anymore, nothing, nothing at all, not anything* [14, p. 73]; though the negative pronoun *veryavin- nobody at all ever* was not revealed in the four texts we have investigated, it is notable that two new forms of pronouns *aryavin, veryavin - nobody anymore and not anybody anymore* were added to the list of the pronouns above:

*ara+vin > aravin-not+who>not anybody: ...sixaruli t^hk^hueni aravin migiyos t^hk^huengan- let not anybody take away your joy from you [Sinai Polycephalion: Sin. Mr., 1, 3, 29 \(1v\)](#); *arya+vin > aryavin - not any more+who:dahrk^huamath: ...hp'ovoth k'its^hvi dabmul, romelsa k'ats^hi aryavin dadzdomil ars- Saying, . . . you will find tied there a colt that has never been ridden [Tetraevangelium \(redactio athonensis\): NT, Lk., 19, 30](#); *aryara+vin >***

aryaravin - not anymore+who >not anybody any more: amierith^gan aryaravin aq'uedros gardaslvaj igi mts^hnebat^haj... – sincenow not anybody any more reproach for deviation from commandments Sinai Polycephalion: Sin. Mr., 17, 91, 13 (85v); ver+vin > vervin - can't+who: vervin semdzlebel ars yirsad p'at'ivis-ts^hemad misa- anyone can't respect him properly Sinai Polycephalion: Sin. Mr., 23, 139, 36 (135r); verya+vin > veryavin - not anybody anymore+who>not anybody whoever: veryavin ik'adra sit'q'vis-gebad ts'midisa basilisa mats^hilobelt^haganman- not anybody from those who were arguing dared to answer St. Basil Sinai Polycephalion: Sin. Mr., 11, 71, 28 (68v); nu+vin > nuvin - don't+who > don't anybody: da nuvin daak'ldebin ts'odebasa amas sixarulisasa- and let not anybody miss this call of joy Sinai Polycephalion: Sin. Mr., 24, 141, 24 (136v);

ara+ra(j) > araraj- not+what>nothing at all: da araraj miugo mas arts^ha erth^hisa sit'q'visat^hvis.. - But he gave him no answer, not even to a single charge Tetraevangelium (redactio praeathonensis): NT, Mt., 27, 14;...da arara iq'o q^helt^ha fina mist^ha - and nothing at all was at his hands Vetus testamentum iberice, redactio Gelatica: VT, Ju., 14, 6 (376v, 192r); arya+raj > aryaraj - nothing what>nothing at all anymore:arts^haya vin ik'adra mier dyith^gan k'it^hxvad misa aryaraj - nobody dared to tell him any word, nothing at all since that day. Tetraevangelium (redactio athonensis): NT, Mt., 22, 46; vera+raj > veraraj - not any (impossible)+what> impossible something:da vit^har veraraj sargebel ek^hmneboda, mafinya ts'il-igdes - and only when it was impossible to have any benefits then they cast lots Sinai Polycephalion: Sin. Mr., 19, 106, 7 (100r); nu+raj > nuraj - not (don't)+what>not any:th^hk^hu nurajgmobaj ymrth^hisa mimarth^h da mohk'ude- Don't say any blasphemy about God and die Sinai Polycephalion: Sin.Mr., 38, 214, 36 (204v); nura+raj > nuraraj - let be nothing+what>nothing at all: da hrk^hua math^h: nuraraj gak^hun gzasa zeda... - And he said to them: take nothing to your journey Tetraevangelium (redactio athonensis): NT, Lk., 9, 3.

In Old Georgian the negative adverbs' structure is much like one of the negative pronoun's: negative particle+interrogative adverb/noun. The scientists regard the number and qualifications of the adverbs

differently [17, p. 141; 14, p. 159; 6, p. 64]. Taking all the existing opinions into account, the final list of the negative adverbs is as follows: *arasada*, *verasada*, *nusada*, *araodes*, *veraodes*, *nuodes*, *arasadajt^h*, *arazamsa*- *nowhere*, *not anywhere*, *never impossible ever not ever*, *from no side*, *not any time* though in the texts chosen for analyses only two are revealed:

ara+sada > *arasada* -

*no+where>nowhere:...**arasada mts^hnebas* *jsena gardavhq^{hed}*, *da me arasada momets^h thik'ani ert^{hi}*, *rajthamts^ha megobart^ha tsh^hemth^a thana vixare* - *I have never (in nocase, nowhere) disobeyed your command; yet you have never given me even a young goat so that I might celebrate with my friends*
Tetraevangelium (redactio praeathonensis): NT, Lk., 15, 29; nu+sada > nusada - *not+where>nowhere, not anywhere:...**nusada ts'arsts^{he} kh^hvasa pherq^{hi} jeni* - *so that you will not dash your foot against a stone (anywhere)*
Tetraevangelium (redactio athonensis): NT, Lk., 4, 11.

The adverb *arasada* –*nowhere* is mostly evidenced in the Sinai Polycephalion; next by frequency are pre-Athenic and Athenic redactions of the New Testament; as for the adverb *nusada* - *nowhere* Gelati redaction of the New Testament shows most productive in this respect. In the Athenic redaction we discovered only two cases of its use and in Sinai- only one. It often has the meaning of the particle *nuuk'ue/nu* - *let it not/do not*.

In modern Georgian negation is expressed by means of negative pronouns and adverbs by addition of the particles *ar* (*a*), *ver* (*a*) and *nu* (*ra*) - *no, cannot and let not (nothing)*. One of them is always included in a negative pronoun or adverb, namely, negation particle adds to the interrogative pronouns (*vin/ra* - *who/what*): *aravin*, *veravin*, *nuravin* - *nobody, nobody at all, let nobody*; *arara*, *verara*, *nurara* - *nothing, not anything, nothing at all* or some other words add *pheri/nairi/vithari*- *colour/kind of/like*: *arapheri*, *verapheri*, *nurapheri* - *nothing (no kind of/ no colour of)*, *aranairi*, *veranairi*, *nuranairi*; *aravithari*, *veravithari*, *nuravithari* - *nothing like that/nothing of that kind/not any kind of that* [see 16, p. 44].

