Transparent scope expression in Udmurt focus negation as a concomitant of the OV-to-VO change
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Claims

- the development of transparent (linear)-scope constituent negation/focus
  - negation is a potential concomitant of the OV > VO change

- **Udmurt (SOV / SOV>SVO; Uralic; Russia):**
  - standard way for negating constituents: by means of clausal negation
    - negative auxiliary
    - **prosodic focus**
    - Foc > Neg; inverse scope reading is just a semantic entailment
  - *né* particle (< Russian):
    - negates a **syntactic focus**
    - NegP, FocP, **linear scope**: Neg > Foc
    - a concomitant of the ongoing OV > VO change of Udmurt
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Clausal (sentential) negation

• negation has a scope:
  ▪ in clausal neg., negation applies to the proposition
  ▪ the negation operator takes scope above the entire clause, including the main predicate (Penka 2015: 303):

(1) *It is raining.*

(2) *It is not raining.* (Penka: ibid.)

¬ [It is raining. ]
Constituent negation

• in a 1st approach: negation applies to a particular part of the clause → the main predicate may not be in the scope of negation:

(3) John found a job not far away. (Penka 2015: 303)

• however:
  ▪ possible paraphrase by a Rel clause involving sentential negation (4)
  ▪ a further criterion: negator + negated const. form one constituent

(4) John found a job at a place that is not located far away. (ibid.)

• a further notion: focus negation (e.g., Hungarian)
Typological relevance of the topic

• Amiraz (2021): scope interaction of negators and quantifiers in 110 languages:

(5) All that glitters is not gold (¬ > ∀, inverse scope) vs. (6) Not all that glitters is gold (¬ > ∀, linear scope)

➢ V-final languages:
  ▪ inverse scope constructions (5) are common, while
  ▪ scope-transparent constr.s (6) are uncommon (Amiraz 2021: 34)
Typological relevance of the topic – cont.

- diachronically, however, languages show a tendency to develop *scope-transparent* constructions
  → these gradually replace inverse-scope constructions
  
  (Amiraz 2021: 25, 33)

- at least in V-final lang.s, the *development of scope-transparent* constr.-s may be related to a *change in the basic w.o.* of the language
The Udmurt language

• Uralic > Finno-Ugric
  > Permic

• 340 338 native speakers in Russia (2010)

• bi- and trilingual speakers

• strong Russian influence
The Udmurt language

• agglutinative

• non-rigid SOV (Vilkuna 1998 etc.) / ongoing SOV > SVO change (Asztalos, Gugán & Mus (2017), Asztalos (2021) etc.)
  ▪ mainly at the clausal and the CP level, but, to a lesser extent, at the NP level as well

• focus placement:
  ▪ standard variant: immediately preverbal (Tánczos 2010, Asztalos 2020)
  ▪ Russian-induced variant: sentence-final (ibid.)
  ▪ marginally: preverbal but not verb-adjacent (Asztalos 2020)
Clausal negation in Udmurt

• in most tenses: **negative auxiliary** + **connegative stem** of the lexical V:

  ▪ **verb-final:**

    (7) Śibiń-e öj myny.
    Siberia-ILL NEG.1.PST go.CNG.SG
    ‘I didn’t go to Siberia.’

  ▪ **non-verb-final:**

    (7’) Öj myny Śibiń-e.
    NEG.1.PST go.CNG.SG Siberia-ILL
    ‘I didn’t go to Siberia.’
Constituent negation in Udmurt

1. literature: **standard way** (8) (NegAux as in clausal Neg), typically biclausal (Winkler 2011, Edygarova 2015):

   (8) Śibiř-e öj (myny), Jakutǐ-je myn-i.
   Siberia-ILL NEG.1.PST go.CNG.SG Yakutia-ILL go-PST.1SG
   ‘I didn’t go to Siberia but to Yakutia.’

2. **contact-induced** variant: particle ńe (< Russian):

   (9) ńe Śibiř-e myn-i, (a) Jakutǐ-je.
   NEG Siberia-ILL go-PST.1SG but Yakutia-ILL
   ‘I didn’t go to Siberia but to Yakutia.’
Constituent negation in Udmurt

• ! in both cases, the constituent that negation refers/seems to refer to can precede or follow the predicate:

1. NegAux:
   1.1 XP NegAux V
   1.2 NegAux V XP (non-verb-final, contact-induced)

2. ňe:
   2.1 ňe XP V (contact-induced)
   2.2 V ňe XP (contact-induced)

→ this talk mainly concentrates on 1.1 and 2
Negative constructions examined in this study

1. sentences that have been referred to as instances of constituent negation in the Udmurt descriptive linguistic literature

2. negation not scoping over the main predicate
Questions

What syntactic structure can be attributed to the standard variant (with Neg Aux) of constituent negation?
  - clausal negation?
  - XP in focus position?
  - XP in contrastive topic position?

