



UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI



<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Helda

Paratactic negation revisited The case of the Finnish verb epäillä

Salminen, Jutta

European Parliament

2018

Salminen, J 2018, 'Paratactic negation revisited The case of the Finnish verb epäillä',
Functions of Language, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 259-288. <https://doi.org/10.1075/fo1.15030.sal>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/307262>

10.1075/fo1.15030.sal

cc_by_nc

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Paratactic negation revisited: The case of the Finnish verb *epäillä**

Abstract

This paper examines the phenomenon of **paratactic negation (PN)** by analyzing the usage of the Finnish verb *epäillä* ‘doubt, suspect, suppose’, which is associated with both inherent negation and negative evaluation. Paratactic negation refers to an overt negation in a complement clause of an inherently negative verb that results in a single negative reading. This analysis draws on previous research going back to Jespersen (1917), in observing that the PN complement clause verbalizes the content of the activity that is expressed by the matrix verb. In this case, the verb of inherent negation does not have scope over the complement despite its negative semantics. This paper addresses the question of where and why content complements actually occur. The answer to this question is given by accounting for the differences of the content complements from more clearly subordinate target complements. It is shown that such occurrences are related to verb semantics and conventionalized syntagmatic patterns. This is demonstrated by accounting for the differences of the content complements from more clearly subordinate target complements. On the basis of these results, the paper offers a refined definition of paratactic negation. This definition has two major implications: First, it suggests that a semantically non-vacuous PN may be a conventionalized pattern. Second, it leads us to reconsider the limits of PN and the definition of inherent negation.

1. Introduction

Paratactic negation (PN) is a syntactic pattern in which an overt negation is placed in the complement of an inherently negative verb. Despite the presence of two negative elements, the overall interpretation of paratactic negation is a single, negative reading.¹ In order to address this topic, this paper analyzes the usage of the Finnish verb *epäillä* (‘doubt,’ ‘suspect,’ ‘suppose’), whose versatile meaning potential offers a productive context for this discussion. The main objective of this paper is to produce a general overview of the essence of PN through the analysis of this particular verb. Let us consider the following example:

- (1) *Epäilen, että tämä ei onnistu.*
doubt:1SG that this NEG² succeed.CNG
‘I doubt that this will succeed.’

¹ The concept of paratactic negation is also discussed with other syntactic constructions than inherently negative verbs taking clausal complements. For example, Tovena (1996) discusses PN in temporal clauses, albeit she uses the term ‘expletive negation.’

² The Finnish negative marker is a person-inflected auxiliary (Miestamo 2011: 87–89; Vilkuna 2015: 458–459). The main verb appears in the connegative or participial form, depending on the

As example (1) illustrates, a PN pattern consists of a matrix clause with a verb of inherent negation, *Epäilen*, ‘I doubt,’ and a finite complement with an overt marking of negation, *että tämä ei onnistu*, ‘that this will not succeed.’ Nevertheless, these two sources of negation (indicated in bold) do not cancel out each other. In other words, the reading is still simply negative, due to the inherent negation of the matrix verb not having scope over the complement. Instead, the complement explicates the content of the inherently negative matrix process. This means that the covert negation of the matrix verb is made explicit by the complement (Denison 1999: 245).

The term **inherent negation** covers covert expressions of negation that are conveyed by a lexeme, not a grammatical negation marker (Croft 2000: 134). In addition, a **verb of inherent negation** is defined as a complement-taking predicate that carries the meaning of negating the process that is expressed in the complement.³ Of course, how negation precisely occurs depends on the lexical semantics of the verb. For instance, let us consider the English verbs *doubt*, *deny*, *prohibit*, and *refuse*. As this study focuses on the interplay between covert/inherent and overt expressions of negation, the primary aspect of negation analyzed here is its semantic substance (see Saury 2004: 48–51; 2008).

Paratactic negation is one example of **multiple negation**, which is a general term that refers to negating the same idea or proposition more than once. The fact that these phenomena are analyzed and named separately indicates that repetitive negation is somehow unusual. This leads

tense. In this paper, the gloss NEG refers by default to the third-person singular, while the other forms are explicitly marked.

³ This verb group has several names including “verbs of implicit negation” (Iyeiri 2010; see also Horn 1989: 188), “adversative predicates” (van der Wurff 1998), “verbs of negative import” (van der Wouden 1997; Jespersen 1917), “covertly negative verbs” (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 835), and “negative-entailment verbs” (Croft 2000: 135). Moreover, there is no consensus on the exact definition or boundaries of the verb class; van der Wurff (1998: 297–298) justly notes that scholars often only give vague and intuitive definitions.

to the question of the relation between linguistic and logical negation. Even though linguistic negation builds on the principles of logic in many respects, it is not restricted by them (Horn 2010b: 1; Jespersen 1917: 62; Larjavaara 2007: 4.1; Saury 2004: 17–18). In other words, linguistic negation cannot be reduced to logic (Jespersen 1917: 71). This observation is acknowledged at the beginning of most overviews on multiple negation (for example, see Horn 2010a: 111; Horn 1978: 162; Jespersen 1917: 62; van der Wouden 1997: 179).

Multiple negation has also been demonstrated to be typologically rather common (de Cuypere *et al.* 2007: 301, and references therein). Many studies nonetheless treat PN as being truly expletive, semantically vacuous, and by doing so, they seem to adopt a suspicious attitude towards this type of multiple negation (for example, see van der Wurff 1998: 296; van der Wouden 1997: 196; Iyeiri 2010: 1–2). One central aim of this paper is to demonstrate that a functionally motivated and semantically non-vacuous⁴ PN is a conventionalized pattern with the Finnish verb *epäillä*. This contributes to the understanding of how the use of natural language negation extends beyond the principles of logic.

The current analysis of PN starts out from the following statement by Jespersen (1917: 75): “The [sub-]clause here is in some way treated as an independent sentence, and the negative is expressed as if there had been no main sentence of that particular kind.”⁵ This means that the PN complement explicates the **content** of an inherently negative process that is denoted by the matrix verb.⁶ In the following, this phenomenon will be called the **content interpretation** of PN

⁴ Jespersen (1917: 75) states that PN may become an established pattern if the negative marker used in the pattern “no longer has its full negative force” (for example, *ne* in French).

⁵ In his later version, Jespersen (1924: 334) ends this analysis by stating “or as if the corresponding positive verb had been used in the main sentence.”

⁶ Jespersen (1917: 75, 1924: 334) does not use the term *content* in his analysis. Even so, this passage is often cited as if Jespersen did explicate the idea in this manner (see van der Wurff 1998: 307; Yoon 2011: 73).

complement. Even though many linguists have repeated this statement (for example, see Horn 2010a: 121; van der Wurff 1998: 307), the essence of this content interpretation of PN complements has not been thoroughly analyzed. This leads to the core research question of this paper: What is the content role of the (PN) complement generally based on? The answer to this question lies in verb semantics and conventionalized syntagmatic patterns. The analysis will help in understanding where and why PN develops to a regular pattern.

1.1 Data and methods

The data used in the present study represent three diachronic phases: Old Finnish (from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century), Early Modern Finnish (the nineteenth century), and Modern Finnish (from the twentieth century to the present). This study of PN with the verb *epäillä* is part of an examination of the syntactic-semantic behavior, polysemy, and diachronic development of this verb (for example, see N.N. 2015). The diachronic data predominantly contribute to the analysis of the meaning change (an exhaustive treatment is beyond the scope of this paper), but it also reveals that PN has occurred with the verb *epäillä* throughout the literary history of Finnish.

The data examples are restricted to those in which the verb *epäillä* occurs in a finite clause. The Old Finnish data, which consist of a total of 257 such instances, are from the Corpus of Old Literary Finnish (COLF).⁷ The Early Modern Finnish data, with a total of 1,232 instances, are

⁷ Information on the corpora that were used is given below:

Corpus of Old Literary Finnish (COLF): http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/vks/meta/vks_coll_rdf.xml, 3.4 million tokens; Corpus of Early Modern Finnish (CEMF): http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/1800/meta/1800_coll_rdf.xml, 8.6 million tokens; Collections of the National Library (NL): <http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:lb-2014073038>, 17 million tokens; Finnish Text Collection (FTC): <http://www.csc.fi/english/research/software/ftc>, 2.0 million tokens; Corpus of Translated Finnish (CTF): 0.7 million tokens; Corpus of Finnish Literary Classics (CFLC): http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/klassikot/meta/klassikot_coll_rdf.xml; 1.5 million tokens.

from the Corpus of Early Modern Finnish (CEMF) and a sample (from the years 1820–29, 1870, and 1876) from the Newspaper and Journal Collections of the National Library (NL). Finally, a total of 492 occurrences of the Modern Finnish data comprise a sample from the Finnish Text Collection (FTC), a sample from the Corpus of Translated Finnish (CTF), the Corpus of Finnish Literary Classics (CFLC), and additional data examples that were added by the author (AD). Each example presented in this paper will be accompanied by the subpart of the dataset in question, the text genre, and the year that it was written. Some examples that are not found in this primary data are also used to demonstrate the use of PN with Finnish verbs other than *epäillä* (see section 3.2.2). Data sources for each example will also be provided.

