

EXPLETIVE NEGATION:

From embedded speech-acts to embedded propositions

"Empirical approaches to canonical and non-canonical uses of negation"

DGfS Workshop

May 5, 2021

Chloé Tahar

Institut Jean Nicod

CNRS/ENS/EHESS/PSL

A puzzling negation marker

- **Expletive negation:** a negation marker receiving a non-negative reading – in embedded clauses.

(1) *Je **crains** qu' elle **ne** tombe malade.*
I fear that she **ExN** fall.3SG.SUBJ sick
'I fear that she might catch a cold.'

With a puzzling distribution in French

- Apprehensive attitudes

- (2) *Je **crains** qu' on **ne** nous ait entendus.*
I fear that 3SG.CL **ExN** 2PL.CL have.3SG.SBJV heard
'I fear that someone heard what we were saying.'

- Adversative connectives

- (3) *Partez **avant** que je **ne** change d' avis.*
Leave.IMP before that I **ExN** change.1SG.SBJV my mind.
'You should leave before I change my mind.'

- Comparatives

- (4) *Il est **plus** grand que je **ne** le suis.*
He is more tall than I **Exn** it.ACC be.3SG.SBJV
'He's taller than I am.'

A cross-linguistic and diachronic perspective

Did negation turned expletive out of a diachronic path of development? If so, how?

1. Cross-linguistically, there are two main types of ExNs, originating from (i) the grammaticalization of embedded Negative Imperatives or (ii) the grammaticalisation of embedded Polar Questions.¹
2. ExN-complements in French are grammaticalized embedded Negative Imperatives.

¹See also [Makri, 2013], [Roussou, 2015], [Dobrushina, 2020]

INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

Two types of Expletive Negations

Cross-linguistically, two main types of complements with ExN with different historical origins ([Dobrushina, 2020]).

1. ExN deriving from embedded **Polar Questions**
 - **Indicative mood** pattern.
 - **Rogative attitudes** (e.g. *ask, wonder*) and **epistemic attitudes** expressing uncertainty (e.g. *hope, doubt*).
1. ExN deriving from embedded **Negative Imperatives**
 - **Non-indicative mood** pattern.
 - **Negative priority attitudes** (*prevent, fear*) expressing deontic, teleological or buletic dispreference.

A focus on Indo-European languages

	Declarative	Non-declarative	Expletive
LATIN	<i>non</i>	<i>ne</i>	<i>ne</i>
ALBANIAN	<i>nuk/s'</i>	<i>mos</i>	<i>mos</i>
GREEK	<i>dhen</i>	<i>mi(n)/me</i>	<i>mi(n)/me</i>

Figure: Types of negation

Greek

- Expletive Negation deriving from Negative Imperatives

- (5) **Mi** féris ton Jáni!
NEG₂ bring-PNP.2SG the-ACC Jani-ACC
'Don't bring John!'
([Chatzopoulou, 2017])
- (6) **Fovame** (na) **min** erthi.
fear.1SG.IND **SBJV** NEG₂ come.3SG.IND.
'I fear that he comes.' (Giannakidou, 1998)

- Expletive Negation deriving from Polar Questions

(7) **Mi(=pos)** *efije?*²
 NEG₂=COMP=IND leave.3SG.
 'Could it be that he left? ([Roussou, 2015])

(8) *Me* **rotise** **mi=pos** *efaga.*
 me asked.3SG NEG₂=COMP=**IND** ate.1sg.
 'She asked me whether I ate.'
 ([Giannakidou and Mari, 2019])

²According to [Giannakidou and Mari, 2019], *mipos* questions are paraphrasable as *maybe*-polar questions

Albanian

- Expletive Negation deriving from Polar Questions

- (9) **Mos** *e=njihni* *atë?*
NEG₂ cl=know.2PL him?
'Do you happen to know him?'
([Roussou, 2015])
- (10) **Kërkova** **se** **mos** *gjeja* *një*
search.1SG.PAST COMP=**IND** NEG₂ find.1SG.PAST one
fotografie të Vlorës.
photograph of Vlorës.
'I have searched whether I could find a photograph of Vlorës.'

