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4 Negation in Dutch: a typological study

This chapter is dedicated to the description of variation in negation in Dutch, i.e. the range of variation that Dutch exhibits with respect to negation. The chapter is built up diachronically: the first section will deal with the small remains that have survived history. The second paragraph deals with the variation of negation in Middle Dutch. The third paragraph describes the transit between Middle Dutch and Modern (Standard) Dutch, in particular focussing on 17th century Dutch, and the final section will discuss the dialectal variety with respect to negation in Modern Dutch. In this section I will extensively discuss the results of the fieldwork that has been executed for the Syntactic Atlas of Dutch Dialects (SAND).

In these sections I will try to answer the questions that have been mentioned in the end of chapter 3 (repeated in (1)-(6)).

(1) What is the syntactic status of the negative marker that expresses sentential negation in the variety?

(2) In which phase of the Jespersen Cycle can the language/variety be classified?

(3) a. Does the variety exhibit Negative Concord?
   b. If so, is it Strict or Non-Strict Negative Concord?
   c. Does the variety exhibit Paratactic Negation

(4) a. Does the variety exhibit Double Negation?
   b. If so, does the language exhibit Emphatic Negation?

(5) Does the language allow true negative imperatives?

(6) What is the interpretation of constructions in which a universal quantifier precedes the negative marker?

I will answer these questions in four subsections for every section: the first two questions will be addressed in the first subsection on negative markers. The questions with respect to multiple negation ((3)-(4)) in the subsection on Negative Concord. Questions (5) and (6) will be dealt with in the subsections on negative imperatives and universal subjects and negation respectively. After the four sections containing the descriptions of these particular issues, I will describe the correspondences between these data in section 5. These generalisations will be compared with a sample of 25 other languages in the next chapter.

97 There will not be any subsection on universal quantifier subjects in negative sentences in old Dutch due to a lack of data.
The fact that we are dealing with historical material has as an important consequence that not every question can be answered properly due to lack of data. However, on the basis of the data I will draw some generalisations. These generalisations will first be checked with a sample of 25 non-arbitrarily chosen languages. Gaps in the Dutch data may then be compensated by this typological research. The final generalisations, that will form the input for the syntactic and semantic analyses in this book, will thus not suffer from any incompleteness in the Dutch data.

4.1 Negation in Old Dutch

Old Dutch is the name of the earliest known form of Dutch. It refers to all varieties of Dutch that have been spoken until the 10th century. A central problem in the study of Old Dutch is that hardly any original texts are available. Only one text of Old Dutch De Wachtendonckse psalmen ‘The Wachtendonck Psalms’, dating from the 9th Century, has survived. Another manuscript, De Leidse Willeram ‘The William from Leyden,’ is sometimes also considered to be an Old Dutch text. This translation of east lower Franconian comments, in which the high-German elements have been replaced by the dialect of Egmond around 1100 is however significantly younger than The Wachtendonck Psalms and is therefore not a good example of proper Old Dutch.98

The oldest text, the so-called Wachtendonck Psalms99, is a 9th century translation from Vulgate Latin psalm texts. Although the original text disappeared, a copy of a part of the translation remained. The text consists of two parts: a translation of a number of Vulgate Latin psalms; and the glossed translations of several Latin words into Old Dutch, known as Lipsius’ glosses. In both parts, the translation is very close to the texts and it has been subject of debate to what extent this translation can tell us anything about the grammar of Old Dutch. Both Hocksema (1997) and Postma (2002) argue that ‘since they [the psalm glosses] are word-by-word translations from the Latin Vulgate-text, they cannot be used as evidence.’100

However, the observation that the text is a complete word-by-word translation is false. One can find several examples in which the Dutch glosses do not correspond 1:1 with the original text. This is also the case for some negative sentences. The following example shows that the translation included a negative marker *ne* that was absent in the Latin text.

(7) a. *nequando obliviscantur populi mei*101 Vulgate Latin
never forget.3PL.FUT people my

98 Except for these two texts two other very short fragments have survived, but these fragments (one of the two is the famous *habban olla vogala …*), do not contain any instance of negation.
100 Hoeksema (1997): 140.
101 Wachtendonck Psalms: 58:12.
b. that nohuuanne ne fargetin folk min
   that n-ever neg forget.3PL.CONJ my people
   ‘so that they will never forget my people’

Against the background of this strict translation, it is surprising that the translator included this element ne. Apparently the n-word nohuuanne ‘n-ever’ did not suffice to express the sentential negation in this sentence. This supports two conclusions: (i) the Old Dutch negative marker is ne; and (ii) Old Dutch is a NC language. In 4.1.1 I will discuss negative markers in Old Dutch, in 4.1.2 I will discuss NC in Old Dutch. In 4.1.3 I will show that Old Dutch does not allow for true negative imperatives. A paragraph on the interpretation of universal subjects in negative sentences is absent, since the Latin Psalms texts do not contain any such examples. Subsection 4.1.4 concludes.

4.1.1 Negative markers in Old Dutch

The first conclusion that Old Dutch expressed sentential negation by means of a single preverbal negative marker ne is also supported by the fact that ne is the general translation of negative markers in Latin in this text.

(8) a. Et in via peccatorum non stetit102
   And in way sinners.GEN non stood.3SG
b. Inde in uueg ein sundigero ne stûnt
   And in way sinners.GEN neg stood.3SG
   ‘And didn’t stand in the way of sinners’

(9) a. Subito sagittabunt eum, et non timebunt103
   Suddenly shoot.3SG.FUT him, and not fear.3SG.FUT
b. Galico scuton sulun imo, in ne sulun forhtun
   Suddenly shoot will.3SG him, and neg will.3SG.fear
   ‘Suddenly they will shoot him and they will not fear’

However, even Old Dutch already exhibits instances similar to the Middle Dutch negative adverb niet, namely niuweht.

(10) a. Beatus vir qui non abiit in consilio impiorum104
    Blessed man who not walks in counsel impious.PL.GEN
b. Salig man ther niuweht uôr in gerêde ungenéthero
    Blessed man who neg walks in counsel impious.PL.GEN
    ‘Blessed the man who does not walk in the counsel of the impious’

---

102 Wachtendonck Psalms: 1:1.
103 Wachtendonck Psalms: 63:5.
104 Wachtendonck Psalms: 1:1.
The following question immediately rises: what is the status of sentences with a single negative adverb niuueht. At least three different accounts are possible: first, Old Dutch had two different phonologically distinct negative markers, *ne* and *niuueht*; second, Old Dutch was in fact a Jespersen Phase II languages that could optionally add a negative adverb *niuueht* next to the obligatory present *ne*. The fact that *ne* has been left out in these examples is due to the fact that the translator wanted to stay as close to the text as possible; third, *niuueht* is in fact not a negative marker, but a compound of a negative marker *ne* and an indefinite element *uuether* ‘what’.

The first hypothesis would be in contradiction with Jespersen’s diachronic development of negation. Of course it could be the case that Dutch diachronic development of negation is not in line with the general picture sketched by Jespersen (1917), but an analysis that can account for these facts without violating Jespersen’s generalisation is to be preferred. Although not violating Jespersen’s observation, the hypothesis that the translator had left out *ne* in these cases is too strong too, since it follows from the example in (7) that the translator would in fact include an extra negative marker *ne*, if that would be necessary for grammatical reasons. The third hypothesis also accounts for the presence of two distinct negative markers without contradicting Jespersen’s generalisation: suppose that *niuueht* is composed of a negative marker *ne* and some non-negative indefinite element *uuether*. In this case, *ne* would still be the only negative marker, which can be strengthened by adding an indefinite element. This third hypothesis is supported by several facts: (i) many languages strengthen negation by means of adding indefinite elements. Examples are e.g. *pas* ‘step’, *point* ‘point’, *mie* ‘crumb’ and *goutte* ‘drop’ in Old French or *ænige Pinga* ‘any things’ in Old English; (ii) it fits nicely in Jespersen’s general observation of diachronic change of negative markers: the formation of negative adverb is the result of assigning negation to an indefinite particle; (iii) in the Wachtendonck Psalms texts examples of non-negative indefinite *uuether* (related to *uuueht*) can be found as the translation of *numquid* ‘something/somewhat;’ (iv) in Middle Dutch (and still in Modern Dutch) instances of *wat* ‘what’ are still used as indefinite expressions meaning ‘something’ or ‘a bit’; (v) in Early Middle Dutch

---

107 See also 3.2.3.
108 Wachtendonck Psalms: 88.48 (this piece only glosses some terms).
109 This construction, in which a negative marker attaches to an indefinite expression, is similar to the Modern Dutch word *nietwat* (neg what ‘not a bit’).
(i) Vind je het nietwat koud? Find you it neg what cold
‘Don’t you think it’s a bit cold?’
this indefinite wat is allowed to occur in sentences without the obligatory negative marker:

(12)  Die worme ne hebben wat verteren

The worms neg have what digest
‘The worms don’t have anything to digest’

Hence I conclude that Old Dutch is a Phase I or II language with a negative marker ne that always occurs in preverbal position. Occasionally this marker can be strengthened by an indefinite element similar to Middle or Modern Dutch wat ‘what’, that forms a compound with the negative marker, yielding the negative adverb niuueht that in these texts is able to express the sentential negation by itself. This niuueht is the forerunner of Middle Dutch nie(t) ‘neg’.

4.1.2  Negative Concord in Old Dutch

The second conclusion that can be drawn from (7) is that Old Dutch exhibits Negative Concord. This conclusion is also supported by the fact that the translator also translated several Latin non-negatives by n-words.