This study adopts an approach to language and linguistic meaning that is usage-based and cognitive-functional (for example, see Bybee 2010; Croft & Cruse 2004). This means that linguistic structures and their interpretations are not perceived as being fixed, but rather as being subject to continuous change. In addition, linguistic meaning is regarded as profoundly determined by context (Croft & Cruse 2004: 102–103). This study reflects these principles by establishing generalizations that are based on an analysis of naturally occurring data as well as on the native author's judgments. As I will demonstrate in section 4.1, the verb under investigation is polysemous and conveys meanings that alternate between two contrasting polar readings. This demands an especially thorough consideration of the context of each occurrence. Indeed, each analysis concerning the polarity of an utterance is strictly based on its actual context.

The present analysis adopts a functional perspective. Accordingly, no hidden syntactic features are posited in the analysis (see Langacker 2008: 5–6). Furthermore, the present analysis does not assume a strict one-to-one mapping between syntax and semantics: Syntactically similar utterances may, in different linguistic environments, allow for divergent semantics. In other words, meaning in context is seen as resulting from the combination of (morpho)syntactic, lexical, and pragmatic information.

1.2 Aim and organization of this paper

To summarize the main points thus far, the primary objective of this analysis is to determine the basis for the content role of the complement, as this has been recognized as the distinctive feature of PN since Jespersen (1917). Once this question is answered and a definition of PN is articulated, two points will become evident. First, PN is discussed as a conventionalized pattern. Second, the limits of PN are delineated more strictly than this has been done in previous studies.

Each section of this article contributes to these objectives as follows: Section 2 discusses the previous literature on paratactic negation and its related phenomena in order to illustrate the purpose of the current analysis. Section 3 presents the main argument. The basis for content role complements is developed further by analyzing verb semantics and distinguishing between target and content role complements. In section 4, to demonstrate that a functionally motivated and semantically non-vacuous PN can be an established pattern, the analysis is applied to the use of the Finnish verb *epäillä*. Section 5 delimits the phenomenon of PN by excluding cases that are more fruitfully seen as evaluative negation. More specifically, when a non-truth-conditional negative is encountered in the complement of a verb that denotes negative evaluation, that negation does not conform to the present definition of PN. It is argued that the difference between negation proper and evaluative negativity should be considered more closely. Section 6 concludes the paper by summarizing its results and further implications.

2. Paratactic negation in previous literature: terms and definitions

The term **paratactic negation** is derived from the syntactic concept of **parataxis**, which contrasts with the term hypotaxis. These two are often regarded as synonyms for coordination and subordination, respectively (Allwood *et al.* 1977: 36; Larjavaara 2007: 78). However, for purposes of the concept of paratactic negation, parataxis needs to be viewed more generally as **lack of subordination** (de Vries 2007: 203–205).⁸ As Jespersen (1917: 75) has argued, the

⁸ Smyth's (1956 [1920]: 485) definition of parataxis as “coordination in place of subordination” comes close to this, even though the lack of subordination does not automatically make a clause

complement containing PN is “in some way treated as an independent sentence, and the negative is expressed as if there had been no main sentence of that particular kind.” In other words, the main clause with an inherently negative verb and what appears to be its subordinate clause, on the conceptual level, lack a clear subordinate hierarchy, and this motivates the use of an overt negation. Indeed, one feature of the content role complement is the lack of subordination (see more in section 3).

The term **paratactic negation** is generally adopted for the phenomenon analyzed in this study (for example, see Croft 2000: 135–137; Horn 1978; 2010a; Jespersen 1917, 1924). However, other terms have also been utilized, such as expletive negation (Iyeiri 2009, 2010; van der Wurff 1998), sympathetic negation (Smyth 1956 [1920]: 622), pleonastic negation (Horn 2010a), and evaluative negation (Yoon 2011). These different terms often reflect slightly different definitions of the same phenomenon. For a discussion on the limits of PN, see section 6.

Yoon (2011: 62–81) divides the previous accounts on paratactic negation (and its near phenomena) into expletive and non-expletive approaches. The expletive approaches imply that the negative element in the complement is semantically vacuous — even an imperfection of language (see Espinal 2000). In contrast, the non-expletive approaches maintain that this negation has a semantic contribution (for example, see Meibauer 1990; Tovena 1996). This paper endorses the non-expletive position that the negative element in the complement clause actually makes real semantic contribution to the overall interpretation. Let us now turn to some aspects that were discussed in previous work, in order to assess their relevance for the current approach.

Horn (2010a: 121–124; see also 1978: 173–174) observes that the reason behind PN is a mental fusion of two contradictory propositions: One that is affirmative but unexpressed, and another one that is negative and overtly displayed in the PN complement. In other words, the use

coordinate. For instance, parentheticals, such as phrases that are interpolated in a syntactic structure with no overt connective, exhibit one type of paratactic configuration. (Bloomfield 1933: 186; Schneider *et al.* 2015).

of PN reflects the simultaneous processing of two polar versions of the complement. The blend analysis implies that the affirmative complement would be the correct one, consequently disregarding the possibility of an established PN pattern that the current account introduces.

In his general discussion on multiple negation, Jespersen (1917: 72) suggests that one reason for reiterating a negative element might be the processing challenge of keeping one negative element in mind throughout a lengthy utterance. This effect may also evoke the use of PN, especially when there is abundant linguistic material between the inherently negative verb and the verb phrase of the complement (see Jespersen 1917: 75). Nevertheless, as plausible as this analysis is, like the blend analysis, it considers PN to be a logical aberration.

Iyeiri (2009: 161) observes that in later Modern English, from the seventeenth century to the nineteenth century, the increasingly common omission of the complementizer *that* explains the use of PN (which she, however, analyses and refers to as an expletive). Let us consider the following example (2) offered by Iyeiri (2010: 148):

- (2) I doubt their preaching is not always true... (1640 Christopher Harvey, *the Synagogue, or the Shadow of the Temple*)

Iyeiri (2010: 147–148) claims that the omission of *that* enables an interpretation that regards the complement clause (*their preaching is not always true*) as the main clause, and *I doubt* as a sentence adverbial, or a parenthetical, parallel to the phrases *I think* or *maybe* (see Thompson 2002). Two issues require a comment here. First, if *I doubt* is considered to be a genuine parenthetical, the explicit negative does not require either a distinct label or analysis of PN. Instead, clausal negation is the primary negation of the utterance, while *I doubt* functions as a **negative parenthetical** (Horn 1978: 176–179; see also 169). Second, for example, the Finnish complementizer *että* ‘that’ cannot be omitted in the same manner as *that* in English (Laury 2006: 312), which makes this explanation unsuitable for PN in Finnish. Nevertheless, the current analysis of PN as a content reading of a complement as well as the treatment of *I doubt* as a parenthetical are similar in that the syntactic integration between the verb of inherent negation

and an overtly negative clause is not assumed to be (clearly) subordinate (Iyeiri 2010: 127 and references therein).

In her discussion of previous approaches, Yoon (2011) criticizes both expletive and non-expletive approaches. As I have mentioned previously, I agree with her critique of the expletive approaches in that I view PN as not semantically vacuous. Yoon is also critical of the earlier non-expletive approaches for their inability to consistently account for all the instances of non-truth-conditional negation in clausal complements, temporal clauses, exclamations, polite requests, and so on. Yoon refers to these as evaluative negation (EN) (Yoon 2011, ch2). Yoon's endeavor to establish a uniform account is intriguing, but the current analysis demonstrates that separate phenomena call for separate analyses. One central indication of the difference between Yoon's analysis and the current approach to PN is that Yoon's (2011: 133–134) claim that even if EN is not semantically vacuous, it nevertheless lacks the normal negative force (Yoon 2011: 78, 137–142; see also van der Wurff 1998: 305). This analysis argues that the semantic content of PN is equivalent to ordinary negation. The need for a separate analysis stems more from the question of why the negative is placed in the complement, rather than the question of what it contributes to the utterance.

3. Paratactic negation as a content reading of the complement

Let us now proceed to the main argument of this analysis. Thus far, it has been established that the current analysis follows in the footsteps of previous literature, which can be traced back to Jespersen (1917). The claim is that a) a complement with PN expresses the **content** of the process denoted by the verb of inherent negation, and b) in this pattern, the interclausal relation is **not strictly subordinate**. In what follows, I will elaborate on the definition of the content role of PN complements. However, let us first review some aspects of the Finnish complementizer *että* 'that' and the general complexity of subordination.

