

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

Erika Asztalos

Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics

International Conference on Historical Linguistics 25

1–5 August 2022

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
 - *ñe* particle (< Russian):
 - negates a **syntactic focus**
 - NegP, FocP, **linear scope**: Neg > Foc
 - a concomitant of the ongoing **OV > VO** change of Udmurt

Outline

1. Background
 1. Clausal negation, constituent negation, focus negation
 2. Typological relevance of the topic
 3. The Udmurt language
 4. Clausal negation and constituent negation in Udmurt in a first approach
2. Questions
3. Linguistic data
4. Results
 1. Constructions with a negative auxiliary
 2. *ńe*-constructions
5. Conclusions

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* ($\neg > \forall$, **inverse scope**) vs.

(6) *Not all that glitters is gold* ($\neg > \forall$, **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) *Śibir'-e* *öj* *myny.*
Siberia-ILL NEG.1.PST go.CNG.SG
'I didn't go to Siberia.'

- **non-verb-final:**

(7') *Öj* *myny* *Śibir'-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*), *Jakuťi-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*) *Jakuťi-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. *ńe*:

2.1 *ńe* **XP V** (contact-induced)

2.2 **V** *ńe* **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
- *ñe*-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) *Peśataj-my* *Ševernoj Korej-e* *öz* *vuyly.*
grandfather-1pl North Korea-ILL NEG.PST.3SG arrive.CNG.SG

1. 'It's *not North Korea* our grandfather has been to (but South Korea).' **Neg > Foc**
 2. - Among Asian countries, it's only South Korea our grandfather hasn't been to.'
- You're wrong, it's *North Korea* he *hasn't* been to.' **Foc > Neg**
 3. 'Our grandfather hasn't been to North Korea.' (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 Korea* he *hasn't* been to.'
 - linearly: **Foc > Neg**

Results: NegAux constructions

→ How does one get the 'It's **not North Korea** he has been to' interpretation?

Foc > **Neg**

*It is **North Korea** he **hasn't** been to (other places, he has been to)*

⊃ *He hasn't been to N. Korea (and he has been to the other relevant places)*

⊃ **Neg** > **Foc**

*It is **not North Korea** 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: *ńe*-constructions

- to negate a constituent in a Neg sentence → *n'e*:

Context: Dora doesn't like phonology at all.

(16) *Dora noköńa no ńe 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: *ńe*-constructions

- syntactic focus, FocP
- *ńe* 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 *ńe*-constructions may be a concomitant of the SOV > SVO change of Udmurt

Results: *ńe*-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'in-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. *ñe*-constructions:

- negation of a syntactic focus
- NegP and FocP, Neg > Foc
- transparent scope → a concomitant of the SOV > SVO change of Udmurt

Acknowledgements

- The research was made in the framework of the following projects of the National Research Innovation and Development Office of Hungary (NKFIH):
 - NKFI-129921 *Implications of endangered Uralic languages for syntactic theory and the history of Hungarian*
 - NKFI-135958 *How prosody shapes word order: An integrated interface-based approach to the post-verbal domain in OV languages*
 - NKFI-125282 *Typological Database of the Volga Area Finno-Ugric Languages*
 - NKFI-125206 *Nominal Structures in Uralic Languages*
- I am grateful to Yulia Speshilova and Diana Vakhrusheva for their judgements and comments on my Udmurt data. I am especially indebted to Balázs Surányi, as well as to Lena Borise, Irina Burukina, Marcel den Dikken, Barbara Egedi, Tamás Halm, Katalin Gugán, Nikolett Mus and Andreas Schmidt for their valuable comments.

References

- Amiraz, Omri. 2021. A diachronic explanation for cross-linguistic variation in the use of inverse-scope constructions. *Proceedings of SALT 31*. Manuscript.
- Asztalos Erika 2021. From head-final towards head-initial grammar. Generational and areal differences concerning word order usage and judgement among Udmurt speakers. In: Forker, Diana– Grenoble, Lenore A. (eds.): *Language Contact in the Territory of the Former Soviet Union*. John Benjamins. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. 143–182.
- Asztalos, Erika. 2020. Focus in Udmurt: Positions, contrastivity, and exhaustivity. *Finno-Ugric Languages and Linguistics* Vol. 9. No. 1-2., 14–57.
- Asztalos, Erika, Gugán, Katalin & Mus, Nikolett. 2017. Uráli VX szórend: nyenyec, hanti és udmurt mondatszerkezeti változatok. In É. Kiss Katalin, Hegedűs Attila & Pintér Lilla (eds.), *Nyelvelmélet és diakrónia 3*, 30–62. Budapest – Piliscsaba: PPKE BTK Elméleti Nyelvészeti Tanszék – Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszék.

References

- Edygarova, Svetlana. 2015. Negation in Udmurt. In *Negation in Uralic languages*, eds. Matti Miestamo, Anne Tamm, and Beáta Wagner-Nagy, 265–291. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Penka, Doris 2015. Negation and Polarity. In: Riemer, Nick (ed.): *Routledge Handbook of Semantics*. Routledge. London. 303–319.
- Tánczos, Orsolya. 2010. Szórendi variációk és lehetséges okaik az udmurtban. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 107, 218– 228.
- Udmurt Corpus = http://udmurt.web-corpora.net/index_en.html (Last accessed: 26.07.2022)
- Vilkuna, Maria 1998. *Word Order in European Uralic*. In: Siewierska, Anna (ed.): *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe. Empirical approaches to language typology* 20(1). Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin–New York. 173–233.
- Winkler, Eberhard 2011. *Udmurtische Grammatik. Veröffentlichungen der Societas UraloAltaica* 81. Harrassowitz. Wiesbaden.