(13)  a.  Non me derelinquas usquequaque

Neg me leave.2sg.imp anywhere/anytime

Vulgata Latin

b.  nieuuergin

n-where

Old Dutch

‘Don’t leave me anywhere/anytime’

Whereas the Latin texts could suffice with a negative marker non and a non-negative adverb, the Old Dutch translation requires a second negative element. Other examples involve the translation of Vulgate Latin ne ... neque ‘neither ... nor’ standardly translated by Old Dutch ne ... ne óch or ne ... noh (14). However, in some cases the translator added a second negative marker ne after noh in these constructions that got spelled out as nohne (15). This indicates that the sentence would otherwise suffer from ungrammaticality as well.

(14)  a.  Ideo non resurgunt impii in iudicio,

neque peccatores in consilio iustorum

Vulgata Latin

Thus not rise.fut.3PL impious.PL.nom in judgement,
neither sinners in councel justice.GEN

---

110 Der Nature Bloeme, VII Wormen, 12491.
111 Wachtendonck Psalms: 118.8 (the original manuscript consists of a number of translations of Psalm texts and a list of some translated Latin words from other Psalms).
112 Wachtendonck Psalms: 1:5.
b. Bethiu ne upstandunt ungenêthege in urdeile, Old Dutch
   ne óch sundege in gerède rechtero
   Thus not rise.fut.3PL impious.PL.nom in judgement,
   neither sinners in council justice.GEN
   ‘Therefore the impious shall not rise in judgment,
   nor sinners in the council of the just’

(15) a. Non me demergat tempestas aqae, Vulgate Latin
   neque asborbeat me profundum
   Not me let.drown. temptations water.GEN
   neither absorb me deep

b. Ne mi besenki geuuidere uuateres, Old Dutch
   nohne farsuelge mi diupi
   Neg me let.drown temptations water.GEN
   neither swallow.up me deep
   ‘Let not the temptations of water drown me, nor the deep swallow me up’

Thus Old Dutch can be regarded as a NC language, despite the small number of NC occurrences in this text. Note that NC is also clause bound in Dutch. The following example (16) exhibits an instance of Old Dutch with three negative elements. The first two negative are comparable to the not ... nor construction. The third negative element ne is in a subordinate clause and hence unable to establish a NC relation with a negative element in the matrix clause.

(16) a. Non sunt loquelae neque sermones Vulgate Latin
   quorum non adiantur voces eorum
   Not are discourses not.and speeches
   of.which not was.heard voiches their

b. Ne sint spräken noh uuort hero ne uuertthin Old Dutch
   gihôrd a stemmen iro
   Neg are discourses neg are there words
   heard voices their
   ‘There are no discourses nor speeches in which there voices were not heard’

In these texts no instances of Paratactic Negation have been found. Note however, that this does not exclude their existence in Old Dutch. Paratactic Negation (PN) is always optional, and since the psalm texts in Vulgate Latin do not exhibit any NC, there were no examples of PN in the original text. As the translator would only include extra n-words for the sake of grammaticality, there was no need to include PN in the translation. Hence they are not found in the text.

113 Wachtendonck Psalms: 68:16.
114 Wachtendonck Psalms: 18:3.
4.1.3 **Negative Imperatives in Old Dutch**

There are three kinds of imperative constructions in Old Dutch: translations from Latin imperative forms in which a 2\textsuperscript{nd} person pronoun is added in the translation; single imperatives without a 2\textsuperscript{nd} person pronoun and plural imperatives without a 2\textsuperscript{nd} person pronoun.

The latter case only occurs in non-negative contexts (17), both in the Latin and in the Old Dutch text. Hence these examples cannot indicate whether true imperatives are allowed or forbidden in Old Dutch.

(17) a. Cantate deo, psalmum dicite nomini eius
    Sing.IMP god.DAT, psalm say.IMP name.ABL his

   b. Singet gode, lof quethet namon sinin
    Sing.IMP god, hymn say.IMP name his

‘Sing to god, say a psalm in his name’

The other two kinds of negative imperatives in Old Dutch can be preceded by *ne*. The example in (18) shows a negative imperative construction that included as 2\textsuperscript{nd} person singular pronoun *thu* ‘you’, (19) exhibits a negative imperative without an additional personal pronoun.

(18) a. Ne occidas eos\textsuperscript{115}
    Not slay.imp them

   b. Ne reslag thu sia
    Neg slay you them

    ‘Don’t slay them’

(19) a. Ne proicas me in tempore senectutis\textsuperscript{116}
    Neg throw me in time old-age.GEN

   b. Ne faruuirp mi an tide eldi
    Neg throw me in time old

    ‘Don’t throw me in the old ages’

4.1.4 **Concluding remarks**

It follows from this small amount of Old Dutch data that Old Dutch was either a Phase I or II language, which in general expresses negation by means of a preverbal negative marker and occasionally exhibits instances of the negative adverb *niuweht*. Old Dutch also contains indefinite markers, such as *uuether* ‘what’, which may enforce (sentential) negation. Furthermore, Old Dutch is a Negative Concord

\textsuperscript{115} Wachtendonck Psalms: 58:12.

\textsuperscript{116} Wachtendonck Psalms: 70:9.
language, though it remains unknown whether it is Strict or Non-Strict NC. No examples of PN have been found. Finally, Old Dutch seems to allow for negative imperatives. The interpretation of universal subjects in negative sentences remains unclear.

4.2 Negation in Middle Dutch

In this section I will re-address the same questions with respect to Middle Dutch. In 4.2.1 I will discuss the status of negative markers in Middle Dutch, with special emphasis on occurrences of a single preverbal negative marker en/ne. In 4.2.2 I will describe different instances of NC in Middle Dutch and in 4.2.3 I will discuss the presence of true negative imperatives. In 4.2.4 I will discuss the interpretation of sentences containing both a universal quantifier subject and a negative marker and 4.2.5 concludes.

4.2.1 Negative Markers in Middle Dutch

Dutch has often been considered as a prototypical example of a language that underwent the Jespersen Cycle (cf. Jespersen 1917, Hoeksema 1997). Whereas Old Dutch exhibits a negation pattern in which there is only one preverbal negation, Middle Dutch exhibits so-called Embracing Negation, whereby both a preverbal negative marker and a negative adverb together express sentential negation. Embracing negation is found in all environments in which finite verbs may occur: V1 positions (20), V2 positions (21) and clause-final V positions (22).

(20) *'En laettine mi spreke nie*\(^{117}\)
    Neg let.he me speak neg
    ‘If he doesn’t let me speak’

(21) *Sine ware niet genedert heden*\(^{118}\)
    She.neg were neg humiliated currently
    ‘She wasn’t humiliated currently’

(22) *Dat si niet en sach dat si sochte*\(^{119}\)
    That she neg neg saw that she looked-for
    ‘That she didn’t see what she looked for’

Embracing negation, the standard way to express sentential negation in Middle Dutch, is completely in line with Jespersen’s generalisation. The preverbal negative marker *en/ne* is apparently to weak to express negation by itself, and is therefore supported by

\(^{117}\) Lanceloet: 20316.
\(^{118}\) Lanceloet: 20166.
\(^{119}\) Lanceloet: 20042.
a negative adverb *niet*. Still one can find two kinds of exceptions in Middle Dutch: occurrences of single *en/ne* and occurrences of single *niet*. I will discuss the latter phenomenon in the next section (4.3.1), since the absence of *en/ne* is most typical for 16th and 17th century (Holland) Dutch.

The occurrence of sentences with single *en/ne* is also relatively frequent in Middle Dutch. This is not surprising, since the transit from Phase II into Phase III is gradual. Also one finds occurrences of single *en/ne* that are only allowed in specific contexts. Hence one can distinguish two different kinds of occurrences of single *en/ne* in Middle Dutch: (i) remnants from Old(er) Dutch, and (ii) special constructions that require only single *en/ne*.

Burridge (1993) describes that common usage verbs, like *to say* and *to know* are often negated without the adverb *niet*. She accounts for this fact by arguing that common usage verbs are often conservative with respect to syntactic change. This would imply that these expressions are rather stored lexically than syntactically produced. Evidence that common usage expressions tend to be conservative (with respect to negation) follows from the dialect of Ghent (East Flanders), or from English, in which some expressions may still be denied by a preverbal negative marker respectively without the dummy auxiliary *do*.

(23) K’en weet L.neg know ‘I don’t know’

(24) I hope *not* English

Postma (2002) argues that true instances of single *en/ne* can never occur, and that all occurrences of these constructions are related to the fact that the negative adverb *niet* has been replaced by a Negative Polarity Item (NPI). Apart from these common usage verbs and Paratactic Negation (see 4.2.2), Postma lists a series of other contexts in which the preverbal negative marker stands on its own. These contexts are: (i) combinations with the verbs *roeken* ‘to care’, *doghen* ‘ought’ or verbs with a prefix *ghe*; (ii) the gradual markers *twint* ‘the least’, *bore* ‘a lot’ or *meer* ‘(any)more’, (iii) coordination under disjunction and (iv) rhetoric questions.