Examples from the Georgian Language National Corpus: *p'iradad tsh^hemth^{an} aravin ar mosula* – *nobody didn't come to me*

[id=240075157464347&cpos=28744449&corpus=grc;](#)
nurts^hnuravin feets^hdeba- Let not nobody try to do
[thisid=240075206005831&cpos=84723278&corpus=grc;](#)
gulma verara ver feiq'vara- heart could not love
 anything (nothing at all)
[id=240075206005831&cpos=17564283&corpus=grc;](#)
*ert^hmanet^hs verap^heri gavagebinet^h-*we could
 understand each other nothing at all
[id=240075206005831&cpos=28532808&corpus=grc;](#)
nurap^heri segvas^hpot^hebs - let nothing worry us
[id=240075206005831&cpos=19252237&corpus=grc;](#)
veranairi ek^hsp'ert'iza ver t^hat'ardeba - no expertise
 (not at all any) can be done [id=240075206005831&cpos=53608005&corpus=grc;](#)
mat^harts^haravith^hari rts'mena ar gaat^hniat^h...- they do not
 haveno (not any) belief at all
[id=240075206005831&cpos=82455112&corpus=grc;](#)
veravith^hari p'olit'ik'uri rejimi veyar dagits^haus- not
 any political regime will be able to protect you
[id=240075206005831&cpos=141352685&corpus=grc.](#)

The same particles (no, not, do not, not any) are used to derive negative adverbs by adding the adverbs of place, time and manner: -sad-where, -dros-time, -nairad, -gzit^h-manner, means): *arsad, versad, nursad* - nowhere; *arasdros, nurasdros, verasdros* - never; *aranairad, veranairad, nuranairad* - by no manner; *arasgzit^h, verasgzit^h* - by no way: *arsad vmus^haubnowhere* I work
[id=240075206005831&cpos=28636125&corpus=grc;](#)
versad veyar vip'ove- could not anymore find it anywhere
[id=240075206005831&cpos=10773036&corpus=grc;](#)
t^hu vinmes sit'q'va lobireba examus^heba, nursad it'q'vis
 - if anyone does not like the word "lobbying" let him never say it anywhere [id=240075206005831&cpos=55302476&corpus=grc.](#)

The adverb *dros* - during, in time of is itself an unchangeable dative case form of the noun and the case marker -s adds to the particle and is used with it: *ara-s+dro-s, vera-s+dro-s, nura-s+dro-s* never, cannot be ever, let it be nevere.g.: *arasdrosarts^h momsalmebia-* even never greeted me
[id=240075157464347&cpos=140328098&corpus=grc;](#)
burduli k'i verasdros ik^hneboda int'rigebis ep'its^hent'r^hI - Burduli could not ever be in the epicentre of intrigues
[id=240075206005831&cpos=45943848&corpus=grc;](#)

besikⁱs t^oms nurasdroš gadafliš- let him never open the book of Besiki [id=240075157464347&cpos=107601068&corpus=grc](#).

To deliver an adverb of manner the nouns in adverbial case form are used *nairad- in manner: aranairad arts p^halsip^hik'ats^hiast^han da arts^hxarixt^han ar gvak^hvs sak^hme- in no manner we have dealings neither with falsification nor with quality* [id=240075206005831&cpos=2062884&corpus=grc](#); *ts'ut^hisop^hlis dašip^hrul ts'eras veranairad veyar ugebda- could not any more get the meaning of script of the life* [id=240075206005831&cpos=140371533&corpus=grc](#).

One of the lexical units constituting a negative adverb is a noun in the instrumental case form-*gzit^h* (by means): *arasgzit^h ar unda vats'q'eninot^h mošes da davit^his xalxs- weshould by no means hurt the people of Mosesand David* [id=-240075206005831&cpos=31613055&corpus=grc](#); *bulbulis galobis mosmenis msurveli q'vavis q'rant'alit^h verasgzis dak'maq'op^hildeba - by no means can anyone who wishes to hear a nightingale be satisfied of the raven's croak* [id=240075206005831&cpos=52764652&corpus=grc](#).

Thus in Georgian, beginning from the Old Georgian language traditions, there has been an established grammar model of negative pronouns and adverbs compounded with the negative particles and interrogative pronouns/nouns. The negative pronouns evidenced during the research are characterised by relative productivity in the Old Georgian written texts. Most frequent in the Old Georgian written monuments are the following pronouns: *aravin, vervin, nuvin, araraj, veraraj - nobody, nobody at all, let anybody, nothing at all, cannot anything*. It is noteworthy that all the negative pronouns using in Old Georgian did not move into the Modern Georgian; e.g.: *araraj, veraraj, vervin, nuvin, araraj- nothing at all, can't be anything, let nobody, nothing any more*. Some such forms were expected to show in Old Georgian but in all the texts we have studied the following negative pronouns are not evidenced: *arts^hraj, arts^hra, vertš^hra, nurts^hra, nurts^hraj, nurts^haraj, nurts^hvin, vertš^hayavin, nurts^hayavin*.

In Megrelian the lexical units *mit^ha- nobody* and *mut^ha - nothing* are considered native negative pronouns, which are of compound structure and verbs

with them are never in negative form but in positive *mit^ha murs- nobody comes/will come*, *mut^ha utf'irs- nothing matters*. According to this etymology *mit^ha*, will separate in the following way, considering its constituents: *mi-* *who* (interrogative pronoun, +*thi* relative particle + *a* < *var* – *not* negative particle). Thus, *mit^ha* < *mi-thi-var* literal meaning: *who* + *relative particle* + *not* = *nobody*. The same is true about the pronoun *mut^ha*: *mu* - *what* + *thu* < *thi* + *a* < *var*. Thus, *mut^ha* < *mu-thu-var* meaning *what* + *relative particle* - *nothing* [11, p. 256].

