Abstract

This large scale study of negation in English of the period 800-1500AD synthesizes three areas of linguistics: Minimalist syntactic theory, quantitative methodology, and textual study of data from two new large syntactically parsed corpora of Old English (Taylor 2002) and Middle English (Kroch & Taylor 2000). I integrate recent formal models of Minimalist syntactic representation (Chomsky 1995, 2000) with recent quantitative methods and models of change (Kroch 1989) to provide an economical and empirically defensible Minimalist analysis of changes in early English negation observed in progress across a large early English corpus. Quantitative data from morphosyntactic change in progress crucially establish the most appropriate syntactic analysis of early English negation and underpin a new model of grammaticalisation.

I present empirical evidence to distinguish three patterns of early English negation which are ordered in time to constitute Jespersen’s Cycle (Jespersen 1917). These three stages are distinguished within a Minimalist syntactic framework (Chomsky 1995; 2000) using different morphosyntactic features. This approach accommodates the observed distribution of sentential negators in all early English clause types, unlike the accounts proposed by Frisch (1997) or van Kemenade (2000). I claim that grammaticalisation involves change in formal morphosyntactic features. My proposals distinguish two types of polarity head. One has LF interpretable NEG-features. The other does not have any LF interpretation. The Neg-criterion (Haegeman 1995) is reduced to a morphosyntactic feature checking dependency only applicable when the negative head does not bear LF interpretable NEG-features.

Quantitative evidence establishes the relationships between change in the position of negation in clause structure, change to the form of sentential negation, and change to the availability of multiple negation. A Minimalist approach to parametric variation provides a new perspective on the relationships between these early English changes, challenging previous accounts which link changes in the position of negation to Jespersen’s Cycle (van Kemenade 2000) and which link changes in the availability of multiple negation to Jespersen’s Cycle (Rowlett 1998).
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### List of Abbreviations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative Case (in glosses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>Dative Case (in glosses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EME</td>
<td>Early Middle English (c.1150-1350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMnE</td>
<td>Early Modern English (c.1500-1700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive Case (in glosses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMC</td>
<td>Head Movement Constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Lexical Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Logical Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>Late Middle English (c.1350-1500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Middle English (c.1150-1500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHG</td>
<td>Middle High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Sentential negation (in glosses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegV1</td>
<td>A negated finite verb in clause initial position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne+Vf</td>
<td>The negator ne proclitic on the finite verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominative case (in glosses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPI</td>
<td>Negative Polarity item (for example English <em>any</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Old English (c.800-1150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op</td>
<td>Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDE</td>
<td>Present Day English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Phonological form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLD</td>
<td>Primary Linguistic Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPCME2</td>
<td>Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (2nd edition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prn</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Quantifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>Quantifier Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>Subjunctive mood (in glosses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCOE</td>
<td>York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vf</td>
<td>Finite verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X&lt;sup&gt;0&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A syntactic head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP</td>
<td>A maximal projection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1

Issues and Approaches

1.1 Introduction

This thesis discusses the syntactic representation of negation in the early English period 800-1500AD. It encompasses both Old English (800-1150) and Middle English (1150-1500), aiming to establish the syntactic representation at various periods of English and aiming to provide insights into the changes which link these diachronic stages. The Old and Middle English periods witness far-reaching changes in the way negation is marked or expressed. My aims will be both empirical and theoretical. The thesis provides a longer perspective on changes to negation than previous studies. This will enable me to say with a greater degree of certainty exactly what forms negation takes in Old and Middle English and provide a more comprehensive picture of changes in the early English period. The work is based on detailed textual analysis of data from two large syntactically parsed electronic corpora of Old English and Middle English prose, and one smaller syntactically parsed corpus of Old English poetry (the York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry (Pintzuk and Plug 2001)). The Old English prose corpus is the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE) (Taylor et al. 2003). The Middle English prose corpus is the second edition of the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (PPCME2) (Kroch and Taylor 2000a). Both prose corpora consist of 1.5 million words of syntactically tagged and parsed English from the written historical record. These are much larger resources than those available to previous studies of negation, and facilitate a more detailed syntactic account of negation in early English.

The most important empirical contribution this thesis will make is to examine
changes to the early English syntax of negation as a whole within a fairly long
time period of seven centuries (800-1500AD). This is a sufficiently long timespan
to track several changes from inception to completion. Here, I establish the range
of grammatical options at various diachronic stages. The work proposes a repre-
sentation of negation in early English within a syntactic framework of Principles
and Parameters, using the limited range of formal devices and proposals put for-
ward in recent Minimalist work. So my aim is to provide an empirically adequate
syntactic account, which takes account of variation and change but is constrained
by Minimalist notions of parameter. My aims and methods will be familiar from
cross-linguistic or typological studies of parametric variation, the difference be-
ing that here the dialects under investigation do not bear a spatial relation to each
other, but rather a temporal one.

I adopt recent proposals which treat change as grammar competition (Kroch
1989; 1994). These allow change to be modelled over time in ways which inform
the nature of the syntactic options in competition. Using a grammatical com-
petition model of change, I will show that the statistical patterning of changing
usage over time allows us to make much more informed analyses of the syntactic
options which constitute each parameter in a change scenario. Usage frequen-
cies provide statistical evidence of the changing distribution of grammatical op-
tions over time. The relationships which hold between grammatical options in
variation during the course of change provide a new perspective on parametric
change. Quantifying the use of various structural options is just as important
to the analysis as the more conventional qualitative approaches which identify
the range of options in parametric variation. Using quantitative data to model
change provides a basis to make distinctions between different ways of structur-
ing syntactic parameters and hence between different syntactic accounts, in a way
which synchronic studies do not. I seek to establish the range of surface changes
which are attributable to particular parameters, and thereby delimit the number
of parameters required to account for the observed variation. The structure of
each syntactic parameter is informed by the relationship between grammatical
options in actual use.

1.1.1 Minimalist approaches to syntactic variation and change

Throughout the thesis, I will strive for an analysis of early English negation which
is Minimalist in the sense of Chomsky (1995; 1999; 2000). I will follow the version
of Minimalism set out in Chomsky (1999; 2000) for the most part, to see how this framework deals with diachronic data and parametric change. The framework uses morphosyntactic features to drive syntactic operations. Syntactic configurations are the result of feature-driven operations. The intuition which the Minimalist framework formalises is that the syntactic derivation is an optimal response to conditions outside the syntax, at the point where the syntactic structure interfaces with other modules of the brain: the Articulatory-Perceptual interface, which gives the syntactic structure morphological and phonological realisation, and the Conceptual-Intensional interface which gives the structure its logical interpretation. The output of the syntactic derivation must be legible at both interfaces. This implies that the syntax is a perfect and invariant system, which is empirically falsified by the range of parametric variation seen across languages. Given that features drive all syntactic operations, syntactic variation must be seen in terms of the distribution of morphosyntactic features.

Chomsky (1995; 2000) claims that movement is a consequence of features which are defective at the LF interface. These are features which the LF interface cannot interpret, hence the computation must work to eliminate such features before the interface is reached. Any LF uninterpretable features which remain at the interface cause the derivation to crash: the derivation cannot be interpreted as meaningful as it contains features which are uninterpretable at LF. In later work, Chomsky (1999) refines the notion of uninterpretable features, claiming that features consist of [F: value] pairs. Features which are unvalued as they enter the derivation must be valued during the derivation, by entering into a syntactic relation by matching with [F: value] pair of the same feature type. By entering into this relation, the unvalued feature is associated with an appropriate value. Features without a value are not well-formed objects which the LF interface can interpret. In order for the derivation to receive an interpretation at LF all unvalued ([F: ]) features must be valued. The role of unvalued features is to establish syntactic relations between elements. Unvalued features appear at first to be an imperfection in the system, but they do useful work, establishing information structure and scope relations through displacement of elements to higher positions.

The difference between valued and unvalued features is the only distinction between features which has syntactic effects. Chomsky allows the morphological realisations of morphosyntactic features to vary freely, but this variation is post-syntactic, located in the morphological component at the PF interface. There are
three axes of variation in this model. First, variation in the heads with which particular morphosyntactic features are associated. Second, the morphological realisation of morphosyntactic features. Third, the difference between valued and unvalued features on a particular head. This constitutes a severe restriction on the range of variation available in earlier Principles and Parameters approaches, and leaves us with a highly constrained view of parametric variation, which locates variation outside the syntax, either in the feature composition of items selected from the lexicon, or in the post-syntactic morphological realisation of these elements.

There are three syntactic operations in the system all of which value unvalued features: Merge which builds syntactic structure out of lexical items; Agree, which establishes syntactic relations between unvalued and valued features; and Re-Merge, which re-Merges the element targeted by Agree at the root. This happens whenever an [EPP] feature is found, and results in a local spec-head relation between the Agreeing elements. This exhausts the features and operations in Chomsky's system. Syntactic configurations are demoted in significance in comparison to previous Government-Binding approaches. In Minimalist bare-phrase structure theory, which I will adopt, there is no requirement for each head to have a single specifier, as in $X'$-theory.

1.1.2 Assumptions concerning diachronic change

In order to make sense of the variation in Old and Middle English negation strategies, I will make extensive use of quantitative methodology. This allows me to distinguish stable variation from processes of change and examine the interaction of grammatical options over time. This is important to a full understanding of the constitution of a syntactic parameter. We can establish the relationship of options to each other over time. I will argue that grammatical options in direct variation or competition with each other should be regarded as different settings of a single parameter. In order to pursue this approach, I adopt a parameter resetting model of language change, together with the grammar competition model, and the techniques associated with it for modelling change over time.

I assume, following Lightfoot (1979; 1999) that syntactic change occurs through parameter resetting during language acquisition. Each generation of language learners constructs a new grammar, setting parameters on the basis of the data available to them in their linguistic environment (the Primary Linguistic data or
PLD). The problem is that the PLD does not provide the language learner with direct access to the parameter settings of others in the speech community. The PLD is a set of utterances, which are affected by morphological and phonological processes external to the syntax. Therefore, phonological and morphological change affects the PLD available to the language learner and may cause the language learner to fix his or her parameters in a different way to others in the speech community. The frequency of particular types of construction in the PLD may also affect an individual’s parameter settings. Lightfoot argues that certain constructions are more salient cues for parameter setting than others. The most salient constructions are typically the most frequent. Therefore, changes in the frequency of particular grammatical options will have an effect on parameter resetting. Some data are more salient than others because they are unambiguous triggers of a particular parameter setting. Language learners set parameters on the basis of unambiguous PLD. Loss of these data may cause variation or change in the way parameters are set. Change in the way parameters are reset involves reanalysis of linguistic data by the language learner. PLD which once instantiated an old parameter comes to be reanalysed as the instantiation of a new parameter setting.

Minimalist syntax does not allow for ambiguous representations of linguistic data. Each string must map onto a single syntactic representation, so that each string is uniquely syntactically determined. Parameter resetting is typically taken to be abrupt, at least for the individual language learner. This account cannot handle the range of variation we find within individual texts of single authorship. This kind of variation indicates that there is competition between old and new parameter settings even at the level of the individual language learner. This is more in line with sociolinguistic studies, which show that individuals deploy a range of variation chosen from their linguistic repertoire according to the circumstances in which they are linguistic participants, for example the formality of the situation or the desire to project a particular image of solidarity or affiliation. Within a Minimalist account, each example of a particular string must be uniquely mapped onto a single syntactic representation, but that does not mean that there is only one analysis available to the language learner. Two or more structural representations may exist in competition, where they can be reduced to conflicting parameter settings. Kroch (1989) proposes that language users exhibit diglossia between multiple dialects with contradictory parameter settings. Henry (2002) argues that this situation leads to unconstrained levels of multidi-
alectalism given that each parameter setting may involve its own grammar. I will show during the course of this thesis that a Minimalist approach to parameters constrains the possible range of variation and does not require language learners to be multi-dialectal in the sense of Kroch (1989). Pintzuk et al. (2000, 12) propose that Minimalism allows incompatible options within a grammar to be in competition, rather than entire grammars.

More needs to be said about the definition of parameters in the Minimalist framework. Quantitative methods show the way in which innovative parameter settings are diffused throughout linguistic contexts. The diffusion of a new parameter setting is distinct from the reanalysis which leads to the new setting in the first place. The former is a matter of language use, the latter a matter of syntactic reanalysis. The factors which promote competition rather than variation must lie outside the syntax or the process of parameter resetting itself. These may be to do with parsing, communicative felicity or the extralinguistic evaluation of particular options. I will not spend a lot of time being concerned with the problems of actuation or diffusion of syntactic variants, more in identifying what the variants are and the range of variation allowed within a Minimalist framework. Quantitative methodology will allow me to isolate parameters, to examine what constitutes a parameter, examine the relationships holding between syntactic parameters, and also to examine whether the loci of parameteric variation made available by the Minimalist program are sufficient to account for the observed range of parametric variation in diachronic rather than synchronic data.

Quantitative methodology measures the frequency of new and old parameters in use. The two parameters are discrete and structurally incompatible. In measuring the frequency of parametric options in use, I follow the grammar competition model of Kroch (1989; 1994). Grammar competition follows an S-curve when plotted over time and follows the Constant Rate Effect. The Constant Rate Effect states that for each context in which two parameters are in competition, the rate of change from the old to the new parameter setting will be the same. The frequency of an innovative parameter setting may differ according to context, but the effect of the context on the innovative parameter setting remains constant throughout the change. The crucial point which will become important in chapter 5 is that processes of grammatical competition can be differentiated by the way in which contextual factors condition different grammatical competition processes.
1.2 A Typology of sentential negation

This section will present a cross-linguistic typology of negation, identifying the various forms which negation can take in natural languages. It will also describe some of the well known patterns of variation in negation which recur in natural languages. Principal among these is a pattern of change involving sentential negators known as Jespersen's Cycle (Jespersen 1917). However, before discussing the morphosyntactic forms which negation can take, some brief remarks on the semantic interpretation of negation are necessary here.

1.2.1 The semantic representation of sentential negation

Two types of negation are distinguished in the literature: constituent versus sentential negation (Klima 1964). The distinction is concerned with the scope of negation. Sentential negation takes scope over the clause (1), whereas constituent negation negates a constituent which is smaller than the clause, such as a noun phrase (2).

(1) a. Ne ferde heo worigende geond land
   NEG went she roaming throughout land
   'she did not go roaming far throughout the land'
   (cocathom1,+ACHom_I,-9:255.194.1744)

   b. I shal not go fro the
      I shall not go from you
      'I shall not leave you'
      (CMAELR4,12.310)

(2) a. þonne wat ic swiðe lytel oððe nanwiht
    then knew I very little or nothing
    'then I knew very little or nothing'
    (cosolilo,Solil_3:66.31.929)

   b. Alexander cwæð þæt he ondrede God and nærne oðerne on
      Alexander said that he feared God and no other on
      andwerdum life
      actual life
      'Alexander said that he feared God and no other in this life'
      (cocathom2,+ACHom_IL,-20:176.79.3898)

Klima (1964) gives some diagnostics for distinguishing constituent and sentential negation readings in other contexts. Sentential negation licenses nega-
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tive polarity items such as *any, ever*, and clauses with sentential negation take positive tag questions. Constituent negation does not license negative polarity items, and clauses involving constituent negation take negative tag questions. The problem of distinguishing constituent and sentential negation is particularly acute for early English. Klima's tests are difficult to use in the absence of native speaker judgements, although I will attempt to apply them to Old English (OE) and Middle English (ME) where possible. I take the view that negatives take sentential scope unless there is unambiguous evidence for a constituent scope reading. For my purposes here, unambiguous instances of constituent negation appear in clauses where the negative phrase is contrasted or coordinated with a non-negative phrase (2).

There is some debate in the semantic literature, discussed at length by Horn (1989) concerning the semantic representation of sentential negation. At issue is whether the negation operator operates on propositions, such that a proposition $p$ is negated to become $\neg p$, or whether the negative operator operates on predicates, giving 'subject - neg - predicate'. While the locus of propositional negation is high, the locus of predicate negation is low. Horn argues that the close association of negation and the finite verb in natural languages supports the view that negation is a mode of predication, and that there are negative predicates. That negation is a mode of predication has been generally assumed in Principles and Parameters theory since Pollock (1989) represented negation using the functional projection NegP within the INFL complex. I will adopt the same view here, assuming that negation is a mode of predication.1

1.2.2 A typology of sentential negative markers

In many languages negation can be marked on a range of quantifiers or adverbs, for example Present Day English (PDE) *nothing, no-one, never, nowhere*. In addition, languages have negative markers, such as PDE *not*. Unlike negative quantifiers or adverbs which combine negation with some restriction on the negation (*nothing = NO+thing, never = NO+time*), negative markers are elements whose only meaning is the logical operator negation ($\neg$). The Present Day English negative markers are *not* or the contracted clitic form *n't*. The discussion in this section

---

1We will see that negation has a tendency to appear clause initially in certain languages, which apparently supports the idea of negation as a propositional operator in these languages. We might perhaps admit that negation can be either a propositional operator, a mode of predication, with the choice of representation a matter of parametric variation (see section 1.2.5 for discussion).
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will concern itself with the typology of negative markers. Negative quantifiers and negative adverbs are discussed in section 1.2.3.

From a cross-linguistic perspective, Dahl (1979) distinguishes two types of negative markers. One is part of the morphology of the finite verb, the other is an independent negative particle. Arguably, PDE exhibits both types: not is a negative particle which is separable from the finite verb (3a), whilst the contracted n't is affixed to the finite verb, moving along with the finite verb in questions for instance (3b).

(3) a. Did they not warn you?
   b. Didn’t they warn you?

Dahl (1979, 81) distinguishes between synthetic negation which is a verbal inflection, and analytic negation which employs a separate negative particle. Dahl (1979) also notes languages which express negation using two negative markers:

In quite a few languages, Neg is expressed by adding TWO particles rather than one. The most well known is French:

(4) Je ne sais pas ‘I do not know’

Jespersen (1917) observes that variation between negative markers is structured across time. Negative markers are reinforced by a second negative adverb or particle, which comes to replace the original negative marker. Jespersen (1917, 4ff) illustrates with examples from the history of Latin, French, Old Norse and English. The changes undergone by English are summarized below (5-7). This sequence of changes has become known in the literature as Jespersen’s Cycle. Throughout the thesis, I will use the terms ‘unsupported ne’ to refer to ne at stage one, and ‘bipartite negation’ to refer to ne...not at stage two.

(5) ic ne secge (stage 1: Old English)
   I NEG say

(6) I ne seye not (stage 2: Early Middle English)
   I NEG say not

(7) I say not (stage 3: Late Middle English)
   (Jespersen 1917, ex.1-3, 4)

2In using these terms, Dahl situates variability in negation with respect to other typological differences between languages, pointing to the possibility that variation and change in negative markers may be a subcase of a more general shift from a synthetic to an analytic language. Synthetic languages typically have much more inflectional morphology than analytic languages.
The history of negative expressions in various languages makes us witness the following curious fluctuation: the original negative adverb is first weakened, then found insufficient and therefore strengthened, generally through some additional word, and this in turn may be felt as the negative proper and may then in course of time be subject to the same development of the additional word.

(Jespersen 1917, 4)

We see that there is a change in the sentential negation strategies used in early English. In chapter 2, I will discuss the syntax of *ne* and *not* in more detail. In Dahl's typology *ne* corresponds to a verbal inflection and *not* to a negative particle. It is tempting to view Jespersen's Cycle as a case of change from synthetic to analytic forms of negation, in Dahl's (1979) terms. Old English and Early Middle English are characterised by loss of morphological distinctions, for example in case, mood and verbal agreement systems. Loss of case morphology has been argued to have effects on word order (Weerman 1997, Kiparsky 1997), and loss of mood morphology on the development of modal systems, including the infinitive marker *to* which is a non-finite modal (Roberts and Roussou 2003). However, this thesis will examine only changes in negation, leaving aside the broader typological implications of change under Jespersen's Cycle. My central theme will be to provide a syntactic analysis of Jespersen's Cycle which is supported by quantitative data from change in progress.

Chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis discuss the analysis of Jespersen's Cycle and its progress in early English in greater detail. What is interesting about Jespersen's Cycle as a pattern of change is that the new form of negation does not immediately replace the old form, but coexists with it for a time. There is apparent redundancy in the marking of negation at stage two of the cycle. This pattern recurs in many languages, and is not particular to English. I will show that this pattern of change can be reconciled with Minimalist notions of parametric variation, and also accounted for within the grammar competition model (Kroch 1989).

### 1.2.3 Co-occurrence of negative words

Languages vary in the interpretation they assign to clauses in which two or more negative words co-occur. There are two interpretations available in such clauses: a logically 'double negation' reading in which two negatives cancel each other out, resulting in a non-negative reading, or a 'multiple negation' reading in which
two or more negatives do not cancel each other out, and the clause is assigned a sentential negation reading. Jespersen (1917, 62) states:

When logicians insist that "two negatives make an affirmative" their rule is not corroborated by actual usage in most languages.
(Jespersen 1917, 62)

The contrast between the interpretation of (8) and (9) illustrates the difference between multiple negation and double negation languages. The Romance languages are typically multiple negation languages. (8a) illustrates Spanish multiple negation, and (8b) Italian. The Present Day Germanic languages are typically double negation languages. (9) gives the Present Day Standard English equivalent of (8a), and illustrates the difference in interpretation.

(8)  
   a. No conozco a nadie (Spanish)  
       NEG know no-one  
       'I don't know anyone'  
       (Rowlett 1998, ex.14a, ch.3,98)
   b. Gianni non dice niente a nessuno  
       Gianni NEG says nothing to no-one  
       'Gianni doesn't say anything to anyone'  
       (Rowlett 1998, ex.15c, ch.3,98)

(9)  
   a. I don't know no-one (Double Negation = I know someone)

There are two types of multiple negation which I will distinguish throughout the thesis. I will adopt terminology from van der Wouden (1994) to identify the two types. One type involves the regular negative marker in combination with a negative quantifier or adverb. (10a) illustrates multiple negation with the Italian negative marker non. Wouden labels this NEGATIVE DOUBLING. The second type does not involve the negative marker. Instead negative adverbs or quantifiers co-occur with each other. Wouden terms this NEGATIVE SPREAD. (10b) illustrates negative spread in Italian.

(10)  
   a. Mario non ha visto nessuno (Italian)  
       Mario NEG has seen no-one  
       'Mario hasn't seen anyone'  
       (Rowlett 1998, ex.15a, ch.3, 98)
b. Nessuno ha fatto niente (Italian)
   No-one has done nothing
   ‘No-one has done anything’ 
   (Rowlett 1998, ex.15b, ch.3, 98)

Multiple negation involves redundancy in the morphological marking of negation. In a multiple negation clause, negation is morphologically marked on more than one element, despite the fact that multiple negation clauses receive a negative interpretation just as if they contained only one negative (see (8)). Jespersen (1917) characterises multiple negation as a kind of redundancy. He relates the availability of multiple negation to the position of a language on Jespersen’s Cycle.

...repeated negation seems to become a habitual phenomenon only in those languages in which the ordinary negative element is comparatively small in regard to phonetic bulk, as ne and n- in OE and Russian... The insignificance of these elements makes it desirable to multiply them so as to prevent their being overlooked. Hence also the comparative infrequency of this repetition in English and German, after the fuller negatives not and nicht have been thoroughly established. (Jespersen 1917, 71-72)

Rowlett (1998) develops a syntactic account of Jespersen’s observation which links the loss of multiple negation to the introduction of negative markers such as French pas and English not under Jespersen’s Cycle. I will outline Rowlett’s analysis in section 1.4.2, and examine his hypothesis in detail in chapter 6 using historical English data.

The availability of multiple negation readings needs to be parametrised to account for variation between multiple negation and double negation languages. Two issues are relevant. First, what is the most appropriate way to represent the difference between multiple negation and double negation languages in the syntax? I will discuss recent syntactic accounts of multiple negation at length. Second, what is the relationship between ways of marking sentential negation and the availability of multiple negation? In chapter 6, I will bring evidence from early English to bear on these questions.
1.2.4 Redundant negation

Another phenomenon which Jespersen (1917) observes is the redundant use of negative markers. A negative marker may appear in the clausal complements of certain verbs without contributing a negative meaning to its clause. This type of negation has also been termed 'paratactic negation' (Jespersen 1917) or 'expletive negation' (Baghdikian 1979, van der Wurff 1999b). Jespersen (1917, 75) defines the phenomenon as follows:

...paratactic negation: a negative is placed in a clause dependent on a verb of negative import like 'deny, forbid, hinder, doubt'.... It is well known how this develops in some languages to a fixed rule, especially if the negative employed has no longer its full force ...

(Jespersen 1917, 75)

Van der Wouden (1994, 108ff) identifies more contexts for the redundant use of negators, including: verbs expressing fear (11), verbs expressing prohibition (12), some comparative constructions (13), and after certain conjunctions (14) meaning 'before, unless, without'. He claims that all these contexts have negative import.

(11) J'ai peur qu'il ne vienne (French)
I fear that he not come
'I fear he will come'
(van der Wouden 1994, ch.2, ex.38a, 108)

(12) J'empêche qu'il ne vienne (French)
I prevent that he not come
'I prevent him from coming'
(van der Wouden 1994, ch.2 ex.40a, 108)

(13) Il est autre que je ne croyais (French)
It is other than I not believed
'It is other than I thought'
(van der Wouden 1994, ch.2 ex.44a, 109)

(14) Avant que il ne fasse froid (French)
Before that it not gets cold
'Before it gets cold'
(van der Wouden 1994, ch.2 ex.45a, 109)

We will see that early English had redundant negation at a particular stage of its history. Van der Wouden (1994, 114) postulates a close link between multiple negation and redundant negation, indicating that variation and change in
the availability of multiple negation may influence the availability of redundant negation. I will consider the relationship of redundant negation to Jespersen’s Cycle in chapter 4.

1.2.5 The position of negatives in clause structure

Jespersen (1917, 5) notes two tendencies in the placement of negation, first for sentential negation to appear clause initially, and second for sentential negation to immediately precede the finite verb.

...there is a natural tendency, also for the sake of clearness, to place the negative first, or at any rate as soon as possible, very often before the particular word to be negatived (generally the verb...). At the very beginning of the sentence it is found comparatively often in the early stages of some languages...

(Jespersen 1917, 5)

Eythorsson (2002) observes this tendency in a range of Germanic languages, including Old Norse (15), Old English (16), and its ancestor Gothic (17).

(15) Kemr-a nu Gunnarr (Old Norse)
Comes-NEG now Gunnarr
‘Gunnarr does not come now’
(Gōr III 8, (Eythorsson 2002, ex.14a))

(16) Ne gefrægn ic freondlicor feower madmas (Old English)
NEG learned I friendlier four treasures
‘I did not learn of four friendlier treasures’
(Beowulf 1027, (Eythorsson 2002, ex.12b))

(17) ni hugjaþ ei qemjau gatairan witob (Gothic)
NEG think that came-1SG tear-down law
‘do not think that I came to tear down the law’
(Matt 5:17, (Eythorsson 2002, ex.12a))

However, the initial placement of negation in these languages entails fronting of the finite verb. Here, we see both a tendency for negation to be adjacent to the finite verb, and also to be placed first. Dahl (1979, 93) observes that ‘Neg morphemes occur early in the sentence if the verb does, but not to any greater extent if it does not.’ This is evidence for negation as a predicate level operator rather than propositional operator.
Fronting of negation typically entails fronting of the finite verb. However, van Kemenade (2000) observes that there are some negative-initial clauses in Old English in which the initial negative element is separated from the finite verb (18).

(18) no ic me an herewæsum hna græm tælige...
    NEG I myself in prowess poor consider...
    'I do not consider myself poor in prowess'
    *(Beowulf, 677-8, van Kemenade (2000, ex.11b))*

Old English appears typologically anomalous, for reasons I will consider in chapter 3. Variation and change in the position of negatives in clausal structure will inform the syntactic analysis of negative initial clauses. Previous accounts of negative-initial clauses in the history of English (van Kemenade 2000, Ingham 2005) link the disappearance of negative-initial clauses to change in sentential negation strategies under Jespersen's Cycle. However, Jespersen himself, in his (1917) work, does not associate change in the position of negatives to Jespersen's Cycle. Quantitative data showing diachronic change in progress will inform discussion of the relationship between the placement of negation and Jespersen's Cycle in early English.

1.2.6 Summary: the typology of negation and parametric change

The preceding section illustrates the range of typological variation in negative expressions which have been the subject of many syntactic studies in the Principles and Parameters framework. This thesis will take a different perspective on parametric variation. Instead of examining cross-linguistic variation, I will confine my investigations to early English of the period 800-1500CE. My main focus will be what quantitative data from diachronic change reveal concerning parametric change in a large corpus of early English texts.

The preceding discussion makes clear that typological differences in the expression of negation exist not just between languages, but are also manifest as differences between diachronic stages of a single language such as English. Observations by Jespersen (1917) show certain recurrent patterns of variation and pathways of change for which any analysis of parametric change must account. Furthermore, the discussion of typological variation in negation opens up the interesting possibility that the parametric changes to the system of negation may
be quite abstract, if it can be shown that typological changes cluster together. Jespersen (1917) proposes to link changes in sentential negation and the availability of multiple negation. Van Kemenade (2000) links changes in the position of negation in early English to changes in sentential negation strategies. In the light of these proposals it is right to ask how many parameters are required to account for the observed typological variation in negation, and consequently also right to ask how abstract the notion of parameter needs to be to account for the observed variation.

Analysis of diachronic change in real time will address the relationship between typological options over time. This will provide a quantitative demonstration of how abstract the notion of parameter needs to be. Kroch (1989) demonstrates that morphosyntactic changes which are the reflex of a single underlying parametric change will proceed at the same rate over time in all their contexts (the Constant Rate Effect (Kroch 1989)). This makes two very strong predictions. First, if the loss of multiple negation and changes in the position of negation are linked to Jespersen's Cycle these properties will cluster together at certain diachronic stages of the language, such that implicational relationships of the type 'if a language expresses negation using a negative marker which is enclitic on the finite verb, it also exhibits multiple negation' will hold. Second, and more interestingly from the point of view of parametric change, if two or more typological shifts (say changes in sentential negation and the availability of multiple negation) are manifestations of a single parametric change, then there will be parallels between the way these typological shifts will pattern across time when studied quantitatively within the grammar competition model. Thus quantitative data from diachronic change will provide an empirical means of testing theories of parametric variation in a large corpus of early English textual data.

1.3 Syntactic analyses of negation: Principles and Parameters approaches

1.3.1 Representation of negation in clausal structure

Early work in transformational grammar represented negation as a clause peripheral operator (Klima 1964), which lowered into its surface position adjacent to the finite verb. Lasnik (1972) argues that there are two positions for negation
in clause structure: one, a clause initial peripheral operator similar to Klima’s, the second a position for NEG associated with English auxiliaries. Analyses of negation in other Germanic languages such as the Scandinavian languages and German have treated the negatives ekki (Norwegian) and nicht (German) as VP-adjoined adverbials. Two arguments have been advanced for this view. First the similarity between negation and VP adjuncts in respect of object scrambling across them. Definite DPs and pronouns can move leftwards across negation, just as they can move across VP adverbs such as manner adverbs (Diesing 1997). Second, the negative marker has no effect on selectional relations which hold between VP and TP, indicating that negation is not a head.

However, the analysis of negation as an adjoined adverb is unsatisfactory for PDE not. The range of positions available to PDE not is much more restricted than the range of positions available to adjuncts. It cannot precede the finite verb. In PDE negation is distinct from adverbs in another way. not only appears with a subset of finite verbs: modal and aspectual auxiliaries and periphrastic do.\(^3\) This complicates the syntax of negation considerably as there is a syntactic relationship between negation and the finite verb to be taken into account. Modals, aspectuals and periphrastic do are the only finite verbs which appear in the syntactic head Tense (T\(^0\)) in PDE.\(^4\)

This relationship between Tense and negation is characterised by Pollock (1989), Ouhalla (1990) and Chomsky (1995, chapter 2) as selection of negation by tense so that negation is the complement of tense. This allows the co-occurrence of not with a lexicalised T (do, modal or auxiliary) to be stated in terms of Government. The negative head blocks the Government relation between T and V which holds in declarative clauses. As Government holds only between heads, the PDE interaction of negation and the verbal system is accepted evidence for associating a head with negation (Neg\(^0\)) in the literature.

Accounts of do-support (Chomsky 1995, Lasnik 1999) take do to be inserted directly in T as a last resort lexicalisation of Tense features in the absence of other means to lexicalise Tense features by verb-raising or affix-lowering. Lexical verbs do not undergo movement out of V\(^0\): finite verbs follow adverbials (19), unlike in French (20).

\(^3\)Han and Kroch (2000), Han (2000) analyse periphrastic do as a type of last-resort aspectual marker.

\(^4\)Unlike most other Germanic languages which have generalised V to T movement for all lexical verbs.
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(19) a. John often kisses Mary
    b. * John kisses often Mary
    (Pollock 1989, 367, ex.4a,c)

(20) a. * Jean souvent embrasse Marie
    b. Jean embrasse souvent Marie
    (Pollock 1989, 367, ex.4b,d)

For Pollock (1989) and Chomsky (1995, chapter 2), negation blocks the relation of Government which would otherwise hold between Tense and the lexical verb. A first approximation of the blocking effect of negation might take not as a head and appeal to the Head Movement Constraint, as Ouhalla (1990) does, but this cannot be correct as it stands. There is evidence from the scope interactions between negation and modals that some modals are base generated or merged in a position lower than negation, and move across negation to T° during the derivation. This idea is based on the view, first, that inverse scope readings are achieved by reconstruction (Roberts 1998); and second, that an element cannot reconstruct to a position which it has not occupied during the course of the derivation. So, there is evidence for verb movement across negation, at least for some modals.

(21) There can’t be a unicorn in the garden (NOT - POSSIBLE) (Roberts 1998, 115, ex.6a)

(22) You needn’t do that (NOT - OBLIGATION) (Roberts 1998, 116, ex.7b)

So it seems that while negation does not block overt raising of modals and aspectuals across it, it does block other relations between T and V such as the lowering of Tense affixes onto V (Lasnik 1999).^5^5

We are left with a paradox: negation must be a head in order to capture the selectional relationship which holds between it and Tense; but not does not behave like a head under the head movement constraint (HMC). Pollock (1989, 397) attempts to make not exempt from the head movement constraint, by claiming that

---

^5^The reason lexical verbs fail to move overtly to Tense in PDE is arguably due to the features of T rather than the presence of negation. For Pollock (1989) English V to T movement is blocked by the inability of the lexical verb to raise to a head which is intermediate between T and V, but lower than negation. Han (2000), Han and Kroch (2000) analyse the loss of V to T movement with lexical verbs as the loss of V° to Asp° movement (where Asp° is an aspectual head). Asp° to T° movement persists in PDE, as demonstrated by movement of aspectual auxiliaries be and have to T°.
it is ‘inert for government’. Alternatively, he proposes that not might be the speci-
ifier of a null negative head (Neg°).

The internal structure of English NegP is more problematic. If, as tenta-
tively suggested so far, not is the head of NegP, then some version of Rizzi’s “relativized” minimality must be adopted since not does not block movement of be/have/do to TP. Although it lacks the overt (syn-
chronic) support it has in French, one could adopt the alternative idea that NegP in English has a null head and that not stands in its specifier position, like pas in French. This would allow us to preserve an “absolute” version of minimality, at least for the problems at hand, since the pertinent verbs would move through the empty head position of NegP on their way to Tense.

(Pollock 1989, 412)

This transfers the problem of violation of the Head Movement Constraint to the null Neg°. The HMC is circumvented by the claim that the null Neg° can cliticise to V under V to T movement (Pollock 1989, 421), hence it is not a barrier to verb movement. French ne offers overt support for the idea of Neg° as a clitic on the finite verb which moves to T°. As a clitic head, Neg° will not block verb movement through Neg°, instead cliticising to the finite verb. However, in the absence of verb movement, Neg° will block Government between T and V. The idea that the negative head is a clitic is supported by the behaviour of the negative affix ne in French for instance which cliticises to the finite verb as it moves to T°. However, the idea does not receive the same sort of morphological support in English, in which the clitic head Neg° must be null. The question to be asked is whether the syntactic and morphological evidence for negation in a head position is sufficient to justify positing a separate negative head (Neg°). In chapter 4, I show that a feature driven account provides a new perspective on this question.

Ernst (1992) notes problems associated with the NegP approach. He distin-
guishes two approaches: one in which not is the head of NegP, the other in which not is the specifier of a null Neg°. The problems which the first analysis poses

---

6Roberts (1998) proposes an alternative analysis to derive the blocking effect of negation using morphosyntactic features. He proposes to associate [neg] features with do, modals and auxiliaries. The result is that these verbs can move through Neg°, obeying the Head Movement Constraint by virtue of the fact that these verbs have [neg] features. Lexical verbs do not have [neg] features, hence movement through Neg° is blocked.
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for the Head Movement Constraint are the apparent HMC violations discussed above. Ernst (1992, 122) says:

First, allowing Neg to never have any semantic content or grammatical function (except to license not in Spec) ... should be troubling: if Universal Grammar permits this sort of structure, the Head Movement Constraint is rendered vacuous. That is, given a configuration like that in (23) [Ernst's ex. 29], where Y° appears to have raised over X°, it will always be possible to claim that X° is really an XP, in spec of (or adjoined to) some empty headed, inert functional projection ... between Y° and its trace:

(23) Y°; ... X° ... t,

...Treating not as a Spec has the merit of respecting the Head Movement Constraint; it runs into trouble by retaining the maximal projection NegP, with its obligatorily filled Spec, obligatorily empty head, and the problems raised by unconstrained use of the configuration containing them...

(Ernst 1992, 122-3)

Ernst (1992) takes a different approach to the derivation of PDE negative clauses which does not involve selection between Tense and negation. He makes no appeal to notions of Government, and does not posit a separate negative head Neg°. For Ernst (1992), the phrase structure of English negation does not involve NegP. Instead, negation is part of the lexical entry for auxiliary verbs such as don't, can't, won't. Negation and the auxiliary form a unit in the lexicon rather than by cliticisation in the syntax. The finding of Zwicky and Pullum (1983) that PDE negative auxiliaries are distinct lexical items supports Ernst's view. Ernst (1992) generates modals, auxiliaries and periphrastic do in a verbal V[AUX] projection which is lower than Tense. The PDE negative clitic n't is part of the lexical entries of auxiliary and modal verbs. The full negative form not is not part of the lexical entry of modals or auxiliaries. Instead, not is selected by V[AUX] as its specifier. Only auxiliaries select for the negative not. Lexical verbs do not. Hence the restricted distribution of negation in PDE can be accommodated without reference to a separate functional projection NegP.

The problem is how to accommodate periphrastic do in this analysis, if do is a last resort lexicalisation of T°, as Ouhalla (1990) has it. However, both Roberts
(1998) and Han (2000) place periphrastic *do* lower in the structure than TP. For Han (2000) PDE periphrastic *do* originates in Asp°, raising to T° rather than being inserted in T° directly. This view of *do*-support is consistent with Ernst’s (1992) account of *do* as a V[aux]. The selectional relationship between *not* and certain verbal forms restricts its distribution, in contrast to adverbs which are unselected. This account eliminates NegP and the problems associated with it, removing the abstract structure associated with negation. While selection of *not* is crucial to understanding its distribution, it is not necessarily part of a NegP. However, the standard Principles and Parameters approach to negation since Pollock (1989) has employed NegP. In chapter 4, I discuss the implications which a morphosyntactic feature based account of negation has for the structural representation of negation using NegP.

### 1.3.2 The internal structure of NegP

This section elaborates on the representation of negation using NegP, discussing proposals made in recent literature concerning the internal structure of NegP. An X’-theoretic approach makes head and specifier positions of NegP available to host negatives. In section 1.2.2, we saw that negation is predominantly expressed by a single element, but can be represented by two elements. Here I examine how the morphological exponents of negation map onto underlying syntactic structure.

A distinction is made between negatives which are verbal affixes (*ne*) and negative particles (*not, pas, nicht*). Negative affixes are realisations of the syntactic head Neg°. Negative particles are not heads, but adverbal elements. In studies which assume NegP negative affixes and negative particles instantiate the two positions made available within NegP: the head position Neg° is for affixal negatives and its specifier position is an adverbial position associated with negative particles. The use of NegP in the analysis follows from a particular approach to the syntax-morphology interface and from the desire to provide a phrase structure template for negation which constrains the range of possible parametric variation. The empirical evidence for a negative head position is weak. In most languages the negative head is never separated from the finite verb. However, the

---

7My aim in this thesis is to move away from phrase structure based constraints and provide a restatement of the parametric variation in negation in terms of morphosyntactic features and the relations which hold between features rather than positions. This approach is more consistent with recent Minimalist theories of syntax.
most widely adopted Principles and Parameters approach to syntax-morphology mapping requires NegP, as it maintains that each morpheme projects a functional head in the syntax. Postulating a negative head within an X'-theoretic approach to phrase structure entails that there will also be a negative specifier position.\(^8\) Part of the justification for associating each morpheme with a syntactic head has been to create specifier positions where required to host lexical material or provide landing sites for movement. A study of the verbal agreement system by Bobaljik and Thrainsson (1998) shows that overt agreement morphology is associated with a more articulated set of positions for subjects and objects and an enhanced range of movement possibilities for arguments. They account for these correlations between syntax and morphology by arguing that agreement markers project syntactic heads and make additional specifier positions available for arguments.

Syntactic arguments have been made for a specifier position of NegP, based first on agreement, and second on the range of movement possibilities in negative clauses. First, there are languages like French which mark negation using two negative markers. These are analysed as having spec-head agreement between the two negative markers (Pollock 1989, Ouhalla 1990) as (24) below.

\[
\text{(24) NegP} \\
\quad \text{pas} \quad \text{Neg'} \\
\quad \text{ne+V} \quad \text{XP}
\]

Second, arguments have been made that all languages with a negative head also have a negative particle in spec, NegP underlyingly (Ouhalla 1990, Haegeman 1995), even when there is no overt morphological evidence for a negative particle. The structure of NegP proposed for these languages is (25).

\[
\text{(25) NegP} \\
\quad \text{null Op} \quad \text{Neg'} \\
\quad \text{ne} \quad \text{XP}
\]

Evidence comes from the weak island effects induced by negation which were observed by Rizzi (1990). Negation seems to block movement of adverbials across

---

\(^8\)Analyses of negation as a VP-adjunct in the Germanic languages such as Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) show that the converse implicational relationship need not hold. The existence of a negative particle or adverbial does not necessarily imply the existence of a negative head or the functional projection NegP.
it (26b) in the same way as embedded wh-phrases (26c) do. In (26a), the interpretation in which the adverbial for this reason is construed with the embedded clause is licit, indicating that the adverbial has moved out of the embedded clause. In (26b) and (26c) the adverbial for this reason can only be construed with the main clause, indicating that the adverbial cannot move out of the embedded clause across the negation. In the brackets following each example, I schematize the main clause and embedded clause interpretations for the adverbial and give the appropriate grammaticality judgements for each interpretation.

(26) a. It is for this reason that I believe that John was fired
   (REASON-BELIEVE or BELIEVE-REASON) (Ouhalla 1990, 217, ex. 46a)
   b. It is for this reason that I don’t believe John was fired
      (REASON-BELIEVE or *BELIEVE-REASON) (Ouhalla 1990, 217, ex. 46b)
   c. It is for this reason that I know why John was fired
      (REASON-BELIEVE or *BELIEVE-REASON)

These observations underpin Rizzi’s theory of Relativised Minimality. Negation, wh-questions are both barriers to A’-movement. To derive these island effects, Rizzi argues that negation must involve an A’-specifier even when negation is morphologically marked on a head only, as in Italian (27).

(27) a. Perche hai detto che Gianni e partito?
    Why have-2SG said that Gianni is left?
    ‘Why did you say that Gianni left?’
    (REASON-LEAVING or LEAVING-REASON)

   b. Perche non hai detto che Gianni e partito?
      Why NEG have-2SG said that Gianni is left?
      Why didn’t you say that Gianni left?
      (REASON-LEAVING or *LEAVING-REASON)

Adopting this phrase structure for NegP will block the movement of other A’-elements such as the adverbial ‘for this reason’ in (26b) across negation in the same way that movement of adverbials across wh-phrases is blocked. This ties in well with an X’-theoretic approach to NegP which makes both positions available universally in all clauses which have Neg°.
The third argument which has been advanced for NegP is the extra position which its specifier makes available to host moved negative arguments or adjuncts. This movement possibility, and hence position, is not available to positive arguments or adjuncts. Haegeman (1995) makes much of this argument for NegP. She develops a hypothesis in which the specifier-head relation is a necessary condition on the interpretation of sentential negation, in much the same way as a spec-head relation is required between a wh-phrase and a finite verb in interrogatives. She claims that West Flemish negative arguments and adjuncts only attain sentential scope by overt movement into spec, NegP. For Haegeman, movement of negative arguments and adjuncts into spec, NegP is motivated by a licensing condition on sentential negation: the NEG-CRITERION.

1.3.3 The Neg-criterion (Haegeman 1995)

Arguments in the previous section demonstrated that sentential negation in some languages requires two elements in a syntactic relation. The X'-theory approach to NegP makes a syntactic relation available, between a specifier and a head element. Haegeman (1995) develops this idea further, arguing first, that negation in all languages comprises two parts and second that a particular syntactic relation must hold between the two elements involved in sentential negation. She claims that all negatives which are interpreted with sentential scope do so because they appear in a spec-head relation with the functional head Neg°. She proposes a condition on sentential negation which is parallel to the condition holding of wh-interrogatives (the wh-criterion).

(28) The Neg-criterion:
   a. Each Neg X° must be in a spec-head relationship with a Neg operator.
   b. Each Neg operator must be in a spec-head relationship with a Neg X°.
   c. NEG-operator: a NEG phrase in a scope position
   d. Scope position: a left-peripheral A'-position (i.e. XP-adjoined or Spec).
   (Haegeman 1995, 106)

The existence of a spec-head dependency implies that the negative head is somehow defective, in a way which is problematic. In French and West Flemish for example, the negative head is insufficient to express sentential negation on its own. A combination of two negative markers is required to derive a sentential negation interpretation in these languages, yet as Dahl (1979) notes negation
is an atomic concept which is not easily decomposable. Evidence for this position comes from the existence of redundant *ne* in French and expletive *en* in West Flemish (Haegeman 1995, 162), in which what looks like a negative head appears without a negative interpretation. The evidence of redundant negation indicates that it is the specifier of NegP rather than its head which is semantically interpreted as sentential negation. So the status or role of the negative head is not clear, except that it provides means for negation to achieve a sentential scope position.

Haegeman cites two main sources of evidence for the Neg-criterion:

1. Bipartite negation of the French *ne*+*V*...pas type, or the West Flemish *nie*...*en*+*V* type, in which both NegP positions are realised simultaneously.

2. Movement of negative objects, complements of adjectives, and adjuncts out of VP to a higher scope position which she argues is necessary for a sentential scope interpretation of their negation.

A distinction should be made between the arguments for NegP made in previous sections, and the discussion of the Neg-criterion here. Haegeman makes the following distinction:

The Neg-criterion requires a Spec-head relation between a negative operator and a head with the feature [NEG]. This does not commit us to saying that each negative sentence must contain a NegP. In the case of the wh-criterion Rizzi... does not postulate the the Spec-head relation between the WH-operator and the WH-head be realised on a specific WH projection. Rather the WH-feature is hosted by I or by C. It is conceivable that the NEG-feature is also parasitic on another functional head.

(Haegeman 1995, 127)

This section concerns itself with the syntactic relations holding between negative elements rather than arguments for the functional structure associated with negation. Haegeman (1995, 180) claims V to C movement following an initial sentential scope negative in spec,CP (29a) is an instance of the Neg-criterion which parallels V to C movement in wh-questions (29b) under the WH-criterion. Van Kemenade (2000), Haeberli (1991) propose accounts of Old English negative-initial clauses using the Neg-criterion which I examine in chapter 3.
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(29) a. Never will anyone do this kind of thing (Haegeman 1995, 71, ex. 2e)
   b. Why would anyone do this kind of thing? (Haegeman 1995, 71, ex. 2f)

Haegeman (1995) argues that the movement of negative arguments and adjuncts out of VP is a consequence of the NEG-criterion. Negative arguments and adjuncts which take sentential scope must appear in a spec-head relationship with a negative head Neg°. Most of her evidence comes from West Flemish, in which negative arguments and adjuncts with sentential scope obligatorily move out of VP. Haegeman argues that the West Flemish negative head en- is only licensed when it appears in spec-head agreement with a negative argument, adjunct or the West Flemish negative particle nie.

(30) a. da ze [nie ketent me euren kado] en-was
   that she [not contented with her present] en-was
   'that she was not pleased with her present'
   (Haegeman 1995, 134, ex.44a)

b. da ze [p[p me niets] ketent en-was
   that she with nothing contented en-was
   'that she was not pleased with anything'
   (Haegeman 1995, 134, ex.44b)

c. *da ze ketent [me niets] en-was
   that she contented with nothing en-was
   'that she was not pleased with anything'
   (Haegeman 1995, 134, ex.44c)

d. *da ze ketent en-was [p[p me niets]
   that she contented en-was with nothing
   'that she was not pleased with anything'
   (Haegeman 1995, 134, ex.44d)

e. da Valere woarschijnlik nie nor us (en)- goat
   that Valere probably not to house (en)- goes
   'that Valere probably does not go home'
   (Haegeman 1995, 117, ex.6a)

These data appear to support the Neg-criterion, but there is some evidence that the fronting of negative constituents is not always consistent with movement to spec, NegP under the Neg-criterion. First, definite DPs may intervene between two moved negative constituents (31). The definite DPs, being non-negative cannot be analysed as NegP specifier or adjuncts.
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(31)  
\begin{align*}  
\text{a. } & \text{da Valere an niemand dienen boek (nie) getoogd en-eet} \\
& \quad \text{that Valere to no one that book (not) shown en has} \\
& \quad \text{‘that Valere did not show that book to anyone’} \\
& \quad \text{(Haegeman 1995, 116, ex.5a)} \\
\text{b. } & \text{da Valere nooit Jan niets (nie) gegeven en-eet} \\
& \quad \text{that Valere never Jan nothing (not) given en has} \\
& \quad \text{‘that Valere never gave Jan anything’} \\
& \quad \text{(Haegeman 1995, 116, ex.5b)} 
\end{align*}

The second observation which casts doubt on the Neg-criterion is the behaviour of non-negative quantifier phrases observed by Rullman (1998) for standard Dutch. Both affective or downward entailing quantifiers (32-33) and quantified phrases which are not downward entailing (34-35) typically move out of VP. Rullman claims that instances of quantifiers remaining in VP are marginal. He argues that the movement involved is quantifier raising, for reasons of scope or focus. Svenonius (2000) adopts a similar view that the fronting of negative arguments and adjuncts in Norwegian and Icelandic is the same process which fronts all quantified objects, quantifier raising. It is not clear that the fronting of negative quantifiers is sufficiently different from the fronting of non-negative quantifiers to require a distinct syntactic mechanism.

(32)  
\begin{align*}  
\text{a. } & \text{dat Jan [met weinig kado’s] tevreden was} \\
& \quad \text{that Jan [with few presents] satisfied was} \\
& \quad \text{‘that Jan was satisfied with few presents’} \\
& \quad \text{(Rullman 1998, 162, ex. 7a)} \\
\text{b. } & \text{dat Jan tevreden [met weinig kado’s] was} \\
& \quad \text{that Jan satisfied [with few presents] was} \\
& \quad \text{‘that Jan was satisfied with few presents’} \\
& \quad \text{(Rullman 1998, 162, ex. 7b)} 
\end{align*}

(33)  
\begin{align*}  
\text{a. } & \text{dat Jan [met maar twee kado’s] tevreden was} \\
& \quad \text{that Jan [with only two presents] satisfied was} \\
& \quad \text{‘that Jan was only satisfied with two presents’} \\
& \quad \text{(Rullman 1998, 162, ex. 8a)} \\
\text{b. } & \text{dat Jan tevreden [met maar twee kado’s] was} \\
& \quad \text{that Jan satisfied [with only two presents] was} \\
& \quad \text{‘that Jan was only satisfied with two presents’} \\
& \quad \text{(Rullman 1998, 162, ex. 8b)} 
\end{align*}
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(34) a. dat Jan [met de meeste kado’s] tevreden was that Jan [with most presents] satisfied was
‘that Jan was satisfied with most presents’
(Rullman 1998, 162, ex. 9a)

b. ?dat Jan tevreden [met de meeste kado’s] was that Jan satisfied [with most presents] was
‘that Jan was satisfied with most presents’
(Rullman 1998, 162, ex. 9b)

(35) a. dat Jan [met veel kado’s] tevreden was that Jan [with many presents] satisfied was
‘that Jan was satisfied with many presents’
(Rullman 1998, 162, ex. 10a)

b. ?dat Jan tevreden [met veel kado’s] was that Jan satisfied [with many presents] was
‘that Jan was satisfied with many presents’
(Rullman 1998, 162, ex. 10b)

Furthermore, there are many languages in which negative arguments and adjuncts do not need to move to spec,NegP overtly in order to gain sentential scope. There is no negative movement in these languages. Haegeman (1995) claims that the Neg-criterion is satisfied covertly in these languages, as each negative lower than NegP is coindexed with a negative operator in spec,NegP. However, movement of negative arguments and adjuncts provides much less clear support for the Neg-criterion than Haegeman claims. It is not clear that the Neg-criterion is required to accommodate movement of negative arguments and adjuncts out of VP. Raising of negative quantifiers may simply result from quantifier raising as Rullman (1998) and Svenonius (2000) claim. The only unequivocal piece of evidence for the Neg-criterion is bipartite negation, and we saw in our discussion of Jespersen’s Cycle that bipartite negation constitutes a particular typological stage, subject to parametric variation. This does not provide much evidence for the Neg-criterion as a universal principle in the interpretation of negative clauses.

1.3.4 Feature checking approaches to negative dependencies

Haegeman (1995, 285) claims that the Neg-criterion cannot be reduced to feature checking. The Neg-criterion is a surface structure constraint based on the scope requirements of operators rather than morphosyntactic feature checking. Such
surface structure constraints are problematic to a strictly derivational framework such as Minimalism. More recent work on negation has sought to express the relationship between the two negatives within NegP in terms of morphosyntactic features. Kato (1997, 417) challenges Hageman’s claim that the Neg-criterion cannot be reduced to feature checking:

In this connection, let us examine Haegeman’s argument that the criterion cannot be assimilated to feature checking devices. Consider the contrast between (36) [Kato’s ex.42] and (37) [Kato’s ex.43] (cf. Haegeman (1995, 285)).

(36) Who do you think [CP t[AGRP t will arrive first]]

(37) *Niets peinzen-k da ze en-weet
    nothing think I that she en knows

The point is that, while in (36) [Kato’s ex.42] who can undergo further movement after it is checked at the specifier of AgrP, niets in (37) [Kato’s ex.43] must stay in the spec-head configuration with the negative head. Haegeman takes this contrast to be evidence against assimilating the criteria to the feature checking theory. Her argument, however, is not tenable, for the wh-phrase bears at least one operator feature in addition to its phi-features and only the latter are checked at the specifier of AgrP. Conversely, example (37) [Kato’s ex.43] could be independently filtered out as a violation of economy principles: once it satisfies the criterion, the negative operator need not, hence cannot, move further. Hence the apparent contrast between (36) and (37) disappears. This suggests that the checking theoretic approach to the Affect criterion is worth pursuing. It is also expected that this alternative will reduce the proliferated use of non-overt operators and heads, and possibly eliminate the S-structure requirement on the criterion.

(Kato 1997, 417)

I will focus the discussion on Rowlett (1998) who reduces the Neg-criterion to a relation between morphosyntactic features. Under Haegeman’s (1995) Neg-criterion, the specifier of NegP is the element which gets interpreted as negative at LF in all clauses. This is an invariant fact about the structure of NegP, irrespective of whether or not the specifier position is realised overtly by a negative particle. Changes in the morphology of the two NegP positions under Jespersen’s Cycle have no effect on the syntax and semantics of negation which are
invariant. Rowlett modifies Haegeman's approach so that Jespersen's Cycle is not simply a morphological change, but a morphosyntactic one. He proposes that the introduction of an overt spec,NegP element, such as French pas in spec-head agreement with the Neg° ne, marks a shift in the syntactic locus of negation from the negative head (Neg°) at stage one of Jespersen's Cycle to the specifier position (spec,NegP) at subsequent stages. Rowlett's proposals require a view of spec-head agreement which differs from Haegeman's. For Haegeman (1995, 106), the null operator bears a negative interpretation in all instances. Spec-head agreement is viewed as feature identity: both Neg° and spec,NegP have negative features. In contrast, Rowlett adopts a Dynamic Agreement approach (see Rowlett (1998, 110)), under which a specifier can pass features to its head, but not vice versa. He argues that elements in a spec-head configuration must not bear contradictory features, but need not necessarily agree. Negation will have sentential scope providing Neg° has the feature NEG, irrespective of whether it has an agreeing specifier. Therefore, he argues that there is no need for both spec,NegP and Neg° to bear NEG-features at stage one of Jespersen's Cycle when NEG is marked on the negative head. Indeed, he argues further that spec-head agreement based on feature identity introduces redundancy into the derivation.

Indeed, if Haegeman is right in her characterisation of negative clauses, the conception of DA [Dynamic Agreement]... could be argued to follow from economy considerations. If all that is needed to mark sentential negation is the presence of the feature [+NEG] on a functional head, then transferring the feature to an operator in specifier position serves no purpose and should arguably not be allowed. Certainly, as an interpretable feature, the presence of [+NEG] on a functional head at LF should not in itself be problematic. Consequently, the presence of a suitable operator in Spec,NegP cannot be motivated for checking reasons.

---

9One potential problem with Rowlett's account is its insistence that negation must be present on a functional head to be interpreted with sentential scope. The distinction between the interpretation of head and specifier positions which he invokes seems difficult to maintain in a system in which scope relations are derived using C-command. Rowlett's definition of sentential negation entails that negative adverbs in the Germanic languages are not adjuncts, but specifiers of a NegP which has a non-overt head. Under this approach, NegP is universal and necessary for LF interpretation of negation, even in languages in which negation behaves like an adverb, and there is no evidence for a Neg°.
In contrast, transferring the feature from the operator to the head serves a clear purpose, since, in the absence of such a feature specification on the head, sentential negation will not be marked.

(Rowlett 1998, 112)

By implication, the French head *ne* does not have [NEG] features in the lexicon. It only acquires these features by dynamic agreement with spec,NegP *pas* during the syntactic derivation. Rowlett views Jespersen's Cycle as a morphosyntactic rather than a purely morphological change. Although Rowlett's NegP comprises a spec,NegP operator and a head universally, whether or not the spec,NegP operator has NEG-features is a matter of parametric variation. When the negative head has NEG-features the operator in spec,NegP is an expletive operator without NEG-features, whose motivation seems solely to account for weak island effects under Relativised Minimality. The use of dynamic agreement enables Rowlett to distinguish two types of negative head: one with inherent [NEG] features, and another which acquires negative features by dynamic agreement during the derivation.

Rowlett extends his account of parametric variation in the position of NEG-features to account for the link which Jespersen observes between multiple negation and Jespersen's Cycle. See section 6.3.3 for detailed discussion of Rowlett's approach to multiple negation in relation to early English.

### 1.3.5 Summary: Negation in the Principles and Parameters framework

In the preceding sections I outlined representations of negation in Principles and Parameters theory. Negation is represented by its own functional projection NegP, which conforms to the X'-theory of phrase structure. NegP always has a specifier position and a head position, although only one or other of these need be morphologically realised in a negative clause. Underlyingly it is assumed that the marker of negation which gets interpreted at LF is the specifier rather than the head of NegP. The negative head must appear in a local spec-head configuration with a negative in spec,NegP in order to be licensed. This is the NEG-criterion. This approach to the phrase structure of negation builds quite a lot of redundancy into the account. The only unequivocal overt evidence for the Neg-criterion comes from bipartite negation at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle, and from Relativised Minimality accounts of the weak island effects associated with
negation. The representation of negation is abstract, comprising two parts, when typological studies such as Dahl (1979) show that negation is marked by a single morpheme in most languages. Under the NegP schema, Jespersen's Cycle only marks a change in the morphological realisation of syntactic positions which are universally present in the syntax. The NegP schema allows a phrase structure account of the relative strength and weakness of negative markers as adverbial and head elements. However, by making Jespersen's Cycle a purely morphological change, it is difficult to see why Jespersen's Cycle takes the form it does, what motivates the cycle, and why it is such a recurrent pattern cross linguistically.

Rowlett's proposals maintain the functional projection NegP in phrase structure, but allow an account of Jespersen's Cycle as morphosyntactic change. His proposals distinguish two forms of *ne*. This proposal has important consequences for the analysis of Jespersen's Cycle. Chapters 4 and 5 will recast Rowlett's proposals in a Minimalist framework and explore their implications.

### 1.4 Multiple negation

This section discusses the syntactic derivation of multiple negation clauses (38-39) in contrast to the double negation clauses of standard English (40a), standard German (40b) and standard Dutch (40c). Multiple negation languages are languages in which negation can be morphologically marked on more than one word in a sentential negative clause. Double negation languages are languages in which a sentential negative clause contains at most one negative word. In these double negation languages, when more than one negative word is present in a clause, each negative word cancels out the negative force of the others (40). The effect of each negative word in a double negation language is to reverse the polarity of the clause: so a clause with two negators will receive a non-negative interpretation, a clause with three negators will receive a negative interpretation, and so on.

This section will outline syntactic accounts of the contrast between multiple negation and double negation languages. The existence of both languages which permit multiple negation readings (38a-39b) and those which do not (40) indicates that the availability of multiple negation needs to be parametrised to account for both groups of languages.

(38) a. Je n'ai vu personne
   I NEG-have seen no-one
1.4. MULTIPLE NEGATION

'I haven't seen anyone' (French)
b. Non o visto nessuno
   NEG have seen no-one
   'I haven't seen anyone' (Italian)

(Haegeman and Zanuttini 1996, 118, ex.4a-b)

(39) a. Nessuno ha detto niente
   No-one has said nothing
   'No-one said anything' (Italian)
b. Nadie ha dicho nada
   No-one has said nothing
   'No-one said anything' (Spanish)

(Haegeman and Zanuttini 1996, 118, ex.5b-c)

(40) a. I didn't say nothing (=I said something)
   b. Ich habe nicht nichts gesagt (Standard German)
      I have not nothing said
      'I haven't said anything'

c. Ik heb niet niets gezegd (Standard Dutch)
   I have not nothing said
   'I haven't said anything'

(Haegeman and Zanuttini 1996, 117, ex.2)

Syntactic analyses of multiple negation fall into two broad groups. These are distinguished by their approach to concordant negative words (negative words which appear in multiple negation). Haegeman (1995), Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) take all words which are negative in form to have a negative semantic interpretation, whether in multiple negation or double negation. Under this analysis of negative words we would expect all languages to be double negation languages: each negative word has negative semantics and will interact with the negative semantics of every other negative word in its clause to alter the interpretation of the clause as a whole. Hence, the derivation of multiple negation readings must involve some adjustment in the meaning of negative words in order to allow more than one of them to appear in a clause which has a reading of sentential negation. Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) argue for exactly this sort of adjustment in meaning under certain syntactic conditions. Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) propose a negative absorption rule which operates on particular
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syntactic configurations to generate multiple negation readings (see section 1.4.1 below for a more detailed discussion). Haegeman (1995, 139) argues that this rule should be parallel to rules of wh-absorption. In her view, the existence of such a rule follows from the close parallels between negative and interrogative clauses.

The second approach, exemplified by Ladusaw (1992), Deprez (1997), Giannakidou (2000) argues that concordant negative words are negative in morphological form only, and do not convey negative meaning at LF. Therefore, it is possible for any number of concordant negative words to appear in a negative clause. Concordant negatives are subject to syntactic licensing conditions which are much the same as the licensing conditions on PDE negative polarity items such as *any, ever*. They must co-occur with a clausemate negative marker which can be interpreted at LF, which will both give the clause its sentential negation interpretation and license the concordant negative words. In the following sections, I will examine each of these approaches in more detail.

1.4.1 The Neg-absorption approach

Neg-absorption is proposed by Haegeman (1995), Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996). A mechanism of factorization derives multiple negation readings from negative quantifiers (which have the semantic representation \( \forall - \)) which have undergone raising to achieve sentential scope at LF, and are thereby structurally adjacent, all adjoined to the same maximal projection. For Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996), quantifier raising (QR) is responsible for the raising of negatives to undergo absorption in a VP adjoined position. For Haegeman (1995), negatives raise to spec,NegP under the Neg-criterion, where absorption takes place. The process of absorption or factorization is represented in (41).

\[
(41) \quad [\forall x \neg][\forall y \neg][\forall z \neg] = [\forall x, y, z] \neg
\]

Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996, 139) comment:

\[...\] instead of creating two (or more) consecutive instances of a universal quantifier each followed by an instance of negation, negation is factored out and the two (or more) universal quantifiers become one binary (or n-ary) quantifier.

(Haegeman and Zanuttini 1996, 139)

In Haegeman (1995), negative factorisation, or absorption (the latter term is used in Haegeman (1995)) is a by-product of the Neg-criterion. Recall that the
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Neg-criterion associates every sentential scope negative word or phrase into a position of sentential scope during the syntactic derivation. The problems I discussed in respect of the Neg-criterion (section 1.3.3) are also problems for the account of negative absorption. First, not all negatives which undergo absorption are structurally adjacent. Definite DPs can intervene between two negative phrases, yet multiple negation readings, and therefore absorption remains possible. Structural adjacency cannot be a condition on negative absorption.

Whilst the account of negative absorption has some success in capturing the West Flemish data, there are other languages (such as the Romance languages French, Spanish, Italian) which have multiple negation with negative constituents which are internal to VP. There are two options to deal with these cases: either negative constituents undergo quantifier raising to their scope positions covertly at LF, or they are interpreted in their scope positions by virtue of coindexation with a higher element. The latter approach is taken by Haegeman (1995, 201ff). There are two possible implementations of this approach. A null operator in spec, NegP unselectively binds all negative constituents in its scope; or each negative constituent is bound by its own operator. In the latter case, factorization of the negative operators in spec, NegP has to take place to derive a multiple negation reading.

The neg-absorption approach faces conceptual problems. Giannakidou (2000, 483) argues that asymmetries between multiple wh-constructions and multiple negation constructions support an analysis of the two as distinct sets of dependencies. The parallels between wh-absorption and negative-absorption on which Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) base their theory are not clear. Given these asymmetries, Giannakidou (2000, 483) notes that the role of negative absorption is particular to multiple negation rather than being a subcase of a more general absorption rule. This makes multiple negation look more syntactically anomalous and more marked than its widespread occurrence in many languages would seem to indicate.

As a theoretical device, negative absorption is also problematic. Negative absorption involves removing LF interpretable features during the course of the derivation in order to obtain multiple negation readings. This appears to be a violation of the Principle of Full Interpretation (Chomsky 1995, 27). Negative

However, Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) observe that if the intervening element is scope bearing, such as a quantifier, multiple negation readings are not possible, indicating that scope bearing elements create islands for multiple negation.
absorption therefore poses a problem for Minimalist frameworks in which the Principle of Full Interpretation holds.

Finally, it is not clear how to accommodate the observed cross-linguistic variation in the availability of multiple negation to the principle of negative-absorption. Negative absorption applies wherever two or more negatives are in their scope positions, and adjacent to each other. It is a principle of the syntax and as such should not be subject to parametric variation. Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) claim that the availability of NegP is linked to the availability of multiple negation. This might offer some means to parametrise multiple negation, along the lines that NegP is required for negative absorption to take place. However, it is not clear how such a condition could be formulated. Haegeman (1995, 139) makes the availability of negative absorption contingent on the Neg-criterion, but she also claims that the Neg-criterion is a universal principle of the grammar, which leaves unresolved the problem of parametrising multiple negation.

We might parametrise the Neg-criterion and NegP, but it is not clear that NegP is required for negative absorption to take place. Indeed, Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) argue that negative absorption takes place when negative quantifiers undergo quantifier raising to VP-adjoined positions, either overtly or at LF. The negative head is not implicated in this account of multiple negation, so it is unclear that the difference between the availability of multiple negation in Germanic and Romance languages that Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) observe is always linked to the availability of a negative head. Obviously, negative doubling with a negative head is linked to the availability of the head, but other forms of multiple negation involving arguments and adjuncts need make no reference to the negative head, only to the scope position of negative quantifiers. The account does not rule out multiple negation between a VP adjoined negative marker and a negative quantifier within VP in German or Dutch providing both are in their scope positions at some level of representation. Hence, multiple negation should be possible in these languages, contrary to fact.

1.4.2 Multiple negation and Jespersen's Cycle

Jespersen (1917) observes a link between the form of sentential negation used in a language, and the availability of multiple negation in that language. He describes the relationship as follows:

...repeated negation seems to become a habitual phenomenon only in
those languages in which the ordinary negative element is comparatively small in phonetic bulk, as *ne* and *n-* in OE and Russian, *en* and *n-* in MHG [Middle High German], *ou* (sounded *u* in Greek), *s-* or *n-* in Magyar. The insignificance of these elements makes it desirable to multiply them so as to prevent their being overlooked. Hence also the comparative infrequency of this repetition in English and German, after the fuller negatives *not* and *nicht* have been fully established.

(Jespersen 1917, 72)

This is a condition on multiple negation, taken up in the syntactic accounts by Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) and Rowlett (1998). Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) argue that NegP is necessary to license multiple negation. Hence they argue that the difference between languages with and without multiple negation is in the presence of a functional category NegP which C-commands TP. The negative head is implicated in multiple negation. One way to parametrise multiple negation is to parametrise NegP.\footnote{Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996, fn.11) observe that PDE is problematic to the correlation between NegP and multiple negation. Pollock (1989) and others argued that PDE has NegP, yet the standard language does not have multiple negation.} However, in the previous section, I cast some doubt on the link between NegP and multiple negation in Haegeman and Zanuttini’s analysis. They claim that languages such as modern German or Dutch are not multiple negation languages because they mark negation by means of a VP-adjunct.

The negative markers in Germanic languages, as illustrated by German *nicht*, Dutch *niet*, Swedish *ikke* etc will be taken to be adverbial elements. We assume that they are adjoined to VP or a projection dominating VP. We tentatively suggest that these languages in fact lack a negative head projecting a NegP dominating Infl.

(Haegeman and Zanuttini 1996, 124)

The implication of their proposal is that NegP is not universally available at all stages of Jespersen’s Cycle. However, as I observed in the previous section, it is unclear how parametrising NegP has any impact on the availability of negative absorption as formulated in Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996), and hence how the NegP and multiple negation are linked.
Rowlett (1998) takes a different approach to the relationship between Jespersen's Cycle and multiple negation. Recall, that for Rowlett, the move to bipartite negation under Jespersen's Cycle marks a shift in the locus of negation (the NEG-feature) within NegP from the head to the specifier position. This shift in the locus of negation from Neg° to spec,NegP affects the availability of multiple negation. With Neg° the locus of negation, multiple negation is freely available. With the introduction of a negative operator in spec,NegP, multiple negation is no longer licit. Rowlett formalises this as Jespersen's Generalisation (42).