(25) Hem *en roekt* wat sie lieghen120 Him neg cares what they lie ‘He doesn’t care what they lie about’

(26) Hi was al blent, *hine* sag *twint*121 He was already blind, he.neg saw TWINT ‘He was already blind, he didn’t see anything’

120 Cf. Postma (2002).
121 Cf. Postma (2002).
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(27) Wedert been is tobroken, wedert en is.
Whether the leg is broken, whether neg is
‘Whether the leg is broken or not’

Middle Dutch

(28) En es dit Floris mijn soete lief
Neg is this Floris my sweet love
‘Isn’t this Floris, my sweet love’

Middle Dutch

Postma argues that all these contexts are downward entailing and able to license NPI’s. This is according to him the reason for the possible absence of niet. Since the preverbal negative marker in Middle Dutch is too weak to express sentential negation by itself, it always ought to be accompanied by (at least) a second element that enforces the negation. This can either be a second negative marker niet, or an NPI that can only be uttered felicitously in a downward entailing context due to its indefinite character. The same effect can still be seen in French.

(29) a. *Jean n’a une idée
Jean neg.has neg an idea
‘Jean doesn’t have an idea’

French

b. Jean n’a pas une idée
Jean neg.has neg an idea
‘Jean doesn’t have an idea’

c. Jean n’a aucune idée
Jean neg.has any.NPI idea
‘Jean doesn’t have any idea’

In this example the presence of the NPI aucun ‘any’ legitimises the absence of the normally obligatory negative adverb pas. Postma is right in arguing that the absence of niet in many cases should be compensated. However, his claim that this can only be compensated by NPI’s is too strong. E.g. one also finds single en/ne in conservative expressions. Moreover, non-NPI indefinites are also allowed to participate in negative constructions without niet.

(30) Wi*ne hebben [wat, PROa eten t]123
We.neg have WAT eat
‘We don’t have any food’

Middle Dutch

Postma accounts for these facts by arguing that indefinite wat is also an NPI that needs to be licensed by an appropriate context. This context is in this case not introduced by a lexical element but by a structural configuration, the result of so-called tough movement of the Wh element (30). Although it is not excluded that

123 Cf Hoeksema 1997.
syntactic constructions may license NPI's\textsuperscript{124}, in this case the motivation to link these constructions to NPI contexts is to account for the single occurrences of \textit{en/ne} in these contexts, and thus stipulative in nature. Moreover, Middle Dutch \textit{wat} is also allowed in non-negative or non-downward entailing context that lack tough movement constructions as well. Therefore I do not adopt Postma's conclusion that indefinite \textit{wat} should be regarded as an NPI.

\begin{align*}
\text{(31) } & \text{Ic ghi cont wel wat vinden}^{125} \\
& \text{I see you can PRT WAT find} \\
& \text{I see you can find something}
\end{align*}

Thus it is not only empirically ungrounded to account for those constructions as NPI's, it is also unnecessary. It is known that indefinites are able to enforce a negation, and that these indefinites may in due course be reinterpreted as proper negations. Moreover, given the fact that Old Dutch exhibited a single preverbal negative marker as well, the explanation in terms of conservative expressions is plausible, given the gradual character of the change from Jespersen Phase II to Phase III.

Hence apart from negative sentences with Embracing Negation one may find occurrences of single \textit{en/ne}, which are either remnants from Old Dutch, or expressions that contain an indefinite expression that enforces the negation. This indefinite may be an NPI in some cases, and in other cases not.

**4.2.2 Negative Concord in Middle Dutch**

A third case in which the preverbal negative marker \textit{en/ne} does not necessarily occur in combination with \textit{niet} are contexts with \textit{n}-words.

\begin{align*}
\text{(32) a. } & \text{Ic en sag niemen}^{126} \\
& \text{I neg saw n-body} \\
& \text{I didn't see anybody'} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Die niemen en spaers}^{127} \\
& \text{That n-body neg saves} \\
& \text{Who saves nobody'}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{124} Cf. The so-called middle construction can be considered as an NPI construction as it licenses any-terms. Most probably this is due to some hidden negative operator. Cf. Lekakou 2003.

\textsuperscript{125} Reynaarde II: 6112.

\textsuperscript{126} Cf. Hoeksema 1997.

\textsuperscript{127} Vanden levene ons heren 2018.
(33) Ende *en* willen *niets* anders sece\textsuperscript{128} And neg want.3PL n-thing different say
\textit{‘And they don’t want to say anything different’}

(34) Dat *en* haddi *noyt* ghedaen te voren\textsuperscript{129} That neg had.3He n-ever done at before
\textit{‘That he had never done before’}

(35) Hi *en* woude *nergen* gaan\textsuperscript{130} He neg wanted n-where go
\textit{‘He didn’t want to go anywhere’}

(36) Daer *ne* was *gheen* // die roupen dorste\textsuperscript{131} There neg was n- that call dared
\textit{‘There was none who dared to call’}

In these cases an n-word took over the role of the negative adverb *niets* and establishes an NC relationship. This immediately answers the second question to be addressed in this section, namely that Middle Dutch is an NC language. Middle Dutch is in fact a Strict NC language as the preverbal negative marker *en/ne* is allowed to intervene between a preverbal negative subject and the verb:

(37) *Niemen en* had mi *niets* gesien\textsuperscript{132} N-body neg had me neg seen
\textit{‘Nobody saw me’}

Note that the Middle Dutch adverb *niets* is allowed to participate in NC relations as well, as the example above only contains one negation in its semantics. In fact *niets* may even participate in NC relations in which *niets* is followed by an n-word: in (38) *niets noeyt* ‘neg n-ever’ means ‘never’ and in (39) the first *niets* precedes the n-word *niks* ‘n-thing’, but the sentence does not yield any Double Negation. Hence one can safely conclude that Middle Dutch was an NC language.

(38) mi *en* twifelt *niets noeyt* erger quae // dat ic oyt was van venus discipels ionghen\textsuperscript{133} me neg doubts neg n-ever worse evil that I ever was of Venus’ pupils young
\textit{‘I don’t doubt there was ever worse evil than when I was a young pupil of Venus’}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{128} Spiegel Historiae (V): 33243.
\item \textsuperscript{129} Borchgrave van Couchi 1: 158.
\item \textsuperscript{130} Merlijn 1039.
\item \textsuperscript{131} Alexanders geeste n 10:241.
\item \textsuperscript{132} Cf Hoeksema 1997.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Antwerps Liedboek 153:2.
\end{itemize}
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(39) Den onderseten niet en was // gheoorlooft niets niet met allen // aen enen andren paus te vallen\(^{134}\)

The shephards neg neg was // allowed n-thing neg with all PRT an other pope to attack

‘The shephards were not at all allowed to attack another pope together’

Middle Dutch also exhibited PN, as follows from (40).

(40) Doe wilden sie \textit{verbieden} hem dat hi in den temple niet ginge

There would they forbid him that he in the temple neg went

‘They would forbid him to go in the temple’

Note that PN is the only instance of non-clause bound NC in Middle Dutch. In the case of two negations in different clauses, no NC relation is established.

(41) Maer ferguu het hem niet en betrout

Hine liet den rose hem niet na come\(^{135}\)

But Ferguu him neg neg trust, he neg let the giant him neg PRT come

‘But Ferguu didn’t trust him, so he let the giant not follow him’

The claim that NC in Middle Dutch is clause bound has been under attack by Hoeksema (1997), who shows examples in which negative elements in different clauses seem to have a single negative reading.

(42) Ic en wane niet dat te Bonivente //

Ne geen so goet was teegen tiden\(^{136}\)

I neg think neg that at B. neg one so good was at anytime

‘I don’t think that anybody was so good at B at anytime’

However, the examples that Hoeksema shows all involve matrix verbs like \textit{want} or \textit{think}. These verbs are known to allow for so-called \textit{neg raising} (Horn 1989). In these cases the negation in the matrix clause in fact reflects a mere negation in the embedded course that only for pragmatic purposes has raised to a higher position. This phenomenon is still available in Modern Dutch or English:

(43) a. Ik weet niet of ik het mooi vind.

I know neg whether I it nice find

‘I know I don’t like it’

b. I don’t think he shows up tonight

‘I think he doesn’t show up to night’

\(^{134}\) Brabantsche yeesten 7957-9.

\(^{135}\) Ferguu 1168.

\(^{136}\) Cf Hoeksema (1997).
In (43) the matrix clause contains a negation, although these sentences are standardly interpreted as if the negation were in the subordinate clause. The same can be the case for (42). The NC relationship in (42) may be established when the higher negative marker was still in the embedded clause, and therefore examples like (42) cannot count as proper evidence against the claim that NC is clause bound in middle Dutch.

### 4.2.3 Negative Imperatives in Middle Dutch

Strong verbs differ from weak verbs with respect to their imperative singular forms. Strong verbs express the imperative form by means of $\emptyset$ inflection, and weak singular imperatives end on a schwa. These forms are different from the 2nd person singular indicative or subjunctive forms, which always end on an $-s$.\(^{137}\) This makes it possible to investigate the presence of negative imperatives. If we find negative imperatives ending on a schwa or without inflection, there is no ban on negative imperatives. This is indeed the case. Negative imperatives occur quite regularly in Middle Dutch.

(44) \textit{En com an mi niet}\(^{138}\)  
Neg come.imp me neg  
`Don’t touch me’

(45) \textit{En nem in dinen moet // nie gheen valsch ghwonnen goet}\(^{139}\)  
Neg take in your mood neg no falsely gained goods  
`Don’t take in your mind any stolen goods’

(46) \textit{En make mi geen gespringe}\(^{140}\)  
Neg make me no resistance  
`Don’t resist against me’

Hence on the basis of these examples, I conclude that negative imperatives in Middle Dutch are allowed.

