This is an author manuscript post-peer-reviewing (accepted version) of the original publication. The layout of the published version may differ .

– –

Negation in Finno-Ugric: an introduction

– –

Puskas, Genoveva

Negation in Finno-Ugric: an Introduction[*]

Genoveva Puskás

Dept. of general linguistics, Faculty of Letters, University of Geneva, 3, pl. des Bastions, 1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland

Phone: +41 22 379 73 58   e-mail:genoveva.puskas@lettres.unige.ch

1. Introduction

On opening this volume, the reader is probably tempted to ask two simple questions. First, why a volume on negation?

The study of negation has seen recent developments in various directions, which shed a new light on the problem. From all sides, that is the syntactic, the semantic and pragmatic points of view, recent proposals come to challenge the by now standard views on negation in natural languages that developed within the last two decades of linguistic study. Syntactically, the study of negation has experienced an impressive blossoming in the 1990s, with important contributions such as Pollock (1989), Laka (1990), Zanuttini (1991), Progovac (1994), Haegeman (1995). As a consequence of this, the existence of a NegP in the syntactic structure of negative sentences is by now widely accepted. On the other hand, the full measure of its syntactic import has not yet been taken. NegP hosts some "sentential negative marker", but it is not always clear what the sentential negative marker is. In the line of the Affect criteria, it is also claimed to host, overtly or covertly, n-expressions (i.e. elements that have been assumed to contribute to the negative meaning of the sentence). But here again, recent proposals (see e.g. Giannakidou 2000) have questioned the grounds on which n-expressions contribute to the negative - rather than the pure quantificational - content of the sentence.

Recent studies have also launched into the investigation of the quantificational nature of n-expressions. Following Ladusaw (1979), n-expressions had been analysed as indefinites, an analysis based on their syntactic and semantic dependency on the negative marker. The studies provided by Laka, Progovac, Deprez, Zanuttini propose various approaches, alternatively considering these expressions as existentials in the scope of negation, universals with a negative component, or more recently (Giannakidou 2000) universals taking negation in their scope. A series of papers on negation is therefore highly relevant to current research on quantification in general, both from the syntactic and from the semantic points of view.

Second, why a volume on Finno-Ugric? Finno-Ugric languages seem to have different behaviours with respect to negation. Whereas Hungarian, a representative of the Ugric branch, exhibits negative patterns surprisingly similar to Indo-European languages, the Finnic branch shows a more variable pattern. But the same questions arise: is sentential negation expressed by means of a sentential marker, mono or bi-partite ? Is the notion of a NegP pertinent to the analysis of negation in these languages as well? Do n-expressions raise the same kind of question as their Indo-European counterparts? Very few of these problems have been tackled so far. The existence of a NegP hosting a sentential negative marker with properties similar to those of Indo-European languages has been discussed in Puskás (1998, 2000). Similarly, the question of the nature of n-expressions has been raised, at least for Hungarian (Olsvay 2000, Surányi 2001). But much more needs to be done. The papers collected in this volume propose to deal with some of these issues, in different languages of the Finno-Ugric family. Not all issues are tackled by all authors, and the reader might notice a certain asymmetry between representatives of the Finnic group (mainly Finnish) and those of the Ugric group (essentially Hungarian). The answer to this potential criticism has to do partly with the very new interest in Finnic languages among linguists working in the trends this volume considers, and partly with the by now extremely prolific production Hungarian linguists can boast, thanks to the efforts of the first generations of generative linguists in Hungary.

For the reader to appreciate the richness and pertinence of the arguments developed in the papers, this introduction gives, as a background, a short survey of the syntax and semantics of negation, as it has been discussed in the last 40 years. The chapter is organised as follows: section 2 presents the basics of the syntax of negation, as it has developed in the generative framework. Section 3 deals with a descriptive approach to the semantics of negation. Section 4 introduces some of the problems that the standard analyses either raise, or have failed to elucidate. Section 5 gives a quick survey of Finno-Ugric languages, and section 6 presents

and discusses the relevance of the contributions to this volume, in the light of current research on negation. Finally, section 7 is a short conclusion to the chapter.

2. The syntax of negation

2.1 Neg

The earliest reference to negation within the generative framework is probably Klima (1964)'s insightful work. Klima's observation, that negation triggers syntactic effects that can be paralleled with those of other operator-like elements, has become a gradually larger and larger source of inspiration to recent syntactic studies. Klima notes that negative sentences exhibit a certain number of properties, illustrated below:

(1)   a.   The students did not believe that it had happened

      b.   The students never believed that it had happened

      c.   The students hardly believed that it had happened

      d.   The students rarely believed that it had happened

      e.   None of the students believed that it had happened

      f.   Few students believed that it had happened

      g.   The students were unable to believe that it had happened

      h.   The students were too intelligent to believe that it had happened

      i.   The students doubted that it had happened

All the sentences in (1) have some negative import. The first question is whether negation is a unique phenomenon.

Crucially, in English, *not* requires do-insertion (1a), whereas other negative elements don't. Examples (c-d) include "negative adverbs". Their behaviour, according to Klima, is similar to that of *not,* except that they are not associated with aux/tense.

This first distinction gives rise to one of the important propositions with respect to negation, that is, the discrimination between the "head like properties" of *not* and the "adverb like properties" of other negative elements, including *never*. Other elements, such as *unable,* (1g), seem to contain some morphologically encoded expression of negation. Klima proposes that all these sentences contain an (abstract) *neg,* which will then combine with other elements to create the sentential negation effects. Thus *never* is *neg+ever*.

Another important observation is that sentences which contain a "polarity item" contain neither the abstract or realized preverbal *neg,* nor the aux/tense associate *not:*

(2) a.   No one was punished, and nobody was hit, either.

     b.   No one has hit anybody

In these sentences, *no one* licenses an either-tag (2a) and a polarity item (2b). Klima concludes that *no one, nobody,* etc must be derived from a sequence which contains *neg.* He analyses them as the result of a neg-incorporation into indefinites. In this approach, then, "polarity items" are treated as indefinites (note that e.g. ever is [indefinite+time], etc). Klima also observes that these indefinites are licensed in the environment of morphologically negative elements as given in (1g-h), as well as negative verbs (1i). Consider (3-5) below:

(3) a.   He was unable to find any time for that

     b.   *He will be able to find any time for that.

(4)   a.   It is impossible for him to do any more.

      b.   *It is possible for him to do any more.

(5)   They doubt that I need ever consider the problem.

Therefore, Klima proposes that there is a resemblance between the preverbal *neg,* the combined forms of neg+indefinite and the morphologically or lexically encoded negation present in *impossible* or *doubt*. All these elements contain *neg.* The difference is that whereas the negativity of e.g. *never* is derived syntactically from the preverbal *neg,* yielding sentential negation, the morphologically or lexically encoded negation types result in constituent negation. Thus the distinction between sentential and constituent negation is not a matter of different types of elements, but rather of the level of application of the *neg* particle and its scope. A well-known corollary to Klima's basic observation is that interrogative, restrictive, conditional and adversative contexts as well as negative ones (where restrictive is *only,* interrogative is *wh*, and adversatives are *afraid, ashamed, refuse, difficult, hard)* show the same properties, in that they exhibit incorporation, inversion and licensing of indefinites. Klima groups these elements under the term Affective elements.