(42) Jespersen's Generalisation:
A language is an NC [Negative Concord, or multiple negation] language iff the regular marker of pure sentential negation is not associated with SpecNegP.
(Rowlett 1998, 87)

Rowlett (1998, 100) takes Jespersen's Generalisation to apply across a language as a whole. His prediction is strong: if a language can mark negation using phrasal negator in spec,NegP, it is not a multiple negation language. Rowlett (1998) derives Jespersen's Generalisation using a a modified version of the binding theoretic approach Progovac (1994) proposes for NPI licensing. Negative constituents in multiple negation must not be A'-bound by a negative operator in spec,NegP. The Neg° does not A'-bind negative constituents in its complement, so multiple negation is licit. By adopting an approach to scope based on binding, Rowlett is able to claim that [NEG] on a negative head does not interact scopally with [NEG] on a negative constituent in the complement of Neg°. Under his approach to multiple negation, all negatives are interpreted as negative at LF, but can co-occur in certain configurations when no negative takes scope over any other. However, the use of binding relations to determine scope interactions does not seem compatible with the simplest Minimalist assumptions. If a different approach to scope relations is taken, such as the more widely assumed C-command approach, the distinction between configurations which underpin Rowlett's account cannot be maintained.

The distribution of multiple negation predicted under Rowlett's (1998) account differs from its predicted distribution under Haegeman and Zanuttini's (1996) account. For Rowlett, multiple negation is not licensed at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle because the locus of negation is spec,NegP. For Haegeman and Zanuttini, multiple negation is licensed at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle because
a negative head is present at this stage. I discuss the relationship between multiple negation and Jespersen's Cycle in chapter 6. My aims there are twofold. First, to examine the empirical basis to relate Jespersen's Cycle and multiple negation within a large corpus of diachronic data from early English. Second, to provide a syntactic hypothesis within a Minimalist feature-based syntax which can accommodate these data.

1.4.3 Multiple negation as negative polarity item licensing

This section will discuss in detail the view that concordant negatives are negative in morphological form only, and are subject to licensing conditions similar to those holding of negative polarity items (NPIs) such as PDE *any, ever*. This view of multiple negation is proposed in the semantic literature by Ladusaw (1992), van der Wouden (1994), and taken up in syntactic accounts by Deprez (1997), Giannakidou (2000). The basis for this work is a compositional approach to multiple negation, in contrast to the Neg-absorption approach which involves some kind of feature deletion process during the syntactic derivation. Within a compositional approach to multiple negation, only one of the elements which has negative morphology can bear Neg-features which are interpreted at LF. The gist of Ladusaw's proposal is that there are two possible meanings assigned to negative constituents like *no-one*. Broadly the difference between multiple negation and double negation languages is that negation is associated with the clause as a whole in a multiple negation language, whereas negation is associated with individual lexical items in a double negation language. In double negative languages all negative words are individually associated with negation. In multiple negation languages, concordant negative words are licensed only when they are in a relationship with a negative operator. Variation in the cross-linguistic availability of multiple negation is reduced to a lexical difference between languages; whether or not negative words are interpreted as negative at LF.

...the duplicity of the negative argument expressions in LF is a reflex of a simple lexical ambiguity: that they are ambiguous between negative quantifiers and negative polarity items, which are known items of limited distribution.

(Ladusaw 1992, 246)

Recall that I distinguished two types of multiple negation following van der Wouden (1994): negative doubling which involves a marker of sentential nega-
tion, and negative spread which does not. The negative operator which licenses concordant negatives may be an overt negative marker (negative doubling) or non-overt operator (negative spread). In Ladusaw (1992), the difference between negative doubling and negative spread is simply a matter of the morphology associated with the negative operator in the syntax. In negative doubling the operator is morphologically realised. In negative spread it is null.

This account seems preferable to Neg-absorption, as it preserves compositionality, and is in keeping with the spirit of the Minimalist framework. Lexical ambiguity is the only means to represent variation in Minimalism. The derivational component is invariant. Hence Ladusaw’s approach is promising. However, more work is required to ascertain the morphosyntactic features of concordant negatives and to establish appropriate licensing conditions which make reference to these features.

Ladusaw (1992) takes negative constituents within the scope of negation in multiple negation languages to be subject to the same type of licensing requirements as NPIs. Both are analysed as indefinites without quantificational or referential force. Indefinites require binding by an existential in order to be interpreted. Negative polarity items impose the additional restriction that this existential should be negative. However, licensing conditions for concordant negatives differ from licensing conditions for NPIs. NPIs are licensed in interrogatives (43), conditionals (44), in the scope of certain quantifiers (45).

(43) When did you last see anyone doing that?
(44) I’m sorry if anyone thinks this is unusual
(45) Few people know anything

Ladusaw distinguishes indefinites which require negation as a licensor, from indefinites like NPIs which can be licensed by the more general class of monotone decreasing operators. He proposes a licensing condition by which NPIs must be C-commanded by a negative operator located in NegP, either as a negative marker in spec,NegP, or Neg⁰, or a negative argument or adjunct which has moved to or though spec,NegP. He claims multiple negation with concordant negatives in VP always requires the negative marker or some other negative to be present in a position which dominates VP. Both Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) and Ladusaw (1992) claim that at least one negative must C-command the VP in a multiple negation clause (46).
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(46) a. She didn’t give nothing to nobody (Non-standard English)
   (Ladusaw 1992, 250, ex.19c)
   b. Mario non ha parlo di niente con nessuno (Italian)
   Mario NEG has spoken of nothing with no-one
   ‘Mario hasn’t spoken to anyone about anything’
   (Ladusaw 1992, 251, ex.21b)

Ladusaw (1993) suggests that changes in the licensing conditions on concomitant negatives will lead to the loss of multiple negation, and the reinterpretation of concordant negatives as negative quantifiers at LF. He argues that this is linked to changes under Jespersen’s Cycle. One prediction that arises clearly out of Ladusaw’s analysis of negative constituents as NPI indefinites is that the distribution of negatives and negative-polarity items will be parallel. Giannakidou (2000) discusses these predictions in detail. She argues on the basis of the following diagnostics that concordant negative words in some languages with and without multiple negation are quantifiers rather than indefinites as Ladusaw (1992) proposed. The following properties distinguish concordant negatives which are quantificational from NPIs which are indefinites. First, negatives in some languages can be modified by almost (47).

(47) a. K’ (en)-een oast niets nie gezeid
   I (en)-have almost nothing said
   ‘I said almost nothing’
   b. *I didn’t say almost anything
   (Haegeman 1995, 129, ex.30)

Second, the two are subject to different locality constraints. In some languages multiple negation is clause bound, whereas NPI indefinites enter into dependencies across clause boundaries (48). Giannakidou argues that the clause boundedness of multiple negation comes from locality restrictions on quantifier scope which follows if concordant negatives are quantifiers rather than indefinites in certain languages.

(48) You didn’t say that he wanted anything

This is one of the properties of multiple negation which distinguishes it from multiple-wh dependencies. Giannakidou (2000, 471) claims that multiple negation is unlike multiple-wh dependencies, which can be established across clause
boundaries. She takes this as one reason not to assimilate multiple negation and multiple wh, as Haegeman (1995) proposes.

On the basis of these diagnostics, Giannakidou (2000) proposes that there are two types of multiple negation languages, distinguished by the properties of the concordant negatives. In one type, the concordant negatives are exactly parallel to NPIs in their distribution, which indicates that they are indefinites. In the other, NPIs and concordant negatives have distinct distributions, indicating that whilst NPIs are indefinites, concordant negatives are quantificational.

1.4.4 Minimalist Approaches to Multiple Negation

I will discuss three broadly Minimalist approaches to multiple negation in this section: the analysis of Russian multiple negation by Brown (1999), the analysis of non-standard English by Adger and Smith (2003), and the observations on French by Roberts and Roussou (2003). Within a Minimalist framework, morphosyntactic feature checking is the only way to establish dependencies between elements in the syntax. There are strict constraints on the configurations in which features can be checked, so it is an empirical matter to determine whether the configurations of negative elements involved in multiple negation can be accommodated within this restrictive system. Feature checking takes place between interpretable and uninterpretable features. Therefore, we need to determine first of all what features are checked in the licensing of multiple negation, and which of the negative elements involved in multiple negation has interpretable or valued features and which has uninterpretable or unvalued features.

Roberts and Roussou (2003) take an Agree based approach to negative doubling (based on the mechanism of Agree proposed by Chomsky (2000)). Negative doubling involves a probe-goal relation, in which either probe or goal, or both, may be spelled out with negative morphology. For multiple negation to be licit, at least one negative in multiple negation must be a probe. All negators in Present-Day Standard English are goals rather than probes, hence the lack of morphologically overt multiple negation. The difference between probes and goals reduces to the difference between valued and unvalued features in Chomsky's (1999) system.12

12The distinction is not as clear in Roberts and Roussou's system as they do not distinguish valued and unvalued features. Their account of multiple negation appears to be one analysis in which the distinction is required.
Both Brown (1999) and Adger and Smith (2003) start from the position that the sentential negative marker is a head with interpretable negative features, against which the uninterpretable features of each concordant negative constituent must be checked during the derivation. This checking operation iterates for each concordant negative, leaving only the interpretable [neg] feature of the negative head to be interpreted at LF. This is consistent with the mechanism of feature checking proposed in Chomsky (1995). So, the Russian clause in (49a) has the syntactic representation in (49b), where [uF] denotes an uninterpretable feature, and [F] denotes an interpretable feature.

(49) a. Ja nikogo nigde ne videl  
   I no-who no-where NEG saw  
   ‘I didn’t see anyone anywhere’  
   (Brown 1999, 30, ex.26a)  

   b.  
   NegP  
       nikogo [uneg]  
       |  
       |  
       |  
   Neg'  
   |  
   nigde [uneg]  
   |  
   Neg'  
   |  
   ne [neg]  
   |  
   XP  

   (Brown 1999, 30, ex.26b)

These accounts share something with the lexical variation approach taken by Ladusaw (1992). Negative words vary in their ability to be interpreted as negative at LF because of a difference in their morphosyntactic features in multiple negation and double negation languages. In multiple negation languages they have uninterpretable [uneg] features. In double negation languages, they have LF-interpretable [neg] features.

In Chomsky (1995) feature checking is by overt or LF movement in a spec-head configuration. Feature checking is motivated by the need to check uninterpretable features of the moved element against a head with matching interpretable features (‘greed’). Whilst the mechanism of feature checking assumed by Brown (1999), Adger and Smith (2003), follows Chomsky (1995), it is not consistent with the mechanisms of feature checking in subsequent versions of the theory (Chomsky 1999; 2000). In Chomsky (2000) a relationship is established between a probe and a goal. The probe has an uninterpretable feature, and must C-command a goal with a matching interpretable feature for feature checking to take place. The probe has uninterpretable or unvalued features, so feature check-
1.4. MULTIPLE NEGATION

In order to check features of the probe, rather than the goal. Functional heads bear uninterpretable features which allows them to act as probes and initiate a relationship with the closest C-commanded matching feature. There is one to one matching between uninterpretable features of the probe and interpretable features of the closest matching goal. This is problematic to multiple negation in which a negative head may co-occur with several concordant negative phrases. In multiple negation, it is clear that only one morphologically negative item has interpretable [neg] features. The problem is how to implement feature checking so that a negative head can co-occur with several concordant negative phrases, whilst parametrising multiple negation to take account of multiple negation and double negation languages. Little work has been done to derive multiple negation in the latest probe-goal framework of feature checking (see chapter 6 for discussion). It remains to be seen whether multiple negation can be adequately explained as feature checking in this model, or whether we need a semantic licensing condition on concordant negatives such as the one Ladusaw (1992) proposes.

1.4.5 Summary: multiple negation in the Principles and Parameters framework

The issues relevant to multiple negation are how to characterise the relationship between negative words in multiple negation within a syntactic framework, and how to parametrise multiple negation in order to derive both multiple negation and double negation languages. An important secondary issue is to establish the link, if any, between changes in sentential negation strategies and changes to the availability of multiple negation. We have seen to broad approaches to multiple negation, one syntactic, the other lexical. The syntactic approach is 'negative absorption'. Negative quantifiers in particular syntactic relations to each other can undergo absorption, so that the negative force of each quantifier is factored out and we are left with a sentential negation interpretation. For negative absorption to occur, Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) argue that negative quantifiers must escape VP.

Haegeman (1995) argues that each negative must satisfy the Neg-criterion (at NegP) for negative absorption to take place. I noted two problems with negative absorption. First, it faces difficulties in accounting for typological variation in the availability of multiple negation. Second, this derivation of multiple nega-
tion does not preserve compositionality: a syntactic process alters the semantic interpretation of negative lexical items.

The second approach to multiple negation is to treat concordant negatives as items licensed by negation. The licensing conditions on concordant negatives are similar to those on NPIs, with important differences which indicate that concordant negatives are quantificational whilst NPIs are indefinites. This approach accommodates parametric variation in multiple negation as a lexical choice, a matter of variation in the interpretation of particular lexical items. Concordant negatives must be licensed, whilst negative quantifiers are self-licensing. However, this approach leaves unanswered some important questions concerning the representation of the difference between concordant and non-concordant negatives, and particularly concerning the licensing conditions on multiple negation. It is not clear whether the difference between concordant and non-concordant negatives can be represented syntactically, or whether the licensing conditions on concordant negatives are syntactic or semantic. Proposals have been made which subsume multiple negation under morphosyntactic feature checking. However, these proposals require further work, particularly in the light of the probe-goal system of feature checking proposed in Chomsky (1999; 2000). Only then will we be able to say with confidence that the parametric difference between multiple negation languages and double negation languages is a difference in the morphosyntactic features which negative quantifiers bear in the lexicon.

Another problem of this approach is that it is not immediately clear how to relate the availability of multiple negation to changes in sentential negation strategies under Jespersen's Cycle in line with the observation that Jespersen himself makes (Jespersen 1917, 72). There are two views of the relationship between multiple negation and Jespersen's Cycle, which make different predictions for the availability of multiple negation at stage two of the cycle. Rowllett (1998) argues that the introduction of a secondary negator, such as English not at stage two, correlates with the loss of multiple negation. Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) argue that the presence of a negative head (Neg°) distinguishes multiple negation and double negation languages. Neg° is present at stages one and two of Jespersen's Cycle, hence multiple negation should be available at both stages.\(^{13}\)

The relationship between the syntactic representation of sentential negation and

\(^{13}\)Although we should note that a negative head marker is not overtly present in negative spread between two or more negative quantifiers. So a null Neg° is required in these constructions.
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multiple negation is therefore important, changes in the two areas are linked by both Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) and Rowlett (1998), albeit in different ways.

1.5 The present study: structure of the thesis

This thesis will discuss the syntactic representation of negation in early English with particular reference to parametric variation and diachronic change. First I establish the range of variation in early English negation and discuss the syntactic representation of negation in early English. I then turn to the analysis of Jespersen's Cycle. Finally, I discuss multiple negation in early English. The thesis comprises six chapters in addition to this one, each taking a different issue in the representation of negation, as set out below.

1. The locus of sentential negation: does the analysis of early English negation require the functional projection NegP? Chapter 2 presents an inventory of early English sentential negators and the evidence which these provide for NegP.

2. The derivation and loss of negative initial clauses is examined in chapter 3. The discussion focuses on proposals by van Kemenade (2000) to link the loss of negative initial clauses to the introduction of secondary negators under Jespersen's Cycle. I will also examine the relationship between Old English (OE) negative initial clauses which involve fronting of the finite verb and those which do not.

3. Chapter 4 develops a Minimalist morphosyntactic feature based approach to Jespersen's Cycle and considers the status of the functional projection NegP in a feature driven system.

4. Chapter 5 shows that the feature based analysis of Jespersen's Cycle (outlined in chapter 4) is supported by quantitative data showing Jespersen's Cycle in progress in early English. This chapter demonstrates that a model of Jespersen's Cycle as grammatical competition is possible if we adopt a feature based perspective on parametric change in sentential negation. This approach is supported by quantitative data.

5. Multiple negation is given extensive treatment in chapter 6. This chapter considers the relationship between multiple negation and Jespersen's Cycle.
It develops an analysis of multiple negation in terms of morphosyntactic features which is integrated with Jespersen’s Cycle in a novel way. It assimilates multiple negation to a process of morphosyntactic feature checking, and proposes a program of further research in this area.

6. The final chapter concludes the thesis, showing how the analysis in the preceding chapters provides a coherent syntax of early English negation, and discussing some of the implications of my findings for the representation of morphosyntactic change.
Chapter 2

Patterns of Early English negation

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an inventory of sentential negation strategies employed in Old and Middle English prose and establishes the range of variation in Old and Middle English, locating Old and Middle English in respect of Jespersen’s Cycle (Jespersen 1917). Throughout this thesis, my analysis will be based on data from two electronic corpora: the York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE, Taylor et al. (2003)), and the second edition of the Penn Parsed Corpus of Middle English (PPCME2, Kroch and Taylor (2000a)). The early part of this chapter will comprise a description of the historical data used throughout the thesis, and an overview of my assumptions concerning the syntax of Old and Middle English within the Principles and Parameters model. I examine distributional evidence for two classes of sentential negators in both Old and Middle English, which are distinct from negative adverbs or adjuncts, one a verbal affix, and another an adverbial negative particle. My arguments will make crucial reference to analyses of Old and Middle English clause structure proposed by Haeberli (2001; 2002b).

An understanding of Jespersen’s Cycle in English needs to establish which patterns of negation constitute each stage of Jespersen’s Cycle. This is not a simple matter. At stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle, when two negative markers co-occur we need to distinguish exponents of this stage from other forms of multiple negation with negative adverbs which are not involved in Jespersen’s Cycle. Frisch (1997, 44) observes ambiguity between stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle (ne...not), and multiple negation involving an adjoined adverb not which does not constitute stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle. The sentential negator not, evident at
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stages two and three of Jespersen’s Cycle traces its antecedents back to an adjunct or adverbial form, Old English nawiht. So, this chapter will address the basis for distinguishing adverb not from sentential negator not, and also the historical evidence for the transition from adjunct to sentential negator in the textual record.

The same questions arise concerning the status of Old English na as adverb or sentential negator, since van Kemenade (1999; 2000) claims that na is a sentential negator with the same properties as later English not. This claim is disputed by van Bergen (2003), Ingham (2005).

The distribution of both na and not elements is studied in order to determine the syntactic basis on which sentential negators can be distinguished from negative adverbs. Two aspects of their distribution will be relevant: their position relative to subjects, objects and finite verbs, and their readiness to co-occur with other negative markers. These facets of distribution will be sufficient to establish whether na and not are distributionally equivalent. They will also provide grounds to identify any changes to the distribution of na or not over time, which may indicate a change in status from an adverb to a sentential negator. Distinguishing sentential negators from adverbs on positional grounds is very difficult. The positions available to na and not are those available to adjoined adverbs. However, I show that there are sufficient distributional grounds to make the required distinction between both ME not and OE na and negative adverbs.

Discussion of the appropriate syntactic representation of negation at each stage of Jespersen’s Cycle is left aside until chapter 4, when I enter into a detailed discussion of the structural representation of negation in the clause, and the syntactic mechanisms required to deal with the dependencies between negative markers at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle. Here, I establish the empirical facts on which the discussion in chapter 4 is based.

2.2 The Early English data

2.2.1 The Early English corpora

The Early English data are split into two broad periods: Old English (c.800-1150CE) and Middle English (c.1150-1500CE). Three electronic corpora supply the data for this thesis. The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (YCOE) is the source of the Old English prose data (Taylor et al. 2003). The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, second edition (Kroch and Tay-
The source of the Middle English prose data. The two prose corpora each comprise 1.5 million words of written historical English. The corpora do not represent all genres, dialects or sociolects. There is a bias in the historical record towards religious texts, particularly in the OE and EME periods.

The York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English poetry (Pintzuk and Plug 2001) is the source of the Old English poetry data. There is a single poetic text in the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, The Ormulum, which I have excluded from my Middle English database on grounds of genre. For an exhaustive discussion of negation in Middle English poetry see Iyeiri (2001). I confine my discussion of Middle English negation to prose texts. Hence I avoid the problems associated with poetic data, particularly the need to abstract away from the poetry those stylistic devices which are particular to the genre. I include discussion of Old English poetry purely because the OE poetic texts are the widely accepted as the earliest extant texts, and have certain peculiarities in their use of negation which deserve examination in the light of work by van Kemenade (2000). However, we will see in chapter 3 that these data need to be interpreted carefully. There are constraints on the poetry which are absent from the prose.

For the purposes of analysing linguistic change, the YCOE texts are subcategorised into three time periods: preceding 950, 950-1050, 1050-1150 according to the manuscript dates given in Ker (1957). The PPCME2 texts are also subdivided into four periods within the corpus: 1150-1250, 1250-1350, 1350-1420, 1420-1500, again by manuscript dates, as given in the PPCME2 documentation. The late ME periods are shorter than the preceding ones. This is due to the availability of more data in LME. I use these time periods to subcategorise the diachronic data throughout the analysis. As long as consistency is maintained in subcategorization, the fact that the LME periods are shorter than the others is of no practical consequence to my argumentation. There is a certain degree of abstraction involved in subdividing the data in this way, which ignores the variation between individual texts noted by Mazzon (2004). Hence I highlight differences between texts where relevant to the analysis, and where it is noticeable that particular texts deviate from the general patterns for a particular period.

The manuscript dates do not always reflect the date of composition, which is not always known with certainty for these texts. In the case of later manuscript copies of OE originals, it is unclear to what extent the scribes modernised the language, or preserved the linguistic forms of the original. This complicates the identification of linguistic change in OE. This will need to be borne in mind when I discuss OE data, but is an issue which requires far more attention than I can devote to it here.
These corpora are searched electronically, using CorpusSearch (Randall 2000). The size of the available corpora allow much more detailed quantitative analysis than hitherto. The availability of more data make the results more representative of the written language in general, than previous studies which examined a smaller range of texts. However, the data are not evenly distributed within the corpora by date, dialect or genre, so some biases remain to be taken into account. The Middle English period 1250-1350 is particularly problematic. This period is poorly evidenced. The data comprise only three texts, the Ayenbite of Inwit localised to Kent, the Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter localised to Essex and the Kentish Sermons localised to Kent. The majority of material at this period comes from a single text: the Ayenbite of Inwit. The majority of data in this period come from Kentish, a dialect which is only marginally represented in the preceding period, and not represented at all in the Late Middle English data. This has the effect of creating a discontinuity between the EME period (1150-1250) and the LME period (1350-1500), which is not wholly a function of time, but in part is an artefact of the uneven distribution of the data between texts and dialects at successive periods.

In addition, biases towards particular sources, whilst reduced are not entirely eliminated. Works by Ælfric are over-represented in the YCOE, and works by Chaucer are over-represented in the late Middle English prose of the PPCME2. Usages or idioms particular to these authors may affect the quantitative analysis. This is an issue which I will return to in the quantitative analysis, examining the usages of these authors separately to test their representativeness when necessary. The corpora contain sufficient data from other sources to control for the usage of these authors.

It is also clear that some differences within the corpora will not be the result of diachronic change, even though they may appear as variation across time periods. The corpora are not homogenous in all other respects such as dialect or genre. Hence caution is required in distinguishing change from variation. Change is only clear when a trend in a particular direction is seen across several time periods.

The YCOE is more homogeneous than the PPCME2. The majority of Old English prose texts come from the West Saxon dialect area, and are religious works. There are some linguistically important exceptions to this which I will discuss. The Middle English period is one of demographic and social change. In particular, the centres of power, learning and text production shift from the West
and South West Midlands to the South East and London areas. This leads to a concomitant change in the dialect and provenance of most written texts in the corpora. This change has as one of its effects the decline of the West Saxon written standard, which was codified and preserved in scriptoria to a much greater extent than any other variety until the emergence of Chancery proto-standard English in the Early Modern English period. Middle English texts show more dialect variation in orthography, lexis, morphology and syntax than most Old English texts. These facts need to be borne in mind when considering evidence for linguistic change in the transition from Old to Middle English.

These social and demographic changes impact on the dialect distribution of texts in the PPCME2. West Midlands texts predominate in Early Middle English, whereas South East and London texts predominate in Late Middle English. Some linguistic differences which might appear at first glance to be due to diachronic change may be attributable to these dialect differences. In addition, the religious subject matter of most of the texts, and their formal or didactic register means that it is impossible to reconstruct variation or change as it actually affected the spoken language of a Middle English speech community. Spoken language is not represented in the PPCME2. It is therefore extremely difficult to relate linguistic changes in the texts to linguistic changes in the speech community. Problems of genre and scribal practices obscure linguistic variability and change and increase the differences between the written and spoken registers. The language of the texts studied does not represent the linguistic patterns prevalent amongst most language users at the time. We only have direct records of the language used by a small socially elite group, who were not only literate in English but also likely to be literate in Latin (and French, following the Norman conquest). Furthermore, we must also recognise that the purpose of the extant texts is largely one of religious edification or instruction and does not reflect the primary use to which language is usually put, namely of communication between individuals on a day to day level. This is particularly pertinent for Old English, although other genres of texts become more common in late Middle English, typically secular literature, myths, legends and secular histories.

Problems of representativeness associated with the Old and Middle English data are compounded by the fact that many vernacular works are translations from Latin originals. Work is only just beginning to establish the linguistic influence which Latin has on Old English translation practices (see Taylor (2005)). This is another area of variation which must be considered when trying to isolate
linguistic change from other types of variation. Achieving this is not straight-forward, as it requires knowledge of the language of the particular Latin models used for translation. It is not sufficient to make a generalisation like 'Latin does X therefore Old English does Y'. The provenance and language of the Latin originals may vary, for example according to date of composition, among other factors. Mazzon (2004, 34) observes that Latin generally did not have multiple negation, and suggests that this may affect the frequency of multiple negation in Old English translations from Latin.

The York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry poses similar problems to the analysis. It contains only one large scale text Beowulf among many smaller samples. As with the prose, there may be variation between texts and dialects as well as variation according to date of composition. The problems are worse for the poetry however, as it is difficult to localize texts to dialect areas, or to assign anything more than approximate dates to them. In dealing with the poetry data, it is also essential to ascertain the extent to which poetic conventions such as metre affect the syntax used in these texts.

However, the York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry extends our evidence of Old English back into the eighth century, if the early date argued for Beowulf by Fulk (1992) is justified. Van Kemenade (2000) makes a case for using Beowulf to represent early Old English, in a comparison with later OE prose. However, the differences in genre, and the constraints on metre and alliteration in Beowulf limit the comparability of poetry and prose. In the analysis which follows, I will use Beowulf as evidence for Early Old English, whilst noting the problems of this approach (see chapter 3).

2.2.2 Overview of the syntax of Early English

Old and Middle English have attracted considerable attention within the syntactic tradition of Principles and Parameters. Work by van Kemenade (1987) has emphasized the Germanic nature of Old English syntax. Old English looks like an asymmetric verb second language with largely verb-final subordinate clauses. van Kemenade (1987) argues that OE is an SOV language with V to C movement deriving verb-second in main clauses. However, Old English has a set of clitic pronouns which intervene between topic and finite verb, giving rise to verb-third rather than verb second orders.
Pintzuk (1999) established that the syntax of Old English is variable and changing rather than uniform: the headedness of the two verbal projections IP and VP varies. Pintzuk (1999) established that Early English has verb movement to the functional head INFL in both main and subordinate clauses. However, there is variation in the position of the finite verb within the surface string. Pintzuk (1993; 1996; 1999) analyses this as variation and competition in the headedness of IP. Pintzuk (1999) also observes variation in the relative ordering of non-finite verbs and their complements. She adopts the view that there is also variation and competition in the headedness of VP. Old English is therefore both SOV and SVO. This variation in headedness represents two ongoing changes which lead to the loss of head final IP and VP in Early Middle English. I will assume this analysis, and observe some of its implications for the position of not in section 2.4.2.

It is well known that in Old English positive declarative main clauses the position of full NP subjects is distinguished from pronoun subjects by the position of the two types of subjects relative to the finite verb. In clauses with non-subject topics, pronouns typically precede the finite verb, giving rise to verb-third orders; whereas full NP subjects typically follow the finite verb. Assuming the finite verb moves to a head initial INFL leaves two options: either there are two distinct subject positions within the INFL complex, or NP subjects remain in VP. The relative positions of NP subjects and VP-adjoined adverbs indicate that NP subjects move out of VP to a position preceding these adverbs, hence most work in this area has concluded that there are two subject positions within INFL. Haeberli (2002a) shows that two subject positions can be distinguished in many Germanic languages by the distinct behaviour of non-topic pronominal and full NP subjects relative to TP-adjuncts. Pronoun subjects precede TP-adjuncts. Whilst the position of full NP subjects is more variable, these typically follow TP adjuncts. Hence there is a structural difference between the positions of these two types of subjects, and two subject positions outside VP.

In later work, van Kemenade (1999; 2000) takes the view that there is an extra functional projection within IP whose specifier hosts pronominal subjects and objects. This is the view taken by Haeberli (2002b) whose analysis I will adopt here. Haeberli labels the two positions AgrP and TP, following Bobaljik and Thrainsson (1998) who correlate the presence of AgrP with agreement morphology on the finite verb. The resulting Old English clause structure is shown in (50).

---

2 Spec, AgrP is a position for pronominal arguments in OE, both subjects and objects.
In positive declarative main clauses, the verb moves to Agr°, following pronoun subjects, even in clauses with non-subject topics. However, it is well known that certain OE and ME clauses show inversion of the finite verb with a subject pronoun (Pintzuk 1996; 1999, Kroch and Taylor 1997, Hulk and van Kemenade 1997). Pintzuk (1996; 1999) lists the following clause types:

1. Direct questions:
   
   (51) hwæ sceole we oþres mannes niman
   why should we another man’s take
   ‘Why should we take those of another man?’
   (AELS 24.188, Pintzuk (1999, 90, ex 111))

2. Verb initial declarative clauses, such as subjunctives (52) and imperative (53) clauses, but also some declaratives (54) with so called ‘narrative inversion’.

   (52) siewe mide stanum ofswopod
   be he with stones slain
   ‘…he should be slain with stones…’
   (Laws Af El 21 34.1, Pintzuk (1999, 91, ex. 113))

   (53) beo þu on ofeste
   be you in haste
   ‘Be quick.’
   (Beo 386, Pintzuk (1996, 243, ex. 47))

   (54) hæfdon hi hiora onfangen
   had they them sponsored
   ‘they had sponsored them’
   (ChronA 86.28-29 (894), Pintzuk (1996, 242, ex. 46))
3. Clauses with certain adverbs in initial position (55, 56, 57).

(55) þa gemette he sceadan
then met he robbers
‘then he met robbers’
(AELS 31.151, Pintzuk (1996, 243, ex. 48))

(56) bonne magon ge þær eardungstowe habban
then may you there dwelling-place have
‘then you may have a dwelling-place there’
(Bede 28.15, Pintzuk (1999, 91, ex.117))

(57) nu cwæð ic on minum mode þæt...
now said I in my mind that...
‘Now I said in my mind that…
(AELS 24.94, Pintzuk (1999, 91, ex.118))

4. Clauses with a negated verb

(58) ne mihton hi næigne fultum æt him begitan
NEG could they no help from him get
‘…they couldn’t get any help from him…’
(Bede 48.9-10, Pintzuk (1999, 91, ex.114))

These clauses with inversion are often grouped together (van Kemenade 1987, Pintzuk 1999). However, it is not clear that they behave as a group with respect to diachronic change. Pintzuk (1999, 91) observes that the Early OE poem Beowulf does not show inversion following adverbs þa, bonne. Van Kemenade (2000) observes that there are also negative initial clauses without verb movement to C⁰ in Beowulf (see chapter 3 for discussion).

Second, some but not all of these types of inversion survive into PDE. Inversion survives in questions (59), and some conditional or modal contexts (60), although it is my impression that the inversion in (60) is marginal or archaic in PDE.

(59) Did you see that?
(60) Had I not been thinking clearly, the situation might have turned out very differently

It also survives following some adverbs (61), although the set of adverbs which give rise to inversion is not the same as in Old English.
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There is another set of contexts for inversion in Present-Day English whose history is unclear. These are discussed by Haegeman (2001), who analyses inversion as a focalization strategy. These contexts include monotone decreasing quantifiers, including negation. The set of inversion contexts overlaps with the set of contexts which license negative polarity items in PDE. Further work needs to be done to investigate the history of inversion in these contexts. Chapter 3 will address the diachrony of inversion in negative clauses.

The syntax of subordinate clauses differs from the syntax of main clauses in important respects. Topicalisation is generally not available in subordinate clauses, except in the complements of 'bridge verbs' which allow CP recursion. There are no asymmetries between the position of pronoun and NP subjects relative to finite verbs, unlike in main clauses. Both pronoun and full NP subjects generally precede the finite verb, although see section 2.4.4 for some exceptional contexts in which full NP subjects appear lower than the finite verb. Haeberli (2001) accounts for these differences between main and subordinate clauses by proposing a lower head (T°) as the target of verb movement in subordinate clauses. Main clauses have verb movement to the higher head Agr°. On the basis of this evidence, I will assume a split INFL with AgrP dominating TP. It is conceivable in a more articulated functional structure that there are more positions than these two, such as M(odal)P, Asp(ect)P. I do not assume the existence of functional projections in early English unless they are empirically well motivated (see chapter 4 for a discussion of NegP in this connection). I do not assume that articulated functional structures, such as those proposed by Cinque (1999), are universally present in all clauses, as Cinque proposes. I assume the existence of functional projections only when they are either lexicalised, or motivated by their syntactic effects. Like Bobaljik and Thrainsson (1998), I take the existence of certain functional projections to be a matter of parametric variation. There are two types of functional projection: those which are subject to parametric variation and those which are not. I assume that the 'core functional categories' identified by Chomsky (2000) are not subject to parametric variation, because of the semantic contribution they make to every clause. These include C, which encodes information about the proposition, T which anchors the proposition in time, and v which marks transitivity and aspect. The question of whether a functional projection representing negation or polarity should be added to the hierarchy of functional
projections is considered in detail in chapter 4. There, I show how the idea that functional projections are parametrised affects the representation of negation.

### 2.3 An inventory of sentential negators in early English

As a preliminary to the discussion of Jespersen’s Cycle in English, it is necessary to distinguish at least four types of negative marker in Old and Middle English on syntactic grounds: the sentential negator *ne* (62), the sentential negator *not* (63), negative arguments (64) and negative adjuncts (65).

(62) *we ne moten halden Moses e lichamlice*  
\(\text{we NEG might observe Moses' law bodily}\)  
\('\text{we might not observe Moses law literally}'\)  
(CMLAMBX1,89.735)

(63) *Thou shalt not do so*  
\(\text{You ought not do so}\)  
\('\text{You ought not do so}'\)  
(CMROLLTR,41.855)

(64) *He left noping of his lyf \(\text{bat was worthi to be writin}\)*  
\(\text{He left nothing of his life that was worthy to be written}\)  
\('\text{He left nothing of his life that was worthy to be written}'\)  
(CMCAPCHR,59.831)

(65) *I schal neuere ceese fro wepyngge*  
\(\text{I shall never cease from weeping}\)  
\('\text{I shall never cease from weeping}'\)  
(CMAELR,50.776)

Whilst there is a clear distinction between *ne* and the others, a distinction between *not* and negative adjuncts is not so clearly marked by differences in their syntactic distribution. Sections 2.4.2-2.5 will address some of the criteria which have been proposed to distinguish sentential negators and negative adjuncts.

*ne* is distinct from all other negative forms because of its near-categorical adjacency to the finite verb (see section 2.3.1.1), which marks it out as a head in Principles and Parameters terms. Other Old and Middle English negative forms show the properties of phrases or maximal projections: they are syntactically independent of other elements, unaffected by head movement processes. Instead,
they occupy phrasal positions. Two groups of negative phrases can be distinguished: negative arguments, which are assigned a \( \theta \)-role within vP, and negative adjuncts, which do not receive a \( \theta \)-role, and occupy a range of adjoined positions. I will postpone discussion of negative arguments until chapter 5, and concentrate on the syntax of \( ne \) and the negative adverbials in the present chapter.

Cross-linguistic analyses of negation such as Haegeman (1995) and Zanuttini (1997) make a distinction between negative adverbs and a class of sentential negators. The distinction corresponds to a semantic distinction between negative adjuncts which consist of negation plus a restriction on the negation: \( \text{never} = \neg \exists x \ (x=\text{time}) \); and semantically impoverished negative adjuncts which express negation without a restriction, such as Present Day English \( \text{not} \): \( \text{not} = \neg \exists \). For Haegeman (1995) and others, the distinction has a correlate in syntactic structure. Whilst negative adverbs are merged as adjuncts of vP or TP, sentential negators are merged in a structurally higher position as the specifiers of a distinct functional projection NegP associated solely with negation. Both Roberts and Roussou (2003) and van Kemenade (2000) link the semantic impoverishment of negative adjuncts with their structural reanalysis as NegP elements. This reanalysis has a structural correlate in that negators are merged in a higher structural position than formerly. Roberts and Roussou (2003) identify this as one of the properties of grammaticalisation. This makes an interesting empirical prediction, although one which might prove difficult to test: the position of negative adjuncts will change as they are reanalysed as sentential negators.

Distinguishing sentential negators such as \( \text{not} \) from negative adjuncts such as \( \text{never} \) is by far the most difficult task facing an empirical description of early English negation. I will devote most of this chapter to exploring bases to distinguish sentential negators and negative adjuncts. First, however, I will make some remarks concerning the distribution of \( ne \), which identify \( ne \) as a head or clitic element.

### 2.3.1 Negative heads

#### 2.3.1.1 Old and Middle English \( ne \)

In the majority of instances, \( ne \) is left-adjacent to the finite verb, and positionally co-variant with it (Tables 2.2 and 2.2). \( ne \) is adjacent to the finite verb whether the finite verb is in Agr (66, 67), in T (68, 69), or in C (70, 71), and irrespective of the headedness of AgrP or TP (Pintzuk 1999). Examples of I-medial and I-final main
clauses are shown in (66) and (67). (68) is an example of an I-medial subordinate clause, (69) an example of an I-final subordinate clause.

(66) ic ne mæg hit nu swa hraðe asingan
   I NEG can it now so quickly sing
   'I cannot sing it so quickly now'
   (coboeth,Bo:39.127.29.2536)

(67) ic geseon ne mæg
    I see NEG can
    'I cannot see'
    (coaelive,+ALS_[Swithun]:204.4357)

(68) Gif pu nelle me ofslean, asend me to þam casere...
    If you NEG-intend me to-kill, send me to the emperor...
    'If you do not intend to kill me, send me to the emperor...
    (coaelive,+ALS_[Julian_and_Basilissa]:207.1066)

(69) þæt he deap prowigan ne scile
    that he death endure NEG shall
    'that he shall not endure death'
    (coverhom,HomS_24_[ScraggVerc_1]:115.121)

(70) þonne ne mæg he noht geseon
    then NEG can he nothing see
    'then he can see nothing'
    (cocura,CP:11.69.17.448)

(71) Ne brohte we nan þing to þysum middaneardæ
    NEG brought we no thing to this world
    'We did not bring anything to this world'
    (cocathhom1,+ACHom_I, _18.323.188.3595)

The best way to account for this range of positions for *ne* and its close association with the finite verb is to analyse *ne* as a morphological affix on the finite verb. This situation obtains throughout Old and Middle English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th><em>ne</em> adjacent to Vf</th>
<th><em>ne</em> elsewhere</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% adjacent to Vf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>7492</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7504</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>7988</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7995</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: The distribution of *ne* relative to the finite verb in the YCOE.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>ne adjacent to Vf</th>
<th>ne elsewhere</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% adjacent to Vf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: The distribution of ne relative to the finite verb in the PPCME2.

There is one small group of systematic exceptions in Old English. These exceptions take the form of *uton* - *ne* + *V* (n=5). These are examples where *ne* and the finite verb are non-adjacent.

(72) a. Uton ne agildan yfel ongean his god
    Let NEG repay evil against his good
    'Let us not repay his good with evil'
    (coverhom,HomM_13_[ScraggVerc_211:98.2710)

b. uton ne forlaetan gyet ðas boc
    Let NEG abandon yet the book
    'Let us not abandon the book yet'
    (cosolilo,Solil_1:50.14.645)

c. hie sceolon ne underfon ða are þaes lariowdomes
    they ought NEG take the property the-GEN authorities-GEN
    'they ought not take the property of the ecclesiastical authorities'
    (cocura,CPHead:9.2.3)

These Old English examples are very marginal. The important fact here seems to be the relative scope of the modal (*uton*, 'let') and the negation, which is reflected in the surface order of the modal and *ne*. There are no examples of *uton* with preceding *ne*. The analysis of pre-modal verbs by Roberts and Roussou (2003) postulates a biclausal structure. So, *uton* selects a TP complement, in a similar way to a raising verb. *ne* is plausibly associated with the lower verb with which it is adjacent rather than the higher verb. Given this analysis, these few instances of *ne*, which at first sight constitute the only evidence for *ne* as a non-affixal element, independent of the finite verb in surface structure are not unequivocal evidence of non-affixal *ne*.

There are some similar Middle English examples (73) (n=3), all in Margery Kempe), in which a pre-modal or subjunctive verb takes a verb prefixed by *ne* as its complement. A similar analysis might be extended to these examples.

3They appear in only three texts: the *Vercelli Homilies*, the OE *Soliloquies*, and the OE version of Gregory's *Pastoral Care*. 
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(73) mor þan sche xuld haue ellys had, had her euyl langage ne ben
more than she should have else had, had her evil language NEG been
'more than she should have had otherwise, if her evil language had not
been'
(CMKEMPE,43.957)

A second systematic use of *ne* independent of a finite verb emerges in Middle English (n=6), particularly in the works of Wycliffe (n=5/6). In subordinate clauses, a non-assertive complementiser *pat* *ne* is used (74). In this construction, *ne* does not introduce negation, rather it marks non-assertive polarity in the complement clause. I will discuss this use of *ne* in more detail in chapter 4.

(74) and hit is no dowte þat ne syche men ben prophetys
and it is no doubt that ne such men are prophets
'and there is no doubt that such men are prophets
(CMWYCSER,252.513)

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 show that the vast majority of instances of *ne* appear adjacent to a finite verb throughout Old and Middle English. However, there are some very robust differences between the Old and Middle English usage of *ne*. First, the position of *ne* in main clauses differs in Old and Middle English. In the majority of Old English main clauses with *ne*, *ne* is the initial element (n=1578/2304 or 68% have initial *ne*). Initial *ne* is always accompanied by inversion of the finite verb and a subject, whether the subject is a full NP or a pronoun. In this respect, clauses with initial *ne* differ from other main clauses. In most main clauses with initial non-subject elements, the finite verb will invert with an NP subject in spec,TP, but will not invert with a subject pronoun in spec,AgrP. Recall that under Haeberli's analysis, the typical position of the finite verb in main clauses is Agr°, and follows a subject pronoun (50). Thus, inversion of a finite verb and a subject pronoun is typically taken to reflect verb movement to a position higher than the subject pronoun, and higher than the typical landing site of verb movement in clauses without initial *ne*. Both Pintzuk (1999) and Haeberli (2002b) analyse inversion of the finite verb and a subject pronoun as movement of the finite verb to C°. Questions concerning the syntactic status of *ne* in inverted and uninverted contexts, and the syntactic derivation of inversion itself will be discussed at length in chapter 3.

Second, in Old English and Early Middle English, *ne* is present in the majority of negative clauses, and co-occurs with negative arguments (75) and adjuncts
(76), as well as the secondary negator *not* (77). In Late Middle English, the overall frequency of *ne* declines.

(75) And certes rightfully ne mowe ye take no vengeance...
And indeed rightfully NEG must you take no vengeance...
‘And indeed, rightfully, you must not take vengeance’
(CMCTMELI,228.C2.453)

(76) ne scalt ðu næure habban god
NEG ought you never have benefit
‘You ought never have benefit’
(CMVICES1,45.508)

(77) ac of hem ne speke ic noht
but of them NEG spoke I not
‘but I did not speak of them’
(CMTRINIT,95.1272)

Third, the frequency of clauses which are negated by the negator *ne* alone decreases during Middle English.

These three issues will be addressed in subsequent chapters using tools of both syntactic and quantitative analysis. The syntactic analysis will focus on the syntactic representation of negation in feature and phrase structure terms, and representation of the syntactic dependencies between *ne* and the other negatives with which it co-occurs.

### 2.3.1.2 Evidence for *not* as a head in LME

In Late Middle and Early Modern English, some examples with *not* emerge in which the distribution of *not* parallels the distribution of *ne* in earlier English. Risssanen (1994; 1999) notes some examples where *not* inverts with subject pronouns, along with the finite verb in Early Modern English questions. Van Kemenade (2000) takes these examples (78) as indicating positional co-variance of *not* and the finite verb, which we have already seen is an argument for treating a negator as a verbal affix. Crucially, the use of *not* as a verbal affix is not possible when *ne* is present. This use of *not* is in complementary distribution with *ne*.

(78) dyd not I send unto yow one Mowntayne that was both a traytor and a
Did not I send to you one Montagne who was both a traitor and a
herytyke...? 
heretic...?
‘Didn’t I send to you one Montayne who was both a traitor and a heretic?’
(Mowntayne 210, (van Kemenade 2000, ex.25))

These examples show not moving to C° along with the finite verb in questions. The fact that not moves under head movement identifies it as a head element or clitic. Van Kemenade takes this as evidence that not is becoming a clitic head affixed to the finite verb at this period. According to van Kemenade (2000, 70), the crucial factor in this reanalysis of not from adverbial to head element is the loss of the negative head ne.

In the PPCME2 data, such examples are particularly rare even in the period 1430-1500 (n=6/94, 6%). These correspond well to the figures which Rissanen (1999) gives of the frequency of the order not-subject pronoun in ME (n=5/109 or 5%). If the emergence of not in a new position is evidence for a change in its status, the new structural option is hardly productive in Middle English.

2.3.2 Negative arguments and adjuncts

Unlike Present Day Standard English, Old and Middle English typically exhibit multiple negation. A clause can involve two or more markers of negation, yet the whole clause will still be interpreted as negative. This contrasts with the Present Day Standard English situation in which each negative marker contributes a negative interpretation to the clause. Therefore, in PDE, two or more negatives in a single clause will cancel each other out. In Old and Middle English, two or more negatives will not cancel each other out, but the clause which contains two or more negatives will be interpreted at the clause level as a single instance of sentential negation. I will distinguish two types of multiple negation. As well as co-occurring with ne, negative arguments and adjuncts can co-occur with each other. Clauses which exhibit multiple negation between ne and one negative argument or adjunct (75, 76) I will label examples of NEGATIVE DOUBLING (following van der Wouden (1994)). Clauses which exhibit multiple negation between negative arguments and/or adjuncts, in the absence of ne (79) I will label examples of NEGATIVE SPREAD (again following van der Wouden (1994)). Throughout Old English and Early Middle English negative doubling and negative spread co-occur (80).

(79) a. For or now, I found never no knyght that matched me
    For before now, I found never no knight who matched me
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‘for before now, I never found any knight who matched me.’
(CMMALORY, 68.2331)

b. 3e had neuyr no knowlach of me be-fore þis time
you had never no knowledge of me before this time
‘You never had any knowledge of me before this time.’
(CMKEMPE, 58.1293)

c. no man seyd no-thyng a-geyns hem
no man said nothing against him
‘no man said anything against him’
(CMKEMPE, 33.730)

(80) a. nan mann næfð swàpeah nane mihte purh hine sylfne
no man NEG-has however no strength through himself
‘however, no man has any strength of himself’
(coaelhom,+AHom_22: 672.3699)

b. Ne deð nan man nan þing on diglum
NEG does no man no thing in secret
‘No man does anything in secret’
(cowsgosp,Jn_[WsCp]: 7.4.6259)

c. nan cristen man ne sceal þæt gelyfan
no Christian man NEG ought that believe
‘no Christian man ought believe that’
(cocathom1,+ACHom_I, 20:340.145.3982)

Multiple negation of the negative doubling type will be distinguished from the bipartite form of sentential negation \((ne\ldots not)\) which emerges at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle. Negative doubling holds between \(ne\) and a negative argument or adjunct. \(not\) in the bipartite negation \((ne\ldots not)\) has been distinguished from negative adjuncts in previous accounts of Jespersen’s Cycle on the basis that \(not\) is a semantically bleached functional element, which conveys negation without a restriction, unlike negative adjuncts or arguments which consist of negation plus a restriction on the negation (Roberts and Roussou 2003). The remainder of this chapter will be concerned with establishing distributional correlates for the functional distinction between negative adjuncts and the sentential negator \(not\).
2.4 Adverbial negative elements

This section discusses the status of two negative adverbial elements in Old and Middle English: Middle English not and Old English na. Both these elements have been analysed as sentential negators, and distinguished from other negative adverbials such as nafre 'never'. Two sets of diagnostics have been put forward for this view. First, semantic diagnostics. Sentential negators have purely functional meaning, unlike negative adverbs which consist of negation, plus a restriction on the negation, and hence retain some lexical meaning. Second, distributional diagnostics have been used to distinguish adverbial negatives from sentential negators, on the grounds that sentential negators occupy a fixed position in the functional structure of the clause (spec,NegP), unlike other negative adjuncts.

2.4.1 Research questions concerning the distribution of na and not early English

Any discussion of the distribution of na and not in early English must first establish the position of these elements within clausal structure. This is not entirely straightforward, and has been an area of debate in the literature. Van Kemenade (1999, 2000) claims the position of OE na and EME not is high, whilst Haeberli and Ingham (2003) claim that the position of EME not is low. On a superficial level, we might therefore conclude that the position of secondary negators changes in early English. However, I will examine the evidence underpinning these two positions, showing that once variability in the positioning of subjects is taken into account, the evidence for a low position for na and not is much more robust than the evidence for the high position. Van Kemenade (2000, 72) claims that the low position for negation emerges during Middle English. I will present data from both main and subordinate clauses to show that this is not the case.

We are left with the problem of distinguishing negative adverbs and sentential negators. The distinction between negative adjuncts and sentential negators is important to the discussion of early English for several reasons. The sentential negator not is thought to develop out of the negative adjunct nauh in Old or Middle English (Jack 1978b). Frisch (1997) argues that there is empirical evidence for this development in the Early Middle English period (c.1150-1350). Evidence for this development will be examined. A thorough investigation of what consti-
tutes evidence to distinguish the adjunct *not* from the sentential negator *not* will be a necessary part of this discussion. In contrast to Frisch (1997), Haeberli and Ingham (2003) argue that Early Middle English *not* is a sentential negator distinct from adjoined adverbs. I will examine the distributional evidence on which both Frisch (1997) and Haeberli and Ingham (2003) base their conclusions. I will claim that the positional evidence to distinguish *not* from adverbs is less clear than Frisch (1997) and Haeberli and Ingham (2003) propose.

The distributional evidence to distinguish adverbs and sentential negators falls into three parts. First is the position of sentential negators relative to subjects. Van Kemenade (1999, 2000) claims that there is a fixed position for *na* and *not* following pronominal subjects but preceding full NP subjects. Haeberli and Ingham (2003) take issue with van Kemenade’s claims. Instead, they claim that Early Middle English *not* predominantly follows full NP subjects. Second is the position of *not* and adverbs relative to the finite verb. This is the basis on which Frisch (1997) identifies adverb *not*. He claims that all *not* preceding the finite verb are adverbs rather than sentential negators. However, his analysis is incompatible with the syntactic assumptions I adopt, and his conclusions do not follow when we consider the effect of variation in the headedness of INFL (Pintzuk 1999) on the relative positions of *not* and the finite verb.

Third, van Kemenade (2000) and Haeberli and Ingham (2003) consider the distribution of *not* in relation to the positions of pronominal and nominal objects. Haeberli and Ingham (2003) argue that the distribution of *not* differs from the distribution of adverbs relative to objects. On this basis, they distinguish sentential negator *not* from adverbs. I argue that the behaviour of *not* is not unique, but typifies a subset of adverbs. The position of *not* relative to objects does not uniquely distinguish *not* from all adverbs. This chapter will re-examine the evidence for the distinction between sentential negator *not* and adverbs taking data not just from Early Middle English as Haeberli and Ingham (2003) do, but throughout the Middle English period, taking account of differences in the distribution of *not* at different periods.

Diagnostics for distinguishing sentential negators and adverbs are particularly important to the discussion of *na*. Van Kemenade (1999, 2000) has argued for a early distinction between negative adjuncts and *na*, which she claims is a sentential negator in the Old English period 950-1150. Her analysis places the emergence of a phrasal sentential negator much earlier than previously supposed, for example by Jack (1978b). Others, notably van Bergen (2003) and Ingham (2005)
express scepticism about analysing Old English *na* as a sentential negator. In section 2.4.5, I will examine in detail the evidence van Kemenade adduces for this conclusion, in relation to the distributional evidence for the sentential negator *not*. The status of *na* has important implications for the description and analysis of Jespersen’s Cycle in English, as I will show in subsequent chapters.

2.4.2  **Frisch’s (1997) diagnostics for adverb *not***

Frisch (1997) includes *not* within the category of negative adverbs in Early Middle English, whereas Haeberli and Ingham (2003) argue that *not* differs from adverbs, even in the Early Middle English period. Frisch discusses the position of *not* in relation to the position of the finite verb. He claims that instances of *not* preceding the finite verb (81) are adverbial uses of *not* rather than the sentential negator *not*.

(81)  a. naht ne scealt tu libben  
     not NEG shall you live  
     ‘you shall not live’  
     (CMVICES1,147.1833)

     b. he hit naht ne wite  
     he it not NEG knew  
     ‘he did not know it’  
     (CMTRINIT,79.1073)

Frisch’s claim rests on some assumptions which I do not share. The clause structure he assumes is shown in (82).
Frisch's account postulates a functional projection NegP with its specifier as the fixed position for the sentential negator not. The landing site of the finite verb is Agr°, which dominates the functional projection NegP. Sentential negators in spec,NegP are structurally lower than the finite verb, hence postverbal. This distinguishes sentential negators from adverbs which Frisch allows to adjoin to Agr', higher than the landing site of the finite verb (Agr°). This derives pre-verbal adverbs, including pre-verbal not. In calculating the frequency of adverb not, Frisch assumes that adverbial not occupy both pre- and post-verbal positions (Agr'-adjunction and T'-adjunction), in the same way as other adjoined adverbs. Frisch uses the distribution of never across pre- and post-verbal positions to gain an independent estimate of the frequency of Agr'-adjunction. In all ME periods, 16% of instances of never are pre-verbal. On this basis, he claims that the pre-verbal (Agr'-adjoined) instances of not only represent 16% of the total instances of adverb not. He compares the distribution of not with never, concluding that, in periods when the pre-verbal occurrence of not is 16% of the total, all not are adjoined adverbs syntactically the same as never. When the frequency of pre-verbal not is lower than 16%, Frisch takes this to indicate that some not are sentential negators which cannot appear in a pre-verbal position.

There are two problems with Frisch's approach. First, Frisch assumes the landing site of the finite verb is the same in main and subordinate clauses. Fol-
following Haeberli (2001; 2002b), I assume a landing site of Agr° for the verb in main clauses and T° in subordinate clauses. If the position for NegP is high as Frisch assumes, then any failure of T to Agr movement will result in pre-verbal not. Haeberli (2002b; 2001) argues that verb movement targets Agr° in main clauses, and T° in subordinate clauses. Therefore, under Frisch’s clause structure all not should be pre-verbal in subordinate clauses. This is clearly not the case (83), and indicates a lower position for not than the one Frisch (1997) proposes.

(83)  
\[
\text{if fleshly disciples understand this not} \\
\text{‘if mortal disciples do not understand this’} \\
(\text{CMWYCSER,392.2995})
\]

In fact, the distribution of not in relation to subjects (discussed in section 2.4.4) indicates that the position of not is always low in subordinate clauses. We can rule out the high not position in subordinate clauses. The evidence from not placement relative to subjects indicates that there is no high position for not in subordinate clauses. Hence, a reappraisal of the position of not in subordinate clauses is needed. Post-verbal not must be dominated by T° in subordinate clauses. The position of not is lower than Frisch supposes, at least in subordinate clauses, presumably between T and V. The relative ordering of not and the finite verb does not distinguish the two positions for not in main clauses as both high and low positions are dominated by Agr°, therefore post-verbal.

Second, Frisch assumes that the linear order of finite verb and sentential negator not must be constant, ignoring strong evidence for variation in the position of the finite verb, the different landing sites of verb movement in main and subordinate clauses, and variation in the headedness of INFL which Kroch and Taylor (2000b) describe for EME. There are two relevant axes of variation in the position of the finite verb: variation in the linear order of finite verb and not because of variation of the headedness of INFL (Pintzuk 1999, Kroch and Taylor 2000b), and variation in the application of V to Agr or V to T movement.

Variation in the headedness of INFL is one plausible approach to derive Early Middle English pre-verbal not. Pintzuk (1993; 1996; 1999) argues for variation in the headedness of INFL in Old English, on several syntactic grounds, principally the existence of word orders which cannot be derived by movement operations. Kroch and Taylor (2000b) extend Pintzuk’s analysis to Early Middle English. They provide evidence that variation in the headedness of INFL still occurs in early Middle English, albeit that I-final orders are much rarer in Middle
English than Old English. I follow Pintzuk, Kroch and Taylor in assuming variation in the headedness of INFL in Old and Middle English. This has the effect that the relative positions of *not* and the finite verb will vary in the surface string whilst the finite verb will always dominate negation.

However, it is not clear that the frequency of I-final order is sufficient to account for the frequency of pre-verbal *not*. Kroch and Taylor (2000b) claim that INFL-final order becomes marginal in Early Middle English. They give a figure of 9.6% superficial or surface I-final orders in PPCME2 subordinate clause data for the period 1150-1250. Pintzuk (1996; 1999) shows that the frequency of I-final orders is higher in Old English subordinate clauses than in Old English main clauses. Given the persistence of this contextual conditioning throughout the Old English data, there is every reason to suppose that clause type has a similar effect on the frequency of I-final order in Early Middle English. Therefore, I will consider the frequency of pre-verbal *not* in main and subordinate clauses separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th></th>
<th>Subordinate clauses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre-V not</td>
<td>Total not</td>
<td>% pre-V</td>
<td>pre-V not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: The frequency of pre-verbal *not* in subordinate clauses and non-conjoined main clauses.

Table 2.3 shows the frequency of pre-verbal *not* in main and subordinate clauses. For the period 1150-1250, the lack of pre-verbal *not* in main clauses is consistent with the marginal frequency of I-final orders in main clauses. However, the fre-

---

4This is their upper estimate for subordinate clauses. They claim that clauses which are unambiguously I-final are much less frequent. Their estimates range from 1.8% to 4.1%.

5For the period 1250-1350, there are three examples in the *Ayenbite of Inwit* which are problematic. These are main clauses with pre-verbal *not* like (i) (n=3/45 or 7%).

(i) þe oþer naȝt him awrecþ þeuruore (CMAYENB1,115.2209)

   *the other not him strike therefore*

   *therefore the other does not strike him*

They may be a consequence of I-final orders, but this would require an anomalously high frequency of I-final clauses in this text. These may constitute uses of *not* as adjoined adverbs, but
frequency of pre-verbal *not* in subordinate clauses is too high to be a consequence of I-final orders alone. In the period 1150-1250, Kroch & Taylor’s (2000) highest estimate for surface I-final orders in subordinate clauses is 9.6%. Overall, the frequency of pre-verbal *not* in subordinate clauses is double that at 20.6%.

Kroch and Taylor (2000b) give good reasons to suppose that the actual frequency of I-final order is lower than the superficial or surface frequency of I-final orders. They claim that another analysis is available to derive surface I-final orders in clauses with subject gaps or subject pronouns. This is stylistic fronting (Maling 1990). Stylistic fronting is a process by which non-subject material is fronted to spec,TP in those clauses where spec,TP is not itself occupied by the subject. In Middle English, stylistic fronting is available in clauses with subject gaps, and arguably also in clauses with subject pronouns (Kroch and Taylor 2000b), which under Haeberli’s analysis are clitics in spec,AgrP. Once Kroch and Taylor disregard clauses with subject pronouns or subject gaps, their estimates for I-final frequency in EME subordinate clauses range from 1.8% to 4.1%

Stylistic fronting is relevant for the distribution of *not* because Maling (1990) claims that the sentential negator is one of the elements most affected by the fronting process. Instead of standing in spec,NegP *not* can be fronted to spec,TP when spec,TP is vacant (84), (85). Under the assumption that subordinate clauses only have V to T movement, this will result in pre-verbal *not* (84, 85). In main clauses, stylistic fronting to spec,TP will not result in pre-verbal *not* because the finite verb is in a higher position (Agr°). Only in subordinate clauses does stylistic fronting result in pre-verbal *not*. Therefore, a full account of the distribution of pre-verbal *not* needs to take account of different subject types and different clause types. The subordinate clause data are shown in Table 2.4.

(84) pt God fordemô þa mann for þa þinge þe naht nis
that God condemns the man for the thing [that not NEG-is]
‘that God condemns the man for the thing [which is not]’
(CMKENTHO,140.158)

(85) hu mei he luuian wel ure drihten þe he naut ne isihô
how can he love well out Lord [who he not NEG sees]
‘how may he love our Lord well, [though he cannot see him]’

their analysis as adverbs or sentential negators is not clear, given variability in the other means of deriving pre-verbal *not*.

6Recall that Kroch and Taylor (2000b) use the same database that I use here, so our results are directly comparable.
Table 2.4 subdivides the subordinate clause data according to subject type. There are only two examples of pre-verbal *not* in clauses with NP subjects in the period 1150-1250, and these are the only examples until Late Middle English (see below for discussion of these). It is plausible to analyse both EME clauses as examples of I-final clauses. The frequency of pre-verbal *not* in clauses with subject gaps or subject pronouns is much higher, as predicted under an analysis which makes available stylistic fronting. These data support the idea that some EME texts had stylistic fronting. The possibility of stylistic fronting in clauses with subject gaps or subject pronouns must be considered a potential derivation of pre-verbal *not* in subordinate clauses until at least 1350. The evidence of Table 2.4 indicates stylistic fronting is less frequent after 1150, but there is still a higher incidence of pre-verbal *not* in clauses with subject gaps until 1350.

The combined effect of variation in the headedness of INFL and the existence of stylistic fronting means that Frisch’s diagnostic does not provide unequivocal structural evidence for *not* as an adjoined adverb. It is not inconceivable that the reanalysis of *not* as a sentential negator had already taken place by the Early Middle English period. The relative positions of *not* and the finite verb fail to distinguish sentential negator and adverbial uses of *not*. A fixed low position for *not* is sufficient to derive all examples of *not*.

The second potential derivation of pre-verbal *not* is variation in verb movement patterns and the landing site of the finite verb. Failure of V to T movement will result in pre-verbal *not*, even when *not* is analysed as specifier of a low NegP. This kind of analysis is most appropriate for the few Late Middle English examples of pre-verbal *not* (86) once it is generally accepted that the loss of V to T movement begins, circa 1420-1500 (Warner 1997). The general tendency for the
finite verb to precede *not* in LME shows that the loss of V to T movement is not very advanced in ME.

(86) And whils þou may, do pryve penance, þat al men þar noght wyt and whilst you may, do private penance, that all men there not know ‘and whilst you can, do private penance, so that all men there do not know.’

(CMROLLEP,101.614)

This section has demonstrated that a simple estimate of adverb *not* based on its occurrence pre-verbally is too simplistic, ignoring other potential derivations for pre-verbal *not* in Middle English. Once these alternative derivations are taken into account, there is little unambiguous evidence for adverb *not*. Therefore, my Middle English data are consistent with a low frequency of adverb *not* and an early date for the reanalysis of *not*. Frisch’s (1997) estimate of adverb *not* in Early Middle English does not have a firm analytical basis once other facts concerning the syntax of ME are taken into consideration. The general picture which emerges is one in which the distribution of *not* is consistent with its reanalysis as a sentential negator prior to the earliest Middle English period.

2.4.3 On the relative positions of negators, adverbs and objects in Early Middle English

The occurrence of an object pronoun between the finite verb and the negator is used by van Kemenade (2000) as evidence for a low negation position in Middle English (87). Contrary to van Kemenade’s (2000) claims, the relative ordering of *not* and an object pronoun provides evidence for a low position for *not* from Early Middle English onwards (see (87a)). These orders do not emerge during Middle English.

(87) a. ʒif þat hali writ ne wiðœið þe naht if that holy writ NEG abandon you not ‘if you do not abandon that holy writ’

(CMVICES1,101.1223)

b. as his men wiste hit naht as his men knew it not ‘as his men did not know it’

(CMBRUT3,13.347)
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c. if you ne sustayne us noghte
   if you NEG sustain us not
   'if you do not sustain us'
   (CMEDTHOR, 39.548)

Haeberli and Ingham (2003) take this argument one step further for Early Middle English *not*. They claim that whilst postverbal object pronouns precede *not* (88), full NP objects do not (89). This distribution is peculiar to early English *not*. Negators in other Germanic languages, such as German *nicht*, West Flemish *nie* allow scrambling of both object pronouns and object NPs across them.

(88) *pt ich ne seo hire nawt heonne-forð mare*
   that I NEG see her not henceforth any more
   'that I will not see her any more'
   (CMJULIA, 123.489, Haeberli and Ingham (2003, ex.16a))

(89) *pe ne wilen noht here sinnes forletan*
   who NEG want not their sins renounce
   'who does not want to renounce their sins'
   (CMTRINIT, 83.1110, Haeberli and Ingham (2003, ex.13b))

Haeberli and Ingham (2003) argue that the distribution of objects relative to *not* distinguishes *not* from adverbs. Object pronouns may move across both adverbs and *not*. Object NPs may move across adverbs, but always remain lower than *not*. They argue that the negator occupies a structurally higher position than adverbs, across which object pronouns, but not object NPs can move (a partial tree is given in (90)).
However, I find 3 examples of the order 'NP object - not' in the period 1150-1250, which are potential counterexamples to Haeberli and Ingham's conclusion (91). All three have the NP object following the subject but preceding not. Examples like (91) are infrequent, accounting for only 3/74 (4%) examples of not in clauses with nominal objects.

(91) a. Gif þu þe seluen for þissere forbisne ne wilt naht neperin
    if you your self for this example NEG will not abase
    'if you will abase yourself according to this example…'
    (CMVICES1,49.554)

b. þæt þu þe seluen naht ne miht helpen
    that you your self not NEG can help
    'that you cannot help yourself'
    (CMVICES1,65.708)

c. þæt þu þis weork naht ne forlate...
    that you this work not NEG neglect...
    'that you do not neglect this work…'
    (CMVICES1,93.1097)

When compared to the frequency of 'NP object - adverb' orders as a whole for the same period, we see that the frequency of clauses like (91) is much lower than the frequency of clauses like (92). Taking adverbs as a whole, the frequency of 'NP object - adverb' order is n=106/696 or 15%. However, different classes of adverbs behave differently with respect to nominal object movement across them. For
example, the frequency of ‘NP obj - adv’ orders with the temporal adverbs never, then, oft (‘never, then, often’) (93) is much lower at n=7/103 or 7% for the period 1150-1250. Once different types of adverb are taken into account, the similarities between not and the class of discourse or temporal adverbs increase.

(92) þu wilt godes lore bliðeliche understonden and liemin
     you will God’s teaching gladly understand and learn
     ‘You will galdly understand and learn God’s law’
     (CMVICES1,47.532)

(93) þat man his licames lust drige ofte
     that one his body’s lust endure often
     that a man often must endure his body’s lusts’
     (CMTRINIT,31.419)

Two conclusions emerge from this discussion. First, the order ‘NP object - not’ is not impossible, and should not be ruled out in EME. Second, once different classes of adverbs are taken into account, the differences between not and certain discourse or temporal adverbs look much less clear cut than Haeberli and Ingham (2003) claim.

Data from later periods of ME maintain the similarities between not and the temporal adverbs never, then, oft. In the LME periods 1350-1430 and 1430-1500, the incidence of ‘NP object - adv’ orders with these adverbs is only 3/343 or 1%. This distribution is largely consistent with the non-occurrence of the order ‘NP object - not’ in the same periods. What these tentative results show is that without further detailed analysis of NP object movement, in respect of particular adverbs or groups of adverbs, it is not clear that the position of not is necessarily distinct from the position of all adverbs in ME.

2.4.4 The distribution of Middle English not relative to subjects

There are two possible adjunction sites for negative adjuncts which are internal to the clause. These are distinguished by the position of the adjunct relative to a full NP subject. Recall that the clause structure I assume for Old and Middle English distinguishes two subject positions, the higher one typically for subject pronouns, and the lower one exclusively for full NP subjects (94). This is the structure proposed by Haeberli (2002b) for Old English clauses, with V to Agr movement in main clauses and V to T movement in subordinate clauses (Haeberli 2001).
Haeberli (2002a) demonstrates that there is no adjoined position for adverbs at the AgrP level. Using German and Dutch data, he shows that adverbs can intervene between a finite verb in $C^0$ and a full NP subject in spec,TP, but not between a finite verb in $C^0$ and a pronoun subject in spec,AgrP. However, adverbs can appear in spec,CP and adjoined to CP. In summary, there are three positions for negative adjuncts in relation to subjects: preceding a subject pronoun (adjoined to CP or in spec,CP), between the finite verb and a full NP subject, and following a full NP subject. The positions available to *not* in main clauses are more restricted than the positions available to adverbs. Negative adverbs can appear in spec,CP or as CP adjuncts, whereas *not* does not appear there (95), except in one instance (96).

(95) Neuyr took he giftes of man
Never took he gifts from man
‘He never took gifts from man’
(CMCAPCHR,54.666)

(96) naht ne scealt tu libben
not NEG shall you live
‘you shall not live’
(CMVICES1,147.1833)

Much of the literature (for example Frisch (1997) or van Kemenade (2000) for English) assumes a correlation between the semantic impoverishment of sentential negators as conveyors of purely grammatical functional meaning (as gram-
maticalised operators) and positional restrictions on their distribution. The syntactic correlate of functional meaning is reanalysis of the negator as the specifier of a functional projection. The sentential negator is thereby restricted to occur in a fixed position, which is determined by the position of the negative head with which it must agree. Two potential positions for not are distinguished by the position of not relative to subjects. My aim here is first to describe the distribution of not over the course of the entire ME period and compare it with the distribution of adverbs. I will consider two issues:

1. What is the position of not in the Middle English period? Does not undergo any change in distribution which might indicate its reanalysis as a sentential negator, for example impoverishment of the range of positions it can occupy?

