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5 Typological checking

The central objective of this chapter is to check the correctness of the generalisations put forward in the final section of the previous chapter. This is necessary for two reasons: (i) not every phenomenon under research has been covered by the data in Dutch, e.g. the data from Old Dutch are by far insufficient to develop an elaborate analysis about Phase I languages. Therefore additional material from other languages is needed in order to complete the picture; (ii) those phenomena that are well-captured by the Dutch data give rise to generalisations. However, it is not excluded that these generalisations are restricted to Dutch language-internal variation. The goal of this study is to investigate whether the generalisations that hold for Dutch also hold for a larger domain of languages, in principle those languages that express sentential negation by means of a negative marker (cf. chapter 3.3.2). Hence the results of the Dutch microtypological study need to be checked against a set of languages. If the same generalisations also hold for this sample, these generalisations cannot be the results of language-internal variation, and hence count as results from cross-linguistic variation.

The questions, which will be addressed, are similar to those that have been put forward in chapter 3 and 4. For each language the following questions will be asked.

(1) In which phase of the Jespersen Cycle can the language be classified?

(2) What is the syntactic status (preverbal/adverbial) of the negative marker that expresses sentential negation in the language?

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

(4) Does the language exhibit Double Negation (DN)?

(5) Does the language allow negative imperatives?

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

This chapter is constructed as follows: since I followed the diachronic development of Dutch negation, I will also classify the languages by the phase of the Jespersen Cycle they are in. Hence I will start by discussing the languages that are in Jespersen Phase I in section 5.1, languages that are in Jespersen Phase II in section 5.2, etc. At the end of this chapter, in section 5.7, all the results of this typological study will be presented in one table and all generalisations, which will form the input for the theoretical analyses in chapters 6-8, will be presented.
**5.1 Phase I languages**

As has been shown in chapter 3.3, all Phase I languages exhibit sentential negation by means of a single preverbal negative marker. However, with respect to the other phenomena that have been subject to study, one can distinguish three different subclasses of languages within this class of languages: (i) Strict NC languages that allow true negative imperatives (such as most Slavic languages); (ii) Strict NC languages that do not allow true negative imperatives (such as Greek or Hungarian) and (iii) Non-Strict NC languages, which always block true negative imperatives (Spanish/Italian). Non-Strict NC languages that allow true negative imperatives have not been found. In the rest of this section I discuss these three types of Phase I languages.

**5.1.1 Slavic languages**

In Slavic languages, negation is expressed by means of a negative that is prefixed to the finite verb. Languages such as Czech, Polish, Russian and Serbo-Croatian do not have any negative adverbial marker and hence they are Phase I languages.

(7) Milan nevolá
    Milan neg-call
    ‘Milan doesn’t call’

(8) Jan nie pomaga ojcu
    Jan neg helps father
    ‘Jan doesn’t help his father’

(9) Petja na koncerce ne byl
    Petja at concert neg was
    ‘Petja wasn’t at the concert’

(10) Ne vidim ih
    Neg saw.1SG them
    ‘I didn’t see them’

These languages are Strict NC languages. N-words are always required to be accompanied by a negative marker, even if the subject is in preverbal position.

---

181 Example taken from Partee & Borschev (2002).
182 Example taken from Schütze (1994).
(11) a. Milan nikomu nevolá
   Milan n-body neg-call
   ‘Milan doesn’t call anybody’
b. Dnes nevolá nikdo.
   Today neg-calls n-body
   ‘Today nobody is calling’
c. Dnes nikdo nevolá.
   Today n-body neg-calls
   ‘Today nobody is calling’

(12) a. Janek nie pomaga nikomu
    Janek neg helps n-body
    ‘Janek doesn’t help anybody’
b. Nie przyszedł nikt
    Neg came nobody
    ‘Nobody came’
c. Nikt nie przyszedł
    N-body came
    ‘Nobody came’

(13) a. Natasa nichego ne znaet
    Natasa n-thing neg knows
    ‘Natasa doesn’t know anything’
b. Ne rabotaet nichego
    Neg works n-thing
    ‘Nothing works’
c. Nichego ne rabotaet
    N-thing neg works
    ‘Nothing works’

(14) a. Milan ne vidi nista
    Milan neg see n-thing
    ‘Milan doesn’t see anything’
b. Ne zove niko
    Neg came n-body
    ‘Nobody came’
c. Niko ne zove
    N-body neg came
    ‘Nobody came’

Similar to Dutch microvariation, these languages allow Paratactic Negation (PN), if the n-word is licensed by a proper downward entailing operator, such as the preposition without. However, speakers vary with respect to the grammaticality of such PN constructions. In Czech, Polish and Romanian the construction without n-thing is well-formed and yields a reading ‘without anything’. In Russian this is also
accepted, although the expression appears to be more colloquial. Interestingly, the NC reading is unavailable when *nichego ‘n-thing’ is replaced by *nikogo ‘nobody’. In Serbo-Croatian this construction is only accepted in some varieties and is not accepted in the standard language, which uses NPI’s similar to English *any*-terms.