The complex nature of subordination has been widely recognized (for example, see Chafe 1988; Givón 2001: 327–328; Haiman & Thompson 1988; Herlin *et al.* 2014). For instance, several studies have indicated that the subordinate status of clausal complements is not self-evident, as

they often convey the essential message of the whole utterance (Thompson 2002: 152–155; Verhagen 2005: 149–154). This also applies to the Finnish *että* ‘that’ initial clausal complements (Laury & Seppänen 2008: 176; Seppänen & Laury 2007: 562). Moreover, although *että* is generally regarded as a subordinator (Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979: 346–347, 353–354), especially in spoken language, it also functions as an utterance-initial particle. According to Laury & Seppänen (2008), these two functions cannot be distinctly separated (see also Hakulinen *et. al.* 2004: 770). *Et(tä)* initial clauses often also introduce paraphrases or summaries from the previous talk (Seppänen & Laury 2007: 559, 563, 566). Even though *että* clauses function as clear complements in the written data of this paper, the syntactic multi-functionality of this linguistic element makes the paratactic (not clearly subordinate) configuration readily available with *että* clauses.

3.1 Two functional roles of the complement: target and content

The essence of the content role complement can be illustrated by recognizing its conceptual counterpart. This means that the two possible **functional roles of the complement** with respect to the matrix clause predicate are **target** and **content**.⁹ The functional role, which describes the relation between the matrix predicate process and the process that is expressed in the complement clause, is mainly determined by the semantics of the matrix verb. For example, for the verbs of perception, the complement typically expresses the target of what is perceived and reacted to (see Pajunen 2001: 56). This target is independent of the perceiver, as it is in the following sentence by an interlocutor who has changed jobs: *I heard that you have a new job*. In contrast, with the verbs of verbal communication, the complement process is inseparable from the matrix process, since it verbalizes the content of this utterance (see Leino 1999: 24). For instance, in the statement, *He said that he will come*, the saying and the proposition of the complement come from the same

⁹ For clarification, functional roles are not equivalent to the traditional semantic or thematic roles such as Agent, Patient, and Experiencer, but they serve as tools for exploring the syntactic role of the object from the perspective of the internal semantic structure of the utterance.

“source.” In other words, the crucial difference between the target and content configurations is that the process of saying “creates” the proposition of the complement (content), while the process of hearing reacts (more or less actively) to it (target).

The distinction between these two functional roles of complement clauses is assumed to apply across languages. However, of course, cross-linguistic variation occurs in which particular verbs take certain types of complements. (Pajunen 2001: 53.) It is interesting, however, that some verbs allow both types. As the reader may expect, the verb *epäillä* is one of these, but before proceeding to the verbs of inherent negation, the phenomenon is illustrated with the non-negative verb *ihmetellä*, ‘wonder, express surprise’ (examples modified from Leino 1999: 24). This verb functions primarily as a verb of perception (3), which makes the complement a target of a reaction (see *hear* above). In addition, this verb may serve as a communication verb (4), in which case the complement expresses the content of the speech act characterized as wondering (see *say*):

- (3) *Ihmettelen, ett=en saanut Nobelia.*
 wonder:1SG that=NEG get:PTCP Nobel.prize:PART

‘I am surprised I didn’t get a Nobel prize.’

TARGET: ‘I didn’t get a Nobel prize’; a state of affairs, towards which the conceptualizer’s wonder is directed.

- (4) *Ihmettelin, että näyttävät=pä he iäkkäiltä.*
 wonder:PST:1SG that seem:3PL=CL they aged:PL:ABL

‘I wondered how they seem so aged.’

CONTENT: ‘they seem so aged’; a verbalization, that is, the verbal content of the conceptualizer’s wonder.

With a non-negative verb such as *ihmetellä* ‘wonder, express surprise,’ the distinction between target and content complements introduces a highly nuanced level of semantic analysis (see Leino 1999: 24). The distinction is, however, crucial when inherently negative verbs are concerned because it affects the polarity of the complement. For instance, if we consider the situation of example (1), the target of the inherently negative process, doubt, would be expressed

with an affirmative clause ‘this will succeed,’ whereas the content receives the negative form ‘it will not succeed.’

In other words, in target configuration, the process that includes inherent negation is directed to the proposition of the complement, which leads to a reversal in the interpretation of the complement’s polarity, so that there is an interclausal scope of negation.

(5) *Epäilen vahvasti, että se olisi korjattavissa.*

doubt:1SG strongly that it be:COND.3SG fixable(ADV)

‘I strongly doubt that it could be fixed.’ (AD, FB update, 2015)

TARGET: ‘it could be fixed’

polarity reversal in the interpretation: ‘it is probably not possible to fix it’

For the inherently negative verbs that do not regularly allow PN (for example, the English verb *doubt*), the target complement is also the default case. By contrast, when the complement expresses the content of an inherently negative process, the negation is overtly marked in the complement:

(6) *H. T. epäili, ett=ei muovi ole paras mahdollinen*

H.T. doubt:PST:3SG that=NEG plastic be.CNG best possible

houkutin asuinalueen nimessä.

lure neighborhood:GEN name:INES

‘H.T. doubted that [NEG] plastic is the best lure in the name of a neighborhood.’

(FTC, Newspaper, 2000)

CONTENT: ‘plastic is (probably) not the best lure in the name or a neighborhood’

The verbalization of an inherently negative process naturally contains negation. This can be demonstrated by paraphrasing the situation in question, beginning with the nominalization of this process and a copula, and continuing with the content expression. Thus, the interpretation of example (6) would be: ‘The doubt is: plastic is (probably) not the best lure...’

In the final analysis, the two roles are a matter of verb semantics. Although the verb *epäillä* expresses the dubious mental state in both examples (5) and (6), and may therefore be regarded

as a verb of cognition, the two usage patterns highlight different sides of this state. In example (5), the essential feature of the expression is the dubious reaction towards a proposition, whereas in example (6), it is the expression (mental or verbal) of this dubious stance that is focused on, which means that the verb function is similar to communication verbs. Since a reaction and its expression may be inseparably intertwined, it is completely understandable that one verb may, in different contexts, highlight either one of these aspects. This twofold syntactic-semantic potential is intrinsic to the verb *epäillä*.

Example (6) therefore exhibits the usage of paratactic negation in that the overtly negative complement expresses the content of the doubt denoted by the matrix verb *epäillä*. No scope of negation extends from the matrix to the complement, meaning that the inherent negation in the matrix and the overt negation in the complement appear co-ordinate semantically with each other. With the verb *epäillä*, this paratactic configuration is clearly favored over the scope use that is presented in example (5) (see more in section 4.1). Thus, scoping over its complement is not an inalienable feature of a verb of inherent negation, but the verb may “only” characterize the process as inherently negative, such as doubt.

The (non-)presence of the scope of negation is considered to be a syntactic-semantic phenomenon. However, the difference between (5) and (6) comes with no explicit manifestation, as the same verb in (5) creates and in (6) does not create the scope. Thus, the negative scope itself is invisible on the surface of these utterances. Following the principles of the functional framework no hidden syntactic features are assigned to the level of syntax to explain this difference, but a contextual interpretation of an utterance reveals both the scope of negation and the absence of it. In other words, the overt syntax of an utterance does contribute to its semantic interpretation, but not independently of lexical and other contextual material (section 1.1). As examples (5) and (6) illustrate, this means that the same syntactic structure may receive different interpretations in different linguistic environments.

The meaning of paratactic in the term paratactic negation has been defined above as a lack of subordination, and as we have discussed earlier in this analysis, both the inherent negation of

the matrix verb and the overt negation in the complement appear to be semantically coordinated. However, semantically, a PN complement is neither in coordinate nor in subordinate relation to the inherently negative matrix process. Instead, it describes the same idea as the process, only in detail.¹⁰ This is, it articulates the content of, for example, doubt.

3.2 Support for the present analysis of PN

Next, the two functional roles of clausal complements will be compared to other linguistic elements that exhibit properties of the content or the target role and therefore lend independent support to the above analysis.

