

A strong argument for the derivation we propose comes from the flexibility of VP-related clitics in the verb cluster (Arkhangelskiy 2014). These clitics preferably occur after the AUX in clusters consisting of V+AUX, i.e. undergo encliticization to AUX, cf. (8a). We therefore assume that clitics are (initially) linearized between AUX and NEG: [V AUX CL NEG]. Crucially, clitics can but do not have to precede the AUX and the lexical verb in the presence of negation (8c), (9b–d):

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|-----|------------------|------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| (8) | 2-verb clusters: | (9) | 3-verb clusters: | (10) | ö-d=n'i | vetl-e |
| | a. V-AUX-CL | | a. V-NEG-AUX-CL | | NEG.PAST-2=ANymORE | go-PL |
| | b. NEG-V-CL | | b. V-NEG-CL-AUX | | | 'you (pl) didn't go anymore' |
| | c. NEG-CL-V | | c. NEG-AUX-CL-V | | | <i>Udmurt</i> |
| | | | d. NEG-CL-AUX-V | | | |

We propose that the placement options for clitics are due to a structural ambiguity of the clitics: They are functional heads that can be not not have to project their own syntactic phrase. As a result, they are either picked up by successive-cyclic lowering of negation or they are not. The former leads to a cluster-internal position of the clitics (as the clitic forms a constituent with negation), the latter leads to a cluster-final position since the clitic is skipped and, at a later level, leans onto the predicate in search for a phonological host.

Thus, the clitics can only precede AUX in the presence of negation, which follows from the fact that it is the negation that moves. The clitics move along with the negation but do not move themselves. Under a syntactic head-mvt account, it would be impossible to derive the orders [V-Neg-Cl-Aux] and [V-Neg-Aux-Cl] if the direction of adjunction is kept constant: Right-adjunction only results in [Neg-Cl-Aux], [Neg-Aux-Cl] requires left- and right-adjunction. But under flexible direction of adjunction, one can no longer derive the second-to-last position of negation.

Outlook: The necessity of a postsyntactic treatment of verb cluster formation is further demonstrated by cases of constituent negation in Mari, where the negative head is adjoined to the respective constituent. Interestingly, the adjoined negation is accompanied by a copula which can be shown to be completely void of syntactic or semantic features.

- (11) Tõj šaxmat dene o-g-õl, a šaške dene mod-õć
 2SG chess with NEG-PRES.(3SG)-BE, but checkers with play-PAST.2SG
 'You played not (with) chess but (with) checkers.'

We claim that this copula is inserted on PF as a repair to remedy Neg's requirement to be in a local relation with a verb in cases where lowering is impossible. Further, we explore the interactions of lowering with ellipsis in fragment answers and the interaction of split ϕ -probes (cf Sigurðsson & Holmberg 2008) with the postsyntactic module to account for the distribution of ϕ -features on various heads in negated verb clusters. In Mari, ϕ -features are all on the negation, whereas in Udmurt person features attach to Neg and number attaches to the connegative verb. Finally, we show the necessity for the verb cluster forming operation to be independent of the headedness of the language: While Mari is fairly strictly OV, Udmurt allows for much more word order variation and has been claimed to undergo a change to VO (Asztalos 2018). Against the background of the argument made above, we explore several possible analyses of postverbal elements (base generation, syntactic or postsyntactic extraposition).

Selected References: • Arkhangelskiy. 2014. Clitics in the Beserman Dialect of Udmurt. • Asztalos. 2018. Szórendi típusváltás az udmurt nyelvben. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University PhD Thesis • Arregi & Nevins. 2012. Morphotactics. Dordrecht • Edygarova. 2015. Negation in Udmurt. In Negation in Uralic Languages. JB. • Embick, & Noyer. 2001. Movement Operations after Syntax. LI • Lechner. 2007. Interpretive Effects of Head Movement. lingbuzz/000178. • Mitchell. 2006. The morpho-syntax of negation and the positions of NegP in the Finno-Ugric languages. *Lingua*. • Saarinen. 2015. Negation in Mari. In Negation in Uralic Languages. JB. • Sigurðsson & Holmberg. 2008. Icelandic dative intervention. Agreement restrictions. Mouton.