Latin

- "Expletive" Negation deriving from Negative Imperatives

(11) **Ne** *sis plora!*

NEG₂ please cry.2SG.IMP

'Please don't cry' (Pinkster, 2015)

(12) **Timeo** *ne laborem augeam.*

fear-1SG.PRS NEG₂ work-ACC increase-1SG.**SBJV**

'I'm afraid that I shall increase my work.' (Cic, *Leg*, 1-4)

- Expletive Negation deriving from Polar Questions

- (13) *Impetrasti.* :: *Ai=n* *vero?* :: *Certe, inquam.*
 achieved.2SG. :: say.2SG.IND=NEG₂ really? :: certainly say.1SG.
 ‘You achieved it. Do you really say so? Certainly, I’m telling
 you.
 [Schrickx, 2017]

- (14) ***Rogato,*** *servos venerit=ne ad eum tuos.*
 ask.2SG.IMP.FUT, slaves.ACC came=NEG₂ at him yours.
 ‘You must then ask whether your slave has come to him.’
 ([Pinkster, 2015])

Open Issues

- What kind of Polar Questions are Greek *mipos*-questions, Albanian *mos*-questions or Latine enclitic =*ne*-questions ?
- High Negation Questions are indeed constructed with NEG₁.

(15) **Dhen** *tha erthis?*

NEG₁ FUT venir.2SG

Won't you come? ([Makri, 2013])

(16) A **nuk** *ka ardhur Bujar?*

Q=PTC NEG₁ avoir.AUX.PST venu Bujar

'Didn't Bujar arrive?'

(17) **Non** *est iudicatus hostis Antonius?*

NEG₁ AUX.PRES.3SG judge-PRF ennemy-NOM Antonius-NOM

'Wasn't Antonius declared our ennemy?' (Cic, Phil, 7,13)

PROHIBITIVE NEGATION IN LATIN

Negative Imperatives in Latin

- In Indo-European linguistics, the idea of a historical relation between Negative Imperatives and ExN-complements is not new.³

³Among others, it was explored for Greek by [Chatzopoulou, 2012], for Italian by [Parry, 2013], for Latin by [Lackey, 2015]

Imperative clauses are conventionally associated with a wide range of illocutionary forces.

- **COMMAND-type**

- (18) *Nimium est ! – **Ne** clama.* (Command)
Excess-ACC is ! – NEG₂ shout-2SG-IMP
'That's too much! – Don't shout.' (Ter, *Ph*, 664)
- (19) *Uigila, **ne** somno stude.* (Warning)
Stay-awake-2SG-IMP, NEG₂ sleep.DAT seek-for-2SG-IMP
'Open your eyes, don't fall asleep.' (Pl, *Mil*, 215)

- (20) *Misericordia commotus ne sit.* (Advice)
 pity-NOM moved-NOM NEG₂ be-2SG.SBJV
 'Don't be moved by pity.' (Cic, *Mur*, 65)
- (21) *Ignosce, irata ne sies.* (Plea)
 forgive-2SG-IMP, angry NEG₂ be-2SG.SUBJ
 'Forgive me, don't be angry at me.' (Pl, *Amph*, 94)
- (22) *Ne interueneris, quaeso.* (Request)
 NEG₂ interrupt-2SG.SBJV, please
 'Don't interfere, please.' (Pl, *Mil*, 1333-4)

- **WISH-type**

- (23) **Ne** *di* *sirint!* (**Absent wish**)
 NEG₂ gods-NOM allow-3PL
 'May the gods not allow it!' (Pl, *Amph*, 613)

- (24) **Ne** *magis sim* *pulcer* *quam sum.*
 NEG₂ more be-1SG.SUBJ beautiful-NOM than be-1SG-IND
 'May I not be more beautiful than I am.' (Pl, *Mil*, 1086)

- **PERMISSION-type**

- (25) *Haec negat se tuam esse matrem.* – **Ne**
 This-one-NOM-FEM denies CL your be mother-ACC. – NEG
fuat se non uolt. (**Permission/concession**)
 be-3SG.SUBJ if NEG₂ want-3SG-IND
 ‘She says she’s not your mother. – Let her not be if she doesn’t want
 to.’
 (Pl, *Epid*, 584-5)

Prohibitive negation in embedded clauses

Ne-clauses occur with **directive** and **desiderative** verbs (and by extension, **prohibitive** and **apprehensives** verbs) that encode the same range of illocutionary meanings than (negative) imperatives.