3.2.1 Clausal complements “in between” direct quotes and nominal objects

As discussed above, the content role is natural for the complements of communication verbs, specifically in the context of direct quotes (Leino 1999: 24). As can be expected, a direct quote that is introduced by an inherently negative reporting verb includes an overt marking of negation:

(7) – *Et=päs tiedä... elä valehtele! epäilli Tena.*
 NEG:2SG=CLknow.CNG NEG.IMP.2SG lie.CNG doubt:PST.3SG T.

literally: “No, you don’t know... don’t lie!” Tena doubted.’ (CFLC, Novel, 1911)

Comparing the direct quote in example (7) and the indirect report in the complement of example (6) reveals that in terms of polarity, PN complements resemble direct report, even though with respect to other dimensions, such as deixis, they represent indirect report. This idea is not exactly new. For example, Van der Wurff (1998: 301–302, 305, 308) remarks that the mixture of indirect and direct report causes a **polarity shift**, by which he refers to a general tendency to put a negation in the complement of an inherently negative verb. This definition is in accordance with the current account of paratactic negation; in fact, van der Wurff (1998: 308) explicitly points out that the concept of polarity shift resembles Jespersen’s explanation of PN.¹¹

¹⁰ I would like to thank Maria Vilkuna for this idea.

¹¹ van der Wurff (1998: 302) omits the polarity shifts from his main analysis of expletive negation, and this indicates that his expletive negation and PN as defined here are two different phenomena.

The connection between PN and direct report leads us to the hypothesis that those verbs of inherent negation that can be used to introduce direct reports are probably more likely to appear with PN. For example, it seems that the English verb *doubt* as well as other English inherently negative English verbs avoid reporting clauses¹² (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 1027). Thus, it is reasonable to assume that PN is not a regular pattern with *doubt* either.

While the content role prototypically resides in direct quotes, the target role is most typically associated with nominal objects:

- (8) *Sitä uskallan epäillä!*
 it:PART dare:1SG doubt:INF

I dare to doubt that!’ (FTC, newspaper; letter to the editor, 1995)

In example (8), the target of *doubt* is the antecedent of the pronoun *se* ‘it,’ a proposition towards which a dubious attitude is directed by using the inherently negative verb *epäillä*.

The preceding examples have illustrated the difference between the target and content complements with the Finnish verb *epäillä*. Table 1 summarizes this twofold functional potential of complement clauses, which is also applicable on a more general level. Whether a complement-taking verb allows target complements, or content complements, or both, depends on its semantics and conventionalized syntagmatic patterns.

Table 1. A comparison of the functional roles of nominal objects, clausal complements, and direct quotes

“Sub-ordinate” element	<i>Nominal object</i>	<i>Complement clause</i>	<i>Direct quote</i>
Functional role	Target	Target / Content	Content
Examples	(8)	(5) (target) (6) (content)	(7)

¹² Kendra Willson, personal communication.

3.2.2 Paratactic negation with other verbs in Finnish

The suggestion that paratactic negation is an established pattern in standard Finnish with *epäillä* receives further support from the fact that PN is also encountered with other verbs in Finnish, such as the verbs *kiistää* ‘deny, dispute,’ and *kieltää* ‘forbid, prohibit, deny.’ Unlike *epäillä*, these verbs are not entirely conventionalized in their use with PN, but when encountered, the utterances conform to the above analysis of PN. In brief, the complements express the content of an inherently negative process, and the matrix verb functions like a communication verb. The question in example (9) is from a reader’s comment on some news regarding Finland; the discussion concerns the potential consequences of an information leakage:

(9) **Kiistät**=kö ett=**ei** tällaista mahdollisuutta ole
deny:2SG=Q that=NEG this.kind.of:PART possibility:PART be.CNG

olemassa?

be:INF:INES

‘Do you deny the existence of this kind of possibility?’

complement literally: ‘that this kind of possibility does not exist’ (source: HS.fi

News Comment Corpus, 2011¹³)

In (9), the complement verbalizes the content of the assumed denial, which is overtly negative: *tällaista mahdollisuutta ei ole olemassa* ‘this kind of possibility does not exist.’ This formulation is interpreted as being grammatically unproblematic in the discussion forum, as it evokes no confusion in the course of the discussion.¹⁴

¹³ The HS.fi News and Comments Corpus 2011–2012. Data gatherer: Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian, and Scandinavian Studies, University of Helsinki. <https://korp.csc.fi/>

¹⁴ I have also encountered an instance of the *kieltää että ei* ‘deny that not’ that does problematize the use of PN. In this instance, the construction appeared in a newspaper article (<http://www.hs.fi/ulkomaat/a1305931726533>, Feb 25 2015) which generated a response from a reader, literally translated as, “Denies that it was not large? So, it was large?” even though the

In example (10), the same paratactic configuration is seen with the verb *kieltää* ‘prohibit’:

- (10) *Voi=ko vanhemmat kieltää ett=ei heidän lastaan*
can:3SG=Q parent:PL forbid:INF that=NEG they:GEN child:PART:PX
saa laittaa tukiopetukseen tai erityiskouluun?
may.CNG put:INF remedial.education:ILL or special.school:ILL

‘Can parents forbid their child from being transferred to remedial education or a special school?’

complement literally: ‘that their child cannot be put into...’

(source: vauva.fi internet chat forum, 2009)

This question is the heading of a discussion on an internet chat forum that is devoted predominantly to family issues. The writer wonders whether parents have the right to prohibit school personnel from making certain decisions. Again, the complement clearly expresses the content of the hypothetical prohibition.

The verbs *kieltää* ‘forbid’ and *kiistää* ‘deny’ do not evince subtle polar polysemy like *epäillä* ‘doubt, suspect’ (see section 4.1), but they always unequivocally contain inherent negation. For this reason, examples (9) and (10) are not perfectly identical to PN with *epäillä*, but they still testify to the naturalness of PN among speakers of Finnish.

4. Paratactic negation with *epäillä*

Now that we have covered the essence of content complements, let us turn to a closer examination of paratactic negation in the data under investigation. This section begins with a brief overview on the twofold polar semantics of the verb *epäillä*. This overview is necessary for understanding the discussion that follows it, which is a subtle difference between the paratactic and compositional analysis of the *epäillä että ei* ‘doubt/suspect that NEG’ construction. In the last sub-

intended message of the article was obviously the opposite. This indicates that the standard logic of negation is also observed by Finnish speakers, and as a consequence, the acceptability of PN is not automatically shared.

section, negative clauses with PN complements (schematically *ei epäillä että ei* ‘not doubt that NEG’) will be discussed.

4.1 The polar polysemy of *epäillä* in a nutshell

The verb *epäillä* derives etymologically from the negative auxiliary *e(i)*, which represents standard (clausal) negation in Finnish in the sense of Miestamo (2005). The root *epä-* is the reconstructed third-person singular form of the auxiliary and occurs in the derived verbs *evätä*, ‘refuse,’ and *epäillä* (SSA s.v. *epäillä, evätä*). Thus, the presence of inherent negation in the semantics of this verb is rather natural. However, the meaning of the verb cannot be reduced to this.

As demonstrated above, *epäillä* allows both target and content complements, with the content complements being more typical. Moreover, the content complements also exhibit polar variation in their meaning: Due to a change in meaning, the verb does not carry any interpretation of inherent negation in some contexts.¹⁵ This results in structurally identical utterances (that is, an affirmative matrix clause with *epäillä* and an affirmative complement clause) with contradictory messages. In the following examples, the difference is clearly demonstrated by the distribution of polarity items (see Horn 1978: 164–165; 1989: 188; 523): in example (11), the negative polarity item *kukaan* ‘anyone’ reveals that the complement is under the scope of negation (that is, the inherent negation of *epäillä*), while in example (12), *joku* ‘someone,’ which is the positive polarity counterpart of the *kukaan* ‘anyone,’ indicates an affirmative interpretation. Due to the unambiguity of the polarity items (for example, see Horn 1989: 49), the interpretations are unequivocal.

- (11) *Epäilen suuresti, että kukaan tulee riitauttamaan*
 doubt:1SG highly that **anyone** come:3SG contest:INF:ILL

¹⁵ The word *inherent* does not imply that the inherent negation could not bleach. Instead, the inherent nature of negation refers to the inclusion of this negative semantic aspect in the lexical element itself as opposed to a separate grammatical marking of negation.

tätä asiaa.

this:PART matter:PART

'I highly doubt that anyone will contest this matter.' (AD, presentation talk, 2014)

(12) *Epäilen, että alakerran yksiössä mätänee joku.*

suspect:1SG that downstairs:GEN studio:INES decompose:3SG **someone**

'I suspect that there is someone decomposing in the studio downstairs.' (AD, internet forum, 2013)

In other words, in example (11), the conceptualizer¹⁶ is disinclined to rely on the truthfulness of the complement's proposition, while in contrast, example (12) conveys that the conceptualizer is indeed inclined to believe the proposition of the complement. These two polar readings of the *epäillä* construction (verb + its complement) are referred to as **negation-inclining** 'doubt' (11), and **affirmation-inclining** 'suppose'/'suspect' (12), respectively. Polar readings are regulated by several contextual factors, with the polarity items being the clearest ones. The general terms for the polar variants highlight the fact that no single English translational equivalent sufficiently corresponds to the meaning of *epäillä*.

