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• Object case alternates between accusative (ACC) and partitive (PAR) in absolutely positive and negative polar questions (PQs) with inherently bounded verbs

• ACC and PAR lead to different answer biases and response patterns independently of the absolute polarity of the PQ
  – ACC ⇒ positive answer bias (if any)
  – PAR ⇒ negative answer bias (if any)
  – PAR-$kAAn$ ⇒ $#kyllä$ (positive bare particle response)

• The addition of polarity sensitive particles
  – clearly brings out answer biases
  – has an effect on the availability of the aspectual interpretation of PAR
The data can be accounted for by assuming that negation can be [±pronounced] and [±interpreted]

- **The value of [±interpretation]**
  - is detectable from object case-marking and the licensing of polarity particles
  - determines the highlighted alternative and therefore affects the polarity of answer biases

- **The value of [±pronunciation]**
  - determines whether PQs with/without polarity particles are marked or unmarked and therefore affects the discourse effects of the PQ
• Finnish makes use of 15 cases: objects can be marked with ACC, PAR or an inherent case

• Finnish PAR has been argued to have two functions:
  – An **aspectual** function, characterised in terms of
    ★ resultativity (Itkonen 1976, Hakulinen and Karlsson 1979, Larjavaara 1991)
  – An **NP-related** function: quantitatively indeterminate NPs
    ★ indefinite bare plurals
    ★ mass nouns
Kiparsky 1998 unifies these two functions: case-marking of direct objects in Finnish is semantically conditioned by the (un)boundedness of the VP

- A VP is unbounded if either the head (V) or the argument (OBJ) is unbounded
- Objects of unbounded VPs are marked with PAR, and objects of bounded VPs are marked with ACC (except for when inherent case is involved)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASP-PAR</th>
<th>NP-PAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>imperfective grammatical aspect</td>
<td>mass nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atelic lexical aspect</td>
<td>indefinite bare plurals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>quantitatively determinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitatively determinate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expletive and covert negation in Finnish polar questions

Karoliina Lohiniva

Outline
Introduction
In a nutshell
Background
Data
Positive PQs
Negative PQs
Summary
Proposal
Conclusion

Background: negation and PQs in Finnish

• Negation is expressed with a negative auxiliary that agrees with the subject in person and number

• The question particle -kO appears on the leftmost element of the PQ (in FocP, Holmberg 2003, 2013)
  – In neutral non-clefted PQs, it is the highest visible head of the IP/PolP that moves to FocP: either V or Neg

• Object case alternates between ACC and PAR in absolutely positive and negative PQs with a bounded predicate

(1)  Oš-t-t-kö   poro-n   /   poro-a?
  buy-past.2sg.kO reindeer-ACC reindeer-PAR
  ‘Did you buy a/the cat?’

(2)  E-t-kö  oš-t-a-nut   poro-n   /   poro-a?
  neg-2sg.kO buy-pastpart reindeer-ACC reindeer-PAR
  ‘Didn’t you buy a/the cat?’
The polar focus-sensitive particles -kin and -kAAn are
- enclitic (see Holmberg 2014 for the syntax of -kin)
- additive (also, too, either)
- sometimes scalar (‘even’)

Karttunen and Karttunen (1975) analyse the two as a polar pair and argue that their contribution in meaning is an existential conventional implicature/presupposition
- Much like Rullmann (2003) for English ‘too’ and ‘either’

Polarity particles?
- -kAAn is a negative polarity particle (Rullmann 2003, Levinson 2008)
- -kin can appear in a negative declarative without overtly scoping over negation, so it seems not to be a positive polarity particle
Ladd (1981): negative PQs with preposed *n’t are ambiguous between

- an ‘inner negation’ reading where negation scopes inside the IP
  - ✓ NPIs
  - negative answer bias:
    * speaker has an initial belief that \( p \)
    * speaker has encountered evidence against \( p \)
    * speaker is doublechecking \( \neg p \)

- an ‘outer negation’ reading where negation scopes outside of the IP
  - * NPIs
  - positive answer bias:
    * speaker has an initial belief that \( p \)
    * speaker is doublechecking \( p \)