   Jackendoff (1972) argues that English *not* can be of two types: either parallel to the particles *too* and *so* (in which case it alternates with them), or it can be some sort of degree adverb. On the other hand, the [indefinite+neg] elements are lexically negative. All the negative morphemes are independent lexical items. Therefore, they have a syntactic distribution depending on their lexical category. The scope of neg is everything that is c-commanded by the negative morpheme at S-structure. This is based on the following data:

(7)   a.   None of the examples will convince anyone.

b. *The man [who I didn't see] bought anything.

(8) a. I told nobody any of my jokes.

b. *I told anybody none of my jokes.

Thus, Klima and Jackendoff's basic heritage is the distinction between constituent - or lexically determined - negation, and 'sentential negation'. The latter, in Indo-European languages at least, relies on a *neg* particle that can scope over the whole sentence, or at least the relevant portion of the sentence which is related to tense.

2.2 NegP

From this heritage has developed the well-known idea (Pollock 1989, and much subsequent work) that *neg* is an element which is syntactically encoded as a functional head, on a par with tense, agreement, mood and more recently aspect. Moritz (1989), Belletti (1990), Zanuttini (1991), Haegeman (1995) have accounted for the behaviour of this *neg* particle in terms of incorporation, or rather cliticization, on the verbal/temporal head, thus explaining the inversion patterns found in Romance languages and in West Flemish:

(9) a. Jean n' est-il   pas venu?   *French*

Jean *ne* is- he not come

'Didn't John come?'

b. Non e   venuto?   *Italian*

Non is   come

'Didn't he come?'

c. En-eet   Valère   nie s'oavends?   *West Flemish*

En eats   Valère   not   evenings's

?Does Valère not eat in the evening?'

[Haegeman 1995]

Haegeman (1995) proposes that in Germanic languages, sentential negation is realized by a null head and an overt negative marker in the form of a maximal projection occupying the specifier of NegP (10), but that English has a mixed behavior (11), with a distinction between *not* (a maximal projection for Haegeman) and *n't*, arguably a head of the same type as the Romance negative marker:

(10) a.   Hans ist   nicht gekommen.

Hans is   not   come

'Hans didn't come.'

  b.   Ist   Hans nicht gekommen?

is   Hans not   come

'Didn't Hans come?'

(11) a.   John did not come.

  b.   Did John not come?

  c.   Didn't John come?

The NegP approach has been adopted and is widely accepted in current generative studies.

2.3 Polarity Items

In addition to the negative marker discussed above, languages display a class of linguistic expressions in negative sentences whose distribution was first associated with affective contexts (Klima 1964). Among these elements, the "negative polarity items" (NPIs) have the property of being sensitive to a negative environment. English *any* is the prototypical NPI. As such, it occurs in negative contexts, within the scope of negation:

(12) a.   John didn't see anybody

    b.   *John saw anybody

Similar elements in other languages have been termed "negative polarity items" as well, mainly because at a first sight, they behave like the English NPI, in that they occur in negative contexts:

(13) a.   Non ho   visto nessuno   *Italian*

            non have seen anyone

            'I haven't seen anyone'

    b.   *Ho visto nessuno

            have seen anyone

(14) a.   I Elektra   dhen enekrine   kanena   sxedhio.   *Greek*

            the Elektra   *neg* approved-3sg   any   plan

            'Electra didn't approve any plan.'

    b.   *I   Elektra   enekrine   kanena   sxedhio

            the   Elektra   approved-3s   any   plan

            [Giannakidou 1997]

(15) a. Maria   ne vidit   nikogo   *Serbo-Croatian*

         Mary   not sees   noone

         'Mary done not see anyone'

    b.   *Maria   vidit   nikogo

         Mary   sees   noone

         [Progovac 1994]

(16) a. János   nem látott   senkit.   *Hungarian*

         Janos   *neg* see-pas-3s nobody

         'Janos didn't see anybody'

    b.   *János   látott   senkit.

         Janos see-pas-3s   nobody

Note that NPIs also include non-atomic expressions:

(17) a. John didn't lift a finger to help me

    b.   *John lifted a finger to help me.

(18) a. János   'egy fillért   nem költött   el   *Hungarian*

         Janos   one cent   *neg* spend-pas-3s   part

         'John didn't spend a cent...'

    b.   *János   egy fillért   költött..

         Janos   one cent   spend-pas-3s

Much of the interest for these elements concerns their licensing conditions. The literature has proposed several approaches, which depend on the attributed nature of the elements.

2.3.1. C-command (Ladusaw 1979, 1992)

Ladusaw focuses on English NPIs. It is clear that the latter display an extremely transparent behavior with respect to their licenser. The task of determining what class of elements do license NPIs is a semantic one (see section 1.2 below). However, the distribution of NPIs makes it clear that they must be c-commanded by clausal negation, the licenser *par excellence,* at S-Structure:

(19) a.   John didn't see anybody.

     b.   *Anybody didn't see John

2.3.2 SigmaP/PolarityP (Laka 1990, Progovac 1994)

Laka argues that these 'polarity items' or 'n-words' are interpreted as existential quantifiers (see also section 1.2). As they are dependent on negation, they must be in the scope of their licenser (or antecedent). Laka proposes that the licenser is the element which occupies the head of SigmaP (ΣP), which can host either a negative or an emphatic marker. This alternation is illustrated in Basque:

(20) a.   Jon **ez**   da   etorri   *Basque*

        John neg   is   arrived

'John has not arrived'

b.   Jon **ba** da   etorri

John *so* is   arrived

'John has arrived indeed'

[Laka 1990]

She proposes that structurally, the functional projection ΣP occurs between CP and IP. This gives a simple account of the Spanish data below:

(21) Nadie   ha   venido   *Spanish*

nobody   has   come

'Nobody came'

[Laka 1990]

The n-word *nadie* does not occur within the scope of the negative head. However, Laka claims that *nada* does not occupy spec IP, but spec ΣP, where it can be licensed (and receive its negative interpretation) by spec-head agreement with the (non-overt) negative morpheme in Σ^0. Laka proposes that all NPIs move to specΣP at LF in order to be correctly interpreted as negative. Therefore, the licensing conditions are met in a spec-head configuration.

Progovac (1994) also argues in favor of an anaylsis of NPIs as indefinites. She claims that NPIs receive narrow scope with respect to (sentence) negation (see example 20 above). The NPI needs to be licensed, and the best candidate as a licenser is the negative operator. Therefore, the prediction is that NPIs will only be licensed in the presence of a negative operator. However, the Serbo-Croatian data is not uniform. In fact, the language contains two sets of NPIs: the *ni*-NPIs, as in (22) and the *i*-NPIs (as in 23):

(22) a. Marija   ne   voli   ni(t)koga.