2. Does the range of positions available to not distinguish it from discourse adverbs?

Full consideration of these issues will involve establishing the distribution of not and other adverbs relative to subjects in spec,TP. We will see that the way to address this issue is not to consider the distribution of not and adverbs in relation to all subjects. Variation in the placement of nominal subjects will be taken into account. Only a subset of subjects can be used as diagnostics for high and low negation positions. The positions available to positive adjuncts and negative adjuncts like never will be compared with those available to not to establish whether there is any positional evidence to distinguish sentential negators from adjuncts which would indicate the reanalysis of not in ME.

Van Kemenade (1999, 2000) develops an account of the position of not based on an observation by Einenkel (1912). Einenkel (1912) and van Kemenade (1999) observe that full NP subjects often follow not (97a) whereas pronoun subjects always precede not (97b).

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{97} & \textbf{a.} also ne accordeth nat the poeple to that \\
& also NEG accord not the people to that \\
& 'also the people do not accept that' \\
& (Chaucer Melibee 2132, van Kemenade (2000, 69, ex.23b)) \\
\textbf{b.} yet ne wolde he nat answer sodeynly \\
& yet NEG would he not answer suddenly \\
& 'yet he would not answer suddenly' \\
& (Chaucer Melibee 2222, van Kemenade (2000, 69, ex.23a))
\end{tabular}
The relevant clauses under investigation have their subject in the INFL complex, so include all clauses where the subject does not move to spec,CP: that is NegV1 clauses and clauses with non-subject topics. In these clauses, it is possible to determine the position of not in respect of other elements in the INFL complex, such as subjects.

On this basis, van Kemenade (1999; 2000) identifies a high position for Middle English not preceding full NP subjects. She takes this as evidence for the high position for NegP, intervening between AgrP (whose specifier hosts subject pronouns) and TP (whose specifier hosts full NP subjects). However, Haeberli (2000) shows that the high position is not exclusive to the negatives na, not or negative adjuncts. He cites examples of non-negative discourse oriented or temporal adverbs in this position (98). The appearance of not in this position does not distinguish it from adverbs.

(98) Wende þa porphire to freinen þis meiden turned then Porphire to question this maiden ‘Then Porphire turned to question this maiden’
(Kathe, 39.328, Haeberli (2000, 123, ex.21a))

Van Kemenade (2000) also observes a lower negation position in Middle English (99) which she claims is a Middle English innovation.7

(99) so slyly that the preest it nat espide so slyly that the priest it not saw ‘...so slyly that the priest did not see it’
(Chaucer, Canon Yeoman’s Tale, 1230, (van Kemenade 2000, 72, ex.28d))

Quantitative investigation of the distribution of not in the PPCME2 data shows both the orders ‘not-subject’ and ‘subject-not’ in EME and LME. These data provide no evidence for the emergence of the low position in ME. not appears in two positions relative to NP subjects in main clauses in ME (Table 2.5). These are the same two positions available to temporal and discourse adverbs.

Although there are examples of not both preceding a nominal subject and following a nominal subject in main clauses, the same is not true of subordinate clauses. Typically, not in subordinate clauses follows the nominal subject. There are 22 exceptions to this pattern (100) and (101) (Table 2.6).

7It is interesting that all the examples van Kemenade (2000, ex.28) gives (such as (99) are examples of subordinate clauses. I deal with the distribution of not in main and subordinate clauses separately, owing to the syntactic differences between these clause types.
2.4. ADVERBIAL NEGATIVE ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>not-NP su</th>
<th>NP su- not</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% not- NP su</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5: The position of *not* relative to a post-verbal full NP subject in non-conjoined main clauses

(100) so þt in us ne be nouȝt ouden wittes ne ouden willes but his
so that in us NEG are not our own wits nor our own wills but his
only
‘so that in us are not our own wits or our own wills but his only’
(CMVICES4,108.212)

(101) And so had they done had not an olde knyght com amongst them...
And so they would have done if an old knight had not come amongst them...
‘And so they would have done if an old knight had not come amongst them’
(CMMALORY,636.3814)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>not-NP su</th>
<th>NP su- not</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% not- NP su</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.6: The position of *not* relative to a post-verbal full NP subject in subordinate clauses

Haeberli and Ingham (2003) take issue with van Kemenade’s (2000, 72) claim that the low position for *not* emerges during Middle English. Tables 2.5 and 2.6 show that there is good evidence for the low position in the earliest Middle English period, as Haeberli and Ingham (2003) claim, particularly in subordinate clauses.

The apparent differences between the distribution of *not* in main and subordinate clauses pose problems for an analysis of *not* which aims to account for the distribution of *not* in both clause types. Ideally, we would like to claim that the status and position of *not* is the same in both clause types, but the data appear to
contradict this. We are left facing one of two conclusions. Either the position of *not* is different in main and subordinate clauses, or the position of NP subjects is different in main and subordinate clauses. Whilst the distribution of *not* relative to NP subjects might be thought sufficient to identify two positions for *not* in the clausal architecture, one higher than TP and one lower than TP, we need some account of the different distribution of *not* in main and subordinate clauses.

Up to this point we have been assuming that all nominal subjects occupy spec,TP in both main and subordinate clauses. Van Kemenade (1997b) claims that certain types of nominal subjects remain lower than TP. Van Kemenade’s claim suggests another solution to the apparent variation in *not* placement. Variability in the position of subjects in main clauses due to discourse, weight, syntactic or informational requirements may be sufficient to explain the relative orderings of *not* and nominal subjects found in main clauses, and the differences between main and subordinate clauses. Justification for two positions for *not* rests on the assumption that all nominal subjects appear in spec,TP. Haeberli and Ingham (2003) and van Kemenade (1997b) argue that this assumption is not justified. Therefore, to ascertain whether there are two syntactic positions for *not* we need to consider just those clauses in which the subject is in spec,TP. Hence we need to determine which clauses fall into this group.

Van Kemenade discusses the position of ME *not* in relation to all nominal subjects, assuming that nominal subjects uniformly appear in spec,TP. Haeberli and Ingham (2003) take issue with this assumption in their discussion of EME *not*. Two types of low subject must be taken into account: VP-internal subjects, and postposed subjects. In order to get a clearer assessment of the positions available to *not* we need to exclude clauses in which the subject does not occupy spec,TP. Van Kemenade (1997b) argues that subjects remain lower than spec,TP in some clauses. She identifies the relevant clauses as those with impersonal, unaccusative or modal verbs.

For this period, van Kemenade (1997b) analyses modal verbs as lexical raising verbs of the category V which do not have a thematic subject. Roberts and Roussou (2003, 40) propose a similar biclausal analysis of OE and ME pre-modals. So there are two spec,TP positions in structures with pre-modals, one associated with the modal, the other associated with the lexical verb. The failure of subject raising will leave the subject in the lower spec,TP, lower than the modal and any negation associated with it. It is well known that OE and ME have expletive *pro*, in raising and impersonal constructions. Therefore, raising of the lexical sub-
ject into the higher spec, TP is not categorical, and examples of *not* preceding the subjects in constructions with modals are not evidence for a high position for *not*.

Concerning the position of *not* in subordinate clauses, 20/22 exceptions to the post-verbal, post-subject positioning of *not* have be, modal or unaccusative verbs (100, 101). Figures from the PPCME2 indicate that subjects stood in post-verbal position 1205/10974 or 11% of the time with these verbs. The frequency of *not*-subject orders with the same verbs is 20/341 or 6%. The frequency of *not*-subject orders in subordinate clauses is consistent with a single position for *not* below TP plus variable use of a low subject position for subjects of *be*, unaccusatives and modals. In subordinate clauses the evidence points to a low position for *not* throughout ME, rather than the development of a low position for *not* as van Kemenade (2000, 72) claims. The two exceptions to post-subject placement of *not* with transitive verbs appear in LME without *ne*. Therefore, these two instances of *not* might represent head (Neg°) *not*.

We now need to ascertain whether it is plausible for all main clause instances of the order 'be/unaccusative - *not*-subject' to be derived by late subject placement. Van Kemenade (1997b) claims that expletive pro also appears with *be* and unaccusatives. There are 20 examples of *be* and unaccusatives with *not*. 16/20 follow *not*. Of those subjects which follow *not*, 10/16 are heavy subjects which are postmodified by relative clauses, adjectival phrases or adjunct phases, or are conjoined NPs (102).

(102) a. Ne cum nougt to me *be* vice of pride
   NEG comes not to me the vice of pride
   'The vice of pride does not come to me'
   (CMEARLPS, 42.1788)

b. forsothe to Adam was not founden an helpere lijk hym
   truly for Adam was not found a helper like him
   'truly, a helper like him was not found for Adam'
   (CMOTEST, II, 20G. 120)

These are probable candidates for late subject constructions. Warner (2005) shows that long or heavy subjects favour placement later in the clause. This lends support to the idea that the *not*-subject order often arises through late placement of subjects, either VP internal subjects or extraposed subjects. Without knowing more about the information structuring and pragmatic factors operating on late subject placement it is not possible to demonstrate conclusively that late subject placement is responsible for all *not*-subject orders, but these data indicate that
this analysis is at least a plausible one, and weaken the argument for positioning \textit{not} higher than TP.

In order to control for late subjects with be, unaccusatives and modals in main clauses, I exclude these verbs from the analysis. Clauses with these verbs account for most of my data (n=22/25) examples). By limiting my investigation to exclude potential late subject constructions, I limit the number of main clause examples available to the analysis quite severely. For the whole ME period, there are only 3 examples of \textit{not} preceding a subject NP in clauses with transitive or unergative lexical verbs (103).\footnote{The loss of negative initial clauses in Middle English reduces the number of contexts with post-verbal subjects considerably. In clauses without a non-subject topic the subject moves to \textmd{spec,CP} as is typical in verb-second languages.}

\begin{quotation}
(103)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Swo ne answarede noht Moyses ure Drihten...  
Thus NEG answered not Moses our Lord...  
\textquoteleft Moses did not answer our Lord thus...\textquoteright
  
\cite{CMTRINIT,215.3009}
\item b. Ne underouë nawt qô he ëis ilke word alle  
NEG uphold not said he this same word all  
\textquoteleft All do not uphold this same word\textquoteright he said
  
\cite{CMHALI,141.201}
\item c. Nule naut ure lauerd ët amon for an ëing beo twisen  
NEG-intends not our Lord that a man for one thing be twice judged  
\textquoteleft Our Lord does not intend that a man should be judged twice for the same thing\textquoteright

\cite{CMANCRIW,II.228.3297}
\end{enumerate}
\end{quotation}

This is insufficient evidence to determine whether \textit{not} typically precedes or follows TP in main clauses. Two of the three examples of \textit{not}-subject appear in EME and may reflect use of \textit{not} as an adjoined adverb rather than a sentential negator. Alternatively, these clauses may have late subjects for reasons of discourse or information structure which I have not taken into account during the analysis.

Once potential variability in the position of subjects relative to ME \textit{not} is taken into account, we see stronger evidence for a low position for \textit{not} (TP>\textit{not}>vP).
The status of the high position for *not* is not clear. The evidence for it is weak. Although it is difficult to account for all 'not-subject' orders as late subject constructions, this is a possibility. Alternatively, we might account for the few instances of high *not* as adverbial uses of *not* as a TP-adjunct rather than as a sentential negator.

### 2.4.5 The distribution of Old English *na* relative to subjects

I will now turn my attention to Old English *na*. The status of *na* is contested in the literature: van Kemenade (1999; 2000) claims that *na* is a secondary negator, whilst van Bergen (2003) and Ingham (2005) claim that *na* is a discourse adverb. If van Kemenade is correct, change in sentential negation strategies under Jespersen's Cycle begins in English much earlier than previously assumed. Table 2.7 shows that *na* is not particularly frequent in any of the Old English periods as a proportion of all negative clauses. It is less frequent in subordinate clauses than in main clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Non conjoined main cl</th>
<th>2nd conjuncts</th>
<th>Subordinate cls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>na/no Total % na</td>
<td>na/no Total % na</td>
<td>na/no Total % na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850-950</td>
<td>131 778 17%</td>
<td>36 460 8%</td>
<td>82 2278 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-1050</td>
<td>284 2818 10%</td>
<td>131 2280 6%</td>
<td>121 4162 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050-1150</td>
<td>119 675 18%</td>
<td>76 580 13%</td>
<td>102 1596 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>534 4271 13%</td>
<td>243 3320 7%</td>
<td>305 8036 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.7: The overall frequency of *na* in non-conjoined main clauses, second conjuncts and subordinate clauses.

Van Kemenade (1999, 2000) observes that full NP subjects typically follow *na* (104b) whereas pronoun subjects always precede *na* (104a). She argues that this fixed position is typical of a sentential negator and shows continuity with ME *not*.

(104) a. Ne *het* he us na leornian heofonas to wyrccenne  
NEG ordered he us not to-learn heaven’s to make  
‘He did not order us to learn to make the heavens’  
(*Ælfric Lives of Saints* XVI.127, van Kemenade (2000, ex.14a))

b. Ne *sæde* na *ure* Drihten þæt he mid cynehelme oððe mid  
NEG said not our Lord that he with diadem or in  
purpuran gescryd cuman wolde to us  
purple clothed come wanted to us
‘Our Lord did not say that he wanted to come to us with a diadem or
clothed in purple’
((Ælfric Lives of Saints XXXI.762, van Kemenade (2000, ex.14b))

Van Kemenade takes this as evidence for the high position for NegP, intervening between AgrP or FP in van Kemenade’s (2000: 65, ex.17) structure (whose specifier hosts subject pronouns) and TP (whose specifier hosts full NP subjects). However, there are a substantial number of postverbal NP subjects preceding na which constitute evidence for the low position (106a-106d). Van Kemenade (2000) notes examples of na in a lower position, but she does not consider these examples in detail. Such examples occur at all periods of Old English, and account for 54/105 (51%) of all instances of na in main clauses with full NP subjects in the YCOE. Examples like (106a-106d) are not particularly rare at any point in Old English. There are instances of na in positions both higher and lower than NP subjects at all periods of Old English (105a-106d). If we accept that na is a sentential negator in Old English, there is good evidence for its position being low, evidence which challenges van Kemenade’s assertion that the low position for secondary negators is a Middle English development.

(105) finite verb - na - full DP subject
a. Ne do na se Godes peowa Godes þenunge for sceattum
   NEG do NA the God’s people God’s ministry for payment
   ‘God’s people do not perform God’s ministry for payment’
   (ALet1T,+ALet_1_[WulfsigeT]:72.14)

b. Ac us ne het na se hælend him beon gebeogole
   But us NEG called NA the Lord to-him to-be submissive
   ‘But the Lord does not call us to him to be submissive’
   (ALet6,+ALet_6_[Wulfgeat]:123.48)

c. & þone leahtar nyston na þa ðre brōdra.
   and the sin NEG-knows NA the other brothers
   ‘and the other brothers do not know the sin’
   (GDC,GDPref_and_4_[C]:40.326.28.4910)

(106) finite verb - full DP subject - na
a. Da ne onhran þæt fyr him no
   Then NEG touched that fire him no
   ‘Then the fire did not touch him’
   (comart3,Mart_5_[Kotzor]:Ja17,B.23.155)
b. Ne teah Crist him na to on þisum life land. ne welan swa swa
NEG drew Christ him NA to in this life land nor riches just as
he be him sylfum cwæð:
he by him self said
‘Christ did not draw land nor riches to him in this life, just as he himself said’
(CathHomI, +ACHom_I, _10:263.145.1943)

c. Ne wyrco God na þas wundra æt nanes iudeisces mannes
NEG performs God NA these miracles at no Jewish man’s
byrgene
tomb
‘God does not perform these miracles at any Jewish man’s tomb...’
(CathHomI, +ACHom_I,20:344.253.4092)

d. Ne forseon ða gelæredan na ða ungelæredan
NEG despise-SBJ the spiritual NA the temporal
‘The spiritual life does not despise the temporal’
(WHom, WHom_10a:45.806)

The overall distribution of na relative to subjects is similar to ME not. Tables
2.8 and 2.9 show the distribution of na in main and subordinate clauses. Like ME
not, the data show two positions for na, preceding and following NP subjects.
In main clauses, na occurs preceding or following an NP subject with similar
frequency. The predominant pattern in in subordinate clauses is for na to follow
a subject NP. This distribution is similar to that which we saw for ME not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>na-su</th>
<th>su-na</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% na-su</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>850-950</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-1050</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050-1150</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8: The position of na/no/not relative to a full NP subject which is post-
verbal in non-conjoined main clauses.

Having established that there is a low position for na in main and subordinate
clauses, it remains to be determined whether all instances of na can be analysed
as occupying the low position, contra van Kemenade (1999; 2000), or whether we
need to claim two positions for na. This question assumes greater importance
in the light of comments by van Bergen (2003, 190) who cites the variability in
the position of na as evidence to analyse na as an adjoined adverb rather than
### Table 2.9: The position of *na/no/not* relative to a full NP subject in subordinate clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>na-su</th>
<th>su-na</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% na-su</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>850-950</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-1050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050-1150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The specifier of a functional projection, which she claims should be fixed in the clausal hierarchy. A further argument against analysing *na* as the specifier of a functional projection fixed in the clausal hierarchy is the disparity in its position according to clause type. In both main and subordinate clauses, two positions for *na* relative to nominal subjects are attested. However, the distribution of *na* across these two positions is different in the two clause types.

There are very few (n=8/69 or 12%) (ex. 107) and (ex. 108) instances of *na* preceding a subject in subordinate clauses, compared to n=51/105 (49%) of the same order in main clauses. 7/8 examples of 'na-subject' occur in clauses with *be*, modals or unaccusatives (107). The subject of these verbs can remain in VP. So these examples do not challenge the view that the position of *na* in subordinate clauses is lower than TP.

(107) and cwæð þæt ne cymð na antecristes tima þa hwile þe se

and said that NEG comes not antichrist's time until that the casere his cynedomes gewylt

emperor his kingdom-GEN wishes

‘and said that the Antichrist's time does not come until until the emperor

of-his kingdom wishes

(coaelhom,+AHom_29:5.4074)

(108) forðæm þe na se ðorn ðære gitsunga ne wyrð forsearod

because NA the thorn the-GEN desire-GEN NEG becomes withered

on ðæm helme

on the tree

‘because the thorn of desire does not become withered on the tree’

(cocura,CP:45.341.9.2292)

Haeberli and Ingham's proposal for Early Middle English subordinate clauses can be extended to Old English *na*. Once the possibility of late subjects is taken into account in the analysis of subordinate clauses, we can say that the position for *na* is a low one (below TP).
The effect of late subject constructions on the distribution of *na* in main clauses remains to be determined in more detail, but the position of the subject is not fixed in these clauses and does not allow the two positions for *na* to be distinguished. I will control for late subjects by excluding the verbs which permit late subjects, as I did in the discussion of *not* (section 2.4.4). These include the verb *be* (109), unaccusative verbs like *cuman* 'to come' (110), without an external argument, whose subjects can remain lower than TP (van Kemenade 1997b). Van Kemenade (1997, 336) claims that the antecedents of PDE modals also lack an external argument and the position of their subject is similarly ambiguous (111).

(109) Naes na Cristes prowung gefremmed on ðisum dæge.  
NEG-was not Christ's suffering accomplished on this day  
'Christ's suffering was not accomplished on this day'  
(CathHomI,+ACHom_I,-14.1:296.179.2709)

(110) ponne ne cymð na to eow se froergast.  
then NEG comes not to you the holy spirit  
'then the holy spirit does not come to you'  
(GDC,GD_2_[C]:38.177.16.2161)

(111) Ne mihte na se deafa ne se dumba abiddan Pone halgan Hælæand his  
NEG can not the deaf or the dumb ask the holy Lord his  
agen hæle  
own salvation  
The deaf or the dumb cannot ask the holy Lord for his own salvation'  
(coaelhom,+AHom_18:99.2544)

Another clause type which has the nominative argument within the VP are clauses with dative experiencer verbs, in which the dative experiencer is the thematic subject (112) (Allen 1995).

(112) ne þinceð me na þat wundorlic...  
NEG seems me NA that miraculous...  
'that does not seem miraculous to me'  
(cogregdC,GDPref_and_3_[C]:24.227.17.313)

Restricting the analysis to postverbal full NP subjects of active transitive verbs leaves only 12 clauses. 8/12 (66%) have the order 'na - subject', while 4/12 (33%) have the order 'subject - na'. In 4 of the 8 examples in which *na* precedes the subject, the subject is clause final, so the possibility of extraposition of the subject
cannot be discounted. These clauses are too few to support any firm generalisations about the position of *na* in main clauses. Taking main and subordinate clauses together, we see that the evidence for a high position is much less robust than the evidence for a low position, as we saw for ME *not*. There are some apparent exceptions to the low position for *na* like (113) which remain to be accounted for in further research.

(113) Ne do na se Godes þeow use Godes þenunge for sceattum
NEG do NA the God's people God's work for payment
'God's people do not do God's work for payment'

However, the analysis here demonstrates that the evidence for a high position for *na* is unclear and marginal in comparison to the evidence for the low position, once variability in the placement of subjects is taken into account. The analysis in this section does not address the question of whether *na* is a sentential negator or an adjoined adverb, and it is this question to which I now turn. Van Bergen (2003) argues that the distribution of *na* across two positions is evidence for its status as an adverb. However, I have shown that the evidence for two positions is much less robust than van Bergen (2003) supposes.

2.5 Conclusions: evidence for *not* and *na* as sentential negators?

The preceding sections have localised the position of *na* and *not* to a position between TP and vP. I argued that many of the apparent counterexamples to this claim should be discounted. Subordinate clauses provide clearer evidence of the position of *na*, because it is much easier to isolate and examine just those subordinate clauses which have pre-verbal spec,TP subjects, preceding a finite verb in T'. In these clauses, the position of *na* and *not* is low, and largely fixed. However, the position occupied by *na* and *not* does not distinguish *na* and *not* from positive and negative adverbs, which also appear in a position between TP and vP.

Whilst the distribution of *na* and *not* is distinct from the position of other negative adverbials like *næfre* 'never' which occupy positions between AgrP and TP as well as between TP and vP, this distinction is not necessarily one between adverbs and sentential negators. It could equally mark a distinction between different types of adverbs. Although the fixed position for *na* and *not* suggests their
reanalysis as sentential negators occupying a fixed position in the clause, none of the positional diagnostics used to distinguish adverbs and negators which I discussed in this chapter actually distinguishes adverbs and negators. There is no empirical distinction to be made between a vP adjunct position and the position for na and not, and no clear evidence for a distinct position associated with sentential negation. This has important implications for the discussion of NegP in chapter 4.

There are three other facts which suggest a distinction between sentential negative markers and negative adverbs. First, na and not do not often co-occur with negative adjuncts or negative arguments. This distinguishes OE na and EME not from negative adverbs like næfre which do appear in negative spread. In main clauses, 52/277 (18.8%) of næfre co-occur with negative arguments or adjuncts (114), whereas only 6/823 (0.7%) of na appear in these contexts (115). A similar situation holds in subordinate clauses: where 9/320 (2.8%) instances of na/no co-occur with negative arguments or adjuncts (116). The figure is 55/499 (11%) for næfre (117).

(114) ne nan cristen man þat næfre ne sceal gelyfan nor no christan man that never NEG ought believe 'and no Christian man ought to believe that' (cocathom1,+ACHom_I, _20:340.145.3982)

(115) And man ne sceal hit na don nanum samcwycyce men And one NEG ought it NA do no half-dead man 'and one ought not do it to any half-dead man' (colwstan2,+ALet_3_[Wulfstan_2]:12.11)

(116) þæt na nan ænlipig ne modige that NA no individual NEG grow proud-SBJ 'that no man ought grow proud' (cobenrul,BenR:65.125.8.1203)

(117) he næfre nanne synne ne geworhte he never no sin NEG did 'he never did any sin' (coca thom2,+ACHom_II, _3:21.91.511)

The same distribution is seen in the case of EME not. In the EME period 1150-1350, there are only 4/1318 (0.3%) examples of not which co-occur with negative arguments or adjuncts, compared with 24/255 (9%) of never.
Second, the distribution of *na* and *not* across clause types is not the same as the distribution of adverbs across clause types. The proportion of negative clauses involving *na*/fre 'never' is roughly the same for main and subordinate clauses. 322/7942 (4%) of negative main clauses have *na*/fre. This compares with 401/8493 (5%) of negative subordinate clauses. However, the distribution of *na* across the two clause types is markedly different. 777/7591 (10%) of main clauses have *na*, whilst only 305/8036 (4%) of subordinate clauses have *na*. This distribution distinguishes *na* from *na*/fre. We see the same pattern with *not* and *never* in EME. In the period 1150-1250, 357/541 or 66% of non-conjoined main clauses have *not*, whilst only 344/947 or 36% of subordinate clauses have *not*. The EME distribution of *never* is the same in main clauses and subordinate clauses. 127/1610 or 8% of main clauses have *never*, and 128/1662 or 8% of subordinate have *never*. In chapter 5, I argue that the difference between main and subordinate clauses is an important factor in the introduction of a secondary negator at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle. I infer from this that OE *na* is already behaving like a sentential negator in this respect.

Third, there is evidence which indicates that some instances of *na* have undergone semantic reanalysis or bleaching even in OE, losing lexical meaning to become a grammatical marker of negation. We see instances of *na* used in contexts where we would not expect it if it had full lexical meaning as an adverb. Eythorsson (2002, 220, note 12) observes that the etymological root of *na* is ne+a. OE a is a temporal adverb, meaning 'ever, always' (118).

(118) a. and hellewitu he him sceal a ondraedan and torment he himself ought always fear 'and he ought always fear hell's torment' (cobenru1, BenR: 4.17.20.262)

b. þisse halgan Marian saule bip a gewuldrod mid Gode this holy Mary's soul is always glorified with God 'The holy Mary's soul is glorified with God for ever' (coblick, LS_20_[AssumptMor[BlHom_13]]: 147.170.1818)

There are some clauses which clearly have a reading where the reading of *na* as 'never' is much less felicitous than a reading of *na* as a negative marker 'not'. These include clauses where a specific point in time is mentioned (119-120), and declarations of identity which are not temporally anchored (121-122).

(119) Buton gehwylc mann beo acenned of wætere & of þam Halgan Gaste, Unless each man is born of water and of the Holy Spirit,
These distributional facts are sufficient to distinguish *na* and *not* from other adverbs. The parallels between the distribution of *not* and *na* support the view that at least some OE *na* are used as sentential negators, with grammatical functional meaning, rather than negative adverbs with lexical meaning. These data support van Kemenade's (1999, 2000) analysis of *na* as a secondary negator, and are evidence that Jespersen's Cycle has reached its second stage in some OE clauses. However, there is no evidence to distinguish the position of *na* and *not* from adverbs, and by implication, no empirical evidence to associate a particular structural position with negation.
Chapter 3

Negative initial clauses

3.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on negative-initial Old English main clauses, in both prose and poetry. Negation is most commonly placed clause initially in Old English main clauses (n=1698/2547, or 67%). In the Old English prose, the initial negative element is usually *ne* immediately followed by the finite verb (123).

(123)  a. Nylle ic þe ofslean...
       NEG-will I you kill
       ‘I will not kill you’
       (comargaC,LS_14_[MargaretCCC_303]:22.3.341)

   b. Ne het he us na leornian heofonas to wyrccenne
       NEG ordered he us not learn heavens to make
       ‘He did not order us to make the heavens’
       (coaelive,+ALS_[Mark]:147.3294)

   c. ne finde ic nanne intingan on þysum men
       NEG find I no fault in these men
       ‘I find no fault with these men’
       (cowsgosp,Lk_[WSCp]:23.4.5549)

The syntactic analysis of these clauses involves verb movement to a higher position in negative clauses than in non-negative declarative clauses (Pintzuk 1999, Haeberli 2002b). V to C movement is invoked in the following clause types in which the finite verb precedes a subject pronoun: negative-initial clauses, subjunctives, imperatives and following the initial adverbs *pa, bonne, nu* ‘then, now’ (see section 2.2.2).
Negative initial clauses in the Old English poetry do not all show inversion of a finite verb with a subject pronoun. Many negative clauses in the poetry have negative elements other than *ne* in clause initial position. These negatives are not immediately followed by the finite verb (124).

(124) no he him ʰa sǣce ondred  
   NEG he himself the struggle feared  
   ‘he did not fear the struggle’ (cobeowul,73.2345.1917)

The pattern seen in the Old English poetry differs from that seen in Present Day English, where a range of initial negatives trigger subject-verb inversion.

(125) a. Never have I seen such a thing  
   b. On no account should you do that

Only *ne* is immediately followed by a finite verb in C⁰ in either prose or poetry in either my OE or EME data. The converse is also true: there are no initial sentential negators *ne* occurring without V to C movement.

Thus we see that the pattern of inversion common in OE and EME is different from that found in PDE. Furthermore, there is historical discontinuity between the two patterns. There is evidence that the PDE pattern of inversion emerges during Early Modern English. Nevalainen (1997) presents evidence that inversion following negatives such as *never* is variable and increasing in Early Modern English (see section 6.4.2 for discussion of this development). My data provide few Old and Middle English antecedents (n=4) for the Present-Day English pattern in (125). Whilst there are OE examples like (126) they are marginal, and all involve the sentential negator, unlike the Early Modern English pattern.

(126) a. nane are ne dyde he him  
   no honour NEG did he him  
   ‘He did him no honour’  
   (coverhom,HomU_9_[ScraggVerc_4]:224.731)  

b. nanum menn ne secgan ge ʰis ær mannes sunu of deape  
   No man NEG say-SBJ you this before man’s son of death arise  
   arise-SBJ  
   ‘You ought say this to no man before the Son of Man from death arises’  
   (cowsgosp,Mt_[WSCp]:17.9.1139)
There is only 1 example of an initial negative preceding a subject pronoun in a LME clause without *ne*, which has subject vern inversion analogous to the PDE pattern (127).

(127) neuyr took he giftes of man  
     Never took he gifts of man  
     'He never took gifts from men'  
     (CMCAPHR,54.666)

Inversion data from ME and Early Modern English (Nevalainen 1997) challenge van Kemenade's claim that negative-initial sentences are '...a grammatical environment, beside questions, in which English throughout its history has had V movement to C.' (van Kemenade 2000, 62). Early English inversion of finite verb and subject pronoun following initial negatives is restricted to clauses with *ne* in the 9th-12th centuries. Inversion following initial negatives becomes marginal in the 12th century, and is only attested again with any frequency in the 16th century or even later (Nevalainen 1997). The Early Modern English pattern of negative inversion differs from the earlier pattern. The trigger for inversion in Early Modern English is not the sentential negator *not*. Conversely, the earlier pattern of negative inversion affected only the sentential negator *ne*. Thus, the two patterns of negative inversion observed in the history of English are sufficiently different to be considered as separate processes owing to their differences and the lack of diachronic continuity between the two patterns.

Negative inversion with the sentential negator *ne* is lost in Early Middle English. This fact demands a syntactic explanation. The relationship between the negative-initial clauses in poetry and prose demands further examination, addressing in particular the reason why only the clause initial sentential negator *ne* occurs with V to C movement. Other negatives only appear with V to C movement in Late Middle English and Early Modern English. This chapter will focus on three issues: the syntactic derivation of negative initial clauses, the relationship between the negative-initial clauses found in prose and poetry and the loss of negative inversion in Early Middle English.

The loss of negative-initial clauses is not straightforwardly a consequence of the general loss of *ne* witnessed in Middle English. In Early Middle English, the frequency of clauses with initial *ne* declines even as a proportion of all clauses with *ne* (see Table 3.1).

There are several potentially different types of inversion strategy operating in negative clauses. Clauses with imperatives (128), clauses with initial discourse
### Table 3.1: The distribution of *ne* by position. All finite verbs. Clauses with subject pronouns only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Ne+Vf initial</th>
<th>ne+Vf elsewhere</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>850-950</td>
<td>229 (67%)</td>
<td>115 (33%)</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-1050</td>
<td>797 (66%)</td>
<td>419 (34%)</td>
<td>1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050-1150</td>
<td>161 (60%)</td>
<td>106 (40%)</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>49 (45%)</td>
<td>61 (55%)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>8 (15%)</td>
<td>47 (85%)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>16 (89%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

adverbs *pa, ponne, nu* ‘then, now’ (129), and clauses with subjunctive verbs (130) exhibit inversion even when not negated. The loss of inversion may pattern differently in all these contexts. In examining the loss of negative inversion, it is necessary to control for all these other types of inversion which operate in negative clauses.

Negative imperatives (128), negative subjunctives (130), and negatives with initial adverbs *pa, ponne, nu* ‘then, now’ (129) will be treated as separate contexts for discussion of V to C movement in negatives because imperatives and subjunctives are contexts for inversion irrespective of their polarity. These contexts all show higher frequencies of inversion than clauses with morphologically marked indicative verbs (131). Table 3.2 shows the frequency of NegV1 in three contexts in clauses with subject pronouns only. The contexts are clauses with morphologically marked indicative, subjunctive and imperative verbs. All ambiguously marked verbs are excluded.

(128) Drihten, *ne* loca *þu* na to minum synnum

*Lord, NEG look you not to my sins*

‘Lord, do not look to my sins’

(cogregdC, GD_2_[C]:32.166.5.2021)

(129) *ponne* *ne* *miht* *þu* na *þæt* mot ut *æton* of *ðæs* mannæ eagan

*then NEG can you not that speck out draw of the man’s eye*

‘then you cannot draw that speck out of the man’s eye’

(coaelhom,+AHom_14:153.2086)

(130) Soðlice *gif* Abraham *ne* ongæte Lazarum, *ne* spræce *he*

*Truly if Abraham NEG understand Lazarus, NEG spoke-SBJ he*

*nænigra þinga swa to þam weligan men…*

*in no way so to the prosperous people…*

‘Truly, if Abrahm did not understand Lazarus, he ought not have spoken so to the prosperous people…’
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(cogregdC,GDPref_and_4_[C]:34.310.24.4640)

(131) næfst þu nane mihte ogean me
NEG-have you no strength against me
'You have no strength against me'
(cowsgosp,In_[WSCp]:19.11.7303)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V su</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850-950</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-1050</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050-1150</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: The frequency of inversion of ne+finite verb and subject pronoun in three contexts. YCOE and PPCME2 data.

The frequency of V to C movement does not show the same decline in all contexts, even within clauses with ne+finite verb. The decline is most marked in clauses with unambiguously indicative verbs. There is less obviously a decline in V to C movement in clauses with subjunctive verbs. The behaviour of subjunctive verbs is obscured by the loss of the morphological subjunctive itself in Middle English, which reduces the database considerably. There is no decline in inversion in imperative clauses. Inversion in this context remains near-categorical into LME.

The data in Table 3.2 provide clear evidence to separate inversion contexts on the basis of mood. Therefore, throughout the remainder of this chapter, I will confine my discussion to unambiguously morphologically marked indicative verbs. For these verbs, inversion is only productive when they are negated by ne.¹ The frequency data set apart the derivation of V to C movement in negative-initial clauses with indicative verbs (NegV1) from V to C movement in other contexts. One way to do this syntactically is to appeal to the Neg-criterion to derive negative initial clauses rather than analysing NegV1 as a subcase of a more general V to C movement rule.

¹Aside from a small number of 'narrative inversion' contexts. n=296/11483 or 2.6% of clauses with indicative verbs and subject pronouns in the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose have the indicative verb placed first in the clause, preceding the subject pronoun.
3.2. VAN KEMENADE’S (2000) ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I address the distribution of negative-initial clauses and their loss. I highlight some problems with previous accounts, in particular van Kemenade (2000). Van Kemenade’s account has three main aspects to it: first, the syntactic derivation of NegV1 using the Neg-criterion (see section 3.2); second, the loss of NegV1, which she relates to the introduction of secondary negators under Jespersen’s Cycle (see section 3.2.1); third, the relationship between negative initial clauses in poetry and prose (see section 3.5).

3.2 Van Kemenade’s (2000) analysis

Van Kemenade (2000) proposes an account which links the negative-initial clauses in prose and poetry. She argues that the negative initial patterns in Beowulf are linked to the negative initial patterns in later OE prose texts by a process of diachronic change. She supposes an early date of composition for Beowulf (7th-8th century CE), and takes Beowulf to represent an earlier diachronic stage. The link between clauses with initial no and initial ne+Vf1 under van Kemenade’s account is the rise of verb movement to C during early OE. To this end, she argues that no and ne are both operators in spec,CP, but their effect in triggering V to C movement is different: ne occurs with V to C movement while no does not. The hypothesised rise of V to C movement raises many problems for an analysis, which I will discuss in section 3.5.1. Not least of these is that van Kemenade hypothesises a change scenario on the basis of very little evidence, and does not take full account of other differences between prose and poetry.

She links the loss of negative initial clauses to the introduction of secondary negators at the second stage of Jespersen’s Cycle (see section 1.2.2). For van Kemenade (2000), the introduction of secondary negators at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle, and the loss of NegV1 are reflexes of a single parametric change: the loss of operator status for initial ne. In this respect, her account differs from previous accounts of Jespersen’s Cycle. Jespersen (1917) did not link the loss of negative initial clauses to his account of changes to Jespersen’s Cycle, nor have previous syntactic accounts such as Frisch (1997).

Jespersen’s Cycle

- Stage 1: Negation is expressed by one negative marker (OE ne)
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(132) we ne mugen bat don
we NEG can that do
'Ve cannot do that' (CMTRINIT,103.1370)

- Stage 2: Negation is expressed by two negative markers. The negator *ne* co-occurs with a second negative marker *not*, whose position is fixed. The result is sentential negation which is bipartite: *ne...not*.

(133) I ne may nat denye it
I NEG may not deny it
'I may not deny it' (CMBOETH,435.C1.262)

- Stage 3: Negation is expressed by a single negative marker as *ne* is lost (ME *not*).

(134) I know nat the cause
I know not the cause
'I do not know the cause' (CMMALORY,627.3549)

The Old English *ne...na/no* pattern (135)-(136) is interpreted by van Kemenade (1999; 2000) as the Old English equivalent of Middle English *ne...not*. For van Kemenade (1999; 2000), *ne...na* and *ne...not* represent the same dependency at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle. The development of more than one secondary negator is also attested in French (Roberts and Roussou 2003, 156).

(135) Ne het he us na leornian heofonas to wyrccenne
NEG ordered he us not learn heavens to make
'He did not order us to learn to make the heavens'
(Ælfric, Lives of Saints XVI.127, van Kemenade (2000, 64, ex.14a))

(136) Ne sæde na ure Drihten þæt he mid cynehelme oððe mid purpuran
NEG said not our Lord that he with diadem or in purple
gescryd, cuman wolde to us
clothed come wanted to us
'Our Lord did not say that he wanted to come to us with a diadem or clothed in purple'
(Ælfric Lives of Saints XXXI.762, van Kemenade (2000, 64, ex14b))
Van Kemenade's interpretation of Old English na is not universally accepted (for example see van Bergen (2003)). However, in chapter 2, we saw some evidence which supports the analysis of both na and not as secondary negators. There are distributional parallels between na and not which distinguish them from other negative adjuncts: the relatively fixed position of both na and not, their distribution across clause types, and their reluctance to appear in multiple negation with negative arguments or adjuncts. Furthermore, in section 2.5 I presented some evidence consistent with the semantic bleaching of na as a functional negative marker rather than a lexical element.

### 3.2.1 The Neg-criterion, NegV1 and Jespersen's Cycle

Van Kemenade appeals to the Neg-criterion (137) to derive both NegV1 and bipartite ne...na/not negation.

\[(137)\] The Neg-criterion:

a. Each Neg X⁰ must be in a spec-head relationship with a Neg operator.
b. Each Neg operator must be in a spec-head relationship with a Neg X⁰.
c. NEG-operator: a NEG phrase in a scope position.
d. Scope position: a left-peripheral A'-position (i.e. XP-adjoined or Spec).

(Haegeman 1995, 106)

She analyses NegV1 as spec-head agreement between XP ne and a finite verb, (van Kemenade 2000, 62).

\[(138)\]

\[\text{CP} \quad \text{ne} \quad \text{C'} \quad \text{V}_{\text{finite}} \quad \text{AgrP}\]

It seems reasonable to analyse the initial negative element in root clauses in Early Old English as a Spec,CP element, and to say that the finite verb, when moved, is in C. The motivation for the rise of this V-movement strategy could then plausibly come from a condition of Universal Grammar stating that an (operator) element in Spec,CP must be licensed by a lexically filled C. This kind of condition is well known

\[\text{Although it is not clear in what sense the verb is negative, sufficient to satisfy the Neg-criterion. It is not morphologically marked as negative, if ne is analysed as a spec,CP operator.}\]
in the theoretical literature; one appropriate way of formulating it for English past and present is Rizzi's Wh-criterion (Rizzi 1990), and his adaptation of Haegeman's analogous Neg-criterion (Haegeman 1995). The only element that can satisfy this condition without violating the usual conditions on head movement is V...

(van Kemenade 2000, 62)

Van Kemenade (2000) follows a common analysis for bipartite ne...not under the Neg-criterion (Haegeman 1995), extending this analysis to OE ne...na. At stage two of Jespersen's Cycle, spec-head agreement between the spec, NegP operator na/not and Neg° ne satisfies the Neg-criterion at NegP. Frisch (1997) adopts the same analysis in his account of Jespersen's Cycle in Middle English. Frisch (1997) and van Kemenade (2000) analyse bipartite ne...not as spec-head agreement between the head ne and the phrase not in Middle English (139). This forces the analysis of ne as a head in this construction.

(139) NegP
    /\   Neg'
  na/not   ne+V_finite XP

Two points of note arise out of van Kemenade's implementation of the Neg-criterion. First, negative initial clauses and bipartite negation are different means of satisfying the Neg-criterion. Therefore they should be mutually exclusive. Second, her particular implementation of the Neg-criterion at CP requires ne to be a spec,CP operator, contrary to other accounts such as Haeberli (1991), Frisch (1997) which analyse OE and EME ne as a head. A prediction follows from the first point. NegV1 should be lost as bipartite negation becomes more commonly used in Old English (ne...na) and Middle English (ne...not).

The changes which van Kemenade’s analysis postulate amount to a change in the position and manner in which the Neg-criterion is satisfied, from CP to NegP. This change is contingent on reanalysis of ne from spec,CP operator to negative head (Neg°) proclitic on the finite verb. Loss of operator status for ne entails the reanalysis of the adverbials na/not as new negative operators in positions lower than CP. Van Kemenade argues that ne procliticises onto the finite verb and is reanalysed as a verbal prefix. For van Kemenade (2000) the reanalysis of ne as a verbal prefix arises because ne and the finite verb are adjacent in CP. Unlike, clauses with initial no which did not co-occur with V to C movement, clauses with
initial ne+V offer no evidence for ne as an independent spec,CP operator because the finite verb and ne are always adjacent. Van Kemenade links clause initial no and clause initial ne+V by a diachronic change: the rise of V to C movement following initial negative operators. This change is crucial in driving both the loss of NegV1 and Jespersen's Cycle as it creates structural ambiguity which leads to the reanalysis of ne as a syntactic head rather than an operator, and hence the development of a new negative operator in place of ne. The rise of V to C movement in this context alters the syntactic status of ne, and hence the way the Neg-criterion is satisfied in early English.

(140) Jespersen's Cycle recast (van Kemenade 2000, ex.6, 58)

Negative adverbs grammaticalise to negative head status through incorporation resulting from verb movement

As a consequence of the loss of operator ne, na/not take over the operator function previously held by clause initial spec,CP ne. As negative operators na/not satisfy the Neg-criterion, but in a lower position than the operator ne does. The development of a functional projection NegP is a consequence of this reanalysis, forced within an X'-theoretic approach to phrase structure, in which a separate functional projection is required within INFL to accommodate spec-head agreement under the Neg-criterion.³

According to van Kemenade, the change in (140) introduces a new structural option in late OE and early EME. Once ne is no longer an operator in spec,CP, a topic is free to co-occur with a negated finite verb in C⁰ (141). The link which she hypothesizes between the loss of spec,CP ne and the introduction of secondary negators entails that all clauses like (141) should have secondary negators.

(141) biss ne habbe ic nauht ofearned
    this NEG have I not deserved
    'I have not deserved this'
    (CMVICES1,17.192)

For van Kemenade (2000) the loss of negative initial clauses and the introduction of secondary negators are reflexes of a single parametric change. Her distinction between two types of ne at successive stages of Jespersen's Cycle links the loss of NegV1 with change under Jespersen's Cycle. As this claim is central

³The required feature checking configuration may be achieved without NegP in a system which allows multiple specifiers. See section 4.5.1 for a discussion of the status of NegP.
to her account, I will spend much of this chapter discussing evidence for the two distinct types of *ne* and the interaction of NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle. To this end, I will reconsider the distribution of *ne*, seeking evidence to distinguish two different types of *ne*, and evidence for different distributions of *ne* at successive stages of Jespersen’s Cycle, which follows if NegV1 and bipartite negation are alternative manifestations of the Neg-criterion. Whilst the relationship between negative-initial clauses and Jespersen’s Cycle is central to van Kemenade’s account, the significance of this issue extends beyond van Kemenade’s account, to all accounts of negative initial clauses which invoke the Neg-criterion, including Haeberli (1991). These accounts predict the complementary distribution of negative-initial clauses and sentential negators *na/not*.

Van Kemenade’s derivation of Old English negative initial clauses makes reference to two forms of *ne*, an XP operator in initial spec,CP position at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle, and a head in non-initial positions at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle. The structural analysis of *ne* and hence its position is tied to Jespersen’s Cycle. If these are the only two options for *ne*, then there should be no initial *ne* at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle, and no non-initial *ne* at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle. I will show that neither of these scenarios are attested, requiring van Kemenade’s account to be weakened considerably. The account she proposes relies on the idea that the spec,CP operator *ne* is lost, eliminating certain derivational options, one of which is negative-initial clauses, and another of which is the unsupported *ne* found at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle.

Previous approaches to Jespersen’s Cycle did not invoke an XP>X\(^0\) change for *ne*. For Frisch (1997), *ne* is a negative head at both stages. Under Frisch’s (1997) account, the difference between stages one and two of Jespersen’s Cycle is the form of the operator which is in spec-head agreement with *ne*. At stage one it is null. At stage two it is overt *not*. His account does not link change in the form of the operator to change in its position. Similarly, a previous account of NegV1 by Haeberli (1991) did not make use of two forms of *ne*, even though he uses the Neg-criterion to account for NegV1.

### 3.2.2 The positions available to *ne*: distributional evidence for two forms of *ne*

This section will examine van Kemenade’s (2000) account of negative initial clauses in Old English prose. Proposals by van Kemenade (2000) make reference to two
forms of *ne* at successive stages of Jespersen's Cycle: a head or prefix on the finite verb, and a phrase in a specifier position.

It seems that V-movement to C, with the negative element in spec,CP, entails that *ne* is reduced/procliticised to the finite verb. I hypothesize that... this cliticization is phonological, which means that, although *ne* is a prefix/proclitic, it does represent a constituent in Spec,CP... (van Kemenade 2000, 63)

I aim to determine whether the analysis of Old English needs to make reference to both these forms or whether one is sufficient to account for the distribution of *ne* in Old and Middle English.

The predominant position for *ne* in main clauses throughout the Old English period is clause initial position (142-143). Negated finite verbs precede subject pronouns, indicating that V to C movement has taken place (Pintzuk 1999, van Kemenade 1997a; 2000).

(142) Ne brohte we nan þing to þysum middaneardæ
NEG brought we no thing to this world
‘We did not bring anything to this world’
(cocathhom1,+ACHom_I, _18.323.188.3595)

(143) Ne forgife ic eow swa swa ðes middaneard forgifô
NEG forgive I you as the world forgives
‘I do not forgive you as the world forgives’
(coaelhom,+Ahom_10:15.1413)

The clause structure I assume for Old English main clauses is given in (146), and follows Haeberli (2001; 2002b), see section 2.2.2 for more detailed discussion. Under this analysis, Old English has separate Tense and Agreement heads within INFL. In positive declarative main clauses without an initial operator, the finite verb moves to Agr⁰. So, in clauses with non-subject topics, finite verbs typically precede full NP subjects (144) and follow pronoun subjects (145). The split-INFL analysis captures the different position of subject pronouns (in spec,AgrP) and full NP subjects (in spec,TP) relative to the finite verb in Agr⁰.

(144) þinre meder geheolp þin halga geleafa
your mother helped your holy faith
‘your holy faith helped your mother’
(Aelfric's Lives of Saints, I,212.28, Haeberli (2002c, 1, ex.1b))
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(145) 
\[ \text{þæt þu meaht swiðe sweotene ongitan} \]
that you can very easily understand

'You can very easily understand that'

(Boethius, 88.14, Haeberli (2002c, 2, ex.2a))

(146)

Many clauses with negated finite verbs do not show this asymmetry between NP subjects and pronoun subjects, indicating the finite verb has moved to a functional head higher than the position of the pronoun subject (spec,AgrP). Hence these clauses (142) have V to C movement (147). The finite verb is higher than subject pronouns and subject NPs. Van Kemenade (2000) makes the point that clause initial *ne* is ambiguous between a prefix on the finite verb in C° (as I have it in (147)), or a phrasal spec,CP element.

(147)

In OE subordinate clauses, the finite verb occupies the same position in clauses with *ne* and without *ne*. The presence of *ne* has no effect on the position of the finite verb in subordinate clauses. Unlike main clauses with *ne*, subordinate clauses with *ne* do not show subject-verb inversion with pronoun subjects. C° is unavailable as a target for verb movement in subordinate clauses. It is occupied
by a complementiser or subordinating conjunction. Furthermore, Haeberli (2001) observes that there is no inversion of finite verb and subject NPs in subordinate clauses. On this basis, he argues that the target of verb movement in subordinate clauses is lower than in main clauses. He claims that subordinate clauses have verb movement to T° not to Agr°.

(148)  
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3.2.3 Adjacency of ne and the finite verb

Almost all instances of ne in the YCOE are adjacent to the finite verb (Table 3.3). (149) shows one of the exceptions which were discussed in section 2.3.1.1. The principal reason for analysing ne as a syntactic head is this adjacency with the finite verb, which is seen irrespective of the position of the finite verb after verb-movement:

In the Old English found in the prose texts of the ninth and tenth centuries, sentential negation is dominantly expressed by the negative marker ne, which immediately precedes and is often procliticised to the finite verb, whatever the position of the latter. This is sufficient motivation for regarding ne as the (incorporating) head of NegP, allowing us to see the positional co-variance of ne with the finite verb as an instance of head incorporation.

(van Kemenade 2000, 57)

(149)  
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'Let us neglect the book no longer'

(cosolilo,Solil:50.14.645)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>ne adjacent to Vf</th>
<th>ne elsewhere</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% adjacent to Vf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>7492</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7504</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>7988</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7995</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: The distribution of ne relative to the finite verb in the YCOE.

Even at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle, all examples of ne are adjacent to the finite verb whether the finite verb is in Agr (150, 151), in T (152,153), or in C (154, 155), and irrespective of the headedness of INFL (Pintzuk 1999). Examples of I-medial and I-final main clauses are shown in (150) and (151). (152) is an example of an I-medial subordinate clause, (153) an example of an I-final subordinate clause.

(150) ic ne mæg hit nu swa hraðe asingan
      I NEG can it now so quickly sing
      ‘I cannot sing it so quickly now’
      (coboeth,Bo:39.127.29.2536)

(151) ic geseon ne mæg
      I see NEG can
      ‘I cannot see’
      (coaelive,+ALS_[Swithun]:204.4357)

(152) Gif þu nelle me ofslean, asend me to þam casere...
      If you NEG-intend me to-kill, send me to the emperor...
      ‘If you do not intend to kill me, send me to the emperor…’
      (coaelive,+ALS_[Julian_and_Basilissa]:207.1066)

(153) þæt he deaþ þrowigan ne scile
      that he death endure NEG shall
      ‘that he shall not endure death’
      (coverhom,HomS_24_[ScraggVerc_1]:115.121)

(154) þonne ne mæg he noht geseon
      then NEG can he nothing see
      ‘then he can see nothing’
      (cocura,CP:11.69.17.448)

(155) Ne brohte we nan þing to þysum middanearde
      NEG brought we no thing to this world
      ‘We did not bring anything to this world’
      (cocathhom1,+ACHom_I,18.323.188.3595)
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*ne* occurs in three positions: adjacent to a finite verb which is in Agr\(^0\), adjacent to a finite verb which is in T\(^0\) and adjacent to a finite verb which is in C\(^0\). Is *ne* the same lexical item, with the same syntactic status in all these positions?

The position of *ne* is clearly contingent on head (V-) movement at least when V moves to Agr or T. In these instances, the position of *ne* varies according to the position of the finite verb. Therefore *ne* must be a head or a prefix on the finite verb. This analysis could be extended to deal with clause initial *ne+finite verb*, but further analysis is required to provide a rationale for movement of the finite verb to C\(^0\) in these instances.

Examples of non-initial *ne* whose position is covariant with the finite verb (150-153) indicate that *ne* is a head in some instances even in OE. In order to reconcile these examples with van Kemenade’s analysis, there must be two forms of *ne* at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle, one a phrase (clause initially in spec,CP), the other a head which is part of the finite verbal morphology, *ne* cannot be an operator in all contexts at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle. This fact has important implications. There is the question of how the Neg-criterion is satisfied in clauses with head *ne*. A null operator is required, yet postulating the null operator has implications for van Kemenade’s account. Allowing the null operator in cases where *ne* is non-initial, begs the question of why a similar analysis cannot be extended to clauses with initial *ne+V*, with a null operator in spec,CP triggering movement of *ne+V* to C\(^0\). An analysis in which *ne* is a head everywhere is simpler than one which posits both phrase and head *ne*.

Van Kemenade (2000) acknowledges the need for a negative head to account for the distribution of non-initial *ne*, arguing that *ne* in low positions develops via early Old English reanalysis of *ne* from operator to head of NegP. Adjacency of *ne* and the finite verb demonstrates that there is very little evidence for operator *ne* in my Old English prose data in non-initial position, even at the earliest period. Such evidence might take the form of independence in the position of *ne* and the position of the finite verb. For all but 19/1449 instances, the position of *ne* is contingent on verb movement. This evidence is more problematic to her account than van Kemenade acknowledges. In order to meet the Neg-criterion in clauses where head *ne* is the only negator, a null operator is required. Admitting the existence of such an operator undermines van Kemenade’s link between NegV\(_1\) and Jespersen’s Cycle. The development of head *ne* in non-initial positions (including subordinate clauses) does not lead to the introduction of a secondary negator under Jespersen’s Cycle as in her proposed reanalysis of initial *ne*. The reasons
for this difference between developments in initial and non-initial positions is unexplained.

Van Kemenade's account of Jespersen’s Cycle does not address the motivation for the introduction of bipartite negation in instances where the structural analysis of *ne* does not change from operator to head, such as in subordinate clauses. In these instances there is no evidence that head *ne* arises out of Jespersen's Cycle in the way van Kemenade proposes. In these clauses *ne* is not an operator at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle, in the sense required by Haegeman’s Neg Criterion. Distributional evidence indicates that *ne* in these clauses is a head, hence the introduction of *na/not* as a negative operator cannot be a consequence of loss of operator status for *ne* as van Kemenade proposes for negative inversion clauses. She suggests that the developments affecting initial *ne* and non-initial *ne* are independent. It is not clear what the implications are for Jespersen’s Cycle in clauses without negative inversion. Subordinate clauses are particularly problematic in this regard. Van Kemenade's proposed change from operator to head *ne* does not account for the introduction of secondary negators in all clauses.

If we are to pursue van Kemenade’s analysis, we have to admit, as she does, that there are two types of *ne* available at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle, one a head and the other a phrase. Only clause initial *ne* (155), and those examples of *ne* not adjacent to the finite verb (149) are structurally ambiguous between XP and X°, and then only at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle. All instances of *ne* in the *ne...na* or *ne...not* constructions must be heads if bipartite negation is analysed as spec-head agreement within NegP. The reanalysis of *ne* in clause initial position discussed by van Kemenade has the effect of eliminating a phrasal option for *ne* in which *ne* is an operator. It is not the only means by which the head *ne* (Neg°) comes into existence. Change under Jespersen’s Cycle removes the structural option to analyse clause initial *ne* as a phrase occupying spec,CP.

My aim here is to test the evidence for two types of *ne* at successive stages of Jespersen’s Cycle. Should *ne* be considered a head throughout OE and EME, and movement of *ne+Vfinate* extended to stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle to account for negative inversion at that stage in the same way as at later stages, or is a distinct form of *ne* justified for the analysis of negative-initial clauses? Van Kemenade puts forward two lines of argument for a spec,CP operator *ne*, both arguments from syntactic change: the interaction of NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle, and the relationship between the patterns in prose and poetry which she argues is a diachronic one. I discuss the interaction of NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle, using this
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3.3.1 NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle: quantitative evidence

Some predictions follow from van Kemenade’s analysis of clause initial *ne*. If van Kemenade (2000) is right, there should be visible change in the distribution of *ne* between stages one and two of Jespersen’s Cycle. Different structural analyses for *ne* are available at the two stages which necessitate different derivations of *ne* at the two stages, spec,CP operator at stage one and head at stage two, and will correspond to differences in the position of *ne*. Van Kemenade’s (2000) account of *ne* as a spec,CP operator relies crucially on the complementary distribution of NegV1 and bipartite negation which she does not demonstrate.

Here, I argue that the predicted complementarity between NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle does not hold. I show that the overall distribution of *ne*+finite verb in initial and non-initial positions does not differ in clauses with and without secondary negators *na* and *not* in the way van Kemenade’s account predicts. Differences are expected as van Kemenade’s account requires different structural options and syntactic processes to derive negative inversion at the first and second stages of Jespersen’s Cycle. Recall that negative inversion is derived by spec-head agreement between the negative operator *ne* and a finite verb at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle, but by movement of a negated finite verb *ne}*+V_{finite} to CO at stage two. At stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle, negative inversion cannot be derived in the same way as NegV1 at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle, once the operator *ne* in spec,CP is eliminated. Change under Jespersen’s Cycle presupposes concurrent loss of a phrasal option for *ne*. A lower frequency of clause initial *ne* is thus expected at stage two than at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle.

---

4. This distribution is a problem for all approaches which derive NegV1 and bipartite negation using the Neg-criterion.

5. A further problem of this account is that it is not obvious how the finite verb counts as a negative head for the purposes of the Neg-criterion. Negation is not morphologically marked on the verb if we accept van Kemenade’s analysis of *ne* as a spec,CP operator.
This section compares the frequency of clause initial *ne* when *ne* is unsupported and when *ne* co-occurs with *na* or *not*. I will show that the frequency of clause initial *ne* in clauses with and without secondary negators does not support van Kemenade's analysis.

I examine the incidence of (156) which has clause initial *ne* in CP, preceding a subject pronoun in spec,AgrP. This is the context where the status of *ne* is indeterminate between spec,CP and a prefix on the finite verb in C\(^0\). Confining the investigation to *ne*+*Vf* preceding a subject pronoun ensures that all clause initial *ne* are in CP rather than in lower positions. The subject pronoun marks the boundary between CP and lower positions (Pintzuk 1999, Kroch and Taylor 1997, van Kemenade 1997a; 2000, Haeberli 2002b). I exclude second conjuncts from the investigation as these typically do not show movement of the finite verb to C\(^0\) in clauses with *ne* (in the YCOE data the frequency of inversion with a subject pronoun in second conjuncts is 44/701 or 6%). The database includes only morphologically marked indicative verbs, for reasons discussed in section 3.1. Those verbs which are subjunctive or those which the morphology does not disambiguate as indicatives are excluded.

The order (156) is compared with non-initial *ne*+*Vf* in which *ne* is the unambiguously proclitic head Neg\(^0\) (157, 158).

(156) ne+Vf - su pro...
(157) Topic - ne+Vf - su pro...
(158) Su pro - ne+Vf...

The distinction is between clause initial *ne* where there is a potential specifier position to host phrasal *ne*, and other instances of *ne* adjacent to a finite verb where there are no suitable specifier positions to host phrasal *ne*. In these positions *ne* is unambiguously a head. Structurally ambiguous phrase/head *ne* is distinguished from structurally unambiguous head *ne*. For further discussion of this distinction between initial and non-initial *ne*, see section 3.2.3.

The distribution of *ne* across initial and non-initial contexts does not differ significantly across the three OE periods (850-1150), but declines in early ME (1150-1250).

Next, I distinguish the positions of *ne* when it is unsupported (159, 160) and when it appears with a secondary negator (161, 162).

(159) Ne sprycœ he of him sylfôn
     NEG speaks he of him self
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Ne+Vf initial</th>
<th>Ne+Vf elsewhere</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>850-950</td>
<td>148 (58%)</td>
<td>107 (42%)</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-1050</td>
<td>351 (54%)</td>
<td>300 (46%)</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050-1150</td>
<td>67 (51%)</td>
<td>64 (49%)</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>17 (35%)</td>
<td>31 (65%)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: The distribution of ne in in OE non-conjoined main clauses with subject pronouns. Morphologically marked indicative verbs only.

'He does not speak of himself'
(cowsgosp,Jn_[WSCP]:16.13.7081)

(160) ic geseon ne mæg
I see NEG can
'I cannot see'
(coaelive,+ALS_[Swithun]:204.4357)

(161) Ne leofað na se mann be hlæfe anum
NEG lives NA the man by bread alone
'Man does not live by bread alone'
(CathHomL.+ACHom_I, _11:267.50.2038)

(162) ðu ne miht heom na of þissere stowe lædan
you NEG can him NA from this place lead
'You cannot lead him from this place'
(corood,LS_5_[InventCrossNap]:542.573)

I follow van Kemenade (2000) in assuming that both na and not are secondary negators and their appearance represents stage two of Jespersen's Cycle. At stage two, the secondary negator for Old English (850-1150) is na/no (van Kemenade 1999; 2000). For Early Middle English (1150-1250) it is not (Haeberli and Ingham 2003). Instances of na/not which are potentially used as adverbial modifiers (163) and (164) or quantifiers (165), or with constituent scope (166) are not counted as secondary negators.

(163) Nis hit him no swa longe alefed swa þe þinð
NEG-is it him not so long granted as you think
'it is not granted to him for so long as you think'
(coboeth,Bo:38.117.6.2330)

(164) We ne durran gelencgan na leng þysne traht
WE NEG dare lengthen no longer this text
'We dare not make this text any longer'
(coaelhom, +AHom_6:367.1053)
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(165) Ne sind Godes frynd na feawa
NEG are God’s friends not few
‘God’s friends are not few’
(cocathom2,+ACHom_II_.40:301.58.6853)

(166) Nis pis na gesæd be manna sawlum, ac be manna lichaman...
NEG-is this not sated by men’s souls but by men’s bodies
‘This is not sated by men’s souls but by men’s bodies’
(coaelive,+ALS[Ash_Wed]:27.2717)

Contexts in which ne occurs in multiple negation with other negative phrases are excluded from Table 3.5 (167). Frisch (1997) argues for a distinction between ne in multiple negation and ne as a sentential negator at stages one and two of Jespersen’s Cycle. Without further work on the syntax of multiple negation (see chapter 6), it is unclear exactly how ne in multiple negation fits into Jespersen’s Cycle or what the syntactic status is of ne in multiple negation. These examples are not crucial to my argument so I will leave them aside.

(167) Ne brohte we nan þing to þysum middanearde
NEG brought we no thing to this world
‘We did not bring anything to this world’
(cocathhom1,+ACHom_I_.18.323.188.3595)

This leaves the following types of examples under examination in Table 3.5. (168) and (169) are the orders compared at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle. (170) and (171) are the orders compared at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle. The two stages of Jespersen’s Cycle overlap during Old and Middle English as part of an ongoing change. They are separated here for the purposes of analysis.

(168) Ne sprycō he of him sylfon
NEG speaks he of him self
‘He does not speak of himself’
(cowsgosp,Jn_[WSCp]:16.13.7081)

(169) ic geseon ne mæg
I see NEG can
‘I cannot see’
(coaelive,+ALS_[Swithun]:204.4357)

(170) Ne leofað na se mann be hlafæ anum
NEG lives NA the man by bread alone
‘Man does not live by bread alone’
(CathHomI.+ACHom_L_.11:267.50.2038)
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(171) ðu ne miht heom na of þissere stowe lædan
you NEG can him NA from this place lead
‘You cannot lead him from this place’

corood,LS_5_[InventCrossNap]:542.573

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>ne</th>
<th>ne...na/ne...not</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850-950</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-1050</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050-1150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5: The position of ne when ne is unsupported and when it co-occurs with OE na or ME not. Morphologically indicative verbs only.

In Table 3.5, the position of ne when it is unsupported is contrasted with the position of ne accompanied by OE na or ME not. Throughout Old English periods (to 1150) we see that the frequency of NegV1 is actually higher in clauses with na than in clauses without na, contrary to the predictions of van Kemenade’s analysis. Table 3.5 indicates that the use of secondary negators na/not is independent of the position of ne in the clause in a way that does not fit with van Kemenade’s account, which asserts that NegV1 and the secondary negators na/not are structurally incompatible.

Early Middle English (1150-1250) does not show any link between the loss of NegV1 and the introduction of not. not and NegV1 co-occur. I draw two conclusions from this distribution. First, NegV1 and bipartite ne...na/not negation must be structurally compatible and able to co-occur. Therefore, deriving NegV1 and ne...na/ne...not as different instantiations of the Neg-criterion does not capture the independence of these two phenomena. The predicted difference in NegV1 between clauses with ne...na/ne...not and those with unsupported ne is not found. Second, this fact does not support an analysis in which ne in clauses without na or not and ne in clauses with na or not are different syntactic entities in the way van Kemenade proposes. The lack of the predicted distinction in the frequencies of NegV1 in clauses with and without na argues against two different forms of ne in either OE or EME, but instead supports the view that there is one derivation of negative initial clauses in OE and EME irrespective of the occurrence of na or not. Of course Table 3.5 raises the question of why na should be more frequent in NegV1 clauses than elsewhere, which I will leave for future work.
Van Kemenade (2000) asserts that the development of bipartite ne...na is a reflex of the change from phrase ne to head ne which also eliminates negative-initial clauses. The data presented here do not bear out the correlation between loss of NegV1 and the introduction of na or not.

...the fact that at a later stage a topic is readily tolerated in this construction is accounted for by assuming that the constituent status of ne in spec,CP is weakening, and that therefore it ceases to be interpreted syntactically as a topic. A crucial intermediate step in this weakening process is the introduction of a reinforcing negator in spec,NegP which supposedly marks the weakening of the original negator. (van Kemenade 2000, 67).

The quantitative data presented in this section argue against linking a change in the distribution or syntactic status of ne to the introduction of na or not. If there is a change from XP>X° ne, there is no overt evidence for it my Old English prose data. The overall distribution of ne in my quantitative data provides no evidence for any change in the distribution of ne until Early Middle English, at which time the use of not in main clauses is well advanced.

The change from operator to head ne proposed by van Kemenade may antedate the earliest Old English prose data I have looked at, or there may have been no such change. Under the syntactic analysis of Jespersen’s Cycle van Kemenade adopts, the availability of phrase ne should not be independent of Jespersen’s Cycle, but tied to it in a very particular way. The interaction of NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle illustrates that NegV1 is not restricted to clauses in which van Kemenade analyses ne as a spec,CP element. Quantitative data provide no empirical support for this idea. I have demonstrated independence of change in the position of ne and the incidence of na/not which undermines the motivation for distinguishing two types of ne (XP ne and X° ne) in OE and EME clauses with and without na/not. More importantly, it undermines an account of both NegV1 and OE and EME ne...na/ne...not as manifestations of the Neg-criterion. In clauses with NegV1 and na/not the derivation of NegV1 and the dependency between ne and na/not must be independent.

Throughout, I have assumed that na and not are secondary negators rather than negative adjuncts, for reasons I presented in section 2.5. However, if na and not are adjuncts rather than secondary negators then they will not constitute a competing means to satisfy the Neg-criterion, and will be free to co-occur with
NegV1. This is consistent with the distribution shown in Table 3.5.6 The intersection of NegV1 and bipartite forms of negation question the assumption that OE *na* and EME *not* are secondary negators. The Neg-criterion approach to NegV1 and bipartite negation forces an account in which the loss of NegV1 is a precondition for the reanalysis of *not* as a secondary negator. This is not borne out by the data in Table 3.5. Accepting these data we might argue that all EME *not* are adverbs, but this provides a very late date for the development of the sentential negator *not*, by which time *not* already appears in 23/25 or 92% of clauses with indicative verbs in the period 1150-1250 (figures based on Table 3.5). This is an anomalously high frequency for adverbial *not*, but rather indicates grammaticalisation of *not* in this context is nearly complete. Therefore, we need an account of NegV1 and bipartite negation which allows the two phenomena to co-occur each independently of the other. The Neg-criterion approaches of either van Kemenade (2000) or Haeberli (1991) fail to reconcile evidence for the co-occurrence of NegV1 and *na/not* in OE and EME with the independent distributional evidence for analysing *na/not* as a secondary negator discussed in section 2.5.

On the basis of the evidence presented here, I conclude that the loss of NegV1 is independent of the introduction of secondary negators, contrary to van Kemenade's analysis. Furthermore, this independence undermines the distinction between the two types of *ne* which van Kemenade postulates.

### 3.3.2 The loss of NegV1 and the availability of the spec,CP position

One argument which van Kemenade (2000) presents for *ne* being a phrase in spec,CP in Old English is the restricted occurrence of (172). This restriction follows from her account of *ne* as a spec,CP operator. The spec,CP position is not available to host a topic in these clauses. (172a) is one of the few Old English examples with an NP topic (n=8, see Table 3.7). (172b) and (172d) represent the more frequently attested Early Middle English examples with NP topics.

(172) Topic - *ne+Vf* - su pro ...

a. Drihten, pine rihtwisynesse ne behidde ic an minre heortan
   Lord, your righteousness NEG hide I in my heart

---

6See also Haeberli (1991) for a similar argument against analysing OE *na* as a secondary negator.
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‘Lord, I do not hide your righteousness in my heart’
(cochrdrul, ChrodR:79.45.967)

b. Dis ne dede ic næure
This NEG did I never
‘I never did this’
(CMVICES1,13.144)

c. þis ne habbe ic nauht ofearned
this NEG have I not deserved
‘I have not deserved this’
(CMVICES1,17.192)

d. þet ne seide he noht
That NEG said he not
‘He did not say that’
(Kentish Sermons 214.25, van Kemenade (2000, 68, ex.22a))

She argues that this increase follows from the change in the status of ne XP>X⁰ under Jespersen’s Cycle which has the consequence of freeing up spec,CP for topic (cf. (173) and (174)). Therefore, the increase in topics in clauses with negative inversion should correspond to the increased use of na/not as sentential negators (172c, 172d).