### 4.2.4 Universal subjects and negation in Middle Dutch

The final question to be addressed in this section addresses the interpretation of sentences in which a universal quantifier subject ($\forall$-subject) is followed by a negation in Middle Dutch. In most examples in which a universal subject quantifier precedes a sentential negation, the quantifier scopes over the negation.

---

\(^{137}\) Cf. Franck (1967) and Le Roux and Le Roux (1945).
\(^{138}\) Spiegel historial XXXIII: 70.
\(^{139}\) Die x. plaghe en die x. ghebode: 2044-5.
\(^{140}\) Vierde Martijn 840.
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(47) **Ele en haette anderen niet sere**141 Middle Dutch
    Each neg hated others neg very
    ‘Nobody hated the others very much’

(48) **Ele en wilde door den vaer** Middle Dutch
    Van sinen vrient niet sceiden daet142
    Each neg wanted through the fear of his friend neg separate there
    ‘Nobody wanted to be separate from his friend there’

However, few examples can be found where the negation seems to scope over the universal quantifier. A sentence as in (49) obtains a reading in which the negation scopes over the quantifier, since it is clear from the context that the speaker does not count himself to those kind of writers who have no idea what they are saying or writing.

(49) **In loghens niet, ic maect tliet. Maer ele en weet niet** Middle Dutch
    al tbediet // Wat hi seif of wat hi scrijft143
    I.neg lied neg, I made the song. But each neg knows neg
    all it means what he said or what he writes
    ‘I didn’t lie, I made the song. But not everyone knows what it all means
    what he says or writes’

Although there seems to be a strong bias towards an interpretation in which the universal scopes over the negation, Middle Dutch is probably ambiguous with respect to the interpretation of constructions in which a universal subject precedes the marker of sentential negation. A claim that says that universal quantifier subjects always scope over the negation seems to be ungrounded.

4.2.5 **Concluding remarks**

On the basis of the data in this section, it is safe to conclude that Middle Dutch is a prototypical Phase III language, in which except for some conservative expressions, negation is expressed by means of Embracing Negation en/ne ... niet, although a marker indicating indefiniteness may replace niet.

Middle Dutch is a Strict NC language, in which the negative adverb niet is free to participate. Contrary to Hoeksema’s assumptions Middle Dutch NC is clause bound, but allows for (non-clause bound) Paratactic Negation.

Middle Dutch clearly allows for true negative imperatives, and Middle Dutch seems to allow for inverse scope readings of ∀-subjects that precede negative markers.

141 Ferguut 5559.
142 Grimbergse oorlog 4332.
143 Gruuthuse Poems I: 1292.
4.3 Negation in 16th and 17th Century Dutch

Middle Dutch was a Jespersen Phase III language, whereas Modern Dutch is a Jespersen Phase V language. In this section I will describe the transit period in which Dutch exhibited Jespersen Phase IV behaviour. The title of this section is somewhat misleading. Although the major transit from Phase III to Phase IV took place in this period, it was locally restricted to Holland Dutch. Flanders exhibited this change much later, in some dialects even at the end of the 19th century. Second, the change did not appear at once. Already in Middle Dutch there were instances of Phase IV patterns of negation, so 16th and 17th century Dutch exhibits only a part of the era that Dutch was a Phase IV language. However, apart from those instances of Middle Dutch, which are relevant in this discussion, I will restrict myself to 16th and 17th century Holland Dutch.

In the first paragraph I will discuss so-called en deletion, the process in which the preverbal negative marker gradually disappears. In 4.3.2 I will describe different instances of NC in 16th and 17th century Dutch, and in 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 I will discuss instances of negative imperatives and negative sentences with a universal quantifier subject respectively.

4.3.1 Negative markers in 16th and 17th century Dutch

In Middle Dutch, sentential negation was usually expressed by means of Embracing Negation, though sometimes, instances of single niet were already present. Van der Horst & Van der Wal (1979) show that the instances of single niet only occurred in particular syntactic environments. These environments were: (i) V1 sentences (50); (ii) V2 sentences with subject-verb inversion (51); (iii) subordinate clauses (52); (iv) absence of finite verbs that are under the scope of negation. The latter category refers either to constituent negation, in which the verb is not under the scope of negation, or ellipsis, in which a second finite verb is left out. Obviously, in those cases there is no preverbal negative marker. Basically Van der Horst & Van der Wal show that only in V2 contexts without subject-verb inversion en-deletion is not allowed.

(50) a. Suldier niet toe helpen?\textsuperscript{144} 
Will.you.there neg to help
‘Won’t you help there?’

b. Ende nem mi niet voor dijn oordele\textsuperscript{145} 
And take.imp me neg vefore your judgmene
‘Don’t take me in front of your judgement’

\textsuperscript{144} Mariken 470 (cited in Van der Horst & Van der Wal (1979): 9).
\textsuperscript{145} Reynaerde 244/6 (cited in Van der Horst & Van der Wal (1979): 9).
In the 16th century the process of *en*-deletion shows a curious development. Whereas in Middle Dutch instances of single *niet* mostly occurred in V1 or subordinate contexts, in 16th century Dutch sentential negation was expressed only by means of the negative adverb *niet* in most V1 and V2 contexts, while subordinate clauses showed a revival of Embracing Negation. In fact, the subordinate clause is the last environment that bans Embracing Negation. The following table (taken from Burridge 1993) shows the frequencies of *en*-deletion in Holland and Brabant Dutch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(54)</th>
<th><em>En</em>-deletion in Holland Dutch (in %)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(55)</th>
<th><em>En</em>-deletion in Brabant Dutch (in %)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the picture in (54)-(55) it would follow that *en* deletion took first place in V1 environments, and later in V2 contexts. However, this picture is not entirely correct. Van der Horst & Van der Wal (1979) and De Haan & Weerman (1984) show that *en* deletion occurs simultaneously in V1 and topicalised V2 constructions. This means that all instances of *en* deletion in V2 contexts, in e.g. 1650 Brabant Dutch, are cases

---

149 Topicalized V2 constructions have the order Topic – *en* – Subject.
of inversion. This observation corresponds nicely to the fact that only subjects may be weak in sentence-initial position. Given that *en/ne in 16th and 17th century Dutch has already become a weak element, the fact that *en deletion took place first in V1 and topicalised V2 position can be explained as a result of this ban on non-subject weak elements in preverbal V2 position in Dutch.

(56)  
a. K'heb 'm gezien  
I have him seen  
'I saw him'  
b. *'M heb ik gezien  
Him have I seen  
' Him I saw'

Thus Dutch follows the development as described by Jespersen. Gradually, the preverbal negative marker loses force and the negative adverb adopts the role of the proper negation. Van der Horst & Van der Wal seek an explanation for this in terms of general typological tendencies. They follow Vennemann (1974) who connects the Indo-European development with respect to sentential negation with the alleged shift from SOV to SVO that Indo-European languages underwent in general. Vennemann argues that the OV-VO shift (English being a prototypical example) is in fact a shift from XV to VX where X can be any category, including negation. Hence Old Dutch has the old NegV order with the preverbal negative marker *en/ne as the only expressor of negation, whereas Modern Dutch exhibits only VNeg behaviour. This analysis suffers form several severe problems: first, the claim that Dutch undergoes a shift from OV to VO is false. Both Middle Dutch and Modern Dutch exhibit OV in subordinate clauses, and moreover Middle Dutch was even more liberal with respect to embedded V0 orders than Modern Dutch. Second, De Haan & Weerman (1984) argue that the preverbal negative marker *en/ne shows behaviour that indicates that these elements should be understood as clitics or affixes. Lehmann (1974) however argues that in OV languages clitics occur to the right of the verb, and in VO languages to the left. This would mean that one should expect the preverbal negative marker to occur more frequently rather than less frequently. The question is then: what explains the shift from Embracing Negation to the single appearance of the adverb *niet in sentential negation? I will not answer this question here, as I will deal with aspects of language change and negation extensively in chapter 8, but it seems clear once that the negative adverb that obligatory participates in sentential negation takes over the dominant role, the preverbal negative marker is no longer needed to express negation, and therefore it disappears gradually. The atypical behaviour of the preverbal negative marker in subordinate clauses will be discussed in chapter 8.

16th and 17th century Dutch still exhibits Embracing Negation, but allows for instances of a single negative adverb *niet as well. First these instances occur only in special context (subordinate clauses, V1, V2 under inversion), but gradually this way of expressing negation becomes standard. At the end of the 17th century the preverbal
negative marker is almost completely gone in Holland Dutch. Note that this is not the case for Brabant Dutch or Flemish, where this development takes a longer period, probably due to sociolinguistic motivations.

### 4.3.2 Negative Concord in 16th and 17th century Dutch

The question is whether 16th and 17th century Dutch still exhibited NC. Obviously this is the case when the optional preverbal negative marker is present. In those cases negation is manifested twice in the morpho-syntax, but only once present in the semantics. Some typical examples can be shown from Vondel’s play *Gysbrecht van Aemstel* from 1638. In this text Vondel uses both the Embracing Negation construction and single negative adverbs or n-words. As the text is on meter, it is conceivable that Vondel included the preverbal negative marker for prosodic purposes.