Due to the fact that, arguably, a negative particle, even in a reduced form, is still present in these pronouns, we believe that this results in their agreement with the affirmative forms of verbs. *sk^hani met'i mit^ha p'unania...* - we have nobody but you. Megrelian Texts ed. Qipshidze: IQ, ZS, XIII, 5 (31, 20).

Negative semantics in Megrelian is expressed not only by means of the negative pronouns but also by indefinite pronouns. In particular we mean *mit^hini* - *anyone*, *mut^huni* - *anything*, *namut^hini* - *any generally followed by* verb “to be” together with the negative particle “no”, “not”. Indefinite pronouns in their turn are of the complex construction in Megrelian and are based on the interrogative pronouns [8, p. 049; 13, p. 224-225]: *mut^huni vadvark'at' jxvasie let's not refuse anything to other for anything*) Megrelian Texts ed. Xubua: MX, 21, 86, 6.

Thus, semantics of the negative pronouns in Megrelian is expressed in accordance with the following grammar model: indefinite pronoun + negative particle, and it should be noted that both direct and reverse orders are possible, though negative pronouns show only the direct order, i.e. indefinite pronoun + negative particle: *mit^hini var*, which means *nobody*. It can be said that in both cases the verb with a negative particle tends not to be separated from the indefinite pronoun as their intonation unity introduces semantics of negation.

In Megrelian the indefinite pronouns can also be used in the function of negative pronouns, but this does not imply all groups of the indefinite pronouns; namely, *migidareni* and *migida* of the type “*somebody (that who it is)*” are never evidenced in the above mentioned function, unlike the indefinite pronouns *mit^hini*, *mut^huni*, *namut^hini*. For more information

about the three groups of the discussed pronouns see I. Kipshidze [8, p. 049].

In Megrelian there is a negative adverb *sot^ha* – literally meaning nowhere: “*where+relative particle will not/will be not it*” which, regarding the structure is much like the forms *mit^ha* and *mut^ha*, contains an interrogative word and a reduced form of the negative particle. Adverbs agree with verbs in affirmative forms: *sot^ha vorek^h mantebeli* - *I am not running anywhere (I do not mean to run anywhere)* Megrelian-Georgian Dictionary Kajaia: Megr. Dict., m, mant'ebel-i, 11579. Besides that, in order to deliver negative semantics, an indefinite adverb *sot^hini* is also used, to which a negative particle *var* - *not* is added (comp. delivering negative semantics by means of the I group indefinite pronouns): *seriʃi giot^hanap^halk^h sot^hini vamaʃiis* - *we could not get any shelter for the night* Megrelian Texts (from Сборник материалов): SM, 10/2, 4, 331, 67. Like the case of the indefinite pronouns, here the reverse order is also possible although the direct order prevails and is used to express the semantics of the negative adverb, comp.: *sot^hini var* - *nowhere*.

In Megrelian the adverb of time *dvas*- *today*, with the negative particle *var*- *no* also bears a negative meaning (*dvas var* – etymologically: “*on today*” – never; here day denotes time in general). This adverb of time can be evidenced pre-or post-positionally, though a direct order is more productive *edʒgura dvas vaap^hue boʃiis nadʒirep^hi* - *This boy may have never seen something like this*):

<http://gnc.gov.ge/gnc/document-element?session-id=239320844747656&cpos=67664>.

Thus, in Megrelian, negative pronouns and adverbs are of complex structure; they contain interrogative words and particles, including the remainders of negative particles. In order to express negative semantics a certain group of the indefinite pronouns, containing interrogative words and adverbs is used in combination with the negative particle.

In Laz proper negative pronouns are not evidenced. Simplified forms of the indefinite pronouns *mit^hi* - *nobody* and *mut^hu* - *nothing* are used in this

³ comp: **dvas** in the noun meaning: **dvas** *vaseruans t'q'urae* - *no day he spends idely* [9, p. 221-231].

⁴ comp: **dvas** in the noun meaning: **dvas** *vaseruans t'q'urae* - *no day he spends idely* [9, p. 221-231].

function, containing interrogative pronouns. To express negation, *var* - *no* particle is added. The grammatical model is constructed as follows: indefinite pronoun+*var* negative particle, which is immediately followed by a verb in constructions like: *mit^h var dosk^hidu-doren- nobody did not stay* [4, p. 72]; *ma sk^han sayluyi^sen ba^sk^ha mut^hvar minon - I do not want nothing but your health*) [4, p. 72].

In Laz, *sothi* which is a simplified variation of the indefinite adverb *sothini* is used, which contains an interrogative adverb and adds a negative particle *var/lazuti sothi var ort'u - maize was not nowhere* [7, p. 219]. The Turkish negative particle *hit* is also used in Laz, in the meaning of the negative adverb *daha hit' hamdora^sk^hule va bidi him t^sioi^sa - since that I never go to this village* [7, p. 220].

Thus, the grammatical model containing the negative semantics in Laz is as follows: indefinite pronoun/adverb+negative particle.

Svan, as compared to Georgian, is richer in the number of negative pronouns and the range of their employment also differs not only in different dialects but also in different modes of speech.

Many variations of negative particles in Svan correspond semantically to Georgian particles *ar, ver, nu -no, cannot, do not*: *no - mā, mām(a), mōm(a), mād(e), mōd(e), madma, mad(e), mād(e), mād^m(a), mōdma, mode, mād^s, ma/āj^h, mād^s, dēs(a), dēts^h(a), dēm(a), dēma(m), dēmis, deme(g), dem, dema, demis, bai...*;

can't- de^s, de^ssa, de^sma, me^smam, do^s...;

do not - no, nōs(a), nōm(a), nos(a), nom(a), nu/θm(a), no/emeg, nem...

