

Negation in Skolt Saami¹

Matti Miestamo & Eino Koponen

This chapter describes negation in Skolt Saami in a typological perspective. In the standard negation construction, the negative marker is a negative auxiliary verb and the lexical verb appears in a non-finite form. Negative imperatives employ a special form for the negative auxiliary. The copula used with non-verbal predicates is negated with standard negation, but a special contracted form may also appear. In dependent clauses, negation is expressed either by standard negation or using the verbal abessive. With

¹ We wish to thank Michael Riessler and Jussi Ylikoski as well as Anne Tamm and Beáta Wagner-Nagy for their valuable comments on the manuscript. Thanks are due to Auli Oksanen and Merja Salo for their work in analysing the texts that serve as data for this study, as well as to Skolt Saami native speakers Hilikka Semenoff and Aune Mettäpuro for their help in transcribing and translating the materials. The work on these materials has been supported by Ella and Georg Ehrnrooth's Foundation and the Huhtamäki Fund at the Finnish Cultural Foundation, which is gratefully acknowledged.

negative indefinite pronouns, the negative auxiliary is present in the clause. There is an abessive case for nominals to express absence, and a privative suffix can derive adjectives. Other aspects of negation, such as negative replies, the scope of negation, and reinforcing negation are also addressed.

1. Introduction

Skolt Saami belongs to the Saami branch of the Uralic language family. Together with its western neighbour Inari Saami and its eastern neighbours Akkala, Kildin and Ter Saami, it forms the eastern branch of Saami. The traditional territories of the Skolt Saami lie on both sides of the present-day border between Norway and Russia: the Skolt village of Neiden on the Norwegian side and the Skolt villages of Paatsjoki, Petsamonkylä, Suonikylä, Muotka, Notozero and Girvasozero on the Russian side. When the so-called Petsamo region, which had become part of Finland in the Tartu peace treaty in 1920, was ceded to the Soviet Union in 1944, the Skolt Saami living there moved to the Finnish side and settled in Inari municipality: the inhabitants of Suonikylä in the village of Sevettijärvi and the inhabitants of Paatsjoki and Petsamonkylä in the village of Nellim. There are between 200 and 300 Skolt Saami speakers in Finland today. In the Neiden Skolt village in Norway, the language became extinct in the

early 1900s, whereas to the east, on the Russian side, a few people originating from the villages of Muotka, Notozero and Girvasozero still speak the language. The language is highly endangered in Finland as well, and only very few members of the younger generations have learned it as their native language. There is a standard language created in the 1970s on the basis of the Suonikylä/Sevettijärvi dialect. It is taught in the schools of Sevettijärvi and Ivalo.

As is the case for all Saami languages, the morphology of Skolt Saami has developed from the relatively agglutinative structure of Proto Saami to a rather high degree of fusionality in the modern language. Due to the loss of the original inflectional suffixes, many inflectional forms differ from each other only by the shape of the stem – this is clearly visible in the paradigms we give below. In its fusionality, Skolt Saami stands out even among the Saami languages (see Korhonen [1969] 1996 for more details on the development). As to its syntax, Skolt Saami closely resembles the neighbouring Inari and North Saami languages. Features that distinguish these languages from the more peripheral Saami languages, South Saami in the southwest and Ter Saami in the east, include SVO word order and the obligatory presence of the copula with non-verbal predicates. At least partly, these properties are due to stronger influence from Finnic languages, especially from Karelian in the case of Skolt Saami. These features also distinguish the language from more eastern branches of Uralic. Another

“western-type” syntactic feature is a preference for finite subordinate clauses over non-finite structures.

Skolt Saami has been studied within the Finno-Ugrian tradition, and a lot of synchronic and diachronic information is available in general Uralic or Saami literature. Grammatical descriptions of Skolt Saami are limited to the short grammar sketch by Korhonen (1973), a school grammar by Moshnikoff et al. (2009) and the descriptive grammar by Feist (2010). Despite the existence of these works, the language can still be considered insufficiently described. By taking a closer look at negation, we intend to provide a useful addition to the current knowledge on Skolt Saami.

The existing grammatical descriptions have provided a lot of useful information for the present paper. In addition to them, and to our knowledge of the language,² the paper is based on the examination of negative expressions in 7.5 hours of recordings found at the archives of the Institute for the Languages of Finland.³ The recordings consist mostly of interviews

² Eino Koponen has been doing research on Skolt Saami since the 1980s.

³ More specifically, the recordings with the following archival identification codes were examined: 11308_1a, 11313_1az, 11722_1a, 11722_1bz, 11723_1a, 12744_1a, 12744_1bz, 12896_1a, 12896_2az, 12897_1a, 17454_1bz, 17463_1c, 17463_1d, 17463_1ez, 17465_1b, 17465_1dz. Examples coming from these recordings are marked with the archival code and the time (min:sec) at which the example occurs.

and narratives recorded in the 1970s and the 2000s, and have been transcribed and glossed as part of an ongoing documentation project of Skolt Saami. In addition, negative expressions have been examined in two published text collections, namely Semenoja (1994) and Koponen et al. (2010).

Skolt Saami negation is put in a typological context in this paper, and discussed in the light of several typological studies relevant to the topic. Due to space limitations, the typological background cannot be laid out fully and explicitly, but some more discussion can be found in the introduction to this volume.

2. Clausal negation

2.1. Standard negation

Standard negation, the negation of declarative verbal main clauses, is expressed by a construction in which the negative auxiliary *ij* appears as the negative marker and the lexical verb (LV) is in a non-finite form. In fact, the verb that loses its finiteness in the negative may also be an auxiliary (as in compound tenses); the abbreviation LV is used for this verb irrespective of whether it is a lexical verb or an auxiliary. The negative auxiliary is

inflected for person and number, whereas the form of the LV signals tense and mood. In present indicative negatives, the LV is in a connegative form: a suffixless stem form, homonymous with the 2nd person singular positive imperative, except in the 4th person (indicating impersonal/generic reference), where it has an ending *-u* or *-uku*.⁴ In the past indicative, there is no dedicated connegative, and the LV takes the past participle form. The potential and conditional have their own connegative forms for the LV; these are identical to the 3rd person plural positive potential and conditional forms, respectively. The positive and negative paradigms of the verb *poorrâd* ‘eat’ illustrate the different forms (1).

(1) Paradigms: indicative present and past, potential and conditional

	IND.PRS.AFF	IND.PRS.NEG
1SG	<i>pooram</i>	<i>jiõm poor</i>
2SG	<i>poorak</i>	<i>jiõk poor</i>
3SG	<i>påårr</i>	<i>ij poor</i>

⁴ It is interesting to note that the negation of 4th person differs from the negation of the corresponding impersonal/passive category in the neighbouring Finnic languages, which do not have a special impersonal/passive form of the negative auxiliary and use the 3rd person singular form instead (for Finnish, see Vilkuna, this volume).

