V. A. Orlov

NEGATIVE PRONOUNS IN FINNIC LANGUAGES (BASED ON MATERIALS FROM THE GOSPEL TRANSLATIONS)

The article deals with the subset of indefinite pronouns which are often denoted in the literature as negative pronouns in six Finnic languages (Estonian, Finnish, North and Livvi Karelian, Seto and Veps). The data for the study comes from the translations of the Gospel texts into those languages. Negative pronouns are understood as such indefinite pronouns which are used primarily in the scope of negation and in some related contexts (downward-entailing or non-veridical). The distribution of negative pronouns in the text is described. It is shown that different types of negative pronouns are used in these languages. Finnish and North Karelian have a series of negative pronouns formed with the additive operator *-kaan (-kana* in North Karelian), which is used primarily in negative contexts. It is argued that these pronouns should be analyzed as strong Negative Polarity Items because they could occur in the contexts where an overt marker of negation is not present, such as the scope of adversative predicates, embedded clause of the negated matrix predicate or polar questions. Livvi Karelian and Veps employ pronouns with the prefix *ni-* borrowed from Russian. These pronouns behave like Negative Concord Items because they occur only in the presence of the clausemate sentential negation marker. Some differences in the distribution of these items are attested. Finally, Seto and Estonian do not have any special series of negative pronouns. Instead, the *-gi* pronouns, which have a very broad distribution, are used in these contexts. In Estonian, these can be modified by the marker of constituent negation *mitte*.

Keywords: *Finnic Languages, Indefinite Pronouns, Negative Polarity Items, Negative Concord Items*

Introduction

Most languages have special means to refer to entities that are unknown to the speaker or irrelevant to the discussion. Such entities are usually called indefinite in grammar descriptions. Indefiniteness may be expressed by pure syntactic and prosodic means as well as lexically, usually by determiners or by indefinite pronouns, which are the topic of this research.

Indefinite pronouns have traditionally been part of major discussions in theoretical linguistics such as the semantics of indefinite noun phrases (see (Brasoveanu and Farkas, 2016) and literature therein) or polarity sensitive items ((Giannakidou, 2011) and many others). However, for a long time, this discussion was restricted to well-studied European languages, English in the first place. The situation changed at the end of the 1990s, but many languages have remained understudied in this respect up to these days.

Unfortunately, Finnic languages are no exception to that. The most thoroughly described system of indefinite pronouns is Finnish. A general description of this system is given in (Haspelmath, 1997: 27). There also exist analyses of the semantics of the indefinite pronouns (Karttunen and Peters, 1980; Lohiniva, 2018). Veps has also been given much attention. H. Hienonen discusses the distribution of the major series of indefinite pronouns in Veps and provides a semantic map (Hienonen, 2010). The unmarked indefinite pronouns and the series borrowed to Veps from Russian are discussed in (Karjalainen, 2016), (Karjalainen, 2019), respectively. The system of Estonian indefinite pronouns, to the best of my knowledge, has not been discussed from a typological perspective, but some research was done on the pronoun *min-gi* – 'which-ADD' (Pajusalu, 2000) and *kee-gi* – 'who-ADD' (Pook and Lindström, 2022). Finally, the volume on the negation in Uralic languages (Miestamo, Tamm and Wagner-Nagy, 2015) must be mentioned where some information on negative pronouns in Finnish, Estonian, Livonian and Votic is provided as well as a general overview of the indefinite pronouns in Uralic (Van Alsenoy and van der Auwera, 2015).

This research tries to reduce this gap to some extent. It provides the description of the indefinite pronouns which are usually labeled as negative pronouns[1] because their distribution is

---

[1] Another tradition suggests that negative pronouns include only those pronouns that contain a negative marker, e.g. English *no-* or Russian *ni-* series (Penka, 2011). This approach may be beneficial for developing a separate from other in-

limited to negative and, perhaps, some closely related context in Finnic languages. The data comes from the translations of the New Testament into six languages: Estonian, Finnish, Livvi and North Karelian, Seto and Veps.

Negative pronouns are usually divided into two classes, discussed in the literature. We will argue that the negative pronouns in North Karelian and Finnish are best characterized as Negative Polarity Items (NPI), whereas the units in Livvi Karelian and Veps behave like Negative Concord Items (NCI). Estonian and Seto do not have dedicated negative pronouns. Instead, the *-gi* series is used, which has a very broad distribution. However, in Estonian, these pronouns may be additionally modified with the constituent negation marker in negative contexts.

The article is organized as follows. In section 2, the main properties of NPIs and NCIs are discussed. Section 3 provides some background information on the system of indefinite pronouns in Finnic languages and discusses their form and distribution. NPIs in the Finnic languages are discussed in section 5. Finally, Section 6 is dedicated to NCIs.