The majority of the mentioned particles reveal minor differences in some details, nevertheless it is often advisable to exchange them in texts; consequently, the pronouns, containing those particles show the similar situation in semantic viewpoint, e.g. negative pronouns containing negative particle *mam(a)*, as compared to the pronouns containing *madma* ('*madma*'particle, are less categoric and is used to Expressneutral negation. As for negative pronouns with *madma*-particles they express negation more categorically, against some specific fact. The causes of such semantic differences lay in the particles' structure: categoricalness ("strong language") is emphasised by the units, which simultaneously contain

two different components of negation (*m*, *d*) (*mamagweſ* - *no or nothing*, *madmagweſ* - *nothing at all*. *mām mak'u*- *I don't want*, *mād mak'u*- *I don't want at all, not a bit (specific fact or thing)* [9, p. 27]. It is often impossible to deliver their exact meaning in Georgian.

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

(1) negative particle+interrogative pronoun: *där*-nobody = *de*- *no+jär* - who; *deſjär*- no one = *deſ*- can *no+jär*- who; *nör*- let no one = *noma*- *don't+jär*+ who; *dē/esa*- nothing, no thing at all *no+anything* = *desa*- *no+(h)esa+mäj* - what/something; *deſma* - nothing (cannot anything) = *deſ* - can't+*mäj* - what; *nō/osa*-let nothing= *nō/osa* - let it not + *mäj* - what, *dexeda*-no one = *de*- *no+xeda*- which, *deſma*- cannot anything (=nothing) = *deſ*, *doſ* - can't+ *mä* - what, *xeda*-which and so on; *at^hcxē drojzi d'r igem amzi k'otōl k^horōlars* - *In this time nobody builds (sets) such a small house*) SPT, IV, 49, 64, 5; *zi dexeda tſ'ik^hs lōmāgoſilli* - *it turned out that he did not fill no glass*) (SPT, III, 126, 116, 13); *mitſ^ha jexws deſma axmeqrālvne, de iſgens ēs* - *could not explain anything to his (own) wife and to others*) SPT, IV, 84, 123, 20;

(2) negative particle+noun *gweſ* - *job*: *māmgweſ*/*mamagweſ*/*mādmagweſ*=*mām*/*madma* - *no+gweſ* comp. Georgian *no+color*): *madmagweſ choſk'ena*- he/she has eaten anything Sv-dict, A. Shgni, 1957; *laid tſ^hu nomoyw adgär I lerſwnid eser dem xorſwni demgwaſw* Don't kill me and I will never say a word about it to you [19, p. 316];

(3) negative pronoun+particle expressing possibility-*moſ/därmoſ* - *let nobody can* comp. model (1): *deſjär*;

The structural model of the negative adverbs in Svan is similar to that of the negative pronouns:

(4) negative particle+interrogative adverb: *dēm(e)* - nowhere - *de-m-no+imewhere*: *mahwrēne muxwbēmi tſ^hxwi dēme xegwbenix* the arrow of the younger brother cannot be found anywhere [2, p. 158]; *demegimeg*- nowhere, *demeg*- *no+ imeg* - where: *aſxw sop^hels nentſ^hayalisgäxi demegimeg xar*- one village has no forest near it Svan Prose Texts II (Lower Bal): SPT, II, 125, 250, 3. *deſoma*- *neve*, *de(me)*- *no+ſoma*-when: *γōrda etſ^hxentſ^hu, demeg xoſidda-devi* (a mythological giant) never went in that direction (that side) he was not allowed Svan Chrestomaty: SC, 245, 225, 4.

(5) negative particle+preposition-postposition: dēmt^{he} - nowhere to - dem- no+^{the} -towards: *ywaʃärs q^{halāz} dēmt^{he} xarax- the wild goats had nowhere to go* [2, p. 84];

(6) negative particle +noun ʃ^{hik^h}- time: demtʃ^{hik^h}-s/dēmtʃ^{hik^h}k^ha⁵ - never= deme- not+ʃ^{hik^h}-s, tʃ^{hik^h}k^ha on time: *dʒwinald met^hxwjár häríd dēmtʃ^{hik^h}k^hat'exenda- in old times a hunter would never return without anything (empty)* [2, p. 83];

(7) negative adverb + particle expressing possibility mof: dēmt^{he}-mof - no direction: *dʒgðrāgs esnār ʃuk'w tʃ^hwät^hk^harw'n I k^ha dēmt^{he}mofxexōli - it is said St. George lost his way and cannot find it anywhere)* [2, p. 132].

Thus, grammatical models used to express negation in the Georgian language and other Kartvelian languages which do not possess scripts, are similar by their composition; namely, interrogative words and particles are parts of the models. The negative particles with the meaning “no” occupy a definite position: in Georgian and Svan, such a particle precedes an interrogative word whereas in Megrelian and Lazit follows the interrogative word. Judging by the richness of particles and their semantical diversity, Svan stands out from other Kartvelian languages. It is noteworthy that in addition to the above mentioned, both in pronouns and adverbs, the following different model is evidenced: negative pronoun/adverb particle of possibility.