(15) Bez nikoho
Without n-body
‘Without anybody’

(16) Bez niczego
Without n-thing
‘Without anything’

(17) a. Bez nichego
Without n-thing
‘Without anything’

b. Bez nikogo
Without n-body
‘Without n-body’

(18) a. Bezicing
Without anything
‘Without anything’

b. Beziceg
Without n-thing
‘Without anything’

All these Slavic languages allow true negative imperatives (cf. also Tomic 1999). The examples (19)-(22) show that the imperative verb allows a preverbal negative marker without changing its form.

(19) a. Pracuj!
Work.IMP
‘Work!’

b. Niepracuj!
Neg.work.IMP
‘Don’t work!’

(20) a. Pracuj!
Work.IMP
‘Work!’

b. Niepracuj!
Neg.work.IMP
‘Don’t work!’
The Slavic languages under study yield an inverse reading if a universal quantifier subject (an \(\forall\)-subject henceforward) precedes the negative marker: negation scopes over the universal quantifier in these sentences. Note however, that for all speakers these sentences are marginally grammatical.

(23)  
\(\text{Kazdý nemá takové štěstí}\)  
Everybody neg.has such luck  
‘Not everybody is so lucky’

(24)  
\(\text{Wszyscy nie przyszli na imprezę}\)  
Everybody neg came to party  
‘Not everybody came to the party’

(25)  
\(\text{Kazdyj rebenok ne govorit po-anglijski}\)  
Everybody student neg speaks English  
‘Not every student speaks English’

(26)  
\(\text{Svako nije dosao na zurku}\)  
Everybody neg.AUX come to party  
‘Not everybody comes to the party’

5.1.2 Greek, Romanian, Hungarian, Hebrew

Greek, Romanian, Hungarian and Hebrew differ with respect to the previous set of languages as they do not allow true negative imperatives. With respect to the other phenomena they behave similar. In (27)-(30) it is shown that they are Phase I languages that exhibit sentential negation by means of a preverbal negative marker.
O Stéfanos dhen pigi
The Stéfanos neg walked
‘Stefanos didn’t walk’

Ion nu munceste
Ion neg works
‘Ion doesn’t work’

Nem láttam Jánost
Neg saw.1SG Janos
‘I didn’t see Janos’

John lo oved
John Neg works
‘John doesn’t work’

Greek, Romanian, Hungarian and Hebrew also exhibit Strict NC as both preverbal and postverbal n-words are obligatory accompanied by the negative marker.

Dhen ipo Pavlos TIPOTA
Neg said the Paul n-thing
‘Not everybody is so lucky.’

Dhen irthe KANENAS
Neg came n-body
‘Nobody came’

KANENAS dhen irthe
Neg came n-body
‘Nobody came’

Ion nu suna pe nimeni
Ion neg calls to n-body
‘Ion doesn’t call anybody’

Nu suna nimeni
Neg calls n-body
‘Nobody calls’

Nimeni nu suna
N-body calls
‘Nobody calls’

Balázs nem láttott semmit
Balázs neg saw n-thing
‘Balázs didn’t see anything’

---

183 Example taken from Suranyi (t.a.).
b. *Nem jött el senki*
   Neg came PREF n-body
   ‘Nobody came along’

c. *Senki nem jött el*
   N-body neg came PREF
   ‘Nobody came along’

(34) a. John *lo metzaltzel le-*af exhad
   John neg calls to-n-body
   ‘John doesn’t call anybody’

b. *Lo tziltzel af exhad*
   Neg called n-body
   ‘Nobody called’

c. *Af exhad lo tziltzel*
   N-body neg called
   ‘Nobody called’

Greek, Romanian, Hungarian and Hebrew also accept PN constructions, but these languages vary with respect to the extent to which this is possible. Greek is very restrictive, only allowing anti-veridical operators to participate in PN constructions (cf. Giannakidou 1997, 1999, 2000). Romanian and Hungarian are more liberal and Hebrew has obligatorily PN constructions in most downward entailing contexts.