(56)  

a. De krijgslieen zijn *niet* veer van deeze kloosterpoort\(^{150}\) 1638 Dutch  
The warriors are not far from this monastery gate  
‘The warriors are not far from the monastery’s gate’

b. Zoo veele moeite *en* is het leven my *niet* waerdigh\(^{151}\)  
So much effort neg is the life me not worthy  
‘Life is not worth that much trouble for me’

(57)  

a. Maer *niemant* gaf gehoor\(^{152}\) 1638 Dutch  
But n-body gave obeying  
‘But nobody obeyed’

b. Dat *niemant* zich het woën der vyanden *en* kreunde\(^{153,154}\)  
That n-body SE the raging of the enemies neg moaned  
‘That nobody cared about the raging of the enemies’

The example in (57)b indicates that 16th and 17th century Dutch exhibit Negative Concord, but these examples are rare. Two explanations account for this. First, most NC expressions consist of a negative marker and an n-word. As the negative marker tends to lose force, the frequency of NC examples decreases. Though one may still expect NC in cases in which two n-words or the negative adverb and an n-word co-occur. The following examples demonstrate that this is indeed the case.

\(^{150}\) Gysbrecht IV: 1038.  
\(^{151}\) Gysbrecht IV: 955.  
\(^{152}\) Gysbrecht V: 1368.  
\(^{153}\) Gysbrecht V: 1410.  
\(^{154}\) This is an example in which the absence of *en* would break the meter. Saving meter is probably the primary reason the include this negative marker in this line.
(58) s’Ondekt het niemand niet\textsuperscript{155}  
She tells it n-body neg  
‘She doesn’t tell anybody’ 

(59) Hy vreesde Herkles knods noch Samsons vuisten niet\textsuperscript{156}  
He feared Hercules’ spadix nor Samson’s fists.  
‘He feared Hercules spadix nor Samson’s fists’ 

(60) Zulcx en heeft noyt niet ghebleken\textsuperscript{157}  
Such neg has never neg appeared  
‘Such has never appeared (to be the case)’ 

(61) Om niet al levendigh en versch te zijn verslonden  
Van hem, die op zijn jagh geu aes en had gevonden\textsuperscript{158}  
In order neg PRT too alive and fresh to be devoured  
‘By him who on his hunt no lure neg has found  
‘In order not be devoured fresh and alive  
by him who didn’t find any lure while hunting’ 

16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century Dutch also exhibits Paratactic Negation, as becomes clear from the following examples. 

(62) Uit vreeze dat de Stae t niet strande, en ga te gront\textsuperscript{159}  
Out. of fear that the state collapse.\textsc{conj} and goes to ground  
‘Out of fear that the state will collapse and topples down’ 

(63) Van vreeze datz:e niet wierd nae haer dood mishandelt\textsuperscript{160}  
Out. of fear that she neg becomes after her dead molested  
‘Out of fear that she will be molested after her death’ 

Thus, 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century Dutch is an NC language, although the preverbal negative marker is only optionally available. 

The role of the negative adverbiaal marker in 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century Dutch is distinct from Middle Dutch. In Middle Dutch the negative adverb was free to participate in NC relation, regardless of its position with other n-words in the clause. In 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century niet is only allowed to participate if it follows all other n-words as (60) proves, or as follows from the fragmentarian answer in (64). 

\textsuperscript{155} Hypolitus III.  
\textsuperscript{156} Gysbrecht V: 1316.  
\textsuperscript{157} Katholiek spotgedicht op Oranje en zijn godsdienstvrede.  
\textsuperscript{158} Gysbrecht I: 13-14.  
\textsuperscript{159} Maria Stuart: III (cited in Van der Woude 1994b).  
\textsuperscript{160} Hierusalem verwoest IV: 1878 (cited in Van der Woude 1994b).
Once that the negative adverb *niet* precedes an n-word, the negative adverbial marker blocks NC readings, as follows from (65), where three n-words in fact exhibit two negations in the semantics.

(65)  

\[
\text{dat niet allen noyt geene bochten off cromten [...]} \\
\text{en sullen worden bevonden}\]

that neg only n-ever no curves or bends neg will be found  
‘that not only never any curve or bend may be found’

However, the example in (66) shows that a negative subject that is followed by the negative adverb gives also rise to a Double Negation reading. This example can be considered an indication that 16th and 17th century Dutch is less tolerant with respect to NC constructions than previous stages of the language.

(66)  

\[
\text{Niemant [...] niet en murmureert}\]

N-body neg neg complains  
‘Nobody does not complain’

Hence, although 16th and 17th century Dutch lacks the obligatory presence of a preverbal negative marker, it remains an NC language that behaves similar to Middle Dutch: it allows clause-bounded NC only and it allows Paratactic Negation. Contrary to Middle Dutch, 16th and 17th century Dutch does not allow for NC with n-words following the adverbial negative marker *niet*.

**4.3.3 Negative Imperatives in 16th and 17th century Dutch**

V1 contexts are sensitive to *en*-deletion. As is shown in the tables in (54)-(55) Holland Dutch does not exhibit any imperatives with a preverbal negative marker *en/ne* in the 17th century and Brabant Dutch expresses imperatives with single *niet* only in the second half of the 17th century, according to the sample of texts that Burridge (1993) based her analysis on. Imperatives in this stage of the language can have two forms: singular imperatives are similar to the verbal stem and plural imperatives have a suffix *–t*. Since Old and Middle Dutch did not ban true negative imperatives, it is unlikely that 16th and 17th century Dutch all of a sudden would forbid these constructions to appear. This expectation is born out: we find examples of

---

161 Warenar: 1051.
162 Contract between Claes en Frans Dirksz with the city of Amsterdam (http://www.amsterdamsebinnenstad.nl/binnenstad/lamp/dcoter.html).
163 Van Sinte Niemant: 155.
singular and plural imperatives both with and without the preverbal negative marker *en/ne*.

Negative imperatives with a preverbal word occur rather frequently in 16th and 17th century Dutch, but in many cases it is unclear whether *en* is a negative marker, or a coordinator. The following example e.g. can be interpreted in two ways.

(67) Schep moed, *en* wanhoop *niet*164  
Create courage, and/neg despair neg  
‘Create courage, (and) don’t despair’

(68) Noch *en* laat myn ziele van *u niet* vliën165  
Nor neg let my soul of you neg flee  
‘Nor let my soul not flee away from you’

(69) a. Roept *niet* luid166  
Call.IMP.PL neg loudly  
‘Don’t shout’

b. Doet duecht ende *en* roept *niet* cras cras167  
Do.IMP.PL virtue and neg call.IMP.PL neg cras cras  
‘Be honourable and don’t say ‘cras cras’’

Given the presence of imperatives that are still preceded by a preverbal negative marker *en*, it is safe to conclude that there is indeed no ban on negative imperatives in Middle Dutch regardless of the choice of the negative marker.

**4.3.4 Universal subjects and negation in 16th and 17th century Dutch**

The final question to be addressed in this section is the interpretation of universal quantifying subjects that are followed by a negative marker. Again, as was the case with Middle Dutch, this is hard to investigate for previous stages of the language, since contexts often do not disambiguate these sentences. Still, I found several examples that prove that 16th and 17th century Dutch allows for inverse scope readings, in which the negation scopes over the universal quantifier.

(70) Al dat waggelt, *en vat niet*168  
All that waddles, neg falls neg  
‘Not everything that waddles falls’

---

164 Gysbrecht V: 1855.  
165 Het priëelken der geestelijken wellusten: 79-12.  
166 Gysbrecht II: 501.  
167 Refreyen int soot amoureus wijs: 45.  
168 Banket-werk van goeden gedachten: XVI.
That this is not a single instance of this construction can be seen in the following example in 18\textsuperscript{th} century Dutch, in which the quantifier *geen* ‘no’ scopes over the universal quantifier *al*.

\begin{quotation}
(71) Ja, 't is al geen goud dat er blinkt
Yes, it is all no gold that there glitters
'It is not all gold that glitters'
\end{quotation}

On the basis of these few examples I conclude that 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century Dutch at least allowed for inverse scope readings in sentences with a negative marker and a universal quantifier subject.

### 4.3.5 Concluding remarks

16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century Dutch does not have an obligatory preverbal negative marker and allows sentential negation to be expressed by means of a single negative adverb. The disappearance of the preverbal negative marker starts in subordinate clauses, and then takes place in V1 and V2 contexts (under inversion). After that, normal V2 S-V orders allow *en*-deletion. When matrix clauses hardly show examples of the preverbal negative marker *en/ne*, it shows up again in subordinate clauses. Finally around the end of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century the preverbal negative marker is completely gone.

16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century Dutch also exhibit NC, which is clause-bound except for cases of Paratactic Negation. Contrary to Middle Dutch, 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century Dutch does not allow the negative adverb to participate in NC relations, unless it is the final negative element in the concord chain.

There is no ban in 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century Dutch against negative imperatives, regardless of the choice for the negative marker (Embracing Negation or a single negative adverb).

Finally, there is no general ban either on negation that scopes over universal quantifier subjects in the case of the subjects preceding the negative marker at surface structure.

### 4.4 Negation in Modern Dutch

In this section I will compare the results that have been found for the historical stages of Dutch with the contemporary situation. Therefore the four different topics that have been investigated for Old Dutch, Middle Dutch and 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century Dutch, will now be investigated for both Standard and non-Standard Modern Dutch. The situation for Standard Modern Dutch is not very complicated, although it differs crucially from older stages of Dutch with respect to some phenomena. However, in this section I will also discuss dialectal variation with respect to negation. We will see that many Flemish dialects show a large range of variation in the way negative expressions are expressed or interpreted and sometimes behave more on a par with Middle Dutch or 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century Dutch than with Standard Modern Dutch.
The data that are used in this section come from the database that forms the basis of the Syntactic Atlas of Dutch Dialects (SAND) (see also section 1.2). During this project, fieldwork was done in 267 different places in the Netherlands, Belgium and France. The study presented here reflects the range of variation that has been found with respect to negation.