(173) \[CP ne [C V_{finite} [AgrP subject pronoun ...]]\]
(174) \[CP NP [C ne+V_{finite} [AgrP subject pronoun ...]]\]

In (172b-172d), spec,CP is not available to host a negative operator, so the Neg-criterion cannot be held responsible for inversion of finite verb and subject pronoun. It is not clear exactly how this type of inversion following a non-negative spec,CP constituent is derived. These clauses are not amenable to analysis under the Neg-criterion in the same way van Kemenade proposes for clauses with initial ne, in which she claims that ne is a spec,CP operator triggering verb movement to C (173). Topics in spec,CP are not operators, and are not necessarily negative (172b-172d).

Van Kemenade (2000) seeks to link the increased appearance of topics in clauses with inversion to a structural difference between negative clauses in Old and Early Middle English. In (173), ne is necessarily clause initial, an operator in spec,CP. In (172) ne is a head. Indeed, under van Kemenade’s assumptions the negative head cannot be initial, as movement of head ne to clause initial position cannot be motivated. For van Kemenade, ne is only initial when it is a spec,CP
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operator. For van Kemenade (2000), the syntactic status of *ne* is different at the two periods. In Old English *ne* is a phrase in spec,CP, hence no position is available to host topics. In Early Middle English, *ne* is a clitic on the finite verb in C°, hence the spec,CP position is available for topics. This difference requires different inversion strategies to apply to the two types of *ne* (173), (174). Loss of operator *ne* from spec,CP means that the Neg-criterion no longer holds at CP. It follows from van Kemenade’s analysis that the Neg-criterion will apply at NegP in these clauses between the head *ne* and an overt negative operator *na* or *not*, and that inversion following a spec,CP topic cannot be due to the Neg-criterion.

It is not clear why the position of the negated finite verb in (172d) is higher than the position of the finite verb in the non-negative declaratives with NP topics. Van Kemenade’s account does not really address this issue. In order to derive inversion in these clauses a different mechanism and different rationale is required for V to C movement in clauses with initial negatives and initial NPs. Van Kemenade claims that the availability of this new type of inversion is linked to the loss of operator *ne*, and therefore also to the introduction of bipartite negation under Jespersen’s Cycle. If the structural option in (172) arises as a consequence of the loss of NEGV1, all clauses like (172) should have bipartite forms of negation. It is clear that *ne* must be a head in clauses which have the structure (172). For example take (172d). *ne* follows an NP which occupies the spec,CP position. It follows that *ne* is a head because there is no specifier position between spec,CP and the finite verb for *ne* to occupy (172).\(^7\)

Van Kemenade’s account implies that the incidence of (172) should increase in parallel with the change under Jespersen’s Cycle which frees up spec,CP as a host for topics. Table 3.6 shows that both changes advance in Early Middle English. However, the introduction of spec,CP elements in negative inversion clauses does not correlate very precisely with the frequency of *na/not* as operators despite the fact that both increase in Early Middle English.

I include initial adverbs and PPs as well as NPs under the label ‘Topic’ in Table 3.6. As van Kemenade (2000) observes, some initial adverbs and PPs may be adjoined to CP rather than topics in spec,CP. Certain adverbs such as *pa, ponne* ‘then’ systematically trigger inversion in OE and ME prose, so should be excluded from the discussion. Therefore, I present the data for NP topics in clauses with neg-

\(^7\)This is the situation which follows from van Kemenade’s assumptions. However, if we assume an articulated CP structure, or the possibility that C° has multiple specifiers, these claims do not necessarily follow.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Jespersen’s Cycle</th>
<th>ne V su pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stage 2</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850-950</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-1050</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>2818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050-1150</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6: The changes under Jespersen’s Cycle and the availability of topics. Figures showing the distribution of *na* are from Table 2.7. Figures showing the overall distribution of EME *not* are from PPCME2. All verbs are included irrespective of marking for mood.

Table 3.7: The distribution of NP topics in clauses with inversion of finite verb and subject pronoun and a non-subject NP argument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Negative inversion clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850-950</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-1050</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050-1150</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial topics do not generally trigger V to C movement in Old or Middle English positive declaratives, where inversion of the finite verb and a subject pronoun indicate V to C movement has occurred (Pintzuk 1999, Haeberli 2002b). It is unclear why these initial elements should co-occur with inversion of of *ne*+V\textit{finite} and a subject pronoun if they are topics. Haeberli (2002c) and Kroch and Taylor (1997) show that inversion of a subject pronoun and finite verb is possible following a non-subject NP topic in positive clauses. However, the frequency of this inversion following a non-subject NP is put at only 5% for EME by Kroch and Taylor (1997), too low to account for all instances of inversion following non-subject NPs in clauses with *ne*. In 1150-1250 there are 10 examples with initial non-subject NPs, pronominal subjects and negated finite verbs. 7/10 exhibit inversion of the finite verb and the subject. V to C movement in this context differs from NegV1 and must represent a different pragmatic strategy, perhaps focalisation of the initial spec,CP constituent.
EME shows a marked increase in topics in negative inversion clauses which seems at first sight to correlate with the increased use of *not* in this period. However, the problem for van Kemenade's account is that the introduction of NP topics (as shown in Table 3.7) does not occur in parallel with the introduction of *na/not*. As I demonstrated in the previous section, there are NegV1 clauses with the secondary negators *na* and *not*. Van Kemenade's analysis predicts that these clauses should have subject or non-subject topics. In Old and Middle English clauses without initial operators, spec,CP is typically filled by a topic, either a non-subject or a subject topic. Hence NegV1 clauses with the secondary negators *na/not*, in which van Kemenade analyses *ne* as a head rather than a spec,CP operator, fall outside her analysis, and as such are a problem to it. She provides no rationale for *ne+V* movement to *C^0* in such clauses.

This undermines the structural account of (172) which van Kemenade proposes. Her proposals are unable to account for all negative clauses without further modifications. Van Kemenade's account involves a change in the spec,CP element from an overt operator *ne* to an overt topic (non-subject or subject). This follows from the reanalysis of *ne* from XP operator >X^0, and the fact that the new negative operator (*na/not*) occupies a position lower than spec,CP. In view of this change, one might expect the reanalysis of *ne* from operator to head to lead to the loss of negative inversion. It can no longer be motivated under the Neg-criterion by an operator in spec,CP. The fact that inversion continues to occur following a fronted argument in spec,CP is puzzling. It is not clear whether this pattern arises as a consequence of the loss of NegV1 or whether it is a distinct pragmatic and syntactic strategy, such as focalisation, which just happens to be more frequent in Early Middle English. If operator *ne* and topics are the only two options in competition for spec,CP in EME as van Kemenade's account implies, the replacement of operator initial NegV1 clauses should be with topic-initial clauses in all cases.\(^8\) Van Kemenade proposes that loss of operator-hood for *ne* drives Jespersen's Cycle. Change from spec,CP operator to spec,CP topic is a consequence of Jespersen's Cycle. Hence the transition from operator-initial to topic initial clauses should exactly correlate with change under Jespersen's Cycle to eliminate NegV1. However, there are many NegV1 clauses with secondary negators (see Table 3.5) in which for van Kemenade (2000), the initial *ne* must be a head rather than a spec,CP element. Van Kemenade’s proposals cannot account for the lack of topics in these clauses. NegV1 clauses at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle

---

\(^8\)Irrespective of whether the finite verb is in *C^0* or a lower position in the topic initial clauses.
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fall outside van Kemenade's account.\(^9\)

\[(175)\text{ Ne understandeð hie naht pat alswa michel senne hit is to breken }\]
\[\text{ Neg understand they not that also great sin it is to break }\]
\[\text{ fasten mid drinke... fast with drink...}\]
\[\text{ 'They do not understand that it also a great sin to break the fast with }\]
\[\text{ drink...'}\]
\[(CMVICES1,137.1701)\]

Such clauses account for 8/25 (32%) of clauses with ne...not in the period 1150-1250. The results of the previous section show no loss of NegV1 contingent on Jespersen's Cycle. A syntactic account which links the incidence of topics in clauses with ne and change under Jespersen's Cycle makes a correlation where there is no evidence for one. There are plenty of exceptions to the correlation van Kemenade proposes: NegV1 clauses with bipartite negation which her account cannot handle. Also, van Kemenade's analysis does not take account of the fact that NegV1 needs to be productive at both stages of Jespersen's Cycle. So, although the increase in the "Topic - ne+V\(_{finite}\) - subject pronoun" pattern is the result of the loss of NegV1, I find no correlation between this change and the increased use of the secondary negators na/not.

3.3.3 Conclusions: negative initial clauses and Jespersen's Cycle

The data presented here show that the loss of NegV1 is independent of the introduction of secondary negators. This finding compromises the account of 'XP - ne+V su prn' given in van Kemenade (2000). The increase in this pattern is contingent on the loss of a structural option for ne which both eliminates NegV1 and is responsible for the introduction of secondary negators. There is no direct correlation between the loss of NegV1, the increase in 'XP - ne+V su prn' orders, and the introduction of secondary negators. Therefore, there is no empirical evidence for the structural change affecting ne which van Kemenade proposes.

The findings of this section provide no evidence to distinguish the behaviour or syntactic status of ne at successive stages of Jespersen's Cycle in the way van Kemenade proposes. There is no quantitative evidence for the loss of phrasal ne

\(^9\)Furthermore, not all instances of the 'Topic - ne+V\(_{finite}\)' pattern have bipartite negation (see (172a) for example). The two patterns are not in complementary distribution at the two stages of Jespersen's Cycle.
in any of the OE prose data, and no evidence that any change in the status of *ne* is responsible for the increase in clauses with 'Topic - *ne*+*V* \textsubscript{finit} - subject pronoun' orders. Invoking two competing forms of *ne* does not account for the loss of NegV1, or Jespersen's Cycle, or for the distribution of 'Topic - *ne*+*V* \textsubscript{finit} - subject pronoun' orders in the way that van Kemenade proposes.\(^{10}\) Therefore, I argue that clauses with initial *ne*+*V* \textsubscript{finit} are derived in the same way at both stages one and two of Jespersen’s Cycle, with *ne* a prefix on the finite verb which moves to C\(^0\). This is a simpler analysis. It does not require a change from operator to head *ne* for which the predicted evidence is lacking.

An account is required which can accommodate the independence of NegV1 and the introduction of sentential negators *na/not*. The independence of NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle has been crucial to my argument, but brings its own problems for the syntactic analysis. The dependencies which NegV1 and bipartite negation represent must be independent. If we accept that Old English *ne...na* and Early Middle English *ne...not* are bipartite secondary negators in spec-head agreement with *ne*, as I claim here following van Kemenade (2000), then Jespersen’s Cycle and the loss of NegV1 are two distinct parametric changes which cannot both be accommodated under the Neg-criterion. Invoking the Neg-criterion to account for both these phenomena does not allow them to co-occur, and is therefore empirically inadequate. There are two solutions to this problem in a Government-Binding framework: first to deny that Old English *na* and Early Middle English *not* are sentential negators subject to the Neg-criterion. This is the approach taken by Ingham (2005), but this ignores other evidence for the sentential negator status of these elements (see section 2.5). Second, the independence of NegV1 and bipartite negation could be modelled using two instances of the Affect-criteria which make reference to different features in the derivation of NegV1 and bipartite negation, or two different feature checking dependencies. Patterns of negation in the Old English poem *Beowulf* offer further arguments against analysing NegV1 under the Neg-criterion (see sections 3.5.1-3.5.2 for a full discussion).

\(^{10}\)It remains unclear why initial non-subject arguments co-occur with negative inversion in Early Middle English. However, I have established that questions concerning the derivation of these clauses do not impact on the relationship between NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle, so I will leave them aside here.
3.4 Feature checking accounts of negative initial clauses

Eythorsson (2002) observes a pattern of verb movement in Old Norse negative main clauses, which is similar to that seen in the Old English prose (176). The Old Norse negator is a suffix -at on the finite verb. While the Old Norse finite verb typically follows the subject in non-negative declaratives, finite verbs with the negative suffix -at precede the subject. Eythorsson (2002) draws parallels with the similar Old English phenomenon involving the negator ne, and with a similar phenomenon in Gothic (177) and Old High German (178). Eythorsson's Old Norse data parallel the OE data in that negative inversion typically results in a negative initial clause. The crosslinguistic Germanic evidence for NegV1 casts doubt on van Kemenade's analysis of NegV1, which treats it as a particularly OE innovation. The Gothic data indicate that NegV1 is not an OE innovation, but has common Germanic roots which antedate Old English.

(176) gaft-at-tu ástgiafar (Old Norse)
gave+NEG+you-SG love-presents
'you did not give love-presents'
(Rm 7, Eythorsson (2002, 199, ex. 16b))

(177) ni hugjaiþ ei qemjau gatairan witþ (Gothic)
NEG think that came-1SG tear-down law
'do not think that I came to tear down the law'
(Matt 5:17, Eythorsson (2002, 196, ex. 12a))

(178) ni waniu ih iu lii habbe (Old High German)
NEG expect I still life has-3SG
'I do not expect that he is still alive'
(Hildebrandlied 29, Eythorsson (2002, 197, ex. 12c))

Eythorsson (2002) proposes a simple feature checking account which locates [NEG] features on C°. Movement of the negated finite verb to C° is then motivated by the need to check [NEG] features on C°. This kind of analysis could be extended to Old English clauses with negated finite verbs inverted with pronoun subjects. This obviates the need for the Neg-criterion to derive NegV1 clauses. The Neg-criterion is reduced to a feature checking dependency on C°. However, questions remain over how this feature checking dependency is satisfied in Old English. Minimalism provides two ways to satisfy the features of C°: Merge or Move, so initial ne may be merged or moved into a local relationship with C°. So, at issue is whether ne forms a syntactic unit with the finite verb in a position lower
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than C°, or whether the derivation of initial ne is independent of verb movement. If ne forms a unit with the finite verb lower than C° (either in the lexicon or at Neg°), then a [uneg] feature on C° will derive both the positions of ne and the finite verb through a single operation. Movement of ne will take the finite verb with it to C°. On the other hand, if ne is merged to satisfy features of C°, another feature checking dependency must be invoked to derive V to C movement.

A Minimalist approach provides a new perspective on the phrase structure of ne. A bare phrase structure approach to clitics like ne allows them to be an indeterminate X°/XP category, behaving like a head in some ways and like a maximal projection in others. In a feature-driven derivation of negative initial clauses, the status of ne as head or phrase is not the central issue. More important questions are the position at which ne enters the derivation relative to the finite verb and how the features of C° and ne interact syntactically.

Unlike van Kemenade (2000), Eythorsson (2002) claims that the syntactic analysis of negated finite verbs in clause initial position should be the same throughout the history of negative initial clauses. He makes brief reference to Old English in this connection, arguing against van Kemenade's position. His central point, which my findings endorse, is that there is no reason to doubt that ne is a verbal prefix throughout Old English.

It is not immediately clear how a feature checking approach interfaces with changes under Jespersen's Cycle at this stage of the discussion. A recent account by Ingham (2005) maintains complementary distribution of bipartite negation and NegV1. In Ingham's account, ne only has suitable features to be a target for movement to C° at stage one of Jespersen's Cycle. Hence the conclusion that NegV1 is independent of Jespersen's Cycle is equally problematic to Ingham's analysis. He proposes that na and not are not secondary negators in clauses with NegV1. As in the Neg-criterion approach, this forces a late date for the reanalysis of EME not as a secondary negator. In chapter 4, I will use recent Minimalist assumptions to develop an alternative account which allows NegV1 and Jespersen's Cycle a measure of independence.

This discussion demonstrates that negative initial clauses cannot be considered in isolation from other patterns of early English negation. Negative initial clauses and bipartite negation at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle are predicted to be in complementary distribution by all existing approaches. Further research presented in chapter 4 will establish Minimalist syntactic analyses of both phenomena which takes proper account of their independence. These proposals will
be presented in the context of the Minimalist feature checking account of Jespersen’s Cycle I develop in chapter 4.

3.5 Patterns of negation in the OE poem Beowulf

Van Kemenade (2000) provides an account for the lack of topics in clauses with negative inversion which makes reference to phrasal spec,CP ne. She proposes to treat clause initial ne+finite verb as an ‘operator - head’ construction fulfilling the requirements of spec-head agreement at CP under a version of the NEG-criterion. I argue that there is no quantitative evidence for the existence of phrasal ne in OE prose. There is no evidence for the loss of phrasal ne in the prose data or any competition between phrase or head ne in the prose linked to Jespersen’s Cycle as van Kemenade’s (2000) account predicts.

Evidence from Beowulf is less conclusive. The distribution of negatives is different in this text. Van Kemenade (2000) discusses a pattern of sentential negation with clause initial no (179, 180) which is not attested in the OE prose data. In Beowulf, at least some clause initial ne might have the same syntactic status as clause initial no: a spec,CP element. This is van Kemenade’s (2000) claim.

(179) no he him þa sæce ondred
NEG he himself the struggle feared
‘he did not fear the struggle’ (cobeowul,73.2345.1917)

(180) No he owiht fram me flodyþum feor fleotan meahte
NEG he at all from me waves-DAT far swim could
‘he could not get far from me at all on the waves’ (cobeowul,18.541.460)

Instances of ne which are not clause initial show positional covariance with the finite verb, and therefore are heads (181), but clause initial ne could be either a head or a phrase (182).

(181) Hie þæt ne wiston
They that NEG knew
‘They did not know that’ (cobeowul,26.798.684)

(182) ne mæg ic her læng wesan
NEG can I here long be
‘I cannot be here long’ (cobeowul,86.2799.2283)

The occurrence of initial phrasal negatives in spec,CP such as no in Beowulf might support a parallel analysis of ne as a spec,CP element. This contrasts with
the conclusions I made in section 3.3.3 concerning the status of *ne* in the YCOE data. If there is phrase *ne* in *Beowulf* it must be lost between the time of *Beowulf* and the Old English prose, since there are good arguments against phrase *ne* in the prose. Unfortunately there are insufficient data from the early English period represented by *Beowulf* to show this change in progress.

### 3.5.1 Negative-initial clauses and the position of the finite verb

There is one reason to distinguish *ne* from phrasal negatives like *no*, *nxfre* in the poetry. Initial *ne* always appears with a finite verb immediately following in \( C^0 \). *No* (179-180), *nxfre* (183) are never immediately followed by finite verbs in \( C^0 \).

\[
\text{(183) Næfre ic æne gum men ær alyfde}
\]

Never I any man before injured

'I never injured any man before'

(cobeowul,22.652.549)

Van Kemenade (2000, 62) links the pattern with clause initial *no* in *Beowulf* with the NegV1 pattern in the OE prose. For van Kemenade (2000) the link between negative initial clauses with and without movement is diachronic and reflects the rise of V to C movement following initial negatives in early OE. This diachronic change has two aspects to it: phonological reduction of the spec,CP operator *no* to *ne*, and the rise of V to C movement following initial negative operators. Hence initial *no* in *Beowulf* is replaced by initial *ne*+\( V_{\text{finite}} \) in later OE prose. These two changes need to be linked in order to account for the fact that *ne* in Old English is the only initial negative to appear clause initially with a finite verb in \( C^0 \). This accounts for the loss of initial *no*. However, there are examples of initial negatives such as *nxfre* which do not occur with a finite verb in \( C^0 \) in the prose (184-185) or in *Beowulf*. The prose examples (184-185) show that a generalised rise of V to C movement following initial negatives does not happen in OE.

\[
\text{(184) Næfre ofer his ic owiht ma spreo}
\]

Never of this I any more said

\[11\]Unlike Present Day English (i), (ii):

(i) Never will I believe it

(ii) Nothing have I seen that could rival the pyramids (Haegeman 2001, 26, ex 9b)
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'I never said any more of this'

(185) Nænge þinga ic þas bliðe aberan mæg
No thing-GEN I this cheerfully bear can
'I cannot bear anything of this cheerfully'
(cobede,Bede_4:12.290.18.2930)

Beowulf frequently employs negative initial clauses with no, nafre, nælas (n=64), in addition to clauses with initial ne (n=77). Only initial ne appears with a finite verb in C° (n=77/77 initial ne). Any account must make a distinction between ne, which induces verb movement, and negatives like nafre which do not. The Neg-criterion does not easily accommodate this distinction. It applies wherever an negative operator is found. In order to derive the difference between ne and other spec,CP negatives in respect of verb movement, ne must be the only initial negative to count as an operator for the Neg-criterion, so that no, nafre are excluded from the criterion.

This distinction is difficult to maintain under Haegeman’s (1995, 107) definition of a negative operator. Under this definition, Ne, no, nafre are all equally sentential negative operators in spec,CP and should all be subject to the Neg-criterion in the same way.

(186) a. NEG-operator: a negative phrase in a scope position;
    b. Scope position: left peripheral A’-position [Spec,XP] or [YP,XP]
    (Haegeman 1995, 107)

The distinction between initial ne with V to C movement, and no, nafre without V to C movement could be derived by applying movement at different levels of the grammar. The Affect-criterion could apply overtly for ne and at LF for no, nafre, but applying the criterion at different levels for different lexical items seems difficult to motivate and rather arbitrary.

Van Kemenade’s account requires variation and change in the way the Affect-criterion is satisfied in Early and later Old English to account for what she proposes are changing patterns of verb movement. She claims that initial no is reduced to ne by an increase in V to C movement following initial negatives (187, 188). This does not fit well with the idea of the Neg-criterion as a principle of Universal Grammar (see Haegeman (1995)).

(187) \[ CP no [C [AгрP subject pronoun [Aгр V_finite \ldots ]]] \]
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(188) \[ CP \, ne \, [ C \, V_{finite} [ AgrP \, subject \, pronoun \, [ Agr \, t \ldots ] ] ] \]

She claims this accounts for the lack of initial no in her Old English prose data. However, where patterns analogous to those seen in Beowulf with initial nxfre, appear in later prose (184), they provide no evidence for change in V to C movement patterns. Initial nxfre occurs in later prose without V to C movement just as it did in Beowulf. V to C movement does not develop in this context. Regrettably, there are no instances of clause initial no in the prose for comparison with those in poetry. The evidence available to me is consistent with an analysis with no change in verb movement patterns, either between poetry and prose, or between successive stages of Jespersen’s Cycle: fronting of ne always entails verb movement to C⁰, fronting of other negatives (no, nxfre) does not. The difference between poetry and prose is therefore likely to be the absence of clauses with clause initial no, nxfre as the primary sentential negator in the prose rather than any rise in V to C movement following clause initial negatives.¹²

Eythorsson (2002) argues against van Kemenade’s link between ne and no. He claims that ne and no are etymologically distinct, even in the pre-Old English period. No is not reduced to ne by a process of change. This is consistent with the distribution of ne found in earlier Germanic languages such as Gothic (Eythorsson 2002).

The negation ni (ne) is a prefix like element on the verb, representing an Indo-European inheritance in Old Germanic ... The anonymous reviewer, citing van Kemenade (2000), mentions that there is evidence for a stage in the earliest Old English at which a negative element could occur in a clause-initial position without “attracting” the verb. This view, however, seems to be based on a confusion regarding the relevant form in question. In particular, the claim in van Kemenade (2000, 61-63) that the prefixal negation ne represents a “reduced” variant of the free form (adverb) no (na) ‘not at all, not, never’ in Old English fails to take the long-established etymology of these elements

¹²Taken at face value, the YCOE data provide little evidence for the loss of no which follows from van Kemenade’s account. In Beowulf, na/no accounts for 37/163 (23%) of negative non-conjoined main clauses. In the O2 prose, na/no accounts for 114/466 (24%) of negative non-conjoined main clauses. The difference between the two datasets is that in Beowulf only 1/37 (3%) co-occur with ne. In O2 82/83 (99%) co-occur with ne. These figures do not show the loss of no/na. They show that no/na comes to be supplemented by ne in negative doubling rather than replaced by ne.
into consideration, according to which *ne* is the inherited negation but *no* (*na*) derives from a combination of this negation with an adverb, corresponding to Gothic *ne aiw* 'never (i.e. not ever)' (e.g. Klæber 1950:381). Thus, in Old English from the earliest times, the negation *ne*, by virtue of being a prefix, regularly precedes the finite verb, irrespective of its position in the clause. The word *no* (*na*), on the other hand, is an adverb and can occur separated from the verb.

(Eythorsson 2002, 219-220, note 12)

Eythorsson's account favours an analysis of *ne* as a clitic or prefix throughout the Old English period. *Ne* should be kept distinct from *no* and other initial adverbs. The differences in the position of the finite verb following these elements requires them to be distinguished so that only initial *ne* co-occurs with a finite verb in C°. I have argued that a Neg-criterion based derivation does not facilitate an account of this difference. However, a feature-checking based account, such as Eythorsson (2002) does, providing *ne* and the finite verb form a unit prior to movement to C°. The difference between *no* and *ne* is that *no* is an adverb whilst *ne* is a prefix on the finite verb. Only movement of *ne* will require movement of the finite verb.

In summary, there is no reason to argue that the syntactic status of *ne* in the poetry differs from *ne* in the later prose, scant evidence for a rise in V to C movement in Early Old English negative initial clauses, and good syntactic reasons for separating *no* and *ne* in Early Old English. In the next section, I will show that there is good evidence from prosody to distinguish *no* and *ne* in Beowulf. *Ne* behaves as a clitic, *no* behaves as an adverb. Given that there is no good empirical evidence for a change in the status of *ne* during Old English, the analysis of *ne* as a head can be adopted from the Early Old English of Beowulf onwards as the simplest or null hypothesis. V to C movement only co-occurs with *ne*+finite verb because *no*, *næfre* are never prefixed to the finite verb either in the lexicon or during the derivation. Eythorsson's (2002) observations concerning Old English in relation to other Germanic languages support my hypothesis.

### 3.5.2 The prosody of *no* and *ne*

Under a feature checking account of negative initial clauses, a further issue remains to be addressed. Why is fronting of *no*, *næfre* categorical in Beowulf whilst fronting of *ne*+finite is not? Up to now, I have assumed that the derivation of ini-
tial no, næfre is the same as the derivation of initial ne+Vₕ₁nster, namely [neg] feature checking on C⁰, yet negated finite verbs do not move to C⁰ in all instances, unlike negative adverbs (Table 3.8). However, the distribution of negative adverbials is similar to that of non-negative adverbials. Both tend to appear in clause initial position. So the fronting of negative adverbs may simply be a subcase of a more general movement rule which fronts adverbs (negative and non-negative) to clause initial position. In this section, I argue that the movement of negative adverbs to clause initial position is related to prosodic constraints operating on alliterative poetry. This motivation for movement is common to negative and non-negative adverbials. However, the syntactic form or motivation of this movement rule requires further work to establish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Clause initial</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ne</td>
<td>77 (61%)</td>
<td>49 (39%)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>37 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>næfre</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nænig/nealles</td>
<td>22 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>141 (74%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>49 (26%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8: The distribution of negatives relative to subject pronouns in Beowulf. Non-conjoined main clauses only.

Negative adverbs, including no, categorically appear clause initially in non-conjoined main clauses in Beowulf, whereas negated finite verbs do not. This fact demands an explanation, particularly for a feature checking account in which movement to C is to check [NEG] features on C⁰. Under such an account we would expect a uniform frequency of fronting for all elements with [NEG] features, whether verbal or non-verbal, because the motivation for fronting is a requirement of the head C⁰ rather than the moved element. However, I claim that prosodic constraints affect the fronting of negatives to clause initial position. The prosodic status of ne and no is different, hence the prosodic constraints operating on the placement of verbal and non-verbal negatives are different.

What we know about the prosody of Beowulf leads us to expect differences in the distribution of adverbs and finite verbs under Kuhn’s laws (see Lucas (1990) for an English summary of Kuhn’s Laws). The different distributions of no and ne lie in the different prosodic behaviour of ne and no and provide a further argument for distinguishing these elements.

The prosodic organisation of Beowulf is for each line to be split into two half-line units. The stressed syllables of the two half-lines must alliterate. Evidence
from alliteration indicates that *no* and *ne* are never stressed. The distribution of unstressed elements is highly constrained under Kuhn's laws. Below I cite the English summary of Kuhn's laws given in Lucas (1990). We see that unstressed elements can be of two kinds: particles or clitics. *No* has the status of a particle, whilst *ne* has the status of a clitic.

**Particles** are words which do not naturally carry a strong stress, but neither are they subordinated to any other word in particular: finite verbs, personal and demonstrative pronouns, conjunctions and some adverbs.

(Lucas 1990, 293)

**Clitics**: if as is usual, they are proclitics, are unstressed words dependent on a following stress word.

(Lucas 1990, 293)

**Kuhn's First Law**: his law of particles (*Satzpartikelgesetz*) states that all the particles in a verse clause [I take this to mean a half-line] must be grouped together in the first metrical dip, ie. all before ... the first stress-word; if a particle does not occur in the first dip, it ceases to be a particle and becomes a stress-word. There are hardly any certain breaches of Kuhn’s first law in *Beowulf*.

**Kuhn's Second Law**: his law of clause openings (*satspitzengesetz*) states that if there is a natural dip before the first lift in a verse clause then the dip must contain a particle; the dip may not be occupied solely by clitics.

(Lucas 1990, 294)

The distribution of clitics is dependent on the distribution of their hosts. In the case of *ne* the host is the finite verb. Getty (2000) shows that fronting of the finite verb in *Beowulf* is affected by prosodic factors, such as stress and syllabic weight. Stressed and alliterating verbs will follow all particles in a half-line. Furthermore, Getty argues that fronting of the finite verb is less favoured the heavier its syllabic weight is. Subject pronouns are particles, so in clauses with subject pronouns, only unstressed and syllabically light verbs which are themselves particles can precede the subject pronoun. Stressed or syllabically heavy verbs will follow the subject pronoun, and other particles such as adverbs.
In contrast, *no* and *naefre* are prosodically independent of the verb, as particles which are always unstressed. Metrical differences in the behaviour of negative elements reduce to two prosodic facts: first, whether a negative element is a clitic or a particle, and second if the negative is a clitic, the syllabic weight and stress associated with its host element. Under Kuhn’s laws, a negative element’s position in the clause follows from these facts. *no*, *naefre* are always particles. Negative adverbs such as *no*, *naefre* do not bear stress or alliterate. Some negated finite verbs are particles, but others can alliterate and bear stress. Hence, negative adverbs always have the status of ‘particles’ under Kuhn’s laws, whereas the prosodic status and behaviour of negated finite verbs is more variable. Factors determining the position of *no* are independent from those determining the position of *ne*, hence we see no diachronic link between clauses with initial *no* and clauses with initial *ne*. These two negatives are clearly distinct in the poetry, and syntactically unrelated. The reasons why the *no*-initial pattern is only found with any frequency in *Beowulf* is not due to a rise in V to C movement in later OE as van Kemenade (2000) claims, but due first to the fact that *ne* is rarer in *Beowulf* than the later prose, and second, that the prosodic constraints affecting the position of *no* are not a factor in prose texts.

This account is an advance on van Kemenade (1997a; 2000) who has no account for the distribution of adverbs such as *naefre* in OE prose. These do not trigger V to C movement at any period, and cannot be related to the later negated finite-verb initial pattern in the same way as van Kemenade’s account proposes for *no*. They provide no evidence for a generalised rise of V to C movement following initial negatives, and fall outside van Kemenade’s account. She does not relate the distribution of *no* to the distribution of other negative constituents in clause initial position.

The fronting of negative phrases in poetry is partly a response to prosodic demands particular to the alliterative poetry of the early Old English period. However, there are a few (n=32) examples of initial negative phrases in the OE prose which do not co-occur with *ne*. These can appear clause initially, and do so without inducing V to C movement in all cases. Examples are given in (189-190). In prose texts, the placement of negative phrases is more variable than in *Beowulf*, they appear in lower positions too (191, 192).\(^{13}\) This difference between poetry

\(^{13}\)It is worth noting here that the OE *Bede* and the *Vercelli Homilies* are texts which provide most instances of initial negative adverbs or NPs in the prose. One speculation concerning the reasons for this is dialect. Both the OE *Bede* and the *Vercelli Homilies* are observed by Levin (1958) to have
and prose supports the idea that the position of negative adverbs in Beowulf is constrained by prosodic factors which are absent from prose.

(189) Naefre ofer þis ic owiht ma spreco
    Never of this I any more said
    'I never said any more of this'

(190) Nænge þinga ic þas bliðe aberan mæg
    No thing-GEN I this cheerfully bear can
    'I cannot bear anything of this cheerfully'
    (cobede, Bede_4:12.290.18.2930)

(191) Se næfre ænig word gecweðan meahte
    He never any word say could
    'He could never say a word'
    (cobede, Bede_5:2.388.17.3859)

(192) Dæt geat soðlice þæs mynstres næfre geopenod wæs
    The door certainly the church-GEN never opened was
    'Certainly, the door of the church was never opened'
    (comary, LS_23_[MaryofEgypt]:101.65)

3.5.3 Towards unifying of the patterns seen in poetry and prose

I argued that ne is a prefix on the finite verb in both poetry and prose, throughout the Old English period. An account which invokes two forms of ne is not required. This is a more satisfactory account than van Kemenade's which links the patterns seen in poetry and prose by invoking a rise in V to C movement. A rise in V to C movement is difficult to motivate under the Neg-criterion. My account is simpler, and the derivation of initial negatives the same throughout Old English and Early Middle English. Negatives which appear in initial position do so to check negative features on C°. Only fronting of ne entails V to C movement, as only ne forms a syntactic unit with the finite verb (as a prefix or clitic) at the point when movement to C takes place. no, næfre do not form a syntactic unit with the finite verb at any point of the derivation.

more Mercian or Anglian features than other texts which are more strictly West Saxon in dialect. Similarly, Beowulf, in which fronted non-verbal negatives are most frequent has also been argued by Fulk (1992) to contain features associated with Anglian or Mercian dialects, in common with much of the poetry.
There are two differences between poetry and prose, which may be due to linguistic change, or other sources of variation such as dialect or stylistic factors such as genre. First, there is more *ne* in prose than poetry (Mitchell (1985, §1609), and see also section 6.2). Second, prosodic factors affect the frequency of fronting of adverbs *no, nafre* and negated finite verbs in poetry in ways which are absent from the prose. The differences between prose and poetry can be explained away as the consequence of external facts about the prosodic organisation of the poetry. Once these are taken into account, the patterns of negation in *Beowulf*'s main clauses require no reference to changes in movement strategies. I maintain that there are no changes in V to C movement strategies until negative initial clauses are lost in Early Middle English.

### 3.6 Summary and Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated shortcomings in Neg-criterion approaches to the derivation of negative-initial clauses. First, such approaches derive complementary distribution between negative-initial clauses and bipartite negation (*ne...na/ ne...not*). This does not accurately reflect the observed distribution of clauses with initial *ne*, which may also have bipartite *ne...not/ne...na* negation in late Old English and early Middle English. I used these data to argue against postulating two distinct forms of *ne* at successive stages of Jespersen's Cycle (as van Kemenade (2000) does), but these data pose a problem for all accounts which discuss the interaction of NegV1 and Jespersen's Cycle, not just van Kemenade's account. An account is required which accommodates the observed independence of NegV1 and secondary negators, that is one which can explain the loss of negative-initial clauses without preventing the derivation of negative-initial clauses at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle. Alternatively, we are forced to claim, like Haeberli (1991) that Old English *ne...na* is not bipartite negation representing spec-head agreement under the Neg-criterion. The same goes for early Middle English *ne...not*, at least in clauses where *ne* is clause-initial. If we take the semantic bleaching of *not* and its frequency as two measures of *not*'s reanalysis then it appears to be used as a sentential negator in many instances in EME, irrespective of its appearance in NegV1 clauses. These data are problematic for an account which takes NegV1 and bipartite negation to be distinct manifestations of the Neg-criterion. See chapter 4 for a feature based account of Jespersen's Cycle and NegV1 which allows for the distribution of NegV1 and bipartite sentential negation.
My second argument against a Neg-criterion approach is that it fails to provide sufficient flexibility to address the relationship between negative initial clauses in prose, which have V to C movement, and those negative-initial clauses in the Old English poem *Beowulf* which do not have V to C movement. The Neg-criterion does not accommodate the distinction very easily, and van Kemenade's proposed increase in V to C movement during early Old English is poorly evidenced in my data. Instead, I proposed that the different verb-movement patterns follow from the fact that *ne* is a prefix on the finite verb at the point of movement of *ne* to C to check [NEG] features. Therefore, movement of *ne* to C entails movement of the finite verb to which it is prefixed. In contrast, *no, næfre* are independent adverbial elements which never form a syntactic unit with the finite verb. Differences in the frequency of fronting of various elements in prose and poetry are in part consequences of prosodic constraints which hold of the different elements in the poetry, and the lack of such constraints in the prose.

I have shown that an account of negative-initial clauses in prose or poetry need make no reference to changes in the status of *ne*, nor to changing patterns of verb-movement.
Chapter 4

Parametric change in early English negation

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter demonstrated that the introduction of secondary negators and the loss of NegV1 are the consequences of two independent parametric changes, contrary to van Kemenade’s (2000) proposals. This chapter will consider the nature of these changes within a Minimalist feature driven framework. A Minimalist approach to parametric variation provides a new perspective on Jespersen’s Cycle and to the phrase structure of negation in comparison to previous Government-Binding approaches under the Neg-criterion (Haegeman 1995). It also provides a new perspective on negative initial clauses which avoids the problems associated with van Kemenade’s (2000) Neg-criterion based approach.

I seek to identify the parameters underlying change under Jespersen’s Cycle and the loss of NegV1. Considering the loci of parametric variation informs a structural analysis of negation. Jespersen’s Cycle is not a straightforward case of change. There is a stage in EME at which two negative markers are regularly used to mark sentential negation. This appears to violate principles of semantic compositionality. However, this stage is typologically marked and diachronically transient in the history of many languages (including Dutch, German and the Scandinavian languages). I will pursue some ideas which arise out of van Kemenade’s account. Her account involves a change in the status of *ne* in the history of English. We saw in chapter 3 that change under Jespersen’s Cycle does not involve a change in the phrase structure status of *ne* from operator to head, as
van Kemenade proposes. All the Old and Middle English evidence points to *ne* being a head throughout the period at both stages one and two of Jespersen’s Cycle. Rowlett (1998) proposes to distinguish two types of *ne* at successive stages of Jespersen’s Cycle whilst maintaining the idea that the two are the same in phrase structure terms, both heads. This approach lends itself to an account within the Minimalist framework, and has important implications for the phrase structure representation of negation. I contrast an approach which posits two types of *ne* with more conventional Neg-criterion approaches which posit only one. I conclude that the Neg-criterion can be parametrised in English as part of Jespersen’s Cycle. In chapter 5, I develop a quantitative account of Jespersen’s Cycle as grammatical competition based on these proposals. I examine quantitative evidence for two types of *ne* in Middle English. The different approaches to bipartite negation considered here, which involve one or two forms of *ne* make different predictions concerning the progress and structure of Jespersen’s Cycle. The diachronic facts will support an account which makes reference to two different types of *ne*.

These proposals concerning *ne* have consequences for the availability of redundant or expletive negation in English. The distribution of redundant *ne* provides important evidence for distinguishing two types of *ne* at a particular stage of early English. Finally for this chapter, I consider the derivation of NegV1. The architecture of a phase-based Minimalist framework (Chomsky 1999) allows for the independence of NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle. I will argue that *ne* ceases to be a target for movement to C because it loses the features which identify it as a target for movement. This is independent of the progress of Jespersen’s Cycle. This accords with the data I presented in chapter 3 and avoids the stipulation that EME *not* must be an adverb rather than a sentential negator which Ingham (2005) proposes.

4.2 Parametric change and negative dependencies

4.2.1 Jespersen’s Cycle

The co-occurrence of *ne* and *not* is problematic to a compositional account of negation. *Ne...not* emerges at a particular point in the history of English (EME) as a diachronic stage in Jespersen’s Cycle.

Jespersen’s Cycle:
4.2. PARAMETRIC CHANGE AND NEGATIVE DEPENDENCIES

- Stage 1: Negation is expressed by one negative marker (OE and EME ne).

  (193) we ne mugen pat don
  we NEG can that do
  'We cannot do that' (CMTRINIT,103.1370)

- Stage 2: Negation is expressed by two negative markers. The negative at stage one co-occurs with a second negative marker, whose position is fixed (ME ne...not, OE ne...na/no).

  (194) I ne may nat denye it
  I NEG may not deny it
  'I may not deny it' (CMBOETH,435.C1.262)

- Stage 3: Negation is expressed by a single negative marker as the original negative marker present at stage 1 is lost (ME not).

  (195) I know nat the cause
  I know not the cause
  'I do not know the cause' (CMMALORY,627.3549)

Analysis of ne...not is problematic. At the preceding stage of Jespersen’s Cycle ne is sufficient to mark negation independently. Likewise, at a later stage of Jespersen’s Cycle not is sufficient to mark negation independently, yet there is a period in Middle English when they co-occur. At this point, they cannot both be semantic markers of negation, or double negation readings should result. Jespersen’s Cycle does not involve the substitution of one sentential negator (ne) with another (na/not). This constitutes the simplest change scenario. However, instead of a substitutive change (ne>not), Jespersen’s Cycle involves a supplemental change (ne>ne...not>not).

The changes to negation in Middle English provide evidence for two negative elements, and a dependency between them. However, the stage when morphology provides evidence for this dependency, at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle, is short-lived in English. The central question for an account of parametric variation is whether this dependency is universal, as Haegeman (1995) proposes under the Neg-criterion, or whether it should be parametrised and variable.
4.2.2 The Neg-criterion (Haegeman 1995)

The Neg-criterion is a syntactic licensing condition on negation, which is manifest as an evaluative well-formedness condition or surface filter (196). See section 1.3.3 for a discussion of the Neg-criterion, its syntactic effects and motivation.

(196) The Neg-criterion:
   a. Each Neg X° must be in a spec-head relationship with a Neg operator.
   b. Each Neg operator must be in a spec-head relationship with a Neg X°.
   c. NEG-operator: a NEG phrase in a scope position
   d. Scope position: a left-peripheral A'-position (i.e. XP-adjoined or Spec).

(Haegeman 1995, 106)

The condition makes negation parallel to other operators such as interrogative wh-. The Neg-criterion is a subtype of the Affect-criterion, which is used by Haegeman and others to derive wh- movement. However, the parallel between negative constructions and wh-constructions is not the most useful perspective from which to view the historical development of negation. Negative clauses go through several historical developments or stages, whilst the syntax of wh-phrases appears to remain largely unchanged.

The Neg-criterion holds of all negative clauses. Therefore, negation is always composed of two parts, even when only one receives overt morphological expression. The structure of negation always involves spec-head agreement between a negative head and a negative operator, as in (197). The agreement relation under the Neg-criterion does not presuppose the existence of NegP. However, not is commonly assumed to be a negative operator, merged to satisfy the Neg-criterion at spec,NegP. Wherever NegP is projected it conforms to the X'-schema, having a single specifier position and a single head position. NegP is commonly assumed to be a projection in the INFL complex where the spec-head configuration required by the Neg-criterion within INFL requires an extra head and specifier position.

(197) NegP
      \---/   \---/   \---/   \---/
        |         |         |         |
   neg-Op Neg' Neg° XP

Under the Neg-criterion hypothesis, Jespersen’s Cycle relates to the morphological expression of negation. The changes do not affect the underlying syntac-
tic representation of negation in any way. Therefore, the bipartite *ne...not* pattern is analysed by Frisch (1997) and van Kemenade (2000) as a construction in which both positions are morphologically realised. The occurrence of two negative markers does not indicate any morphosyntactic change in the syntactic representation of negation, but simply a change in the way the two pre-existing NegP positions are realised in the morphology.

Morphologically overt bipartite negation is largely transient in the history of Germanic languages (English, Dutch, German). The Neg-criterion based accounts rely heavily on non-overt heads and operators to derive the observed patterns of negation in the history of English at stages one and three of Jespersen’s Cycle. A non-overt operator is required in Old English clauses negated by *ne*. A non-overt head is required for Middle English clauses negated by *not*. The change from non-overt to overt operator and the change from overt to non-overt head are independent morphological changes (see Frisch (1997) for an account of Jespersen’s Cycle based on this view). The logical conclusion of this is that both specifier and head positions could be filled by non-overt material, and a clause receive a negative interpretation without having any overt negative morphology. An additional constraint has to be stipulated that negation must be morphologically identified on either specifier or head position for NegP to be projected. This constitutes a dependency between the morphological realisations of negation in the clause under the Neg-criterion which is not predicted by, or easily accommodated within the account. Whilst such a surface filter, like Economy of Projection (Frisch 1997, 50), is possible in the Government-Binding framework, it is not in keeping with recent derivational frameworks such as Minimalism. Hence one aim of my analysis is to see whether this condition on the expression of negation can be incorporated into the syntactic analysis rather than being imposed as an additional stipulation.

Frisch (1997) proposes an account of Middle English changes in sentential negation in terms of the Neg-criterion. He claims that there are two changes: in the morphological realisation of the head and the morphological realisation of the operator in specifier position. These two changes are independent. The bipartite negation found at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle results from the intersection of these two changes. Bipartite negation is a consequence of the way the change is structured over time, with the introduction of *not* preceding the loss of *ne*. One problem with this approach to Jespersen’s Cycle is that it does not offer any explanation for why the change in negators is structured in three stages in so many
languages. The three stages are an historical accident of the way the changes pattern in English: the fact that the introduction of not precedes the loss of ne. This seems an inadequate explanation given the recurrent pattern of Jespersen’s Cycle cross linguistically. This indicates to me that some linguistic principles are at work rather than language particular factors.

4.2.3 Modifications to the Neg-criterion: Rowlett (1998)

Rowlett (1998) addresses the use of null categories under the Neg-criterion, questioning the need for spec-head agreement in all negative clauses. Unlike Haegeman (1995), he argues that negation must be interpretable on a head for a reading of sentential negation to obtain. Rowlett’s version of spec-head relations does not require feature identity like Haegeman’s approach. Rowlett argues that it is sufficient that the feature specifications of specifier and head are compatible, that is non-contradictory. Hence when [neg] features are present on a functional head, there is no need to introduce an agreeing specifier in order for [neg] to be interpreted at LF. The specifier is only introduced when required to pass negative features on to a head which is not lexically specified with these features.

If all that is needed to mark sentential negation is the presence of the feature [+NEG] on a functional head, then transferring the feature to an operator in specifier position serves no purpose and should arguably not be allowed. Certainly, as an interpretable feature, the presence of [+NEG] on a functional head at LF should not in itself be problematic. Consequently, the presence of a suitable operator in Spec,NegP cannot be motivated for checking reasons.

In contrast, transferring the feature from the operator to the head serves a clear purpose, since, in the absence of such a feature specification on the head, sentential negation will not be marked.

(Rowlett 1998, 112)

Jespersen’s Cycle involves different syntactic configurations at stage one and stage two. A syntactic dependency between a specifier and a head emerges at stage two which was not present at stage one. Rowlett’s account implies that Jespersen’s Cycle is driven by changes affecting the ability of ne to mark sentential negation, which corresponds to Jespersen’s own view of the motivation behind
the change. There are two different types of *ne* at successive stages of Jespersen's Cycle.

Haegeman observes that the West Flemish negative marker *en-* is only licit when another negative element is present in the clause. Both Haegeman and Rowlett therefore have 'negative' heads which are not inherently negative at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle, and sentential negation marked by a negative phrase (*pas* in French, *nie* in West Flemish). For Rowlett (1998), *ne* is only assigned [+NEG] during the syntactic derivation rather than in the lexicon. One problem with Rowlett's approach is that he does not make clear what the features associated with the agreeing form of *ne* are. He claims that *ne* is not [+NEG], but it is necessary for *ne* to have some feature which restricts its distribution to negative and expletive negative contexts, and allows it to enter the derivation as a syntactic head.

Importantly for Rowlett, the phrase structure of NegP remains the same at all stages of Jespersen's Cycle, with specifier and head elements, but the morphosyntactic feature [neg] is distributed differently within NegP at successive stages of Jespersen's Cycle. At stage one [neg] is associated with the head Neg°. At stage two [neg] is associated with spec,NegP and is introduced in order to pass features on to Neg°. The phrase structure of NegP is invariant, with an operator in specifier position in all instances. However, this operator does not have [neg] features at stage one of Jespersen's Cycle. At this stage, it is an expletive operator and serves only to mark a barrier to A'-movement operations. This operator serves to derive Relativised Minimality effects and explain why negative clauses are islands for wh-extraction (see section 1.3.2).

Some aspects of Rowlett's proposals are slightly unclear, in particular the syntactic status of the negative head at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle. At this point of the discussion, it is not clear what the role of Neg° is at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle, given that it is redundant as a marker of sentential negation. This amounts to the question of how to characterise the difference between stages two and three of Jespersen's Cycle. As a first approximation, we might say that *ne* is an historical relic of an earlier stage, that the deletion of *ne* is not simultaneous with its becoming redundant as a negative marker. We will see in chapter 5 that this idea fits naturally with the notion of grammar competition.

Rowlett's proposals yield a new account of the changes involved in Jespersen's Cycle. Instead of Jespersen's Cycle being a product of variation in the morphological expression of an underlying and invariant spec-head relation under
the Neg-criterion, the variation involved is morphosyntactic rather than purely morphological. Variation in the feature specifications of the operator and head drives Jespersen's cycle. This requires different types of ne at successive stages of Jespersen's Cycle one with [+NEG], the other without. These are two different lexical items and will behave independently across time. Furthermore, under Rowlett's account there is no null [+NEG] operator. The only [+NEG] operator is overt not. The distribution of the [+NEG] operator not is determined by the featural specification of the head, and its introduction represents the innovation of a new feature checking dependency. This account ties the semantic expression of negation more closely to its morphological expression than previous approaches under the Neg-criterion. Every lexical item with [NEG] features in the syntax must have a morphological realisation. This has advantages for the language learner. However, it is not precise enough: at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle ne is an overt morpheme, yet it does not have [NEG] features. The features associated with ne at this stage need to be worked out. Rowlett's approach to Jespersen's Cycle based on feature checking fits naturally into more recent Minimalist frameworks, with some slight modifications. In the next section, I will outline the Minimalist framework I will adopt, as a preliminary to my syntactic proposals in section 4.4.

4.3 The Minimalist framework: syntactic assumptions

Recent Minimalist feature driven frameworks provide a new and different perspective on morphosyntactic variation and change, and on the nature of syntactic dependencies, such as the one which holds between ne and not at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle. In this section, I set out the salient tenets of the framework, including the architecture of the system, the nature of morphosyntactic features and dependencies. The framework I adopt is based on Chomsky (1999; 2000), with a few modifications, which have important consequences for the derivation of the patterns of negation attested in early English.

4.3.1 The architecture of the system

The impetus behind this framework is to simplify the range of syntactic operations, so that all dependencies and movement processes are products of the same syntactic mechanisms. The intuition which the programme explores is that the
syntax is an optimal response to conditions at the interfaces. The syntax interfaces
with two other modules of cognitive competence: the conceptual-intensional sys-
tem (at the LF interface) and the articulatory-perceptual system (at the PF inter-
face) which impose legibility conditions on the derivation. The derivation must
contain only elements which can be interpreted at one or both of these interface
levels.

All syntactic operations are triggered by features on lexical items which are
selected from the lexicon to form a numeration at the start of each derivation.
This reduces all parametric variation to lexical variation. The properties of lexical
items have primary relevance to determining the application of syntactic rules
and operations. The mechanisms of the computation, by which the derivation
is constructed, are themselves invariant. There are only two operations: Merge
which builds syntactic structure, and Agree which underlies all syntactic de-
pendencies, including long distance agreement and movement. Movement is
achieved by a combination of Agree and (re-)Merge (see section 4.3.2 for a dis-
cussion of agreement and movement).

Parametric variation is highly constrained, amounting to differences in fea-
tures which allow the application or non-application of universal syntactic rules.
Features are bivalent rather than multivalent, so parameters are binary: either an
operation applies to a particular lexical item (LI), or it does not.

Within this framework, phrase structure is constructed as a consequence of
syntactic operations rather than being a primitive as in X'-theory. Therefore,
phrase structure is demoted in importance to syntactic relations. What is more
important is the relation between morphosyntactic features. One consequence is
that a head can have multiple specifiers if feature checking requires this configu-
ration. Conversely, a head does not always need to appear with a matching spec-
ifier if it does not have the features which will attract an element into a specifier
position. These ideas will have important consequences for the phrase structure
of negation at the different stages of Jespersen’s Cycle.

4.3.2 Morphosyntactic features and syntactic operations

There are two types of morphosyntactic features within this system, those which
have a value at the LF interface, and those which do not have any value or inter-
pretation at LF. Following Chomsky (1999), I will adopt the idea that morphosyn-
tactic features are [attribute:value] pairs. There is a distinction between features
which emerge from the lexicon with both attribute and value and features which emerge from the lexicon with attribute but no value. Unvalued features must become valued during the course of the syntactic derivation, before the LF interface is reached. Unvalued features are deficient and illegible at the LF interface. Any such features remaining at the interface will cause the derivation to crash. Unvalued morphosyntactic features are present either because they have some morphological reflex at PF, or because they are formally required to induce certain syntactic operations and relations during the derivation. All syntactic relations hold between valued and unvalued features. The syntactic operations which induce syntactic relations or dependencies also eliminate unvalued features prior to the LF interface. Unvalued features are valued by matching against features with the same attribute which already have a value. Feature valuation is subject to syntactic constraints. Let us call the unvalued feature the probe, and the valued feature the goal, and the feature valuing relation between them Agree, as in Chomsky (1999; 2000). The following conditions hold on Agree

1. The probe must C-command the goal.

2. The goal must have a valued feature which matches the probe's unvalued feature.

3. The goal must also have an unvalued feature, which renders it syntactically active and identifies it as a target of Agree. This feature will be matched with a valued feature of the probe.

4. The probe and goal relation must be the most local pair of matching features. No item with matching features can intervene between the probe and the goal.

Following Chomsky (1999; 2000) I accept that Agree does not entail movement, unlike Chomsky (1995). Agreement and movement are distinct. Agree identifies the target of movement and its landing site, but an additional feature is postulated to induce movement rather than long-distance agreement. This is the [EPP] feature, which triggers re-Merge of the goal as a specifier of the probe. For the sake of simplicity, I will adopt the same view of head movement. This is justified in a bare phrase structure. Instead of being a specifier of the probe, a lower head will adjoin to the probe by head adjunction.\footnote{Although various other approaches to head movement have been proposed, including the idea that it is a post-syntactic operation, applying at PF (Chomsky 1999).}
Another important aspect of feature valuation is that it induces deletion of the features which have been valued. The derivation distinguishes between features which entered from the lexicon with a value, and features which have been valued during the derivation by Agree. As the derivation is sent to the PF and LF interfaces, each feature valued during the course of the derivation is deleted. There are two schools of thought on the timing of feature deletion. Chomsky (1995) claims that feature valuation and feature deletion are simultaneous, aspects of the same operation. However, in later proposals separate feature valuation and deletion (Chomsky 1999). Feature valuation happens during the derivation, whereas feature deletion is part of the process of spell-out which hands over the syntactic structure to the PF and LF interfaces. The timing of feature deletion depends on the timing of spell-out. The choice of approach has an empirical consequence. Under the view that feature valuation and deletion are simultaneous, features valued during the derivation cannot act as goals for subsequent Agree relations as they do not have the relevant features. Under the deletion at spellout model, feature valuation and deletion are not simultaneous, hence a feature valued by Agree can be a goal to a subsequent Agree relation, prior to spell-out, in exactly the same way as a feature can which emerges valued from the lexicon.

4.3.3 Syntactic operations and locality

In Chomsky (1999; 2000) Agree holds between pairs of features on the most local probe and goal. The probe values features of at most one (the closest) goal. Hiraiwa (2001), Frampton and Gutmann (2000) propose mechanisms for multiple feature checking. We will see that multiple feature checking is important in the account of multiple negation I propose. Hiraiwa (2001) proposes that a probe can Agree with all the active matching features it C-commands, provided no inactive feature of the same type intervenes between the probe and any of the active matching features. Frampton and Gutmann (2000) propose a similar account.

(198)

```
XP
  YP [feature: F]
  X' [feature: ]
  X [feature: ]
  ZP
  ... [feature: ]
```
4.4 A Minimalist approach to Jespersen’s Cycle

Rowlett’s (1998) approach lends itself to reformulation in a Minimalist framework in terms of morphosyntactic features. The hypothesis I will explore is that the morphosyntactic features associated with ne are different at stages one and two of Jespersen’s Cycle. In keeping with the Minimalist framework, I propose that polarity is a morphosyntactic feature (see also Kato (2001), Martin-Gonzalez (2000) for other feature based Minimalist approaches). Every negative clause must have a polarity feature which has the value negative in an appropriate scope position. I will notate this feature as an attribute value pair polarity:negative or [pol:neg]. Rowlett’s distinction between two types of ne is easily recast in these
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terms. At stage one, *ne* emerges from the lexicon with both attribute and value [pol:neg]. It is sufficient to negate a clause on its own. At stage two *ne* is insufficient to negate a clause on its own. *ne* has a [pol: ] feature, which is not valued in the lexicon, and therefore must be valued during the derivation in order for negation to be marked at LF and interpreted at the conceptual-intensional interface. This enforces the relation between *ne* and a secondary negator such as *not*, which has [pol:neg] in its lexical entry. There is a stage of the language in EME when both types of *ne* are available and the use of these two options is subject to variation (and competition, as I will show in chapter 5).

This approach captures Rowlett's idea that *ne* is not inherently negative. The idea of *ne* as a polarity item has been proposed by Ladusaw (1993), van der Wouden (1994), but my account allows this idea to be formalised within a Minimalist framework in which structure is built endocentrically to satisfy the featural deficiency of the head prior to the interfaces. The appearance of *ne* at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle is subject to syntactic licensing conditions, namely that it Agree with an LI bearing a [pol:neg] feature. Merge of *not* in a specifier-head configuration meets this requirement. This approach preserves Rowlett's ideas, but instead of *ne* being licensed by a particular configuration in NegP, *ne* is licensed in a particular feature checking configuration. At this stage of the discussion, it is not clear whether feature checking requires the functional projection NegP. Phrase structure configurations are not of primary importance in the Minimalist framework. I will explore the consequences of my proposals for the representation of negation using NegP in section 4.5.

In broad descriptive terms, the negative marker *ne* becomes part of the verbal morphology, with no intrinsic meaning of its own at LF, a little like verbal agreement morphology. Verbal agreement morphology is interpretable on the subject, which is the specifier of some verbal projection, rather than the verb itself. Similarly, negation becomes interpreted on a specifier of some verbal projection rather than on the verb itself. The next issue to examine is whether a correlation can be established between changes in morphosyntactic features and changes in the phrase structure of negation which eliminates the need for the null elements required by Haegeman's and Rowlett's approaches. Suggesting that the phrase structure of negation is subject to parametric variation goes further than Rowlett (1998) who argues for an underlying operator-head construction in all negative clauses. Rowlett takes this approach in view of Relativised Minimality (Rizzi 1990). Rizzi observes that negatives form weak islands barring wh-movement
across them. His analysis of weak island effects is based on the idea that negatives and wh-phrases are operators which occupy A'-positions, and thereby prevent A'-movement across them.

Minimalist accounts of negation, such as the one I propose here, or the one proposed by Brown (1999) do not maintain that negation is always an XP operator in an A'-position. Therefore, an alternative analysis of Relativised Minimality is required which does not make reference to operators in A'-positions. Manzini (1998) proposes a modification to the Minimal Link Condition (Chomsky 1995, 311) which derives weak island constraints in terms of features, by grouping features such as wh- and neg-features into a superset of operator features, each of which interacts with the others under the Minimal Link Condition. In the case of negative islands in wh-constructions, the presence of an intervening negative feature prevents agreement between C and the wh-phrase (199).

(199) Why didn’t he say he was fired? (*why = for what reason was he fired)

Other accounts of weak island constraints have been proposed based on semantic or scope properties of certain features or lexical items, or on discourse or pragmatic properties. If these proposals are on the right lines, then a null operator in spec,NegP is not required to derive weak island constraints under Relativised Minimality. In clauses which have [neg] features on a head, the only motivation for a null element in spec,NegP is to derive island constraints. To the extent that other ways to derive island constraints are plausible, such as Manzini’s feature based proposal, a null spec,NegP operator is not required. Therefore, it might be possible to claim that the alternation in the position of [pol:neg] features under Jespersen’s Cycle leads to parametric variation in the phrase structure of negation, if a negative specifier is not required at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle.

This view of Jespersen’s Cycle differs from previous approaches as it is change in the morphosyntactic specification of ne which drives Jespersen’s Cycle forwards. It allows Jespersen’s Cycle to be parametrised in a new way. Furthermore, Jespersen’s Cycle can be derived by grammatical competition (Kroch 1989). In the original formulation proposed by Kroch (1989), grammatical competition involves structurally incompatible forms. This is a problem to Frisch’s analysis of Jespersen’s Cycle under the Neg-criterion. For him, ne and not cannot be structurally incompatible, as they co-occur. Frisch (1997) is forced to diverge from the account of grammatical competition proposed by Kroch (1989). My proposals distinguish two forms of ne at successive stages of Jespersen’s Cycle. These are
both heads (as I argued in chapters 2 and 3), which only differ minimally in one morphosyntactic feature. Therefore they are structurally incompatible and meet the conditions for grammatical competition. In chapter 5 I discuss morphosyntactic variation and competition in more detail, and develop a diachronic model of Jespersen’s Cycle based on this hypothesis.

4.5 Implications of the analysis of Jespersen’s Cycle for the phrase structure of negation

This section will develop some issues for the phrase structure of negation which arise out of my proposals. Most of the literature on negation in the Principles and Parameters framework assigns negation to its own functional projection NegP, following Pollock (1989). This section will examine the justification for NegP in a Minimalist theory based on bare phrase structure. I will compare the motivation for NegP under a Neg-criterion approach to the motivation for NegP under the proposals I outlined in section 4.4. The availability of NegP might be parametrised along with the expression of negation under Jespersen’s Cycle rather than being a universal category in all languages. This idea is supported by the distribution of negation in German, Dutch and the Scandinavian languages. In these languages, the negatives nicht, niet, ikki are phrasal, and behave like VP-adjuncts rather than specifiers of a functional projection. There is no evidence for a negative head in these languages. In contrast, the existence of do-support in Present Day English is taken as evidence for a negative head, and hence for NegP in Present Day English. I will examine evidence for NegP in earlier stages of English.

4.5.1 Evidence for NegP as the locus of negation in early English

We have already seen that negation is not universally expressed by a specifier-head relation. The Neg-criterion is a parametrised and variable, a feature-checking relation applying at a particular stage of Jespersen’s Cycle. There is only overt evidence for co-occurrence of negation on both a head and specifier at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle. Languages at stage three of Jespersen’s Cycle, have an adverbial negator (German nicht, Norweigian ikki, Dutch niet), whose distribution does not provide any evidence for NegP. In chapter 2, I demonstrated that the position of negation is indistinguishable from the position of discourse adverbs, adjoined
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To vP. Although we can disambiguate the morphosyntactic feature configurations at stages one and two of Jespersen's Cycle, stage three is more problematic. At stage three of Jespersen's Cycle the position of not is ambiguous between an unselected vP adjunct as in German, or a selected element which checks the [pol:] feature of a null negative head. The problem is particularly difficult because I showed in chapter 2 that the position of secondary negator not is the same as the vP adjunct position which discourse and temporal adverbs occupy. NegP is not necessary in most languages with phrasal negators once stage three of Jespersen's Cycle is reached. In morphosyntactic feature terms, there is no evidence for polarity features on a head, or for any Agreement relation between head and specifier elements. In the absence of such evidence, the easiest route for the language learner is not to have a negative head in his or her inventory of negative lexical items, but to treat not as an unselected vP adjunct.

Late Middle English might be included in the group of languages which have negative markers which are unselected vP adjuncts. The issue hinges on the question of whether loss of ne is phonological, leaving a [pol:] feature in place on a head, or whether the loss of ne is a structural change which eliminates both the [pol:] feature and its morphological realisation. If the former, then not remains selected by a head for the purpose of morphosyntactic feature checking. If the latter, then there is no dependency between a head and not. The latter approach does not posit a morphosyntactic dependency where there is no overt morphological evidence for one.

In languages which only mark negation on a head, it is not clear that negation must project a separate head Neg⁰, as it is the feature [pol:neg] which marks negation, rather than a particular phrase structure configuration. This [pol:neg] feature may be located on a projection of the verb. The link between sentential negation and propositionality indicates that the [pol:neg] is located on a head associated with tense (T⁰) or event structure (v⁰).

However, it is well known that the behaviour of not at later stages of Modern English is different from its German counterpart nicht. The set of verbs which co-occur with negation in PDE is restricted to be, have, modals and do, which Han and Kroch (2000) categorise as a modal. A full discussion of this pattern, or its development in Early Modern English is outside the scope of this thesis. However, the interaction of negation and modality in PDE has been used as an argument that not is a specifier of NegP (Pollock 1989, Ouhalla 1990) (see section 1.3.1 for a discussion).
Still further, in clauses which have a negative head element and a negative specifier element, it is not clear that a separate projection is required to accommodate agreement between the two negatives. Under Minimalist bare phrase structure theory (Chomsky 1995; 2000) there is no one to one correspondence between specifier and head. Specifiers are created to check the features of a head by Move or Merge. If a head has more than one feature which needs to be checked, it will have multiple specifiers. Conversely, if the head has no uninterpretable features, if will not project a specifier.

Within the formal framework of Minimalism, a separate Neg⁰ head is not required at any stage of Jespersen's Cycle, unlike in earlier X'-theory approaches. In principle, [pol:neg] features could be part of the feature specification of any functional head. Furthermore, there is no reason why the feature checking between ne and not requires a distinct negative projection for the dependency to hold. Just as the valued [pol:neg] feature could be part of the lexical entry of any functional head, unvalued [pol:] features could also be part of the feature specification of any functional head, provided we allow for the checking of [pol:] features in a multiple specifier configuration.

The dependency could hold between a negative T⁰ or v⁰ with [pol:] and not [pol:neg] in an outer spec,TP or spec,vP position. However, invoking a multiple specifier configuration to deal with bipartite negation may result in problems ordering not with respect to the other specifiers of T or v such as the subject which originates in spec,vP, and moves to spec,TP to check φ-features and case. In order to derive the two observed orderings of negation and subjects, the subject must occupy the inner specifier position of v or T whilst negation must occupy the outer specifier.

4.5.2 Morphosyntactic features and the phrase structure of negation

My proposal to assign ne the feature [pol:] impacts on the viability of PolP/NegP as an independent projection. At stage two, ne serves only to initiate a dependency leading to Merge of not. Jespersen's Cycle offers no motivation for assigning other additional features to ne. This is consistent with the role of ne as verb. However, the Old English distribution of ne is consistent with its being a prefix on the finite verb in the lexicon. There may be a diachronic change in the status of the negative marker here at an earlier stage of Jespersen's Cycle.
a negative agreement marker on the finite verb, and aligns the status of *ne* with agreement morphology (which is uninterpretable on the finite verb and its associated heads, and interpretable on the subject). Given that NegP has the same status as AgrP at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle, consisting of uninterpretable features, the existence of NegP/Po1P is largely a matter for the syntactic theory adopted in the same way AgrP is. The representation of agreement morphology depends on the view taken of the morphology-syntax mapping.

In a Minimalist framework, it is unclear whether heads consisting entirely of uninterpretable features can have an independent existence in syntax and project (Chomsky 2000, 138-9):

> In MP [The Minimalist Program] it is speculated that categories lacking interpretable features should be disallowed - specifically Agr, consisting only of uninterpretable φ-features. That conclusion is forced in this version. Suppose α is an LI that consists of uninterpretable features only and selects β, yielding the syntactic object K=α,β with label α. In the course of a convergent derivation, α will disappear, leaving K and higher projections of α without a label. But terms without labels are not well-formed syntactic objects. Accordingly such elements as Agr not only might not exist, but cannot exist, on rather plausible assumptions. (Chomsky 2000, 138-9)

This can be seen to be a problem for *ne* if Chomsky's formalism is made concrete by substituting *ne* [pol:] for α and *not* or *pas* [pol: neg] for β. 4

If Chomsky's proposal is to be taken seriously, it constrains the syntactic representation of negation at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle. The [pol:] feature must be accommodated on a projection which has interpretable features. I envisage two solutions to this problem. The first is to ensure that, in addition to [pol:], *ne* has an LF interpretable feature of some sort, which allows it syntactic independence. The problem here is to determine what else *ne* might be specified for in addition to negation. One reason for assigning elements to functional projections in the first place is that they convey only limited, grammatical functional, meaning. However, Martin-Gonzalez (2000), Kato (2001) argue that two features are

---

4Chomsky (2000) makes his remarks in view of Agr. Ouhalla (1990, 191) draws a parallel between the phrase structure of Neg and the phrase structure of Agr: both have an abstract head which licenses an overt specifier. The conceptual parallel is increased if bipartite negation is a kind of negative agreement.
involved in the expression of sentential negation: a negation \([\text{neg}]\) feature, and a polarity feature \([\text{pol}]\). Martin-Gonzalez argues for a configuration of features \([\text{pol}, \text{uneg}]\) on an independent head. The interpretable \([\text{pol}]\) feature allows projection of PolP, as an independent projection in the syntax, whilst the \([\text{uneg}]\) feature establishes the syntactic dependency with \textit{not} required at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle (200).

\[
\text{(200)} \quad \text{PolP} \\
\quad \text{not} \quad \text{Pol} \\
\quad \text{[neg]} \\
\quad \text{Pol'} \\
\quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \text{[pol][uneg]}
\]

The biggest problem with this analysis is that the motivation for the \([\text{pol}]\) feature appears to be theory-internal. The patterns of negation at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle offer no empirical evidence for this feature. It is not clear whether the interpretable \([\text{pol}]\) feature has any syntactic independence on a head position or what its role at LF would be, given that polarity is also marked by negative features.

The second approach is to assign the \([\text{pol:} ]\) feature to another head which has independent existence. A good candidate, which derives the appropriate position for \textit{not} is \textit{v}. Checking must be carried out in a multiple specifier configuration, with \textit{not} or \textit{na} in the outer specifier. The positions of negators are indistinguishable from the positions of TP or vP adjoined adverbs. Hence this approach seems a promising way to eliminate PolP. Chomsky (1999) suggests that vP can have more than one specifier, the inner specifier an A-specifier, the outer one an A'-specifier. vP also constitutes a syntactic phase in Chomsky's (1999) model. In the syntax, negation appears at the phase edge. This aligns it with other affective operators such as wh-operators, which are subject to successive cyclic locality constraints.