Han and Romero (2004) use Höhle’s (1992) epistemic operator \texttt{VERUM}:

- \texttt{VERUM} \textgreater \texttt{negation} = inner negation
- \texttt{negation} \textgreater \texttt{VERUM} = outer negation
ACC-\textit{kAAn} is ungrammatical: (3c)

(3) a. Ost-i-t-ko sinä poro-n?
    buy-past.2sg.kO you-NOM reindeer-ACC
    ‘Did you buy a/the reindeer?’

b. Ost-i-t-ko sinä poro-n-kin?
    buy-past.2sg.kO you-NOM reindeer-ACC.\textit{kin}
    ‘Did you buy a/the reindeer too?’

c. * Ost-i-t-ko sinä poro-n-kaan?
    buy-past.2sg.kO you-NOM cat-ACC.k\textit{AAn}
    ‘Did you buy a/the/some reindeer either?’
ASP-PAR is incompatible with -kin: (4b)

(4) a. Ost-i-t-ko sinä poro-a?
    buy-past.2sg.kO you-NOM reindeer-PAR
    ‘Did you buy a/the/some reindeer?’

    b. Ost-i-t-ko sinä poro-a-kin?
       buy-past.2sg.kO you-NOM reindeer-PAR.kin
       ‘Did you buy *a/*the/some reindeer too?’

    c. Ost-i-t-ko sinä poro-a-kaan?
       buy-past.2sg.kO you-NOM reindeer-PAR.kAAAn
       ‘Did you buy a/the/some reindeer either?’
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POS PQs: Answer bias with ACC

Positive answer bias comes with a feel of **surprise**:

- initial speaker belief $\neg p$
- contextual evidence for $p$
- speaker is double-checking $p$

(5) a. Ost-i-ko Liisa poro-n?
    buy-past.2sg.kO Liisa-NOM reindeer-**ACC**
    ‘Did Liisa buy a/the reindeer?’

    **ACC** ⇒ neutral or positive answer bias

b. Ost-i-ko Liisa poro-n-kin?
    buy-past.2sg.kO Liisa-NOM reindeer-**ACC.kin**
    ‘Did Liisa buy a/the reindeer too?’

    **ACC-kin** ⇒ positive answer bias
POS PQs: Answer bias with PAR
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POS

PQs: Answer bias with PAR

(6) a. Ost-i-ko Liisa poro-a?
   buy-past.2sg.kO Liisa-NOM reindeer-PAR
   ‘Did Liisa buy a/the/some reindeer?’

   PAR ⇒ neutral or negative answer bias

b. Ost-i-ko Liisa poro-a-kaan?
   buy-past.2sg.kO Liisa-NOM reindeer-PAR.kAAn
   ‘Did Liisa buy a/the/some reindeer either?’

   PAR-kAAn ⇒ negative answer bias

Negative answer bias comes with a feel of **disappointment**:

- initial speaker belief \( p \)
- contextual evidence for \( \neg p \) or no contextual evidence for \( p \)
- speaker is double-checking \( \neg p \)
POS  PQs: Responding
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(7) Ost-i-t-ko siinä
buy-past.2sg.kO you-NOM
poro-n-kin?
reindeer-ACC.kin
‘Did you buy a/the reindeer too?’

a. Ost-i-n
buy-past.1sg
‘Yes’ (= I bought a/the reindeer)

b. Kyllä
yes
‘Yes’ (= I bought a/the reindeer)

c. E-n
neg-1sg
‘No’ (= I did not buy a/the reindeer)

(8) Ost-i-t-ko siinä
buy-past.2sg.kO you-NOM
poro-a-kaan?
reindeer-PAR.kAAAn
‘Did you buy a/the reindeer either?’

a. Ost-i-n
buy-past.1sg
‘Yes’ (= I bought a/the/some reindeer)

b. #Kyllä
yes
‘Yes’ (= I bought a/the/some reindeer)

c. E-n
neg-1sg
‘No’ (= I did not buy a/the/some reindeer)
ACC-\textit{kAAn} is ungrammatical: (9c)

(9) a. E-t-kö sinä osta-nut poro-n? neg-2sg.kO you-NOM buy-pastprt reindeer.\textbf{ACC} ‘Didn’t you buy a/the reindeer?’