(35) Xoris KANENAN\(^{184}\)
    Without n-body
    ‘Without anybody’

(36) Fara *nimic*
    Without n-thing
    ‘Without anything’

(37) *Semmi ne’lkül*
    N-thing without
    ‘Without anything’

(38) Bli shum davar
    Without n-thing
    ‘Without anything’

Greek, Romanian, Hungarian and Hebrew are distinct from the Slavic languages, as they do not allow true negative imperatives. In these languages the negative marker cannot precede the imperative verb, and negative imperatives can only be expressed by means of a surrogate imperative. In Greek and Hungarian the imperative verbs are

\(^{184}\) Example taken from Giannakidou (1997).
replaced by subjunctives, in Romanian by an infinitive and in Hebrew the negative imperative requires a future form.\textsuperscript{185}

(39)  
\begin{enumerate}[a.]
    \item Diavase to!  
        Read it  
        ‘Read it’
    \item *Dhen diavase to!  
        Neg read.IMP it  
        ‘Don’t read it’
\end{enumerate}  

Greek

(40)  
\begin{enumerate}[a.]
    \item Lucreaza!  
        Work.IMP  
        ‘Work!’
    \item *Nu Lucreaza!  
        Neg work  
        ‘Don’t work!’
\end{enumerate}  

Romanian

(41)  
\begin{enumerate}[a.]
    \item Olvass!  
        Read.IMP. INDEFOBJ  
        ‘Read it’
    \item *Nem olvass!  
        Neg read.IMP. INDEFOBJ  
        Don’t read it’
\end{enumerate}  

Hungarian

(42)  
\begin{enumerate}[a.]
    \item Avod!  
        Work.IMP  
        ‘Work!’
    \item *Lo avod!  
        Neg work  
        ‘Don’t work!’
\end{enumerate}  

Hebrew

Finally, Greek, Romanian, Hungarian and Hebrew constructions in which an $\forall$-subject precedes the negative marker give rise to a reverse reading, where the negation scopes over the quantifier. However, the acceptability of these sentences differs. In Romanian and Hebrew they are well-formed, in Greek and Hungarian they are marked.

\textsuperscript{185} In Romanian, the surrogate negative imperative is only infinitive in singular forms. The plural negative imperative is a true imperative form, but this form is phonologically identical to the $2^{nd}$ person plural indicative verb. Hence the (un)grammaticality of true negative imperatives can only be determined with singular verbs. (Oana Ovarescu p.c.).

The case in Hungarian is more complicated. The negative marker \textit{nem} is not allowed in imperatives or pseudo-imperative constructions. Hungarian has a special negative marker for imperatives, \textit{ne}. However, this negative marker \textit{ne} may not be followed by a verb in the imperative form, but only by a subjunctive verb. (Kriszta Szendrői p.c.).

In Hebrew, there is a special imperative negative marker too, \textit{al}, which cannot be combined with an imperative verb, but only with a verb in future tense. (Eytan Zweig p.c.).
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(43) "Kathe agora dhen efij e
Every boy neg left
‘Not every boy left’

(44) Toata lumea n-a venit la petrecere
Everybody neg-has come to party
‘Not everybody has come to the party’

(45) Mindenki nem beszél angolul
Everybody neg speaks English
‘Not everybody speaks English’

(46) Kulam lo bau la-mesiba
Everybody neg came to-DEF.party
‘Not everybody came to the party’

5.1.3 Italian, Spanish, Portuguese

The third group of Phase I languages exists of most Romance languages. These languages express sentential negation by means of a single preverbal negative marker as is shown for Italian (47), Spanish (48) and Portuguese (49).

(47) Gianni non mangia
John neg eats
‘John doesn’t eat’

(48) Juan no vino
Juan neg came
‘John didn’t come’

(49) Eles não a conhecem
They neg her know
‘They don’t know her’

Italian, Spanish and Portuguese are Non-Strict NC languages, as they do not allow n-words to dominate the negative marker. Hence, if an n-word is in preverbal subject position, the sentence is ungrammatical.187

---

186 Preverbal negative markers in this type of languages generally allow clitics to intervene. In chapter 6, I will elaborate on clitic intervention in negative sentences in more detail.