1PL	<i>poorrâp</i>	<i>jeä' p poor</i>
2PL	<i>poorrve' ted</i>	<i>jeä' ped poor</i>
3PL	<i>pâ' rre</i>	<i>jie poor</i>
4	<i>poorât</i>	<i>jeät porru</i>
	IND.PST.AFF	IND.PST.NEG
1SG	<i>po' rrem</i>	<i>jiõm poorrâm</i>
2SG	<i>po' rriķ</i>	<i>jiõk poorrâm</i>
3SG	<i>poori</i>	<i>ij poorrâm</i>
1PL	<i>poorim</i>	<i>jeä' p poorrâm</i>
2PL	<i>poorid</i>	<i>jeä' ped poorrâm</i>
3PL	<i>po' rre</i>	<i>jie poorrâm</i>
4	<i>po' rreš</i>	<i>jeät poorrâm</i>
	POT.AFF	POT.NEG
1SG	<i>pooržem</i>	<i>jiõm poorže</i>
2SG	<i>pooržiķ</i>	<i>jiõk poorže</i>
3SG	<i>poorâž</i>	<i>ij poorže</i>
1PL	<i>pooržep/pooržim</i>	<i>jeä' p poorže</i>
2PL	<i>pooržid</i>	<i>jeä' ped poorže</i>
3PL	<i>poorže</i>	<i>jie poorže</i>
4	<i>pooržet</i>	<i>jeät poorže</i>

	COND.AFF	COND.NEG
1SG	<i>poorčem</i>	<i>jiõm poorče</i>
2SG	<i>poorčik̃</i>	<i>jiõk poorče</i>
3SG	<i>poorči</i>	<i>ij poorče</i>
1PL	<i>poorčim/poorčep</i>	<i>jeä' p poorče</i>
2PL	<i>poorčid</i>	<i>jeä' ped poorče</i>
3PL	<i>poorče</i>	<i>jie poorče</i>
4	<i>poorčeš</i>	<i>jeät poorče</i>

Examples of some of these forms as used in negative sentences are given in (2)-(5). The negative auxiliary occurs before the lexical verb in most cases (more on word order in Section 4.1).

- (2) *mon jiõm ěâlstõõl*
 1SG NEG.1SG tell.lies.CNG
 ‘I don’t tell lies.’ (11308_1a: 14:16)

- (3) *asontalast te' l jiâ jâlstan tälvva*
 dormitory.LOC then NEG.3PL live.PTCP.PST in.winter
 ‘In the dormitory they didn’t then live in wintertime.’ (11722_1a:
 00:57)

- (4) *muu jeä' pet åaskže*
1SG.ACC NEG.2PL believe.POT.CNG
'you probably don't believe me.' (12744_1a: 11:13)

- (5) *nue' rr ij tee' st ěiõđâst kõõčč'če*
string.NOM NEG.3SG 2PL.LOC hand.LOC fall.COND.CNG
'The string would not fall off your hand.' (lit. 'from you off hand')
(11308_1a: 10:56)

Note that as these are examples taken from authentic text, the exactly corresponding affirmatives cannot be given. The above paradigms (1) however illustrate the affirmative-negative correspondences; structural differences between negatives and affirmative are not observed beyond the forms of the verbs.

In compound tenses using the verb *lee'd* 'be' as auxiliary, it is this auxiliary that has the status of LV in the negative. It appears in the connegative/participle form required by the tense-mood category: (present) connegative *leäk'ku* in the perfect, past participle *leäm'maš* in the pluperfect, and potential connegative *le' žže* and conditional connegative *le' čče* in the potential and conditional perfect. The paradigms of *poorrâd* 'eat' in (6) illustrate the affirmative-negative correspondences.

(6) Paradigms in compound tense/mood categories

	PRF.AFF	PRF.NEG
1SG	<i>leäm poorrâm</i>	<i>jiõm leäk'ku poorrâm</i>
2SG	<i>leäk poorrâm</i>	<i>jiõk leäk'ku poorrâm</i>
3SG	<i>lij poorrâm</i>	<i>ij leäk'ku poorrâm</i>
1PL	<i>leä' p poorrâm</i>	<i>jeä' p leäk'ku poorrâm</i>
2PL	<i>leä' ped poorrâm</i>	<i>jeä' ped leäk'ku poorrâm</i>
3PL	<i>lie poorrâm</i>	<i>jie leäk'ku poorrâm</i>
4	<i>leät poorrâm</i>	<i>jeät leäk'ku poorrâm</i>
	PPF.AFF	PPF.NEG
1SG	<i>le' jjem poorrâm</i>	<i>jiõm leäm'maş poorrâm</i>
2SG	<i>le' jjiķ poorrâm</i>	<i>jiõk leäm'maş poorrâm</i>
3SG	<i>leäi poorrâm</i>	<i>ij leäm'maş poorrâm</i>
1PL	<i>lei' m poorrâm</i>	<i>jeä' p leäm'maş poorrâm</i>
2PL	<i>lei' d poorrâm</i>	<i>jeä' ped leäm'maş poorrâm</i>
3PL	<i>le' jje poorrâm</i>	<i>jie leäm'maş poorrâm</i>
4	<i>le' jješ poorrâm</i>	<i>jeät leäm'maş poorrâm</i>
	POT.PRF.AFF	POT.PRF.NEG
1SG	<i>le' žžem poorrâm</i>	<i>jiõm le' žže poorrâm</i>
2SG	<i>le' žžik poorrâm</i>	<i>jiõk le' žže poorrâm</i>
3SG	<i>leežž poorrâm</i>	<i>ij le' žže poorrâm</i>

1PL	<i>le' žžep poorrâm</i>	<i>jeä' p le' žže poorrâm</i>
2PL	<i>le' žžve' ted poorrâm</i>	<i>jeä' ped le' žže poorrâm</i>
3PL	<i>le' žže poorrâm</i>	<i>jie le' žže poorrâm</i>
4	<i>le' žžet poorrâm</i>	<i>jeät le' žže poorrâm</i>
	COND.PRF.AFF	COND.PRF.NEG
1SG	<i>le' ččem poorrâm</i>	<i>jiôm le' čče poorrâm</i>
2SG	<i>le' ččik poorrâm</i>	<i>jiõk le' čče poorrâm</i>
3SG	<i>le' čči poorrâm</i>	<i>ij le' čče poorrâm</i>
1PL	<i>le' ččep poorrâm</i>	<i>jeä' p le' čče poorrâm</i>
2PL	<i>le' ččid poorrâm</i>	<i>jeä' ped le' čče poorrâm</i>
3PL	<i>le' čče poorrâm</i>	<i>jie le' čče poorrâm</i>
4	<i>le' ččeš poorrâm</i>	<i>jeät le' čče poorrâm</i>

In the third person, the negative auxiliary and *lee' d* as LV often fuse together. Examples of the contracted forms are given in (7). Note that the contracted present forms given (except for the 3rd singular *i' lleäkkü* and perhaps *i' lleäk*) are based on the suffixless form of the connegative (originally ending in *-k*) that is not in use anymore; remember that all other verbs still have a shorter and longer form of the present connegative.