- COMMAND-type
 - *Impero* ('order')
 - *Prohibeo* ('forbid')
- WARNING-type
 - *Moneo* ('warn')
 - ?
- REQUEST-type
 - *Rogo* ('ask')
 - *Impedio* ('prevent')
- ADVICE-type
 - *Suadeo* ('advise')
 - *Dissuadeo* ('dissuade')
- PLEA-type
 - *Obsecro* ('beg')
 - ?
- WISH-type
 - *Opto* ('wish')
 - *Timeo* ('fear')

ANALYSIS

Latin

Embedded Imperatives: The Missing Chain Link

- [Jespersen, 1917]; [Ageno, 1955]; [Parry, 2013] claimed that Latin embedded *ne*-clauses are in fact **paratactic** clauses, ie. clauses that are juxtaposed to the main verbal clause.
- I propose that *ne*-clauses are **embedded negative imperatives**; they represent an intermediary stage of development between parataxis and hypotaxis.

- Indeed, even though *ne*-clauses are introduced by no embedding device, they display characteristic properties of embedded clauses.⁴

1. Sequence of tense

- (26) *Caesar suis imperavit ne quod omnino*
 Caesar POSS.DAT order-3SG.PRF NEG₂ some none
telum in hostes reicerent.
 weapon-ACC to enemies-ACC throw-3PL.SBJV.IPFV
 ‘Caesar ordered them not to thrown back any weapon.’
 (Caes, *Bell.Gall.*, 1-46)

2. Coreference between matrix and embedded subject

- (27) [*Sententiam ne diceret_i*] recusavit_i.
 opinion-ACC NEG₂ say-3SG.SBJV.IPFV refuse-3SG.PERF
 ‘He refused to give his opinion.’ (Cic, *Off*, 3)

⁴For a discussion of these properties, see [McCloskey, 2006].

In a series of recent studies, Krifka has promoted the idea and developed a formal model for speech act embedding.⁵ He argues that the verb *say* only embeds a proposition in (28-a); in (28-b), *say* is claimed to embed a speech act (of assertion).

- (28) a. Mary said that she hates John.
b. Mary said she hates John.
- (29) a. $[[[_{VP} \text{ Mary } [_{V'} \text{ say } [_{CP} \text{ that } [_{IP} \text{ she hates John }]]]]]]$
b. $[[[_{VP} \text{ Mary } [_{V'} \text{ say } [_{\text{ForceP}} \text{ she hates John }]]]]]]$

⁵See [Krifka, 2014]; [Krifka, 2017]; [Krifka, 2020]; and for a discussion see also [Crnič and Trinh, 2009]; [Kaufmann, 2012]; [Woods, 2016]

In this perspective, *ne* is a specialized negation in ForceP, assuming a clause-typing function.

- (30) *Metuo, **ne** patrem, dum morior, occidam.*
fear-1SG, NEG₂ father-ACC, while die-1SG.PRS, kill-1SG.SBJV
Lit. 'I fear, may I not kill my father, while dying' (Ad, 403)

- (31) $\llbracket [_{VP} \textit{metuo} [_{ForceP} \textit{ne patrem occidam}]] \rrbracket$

Parenthetical Performatives

An important hindsight of [Krifka, 2014] is that speech act embedding verbs are not attitude reports. Rather, they are speech act reports, ie., they describe a locutionary act.

- Verbs explicitly denoting a locutionary act (e.g; *ask*)
- Verbs implicitly denoting a locutionary act⁶ (e.g; *wonder*)

⁶Describing the psychological attitude one has when performing a question speech act to oneself (e.g; *se demander*, *sich fragen*, 'ask oneself').

Latin directives and desideratives receive a parenthetical use, which can be assimilated to (illocutionary force) **hedging**⁷.

- Directives (and prohibitives) explicitly denote a locutionary act; they indicate the intended illocutionary force of the embedded speech-act (**presentative function**).

(32) 'X {advises/dissuades}: PROHIBITION'

- Desideratives (and apprehensives) implicitly denote a locutionary act, they indicate the subject's emotional orientation wrt the embedded speech-act (**evidential function**).

(33) 'X {wishes/fears}:: PROHIBITION'

⁷[Simons, 2007]

French

Downward-reanalysis

- From Latin to French, the use of the complementizer *que* (from Latin *quod*) develops and systematizes. The "*ne*" undergoes **downward-reanalysis** from ForceP to MoodP ([Cinque, 1999]).

(34) Je crains **que** mon frère **ne** soit à
I fear.1SG.IND that my brother ExN be.3SG.SBJV in
l'intérieur.
inside
'I fear that my brother may be inside.'