II. Issues of the double negation

In the Georgian language we have the evidence of single and also double negation. Negation is single where only one negative word is used: either a pronoun, adverb, or a particle. Negation is double if, besides a negative pronoun and a negative adverb, there is a negative particle too, e.g. *ar movida- did not come; aravin movida- nobody came; comp. aravin ar movida- nobody did not come; versad ver vip'ove- could not find anywhere.*

Theoretically this issue is investigated thoroughly in Georgian linguistics in diachronic and synchronic planes. Besides that a particular attention is paid to

⁵The second component **tʃ^{hik^h}** meets only in the structure of adverbs: **amtʃ^{hik^h}k^ha** - this time, **amtʃ^{hik^h}d** - till this time, **edʒtʃ^{hik^h}k^ha** - that time...

grammatical-stylistic aspects of using double negation [20; 3; 15; 12; 5; 1; 21]. According to the research by V. Topuria, double negation was not used anywhere in original Georgian texts or translations from Greek of the X-XI Centuries. The scientist acknowledges only one case of double negation in “*Adishi Tetra evangelium*” which he considers to be accidental.

According to V. Topuria, double negation is a secondary phenomenon for the Georgian language and begins from the Middle Georgian period. In the epic poem *Vepkhistkaosani* (*Knight in the Panther Skin*) both kinds of negation coexist. The famous scholar suggests that such forms did not develop under the influence of the foreign languages and “double negation is a natural phenomenon for Georgian” [20, p. 322].

Concerning usage of single and double negations, their “mutual substitution is free and belongs to the sphere of stylistics” [1, p. 178], but nevertheless there are some cases where the choice does not depend on the author’s will and where double negation is necessary: 1. When a negative pronoun or adverb stays apart from the verb; 2. When a pronoun is a prepositioned determiner; 3. When negative words – a pronoun, or a noun adds a relative particle *-ts^ha* [12; 1, p. 178; 21, p. 124-125]. The cases of misusing of this type in mass media were studied by L. Geguchadze who emphasised that journalists prefer single negation even in the cases where double negation is necessary [5, p. 32-40].

The data of the Georgian Language Corpus enables us to ascertain frequency and peculiarities of usage of single and double negation in Modern Georgian as the corpus methodology provides a reliable statistical picture.

All the negative pronouns, either used separately or with particles, were evidenced in the Georgian language national Corpus: *arap^heri*, *verap^heri*, *nurap^heri*- *nothing, not anything*; *aravin*, *veravin*, *nuravin* - *nobody, cannot any*; *aranairi*, *veranairi*, *nuranairi*- *no kind*; *aravith^hari*, *veravith^hari*- *no way*; *arara*, *verara*- *no means, etc.* The pronouns *nuravith^hari* and *nurara* - *let no kind of* and *let nothing* are relatively rarely used pronouns (*nurara*- *let nothing* is sometimes divided in *nura ra*). In order to express double negation the negative particle *ar-ts^h*, *ayar-ts^h* is used with the pronouns. Only rarely those

particles precede the pronouns.

Statistical data of the negative pronouns usage (separately or with the particles) are given below:

Pronouns	Total	Double (of the given number)	Particles used with the pronouns				First a particle, then a pronoun	
<i>arap^{he}ri - nothing</i>	36,495	3,840	ar-not	arts ^h -neither, either	ayar - not any more	yarts ^h ot any more	arts ^h +pronoun-neither	ayarts ^h +pronoun - not any more
<i>verap^{he}ri - cannot anything</i>	4,621	261	ver - cannot	verts ^h - cannot either	veyar - cannot any more	veyarts ^h - cannot any more	verts ^h +pronoun-cannot either	veyarts ^h +pronoun cannot any more
<i>nurap^{he}ri - let not anything</i>	27	5	nu - do not	nurts ^h - do not either	nuyar - do not any more	nyarts ^h - do not any more or either	nurts ^h +pronoun - do not either	nuyarts ^h +pronoun - not any more or either
<i>aravin - nobody</i>	21,248	2,177	ar - not	arts ^h - neither, either	ayar - not any more	yarts ^h - not any more or neither	arts ^h +pronoun - neither	ayarts ^h +pronoun - not any more or neither
<i>veravin - not anybody</i>	6,301	611	ver - cannot	verts ^h - cannot either	veyar - cannot any more	eyarts ^h - cannot any more or cannot either	verts ^h +pronoun - cannot either	veyarts ^h +pronoun cannot any more cannot either
<i>nuravin - let not anybody</i>	383	46	nu - do not or let not	nurts ^h - do not either	nuyar-do not any more	nyarts ^h - do not any more or do not either	nurts ^h +pronoun - do not either	nuyarts ^h +pronoun - do not any more do not either
<i>aranai - no kind of</i>	9,661	87	ar - not	arts ^h -not either	ayar-not any more	yarts ^h - not any more or not either	arts ^h +pronoun - not	ayarts ^h +pronoun - not any more or neither

							either	
<i>verana</i> <i>iri</i> - <i>cannot</i> <i>any</i> <i>kind of</i>	655	4	ver - cannot	verts ^h - cannot either	veyar- cannot any more	eyarts ^h cannot any more or not either	verts ^h + prono un - canno t either	veyarts ^h +p noun cannot a more or n either
<i>nurana</i> <i>ir(i)</i> - <i>let not</i> <i>any</i> <i>kind of</i>	8	7	nu - do not or let not	o	o	o	nu+pro noun - do not or let not	o
<i>aravith</i> <i>ari</i> - no <i>kind</i>	7,48 9	52	ar -not	arts ^h -not either	ayar -not any more	arts ^h aya - not any more or not either	arts ^h +p ronoun - not either	ayarts ^h +pro oun - not a more or n either
<i>veravit</i> <i>h</i> ari - <i>cannot</i> <i>any</i>	402	3	ver - cannot	verts ^h - cannot either	veyar- cannot any more	arts ^h vey - cannot any more or cannot either	verts ^h + pronou n - cannot either	veyarts ^h +p noun cannot a more cannot eith
<i>nuravi</i> <i>h</i> ari - <i>let not</i> <i>any</i>	7	6	nu - do not or let not	o	o	o	Nu+pr onoun - do not or let not	o
<i>arara</i> - <i>nothin</i> <i>g at all</i>	125	2	ar - not	arts ^h -not either	ayar-not any more	arts ^h aya -not any more	arts ^h +p ronoun - not either	ayarts ^h +pro oun - not a more
<i>verara</i> - <i>nothin</i> <i>g can</i>	35	12	ver cannot	verts ^h - cannot either	veyar - cannot any more	eyarts ^h cannot any more or cannot either	verts ^h + pronou n - cannot either+ pron.	veyarts ^h +p noun cannot a more cannot eith +pron.
<i>nura...r</i> <i>a</i> - let <i>nothing.</i> <i>..</i>	3	o	o	o	o	o	o	o