Mary   not loves   noone

'Mary doesn't love anyone.'

b. *Ne verujem da Marija   voli   ni(t)koga

not claim   that Mary   loves   anyone

'I don't claim that Mary loves anyone'

(23) a. Milan   ne   tvrdi [da Marija   poznaje   i(t)koga]

Milan   not claims   that Mary   knows   anyone

'Milan does not claim that Mary knows anyone.'

b.   *Milan   ne   poznaje   i(t)koga

Milan   not knows   anyone

[Progovac 1994]

Whereas the *ni*-NPIs are licensed by clause mate negation only (22a,b), the *i*-NPIs are

ungrammatical in the same context (21a); they can only appear with superordinate negation

(23b). Progovac thus proposes a system in which the syntactic licensing conditions resemble

Binding Principles, and the different NPIs have either pronominal or anaphoric properties.

The generalization is the following:

(24) a. Universal: all NPIs must be bound and are subject to Binding Principles

b. Parameter 1: Some NPIs are subject to Principle A (SC NI-NPIS, English NPIs)

whereas others are subject to Principle B (SC I-NPIs)

c. Parameter 2: Some NPIs raise at LF (English NPIs), whereas others do not (SC NI-

NPIs)

The syntactic licensing is thus determined by the intrinsic nature of the various types of NPIs.

It is done via syntactic binding.

2.3.3. The Neg-criterion

Zanuttini (1991), Haegeman and Zanuttini (1991), Haegeman (1995) argue that NPIs - or

n-expressions - are universal negative quantifiers. That is, in addition to their universal

quantifier property (see 1.2. for discussion), n-expressions are intrinsically negative. The

arguments are based on the following data:

(25) a.   E rimasto con niente in mano.   *Italian*

Is left with nothing in hand

'He was left with nothing'

b.   Voglio o te o nessuno

I want either you or no one

c.   Chi ha telefonato?   Nessuno

'who has called? Nobody.'

[Zanuttini 1991]

(26) a.   wad ee-j gekocht?   Niets.   *West Flemish*

What have you bought? Nothing.

[Haegeman 1995]

The Italian examples in (25) show that n-expressions can occur in contexts in which there is no formal licenser (i.e. no negative operator). Whereas (25a) illustrates "constituent negation", (25b) is a case of coordinate structure and (25c) a fragment answer. Haegeman shows that fragment answers can also contain a negative expression in West Flemish, n-expression which does not seem to be licensed by any negative operator. Therefore, these authors propose that n-expressions have a feature [+neg].

Hageman and Zanuttini (1991) propose that n-expressions are syntactically licensed. The formal licensing conditions are expressed as a well-formedness condition, the Neg-Criterion:

(27) a.   A NEG-operator must be in a spec-head configuration with an X^0 [NEG]

     b.   An X^0 [NEG] must be in a spec-head configuration with a NEG-operator

where the following definitions hold:

(28) a.   NEG-operator: a NEG phrase in a scope position

     b.   Scope position: left-peripheral A'-position (an XP-adjoined position or a specifier position)

The syntactic condition expressed in the configurational terms of the Neg-Criterion accounts for the West Flemish cases in (29) below. The non-negative PP *me euren kado,* complement of the adjective *ketent* follows the adjective in (29a). In (29b), the same complement is a negative constituent *me niets.* It appears higher, preceding the adjective *ketent.* Haegeman argues that it appears in the position in which *nie* sits in (29a). This position is spec NegP. In

order to be licensed, the negative element has raised to spec NegP, satisfying thus the Neg-Criterion. (29c,d) show that any other position leads to ungrammaticality:

(29) a.   da   ze   nie   ketent   me euren   kado   en-was   *West Flemish*

        that she neg   happy   with her   present   *en*-was

        'that she was not happy with her present.'

     b.   da   ze   me   niets   ketent   en-was

        that she with nothing   happy   *en*-was

        'that she wasn't happy with anything.'

     c.   *da ze   ketent   me niets   en-was

        that she happy   with nothing   *en*-was

     d.   *da ze   ketent   en-was   me niets

        that she happy   *en*-was   with nothing

        [Haegeman 1995]

Haegeman, citing Hamann (1993), shows that German exhibits the same kind of constraint:

(30) a.   weil   Peter   zufrieden mit seinem   Auto ist   *German*

        because Peter   pleased   with his   car is

        'because Peter is pleased with his car'

     b.   weil Peter mit seinem Auto zufrieden ist

(31) a.   weil   Peter   mit nichts   zufrieden ist

        because Peter   with nothing   pleased   is

     b.   ??weil Peter zufrieden mit nichts ist

The strong degradation of (31b) is explained as a violation of the Neg-criterion: the PP *mit nichts* ('with nothing'), which has a [+neg] feature, has not raised to spec NegP.

Haegeman claims that all languages have a NegP, and all languages are subject to the Neg-Criterion. In English, NegP hosts the negative marker *not* in its specifier, satisfying *de facto* the Neg-criterion. However, not all negative sentences contain a *not*. As was discussed above, English has two distinct paradigms of negative expressions, the so-called NPIs (such as *anybody*, *anything,* etc) and the negative expressions of the type *nobody, nothing*, etc. The latter never appear with the negative marker *not:*

(32)   John said nothing

As in (32), the negative expression *nothing* has not moved, the sentence seems to challenge the Neg-criterion. However, Haegeman proposes that in its Surface-Structure position, it does not qualify as an operator (see 28 above), therefore it does not violate the criterion. But this still leaves another question open, that of the licensing of the n-expression itself. Haegeman proposes that the sentence contains a covert Neg^0, and the criterion is satisfied with a null negative operator in spec NegP, which is co-indexed with the n-expression, licensing it "at a distance":

(33) John [$_{NegP}$ OP$_i$ [said nothing$_i$]]

2.4 Negative Concord

Languages differ with respect to the treatment of multiple n-expressions. The main difference lies in the interpretation of a sentence containing several n-expressions. In some languages, multiple n-expressions are interpreted as conveying one unique negation; in others, n-expressions appear as individual negative elements whose combination cancels out the negative force of the sentence. Languages of the first type, known as Negative Concord languages, are exemplified in (34), whereas languages of the second type are illustrated in (35):

(34) a. Jean n'a   jamais   rencontré personne.   *French*

Jean *ne*-has   never   met   nobody

'Jean has never met anyone.'

b. Péter   senkivel   nem beszélt   semmiröl.   *Hungarian*

Peter   nobody-instr   neg speak-pas-3s   nothing-delat

'Peter didn't speak to anybody about anything.'

c. KANENAS   dhen edhose   TIPOTA se   KANENAN.   *Greek*

nobody   not gave-3s   nothing   to   nobody

'Nobody gave anything to anybody.'

[Giannakidou 1997]

d. da Valere   nooit an geen mens   niet   nie gezeid   en-oat

that Valere   never to no   person   nothing   not said   en-had

'that Valère had never told anything to anyone.'   *West Flemish*

[Haegeman 1995]

(35) a.	John said nothing to nobody.	*English*

  b.	das Hans mit keinem Mensch über nichts gesprochen hat German	*German*

    that Hans with no   man   on nothing spoken   has

    'that Hans spoke about nothing with nobody.'