b. E-t-kö sinä ostanut poro-n-kin? neg-2sg.kO you-NOM buy-pastprt reindeer-\textbf{ACC.kin} ‘Didn’t you buy a/the reindeer too?’

c. * E-t-kö sinä ostanut neg-2sg.kO you-NOM buy-pastprt poro-n-\textbf{kAAn} reindeer-\textbf{ACC.kAAn}
ASP-PAR is incompatible with -kin: (10b)

(10) a. E-t-kö sinä osta-nut poro-a? neg-2sg.kO you-NOM buy-pastprt reindeer.\text{PAR}\ ‘Didn’t you buy a/the/some reindeer?’

b. E-t-kö sinä ostanut poro-a-kin? neg-2sg.kO you-NOM buy-pastprt reindeer-\text{PAR.kin}\ ‘Didn’t you buy *a/*the/some reindeer too?’

c. E-t-kö sinä ostanut neg-2sg.kO you-NOM buy-pastprt poro-a-kaan? reindeer-\text{PAR.kAAn}\ ‘Didn’t you buy a/the/some reindeer either?’
(11)  a. E-i-kö Liisa osta-nut poro-n?  
    neg-2sg.kO Liisa-NOM buy-pastpart reindeer-ACC  
    ‘Didn’t Liisa buy a/the reindeer?’

    b. E-i-kö Liisa osta-nut poro-n-kin?  
    neg-2sg.kO Liisa-NOM buy-pastpart  
    reindeer-ACC.kin  
    ‘Didn’t Liisa buy a/the reindeer too?’

    ACC(-kin) ⇒ positive answer bias

Positive answer bias comes with a feel of confidence:

- initial speaker belief $p$
- contextual evidence for $\neg p$ or no contextual evidence for $p$
- speaker is double-checking $p$
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NEG PQs: Answer bias with PAR

(12) a. E-i-kö Liisa osta-nut poro-a?
    neg-2sg.kO Liisa-NOM buy-pastpart reindeer-PAR
    ‘Didn’t Liisa buy a/the/some reindeer?’

    b. E-i-kö Liisa osta-nut
    neg-2sg.kO Liisa-NOM buy-pastpart
    poro-a-kaan?
    reindeer-PAR.kAAn
    ‘Didn’t Liisa buy a/the/some reindeer either?’

PAR(-kAAn) ⇒ negative answer bias

Negative answer bias comes with a feel of disappointment:

- initial speaker belief $p$
- contextual evidence for $\neg p$ or no contextual evidence for $p$
- speaker is double-checking $\neg p$
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NEG PQs: Responding

(13) E-t-kö sinä neg-2sg.kO you-NOM osta-nut buy-pastpart poro-n-kin? reindeer-ACC.kin
‘Didn’t you buy a/the reindeer-kin?’
   a. Ost-i-n buy-past.1sg ‘Yes’ (= I bought a/the reindeer)
   b. Kyllä yes ‘Yes’ (= I bought a/the reindeer)
   c. E-n neg-1sg ‘No’ (= I did not buy a/the reindeer)

(14) E-t-kö sinä neg-2sg.kO you-NOM osta-nut buy-pastpart poro-a-kaan? reindeer-PAR.kAAn
‘Didn’t you buy a/the/some reindeer-kAAn?’
   a. Ost-i-n buy-past.1sg ‘Yes’ (= I bought a/the/some reindeer)
   b. #Kyllä yes ‘Yes’ (= I bought a/the/some reindeer)
   c. E-n neg-1sg ‘No’ (= I did not buy a/the/some reindeer)
### Core data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POS</th>
<th>NEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>PAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no PP</td>
<td>neutral/positive bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kin</td>
<td>positive bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kAAn</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• What is the source of the object case alternation in absolutely positive and negative PQs?
  – Why is ASP-PAR lost in absolutely positive and negative PQs with -kin, and why is ACC-kAAn ungrammatical?

• What is the source of the answer biases of absolutely positive and negative PQs?
  – Why can object case alone determine answer biases in absolutely negative PQs?
  – Why do polarity particles clearly bring out the same case-linked biases in absolutely positive PQs?