187 Unless the subject is emphasized. In that case the sentence receives a DN reading.
(50) a. Gianni *non* ha telefonato a *nessuno*  
Gianni neg has called to n-body  
‘Gianni didn’t call anybody’
b. *Non* ha telefonato *nessuno*  
Neg has called n-body  
‘Nobody called’
c. *Nessuno (*non*)* ha telefonato  
N-body neg has called  
‘Nobody called’

(51) a. Juan *no* miraba a *nadie*  
Juan neg looked at n-body  
‘Juan didn’t look at anybody’
b. *No* vino *nadie*  
Neg came n-body  
‘Nobody came’
c. *Nadie (*no*)* vino  
N-body neg came  
‘Nobody came’

(52) a. O Rui *não* viu *ningém*  
Rui neg looked at n-body  
‘Rui didn’t look at anybody’
b. *Não* veio *ningém*  
Neg came n-body  
‘Nobody came’
c. *Ninguém (*não*)* veio  
N-body neg came  
‘Nobody came’

Similar to other Phase I languages that have been studied, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese exhibit PN, as is shown in the following examples.

(53) Senza *nessuno*  
Without n-body  
‘Without anybody’

(54) Sin *nadie*  
Without n-body  
‘Without anybody’

(55) Sem *ningém*  
Without n-body  
‘Without anybody’
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Italian, Spanish and Portuguese also ban true negative imperatives. This is related to the fact that these languages are Non-Strict NC languages. No Non-Strict NC language has been found that allows true negative imperatives.

(56) a. Telefona!  
Call  
‘Call!’

b. *Non telefona!  
Neg call.IMP  
‘Don’t call’

(57) a. ¡lee!  
Read.IMP  
‘Don’t read’

b. *¡No lee!  
Neg read.IMP  
‘Don’t read’

(58) a. Faz isso!  
Do.IMP it  
‘Do it’

b. *Não faz isso!  
Neg read.IMP it  
‘Don’t do it’

Finally, clauses in which a universal quantifier subject (\(\forall\)-subject henceforward) precedes a negative marker, a reverse interpretation is possible whereby negation scopes over the subject. Note that in Italian these constructions are only marginally acceptable. In Portuguese these constructions are even reported to be unwellformed.

(59) ‘Tutti non parlano Inglese  
All neg speak English  
‘Not everybody speaks English’

(60) Todo el mundo no vino  
All the world neg came  
‘Not everybody came’

(61) *Todos não vieram  
Everybody neg came

188 Example taken from Zanuttini (1996).
189 Data are from Tomic (1999).
5.1.4 Concluding remarks

The languages discussed above provide sufficient data to confirm the generalisations that have been drawn on the basis of Dutch diachronic and dialectological variation.

First, all Phase I languages are NC languages. Hence the generalisation that NC seems to occur in every language that has a preverbal negative marker holds for all Phase I languages discussed.

Second, it turns out that Non-Strict NC languages also ban true negative imperatives. However, the ban on negative imperatives is not restricted to Non-Strict NC languages. Some Strict NC languages, such as Greek, also ban negative imperatives. On the other hand, other Strict NC languages, such as the Slavic languages, allow true negative imperatives.

Finally, the generalisation phrased in the previous chapter that all NC varieties of Dutch yield inverse readings in constructions in which the negative marker is preceded by an $\forall$-subject, also holds for the set of Phase I languages.

5.2 Phase II languages

The number of Phase II languages is much smaller than the number of Phase I languages (cf. Haspelmath 1997). In Phase II languages the second negative marker is optional and therefore these languages can be seen as transit languages. These languages are on their way from Phase I to Phase III. Hence these languages are not stable with respect to the expression of sentential negation, which explains their low frequency.

In this section, I discuss two languages that exhibit Phase II behaviour: Tamazight Berber and Catalan. These two languages express negation by means of a single preverbal negative marker, but allow for an optional negative adverb to occur in negative sentences.

(62) $Ur$ ughax ($sha$) lktaab
    Neg 1SG.bought neg book
    ‘I didn’t buy the book’

(63) $No$ serà ($pas$) facil
    Neg be.FUT.3SG neg easy
    ‘It won’t be easy’

All Phase II languages exhibit NC. In (64) and (65) it is shown that the preverbal negative marker $ur$ is allowed to participate in NC relations. However, the question
whether Tamazight Berber is a Strict NC languages cannot be answered straightforwardly, as languages only exhibit Strict or Non-Strict NC with respect to a particular negative marker. Berber is a Strict NC relation with respect to this marker ur, as it co-occurs with negative subjects as well, both in preverbal and postverbal position. The negative adverb sha is not allowed to participate in NC relations, unless it heads the NC chain, i.e. it dominates all other n-words. Hence, Berber is a Non-Strict NC language with respect to sha, as the subject n-word may not precede this negative marker (65).