Haegeman and Zanuttini (1991) argues that in Negative Concord languages (34), the various n-expressions are able to undergo neg-absorption at LF (following Higginbotham) and therefore are interpreted as one unique negation. This is subordinate to their appearing in spec NegP, or positions adjoined to it. Haegeman argues that the contrast in (36) below follows directly from this constraint:

(36) a.	da	Valère	van	niemand	nie	ketent	en-was	*West Flemish*

    that	Valère	of	no one	not	pleased	en-was

    'that Valère was not pleased with anyone.'

  b.	da	Valère	nie	ketent	van	niemand	en-was

    that	Valère	not	pleased	of	no one	en-was

    'that Valère was not pleased with no one.' (DN)

(36a) is another illustration of NC. In (36b), on the other hand, the n-sequence *van niemand* ('of no one') follows the negative marker *nie*. Haegeman argues that the word order reveals that the PP has not moved to spec NegP. Therefore only the double-negation reading is available as it cannot undergo neg-absorption.

3. The semantics of negation

The semantics of negation is based on a certain number of claims. I will briefly review some of them, keeping to a rather informal, descriptive approach.

3.1 neg

First, it is assumed that negation involves a negation operator which is a one-place operator (but see Kratzer 1989 for a different view). The main property of negation is to invert scope. In the pairs below, this is translated as follows:

(37) a.   Everyone loves someone I know   : $\forall \exists$ ($\exists \forall$ as particular cases is acceptable)

b.   It is not the case that everyone loves someone I know   : $\neg \exists \forall$

Formally, negation yields the following:

(38) $[[\neg A]]^{M1,\, g1} = 1$ iff $[[A]]^{M1,\, g1} = 0$

Negation operates then on truth values. But since negation appears often as a sister to entities smaller than the clause it operates on, there must be an operation which guarantees the correct scope, a sort of "scope raising" operation. Sentential negation is thus standardly treated in a purely formal way: the negation operator scopes over the whole sentence. As such, sentential negation markers are expressions of sentential negation, which scope over the whole sentence. The contrasting pair in (40) below illustrates this problem:

(39) a.   He didn't know that anything has happened.

b.   He knew that nothing has happened.

Whereas in the (a) example, negation scopes over the main clause, the (b) sentence expresses subordinate negation: the fact that there is no negative marker in the main clause excludes a matrix negation reading. The same kind of contrast can be observed in other languages:

(40) a. Il   ne savait pas   que   quelque chose se soit   produit.[1]   *French*

        he   *ne* knew   *neg*   that something   *refl* be-subj   happened
        'He didn't know that anything had happened.'

    b. Il   savait que   rien   ne s'était   produit.
        He   knew that   nothing   *ne refl*-was   happened
        'He knew that nothing had happened.'

(41) a. Nem tudta,   hogy valami is történt   volna.   *Hungarian*
        neg know-pas-3s   that anything happened subj.
        'He didn't know that anything had happened.'

    b. Tudta,   hogy   semmi   nem történt.
        Know-pas-3s   that   nothing   neg happen-pas-3s
        'He knew that nothing had happened.'

Jackendoff (1972) proposes the following definition:

(42)   a sentence [X – neg Y] is an instance of sentence negation if there exists a
          paraphrase (disregarding presuppositions) 'It is not so that [S – Y].

This is crucial to distinguish sentential negation (43a below) from "constituent" negation (VP negation, 43b). If one conjoins a sentence and its negated counterpart, sentential negation leads to contradiction (44a). This is clearly not the case with "VP negation", as illustrated in (44b):

(43) a.   Not many of the demonstrators were arrested by the police.

b.   Many of the demonstrators weren't arrested by the police.

(44) a.   *Not many of the demonstrators were arrested by the police, but many were.

b.   Many of the demonstrators weren't arrested by the police, but many were.

[Jackendoff 1972]

3.2 NPIs

The description of negative expressions is more problematic. There are three main trends as to their semantics. Recall that Laka (1990), Progovac (1994) argue in favor of an account of NPIs as existential quantifiers within the scope of negation. Therefore, a sentence as in (45a) has the representation in (45b):

(45) a.   John didn't see anyone

b. $\neg\exists x$ (John saw x)

Ladusaw (1979) argues that English NPIs are indefinites. This means that they have no quantificational content at all:

(46) An indefinite is an argument expression which has descriptive content but no inherent quantificational or referential force.

Ladusaw proposes that NPIs, such as *any, ever*, are subject to two licensing conditions: they must be "roofed" (i.e. bound by an operator which triggers the anchoring of the indefinite) by an appropriate negative operator, and they must be c-commanded by clausal negation at S-structure. Semantically, NPIs are subject to licensing by a class of elements which exhibit similar properties, and have been termed downward entailing elements, that is elements which have the property of inverting scalar values (that is, they allow inferences from the set to the subset within their scope). This is illustrated in (48-50) below. In each of the cases, the proposition expressed in the (a) example entails the one expressed in the (b) example:

(47) a.   Mary did not bring roses

   b.   Mary did not bring red roses

(48) a.   No guest brought roses

   b.   No guest brought red roses

(49) a.   Few guests brought roses.

   b.   Few guests brought red roses

This is not the case with e.g. *some*, which is not a downward entailing expression:

(50) a.   Some guests brought roses.

   b.   Some guests brought red roses.

Ladusaw proposes that only expressions which denote downward entailing functions license NPIs. However, the class of elements which do license NPIs has to be extended, as neither questions, nor conditionals (see section 1.1.1 above) can be argued to be of the downward entailing type.

Zwarts (1995), Giannakidou (1997) introduce the notions of nonveridical and antiveridical operators. Nonveridical operators have the property of affecting the truth of the proposition they embed. In other words, whenever OP p is true, p may be true or may not be true. Averidical operators entail the falsity of the proposition they embed, i.e. whenever Op p is true, p is false. Zwarts shows that the class of operators which are downward entailing form a subset of the class of nonveridical operators. Indeed, *few* has been taken as a downward entailing expression (see 49 above), and it clearly exhibits nonveridical properties (51), as shown by the fact that the embedded proposition may either be true or false (a continuation as in (51a) is possible); on the other hand, polar questions are not downward entailment denoting functions, as shown by the fact that there is no entailment relation at all between (52a) and (52b); but they also exhibit nonveridical properties (53), as they denote a set of propositions which can be affirmative or negative:

(51) a   Few students brought wine -/→ students brought wine

    b.   In fact, none of them did.

(52) a.   Did the students bring wine? -/→

    b.   Did the students bring red wine?

(53) a.   Did the students bring wine?

b.   S = ⟨ the students brought wine, the students did not bring wine ⟩

Giannakidou (1997) develops this approach, arguing that Polarity Items show different behaviors. In Greek, whereas the non-emphatic "NPI" is licensed in nonveridical contexts, the emphatic version is possible only in averidical contexts, which include negation, *without* clauses and *before*-clauses:

(54) a.   Idhes   kanenan   sti   sxoli?   *Greek*

          Saw-2sg   anyone   in-the   department

          'Did you see anybody at the department?'

     b.   Xoris   (na) pi   TIPOTA...

          without   subj say-3sg   nothing

          'without saying anything'

          [Giannakidou 1997]

The reader is referred to Giannakidou (1997) for a full discussion of these facts.