• Why is the bare particle response kyllä ‘yes’ not felicitous with absolutely positive and negative PQs with PAR-kAAn?

\[(15)\]

a. Isn’t Jane coming either?
   \[CP \ Q \ \text{VERUM} [ \ \text{not} \ [IP \ Jane \ is \ coming] \ \text{either}] \]

b. Isn’t Jane coming too?
   \[CP \ Q \ \text{not} \ [ \ \text{VERUM} \ [IP \ Jane \ is \ coming] \ \text{too}] \]

c. Did Jorge really bring a present?
   \[CP \ Q \ [ \ \text{VERUM} \ [IP \ Jorge \ brought \ a \ present]] \]

Finnish:

- negation > VERUM should line with ACC-kin
- VERUM > negation should line with PAR-kAAn

Accounting for the across-polarity parallel?

- Absolutely positive PQs could introduce \text{VERUM}
- \textbf{But} no licensing of NPIs/NPPs is predicted:
  \[\{\text{VERUM} \ p, \ \neg \text{VERUM} \ p\}\]
The answer bias data is systematic, but could be argued to be due to the presence of the PPs: when no PPs are present, the judgments are not as clear.

The most stable data comes from the loss of ASP-PAR with -kin:

- If -kin can be shown to be a PPP (a positive polarity particle), the loss of ASP-PAR can be attributed to the loss of negation.
Rullmann 2003: If the presuppositions of ‘too’ are satisfied, it can appear in the scope of negation:

(16) a. Ost-i-n kirve-n. E-n osta poro-a-kin
buy-past.1sg elk-ACC neg-1sg buy reindeer-PAR.kin
‘I bought an/the elk. I won’t buy a/the/some reindeer too’

b. E-n osta-nut kirve-ä. ?*E-n osta
neg-1sg buy-pastpart elk-PAR neg-1sg buy
poro-a-kin
reindeer-PAR.kin
‘I didn’t buy an/the elk. ?*I won’t buy a/the/some reindeer too’
In PQs, this contextual manipulation has no effect: ASP-PAR is non-recoverable (in both positive and negative PQs)

(17) a. Liisa ost-i hirve-n. E-i-kö hän Liisa-NOM buy-past.3sg elk-ACC neg-3sg.kO she-NOM osta-nut poro-a-kin?
buy-pastpart reindeer-PAR.kin

‘Liisa bought an/the elk. Didn’t she buy *a/the/some reindeer too?’

⇒ The stars indicate impossible readings of the Finnish example: the English sentence with a/the is fine

she-NOM buy-pastpart reindeer-PAR.kin

‘Liisa didn’t buy an/the elk. Didn’t she buy *a/the/? *some reindeer too?’
**Why do we lose ASP-PAR?**
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**Why do we lose ASP-PAR?**

**-kin** is

- **incompatible** with ASP-PAR in PQs with inherently bounded verbs in spite of contextual manipulation
- **compatible** with ASP-PAR in declaratives and PQs with inherently unbounded verbs

(18) Ets-i-n tä-tä poro-a-kin
seek-past.1sg this-PAR reindeer-PAR.**kin**
‘I was looking for this reindeer too’

(19) Ets-i-t-kö tä-tä poro-a-kin?
seek-2sg.kO this-PAR reindeer-PAR.**kin**
‘Were you looking for this reindeer too?’

- **compatible** with ASP-PAR in declaratives and PQs where PAR marks imperfective aspect

(20) Lu-i-n tä-tä kirja-a-kin
read-past.1sg this-PAR book-PAR.**kin**
‘I was reading this book too’ (imperfective)

(21) Lu-i-t-ko tä-tä kirja-a-kin?
love-2sg.kO this-PAR book-PAR.**kin**
‘Were you reading this book too?’ (imperfective)
ASP-PAR on the object in PQs could be due to

- unboundedness unrelated to negation
  - *ASP-PAR-kin not expected (cf. previous slide)

- unboundedness due to negation
  - *ASP-PAR-kin expected if -kin is a PPP

(a positive polarity particle)