Since this section represents a corpus that contains data from 267 different dialects it is virtually impossible to present an overview here of all dialectal differences. Therefore I focus first on those dialects that still exhibit Jespersen Phase IV behaviour. It will turn out that there are three classes of Dutch dialects that do so. After that I will check whether these dialects exhibit NC, and if so what kind of NC, and I will compare this result with other varieties of Modern Dutch. It will turn out that although Modern Dutch varieties can be divided in NC and non-NC dialects, the dialects that are Phase IV all exhibit NC. I will then look at the occurrence of negative imperatives, both for Phase IV varieties and Phase V varieties, and I will conclude that there is no ban on negative imperatives in Modern Dutch and finally I will look at the interpretation of sentences that have a universal quantifier subject followed by a negative marker. I will show that the set of languages that are able to assign an inverse reading to such sentences form a superset of the set of NC varieties. This method makes it possible to provide a coherent overview of the range of dialectal variation with respect to the expression of negation and to draw correct generalisations on the basis of Dutch microvariation.

In subsection 4.4.1 I will discuss the variation in Modern Dutch with respect to the way sentential negation is expressed. In subsection 4.4.2 I will discuss which varieties of Dutch exhibit NC and to whether this form of NC is different from the ones that we explored in the previous sections. In 4.4.3 I will discuss the presence of negative imperatives in Dutch dialects and in 4.4.4 I will discuss the interpretation sentences with a universal quantifier subject that are followed by a negative marker. 4.4.5 contains some concluding remarks.

### 4.4.1 Negative Markers in Modern Dutch

In this subsection I will discuss the variety that Modern Dutch exhibits with respect to the expression of sentential negation. Standard Dutch uses a negative adverb niet that occupies the same position as in the older varieties of Dutch (to the right of $V_{\text{fin}}$ in V1 and V2 contexts and to the left of the verb in subordinate clauses).

\[
\begin{align*}
(72) & \quad \text{a. Jan loopt \textit{niet}} \\
& \quad \text{Jan walks neg} \\
& \quad \text{‘Jan walks’} \\
& \quad \text{b. ...dat Jan \textit{niet} loopt} \\
& \quad \text{that Jan neg walks} \\
& \quad \text{‘... that Jan walks’}
\end{align*}
\]

Standard Dutch
c. *Loop* Jan niet?
   Walks Jan neg?
   ‘Doesn’t John walk?’

However, we see that many dialects, especially from Flanders, have other means of expressing negation at their disposal. Several dialects have not made the transit from Phase IV to Phase V of the Jespersen Cycle (yet) and do not only express sentential negation by means of a negative adverb, but also allow for an optional additional preverbal negative *en/ne*, comparable to the 17th century dialects of Holland Dutch. A map of places where these dialects are spoken is in (73) below.

(73) Map of places with dialects that still allow for an optional preverbal negative marker *en/ne* are spoken.

In sum 40 different dialects exhibit this pattern, all located in the southwestern part of the Dutch language area. Three areas can be distinguished where Embracing Negation still takes place: (I) East Flanders where the majority of Phase IV dialects has been found (74)-(75); (II) Northern West Flanders169 (76)-(77) and (III) French Flanders (including some border dialects in Southern West Flanders) in the extreme south west of the Dutch language area, in which the original Dutch dialect is highly influenced by

169 Although West Flemish has featured as the prototypical variety of Dutch that still exhibits Phase IV behaviour (cf. Haegeman 1995, Zanuttini & Haegeman 1996), it turns out that preverbal *en* has almost completely disappeared from this area.
French; In all three areas the preverbal negative marker is optionally present, which means that apart from Embracing Negation examples, negative sentences with single nie(t) are also available.

(74) a. Ik *en ga* nie naar t school
    I neg go neg to the school
    ‘I don’t go to school’

b. Pas op dage *nie en valt*
    Look out that you neg neg fall
    ‘Make sure you don’t fall’

(75) a. Da vinnek ook *nie*
    That find. I too neg
    ‘I don’t find that either’

b. Ge weet toch ook da’t *nie plezant* is
    You know PRT too that. it neg pleasant is
    ‘You know too that it is not pleasant’

(76) a. *Ze en* weet da *niet*
    She neg knows that neg
    ‘She doesn’t know that’

b. Past op dage *nie en valt*
    Look out that you neg neg fall
    ‘Make sure you don’t fall’

(77) a. *Ze weet* nog *nie* da Marie gisteren dood is
    She knows yet neg that Marie yesterday dead is
    ‘She doesn’t know yet that Marie died yesterday’

b. K gelovien daigje zo slim *nie ziit* of wiedre
    I believe that you so smart are as we
    ‘I believe that you are not as smart as we are’

(78) a. Neeneenk kenzijn de moeder *nie*
    No. no. I neg. am the mother neg
    ‘No, no. I am not the mother’

b. Noes mepeizen daigje zo boos *nieëzijt* of wiedre
    We believe that. you so angry neg. neg. are as we
    ‘We believe that you aren’t as angry as we are’

(79) a. E klapt *nie* wel Frans
    He speaks neg good French
    ‘He doesn’t speak French well’

b. Kpeizen dat *nie* morgen goa komn
    I think that he neg tomorrow goes come
    ‘I think that he will not come tomorrow’
Both in West Flemish and East Flemish the participation of the preverbal negative marker in negative sentences is restricted to V2 main clauses and subordinate clauses. In French Flanders the preverbal negative marker is also allowed in V1 contexts, though the only available data are from negative imperatives, and therefore these data will be presented and discussed in section 7.3. Another observation is that the majority of negative constructions in French Flanders still exhibits Embracing Negation, whereas the West and East Flemish examples lack Embracing Negation in most cases. Hence one can observe that those Dutch dialects that still exhibit Embracing Negation reflect the pattern of en-deletion that has been found for 16th and 17th century Dutch, where the preverbal negative marker first ceased to exist in V1 contexts. French Flemish proves to be more conservative than East Flemish, which on its turn is more conservative than the West Flemish dialects in which Embracing Negation has only been rarely found.

Still, this is not the only phenomenon that one can find in the range of variation of the usage of negative markers that Dutch dialects exhibit. In the rest of this section I will discuss another phenomenon, namely instances of single en in Modern Dutch Dialects. Although it is not possible to express sentential negation by means of a single preverbal negative marker, some conservative expressions still allow for it. The examples in (80) are short answers, and are probably expressions that have become lexicalised.

\[(80)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{IJ en doet} & \text{Berlare} \\
& \text{He neg does} & \\
& \text{‘He doesn’t’} & \\
\text{b. } & \text{K’en weet} & \text{Gent} \\
& \text{L.neg know} & \text{(East Flemish)} \\
& \text{‘I don’t know’} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Preverbal negative markers may also still occur in sentences that are negatively connotated, e.g. by a semi-negative verb such as *twijfelen* ‘doubt’ or in the case of particles, such as *maar* or *juist* that indicate a speaker’s negative attitude towards the contents of a proposition. The distribution of this use of *en* is more widespread than the use of *en* as a participant in Embracing Negation. Not only can this usage be found in those dialects that exhibit Embracing Negation (81), it also occurs in dialects that do not allow the negative marker to participate in the expression of sentential negation (82).

---

170 In some cases it is problematic to analyse possible occurrences of the preverbal negative marker *en*, as it has the same phonological form as the standard conjunction *en* ‘and’.

171 The question why French Flemish exhibits more cases of Embracing Negation remains open: either it could be that this is due to the influence of French, which also exhibits Embracing Negation. But it is also conceivable that this is a result of a stronger marking of the original French Flemish dialect against the dominance of French.
It is thus conceivable to think of this particular use of *en/ne* as a final stage of Jespersen Phase IV, where single *en/ne* is hardly used to express sentential negation, but where it still may be included in expressions that have a negative connotation.

**4.4.2 Negative Concord in Modern Dutch**

Whereas Middle Dutch and 17th Century Dutch (Van der Wouden 1995) exhibit NC, it is known from chapter 3 that Standard Dutch is a Double Negation language.

(83) ... dat Jan *niet niemand* ziet
     ... that Jan *neg* nobody sees
     ‘... that Jan doesn’t see nobody’ = ‘that John sees somebody’

The results from the SAND fieldwork provide a richer and more fine-grained overview of the distribution of NC in the Dutch language area. Moreover, it sheds more light on the exact behaviour of NC in Dutch.

In this subsection I will first describe the occurrences of NC in those varieties of Modern Dutch that allow for an (optional) preverbal negative marker. I will show that the three varieties under discussion, East, West and French Flemish, indeed exhibit NC. Then I will discuss different kinds of NC constructions that may or may not appear in these varieties. I will finally show that NC is not restricted to those varieties, but that many other varieties also exhibit NC.

East Flemish varieties exhibit NC relations between an *n*-word and the preverbal negative marker (84)a, between an *n*-word and the negative adverbal marker (84)b or between an *n*-word, the preverbal and the postverbal negative marker (84)c. Note
however that in all cases in which the adverbial negative marker enters an NC relation it follows any n-words. This fact is also known in West Flemish (Haegeman 1995), where constructions in which an n-word follows the negative adverbial marker are reported to be instances of Double Negation\(^\text{172}\). Finally, n-words can also participate in Negative Spread construction, in which no negative marker is involved (85).