   Finally, Zanuttini (1991) claims that n-expressions are negative universal quantifiers. She observes that they share some interesting properties with the latter. One of the most relevant ones, she claims, is the possibility to undergo *almost,* or *absolutely* modification, an observation due to Horn (1972). Universal quantifiers, but not existential quantifiers, accept a modification by *almost:*

(55) a.   I saw almost everybody

     b.   *I saw almost somebody

Italian n-words belong with universal quantifiers from this point of view:

(56) a.   non ha telefonato quasi nessuno   *Italian*

              not has called   almost nobody

              'Almost nobody called'

              [Zanuttini 1991]

4. Problems

Despite the tremendous amount of research on negation, a few important issues have not –yet – been handled at a large scale. One striking question is that of the adequation between syntactic facts (negation is expressed differently in different languages) and a semantic unicity, at least to a certain extent: languages seem to be able to express identical negative contents. The presence and the scope of the negative marker is a fairly straightforward problem: many languages exhibit a negative marker, which can be identified as the sentential negation marker. In other words, when this particle is not present, the sentence cannot be interpreted as negative:

(57) a.   Paolo **non** ha   mangiato.   *Italian*

              Paolo neg has   eaten

              'Paolo has not eaten.'

      b.   Pál   **nem** evett.   *Hungarian*

              Pal-nom   neg   eat-pas-3s

'Pal did not eat.'

c. **Dhen** efaje i Roxani. *Greek*

neg ate-3sg the Roxane

'Roxane did not eat.'

d. Kòjó **má** dù nú *Gungbe*

Kojo neg eat-perf thing

'Kojo has not eaten.'

[Aboh 1999]

However, even this simple question raises a certain number of problems. French, for example, seems to have a negative marker identical to the Italian one. The original claim that French *ne* occupies the head Neg^0 (Pollock 1989) has been adopted straightforwardly for Italian *non* (Belletti 1990, Zanuttini and Haegeman 1991, Haegeman 1995). However, the optionality of the marker in French, in addition to the obligatory presence of the second part of the marker *pas,* leads authors to propose that *ne* is not involved in sentential negation *per se,* but only in sentential scope marking (Matthieu 2003). The negative property and the scope marking property of negation may then have to be distinguished.

Another problem arises in languages like English, which exhibit an alternation between sentential negation marking with *not* (analysed as a maximal projection, cf. Haegeman 1995) and the possibility of expressing sentential negation by means of a bare n-word, such as *nobody*. Although Haegeman proposes an analysis which gives a uniform account of the two instances of sentential negation in English (see section 2.3), it is at the cost of a complex mechanism involving multiple null elements.

Zanuttini (1997) tackles yet another problem related to the sentential negative marker. She observes that bare negative markers exhibit different behaviors in different Northern Italian

dialects: whereas some of them appear only post-verbally, like Valdotan *pa*, or Milanese *minga,* others are clearly pre-verbal, such as Italian *no.* In addition, she shows that the apparently similar head-type negative markers, such as French *ne* and Italian *non* actually differ with respect to cliticisation and other patterns. The author proposes that the locus of the sentential negation marker varies cross-linguistically, in that sentential negation markers are not only distributed as either heads (*non, ne)* or maximal projections (*pa, minga)*, but also in that they are generated in different NegPs. Thus, whereas Italian *non*, as well as its Catalan and Spanish counterpart *no,* head a higher NegP, French *ne* occupies the head of a lower NegP; similarly, Occitan *pas* occupies the specifier of the higher NegP while French *pas,* or Milanese *minga* sit in the specifier of the lower NegP. These distinctions enable Zanuttini to account for the variations negative markers show with respect to other adverbial elements. The distribution of all these elements is contingent on the application of (some version) of the Neg-criterion, which, in the case of bare sentential negation, assumes that a null operator (or a null head) satisfy the required spec-head configuration locally with the negative marker, in NegP. But, in Zanuttini's system, this requires more than one NegP.

The problems multiply when one starts looking at n-expressions. As was mentioned above, the nature of n-words has been widely discussed in the literature. Whereas Ladusaw (1979) argues that they are indefinites, Laka (1990), Progovac (1994) view them as existential quantifiers in the scope of the negative operator. As for Zanuttini and Haegeman (1991), they argue that n-words are universal negative quantifiers. Their negative force is intrinsic, hence it does not depend on the presence of the negative operator. The latter determines sentential negation, and the various n-words enter into NC by neg-absorption. Recently, this view has been challenged by Giannakidou (2000) who argues that n-expressions in NC languages are universal quantifiers indeed, but without their own negative force.

Recall (section 2.3.3) that Zanuttini bases her arguments on the existence of negative

fragment answers (25c, repeated here as (58a)), as well as coordinate structures (25b, repeated

here as 58b):

(58) a.   Chi hai   visto?   Nessuno.   *Italian*

           Who have-you seen?   Nobody.

     b.   Voglio   o   te   o   *nessuno.*

           I want   either   you or   no one.

     [Zanuttini 1991]

In addition, in Italian, n-words can also contribute to a double negation reading (henceforth

DN). Note that this is possible only in preverbal contexts, and given some special intonation:

whereas the NC reading obtains under a continuous, slightly falling intonation, Zanuttini

notes that a sharp fall (followed by a slight rise and a pause) on the n-expression *proprio*

niente yields a DN reading:

(59) a.   Proprio   niente,   non ho   detto.

           Really   nothing   neg have-I said

           'I haven 't said anything.'

           'I haven't said NOTHING.'

In all these contexts, the n-expression seems to be able to contribute some negative meaning

independently of the presence of a negative marker. Therefore, claims Zanuttini, n-

expressions come with their own negative force.

On the other hand, most of Zanuttini's arguments can be shown to have no real impact on the negativity of n-expressions. Giannakidou (2000) argues that so-called fragment answers are in fact cases of ellipsis (60a). Therefore, they are not intrinsically negative, since in Greek, if the full non-elliptical structure were to be spelled out, it would need the negative marker (60b):

(60) a. Pjon idhes?   KANENAN.   *Greek*

who saw.2s   n-person

'who did you see? Nobody.'

   b. KANENAN   [*(~~dhen~~) ~~idha~~]

n-word   not saw.1sg

'Nobody [I saw].'

[Giannakidou 2000]

Giannakidou adds, as an argument against the negativity of n-expressions, the fact that in Greek, multiple occurrences of n-expressions can never yield a DN interpretation.

The behaviour of Hungarian n-expressions also provides arguments against the intrinsically negative approach. Indeed, in fragment answers, they exhibit case-endings which correspond to that of the argument of the verb:

(61) a. Kit   láttál?   Senkit.   *Hungarian*

Who-acc see-pas-2s nobody-acc

'Who did you see? Nobody.'

   b. Kivel   beszéltél?   Senkivel.

Who-instr speak-pas-2s?   Nobody-instr

'Who did you speak with? Nobody.'