As has already been demonstrated, paratactic negation, that is, explicitly negative complements, occurs with the verb *epäillä*. Naturally, the verb itself may be used in a negative form as well. When we consider all these possible manifestations of negation, and the polar polysemy demonstrated above, we arrive at a total of six possible polarity combinations, which are illustrated here on the basis of naturally occurring examples:

¹⁶ The term *conceptualizer* is used here to refer to the subject argument of the matrix verb. The proposition of the complement is assessed from the conceptualizer's perspective (see Langacker 2008: 445–446).

Polar interpretation of the construction	Functional role of the complement
negation-inclining (an affirmative form of <i>epäillä</i>): ‘doubt’	Target
<p>i. <i>Epäilen, että uskovat tämän historian.</i> doubt:1SG that believe:3PL this:GEN story(history):GEN ‘I doubt that they believe this story.’ (CEMF, play, 1864)</p>	
Refuted negation-inclining (a negative form of <i>epäillä</i>): ‘not doubt’	Target
<p>ii. <i>Emme epäile, että saadaan kokoon se rahasumma.</i> NEG:1PL doubt.CNG that get:PASS together it sum ‘We do not doubt that that sum of money will be collected.’ (NL, news, 1870)</p>	
PN construction (an affirmative form of <i>epäillä</i> + a negative complement)	Content
<p>iii. <i>M. epäili, ett=ei hänen raporttejaan luettu tarkkaan.</i> M. doubt:PST.3SG that=NEG he:GEN report:PL:PART:PX read:PTCP <i>tarkkaan.</i> closely ‘M. doubted that his reports were closely read.’ (FTC, editorial, 1995)</p>	
Negated PN construction (a negative form of <i>epäillä</i> + a negative complement)	Content
<p>iv. <i>En minä epäile, ett=ei Jumala rukouksiani kuullut ole.</i> NEG:1SG I doubt.CNG that=NEG God prayer:PL:PART:PX <i>kuullut ole.</i> hear:PTCP be.CNG ‘I do not doubt that God has heard my prayers.’ (COLF, Biblia, 1642)</p>	
Affirmation-inclining <i>epäillä</i> (an affirmative form): ‘suppose/suspect’	Content
<p>v. <i>Epäilen, että ideat kaatuvat juuri siihen.</i> suspect:1SG that idea:PL fall:3PL very it:ILL</p>	

	‘I suspect that is the very obstacle that will rule out the ideas.’ (FTC, newspaper, 1990–2000)	
Refuted affirmation-inclining <i>epäillä</i> (a negative form): ‘not suppose/suspect’		Content
vi.	<i>Kukaan ei osannut epäillä, että poika oli kuollut.</i> anybody NEG can:PTCP suspect:INF that boy be:PST.3SG dead ‘There was no one who could suspect that the boy was dead.’ (TCF, novel, translated 1992)	

Table 2 classifies all the occurrences of the *epäillä että* construction in the data into these six categories. Furthermore, the table provides the total number of the *epäillä* instances for each time period in the data (these figures represent all possible complement constructions, including those that do not allow PN, and are consequently excluded from the current discussion). The bolded numbers indicate the PN constructions.

Table 2. Polar interpretations of the *epäillä & että* clause constructions in the data

Polar interpretation	Old	Finnish	Early	Modern	Modern	Finnish
	(OF)		Finnish		(MF)	
	pre-19 th	century	(EMF)	19 th	century	20 th century to present
	(n=57; total=263)		(n=200; total=1232)			(n=139; total=492)
negation-inclining	1		18		5	
refuted	neg.-	42		121		3
inclining						
PN construction		2		10		45
neg. PN construction		10		44		11
affirmation-inclining		2		6		71
refuted affirmation-		0		1		4
inclining						

The numbers indicate that the most typical reading in Modern Finnish is affirmation-inclining (examples 12 and v), while the negation-inclining reading with an interclausal scope of negation is in the minority. Moreover, the table reveals that this use of *epäillä* has been more frequent earlier. This indicates that a change from the negation-inclining reading to the affirmation-inclining one has occurred (further discussed in N.N. 2015). However, this change is not complete; negation-inclining uses still exist. In addition to examples such as (5) and (11), the negation-inclining reading remains the typical one in certain other contexts— for instance, when the verb *epäillä* occurs with no overt complement and reacts to something in the previous linguistic context:

- (13) *Tällä tavalla=ko se saavutetaan? Rohkenen epäillä.*
 this:ADE manner:ADE=Q it achieve:PASS dare:1SG doubt:INF
 ‘Is this the way it will be achieved? I dare to doubt.’ (FTC, newspaper; letter to the editor, 1995)

Thus, in (13), the preceding question is the **target** of the doubt, in a similar manner as nominal objects and target role complements that were analyzed in Section 3.2.1.

To summarize, inherent negation in many contexts still remains a part of the verb meaning despite the partial meaning change. An overview of this is that on the one hand, when the verb takes the complement in the scope of negation (see examples 5 and 11), the presence of inherent negation is obvious; on the other hand, when the final interpretation is affirmation-inclining (example 12), the non-existence of inherent negation is obvious, and finally, when the complement is explicitly negative (example 6), the answer is unclear, which leads us to the topic of the next sub-section.

4.2 Paratactic versus compositional analysis of *epäillä että ei* ‘doubt/suspect that NEG’

As can be seen from Table 2, paratactic negation has been used with *epäillä* continuously throughout the recorded history of Finnish. Moreover, this usage seems to have increased, as the combined number of all the PN instances (with an affirmative and negative matrix verb) is rather

similar in Early Modern and Modern Finnish, even though the latter dataset is considerably smaller. This increase, nonetheless, requires a more detailed analysis.

Considering the emergence of the aforementioned polar polysemy, one could claim that the increased usage of an overtly negative complement results from the fact that with an affirmative *että* complement clause, the *epäillä* construction tends to be interpreted as affirmation-inclining, that is, ‘suspect’/‘suppose.’ Following this line of thought, a pattern with a negative complement could be analyzed as ‘suppose/suspect that NEG.’ Furthermore, as these translations are not considered as belonging to the verbs of inherent negation, the negation in this type of pattern would not require a separate analysis (that is, paratactic negation), as it does not repeat negation but expresses the first negation in the utterance. If this applied to all such instances in the data, the analysis of PN would be useless for *epäillä*, but this is clearly not the case. As discussed above, inherent negation is still strongly associated with *epäillä*, in Modern Finnish. In addition, when *epäillä* occurs with an overtly negative *että* complement, the verb often contains at least a remnant of the inherent negation, which indicates the plausibility of the paratactic analysis of ‘doubt that NEG.’ Let us now turn to the compositional and paratactic analyses of *epäillä että ei*.

First, it is important to note that the final reading of *epäillä että ei* ‘doubt/suspect that NEG’ is always negation-inclining. The difference discussed here concerns the question of the **internal semantic structure** of this pattern. The question therefore regards the contribution of each linguistic element to the whole pattern, and more specifically, the contribution of the verb *epäillä*. In the paratactic analysis, the verb is analyzed as containing inherent negation, while in the compositional analysis it is analyzed without it, which means that the verb’s interpretation corresponds to its use in an affirmation-inclining construction (see example 12) and the only source of negation is the overt negative in the complement.

(14) a. Compositional analysis:

epäillä (non-negative verb) & negative *että* complement

‘suppose/suspect that NEG’

b. Paratactic negation analysis:

epäillä (verb of inherent negation) & negative *että* complement

‘doubt that NEG’

As the final reading does not vary according to the choice of analysis, language users who utilize this pattern need not make this distinction: The utterances are fully understandable without this level of analysis. Furthermore, formulating clear categories regarding this division is impossible, which is why all constructions with this form are categorized as PN in the data. This choice is further supported by the observation that readily compositional cases, such as example (15) below, are relatively rare in the data. Despite the ambivalent nature of this distinction, it is important to demonstrate the possibility of both analyses. This is essential because it supports the observation that the meaning change is incomplete, and that *epäillä että ei* can be identified as an established pattern of paratactic negation; indeed, this is part of the main argument of this paper.

The meaning change briefly discussed above and the subtle difference between these two analyses, have a reciprocal relation. In fact, the possibility of both analyses for *epäillä että ei* ‘doubt/suspect that NEG’ was initially key to the change in polarity (further discussed in N.N. 2015). Due to the incompleteness of this change, both analyses are plausible in contemporary Finnish. Jespersen (1917: 75) observes that PN may become established in a language if the negative in the complement no longer has its full semantic power. In the context of the Finnish verb *epäillä*, this thought is applicable in the reverse order. Thus, the PN pattern may become established when the verb of inherent negation no longer clearly has its full semantic power of negation in all contexts.