2. Properties of negative pronouns

2.1. Negative Polarity Items

As was mentioned, negative pronouns are generally not treated as a single class in the literature and could be split into at least two subclasses which partially coincide in their distribution. These subclasses are NPIs and NCIs. We will start our discussion with NPIs. Since the literature on this topic is vast, we will limit ourselves to the general information concerning their distribution and key properties.

NPIs are constituents that are excluded from assertive episodic contexts. A canonical example of an NPI is the English determiner *any*.

(1) John has *(not) seen any camels

Any can also occur in other contexts which do not contain explicit negation. Those include the antecedent of the conditional construction, (2a) the restrictor of the universal quantifier (b), and adversative predicates (c).

(2) a. If you say anything about this, I'll be very upset   (Giannakidou, 2011: #26a)
    b. Every student who saw anything contacted the police   (Giannakidou, 2011: #25a)
    c. I doubt that John will have any complaints   (Chierchia, 2013: 129)

Multiple ideas were suggested to account for such distribution. The most widespread hypothesis nowadays seeks to find the common meaning component shared by the contexts that license NPI and thus are semantic in nature. These are the so-called downward-entailment hypothesis (Fauconnier, 1975; Ladusaw, 1979; Kadmon and Landman, 1993; Chierchia, 2013 and others)[2] and non-veridicity hypothesis (Zwarts, 1995; Giannakidou, 1998 and others)[3]. It should be noted, though,

---

definite pronouns analysis of these units. However, such terminology might obscure the vicinity of these units in terms of their distribution to other indefinite pronouns discussed in this article.

[2] Downward entailment could be loosely defined as follows. Suppose that there are two expressions R1 and R2 such that R2 is semantically stronger (i.e. R2 is a subset of R1) and a downward-entailing operator f. Then the following holds: f(R1) → f(R2). For example, the expression *Snowball is a white cat* entails that *Snowball is a cat* but not versa. The negation reverses the entailment: *it is not the case thas Snowball is a cat → It is not the case that Snowball is a white cat.* For a more thorough discussion see (Chierchia 2013) and others.

[3] An operator f is veridical if the following holds: f(p) → p, otherwise it is non-veridical. An example of a veridical context is an assertive episodic sentence, e.g. *John read a book.* Non-veridical contexts include downward-entailing contexts as well as some others, e.g. modals *John can read a book -\> John read a book.*

that both approaches have some flaws in terms of their empirical and theoretical adequacy, see the discussions in (Chierchia, 2013; Giannakidou, 2018).

It was also noted that not all NPIs are equal. For instance, the temporal expression *in weeks* is reported to be an NPI (3). However, unlike *any*, it cannot be used in the antecedent of the conditional construction (4) and some other downward-entailing contexts.

(3) I have *(n't) seen Mary in weeks   (Penka, 2020: #25.a)

(4)   a. If Bill has ever seen anyone, he is keeping it a secret.
        b. *If Bill has seen Mary in weeks, he is keeping it a secret.
        (Gajewski, 2011: #40.a, b)

The expressions like *any* are usually called weak NPIs whereas those like *in weeks* are strong NPIs. This distinction will be important for the discussion of the Finnish and Karelian negative pronouns.

Summing up, we will consider an indefinite pronoun an NPI if it is excluded from assertive episodic contexts and if the contexts it occurs are somehow connected to negation (by virtue of being downward-entailing or non-veridical).

2.2 Negative Concord Items

Another class of negative pronouns discussed in the article are NCIs ((Zeijlstra, 2004; Penka, 2011; Giannakidou and Zeijlstra, 2017) and others). They are similar to NPIs in terms of the distribution, since they are also used in negative contexts. Another property of NCIs is that they contain some marker of negation. A typical example of NCI are the Russian *n'i-* pronouns.

(5)   *n'i-kto*   *n'e*   *poše-l*   *v*   *k'ino*
        NEG-who   NEG   go-PST   in   cinema.ACC
        'No one went to the cinema'.

Unlike NPIs, NCIs usually require an overt negation marker to be present in the structure. It means, for example, that they cannot be licensed by adversative predicates as shown in (6) where the NPI *-libo* series but not the *n'i-* series[4] is possible.

(6)   *somn'evaj-us'*   *čto*   **n'i-kto /*   *kto-l'ibo*   *znaj-et*   *èto*
        doubt-1SG   that   NEG-who   who-INDEF   know-3SG   this.ACC
        'I doubt that anyone knows this'.

Another well-known difference is the ability of NCIs to be used in fragment answers.