There is strong evidence that the fragment answers, as well as the coordination constructions as discussed in Zanuttini (1991) are the result of ellipsis, as discussed in Puskás (2002). However, Hungarian displays DN. This latter observation seems to cast doubt on the non-negative nature of n-words (recall that DN is assumed to be the result of a lack of neg-absorption, leaving the negative n-expressions with their individual negative force, see Haegeman 1995). However, given the rather strict conditions in which DN occurs, namely particular intonation (62a versus b) and preverbal position preceding that of n-expression licensed by the sentential negation marker (62c vs 62d)), it has been argued in Puskás (2002) that double negation is the result of a secondary negation, parasitic on sentential negation (the diacritic √ indicates a fall-rise intonation on the following n-word).

(62) a.   Senkivel   nem beszélt   semmiröl.   *Hungarian*

        Nobody-instr   neg speak-pas-3s   nothing-delat

        'He didn't speak about anything with anybody' (NC)

    b.   Senkivel   nem beszélt √ semmiröl

        'He didn't speak with anybody about nothing' (DN)

    c.   Senkivel   semmiröl   nem beszélt

        Nobody-instr   nothing-delat   neg   speak-pas-3s

        'He didn't speak about anything with anybody.' (NC)

    d.   √ semmiröl senkivel nem beszélt (DN)

        'He didn't speak with anybody about nothing' (DN)

On the other hand, the status of Germanic n-words necessitates further research. Although Haegeman, assuming that all n-expressions are intrinsically negative, assigns the same status to English *nobody* than to Italian *nessuno*, it seems that the properties of these two classes of expressions would need to be investigated in more detail:

(63) a.   non ho richiamato   che Gianni (lie-subj)   a nessuno   *Italian*

         not   have requested   that Gianni   lie-subj   to nobody

         'I haven't requested that Gianni lie to anybody'

    b.   *I haven't requested that Gianni lie to nobody

The other issue, which still feeds a lively debate, is that of the quantificational force of the n-expression. Recall that negation *à la* Ladusaw assumes (Heimian, cf Heim 1982) indefinites, whereas Laka argues in favour of an existential quantifier and Zanuttini claims that n-expressions are universal quantifiers. Giannakidou adopts most of Zanuttini's arguments and considers that in most of the languages she examines (Greek, Catalan, Italian, etc), they are of the form in (63a); but she does not exclude that some languages (e.g. Polish, following Blaszczak 1998) may express negation with existential n-words in the form of (64b):

(64) a. $\forall\neg$

    b. $\neg\exists$

Given the typology of languages, Giannakidou does not exclude that some language may have both (64a) and (64b).

5. Finno-Ugric

The Finno-Ugric languages belong to the group of Uralic languages. The most wide-spread languages of the group are Finnish, Hungarian and Estonian. These three languages belong to different sub-groups of the Finno-Ugric family. While Finnish and Estonian are part of the Finno-Permic language sub-group, more precisely to the sub-family of the Baltic Finnic languages (along with Karelian, Veps, Livonian, among others), Hungarian is the main representative of the Ugric languages. Finno-Ugric languages are characterized by a certain number of distinctive properties. First, they are agglutinative languages, which make an extensive use of bound morphemes:

(65) a.   ote-ta-isi-in   *Finnish*

    take-passive-conditional-positive

    'would be taken'

  b.   meg-csokol-tat-hat   *Hungarian*

    perfective-kiss-causative-potential

    'may make to kiss'

They are also highly inflected languages, displaying a rich inflection both in the nominal and verbal domains.

(66) a.   a gyerek-e-i-m-nek   *Hungarian*

    the child-Plural-PossessedPlural-Possessor1sg-dative

'to my children'

b.

Moreover, they exhibit similar phonological properties: both Hungarian and Finnish have the stress systematically on the first syllable, and both display vowel harmony.

Although Finnish, Hungarian and Estonian are the main representatives of the Finno-Ugric languages, the family comprises many other languages, some of which close to extinction. Within the Baltic-Finnic group (to which Finnish belongs), we find Karelian, Vepsian, Livonian, Votian, Ingrian; a "sister" to the Baltic-Finnic group, the Lapic group, includes Saami; The Finno-Permic group also comprises, with various degrees of "relatedness" to Finnish and Estonian, Mordva, Mari, Udmurt and Komi. The Ugric group, in addition to Hungarian, also includes, in the Ob-Ugric family, the languages Mansi and Khanty. Mitchell's paper in this volume includes examples in most of these languages. She notes, however, that in Hungarian, Mansi and Khanty, negation is expressed as an invariant element, as opposed to the other languages, in which she shows that they behave like auxiliaries. In the expression of sentential negation, the Ugric group thus radically differs from the Finno-Permic group.

6. The contributions in this volume

The papers collected in this volume all contribute in some important way to the current issues described in the previous section, specifically in the light of Finno-Ugric languages.

6.1 Mitchell

One topic of discussion is the position of NegP(s) in Finno-Ugric languages. Although the presence (and maybe to some extent the IP-internal position) of NegP in Hungarian has

become fairly uncontroversial, it is still the case that both the realization and the position of NegP is under question in most other languages of the family. Mitchell's paper tackles the interesting variations which lead to typological differences. The morpho-syntactic variations one can observe, on the basis of the rich set of data that she examines, are argued to reduce to a lexical variation between sentence negation morphemes. Comparing an impressive number of Finnic languages, Mitchell notes that they vary with respect to the realization of agreement morphemes on the negative marker. She assumes that in these languages, this negative marker is a "negative auxiliary". Basing her analysis on the morphological evidence of the distribution of the morphemes on different elements, she argues that there must be some variation in the ordering of the functional projections within the structure. More specifically, she argues that NegP occurs in two different positions with respect to T and Agr.

Therefore, Mitchell claims, NegP may not be universally identical (see e.g. Ouhalla 1990). She grounds these variations in the lexical (feature set) properties of negative elements cross-linguistically. Given the discussion on the realization of NegP, the morphological evidence presented here seems to corroborate the proposal defended in Zanuttini (1997) that NegP is not a uniform functional head.

6.2 Olsvay

Olsvay also claims that a unique NegP, occurring between AgrP and TP as originally proposed by Belletti (1990), cannot account for the complex distribution of n-words in Hungarian. Hungarian is well-known for its relatively "free" word-order, and n-words happen to be a typical realization of this variability:

(67) a. Pál nem beszélt   senkivel.   *Hungarian*
         Paul neg speak-pas-3s   nobody-instr

'Paul didn't speak with anybody.'

   b.   Pál   senkivel   nem beszélt.

        Paul nobody-instr   neg speak-pas-3s

        'Paul didn't speak with anybody.'

Olsvay raises the question of the licensing of these n-words in different positions, as well as the motivation for (overt) movement. His choice is to adopt Zanuttini (1991), Haegeman and Zanuttini (1991) and to argue that n-words are intrinsically [+neg]. Therefore, they must check the [+neg] feature. Olsvay is thus led to propose that Hungarian has two NegPs, as higher, "focus-related" one and a lower one. Note that this is parallel to recent proposals by Brody and Szabolcsi (2002), who account for the variations in the surface positions of universal quantifiers (68a,b) by positing two DistP projections, a H[igh]DistP and an IP-internal DistP.