(7) Contracted forms of NEG and *lee' d* as LV (Feist 2010: 278)

PRES.3SG *ij leäk'ku* → *i' lla ~ i' llä ~ i' llää ~ i' lleäk ~*
i' lleäkku

PST.3SG *ij leäm'maš* → *i' lleäm*

COND.3SG *ij le' čče* → *i' lle' čče*

POT.3SG *ij le' žže* → *i' lle' žže*

PRES.3PL *jie leäk'ku* → *jeä' la*

The contracted forms are used both when *lee' d* functions as auxiliary in compound tenses and as copula in non-verbal predications (see 2.3 for the latter). Examples of the negation of compound tenses are given in (8)-(10). Note that in (10) the corresponding affirmative precedes the negative.

(8) *mon jiõm leäkku jáåttam eteläst*

1SG NEG.1SG be.CNG travel.PTCP.PST south.LOC

'I haven't been to the south.' (12744_1bz: 22:25)

(9) *näskk risttjeä' nn i' lla puärsmam*

Näskk.NOM god.mother.NOM be.NEG.3SG become.older.PTCP.PST

'Godmother Näskk has not got older.' (12744_1bz: 24:10)

- (10) *mie' rre mō' nne, leežž kãã' tt piâssâm,*
sea.ILL go.PST.3PL be.POT.3SG who get.away.PTCP.PST
i' lle' žže piâssâm
be.NEG.POT.3SG get.away.PTCP.PST
'They went into the sea, perhaps someone got away, perhaps
didn't.' (11308_1a:11:53)

In the third person compound tenses, the contracted forms are much more commonly found in speech than the non-contracted forms. Some of the contracted forms are transparent and can be seen as consisting of the negative auxiliary and the copula verb *lee'd* 'be', and the negative construction can thus be seen as essentially the same as the negative auxiliary construction used with non-contracted forms of compound tenses and with simple tenses. The less transparent forms, however, are not necessarily synchronically analysable as combinations of negative auxiliary and copula, and are thus not negative auxiliary constructions; rather, the negative construction then consists of the replacement of the positive copula by the portmanteau negative copula.

A special construction consisting of the past tense form of the auxiliary *lee'd* and the infinitive of the lexical verb can be used as an alternative to the conditional perfect. A slight deviation from the above negation patterns

is observed in the negation of this construction:⁵ the special past connegative form *le'jje*, identical to the 3rd plural past form of the verb, is used. The examples in (11)-(13) show both positive and negative forms.

(11) *jiâ le'jje oi'ğğeed,*

NEG.3PL be.PST.CNG hand.INF

tâ'l lääi pue'tted ķedda

then be.PST.3SG come.INF field.ILL

‘[if] they hadn’t handed [the eggs back to the snake], then [it] would have come ashore.’ (Semenoja 1994: 56)

(12) *jõs tie'tted le'jjem, tâ'l i'lle'jje lue'štted*

if know.INF be.PST.1SG then be.NEG.PST.3SG let.go.INF

‘If I had known [that it was St. Peter’s Day, when one may not swim], [the nix] wouldn’t have let go [from the water].’ (Semenoja 1994: 71)

(13) *i'lle'jje piijjled vuâstta,*

be.NEG.PST.3SG put.INF against

⁵ Being a special way of negating a somewhat marginal construction, this does not belong to standard negation, but we are still discussing it in this section together with the other ways of negating the conditional.

ǰedda lääi pue' tted,

field.ILL be.PST.3SG come.INF

mâid i' lle' jje vuei' tted tuejjeed

what.PL.ACC be.NEG.PST.3SG be.able.INF do.INF

‘Had they not put back [the eggs to the snake], it would have come ashore, they could not have done anything.’ (Semenoja 1994: 57)

In his short discussion of the negation of this construction, Feist (2010: 277) observes only cases in which the negative auxiliary and *lee' d* are contracted. As (11) shows, non-contracted forms also occur. In (13), a 3rd singular form of the negative auxiliary is found contracted with *le' jje* even if the reading is plural (a similar case is observed by Feist 2010: 277). When discussing the form of *lee' d* he calls it a past tense form. It is true that *le' jje* is identical to the 3rd person plural past tense form, but as we can see in the examples, the form is used in other person-number combinations as well, so it is better analysed as a connegative form specific to this construction – taking it to be a finite past tense form would also be in stark contrast with the general properties of Skolt Saami negative auxiliary constructions, in which the LV appears in a non-finite form. We have glossed it as past connegative here since it is the negative counterpart to a past tense form of the verb *lee' d*.

Putting Skolt Saami standard negation in a cross-linguistic perspective, we may note that negative auxiliary verbs are the most common type of negative markers in the Uralic language family, and they are well-known in a general typological perspective as well (although typologically they are clearly less common than negative particles and affixes); for some more discussion of the variation within Uralic in a typological perspective, see the introduction to this volume. The standard negation construction is an asymmetric negative construction in Miestamo's (2005) typology and, more specifically, it belongs to subtype A/Fin of asymmetric negation. This subtype is defined by the loss or reduction of finiteness of the lexical verb usually accompanied by the addition of a finite element (auxiliary); in a negative verb construction (A/Fin/NegVerb), as in Skolt Saami, the finite element that is added is the negative marker itself. In the present tense indicative, the connegative is homonymous to the 2nd singular positive imperative, but there are no reasons to consider the connegative as an imperative form – the two forms are identical by virtue of being unmarked stems (see Miestamo 2011b for more discussion).

As to the negation of compound tenses with the contracted auxiliaries, the cases in which the combination of the negative auxiliary is transparent (see discussion above) can be analysed as negative auxiliary constructions, i.e. Type A/Fin/NegVerb, in the same way as in the case of non-contracted forms. The non-transparent ones replacing the positive copula with a

negative portmanteau copula could, however, be seen as belonging to type A/Cat in which the marking of tense and person changes through the replacement of an element (the copula) marking these categories in the affirmative by the portmanteau negative copula in the negative.

2.2. *Negation in non-declaratives*

It is typologically common that a negation strategy deviating from standard negation is used in imperatives. This is also the case in Skolt Saami. Imperatives are negated with an auxiliary construction just like declaratives, but the negative auxiliary has special forms for the imperative: *jeäl-/jeä' l-*. The paradigm of *poorrâd* 'eat' in the positive and negative imperative can be seen in (14).

(14) Imperative paradigm

	POS.IMP	NEG.IMP
2SG	<i>poor</i>	<i>jeä' l poor</i>
3SG	<i>pååras</i>	<i>jeälas porru</i>
1PL	<i>poorrâp</i>	<i>jeäl'lap porru</i>
2PL	<i>poorrâd</i>	<i>jeä' l'led porru/poor</i>
3PL	<i>pårraz</i>	<i>jeäl'laz porru</i>

In the 2nd person negative imperative the connegative form is identical to the connegative form used in present indicative negation, which is homonymous with the 2nd person positive imperative form. In the other persons the connegative has a special connegative imperative form ending in *-u/-uku*. The 2nd person plural, however, can alternatively use the same form as the 2nd person singular. The verb *lee' d* 'be' has consistently *leäk'ku* for the connegative in all persons; this is also the 2nd person positive imperative form. Some authentic examples of negative imperatives are given in (15)-(18).