(7)   *– kto*   *t'eb'e*   *pomoga-l?*
        Who   you.DAT   help-PST
        – n'i-kto /   **kto-l'ibo*
        NEG-who   who-INDEF
        '– Who helped you?
        – No one'.

---

[4] For the discussion of Russian NPIs see (Pereltsvaig, 2000)

The local dependency on the overt marker of negation and presence of negative morphology on these items suggest that NCIs are licensed by some syntactic mechanism, and one of the most prominent analyses of these units (Zeijlstra, 2004) explores the idea that they are licensed by the syntactic operation Agree. Moreover, it is argued that there is a distinction between so-called strict NCIs like the Russian *n'i*-series and non-strict which are attested in Romance languages ((Zeijlstra, 2004) and others). However, the status of the latter group is doubted by some researchers (see the recent discussion in (Россяйкин, 2021)). I will not take part in this discussion, since the Finnic languages analyzed here do not have non-strict negative concord.

Therefore, the main properties of NCIs relevant for the present research are their local dependence on the overt marker of negation and their ability to be used as fragment answers.

3. Indefinite Pronouns in Finnic languages

3.1. Formal properties

As discussed in (Haspelmath, 1997), indefinite pronouns usually occur in series formed with the indefiniteness marker and the 'rootlike' part referring to some ontological category which is usually expressed by the interrogative pronoun or the generic noun such as 'person', 'thing', etc.

In Finnic languages, they are formed from the interrogative pronouns. It is most common for the indefiniteness marker to follow the stem, the only exception being the *ni-* prefix in Veps and Livvi Karelian, which was borrowed from Russian (Blockland, 2011: 4). Unmarked indefinite pronouns are attested in Livvi and North Karelian. Case and number markers precede the indefiniteness marker. The locative forms are based on the genitive stem.

At the end of this section, the table showing the main forms of the discussed pronouns formed from *mi-* 'what*'* and *ken* – 'who' (Karelian) is provided.

Table 1

Main forms of negative pronouns in Finnic languages

Case\Language	Estonian	Finnish	Livvi Karelian	North Karelian	Seto	Veps
NOM	*mis-ki* *kee-gi*	*mi-kään* *ku-kaan*	*ni-mi* *ni-ken*	*mi-känä* *ken-känä*	*miä-ki* *kiä-ki*	*ni-mi* *ni-ken*
GEN	*mille-gi* *kelle-gi*	*min-kään* *kenen-kään*	*ni-min* *ni-kenen*	*min-känä* *kenen-känä*	*min-ki* *kin-ki*	*ni-min* *ni-kenen*
PART	*mida-gi* *keda-gi*	*mitä-än* *ketä-än*	*ni-midä* *ni-kedä*	*mitä-nä* *ketä-nä*	*midä-gi* *kedä-gi*	*ni-midä* *ni-keda*

3.2. Distribution

Indefinite pronouns differ in their distribution. M. Haspelmath (1997) distinguishes nine main functions in which indefinite pronouns are used cross-linguistically. Specific indefinite pronouns could be used and interpreted independently of another semantic operator. Accordingly, non-specific are grammatical only in the presence and in the scope of such. Depending on the operator, different functions of non-specific pronouns are distinguished.

These functions are relevant to our data as well. The major series of indefinite pronouns in the languages under consideration are given in Table 2 according to the functions they perform in the text. The negative pronouns are written in bold.

Table 2

Distribution of indefinite pronouns in the discussed Finnic languages

Function\Language	Estonian	Finnish	Livvi Karelian	North Karelian	Seto	Veps
SPECIFIC KNOWN	*-gi*	*-kin*	n\a	n\a	*-gi*	n\a
SPECIFIC UN-KNOWN	*-gi*	*-kin*	*-lienne* *-tahto*	*-lienöy* *-nih*	*-gi*	*-se*
NON-SPECIFIC, IRREALIS	*-gi*	*-kin*	*-tahto*	*-nih*	*-gi*	*-se* *-ni*
CONDITIONAL PROTASIS	*-gi*	*-kin*	*-tahto* *unmarked*	*-nih* *unmarked*	*-gi*	*-se* *-ni*
COMPARATIVE	n\a	n\a	*-tahto*	*-nih*	n\a	*-ni*
POLAR QUESTION	*-gi*	***-kaan***[5] *-kin*	*-tahto* *unmarked*	*-nih* ***-kana*** *unmarked*	*-gi*	*-ni*
INDIRECT NEGATION	*-gi*	***-kaan***	*-tahto*	***-kana*** *-nih*	*-gi*	*-se* *-ni*
DIRECT NEGATION	***(mitte) -gi***	***-kaan***	***ni-***	***-kana***	*-gi*	***ni-***
FREE CHOICE	*tahes*	*tahansa*	*-tahto*	*vaikka*	*taht*	*taht*

4. Negative polarity items in Finnic languages

As it was discussed in Section 2.1. the main property of NPIs is their licensing by the contexts that bear some semantic resemblance to negation (downward entailment or non-veridicity). Two series of indefinite pronouns have such distribution – the Finnish *-kaan* series and the North Karelian *-kana*, which are formed with the bound additive operator, the distribution of which is restricted to negative contexts (see the analysis of this item in Finnish in (Lohiniva, 2018)).