(68) a.   Pál   többször   beszélt   mindenkivel[2]   *Hungarian*

        Paul several times   speak-pas-3s   everybody-instr

        'Paul spoke several times with everybody.'

        Pál   mindenkivel   többször   beszélt.

        Paul everybody-instr   several times   speak-pas-3s

        'id.'

The quantificational nature of n-words is central to Olsvay's account. He argues that in addition to being intrinsically [+neg], n-words can also be optionally [+q]. This will explain the variations in the surface positions of n-words. Obviously, Olsvay's contribution is at the heart of the debate on the nature of n-word. Recall that there is (yet) no consensus on the

exact nature of n-words (see section 4 and, for more details Giannakidou (2000), Haegeman (1995), Deprez (), Mathieu 2003)). Neither is there a consensus in Hungarian (see Puskás 2000 vs Puskás 2002!). In addition, there is a growing interest for the parallels one should draw between the properties of n-words and those of other quantifiers. Olsvay's paper gives a purely syntactic account of the phenomenon, based on the syntactic definition of the features involved.

6.3 Surányi

Surányi's contribution provides an interesting contrast with the previous one. Suranyi takes a radically opposed view and claims that Hungarian n-words (at least the simplex ones, discussed in Olsvay as well and illustrated in (67) are not negative. On the other hand, he agrees that, to some extent at least, they behave like universal quantifiers. Namely, he shows that they are sensitive to some of the tests proposed in Giannakidou (1997) for Greek, and Puskás (1999) for Hungarian. But he also argues that n-expressions are assimilable to universal quantifiers to some extent only. Indeed, he also identifies syntactic behaviors which argue against the universal quantifier analysis, such as focusing. Surányi chooses not to investigate thoroughly the syntactic implications of such a view (i.e. are there specific features which make n-words look like negative expressions? How are they licensed syntactically?). He concentrates on the semantics and the presuppositional implications of such an analysis.

Surányi's original contribution opens the way for a novel path, proposing a solution which lies in between the pure negative universal quantifier approach adopted by Olsvay (this volume) and the non-negative universal quantifier approach adopted e.g. in Puskás (1999, 2002). He claims that Hungarian realizes the case of a language which has a set of n-words ambiguous between the universally quantified version and a pure indefinite. In this sense, Surányi's paper contributes to the general characterization of n-words in Hungarian from a

semantico-syntactic point of view. Interestingly, his analysis seems to provide evidence that there is a language which corresponds to Giannakidou's hypothetical hybrid language (see section 4).

6.4 Kaiser

Kaiser investigates the left peripheral domain of Finnish. She argues that in addition to the standard IP-internal NegP, the negative marker *ei* also plays a role in the left periphery. Given the left-peripheral constraints observed in Finnish, she notes that preposed negation has the property of reversing the ordering constraints. Non-negated sentences have the order Focus-Topic (69). (A focused constituent is marked with a capital, and a topic with a lower case)[3]. The preposed negation partially reverses this order (70).

(69) a.   O-s-v

    b.   *s-O-v

    c.   S-o-v

    d.   *o-S-v

(70) a.   **ei*-O-s-v

    b.   *ei*-s-O-v

    c.   *ei*-S-o-v

    d.   *ei*-o-S-v

Kaiser proposes that the preposed *ei* occupies a high PolP (since an emphatic positive element alternates with the preposed negative marker). Therefore, her account also hinges on the presence of another neg-related functional projection.

However, Kaiser notes that the preposing of *ei* to this sentence-initial position modifies the information structure. The question that needs to be raised, in a more general approach, is whether "sentential negation " is really what it has been analysed to be. Scoping over left-peripheral elements makes this fronted negation look more like a counterpart to "verum focus" (see Höhle 1992), which Kaiser signals. Although these instances of non-canonical sentence negation have been analyzed as possible instances of "constituent negation", Kaiser clearly shows that it is not the case. Syntactically, this has the consequence of "opening" the left-periphery, right at the crucial junction between what has been considered as the syntactic domain of the sentence and its anchoring into discourse (ForceP in Rizzi 1997). This clearly raised the question what the left periphery should actually encode. Beyond this "local" problem, Kaiser's paper also triggers interrogations about the interaction between syntactic information and discursive/pragmatic information.

6.5 Wedgwood

Coming as almost as an echo to the questions Kaiser's paper raise, Wedgwood's contribution proposes a novel analysis which altogether dispenses with a syntactic account for negation. He argues that the expression of negation can be derived pragmatically. His arguments are based on the empirical evidence, often noted but not in the relevant point of view, that in Hungarian, some types of elements compete for the same "syntactic" position, but that these types do not constitute a uniform class. Wedgwood therefore proposes that the idea of a syntactic position is misleading, and that focusing, as well as other pre-tense elements, can be re-read as instances of main predication. The constraints on negation therefore become those of a simple "linear" effect, as negation (precisely the negative marker *nem*) contributes a local operator over predicates.

Wedgwood thus introduces an original analysis of negation, arguing that much of the syntactic complexity can be reduced to pragmatic effects. Thus the distinction that has been suggested between constituent negation and sentential negation boils down to a question of "domain of operation" of the negative operator. Although Wedgwood claims that his analysis take into consideration Hungarian negation solely, it is worth bearing in mind that other Finno-Ugric languages display some of the pre-tense focus effects observed for Hungarian, and that ultimately, this has also been argued to be the case in Indo-European and other non-Indo-European languages as well (see e.g. Aboh 1999).

6.6

Finally, Babarczy proposes a survey of the acquisition of negation in Hungarian, as a phenomenon which parallels that of focusing. It has been argued (see e.g. Tóth 1996) that sentences with bare negative markers are "neutral" sentences, where the subject appears in spec AgrP:

(71) a.　János　　　　nem látta　　Marit.　　　　　　　　　　*Hungarian*

　　　　　Janos-nom　　neg　see-pas-3s Mari-acc

　　　　　'Janos did not see Mari.'

　　b.　[$_{AgrP}$ János [$_{NegP}$ nem látta Marit]]

However, as observed in Puskás 2000, even these seemingly neutral sentences involve movement to some higher position, as the verb exhibits verb-particle inversion (compare (72a), an affirmative "neutral" order sentence with (72b), a negative sentence):

(72) a.　János　　　　　meg ette　　　a　　levest.

Janos-nom   part eat-pas-3s the   soup-acc

'Janos ate the soup.'

    b.   János   nem ette   meg a   levest.

         Janos   neg eat-pas-3s part the   soup-acc

         'Janos did not eat the soup.'

The inversion observed in the negative sentence appears also in Focus sentences:

(73 a.   A LEVEST   ette   meg János.

        The soup-acc   eat-pas-3s part Janos-nom

        'It is the soup that Janos ate.'