(35) \llbracket_{VP} Je $\llbracket_{V'}$ crains \llbracket_{CP} que \llbracket_{IP} mon frère₁ \llbracket_{MoodP} $\llbracket_{Mood'}$ **ne** \llbracket_{Mood0} est₂-**SBJV** \llbracket_{VP} t₁ t₂ à l'intérieur]]]]]]]

- In line with [Abels, 2005]; [Zovko-Dinkovic, 2017]; [Yoon, 2011]; [Liu, 2019], I argue that *ne* is akin to an **evaluative adverb**.

Modal Harmony

- ExN conveys the speaker's preferential attitude towards the negation of p at the level of Conventional Implicature⁸ and enters Modal Harmony with the apprehensive attitude.

(36) **Modal Harmony:** ([Lyons, 1977]; [Huitink, 2012]; [Giannakidou and Mari, 2018]) is the phenomenon whereby the adverb and the verb bear similar modal meaning⁹.

a. John *must definitely* be at home.

- The embedding attitude and the expletive negation both convey preference for not- p .

⁸See also [Yoon, 2011] and [Liu, 2019]

⁹(wrt. force and flavor)

PREDICTIONS

The distribution NEG₂ ... NEG₁

- (37) *Sed timeo ne non impetrem.* [Latin]
But fear-1SG.PRS NEG₂ NEG₁ achieve-1SG.SBJV
'But I fear that I may not obtain it. (Cic, Att, 9)
(Lit.: But I fear, may it not be that I not obtain it.)
- (38) [_{VP} *Timeo* [_{ForceP} **ne** [_{NegP} **non** [_{IP} *impetrem*]]]]

- (39) *Fovame* **mi** **dhen** *fai tipota.* [Greek]
Fear.1SG NEG₂ NEG₁ eat.3SG anything.
'I fear he will not eat anything.'

- (40) Two options:

- a. [_{VP} *Fovame* [_{ForceP} **mi** [_{NegP} **dhen** [_{IP} *fai tipota*]]]
b. [_{VP} *Fovame* [_{CP} \emptyset [_{MoodP} **mi** [_{NegP} **dhen** [_{IP} *fai tipota*]]]]

(41) *Frika se **mos** ata **nuk** vinin.* [Albanian]
 fear-1SG that NEG₂ they NEG₁ come-3PL.IND
 'I fear that(/whether) they will not come.'

(42) [_{VP} *Frika* [_{CP} *se* [_{MoodP} **mos** [_{NegP} **nuk** [_{VP} *ata vinin*]]]]

The co-occurrence of NEG₂ and SBJV

Diachronic relation between the imperative (sentential mood) and the subjunctive (verbal mood).¹⁰

- Subjunctive mood as a bound morpheme

- (43) a. *Je crains qu' il **ne** soit.**SBJV** à l'intérieur.*
I fear.1SG.IND that he ExN be.3SG.SBJV in inside
'I fear that he may be inside.'
- b. *Je crains qu' il **n'** #est.**IND** à l'intérieur.*
I fear.1SG.IND that he ExN be.3SG.IND in inside
'I fear that he may be inside.'

¹⁰[Zanuttini, 1996]; [Kempchinsky, 2009]

- (44) a. *Bijau, kad pradės.IND lyti. [Lithuanian]*
fear.1SG COMP begin.3SG-FUT rain.INF
'I fear that it may start raining.'
- b. *Bijau, kad **ne**-pradėtų.SBJV lyti.*
fear.1SG COMP ExN-start.3SG-SBJV rain.INF
'I fear that it may start raining.'
([Holvoet, 2016])

- Subjunctive mood as a free morpheme

(45) *Bojus, kak **by** on **ne** zabolet.* [Russian]
fear-1SG COMP SBJV he ExN fall=ill-3SG
'I fear that he will fall ill.'

(46) *Bojus, čto on **ne** zabolet.*
fear-1SG COMP he NEG fall=ill-3SG
'I fear that he will not fall ill.'
([Inkova, 2006])

CONCLUSION

In this talk, I have argued that:

1. ExN-complements may either be (i) grammaticalized embedded Negative Imperatives or (ii) grammaticalized embedded Polar Questions.
2. In case of (i), ExN derives from the grammaticalization of 'prohibitive' negation, undergoing downward-reanalysis from ForceP to MoodP.



Abels, K. (2005).

Expletive negation in russian : A conspiracy theory.
In Journal of Slavic Linguistics, volume 13, pages 5–74.



Ageno, F. B. (1955).

L'uso pleonastico della negazione nei primi secoli.
Studi di filologia italiana, 13:339–361.