(84)  

a. **K en geef niets aan een ander**  
   I neg give n-thing to an other  
   ‘I don’t give anything to another’  

b. **Dr wil niemand nie dansen**  
   There wants n-body neg dance  
   ‘Nobody wants to dance’

c. **K en e niemand nie gezien**  
   I neg have n-body neg seen

(85)  

**Dr zitten hier nieveranst geen muizen**  
There sit here n-where n-mice  
‘There aren’t any mice anywhere around’

Apart from these more ’standard’ forms of NC, East Flemish dialects also show NC relations in which the adverbial negative marker occurs twice (86). In this case the first instance of **nie** is the marker of sentential negation, where the second **nie** marks the adverb **meer** ‘more/anymore’ for negation.

(86)  

**Jan (en) ee nie veel geld nie meer**  
Jan has neg much money neg more  
‘Jan hasn’t much money anymore’

In order to determine whether these East Flemish dialects are Strict or Non-Strict NC varieties, both the combination between a negative subject in preverbal position and a preverbal negative marker and between the subject and a negative adverb should be investigated. It turns out that East Flemish dialects allow for both NC relations, although some informants judged the NC relation between a negative subject and the preverbal negative marker as archaic.

(87)  

a. **Niemand en eet dat ooit gewild of gekund**  
   N-body neg has that ever wanted or can.Perf  
   ‘Nobody ever could or wanted to do that’

\(^{172}\) Haegeman (1995: 142) provides the following minimal pair from West Flemish:

(i)  
... da Valère van niemand nie ketent (en) is  
... that Valère of n-body neg pleased neg is  
NC: ‘that Valère is not pleased with anyone’

(ii)  
... da Valère nie van niemand ketent (en) is  
... that Valère neg of n-body pleased neg is  
DN: ‘that Valère is not pleased with no one’
b. Ik peis dat niemand nie gezien ('*en) eet
   I think that n-body neg seen has
   'I think nobody saw (it)'

The number of instances of Paratactic Negation in the NC varieties is smaller. Only in the southern East Flemish dialects examples of Paratactic Negation have been found. In these cases a comparative in the matrix clause licensed the presence of a preverbal negative marker in the subordinate clause that does not contribute to the negative semantics. As comparative constructions are also known to participate in NC relations in other languages (cf. Herberger 2001), and can be analysed as semi-negatives because of their monotonic properties (Van der Wouden 1994a) or semantic decomposition (cf. Von Stechow 1984, Kennedy 2001), these instances can be considered as a form of NC.

(88) IJ is veel leper of datrij uit en ziet
   He is much smarter if that.there.he PART neg looks
   'He is much smarter than he looks like'

West Flemish dialects that still allow an optional preverbal negative marker resemble East Flemish dialects to a large extent with respect to the expression of NC. N-words are allowed to show Negative Spread with both the preverbal negative marker the negative adverb or with both173 (89). Negative Doubling and NC relations with nie meer 'not anymore' phrases are also allowed.

(89) a. Jenhoort da niemer'
    You.neg.hear that n-ever
    'You don't ever hear that'

b. K geloof dak niemand nie gezien en
   I believe that.I n-body neg seen have
   'I believe that I didn't see anybody'

c. ...da Valère van niemand nie ketent en was
   ...that Valère of n-body neg pleased neg was
   '...that Valère wasn't pleased with anyone'

(90) Zitn dr ier nieverans geen muizen binn
    Sit there here n-where n-mice
    'There aren't any mice anywhere around'

(91) Asset azo voort doet zalt nie lange nie mee trekn
    If.he so further does will.he neg long neg more pull
    'If he continues (his behaviour), he won't live long'

173 The SAND fieldwork did not show any combinations of combinations of *en, nie and an n-word in the West Flemish dialects. However, the informants did not reject these examples either. Moreover, many of such examples have been reported in the literature (cf. Haegeman 1995).
174 Taken from Haegeman 1995: 142.
West Flemish differs from East Flemish in the sense that West Flemish also allows the *not A no N* construction. Here a combination of negative marker on top of an AN construction establishes an NC relation with the n-word *geen* ‘no’ (92) that may intervene between A and N.\(^{175}\)

(92) a. E klap *nie* goed *geen* Frans
   He talks neg good n- French
   ‘He doesn’t speak any good French’

b. Tleevn *nie* vele *geen* mensn meer van de boerenstiel
   It.live neg many neg people more of the farm
   ‘Not many people make a living from farming’

The question whether West Flemish is a Strict or Non-Strict NC languages is not straightforward. It is known from the literature that the negative subject is not allowed to occur in sentence-initial position. However, this is a consequence of a general rule in West Flemish that obliges indefinite expressions to form an existential *there* construction and therefore bans indefinites to occur in sentence-initial position.

(93) a. *...da nen student da gezeid eet
   ... that a student that said has
   ‘... that some student said that’

b. Datter *nen* student da gezeid eet
   That.the there a student that said has
   ‘That some student said that’

(94) a. *... *da *niemand* dienen boek gelezen eet
   ... that n-body that book read has
   ‘... that nobody read that book’

b. ... datter *niemand* dienen boek gelezen eet
   ... that there n-body that book read has
   ‘... that nobody read that book’

Hence, the ban on n-words in the canonical subject position is not related to the question whether the variety exhibits Strict or Non-Strict NC. The question is then whether a negative subject followed by a negative marker in a *there* construction is allowed or not. It is shown in (95) that in West Flemish dialects both negative markers may follow the negative subject.

\(^{175}\) This construction has first been observed by Vanacker (1975) and has been discussed in Haegeman (2002) for French Flemish dialects.

\(^{176}\) Data from Haegeman & Zanuttini: 126.

\(^{177}\) Data from Haegeman & Zanuttini: 126-7.
A crucial difference between West and East Flemish dialects is that the group of West Flemish dialects does not exhibit Paratactic Negation. In the SAND fieldwork these examples have actively been triggered, without any response, and in several cases informants have judged these examples as ill-formed. Haegeman (1995: 161, p.c.) also reports these constructions to be unwellformed (96): The single expletive *en may not give rise to PN constructions and if both negative markers occur a subordinate clause a DN reading is yielded. Therefore I conclude that Paratactic Negation is not allowed in West Flemish.

The third group of dialects under investigation are the French Flemish varieties. These varieties exhibit NC, mostly in the same way as the West and East Flemish varieties. French Flemish can establish Negative Spread between the preverbal negative marker and n-words, or Negative Doubling relations between two n-words (97). French Flemish allows for not ... not more construction and the not A no N construction as well, and even allows quantifiers, such as veel ‘much/many’ to occupy the position of the adjective (98).
Although the constructions in (98) seem to allow NC relations in French Flemish in which the adverbial negative marker *nie* occurs, French Flemish speakers only marginally accept other cases in which an n-word is in NC relation with the adverbial negative marker. Informants reject cases in which an n-word in object position is followed by a negative marker by offering translations in which the negative adverb is lacking. Moreover, while determining whether French Flemish exhibits Strict or Non-Strict NC, it turns out that subject n-words are allowed to be followed by a preverbal negative marker, but the negative subject is only accepted marginally if it is followed by *nie* (99).

(99) a. *Niemand enèët dat newild*  
N-body neg has that wanted  
‘Nobody wanted that’

b. *Tewwil niemand (’nie) dansen*  
It.neg.wants n-body neg dance  
‘Nobody wants to dance’

Apparently French Flemish does not seem to allow constructions in which the negative adverb *nie* follows one or more n-words. Note that this is reminiscent of Standard French. Under this assumption one can conclude that French Flemish is Strict NC: it allows constructions in which a negative marker follows the negative subject. Cases in which this is unacceptable are ruled out for other reasons.

Finally, French Flemish shows Paratactic Negation. In the matrix verb *twijfeln* ‘doubt’ allows for both negative markers in the subordinate clause, although these markers do not contribute to the negative semantics of the sentence.

(100) *Ktwijfeln atn nieëngaat doen*  
I.doubt that.he neg.neg.goes do  
‘I doubt he’ll do it’

To conclude, all three dialects groups that have a preverbal negative marker also exhibit NC, though there are some minor differences. Thus so far we partially succeeded our task to find any correspondences between the status of the negative marker and the exhibition of NC. It turns out that all Dutch varieties that have an (optional) preverbal negative marker also show NC behaviour. Recall that this observation was also made when describing diachronic variation.

The question then rises whether this generalisation is uni-directional or bi-directional. In order to answer this question it suffices to see whether there are other NC varieties in Modern Dutch. As there is no preverbal negative marker left in those varieties, the only two NC options are Negative Doubling (two n-words) and Negative Spread (n-
word + adverbial negative marker). A picture of dialects in which at least one of these is accepted can be found in (101).

Roughly speaking, in almost every Flemish variety NC is available, as well as in many of the other Belgian dialects. In the Netherlands some of the Brabant and Limburg Dutch dialects also show NC, and NC is found in a few Frysian dialects and in several dialects from Twente Dutch (in the eastern part of the country). I include examples of NC (both negative Spread and Negative Doubling, if present) in those dialects below.