Despite the lack of clear distinctive features for both compositional and paratactic analyses, some factors that support either one of them can be detected. The only feature that clearly supports the compositional analysis of *epäillä että ei* ‘suspect/suppose that NEG’ is another nearby occurrence of an affirmation-inclining *epäillä* construction:

(15) *V. L. epäilee, että ns. moduulirekkojen mahdollinen*

V.L. suspect:3SG that ABBR module.truck:PL:GEN possible

tulo Suomen maanteille romuttaisi liikenneturvallisuutemme
 coming Finland:GEN road:PL:ADE wreck:COND.3SG traffic.safety:GEN:PX
ja saastuttaisi ympäristömmе. Hän epäilee myös,
 and pollute:COND.3SG environment:GEN:PX she suspect:3SG also
että rekkojen mittakiistassa ei olisi
 that truck:PL:GEN argument.about.size:INES NEG be:COND.CNG
kuultu laajasti ja monipuolisesti asiantuntijoita.
 hear:PTCP widely and diversely consultant:PL:PART

‘V.L. suspects that, if adopted into use, module trucks would wreck our traffic safety and pollute our nature. She also suspects that, in the argument about the permitted size of trucks, specialists may not have been consulted extensively enough.’ (FTC, Newspaper, 1995)

The affirmation-inclining reading in the first line makes it natural to interpret the verb similarly in the sentence that follows; the use of the additive particle *myös* (‘also’) reinforces the interpretation of that similarity.

By contrast, the PN analysis (including the inherent negation of *epäillä*) is enhanced when the turn that includes *epäillä* is reactive in the discourse. Negation prototypically exhibits a closer connection to its linguistic context than affirmation (for example, see Givón 1978: 79–81; Horn 1989: 190; Miestamo 2005: 7; Tottie 1991: 21, 27). For this reason, one is led to interpret the verb as containing inherent negation by the discourse function of reacting.

- (16) ”*Ei=kö se ole osa työläisten taistelua*
 NEG=Q it be.CNG part worker:PL:GEN fight:PART
vapauden puolesta — en=kö minä muka tahdo olla
 freedom:GEN pro NEG=Q I as.if want.CNG be:INF
siinä mukana?” ”On on. Mutta minä epäilen, että teillä
 it:INES along Yes, yes but I doubt:1SG that you:PL:ADE
ei ole kestävyyttä.

NEG be.CNG resiliency:PART

“Isn’t it a part of the working class’s fight for freedom — as if I wouldn’t want to be part of it?” “Yes, yes. But I doubt that [NEG] You have (enough) resiliency.”

(TCF, Novel, trans. 1991)

In (16), the last sentence is a reaction to a girl’s eager assurances regarding her ability to participate in a political struggle. The reactive nature of the *epäillä* construction is even more obvious in the following example, where the second, elliptical sentence containing *epäillä* is a response to the question evoked in the previous sentence:

- (17) *Jutusta ei ilmene, on=ko mahdollista*
story:ELAT NEG turn.out.CNG be:3SG=Q possible:PART
valita ei lainkaan tietä -vaihtoehto.
choose:INF NEG at.all road:PART alternative
Epäilen, että ei.
doubt:1SG that NEG

‘The story doesn’t tell if it is possible to choose “no road at all” as an alternative.

I doubt it [NEG].’ (FTC, Newspaper; editorial, 1995)

As indicated in the translation, example (17) resembles the use of *epäillä* with no overt complement. Within this context, due to the reactivity of this construction, the polar interpretation would be consistently negation-inclining (see example 13).

The analysis of PN, which was discussed in section 3, attests to the complement expressing the content of the inherently negative process denoted by the matrix verb. This applies to both examples (16) and (17): Both feature the complement clauses verbalizing the conceptualizer’s doubt. Even though the possibility of a compositional reading of *epäillä että ei* ‘suspect that NEG’ has to be considered, the analysis of PN plausibly applies to this pattern more often than not. Thus, *epäillä että ei* constitutes an established PN pattern.

4.3 Paratactic negation with the negated matrix verb

This section now concludes the discussion on PN with *epäillä* by introducing cases where PN occurs with a negated matrix predicate. The choice between compositional and paratactic analyses, described above, is not relevant here, because the matrix negation rather unequivocally leads to an interpretation of ‘not doubt,’ which then indicates that the verb contains inherent negation and that the negative in the complement is indeed paratactic (see Table 2 for the infrequency of the uses of refuted affirmation-inclining).

Van der Wouden (1997: 203) claims that the ability of a verb to evoke PN disappears when the verb occurs in the negative form. However, the current data features several examples of this precise pattern (see Table 2, example iv). The mismatch between the data and the claim by van der Wouden suggests that, despite the same label, he discusses a rather different phenomenon; van der Wouden (1997: 204–205) regards PN to be parallel to negative polarity items. In contrast, as described here, PN occurs after a negated matrix verb as well. Example (18) illustrates the use in Early Modern Finnish:

(18)	<i>Sitä</i>	<i>ei</i>	<i>ole</i>	<i>vielä</i>	<i>kukaan epäillyt,</i>	<i>ett'=ei</i>
	it:PART	NEG	be.CNG	yet	anyone doubt:PTCP	that=NEG
	<i>Suomen</i>	<i>kansan</i>	<i>varat</i>	<i>kestäisi</i>	<i>kaiken</i>	
	Finland:GEN	nation:GEN	resource:PL	bear:COND.CNG	all:GEN	
	<i>saksalaisen</i>	<i>hyvän</i>	<i>hankkimiseen.</i>			
	German:GEN	good:GEN	purchase:NMLZ:ILL			

‘No one has yet doubted that the resources of the Finnish nation would [NEG] be enough to purchase every piece of German goods [products].’ (CEMF, Journal, 1867)

In example (16), the existence of doubt is refuted. Despite the third (linearly, the first) negative element, which expresses this refutation, the underlying interplay between the verb *epäillä* and the negation in the complement clause is identical to the PN with an affirmative form of the verb. In other words, they do not exclude each other because the complement verbalizes the content of

the doubt. Thus, example (18) could be paraphrased as: “No one has expressed the following doubt: the resources of the Finnish nation would not be enough...”

According to the data, when the matrix clause is in the negative form, the subordinator systematically takes the form *etteikö* in Modern Finnish. This form can be morphologically analyzed as a combination of *että* and two cliticized elements, namely, the negator and the question clitic *-kO*.¹⁷

- (19) *Ei ole mitään syytä epäillä, ett=ei=kö*
 NEG be.CNG any:PART reason:PART doubt:INF that=NEG=Q
yksimielisyys jatkuisi myös tulevina vuosina.
 consensus continue:COND.CNG also following:PL:ESS year:PL:ESS
 ‘There is no reason to doubt that [NEG=Q] the consensus will continue during the following years.’ (FTC, Newspaper, 1995)

This use of *etteikö* is lexicalized and does not carry any interrogative meaning. Instead, its consistent use in constructions containing three sources of negation indicates that it functions to clarify the stance of the conceptualizer; processing the combination of multiple negatives is a complex task (for example, see Horn 1989: 168). Thus, in example (19), *etteikö* emphasizes that it is the affirmative counterpart of the complement that the writer of this utterance invites his or her reader to believe in: ‘The consensus most likely will continue.’ (Larjavaara 1992). Nonetheless, the negative clause in the complement verbalizes the content of the doubt, ‘the consensus would not continue.’

5. Evaluative negation: difference from paratactic negation

Throughout this paper, it has been shown that different scholars’ definitions of PN only partially overlap. In what follows, I will discuss one crucial question concerning the limits of this phenomenon. Most of the previous studies on PN do not distinguish between an allegedly

¹⁷ The combination *ett=ei* (inflected in person) is one of several cases where the Finnish negative cliticizes on a conjunction (Vilkuna 2015: 480–481).

superfluous negation that appears in the complements of the verbs that convey negative evaluation, such as ‘fear,’ and PN as discussed thus far. Consequently, they also consider the semantic category of “unfavorable evaluation” to be included within inherent negation (for example, see Horn 2010a: 122–123; Iyeiri 2010; van der Wouden 1997: 196–197, 201). A subtle difference can, however, be detected, and to capture this difference, the distinction between negation proper and evaluative negativity needs to be addressed (see Cruse 1977; Horn 1989: 274; Iyeiri 2010: 5 and references therein).