Examples: *dʒer arap^heri ar aris dak'arguli* - *nothing*
is not lost yet

(id=240075781283829&cpos=28666052&corpus=grc); *am p'rots^hess verap^heri veyar feat^herebs*- nothing cannot stop this process
 (id=240075781283829&cpos=68224037&corpus=grc);
p'iradad t^hemt^han aravin ar mosula- nobody did not come to me
 (id=240075781283829&cpos=28744443&corpus=grc); *axla k'i mat^h xels veravin veyar seu^hflis* - and now nobody will not interfere with them)
 (id=240075781283829&cpos=54866641&corpus=grc);
nuravin nu imuk^hreba da nu gvafinebs ts'asvli^h - let nobody do not scare us and do not threaten with leaving
 (id=240075781283829&cpos=46169246&corpus=grc); *t^hiri aranairi ar varga*- nothing harmful is good
 (id=240075781283829&cpos=51154703&corpus=grc);
masze vert^hveranairi ek^hsp'ert'iza ver t^hat'ardeba - not any kind of expertise cannot do with it (id=240075781283829&cpos=53608005&corpus=grc); *mat^h arts^h aravit^hari rts'mena ar gaat^hniat^h* - they do not have no belief at all (id=240075781283829&cpos=82455112&corpus=grc); *veravit^hari p'olit'ik'uri rezimi veyar dagit^havs* - no political regime cannot protect you any more
 (id=240075781283829&cpos=141352680&corpus=grc);
გულმა არარა არ გაიკარა gulma arara ar gaik'ara - the heart did not let nothing close to it
 (id=240075781283829&cpos=17564207&corpus=grc);
magis nura gep^hik^hrebat^h-ra - do not worry anything about it
 (id=240080269683483&cpos=143562809&corpus=grc).

In the corpus all the negative pronouns were revealed, independently or with the negative particle, except for two of them: *nuranairad andaragzit^h* - by no manner and by no way: *arsad, versad, nursad, arasdros//arasodes, verasdros//verasodes, nurasdros//nurasodes, aranairad, veranairad, arasgzit^h, vera(s)gzit^h* - nowhere, cannot anywhere, never, etc. In order to express double negation, negative particles with or without relative particlets^h are used with the named adverbs: *ar(ts^h), ayar (ts^h)* – no, not more).

The statistical data of using the negative adverbs are given in the table below:

A Adverbs	Tot al	double out of the given number	particles used with those adverbs				a particle, then an adverb	
<i>arsad- nowhere</i>	5,095	981	ar -no	arts ^h - neither	ayar- not anymore	ayarts ^h - not either	arts ^h +adv.- neither	ayarts ^h +a not either
<i>arsad cannot anywhere</i>	1,507	181	ver- cannot	verts ^h - cannot either	veyar - cannot any more	veyarts ^h - cannot any more or cannot either	verts ^h +adv. - cannot either	veyarts ^h + - cannot more cannot ei
<i>nursad nowhere</i>	27	7	nu - do not	0	nuyar - do not more	0	nu+adv.- do not	0
<i>nurasdros - never</i>	8,718	962	ar - not	arts ^h - not either	ayar - not any more	ayarts ^h - not any more or not either	arts ^h +adv.- not either	ayarts ^h +a - not any or not eit
<i>arasodes- never</i>	13,219	1,504	ar - not	arts ^h - not either	ayar - not any more	ayarts ^h - not any more or not either	arts ^h +adv.- not either	ayarts ^h +a - not any or not eit
<i>arasdros - impossible ever - at any time</i>	1,230	173	ver - cannot	verts ^h - cannot either	veyar - cannot any more	veyarts ^h - cannot any more or not either	verts ^h +adv.- cannot either	veyarts ^h + - cannot a more or n either
<i>verasodes - cannot ever</i>	2,077	302	ver - cannot	verts ^h - cannot either	veyar- cannot any more	veyarts ^h - cannot any more or cannot either	verts ^h +adv. - cannot either	veyarts ^h + - cannot a more or cannot ei
<i>nurasdros- let it never</i>	32	8	nu- do not	nurts ^h - do not either	nuyar - do not any more	nuyarts ^h - do not anymore or do not either	nurts ^h +adv.- do not either	nuyarts ^h + do not anymore not either
<i>nurasodes - let it never</i>	87	19	nu - do not	nurts ^h - do not either	nuyar- do not any more	nuyarts ^h - do not anymore or do not either	nurts ^h +adv.- do not either	nuyarts ^h + do not anymore not either
<i>aranairad - by no means</i>	1,461	1,228	ar - not	arts ^h - not either	ayar -not any more	ayarts ^h - not any more or not either	arts ^h +adv.- not either	ayarts ^h +a not any n or not eit
<i>aranairad -cannot</i>	703	567	ver- cannot	verts ^h - cannot	veyar - cannot any	veyarts ^h - cannot any more or cannot	verts ^h +adv. - cannot either	veyarts ^h + - cannot a more or