I will begin with a discussion of the Finnish and the Karelian pronouns. The data does not suggest any differences between these series, so they will be analyzed together.

The main context they occur is in direct negation.

(8)   a.   FINNISH

Ja   *hän*   *e-i*   *salli-nut*   *kene-n-kään*   *muu-n*
and   (s)he   NEG-3SG   allow-PTCP.PST   who-GEN-ADD   other-GEN
seura-ta   *mukana-nsa*   *kuin*   *Pietari-n*
follow-INF   with-POSS.3SG   except   Peter-GEN

   b.   NORTH KARELIAN

Hiän   *e-i*   *otta-n*   *ketä-nä*   *muuta*   *kerallah*
(s)he   NEG-3SG   take-PTCP.PST   who.PART-INDEF   other-PART   with
kuin   *Petri-n*
except   Peter-GEN

'And he allowed no man to follow him except Peter'.(Mk. 5.37)

There are also cases when they occur in indirect negation. For example, it can be used in the complement clause of *tahtoa (*North Karelian *tahtuo*) – 'want' if the matrix clause is negated.

---

[5] Possible vowel harmony and the loss of the initial /k/ is not reflected for more transparent representation

(9)   a.   FINNISH

      e-i=kä   *tahto-nut*   *että*
      NEG-3SG=too   want-PTSP.PST   that
      kuka-an   *sa-isi-Ø*   *si-tä*   *tietä-ä*
      who-ADD   get-COND-3SG   that-PART   know-INF

     b.   NORTH KARELIAN

      e-i=kä   *tahto-n*   *jotta*
      NEG-3SG=too   want-PTCP.PST   if
      ken-känä   *ša-is-Ø*   *šii-tä*   *tietyä*
      who-INDEF   get-COND-3SG   that-PART   know.INF
      'And he did not want anyone to know that'. (Mk.7.24)

Other cases of indirect negation include the clauses headed by the nominalized verb forms (10) in the abessive case or the adversative predicate *kieltää* – 'forbid' (11).

(10)   a.   FINNISH

      ja   *kulutta-nut*   *kaike-n*   *omaisuute-nsa*
      and   spend-PTCP.PST   all-GEN   property.GEN-POSS.3SG
      saa-ma-tta   *mitä-än*   *apu-a*
      get-NMLZ-ABE   what.PART-ADD   help-PART
      'And she spent everything she had without getting any help'(Mk. 5.26)

     b.   NORTH KARELIAN

      Näin   *työ*   *anna-tta*   *häne-llä*   *valla-n*   *olla*
      so   you   give.PRS-2PL   (s)he-ADE/ALL   free-GEN   be.INF
      ruata-ma-tta   *mitä-nä*   *tuato-n*   *tahi*   *hyvä-kši*
      work-NMLZ-ABE   what.PART-INDEF   father-GEN   or   good-TRANSL
      'So you let them be without doing anything good for their mother or father' (Mk.7.12)

(11)   a.   FINNISH

      Ja   *hän*   *kiels-i-Ø*   *ankarasti*   *hei-tä*
      and   (s)he   forbid-PST-3SG   strictly   they-PART
      anta-ma-sta   *kene-lle-kään*   *tieto-a*   *täs-tä*
      give-NMLZ-ELA   who-ALL-ADD   knowledge-PART   this-ELA

     b.   NORTH KARELIAN

      Iisussa   *kielt-i-Ø*   *hei-tä*   *lujašti*
      Jesus   forbid-PST-3SG   they-PART   firmly
      šano-ma-šta   *täš-tä*   *ke-llä-nä*
      say-NMLZ-ELA   this-PART   who-ADE/ALL-ADD
      'And he strictly forbade them to tell anyone about this'. (Mk. 5.43)

The contexts above and the absence of these pronouns in other downward-entailing or non-veridical contexts suggest that they have a distribution of strong NPIs. However, they can also be used in polar questions.