☆ Possible evidence for the PPP-ness of -kin:
  in PQs with a bounded V, ASP-PAR is absent regardless of contextual manipulation (cf. (17a))

☆ Further work on -kin is needed

- **But** *ASP-PAR-kin* in both absolutely positive and negative PQs...
Proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[±pron]</th>
<th>[±int]</th>
<th>“real” polarity</th>
<th>case / -kAAn</th>
<th>negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>PAR, ✓ -kAAn</td>
<td>“optimal”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>ACC, *-kAAn</td>
<td>expletive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>PAR, ✓ -kAAn</td>
<td>covert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>ACC, *-kAAn</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ASP-PAR is lost when negation is [–interpreted] regardless of whether it is pronounced or not.
- -kAAn is ungrammatical when negation is [–interpreted] regardless of whether it is pronounced or not: *ACC-kAAn
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Case as an indicator of highlighting

The inquisitive semantics of interrogatives involves highlighting (Roelofsen and van Gool 2010, Farkas 2011, Roelofsen and Farkas 2015, Farkas and Roelofsen submitted):

- Although the partition of worlds is the same with absolutely positive and negative PQs,
  - absolutely **positive** PQs highlight the **positive** alt.
  - absolutely **negative** PQs highlight the **negative** alt.

- Non-default conventional discourse effects depend on highlighting: any bias will be in favour of the highlighted alternative in the proposition expressed by the PQ

Finnish highlighting depends on the [±interpretation] of negation (not [±pronunciation]):

- bounded V + **ACC**-object PQs highlight the **positive** alt.
- bounded V + **PAR**-object PQs highlight the **negative** alt.
### Answer biases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[±pron, ±int]</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>bias</th>
<th>init.</th>
<th>cont. ev.</th>
<th>db-checks</th>
<th>feel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+ , +]</td>
<td>-kAAn</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$\neg p \lor \emptyset p$</td>
<td>$\neg p$</td>
<td>disappointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+ , −]</td>
<td>-kin</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$\neg p \lor \emptyset p$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−, +]</td>
<td>-kAAn</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$\neg p \lor \emptyset p$</td>
<td>$\neg p$</td>
<td>disappointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−, −]</td>
<td>-kin</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>$\neg p$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>surprised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer biases **without polarity particles**:

- Clearly present with [+pronounced] negation
- Can be absent with [−pronounced] negation
  - If present, concern the highlighted alternative (defined by the value of [±interpretation])
Farkas and Roelofsen (submitted):

- Bias is modelled as a speaker’s **conditional commitment** to the highlighted alternative: it becomes actual after the addressee’s ratification

- Conditional commitment is a non-default conventional discourse effect

- Only **marked** PQs can give rise to non-default discourse effects
  - If [+] pronounced negation PQs in Finnish are marked, they can give rise to non-default discourse effects
  - If [—even pronounced] negation PQs in Finnish are unmarked, they cannot give rise to non-default discourse effects
  - If the addition of a polarity particle to a [—pronounced] negation PQ yields markedness, non-default discourse effects are possible

- Additional discourse effects may arise pragmatically
• Bare particle responses to negative polar questions are considerably less felicitous than responses with an explicit prejacent (Kramer and Rawlins 2012, Roelofsen and Farkas 2015)
  – Whatever the reason behind it, the infelicity of bare *kyllä* in PQs with PAR-*kAAn* conforms to the picture as long as it is the [±interpretation] of negation that matters
The Finnish data was accounted for by assuming that negation can be $[\pm$pronounced$]$ and $[\pm$interpreted$]$

- The value of $[\pm$interpretation$]$ defines which alternative is highlighted: object case alternation in PQs reveals a difference in highlighting
- The value of $[\pm$pronunciation$]$ contributes to markedness, and therefore to the availability of conventionally derived bias

Theoretical implications

- NPI-licensing in Finnish PQs
- Typology of PQs...
The typology of polar questions (Büring and Gunlogson 2000):

- PQs
  - positive
  - negative
    - outer negation
    - inner negation
If the proposal is correct, inner and outer negation PQs do not form a natural class:

![Diagram showing the structure of PQs with expletive negation, no negation, optimal negation, and covert negation categories.](image)
Thank you for your attention!
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