<i>by any means</i>				either	more	either		cannot ei
<i>nuranair ad- by no manner</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>arasgzit^h- by no way</i>	117	91	ar -not	arts ^h - not either	ayar - not anymore	ayarts ^h - not any more or not either	arts ^h +adv. -not either	ayarts ^h +a not any or not eit
<i>aragzit^h - by no way</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>verasgzit^h - cannot by any way</i>	153	99	ver- cannot	verts ^h - cannot either	veyar - cannot any more	veyarts ^h - cannot any more or cannot either	verts ^h +adv.- cannot either	veyarts ^h + -cannot a more or cannot ei
<i>veragzit^h - can not by any way</i>	7	3	ver- can not	0	0	0	0	0

Examples: *arsad ar aris nat^hkhvami*- it is not said nowhere
(id=240075781283829&cpos=49986401&corpus=grc)
; *sen nursad nu ts'axval xval*- do not go nowhere tomorrow
(id=240075781283829&cpos=141951921&corpus=grc); *igini arasdros ayarfeiq'rebian ert^had* - they will not assemble together never
(id=240075781283829&cpos=8386282&corpus=grc); *ymert^ho, nurasdros nu dagvats^hileb!* - Oh God, let not part us never!
id=240075781283829&cpos=82886349&corpus=grc); *aset^hi p'roblema aranairad ar ats'uxebt^h* - such problem does not trouble them no manner
(id=240075781283829&cpos=45196232&corpus=grc); *ruset^his revoluts^hiis ist'oria sak^harth^hvelos gamorits^hxvit^harasgzit^h ar daits'ereba* - history of Russian revolution couldnot be written without Georgia by no way (id=-240075781283829&cpos=75971720&corpus=grc).

Altogether 121, 859 contexts expressing negation are found in the Georgian Language National Corpus (GEKKO), 11,233 of them contain double negation (about 9.21%). These data confirm the scientists' observations about co-existence of single and double negations in Georgian, though single negation cases prevail. According to the GEKKO-data, literary texts show scarcely any examples of single negation in the

place where double negation is needed. Unlike this, the media language revealed the cases where a negative pronoun *aranairi*, *veranairi*, *nuranairi*; *aravithari*, *veravithari*, *nuravithari* - *no kind of*, *cannot any kind of*, *let no kind of*, *nothing of the kind*, *nothing like that*, *let nothing like that* is in the role of the attribute, e.g. *dek'anosidzes thithqhmis aranairi p'roblema ar seqhmnia* - *Dekanosize had almost no problem* (id=240075206005831&cpos=28557759&corpus=grc).

The data of the corpus also shows with which pronoun or adverbis often used with single negation. (e.g. *arapheri* – “*nothing*”): out of 36,495 contexts only 3,840 are double) and also, which double negation is favored (e.g., *aranairad* – *by no means*) from 1,461 examples 1,228 are double).

Double negation is absolutely unacceptable for the Svan language. There are no such forms as *nobody did not come* – the correct form is: *d'r anqäd* - *nobody came*. As well as this, it is not correct to use a negative pronoun and a negative adverb in the same context, e.g. *nobody nowhere goes* in Svan will be *d'rimth'esxri* (<*d'rimthe esxri*), literally: – *nobody where goes*; *never no one came* but instead it: *deřomajäranyðrda*; literally: *never who came*.

Double negation is also not used in Megrelian and Laz languages. The negative particle *var* - not/cannot, standing in an initial position is considered both a part of the grammatical model expressing negation and a determiner of negative semantics. For example, *mithini vamurs*, which literally means: *whoever there be that is not coming*.

Bibliography:

1. Arabuli A., *Georgian Speech Culture*, “Universal”, Tbilis 2004 / არაბული, ა., *ქართული მეტყველების კულტურა*, „უნივერსალი“, თბ., 2004.
2. *Chrestomathy of Svan language*. (The texts gathered by A. Shanidze, M. Kaldani and Z. Chumburidze). “TSU Publishing house”, Tbilisi 1978. / *სვანური ენის კრესტომათია* (ტექსტები შეკრიბეს ა. შანიძემ, მ. კალდანმა და ზ. ჭუმბურიძემ), „თსუ გამომცემლობა“, თბ., 1978.
3. Chumburidze Z., “Negative Particles in Georgian and Stylistic Peculiarities of Their Usage”: *Georgian Language and Literature in School*, #2, Tbilisi 1970,

p.p. 41-46. / ჭუმბურიძე, ზ., „უარყოფითი ნაწილაკები ქართულში და მათი ხმარების სტილური თავისებურებანი“: *ქართული ენა და ლიტერატურა სკოლაში*, N2, თბ., 1970, გვ. 41-46.

4. Dumezil G., *Laz Folk Tales and Legends*, (Georgian version of text and the vocabulary compiled by Manana Bukia). "Meridiani", Tbilisi 2009. / დიუმეზილი, ჟ., *ლაზური ზღაპრები და გადმოცემები*, (ლაზური ტექსტის ქართული ვერსია და ლექსიკონი შეადგინა მანანა ბუკიამ). „მერიდიანი“, თბ., 2009.

5. Geguchadze L., "About the Wrong Forms of Single Negation in Modern Georgian": *The Problems of the Georgian Literary Language: History and Modern State, Collection I*, Tbilisi 2007, pp. 32-40. / გეგუჩაძე, ლ., „ერთმაგი უარყოფის მცდარ ფორმათა შესახებ თანამედროვე ქართულში“: *ქართული სალიტერატურო ენის საკითხები: ისტორია და თანამედროვე მდგომარეობა, კრ. I*, თბ., 2007, გვ. 32-40.

6. Imnaishvili D., "Negative Pronouns and Negative Adverbs in Iberian-Caucasian Languages", *Iberian-Caucasian Linguistics*, v. IV, (ed. by I. Gigineishvili). "Georgian Academy of Sciences Publishing House", Tbilisi 1953, pp. 53-73. / იმნაიშვილი, დ. „უარყოფითი ნაცვალსახელები და უარყოფითი ზმნიზედები იბერიულ-კავკასიურ ენებში“: *იბერიულ-კავკასიური ენათმეცნიერება, ტ. IV*, (რედ. ი. გიგინეიშვილი), „საქ. სსრ მეცნ. აკად. გამომცემლობა“, თბ., 1953, გვ. 53-73.