(12)   a.   FINNISH

      voi-Ø=ko   *Nasareti-sta*   *tulla*   *mitä-än*   *hyvä-ä*
      can-3SG=INTER   Nazareth-ELA   come.INF   what.PART-ADD   good-PART

b. NORTH KARELIAN

Voi-t=ko	*Nasareti-sta*	*tulla*	*mitä-nä*	*hyvy-ä*
can.PRS-2SG=INTER	Nasareth-ELA	come.INF	what.PART-ADD	good-PART

'Can anything good come from Nasareth?' (Jn. 1.46)

Polar questions are the next extension of NPIs beyond contexts of negation in many languages (Giannakidou, 2011: 1671). However, this fact still poses many problems for the theories of NPI (see (Guerzoni and Sharvit, 2007)). It is also often noted that questions containing NPIs are negative-biased (ibid.). Our data does not provide evidence for or against this claim. Along with examples like (12), which do seem negative-biased, there is also quite neutral (13) (in the parallel example from North Karelian the unmarked series is used). It is also reported that Finnish *-kaan* pronouns do not add negative-bias effect (Kaiser, 2002: 204).

(13) FINNISH

Lapse-t	*on=ko*	*tei-llä*	*mitä-än*	*syö-tä-vä-ä*
child-PL	be.3SG=INTER	you-ADE	what.PART-ADD	eat-IPS-PTCP.PRS.-PART

'Children! Do you have any food?' (Jn. 21.5)

Another feature of *-kaan/-kana* series which is uncharacteristic of NPIs in most European languages is their ability to be used in the subject position of the clause (14). This is problematic for theories of NPI because it is usually assumed that an NPI must be structurally below negation to be licensed. Some researchers suggest that subject NPI is a feature of SOV-languages and propose that the subject position in those languages must be below the negation (see the discussion in (Россяйкин, 2022: 158)). Finnish and North Karelian data clearly contradicts such generalization, since these languages are SVO.

(14) a. FINNISH

e-i	*kuka-an*	*ole*	*jumala-a*	*milloin-kaan*	*näh-nyt*
NEG-3SG	who-ADD	be	god-PART	when-ADD	see-PTCP.PST

'No one has ever seen the God' (Jn. 1.18)

b. NORTH KARELIAN

Ken-känä	*e-i*	*ota*	*tilkku-o*	*uuvve-šta*	*vuattie-šta*
who-ADD	NEG-3SG	take	patch-PART	new-ELA	cloth-ELA

'No one takes a patch from new clothes'. (Lk. 5.36)

However, the syntax of the constructions involving NPIs clearly differs in Finnish from standard negation, the difference being the preposition of the negative marker in relation to the subject. There is one example (against 27 with the inversed word order), though, which shows that this word order is not obligatory (15) and in North Karelian the negation marker in most cases follows the subject NPI (14b). Further research on these constructions is needed to understand the interaction between negation and subject NPIs.

(15) FINNISH

Ja	*ku-kaan*	*e-i*	*voi-nut*	*vasta-ta*	*häne-lle*	*sana-a-kaan*
and	who-ADD	NEG-3SG	can-PTCP.PST	answer-INF	he-ALL	word-PART-ADD

'And no one could say a word to him'. (Mt. 22.46)

We may now conclude that the respective series in Finnish and North Karelian are best described as strong NPIs. Most of the observed deviations (licensing in questions, are well-attested cross-linguistically but require further investigation both in terms of acquiring more data and developing a theoretical analysis.

5. Negative Concord Items in Finnic languages

NCIs were defined in section 2.2. as items which bear some negative marker on them and depend on the presence of the overt marker of sentential negation. There are two classes of negative pronouns in the Finnic languages we discuss which have these properties – the Livvi Karelian and Veps *ni-* pronouns and the *mitte* wh-*gi* constructions in Estonian.

We will start the discussion with the latter constructions. As was shown in Table 2, Estonian and Seto make use of the indefinite pronouns formed with the additive clitic *-gi,* which are used in all functions except free choice. There are multiple cases when they are used in direct negation as well.

(16) a. ESTONIAN
nei-l	*ei*	*ole*	*mida-gi*	*süüa*
they-ADE	NEG	be	what.PART-INDEF	eat.INF

  b. SETO
näi-l	*olõ-i*	*midä-gi'*	*süvvä'*
they-ADE	be-NEG	what.PART-ADD	eat.INF

'They have nothing to eat'. (Mt.15.32)

However, in Estonian, they can be additionally modified in this function by the marker of constituent negation *mitte.* The distribution of this construction is limited to direct negation.

(17) ESTONIAN
mitte	*kee-gi*	*ei*	*ole*	*näi-nud*	*isa*
CNEG	who-ADD	NEG	be	see-PTCP.PST	father
peale	*selle*	*kes*	*on*	*Jumala*	*juurest*
except	тhat.GEN	who	be.3SG	god-GEN	from

'No one has seen the Father except the one [sent from] the God'. (Jn. 6.46)

It should be noted, though, that there are no examples attested in which this construction would be used in fragment answers. In this case, the marker of the sentential negation *ei* is used.