- (15) *jeä' l* *viižž* *tuejjeed* *nu' t*
NEG.IMP.2SG bother.CNG do.INF so
'Please don't do so.' (12744_1a: 09:58)

- (16) *jeä' l* *čuu' t* *uus* *spoukkâl*
NEG.IMP.2SG hard door.ACC bang.MOM.CNG
'Don't slam the door loudly.' (12744_1bz: 00:04)

- (17) *jeä' lled* *cie' lķ* *vue' žž* *mutta* *triâηgg*
NEG.IMP.2PL say.CNG meat.NOM but farmhand.NOM
'Don't say meat but farmhand.' (Koponen et al. 2010: 17)

- (18) *jeä' lled jurddu, što...*
NEG.IMP.2PL think.CNG.IMP that
'Do not think that...' (EE: 5,45)

A perfect tense imperative can be formed by the imperative of the verb *lee' d* and the past participle. This form is negated by the imperative negative auxiliary and the auxiliary *lee' d* then appears in the connegative as expected. Such a form is of marginal use and will not be exemplified here.

In a typological perspective, van der Auwera and Lejeune (2005) distinguish different types of 2nd person singular negative imperatives according to whether or not the imperative verb form used in negative imperatives differs from the imperative verb form used in positive imperatives and whether or not the marker of negation used in negative imperatives differs from the marker of negation used in declaratives. In Skolt Saami 2nd person singular negative imperatives, the negative auxiliary has a different stem from the negative auxiliary used in standard negation and the morphological form of this auxiliary expressing the imperative is an unmarked stem just like the form of positive imperatives. Therefore, as Miestamo (2011b) has argued, the construction can be analysed as belonging to van der Auwera and Lejeune's Type 2, in which the negative imperative uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives. The

situation is more complicated if other persons than 2nd person singular are considered.

As seen in Section 2.1, moods other than the imperative are negated with the standard negation construction using the negative auxiliary *ij*. Non-declaratives thus have a non-standard negation strategy only in the case of the imperative. Negative questions, although they are negated by standard negation, exhibit some interesting characteristics, and these will be discussed in 4.6 below.

2.3. *Negation in non-verbal clauses*

Non-verbal clauses, as defined in the questionnaire, are another environment in which it is typologically common to find non-standard negative strategies. In this section we will discuss the negation of non-verbal clauses in Skolt Saami and see whether and how it differs from standard negation.

All non-verbal clause types (equation, proper inclusion, attribution, locative predication, existential predication, possessive predication) use the verb *lee' d* 'be' as copula. The copula is negated with the negative auxiliary just like any other verb, and as a general rule, we may say that negation in non-verbal clauses does not differ from standard negation. However, the present connegative of *lee' d* differs from other verbs in not being a simple

uninflected stem but ending in *-kku* (it is still identical with the 2nd person imperative form). The forms of *lee' d* as LV are given in (19).

(19) 3rd singular forms of *lee' d* 'be'

	AFF	NEG
PRES	<i>lij</i>	<i>ij leäk'ku</i>
PST	<i>leäi</i>	<i>ij leäm'maš</i> (past participle)
COND	<i>le' čči</i>	<i>ij le' čče</i>
POT	<i>leežž</i>	<i>ij le' žže</i>

As shown in connection with the compound tenses above (2.1), the negative auxiliary and the copula may fuse to form special negative copula forms in the third person singular and plural (7, repeated here as 20).

(20) Contracted forms of NEG and *lee' d* as LV (Feist 2010: 278)

PRS.3SG	<i>ij leäk'ku</i>	→	<i>i' lla ~ i' llä ~ i' llää ~ i' lleäk ~ i' lleäkku</i>
PST.3SG	<i>ij leäm'maš</i>	→	<i>i' lleäm</i>
COND.3SG	<i>ij le' čče</i>	→	<i>i' lle' čče</i>
POT.3SG	<i>ij le' žže</i>	→	<i>i' lle' žže</i>
PRS.3PL	<i>jie leäk'ku</i>	→	<i>jeä' la</i>

Both non-contracted and contracted forms can occur in the different types of non-verbal predications. As noted above in connection with compound tenses, the contracted forms are clearly more common in the third person singular and plural. Examples of negated non-verbal predications are given in (21)-(26): equation (21), proper inclusion (22), attribution (23), locative (24), existential (25), and possessive (26).

(21) *ij ni ååkkaž leäm*

NEG.3SG NPM Ååkkaž.NOM be.PTCP.PST

tän mä' rj jeä' nn

this.GEN Mä' rjj.GEN mother.NOM

'not even Ååkkaž was the mother of this Mä' rjj' (12744_1bz:

25:01)

(22) *pie' nne-njuu' nn, piännai-han tät lij,*

dog.GEN-muzzle.NOM dog.NOM-DM this be.3SG

i' lla ooumaž

be.NEG.3SG human.being.NOM

'A dog's muzzle, a dog this is, it is not a human being.' (11722_1a:

27:06)

(23) *što leäk-a tiõrvâs, jiõk leäkku tiõrvâs*
that be.2SG-Q healthy.NOM NEG.2SG be.CNG healthy.NOM
‘whether you are healthy or not’ (lit. ‘that are you healthy, you’re
not healthy’ (11308_1a: 02:13)

(24) *te' l jeä' lääm vâl siidâst*
then be.NEG.PST.3PL yet village.LOC
gu gu rosttov le' jje
when when Christmas.PL.NOM be.PST.3PL
‘Then they weren’t yet in the village when it was Christmas’
(11723_1a: 00:28)

(25) *de åå' n jeä' la teänab nåkkam sää' m*
and now be.NEG.3PL anymore that.kind.of Skolt.PL.NOM
‘and now there aren’t such Skolts anymore’ (11308_1a: 21:28)

(26) *no tääi' ben mee' st i' lla konttor mutta*
well here 1PL.LOC be.NEG.3SG office.NOM but
‘Well, here we don’t have an office but...’ (17465_1dz: 05:17)

In terms of Veselinova’s typology (2013, this volume), Skolt Saami
would be classified as an intermediate type with variation between one or

two negation strategies: when the non-contracted forms of the copula are used, all types of non-verbal negation are identical to standard negation, and only one strategy is found, but when the contracted forms of the copula are used, all types of non-verbal negation have a strategy different from standard negation, and we find two strategies. Since the contracted forms can be used for all types of non-verbal predicates, they can be analysed as general stative negators. As to the typology of existential negatives proposed by Croft (1991), Skolt Saami shows variation between types A and B: in type A the existential predicate is negated with standard negation – this is the case when the copula does not contract with the negative auxiliary – and in type B there is a special existential negator different from standard negation – this is the case when the copula and the negative auxiliary are fused. For more discussion on Croft’s typology, see Veselinova (this volume).