(101) NC dialects in Modern Dutch

A question might be whether these examples are not instances of Emphatic Negation. Although the borderline between NC and EN is not always sharp, the choice of sentences was such that the examples are non-emphatic. E.g. the construction *there wants nobody not dance* is not emphatic, since the *there is* construction generally does not invite emphatic elements (which tend to occupy a sentence-initial position under topic or focus). Other examples, such as *nowhere no friends* (104), were in fact translations of single negation sentences in the input ‘everywhere no friends’.
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(102) a. *Ie wil nievers nie dansn*
There wants n-body.neg dance
‘Nobody wants to dance’

b. *Ie wil geen soep nie meer eet*
He wants n-soup neg more eat
‘He doesn’t want to eat any soup anymore’

(103) a. *Doe wil niemandni danse*
There wants n-body.neg dance
‘Nobody wants to dance’

b. *Haa wil geen soep ni mie eet*
He wants n-soup neg more eat
‘He doesn’t want to eat any soup anymore’

(104) a. *Der wil niemann danse*
There wants n-body.neg dance
‘Nobody wants to dance’

b. *Hiet nergens geen vrienden*
He.has n-where neg friends
‘He hasn’t any friends anywhere’

(105) a. *Der wil niemand nie danse*
There wants n-body. neg dance
‘Nobody wants to dance’

b. *Hij heet nergens geen vriende*
He.has n-where neg friends
‘He hasn’t any friends anywhere’

(106) a. *Der wil niemand niet danse*
There wants n-body. neg dance
‘Nobody wants to dance’

b. *Hi het nergens geen vriende*
He.has n-where neg friends
‘He hasn’t any friends anywhere’

(107) a. *Der wol net ien net dansje*
There wants neg one neg dance
‘Nobody wants to dance’

b. *Zitte hjir nergens gijn muizen?*
Sit here n-where n-mice
‘Are there any mice around here’

(108) a. *Der wil geen een nich danse*
There wants n-one neg dance
‘Nobody wants to dance’

Hertsberge
(West Flemish)

Leuven
(Brabant (B) Dutch)

Houthalen
(Limburg (B) Dutch)

Vorstenbosch
(Brabant (N) Dutch)

Meterik
(Limburg (N) Dutch)

Anjum
(Frisian)

Rossum
(Twente Dutch)
b. Hij wil geen soep niet meer etn niet
He wants no soup neg more eat neg
‘He doesn’t want to eat anymore soup’

As follows from the examples, Modern Dutch NC is subject to variety. E.g. sentence-final negation has only been observed in Twente Dutch\textsuperscript{178,179}, whereas NC is generally rare in these varieties. An investigation of the exact difference between all varieties of Dutch that exhibit NC is subject of further research and beyond the scope of this study, as its primary objective is to find correlations between different phenomena in the field of negation.

The conclusion of this subsection is thus that the relation between the status of the negative marker and the occurrence of NC is uni-directional: all dialects that have a preverbal negative marker exhibit NC, whereas not every NC dialects allows for an (optional) preverbal negative marker.

### 4.4.3 Negative Imperatives in Modern Dutch

Negative imperatives are not problematic in any Phase V dialect. In Standard Dutch, negative imperatives consist of an imperative in V1 position followed (not necessarily immediately) by a negative adverb.

(109) Vertel maar niet wie ze had geroepen
Tell PRT neg who she had called
‘Don’t tell who she called’

There is no relevant variation with respect to this construction amongst the different Dutch varieties. Hence the only domain in which relevant variation may be expected is the domain of Phase IV dialects. The question is then, is there a ban on true negative imperatives in the West Flemish, East Flemish and French Flemish dialects that still allow for an (optional) preverbal negative marker.

(110) a. Vertel mo nie wien dassezie a kunn roepn
Tell PRT neg who that she had can call
‘Don’t tell who she could have called’

b. Vertel maar nie wie dassiezij ou kunne roepn
Tell PRT neg who that she had can call
‘Don’t tell who she could have called’

c. Enzeg niet wien dase gonz wiln roepn
Neg.tell neg who that she go want call
‘Don’t tell who she wanted to call’

\textsuperscript{178} Cf. Pauwels 1959 who observed similar phenomena in e.g. Aalst Dutch.

\textsuperscript{179} Note that this pattern seems to be similar to the pattern in Afrikaans in which sentence-final negation is highly frequent.
French Flemish allows for true negative imperatives. There are no instances found of negative imperatives in West Flemish or East Flemish. Although West Flemish informants strongly reject examples such as (110), Haegeman (1995) reports cases in which they are accepted (111).

(111) a. *En doet da nie*
   Neg do that neg
   ‘Don’t do that’

b. *En zegt dat an niemand*
   Neg say that to n-body
   ‘Don’t tell anybody’

The absence of examples as in (111) in East/West Flemish is in line with another generalisation, namely the absence of the preverbal negative marker in V1 context. Apparently there is variation amongst speakers of West Flemish with respect to the possibility of the preverbal negative marker to occur in V1 contexts.

This picture corresponds with the general picture of *en*-deletion that shows that the preverbal negative marker disappears completely in V1 contexts, before disappearing in (non-topicalised) V2 contexts and subordinate clauses.

The absence of negative imperatives in these cases is not the result of a ban on negative imperatives, but a consequence of the process of *en* deletion that is going on in these varieties.

### 4.4.4 Universal subjects and negation in Modern Dutch

The question what the interpretation in different Dutch dialects is of sentences containing of a universal subject followed by a negative marker, is hard to test in fieldwork, as informants find judging these examples quite hard. However, many informants accepted the sentence *iedereen is geen vakman* ‘everybody is not an expert’, which has a reading $\forall > \neg$ in Standard Dutch, in their dialects under the inverse reading ($\neg > \forall$).

(112) *Iedereen is geen vakman*

Everybody is no expert

$\neg > \forall$: ‘Not everybody is an expert’

$\forall > \neg$: ‘Nobody is an expert’

The map in (113) shows that in many dialects this inverse reading is accepted. More importantly, all dialects that exhibit NC also allow for this reading, whereas only a part of the non-NC dialects allowed for this construction under the inverse reading, again pointing at a uni-directional relation between NC and the interpretation of sentences with a universal quantifier subject followed by a negation.
For now, it suffices to conclude that the inverse readings in these constructions are widespread amongst Dutch varieties and always possible in the NC dialects. It should however be acknowledged that the map in (113) may be subject to minor changes after a closer examination of the facts, as this construction is harder to test than the constructions in previous sections.

(113) Dialects that allow inverse readings of the interpretation of sentences with a universal quantifier subject followed by a negation.

4.4.5 Concluding remarks

It becomes clear from the SAND fieldwork that Modern Dutch shows variety with respect to all four topics that have been investigated. Although every variety of Dutch uses the adverbial negative marker to express negation, West Flemish, East Flemish and French Flemish exhibit Jespersen Phase IV behaviour. In some other dialects the preverbal negative marker is not used anymore to express sentential negation, but can still be used in a pleonastic sense.
It turns out that all these phase IV dialects also exhibit NC, but the distribution of NC is not restricted to those dialects. Many other varieties, both from the Netherlands and from Belgium, are NC varieties too. All these varieties proved to be Non-Strict NC varieties. In this study subtle differences between the different NC varieties were found, such as the occurrence of Paratactic Negation and the possibility of the so-called *not A/Q no N* construction.

Modern Dutch does not know any ban on negative imperatives, although West and East Flemish Phase IV dialects do not allow the preverbal negative to occur in imperatives. This is however due to the fact that this marker does not occur in V1 contexts anymore, a natural stage in the process of *en*-deletion.

Finally the research indicated that inverse readings of constructions in which a universal quantifier subject was followed by negative marker are widespread under Modern Dutch varieties, including all varieties that exhibit NC.

### 4.5 Conclusions

The general aim of this chapter was to find any correspondences between the four phenomena under study: (i) the way sentential negation is expressed; (ii) the interpretation of multiple negation (Double Negation or NC, and if NC what kind of NC); (iii) the occurrence of true negative imperatives; and (iv) the interpretation of sentences in which a universal quantifier subject is followed by a negative marker.

The results of this chapter are summarised in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>PN</th>
<th>$\neg \rightarrow \forall$</th>
<th>NegImmp</th>
<th>Varieties:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I / II</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Old Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Middle Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16th and 17th Century Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>French Flemish: Ste Marie Chapelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>East Flemish: Berlare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>West Flemish: Oostende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Most southern Varieties: map (101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Most varieties: map (113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Standard Dutch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of (114) the following generalisations can be formulated:
• Every variety that has an (optional) preverbal negative marker in order to express sentential negation is an NC variety; not every variety that exhibits NC has a preverbal negative marker at its disposal.
• Not every NC variety allows for Paratactic Negation. Every variety that exhibits Paratactic Negation is an NC variety\textsuperscript{180}.
• Every NC variety allows for inverse readings of sentences with a universal quantifier subject followed by a negation; not every variety that allows for inverse readings of sentences with a universal quantifier subject followed by a negation exhibits NC.
• Dutch does not know any ban on true negative imperatives.
• Every Dutch NC variety is a Non-Strict NC variety.

These generalisations will form the input for the analyses in the coming chapters. However, whether the correspondences that have been described are also valid for other languages, or whether they only hold for Dutch, has to be checked first. Moreover, as Dutch does not exhibit Strict NC or a ban on negative imperatives, it should be investigated for other languages whether these two phenomena are related to the other phenomena. Finally, the majority of Dutch variations under study proved to be Phase IV or Phase V varieties. Therefore a closer look at the behaviour of Phase I, Phase II and Phase III languages is required. In order to fulfil these requirements these generalisations will be checked against a set of 25 languages in the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{180} The second part of this generalization follows from the definition of Paratactic Negation.