5.1 Negation proper and negative evaluation in the interpretation of *epäillä*

The polar polysemy of *epäillä* was discussed in section 4.1 and the conclusion was that it is a verb of inherent negation to a certain extent, but not in every context because the affirmation-inclining reading ‘suspect/suppose’ has emerged. Inherent negation, present in the negation-inclining interpretation ‘doubt,’ represents **negation proper**, this is, semantic substance that reverses polarity. This polarity reversal effect can be seen most clearly in the instances where the verb *epäillä* takes its complement in the scope of negation. Let us consider example (11), revisited here:

- (11) *Epäilen suuresti, että kukaan tulee riitauttamaan*
 doubt:1SG highly that **anyone** come:3SG contest:INF:ILL
tätä asiaa.
 this:PART matter:PART

‘I highly doubt that anyone will contest this matter.’ (AD, presentation talk, 2014)

As a comparison, in contexts where the interpretation of this verb lacks inherent negation (affirmation-inclining variant, ‘suspect’), *epäillä* typically continues to convey a tone of undesirability. This means that the verb expresses the conceptualizer’s undesirable attitude towards the message of the verb’s complement, which he or she nonetheless regards as true. For instance, in example (12), independent of who is the conceptualizer, he or she is likely to regard the potential presence of a decomposing body next door undesirable.

- (12) *Epäilen, että alakerran yksiössä mätäneee joku.*
 suspect:1SG that downstairs:GEN studio:INES decompose:3SG **someone**
 ‘I suspect that there is someone decomposing in the studio downstairs.’ (AD, internet forum, 2013)

Undesirability or unfavorable evaluation belongs to the abstract semantic category of **evaluative negativity**, comprising perspective-linked meanings of affective, moral, aesthetical, and other types of counter-preference. Unlike the aforementioned studies, this analysis excludes evaluative negativity from the verbs of inherent negation. This distinction is supported by the observation that only positive polarity items (*joku* ‘someone’) conform to the affirmation-inclining reading of example (12). Thus, the interpretations of the verb *epäillä* in examples (11) and (12) differ with respect to the presence of inherent negation; example (12) only conveys evaluative negativity. Admittedly, the distinction between negation proper and evaluative negativity is extremely subtle, which is illustrated by the fact that the use of negation proper (such as a negative clause) often carries an implication of negative evaluation (Tuppurainen 1991: 117–122). In other words, negation and evaluative negativity often occur together. However, as example (12) reveals, evaluative negativity may also exist without negation proper.

5.2 Evaluative negation reflects underlying wishes

Let us now proceed to the allegedly superfluous negation in the complements of evaluatively negative predicates. In fact, this type of negation may occur due to the tone of undesirability in the interpretation of an affirmation-inclining *epäillä*. The pattern is not as established as PN with a negation-inclining interpretation of *epäillä*, but it occurs occasionally, especially in spoken language:

- (20) *Se [lääkäri] oli epäillyh heti*
 it [doctor] be:PST:3SG suspect:PTCP instantly
ett=ei tässä [jalasa] vaan oo kuolio.
 that=NEG this:INES [foot:INES] just be.CNG gangrene

‘He/she [the doctor] had instantly suspected that [NEG] there might be gangrene in this [foot].’ (Dialectal data, interview)¹⁸

The current account of paratactic negation maintains that the negative complement expresses the content of an inherently negative matrix process, such as ‘doubt.’ Yet in example (20), the negative complement is not the content of the suspicion in the same sense; the purpose of the utterance is to state that the gangrene may actually exist. When describing the situation of example (20) with a similar paraphrase that was used to demonstrate the negative form of the content of doubt in example (6) (see section 3.1), it becomes clear that the content of suspicion becomes affirmative instead: ‘The suspicion is: the patient’s foot probably has gangrene.’ If the negative clause encountered in the complement of example (20) exhibits the content of something, it is the **underlying wish** evoked by this utterance conveying evaluative negativity (see Horn 1978: 152; Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 836–837). Thus, the overt marking of negation agrees with the undesirable aspect of *epäillä*, and not the inherent negation, as this aspect of meaning is absent here. Due to this difference, the non-truth-conditional negatives that occur in the complements of evaluatively negative verbs should be accounted for separately from PN. For this purpose, I adopt Yoon’s (2011, 2013) term **evaluative negation** (EN), because it appositely describes the link to evaluative negativity.¹⁹

In general, linguistic expressions with negation are most often used to contrast with expectations that the speaker has or might assume the hearer to have. In other words, this is usually recognized as a special feature of negation, which implies a possibility or even expectation of its affirmative counterpart (for example, see Givón 1978: 69; Tottie 1991: 21–24). In reality, affirmations are also uttered in contrast to their negative counterparts (Giora 2006). However, the expressions of evaluative negativity, such as the affirmation-inclining *epäillä* ‘suspect,’

¹⁸ Morphology Archives: <http://www.helsinki.fi/fus/research/ma.html>

¹⁹ However, this choice does not entail a total commitment to the whole theory proposed by Yoon, as was explained in section 2.

prominently feature underlying expectations, and even more strongly, underlying desires. This is because an expression of counter-preference unavoidably evokes the preferred opposite. When an overtly negative complement is used, such as the one that occurs in example (20), an underlying desired state of affairs surfaces in the language and highlights the negative evaluation that is conveyed by the utterance.

The construction that begins with *ettei vaan/vain* ‘that just not’ as in example (20) constitutes a fixed expression that conveys apprehension in colloquial Finnish (KS s.v. *vaan, vain*).²⁰ Furthermore, EN may be expressed idiomatically by this construction only (see Tommola 2015). It is interesting to note that EN also occurs with the verb *pelätä* ‘fear,’ as semantically equivalent verbs in other languages, such as the French *craindre*, also appear with EN (for example, see Horn 2010a: 122). Even so, it is plausible that the underlying wish analysis offered for example (20) does not sufficiently explain the EN expressed by a negative marker that has lost its full semantic effect, such as the French *ne* (see Jespersen 1917: 75; Horn 1978: 172–173; de Cuypere *et al.* 2007: 307). The treatment of these types of cases, however, is beyond the scope of this analysis.

In conclusion, the core difference between paratactic negation and the evaluative negation discussed here is that evaluative negation agrees with the inherent negation proper of the verb, and verbalizes the content of the process expressed by this verb, while the second derives from a negative evaluation, such as undesirability, and exposes underlying desires instead. In other words, PN functions on the basic semantic level of an utterance by aligning with its main message, while EN reveals the implications of an utterance. Hence, the analysis in this paper leads to the conclusion that while paratactic negation conveys the normal semantic contribution of negation, evaluative negation can be considered as non-truth-conditional.

²⁰ This conventionalized expression is an example of an independent *että* initial clause (see Laury & Seppänen 2008, Seppänen & Laury 2007).

6. Conclusions

This study has revisited the concept of paratactic negation in the context of the Finnish verb *epäillä*. This verb has offered a productive departure point for this project due to its semantic association with both inherent negation and evaluative negativity. The main results of this analysis are the following: First, the content reading, which has traditionally been regarded as a central feature of PN complements, emerges when the matrix verb functions as, or at least resembles, a verb of communication, and there is no interclausal scope of negation despite the inherently negative semantics of this verb. This definition was further illustrated by demonstrating the content complements' similarity to direct report. Second, the regular use of PN with *epäillä* suggested that PN may create an established pattern. Third, the limits of paratactic negation were re-evaluated by excluding the evaluative negation from its scope; there is a subtle difference between PN, expressing a content of an inherently negative process, and EN, reflecting underlying wishes in an evaluatively negative process.

These findings suggest several interesting prospects for future cross-linguistic research on the complementation patterns of inherently negative verbs. First, the similarity between content role complements, characterizing PN, and direct report, supports the following hypothesis: Verbs encountered in reporting phrases are also likely to be used with PN (see section 3.2.1). This hypothesis could be tested in cross-linguistic comparisons. Second, the analysis suggests that a conventionalized PN pattern exists in Finnish. However, due to the polar polysemy of *epäillä*, compositional analysis of the *epäillä että ei* 'doubt/suspect that NEG' pattern is also available in some contexts. Thus, future research might explore whether conventionalized patterns of PN also occur with verbs that have no polar polysemy. Third, comparisons between the use of PN in written and spoken language would be interesting, as negatives tend to occur more frequently in conversations than in written texts, and as one of the speech-specific functions of negation has been identified to be an explanatory repetition (Tottie 1991: 17, 42–43).

Finally, according to the current analysis, paratactic negation constitutes a completely motivated usage pattern of multiple negation. This supports the idea that the usage of natural language negation often expands beyond the rules of logical negation.

Glossary

1 = first person

2 = second person

3 = third person

ABBR = abbreviation

ABL = ablative

ADE = adessive

CNG = connegative

COND = conditional mood

ELAT = elative

GEN = genitive

ILL = illative

INES =inessive

INF = infinitive

NEG = negation (when no marking of person, 3rd person singular)

PART = partitive

PL = plural

PST = past tense

PTCP = participle

Q = question clitic

SG = singular

Acknowledgements

* I would like to thank Maria Vilkuna, Tiina Onikki-Rantajääskö, Kendra Willson, Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg, and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments, suggestions, and questions on this paper. Any remaining errors and inconsistencies are entirely my own responsibility.