2.4. Negation in dependent clauses

In finite dependent clauses, the negative constructions described above are used in the same way as in main clauses. There are, however, more interesting things to say about non-finite clauses and negation. The non-finite verb forms that form positive non-finite dependent clauses are not combined with negative markers. However, there is a separate negative non-

finite form, the verbal abessive, which can function as the negative equivalent of some non-finite verb forms. It is found as modifier in NPs and forming adverbial non-finite clauses (Moshnikoff et al. 2009: 125-126; Feist 2010: 213, 216, 317-318). The verbal abessive is formed with the suffix *-ĵani*. Examples of its use are given in (27) and (28).

(27) *mâŋŋa nu' t tie' ĵkani*

later that.way know.VABE

puä' tte suõnid pââ' nned

come.3PL thread.PL.ACC spin.INF

‘later, that way, without knowing, they came to act as match makers.’ (lit. ‘came to spin threads’) (11723_1a:10:29)

(28) *paaccĵani poomm le' jje jiânnai*

explode.VABE bomb.PL.NOM be.PST.3PL many

‘there were many unexploded bombs.’ (Feist 2010: 216)

When acting as a modifier in NPs (as in 28), the verbal abessive functions as the negative counterpart of participles, and when forming adverbial non-finite clauses (as in 27), it corresponds mainly to the *-een* and *-ee' l* gerunds, which have temporal and instrumental usages, respectively.

2.5. Other clausal negation constructions

In this section we will discuss some more marginal ways of negating clauses. The verbal abessive may combine with the copula or the verb *pää'cced* 'remain' to form a non-standard negation construction used in main clauses, see (29).

- (29) *di tõt pue' lĵani paa' ʒʒi, ij puállam*
so it burn.VABE remain.PST.3SG NEG.3SG burn.PTCP.PST
'so it didn't burn (lit. remained unburned), it didn't burn.'
(11308_1a: 25:04)

Example (29) is interesting in the sense that after having expressed negation with the verbal abessive construction, the speaker then rephrases the same content using standard negation. This shows that the two constructions are semantically very close to each other. The specific pragmatic conditions for the use of this non-standard negation construction are in need of further investigation, but it seems that it is used in contexts where the expectation of the corresponding affirmative is higher than usual. In (29) the preceding context describes the burning of a church and the construction with the verbal abessive is used to express that a part of the church, namely an altar built by a saint, did not burn, contrary to expectations.

The modal verb *õuggâd ~ õlggâd* ‘must, have to’ can fuse with the negative marker and form a special lexicalized negative construction in the 3rd person singular: *i-g õl* instead of the non-fused *ij õõlg*, see (30).⁶

(30) *i-g õl* *ceä' lķķed* “*piännai*”

NEG-must.CNG say.INF dog.NOM

‘one shouldn’t say “dog”’ (11722_1a: 27:13)

It is worth noting that the modal has scope over the negative here, i.e. the meaning of the negated forms of *õuggâd ~ õlggâd*, be it standard negation or this contracted form, is ‘must not’ rather than ‘does not have to’.

3. Non-clausal negation

3.1. Negative replies

Polar questions are replied to in the negative by the negative auxiliary inflected according to the person and number of the subject, see (31).

⁶ The *g* in *i-g õl* goes back to an initial **k* in an earlier form of the verb (*õlggâd < *kõlggâd : i-g õl < *ij kõõlg*). This shows that the contraction has happened at a relatively early historical stage.

(31) A: *jiõk muu' št tõn?*
NEG.2SG remember.CNG it.ACC

‘You don’t remember that?’

B: *jiõm*

NEG.1SG

‘No.’ (11722_1bz: 19:21)

This negates the propositional content of the question, not its polarity, i.e. the reply in (31) means that the speaker who replies to the question does not remember. The LV may generally also be included in the negative reply; in fact the example given in (31) is followed by the repetition of the reply, this time with the LV: *jiõm muu' št* (11722_1bz: 19:24), see also Feist (2010: 323-324).

The 3rd person singular form of the negative auxiliary is also found functioning as a negative particle ‘no’, see (32).

(32) *ij, jeä' p mij vuei' t vue' rdded,*
no NEG.1PL 1PL.NOM can.CNG wait.INF

puk son talkknid kâ33
all 3SG.NOM talkkuna.PL.NOM eat.3SG

‘No, we cannot wait, he will eat all the talkkuna [type of flour].’

(Semenoja 1994: 19-20)

It can clearly be seen that *ij* is a particle here since it does not inflect for the subject of the following clause.

3.2. *Negative indefinites and quantifiers*

Negative indefinites are formed by adding the negative polarity marker *ni* in front of interrogative pronouns *ķii* ‘who’ and *mii* ‘what’: *[ij] ni ķii* ‘[not] anybody’ and *[ij] ni mii* ‘[not] anything’. The corresponding positive indefinites are built on interrogatives with the enclitic *-ne*: *ķii-ne* ‘somebody’ and *mii-ne* ‘something’. The negative indefinites do not have negative force by themselves and they have to cooccur with verbal negation in clauses. See examples (33)-(35). In the texts examined, when multiple indefinites occur in the scope of one negator, *ni* only occurs in front of the first one as in (34)-(35).

- (33) *di logškue' ttem ķee' rj,*
and read.INCH.PST.1SG book.ACC

ij ni ĵii muu mätt'tam

NEG.3SG NPM who.SG.NOM 1SG.ACC teach.PTCP.PST

‘and I started to read a book, no-one taught me.’ (11313_1az:
03:11)

(34) *mutta teänab jiâ ni koozz vuâlggam*

but anymore NEG.3PL NPM where.ILL go.PTCP.PST

mâi' d tuejjeed

what.PL.ACC do.INF

‘but they didn’t go anywhere anymore to do anything’ (11308_1a:
29:08)

(35) *ââ' n â' tte i' lla ni mii ko' st*

now you.see be.NEG.3SG NPM what.SG.NOM where.SG.LOC

‘Now, you see, there isn’t anything anywhere.’ (11723_1a: 02:24)

The negative indefinites are inflected in the same way as their positive counterparts and they occur in the same syntactic functions, as arguments or adjuncts, inflected for the appropriate case. The negative indefinites only occur in negative contexts; more specifically, they only cover the direct negative function on Haspelmath’s (1997) semantic map.

The authentic materials also exhibit quite a number of examples of negative indefinites without *ni*, i.e. the bare interrogative pronoun, as illustrated in (36).

- (36) *to' b i' llakku mii hue' neld*
there be.NEG.3SG what.SG.NOM bad.MNR
'There nothing is wrong.' (12744_1bz: 20:38)

In standard Skolt Saami *ni* is required, but it is not always found in language use. Whether a regular pattern can be found in its use and non-use or whether it is a matter of free variation is not clear and needs to be studied in more detail. It may also be noted that in contemporary Skolt Saami, it is quite common to find negative indefinites formed using the enclitic *-kaan* (borrowed from Finnish) instead of *ni*.