Babarczy's study shows that the acquisition of inversion contexts follows similar steps, both in negation and in focus constructions, reinforcing thus the idea that negation involves movement of (at least) the verb, to higher (possibly IP-external) positions. Again, Hungarian transparently displays an important property of negation, which is to operate at the propositional level, rather than the predicational level. That this operation necessarily applies, probably covertly in other languages, remains to be demonstrated cross-linguistically.

7. Conclusion

   The papers in this volume are at the same time very different and, to some extent, very similar. They are different because the issue of negation triggers interesting contributions coming from different horizons, and it is a choice in this volume to consider negation from the syntactic, the semantic, the pragmatic and the acquisition point of view. They are also

probably very similar, because they all deal with negation in a given language group, and in addition, they happen to focus on some of the major languages of the group. As such, they are an interesting contribution to the study of negation in Finno-Ugric languages.

But their rather specific nature should not divert us from what seems to be an important goal: a general understanding of what negation is. Thus, as specific as they may be, the papers all raise questions about more general issues, such as the position – and in that matter, the very existence – of a NegP. Is there really cross-linguistic variation, as some of the papers seem to suggest? Is there need for several functional projections of the same type, maybe differentiated as proposition-relevant versus predicate-relevant projections? Extending this view, we might also wonder whether some of the discourse-functional properties of negation should be encoded, and where. A different group of questions revolve around the proper characterisation of "n-words". As was mentioned above, the floor is open for discussion, and the contributions of this volume may help tilt the scale this or that way. Again, although these contributions are meant to be language-specific, they inevitably raise the question of the cross-linguistic validity of their claims. Therefore, they should encourage the development of larger scale projects.

As such, I hope that the volume proves to be relevant not only to Finno-Ugricists (if such a category does indeed exist), but to everybody who, because she/he at some point got entangled in the net of negation, finds it irremediably fascinating.

References

Aboh, E., 1999. From the Syntax of Gungbe to the Grammar of Gbe. Sierre: A La Carte.

Belletti, A., 1990. Generalized Verb Movement. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Blaszczak, J., 1998. The riddle of n-words in Polish: quantificational versus nonquantificational, universal versus existential, ms. Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

Brody, M. and A. Szabolcsi, 2003. Overt Scope in Hungarian. Syntax 6(1), 19-51.

Deprez, V., 1997. Two types of Negative Concord. Probus 9, 103-143.

Giannakidou, A., 1997. The Landscape of Polarity Items. Doctoral dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Giannakidou, A., 2000. Negative...Concord?. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 18(3), 457-523.

Haegeman, L., 1995. The Syntax of Negation. Cambridge:CUP.

Haegeman, L. & R. Zanuttini, 1991. Negative heads and the Neg criterion. The Linguistic Review 8, 233-251.

Hajičová, E., B. H. Partee & P. Sgall 1998. Topic-Focus Articulation, Tripartite Structures, and Semantic Content. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Hamann, C., 1993. Notes on negation in German. Ms, University of Geneva.

Heim, I., 1982. The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite NPs. PhD dissertation, Amherst, Umass.

Höhle, T. 1992. Über Verum-Focus in Deutschen. Linguistische Berichte, Sonderheft 4, 112-141.

Horn, L., 1972. On the Semantic Properties of Logical Operators in English. PhD dissertation, UCLA.

Jackendoff, R., 1972. Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Klima, E.,1964. Negation in English. In: J. Fodor & J. Katz (eds), The Structure of Language. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kratzer, A., 1989. Stage-Level and Individual-Level Predicates. In: B. Bach, A. Kratzer and B. Partee (eds), Papers on Quantification, NST report, UMass.

Ladusaw, W., 1979. Polarity Sensitivity as Inherent Scope Relations. PhD thesis, UT Austin.

Ladusaw, W., 1992. Expressing negation. In: C. Baker & D. Dowty (eds), Proceedings of the second conference on Semantics and Linguistic Theory [SALT II] , 237-259. Ohio:Ohio State University

Laka, I., 1990. Negation in Syntax: on the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections. PhD dissertation, MIT.

Matthieu 2003. On the nature of French N-words. Ms, UCL.

Moritz, L., 1989. Aperçu de la syntaxe de la négation en français et en anglais. Mémoire de licence, université de Genève.

Olsvay, Cs., 2000. A syntactic analysis of negative universal quantifiers in Hungarian. MA Thesis. Budapest, Eötvös Loránd University.

Ouhalla, J., 1990. Sentential negation, relativised minimality and the aspectual status of auxiliaries. Linguistic Review 7, 183-231.

Pollock, J.-Y., 1989. Verb movement, UG and the structure of IP. Linguistic Inquiry 20, 364-424.

Progovac, L., 1994. Negative and Positive Polarity. Cambridge: CUP.

Puskás, G., 1998. On the Neg-criterion in Hungarian. Acta Linguistica Hungarica, 45 (1-2), 167-213.

Puskás, G., 1999. Negation and n-words in Hungarian. In N. Antrim, G. Goodall, M. Shulte-Nafeh and V. Samiian (eds), Proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Western Conference on Linguistics, 11 [Wecol 99], 443-456. Fresno: California State University.

Puskás, G. 2000. Word Order in Hungarian. The Syntax of A-bar Positions. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Puskás, G., 2002. On negative licensing contexts and the role of n-words. In I. Kenesei, K. E-Kiss and P. Siptár (eds), Approaches to Hungarian, Vol. 8, 81-106. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Rizzi, L., 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In: L. Haegeman (ed), Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax, 281-338. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Surányi, B. 2001. Negation and an ambiguity account of n-words: the case of Hungarian. M.A. Thesis, Budapest.

Tóth, I., 1995. Negative Polarity licensing in Hungarian, MA dissertation, József Attila University.

Zanuttini, R., 1991. Syntactic Properties of Sentential Negation: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Zanuttini, R., 1997. Negation and verb movement. In: L. Haegeman (ed.), The New Comparative Syntax. London: Addison, Wesley, Longman.

Zwarts, F., 1995. Nonveridical contexts. Linguistics Analysis 25 (3-4), 286-312.

Notes

[1] Note that the subjunctive in the embedded clause forces the polarity item reading of *quelquechose*. This contrast with:

(i)   Il ne savait pas que quelquechose s'était produit
        he neg knew pas that something had happened
        'He didn't know that something had happened.'

[2] I am not discussing here the reasons and implications of the presence of the adverb *többször* ('several times') in the preverbal position. The example is simply meant to illustrate two possible occurrences of the universal quantifier *mindenkivel* ('with everybody').

[3] A discussion of the Topic-Focus articulations would lead us too far from our primary goal. In an extremely sketchy way, let us simply assume that a Topic corresponds to background information, i.e. elements which somehow correspond to 'old information'. Focus, on the other hand, corresponds to 'new information'. Authors have argued that there are different types of Foci (contrastive, new information, exhaustive) which may or may not be realised as different syntactic positions in different languages. For a discussion of the problem in syntactic terms, the reader is referred to Rizzi (1997). There is also a very rich corpus of literature discussing these issues from the semantic and the pragmatic points of view, the listing of which would necessarily lead to unjustified omissions. Nevertheless, it might be worth mentioning the very interesting volume Hajicova et al. 1998 and the references therein.