(18) ESTONIAN
kas	*kee-gi*	*ei*	*ole*	*sin-d*	*surm-a*
INTER	who-INDEF	NEG	be	you-PART	death-PART
mõist-nud	*ei*	*kee-gi*	*Issand!*		
understand-PTCP.PST	NEG	who-INDEF	lord		

'Has anyone judged you? – No one, o Lord'. (Jn. 8.10–11)

Let us proceed with the Livvi Karelian and Veps data. These languages make use of the *ni-*pronouns, which occur specifically in the direct negation function. As can be also seen from these examples, the marker *ni* could be used independently as the additive operator in the contexts of negation.

(19) a. LIVVI KARELIAN
ni-ken	*e-i*	*voin-nuh*	*sanuo*	*häne-le*	*vastah*
INDEF-who	NEG-3SG	can-PTCP.PST	speak.INF	he-ALL	against
ni	*ühtü*	*sanu-a*			
ADD	one.PART	word-PART			

b. VEPS

ni-ken   *e-i*   *voi-nd*   *sanu-da*   *häne-le*
INDEF-who   NEG-3SG   can-CONN   say-INF   he-ALL

ni   *üht*   *sana-d*
ADD   one   word-PART

'No one could say a word to him' (Mt. 22.46)

Though these items might seem identical in Veps and Livvi Karelian, some differences can be attested between them. First, the *ni-* pronoun is used in fragment answers only in the Veps text. It is used with the additional negative marker *ei* in Livvi Karelian (20.b).

(20)   a.   VEPS

e-i=ik   *ni-ken*   *sudi-nd*   *sin-dai*
NEG-3SG-INTER   INDEF-who   judge-CONN   you-PART

ni-ken   *hüvä*   *mez'*
INDEF-who   good   man

b.   LIVVI KARELIAN

E-i=go   *ni-ken*   *suudi-nuh*   *sinuu*
NEG-3SG=INTER   INDEF-who   judge-PTCP.PST   you.PART

ižändü   *ei*   *ni-ken*
lord   NEG   INDEF-who

'Has anyone judged you? No one, Lord'. (Jn. 8.10–11)

Second, the data suggests the difference in the local domain in which *ni-* pronouns can be licensed. It is shown in (21), where the *ni*-pronoun is used in the complement infinitival clause of the negated verb *mennä* in Livvi Karelian. In the example from Veps, which seems to be structured in the same way in the relevant aspects, the *-ni* series is used which is restricted to non-specific functions.

(21)   a.   LIVVI KARELIAN

Ken   *ku*   *ollou*   *levo-l*   *häne-l*   *e-i*
who   if   be.POT.3SG   roof-ADE   he-ADE   NEG-3SG

pie   *heittüö*   *ala-h*
need   descend.INF   down-ILL

e-i=go   *mennä*   *perti-h*   *ni-midä*   *otta-ma-h*
NEG-3SG=INTER   go.INF   house-ILL   INDEF-what.PART   take-NMLZ-ILL

b.   VEPS

Ken   *om*   *katuse-l*   *ka*   *al-gha*   *män-goi*   *alaha-ks*
who   be.3SG   roof-ADE   PTCL   PROH-3SG   go-CONN   down-TRANSL

pert'-he   *ot-ma-ha*   *midä-ni*   *sigä-päi*
house-ILL   take-NMLZ-ILL   what.PART-INDEF   there-from

'Whoever is on the roof, don't go down into the house to take anything from there'. (Mk. 13.15)

These examples show that NCIs in Livvi Karelian and Veps may have different properties. The most important evidence comes from the fragment answer examples (20), which might suggest that *ni-* pronouns in Livvi Karelian might be not NCI at all, but its distribution and morphological form suggest otherwise.

Conclusion

This research has discussed the series of negative pronouns in 6 varieties of the Finnic languages represented in the translations of the Gospel texts. The distribution of these items was discussed and a classification was proposed.

The negative pronouns in Finnic languages could be divided into two classes, which are discussed in the literature and can be distinguished according to their distribution. The first class is formed by various NPIs. It is shown that they are present in Finnish and North Karelian, in which NPIs based on the negative additive operator *-kaan / -kana* are attested. Their distribution is limited to the functions of direct and indirect negation and polar questions. The second class is constituted by NCIs, which are found in Livvi Karelian and Veps. These languages make use of the borrowed from the Russian prefix *ni-,* which attaches to the interrogative pronouns. These forms can only occur in the presence of the clausemate sentential negation marker.