As can be seen in (37), negative indefinites in replies require the presence of the negative auxiliary (here it is actually the same speaker that poses the question and then answers it).

- (37) A: *ķeässa mä' htt tōn kuåsttåd*
in.summer how it.ACC reach.INF
'How does one reach it in summer time?' (11722_1a: 18:47)

A: *ij ni mä'htt*

NEG.3SG NPM how

'In no way.' (11722_1a: 18:50)

In terms of Kahrel's (1996) typology, we may note that negative indefinites (i.e. the ones formed with *ni* or *-kaan*) behave according to Type II: special indefinite co-occurs with verbal negation. In Haspelmath's (1997, 2005) typology we are dealing with Type 1 in which negative indefinites co-occur with predicate negation, and as to the indefinites themselves, we have observed that their use is limited to the direct negation function on the semantic map. See Van Alsenoy and van der Auwera (this volume) for more typological discussion.

3.3. *Abessives and privatives*

Skolt Saami has an abessive case which signals the absence of an entity denoted by the noun on which it appears, e.g., the absence of an instrument or the absence of a person or object accompanying another. The abessive ending is *-tää*. In some cases it is the negative counterpart of the comitative that expresses accompaniment, but its text frequency is much lower than that of the comitative. Examples of the use of the abessive are given in (38)-(39).

- (38) *ja tuâjtää še ooumaž ij jeällam*
and work.SG.ABE too man.SG.NOM NEG.3SG live.PTCP.PST
‘and without work one didn’t live either.’ (17463_1d: 23:04)

- (39) *tuutää i’lla hää’šk*
2SG.ABE be.NEG.3SG fun.SG.NOM
‘Without you it’s not fun.’ (Moshnikoff et al. 2009: 60)

It may be further noted that the abessive is one of the cases affected by the phenomenon of partial agreement.⁷ In general, dependents do not agree in case with the head noun in NPs except for demonstrative pronouns, numerals and comparative adjectives. These agreeing modifiers show a reduced paradigm in which the singular illative, locative and abessive forms are identical to the singular genitive form and the plural comitative and abessive are identical to the plural genitive form. In addition, the endings of these same cases show clitic-like behaviour and appear after enclitics such as possessive suffixes. These case markers, one of which is the abessive

⁷ We use the term *partial agreement* here. The phenomenon is known as *puolikongruenssi* in Saami literature written in Finnish, translated as *partial congruence* in Sammallahti (1998). Feist (2010) uses *weak declension*, translating the term *heikko taivutus* used by Moshnikoff et al. (2009).

marker, thus show evidence for a less advanced stage of grammaticalization than the other cases. (See Moshnikoff et al. 2009: 51, 67-69 and Feist 2010: 210 for more details and discussion.)

In addition to the abessive inflection, Skolt Saami possesses a privative derivational suffix that derives adjectives from nouns and verbs. The privative suffix is *-te' m*, and its function is to express the absence of what is expressed by the noun (40a) or negation of the action expressed by the verb (40b). The attributive form of these derived adjectives has the ending *-es*, and in the comparative and superlative, the comparative marker *-ab* and the superlative marker *-umus* replace the final *-e' m* of the privative suffix (40c). A sentential example can be seen in (41).

- (40) a. *lää' k̄k̄* 'law' – *lää' jite' m* 'lawless, illegal'
b. *jue' k̄ked* 'divide' (*-ed* = infinitive ending) – *jue' jite' m*
(indivisible)
c. 'lawless, illegal': PRD: *lää' jite' m*, ATTR: *lää' jite' mes*, COMP:
lää' jitab, SUP: *lää' jtumus* (Feist 2010: 200-201)

- (41) *vie' k̄ktam tōid tuâj-te' m-es oummid ja*
help.CAUS.1SG it.PL.ACC work-PRIV-ATTR man.PL.ACC and
'I help those unemployed people and' (17465_1dz: 02:42)

It is also interesting to note that the privative, like many other derivative suffixes, can be followed by the translative verb derivation that expresses the meaning of entering the state or gaining the property expressed by the base. Thus the combination of the privative and the translative results in the meaning 'to become X-less/X-free', e.g., *čuõškk* 'mosquito' → *čuõškte' m* 'mosquito-free' → *čuõšktõõvvâd* 'become mosquito-free' (Feist 2010: 191).

4. Other aspects of negation

4.1. The scope of negation

A systematic study of the devices to mark information structure in Skolt Saami has not yet been undertaken and, consequently, this section is a collection of observations related to the scope of negation rather than an exhaustive account. As noted in Section 2.1, the negative auxiliary generally occurs before the lexical verb. In most of the examples seen so far, the negative auxiliary and the LV are adjacent to each other. This is indeed the

most frequent pattern, but sometimes other material is found intervening between the two verbal elements, e.g., in (42). Feist (2010: 285-286) also notes that the separation of negative auxiliary and LV happens much more rarely than the separation between auxiliary and main verb in compound tenses.

- (42) *måttam* *kuâddje* *jiâ* *måttam*
some.PL.NOM stay.3PL NEG.3PL some.PL.NOM
sâ' jjuu' d *beä' lnn* *vuâlggam*
Sâ' jjuu' vd.GEN from.the.direction.of set.off.PTCP.PST
'some stayed, some didn't leave from around Sâ' jjuu' vd'
(12744_1a: 26:04)

To what extent placing the negative auxiliary in front of an element other than the LV can be used to indicate the focus of negation needs to be studied in more detail, but it is clear that this is not the primary means to mark this function. Stress and intonation can be used to focus an element while the negative verb stays at its normal place before the LV. A further device to mark an element as being in the focus of negation is the negative polarity marker *ni*, which will be discussed in more detail in Sections 4.2 and 4.4.

Occasional examples of the negative auxiliary appearing after the LV are found, see (43) and (44). Placing the LV before the negative auxiliary in this way seems to focus the lexical content of the verb. This is well illustrated by example (44) in which there is a clear contrast between *kââ'lm* and the lexical verb of the preceding clause *levvje*.

(43) *no koozz tok mō' nne ni koon årra*

well whither thither go.PST.3PL NPM what.SG.GEN to

pääu' t se' st piâzz jiâ de

cliff.SG.GEN in get.away.CNG NEG.3PL and

‘well, where, there they went, they can’t get to any direction from
the cliff then’ (11308_1a: 11:46)

(44) *levvje leâša kââ' lm sami jiâ*

tire. 3PL but die.CNG quite NEG.3PL

‘they tired, but they didn’t quite die’, ‘they tired, (yes), but die they
did not’ (Feist 2010: 288)

The present tense forms in example (44) refer to past events as is common in Skolt Saami narratives (see Feist 2010: 263).