ńe-constr.-s: the structural position
  - of ńe
  - of the negated constituent
Linguistic data

- **questionnaire** – pilot study:
  - 2 native speakers of Udmurt (W, age 30–40)
  - grammaticality judgements about 20 constructed sentences, 5-point Likert scale

- **ńe-constructions**:
  - Udmurt Corpus (newspaper texts, blog posts, Wikipedia articles, literature)
  - 93 hits

- further **consultation** with a native speaker
Results: NegAux constructions

• what seems to be constituent negation is, in fact, **clausal negation**
• more precisely, the negation of a clause with a **prosodic focus**
• linearly: Foc > Neg
Results: NegAux constructions

• NegAux constructions contain a **focused** constituent

  ← **ellipsis test:** ellipsis of the V from the 2nd clause is grammatical:

  Context: ‘Where was your child born? In Mozhga?’

  (10) So **Možga-la-n öz vordsky,** (a) **Kukmor-yn.**

  3SG Mozhga-INE NEG.PST.3 be_born.CNG.SG but Kukmor-INE

  ‘He wasn’t born in Mozhga but in Kukmor.’
Results: NegAux constructions

• best rated: sentences with an *immediately preverbal* focus
  (→ standard position for foci)

• preverbal focus also in the example in the literature (XSV instead of SXV):

(11) Škola-je  *mon*  ug,  *ton*  myn-o-d.
    school-ILL  1SG  NEG.1SG  2SG  go-FUT-2SG

‘It is not me but you who will go to school.’ (Edygarova 2015: 285)
Results: NegAux constructions

• however, the focused constituent can be placed in other linear positions as well (similarly to non-negative sentences):

  ▪ **sentence-final** (Russian-induced variant):

    ‘Where was your child born? In Yekaterinburg?’

    (12) *So öz vordsky Jekaterinburg-yn, (a) Perm-yn.*
    3SG NEG.PST.3 be_born Yekaterinburg-INE but Perm-INE
    ‘S/he wasn’t born in Yekaterinburg but in Perm.’

  ▪ **preverbal but not verb-adjacent:**

    (13) *Jekaterinburg-yn so öz vordsky, (a) Perm-yn.*
    Yekaterinburg-INE 3SG NEG.PST.3 be_born but Perm-INE
Results: NegAux constructions

• the alternative(s) of the focus must be given,
• if not → multiple readings, the context (may) disambiguate(s):

(14) Pešataj-my  Ševernoj Korej-e öz vuyly.
    grandfather-1pl  North  Corea-ILL  NEG.PST.3SG  arrive.CNG.SG

1. ‘It’s not North Corea our grandfather has been to (but South Corea).’  Neg > Foc

2. - Among Asian countries, it’s only South Korea our grandfather hasn’t been to.’
   - You’re wrong, it’s North Corea he hasn’t been to.’  Foc > Neg

3. ‘Our grandfather hasn’t been to North Corea.’ (clausal negation)
   → prosodic (not syntactic) focus
Results: NegAux constructions

- the data suggest that the NegAux strategy for negating constituents is, in fact, **clausal negation**
  - more precisely, negation of a sentence with a **prosodic focus** (not of the focused element itself):
    - ‘It is *Jekaterinburg* where he *wasn’t* born.’
    - ‘It is *North Corea* he *hasn’t* been to.’
  - linearly: **Foc > Neg**
Results: NegAux constructions

→ How does one get the ‘It’s not North Corea he has been to’ interpretation?

**Foc > Neg**

*It is North Corea he hasn’t been to (other places, he has been to)*

⇒ He hasn’t been to N. Corea (and he has been to the other relevant places)

⇒ **Neg > Foc**

*It is not North Corea he has been to (but other relevant places)*

• linearly: Foc > Neg; the inverse scope (Neg > Foc) reading is just a semantic entailment
• this way of expression may be related to the SOV properties of Udmurt (cf. Amiraz 2011)
Results: ňe-constructions

• to negate a constituent in a Neg sentence $\rightarrow$ ňe:

Context: Dora doesn’t like phonology at all.

(16) Dora noköña no ňe fonologi-jez ug jaraty,
    D. at_all also NEG phonology-ACC NEG.3SG love.CNG
    a sintaksis-ez.
    but syntax-ACC

‘It is not phonology Dora doesn’t like at all but syntax.’
Results: ňe-constructions

• syntactic focus, FocP
• ňe always immediately precedes the negated constituent
  → linear (transparent) scope (Neg > Foc); no scope ambiguity
• NegP above FocP
• construction borrowed from Russian (SVO)
• linear-scope constructions (at least in quantifier negation) are uncommon in SOV languages → the development of ňe-constructions may be a concomitant of the SOV > SVO change of Udmurt
Results: ņe-constructions

• the negated constituent is focused ⇐ ellipsis test
• negated constituent: immediately preverbal/sentence-final/preverbal but not verb-adjacent:

‘Where was your child born? In Riga?’

(17) (Ńe Riga-yn) so (ńe Riga-yn) vordsk-i-z (ńe Riga-yn),

NEG Riga-INE 3SG NEG Riga-INE be_born-PST-3.SG NEG Riga-INE

(a) Tall’lin-yn.

but Tallinn-INE

‘S/he wasn’t born in Riga but in Tallinn.’
Conclusions

- what has been called “constituent negation” in Udmurt in the literature:

1. **NegAux** strategy:
   - clausal negation
   - prosodic focus in the sentence
   - Foc > Neg; Neg > Foc reading is just a semantic entailment

2. **né**-constructions:
   - negation of a syntactic focus
   - NegP and FocP, Neg > Foc
   - transparent scope → a concomitant of the SOV > SVO change of Udmurt
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