The study leaves many questions unanswered. First, these are empirical questions, such as the differences between *mitte* wh-*gi* construction and the wh-*gi* indefinite pronoun in Estonian or the exact distribution of the *ni-* pronouns in Livvi Karelian and Veps in terms of the local domain they may be used with regard to the negation marker and the ability to occur in fragment answers.

Finnic data also poses some theoretical questions. How do we account for the distribution of the Finnish and North Karelian NPIs? How subject NPIs are licensed in these languages? What should the semantics of Estonian and Seto *-gi* pronouns look like to account for the wide distribution of these items? Why do Livvi Karelian and Veps NPIs behave differently with regard to the domains they are licensed in and fragment answers? These questions require further study on separate languages and more data from the speakers of these languages.

Abbreviations

ABE – abessive, ACC – accusative, ADE – adessive, ALL – allative, ADD – additive marker, CNEG – constituent negation, COND – conditional mood, CONN – connegative, DAT – dative, ELA – elative, GEN – genitive, ILL – illative, INDEF – indefiniteness, INF – infinitive, INTER – interrogative, IPS – impersonal, NEG – negation, NMLZ – nominalizer, PART – partitive , PL – plural, POSS – possessive, POT – potential , PROH – prohibitive, PRS – present tense, PST – past tense, PTCL – particle, PTCP – participle, SG – singular, TRANSL – translative

Sources:

Mi' Issändä Jeesusõ Kristusõ pühä Evangeelium: Matvei, Marki, Luka ni Joanni kirotõt, 1926 [2013]. . Seto Instituut, Värska.
Pyhä ramattu, 1938. . Suomen Kirkon Sisälähetysseura.
Uuši Šana vienakarjalakši, 2011. . Piiplijankiännöšinstituutti, Helsinki.
Uuzi Sana livvikse, 2003. . Biblienkiännändüinstituuttu, Helsinki.
Uz' zavet: vepsän kelel, Kodvpainduz. Ed, 2006 . Biblijan Kändmižen Institut, Helsinki.

References:

Blockland R. Borrowability of pronouns: evidence from Uralic // Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilugen. Vol. 35. 2011. P. 1–34.
Brasoveanu A., Farkas D. F. Indefinites / M. Aloni, P. Dekker (eds.). The Cambridge Handbook of Formal Semantics. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press. P. 238–266.
Chierchia G. Logic in grammar: polarity, free choice, and intervention. Oxford studies in semantics and pragmatics, 2. Oxford: Oxford university press, 2013.
Gajewski J. R. Licensing strong NPIs // Natural Language Semantics. No. 19 (2). 2011. P. 109–148.
Giannakidou A. Polarity sensitivity as (non)veridical dependency. Linguistik Aktuell, 23. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1998.

Giannakidou A. 64. Negative and positive polarity items / K. von Heusinger, C. Maienborn, and P. Portner (eds.). Vol. 2. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. 2012. P. 1660–1712.

Giannakidou A. A critical assessment of exhaustivity for Negative Polarity Items: The view from Greek, Korean, Mandarin, and English // Acta Linguistica Academica. 2018. No. 65(4). P. 503–545.

Giannakidou A., Zeijlstra H. The Landscape of Negative Dependencies: Negative Concord and N-Words // M. Everaert and H.C. van Riemsdijk (eds.) The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Second Edition. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2017. P. 1–38.

Guerzoni E., Sharvit Y. A question of strength: on NPIs in interrogative clauses // Linguistics and Philosophy. 2007. No. 30(3). P. 361–391.

Haspelmath M. Indefinite Pronouns. Oxford: Oxford university press, 1997.

Hienonen H. The Implicational Semantic Map for Veps Indefinite Pronouns // Linguistica Uralica. 2010. No. 46(4). P. 281–292.

Kaiser E. Case Alternation and NPIs in Questions in Finnish // WCCFL 21 Proceedings, 2002. P. 194–207.

Karjalainen H. Vepsän kielen paljaiden interrogatiivien indefiniittinen käyttö // Virittäjä. 2016. No. 120(3). P. 360–397.

Karjalainen H. Borrowing morphology // Uralica Helsingiensia [Preprint]. 2019. No. 14.

Karttunen L., Peters S. Interrogative quantifiers / C. Rohrer (ed.) Time, Tense, and Quantifiers. De Gruyter, 1980. P. 181–206.

Lahiri U. Focus and Negative Polarity in Hindi // Natural Language Semantics. 1998. No. 6. P. 57–123.

Lohiniva K. The syntax and semantics of additivity in Finnish. Université de Genève, 2018. URL: https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:115531

Miestamo M., Tamm A., Wagner-Nagy B.B. (eds.) Negation in Uralic Languages. Typological Studies in Language. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2015.