Feist (2010: 282-283) notes that fronting elements may be used to mark them as new information, and this device can thus also serve to mark them explicitly as being in the scope of negation, see (45).

- (45) *lää' ddkiõl mon jiõm fi' tte*
Finnish.SG.ACC 1SG.NOM NEG.1SG understand.CNG
ni mõõn
NPM what.SG.ACC
'Finnish, I don't understand at all.' (Feist 2010: 283)

Here, the object *lää' ddkiõl* is fronted, and it is this object that negation focuses on. In this case, the focus seems to be contrastive. In general, new information appears at the end of the sentence in Skolt Saami. A more detailed account of the role of word order in marking the scope of negation is to be left for future research.

4.2. Negative polarity

Negative polarity has already been addressed above in Section 3.2, where we discussed the negative indefinites formed by putting the negative polarity marker *ni* in front of interrogative pronouns. This section contains some more discussion on negative polarity. Examples of the word *teünab*

used in negative contexts to express the meaning ‘anymore’ have been given above: (25) and (34). It does not occur in positive contexts and is therefore clearly a negative polarity item. Note that the word *vâl* expressing ‘yet’ in (24) above also occurs in positive contexts with the meaning ‘still’.

The negative polarity marker *ni* can appear in front of (almost) any constituent in a negative clause. Its functions range from additive (‘neither X’) to scalar (‘not even X’). Example (46), in which *ni* precedes the 1st person pronoun, illustrates the former reading. We will come back to this construction in 4.4, where we discuss the scalar use of *ni* to reinforce negation.

(46) A: *jiõm teänab tie'đ*
NEG.1SG anymore know.CNG
‘I don’t know anymore.’

B: *de jiõm ni mon teänab muu'št*
and NEG.1SG NPM 1SG.NOM anymore remember.CNG
‘And neither do I remember anymore.’ (11722_1a: 21:29)

4.3. Case marking under negation

Negation does not affect case marking in Skolt Saami.

4.4. Reinforcing negation

Apart from prosodic means, there are a number of ways to reinforce negation. The most common ones are *ni õhtt* ‘not even one’ and *ni voo’ps* ‘at all’, see (47)-(48). A negative indefinite (*ni* + interrogative pronoun) may also be used to reinforce negation as in (49)-(50).

- (47) *beâddaamon jïõm muu’št kuuskõõzzid*
INTRJ 1SG.NOM NEG.1SG remeber.CNG northern.lights.PL.ACC
ni voo’ps
NPM in.all
‘Oh my! I don’t remember the northern lights at all!’ (11722_1bz:
07:28)

- (48) *škoou’le mõõnim te’l leäi vaiggâd*
school.SG.ILL go.PST.1PL then be.PST.3SG difficult.SG.NOM
ko ij silttääm ni õõut sää’n
when NEG.3SG know.PTCP.PST NPM one.ACC word.SG.ACC
‘We went to school, then it was difficult, as one didn’t know a
single word.’ (12897_1a: 12:14)

- (49) *muttako siidâst, jiâ pääccam oummu*
but as village.SG.LOC NEG.3PL stay.PTCP.PST man.PL.NOM
ni mōōk
NPM what.PL.NOM
‘but [of those] as [were in] the village, no people [or] anything
stayed [alive].’ (11308_1a: 14:50)

- (50) *mutta jiâ-han sij leäkku u' čtee' l*
but NEG.3PL-DM 3PL.NOM be.CNG teacher.PL.NOM
ni mōōk õs tōk kook
NPM what.PL in.turn it.PL.NOM who.PL.NOM
‘But surely they are no teachers, but those who...’ (17463_1d:
18:04)

It was noted in 4.2 that the negative polarity marker *ni* can be used in front of clause constituents in a scalar meaning (‘not even X’), which often has the function of reinforcing the negation of that constituent. Examples of this function of *ni* are seen in (21 repeated here as 51) and (52).

- (51) *ij ni ååkkaž leäm*
NEG.3SG NPM Ååkkaž.SG.NOM be.PTCP.PST

tän mää' rj jeä' nn

this.GEN Mä' rjj.SG.GEN mother.SG.NOM

‘not even Ääkkäž was the mother of this Mä' rjj’ (12744_1bz:
25:01)

(52) *jiâ ni mōōn ni kōōjj*

NEG.3PL NPM what.SG.ACC NPM ask.CNG

‘They don’t even ask anything.’ (11308_1a: 02:12)

As was already noted in 3.2, the scalar/additive enclitic *-kaan* borrowed from Finnish is sometimes used instead of *ni* in contemporary spoken Skolt Saami, and we may note that *-kaan* can replace *ni* in the reinforcing function as well.

Finally, examples are found in which the negative auxiliary is repeated. The repetition also seems to have a reinforcing function, see (53).

(53) *Jiâ ni veäncčōōđ jiâ*

NEG.3PL NPM marry.RFL.CNG NEG.3PL

‘They don’t even get married, no.’ (11723_1a: 15:31)

In many of the examples found, the repetition cooccurs with some other mechanisms of reinforcement, as is the case in (53), too.

4.5. Negation and complex clauses

Section 2.4 addressed the negation of dependent clause predicates. This section will address other issues relevant for negation in complex clauses. The enclitic *-ga* ‘nor’ is used to coordinate negated clauses or constituents. It is attached to the negative auxiliary, see (54)-(55).

(54) *jiõm leäkku jeällam, jiõm-ga mõõn!*

NEG.1SG be.CNG visit.PST.PTCP NEG.1SG-CRD go.CNG

‘I haven’t been there, nor will I go!’ (Koponen et al. 2010: 69)

(55) *vuäžžak jälsted täi tie' gğäädvui' m,*

be.allowed.2SG live.INF this.PL.GEN money.PL.2SG.PX.COM

ij taarbâž reâuggad

NEG.3SG need.CNG work.INF

ij-ga ä' kken vue' lğged

NEG.3SG-CRD wife.SG.ESS go.INF

‘You may live with this money. There is no need to work, nor to get married.’ (11722_1bz: 13:53)

In (55) the negative clause coordinated by *-ga* is elliptic, as the LV which would be the same as in the other member of the coordination, viz. *taarbâž*, is dropped. It should further be noted that a negative clause can be coordinated with another clause also by using the regular coordinators *da* ‘and’ and *de* ‘so, therefore’, as any non-negative clause can.

4.6. Further aspects of negation

In this section we will take up some further issues that are of interest in the negation system of Skolt Saami. We will start by discussing negative questions. As noted in 2.3 above, negative questions do not have any special negative construction different from standard negation. It is, however, interesting to note the following about negative polar interrogatives. In polar interrogatives the element in the focus of the question occurs clause-initially and carries the interrogative enclitic. In questions that are as neutral as possible in terms of focus, the fronted element is the finite verb. In negative polar interrogatives, it is usually the negative auxiliary that is fronted and, consequently, carries the interrogative enclitic. Example (56) illustrates negative polar interrogatives.