Whilst interesting, Chomsky's proposal is not the only perspective through which to view the question of NegP. Bobaljik (1995), Bobaljik and Thrainsson (1998) take each morpheme to correspond to a functional head in the syntax, continuing the Government-Binding approach to functional projections. This is the approach which underpins Haeberli's clause structures for early English. If I admit AgrP on the basis of overt agreement morphology as Haeberli (2002b) does, following Bobaljik and Thrainsson (1998), I am forced to admit NegP on the basis
of the negative morpheme *ne*. The loss of overt morphological evidence (*ne*) for the negative head has potential to induce syntactic changes in the representation of negation, in the same way that Bobaljik and Thrainsson (1998) demonstrate that loss of overt agreement morphology entails changes in verb movement, loss of a subject position, and loss of object movement possibilities. However, it is not clear that loss of the overt head *ne* has any visible effect on the distribution of *not* in Middle English.

Finally, both NegP and AgrP may be analysed as Proxy Projections (Nash and Rouveret 1997), created for the purpose of checking features only. A similar approach follows from Giorgi and Pianesi's *Feature Scattering Principle*.

(201) *Feature Scattering Principle*: Every feature can head a projection

Giorgi and Pianesi (1997, 231)

Under both approaches the [pol:] feature on v° will project Neg° solely to provide a specifier position in which [pol:] can be valued by *not* [pol:neg]. These approaches eliminate multiple specifiers, as each feature which is valued heads its own functional projection. Only unvalued features need to project in order for checking or valuation to occur in a spec-head configuration. Following this approach to its logical conclusion, NegP is only present as a syntactic (proxy) category at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle when the expression of negation involves morphosyntactic feature checking. At stage one [pol:neg] is a feature of v°. At stage three [pol:neg] is a feature of an unselected vP adjunct. Whilst these approaches correlate variation in the phrase structure of negation with its morphosyntactic features, providing an account of parametric variation in the phrase structure of negation, they face the same problem which the multiple specifier approaches face. Under both these approaches, feature checking operations must be ordered in order to generate the observed morphological and functional hierarchy, whether or not each unvalued feature projects its own functional head.

4.5.3 Summary: the phrase structure of negation

In this section, I showed that there is no concrete evidence that the functional projection NegP is necessary or present in all negative clauses. Whether or not one makes reference to NegP depends on the approach one takes to functional structure. My account of Jespersen's Cycle draws parallels between NegP at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle, and AgrP. Both are checking positions whose heads have no interpretable features. In this way, Agr° and Neg° differ from the functional
heads which Chomsky (1995; 2000) labels Core Functional Categories (CFCs): C, T, v. These have important semantic contributions to the clause. v introduces event structure, aspect, and existential closure over the predicate. T provides temporal anchoring for the proposition. C encodes properties such as force and pragmatic or information structure information such as focus. A semantic justification is only available for a negative head at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle, when it actually introduces negation. At subsequent stages, the role of the negative head, if present, is as a morphological marker of negation rather than a semantic one.

At stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle, there is no reason why ne should not be an independent head, dominating v or T. However, early English offers no evidence to dissociate the negative head from the aspectual head v° or temporal head T°.

At stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle, a checking relation holds between a head with [pol: ] and an XP with [pol: neg] features. Under X’-theory, this configuration requires its own projection, with a single specifier and a single head. The same is not true under bare phrase structure theory, which admits multiple specifiers. Alternatively, neg-feature checking can occur in a proxy projection which is created specifically for the purpose of checking (under the approaches proposed by Nash and Rouveret (1997), Giorgi and Pianesi (1997)). In the latter case, we can see that the nature of NegP differs from Chomsky’s Core Functional Categories. The role of NegP, like AgrP, is purely syntactic unlike C, T, v which are crucial for propositional semantics. The features of the proxy head Neg° will be checked and deleted at spell-out. Once the [pol:neg] feature is no longer present on a head ne, ne no longer has any role in LF interpretation.

4.6 Redundant Negation

This chapter discussed syntactic analyses of Jespersen’s Cycle and their implications. I proposed that there are two types of ne in early English, and that competition between them drives Jespersen’s Cycle. We will see in this section that the behaviour of ne in redundant negation supports a distinction between two forms of ne which differ in syntactic and semantic properties at successive stages of Jespersen’s Cycle.

In this section, I discuss the syntax of redundant negation in early English (also termed ‘paratactic negation’ (Jespersen 1917), and ‘expletive negation’ (van der Wurff 1999b)). I refer to the phenomenon here as redundant negation. I distin-
4.6. REDUNDANT NEGATION

guish two patterns of redundant negation in early English on both synchronic and diachronic bases. The ME distribution of *ne* in redundant negation distinguishes it from OE *ne* and ME *not*. One pattern of redundant negation emerges in ME and only involves *ne*, so that ME *ne* appears in one context where no other sentential negators appear. The other pattern of redundant negation is productive throughout OE, ME and Early Modern English and involves the full range of sentential negators available at each stage of early English. These two patterns inform discussion of the syntax of *ne* and support my claim that there are two distinct forms of *ne* in early English.

Data for this section are taken from the literature on redundant negation as well as the YCOE and PPCME2 corpora. In order to supplement the small number of examples found in the corpora the following sources of examples were also used to construct a database of examples: the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the *Middle English Dictionary*, Mitchell (1985), Baghdikian (1979), van der Wurff (1999b), Jack (1978a), Iyeiri (2001), Warner (1982).

4.6.1 Patterns of redundant negation in early English

Van der Wouden (1994, 107) defines redundant or paratactic negation as:

... various languages and dialects show the effect that a verb (or something else) of negative import triggers a superfluous negation in a subordinate clause. ... Paratactic negation falls apart into two subtypes: the elements with 'negative import' either trigger the occurrence of one or more negative morphemes in their complement clause, or they select a special type of complementiser that may or may not be homophonous to a negation operator. 

(van der Wouden 1994, 107)

Present Day English does not permit either of these two types of redundant negation, but both are attested in earlier stages of English following certain verbs. (202-205) exemplify Wouden's first type of redundant negation, with a full range of negative markers used redundantly, including OE *ne* (202), ME *not* (203), Early Modern English *not* (204), as well as negative quantifiers (205). These examples show that redundant negation is not restricted to occur with particular negators or at particular points in Jespersen's Cycle.
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(202) He pa opsoc þæt he hit nære
He then denied that he it NEG-was
‘He then denied that it was he’
(Aelfric Lives of Saints XXX, 23)

(203) Now sithen he deffendeth that man sholde nat yeven to his broother ne
Now since he forbids that man should not give to his brother nor
to his freend te myght of his body
to his friend the might of his body
‘Now, since he forbids man to give his brother or friend power over his body’
(Chaucer, Melibee 1756).

(204) You may deny that you were not the meane of my Lord Hastings late
You may deny that you were not the means of my Lord Hastings late
imprisonment
‘You may deny that you were the means of my Lord Hastings late impris-
onment’
(Shakespeare, Richard III, I.ii.502-503)

(205) Nature deffendeth and forbedeth by right that na man make hym self
Nature prohibits and forbids by right that no man make himself
riche vn to the harm of another persone
rich in to the harm of another person
‘Nature prohibits and forbids by right that any man should make himself
rich at the expense of another person’
(Chaucer, Melibee, B. 2774)

The negative complementiser þæt ne, which Jack (1978a, 66) argues is mod-
elled on Latin quin exemplifies Wouden’s second type of redundant negative
marker (206).

(206) a. And so we mai not denye þat ne Crist and his eldris weren pore
And so we can not deny that Crist and his parents were poor
folk…
people…
‘and so we cannot deny that Christ and his parents were poor peo-
ple…’
(Wycliffe Sermons, i.246.3)

b. And Cristen men han noo doute þat ne Joon was verry Maries
and Christian men have no doubt that John was truly Mary’s
4.6. REDUNDANT NEGATION

The triggering contexts for Old and Middle English redundant negation are predicates of prohibition, denial and doubt. van der Wurff (1999b, 297) observes that the set of verbs which license redundant negation in earlier English resists precise syntactic categorisation. They comprise a subset of verbs of negative import, but redundant negation is not licit with all verbs of negative import such as hate, dislike, or negated verbs such as not say, not think. The set of verbs which license redundant negation are the same set of verbs which license negative polarity items (NPIs) in their complement clause. Van der Wouden (1994, 108) characterises the contexts for redundant negation semantically, as downward monotonicity contexts. In syntactic terms, the potential to license redundant negation can be analysed as a subcategorisational requirement of particular verbs. For the sake of the exposition here, I will refer to predicates which license redundant negation as 'adversative' following van der Wurff (1999b). In addition, ME redundant negation appears in comparatives or following certain complementisers which have negative import (207, 208).

(207) And thanne thilke thing that the blake cloud of errour whilom hadd and then the same thing that the black cloud of error formerly had ycovered schal lighte more clerly than Phebus hymself ne shyneth covered will light more clearly than Phoebus himself ne shines

'And then the same thing that the black cloud of error had covered in the past will light up more clearly than Phoebus himself shines'
(Chaucer, Boece III M.11,10, van der Wurff (1999b, ex.8))

(208) ther bihoveth greet corage agains Accidie lest that it ne swolwe the there is-needed great courage against sloth lest that it ne swallow the soule by the sin of sorrow soul by the sin of sorrow

'Great courage is needed to fight sloth, lest it swallow up the soul by the sin of sorrow'
(Chaucer, Parson's Tale 731, van der Wurff (1999b, ex.9))

5With one important difference. A main clause negative is sufficient to license NPIs in a complement clause with any verb: I didn’t say that I would do anything about it, but redundant negation is only licensed by a particular subset of verbs.
4.6.2 Two types of redundant negation in early English

There are two types of redundant negation in early English, which are distinguished both by properties of the main clause licensing context and by the negators used redundantly in the complement clause.

Redundant negation is attested with a full range of negatives in clauses where the matrix licensing predicate is non-negative: with OE *ne* (209), with ME *not* (210) and in Early Modern English, also with *not* (211). This form of redundant negation is attested throughout the early English period, from Old English to Early Modern English.

(209) ðeah for eaðmodnesse wandiað ðæt hi hit ne sprecað
yet for humility hesitate that they them NEG preach
‘yet for humility they hesitate to preach them’
(CP 117.13)

(210) Bochas forbade husbandes without prefe not to leve to sone their
Bochas forbade husbands without proof not to leave too soon their
wyves
wives
‘Bochas forbade husbands without proof to leave their wives too soon’
(c. 1430-40, Lydg. Bochas (1554) 22b)

(211) She silly Queene forbad the boy he should not passe those grounds
She silly Queen forbade the boy he should not pass those grounds
‘She, silly Queen, forbade the boy to pass those grounds’
(1599 Shaks, Pass Pilgr. 124)

In ME, we find redundant negation in the complement clauses of adversative predicates which are themselves under the scope of sentential negation in the main clause (212).

(212) a. ne doute the nat that alle thinges ne ben don aryght
NEG doubt you not that all things ne are don rightfully
‘Do not doubt that all things are done rightfully’
(Chaucer’s Boethius IV P5,49)

b. Certes…it nys no doute that it nys right worthy to ben
Truly…it NEG-is no doubt that it ne-is truly worthy to be revered
revered
‘Truly, there is no doubt that it is worthy of reverence’
(Chaucer, Boethius 3, pr.9.42)
There are reasons to believe that redundant negation under non-negative and negative matrix predicates is not the same phenomenon. First, redundant negation under a negated predicate is only productive in Middle English, unlike the other pattern of redundant negation which continues to be productive into the Early Modern English period. In Old English, redundant negation with *ne* is found (*n*=12), but *ne* usually follows a non-negative adversative predicate (*n*=9). In my database of examples, there are only 3 Old English examples of *ne* in the complement of a negated predicate (213), compared with 32 Middle English examples of the same construction (215).

(213) *fopon nis nan tweo þæt he forgifnesse syllan nelle*

although NEG-is no doubt that he forgiveness grant ne-will

‘although there is no doubt that he will grant forgiveness’

(BIHom 65.8)

Second, the negator *ne* is almost always used to mark redundant negation in the complement clause of a negated predicate, even in LME when the typical sentential negator is *not*. There is only one exception in which *not* is used redundantly in the complement clause of a negated matrix verb (214). This is 1 of a total 36 examples, and is also the latest example of this type, dating from 16th century Early Modern English.

(214) *nor does not doute that it is not the feet’s office*

nor does not doubt that it is not the feet’s office

‘nor does not doubt that it is the feet’s office’

(Queen Elizabeth’s Boethius P2,38, (Baghdikian 1979))

In LME the two redundant negation contexts are clearly distinct: in the complement clause of a negated predicate the redundant negative is always *ne* (215). Other redundant negation contexts mark redundant negation using *not* (216).

---

This is in an Early Modern English translation of the *Boethius* from French. Patterns of redundant negation in French rather than those of English may provide the model for this example and account for its anomalous appearance.

The last example of redundant *ne* I have found with a non-negative adversative predicate dates from c.1275 (i). The last examples of *ne* in the complement of a negated adversative predicate date from the 15th century.

(i) *lesus hire po for-bed þat heo attryne ne sceolde his hond ne his fet*

Jesus her though forbade that she bind ne ought his hands nor his feet

‘though Jesus forbade her to bind his hands or his feet'
(215) no man doubteth that he ne is strong in whom he seeth strengthe no man doubts that he *ne* is strong in whom he sees strength
‘No one doubts that that person is strong in whom he can see strength’.
(Chaucer Boece II, Pr.6, 93-4)

(216) Now sithen he deffendeth that man sholde nat yeve to his broother ne Now since he forbids that man should not give to his brother nor to his freend te myght of his body to his friend the might of his body
Now, since he forbids man to give his brother or friend power over his body’
(Chaucer, Melibee 1756)

Jack (1978a) identifies redundant negations which are dependent on a negative matrix predicate as one of the last contexts to lose *ne* in Middle English. Examples of redundant negation following a negated matrix predicate seem to emerge at the same time as bipartite negation at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle, and are lost with the loss of supported *ne* in LME at stage three of Jespersen’s Cycle. The period of productivity for redundant negation in the complement of negated predicates corresponds to stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle. The distribution of *ne* in redundant negation divides instances of *ne* into two types at successive stages of Jespersen’s Cycle: Old English *ne* appearing in the complement of a non-negative predicate (217) and the Middle English *ne* appearing in the complement of a negated predicate (218).

(217) ða wiðsoc Crist swiðe rihtlice þæt he deofol on him næfde then denied Christ very rightfully that he devil in him ne-had ‘then Christ denied very rightfully that the devil was in him’
(AECHom ii. 230.1)

(218) Certes... it nys no doute that it nys right worthy to ben reverenced Truly... it *NEG*-is no doubt that it *ne*-is truly worthy to be revered ‘Truly, there is no doubt that it is worthy of reverence’
(Chaucer, Boethius 3, pr.9.42)

Van der Wurff (1999b) makes a similar distinction between two redundant negation contexts. He distinguishes polarity shift (216) and expletive negation proper (215). However, he does not distinguish the two types according to the

---

(c. 1275 Passion 581 in OE Misc 53)
polarity of the matrix predicate, or take account of the changing distribution of ne. A change in the polarity of the licensing contexts for redundant ne indicates a change in the syntax of ne. Whilst non-negative adversative predicates select negative complements containing a sentential negator such as ME not, negative adversative predicates do not. They take complements with ne at a time when unsupported ne is not a productive negative marker. The constructions with LME ne are instances of non-local multiple negation. The question is how ne comes to appear in multiple negation at this period.

Evidence from the distribution of ne in redundant negation contexts supports the distinction I proposed between two types of ne. In Middle English, redundant ne appears in non-local multiple negation across a clause boundary. The appearance of redundant ne in non-local multiple negation shows that ne is insufficient to mark negation on its own in the complement clause. It appears when licensed by another negative. The availability of this new context for ME ne is further evidence of the competition between two types of ne which I proposed for Middle English: one type of ne has morphosyntactic features which give it a negative interpretation, the other has features which mark it for polarity, rather than negation, and which require ne to be licensed by another negative. The first ne cannot appear in non-local multiple negation. The second can. Hence the growing availability of non-local multiple negation in ME marks a change in the syntax and semantics of ne which is concurrent with change under Jespersen's Cycle and arguably part of the same change as the one which drives Jespersen's Cycle.

Whilst the syntax and semantics of LME ne differs from earlier ne, LME redundant ne cannot be included in the class of negative polarity items (NPIs) as the conditions on NPIs and redundant ne differ. These differences are problematic to van der Wouden's (1994) account. He exploits the fact that adversative predicates license both NPIs and redundant negation to claim that redundant negatives are NPIs. However, the context for ME redundant ne is different from the context for any- NPIs in English. NPIs are licensed in the complement clauses of negative and non-negative adversative predicates even in PDE (219), whereas ME ne is only licensed in the complement clauses of negated predicates. Even in the clausal complements of adversative predicates, ME ne requires the presence of negation in the main clause unlike PDE NPIs. This indicates that the distribution of ME ne is not that of an NPI. Its licensing conditions are more specific.

(219) a. I forbid anyone to do that
    b. I don't forbid anyone to do that
4.7 The relationship between NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle

This section will return to consider the relationship between negative initial clauses and Jespersen’s Cycle. I now have accounts of both in terms of morphosyntactic features. For an account of Jespersen’s Cycle see section 4.4 of this chapter. In chapter 3, I gave good reasons to doubt that NegV1 and secondary negators were in complementary distribution as van Kemenade (2000), Ingham (2005) claim. This section will examine ways in which the apparent independence of NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle can be accommodated.

Eythorsson (2002) proposes to derive negative initial clauses by a [+neg] feature on $C^0$. In the framework of valued and unvalued features I adopt here, this feature equates to unvalued [pol:] on $C^0$. Movement of the negated finite verb to $C^0$ will only be possible when ne+V has valued [pol:neg] features at the point when $C^0$ probes, allowing ne+V to be the goal of Agree. The secondary negator not never moves to $C^0$, even though it takes over the role of negative marker at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle and has [pol:neg] features. The data I presented in chapter 3 showed that ne+V continues to move to $C^0$ even in EME clauses with not.

4.7.1 A feature based account: Ingham (2005)

Ingham (2005) adopts Eythorsson’s feature checking account of NegV1. He also adopts a version of Rowlett’s account of Jespersen’s Cycle in which [+neg] features shift from head to specifier position of NegP at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle. His claim regarding the loss of NegV1 is simple. Once the [pol: neg] feature is no longer marked underlyingly on the head ne, ne lacks the features which will check the features of $C^0$ and which allow ne+V to head adjoin to $C^0$. At stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle, ne is valued negative during the derivation by checking against not [pol:neg]. The [pol: neg] feature which ne inherits by checking

---

8Eythorsson claims the existence of negative complementisers as supporting evidence for this view. Middle English þæt ne ‘that not’ is an example of a negative complementiser, albeit one which is not widely attested outside the works of Wycliffe. The distribution of ne in the þæt ne construction is different from other instances of ne. It is separated from the finite verb, and precedes the subject in subordinate clauses. It also never appears unsupported, without another negative in the subordinate clause, so is an instance of my [pol:] rather than having negative features of its own.
against *not* is deleted as part of the feature valuation process, so that *ne* does not have a [pol:neg] feature at the point where C° [pol:] is merged and probes for an Agreeing goal.

One question is why loss of [pol:neg] on *ne* should lead to the loss of negative initial clauses rather than a switch in the target of movement from *ne+V* to the secondary negator *not* which has a [pol:neg] feature. There is no evidence for fronting of *not* in Middle English. The empirical predictions concerning the interaction of NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle which arise out of Ingham’s account are not borne out either. His account predicts that NegV1 and secondary negation should be in complementary distribution (a similar prediction also arises out of van Kemenade’s analysis, although for different reasons). I showed in chapter 3 that NegV1 is at least as frequent in clauses with *na* and *not* as in clauses without *na* and *not*. Ingham gets around this problem by arguing that the grammaticalisation of *not* as a secondary negator postdates the loss of NegV1. Hence OE *na* and EME *not* are adverbs. There is no independent basis for this distinction between adverbs and secondary negators. The distinction between sentential negator and adverb status hinges on Ingham’s analysis of NegV1. In section 4.7.2, I will present an alternative account of the loss of NegV1 which is independent of Jespersen’s Cycle, in accordance with the findings of chapter 3, and does not require a distinction between adverb *not* and sentential negator *not* to be made in EME, for which there is no independent basis (see chapter 2).

Ingham’s conclusion that *not* is reanalysed as a secondary negator in LME leaves the increasing frequency of EME *not* unmotivated. If *not* is an adverb at this period we might expect its use to be variable, but we have no reason to expect its use to increase during the period. The frequency of adverb *not* will be constrained by the availability of contexts for the adverb. Whilst the availability of contexts for adverb *not* may vary over time, there is no reason to expect a steady increase over time unless it is grammaticalised as a negative marker, which is what we see in the case of *not*. On the other hand, if *not* is reanalysed with a [+neg] feature in OE or EME, and begins to compete with *ne* [+neg] as an expression of sentential negation, its use will spread outside the original contexts.

---

9Ingham argues that differences in the frequency of *not* according to clause type indicate that it is an adverb rather than a grammaticalised sentential negator. He assumes that grammaticalisation is only complete once the use of *not* is no longer different in main and subordinate clauses. I do not understand how this argument distinguishes adverbs and secondary negators, given that the grammaticalised *not* is potentially a more frequently used grammatical option in main clauses than subordinate clauses during the course of the grammaticalisation itself. See chapter 5.
for adverb *not* in the manner expected of an innovative form in grammatical competition. The reanalysis of *not* is the starting point for its diffusion by grammatical competition rather than the endpoint of the change. Whilst it is undoubtedly the case that the sentential negator *not* developed out of an adverbial use of OE *nawiht* ‘nothing, in no way’, I take issue with the late date proposed for the reanalysis by Ingham.

Ingham’s account faces a theoretical problem too. He assumes that feature valuation and deletion are simultaneous, following Chomsky (1995). However, in later approaches, Chomsky (1999; 2000) dissociates feature valuation and deletion. Feature valuation happens when an appropriate probe-goal relation can be established. Deletion of features valued by Agree happens at spell-out when phases of the derivation are handed over to the interfaces for interpretation. Spell-out of each phase is delayed until a subsequent phase is completed, so that a vP phase is not spelled out until the CP phase which dominates it is complete.

The agreement between *not* and *ne* which endows *ne* with a [pol:neg] feature does not result in the deletion of [pol:neg] on *ne* until spell-out. Instead, *ne* has a valued [pol:neg] feature until the phase is spelled out. The [pol:neg] feature on *ne*, whether valued in the derivation or as part of the lexical entry, is the closest matching goal to $C^0$ so will Agree with it and move to $C^0$ by head adjunction.

Agreement between $C^0$ [pol:] and *ne* [pol:neg] will happen in the same way whether the [pol:neg] features of *ne* originate in the lexicon or from a previous application of Agree with *not*. There is no way for subsequent derivational operations to distinguish between features valued in the lexicon and during the derivation. *ne+V* is equally accessible to an Agree relation with $C^0$ [pol:] in either case. Deletion of valued features at spell-out only takes place after $C^0$ is merged and has had a chance to Agree with *ne* and move *ne+V* to adjoin to $C^0$. The valued features of *ne* will not be deleted until the phase is complete, after all unvalued features of $C^0$ have been valued. Therefore, V to C movement of *ne+V* is equally possible at stages one and two of Jespersen’s Cycle in a phase based spell-out model. This accords with the lack of evidence for a difference in the position of *ne+V* at the two stages of Jespersen’s Cycle which I observed in chapter 3. However, it leaves open the issue of how and why NegV1 is lost in Early Middle English.
4.7.2 An alternative account

Under Chomsky's (1999, 2000) account of movement, a [pol:] feature on C° is not sufficient to trigger movement on its own. It will probe for a matching [pol:neg] feature on a goal, which must be active. For agreement between C° and ne to take place, ne must be active. That is, it must have an unvalued feature of its own, which is valued by matching with a feature on C°. The valued features of both probe and goal delete but not until spell-out at the phase level. Some mechanism is also required to derive head adjunction of ne+V to C° in cases of V to C movement, perhaps an [EPP] feature which targets the Agreeing goal, irrespective of its phrase structure status as XP or X°.\(^{10}\)

One possible candidate for the feature which activates ne for movement is [focus], which Watanabe (2002; 2004) argues is the A'-system's analogue of structural case in the A-system, activating goals for Agree. However, the motivation for this feature is entirely theory internal. It is only posited for consistency with the framework in Chomsky (1999). More work remains to be done to establish whether the negation is focused in all NegV1 clauses.

Thus there are three changes which can account for the loss of NegV1: loss of the [pol:] feature on the probe C°, loss of the feature on ne which makes it an active goal for Agree, or loss of the [EPP] feature on C°, which will prevent movement of ne to adjoin to C°. On the basis of highly productive movement of topics or subjects to C° in ME main clauses, it is implausible to explain the loss of NegV1 by the loss of [EPP] on C°, which is independently needed to motivate topic and subject movement to spec,CP.

Loss of either of the other features on probe or goal is more likely. Given what we know about the morphosyntactic and phonological weakening of ne at the period, loss of the feature on ne which renders it active for Agree with C° is plausible. Negative movement to C will fail because there is no suitably active goal for C° [pol:] to Agree with. The only convergent derivations will be ones without C° [pol:]. Hence, loss of the active goal will force loss of the probe. The failure of not or other negatives to move to spec,CP follows if not and other negatives lack the features which activate them for Agree with C°. In a phase

---

\(^{10}\)It should be noted here that the [EPP] feature is usually employed in cases of XP movement. Using the [EPP] feature to derive head movement is a tentative departure from standard Minimalist proposals. However, if we assume that features have primacy over phrase structure configurations, restricting the [EPP] to XP movement seems arbitrary. It can be used to derive movement of an element in an Agree relation irrespective of that element's phrase structure status.
based spell-out model, a difference between *ne* [pol:neg] and *ne* [pol: ] cannot have a role. At the point when C° [pol: ] is merged, both types of *ne* have the feature [pol:neg].

The temporal association between loss of NegV1 and the introduction of *not* is accidental. Under the phase based spell-out model it is difficult to see how a causative link could be established between the two changes. This fits well with my findings concerning the distribution of NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle (chapter 3). The two changes are formally independent, but both are aspects of the morphosyntactic weakening of *ne* which happen at this time.

### 4.8 Summary and Conclusions

This chapter proposed a Minimalist analysis of Jespersen’s Cycle which develops proposals made by Rowlett (1998) to modify the Neg-criterion. I argue that the Neg-criterion is not a principle of Universal Grammar, but a morphosyntactic feature checking dependency which is parametrised. The different syntactic dependencies holding at each stage of Jespersen’s Cycle are the morphological evidence of this parametric variation. My perspective on parametric variation is strictly Minimalist: changes in the syntactic dependencies which negative words enter into are a result of variation and change in the morphosyntactic features which negative words have in the lexicon. I argued that the change from unsupported *ne* to bipartite *ne...not* negation under Jespersen’s Cycle is driven by a change in the morphosyntactic features of *ne* from [pol:neg] to [pol: ]. The necessity to value the [pol: ] feature results in a dependency with a secondary negator. In effect, *ne* becomes part of the verbal agreement morphology, a negative agreement marker. The redundancy of *ne* at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle leads to its loss at stage three.

This account requires two types of *ne* in early English, differing in morphosyntactic features. I argued that the distribution of redundant *ne* changes in Middle English, providing evidence for change in the syntactic and semantic properties of *ne* which correlate with the introduction of bipartite negation under Jespersen’s Cycle. Both bipartite negation and redundant negation show *ne* is licensed within the scope of another negative in Middle English in a way which was not so commonly attested in Old English.

The idea that morphosyntactic inadequacy of *ne* drives Jespersen’s Cycle provides a new perspective on Jespersen’s Cycle in a model of diachronic change.
as grammatical competition. Kroch (1989) argues that grammatical competition holds between structurally incompatible morphosyntactic doublets. This is problematic to the account of Jespersen’s Cycle by Frisch (1997), who claims that the loss of *ne* and the rise of *not* are independent. An account of Jespersen’s Cycle which is driven by competition between two types of *ne* (which have different morphosyntactic features) preserves the notion that competing forms are structurally incompatible. The competition is between *ne* [pol:neg] and *ne* [pol:]. The next chapter will show how a distinction between two competing forms of *ne* lends itself to a diachronic model of Jespersen’s Cycle which surpasses Frisch’s (1997) model in its empirical coverage. I will show that the loss of *ne* is in fact the result of two changes and supports the idea that there are two forms of *ne* in competition in early English.

My proposals allow arguments for the functional projection NegP to be viewed from a different perspective. NegP is not universally required as a position within INFL at which the Neg-criterion holds. A Minimalist account of Jespersen’s Cycle does not necessarily require feature checking to occur in a distinct functional projection. The existence of NegP is largely a matter of the theoretical position adopted concerning the interaction of syntax and morphology. Evidence from Jespersen’s Cycle indicates that at stage two the head *ne* has no interpretable features. This gives NegP the same status as AgrP, a projection which consists entirely of uninterpretable features, and whose sole purpose is to provide a distinct position for feature checking in a spec-head configuration. AgrP has been motivated by the extra subject and object positions it allows. These positions are empirically well motivated in certain languages (Bobaljik and Thrainsson 1998), including early English (Haeberli 2002b). For the sake of consistency with Haeberli’s account I will assume that [pol:neg] or [pol:] features project PolP or NegP in early English. However, the status of NegP at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle is a place-holder category like AgrP, rather than the core functional categories of C, T, v whose heads always make a semantic contribution to the clause at LF. At stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle when *ne* has [pol:neg] features, it is not clear that a negative head need be projected at all. The [pol:neg] feature could equally be present on v or T.

Finally, I address the relationship between negative initial clauses and Jespersen’s Cycle. I discussed the empirical facts at length in chapter 3. Here I showed that feature based analyses of both NegV1 and Jespersen’s Cycle are possible, and used the interaction between the two phenomena to inform the analy-
sis. Crucially, my account relies on a phase-based spell-out model, as proposed in recent work by Chomsky (1999). This model allows *ne* to inherit [pol:neg] features during the course of the derivation which allow it to move to *C*\(^0\) [pol: ] at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle in just the same way as at stage one of the cycle when *ne* has [pol:neg] features in its lexical entry. Under a phase based spell-out model, the introduction of a secondary negator cannot derive the loss of NegV1. The loss of NegV1 is accounted for independently of Jespersen's Cycle by loss of another uninterpretable feature on *ne* which activates *ne* for movement to *C*\(^0\). This uninterpretable feature activates *ne* for movement to *C*\(^0\). Its loss will prevent Agreement and Movement, which both require the goal to be active. One objection to this model might be that it posits a second feature on *ne* which is poorly evidenced. However Agree and Move in Chomsky's system require the goal to have at least two features, one interpretable and one uninterpretable. The conclusion that *ne* has at least two different morphosyntactic features is forced on us by the syntactic model which requires two features for an Agreement dependency to hold. Hence it seems sensible to exploit this duality of features to derive two independent changes: the loss of NegV1 and Jespersen's Cycle.

The next chapter will propose a diachronic model of Jespersen's Cycle along the syntactic basis I have outlined in this chapter. Quantitative data will demonstrate the advantages for a grammatical competition model of assuming that there are two morphosyntactically distinct forms of *ne* at successive stages of Jespersen's Cycle. I will compare my model with Frisch (1997), and argue that an account which can distinguish two types of *ne* provides a better fit to the quantitative data and models change more effectively.
Chapter 5

A diachronic model of Jespersen’s Cycle

5.1 Introduction

The preceding chapter addressed the structural and formal analysis of the negative dependencies involved in Jespersen’s Cycle. I developed an account in which the co-occurrence of ne...na and ne...not at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle represents the innovation of a syntactic dependency at this stage which was not present at earlier stages. I propose that the dependency is a feature checking relationship which results from the underspecification of ne for negation at LF. I propose two types of ne with different feature specifications, ne [pol:neg] which is an independent semantically interpretable expression of negation, and ne [pol: ] which is not an independent semantically interpretable expression of negation. Valuation of the [pol: ] feature on the latter type of ne is responsible for the dependency which leads to co-occurrence of ne...not. The emergence of a new redundant use of ne at stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle supports the view that there are two different types of ne at successive stages of the cycle.

An account based on feature specifications allows a distinction to be made between the two types of ne involved in Jespersen’s Cycle. In this chapter, I will present quantitative evidence for distinguishing the two forms of ne involved in Jespersen’s Cycle. Distinguishing two types of ne provides a more articulated view of Jespersen’s Cycle, avoiding some problems of Frisch’s (1997) account which I discuss in section 5.3. Distinguishing two types of ne means that the loss of ne is two changes rather than a single change. This chapter shows that
the two changes have different properties. An account of *ne* as a single change (Frisch 1997) cannot accommodate these differences, whereas they naturally fall out of the feature based model I proposed in chapter 4.

The main aim of this chapter is to show how the structural analysis of Jespersen’s Cycle I proposed in chapter four lends itself to an account of Jespersen’s Cycle as grammatical competition. The change from stage one to stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle is competition between lexical items with mutually exclusive syntactic feature specifications. Stages one and two constitute different syntactic systems (the difference between *ne [pol: neg]* and *ne [pol: ]* in my account). These two systems are not exclusive to different periods of time; they co-occur in Middle English, but they are not in stable variation. Rather the frequency of use of the two systems changes over time, through grammatical competition between the two options which are structurally incompatible competitors.

An account which distinguishes *ne* and *ne...not* as syntactically independent systems has empirical advantages. A detailed description of the use of the two options across contexts and across time becomes possible because of the new way I subdivide the diachronic data in this model. Frisch overlooks certain facets of the distribution of *ne* and *not*. In section 5.3.3, I show that his model cannot accommodate the distribution of *ne* and *not* once contextual conditioning on the competing forms is taken into account. The model I propose will take account of some aspects of the change in sentential negators which Frisch overlooks, and avoid some of the problems of his analysis. Quantitative data showing the distribution of competing forms across time and across contexts supports the model in which there are two forms of *ne* rather than just one. These data support the idea that bipartite *ne...not* represents the innovation of a syntactic dependency by morphosyntactic competition. The structure of the chapter is as follows. First, I outline my assumptions concerning morphosyntactic change and its representation in a Minimalist framework. Then, I discuss Frisch’s account in detail. Finally, I show that structuring Jespersen’s Cycle in the terms I have outlined above and in chapter four provides a more coherent quantitative model of the changes involved.
5.2 Assumptions concerning morphosyntactic change

5.2.1 The logistic model (Kroch 1989)

This section will outline the formal model of morphosyntactic change I will adopt. It must be remembered that the model is a simplification and idealisation of the actual language change situation. However, I believe the results obtained using this model justify its use, as I will show in the course of this chapter.

My approach to morphosyntactic change follows Kroch (1989; 1994). Kroch adopts an approach to change in which each language learner constructs his or her own new grammar on the basis of Primary Linguistic Data in the input, in accordance with certain innate linguistic principles (see for example Lightfoot (1979; 1999)). This allows the capacity for potentially catastrophic language restructuring in each individual language learner. Each individual sets his or her parameters on the basis of the Primary Linguistic Data available to him or her. Hence, each new generation of speakers resets their parameters. I will refer to this approach as the 'parameter resetting approach'. Such restructuring will manifest itself as change if it is sufficiently shared by members of a speech community.

Kroch (1989) extends the parameter resetting approach by arguing that individuals may use two contradictory parameter settings if the linguistic data warrant it. These speakers have two grammars: each grammar having a different and mutually exclusive parameter setting. The choice of which grammar is used in a given context is therefore a matter of language use (similar to code-switching or diglossia amongst bilingual speakers). Parametric options vary not only across populations of language users, but also within the individual, who reacts to parametric variation in the speech community by establishing two or more grammars, each of which instantiates one of the parametric options. The individual's linguistic competence includes information about use of the two grammars.

Kroch demonstrates that morphosyntactic changes proceed in a uniform way, which can be mathematically modelled. This provides a way of describing and comparing changes, of identifying the contexts in which a change operates and those in which it does not, and a means of grouping surface syntactic effects together as reflexes of a single process of change within the grammar. Kroch demonstrates that variation between two variants of a variable undergoing change follows an S-shaped curve. When the frequency of the innovative or advancing form is plotted as a function of time, an S-shaped curve results. The logistic function provides a good fit to this curve. Kroch (1989) observes that linguistic
variants compete in the same way as biological variants in the process of evolutionary competition. Fitting a mathematical function to the S-curve associated with a linguistic change allows two parameters of the change to be estimated. The resulting S-curve has a slope parameter, which equates to the rate of change (in logits per century). The curve also has an intercept parameter: the point at which the line intersects the y axis, which signifies the beginning of the change. The intercept parameter gives the frequency of the innovative form at the start point of the change.

The model allows the two parameters of a change to be considered separately. Kroch claims that a morphosyntactic change proceeds at the same rate in all its contexts, where context refers to any salient factor affecting the frequency of the innovative form, such as the main-subordinate clause distinction for example. In all these contexts, the slope parameter of the S-curves is the same. The contextual differences arise, not through different rates of change, or even different start times for the change (as had been proposed by Bailey (1973)). The contextual effects are differences in the intercept parameter which are maintained as constants throughout the time course of the change, from its inception to its completion. Another way of thinking of this is that although the frequencies of an innovative or advancing form may be different in different contexts, the relationship between the frequency of the advancing grammatical option in all its contexts will remain the same over time. The intercept parameter reflects these contextual differences which mark the relationship between the contexts at the change's actuation. The differences between the contexts seen at the change's actuation remain the same throughout the entire course of the change.

... in statistical terms, the constant rate hypothesis is the claim that the overall rate of use of a form is independent of the contextual effects on its use. (Kroch 1989, 205)

The important point for my purposes is that contexts of a single change can be identified by the same rate of change (slope parameter), and distinguished from unrelated independent changes which will have a different rate of change (slope parameter).1 Given the small amounts of data I am dealing with throughout, and

1The possibility remains that the same slope could characterise two independent changes by coincidence. The two changes need to be plausibly related as effects of the same parameter. This relies on a plausible syntactic account of change. The Constant Rate Effect only provides empirical support for the syntactic analysis, it does not determine what that analysis should be.
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the difficulty of assigning precise dates to most of my sources, I do not perform logistic regression on my data. Instead, I compare and contrast changes according to the different effects which contextual factors, such as clause type, have on each change. The data are split into four Middle English time periods (1150-1250, 1250-1350, 1350-1420, 1420-1500).

Kroch models the process of morphosyntactic change within a Principles and Parameters syntactic framework. Each competing set of variants are identified on the following grounds. First, competing forms must bear a plausible syntactic relation to each other, hence, for instance, changes under Jespersen’s Cycle will not be directly related to a change in another area of the grammar, for instance changes in case marking or binding. The competing forms must be plausibly related by a syntactic parameter. Second, competing forms must be mutually exclusive forms at the formal syntactic level, otherwise there is no process of competition. Kroch (1989) addresses morphosyntactic change in terms of abstract parameter settings. The notion of abstract parameter has changed in recent Minimalist frameworks. As I am using such a framework, I will now discuss the way in which Minimalism accommodates change.

5.2.2 Variation, change and Minimalist syntax

Minimalism (Chomsky 1995; 2000) does not make any reference to abstract ideas of syntactic parameter, only to features and their effects at the LF and PF interfaces. There are no syntactic levels other than the interfaces, and no syntactic formatives other than morphosyntactic features. Hence, it would seem that variation must be reducible to some consequence of the morphosyntactic features. Minimalism is problematic for variation in general as it does not permit syntactic operations to apply optionally. Each syntactic operation must be motivated by features, within the constraints of the derivational system. The derivational system makes reference only to processes of (re-)Merge or Agree. The computational system is invariant, performing operations according to the input it receives in terms of morphosyntactic features from the lexicon. Hence, the lexicon is a natural place to accommodate variation in this theory. Both aspects of variation in languages, lexical and morphosyntactic variation, are the result of how the language learner constructs his or her lexicon during the process of language acquisition. Parametric variation is then reduced to lexical variation.

This has the consequence that the range of morphosyntactic variation is equal
to the number of morphosyntactic features and their values. It renders unnecessary the concept of diglossia and multiple grammars. Grammar competition does not require multiple grammars, just multiple and mutually exclusive lexical entries associated with some item in the lexicon (see Kroch (1994)). Roberts and Roussou (2003) propose to limit morphosyntactic variation to functional items in the lexicon. However, this distinction may be an artificial one as far as the language learner is concerned. The language learner will posit variation and competition, wherever there is evidence for it in the Primary Linguistic Data. In principle only the number of morphosyntactic features in the lexicon restricts the number of parametric options and values available. The difference between variation and change represents stability and instability of variation across time. The factors which make some variation unstable across time are as yet unclear.

This 'grammatical competition' view of change is somewhat idealised. It says little about the innovation and beginnings of changes, or about the motivation for change in the first instance. It can only describe the diffusion of a change across time, but by providing evidence for the structure of parametric competition over time, it indicates the way parametric options are structured within this competition in a way which synchronic studies of parametric variation do not. However, the processes of reanalysis which are necessary in order to initiate changes raise separate issues concerning the innovation of parametric options and the actuation of change. The parameter resetting approach allows each individual language learner to establish his own inventory of parametric options. However, Minimalism does offer a sort of evaluation mechanism to distinguish more and less economical grammars. It may be that the language learner is innately conservative (Roberts and Roussou 2003) preferring simpler derivations to more complex ones. This provides some rationale for adaptive change to reduce grammatical complexity. Within Minimalism, the most economical derivation would involve no collocation or syntactic operations at all. Such a derivation would proceed directly from the lexicon to the interfaces, without any need for syntactic feature checking operations. The more syntactic feature checking operations required in the derivation, the less economical the derivation. Hence synthetic or inflected languages are more economical than analytic languages which make use of more Merge/Agree operations. The existence of less economical languages must be due to other types of pressure which act to preserve less economical derivations. The notion of economy is only one of the motivations for change, which after all arises from patterns of language use in the speech community.
(Kroch 1989). Patterns in the input or trigger experience are crucial within the parameter resetting approach. The Primary Linguistic Data in the input do not always direct the language learner to the optimal (most economical) derivation in the Minimalist syntactic sense.

5.2.3 Problems for the grammatical competition approach: Jespersen’s Cycle

Frisch (1997) proposes to model Jespersen’s cycle within the grammatical competition framework, using the logistic model (Kroch 1989). However, Jespersen’s Cycle is not obviously amenable to analysis as grammatical competition. There is no direct morphosyntactic replacement of *ne* by the innovative form *not*. Instead, there is a period in which *ne* and *not* co-occur increasingly frequently, before *ne* is lost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>ne</th>
<th>%</th>
<th><em>ne...not</em></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>not</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>2086</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>2060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: The distribution of the three forms *ne*, *ne...not*, *not* in the PPCME2 data. All clause types.

The existence of three stages in the Middle English Jespersen’s Cycle indicates that there are two processes of change at this period, which overlap in time. The issue is how to characterise these two processes of change as grammar competition, understood in the Minimalist sense of competition between lexical items with contradictory morphosyntactic features. The analysis proposed by Frisch (1997) involves two processes of competition, between overt or null realisations of spec,NegP and Neg⁰, which he claims are independent. The analysis I proposed in chapter 4 differs from Frisch’s. I propose that the first change creates a dependency between *ne* and *not*, whilst the second change eliminates *ne* in those contexts where it is redundant. The differences are schematized below:

(220) Frisch’s model:

a. Neg⁰: *ne* > null

b. spec,NegP: null > not

(221) Feature based model:
a. \([\text{pol:neg}] > [\text{pol: }]\): ne > ne...not
b. Loss of ne: ne...not > not

Quantitative data support my model better than they support Frisch’s model, as shown below. The analysis of morphosyntactic change informs the syntactic representation of negation in the Middle English period. The way the changes interact with each other over time is crucial to an analysis of Jespersen’s Cycle which provides a coherent view of the quantitative data. I will argue that the effects of parametric change are syntactic, not simply changes in the morphological realisations of underlyingly present NegP positions. This view is more consistent with Minimalist notions of economy and subdivides the stages of Jespersen’s Cycle in a way which is supported by the quantitative analysis.

5.3 Accounts of Jespersen’s Cycle: Frisch (1997)

5.3.1 Frisch’s account: the redundant licensing model

Frisch (1997) undertakes a quantitative analysis of the changes to sentential negation in Middle English within a grammar competition framework. He uses the logistic model to argue that the loss of ne and the rise of not are independent changes, proceeding at different rates. These two changes are structurally unrelated: the change involving ne is centred on the head of NegP, the change involving not on its specifier position. The structural relation between specifier and head is constant throughout Middle English, even when head and specifier positions are not realised by overt morphemes. The two changes involve the morphological realisation of these positions. There are two processes of competition between overt and null morphemes, one in specifier position, and one in head position. There is no direct competition between ne and not as these are different ways to identify NegP using overt morphology.

The ne...not forms arise from the interaction between the competition in specifier and head positions. Frisch (1997) claims that NegP must be licensed by overt morphology (Economy of Projection) in either specifier or head position. He claims that NegP is redundantly licensed by ne...not as both head (ne) and specifier (not) positions are morphologically realised.
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Frisch takes this approach to its logical conclusion, arguing that bipartite *ne...not* negation is not an independent system. It is an historical accident that both positions just happen to be realised by overt morphemes in the Early Middle English period, with no syntactic consequences. Bipartite *ne...not* is an epiphenomenon resulting from the different rates and time courses of the decline in use of *ne* and the increase in use of *not*. Simply, the rise of *not* happens earlier than the loss of *ne*, hence the two changes overlap, and there is a period in which the two forms co-occur. This is an attractive and simple view of the change at the descriptive level. However, it relies on the assumption that the head *ne* and the specifier *not* are syntactically independent. That is, that the syntactic configuration involved in sentential negation is an invariant Neg-criterion configuration (Haegeman 1995), and only the morphological realisations of underlying positions changes (contrary to the account I proposed in chapter 4).

5.3.2 Theoretical issues

Frisch's account relies on an X'-theoretic approach to NegP, and the Neg-criterion (Haegeman 1995) underlies much of his analysis. Thus, Frisch's NegP always has two parts, a specifier and a head, either of which can be overtly morphologically realised. It also relies on the existence of a null negative operator, which I argued in chapter 4 was unnecessary (following Rowlett (1998)).

The bipartite *ne...not* pattern arises when both specifier and head positions of NegP are morphologically realised. The changes under Jespersen's Cycle are changes in the way NegP is morphologically identified and licensed by the existence of negative morphology. Underlyingly, NegP consists of an operator in its specifier position and a head element, as proposed by Haegeman (1995). In chapter 4, I discussed Rowlett's (1998) objections to the Neg-criterion, and proposed an alternative analysis in which the structures associated with *ne* and *ne...not* are different. This approach has the advantage that it links overt morphology to syntactic structure in a more direct way. In this chapter, I discuss some theoretical and empirical problems which Frisch's account faces, and show how the Minimalist alternative I proposed in chapter 4 fares in dealing with the diachronic
Frisch adopts the view that there are licensing conditions associated with NegP. These can be summarised as follows. Economy of projection means that in order for negation to be identified, and NegP to be projected one of the positions in NegP must be given overt morphological realisation. This rules out configurations like (223) being used to convey negation.

(223) NegP
     \[
     \begin{array}{c}
     \text{Neg'} \\
     0
     \end{array}
     \]
     \[
     \begin{array}{c}
     \text{XP}
     \end{array}
     \]

However, Frisch’s account does not consider the full implications of this condition on NegP for the quantitative account. In effect, it counters Frisch’s claim that changes to the realisations of spec, NegP and Neg° are independent. In practice, the licensing condition constrains the changes possible under Jespersen’s Cycle so that ne can only be absent if not is present. In describing the progress of Jespersen’s Cycle, Frisch (1997) implies that the changes are structured in this way.

Thus we see a pattern where the original negator ne is used while a new negator not (in the specifier of NegP) becomes established. Once not is well established, but not before, the use of ne declines... In the change in negation in Middle English, the emergence of a new structural option for not is the precursor to syntactic variation and change in the use of ne. (Frisch 1997, 47)

However, his quantitative model of the changes does not take account of the relationship between the changes. His model maintains the independence of the loss of ne and the spread of not in a way which does not fully take account of the licensing requirements on NegP.

The relationship between changes affecting ne and not is not one of independence, but of the introduction of not feeding the loss of ne by creating the context in which loss of ne can occur without violating the morphological licensing conditions on NegP (225). Frisch’s account can be schematised as (224). The alternative I outline here is schematised as (225).

(224) a. Spec, NegP: \(0 \rightarrow \text{not} \) (introduction of not)
    b. Neg°: ne \(0 \rightarrow 0 \) (loss of ne)
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(225) a. ne > ne...not (introduction of not)
   b. ne...not > not (loss of ne)

In (224), ne...not is epiphenomenal, an accident of the way the two changes pattern over time. The conjunction of the two changes in Middle English produces ne...not forms. In (225), ne...not is a distinct stage in its own right. It is relevant to the progress of Jespersen's Cycle as it creates the conditions for the loss of ne to operate. I show that modelling data from the PPCME2 using (225), that is, with ne...not as a distinct stage relevant to the progress of the cycle, produces a more coherent view of the quantitative data than Frisch's model (224). The relationship between the changes in (225) requires two different types of ne to be distinguished. (225) claims that ne can only be lost in the context of not. Forms of ne which co-occur with not must be differentiated from those which do not. Only the former type can lose its PF realisation. The syntactic distinction I make between two forms of ne in chapter 4 lends itself to the account of Jespersen's Cycle I propose here, as it allows two different types of ne to be distinguished.

5.3.3 Empirical issues and problems

The independence of ne and not proposed by Frisch makes a strong prediction concerning the frequency of ne...not. Given Frisch's proposal that ne is subject to one change and not to a separate change, the changing frequency of ne...not should result from the intersection of the changing overall distributions of ne and not as they compete with null elements for head and specifier positions of NegP respectively. Therefore, the frequency of ne...not is predicted to be equal to the product of the frequencies of ne in Neg° and not in spec, NegP (226).

(226) \( P(\text{ne...not is used}) = P(\text{ne is used}) \times P(\text{not is used in spec, NegP}) \) (Frisch 1997, 51)

Importantly, for this equation, Frisch (1997) does not count all instances of not as spec, NegP not. There are two alternative analyses of not which compete with spec, NegP not during Middle English: the adverbial adjunct not and the head not (Neg°).

In the earlier Middle English periods, he claims that a large proportion of not are adverbial adjuncts rather than specifiers of NegP. I do not accept Frisch's assertion that all not in Early Middle English are adverb not rather than the sentential negator not. In chapter two, I rejected the basis on which Frisch calculates the
frequency of adverb *not*. He claims that all *not* preceding the finite verb must be
adjoined to positions higher than NegP. I showed that there are no clear empirical
grounds to distinguish adverb *not* from sentential negator *not* in a Middle English
syntax which has variation in the headedness of INFL and stylistic fronting to de-
rive pre-verbal *not* (see section 2.4.2). There is no evidence for change in the status
of *not* from adverbial adjunct to sentential negator in Middle English. It follows
that the increased use of *not* in the Middle English period is not due to any dis-
cernible change in the properties of *not* at this period. Rather, syntactic licensing
conditions on *ne* change to entail the more frequent use of *not* in Middle English.

Frisch (1997) claims that the loss of *ne* (Neg°) leads to an alternative analysis
of *not* as the negative head. He argues that in clauses without *ne*, a substan-
tial proportion (17\%) of Late Middle English *not* are the head Neg° rather than
spec,NegP, in the periods from 1350 onwards. Frisch bases this argument on the
frequency of *not* preceding a subject in clauses showing subject verb inversion.
Both NP and pronoun subjects are included in Frisch's calculations. He locates
both subject pronouns and subject NPs in spec,AgrP (227).²

(227) CP
   spec
     C
       C'
         AgrP
           subject pronoun/NP
             Agr'
               V<sub>finite</sub>
                 NegP
                   not
                     Neg'
                       Neg
                         TP

(Frisch, 1997, ex.7, 26)

Therefore, any instances of *not* preceding subjects are higher than spec,AgrP.
Frisch claims that the only position available for *not* in these contexts is C°, and
that these *not* are clitics on the finite verb, in other words, heads. His estimate of
head *not* is based on the frequency of *not* preceding a subject in all cases of subject
verb inversion.

²The analysis of OE and ME involving two subject positions (Haeberli 2002b) had not been
proposed at the time when Frisch (1997) conducted his analysis of negation. However, we will
see that Haeberli's analysis has important implications for Frisch's model.
However, the structural assumptions I make in chapter two are not consistent with Frisch’s method for estimating head *not*. I make a distinction between the positions of subject pronouns and subject NPs: subject pronouns occupy spec, AgrP, but subject NPs typically occupy a range of lower positions (either in spec, TP or as late subjects which are in VP or extraposed). Late subjects will follow *not* even when *not* is the specifier of a low NegP. The position of *not* relative to these subjects does not disambiguate head *not* from spec, NegP *not*. Only inversion of V+*not* with a subject pronoun provides unambiguous evidence for *not* as a head in C⁰, clitic on the finite verb which undergoes V to C movement. Pronominal subjects do not remain in VP or extrapose. These contexts are few in Middle English, comprising mostly imperative and interrogative clauses. Rissanen (1999) discusses the position of *not* in Middle English negative interrogatives. He shows that the frequency of *not* preceding a subject pronoun is lower than the frequency of *not* preceding a subject NP (Table 5.2 based on Rissanen (1999, Table 3)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Personal prn subject</th>
<th>NP or demonstrative prn subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V + subject + not</td>
<td>104 (95%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V + not + subject</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>18 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109 (100%)</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Late Middle English (1350-1500) occurrences of post-verbal subject and *not* in the Helsinki Corpus (subperiods ME3-ME4). Data from Rissanen (1999, Table 3).

This difference between pronouns and NPs throws Frisch’s estimate of the frequency of head *not* into question, as clauses with ‘V+not - subject pronoun’ which are unambiguous evidence for *not* as a head must be isolated from those with ‘V+not - subject NP’ which are not. Clauses with inversion of finite verb and subject pronoun are structurally unambiguous. In Late Middle English (1350-1500), Rissanen (1999) notes 109 relevant clauses in the Helsinki Corpus, only 5 of which have *not* preceding the subject pronoun (228).

(228) a. Xal not I don so?
     Shall not I do so?
     ‘Shan’t I do so?’
     (Chaucer, *Melibee* 221, C1 (Rissanen 1999, ex.15))

b. Am not I lord and kyng of the cuntre?
   Am not I lord and king of the country?
'Aren't I king and lord of the country?'

(Digby 100 (Rissanen 1999, ex.16))

c. wyl not ye stande by me as a frende ought do to another?
will not you stand by me as a friend ought do to another?

'Won't you stand by me as one friend ought do to another?'

(Caxton, Reynard [REYNARD], 56 (Rissanen 1999, ex.17))

On this basis, I estimate the frequency of head not to be around 5%, much lower than Frisch's estimate (of 17%). Once the lower estimate of head not is applied to the PPCME2 data, the redundant licensing model, repeated here as (229), fails to provide a good fit for the Late Middle English (1350-1500) periods.\(^3\)

(229) Frequency of ne...not = Frequency of ne in Neg\(^0\) X Frequency of not in spec,NegP

Instances of ne...not are counted twice in this model (Table 5.3) as they involve both ne and not. Hence the total number of negative clauses in the model does not equal the sum of the ne and not columns, nor does the combined frequency of the total ne and total not equal 100%. The frequency is of the number of clauses involving ne or not. Clauses with ne...not are counted twice as they involve both forms. In Table 5.3, the totals column is the total number of negative clauses for each period.

Table 5.3 includes all clause types. Instances of ne in negative doubling with negative adverbs or negative NPs are excluded as in Frisch's original model. Inputs to the model include ne, ne...not and not, where not is in spec,NegP. The frequency of ne...not is calculated by the formula in (229). The frequency of ne...not calculated based on my PPCME2 data using the formula in (229) provides a progressively worse estimate for the frequency of not throughout the Middle English period. I give some indication of this by showing how closely the estimated and actual frequencies of ne...not correspond in the final column of Table 5.3. I demonstrate this through the formula estimated ne...not/observed ne...not. The closer the resulting figure is to 1.00, the closer the fit of the estimate to the observed frequency. Figures higher than 1.00 show that the model overestimates the frequency of ne...not and give an indication of the magnitude of the overestimate.

\(^3\)It is worth noting here that even if Frisch's (1997) estimate of 17% Neg\(^0\) not is accepted, his redundant licensing model still fails to provide an adequate fit to the PPCME2 data.
Table 5.3: The model of ne...not as redundant licensing compared with the observed frequency of ne...not, following Frisch (1997, 51ff). Matrix and subordinate clauses from the PPCME2. Excluding head not at a rate of 5% of the total not in periods following 1350.

Table 5.3 shows that the fit of Frisch's redundant licensing model is not good for my PPCME2 data. In fact the examples of estimated and observed ne...not constitute significantly different proportions of the total negative clauses for the periods 1350-1420 and 1420-1500. $\chi^2$-tests illustrate the poor fit of the redundant licensing model for the Late Middle English PPCME2 data. Table 5.4 shows the $\chi^2$-test performed for 1350-1420, Table 5.5 shows the $\chi^2$-test performed for 1420-1500. These take as their inputs the estimated and observed figures for not and the frequency of other forms of sentential negation (involving single negators). The resulting $\chi^2$ and p values are shown in the final two columns. All these $\chi^2$-tests involve one degree of freedom. Only the $\chi^2$-tests for Late Middle English are shown here. Similar tests for the period 1150-1350 do not report significance.

Table 5.4: The chi-square test to test the significance of differences between estimated and observed ne...not for the period 1350-1420.

Table 5.5: The chi-square test to test the significance of differences between estimated and observed ne...not for the period 1420-1500.

In the PPCME2, which is a much larger corpus than the first edition of the PPCME used by Frisch, the redundant licensing model does not provide an adequate fit for the LME data. Using a revised estimate of head not which is more consistent with my structural assumptions impacts on the success of Frisch's model. Once only 5% of Late Middle English not are excluded as heads, Frisch's
model overestimates the frequency of *ne...not* in the period 1350–1500 by a significant margin.

I will now show why the redundant licensing model fails for the PPCME2 data. Frisch's account makes very concrete predictions about the distribution of *ne...not* in all contexts. For each context, the frequency of *ne...not* should be equal to the intersection of the overall frequencies of *ne* and *not*. A problem with Frisch's account of the change from *ne* to *not* is that he considers Jespersen's Cycle to be a unitary change, operating in the same way across all clause types. Frisch's database is described as 'declarative clauses' (Frisch 1997, 31), which I take to include main, conjoined and subordinate clauses. Frisch does not offer a more precise description of the clauses included in his database or detailed examination of Jespersen's Cycle in particular subsets of clauses or other relevant contexts. Therefore, the next section of the discussion will concentrate on the application of Frisch's model to two groups of clauses: main clauses and subordinate clauses.

If the frequency of *ne...not* in main clauses (including non-conjoined, first and second conjunct main clauses) and subordinate clauses is modelled separately for each context using the redundant licensing model, differences emerge between the fit of the model to the two datasets. These are unexpected. The redundant licensing model makes a very strong and simple claim: that the frequency of *ne...not* in each context should follow directly from the overall frequencies of *ne* and *not* without further stipulations or mechanisms being invoked.

However, the redundant licensing model provides a worse fit for subordinate clauses (Table 5.6) than for main clauses (Table 5.7), particularly in Late Middle English. I give an indication of the fit of the redundant licensing model, as before, by dividing the estimated *ne...not* figure by the actual figure for *ne...not* (estimated *ne...not* / actual *ne...not*). The closer this figure is to 1.00 the better the correspondence between estimated and observed figures, and the better the fit of the model. Figures higher than 1.00 show that the frequency of *ne...not* is overestimated, and gives an indication of the magnitude of the overestimate of *ne...not* within the redundant licensing model. Again, I assume that only 5% of the total *not* in the period 1350-1500 are heads. These are excluded from Tables 5.6 and 5.7.

The estimated and observed frequencies of *ne...not* do not contribute significantly different proportions of the negative clauses at any period in main clauses. Table 5.8 shows the form of the $\chi^2$-tests conducted to establish this conclusion.

For subordinate clauses, $\chi^2$-tests show that the estimated incidence of *ne...not* comprises a significantly different proportion of the total negative clauses, in
### Table 5.6: The model of redundant licensing, following Frisch (1997). All Subordinate clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>ne</th>
<th>not</th>
<th>Total neg cl</th>
<th>Estimated ne...not</th>
<th>Observed ne...not</th>
<th>Observed / Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>980 (100%)</td>
<td>334 (34%)</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>333 (34%)</td>
<td>332 (34%)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>332 (94%)</td>
<td>203 (57%)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>190 (53%)</td>
<td>180 (51%)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>245 (19%)</td>
<td>1166 (88%)</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>216 (16%)</td>
<td>152 (12%)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>43 (4%)</td>
<td>963 (92%)</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>40 (4%)</td>
<td>11 (1%)</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.7: The model of redundant licensing, following Frisch (1997). All main clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>ne</th>
<th>not</th>
<th>Total neg cl</th>
<th>Estimated ne...not</th>
<th>Observed ne...not</th>
<th>Observed / Estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>538 (99%)</td>
<td>357 (66%)</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>355 (66%)</td>
<td>354 (65%)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>418 (87%)</td>
<td>424 (88%)</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>368 (77%)</td>
<td>361 (75%)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>158 (14%)</td>
<td>1080 (92%)</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>146 (12%)</td>
<td>126 (11%)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>17 (2%)</td>
<td>956 (95%)</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>16 (2%)</td>
<td>13 (1%)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.8: The data input to a chi-square test to test the significance of differences between estimated and observed ne...not and the fit of Frisch's model.
comparison to the observed incidence of *ne...not* for the periods 1350-1420 and 1420-1500. The figures input to $\chi^2$-tests for each period, and the resulting $\chi$ and $p$ values are shown in Table 5.9. All these $\chi^2$-tests are based on one degree of freedom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Observed single negators (ne, not)</th>
<th>Estimated ne...not</th>
<th>Chi$^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed single negators (ne, not)</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed single negators (ne, not)</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9: Chi-square tests for the significance of differences between estimated and observed *ne...not* and the fit of Frisch's model in subordinate clauses

These differences in fit between clause types fall outside Frisch's model, as does the fact that in both clause types, the fit of the model progressively worsens during Middle English. The model of redundant licensing proposed by Frisch (1997) produces a much better estimate of the frequency of *ne...not* in main clauses than in subordinate clauses, but its failure to account for the overall distribution of *ne...not*, or the difference between the distribution by clause types calls Frisch's account into question.

The redundant licensing model does not hold as predicted. Frisch's account assumes that the relationship which holds between the three forms involved in Jespersen's Cycle (*ne, ne...not, not*) is the same in all periods and clause types, so the differences between main and subordinate clauses should be attributable to differences in the frequency of *ne* and *not*. These are the only two parameters in Frisch's model. The data I presented here show that the relationship which the redundant licensing model forces between *ne, not, ne...not* does not allow for the observed difference between main and subordinate clauses. The fit of the redundant licensing model is worse for Late Middle English subordinate clauses than for main clauses, indicating a systematic difference between clause types which is unexplained under Frisch's model. Furthermore, the redundant licensing model is consistently a worse fit for Late Middle English data than for Early Middle English data, indicating some aspect of change in Late Middle English which eludes Frisch's model. There is some aspect of Jespersen's Cycle which is

---

4 The reasons for the differences between main and subordinate clauses are unclear at this point. The underlying reasons for the differences between main and subordinate clauses will await further detailed research.
sensitive to clause type and which is part of a process of change which Frisch's model overlooks. So the relationship between the three forms (*ne*, *ne...not* and *not*) changes during Middle English, and is sensitive to contextual factors such as clause type. Frisch's model does not lend itself to the larger PPCME2 corpus, nor does it accommodate the contextual factors identified in this section.

In section 4.4, I proposed an alternative way to relate the changes involved in Jespersen's Cycle. I will pursue this account here in order to examine the relationship between *ne* and *not* in more detail, to see whether Jespersen's Cycle can be accommodated within a grammar competition model.

5.3.4 An alternative diachronic model of Jespersen's Cycle

In the preceding sections, I have outlined some theoretical and empirical difficulties with and objections to Frisch's (1997) account of Jespersen's Cycle, and suggested an alternative account. I will elaborate this account here, before continuing to examine quantitative evidence from change in the Middle English period to support my claims. I hypothesize that Jespersen's Cycle involves three independent stages, linked by two processes of change (230). First is a change from unsupported *ne* to supported *ne...not*. *ne...not* is a syntactically independent stage, and the context for loss of *ne*. Given that negation must be morphologically identified, *ne* can only be eliminated in contexts where it is redundant as a marker of negation, that is in contexts where *ne* is supported by *not*.

(230)  
\[ \text{a. } ne > ne...not \text{ (introduction of not)} \]
\[ \text{b. } ne...not > not \text{ (loss of ne)} \]

My approach to the changes will examine whether there is quantitative justification for this approach to Jespersen's Cycle. I will show that the properties of the two changes are different, such as their sensitivity to contextual factors, which derives the differences seen between main and subordinate clauses.

5.4 Quantitative evidence for a model of Jespersen's Cycle as grammatical competition

This section will show the progress of the two changes I postulate to account for Jespersen's Cycle. The frequency of innovative forms will be plotted over four
time periods in different linguistic contexts. The data comprise the prose texts in the PPCME2 (Kroch and Taylor 2000a). I will not assign specific dates to each text. Some of the Middle English texts are difficult to date precisely. Furthermore, there are insufficient data to achieve a representative spread of data across the whole time continuum, particularly in Early Middle English. There are large gaps in the Middle English period where there are no extant texts. Therefore, I will divide the Middle English data into four periods. These are the periods used in the PPCME2: 1150-1250, 1250-1350, 1350-1420, 1420-1500. These periods differ from those used by Frisch (1997), who assigns texts to five periods of equal length (70 years). Subdividing the Early Middle English into longer periods than the Late Middle English counteracts the fact that there are fewer Early Middle English data and fewer texts in the early periods. Some of the points I made concerning data in chapter 2 are pertinent here, in particular, the fact that there are only three large texts in the period 1250-1350 makes this period unrepresentative. Also, there is dialect discontinuity between texts from the period 1150-1250, which are predominantly localised to the West Midlands, and the later periods 1350-1500 which are predominantly localised to the East Midlands and London. I will be consistent in my subdivision of the corpus into time periods, in order to make all my results comparable. My results must be necessarily more approximate than they would be if each text were assigned a precise date along a time continuum, however, there are insufficient data to make fine distinctions by date. I will show that substantive results can be obtained despite this.

5.4.1 Quantifying the increased use of *not*

I hypothesize that the increased use of *not* is due to a change in the morphosyntactic features of *ne* ([pol: neg]>[pol: ]) which is distinct from the later stage of Jespersen’s Cycle at which the morpheme *ne* is lost. There are two types of *ne*: *ne* [pol:neg] at stage one, and *ne* [pol:] at stage two.

The secondary negator replaces unsupported *ne*, as *ne* loses its negative value. So, *not* and unsupported *ne* are in complementary distribution, as both have [pol:neg] features and function as negative markers. However, *not* is not in complementary distribution with all instances of *ne*. *not* co-occurs with *ne* at stage two. At this stage, I propose that *ne* has unvalued [pol:] features which must receive a value from *not*. Whilst unsupported *ne* and the secondary negator *not* are not competitors in phrase structure terms, they are mutually exclusive options.
in terms of their morphosyntactic features. *not* is brought into competition with unsupported *ne* because of changes in the morphosyntactic features on *ne* (from [pol: neg] to [pol: ]).

Therefore the quantitative model measures the frequency of *not* versus unsupported *ne*. These are the two forms with [pol: neg] features, which are mutually exclusive options throughout Jespersen’s Cycle. The model takes all instances of *not* as the innovative form, irrespective of whether *ne* co-occurs with *not*. *ne* in the context of *not* is a separate lexical item which is not in complementary distribution with *not*, and as such plays no role in the introduction of *not*. So, the overall frequency of *not* is compared with the overall frequency of unsupported *ne*. The total database comprises clauses with *ne, ne...not* and *not*.

I showed that the distribution of *not* is different in main and subordinate clauses. Tables 5.6 and 5.7 illustrate that *not* is less frequent in subordinate clauses than main clauses. There is some evidence that *not* appears less frequently in certain other clause types too. Jack (1978a) notes some contexts in which unsupported *ne* continues to appear in Late Middle English (c. 1400). The latest examples of unsupported *ne* in these contexts postdate most of the examples in other main and subordinate clause contexts. Jack gives Late Middle English examples of unsupported *ne* in the following contexts:

1. *That*-clauses within the scope of a negative or interrogative. I define scope in terms of the C-command relation, so that these clauses are clauses C-commanded by a negative or interrogative element.

(231) For ther nys no creature so good that hym ne wanteth
For there NEG-is no creature so good that he NEG needs
somwhat of the perfeccioun of God
something of the perfection of God
‘For there is no creature so good that he doesn’t need something of
God’s perfection’
(Melibee 1080, Jack (1978a, 60))

(232) For what man is so sad or of so parfait welefulness, that he
For what man is so satisfied or of so perfect happiness, that he
ne stryveth or pleyneth ayen the qualite of his estat?
NEG quarrels or complains about the quality of his circumstances?
‘For who is so satisfied or perfectly happy that he doesn’t quarrel or
complain about his circumstances?’
(Boece II, pr.4,72-5, Jack (1978a, 60))
2. In clauses in which the negation is only formal or redundant: that is, *ne* does not contribute a negative interpretation to the semantics of the clause (see section 4.6 for discussion of redundant negation).

(233) No man doubteth that he ne is strong... 
No man doubts that he NEG is strong... 
'No man doubts that he is strong...'

*(Boece II, pr. 6 93-4, Jack (1978a, 60))*

3. In conditional clauses introduced by *if*:

(234) if he ne hadde pitee of mannes soule, a sory song we myghten 
if he NEG had pity on a man's soul, a sorry song we might 
alle synge 
all sing 
'if he didn't take pity on a man's soul, we might all sing a sorry song'

*(Parson's Tale 315, Jack (1978a, 61))*

Two of Jack's contexts provide sufficient data to be distinguished during the quantitative analysis: conditional *if*-clauses (234), and clauses within the scope of negation (231). These subordinate clause contexts will be distinguished from other subordinate clauses (237). (235) and (236) show that *ne*, *ne...not*, *not* are all attested in these clauses. Therefore, any difference between clauses is one of frequency of the various forms.

(235) Conditional *if*-clauses:

a. Yef sho wil noht amende, pe reule of discipline sal sho feie 
If she will not repent, the rule of discipline shall she feel 
'if she will not repent, she shall feel the rule of discipline'

*(CMBENRUL, 44.1356)*

b. And therefore be we alle born sones of wratthe and of dampnacioun 
And therefore be we all born sons of wrath and of damnation 
perdurable, if it nere baptesme that we receyven 
perdurable, if it NEG-were baptism that we receive 
'and therefore be we all born of wrath and damnation if it were not for the baptism we receive...'