7. Kartozia G., "Laz Texts", *Matsne*, #4 (Academy of Sciences of Georgia), (ed. by Al. Baramidze). "Science", Tbilisi 1970, pp. 219-232. / კარტოზია, გ., ლაზური ტექსტები: *საქ. სსრ მეცნ. აკად. „მაცნე“ ენისა და ლიტერატურის სერია, #4* (რედ. ალ. ბარამიძე). „მეცნიერება“, თბ., 1970, გვ. 219-232.

8. Kipshidze I., *Grammar of Megrelian (Iberian) language with reading texts and dictionary*. Imperial Academy of Sciences, S. Petersburg 1914 (in Russian). / ყიფშიძე, ი., *Грамматика мингрельского (иверского) языка с хрестоматией и словарем*, ТИПОГРАФИЯ ИМПЕРАТОРСКОЙ АКАДЕМІИ НАУКЪ, СПБ, 1914.

9. Lomia M., "The principles of Functional Distribution of the Negation and Confirmation Participles in Megrelian": *Problems of Linguistics*, "TSU Publishing House", Tbilisi 2013, pp. 221-231. / ლომია, მ., „უარყოფითი და დადასტურებითი ნაწილაკების ფუნქციური განაწილების პრინციპები მეგრულში“ : *ენათმეცნიერების საკითხები*, "თსუ გამომცემლობა", თბ., 2013, გვ. 221-231.
10. Margiani-Subari Q., *Derivation of the Negative Forms in Svan and in Abkhaz-Adighe Languages* (Diploma work, manuscript), Tbilisi 1978. / მარგიანი-სუბარი, ქ., *უარყოფითი ფორმების წარმოება სვანურსა და აფხაზურ-ადიგურ ენებში* (სადიპლომო ნაშრომი, ხელნაწერი), თბ., 1978.
11. Martirosov A., *Pronoun in Kartvelian Languages*, "Georgian Academy of Sciences Publishing House", Tbilisi 1964. / მარტიროსოვი, ა., *ნაცვალსახელი ქართველურ ენებში*, "საქ. სსრ მეცნ. აკად. გამომცემლობა", თბ., 1964.
12. *Reference Book for Journalists*, International Journalistic Centre. Tbilisi 2002. / ჟურნალისტის სტილისტიკური ცნობარი, ჟურნალისტთა საერთაშორისო ცენტრი, თბ., 2002.
13. Rogava G. "Trail of Zan conjunction - particle -(ni) in Chandialect": *Iberian-Caucasian Linguistics*, v. XXVII. "Mecniereba" Publishing House, Tbilisi 1988, pp. 221-226. / როგავა, გ., „ზანური -ნი კავშირ-ნაწილაკის კვალი ჭანურ დიალექტში“ : *იბერიულ-კავკასიური ენათმეცნიერება*, ტ. XXVII, „მეცნიერება“, თბ., 1988, გვ. 221-226.
14. Sarjveladze Z., *Old Georgian Language*, "Tbilisi State Pedagogical Institute Publishing House", Tbilisi 1997. / სარჯველაძე, ზ., *ძველი ქართული ენა*, „თბილისის სახელმწიფო პედაგოგიური უნივერსიტეტის გამომცემლობა“, თბ., 1997.
15. Shalamberidze, G., *Some Questions of the Georgian Correct Speech*, "TSU Publishing House", Tbilisi 1980. / შალამბერიძე, ქართული სწორმეტყველების ზოგიერთი საკითხი, „თსუ გამომცემლობა“, თბ., 1980.
16. Shanidze A., "Bases of Georgian Grammar", *Collected works in 12 volumes, vol. III*. "TSU

Publishing House”, Tbilisi 1980. / შანიძე, ა., *ქართული ენის გრამატიკის საფუძვლები*, ტ. III, *თხზულებანი თორმეტ ტომად*. “თსუ გამომცემლობა”, თბ., 1980.

17. Shanidze A., *Old Georgian Grammar*, “Tbilisi State University Publishing House”, Tb., 1976. / შანიძე, ა., *ძველი ქართული ენის გრამატიკა*, “თსუ გამომცემლობა”, თბ., 1976.

18. Sharadzenidze T., “Negative particles in Svan”: *Iberian-Caucasian Linguistics*, vol. I. “Georgian Academy of Sciences Publishing House”, Tb., 1946, pp. 289-328. / შარაძენიძე, თ., „უარყოფითი ნაწილაკები სვანურში“: *იბერიულ-კავკასიური ენათმეცნიერება*, ტ. I. „საქ. მეცნ. აკად. გამომცემლობა“, თბ., 1946, გვ. 289-328.

19. *Svan Prosaic Texts*, vol. II, Lower-Bal dialect. (The texts collected by A. Davitiani, V. Topuria and M. Kaldani). “Georgian Academy of Sciences Publishing House”, Tbilisi 1957. / *სვანური პროზაული ტექსტები*, ტ. II, *ბალსქვემოური კილო* (ტექსტები შეკრიბეს ა. დავითიანმა, ვ. თოფურიამ და მ. ქალდანმა), „საქ. სსრ მეცნ. აკად. გამომცემლობა“, თბ., 1957.

20. Topuria V., *Collected Works*, vol. II, “Georgian Language”, Tbilisi 2002. / თოფურია, ვ., *შრომები*, ტ. II, „ქართული ენა“, თბ., 2002.

21. Zeqalashvili R. *The Issues of Georgian Orthography*, “Univrsali”, Tbilisi 2004. / ზეკალაშვილი, რ., *ქართული ენის მართლწერის საკითხები*, „უნივერსალი“, თბ., 2004.