- (56) *Na jïök-go leäkku veär raajjâm ouddâl?*
well NEG.2SG-Q be.CNG food.SG.ACC make.PTCP.PST before
'Well haven't you cooked before?' (Koponen et al. 2010: 100)

There are a few interrogative enclitics that can appear on the fronted constituent: *-a*, *-go* and *-mana*, and while *-a* is the most common one in positive questions, *-go* seems to be the most frequent one in negatives.

In this context it is also interesting to point out a special use of negation: in addition to the common interrogative construction in which the interrogative enclitic appears after the first element of the sentence, polar questions are sometimes formed by the negative auxiliary following the positive form of the verb inflected in the same person and number, see (57)-(58).

- (57) *vuõi' nniĵ jik peei' v?*
see.2SG NEG.2SG sun.SG.ACC
'Did you see the sun?' (Itkonen 1931: 206)

- (58) *tie' ttve' ted jeä' ped,ko' st liâ denisa*
know.2PL NEG.2PL where be.3PL Denis.SG.GEN
päärna?
children.PL.NOM

‘Do you know where Denis’ children are?’ (Semenoja 1994: 17)

These are reminiscent of the so-called A-not-A construction type found in a number of the world’s languages, e.g., Mandarin and Kobon (a Papuan language), where polar interrogation is expressed by a disjunction of a positive predicate and its negation (see Miestamo 2011a for some more discussion of these constructions in Skolt Saami). Note that Feist (2010: 324) considers these as tag questions. However, as the negative auxiliary is not necessarily sentence-final but occurs after the positive verb and can be followed by other material, an analysis in terms of A-not-A is more appropriate. A couple of examples of this construction occurring in indirect questions are also found, e.g., (59).

(59) *kuvddlam što liâ jeä’la tääi’ben*

listen.1SG that be.3PL be.NEG.3PL here

‘I’m trying to hear whether they are here.’ (17463_1ez: 06:19)

In this example, the negative element following the positive verb form is the fused negative copula instead of the negative auxiliary.

5. Conclusion

This paper has provided a general description of the system of negation in Skolt Saami. We have looked at standard negation and other types of clausal negation, especially the negation of imperatives and non-verbal predicates. We have addressed non-clausal negative expressions such as negative replies, negative indefinites and abessive and privative negation. Other negation-related phenomena such as the scope of negation, reinforcing negation and negative polarity have also been discussed. The findings have been related to current typological knowledge of negation. It is our hope that this paper has given an adequate overview of the system of negation in Skolt Saami in a typological perspective. As we have pointed out in several sections above, many issues are still in need of further research before a more complete picture of Skolt Saami negation can be given. The main aspects of Skolt Saami negation are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Skolt Saami negation.

Clausal negation	Standard negation	NEG.AUX+V[CNG/PTCP] NEG.COP[replacesPOS.COP]+V (alternatively in compound tenses formed with copula)	
	Negation of imperatives	NEG.AUX.IMP+V[CNG/CNG.IMP]	
	Negation of non-verbal predicates	standard negation NEG.COP (general stative negator, alternative to SN)	
	Negation in dependent clauses	finite clauses:	standard negation

		non-finite clauses:	verbal abessive
	Other clausal negation constructions	'be'/'remain'+verbal abessive	
Non-clausal negation	Negative reply	NEG.AUX(+V) NEG.PTCL	
	Negative indefinites	<i>ni</i> +Q.PRON with negation present in the clause Q.PRON with negation present in the clause Q.PRON- <i>kaan</i> with negation present in the clause	
	Absence	abessive:	case suffix <i>-tää</i>
		privative:	derivational suffix <i>-te'm</i>
Other aspects of negation	Scope of negation	prosody negative polarity marker <i>ni</i> +X word order	
	Negative polarity	negative polarity marker <i>ni</i> +X lexical items (<i>teänab</i> 'anymore')	
	Case marking under negation	negation has no effect on case marking	
	Reinforcing negation	negative polarity marker <i>ni</i> +ADVERB/PRONOUN negative polarity marker <i>ni</i> +X <i>X-kaan</i> (enclitic) repetition of NEG.AUX	
	Negation and complex clauses	enclitic <i>-ga</i> coordinates negative clause	

References

van der Auwera, Johan & Lejeune, Ludo. 2005. The prohibitive. In *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, Martin Haspelmath, Matthew Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds), 290-293. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Croft, William. 1991. The evolution of negation. *Journal of Linguistics* 27 (1): 1-27.
- EE = *Evvan evanže' lium* [Gospel of John]. 1988. Helsinki: Lää' dd pipliaseä' rvv.
- Feist, Timothy. 2010. A Grammar of Skolt Saami. PhD dissertation, University of Manchester.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2005. Negative indefinite pronouns and predicate negation. In *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, Martin Haspelmath, Matthew Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds), 466-469. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Itkonen, Toivo Immanuel. 1931. *Koltan- ja kuolanlappalaisia satuja* [Skolt and Kola Lappish Tales] [Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuran toimituksia 60]. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Kahrel, Peter. 1996. Aspects of Negation. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Koponen, Eino & Moshnikoff, Jouni & Moshnikoff, Satu. 2010. *Sää' m̃kiõll, ä' rbb̃kiõll* [Skolt Saami, Heritage Language] [Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen verkkojulkaisuja 14]. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.
<<http://scripta.kotus.fi/www/verkkojulkaisut/julk14/>>

- Korhonen, Mikko. 1973. Kieliopin pääkohdat [The essentials of grammar].
In *Koltansaamen opas* [Guide to Skolt Saami] [Castrenianumin toimitteita 4], Mikko Korhonen, Jouni Moshnikoff & Pekka Sammallahti, 9-97. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.
- Korhonen, Mikko. (1969) 1996. Die Entwicklung der morphologischen Technik im Lappischen. In *Typological and Historical Studies in Language by Mikko Korhonen. A Memorial Volume Published on the 60th Anniversary of His Birth* [Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 223], Tapani Salminen (ed.), 17-143. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.
[Originally published in *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 37, 1969]
- Miestamo, Matti. 2005. *Standard Negation: The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective* [Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 31]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2011a. Polar interrogatives in Uralic languages: A typological perspective. *Linguistica Uralica* 47 (1): 1-21.
- Miestamo, Matti. 2011b. Skolt Saami: A typological profile. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 93: 111-145.
- Moshnikoff, Satu & Moshnikoff, Jouni & Koponen, Eino. 2009. *Koltansaamen koulukielioppi. Sää' m̄kiõl̄ kiõllvuä' p̄pes škoou' li vääras* [School Grammar of Skolt Saami]. Inari/Aanar: Saamelaiskäräjät/Sää' mte' šš.

Sammallahti, Pekka. 1988. *The Saami Languages. An Introduction*.

Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.

Semenoja, Sinikka. 1994. *Toben mádd má' te vuáđđ*. Oulu: Oulun yliopisto.

Veselinova, Ljuba. 2013. Negative existentials: A cross linguistic study.

Italian Journal of Linguistics (special issue on existential constructions)

25 (1): 107-146.