*(CMCTPARS, 297. C1.377)*

c. 3ef heo hit ne bihat naut heo hit mei don... 
if she it NEG promises not she it may do...
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‘if she doesn’t promise it, she may do it...’
(CMANCRIW.I. 46.56)

(236) Clauses within the scope of negation:

a. but he is not anumbered among the emperors because he reigned not in Italy

‘but he is not counted amongst the emperors because he did not reign in Italy’
(CMCArifCHR, 90.1771)

b. Ye NEG eat not with the proud eye, and with heart that may not be fulfilled

‘Do not eat with a proud eye and with a heart that may not be satisfied’
(CMEARLPS, 121.5305)

c. “it may not be,” said he, “that where great fire has been for a long time that it isn’t warm there”
(CMCTMELI, 223.C2.269)

(237) a. Many there are who do not have this grace...

‘there are many who do not have this grace’
(CMCAELR4, 23.702)

b. And thus should it seem that the prophecies were not true

‘And thus it should seem that the prophecies were not true’
(CMMAntDev, 51.1252)

c. With that is signalled that Christian men ought not trust in worldly things, but in God only

‘that signifies that Christian men ought not trust in worldly things, but in God only’
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Jack (1978b) does not observe these contextual differences in the frequency of *not* in his work on Early Middle English. Kroch's model predicts that the differences between the contexts in respect of the frequency of *not* should hold throughout the introduction of *not*. Therefore, quantitative examination of Early Middle English should show the same distribution of *not* across these contexts. All types of subordinate clauses are included in the database, including complement clauses (236c), adverbial clauses and relative clauses (236a, 236b) except *if*-clauses which are also subordinate to a negative. These were excluded. It is difficult to determine under which context these should be subcategorised, as there are potentially two factors influencing the distribution of *not* in these clauses.

So, there are four potential contexts for change under Jespersen's Cycle to be examined quantitatively: clauses within the scope of negation, conditional clauses introduced by *if*-, other subordinate clauses and main clauses. Clauses with negatives other than *ne* or *not*, such as negative NPs or adverbs are excluded. Section 5.4 discusses the distribution of *ne* and *not* in these clauses. Frisch (1997), Jack (1978a) claim that clauses with negative NPs or adverbs resist the introduction of *not*. Clauses involving the construction *ne...but* meaning 'only' (238) were also excluded. These are considered separately in section 5.7.3. It is not clear that *ne* marks sentential negation in these clauses. The meaning of the whole *ne...but* construction is non-negative. Clauses in which *ne* is clearly redundant (239) were also excluded (see section 4.6 for discussion of redundant *ne*).

(238) ...certes by nature ther nys but o God
...truly by nature there NEG-is but one God
'...truly by nature there is only one God'
(CMBOETH,433.C1.183)

(239) And of alle thise things ther nis no doute that thei ne ben doon
And of all these things there NEG-is no doubt that they NEG are don
rightfully and ordeynly...
'and of all these things there is no doubt that they are done rightfully and as ordained…'
(CMBOETH,453.C2.536)

---

5Jack (1978b) does mention that *ne* is exclusively used in negative interrogatives in the Early Middle English texts he has examined (Jack 1978b, 301).
The data will be subdivided as in (240), so that the effect of each clausal context on the introduction of not and the loss of ne can be measured.

(240) a. ne>ne...not
b. ne...not>not

Table 5.10 presents the overall frequency of the secondary negator not in the 'Total not' column. As discussed earlier, the overall frequency of not combines instances which do and do not co-occur with ne. The important point is to describe the introduction of not: not and unsupported ne are in complementary distribution throughout the change. It is irrelevant to this part of the analysis whether not co-occurs with ne at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle, because I distinguish this supported form of ne as a separate lexical item, subject to a different change.

The 'TOTAL' column includes ne, ne...not and not. It excludes instances of ne which co-occur with negatives other than not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>in scope of negation</th>
<th>if-cls</th>
<th>other sub cls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not TOTAL</td>
<td>% not</td>
<td>not TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10: The frequency of not (including not in ne...not and not) in subordinate clauses in scope of negation, and in conditional if-clauses.

Table 5.10 shows that not is less frequent in subordinate clauses within the scope of negation than in other subordinate clauses in the period 1150-1420. The differences between if-clauses and subordinate clauses outside the scope of negation are very small and only statistically significant under \( \chi^2 \)-tests for the period 1350-1420 at the 0.025 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>not (incl ne...not)</th>
<th>unsupported ne</th>
<th>Chi(^2) = 5.78</th>
<th>p ≤ 0.025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>if-clauses</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other sub cls</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11: Chi-square test showing a significant difference between the distribution of not in if-clauses and other subordinate clauses (outside the scope of negation) for the period 1350-1420.

The frequency of not in if-clauses does not differ significantly from the frequency of not in other subordinate clauses, except in the period 1350-1420. Therefore, I conclude that if-clauses are not a distinct context for the introduction of not...
in ME, so I will not separate *if*-clauses as a distinct context in the remainder of this chapter.

The differences between subordinate clauses within the scope of negation and those outside the scope of negation\(^6\) are clearer. These differences are statistically significant under \(\chi^2\) tests. Table 5.12 shows the \(\chi^2\) and p values obtained under \(\chi^2\) tests when the distribution of *not* in subordinate clauses within and outside the scope of negation is compared against the frequency of unsupported (stage one) *ne* in each of the two contexts. \(\chi^2\) tests are performed on the data for each period to 1420. Hence all the tests in Table 5.12 are performed with one degree of freedom. The difference between the contexts is unlikely to be coincidental, or due to the distribution of the admittedly small amounts of data from clauses within the scope of negation. Figures for the period 1420-1500 show that all tokens in clauses within the scope of negation involve *not*, this means that statistically significant differences between the two contexts cannot be demonstrated by means of \(\chi^2\)-tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>outside scope of negation</th>
<th>in scope of negation</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
<th>p≤</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Total not</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Total not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12: The results of chi-square tests comparing the distribution of clauses subordinate to a negative and clauses in the 'other' group. All under one degree of freedom.

These data indicate that the change in morphosyntactic features resulting in stage two of Jespersen's Cycle is sensitive to a superordinate negative. This factor persists throughout the Middle English data from the earliest period. Figure 5.1 illustrates the distribution of unsupported *ne* in these contexts.

I will now compare the distribution of *not* in main and subordinate clauses.\(^7\) The figures are presented in Table 5.13 in the same way as in Table 5.10. The figures for subordinate clauses come from Table 5.10. The data shown in Table 5.13 are also shown in Figure 5.1. In interpreting Figure 5.1 it is important to note that the x-axis does not represent time as a linear continuum, and that the four periods represented are not of equal length. The resulting plots of the change in

\(^6\)Which includes the *if*-clauses previously separated in Table 5.10.

\(^7\)Outside the scope of negation, but including *if*-clauses.
various contexts are approximate only, and should be regarded as an indication of the relationship holding between the three contexts in four distinct periods, rather than a plot of change across time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th>Subordinate clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total not</td>
<td>TOTAL % not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>1169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13: The frequency of not (including not in ne...not and not) in main and subordinate clauses.

Figure 5.1: The distribution of not in main clauses, subordinate clauses and clauses within the scope of negation.

The differences between main and subordinate clause contexts for each period are statistically significant under $\chi^2$ tests (Table 5.14). All tests performed under one degree of freedom.

The findings of this section demonstrate contextual influences on the rise of not (at the expense of unsupported ne). The evidence from change supports the
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th>Subordinate clauses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Total not</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Total not</td>
<td>x²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>121.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>87.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>13.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>21.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.14: The results of chi-square tests comparing the distribution of main and subordinate clauses. All under one degree of freedom.

idea that there are three contexts. The relevant contexts are main clauses, subordinate clauses and clauses within the scope of negation. Being within the scope of other non-assertive polarity operators has no discernible effect on the frequency of the innovative form not. Frisch fails to take these contextual factors into account.

5.4.2 Quantifying the decline in use of ne

I hypothesized that the loss of the morpheme ne affects only those instances of ne in clauses where ne is redundant to the morphological identification of negation because not is also present. This avoids negative clauses in which negation is not morphologically identified. Therefore, the loss of ne is contingent upon, and follows the introduction of not (241b).

(241) a. ne>ne...not
    b. ne...not>not

Unsupported ne has no role in or effect on the loss of the morpheme ne in this model. Hence unsupported ne can be excluded from examination of the later stages of Jespersen’s Cycle, as the morpheme ne can only be eliminated once negation is identifiable elsewhere in the clause. I will examine the transition from stage two to stage three of Jespersen’s Cycle (which I describe as the ‘loss of ne’) without any reference to stage one unsupported ne.

The loss of ne characterised in this way is distinguished from the introduction of not described in the previous section, by the role which contextual differences play in the change. Subdividing the data according to the three contexts found relevant for the introduction of not above demonstrates no such differences between these contexts for the loss of ne. The change takes the same time course in all clausal contexts. The relevant data are shown in Table 5.15, which separates main clauses, subordinate clauses, and clauses within the scope of negation.
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| Period     | Main clauses | | | Subordinate clauses | | | In scope of negation | |
|------------|--------------|--------|--------|----------------------|--------|-------------------|-------------------|
|            | ne... | Total | % ne... | not     | ne... | Total | % ne... | not     | ne... | Total | % ne... | not     |
| 1150-1250  | 354     | 357   | 99%     | not 326 | 327   | 99.7% | 6   | 7     | 86%     | not 6   | 7     | 86% |
| 1250-1350  | 361     | 424   | 85%     | not 174 | 195   | 89%   | 6   | 8     | 75%     | not 6   | 8     | 75% |
| 1350-1420  | 126     | 1137  | 11%     | not 146 | 1021  | 13%   | 6   | 60    | 10%     | not 6   | 60    | 10% |
| 1420-1500  | 4       | 1006  | 1%      | not 10  | 963   | 1%    | 1   | 41    | 2%      | not 1   | 41    | 2% |

Table 5.15: The frequency of _ne_ in the context of _not_. PPCME2 data subdivided by clause type.

The lack of contextual differences is most clearly demonstrated by comparison of main and subordinate clauses. Differences between the frequency of supported _ne_ in main clauses and subordinate clauses are not statistically significant under χ²-tests for any ME period. The distribution of supported _ne_ in clauses within the scope of negation is not demonstrably different from the distribution of supported _ne_ in main or subordinate clauses. Given the propensity of clauses within the scope of negation to use unsupported _ne_ until the late Middle English period, the number of clauses involving _not_ under investigation here is small, particularly for the periods to 1350. There are too few data to perform χ²-tests on the data for the periods 1150-1250 and 1250-1350 to compare the distribution of supported _ne_ in this context with the other clausal contexts. In the late Middle English periods following 1350, for which there are more data, clauses within the scope of negation pattern just like main and subordinate clauses. These data do not give sufficient reason to suppose that the loss of _ne_ patterns differently in this context.

The parallels between the loss of _ne_ in the three clausal contexts with _not_ are illustrated in Figure 5.2. In interpreting Figure 5.2, note that the x-axis does not represent time as a linear continuum. Texts are subdivided into four periods of unequal lengths. The resulting plot is only an approximate representation of the change under discussion, but is sufficient to demonstrate the lack of differences between the contexts examined.

When the loss of _ne_ is considered in this way, splitting the negative _ne_ into two groups according to its co-occurrence with other negatives, clause type is seen to have no effect on the transition from stage two to stage three of Jespersen's Cycle, whereas it conditions the transition from stage one to stage two, resulting in statistically significant differences between the contexts.
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The distribution of *ne* in clauses with *not*

Figure 5.2: The frequency of *ne* in the context of *not*. Main and subordinate clauses.
5.5 An alternative syntactic model of Jespersen's Cycle

The differences between the two changes, the introduction of *not* and the loss of *ne* as described above provides empirical support for the relationship between the two changes I proposed in section (242).

(242) a. *ne* > *ne*... *not*
    b. *ne*... *not* > *not*

The effect of clausal context on the two changes is clearly different. (242a) is sensitive to morphosyntactic conditioning factors such as clause type. (242b) is not sensitive to these factors. This difference between the two changes only emerges when the data are subcategorised in this way, and when two distinct forms of *ne* are distinguished.

My account of Jespersen's Cycle differs from Frisch (1997) because it takes *ne*... *not* to be an independent stage relevant to the change. Therefore, *ne*... *not* needs to be characterised as an independent stage at the morphosyntactic level. A distinction needs to be made between unsupported *ne* which cannot be eliminated from the grammar, and *ne* supported by *not* which can be eliminated. The Minimalist analysis I presented in chapter 4 facilitates such a distinction based on morphosyntactic features. There, I argued that the dependency between *ne* and *not* results from unvalued [pol:] features on *ne*. The difference between valued [pol:neg] features on *ne* at stage one of Jespersen's Cycle and unvalued [pol:] features on *ne* at stage two, allows the two relevant types of *ne* to be distinguished. The effect of spell-out will be to eliminate the [pol:] feature of *ne* when it is valued during the derivation, leaving stage two *ne* without any LF interpretation. *ne* is an agreement morpheme and is therefore redundant. The loss of *ne* eliminates *ne* in just those cases when it is redundant at LF. Elimination of the morpheme *ne* leads to a less abstract representation of negation, and restores the correspondence between PF and LF markers of negation which was lost when *ne* became an agreement marker. In this account, however, the role of *ne* is crucial. The change in morphosyntactic features on *ne* drives Jespersen's Cycle by initiating a dependency with *not*. Only once this dependency is in place can *ne* be lost.

8In effect, this states that all *ne* at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle are redundant or expletive *ne*. Parallels between the distribution of redundant *ne* and *ne*... *not* over time support this conclusion (see chapter 4).
This approach to Jespersen's Cycle allows it to be analysed as two processes of grammatical competition targeting a head with polarity features (perhaps Neg° or Pol°, but not necessarily, see chapter 4 for discussion). The first involves competition between [pol: neg] and unvalued [pol: ] features, the second change is restricted to a head with unvalued [pol: ] features, and is between the morphological representation of this head as ne or null. The first change operates at the level of morphosyntax, it makes reference to clause typing features and scope relations for example. The second change does not necessarily operate at the syntactic level. It makes no reference to syntactic contextual factors, and operates uniformly. Therefore it may be postsyntactic, operating at spell-out to eliminate the morpheme ne just when it is redundant at LF.

- Stage One: unsupported ne: a semantically interpretable [pol: neg] feature is associated with a head position in the syntax. This head position may be Neg°, if NegP is assumed in some form. However, there is no reason why it must be associated with Neg°, and no evidence to postulate a distinct functional projection for negation unless this is forced by the formal framework, as in Government-Binding theory, or Distributed Morphology. In later Minimalist work, Chomsky proposes that functional projections are checking positions for morphological features of items which enter the derivation fully inflected. At this stage there is no need for a checking position to be associated with negation.

- Stage Two: supported or bipartite ne: a semantically unvalued [pol:] feature is associated with a head position in the syntax. The head has the overt morphological realisation ne. This feature initiates a syntactic dependency, requiring a specifier element to be introduced. In the case of ne...not this dependency is satisfied by Merge of not, and the [pol:] feature on ne is valued and deletes at spell-out.

- Stage Three: unsupported not: The distribution of not does not change immediately upon the loss of ne. It retains the distribution of a phrasal specifier or adverbial element. However, there is no evidence that not enters into a syntactic dependency at this stage. In the absence of morphological evidence for a dependency, it may be that not is reanalysed as an unselected vP-adjunct like nicht in German.

This view of each stage of Jespersen's Cycle allows a model of grammatical competition to be constructed which has two processes of competition between
heads which are structural competitors. The first process of competition is between valued and unvalued polarity features. This has the effect of introducing a syntactic dependency with not. The second process of competition is between a head which has the feature [pol:], and one which does not.

By ordering the changes across time as two stages in the morphosyntactic weakening of ne, there is no need for independent identification principles on negation. Any item with [pol:] features must be morphologically identified as negative. The loss of the morpheme ne leads to the loss of [pol:] features on a syntactic head. Morphological marking of negation on an element bearing unvalued [pol:] is redundant and duplicates the morphological marking of negation which is already present on not. It follows that items with [pol:] features must be morphologically identified, but second, that the duplication of negative morphology in ne...not creates pressure for the loss of ne, both the morpheme ne and the morphosyntactic feature [pol:] which is responsible for the syntactic agreement between the two negatives.

Not only is the model I propose syntactically justifiable in a Minimalist framework which allows two types of ne to be formally distinguished, it provides a more insightful and economical view of the changes involved in Jespersen’s Cycle on two grounds. First, it allows two empirically distinct processes of change to be distinguished in a principled way. Second, it does not require a stipulation to rule out clauses where negation is not morphologically identified, or require any null elements in the syntactic representation of negation. That follows from the ordering of changes, so that the first change creates negative agreement morphology on a head, and the second change eliminates the morphological reflex of that agreement, as it is rendered redundant by the rise of a syntactic dependency which introduces another negator. This chapter demonstrates the advantages of postulating two types of ne at successive stages of Jespersen’s Cycle on empirical grounds as well as formal theoretical grounds. The ability to distinguish two types of ne allows the three stages of Jespersen’s Cycle to be formally distinct and independent of each other, linked by two changes with different properties. The ne...not stage involves no syntactic redundancy. The redundancy is solely morphological, and arises because the morpheme ne is only lost when the unvalued feature [pol:] is lost, rather than when the valued [pol:neg] is lost.
5.6 Speculations on the character of later changes under Jespersen’s Cycle

The loss of *ne* removes the evidence for a syntactic feature checking dependency at stage three of Jespersen’s Cycle. The only dependencies involved in negative clauses are those for which there is overt morphological or syntactic evidence. With the loss of *ne*, the conservative nature of the language learner and his/her preference for more economical representations mitigates against an analysis under which the distribution of *not* is determined by the same syntactic dependency as was morphologically evidenced in bipartite *ne...not* negation. Under a Minimalist framework, economy receives a precise syntactic correlate: derivations without feature valuing dependencies are more economical than those with feature valuing dependencies. The introduction of unvalued features into a derivation necessitates additional operations of Merge or Agree, hence the learner’s inductive bias will seek to eliminate unvalued features wherever syntactic or morphological evidence for these unvalued features is weak. This makes the possibility of syntactic reanalysis by subsequent generations of language learners quite likely. The loss of *ne* eliminates unvalued [pol: ] features.

*Not* will be reanalysed as an unselected adverbial element adjoined to vP rather than a specifier element, thereby eliminating the feature checking dependency which introduces *not* as a specifier. At the syntactic level, Jespersen’s Cycle will involve alternation between two syntactic representations (243).

(243) a. Stage one: [pol:neg]
   b. Stage two: [pol: ]...[pol:neg ]
   c. Stage three: [pol:neg]

Van Kemenade (2000) proposes the fourth stage of Jespersen’s Cycle is reanalysis of *not* as the head Neg°. Van Kemenade identifies some empirical evidence for the reanalysis of *not*. Its distribution changes so that it can appear adjacent to the finite verb in cases of V to C movement across a subject pronoun.

Two orders are compared: (244) and (245).

---

The view that *not* is reanalysed as a clitic on the finite verb in C° depends on there being no position between the finite verb and subject pronoun which could host *not*. Therefore, the analysis relies on the spec,AgrP placement of subject pronouns, and assumes that the position of pronominal subjects remains constant throughout the entire Middle English period. It is necessary to evaluate this assumption. Haeberli (2002c) shows an increase in inversion of finite verbs and subject pronouns in late Middle English non-operator declarative clauses. If these have the
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(244) ... finite verb - not - subject pronoun

a. Therefore is not he aountid among be emperoure
Therefore is not he counted among the emperors
'Therefore he is not counted among the emperors'
(CMCAPCHR, 91.1792)

b. Xal not I don so?
Shall not I do so?
'Shan't I do so?'
(KEMPE, 50.1133)

c. And sire, by youre leve, that am nat I
And sir, by your leave, that am not I
'And sir, by your leave, that I am not'
(CMCMTMELI, 221.C1.148)

(245) ... finite verb - subject pronoun - not

a. Seest thou not how oure Lady wepith?
See you not how our Lady weeps?
'Do you not see how our Lady weeps?'
(CMAELR4, 21.642)

b. bat wyl I not grawnt sow
that will I not grant you
'I will not grant you that'
(CMKEMPE, 24.504)

c. Why sholde I nat ryde this way?
Why should I not ride this way?
'Why should I not ride this way?'
(CMMMALORY, 195.2940)

There are few examples of (244) in the PPCME2: 1 in the period 1350-1420 and 6 in the period 1420-1500. (n=6/94 or 6%) There are no examples in earlier periods, suggesting an incipient change at the end of the late Middle English period, whose beginnings appear in the mid 15th century, at a time when ne is only residually present. Further data from the Early Modern English period are

finite verb in Agr°, inversion of finite verb and subject pronoun indicates a lower spec, TP position for the subject pronoun. A shift in the position of subject pronouns could equally account for the different distribution of not relative to pronoun subjects. It is necessary to determine whether the change in distribution observed for not is particular to not, or is also seen with adverbial phrasal adjuncts to TP. If it is particular to not, then this is good evidence for a change in the syntax of not.
needed to follow this change further and to describe it in more detail. Rissanen (1994; 1999) provides data concerning the relative positions of not and subject pronouns in Early Modern English interrogatives. His figures show an increase in inversion of not and a subject pronoun in Early Modern English: n=19/77 or 25% in the period 1500-1570 of the Helsinki Corpus (figures based on Rissanen (1999, Table 4)).

English differs from other Germanic languages in the development of a negative head in Early Modern English. German nicht and Dutch niets remain vP adjuncts. The reasons why English developed a negative head are outside the scope of this thesis, as we can see that this development postdates the Middle English period. More work needs to be done in this area.

There are further changes to the syntax of negation in the Early Middle English period which may be amenable to analysis in terms of features, and have been analysed as part of Jespersen’s Cycle. As generalised V to T movement is lost, negation comes to co-occur only with lexicalised T, whether lexicalised by verb movement or do-support. The emergence of an independent modal or aspectual categories, coupled with the loss of generalised V to T movement, may initiate an reanalysis of the host for [neg] features, from the vT or Neg heads, to the head of a modal (M°) projection or an aspectual (Asp°) projection. This development might be important in the development of the negative head n’t. The development of new restrictions on the distribution of not can be thought of as a redistribution of [pol: neg] or [pol: ] features in the lexicon so that they are associated with modals and aspectuals only (cf. Ernst (1992)). If this analysis is correct, Present-Day standard English negation need make no reference to the independent syntactic projection NegP, instead, [neg] features are parasitic on modals and aspectuals. Ernst (1992) pursues this kind of analysis of Present Day English not.

5.7 Jespersen’s Cycle and multiple negation

I will now turn my attention to the progress of the two changes (introduction of not, loss of ne) in clauses which involve negative arguments or adjuncts. Jespersen’s Cycle does not progress in the same way in these clauses. Frisch (1997) notes these difficulties, and leaves clauses which have negative arguments or adjuncts out of his analysis. The situation is quite complex. We see that whilst not is not generally introduced into multiple negation contexts in Middle English, ne
is lost from these same contexts during Middle English. Here, the relationship between the loss of *ne* in all its contexts is examined using Middle English data. I show that the loss of *ne* proceeds in the same way irrespective of whether it is supported by *not* or in multiple negation with some other negative word. The presence of *not* is not a precondition for the loss of *ne* in all contexts as my model of Jespersen’s Cycle proposes.

The question arises of how to integrate multiple negation contexts into the diachronic and syntactic model. This section will outline the empirical diachronic data and the problems these data pose to the model of change, but for a syntactic discussion and interpretation of these data see chapter 6. The relationship between the loss of *ne* and introduction of *not* in multiple negation contexts differs from the relationship between the two changes in the contexts already examined. The introduction of *not* is not a prerequisite for the loss of *ne* in all contexts. The model must be able to relate the loss of *ne* in multiple negation to the loss of *ne* elsewhere, whilst accounting for fact that *ne* is not replaced by *ne...not* or *not* in all clauses which contain a negative adverb or negative quantifier.

### 5.7.1 *Not* in the context of negative NPs or adverbs

Jack (1978a,b) claims that *not* is rarely introduced in clauses with negative NPs or adverbs.

Clauses containing a negative form such as *never* or *no*... show some degree of regularity in the choice of adverbs of negation [Jack’s term for *ne* and *not*]. These clauses may contain an adverb of negation, but need not. When an adverb of negation is used in a clause of this kind it is generally *ne*, the forms *not* and *ne...not* being distinctly uncommon. I have noted 272 instances with *ne*, beside twenty-eight with *not* and thirty-five with *ne...not*.

(Jack 1978a, 62)

*Not* is not in complementary distribution with negative arguments or adjuncts in late Middle English (246),(247), although it is infrequent in these contexts, either with *ne* (246) or without it (247).

(246)  a. ...thou ne schalt nat seen in no place no thing of yvel
...you NEG shall not see in no place no thing of evil
‘...you shall see nothing of evil anywhere’

(CMBOETH,454.C2.565)
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b. Gret grace is it of God whan þe wille of a man or a womman is so hard and rooted fast in God þat he ne may not wawe for no temptation.

'God's grace is great when the will of a man or a woman is so firm and rooted fast in God that he may not waiver despite any temptation.'

(CMVICES4,106.180)

(247) a. he schuld not begynne no werre withoute the same councell he ought not begin no war without the same advice

'he ought not to begin any war without the same advice'

(CMCAPCHR,137.3171)

b. And thenn our soverayne myght not no longer hyde his maryage and then our sovereign might not no longer hide his marriage

'and then our sovereign might no longer hide his marriage'

(CMGREGOR,227.2288)

The lack of absolute complementary distribution indicates that there is no structural reason to bar *not* from clauses involving negative NPs or adverbials. Rather this is a context in which *not* is much less frequent. In Late Middle English, clauses in which *not* co-occurs with negative arguments (246a) or adverbials, such as PPs (247b) are attested, but their frequency is marginal.

Out of 5379 clauses involving *not*, there are only 113 (2%) examples of *not* co-occurring with a negative phrase (argument or adverbial). Therefore, multiple negation contexts must be excluded from Frisch’s redundant licensing model, and distinguished from other contexts for the introduction of *not* in some way. Frisch (1997) acknowledges this problem, and proposes to exclude *ne* in multiple negation from his redundant licensing model.

Recall that the use of *ne* in negative concord situations [multiple negation] was excluded from the quantitative analysis. If these tokens are included, the model of the use of *ne...not* as redundant licensing fails to provide an adequate fit. Without the analysis of redundant licensing the other results in this paper are difficult to explain.

(Frisch 1997, 57)

Frisch’s account provides no basis to distinguish negative clauses in which the introduction of *not* goes to completion in Middle English (main clauses, sub-
ordinate clauses) from those in which the introduction of not is marginal (clauses with negative arguments or adjuncts). This decision leaves unaddressed the issue of the relationship between Jespersen’s Cycle and multiple negation. This section has established that not is not introduced into multiple negation in the same way that it is introduced elsewhere, whilst leaving aside the reasons for this. I will return to discuss these in chapter 6.

5.7.2 The loss of ne in negative doubling

At the empirical level, we see that negation is redundantly morphologically identified in negative doubling just as in the ne...not construction, although it remains to be seen whether ne...not and negative doubling are morphosyntactically equivalent feature checking configurations (see section 6.5). These parallels between ne...not and negative doubling extend to quantitative analysis of the loss of ne. These data present a strong case for the syntactic equivalence of ne...not and negative doubling. The loss of ne in negative doubling is exactly parallel to the loss of ne in the context of not. Two contexts demonstrate this: clauses with the negative adverb never (248), and all clauses with negatively quantified NPs such as nothing (249). These are referred to as ‘never’ and ‘no+NP’ in Table 5.16. Table 5.16 shows the frequency of ne in these two contexts, comparing them with the frequency of ne in the context of not (250).

(248) Negative doubling with negative adverbial:

a. þat þai nolde neuer speke with ham ...
   that they NEG-would never speak with him ...
   ‘that they would never speak with him …’
   (CMBRUT3,99.2990)

b. and þow seist “whoeuere kepþ my word schal neuere dy3e.”
   and you say “whoever keeps my word shall never die”
   ‘and you say “whoever obeys my commands shall never die”
   (CMWYCSER,420.3488)

(249) Negative doubling with negative NP argument:

a. And thei seye þat þere nys no purgatorie ...
   And they say that there NEG-is no purgatory …
   ‘And they say there is no purgatory …’
   (CMMANDEV,12.242)
b. they hade no power to speke.
   they had no power to speak
   'They had no power to speak'
   (CMSIEGE, 93.728)

(250) *ne...not* construction:

a. I nel not go fro pe,
   I NEG-will not go from you
   'I will not leave you'
   (CMAELR3, 50.775)

b. and he may not falle to synne sip he is rigtwisnesse hymself.
   and he may not fall to sin since he is righteousness himself.
   'and he may not sin since he is righteousness itself.'
   (CMWYCSER, I, 477.3629)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>negative NP</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16: The overall distribution of *ne* by date.

The frequency of *ne* in the context of *never* or negative NPs is compared with
the frequency of *ne* in the context of *not*, to determine whether the frequency of
*ne* in the negative doubling contexts differs significantly from the frequency of *ne*
in the context of *not* under $\chi^2$-tests for each period of Middle English.

Comparing the frequency of *ne* in the context of negative NPs with the frequency
of *ne* in the context of *not* yielded no significant differences between the
frequencies of *ne* for the periods following 1250. The frequency of *ne* in the *not*
context differs significantly from the frequency of *ne* in the negative doubling
contexts in the period 1150-1250. The two negative doubling contexts do not
differ significantly from each other at this period. Hence the negative doubling
contexts (negative NPs and *never*) can be combined, giving 757 negative arguments
or adjuncts with *ne* and 49 without *ne* compared to 686 instances of *not*
with *ne* and only 5 without *ne*. The difference between these contexts in 1150-
1250 is highly significant: $\chi^2=30.69$, $p\leq0.001$, 1 degree of freedom. Establishing
the reasons for this difference is an area for further investigation.
Figure 5.3 graphically represents the distribution of *ne* in the three contexts. If we look at the periods following 1250, there is no evidence for any differences in the loss of *ne* in negative doubling and *ne...not* contexts. There is no evidence for different rates of change. More strikingly, there is no evidence for any intercept or frequency differences between the contexts. The loss of *ne* apparently proceeds as a single change wherever *ne* occurs in the context of another negative, whether that negative is *not*, *never* or a negatively quantified NP. Contexts for the loss of *ne* cannot be differentiated either in terms of rate of change or the intercept parameter.

![The frequency of ne with not and in negative doubling](image)

Figure 5.3: The frequency of *ne* in the context of *not*, *never* (negative doubling) and the sentential negator *not*.

The distribution reflected in Figure 5.3 is not necessarily an accurate reflection of a process of diachronic change. It does not isolate change from other factors which may influence the frequency of *ne*. These factors may include dialect and genre. There is discontinuity in the dialects represented at the earlier periods 1150-1350 and the later periods 1350-1500. It is possible that the survival of *ne* is linked to dialect. Idiomatic factors also prove important. The frequency of *ne* is particularly high in the late 14th century works of Chaucer which are included in the PPCME2. The frequency of *ne* in Chaucerian texts affects the overall fre-
quency of *ne*, making it higher than it otherwise would be if the works of Chaucer were not over represented in the data for this period. However, biases in the data do not affect my overall conclusions: whatever the overall frequency of *ne* in particular groups of texts, its frequency is the same in all the linguistic contexts investigated (see Table 5.17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>not with ne</th>
<th>not total</th>
<th>never with ne</th>
<th>never total</th>
<th>neg NP with ne</th>
<th>neg NP total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>81 (40%)</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47 (38%)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>45 (5%)</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30 (7%)</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17: The distribution of *ne* in the contexts of not, never and negative NPs for the period 1350-1420. Texts by Chaucer considered separately. Main clauses.

The distinction which Frisch makes between *ne* as a sentential negator in the *ne...not* construction and *ne* as 'negative agreement' (Frisch 1997, 33) in negative doubling implies that there are two processes by which these two types of *ne* are lost.

These uses of *ne* in negative concord situations are excluded from the quantitative analysis... I claim that the use of *ne* in a negative concord construction is not a use of *ne* in its function as sentential negator. The use of *ne* in these cases is apparently not as a true sentential negator, to express the negation of a proposition, but instead as a necessary component of the negative concord construction. While I believe the syntactic use of *ne* in these cases is as the head of NEGP, the function of *ne* is quite different. In this respect, the use of the negative head in negative concord is similar to the inflectional heads of agreement and tense. *Ne* in these instances is 'negative agreement' (Frisch 1997, 33)

There is no quantitative evidence for such a distinction. The loss of *ne* is a unitary change operating in the context of some other negative marker. At the level on which the loss of *ne* operates, all instances of *ne* are the same, parallel as far as the change is concerned. All candidates for the loss of *ne* have negation marked on some other element in the clause. *ne* is therefore arguably redundant.

---

10The texts by Chaucer under examination are the PPCME2 text samples of *Melibee* (CMCT-MELI), *The Parson’s Tale* (CMCTPARS), the *Boethius* (CMBOETH), the *Treatise on the Astrolabe* (CMASTRO), and the *Equatorie of the Planets* (CMEQUATO).
as a morphological marker of negation, and like other agreement morphology is liable to phonological reduction, loss of salience and ultimate elimination from the grammar.

In order for the redundant licensing model to work, Frisch must exclude *ne* in negative doubling from his analysis. My analysis is not constrained in this way. The way I set up the changes within a Jespersen's Cycle with three independent stages allows the loss of *ne* to be extended to contexts with negative adverbs or negative NPs without impacting on the distribution of *not* in any way. This allows the loss of negative doubling to be integrated into the model of Jespersen's Cycle as a consequence of the transition from stage two to stage three of the cycle. This parallel implies some kind of equivalence between *ne*. . . *not* and negative doubling. However, it remains to be seen whether this descriptive parallel between *ne*. . . *not* and negative doubling has a formal syntactic correlate. I will address this issue in chapter 6, along with the issue of why contexts with negative adverbs or negative NPs resist *not*.

### 5.7.3 The distribution of *ne* in the *ne*. . . *but* construction

There is another context for *ne*, in which *ne* appears as an agreement marker, which I will address here. This is *ne* in the *ne*. . . *but* construction (which has the constructional meaning 'only'). The loss of *ne* should proceed in exactly the same way in this context as in negative contexts. Table 5.18 shows the frequency of *ne* in clauses involving *but*, where *but* is a particle with the exclusive meaning 'only' rather than a clause level conjunction (251-253).

(251) ...certes by nature ther nys but o God
     ...truly by nature there NEG-is but one God
     '...truly by nature there is only one God'
     (CMBOETH,433.C1.183)

(252) þer nis buten an godd þur hwam witerliche ha alle there NEG-is but one God through whom undoubtedly they all weren iwrahte...
     were made...
     (CMKATHE,22.56)

(253) And fro Bethleem unto Ierusalem nys but .ij. myle
     and from Bethlehem to Jerusalem NEG-is but two miles
     'And from Bethlehem to Jerusalem is only two miles'
     (CMMANDEV,47.1181)
Although there are fewer data in this context than in *ne...not* or negative doubling contexts, the time course of the loss of *ne* in *ne...but* is consistent with the time course of the loss of *ne* in negative doubling and *ne...not* contexts as shown in Table 5.18. The similarity of this context to the *ne...not* and negative doubling contexts adds further support to the hypothesis that the loss of *ne* is a single unitary change operating in the same way across all contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th><em>ne</em></th>
<th>Total but (<em>ne...but</em> and <em>but</em>)</th>
<th>% with <em>ne</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.18: The frequency of *ne* in the context of *but*

### 5.8 Summary and Conclusions

The diachronic data presented in this chapter support a view of the change from *ne>* *ne...not>* *not* as a three stage process, involving two changes ordered in time. I show that Frisch's (1997) redundant licensing model relies on some dubious assumptions, and fails to account for differences between clause types in the progress of Jespersen's Cycle. There are two changes, differentiated by the contextual factors which condition them: a change from *ne>* *ne...not* which is conditioned by clause typing factors, and a change from *ne...not>* *not* which operates uniformly in all contexts. The different properties of the two changes studied quantitatively over time allow the relationship between the three stages of Jespersen's Cycle to be readdressed in a way which is consistent with the progress and properties of change over time. Hence properties of the competition between negators inform a syntactic account of Jespersen's Cycle in a way which could not be achieved without examining change within the grammar competition model. The way that forms interact diachronically is crucial to the syntactic analysis.

In this case, what change reveals is that two types of *ne* must be distinguished: one which is unsupported, the other which is supported by *not*. These two types of *ne* are subject to different processes of change which can be distinguished by the way they are structured across contexts and across time. This empirical finding corresponds to the distinction between two forms of *ne* I made in chapter 4 on formal syntactic grounds, and adds empirical support to a Minimalist account.
of early English negation which derives variation in negation strategies through variation in morphosyntactic features. Thus two forms of *ne* are available in Middle English, in direct structural competition: lexically valued *ne* [pol: neg] and lexically unvalued *ne* [pol: ]. Competition between these forms derives the dependency between *ne* and *not* seen at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle. This distinction also allows for a simple statement of the conditions on the loss of *ne*, along the lines of 'eliminate the morpheme *ne* in those contexts where it is redundant at LF'. All *ne* [pol: ] receiving a value during the syntactic computation will have their value stripped away by spellout and receive no interpretation at LF. This approach formalises the fact that the introduction of *not* is a prerequisite for the loss of *ne*. This approach receives empirical support in sentential negation contexts. However, clauses with negative arguments or adjuncts are problematic. The introduction of *not* in these clauses is not a prerequisite for the loss of *ne* in these clauses. Use of *not* in these clauses remains marginal in Middle English, whilst the loss of *ne* in this context proceeds exactly the same way as in other contexts in which *ne* is supported by another negative. *ne* is lost in all contexts in which negation can be morphologically identified on some other element. I have left aside the syntactic representation of clauses involving negative arguments or adjuncts for discussion in chapter 6. However, the parallels between the loss of *ne* in all contexts indicate that all contexts are formally equivalent in some sense which is relevant to the progress of the change.

This chapter demonstrates that an account of Jespersen's Cycle based on morphosyntactic features, for which I gave theoretical justification in chapter four, provides for a diachronic model of Jespersen's Cycle in which the introduction of *not* feeds the loss of *ne*. This relationship between the loss of *ne* and introduction of *not* receives empirical and quantitative support from the diachronic data. Unlike Frisch, I take the view that the three stages in Jespersen's Cycle each have independent syntactic reality and relevance to Jespersen's Cycle. My model requires a distinction between two types of *ne*, as the two types are affected by different processes of change. A Minimalist account, based on morphosyntactic features provides the required distinction.
Chapter 6

Multiple negation

6.1 Introduction

In previous chapters, I concentrated on the syntax of sentential negators, *ne* and *not*. This chapter will complete the picture with a discussion of the syntax of negative arguments and adjuncts. Old and Middle English are multiple negation languages. Here, I chart the availability of multiple negation and relate changes in the availability of multiple negation to Jespersen’s Cycle. I argue that the properties of negative arguments and adjuncts themselves are crucial to the availability of multiple negation in English. This account exploits the approaches to multiple negation proposed by Ladusaw (1992), Deprez (1997) and Giannakidou (2000). I extend this account to deal with variation and change in the availability of multiple negation during the Middle English period. This chapter will develop some of the remarks concerning multiple negation which I made in chapter five into a more detailed syntactic account of this phenomenon in Early English, which integrates with the model of Jespersen’s Cycle I proposed. I show that early English multiple negation is not tied to Jespersen’s Cycle in the way Rowlett’s (1998) proposals predict and present an alternative proposal.

There are two issues for the analysis of multiple negation. First, how is multiple negation licensed in a way which is semantically compositional, and consistent with Minimalist syntax, particularly the Principle of Full Interpretation. Syntactic and semantic approaches will be considered. Second, two approaches to concordant negative words are available in the literature. Ladusaw (1992), Deprez (1997) consider concordant negative words to be indefinites. Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996), Giannakidou (2000) consider concordant negative words to be
quantificational. I will consider their arguments in order to take a position on the status of early English concordant negative words. I propose an account in which the morphosyntactic feature specifications of negative words differs in multiple negation and double negation languages. This allows changes in the availability of multiple negation to be a matter of parametric variation in the Minimalist sense, and reduces multiple negation to a morphosyntactic feature checking dependency.

Multiple negation takes two forms in the history of English. These are the forms which van der Wouden (1994) distinguishes as NEGATIVE DOUBLING and NEGATIVE SPREAD. Negative doubling is the term given to the co-occurrence of a sentential negative like *ne* and one negative argument or negative adjunct. Negative spread is the term given to the co-occurrence of two or more negative arguments or adjuncts or a combination of negative arguments and adjuncts (254).

\[(254)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
a. \hspace{1em} & \text{pan had He neuer no begynnynge} \\
& \text{then had He never no beginning} \\
& \text{‘then He never had any beginning’} \\
& \text{(CMEDTHOR,46.717)} \\

b. \hspace{1em} & \text{no man seyd no-thyng a-gens hem} \\
& \text{no man said nothing against him} \\
& \text{‘no man said anything against him’} \\
& \text{(CMKEMPE,33.730)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Middle English exhibits both patterns: negative doubling is most common in Early Middle English, whilst negative spread is most common in Late Middle English.

In chapter five, I showed that *not* tends not to co-occur with negative arguments or adjuncts. Frisch (1997) leaves aside multiple negation from his account, claiming that the change in sentential negation from *ne* to *not* does not happen in multiple negation contexts. We will see that the situation in my data is not so clear cut. There are clauses in which negative arguments or adjuncts appear in multiple negation with *not* (255) which are problematic to both Frisch (1997) and Rowlett (1998). The analysis must take account of these.

\[(255)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
a. \hspace{1em} & \text{you shalt not bere no false wyttenes a3ens no man by no way} \\
& \text{you ought not bear no false witness against no man in no way} \\
& \text{‘You ought not bear false witness against any man in any way’} \\
& \text{(CMMIRK,103.2797)} \\
\end{align*}
\]
b. and he wolde not make no confessyon  
    and he would not make no confession  
    ‘and he would not make any confession’  
    (CMGREGOR,233.2474)

6.2 The availability of multiple negation in early English

The aim of this section is to establish the patterns of negative co-occurrence which negative arguments can enter into in early English. There are two types of multiple negation in Old English prose: negative spread (256) and negative doubling (257) (van der Wouden 1994). These may occur in combination (258).

(256) and næfre nænig leoð geleornade  
    and never no song learned  
    ‘and [he] never learnt any song’  
    (cobede,Bede_4:25.342.19.3436)

(257) Ic ne funde nanne gylt on him  
    I NEG found no sin in him  
    ‘I found no sin in him’  
    (cowsgosp,Jn_[WSCp]:19.6.7261)

(258) Ne maeg þonne nan man nahwar beon behydd  
    NEG can then no man nowhere be hidden  
    ‘Then no man can be hidden anywhere’  
    (coaelhom,þ AHom_11:391.1688)

It is generally assumed that Old and Middle English are both multiple negation languages. However, the situation is more complex and variable. There are two strategies by which negative doubling can be avoided:

First, the verb in a negative sentence is not always preceded by … ne… Second, not all elements which can be negated by the addition of ne are so negated… But the strength of the tendency to negate adverbs and adjective/pronouns in prose sentences with adv[erb] ne prefixed to the verb must not be underestimated.  
(Mitchell 1985§1607)
This section quantifies the frequency of multiple negation and non-multiple negation of the two types using data from the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose and the York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry. There is a marked difference in the frequency of multiple negation in the Old English prose and poetry. I examine the contexts or factors which affect the frequency of multiple negation in the two genres.

6.2.1 The frequency of multiple negation in the YCOE and the PPCME2

6.2.1.1 Negative doubling

The frequency of both negative doubling and negative spread is high in the Old English prose. Many of the exceptions, clauses which do not show multiple negation, may have constituent rather than sentential scope negation. Constituent scope negators do not co-occur with the sentential negator ne (259). It is difficult to factor instances of constituent negation out of the quantitative data completely. Obvious examples, such as those in contrastive or conjoined environments (259) have been removed from the figures.

(259)  
   a. ponne wat ic swiöe lytel oðde nanwiht  
       then knew I very little or nothing  
       'then I knew very little or nothing'  
       (cosolilo, Solil_3:66.31.929)

   b. Alexander cwæd þæt he onдрede God and nænne oðerne on  
      Alexander said that he feared God and no other on  
      andwerdum life
      actual life  
      'Alexander said that he feared God and no other in this life'  
      (cocathom2,+ACHom_Ii,20:176.79.3898)

The results in Table 6.1 show a high frequency of negative doubling with ne, although there is some variation between texts.

Table 6.1 shows that most negative phrases co-occur with ne in all periods. However, the data do not pattern uniformly across all texts. The frequency of ne is lower in 850-950 than the other periods. Examining the figures for individual

1The second conjuncts include clauses introduced by the negative conjunction ne ‘nor’ as well as non-negative conjunctions such as and, or.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th>Second conjuncts</th>
<th>Subordinate clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850-950</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-1050</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050-1150</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: The occurrence of *ne* in negative doubling by period and clause type

texts, this difference in 850-950 is caused by particularly low frequencies of *ne* in all clause types in the Old English *Bede*. Table 6.2 shows the frequency of negative doubling with *ne* in the *Bede* and the remainder of the 850-950 texts, excluding the OE *Bede*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th>Second conjuncts</th>
<th>Subordinate clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE Bede</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 850-950</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 850-950</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: The occurrence of *ne* in negative doubling in 850-950 by text

There are two possible reasons for the anomalous behaviour of the Old English *Bede*. The Old English text is a translation from Latin. The lower frequency of *ne* in negative doubling may result from translation practices. However, many other texts of the same period such as the OE *Boethius* and the *Cura Pastoralis* are also direct translations from Latin sources. These do not show the same pattern. The second option is that the OE *Bede* represents a different grammar of negation which has less *ne* in this context. Levin (1958) argues that the Old English *Bede* has orthographic and morphological features typical of the Anglian rather than West Saxon dialect. The frequency of negative doubling may differ according to dialect. Unfortunately, there are too few Anglian texts in the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose to investigate this idea fully.

In the period 950-1050, the frequency of negative doubling with *ne* is higher in texts by Ælfric than other texts in both clause types (Table 6.3). This is a particularly important factor on the overall distribution of negative doubling in the period 950-1050 as texts by Ælfric provide 1918/3099 (62%) of the relevant clauses in this period.

Once Ælfric’s usage is excluded, there appears to be continuity between 950 and 1150. With *Bede* excluded from the earlier period 850-950, the figures for
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th></th>
<th>Second conjuncts</th>
<th></th>
<th>Subordinate clauses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% ne</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelfric</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 950-1050</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 950-1050</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: The occurrence of *ne* in negative doubling in 950-1050 by text

This period shows a large degree of continuity with those for later periods. Whilst there is some variation between particular texts, the overall frequency of *ne* in the Old English prose is largely consistent, once the anomalous texts are taken into account.²

Turning to the Middle English prose data shows a steadily decreasing frequency of *ne* in all contexts where it occurs. Table 6.4 is a recapitulation of figures from chapter 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>negative NP</th>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% ne</td>
<td>ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4: The overall distribution of *ne* in negative doubling by date.

The loss of *ne* results in a substantial decline in the frequency of multiple negation in Late Middle English. However, the loss of *ne* does not lead to the loss of multiple negation at this period. Examples of negative spread continue to occur through into the Early Modern English period (Nevalainen 1996). Instances of multiple negation involving *not* (255) are also attested. Table 6.5 shows the frequency of negative doubling involving *not* in the context of a negative NP. The co-occurrence of negative NPs and *not* is not frequent, comprising less than 3% of all clauses with negative NPs. The co-occurrence of negative adjuncts, most commonly PPs with negative objects, and *not* is more frequent, amounting to 30% of clauses with negative adjuncts in the period 1420-1500.

²Note also that the figures for clauses without *ne* may include some constituent scope negations, which are difficult to isolate from sentential scope negations.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>negative NP</th>
<th>PP+negative NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5: The frequency of not co-occurring with a negative NP or a PP+negative NP.

6.2.1.2 The use of non-assertive *any*-forms

Quantification of the use of non-assertive negative polarity items, which is a second strategy for avoiding negative doubling, again shows that multiple negation is predominant in Old English prose. The non-assertive negative polarity items *ænig, æfre* ‘any, ever’ are generally avoided in negative contexts (Table 6.6), although there are some examples (260).

(260) a. Ne was æfre ænig cyninga ne aldormanna, þætte ma heora londa utamaerde & him to gewealde underpeodde land-GEN depopulated and himself to control subjected ‘There was never any king or nobleman that...’ (cobede,Bede_1:18.92.7.840)

b. Ne cymð he æfre to Godes rice gif... NEG comes he ever to God’s kingdom if... ‘He will never come to God’s kingdom if...’ (cowulf,WHom_7:159.500)

c. Ne habbap we ænigne cyning butan Casere NEG have we any king but Caesar ‘Ne do not have any king except Caesar’ (coverhom,HomS_24_[ScraggVerc_1]:197.208)

Table 6.6 shows the frequency of the non-assertive forms in (260), in comparison to the frequency of negative doubling in the same contexts. The totals include all potential contexts for negative doubling, so the table shows the frequency with which negative doubling is avoided by use of *ænig*/*æfre* forms rather than the corresponding negative forms. All clauses included in Table 6.6 have the sentential negator *ne*, so are potential negative doubling contexts. The comparison is between the forms in (261a) and (261b). Both are included in the ‘Total’ column, and the frequency of (261b) is shown in Table 6.6.
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(261) a. ne ... nænig/naefre ...

b. ne ...ænig/æfre ...

Examples of nænig, naefre in clauses with other negatives, such as negative phrases and negative conjunctions will be considered separately below. The column labelled ‘any’ (=contexts where negative doubling is potentially available but avoided by use of nænig, naefre forms) includes both instances of nænig and naefre in the construction (261b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th>Second conjuncts</th>
<th>Subordinate clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>any</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850-950</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950-1050</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050-1150</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wulfstan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o Wulfstan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6: The frequency of nænig, naefre in all clauses with ne

The overall figures hide a wide range of variation between texts, particularly in 1050-1150. Figures for texts by Wulfstan (Wulfstan's Homilies and Wulfstan's Canons of Edgar) have been separated out of the total for the period 1050-1150 on account of Wulfstan's markedly different use of non-assertive nænig, naefre forms in negative clauses. Considering all clause types, there are 151 potential negative doubling contexts in Wulfstan's Homilies, of which 78/151 (52%) have nænig/naefre rather than negative doubling. Wulfstan's Canons of Edgar have 29/32 (91%) nænig/naefre in these contexts. Table 6.6 shows continuity between 950 and 1150, once texts by the anomalous Wulfstan are excluded.

The Old English Bede also shows a high frequency of NPI forms. Across all clauses, 11/47 (23%) of potential negative doubling contexts have NPIs rather than negative doubling. In the case of the Old English Bede, the lower frequency of negative doubling might reflect its putative Anglian origins. Whether the same explanation can be extended to the works of Wulfstan is less clear.

The PPCME2 data show even fewer examples of non-assertive NPIs any, ever in negative clauses than the Old English prose data. I separate negative doubling

---

3Here, as previously, second conjuncts introduced by the negative conjunction ne 'nor', as well as non-negative conjunctions such as and, or are included.
contexts and negative spread contexts. There are 6 examples of *any* in Late Middle English like (262) which are potential negative spread contexts, and 8 like (263)\(^4\) which are potential negative doubling contexts. There are no examples of *any* in EME clauses. The first examples are found in texts by Wycliffe (late 14th century).

(262) for no man doith any thing in hiddlis
  for no man does any thing in secret
  ‘for no man does anything in secret’
  (CMNTEST, VII, 1.585)

(263) pat God may not iuge folily any man
  that God may not judge erroneously any man
  ‘that God may not judge any man erroneously’
  (CMWYCSER, I, 237.255)

Table 6.7 shows the frequency of *any*- in two potential negative doubling contexts with *not*. The first are contexts in which negative doubling with a negative NP may be used. The second are contexts in which negative doubling with a PP adjunct plus negative object may be used. The frequency of *any*- in these two contexts equals to the frequency with which negative doubling is avoided. The frequency with which non-assertive *any*- forms are used instead of negative doubling is higher in Middle English than in Old English. In Late Middle English, *any*-forms are used in around 10\% of these potential negative doubling contexts (Table 6.7) compared with only 241/5405 or 4.5\% in the YCOE (OE figures based on Table 6.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>not...neg/anyNP</th>
<th>not...neg/anyPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anyNP</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7: The frequency of non-assertive *any* in potential negative doubling contexts with *not.*

The data presented here demonstrate that negative doubling is predominant throughout the Old and Early Middle English prose, although it is not categorical. We have also seen that the loss of *ne* does not mean the end of negative doubling. There are some examples of negative doubling with *not.*

\(^4\)These examples appear most commonly in works by Wycliffe, including the Wycliffite Sermons and Bible translations.
Negative spread, in which negative arguments and/or adjuncts co-occur in the absence of a sentential negator is also variable. The number of LME clauses with negative spread between two negative NPs is quite small (n=9). Non-assertive any (n=4) accounts for 4/13 or 31% of contexts where negative spread could hold between two NPs. These figures are small, but suggest that Middle English negative spread is not as categorical as has been supposed, even though there are insufficient data here to consider a full range of texts and dialects which may behave differently in respect of multiple negation.

6.2.2 The Old English poetry data

Mitchell (1985, §1629) notes the findings of Klaeber and Knork concerning multiple negation in the OE poetry. The poetry differs from the prose in two respects:

1. In the majority of sentences in Beowulf in which ne precedes the finite verb it is the only negative.

2. There are many more sentences [involving a negative argument or adverbial PWW] without ne prefixed to the finite verb in the poetry than in the prose.

(Mitchell 1985§1629)

These are the same two strategies for marking sentential negation without employing negative doubling that I have already looked at in the Old and Middle English prose: omission of ne and use of NPIs in negative contexts. In both respects, the frequency of negative doubling is lower in the poetry than in the prose.

6.2.2.1 Negative doubling

Table 6.8 shows the frequency of ne in negative doubling with a negative phrase is much lower in the poetry than the prose (cf. (264-266)). The only exception is the Metrical Boethius in which the frequency of negative doubling is comparable with prose (265, 266).

(264) Nanig siÖÖan was weorÖ on weorulde
Nothing afterwards was honourable in world
‘afterwards, nothing was honourable in the world’
(cometboe, 162.8.36.90)
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(265) nat næg mon hwær hi nu sindon.
NEG-knows no man where they now are
'No man knows where they are now'
(cometboe,166.10.52.164)

(266) þonne næfde he nane scylde
Then NEG-had he no shield
'Then he had no shield'
(cometboe,192.25.67.427)

There are only four poetic texts with sufficient data to make any comparison
with prose: Beowulf, Cynewulf, The Exeter Book and the Metrical Boethius. There are
also insufficient data to separate second conjuncts from other main clauses. Both
are included in the category of 'main clauses' in Table 6.8. Subordinate clauses
are considered separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th></th>
<th>Subordinate clauses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with ne</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% ne</td>
<td>with ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coandrea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cobeowul</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cobrunan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cochrist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cocynew</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>codream</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coexeter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coexodus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cogenesi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cometboe</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conorthu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cophoeni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coriddle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8: The occurrence of *ne* in negative doubling in the York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry by text.

Table 6.8 presents the frequency of negative doubling in the poetry. All clauses
in the 'Total' column have a negative XP (argument or adjunct). Table 6.8 shows
how many of these negative XPs appear in negative doubling with the sentential
negator *ne*.

Table 6.8 shows that the frequency of negative doubling with *ne* in the po-
etry is lower than the prose. In most poetic texts, negative XPs are sufficient to
negate a clause on their own, without the negative marker *ne*. One exception is the *Metrical Boethius*. Fulk (1992) describes the *Metrical Boethius* as a late text, and localises it to the West Saxon dialect. The other large poems, *Beowulf* and *Cynewulf* are early texts, believed to be composed in the 8th century or earlier, although the manuscript versions we have date from later in the OE period. Fulk (1992) localises these texts to the Anglian dialect, on the basis of orthographic and morphological features. Date and dialect may be relevant factors in the use of negative doubling. In addition, it is important to take note of the poetic conventions and how these might differ in the early and late poetry. The behaviour of the *Metrical Boethius* indicates that multiple negation is not exclusive to prose, but the poetic conventions used in this text may differ from those used in earlier texts. The use of *ne* differs in prose and poetry in line with the observations made in Mitchell (1985). However, as well as a difference between the two corpora, there are differences between texts within the corpora.

### 6.2.2.2 The use of non-assertive *any* forms

Turning to the second strategy for avoiding negative doubling, the frequency of non-assertive *ænig/læfre* in potential negative doubling contexts is much higher in the poetry than in the majority of the prose, with the exception of prose works by Wulfstan. This is shown in Table 6.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th></th>
<th>Subordinate clauses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ne..any</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>ne..any</td>
<td>Total %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coandrea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cobeowul</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cobrunan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cochrist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cocynew</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>codream</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coexeter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coexodus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cogenesi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cokentis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cometboe</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cophoeni</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coriddle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.9: The distribution of *any* in clauses with *ne* versus multiple negation with *ne* in the OE poetry corpus
Mitchell (1985§1629) speculates that the demands of alliteration may affect the distribution of multiple negation in the poetry. He hypothesises that the use of *ænig* and *æfre* facilitates alliteration. A word with an initial vowel can alliterate with a word with any other initial vowel. Words with initial *n*- can only alliterate with words with an initial *n*- . Thus the range of possible alliteration is much greater with *ænig* and *æfre*, and the need for alliteration in the early poetry may be a factor in their more frequent use. However, Mitchell (1985) is ambivalent about the value of this hypothesis. He discusses several cases where alliteration may play a role in the choice of *ænig, æfre* over *nænig, næfre*, but also observes instances of *ænig* and *æfre* which do not alliterate. He concludes:

...that the fact that multiple negation was less common in the poetry than in the prose is due partly, but not entirely, to the demands of alliteration...

(Mitchell 1985, §1613)

Table 6.10 compares the frequency of negative doubling (265-266) with the frequency of *ne...any/ever* (267-270). It includes all potential negative doubling contexts in main and subordinate clauses, and divides the data according to whether *ænig/æfre* or the negative equivalent *nænig/næfre* alliterates with an element in its companion half-line. *Ænig* and *æfre* are most frequent in alliterating contexts (267-270), whilst *ænig, æfre* and *nænig, næfre* occur in roughly equal measure in other contexts (271-273), where other syllables alliterate. In these examples, ‘/’ represents a half-line break. ‘//’ represents a line break. The alliterating elements under examination are italicised.

(267) Nolde  *eorla* hleo / *ænige* þinga / þone cwealmcuman / NEG-wished earl’s protector / any thing / the death-bringer / cwicne forlætan, // alive / release //

‘The protector of earls did not wish in any way to release the bringer of death alive’

(cobeowul, 26.791.678)

(268) ne  meahte horde neah / *unbyrnende* / *ænige* hwile / deep NEG could / hoard near / without burning / any time / deep gedygan / for dracan lege. // endure / for dragon’s fire //
'he could not endure the depths near the hoard for any length of time because of the dragon's fire'
(cobeowul,79.2546.2081)

(269) Hio him ondsware / ænige ne meahton // agifan togenes / They him answer / any NEG could // give in reply / 'They could not give him any answer in reply'
(cycnew:ELENE,70.166.259)

(270) Ne þearf ic ænigre / are wenan // on woruldrice, / NEG need I any / glory hope // in earth's kingdom / 'I need not hope for any glory on earth'
(cogenesi,33.1022.263)

(271) Ñæbbe ic synne wið hie, // facna ænig / gefremed gena. // NEG-have I sin with them, // crimes any / committed now' // 'I have committed no sin, nor any crimes with them now'
(cogenesi,79.2651.643)

(272) Naes þæt yðe ceap // to gegangenne / gumena ænigum. NEG-was that easy bargain / to obtain // man-DAT any 'That was not an easy bargain to obtain for any man'
(cobeowul,75.2415.1968)

(273) þæt þu þinne mægðhad / meotude brohtes, // sealdes butan that you your chastity / God offered // gift without synnum. / Nan swylc ne cwom // ænig ðer / ofer ealle men, sin. / No such NEG satisfied // any other / of all men 'that you offered your chastity to God, a gift without sin. No such a one satisfied any other man'
(cochrist:CHRIST_I,11.290.197)

The distribution in Table 6.10 indicates that alliterating contexts highly favour the use of ænig, æfre, but alliteration does not entirely account for the higher frequency of these forms in poetry than in prose. Table 6.10 supports Mitchell (1985, §1613). There are two differences between poetry and prose which could potentially account for the different frequencies of negative doubling: dialect and date. Fulk (1992) localises most of the poetry to the Anglian dialect, and dates much of it earlier than the extant OE prose. There is one notable exception in the York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry: the Meters of Boethius, which is described as 9th or 10th century West Saxon. This is the text with the highest
The frequency of negative doubling, on both measures I have investigated.\textsuperscript{5}

The frequency of multiple negation is typically much lower in the poetry than in the prose. However, there are exceptional texts which indicate that a split on the basis of genre might not be appropriate. Furthermore, the requirement of alliteration alone does not account for the lower frequency of multiple negation in the poetry. Comparison with the OE prose data shows a situation which is not entirely uniform: the OE Bede is anomalous on both measures of negative doubling, and texts by Wulfstan have an abnormally high frequency of xenig, xfre. Both these texts are said to have features of the Anglian dialect. The data from these texts might support the view that there is a dialect split in the patterns of negative doubling, but this must remain speculative in the absence of sufficient unambiguous data.

There are two groups of texts in Old English with respect to multiple negation. It will be the purpose of subsequent sections to provide a syntactic characterisation of both groups. The evidence from Old English is problematic for the analysis of multiple negation proposed by Rowlett (1998). Rowlett (1998) pro-

\textsuperscript{5}Turning to negative spread, there are no examples of negative spread in the York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry data. There are 8 examples of clauses containing a negative phrase plus xenig, xfre.
poses to link the availability of multiple negation to the position of a language on Jespersen's Cycle. The variation in multiple negation in early English prose and poetry is not directly linked to Jespersen's Cycle: clauses with the negative head *ne* exhibit variability in multiple negation, as do Late Middle English clauses without *ne*. So, how does multiple negation relate to Jespersen's Cycle? In section 6.3.3, I will discuss Rowlett's proposed link between multiple negation and Jespersen's Cycle in detail, outlining some of the problems with his account, and considering some alternatives. Before discussing Rowlett (1998), however, the next section will outline the two major approaches to multiple negation within the Principles and Parameters framework.

### 6.3 Syntactic analyses of multiple negation

Several syntactic accounts of multiple negation have been proposed in the literature (Haegeman and Zanuttini 1996, Ladusaw 1992, Deprez 1997, Giannakidou 2000, Brown 1999). These analyses fall into two groups. First, those in which concordant negatives bear semantically interpretable negative features, and under which multiple negation arises from particular syntactic configurations (Haegeman and Zanuttini 1996, Rowlett 1998). Second, those in which concordant negatives do not bear semantically interpretable negative features but are licensed within the scope of negation, like PDE negative polarity items (Ladusaw 1992; 1993, Deprez 1997, Giannakidou 2000). Early English multiple negation provides a new perspective from which to evaluate these two approaches: how well they accommodate the observed variation and change in multiple negation.

#### 6.3.1 The Neg-criterion and negative absorption

Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) propose to account for negative doubling under the Neg-criterion (see section 1.3.3). For them, the relationship between a negative adjunct or argument is the same spec-head relation which holds between the negators in the bipartite *ne...not* form. However, negative doubling between *ne* and negative arguments or adjuncts does not always result in negative adjuncts or negative arguments occupying the same surface position as secondary negators. In order to account for this fact, the Neg-criterion may apply at LF. The Neg-criterion approach makes parallel the structural analysis of *ne...not* and negative doubling.
This parallel is reflected in the diachronic behaviour of the two phenomena in the Middle English period at the point when both *ne* is lost simultaneously from bipartite *ne...not* negation and from negative doubling (see section 5.7.2). The featural account of spec-head agreement between negatives which I proposed in chapter four to account for bipartite *ne...not* could be extended to account for negative doubling (274). This approach gains syntactic unity between all bipartite forms of negation. Furthermore, there is some evidence that negative arguments may move, to a position which van der Wurff (1999a), Ingham (2000) argue is spec,NegP, thus forming at spellout the spec-head configuration required for feature checking. Under this approach *ne* in negative doubling and in bipartite *ne...not* is a morphological agreement marker with no LF interpretation. This is similar in spirit to van der Wouden's (1994) proposal that the semantic function of the negative marker in negative doubling is one of the identity function. This account extends the proposal of chapter 4 that there are two types of *ne*, and that *ne* is only eliminated at PF when it has no interpretable features.

(274) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NegP} \\
/ \quad / \\
\text{neg argument/adjunct [pol: neg]} & \text{Neg'} \\
\text{ne [pol:]} & \text{XP}
\end{array}
\]

This account cannot be correct as it stands, however. It relies on a one to one specifier head relation to satisfy the Neg-criterion or value the unvalued [pol:] feature on the negative head. The account ignores the co-occurrence of negative arguments and/or negative adjuncts. Negative arguments and adjuncts can co-occur with each other in clauses with and without the negative head *ne*. In order for negative spread to be licensed, the Neg-criterion, or its feature checking equivalent, must hold between all the concordant negative phrases and the negative head. The Neg-criterion is insufficient on its own to account for negative spread. The feature checking proposal I make in chapters four and five establishes a one to one syntactic dependency between the unvalued features of a head and matching valued features of its specifier. Multiple movement to spec,NegP is unmotivated for feature checking reasons. Even if multiple specifiers of NegP were licit, we need some mechanism to convert several instances of the feature [pol: neg] on the multiple specifiers into a single instance of that feature, in order to derive a multiple negation reading rather than a logical double negation reading.
There are two approaches to dealing with this problem proposed in the literature: the licensing approaches (Ladusaw 1992, Deprez 1997, Giannakidou 2000) which treat concordant negative words as negative polarity items without negative features, and the negative factorisation or absorption approach (Haegeman and Zanuttini 1996) which takes all negative XPs to be interpretable as negative at LF. The latter approach faces the problem of semantic non-compositionality. Under this approach, multiple negation readings arise through a particular syntactic configuration. All negative arguments and adjuncts are subject to the Neg-criterion, moving to spec, NegP at LF in which position all negative arguments and adjuncts form a complex specifier, and the negative force of the individual component negative phrases is factored out. Absorption is a non-compositional approach to multiple negation under which not every LF interpretable negative feature introduced into the syntax survives to be interpreted at LF. Absorption or factorisation eliminates features on certain lexical items which are interpretable at LF. Chomsky (1995, 27) bars such operations by the Principle of Full Interpretation.

From a language change perspective, Neg-absorption raises further problems. Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) characterise negative absorption as a principle of interpretation at LF. Languages with and without multiple negation differ in the application of this principle, for reasons which are not made clear. Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) hypothesise that multiple negation languages have spec-head agreement within the functional projection NegP, whilst double negation languages lack NegP. The Agreement in NegP (the Neg-criterion) is then parametrised to only apply in certain languages where there is morphological or syntactic evidence for it. The difference between double negation and multiple negation languages follows if negative absorption is made contingent on agreement within NegP. However, it is not clear how this follows from Haegeman & Zanuttini's (1996) account, or how negative absorption should be parameterised. Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) consider the possibility that negative absorption is parameterised to apply only when a negative word has [neg] features on its head. In section 6.5.1, I propose an alternative account of multiple negation as feature checking in which the availability of multiple negation is determined by the morphosyntactic features of negative words.

Multiple negation is lost in the history of Standard English. The potential for negative absorption within the language must change. However, it seems contrary to Principles and Parameters approaches to claim that the mechanisms of
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semantic interpretation change during the history of a language. Under Chomsky's recent Minimalist proposals, LF interpretative processes are part of the computational component and should remain invariant. Finally, the development of LME negative doubling with spec,NegP not is not predicted by this approach. In a system under which either negative phrases or spec,NegP not mark sentential negation at LF, there is no syntactic motivation to introduce spec,NegP not into clauses which have negative phrases as both have LF interpretable [pol:neg] features. Therefore, the two should be in complementary distribution. Where not co-occurs with other phrasal negatives, double negation should result. This is not the case.

In light of the problems posed by the process of negative absorption, I will not pursue this approach further here. In a Minimalist framework, the problem becomes how to account for multiple negation whilst maintaining semantic compositionality, and accommodating parametric variation and change in the availability of multiple negation. Compositionality enforces the conclusion that only one of the negatives in any clause with multiple negation can actually bear a negative interpretation at LF. Haegeman (1995, 185) proposes that the Neg-criterion holds between a negative head and a null spec,NegP operator which licenses negative adjuncts and arguments within its scope by binding. The operator receives a negative interpretation at LF, and satisfies the Neg-criterion. The implication is that the negative words bound by this operator do not themselves contribute a negative interpretation at LF. They are interpreted with reference to the operator which binds them. In order for this approach to work, the only interpretable negative element must be the null operator. The negative arguments and adjuncts must be negative in morphology only, and subject to licensing conditions on their distribution. Two questions follow. First, how to characterise the licensed elements both semantically and syntactically. Second, how to define appropriate syntactic or semantic licensing conditions.

6.3.2 Concordant negatives as negative polarity items (NPIs)

Ladusaw (1992) discusses the problems which multiple negation poses for semantic compositionality. He proposes that negative words are ambiguous between negative quantifier and negative polarity item (NPI) interpretations. They are negative quantifiers in logical double negation languages, and NPIs in multiple negation languages. Ladusaw (1992) proposes that the negation which is
interpreted by the semantics in multiple negation languages is in fact an abstract category rather than a morphologically realised one. The abstract category is able to be abstract precisely because of the NPIs which it licenses. Further work on the hypothesis of concordant negatives as NPIs has moved to a more morphologically concrete position. Both Deprez (1997) and Giannakidou (2000) argue that the licensor of negation in a multiple negation clause is the negative marker, and it is this which is semantically interpreted at LF. They maintain Ladusaw's idea that concordant negatives are NPIs licensed by the negative marker. Where Deprez (1997) and Giannakidou (2000) differ is in their analysis of the nature of the concordant negatives. Deprez (1997) argues that concordant negatives are indefinites, subject to the same licensing conditions as NPIs such as English any-forms at spellout. Giannakidou (2000) argues that concordant negatives, whilst being NPIs are not indefinites but quantifiers. She argues that concordant negatives have the distribution of quantifiers, being subject to strict locality, syntactic island constraints, and undergoing quantifier raising. Section 6.4.3 will apply arguments from this literature to show that the distribution of concordant negatives in Middle English is more highly constrained than the distribution of NPIs.