References

- Allwood, Jens, Lars-Gunnar Andersson & Östen Dahl. 1977. *Logic in linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.
- Bybee, Joan. 2010. *Language, Usage, and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1988. Linking intonation units in spoken English. In John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*, 1–27. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Croft, William. 2000. *Explaining language change. An Evolutionary Approach*. London: Longman.
- Croft, William & D. Alan Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cruse, D. Alan. 1977. Antonyms and gradable complementaries. In Dieter Kastovsky (eds.), *Perspektiven der lexikalischen Semantik*. Beiträge zum Wuppertaler Semantikkolloquium vom 2.–3. Dezember 1977.
- Cuyper, Ludovic de, Johan van der Auwera & Klaas Willems. 2007. Double negation and iconicity. In Elzbieta Tabakowska, Christina Ljungberg & Olga Fisher (eds.), *Insistent Images*, 301–320. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Denison, David. 1999. Syntax. In Suzanne Romaine (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language IV 1776–1997*, 92–329. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Espinal, Maria Teresa. 2000. Expletive negation, negative concord and feature checking. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 8. 47–69.
- Giora, Rachel. 2006. Anything negatives can do affirmatives can do just as well, except for some metaphors. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38. 981–1014.
- Givón, Talmy. 1978. Negation in language: Pragmatics, Function, Ontology. In Peter Cole (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics. Volume 9: Pragmatics*, 69–112. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax: An Introduction. Volume 2*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hakulinen, Auli & Fred Karlsson. 1979. *Nykysuomen lauseoppi. [Syntax of Modern Finnish.]* Helsinki: SKS.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja-Riitta Heinonen & Irja Alho. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi. [A Comprehensive Finnish Grammar]*. Helsinki: SKS.
- Haiman, John & Sandra A. Thompson. 1988. Introduction. In John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Typological Studies in Language 18, ix–xiii. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Herlin, Ilona, Jyrki Kalliokoski & Laura Visapää. 2014. Introduction. In Laura Visapää, Jyrki Kalliokoski & Helena Sorva (eds.), *Contexts of Subordination*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1978. Some Aspects of Negation. In Joseph Greenberg, Charles Ferguson & Edith Moravcsik (eds.), *Universals of Human Language*, 127–210. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1989. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Horn, Laurence R. 2010a. Multiple negation in English and other languages. In Laurence R. Horn (eds.), *The Expression of Negation*, 111–148. Berlin: Mouton.
- Horn, Laurence R. 2010b. Introduction. In Laurence R. Horn (eds.), *The Expression of Negation*, 1–7. Berlin: Mouton.
- Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Iyeiri, Yoko. 2009. The historical development of the verb *doubt* and its various patterns of complementation. In Ute Römer & Rainer Schultze (eds.), *Exploring the Lexis-Grammar Interface*, 153–169. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Iyeiri, Yoko. 2010. *Verbs of Implicit Negation and their Complements in the History of English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1917. *Negation in English and other languages*. Historisk-filologiske meddelelser / Det Kongelige Danske videnskabernes selskab; 1, 5. København: Andr. Fred. Høst & søn.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1924. *The philosophy of Grammar*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- KS = *Kielitoimiston sanakirja*. [The new Dictionary of Modern Finnish.] Online version: <http://www.kielitoimistonsanakirja.fi/>
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larjavaara, Matti. 1992. Etteikö kelpaa? [As if it won't (*etteikö*) do?] *Virittäjä* 96. 119–122.
- Larjavaara, Matti. 2007. *Pragmasemantiikka*. [Pragmatics.] Helsinki: SKS.
- Laury, Ritva. 2006. On Subordination, Finnish-Style: Questioning the category of finite clausal complements in spoken Finnish. In Mickael Suominen, Antti Arppe, Anu Airola, Orvokki Heinämäki, Matti Miestamo, Urho Määttä, Jussi Niemi, Kari K. Pitkänen & Kaius Sinnemäki (eds.), *A Man of Measure: Festschrift in honour of Fred Karlsson on his 60th birthday*. *SKY Journal of Linguistics. Special Supplement 19*. 310–321.
- Laury, Ritva & Eeva-Leena Seppänen. 2008. Clause combining, interaction, evidentiality, participation structure, and the conjunction-particle continuum. The Finnish *että*. In Ritva Laury (eds.), *Crosslinguistic Studies in Clause Combining. The multifunctionality of conjunctions*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Leino, Jaakko. 1999. Selvää on se, että [‘It is clear that’]. *Kielikello* 3/1999. 20–25.
- Meibauer, Jörg. 1990. Sentence mood, lexical category filling, and non-propositional nicht in German. *Linguistische Berichte* 130. 441–463.

- Miestamo, Matti. 2005. *Standard negation: the negation of declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2011. A typological perspective on negation in Finnish dialects. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 34(2). 83–104.
- Pajunen, Anneli. 2001. *Argumenttirakenne. Asiantilojen luokitus ja verbien käyttäytyminen suomen kielessä. [Argument structure. The classification of state of affairs, and the behavior of verbs in Finnish.]* Helsinki: SKS.
- Salminen, Jutta. 2015. From doubt to supposition: The construction-specific meaning change of the Finnish verb *epäillä*. In Juhani Rudanko, Jukka Havu, Mikko Höglund & Paul Rickman (eds.), *Perspectives on Complementation. Structure, Variation, and Boundaries*, 157–176. London: Palgrave.
- Saury, Jean-Michel. 2004. *The Phenomenology of Negation and its Expression in Natural Language*. Gothenburg Monographs in Linguistics 27. Department of Linguistics. Göteborg University.
- Saury, Jean-Michel. 2008. The Phenomenology of Negation. *Phenom Cogn Sci* (2009) 8. 245–260.
- Seppänen, Eeva-Leena & Ritva Laury. 2007. Complement clauses as turn continuations: the Finnish *et(tä)*-clause. *Pragmatics* 17:4. 553–572.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. 1956 [1920]. *Greek grammar*. Oxford: Harvard University Press.
- Schneider, Stefan, Julie Glikman & Mathieu Avanzi. 2015. Introduction. In Schneider, Stefan, Julie Glikman & Mathieu Avanzi (eds.), *Parenthetical verbs*, 1–12. Berlin: Mouton.
- SSA = *Suomen sanojen alkuperä: etymologinen sanakirja 1: A–K. [The origin of Finnish words: etymological dictionary]*(1992) (Helsinki: SKS).
- Thompson, Sandra A. 2002. “Object complements” and conversation: Towards a realistic account. *Studies in Language* 26. 125–164.
- Tommola, Hannu. 2015. Conversation “fear + NEG” in LingTyp mailing list on 20 March 2015: <http://listserv.linguistlist.org/pipermail/lingtyp/2015-March/thread.html>

- Tottie, Gunnel. 1991. *Negation in English Speech and Writing: a study variation*. Quantitative analyses of linguistic structure, 4. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Tovena, L. M. 1996. An expletive negation which is not so redundant. *Grammatical Theory and Romance Languages: Selected Papers From The 25th Linguistic Symposium On Romance Languages (LSRL XXV)*. 263–274.
- Tuppurainen, Hanna. 1991. *Kieltojen merkitys ja käyttö keskustelussa. [The meaning and use of negations in conversation.]* Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Finnish Language.
- Verhagen, Arie. 2005. *Constructions of Intersubjectivity. Discourse, Syntax, and Cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vilkuna, Maria. 2015. Negation in Finnish. In Matti Miestamo, Anne Tamm & Beata Wagner-Nagy (eds.) *Negation in Uralic Languages*. Typological Studies in Language, 108, 457–486. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Vries, Mark de. 2007. Invisible constituents? Parentheticals as B-merged adverbial phrases. In Nicole Dehé & Yordanka Kavalova (eds.), *Parentheticals*, 203–234. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wouden, Ton van der. 1997. *Negative contexts. Collocation, polarity and multiple negation*. London: Routledge.
- Wurff, Wim van der. 1998. On Expletive Negation with Adversative Predicates in the History of English. In Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Gunnel Tottie & Wim van der Wurff (eds.), *Negation in the History of English*, 295–328. Berlin: Mouton.
- Yoon, Suwon. 2011. *'Not' in the mood: The syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of evaluative negation*. Department of Linguistics. University of Chicago.
- Yoon, Suwon. 2013. Parametric variation in subordinate evaluative negation: Korean/Japanese versus others. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 22. 133–166.