Chatzopoulou, K. (2012).

Negation and Nonveridicality in the history of Greek.
PhD thesis, University of Chicago.



Chatzopoulou, K. (2017).

The history of the Greek neg2 : Two parameter resets linked to a syntactic shift.
volume 2(5), pages 1–48.



Cinque, G. (1999).

Adverbs and functional heads: a crosslinguistic perspective.
Oxford University Press.



Crnič, L. and Trinh, T. (2009).

Embedding Imperatives in English.

In Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung, volume 13, pages 112–127.



Dobrushina, N. (2020).

Negation in complement clauses of fear-verbs.

Functions of language.



Giannakidou, A. and Mari, A. (2018).

The semantic roots of positive polarity: epistemic modal verbs and adverbs in greek and italian.

In Linguistics and Philosophy, volume 41(6).



Giannakidou, A. and Mari, A. (2019).

Modalization and bias in questions.



Holvoet, A. (2016).

Semantic functions of complementizers in Baltic.

In Boye, Kasper; Kehayov, P., editor, Complementizer Semantics in European Languages, pages 225–265.



Huitink, J. (2012).

Modal concord : A case study of dutch.

Journal of Semantics, 29:403–437.



Inkova, O. (2006).

La négation explétive: un regard venu d'ailleurs.

Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure, 59:107–129.



Jespersen, O. (1917).

Negation in English and other Languages.

Copenhagen: A.F.



Kaufmann, M. (2012).

Interpreting imperatives.

Springer: Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy.



Kempchinsky, P. (2009).

What can the subjunctive disjoint reference effect tell us about the subjunctive.

In Lingua 119, page 1788?1810.



Krifka, M. (2014).

Embedding Illocutionary Acts.

In Roeper, T. and Speas, M., editors, Recursion: Complexity in Cognition, pages 59–88.



Krifka, M. (2017).

The Semantic Types of Clausal Complements.

Talk presented at Covegno Annuale Società Italiana di Glottologia & Arbeitstagung Indogermanische Gesellschaft.



Krifka, M. (2020).

Layers of Assertive Clauses: Propositions, Judgements, Commitments, Acts.

Propositional Arguments in Cross-Linguistic Research: Theoretical and Empirical Issues.



Lackey, H. (2015).

The grammaticalization of latin n? + subjunctive constructions.
Journal of Latin Linguistics, 14(1):65–100.



Liu, M. (2019).

The semantics and pragmatics of *chadian-mei* in mandarin chinese.

Linguistische Berichte, 258.



Lyons, J. (1977).

Semantics.

Cambridge University Press.



Makri, M.-M. (2013).

Expletive negation beyond romance.

Master's thesis, University of York.



McCloskey, J. (2006).

Questions and questioning in a local English.

In Campos, H., Herburger, E., Portner, P., and Zanuttini, R., editors, Crosslinguistic research in syntax and semantics: Negation, tense and clausal architecture, pages 87–126.

Georgetown University Press, DC.



Parry, M. (2013).

Negation in the history of Italo-Romance.

In Willis, D., Christopher, L., and Breitbarth, A., editors,
Recursion: Complexity in Cognition, pages 59–88.



Pinkster, H. (2015).

Latin Syntax.

Oxford University Press.



Roussou, A. (2015).

Is particle a unified category?

In Bayer, J., Hinterhölzl, R., and Trotzke, A., editors,

Discourse-oriented approaches to syntax, pages 121–158. John
Benjamins Publishing Company.



Schrickx, J. (2017).

Polar questions in latin with and without the enclitic particle
-ne.

Pragmatics Approaches to Latin and Ancient Greek, pages
235–255.



Simons, M. (2007).

Observations on embedding verbs, evidentiality, and presupposition.

Lingua, 117(6):1034–1056.



Woods, R. (2016).

Embedded Inverted Questions as Embedded Illocutionary Acts.

In Kyeong-min, K., editor, Proceedings of the 33rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, pages 417–426.



Yoon, S. (2011).

Not in the Mood: the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of evaluative negation.

PhD thesis, University of Chicago.



Zanuttini, R. (1996).

On the relevance of Tense for sentential negation.

In Belletti, A. and Rizzi, L., editors, Parameters and Functional Heads. Essays in Comparative Syntax, pages 181–207. Oxford University Press.



Zovko-Dinkovic, M. (2017).

Pleonastic negation from a cross-linguistic perspective.
In Jezikoslovje, volume 18, pages 159–180.