The problem with these approaches to multiple negation as NPI licensing is that they do not discuss negative spread in detail. However, I propose that variation between negative quantifier and NPI interpretations of negative words in Middle English derives the observed patterns of multiple negation, and can also explain the eventual loss of multiple negation in Early Modern English. In section 6.4.1 I will apply the NPI licensing approach to multiple negation in the history of English, paying particular attention to the relationship between Jespersen's Cycle and multiple negation. I will discuss Rowlett (1998) in detail, and show that a model which takes concordant negatives to be negative polarity items (NPIs) lends itself to the observed variation and change in multiple negation in English. The diachronic transience of negative spread in English will be accounted for under this model. Negative spread emerges only when ne is lost, then is only productive for around 250-300 years, during which time its use is variable and declining (see Nevalainen (1996)).

6.3.3 Multiple negation and Jespersen's Cycle: Rowlett (1998)

Rowlett (1998) connects the availability of multiple negation and the position of a language with regard to Jespersen's Cycle, developing an observation made by
There is one very important observation to be made, without which I do not think we shall be able to understand the matter, namely that repeated negation [multiple negation] becomes an habitual phenomenon in those languages only in which the ordinary negative element is comparatively small in phonetic bulk... If this repetition is rarer in modern English and German than it was formerly, one of the reasons probably is that the fuller negative not and nicht have taken the place of the smaller ne and en.

(Jespersen 1924, 333)

Rowlett formulates this syntactically as Jespersen’s Generalisation (275).

(275) Jespersen’s Generalisation

A language is an NC [negative concord, or multiple negation] language iff the regular marker of pure sentential negation is not associated with spec,NegP.

(Rowlett 1998, 87, ex.2)

Jespersen’s Generalisation makes predictions about the availability of multiple negation, not only in particular clauses, but in a language as a whole. As not gains ground as a sentential negator in the Middle English period, multiple negation should be lost in parallel with the introduction of not under Jespersen’s Cycle. Jespersen’s Generalisation predicts that multiple negation should only occur in Old and Early Middle English when the sentential negative marker is unsupported ne. The loss of the negative head ne leads to a sharp decrease in negative doubling in Late Middle English. However, it does not lead to the outright loss of negative doubling. Some examples appear with ne...not or not. If not is a sentential negator in these examples, they are counter-examples to Jespersen’s Generalisation.⁶

⁶Haegeman & Zanuttini’s (1996) proposals relate multiple negation and Jespersen’s Cycle differently. For them, multiple negation declines with the loss of the negative head in the transition from stage two to stage three of Jespersen’s Cycle, rather than with the introduction of not at stage two. Negative doubling with not and negative spread in Middle English are problematic for this analysis too, as these forms of multiple negation do not involve a morphologically overt negative head. For ME to be consistent with this analysis, a null negative head is required.
Second, negative spread must be considered. This refers to the co-occurrence of two negative arguments and/or adjuncts. Late Middle English marks sentential negation using *not*, yet in clauses with the relevant indefinites which are potential contexts for negative spread, negative spread is the norm in LME.

Negative spread is the norm irrespective of the presence (276) or absence (277) of the negative head *ne*. If there is any connection between the introduction of *not* and the loss of negative spread, it must be indirect.

(276) a. nan mann næfðæ swæþeh mane mihte þurh hine sylfne
   no man NEG-has however no strength through him self
   'however, no man has any strength of himself'
   (coaelhom,+AHom_22:672.3699)

b. Ne deð nan man nan þing on diglum
   NEG does no man no thing in secret
   'No man does anything in secret'
   (cowsgosp,Jn_[Wscp]:7.4.6259)

c. nan cristen man ne sceal þæt gelyfan
   no Christian man NEG ought that believe
   'no Christian man ought believe that'
   (cocathomi,+ACHom_I, _20:340.145.3982)

(277) a. For or now, I found never no knyght that matched me
   'for before now, I never found any knight who matched me.'
   (CMMALORY,68.2331)

b. ȝe had neuyr no knowlach of me be-fore þis time
   you had never no knowledge of me before this time'
   'You never had any knowledge of me before this time.'
   (CMKEMPE,58.1293)

c. no man seyd no-thyng a-geyns hem
   no man said nothing against him
   'no man said anything against him'
   (CMKEMPE,33.730)

This situation runs counter to Jespersen’s Generalisation. Middle English is a language with a spec,NegP sentential negator *not*, yet this sentential negator co-occurs with a productive system of multiple negation. One solution is to relate Jespersen’s Generalisation to subsets of clauses such that there are two grammars in competition which realise both options under Jespersen’s Generalisation.
We might expect competition between these two grammars to derive Jespersen’s Cycle and the loss of multiple negation simultaneously. Multiple negation will be lost as the grammar with sentential negator not gradually takes over. However, the persistence of multiple negation into Early Modern English, when not is firmly established as a sentential negator is anomalous, as is the use of not in multiple negation. The time lag between the introduction of not as a sentential negator and the loss of multiple negation may indicate that multiple negation contexts are a separate context for the change in the locus of NEG-features from head to specifier of NegP. However under Rowlett’s account, licensing of multiple negation after the morpheme ne is lost requires a null head with LF-interpretable NEG-features, something I argued against in chapter 5.7 Ingham (2004, 161ff) argues for this approach to negative spread, and for negative doubling with not. Arguing that the Neg° in negative doubling with not is actually the locus of NEG-features, implies that the morpheme not does not in fact bear NEG-features in these constructions, and is not a sentential negator. This is anomalous with its use as a sentential negator elsewhere. This finding is at odds with Ingham’s account of multiple negation, and sufficient motivation to search for an account which does not make reference to NEG-features on the null Neg°.

Three more criticisms of Rowlett’s account of Jespersen’s Generalisation call it into question. First, this account does not explain the loss of negative spread in clauses in which not is absent. Second, it predicts no clauses with a mixture of multiple negation and NPIs. Although I have found no such examples in my Middle English data, Nevalainen (1996) gives some Early Modern English examples (278).

There shall no poore neghbore of myne berre no losse by eny chance...
There shall no poor neighbour of mine bear no loss by any event...
‘No neighbour of mine shall bear any loss in any event…’
(MORE Thomas More 423 (1529), Nevalainen (1996, 268, ex.3a))

Third, loss of the negative head ne leads to the development of a form of negative doubling with not. Late Middle English provides some apparent counter-examples to Jespersen’s Generalisation. These are clauses in which not co-occurs with negative adjuncts (279) or arguments (280). If Jespersen’s Generalisation holds, then in examples of multiple negation with not, not cannot be a sentential

7There, I argued that the PF realisation of the negative head as ne was only eliminated when ne became an agreement morpheme with unvalued [pol:] features. The loss of LF interpretability was found to be a precondition for the loss of the morpheme ne at PF.
negator. In order for these clauses to accord with Jespersen's Generalisation, it must be an adjoined adverb, or the negative head (Neg°).

(279) And thenn our soverayne myght not no longer hyde his maryage
and then our sovereign might not no longer hide his marriage
'and then our sovereign might no longer hide his marriage'
(CMGREGOR,227.2288)

(280) he schuld not begynne no werre withoute the same councell
he ought not begin no war without the same advice
'he ought not to begin any war without the same advice'
(CMCAPCHR,137.3171)

This form of negative doubling indicates that a syntactic account enforcing complementary distribution of not and multiple negation is empirically inadequate. Interestingly, the frequency of negative doubling with not (n=137/145 or 94%) is much higher than the frequency of not+anyXP ((ex. 281), n=8/145 or 6%) which is the pattern under Jespersen's Generalisation predicted to involve the sentential negator not.

(281) a. he myst not do ony thing
    he might not do any thing
    'he might not do anything'
    (CMNTEST,IX.20.930)

b. A man may not take ony thing
    A man may not take any thing
    'A man may not take anything'
    (CMNTEST,III.20.222)

For negative doubling with not to be counter to Jespersen's Generalisation requires that not in negative doubling is in spec,NegP rather than an adjoined adverb or a head Neg°. In many examples, not is adjacent to the finite verb and is ambiguous between a spec,NegP position and a clitic or affix on the finite verb (279, 280). However, there are also examples of ne...not co-occurring with negative arguments (282, 283) in which not must be an XP, either in spec,NegP or an adjoined position.

(282) ... thou ne schalt nat seen in no place no thing of yvel
    ... you NEG shall not see in no place no thing of evil
    '... you shall see nothing of evil anywhere'
    (CMBOETH,454.C2.565)
Great grace is it of God when the will of a man or a woman is so firm and rooted fast in God that he may not waiver despite any temptation.

(GMVICES4,106.180)

Whilst all instances of not in these examples are potentially analysable as head (Neg°) or adjoined adverb, the diachrony of not in negative doubling fits with the analysis of not as a sentential negator rather than an adverb or a head. Table 6.11 shows the introduction of not in negative doubling contexts. These data show a gradually increasing frequency of negative doubling with not throughout Middle English, which is consistent with the introduction of the sentential negator not in other contexts. The final three columns show the frequency of not in the three sentential negation contexts discussed in chapter 5 for comparison. The introduction of multiple negation with not is most clear in the context of ‘PP+negative quantifier’, but is also seen in the context of negative NPs. Table 6.11 takes two negative doubling contexts, showing the frequency of negative doubling with not as a proportion of the total negative doubling context (involving both ne and/or not).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Negative NP</th>
<th>PP+negative Q</th>
<th>% not in sentential negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11: The distribution of not in negative doubling contexts compared with its distribution in sentential negation contexts.

There is a clear move towards negative doubling with not in Late Middle English. We can see that although the overall frequency of not is much lower in negative doubling contexts than in sentential negation contexts, there is a consistent increase in the use of not across negative doubling contexts. This patterning is not consistent with the distribution of adjoined adverbs or of not as the negative head (which I argued is available in less than 5% of Late Middle English clauses, in section 5.3.3). The LME incidence of not in negative doubling is more common than either the incidence of adjoined adverb not or head not at the same
Neither the adjoined adverb or Neg° analyses of not predict the observed gradual increase in not in negative doubling seen in Middle English. The gradual introduction of not in negative doubling is consistent with the introduction of not as a spec, NegP sentential negator under Jespersen's Cycle, as a consequence of competition between ne [pol: neg] and ne [pol: ] (see chapter 5). The diachronic evidence points to the same change in negative doubling contexts as in sentential negation contexts, the introduction of not as a consequence of Jespersen's Cycle.

The analysis of ne... not I gave in chapters three and four makes clear that not is introduced in spec, NegP for the purposes of marking negation at LF. The fact that not is introduced in negative doubling as part of Jespersen's Cycle is an argument against Jespersen's Generalisation. This is also an argument for analysing at least some negative NPs and PPs as lacking [neg] features. Under my account of Jespersen's Cycle, not is introduced in order to provide a valued [pol: neg] feature for interpretation at LF. Therefore, the introduction of not in negative doubling implies that the concordant negative NP or PP does not have sufficient [pol: neg] features of its own to mark negation at LF.

Whilst the examples of not in negative doubling are structurally ambiguous in all instances, the crucial point is that the distribution of not in Late Middle English is not as Jespersen's Generalisation predicts particularly when viewed from a diachronic perspective. Rowlett's analysis predicts the loss of negative doubling as a consequence of the introduction of not in spec, NegP. His account predicts the emergence of negative doubling with not, only when not is reanalysed as a head.

However, Middle English provides no evidence of a stage without negative doubling which would be consistent with the use of not in spec, NegP under Jespersen's Generalisation. Instead, the introduction of not in negative doubling coincides with the introduction of not elsewhere under Jespersen's Cycle (see Table 6.11), albeit that not is less favoured in negative doubling contexts than elsewhere.

Given the standard cyclic development of sentential negation the shift from ne to ne... not and not should produce a corresponding shift away from multiple negation under Jespersen's Generalisation, and a return to it as not becomes a head. There is no historical evidence for the cyclic shift away from and return to multiple negation. The interaction of Jespersen's Cycle and Jespersen's Generalisation is schematised in Table 6.12 and compared to the observed developments in Middle English.

There should be a stage when ne... not and not co-occur with any- NPIs before a return to negative doubling contingent on the reanalysis of not as a head. The
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{| Stage | Jespersen's Generalisation | Observed Middle English |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EME</td>
<td><em>ne ...neg XP</em></td>
<td><em>ne ...neg XP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td><em>ne...not ...any- NPI XP</em></td>
<td><em>(ne)...not ...neg XP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMnE</td>
<td><em>not ...negative XP</em></td>
<td><em>not ...any- NPI XP</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.12: Patterns of multiple negation predicted under Jespersen’s Generalisation (Rowlett 1998), and observed in the historical English data.

LME data do not bear out this diachronic scenario. There are very few examples of *any*-NPIs in the scope of *not* in LME (284), far fewer instances (n=8) than there are of *not* in negative doubling (n=137).

(284) \textit{that God may not judge erroneously any man}  
\textit{‘that God may not judge any man erroneously’}  
\textit{(CMWYCSER,I,237.255)}

The failure of Middle English to observe the predicted diachronic development indicates that Rowlett’s proposed correlation between Jespersen’s Cycle and multiple negation is not appropriate. Change under Jespersen’s Cycle apparently pre-dates the introduction of *any*-NPIs into negative contexts in the history of English. The empirical facts lead to the conclusion that multiple negation is not directly linked to Jespersen’s Cycle under Jespersen’s Generalisation (Rowlett 1998, 87), and constitute an argument against a syntactic analysis which makes spec,NegP *not* structurally incompatible with negative arguments and adjuncts. This conclusion is not only based on the appearance of a negative doubling with *not* at an early stage of Jespersen’s Cycle, which is not predicted, but also on the non-occurrence of the predicted patterns involving spec,NegP *not+any*-NPIs. Early Modern English witnesses the loss of both negative doubling with *not* and the loss of negative spread (Nevalainen 1996). Jespersen’s Generalisation provides no account for the emergence of loss of negative doubling with *not*, as it is the introduction of *not* itself which is proposed to lead to the loss of multiple negation under this account.

Rowlett (1998) notes languages which are exceptions to Jespersen’s Generalisation, which he seeks to accommodate within the syntactic analysis. In order to establish whether early English can be accommodated by his proposals, I will first outline Rowlett’s syntactic analysis. Rowlett distinguishes the first stage of Jespersen’s Cycle from later stages by the position of [neg] features within NegP. At stage one [neg] is associated with the head position. At stages two and three,
the [neg] feature is associated with the specifier position. Crucial to Rowlett’s approach are the ways in which negation takes scope. He argues (following Progovac (1994)) that scope relations between two negatives are determined by A’-binding. Hence the negative head does not interact scopally with negative arguments or adjuncts which it C-commands, whilst the spec,NegP negative marker does, by virtue of its A’-position. A negative argument or adjunct A’-bound by spec,NegP not should therefore yield an interpretation of logical double negation rather than being interpreted as a single instance of sentential negation (as in multiple negation). See Rowlett (1998, 120ff) for more details of the analysis. Rowlett’s account runs into another problem: as A’-binding is required for a double negation reading, his account provides no reason why negative spread between arguments in A-positions is lost in Early Modern English.

West Flemish is one of the exceptions to Jespersen’s Generalisation. The sentential negative marker is nie. Nie can co-occur with negative arguments and adjuncts (285). Rowlett (1998, 127ff) observes that the concordant negatives all move to positions to the left of not. He follows Haegeman (1995) in claiming that this movement is necessary for the negatives to take sentential scope. Movement is to spec,NegP where negative absorption takes place. Negative absorption is an operation proposed by Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) under which the [neg] features of negatives with the same scope are factored out, leaving a single [neg] feature in spec,NegP.

(285) da Valere [an niemand] [niets] [nie] gezeid (en-) oat

that Valere to no-one nothing not said NEG had

‘that Valere hadn’t said anything to anyone’

(Haegeman 1995, 133, ex.40a)

Rowlett argues that there are configurational constraints on multiple negation in West Flemish which demonstrate that it is not a generalised multiple negation language. Multiple negation is only available when all negative and arguments move to spec,NegP and undergo negative absorption. There are no such configurational constraints on the co-occurrence of not and negative arguments in Middle English. In most examples not C-commands the negative argument (280-283). The overt multiple movement of West Flemish is not found in Middle English. While there is nothing to stop negative arguments and adjuncts from achieving the configuration required for negative absorption at LF by covert movement, admitting this possibility would render Jespersen’s Generalisation vacuous, as LF operations could be invoked to deal with any exceptions. Therefore, propos-
ing that all ME negatives move to spec, NegP at LF does not seem an attractive solution.

Some of Rowlett’s syntactic assumptions do not translate well into a more Minimalist framework. Jespersen’s Generalisation is a configurational account of multiple negation which assumes, controversially, that scope relations are a product of A’-binding relations. If a more standard view of scope relations, based on C-command, is adopted, the syntactic basis of Jespersen’s Generalisation is unformulable. ME data challenge the binding approach to multiple negation. Under Rowlett’s analysis one negative cannot A'-bind another. Jespersen’s Generalisation follows from the fact that negative operators such as not are in an A’-position, whereas negative heads are not in an A’-position. Contrary to the predictions of Rowlett’s (1998, 122) account of negative spread, ME negative spread is licit when one of the negatives is in an A’-position. For example, the adverb never in an A’-adjoined position can enter into negative spread with a negative object (286).

(286)  

a. ye had neuyr no knowlach of me be-fore pis tyme
  you had never no knowledge of me before this time
  ‘You never had any knowledge of me before this time’
  (CMKEMPE, 58.1293)

b. for they aske never nothynge of me
   for they ask never nothing of me
   ‘for they never ask anything of me’
   (CMMALORY, 668.4914)

Conversely, an account based on A’-binding can never eliminate the possibility of negative spread between two arguments in A-positions (Rowlett 1998, 122), although we see from Nevalainen (1996) that such negative spread is lost in Early Modern English. Rowlett’s account allows for negative spread between negative arguments, but provides no mechanism for parametric variation in negative spread in these contexts. His account does not accommodate the change seen between ME and Present Day Standard English. The distinction between ways of scope taking which Rowlett proposes is at odds with most other accounts of negative or quantifier scope. The simplest view of scope is defined on occurrences of LF interpretable features using the C-command relation. A [neg] feature which C-commands another [neg] feature takes scope over it (Ladusaw 1992, Giannakidou 2000, Roberts and Roussou 2003). This is the simplest view in a Minimalist framework where C-command is a primitive. It also respects semantic composi-
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... tionality: a clause with one [neg] feature is interpreted as negative, a clause with two [neg] features is a logical double negative and so on.

I propose that all multiple negation clauses have only one [neg] feature, to distinguish them from logical double negation which involves two or more [neg] features, one taking scope over the other. Therefore it follows that some of the morphologically negative words in multiple negation are negative in form only, and lack [pol: neg] features. The analysis of negative doubling with *not*, and negative spread in Late Middle English requires some of the negative words to be negative in form only, and lack [pol: neg] features. I have already argued that *ne* in the *ne...not* construction is one such negative word. The appearance of the sentential negator *not* in negative doubling indicates that at least some ME negative quantifiers require an analysis as lexical items underspecified for polarity, which are licensed by sentential negation. In the context of these quantifiers, when *ne* becomes insufficient to mark sentential negation itself, *not* is introduced.

Rowlett's analysis of French makes use of these polarity underspecified words to circumvent the restrictions on multiple negation which the analysis imposes. French is another exception to Jespersen's Generalisation. Rowlett (1998, 131ff) argues that those modern French negative arguments and adjuncts which appear in multiple negation are not really negatives, and are subject to licensing conditions similar to those licensing negative polarity items. Hence these polarity underspecified words can co-occur in a language which has a spec,NegP marker. Co-occurrence of *not* with *nothing, no-one* is attested in Middle English. Extending Rowlett's analysis of French to Middle English requires negative arguments (*nothing, no one*) and adjuncts (*no longer*) to lack [neg] features in Middle English in those cases where *nothing, no-one* co-occur with spec,NegP *not*, in contrast to their Present Day standard English counterparts.

A change in the features of negative arguments and adjuncts is sufficient in the Early Modern English period to account for the loss of multiple negation in all contexts. Negative arguments and adjuncts go from being underspecified for polarity and licensed by a superordinate negative, to having LF interpretable [pol:neg] features and thereby being self-licensing, and required to appear outside the context of a superordinate negation. The question is why this change should occur in LME and Early Modern English as it does.

Middle English offers little evidence that the introduction of *not* leads to loss of multiple negation in the way that Rowlett (1998) proposes. Jespersen's Generalisation does not fully explain the loss of multiple negation in Middle English.
However, the relationship between Jespersen’s Cycle and the availability of multiple negation remains an open issue. Haegeman and Zanuttini (1996) propose that a negative head is present in all multiple negation languages. In section 6.5.1, I recast this idea in a Minimalist framework, arguing that syntactic agreement is required in multiple negation languages. However, it is not clear that a negative head is required to facilitate this agreement in all instances of multiple negation.

In this section, I demonstrated that Jespersen’s Generalisation does not adequately characterise the diachronic interaction of Jespersen’s Cycle and multiple negation in Middle English. The appearance of multiple negation is independent of the introduction of not and the loss of ne. We need an account of its loss which is less dependent on changes in sentential negation strategies. ME provides insufficient data to examine the loss of multiple negation in any detail. Further study of the loss of multiple negation using Early Modern English corpora will illustrate the relationship between the loss of multiple negation and Jespersen’s Cycle more clearly in the diachronic data, and provide more detail concerning the loss of multiple negation and the factors conditioning the change. Nevalainen (1996) identifies extralinguistic factors relevant to this change, including the changing social evaluation of multiple negation in certain social groups.

The next section proposes an alternative account of the loss of multiple negation based on grammatical competition between competing forms of negative words: one set which are lexically specified as negative, the other which are underspecified for polarity. At present, these proposals should be regarded as hypotheses which require further empirical support using data from later periods of English. Here, I show that the ME situation provides a different perspective on the syntax of multiple negation and its loss in English within the Minimalist framework.

6.4 Middle English multiple negation and grammar competition

6.4.1 Jespersen’s Cycle and multiple negation

We have seen that configurational accounts of multiple negation such as Jespersen’s Generalisation (Rowlett 1998) do not address the variation and change
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in Middle English multiple negation. Here I propose that the facts are more consistent with treating multiple negation as a subcase of NPI licensing (Ladusaw 1992). Giannakidou (2000, 463) proposes that only negative markers (such as early English ne and not) are negative in multiple negation languages. Other negatives are negative in morphological form only (concordant negatives). This accounts for the replacement of Neg° by spec,NegP not in multiple negation when ne becomes insufficient to mark negation. Without a sentential negative marker concordant negatives are not licensed.

In negative doubling clauses a sentential negator licenses a concordant negative word, irrespective of whether the sentential negator is ne or not. This is the situation which held throughout Old English and Early Middle English, when negative NPs, PPs or adverbs always co-occurred with ne. The shift from ne to not in negative doubling is simply a context of Jespersen's Cycle. not is required when ne becomes underspecified for polarity [pol: ] , as an alternative means to mark negation at LF. The concordant NP or PP is also underspecified for polarity and needs to be licensed by a [pol:neg] feature, so not is introduced. Under this account, I predict that all negative NPs or PPs must occur in negative doubling, with a [pol:neg] element, either ne, or when ne loses its [pol:neg] features, with not. However, the overall frequency with which negative quantifiers or adverbials co-occur with not in LME (Table 6.5) does not bear out this hypothesis. Negative doubling with not does not account for more than 3% of clauses with negative words. After the loss of ne, negative doubling with not is a minority pattern. The more typical pattern is for the negative quantifier or adverbial to be the only negative word in the clause.

This situation is explained if we assume that Middle English has two grammars, one which allows multiple negation, the other which does not. The grammar which permits negative doubling with ne or not is one of the two grammars involving negative words in Middle English. In the other grammar, negative words are not licensed by a negative marker, but are self-licensing negative quantifiers which negate clauses on their own. The majority of clauses without ne, in which negative NPs or PPs are the sole negative word, represent the latter grammar. Their distribution is consistent with them having LF interpretable negative features themselves, unlike concordant negatives. Therefore, I propose that both types of negative word are available in Middle English, those which are lexically

---

8I use the term licensed in a broad sense. The exact mechanism by which concordant negatives are licensed is discussed in section 6.5.1.
specified [pol:neg] and those which are not.9

This hypothesis differs from Jespersen's Generalisation proposed by Rowlett (1998). Jespersen's Generalisation describes two grammatical options, but aligns these two grammatical options with the availability of the sentential negator not. Under my hypothesis the availability of the multiple negation and non-multiple negation grammars is not connected to the introduction of not. So the question to be addressed is why ME shifts from one option to the other.

In contrast, Old English provides more evidence for lexically underspecified negative words. All co-occur with ne, and we know from patterns of sentential negation in which ne negates a clause on its own, that ne has the feature [pol:neg].10 However, we also know that Jespersen's Cycle introduces a form of ne which is underspecified for negation [pol:]. We see that this featural change has no overt manifestation in most negative doubling contexts unlike sentential negation contexts, although we have seen that it leads to the introduction of not in some instances of negative doubling. On the evidence of negative doubling with not, I propose that the feature change underlying Jespersen's Cycle happens in multiple negation contexts too. This has the advantage of unifying sentential and multiple negation.11 I assume that a change will happen uniformly in all contexts, unless there is evidence to the contrary. However, the manifestation of this change is different in sentential and multiple negation clauses. In multiple negation clauses, the loss of [pol: neg] features on ne under Jespersen's Cycle results in strings like (287) which are ambiguous. These clauses provide evidence for two alternative licensing conditions on multiple negation, one in which ne licenses the concordant negative word, and one in which the negative word licenses ne. The language learner can assign these clauses one of two representations (287).

(287) a. ne [pol:neg] ... negative word
    b. ne [pol: ] ... negative word[pol:neg]

The loss of [pol: neg] features on ne under Jespersen's Cycle results in reanalysis and competition between two different types of negative word, one type which is self-licensing [pol: neg] and another which is licensed by a superordinate negator. However, the competition between ne [pol: neg] and ne [pol: ] is not

9The morphosyntactic features of concordant negatives will be the subject of section 6.5.1.
10Although we must allow for some negatives with the feature [pol: neg] in cases of constituent negation.
11Unlike the analysis of Jespersen's Cycle proposed by Frisch (1997).
simultaneous with the reanalysis of negative words in all instances. There are
a small number of concordant negative words even at stage two of Jespersen's
Cycle when *ne* has [pol: ] features. In clauses with this type, the requirement for
the clause to contain an LF-interpretable [pol:neg] feature forces the introduction
of *not* as a licensor of both *ne* and the concordant negative word.

This approach facilitates a description of variation and change in Middle En-
GLISH multiple negation as competition between two sets of homophonous lexical
items, one of which is lexically specified for negation, conveys negation at LF,
and is self-licensing rather than requiring licensing by a C-commanding nega-
tive. The second is not lexically specified for negation, does not convey a negative
meaning at LF, and must be licensed by a superordinate negative. These are the
two parametric options which Ladusaw's (1992) account makes available. The
competition between them arises from reanalysis of a string which is rendered
ambiguous by an independent change (*ne* [pol:neg] $\rightarrow$ [pol:], which I argued drove
Jespersen's Cycle chapters 4 and 5). Although Jespersen's Cycle provides the im-
petus for the reanalysis, the subsequent process of competition is independent
of Jespersen's Cycle, as shown by instances of negative doubling with *not*, and
variation and change in the availability of negative spread.

The existence of negative spread provides evidence for two types of negative
word one which is underspecified for negation, the other which is not. Negative
spread follows naturally from this account. The two competing forms of nega-
tive word can co-occur, as the one with [pol:neg] features licenses the one with
[pol:] features. Unlike Ingham (2004) this analysis does not make any recourse
to a null head to license negative spread. Loss of negative doubling with *not*
and loss of negative spread will be simultaneous reflexes of the competition be-
tween the two types of negative words as the competition draws to its end in
Early Modern English. Presumably these contexts, which provide unambiguous
evidence for underspecified negative words will disfavour the use of negatives
with LF interpretable [pol:neg] features throughout the change. Use of *any-* NPIs
in negative contexts will be by default as underspecified negative words are lost.
From a language typology point of view, this account makes negative spread a
consequence of a language having two different types of negative words. Hence
negative spread is typologically marked, a consequence of a language in transit-
ion from having concordant negative words to having non-concordant negative
words.

The present study faces the problem that there are insufficient data show-
ing the loss of multiple negation to investigate its loss. This topic awaits further research using Early Modern English corpora. However, I predict that the frequency of *not* in multiple negation continues to increase only as *ne* [pol:neg] is replaced by *ne* [pol:], so there should be no large scale increase in the use of negative doubling with *not* in Early Modern English once this change is complete. I also predict that the loss of negative doubling and the loss of negative spread should be parallel, as they are reflexes of the same competition between concordant and non-concordant arguments and adjuncts.

The proposed account derives the two patterns of negation attested in Present Day English clauses with indefinites: *no*-negation where the structurally highest indefinite is negated (288), and *not*-negation where the indefinite is realised by an *any*-NPI C-commanded by the negative marker *not* (289). The terminology is taken from Tottie (1991) who examines the variation between these two negation strategies in Present Day English.

(288) He wrote nothing
(289) He didn’t write anything

The Middle English antecedents of this variation are clauses with self-licensing, non-concordant negative words (*no*-negation), and negative doubling with *not* (*not*-negation). *No* negation demonstrates reanalysis of a negative argument or adjunct as [neg] sufficient to mark sentential negation and presumably achieving scope by some form of quantifier raising. *Not* negation indicates the former presence of negative doubling with *not*. This is the only way *not* could be introduced into the context of an indefinite. The replacement of the concordant negatives by an NPI must have happened at a later date when negative doubling with *not* was already established. Future study of Early Modern English should show whether these conjectures are on the right lines. It also remains to be seen whether the factors which influence the PDE distribution of these two negation strategies, such as register (Tottie 1991), also influence the distribution of their Middle English antecedents, and how the variation develops historically.

### 6.4.2 Multiple negation and negative inversion

Nevalainen (1997) observes an Early Modern English increase in subject verb inversion following initial negative phrases such as *never, neither, nor* (290), in the Early Modern English periods of the Helsinki Corpus (1640-1710). See Nevalainen...
(1997, 209) for data and discussion. She correlates this with the loss of multiple negation. My analysis of the loss of multiple negation as grammatical competition throws new light onto this correlation, both changes might be consequences of the development of negative (LF \( \neg \)) quantifiers.

I perceive your opinion of owre monnyes, which dissentyth not partely from others I have herd of beffore; neither dyde I suppose anny better sequele of it

'I perceive your opinion of our money, which does not differ in part from others I have heard before; neither did I suppose any better sequel to it' (CEEC; ANTHONY CAVE 1476, Nevalainen (1997, ex.8))

Initial non-negative phrases behave differently. For the adverb then which robustly triggers inversion of finite verb and pronominal subject throughout Old and Middle English, the frequency of inversion declines in the Early Modern English period to as little as 12% in the mid seventeenth century. Nevalainen (1997) claims that 'Thinking of never as an established adverb one would have expected it to have retained the inversion rule just like the non-negative adverbs' (Nevalainen 1997, 209).

Nevalainen observes that the increase in inversion following initial negatives parallels the loss of multiple negation described in Nevalainen (1996). The account I propose here provides a means of formally unifying these two developments. Both are reflexes of the loss of concordant negatives and their replacement by inherently negative arguments and adjuncts.

Initial negatives come to be interpreted as a monotone decreasing or non-veridical context by virtue of their \([\text{neg}]\) features, acquired as multiple negation is lost. Negative quantifiers replace concordant negatives which are quantificational but not monotone decreasing or non-veridical. The loss of concordant negatives also leads to the loss of multiple negation in the standard language. Quantitative evidence for a link between increased negative inversion and the loss of multiple negation, in the form of the Constant Rate Effect (Kroch 1989), awaits study with Early Modern English corpora. Nevalainen (1997) observes lexical diffusion of inversion following initial negatives. It remains to be seen whether the loss of multiple negation follows the same pattern of lexical diffusion.
6.4.3 Concordant negatives in Middle English: indefinites or quantifiers?

I will now turn my attention to the licensing conditions for concordant negatives, showing that an analysis of concordant negatives as indefinites, parallel to Present Day English negative polarity items (NPIs), does not fully capture the distribution of concordant negatives in Middle English. Ladusaw (1992, 237) asks ‘which of the occurrences of negative phrases in a clause showing negative concord expresses the negation?’ In answering this question, I show that the C-command relation does not hold of concordant negatives and their licensor at spell-out in Middle English. This, along with other properties I discuss, distinguishes concordant negatives from indefinites.

Ladusaw (1992) proposes an abstract expression of negation which does not correspond to any of the morphologically negative formatives, is not necessarily overt, and which is outside VP. He claims that concordant negatives require a licensor which is outside VP, either Neg°, spec, NegP or an element like a negative subject which moves through spec, NegP during the derivation. An element with \([\text{neg}]\) features must C-command concordant negatives in Spanish and Italian, for example (291). I have argued against an approach which requires an abstract operator to license multiple negation, instead making use of morphosyntactic features on morphologically overt lexical items. This has the advantages of compositionality and learnability.

Two analyses of concordant negatives have been proposed: as indefinites (Ladusaw 1992, Deprez 1997) and as quantifiers (Giannakidou 2000). Giannakidou (2000, 472) analyses concordant negatives as universal quantifiers. Giannakidou (2000) distinguishes syntactic and semantic licensing conditions on concordant negatives, in a way which might be useful to distinguish these two possibilities. The licensing conditions on quantifiers and indefinites are different. The quantificational force of quantifiers allows them a measure of syntactic freedom which is not available to indefinites (which are variables without any quantificational force, following Diesing (1997)). For Giannakidou (2000), concordant negatives are quantificational and can move higher than their licensor, providing they are licensed during the derivation. NPIs such as PDE any are indefinites and therefore bound to appear in the scope of existential closure (Diesing 1997).
6.4. Multiple negation and locality

Concordant negatives in Spanish and Italian must be C-commanded by a negative at S-structure (291). Multiple negation is not available when the concordant negative appears outside this configuration, for example when a concordant negative C-commands a negative marker (292). Labov (1972) shows the same subject-object asymmetry holds of any-NPIs in Present Day English. NPIs must be C-commanded by their licensor. All the examples of any I have seen in Middle English negative clauses conform to this pattern too. This is an argument for regarding concordant negatives in Italian as indefinites like English NPI any-.

(291) a. *(Non) ha visto nessuno
    NEG has seen no-one
    ‘I did not see anyone’
    (Italian, Deprez (1997, 55, ex.1))

b. *(no) compre nada
    NEG buy nothing
    ‘I did not buy anything’
    (Spanish, Deprez (1997, 55, ex.1))

(292) a. Nessuno (*non) ha telefonato
    No-one (*NEG) has called
    ‘No-one called’
    (Italian, Deprez (1997, 55, ex.4))

b. Nadie (*no) comio
    No-one (*NEG) ate
    ‘No-one ate’
    (Spanish, Deprez (1997, 55, ex.4))

There is no complementary distribution between sentential negative markers and negative subjects in Middle English (293). They can co-occur with a multiple negation interpretation. This indicates that some negative subjects in ME (293) can be concordant underspecified negative words, licensed by negative doubling with the negative marker not, even though they are not C-commanded by not. ME concordant negatives do not need to be C-commanded at spell-out by a negative which is lexically specified [pol: neg] in order to be licensed. There is no pre-/post-verbal asymmetry unlike in Italian or Spanish. This is an argument for differentiating concordant negatives in Middle English from Italian concordant negatives which are indefinites.
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(293) a. & noman knoweth not the cause
and no-one knows not the cause
‘and no-one knows the cause’
(CMMANDEV,100.2424)

b. For þei seyn þat none so foule synfull men scholde not come in so
For they say that none so foul sinful men should not come in so holy place.
holy place.
‘For they say that no such sinful men should come into such a holy place’
(CMMANDEV,53.1316)

c. and nowther man ne best ne nothing þat bereth lif in him ne
and neither man nor beast nor nothing that bears life in him NEG
may not dyen in þat see
may not die in that sea
‘and neither man nor beast nor anything that bears life may die in that sea’
(CMMANDEV,67.1677)

The relevant licensing conditions on ME concordant negatives can be met during
the derivation, or by LF reconstruction of subjects to their vP internal position C-commanded
by the negative operator. Middle English provides no evidence of C-command as a licensing condition
on concordant negatives at spellout. Concordant negatives have syntactic properties which allow
them to escape vP, unlike indefinites (Diesing 1997). Further evidence of this status comes from
rightward movement of negative objects out of VP (van der Wurff 1999a, Ingham 2000, Pintzuk and
Taylor 2003), such as evidence of their scrambling across adverbs (294). See section 6.4.3. This is
good evidence that ME concordant negatives are quantifiers rather than indefinites.

(294) he ne may noþing wel conne
he NEG can nothing well know
‘he can know nothing well’
(CMAYENBI,117.2247)

Giannakidou (2000) gives several further tests for distinguishing quantifiers and indefinites. Negative polarity items are typically analysed as indefinites. Therefore, a comparison
of the distribution of negative polarity items and negative arguments or adjuncts shows whether negative arguments and adjuncts are
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indefinites. Locality constraints differentiate negative arguments from the negative polarity item any. Any can be licensed in the scope of negation irrespective of intervening finite clause boundaries (295).

(295) I didn’t say that you thought you wanted to badmouth me to anybody
Giannakidou (2000, 471, ex.27)

However, both Giannakidou (2000) and Zeijlstra (2004) observe locality constraints on multiple negation. Multiple negation can be established only across subjunctive, but not indicative clause boundaries. In ME, multiple negation is largely clause bound. There are exceptions to the clause boundedness of multiple negation (Ukaji 1999). These fall into three main groups (Ukaji 1999):

1. The clausal complements of ‘... verbs of predicates expressing belief or opinion: advise, believe, deem, think, trow, ween’ (Ukaji 1999, 284), of predicates expressing modality. Ukaji (1999) lists be pertinent, need, will (main verb) and modal verbs. Finally concordant negatives appear in the clausal complements of verbs expressing cognition: know, see, understand, wit (Ukaji 1999, 284).

(296) a. and he tolde hym that he hade no wrytynge nor euidens of no
 and he told him that he had no writing nor evidence of no
 swyche thyng..., ner not wyst were he scholde haue
 such thing..., nor not knew where he should have
 cnowlage of no swyche thyng
 knowledge of no such thing
‘and he told him that he had no writing or evidence of any such
 thing..., nor knew where to gain knowledge of any such thing’
(ca.1459 Paston Letters 152.4-6, Ukaji (1999, ex.24))

b. Nulle ich pet nan iseo ow bute he habbe of ower
 NEG-intend I that none see you except he has of your
 meister spetiale leaue
 master special leave
‘I do not intend that any should see you except he who has special leave of your master’
(ca. 1230 Ancrene Wisse 14b. 24-26, Ukaji (1999, ex.8))

2. Infinitival complements of verbs in negative clauses.
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(297) a. yette woll I nat wyghte my lady to be in no joupardye
yet will I not allow my lady to be in no jeopardy
'Yet I will not allow my lady to be in any danger'
(a. 140 Malory Works 127.18-19, Ukaji (1999, ex. 21))

b. I whollde not awyse yow to ressaue none of this mony tyll
I would not advise you to receive none of this money until
my Loor cum himselfe
my Lord comes himself
'I would not advise you to receive any of this money until my
Lord comes himself'
(1481, Cely Letters 121.13-14, Ukaji (1999, ex. 22))

These contexts are ones in which the dependent clause does not have the force of an assertive declarative. They all involve non-declarative mood, expressing hypotheses, potential or possible states of affairs or conditions. Zeijlstra (2004, 267) argues that multiple negation can hold between main verb and subjunctive CP complement because subjunctive CPs are deficient in force features.\textsuperscript{12}

Ukaji (1999) notes a further context for wide scope multiple negation: Subject relative clauses which are the subjects of existential be

(298) Ther ys no mane byd no mony for them...
There is no man bid no money for them
'There is no man who bid any money for them'
(1480 Cely Letters 91.27-28, Ukaji (1999, ex. 34))

These relative clause examples are more difficult to characterise. They involve multiple negation across an assertive declarative CP. Ukaji (1999, 277) suggests the nominal head of the relative clause starts out as the subject of the lower clause. Therefore, the licensing relation holds between two elements in the same clause prior to movement of the relative clause's subject to a higher position.

The strict locality of multiple negation constitutes another argument that an analysis of Middle English concordant negatives as indefinites like any-NPIs is inappropriate. There are two possible reasons for the locality of multiple negation. Giannakidou (2000) argues that such locality follows from an analysis of conor-

\textsuperscript{12} Further evidence for the special status of subjunctive clauses in respect of locality comes from anaphora. Giorgi (2004) claims that subjunctive clauses do not block movement out of the clause and that anaphors in subjunctive clauses can have main clause antecedents, unlike anaphora in indicative clauses.
dant negatives as quantifiers, whose scope is clause bound by definition. Zeijlstra (2004) on the other hand, argues that concordant negatives are indefinites, but are subject to local syntactic licensing conditions unlike any-NPIs which are not. However, the differences are analysed, the fact that the distribution of ME concordant negatives within the clause is unlike NPIs at any stage of English is an argument for distinguishing concordant negatives from NPIs. Negative quantifiers move out of VP at all stages of English, which constitutes an argument for their status as quantifiers throughout English.

Negatives are only licensed in a subset of the contexts available to NPIs. NPIs are licit in both negative and non-negative clauses of the following types: interrogatives, conditionals, modal verbs, comparatives, clausal complements of verbs of mental attitude such as doubt, believe. NPIs can also appear in clauses dependent on any of the above clause types, irrespective of the polarity of the main clause. Concordant negatives only appear when licensed by a negative or polarity operator. Ladusaw (1992) characterises the difference between the two sets of contexts in semantic terms. NPIs are licensed in monotone decreasing or downward entailing contexts, whereas concordant negatives are licensed only by negation, an anti-additive context. Giannakidou (2000, 468) makes the same distinction in different terms. For her, NPIs are licensed in non-veridical contexts, which are contexts which do not entail the truth of the proposition they express. Concordant negatives are licensed in anti-veridical contexts: contexts which entail the falsity of the proposition they express.

The strict licensing requirements and locality constraints on concordant negatives suggest that a syntactic account of multiple negation is a plausible one. This is the approach I will explore in the next section.

6.5 Minimalist accounts of multiple negation

Current views of variability in Minimalism, under which the locus of variation is the lexicon, force the difference between multiple negation and non-multiple negation languages to be a consequence of the features present on particular lexical items within the lexicon. This is in line with Ladusaw (1992), van der Wouden (1994) who view the difference between multiple negation and non-multiple negation languages as lexical ambiguity or variability. It fits with the view of multiple negation I have taken in this chapter. However, I have not yet characterised the difference between concordant and non-concordant negative
words, and the licensing conditions on multiple negation in syntactic terms. In this section, I will investigate the possibility that the licensing conditions on multiple negation are syntactic, and that the difference between multiple negation and non-multiple negation languages is due to a difference in the morphosyntactic features of negative words.

This approach facilitates a parametric approach to multiple negation, which observes compositionality at LF, and can account for the locality constraints on multiple negation. I propose the following morphosyntactic distinction as my working hypothesis, which I will examine here, and pursue more extensively in future research. A multiple negation language is one which has a feature checking relation between negative words. Multiple negation languages have negative words with features which must be valued, double negation languages do not.

1. Languages without multiple negation have [pol: neg] features on all their negative words, each is interpreted as a logical negative at LF, hence multiple negation is impossible.

2. Languages with multiple negation have negative words which have an unvalued [pol: ] feature which must be valued during the derivation, causing them to enter into a dependency with another negative word or a negative marker which has [pol: neg] features.

Hence the licensing configuration for multiple negation must be an instance of one of the configurations in which morphosyntactic features can be valued. That is, a probe [pol: ] must be valued by features of a goal [pol: neg] in the same way that all other morphosyntactic features are valued. The distinction between types of negative words is not a new one. Brown (1999), Adger and Smith (2003) have put forward similar proposals to parametrise multiple negation.

### 6.5.1 Multiple negation as morphosyntactic feature checking

The biggest difficulty for a Minimalist approach is to establish the configurations in which concordant negatives are licensed. Both Brown (1999) and Adger and Smith (2003) propose spec-head agreement between a single head and multiple specifiers. The head bears an interpretable [neg] feature which values uninterpretable negative [uneg] features on negative arguments or adjuncts which move to spec, NegP for the purpose of feature checking (299).
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(299) Ne P
   no-one [uneg]   Neg'
      nothing [uneg]   Neg'
         ne [neg]   XP

All negative phrases must enter into a feature checking relation with the negative head to be interpreted as negative. This will check and delete their [uneg] features, with the result that only the negative head is interpreted as negative [neg]. Hence the single negation reading. For Brown, the required feature checking configuration is specifier-head, achieved either overtly by movement or at LF by covert movement.

Brown's (1999) mechanism of feature checking follows Chomsky (1995), by which the uninterpretable features of the moved element force movement into the specifier of a matching head (299). This type of feature checking is motivated by uninterpretable or unvalued features of the goal, rather than the probe (as in Chomsky (1999; 2000)), and is known as 'Greed'. There is no formal reason why this type of feature checking should not be recursive, applying to each goal which has matching uninterpretable [uneg] features. However, this type of feature checking is inconsistent with the mechanism Chomsky proposes in later work. In later versions of the Minimalist framework, (Chomsky 1999; 2000) the mechanism of feature checking is revised to make feature checking more local and less reliant on look-ahead.13

In Chomsky (1999; 2000), unvalued features of the target of movement (heads) initiate feature checking by probing into their complement for matching features. Feature checking is always driven by uninterpretable features on functional heads (300).

(300) Ne P
   YP [neg]   Neg'
       Neg [uneg]   XP

Therefore both Brown's proposals and those of Adger and Smith (2003) are at odds with the most recent version of feature checking. Chomsky's (1999, 2000)

13In order for Greed to work at the point where a goal with [uF] is merged, we need to look ahead in the derivation to find a C-commanding head with a matching interpretable feature, suitable for feature checking. If no such matching interpretable feature is introduced the derivation will crash at the interfaces due to an undeleted [uF].
version of feature checking is not recursive and does not allow multiple move-
ment. There is a one to one relationship between features of the head and match-
ing features of the concordant negative word, after which the checked features of the head are valued, they become inactive, and cannot probe again. These formal constraints make multiple negation difficult to accommodate in a frame-
work of morphosyntactic feature checking. Negative doubling can be analysed as feature checking between valued \([\text{pol: neg}]\) on a negative word and unvalued \([\text{pol: }]\) on a negative head, in a one-to-one agreement relation. However, this does not allow for negative doubling with spec,\(\text{NegP not}\), or for negative spread between negative words. It also does not address the representation of multiple negation at stage one of Jespersen's Cycle when \(\text{ne}\) has valued \([\text{pol: neg}]\) features. At this stage, we might propose that concordant negatives have unvalued \([\text{pol: }]\) features, valued by agreement with the negative head, but the appropriate con-
figurations for feature valuation remain to be established. What is needed here is a way for a \(\text{Neg}^0\) \([\text{pol: neg}]\) to value several \([\text{pol: }]\) features, subject to appropriate locality conditions.

Proposals have been made which allow for multiple agreement between a valued feature and several unvalued features of the same type. Frampton and Gutmann (2000), Hiraiwa (2001) propose that multiple unvalued features can be valued in a single syntactic operation, providing a valued feature of the same type does not intervene between them. It follows that when any occurrence of \([\text{pol: }]\) is valued, all the others will be valued simultaneously.

This will hold of all matching features in all material which has not yet been spelled out (the current phase and the previously completed phase according to Chomsky (1999)). This reduces the locality conditions on multiple negation to the locality conditions applying to all syntactic operations.

In the following pages, I present a speculative first attempt at an analysis of multiple negation as morphosyntactic feature checking, which makes use of the idea of multiple agreement between all matching features before spellout. More work remains to be done to refine this hypothesis. Here, I consider clause bound multiple negation only. The application of multiple feature checking to multiple negation dependencies varies according to the negators involved. I distinguish negative doubling with \(\text{ne}\), negative doubling with \(\text{not}\) and negative spread. First, I describe negative doubling with \(\text{not}\), which is the simplest case.

In negative doubling with the sentential negator \(\text{not}\) (301), all \([\text{pol: }]\) features C-command each other and are valued as a result of spec-head agreement at
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NegP with Neg° [pol: ] as the probe. not is merged to value the [pol: ] features of Neg°. This operation also values the [pol: ] features of the negative quantifiers which not C-commands because no matching inactive features intervene between the two [pol: ] features at the point in the derivation where not is Merged. This follows as a straightforward case of multiple agreement in the sense of Frampton and Gutmann (2000) and Hiraiwa (2001). The derivation is shown in (301), where the arrows are used to mark multiple Agreement (probe-goal) dependencies. All the [pol: ] features are valued simultaneously at the point where not is Merged.14

This configuration requires agreement between not and Neg°, even when Neg° is non-overt at stage three of Jespersen’s Cycle. Hence the account of stage three of Jespersen’s Cycle I gave in chapter 5 needs modification. There, I argued that not at stage three of Jespersen’s Cycle is a vP adjunct, and does not enter into any Agree relations. The negative doubling data provide evidence for an Agree relationship between not and Neg° even when Neg° is non-overt: without this Agreement in NegP, [pol: ] features lower in the structure can never receive a value from not. The loss of negative doubling with not rather than the loss of the morpheme ne marks the loss of the [pol: ] feature on a functional head, and the syntactic agreement relation between not and Neg°. Multiple negation provides sufficient evidence of the Agree relation which leads the language user to postulate a null Neg° with [pol: ] features.

(301)

Zeijlstra (2004) proposes a similar account for negative doubling with a negative head (like ME ne), in which there is spec-head agreement between Neg° ne [pol: ] and a null spec NegP operator [pol: neg]. The syntactic configuration is shown in (302). It is the same as in (301) but for the form of the element bear-

---

14This analysis is also sufficient to license the ME uses of redundant ne which are embedded under negated main clause predicates, providing multiple agree can be established across the relevant types of CP.
Let me now turn to the issue of whether an analysis of multiple negation with *ne* requires the configuration in (302) with a null operator which has [pol: neg] features. Recall that there are two possible feature configurations associated with *ne* in Middle English: *ne* [pol: neg] and *ne* [pol: ]. So why does multiple negation involve *ne* [pol: ] rather than *ne* [pol: neg]? The simple reason is that *ne* [pol: neg] does not act as a probe. It does not initiate any Agree relations. [pol: ] features C-commanded by *ne* can never be valued by multiple Agreement with *ne* as the valued and unvalued features are not in a legitimate configuration for multiple feature checking. For multiple feature checking to be licit, there must be an instance of probe-goal or specifier-head Agreement from which all matching unvalued features can receive a value parasitically. If *ne* has only the feature [pol: neg], no such instance of Agreement can be established. One solution is to require *ne* itself to Agree in [pol: ] features with some other element, such as a null [pol: neg] operator. This is similar to the operator-variable binding approaches in the Government-Binding literature such as Haegeman (1995).

The null operator is introduced in order to ensure syntactic agreement and feature valuation, but it is at odds with my account of Jespersen’s Cycle, in which I eschewed null operators. Instead I distinguished two types of *ne*, *ne* [pol: ] which enters into a dependency with *not*, and *ne* [pol: neg] which does not enter into a dependency with *not*. The problem for an analysis of negative doubling, is that negative doubling is available at all stages of Jespersen’s Cycle, with *ne*, *ne*...not and not.

So I need first to determine whether multiple negation contexts should be considered syntactically parallel to sentential negation contexts at each stage of Jespersen’s Cycle. Do they undergo the same change in the feature specification
of *ne*? If so, I need a way which allows *ne* [pol: neg] to enter into dependencies with negative arguments and adjuncts.

Given my assumptions, cases of negative doubling with *ne* are more difficult than negative doubling with *not*. At this stage *ne* is not required to enter into an Agree relation with any other element to check its own features, yet it Agrees with negative arguments and adjuncts in multiple negation.

It is not clear that we need the null operator to value [pol: ] features of concordant negatives if we make the checking of [pol: ] features parasitic on other syntactic operations, involving a lower head such as $v^0$ (303). Locating [pol: neg] on $v$, will mean that [pol: ] features on the subject are checked locally as the subject is Merged into spec, $vP$. The same local checking configuration holds of adjuncts which are in the outer specifier of $vP$, or adjoined to $vP$. Adjunction of adjuncts with [pol: ] features to $vP$ will ensure they receive a value as they are sufficiently local to the head $v$ which has [pol: neg] features to receive a value from it by Agree. Finally, [pol: ] features of the negative object can be checked as a side effect of object case/φ-feature checking with $v$ (303). Case and phi-feature checking by Agree between $v$ and the object establishes a relation upon which [pol: ] feature checking can happen parasitically.

(303)

The derivation in (303) proceeds as follows:

1. $v$ is merged with a valued [pol: neg] and an unvalued set of φ-features.
2. The [phi:] features check against [phi:3sg] of the object *nothing*.
3. This establishes the Agree relation between [pol: neg] on $v$ and [pol:] on the object, as a consequence of which [pol:] on the object is valued parasitically.
4. The negative subject *no-one* is merged in spec,$vP$. The [pol:] feature on *no-one* probes for a matching feature. The subject is in a local spec-head configura-
tion with v, so its \([\text{pol:}]\) feature receives a value from the \([\text{pol:neg}]\) feature of v.

5. The negative adverb never is adjoined to vP. Its \([\text{pol:}]\) features probe for a matching goal, and Agree with \([\text{pol:neg}]\) on v, which never C-commands.

6. All features valued during the derivation are deleted at spell-out.

Thus, multiple negation can be seen as a local operation within vP, which happens prior to the displacement of material to higher positions. The only additional consequence of this proposal is that ne does not head an independent NegP. This is consistent with the distribution of ne and not (which is an outer specifier of vP or specifier of a proxy projection (Nash and Rouveret 1997)), which I outlined in chapter 4.

Finally, cases of negative spread fall out of this model without reference to a null Neg° or negative operator: a higher negative with \([\text{pol:}]\) C-commanding a lower negative with \([\text{pol:neg}]\) will agree with it in the standard probe-goal way. This operation is will iterate for all negatives with \([\text{pol:}]\), providing each \([\text{pol:}]\) C-commands a \([\text{pol: neg}]\), see (304).

(304) vP

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{never [pol:]} \\
\text{no-one [pol:]} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{V nothing [pol: neg]}
\end{array}
\]

6.5.2 Summary: multiple negation and feature checking

In this section, I have proposed a syntactic hypothesis which accounts for the empirical facts of Middle English negative doubling and negative spread, based on morphosyntactic feature checking. It is possible to construct a theory without reference to a null negative operator. However, the feature checking mechanism I adopt is not that of Chomsky (1999; 2000). Multiple feature agreement is required. Frampton and Gutmann (2000), Hiraiwa (2001) argue for multiple feature checking on independent grounds. Their proposals make a syntactic account of multiple negation possible. More work is required to refine this hypothesis and
explore its implications and its predictions concerning the loss of multiple negation in Early Modern English. However, my discussion of ME indicates that an approach to multiple negation in terms of morphosyntactic features, and of its loss in terms of competition between lexical items with different feature specifications is a possible one which merits further research.

6.6 Summary and Conclusions

This chapter has shown that Old and Middle English are multiple negation languages and has sought a syntactic analysis of this fact which distinguishes Old and Middle English from Present Day standard English, which does not employ multiple negation. I have shown variability in the availability of multiple negation in both Old and Middle English which is unrelated to Jespersen's Cycle. Not is introduced into negative doubling contexts in the same way it is introduced elsewhere. Therefore, the link which Rowlett (1998) proposes between Jespersen's Cycle and multiple negation is not borne out in the Middle English data. Study of a diachronic situation in real time indicates that Jespersen's Generalisation makes inappropriate predictions concerning the availability of multiple negation in Middle English. The loss of multiple negation in English postdates the introduction of not under Jespersen's Cycle. Furthermore, Jespersen's Cycle introduces not into some clauses with negative arguments and adjuncts. not is not in complementary distribution with negative arguments or adjuncts as Jespersen's Generalisation predicts. A less direct link between Jespersen's Cycle and the availability of multiple negation is more empirically appropriate for Middle English. Jespersen's Generalisation makes inappropriate predictions regarding the diachrony of multiple negation in Middle English.

I proposed an alternative account under which there are two types of negative words in competition in the Middle English period. Loss of [pol:neg] features on ne creates the conditions for reanalysis of negative words as [pol:neg] items, which then diffuse through all contexts by grammar competition between morphosyntactic doublets: negative words specified [pol:neg] and negative words underspecified [pol: ]. Although the loss of multiple negation is not directly linked to Jespersen's Cycle, change under Jespersen's Cycle provides the conditions for the grammatical competition which leads to the loss of multiple negation in Early Modern English. Finally, I suggested that this account has useful potential to explain the rise of negative inversion in Early Modern English (Nevalainen
1997) and variation between *no*-negation and *not* negation (Tottie 1991) which survives in Present Day English.

The theoretical focus of this chapter has been to provide an account of multiple negation which preserves semantic compositionality and is consistent with the Minimalist syntactic framework. The Principle of Full Interpretation bars absorption or factorisation of LF interpretable features and forces the conclusion that only one of the negatives in multiple negation can bear the interpretation of sentential negation at LF. Variation in the lexicon between concordant negatives which are negative in morphological form only [pol: ], and negatives which bear negation at LF [pol:neg] emerges as a consequence of the loss of [pol: neg] features on a functional head (v°). The loss of [pol:neg] on the head means that the syntactic configuration underlying multiple negation changes, so that one of the concordant negative words must mark negation at LF, and is reanalysed as having [pol:neg] features. This innovative form diffuses by grammar competition until there are no concordant negatives left. The loss of concordant negatives means the loss of multiple negation. Without concordant negatives, the feature checking relation which underlies multiple negation can no longer be established.

In order to support this account of the loss of multiple negation, I put forward a hypothesis for multiple negation licensing as morphosyntactic feature checking of unvalued [pol: ] features. The account I propose has the advantage of maintaining compositionality. Locality constraints support the idea that concordant negatives are quantificational in Middle English, and that they are licensed syntactically. They do not share the same distribution as negative polarity items, which have been analysed as indefinites. Concordant negatives differ from other quantifiers by their need to be licensed in the context of a polarity operator. This licensing requirement is difficult to analyse within the most recent Minimalist version of feature checking (Chomsky 2000), but I argued a syntactic analysis is possible once we allow multiple feature checking.

A new perspective on the relationship between multiple negation and Jespersen's Cycle follows from my syntactic account (cf. Zeijlstra (2004) for alternative proposals based on feature checking). Two syntactic facts distinguish multiple negation languages from logical double negation languages. First, in multiple negation languages some negative words are underspecified for polarity [pol: ]. Second, multiple negation languages are those in which a syntactic Agree relation can be established between [pol: ] and [pol:neg] features. Negative spread should be a very uncommon, diachronically transient stage of languages
which are undergoing change, as it arises from the co-occurrence of two competing types of negative word. Those negatives which are concordant are licensed by those which are not. As the loss of concordant negatives proceeds, negative spread will be lost. Negative spread is just one of several negation strategies in Middle English, which include multiple negation with *not*, and negation strategies which do not involve multiple negation. These arise out of morphosyntactic competition between negatives with \([\text{pol: }]\) features and those with \([\text{pol:neg}]\) features. This competition is an indirect consequence of change in the locus of \([\text{pol:neg}]\) features under Jespersen’s Cycle. Middle English is in the transition from a multiple negation language to a double negation language. Further examination of the loss of multiple negation awaits study with Early Modern English corpora.
Chapter 7

Conclusions

7.1 Introduction

The research presented in the preceding chapters integrates quantitative models and methods, textually based analysis of syntactically parsed corpora and recent Minimalist theory to provide a new perspective on Jespersen’s Cycle and other changes to the syntax of negation in the early English period. I show that a Minimalist perspective on parametric variation allows empirically relevant distinctions to be made between successive diachronic stages in the syntax of early English negation, which are supported by data from diachronic change. In this chapter, I will provide an overview and an assessment of the contribution of the present research to understanding of three areas: early English negation, grammaticalisation and linguistic change, and a Minimalist syntax of negation.

I demonstrated the importance of quantitative data in establishing the parameters relevant to the changing syntax of negation. Different analyses make different predictions concerning the structure of change over time. Therefore, quantitative modelling of change over time allows syntactic hypotheses to be tested. The test of each syntactic analysis is whether it accounts for variation and change in a way which is consistent with quantitative evidence of the change within the logistic model. I apply this methodology to three large issues in the history of English negation, drawing the following conclusions with regard to previous analyses:

1. Quantitative data do not support Frisch’s (1997) analysis of Jespersen’s Cycle as two independent but intersecting morphological changes.

2. Rowlett’s (1998) analysis of Jespersen’s Cycle makes predictions concerning
the relationship of Jespersen's Cycle and the availability of multiple negation which are not borne out.

3. Quantitative data do not support the change from XP ne to X° ne which van Kemenade (2000) proposes to account for Jespersen's Cycle and the loss of negative initial clauses.

This chapter will bring together my empirical findings into a coherent theory of parametric change in English negation. My empirical findings support a Minimalist view of parameters. The range of parametric variation is entirely consistent with the options made available by the Minimalist framework. This is an advance, the Minimalist theory of parametric variation has been based largely on synchronic studies. Here, I show that it accommodates diachronic variation, making appropriate predictions concerning the structure of change over time.

I adopt recent approaches to parametric variation in which the notion of parameter is highly constrained along Minimalist lines. I follow proposals in Roberts and Roussou (2003) and Kroch (1994) which make the lexicon the locus of morphosyntactic and parametric variation. Parametric variation is reduced to variation in the morphosyntactic feature specification of lexical items. However, my proposals concerning parametric variation differ from Roberts and Roussou (2003), who argue that all parametric variation is in the phonological realisation of already existing positions in a given syntactic structure. My account allows variation in the phonological realisation of positions as does Roberts and Roussou (2003), but it also allows highly constrained parametric variation in syntactic structures through variation and competition between valued and unvalued morphosyntactic features. Unvalued features must enter into syntactic dependencies in order to receive a value, so change in the value associated with a feature has syntactic effects on syntactic distribution of that item, imposing conditions on the item which it did not have previously. This has important implications for the phrase structure of negation which changes at successive stages of Jespersen's Cycle, with consequences for the status of NegP as a functional projection.

This is a severe restriction on what counts as a parameter, which impacts on the way changes to negation are analysed in English. Parametric variation is limited to the syntactic effects of the distribution of valued and unvalued features in the lexicon, namely, the occurrence or non-occurrence of particular syntactic dependencies with a given head, and whether these are specifier-head dependencies resulting from Merge or long distance dependencies resulting from
Agree. The means by which these dependencies are satisfied is determined by the computational algorithms Merge and Agree, which underpin all syntactic operations. The mechanisms of Merge and Agree remain invariant. Differences in morphosyntactic features result in differences in the application of syntactic processes. Throughout this thesis, I have shown that the dependencies into which negative items enter are subcases of the dependencies allowed within a feature based Minimalist framework. The dependencies which hold between negative items are the result of their morphosyntactic features and can be subsumed into a general theory of feature checking.

The role of the language learner is crucial in mediating between primary linguistic data in the input and a syntactic representation in which all parameters are unambiguously set. This is hardly a novel observation. I follow a long tradition of work in the Principles and Parameters model which gives primacy to the language learner (Lightfoot 1979; 1999). I assume that each language learner constructs his or her own unique grammar on the basis of primary linguistic data. However, the role of the language learner is slightly different under a Minimalist approach than under previous Principles and Parameters approaches, as notions of computational complexity and economy become relevant to the learning algorithm.

The structure of this chapter is as follows. I will discuss the impacts of my findings on theories of parametric variation within the Minimalist framework. My account of negation as a whole relies on the idea that parametric variation results from highly constrained variation in the distribution of morphosyntactic and phonological features within the lexicon. I will discuss what I consider to be my most significant finding: the Minimalist analysis of Jespersen's Cycle which the quantitative data support. This provides a new approach to grammaticalisation, which differs from the most recent Minimalist treatment of grammaticalisation in Roberts and Roussou (2003). I will discuss the theoretical and typological implications of my analysis here. Some implications for the syntactic representation of negation follow. Finally, I will outline some issues in the syntax of negation which my thesis does not address. The present work suggests some perspectives on these issues which I will examine in future work.
7.2 Jespersen's Cycle, grammatical competition and grammaticalisation

7.2.1 Jespersen's Cycle and grammatical competition

A Minimalist, feature-based conception of parametric variation allows for an account of Jespersen's Cycle as grammatical competition, and informs a view of grammaticalisation which is different from that proposed by Roberts and Rousso (2003). A Minimalist syntactic framework does not accommodate redundancy in syntactic representations, such as that proposed by Frisch (1997) within NegP at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle. Through detailed quantitative work, I establish the progress and properties of the reanalyses involved in Jespersen's Cycle. Modelling the changes involved within the grammatical competition model (Kroch 1989) provides a coherent view of the changes which is compatible with Principles and Parameters approaches, and Minimalist theory in particular. I propose a feature-based account in which the loss of ne is contingent on the introduction of not, hence Jespersen's Cycle is formalised as three distinct and autonomous syntactic stages.

1. Stage One: unsupported ne [pol:neg]

2. Stage Two: ne [pol: ] ... not [pol:neg]. [pol: ] on ne is valued by Agree with not.

3. Stage Three: not [pol:neg] (a vP-adjunct or specifier of a null head with [pol:] features)

Quantitative data showing the progress of changes to negation and their interaction to constitute Jespersen's Cycle leads me to challenge the previous account of Jespersen's Cycle in Frisch (1997), who argued that Jespersen's Cycle comprises two changes, loss of ne and introduction of not, which intersect to produce ne...not. First, Jespersen's Cycle does not proceed uniformly across all clause types. Once differences between clause types are taken into account, Frisch's redundant licensing model, based on the independence of changes involving ne and not fails to provide an adequate fit of the data in all clause types. The incidence of not is

1These two possibilities cannot be distinguished, except in multiple negation contexts, in which I argued that a [pol: ] feature on a head is required to allow the agreement between not and negative words.
lower in subordinate clauses and clauses within the scope of a negative than it is in main clauses throughout the entirety of the change.

The factors which condition the change from *ne* → *ne*... *not* are different from the factors which condition the change from *ne*... *not* → *not*. This shows that the data should be subdivided to allow for these two distinct changes. Different changes affect *ne* at successive stages of Jespersen’s Cycle. Hence, the evidence from change points to grammatical competition between two different types of *ne* each subject to a different change: unsupported *ne* and supported *ne* at the first two stages of Jespersen’s Cycle. The difference is formalised in terms of morphosyntactic features, *ne[pol: neg]* at stage one, *ne [pol: ]* at stage two.² The properties of the changes affecting the two types of *ne* are different, as are the time courses of the two changes. Loss of unsupported *ne* is sensitive to clause type. It results from morphosyntactic competition between *ne [pol: neg]* and *ne [pol: ].* Loss of supported *ne* is not sensitive to clause type.

This competition between *ne [pol: neg]* and *ne [pol: ]* is independent of the morphological loss of *ne*, which affects only supported *ne*, that is *ne* which has unvalued [pol: ] features. The change from [pol: neg] to [pol:] must precede the loss of *ne* in all contexts (including multiple negation), as it creates a dependency which makes sentential negation morphologically identifiable on another element at LF and makes *ne* redundant as a negative marker.

These findings directly challenge Frisch (1997) who argues that the loss of *ne* is a single change. Once differences between clause types are taken into account, Frisch’s (1997) redundant licensing model fails to model the subordinate clause data. I show that the redundant licensing model of Jespersen’s Cycle (Frisch 1997) structures the variation and changes involved in Jespersen’s cycle in a way which takes insufficient account of the properties of the change modelled over time using quantitative data. Frisch (1997) overlooks crucial contextual factors affecting the distribution of *ne* and *not* which inform an account of the change. The way these factors affect the distribution of grammatical options at successive stages of Jespersen’s Cycle shows that the loss of *ne* is not a homogeneous process of change, but rather two processes of change, which are conditioned by different factors. The loss of unsupported *ne* is a morphosyntactic change, conditioned by syntactic factors such as clause type. The loss of supported *ne* is not conditioned by the same factors. Subdividing the change in this way makes sense of the pat-

²I also provide evidence for this distinction from the changing distribution of redundant *ne* in ME.
terns of variation between the competing grammatical options at each stage of Jespersen’s Cycle.

Bipartite negation arises because there is a time lag between the morphosyntactic feature change and the loss of *ne*. At LF, *ne*...not involves no redundancy, although there is redundant morphological marking of negation at PF. At this stage, the language learner has strong motivation to eliminate *ne* as it is redundant as a negative marker at both LF and PF. At stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle *ne* is an agreement marker similar to the verbal [s] marking subject-verb agreement. There are formal parallels between the Neg-head and the Agr-head which hosts underspecified or unvalued features. Subsequent changes under Jespersen’s Cycle follow from computational economy. The morpheme *ne* is lost at PF as it is redundant. The subsequent morphologisation of *not* as a negative head which happens in Early Modern English (van Kemenade 2000, 69ff) is economy driven. It eliminates a syntactic dependency between specifier and head which is no longer robustly motivated by morphological evidence. This has the effect of making Jespersen’s Cycle a cyclic shift from valued to unvalued features on the negative head: *ne* [pol: neg] > *ne* [pol: ] > 0 [pol: ] > *not* [pol: neg] which does not always correspond to morphological changes at PF.

For a time, there are two distinct types of *ne* of which the syntax must take account, one of which enters a syntactic dependency with *not*, the other which does not enter into a syntactic dependency. These are subject to different processes of change which operate according to different constraints, in different modules of the grammar. I argue that this evidence of two types of *ne* can be given a structural correlate in Minimalist syntactic theory which distinguishes supported *ne* from unsupported *ne*. I do not claim that this is a necessary part of the model of change I have adopted. The diachronic model does not imply the correctness of the syntactic model. There may be other ways to formalise my diachronic data. However, the syntactic model I adopt has advantages over previous syntactic models. First, it accounts for parallels between the availability of bipartite *ne*...not and expletive *ne* in clauses like (305) at a particular point in Middle English: both have unvalued [pol: ]. It is only when *ne* has unvalued [pol: ] features that it can enter into wide scope multiple negation with a negative marked [pol: neg] in the main clause. There is a striking diachronic parallel between the availability of these constructions and stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle in Middle English.

(305) ne doute the nat that alle thinges ne ben don aryght  
ne doubt you not that all things ne are done rightfully
Second, Minimalism provides a means to analyse Jespersen's Cycle as grammatical competition which eluded Frisch (1997), and provides an account of the different processes of change involved in the cycle. Third, it links the availability of syntactic dependencies to overt morphological evidence for those dependencies, which requires less abstraction on the part of the language learner. The difference between fully specified or valued features, which are syntactically autonomous, and underspecified or unvalued features which must obtain their value by entering into a syntactic dependency with matching valued features allows a spec-head dependency between ne and not to emerge during the history of English. This is a matter of parametric variation (understood in the featural sense). Morphosyntactic feature change accounts for the rise of ne...not as a distinct system of negation. The methodology by which I arrive at this conclusion involves synthesis of three areas of linguistics: recent Minimalist syntactic theory, quantitative methodology and models of change, and textually based study of data from two new large scale syntactically parsed corpora of Old and Middle English, the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (Taylor et al. 2003) and the second edition of the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (Kroch and Taylor 2000a). My approach provides quantitative support to Minimalist theoretical proposals in a way which previous studies of syntactic change in the Minimalist framework (Roberts and Roussou 2003) do not.