Pajusalu R. Indefinite determiners mingi and üks in Estonian / E. Mati. (ed.) Estonian: Typological studies IV, 2000. P. 87–117.

Penka D. Negative indefinites. Oxford studies in theoretical linguistics. No. 32. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Penka D. Negative and Positive Polarity Items / M.T. Putnam, B.R. Page (eds.) The Cambridge Handbook of Germanic Linguistics. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, 2020. P. 639–660.

Pook H., Lindström, L. The use of the indefinite pronoun keegi "someone" in Estonian dialects // Nordic Journal of Linguistics. 2022. P. 1–32.

Rossyaykin P. Russkiye ni-mestoimeniya litsenziruyutsya nad otritsaniyem [Russian negative pronouns are licensed above Negation] // Rhema. 2021. No. 4. P. 69–118.

Rossyaykin P. Fokusnyy chastitsy i otritsatelnaya polyarnost' [Focus particles and negative polarity] // Voprosy yazykoznaniya. 2022. No. 2. P. 30–64.

Rossyaykin P. Sfera deystviya propozitsionalnykh operatorov (na materiale otritsaniya i modal'nosti) [Scope of propositional operators (on the data on negation and modality). Thesis of the kandidat filologicheskikh nauk. MSU, 2022.

Van Alsenoy L.., van der Auwera J. Indefinite pronouns in Uralic languages / M. Miestamo, A. Tamm, and B. Wagner-Nagy (eds.) Negation in Uralic Languages. Typological Studies in Language. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2015. P. 517–546.

Zeijlstra H. Sentential Negation and Negative Concord. Utrecht: LOT publications, 2004.

Zwarts F. Nonveridical contexts // Linguistic Analysis. 1995. No. 25. P. 286–312.

Orlov Vladislav Andreevich.
Junior researcher.
Institute of Linguistics of the RAS.
Bolshoj Kislovskij lane, 1, build. 1, Moscow, Russia, 125009.
Email: vladorlov@iling-ran.ru

В. А. Орлов

ОТРИЦАТЕЛЬНЫЕ МЕСТОИМЕНИЯ В ПРИБАЛТИЙСКО-ФИНСКИХ ЯЗЫКАХ (ПО ДАННЫМ ПЕРЕВОДОВ ЕВАНГЕЛИЙ)

В работе на материале шести прибалтийско-финских идиомов (вепсского, северного и ливвиковского вариантов карельского языка, сето, финского и эстонского) рассматривается подкласс неопределенных местоимений, который в литературе часто именуется отрицательными местоимениями. Материалом ис-

следования послужили переводы текстов Евангелий на эти языки. Под отрицательными местоимениями подразумеваются такие неопределенные местоимения, которые в основном используются в сфере действия сентенциального отрицания, а также, возможно, в некоторых близких контекстах (контекстах с нисходящей монотонностью или контекстах со снятой утвердительностью). В статье описывается дистрибуция отрицательных местоимений в прибалтийско-финских языках и показывается, что эти единицы распадаются на две группы. В финском и северном карельском языках отрицательные местоимения образуются на основе аддитивного показателя *-kaan/-kana* соответственно, чья дистрибуция ограничена отрицательными контекстами. Дистрибуция этих местоимений соответствует сильным единицам отрицательной полярности (strong Negative Polarity Item (NPI)), поскольку, помимо собственно отрицательных контекстов, они могут употребляться при предикатах с импликацией отрицания, во вложенной клаузе при отрицании матричного предиката, а также в общих вопросах, однако они исключаются из иных контекстов, типичных для NPI, например, не употребляются в протазисе условной конструкции. Для ливвиковского карельского и вепсского языков характерны местоимения с префиксом *ni-,* который был заимствован из русского. Эти единицы ведут себя как единицы отрицательного согласования (Negative Concord Item (NCI)): они могут использоваться только в присутствии в одной локальной области с ними показателя отрицания. Отмечается, что вепсские и ливвиковские местоимениями на *ni-* отличаются в дистрибуции. Наконец, для эстонского и сето не характерны специальные отрицательные местоимения. Вместо этого используются местоимения на *-gi*, имеющие крайне широкую дистрибуцию. В эстонском эти местоимения могут в отрицательных контекстах дополнительно модифицироваться показателем присловного отрицания *mitte*.

Ключевые слова: *прибалтийско-финские языки, неопределенные местоимения, единицы отрицательной полярности, единицы отрицательного согласования*

Орлов Владислав Андреевич.
Младший научный сотрудник.
Институт языкознания РАН.
Большой Кисловский пер., 1, стр. 1, Москва, 125009.
E-mail: vladorlov@iling-ran.ru