I claim that this model makes Jespersen's Cycle amenable to analysis as two processes of grammatical competition in the strictest sense of competition between mutually exclusive grammatical options (Kroch 1994). This is a significant advance for the empirical coverage of this model. Frisch (1997) argued that the grammatical competition model needed to be adapted and weakened in order to account for Jespersen's Cycle. The competition he proposes between ne and not is not between exclusive options, as they co-occur, resulting in ne...not. I propose a model which preserves the ideas of the grammatical competition between mutually exclusive grammatical options, understood in terms of mutually exclusive morphosyntactic feature specifications on a negative head. Grammatical competition is compatible with Minimalist accounts of parametric variation between lexical items with incompatible feature values. The Middle English grammaticalisation of not as a sentential negator is analysed as two processes of grammatical
competition, one morphosyntactic, the other purely morphological. Grammatical competition between two negative heads differing in the value of their [pol: ] features ([pol: neg] versus [pol: ]) drives the spread of not (section 5.5). These two negative heads are structurally incompatible and differ minimally in a single morphosyntactic feature, in accordance with Kroch’s (1989) formulation of grammatical competition as competition between incompatible structural competitors. The second process of grammatical competition is between a head with the unvalued [pol: ] feature and a head without this feature. Jespersen’s Cycle can be entirely accounted for by changes in the way the negative head behaves. This account is particularly minimal as differences in the syntactic configurations involved in Jespersen’s Cycle follow from these changes. I claim that grammaticalisation involves a change in morphosyntactic features which precedes the loss of a morpheme. The change in morphosyntactic features is the primary force behind grammaticalisation of not in the syntax.

A grammatical competition account addresses the distribution of two lexical items over time. However, it says nothing about the emergence of the variants in competition. A parameter resetting approach to language change (Lightfoot 1999) forces us to adopt the view that new morphosyntactic variants arise through reanalysis of primary linguistic data on the part of the language learner, leading to a novel morphosyntactic feature specification for a particular lexical item. There is little clear evidence for the reanalysis of not in the Old or Middle English data. This is perhaps not surprising, as reanalysis occurs when a surface string is structurally ambiguous, mapping equally well onto more than one syntactic representation. Thus the string ne...nawiht in early English has two possible analyses: nawiht is an nominal adjunct of extent in negative doubling with ne (306), or as a secondary negator used to support ne which is lacking LF [neg] features (307).

\[(306) \text{ ne [pol: neg]} \ldots \text{nawiht [pol: ]}\]
\[(307) \text{ ne [pol: ]} \ldots \text{not [pol: neg]}\]

The configurations of morphosyntactic features involved in these two representations are distinct (306), (307), but equally well supported by the Primary Linguistic Data available to the language learner. Minimalism does not allow for

\[^{3}\text{There is arguably a third process of grammatical competition involving morphosyntactic features which marks the transition from specifier to head not in Early Modern English, but this change is outside the scope of this thesis.}\]
any indeterminate representations or any ambiguity, each string must uniquely map onto a syntactic representation. In my approach, ambiguity in the string plays a crucial role in reanalysis, but this role is in the process of language learning rather than the formal syntactic representation. The reanalysis of *nawiht* from lexical to functional meaning is arguably a simplification (see Roberts and Roussou (2003, 209ff)), but leads to the innovation of a feature checking dependency which is arguably a complication of the grammar, an imperfection (see Chomsky (1995; 2000)). Structural simplification in one area leads to structural complication in another.

Structural ambiguity does not provide adequate motivation for change, it merely establishes the possibility of variation in syntactic representation of a particular string, and the form which this variation will take. It does not provide the reason why one variant is favoured over the other, which is required for the two variants to compete rather than vary. Competition involves an extension of the use of *not* into new contexts, including those where its previous reading as an adverb of extent is not available. In my account, the spread of *not* can be formally motivated by weakening of the features of *ne* so that *ne* is deficient at one of the interfaces, therefore requiring the support of *not*. Diffusion of *not* is a response to ambiguity and competition between two types of *ne*. This is an advance over previous accounts (Frisch 1997, Roberts and Roussou 2003) in which the spread of secondary negators is essentially unmotivated. At a the second stage of Jespersen's Cycle, *ne* requires co-occurrence with *not* for convergence at the LF interface.

We know from previous studies that there is evidence for phonological weakening of unstressed syllables and a consequent simplification of morphology in the case and agreement system in late Old and early Middle English at about the same time as the changes in negation are taking hold in Late OE and Early ME. Phonological weakening of *ne* may provide the conditions for reanalysis of negative adverbs as secondary negators in OE and ME, and hence for the emergence of a new grammatical option for marking negation. Already in OE we can see that the clitic behaviour of *ne* marks it out as phonologically weak.

Weakening of *ne* provides the language learner less clear evidence to associate the PF representation *ne* with negation at LF. In those clauses which have a potential alternative marker of negation which has greater phonological bulk and therefore greater salience to the language learner, a reanalysed structure might be preferred as [neg] features are more clearly morphologically identified. Of
course, this is difficult to establish as the written record provides no evidence from which this change can be reconstructed. Surface ambiguity is a necessary condition for reanalysis in the model. Phonological weakening may favour the representation *ne...not [pol:]*...[pol:neg], as the expression of negation at LF receives a clearer phonological and morphological exponent in the secondary negator.

The reanalysis which actuates Jespersen’s Cycle associates morphosyntactic [neg] features with *nawiht*. It acquires grammatical features and loses its already weak quantificational restriction. This is arguably a simplification from lexical>functional features, in the sense that the number of morphosyntactic features associated with *nawiht* is reduced. I claim that the changes affecting *nawiht* are not unique to *not*. Distributional parallels between Old English *na* and Middle English *not* indicate that the grammaticalisation of secondary negators has happened more than once in the history of English.4 Old and Early Middle English show a degree of variation in which form is used as a secondary negator. However, both have weak lexical meaning in common, making them prone to reanalysis as functional elements.

### 7.2.2 The interaction of Jespersen’s Cycle and multiple negation in the grammatical competition model

In chapter 6 I argued that *not* and multiple negation are not in complementary distribution, as Rowlett (1998) predicts. The distribution of *not* and the loss of multiple negation are crucial in determining the relationship between Jespersen’s Cycle and multiple negation. The Middle English facts are as follows: *not* can appear in multiple negation, so there is no motivation for an analysis which derives the complementarity of *not* and multiple negation (as for example Rowlett (1998) does). I use this fact to establish that multiple negation and *ne...not* represent different types of syntactic dependencies. LME data show the introduction of *not* in clauses with negative quantifiers. If *ne...not* and multiple negation represented the same dependency, there would be no motivation to introduce *not* into multiple negation contexts for feature checking reasons. Rowlett (1998) and other approaches which take *ne...not* and multiple negation to be distinct instantiations

---

4Roberts and Roussou (2003, 156) argue that a range of secondary negators also emerged in medieval French *pas, mie, goutte* from the lexical meanings 'step, crumb, drop'. As in English, only one (*pas*) survived to stage three of Jespersen’s Cycle in French.
of the Neg-criterion (Haegeman 1995) face this problem. I capture the difference between ne...not and multiple negation by assigning not valued \([\text{pol: neg}]\) features, whilst negative quantifiers in multiple negation have unvalued \([\text{pol: }]\) features. The \([\text{pol: }]\) feature on these quantifiers must receive a value, either from \(ne \ [\text{pol: neg}]\) at stage one of Jespersen's Cycle, or from \(not \ [\text{pol: neg}]\) at stage two of Jespersen's Cycle. This account predicts the introduction of \(not\) into multiple negation contexts in the same way as elsewhere.

I showed that \(not\) is introduced in multiple negation contexts as in other contexts, but that the overall frequency of \(not\) in multiple negation is lower than in sentential negation contexts. It follows from the analysis of Jespersen's Cycle I propose that a change in morphosyntactic features, from \([\text{pol: neg}]\) to \([\text{pol: }]\), should happen in all contexts at the same rate although the frequency of the innovative form will not necessarily be the same in all contexts. This includes clauses with negative adjuncts or arguments. Following Kroch's Constant Rate Hypothesis, this is the null hypothesis. I speculated that morphosyntactic feature change on the head \(ne\) from \([\text{pol: neg}]>[\text{pol: }]\) is manifest by the introduction of \(not\) in these contexts as elsewhere, primarily as a way to derive the emergence of \(not\) in contexts where Rowlett's (1998) analysis predicts it should not appear. The ME situation shows that the introduction of \(not\) is not responsible for the loss of multiple negation in the way Rowlett (1998) predicts. From the argumentation so far, we expect that multiple negation should continue to be productive at stages one and two of Jespersen's Cycle. This is true, but leaves open the questions of why multiple negation was lost, and why \(not\) is less frequent in multiple negation contexts than elsewhere. These two issues are linked.

Recall that I proposed that the loss of multiple negation results from competition between two types of negative quantifiers: one which has \([\text{pol: }]\) features and is licensed by agreement in multiple negation with another negative, and one which has the feature \([\text{pol: neg}]\) which is self-licensing. Negative spread results from the co-occurrence of these two types of negative quantifiers, so that \(neg+Q \ [\text{pol: neg}]\) licenses \(neg+Q \ [\text{pol: }]\). The process of competition between these quantifiers is similar to the competition between the two forms of \(ne\) involved in Jespersen's Cycle. It ultimately leads to the loss of multiple negation. Multiple negation requires at least one negative with an unvalued \([\text{pol: }]\) feature which can enter into a dependency with a valued \([\text{pol: neg}]\) feature. Each negative clause must contain only one \([\text{pol: neg}]\) feature. The loss of items bearing \([\text{pol: }]\) features will lead to the loss of multiple negation.
The questions to be addressed are how and why this process of competition comes into being. I argued in chapter 6 that the change in the morphosyntactic features of \( ne \) is instrumental to the loss of multiple negation. Competition between \( ne \) [pol:neg] and \( ne \) [pol:] underlying Jespersen’s Cycle precipitates the loss of multiple negation by inducing the reanalysis of negative quantifiers as negative markers at LF with [pol:neg] features.

At stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle (308) \( ne \) has [pol:neg] features, therefore all negative quantifiers in multiple negation with \( ne \) must lack [pol:neg] features in order for a multiple negation reading to obtain. A negative clause can contain maximally one [pol:neg] feature. In chapter 6, I claimed that the negative quantifiers at this stage bore [pol:] features which needed to be valued in a local (specifier-head, or head complement) relation with the [pol:neg] features on \( ne \) which is an affix on \( v^0 \).

(308) \( ne \) [pol:neg] ...nothing [pol:]

(309) \( not \) [pol:neg] ...\( ne \) [pol:] ...nothing [pol:]

(310) \( ne \) [pol:] ...nothing [pol:neg]

Once stage two of Jespersen’s Cycle is reached (309) \( ne \) loses its [pol:neg] features and has an unvalued [pol:] feature. Hence \( ne \) is no longer sufficient to check the [pol:] features of the negative quantifiers. There are two solutions to this problem, both of which are attested in Middle English. First, introduce \( not \) in this context as elsewhere. If we allow multiple feature checking (Hiraiwa 2001, Frampton and Gutmann 2000), then the [pol:neg] features of \( not \) will value all the [pol:] features on both \( ne \) and the negative quantifiers (309). Alternatively, one of the concordant negative quantifiers is reanalysed as a marker of negation at LF. That is, it has [pol:neg] features which will value all instances of [pol:] on both \( ne \) and any other negative quantifiers in the clause (310). The introduction of \( not \) cannot be motivated for feature-checking in (310). The introduction of \( not \) in multiple negation is not required when the negative quantifier becomes an LF marker of negation (with [pol:neg] features) through reanalysis. The syntactic analysis of multiple negation differs at stages one and two of Jespersen’s Cycle (308-310). Change under Jespersen’s Cycle allows a new structural analysis of

---

5 Its effects remain to be examined in more detail in Early Modern English data, but this research is outside the scope of this thesis. See section 7.4 for some comments on issues for further research.
negative quantifiers to emerge and compete with the established negative quantifiers. Hence change in the negative dependencies available at stages one and two of Jespersen’s Cycle indirectly leads to the loss of multiple negation by initiating a second process of grammatical competition between two types of negative quantifiers. This process of competition is not complete until the Early Modern English period.

This reanalysis of negative quantifiers as \([\text{pol: neg}]\) leads to a duality in negative quantifiers: one set with \([\text{pol: }]\), the other with \([\text{pol: neg}]\). The two forms co-occur in negative spread (311).

(311)  
a. Pan had He neuer no begynnynge  
then had He never no beginning  
‘then He never had any beginning’  
(CMEDTHOR, 46.717)

b. no man seyd no-thyng a-gens hem  
no man said nothing against him  
‘no man said anything against him’  
(CMKEMPE, 33.730)

The loss of multiple negation results from competition between these two types of quantifier, with neg+Q \([\text{pol: neg}]\) winning out over neg+Q \([\text{pol: }]\), presumably because unambiguous linguistic evidence for neg+Q \([\text{pol: }]\), which comes from multiple negation, is much weaker than the evidence for neg+Q \([\text{pol: neg}]\) in LME and Early Modern English.

Negative spread and negative doubling with \textit{not} emerge because the loss of neg+Q \([\text{pol: }]\) and the loss of \textit{ne} \([\text{pol: neg}]\) are not simultaneous developments. Competition between neg+Q \([\text{pol: }]\) and neg+Q \([\text{pol: neg}]\) is initiated by Jespersen’s Cycle, but goes to completion long after Jespersen’s Cycle itself. Negative spread and negative doubling with \textit{not} are alternative ways of licensing neg+Q \([\text{pol: }]\) whilst competition between neg+Q \([\text{pol: }]\) and neg+Q \([\text{pol: neg}]\) is ongoing.

The loss of multiple negation is a simplification of the syntax of negation. Unvalued \([\text{pol: }]\) features are eliminated, and along with them syntactic dependencies between negative items. The resulting system is simpler from a learnability point of view as each negative morpheme which marks negation at PF also bears morphosyntactic negative features which are interpretable at LF. The implications of my analysis for variation and change in multiple negation remain to be worked out more fully, using more extensive Early Modern English data to examine the loss of multiple negation in more detail. However, my work on ME multiple
negation show that the effect which introducing *not* has on multiple negation is less direct than Rowlett (1998) proposes. The same morphosyntactic change which introduces *not* creates the conditions for a reanalysis of negative quantifiers which ultimately leads to the loss of multiple negation, but the introduction of *not* and loss of multiple negation do not proceed in parallel. Crucially, the reanalysis of negative quantifiers precipitated by Jespersen’s Cycle is the starting point for competition between two types of negative quantifiers, which proceeds gradually throughout LME and Early Modern English. This process eliminates the dependencies between negative items which derive multiple negation, by eliminating lexical items which have the features necessary to appear in multiple negation. The elimination of multiple negation is modelled as a process of lexical competition between items which have contradictory features. Those items with features which enter into syntactic dependencies with other negative elements are eliminated by a process of simplification on the part of the language learner so that each PF expression of negation is also an LF expression of negation.

### 7.2.3 Implications for a Minimalist theory of grammaticalisation (Roberts and Roussou 2003)

The most recent large scale study of grammaticalisation and parametric change within a Minimalist framework is Roberts and Roussou (2003). My account of Jespersen’s Cycle differs from theirs on a number of counts. Most significant is that I find a distinction between valued and unvalued features useful to account for the distribution of *ne* at successive stages of Jespersen’s Cycle, and provide an account of Jespersen’s Cycle as grammatical competition. Roberts and Roussou (2003) conceive of parametric variation as variation in the way pre-existing functional positions are phonologically realised, hence Jespersen’s Cycle describes changes in the lexicalisation of two negation positions as *ne* and *not*. The two positions are in the same syntactic relation irrespective of whether or not they are lexicalised. The fact that both appear lexicalised in Middle English *ne...not* is an historical accident. Analysing Jespersen’s Cycle as two changes in the phonological realisation of existing syntactic positions, as Roberts & Roussou do, predicts that the introduction of *not* and the loss of *ne* should be independent processes. It follows that Roberts & Roussou’s structural changes should be adequately quantitatively modelled using Frisch’s (1997) redundant licensing model. It also follows from Roberts and Roussou (2003) that language learners will acquire an
invariant syntactic structure irrespective of the morphological and syntactic evidence for that structure. My account of Jespersen's Cycle requires a dependency between *ne* and *not* as a precondition for the loss of *ne*. The process by which *ne* is lost makes a distinction between two types of *ne* involved in sentential negation. The innovation of a syntactic dependency between *ne* and *not* is crucial in order for the loss of *ne* to take place, as only then is *ne* redundant as a negative marker.

I argue that the dependency between *ne*...*not* is an innovation due to parametric change in the value of a polarity feature between valued [pol:neg] and unvalued [pol: ]. It follows, contra Roberts and Roussou (2003), that this difference represents another way in which morphosyntactic features are parametrised. Roberts & Roussou's view of parametric variation as change restricted to morphological realisations does not allow this. My account is more economical within a bare phrase structure view, as structure is a consequence of syntactic dependencies, and syntactic dependencies only arise from the need to value unvalued features. Therefore, I propose a restricted theory of parametric variation which allows for change in syntactic structures. The relationship between variation in the value of features and syntactic structures follows from synchronic Minimalist proposals (Chomsky 1995; 2000) and is extended in my research to account for parametric change over time. I make use of the notion of simplicity in reanalysis, defining a simple grammar as one in which the language learner has a clear correspondence between LF and PF expressions of negation, no unvalued features and no syntactic dependencies. The loss of *ne* and the loss of multiple negation are examples of simplification. The loss of *ne* removes a redundant marker of negation. Loss of multiple negation follows from the loss of *ne*[pol:neg]: in clauses where negative arguments and adjuncts are the only negative, the simplest representation is to associate [pol:neg] with them at LF. Roberts and Roussou (2003) cannot appeal to the same ideas of simplicity as their LF representation of negation is invariant. For them, the valued-unvalued feature distinction is not parametrised.

All variation in the expression of negation in the history of English can be handled by two axes of variation affecting [neg] features: the way they combine with other morphosyntactic and morphophonological features in the lexicon, and their value as fully specified [pol:neg] or underspecified [pol: ]. Reference to features takes primacy over reference to functional heads in this model. My analysis of multiple negation makes reference to [pol:neg] features on v°. The syntax of sentential negation is entirely consistent with this. If there is a NegP, it is a proxy projection (Nash and Rouveret 1997) which only appears at stage two of
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Jespersen’s Cycle to provide a specifier position for feature checking.

The unmarked most economical situation is to mark negation (or any other feature) morphologically on a functional head. In terms of pathways of change, elimination of underspecified or unvalued features reduces computational complexity, hence the creation of new morphology out of erstwhile independent syntactic items is favoured by the computational system. In contrast, the change from [pol:neg] to [pol:] is marked as it involves underspecification and the creation of new syntactic dependencies which are imperfections (Chomsky 1995; 2000). Therefore, the trigger for this change must be robust in the primary linguistic data. It may be a by-product of phonological weakening or of the lexical-functional reanalysis which secondary negators undergo in the string ne...na or ne...nawiht. Given the limitations of the textual record, it is impossible to know which of these factors caused the innovation of a new structure, or whether a combination of factors was responsible.

The same concept of markedness is relevant to linguistic change and synchronic syntax: underspecified [pol:] without a value in the lexicon is more marked than [pol:neg]. A perfect system would have no underspecified or unvalued features. Chomsky (1995; 2000) has shown that synchronic syntax works to eliminate unvalued features which are defective at the interfaces and prevent convergence. It is natural to propose that the same simplicity metric is at work for the language learner, leading to the elimination of unvalued features except where these are strongly evidenced by overt syntactic dependencies. Loss of ne [pol:] seems to initiate another process of grammar competition between adverbial or specifier not and head not in Early Modern English, a detailed examination of which is outside the scope of this thesis.

7.3 Minimalism and the representation of sentential negation

7.3.1 The Neg-criterion reduced to a feature checking dependency

I show that changes to negation can be accommodated using theoretical devices from the Minimalist framework (Chomsky 1995; 2000). I make extensive use of morphosyntactic features, arguing that negation is a morphosyntactic feature, subject to the same syntactic constraints as other morphosyntactic features. This
is not a new idea: I follow Rowlett (1998), Kato (2001), Roberts and Roussou (2003) in making this claim. This approach has syntactic implications, as observed by Rowlett (1998). It eliminates the Neg-criterion (Haegeman 1995), which is no longer formulable as a universal condition on negation. Instead, the effects of the Neg-criterion are derived by a morphosyntactic feature checking dependency between the unvalued feature of a head and the matching valued feature of a specifier. The Neg-criterion is not universal, applying in just those cases where unvalued polarity features are present on a head, in just the same way as feature checking applies when other types of unvalued features are present. The scope of negation is not determined by the Neg-criterion but by the position of [neg] in the structure. [neg] takes scope over all that it C-commands.

The Neg-criterion is relativised to a feature checking configuration, not a universal requirement of the grammar or of interpretation at LF. This simplifies the grammar and reduces the need for null operators. Relativising the Neg-criterion to a particular feature checking configuration requires no stipulations or special status for the criterion. It arises out of a general configurational requirement on feature checking used throughout the syntax (for example for phi-feature agreement on subjects or objects).

7.3.2 A feature based analysis of negation and NegP

A feature based analysis of negation has implications for the structural representation of negation as head of NegP. A [pol:neg] feature can be part of the feature specification of some other functional head, such as v°, rather than projecting as a head itself. When the sole expression of negation is a prefix ne on the finite verb, there is no syntactic evidence for a separate projection which is associated with the [pol:neg] feature. Postulation of NegP with ne as its head, for this stage of the language, is an analytical decision which must be made based on the theoretical framework. There are two opposed views of projection in the Minimalist literature. First, the ‘distributed morphology’ view (Halle and Marantz 1993, Bobaljik 1995, Bobaljik and Thrainsson 1998), in which each morpheme projects to a syntactic head. Second, a ‘morphology in the lexicon’ view (Chomsky 1995; 2000), in which each lexical item emerges from the lexicon fully inflected with its morphology. In this approach, the syntax only does feature checking by Merge or Move, and syntactic structure is only built up through feature checking operations. Hence when the polarity feature does not enter into a checking relation, no
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polarity phrase (Po1P) or negative phrase (NegP) is projected. This is the more
minimal approach, as it removes processes of morphological cliticisation from
the syntactic computation. Either approach is empirically justified in respect of
unsupported ne in Old and Middle English. However, there is evidence that Old
and Middle English are languages in which morphemes project to syntactic heads
for feature-checking purposes. The existence of tense and agreement morphology correlates with two syntactic positions for subjects (Bobaljik and Thrains-
son 1998). Haeberli (2002b) uses this fact to explain differences in the position
of pronoun and full NP subjects in relation to finite verbs in Old and Middle
English main clauses. The question relevant to negation is whether there is any
comparable syntactic evidence for NegP; distributional facts concerning negation
which cannot be explained without reference to NegP, similar to the Old English
distribution of subjects which is usefully analysed with reference to AgrP. Does
the feature checking relation holding between an unvalued [pol: ] feature and
a matching [pol: neg] specifier require Po1P? In principle it does not. Chomsky
(1995; 2000) adopts bare phrase structure, rejecting the X'-theoretic approach to
phrase structure which held in Government-Binding theory. Under X'-theory, the
existence of a specifier entailed the existence of a distinct syntactic head. Chom-
sky (1995; 2000) argues that heads may have multiple specifiers, one for each of
the unvalued features of the head which must be valued locally by (re-)Merge.
The position available to Middle English not is consistent with the outer specifier
position of vP. Chomsky (1999) argues that vP has an inner A-specifier, and an
outer A'-specifier. Therefore, it is possible to eliminate NegP.

7.4 Outstanding issues and problems

The most significant outstanding issues are Early Modern English changes to
multiple and sentential negation. Examination of this period will confirm or re-
fute my hypothesis concerning the relationship between multiple negation and
Jespersen's Cycle, as well as allowing me to address the development of negative
auxiliaries and the loss of multiple negation in more detail. As it stands,
the account of Jespersen's Cycle is not complete. The development of negative
auxiliaries at stage four of Jespersen's Cycle will require the relationship between
negation and modality to be considered. Changes in negation interact with the
development of a class of modal verbs, and the introduction of periphrastic do.
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7.4.1 Further issues relating to Jespersen's Cycle

The discussion of Jespersen's Cycle I presented here is not exhaustive. It focuses on providing an account of Jespersen's Cycle within a particular set of assumptions concerning syntactic structure and language change, and validating this account using quantitative data. Further empirical work on the progress of Jespersen's Cycle will uncover a wider range of factors and constraints on the grammaticalisation of not, which will advance understanding of the motivation and processes involved in grammaticalisation and diffusion of not. A detailed examination of the development of not as a sentential negator in Old and Early Middle English and the changes in its distribution at this period will shed some light on the means by which not goes from an adjunct to a sentential negator. I expect that a much wider range of contextual factors condition the use and diffusion of not in Middle English, such as modality or force, or differences between stative or active verbs. Extralinguistic factors, such as dialect or register may be relevant. The data will be coded for these factors to produce a more articulated account of the progress of Jespersen’s Cycle.

This work will need to rely heavily on statistical tools such as multivariate analysis and logistic regression. The present work makes clear the potential for variability within Jespersen’s Cycle and the need to establish the effect of each factor on this variability independently of the others. This will show how the sentential negator not advances through a real time corpus of linguistic data, and will establish whether the Constant Rate Effect holds throughout the contexts using statistical evidence. Linguistic factors will be the easiest to isolate, but extralinguistic factors should also be considered. These are harder to ascertain for historical texts.

Another important area in research on Early English is the effect of language contact in the broadest sense. Many Old English texts are translations of Latin originals or have Latin sources as models. In order to assess the extent to which the Old English data represent the vernacular English situation, it is necessary to establish and isolate any effect that Latin may be having on the patterns found in certain texts. Taylor (2005) has shown a translation effect of Latin upon Old English, but has also demonstrated that the effect is not straightforward or predictable. Detailed comparison of Old English translations and Latin originals is required to see whether Latin negation has any effect on the patterns found in Old English. This is particularly relevant for texts such as the Old English Bede, which exhibit different patterns of negation to contemporaneous texts. This is an
attempt to disentangle scribal practice from actual language use. Actual language use may be less homogeneous than the written data make the situation appear. The effect of language contact with Scandinavian languages in areas of settlement in the north and east may have linguistic effects on negation strategies. Ingham (2004) makes some remarks on the dialectal distribution of patterns of negation which require further investigation to confirm. Old Norse undergoes Jespersen’s Cycle prior to the change in English (see Eythorsson (2002) for a discussion of negation in Old Norse). Therefore, contact with Old Norse may promote Jespersen’s Cycle in English, in much the same way that it contributed to changes in agreement morphology in eastern dialects of Middle English (Samuels 1972). Patterns of migration and dialect levelling within England may also be relevant to the diffusion of changes in negation strategies. The Middle English dialect data are too sparse to facilitate analysis of these factors in detail, but some aspects of variation may emerge from detailed examination of Early Modern English data, from which patterns of variation in Middle English might be extrapolated.

7.4.2 The relationship between Jespersen’s Cycle and multiple negation

In chapter 6 and section 7.2.2 of this chapter I proposed a particular relationship between Jespersen’s Cycle and multiple negation. I speculated that this relationship has the following consequences:

1. *Not* is introduced in the same way in multiple negation as in other contexts.

2. The introduction of *not* has no effect on the availability of multiple negation.

3. Multiple negation is lost through a change in the morphosyntactic features of a particular set of quantifiers (those licensed by negation in Old and Middle English), and bears no direct syntactic relation to the introduction of secondary negators (*not*) under Jespersen’s Cycle as Rowlett (1998) proposes.

4. Morphosyntactic feature change affecting *ne* is crucial in creating the conditions for changes in multiple negation strategies, leading to a reanalysis of concordant negative arguments and adjuncts with the feature [pol: ], which were previously licensed by Agree with *ne* [pol:neg], as self-licensing negative quantifiers, themselves with the feature [pol:neg]. This leads to the loss of multiple negation. The loss of multiple negation arises because of
the loss of Agreement relations between negatives, whether between a negative marker and a negative argument or adjunct (negative doubling) or between two or more negative arguments and adjuncts (negative spread).

However, I observed that Middle English offers insufficiently variable use of multiple negation to examine variation and change in multiple negation strategies. This will be possible with corpora of Early Modern English data covering the period in which multiple negation is actually lost from the standard language.

A real time, diachronic perspective on the loss of multiple negation in Early Modern English will establish the exact nature of the parametric difference between Middle English, which has multiple negation, and Modern Standard English, which does not, whilst taking account of the behaviour of non-standard dialects which retain multiple negation. The aim is similar to synchronic studies of parametric variation across related dialects, but the dialects in question are related in both space and time. I will seek an approach to the loss of multiple negation which clarifies its relation to Jespersen’s Cycle as I have analysed it here. In parametric terms, the question is whether either of the changes involved in Jespersen’s Cycle and the loss of multiple negation are related directly as aspects of the same parametric changes, indirectly in some way yet to be worked out, or whether multiple negation is completely independent of Jespersen’s Cycle. Typologically, Rowlett (1998) observes that languages with a negative head are typically those with multiple negation. His formalisation of this observation does not fit the early English data well, but that does not mean that I should abandon his observation. There should be another way to formulate the correspondence Rowlett observes which is compatible with the early English situation, and explains why early English is typologically odd in having negative spread for a time.

Examination of Early Modern English corpora will enable me to use quantitative and statistical observations to relate change in sentential negation strategies and the loss of multiple negation. This will enhance understanding of the motivation for, and factors involved in the loss of multiple negation. In particular, I will establish whether Jespersen’s Cycle is one of the factors involved in the loss of multiple negation. The challenge in accounting for multiple negation strategies is to parametrise all the changes involved in a way which derives all the patterns of variation found in Early Modern English data, within the restricted theory of parametric change I outline in this thesis, and which makes parametric changes the products of reanalyses during the process of language acquisition.
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The hypothesis that multiple negation is lost due to lexical ambiguity between concordant negatives and negative quantifiers has not been fully tested yet. I hypothesize that concordant negatives and negative quantifiers are in competition. At the present time, it is not clear which parameters compete to eradicate multiple negation and how many processes of change are involved, let alone how the competition begins, or the factors which promote the loss of multiple negation in the standard language. Standard and non-standard dialects diverge. The lack of multiple negation becomes a marker of the standard language.

In accounting for the loss of multiple negation, work remains to establish the role of linguistic change and extralinguistic factors such as the evaluation of variants and their significance within the speech community. This requires detailed study of the effect of linguistic and extralinguistic constraints using statistical tools such as multivariate analysis to compensate for uneven data distribution in the written historical record. Nevalainen (1996) provides evidence for the social evaluation of multiple negation and the role of sociolinguistic factors in its loss. However, little work has been done on the role of linguistic factors, dialect or register variation or the interaction between a full range of factors. Detailed examination of these factors will inform the way the loss of multiple negation is modelled in the grammatical competition model, and even whether the grammatical competition model is appropriate. I am also aware that the factors relevant to variation between multiple negation and non-multiple negation may change over time as language users re-evaluate the variants. Nevalainen (1996) demonstrates that the social significance of multiple negation changes as the demographics of its use change in the 16th century. It becomes a marker of social rank during this period.

In chapter 6, I proposed that variable use of multiple negation strategies involving not gives rise to the observed PDE variation between no-negation and not-negation (Tottie 1991). An extension of Tottie's research to Early Modern English will clearly show whether this hypothesis is correct or not. I predict that Early Modern English multiple negation involves two changes: a generalisation of not into contexts where it was previously absent, and the replacement of n-words with negative polarity items (any-). The intersection of these two changes provides the conditions for variation between not-negation and no-negation.
7.4.3 The development of negative auxiliaries

Examination of Early Modern English sentential negation strategies should reveal some changes to negation which are contingent on changes in clause structure, on the loss of verb movement and on the development of modal auxiliaries. The development of a class of modal verbs, and the emergence of periphrastic do in the Early Modern English period affect the representation of negation in Early Modern English. The work I have already done on the earlier history of negation might shed some light on the interaction of negation and modality and reasons for the development of negative auxiliary verbs. Zwicky and Pullum (1983) propose that auxiliary verbs are inflected for negation in the lexicon rather than formed by cliticisation of the finite verb and not in the syntax. There has been no lack of literature on the development of a class of modal verbs and especially concerning the development of periphrastic do, but few accounts have examined the interaction between the development of modal verbs and changes to the syntax of negation. Further work is needed to establish the process and motivation by which not loses its syntactic independence in Early Modern English, and why it becomes associated with a particular subset of verbs, the modal auxiliaries. The development of a class of modals, and the loss of V to T movement with lexical verbs are both necessary conditions for the development of negative auxiliaries.

7.5 Summary of conclusions

This thesis has demonstrated the value of large scale research over a long timespan using syntactically parsed corpora and an approach which integrates quantitative methodology, textual analysis and Minimalist syntactic theory. I provide a more constrained view of parametric variation in negation than previous accounts, advancing empirical evidence for the Minimalist idea that parametric variation is lexically based variation in the distribution and value of morphosyntactic features as well as the morphological realisation of these features. This view of parametric variation is more complex than Roberts and Roussou (2003), but has the advantage of clarifying the relationships between changes in early English negation, in particular those which go to make up Jespersen’s Cycle. This view of parametric variation allows a simple account of Jespersen’s Cycle as grammatical competition. It also has the (synchronic and diachronic) benefit of simplifying the representation of negation in early English, reducing the num-
ber of null elements and syntactic dependencies involved in the representation of negation. This has the consequence of making negation strategies more learnable on the basis of overt morphological evidence. Finally, I show that quantitative data are crucial in making sense of the relationships between changing patterns of negation in early English and informing an appropriate syntactic analysis.
Appendix A

Texts and Editions included in the York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose

The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose (Taylor et al. 2003) comprises the following texts. I split the data into three broad chronological periods according to the manuscript dates given in Ker (1957). Only one manuscript version of each text is included. All this information is taken from the YCOE documentation, available with the corpus through the Oxford Text Archive.

A.1 Pre-950

- Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English Church and People Preface, Headings, Books 1 and 2 (COBEDE.02)

- Boethius, Consolation of Philosophy (COBOETH.02)

- Gregory's Pastoral Care Chapters 1-39 (COCURA.02)

- Gregory’s Pastoral Care Chapters 1-39 (COCURAC)

- Charters and Wills (CODOCU1.01)
  (1) Harmer, F.E. 1914. Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries. Cambridge: CUP.

- Charters and Wills (CODOCU2.012)

- Charters and Wills (CODOCU2.02)
  (1) Harmer, F.E. 1914. Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries. Cambridge: CUP.

- Bald’s Leechbook (COLAECE.O2)

- Laws of Alfred (COLAWAF.O2)

- Alfred’s Introduction to Laws (COLAWAFINT.O2)

- Laws of Ine (COLAWINE.OX2)

---

1 Defective section 33 replaced by Cotton Tiberius B.XI, see cocuraC
2 Replaces defective section 33 in Hatton 20
• **Orosius** Books 2 and 3 (COOROSIU.02)

• **Preface to Cura Pastoralis** (COPREFCURA.O2)

**A.2 950-1050**

• **Ælfric’s Supplemental Homilies** (COAELHOM.O3)

• **Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies I** (COAELIVE.O3)

• **Alexander’s Letter to Aristotle** (COALEX.O23)

• **Apollonius of Tyre** (COAPOLLO.O3)
  Goolden, Peter. 1958. The Old English “Apollonius of Tyre”. London: OUP.

• **The Benedictine Rule** (BENRUL.O3)

• **The Blickling Homilies** (COBLICK.O23)

• **Byrhtferth’s Manual** (COBYRHTF.O3)
• Ælfric's Catholic Homilies I (COCATHOM1.03)
  Clemoes, P. 1997. Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series. EETS s.s. 17.
  Oxford: OUP.

• Ælfric's Catholic Homilies II (COCATHOM2.03)
  Godden, M. 1979. Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series. EETS s.s.
  5. London: OUP.

• Saint Christopher (COCHRISTOPH)
  Rypins, Stanley. 1971 (1924). Three Old English Prose Texts in Ms. Cotton
  Vitellius A.XV. EETS 161. London: OUP.

• Anglo-Saxon Chronicle A (COCHRONA.023)

• Charters and Wills (CODOCU3.023)
  (1) Harmer, F.E. 1914. Select English Historical Documents of the Ninth and
      Tenth Centuries. Cambridge: CUP.

• Ælfric's Epilogue to Genesis (COEPIGEN.03)
  Crawford, Samuel J. 1922. The Old English Version of the Heptateuch. Ælf-
  fric's Treatise on the Old and New Testament and His Preface to Genesis.
  EETS 160: 333-76. London: OUP.

• Saint Euphrosyne (COEUPHR)
  Skeat, Walter William. 1966 (1881-1900). Ælfric's Lives of Saints. EETS 76,
  82, 94, 114: 334-54. London: OUP.

• Saint Eustace and his Companions (COEUST)
  Skeat, Walter William. 1966 (1881-1900). Ælfric's Lives of Saints. EETS 76,
  82, 94, 114: 190-218. London: OUP.

3Attached to the filename within the ID is an indication of scribe, where cochronA-1 indicates
scribe 1, cochronA-8a indicates scribe 8a, etc. Bately 1986: xxi-xliii (The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle:
A Collaborative Edition) was used as the source for information about and identification of the
scribes. Note that CorpusSearch treats each scribe as a separate text and computes the statistics
appropriately.
• **Gregory’s Dialogues (Ms. H)** (COGREGDH.O23)

• **Lacnunga** (COLACNU.O23)

• **Laws of Cnut I** (COLAW1CN.O3)

• **Laws of Cnut II** (COLAW2CN.O3)

• **Laws of Æthelred V** (COLAW5ATR.O3)

• **Laws of Æthelred VI** (COLAW6ATR.O3)

• **Northumbra Preosta Lagu** (COLAWNORTHU.O3)

• **Ælfric’s Letter to Sigefyrth** (COLSIGEF.O3)

• **Ælfric’s First Letter to Wulfstan** (COLWSTAN1.O3)

- Ælfric's Second Letter to Wulfstan (COLWSTAN2.03)

- Ælfric's Letter to Wulfgeat (COLWGEAT)

- The Old English Martyrology (COMART1, COMART2, COMART3.023)

- comarvel.023 (MARVELS OF THE EAST)

- Mary of Egypt (COMARY)

- The Heptateuch Genesis and Exodus (COOTEST.03)

- Ælfric's Preface to Catholic Homilies I (COPREFCATH1.03)
• Ælfric’s Preface to Catholic Homilies II (COPREFCATH2.O3)

• Ælfric’s Preface to Genesis (COPREFGEN)

• Ælfric’s Lives of Saints (COPREFLIVES.O3)

• Quadrupedibus (COQUADRU.O23)

• The Seven Sleepers (COSEVENSL)

• Solomon and Saturn II (COSOLSAT2)

• De Temporibus Anni (COTEMPO.O3)

• The Vercelli Homilies (COVERHOM)

• The West-Saxon Gospels Matthew (COWSGOSP.O3)
A.3 1050-1150

- **Adrian and Ritheus** *(COADRIAN.O34)*

- **Alcuin's De Virtutibus et Vitiis** *(COALCUIN)*

- **Augustine's Soliloquies** *(COAUGUST)*

- **Chrodegang's Rule** *(COCHDRUL)*

- **Canons of Edgar** *(COCANEDGX)*

- **Other Saints' Lives, The Life of Saint Chad** *(COCHAD.O24)*

- **Distichs of Cato** *(CODICTS.O34)*

- **Charters and Wills** *(CODOCU3.O3)*

- **Charters and Wills** *(CODOCU4.O24)*

- **Honorius of Autun, Elucidarium** *(COELUC1)*

- **Gregory’s Dialogues (Ms. C) Books 1 and 2 (CO GreggDC.o24)**

- **Herbarium (CO HERBAR)**

- **Institutes of Polity (CO INS POLX)**

- **James the Greater (CO JAMES)**

- **Gerefa (CO LAW GER.034)**

- **Laws of William (CO LAW WLLAD.04)**

- **Vision of Leofric (CO LEOFRI.04)**

- **Ælfric’s Letter to Sigewead (Z) (CO SIGEWZ)**

4This text is included in the PPCME2 as part of the Kentish Homilies (cmkenthom1)
- Ælfric’s Letter to Wulfsige (COLWSIGEXA.O34)

- Saint Margaret (COMARGAC.O34)

- Saint Neot (CONEOT)

- The Gospel of Nichodemus (CONICODA)

- Preface to St Augustine’s Soliloquies (COPREFSOLILO)

- The History of the Holy Rood-Tree (COROOD)

- St Augustine’s Soliloquies (COSOLILO)
- **Solomon and Saturn I** (COSOLSAT1.OX4)

- **The Martyrdom of Saint Vincent (2nd half)** (COVINCEB)

- **Vindicta Salvatoris** (COVINSAL)

- **The Homilies of Wulfstan** (COWULF.034)

\(^5\)Although included in B1.3.35 with the part of The Martyrdom of Saint Vincent found in Skeat (1881-1900), this part of the text is from a different manuscript
Appendix B

Texts and Editions included in the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (2nd edition)

The second edition of the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (Kroch and Taylor 2000a) is subdivided into four time periods. The texts included in the corpus and the editions used are as follows. I have categorised texts by the date of the manuscript edition used rather than the supposed date of composition. The *Ormulum* is not listed, as I did not include it in the analysis.

All this information is taken from the PPCME2 documentation, available at [http://www.ling.upenn.edu/mideng/](http://www.ling.upenn.edu/mideng/)

**M1: 1150-1250**

- **Kentish Homilies (CMKENTHO)**

- **The Peterborough Chronicle (CMPETERB)**

- **Ancrene Riwle (CMANCRIW)**

- The Katherine Group
This group includes the following texts: Hali Meidhad (CMHALI), St Katherine (CMKATHE), St Juliana (CMJULIA), St Margaret (CMMARGA), Sawles Warde (CMSAWLES).

- The Lambeth Homilies (CMLAMB1, CMLAMBX1)

- Vices and Virtues (CMVICES1)
Holthausen, F., Vices and Virtues, Part i, Text and Translation, EETS, OS 89.

- Trinity Homilies (CMTRINIT)

M2: 1250-1350

- Kentish Sermons (CMKENTSE)

- The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter (CMEARLPS)

- Ayenbite of Inwyt (CMAYENBI)
Morris, Richard, Dan Michel Ayenbite of Inwyt, EETS OS 23 (London, 1866),

M3: 1350-1420

- Chaucer:

- The Equatorie of the Planets (CMEQUATO)

- English Wycliffite Sermons (CMWYCSER)

- Purvey’s Prologue to the Bible (CMPURVEY)

- The New Testament (Wycliffite) (CMNTEST)

- The Old Testament (Wycliffite) (CMOTEST)
  Forshall, J. and F. Madden (eds.), The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and

- The Cloud of Unknowing (CMCLOUD)

- The Brut or The Chronicles of England (CMBRUT)

- The Polychronicon (John of Trevisa) (CMPOLYCH)

- Mandeville's Travels (CMMANDEV)

- A Late Middle English Treatise on Horses (CMHORSES)

- The Mirror of St. Edmund (Vernon Ms.) (CMEDVERN)

- The Northern Prose Rule of St. Benet (CMBENRUL)

- Aelred of Rievaulx's De Institutione (Ms. Vernon) (CMAELR3)
M4: 1420-1500

- Aelred of Rievaulx's de Institutione Inclusarum (Bodley 423) (CMAELR4)

- The Book of Margery Kempe (CMKEMPE)

- Capgrave's Chronicle (CMCAPCHR)

- Capgrave's Sermon (CMCAPSER)

- Gregory's Chronicle (CMGREGOR)

- Malory's Morte Darthur (CMMALORY)

- In Die Innocencium (CMINNOCE)

- Richard Fitzjames' Sermo de Lune (CMFITZJA)

- Renard the Fox (Caxton) (CMREYNAR)
  Blake, N.F. (ed.), The History of Reynard the Fox. Translated from the Dutch

- **The Siege of Jerusalem (CMSIEGE)**

- **The Life of St. Edmund (CMEDMUND)**

- **Richard Rolle: Epistles (The Form of Living, Ego Dormio, The Commandment) (CMROLLEP)**

- **Richard Rolle: Prose Treatises from the Thornton Ms. (CMROLLETR)**

- **The Book of Vices and Virtues (CMVICES4)**

- **Mirk's Festial (CMMIRK)**

- **The Mirror of St. Edmund (Thornton Ms.) (CMEDTHOR)**

- **Middle English Sermons (CMROYAL)**

- **Dan Jon Gaytryge's Sermon (CMGAYTRY)**
• Hilton’s Eight Chapters on Perfection (CMHILTON)

• Julian of Norwich’s Revelations of Divine Love (CMJULNOR)

• Liber de Diversis Medicinis (CMTHORN)
Appendix C

Texts and Editions included in the York-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Poetry

The following texts are included in the York-Helsinki Corpus of Old English Poetry. These details are taken from the corpus documentation, and can be found at:

http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~lang18/ptext-list.html


- cobrunan.psd. Primary source: THE ANGLO-SAXON MINOR POEMS. THE ANGLO-SAXON POETIC RECORDS, VI. ED. E. V. K. DOBBIE. NEW


Appendix D

Example CorpusSearch Queries

In all these files, the ignore list and node are set up as follows:

```plaintext
ignore_nodes:  */*CONJ*|*VOC*|*LFD*|INTJ|CODE|ID|
LB|'|"|,|E_S|/
node:  IP*
remove_nodes:  F
```

The following definition files are used:

For `not`:

```plaintext
not_neg:  $noht*|na+ght*|Na+ght*|nacht*|Nacht*|naht*|Naht*|nat* |Nat*|nau+gt*|Nau+gt*|nauht*|Nauht*|naut*|Naut*|nawhit* |Nawhit* |nawicht*|Nawicht*|nawiht*|Nawiht*|nawt*|Nawt* |nochht*|Nochht* |noght*|Noght|noghte*|Noghte*|noht*|Nohht* |noht*|Nohht* |not*|Not*|nou+gt*|Nou+gt*|nought*|Nought*|Na+gt* |na+gt*|No+gt*|No+gt*|nowt*|Nowt*|naut|Naut
```

For negative adverb `never`:

```plaintext
never_adv:  n+afr*|n+aur*|n+adem*|nafr*|naurema|nauwer* |neauer*|naur*|nefr*|neuer*|neure*|neyr*|never*|newenn*
```

D.1 Chapter Two

Incidence of `ne`
print_complement: T
query: (((IP-MAT* iDominates NEG*)
    AND (NEG* iDominates !not_neg))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|
        *UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*))

ne adjacent and non-adjacent to a finite verb:

print_complement: T
query: (((IP-MAT* iDominates NEG*)
    AND (NEG* iDominates !not_neg))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|
        *UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*))
    AND (NEG* iPrecedes *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|
        *UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*))

not preceding a pronominal subject in subject verb inversion:

definition file: not.def
query: (((((IP* iDominates NEG)
    AND (NEG* iDominates not_neg))
    AND (IP* iDominates *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|
        *UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*))
    AND (IP* iDominates NP-SBJ*))
    AND (NP-SBJ* iDomsOnly PRO*)))
    AND (NEG precedes NP-SBJ*))

not in clauses with a pronominal subject and subject-verb inversion:

definition file: not.def
query: (((((IP* iDominates NEG)
    AND (NEG* iDominates not_neg))
    AND (IP* iDominates *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|
        *UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*))
    AND (IP* iDominates NP-SBJ*))
    AND (NP-SBJ* iDomsOnly PRO*)))
    AND (*BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|*UT*|*AX*|
        *VBP*|*VBD* precedes NP-SBJ*)))
not preceding a finite verb: (run separately for IP-MAT* and IP-SUB*)

definition file: not.def
query: ((((IP-MAT* iDominates NEG) AND (NEG iDominates not_neg)) AND (IP-MAT* iDominates *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|*UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*)) AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-SBJ*)) AND (NEG precedes *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|*UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*))

definition file: not.def
query: ((((IP-MAT* iDominates NEG) AND (NEG iDominates not_neg)) AND (IP-MAT* iDominates *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|*UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*)) AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-SBJ*)) AND (NEG precedes *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|*UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*)) AND (NP-SBJ* iDomsOnly PRO*))

definition file: not.def
query: ((((IP-MAT* iDominates NEG) AND (NEG iDominates not_neg)) AND (IP-MAT* iDominates *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|*UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*)) AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-SBJ*)) AND (NEG precedes *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|*UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*)) AND (NP-SBJ* iDoms N*|D*|Q*|ADJ*|NPR*))

definition file: not.def
query: ((((IP-MAT* iDominates NEG) AND (NEG iDominates not_neg)) AND (IP-MAT* iDominates *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|*UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*)) AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-SBJ*))
AND (NEG precedes *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*)
*HVD*|*MD*|*UT*|*AX*|*VBP*|*VBD*)
AND (NP-SBJ* iDoms **))

Object pronoun preceding not (run for IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately)

definition file: not.def
query: (((((((((IP-SUB* iDominates NEG)
  AND (IP-SUB* iDominates *BEP*|*BED*|*BEI*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*HVI*|
*MD|*AX|*DOP*|*DOD*|*DOI*|*VBP*|*VBD*|*VBI*))
  AND (IP-SUB* iDominates NP-OB*))
  AND (NP-OB* iDominatesOnly PRO*))
  AND (NEG iDominates np-obj))
  AND (IP-SUB* iDominates NP-SBJ))
  AND (NP-OB* iDominates NEG)) (or cf. NEG precedes NP-OB* for order 'not-obj)

Object NP preceding not (run for IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately)

definition file: not.def
query: (((((((((IP-SUB* iDominates NEG)
  AND (IP-SUB* iDominates *BEP*|*BED*|*BEI*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*HVI*|
*MD|*AX|*DOP*|*DOD*|*DOI*|*VBP*|*VBD*|*VBI*))
  AND (IP-SUB* iDominates NP-OB*))
  AND (NP-OB* iDominates N*|D*|*Q*|*ADJ*|*NPR*))
  AND (NEG iDominates not_neg))
  AND (IP-SUB* iDominates NP-SBJ))
  AND (NP-OB* iDominates NEG)) (or cf. NEG precedes NP-OB* for order 'not-obj)
AND (IP-SUB* iDominates NP-SBJ))
AND (NP-OB* precedes NEG)) (or cf. NEG precedes NP-OB* for order 'not-obj)

Object preceding adverb:

definition file: not.def
query: (((((((((IP-MAT* iDominates ADVP*)
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates
        *BEP*|*BED*|*BEI*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*HVI*|*MD|*AX|*DOP*|
        *DOD*|*DOI*|*VBP*|*VBD*|*VBI*))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-OB*))
    AND (NP-OB* iDomsOnly N*|D*|Q*|ADJ*|NUM*|NPR*))
    AND (
        *BEP*|*BED*|*BEI*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*HVI*|*MD|*AX|*DOP*|*DOD*
        |*DOI*|*VBP*|*VBD*|*VBI* precedes NP-OB*))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-SBJ))
    AND (ADVP* iDominates ADV*))
    AND (NP-OB* precedes ADVP*))

definition file: not.def
query: (((((((((IP-MAT* iDominates ADVP*)
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates
        *BEP*|*BED*|*BEI*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*HVI*|*MD|*AX|*DOP*|*DOD*
        |*DOI*|*VBP*|*VBD*|*VBI*))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-OB*))
    AND (NP-OB* iDomsOnly PRO*))
    AND (
        *BEP*|*BED*|*BEI*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*HVI*|*MD|*AX|*DOP*|*DOD*
        |*DOI*|*VBP*|*VBD*|*VBI* precedes NP-OB*))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-SBJ))
    AND (ADVP* iDominates ADV*))
    AND (NP-OB* precedes ADVP*))
AND (ADVP* iDominates ADV*))
AND (NP-OB* precedes ADVP*))

not preceding a postverbal NP subject in non-conjoined main clauses:
definition file: not.def
query: (((((((((IP-MAT* iDominates NEG)
    AND (NEG iDominates not_neg))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates *VBP*|*VBD*|*BEP*|*BED*|
*MD*|*AX*|*UT*|*HVP*|*HVD*))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-SBJ))
    AND (NP-SBJ iDominates N*|D*|*Q*|*ADJ*|*NPR*))
    AND (NP-SBJ precedes NEG))
    AND (*VBP*|*VBD*|*BEP*|*BED*|
*MD*|*AX*|*UT*|*HVP*|*HVD* precedes NP-SBJ*))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates !*CONJ*))
    AND (*VBP*|*VBD*|*BEP*|*BED*|*MD*|
*AX*|*UT*|*HVP*|*HVD* precedes NEG))

not following a postverbal NP subject in non-conjoined main clauses:
definition file: not.def
query: (((((((((IP-MAT* iDominates NEG)
    AND (NEG iDominates not_neg))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates *VBP*|*VBD*|*BEP*|
*BED*|*MD*|*AX*|*UT*|*HVP*|*HVD*))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-SBJ))
    AND (NP-SBJ iDominates N*|D*|*Q*|*ADJ*|*NPR*))
    AND (NEG precedes NP-SBJ))
    AND (*VBP*|*VBD*|*BEP*|*BED*|*MD*|*AX*|*UT*|
*HVP*|*HVD* precedes NP-SBJ*))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDominates !*CONJ*))
    AND (*VBP*|*VBD*|*BEP*|*BED*|*MD*|*AX*|
*UT*|*HVP*|*HVD* precedes NEG))

not preceding an NP subject in subordinate clauses:
definition file: not.def
query: ((((((IP-SUB* iDominates NEG)
  AND (NEG iDominates not_neg))
  AND (IP-SUB* iDominates *BEP*|*BED*|*HVP*|*HVD*|*MD*|*AXP*|*AXD*|*VBP*|*VBD*))
  AND (IP-SUB* iDominates NP-SBJ))
  AND (NP-SBJ iDominates N*|D*|Q*|ADJ*|NPR*))
  AND (NEG precedes NP-SBJ)) (cf. NP-SBJ precedes NEG
for NP subjects preceding \textit{not})

OE \textit{na} following a postverbal full NP subject:

query: ((((((((((IP-MAT* iDominates ADVP*)
  AND (ADVP* iDominates NEG+ADV*))
  AND (IP-MAT* iDominates *VBP*|*VBD*|*BEP*|*BED*|*MD*|*UT*|*HVP*|*HVD*))
  AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-NOM))
  AND (NP-NOM iDominates N*|D*|Q*|ADJ*|NPR*))
  AND (NP-NOM precedes ADVP*))
  AND (*VBP*|*VBD*|*BEP*|*BED*|*MD*|*UT*
|*HVP*|*HVD* precedes NP-NOM))
  AND (*VBP*|*VBD*|*BEP*|*BED*|*MD*|*UT*
|*HVP*|*HVD* precedes ADVP*))
  AND (NEG+ADV* iDominates na|Na|NA|no|No|NO))

OE \textit{na} preceding a postverbal full NP subject:

query: ((((((((((IP-MAT* iDominates ADVP*)
  AND (ADVP* iDominates NEG+ADV*))
  AND (IP-MAT* iDominates *VBP*|*VBD*|*BEP*|*BED*|*MD*|*UT*|*HVP*|*HVD*))
  AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-NOM))
  AND (NP-NOM iDominates N*|D*|Q*|ADJ*|NPR*))
  AND (ADVP* precedes NP-NOM))
  AND (*VBP*|*VBD*|*BEP*|*BED*|*MD*|*UT*
|*HVP*|*HVD* precedes NP-NOM))
  AND (*VBP*|*VBD*|*BEP*|*BED*|*MD*|*UT*
|*HVP*|*HVD* precedes ADVP*))
  AND (NEG+ADV* iDominates na|Na|NA|no|No|NO))
(similarly for subordinate clauses: IP-SUB*)
The frequency of OE na in multiple negation (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately):

   AND (IP-SUB* iDominates [1]ADVP*))
   AND ([1]ADVP* iDominates [1]NEG*))
   AND ([1]NEG* iDominates na|Na|NA|no|No|NO))

The frequency of OE nxfre in multiple negation (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately):

definition file: never.def
   AND (IP-SUB* iDominates [1]ADVP*))
   AND ([1]ADVP* iDominates [1]NEG*))
   AND ([1]NEG* iDominates never_adv))

The frequency of OE na in multiple negation (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately):

   AND (IP-SUB* iDominates [1]ADVP*))
   AND ([1]ADVP* iDominates [1]NEG*))
   AND ([1]NEG* iDominates na|Na|NA|no|No|NO))

The frequency of ME not in multiple negation (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately):

definition file: never.def
query: (((IP-MAT* iDominates ADVP*)
   AND (ADVP* iDominates *ADV*))
   AND (*ADV* iDominates never_adv))
   AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NEG))
   AND (NEG iDominates not_neg))

definition file: never.def
query: (((IP-MAT* iDominates NP*)}
AND (NP* iDominates *Q*))
AND (*Q* iDominates n*|N*))
AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NEG))
AND (NEG iDominates not_neg))

The frequency of ME *never* in multiple negation (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately):

definition file: never.def
query: ((((((IP-MAT* iDominates ADVP*)
   AND (ADVP* iDominates *ADV*))
   AND (*ADV* iDominates never_adv))
   AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP*))
   AND (NP* iDoms *Q*))
   AND (Q* iDoms n*|N*))

The distribution of EME *not* by clause type (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately):

definition file: not.def
query: (((IP-MAT* iDominates NEG)
   AND (NEG iDominates not_neg))

The distribution of OE na by clause type (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately):

query: (((IP-SUB* iDominates ADVP*)
   AND (ADVP* iDominates NEG+ADV*))
   AND (NEG+ADV* iDomsOnly na|Na|NA|no|No|NO))
   AND (IP-SUB* iDominates NEG*))

All negative clauses with a sentential negative marker (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately):

query: (IP-MAT*|IP-SUB* iDominates NEG*)

D.2 Chapter Three

Non-conjoined negative clauses with *ne* and a subject pronoun
shorthand: (((((IP-MAT* iDominates [1]NEG*)
   AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-NOM))
   AND (NP-NOM iDomsOnly PRO*))
   AND (IP-MAT* iDominates !*CONJ*)))

Query applied to the output of the above to isolate subjunctives and imperatives:
the complement file excluded these.

print_complement: T
shorthand: (((((IP-MAT* iDominates [1]NEG*)
   AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-NOM))
   AND (NP-NOM iDomsOnly PRO*))
   AND (IP-MAT* iDominates !*CONJ*)))
   AND (IP-MAT* iDominates ADVP*)
   AND (ADVP* iDominates NEG+ADV*)
   AND (NEG+ADV* iDominates na|Na|NA|no|No|NO))

Non-conjoined clauses with multiple negation: this file produces a complement file which isolates unsupported ne at stage one of Jespersen’s Cycle

print_complement: T
shorthand: (((((IP-MAT* iDominates [1]NEG*)
   AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-NOM))
   AND (NP-NOM iDomsOnly PRO*))
   AND (IP-MAT* iDominates !*CONJ*)))
   AND (IP-MAT* iDominates ADVP*)
   AND (ADVP* iDominates NEG+ADV*)
   AND (NEG+ADV* iDominates ADVP*|QP*|NP*|ADJP*))

These queries distinguish unsupported and supported ne at successive stages of Jespersen’s Cycle. The following queries establish the position of ne+V in the
clauses, and are run for each stage of Jespersen's Cycle separately, as well as the pool of clauses overall.

Non-conjoined clauses with subject pronouns in which the negation precedes the subject (NegV1 clauses). Clauses with initial adverbs are excluded, as these are separate contexts for inversion in both positive and negative clauses. This query separates negative inversion and non-inversion contexts. The results were checked manually to separate NegV1 clauses and other remaining inversion contexts.

\[
\text{print_complement: } T \\
\text{shorthand: } (((((\text{IP-MAT* iDoms [1]NEG*}) \\
    \text{AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-NOM)}) \\
    \text{AND (NP-NOM iDomsOnly PRO*)}) \\
    \text{AND (IP-MAT* iDominates !*CONJ*)}) \\
    \text{AND ([1]NEG* Precedes NP-NOM)}) \\
    \text{AND (IP-MAT* iDomsNumber1 !ADVP*)))}
\]

For OE prose and poetry, the following query isolates clauses with initial non-verbal negatives without \textit{ne}

\[
\text{shorthand: } (((((\text{IP-MAT* iDoms [1]ADVP*|QP*}) \\
    \text{AND (IP-MAT* iDominates NP-NOM)}) \\
    \text{AND (NP-NOM iDomsOnly PRO*)}) \\
    \text{AND (IP-MAT* iDominates !*CONJ*)}) \\
    \text{AND ([1]ADVP*|QP* Precedes NP-NOM)}) \\
    \text{AND ([1]ADVP*|QP* iDominates NEG+Q*|NEG+ADV*)) \\
    \text{AND (IP-MAT* iDoms ![2]NEG*))}
\]

For negatives following the pronominal subject the order of NP-NOM and [1]ADVP*|QP* is reversed (NP-NOM Precedes [1]ADVP*|QP*).)

\section*{D.3 Chapter Five}

The overall frequency of ME \textit{ne} (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately):

\[
\text{definition file: not.def} \\
\text{query: } (((\text{IP-MAT* iDominates NEG*}) \\
    \text{AND (NEG* iDominates !not_neg)))}
\]
D.3. CHAPTER FIVE

This gets all examples of *ne*, including those in *ne...not* and multiple negation. Therefore, the following query files were run to exclude *ne...not* and multiple negation, by reducing the original data into a series of output and complement files. Once multiple negation and *ne...not* are excluded the final complement file gives the frequency of unsupported *ne*.

The frequency of *ne...not* (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately).

**definition file: not.def**

**query:**

```
(((IP-MAT* iDominates [1]NEG)
    AND ([1]NEG iDominates not_neg))
    AND (IP-MAT* iDoms [2]NEG*))
```

To find multiple negation in order to exclude it here (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately).

**definition file: not.def**

**query:**

```
(((IP-MAT* iDominates [1]NEG*)
    AND (IP-MAT* iDoms NP*[ADJP*]QP*))
    AND (NP*[ADJP*]QP* iDoms *Q*))
    AND (*Q* iDoms n*[N*])
```

**definition file: never.def**

**query:**

```
(((IP-MAT* iDominates [1]NEG*)
    AND (IP-MAT* iDoms ADVP*))
    AND (ADVP* iDoms *ADV*))
    AND (*ADV* iDoms never_adv))
```

Unsupported *not* at stage three of Jespersen's Cycle (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately):

First, find all ME *not*:

**definition file: not.def**

**query:**

```
((IP-MAT* iDominates [1]NEG)
    AND ([1]NEG iDominates not_neg))
```

Then exclude those which co-occur with *ne* by splitting the output (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately):
print_complement: T
definition file: not.def
query: (((IP-MAT* iDominates [1]NEG)
   AND ([1]NEG iDominates not_neg))
   AND (IP-MAT* iDoms [2]NEG*))

Negatives in the scope of a higher negation:

shorthand: (((([1]IP-MAT*|IP-SUB* dominates CP*)
   AND (CP* dominates [2]IP-SUB*))
   AND ([1]IP-MAT*|IP-SUB* iDominates [1]NEG*))

(then ne, ne...not, not separated using the same queries as other subordinate clauses.)

Negative if-clauses:

query: ((((IP-MAT* iDoms PP*)
   AND (PP* Doms P*))
   AND (P* iDoms *if*|*yf*|*ef*))
   AND (PP* iDoms CP*))
   AND (CP* Doms IP-SUB*))
   AND (IP-SUB* iDoms [1]NEG*))

Negative if-clauses in the scope of negation:

query: ((((IP-MAT* iDoms PP*)
   AND (PP* Doms P*))
   AND (P* iDoms *if*|*yf*|*ef*))
   AND (PP* iDoms CP*))
   AND (CP* Doms IP-SUB*))
   AND (IP-SUB* iDoms [1]NEG*))
   AND (IP-MAT* iDoms [2]NEG*))

(then ne, ne...not, not separated using the same queries as other subordinate clauses)

The incidence of multiple negation involving not (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately).
Queries to establish frequency of *ne* in negative doubling: (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately)

Frequency of *ne* then calculated using the following files to split the output:
definition file: never.def
query: (((IP-MAT* iDominates [1]NEG*)
   AND (IP-MAT* iDoms ADVP*))
   AND (ADVP* iDoms *ADV*))
   AND (*ADV* iDoms never_adv))

Frequency of the ne...but construction:

query: (((IP* dominates FP*)
   AND (FP* iDominates but*lbot*))
   AND (IP* iDominates NEG*)
   AND (NEG* iDoms !not_neg))

   Compared with the frequency of but without ne

query: ((IP* dominates FP*)
   AND (FP* iDominates but*|bot*))

D.4 Chapter Six

ME multiple negation with never:

definition file: never.def
query: (((((((IP* iDominates [1]ADVP*)
   AND ([1]ADVP* iDominates [1]*ADV*))
   AND ([1]*ADV* iDominates [1]never_adv))
   AND (IP* iDominates [2]NP*))
   AND ([2]NP* iDominates [2]*Q*))
   AND ([2]*Q* iDominates [2]n*|N*))
   AND (IP* iDoms NEG*))

To separate clauses with and without negative markers:

definition file: never.def
query: (((((((IP* iDominates [1]ADVP*)
   AND ([1]ADVP* iDominates [1]*ADV*))
   AND ([1]*ADV* iDominates [1]never_adv))
   AND (IP* iDominates [2]NP*))
   AND ([2]NP* iDominates [2]*Q*))
   AND ([2]*Q* iDominates [2]n*|N*))
   AND (IP* iDoms NEG*))
ME multiple negation with negatively quantified NPs:

print_complement: T
definition file: never.def
query: ((((((IP* iDominates [1]NP*)
   AND ([1]NP* iDominates [1]*Q*))
   AND ([1]*Q* iDominates [1]n*[N*])
   AND (IP* iDominates [2]NP*))
   AND ([2]NP* iDominates [2]*Q*))
   AND ([2]*Q* iDominates [2]n*[N*])
)

To separate clauses with and without negative markers:

print_complement: T
definition file: never.def
query: ((((((IP* iDominates [1]NP*)
   AND ([1]NP* iDominates [1]*Q*))
   AND ([1]*Q* iDominates [1]n*[N*])
   AND (IP* iDominates [2]NP*))
   AND ([2]NP* iDominates [2]*Q*))
   AND ([2]*Q* iDominates [2]n*[N*])
   AND (IP* iDoms NEG*)
)

OE negative NPs and adverbs:

definition file: never.def
query: (((IP* iDominates [1]NP*|ADVP*)
   AND ([1]NP*|ADVP* iDominates [1]NEG+Q*|NEG+ADV*))
   (for negative doubling add: AND (IP* iDoms NEG*))

OE multiple negation with negative adverbs:

definition file: never.def
query: (((IP* iDominates [1]ADVP*)
   AND ([1]ADVP* iDominates [1]NEG+ADV*))
   AND (IP* iDominates [2]NP*))

OE multiple negation with negatively quantified NPs
definition file: never.def
query: (((((IP* iDominates [1]NP*)
   AND ([1]ADVP* iDominates [1]NEG+Q*))
   AND (IP* iDominates [2]NP*))
   AND ([2]NP* iDominates [2]*NEG+Q*))

The incidence of any in negative contexts: OE:

query: (((((IP-SUB* iDoms [1]NP*|QP*|ADVP*)
   AND ([1]NP*|QP*|ADVP* iDoms [1]NEG*))
   AND (IP-SUB* iDoms [2]NP*|QP*|ADVP*))
   AND ([2]Q*|ADV* iDoms +an*|+afr*|au*|aw*|ow*|ah*|en*))

The incidence of any in ME clauses with not:

define: not.def
query: (((((IP-MAT* iDominates [1]NEG*)
   AND ([1]NEG* iDominates not_neg))
   AND (IP-MAT* iDominates [2]NP*))
   AND ([2]Q* iD ominates +an*|an*|on*|en*))

The incidence of any in ME clauses with never:

query: ((((((IP-SUB* iDoms [1]NP*)
   AND ([1]NP* iDoms [1]Q*))
   AND ([1]Q* iDoms an*|a+n*|on*|en*))
   AND (IP-SUB* iDoms [2]ADVP*))

The incidence of any in ME clauses with negative NPs:

query: ((((((IP-SUB* iDoms [1]NP*)
   AND ([1]NP* iDoms [1]Q*))
   AND ([1]Q* iDoms an*|a+n*|on*|en*))
   AND (IP-SUB* iDoms [2]NP*))

D.4. CHAPTER SIX
The frequency of negative objects intervening between a finite verb and a non-finite verb: (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately)

query: (((((((IP-MAT* iDoms BEP*|BED*|HVP*|HVD* |MD*|AXP*|AXD*|VBP*|VBD*)
  AND (NP-OB* iDoms Q*)) AND (Q* iDoms n*))
  AND (IP-MAT* iDoms [2]BE*|HV*|AX*|DO*|VB*|MD*))
  AND (BEP*|BED*|HVP*|HVD*|MD*|AXP*|AXD*|VBP*|VBD*)
  Precedes NP-OB*))

For objects in multiple negation with a negative marker:

query: (((((((IP-MAT* iDoms BEP*|BED*|HVP*|HVD* |MD*|AXP*|AXD*|VBP*|VBD*)
  AND (NP-OB* iDoms Q*)) AND (Q* iDoms n*))
  AND (IP-MAT* iDoms [2]BE*|HV*|AX*|DO*|VB*|MD*))
  AND (BEP*|BED*|HVP*|HVD*|MD*|AXP*|AXD*|VBP*|VBD*)
  Precedes NP-OB*))

AND (IP-MAT* iDoms NEG*))

The frequency of non-negative quantified objects intervening between a finite verb and a non-finite verb: (IP-MAT* and IP-SUB* separately)

query: (((((((IP-MAT* iDoms BEP*|BED*|HVP*|HVD* |MD*|AXP*|AXD*|VBP*|VBD*)
  AND (NP-OB* iDoms Q*)) AND (Q* iDoms n*))
  AND (IP-MAT* iDoms [2]BE*|HV*|AX*|DO*|VB*|MD*))
  AND (BEP*|BED*|HVP*|HVD*|MD*|AXP*|AXD*|VBP*|VBD*)
  Precedes NP-OB*))

AND (IP-MAT* iDoms NP-OB*))
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