(64) a. *Urugin ur dix (*sha) gher frans
Never neg went.1sg neg to France
'I never went to France'

b. *Sha-ur 3lix walu
Neg-neg see.PERF.1sg n-thing
'I didn't see anything'

(65) a. Ur iddi (*sha) agidge gher-lhefla
Neg went neg n-one to party
'Nobody went to the party'

b. Agidge ur iddin (*sha)
N-one neg went neg
'Nobody went'

c. *Sha-ur iddi agidge gher-lhefla
Neg-neg went n-body to-party
'Nobody went to the party'

There are two varieties of Catalan with respect to NC: one variety that is a Strict NC variation (Catalan I), and one variety that exhibits Non-Strict NC behaviour (Catalan II). In both varieties of Catalan the optional negative adverb pas is allowed to participate in the NC chain.

(66) a. *No ha vist (pas) ningú
Neg has.3sg seen neg n-body
'He didn't see anybody'

b. *No functiona (pas) res
Neg works neg n-thing
'Nothing works'

c. Res *(no) functiona (pas)
N-thing neg works neg
'Nothing works'

(67) a. *No ha vist (pas) ningú
Neg has.3sg seen neg n-body
'He didn't see anybody'
b. *No funciona (pas) res
   Neg works neg n-thing
   ‘Nothing works’

c. Res (*no) funciona (pas)
   N-thing neg works neg
   ‘Nothing works’

Both Berber and Catalan allow PN, as is shown in the following examples:

(68) Bla walu
    Without n-thing
    ‘Without anything’

(69) Sense ningü
    Without n-body
    ‘Without anybody’

These languages are in line with the generalisation drawn in the previous section: all Non-Strict NC languages disallow negative imperatives and Strict NC languages may vary with respect to the availability of true negative imperatives. Catalan disallows true negative imperatives, whereas they are grammatical in Berber.

(70) a. Teddat h
    Go.IMP neg
    ‘Go’

    a. Ur teddath (sha)
    Neg go.IMP go
    ‘Don’t go’

(71) a. ¡Canta esa canción!
    Sing.IMP that song
    ‘Sing that song’

    b. *¡No canta esa canción!
    Neg sing.IMP that song
    ‘Don’t sing that song’

Finally, the two languages all allow inverse readings of sentences in which an ∀-subject precedes the negative marker, although the reading is Berber is marked. So far the generalisation that NC languages render inverse readings in these constructions is confirmed.
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5.3 Phase III languages

In this section I will discuss the behaviour of Phase III languages. The set of Phase III languages is relatively small. Contemporary examples of Phase III languages are Standard French, some varieties of Italian (cf. Zanuttini 1998) and some versions of Arab, such as Baghdad Arab (cf. Haspelmath 1997). The fact that the set of these languages is (similar to Phase II and Phase IV languages) small, probably comes from the fact that Phase III behaviour is from a economical perspective undesirable: rather than using one marker, one needs two markers to express the same. Hence, it is not surprising that once that the second negative marker becomes obligatorily present, the first negative marker exhibits deletion effects.

Given the small number of Phase III languages and the fact that Middle Dutch, also a Phase III language, has been discussed in detail in the previous chapter, I will restrict myself to Standard French in this section.

Standard French expresses negation by means of two negative markers *ne* and *pas*, which embrace the finite verb.

(74)  
Jean *ne* mange *pas*  
Jean neg eats neg  
‘Jean doesn’t eat’

Standard French is an NC language, since multiple *n*-words yield only one semantic negation. With respect to *ne*, French is a Strict NC languages, as the preverbal negative marker may follow the subject *n*-word *personne* (‘n-body’). The other negative marker *pas*, contrary to e.g. Middle Dutch, is not allowed to occur in NC constructions

(75) a. Jean *ne* dit (*pas) *rien* a *personne*  
Jean neg says neg n-thing to n-body  
‘Jean doesn’t say anything to anybody’
b. Il *n’y* a (*pas) *personne*  
It has PRT neg n-body  
‘There isn’t anybody’
Standard French also allows PN. The preposition *sans* (‘without’) is able to select n-words that are not interpreted as semantic negations.

(76) Sans rien
Without n-thing
‘Without anything’

The question whether Standard French allows true negative imperatives is harder to address. At first sight Standard French seems to allow negative imperatives, but closer examination turns out that three are subtle differences between positive and negative imperatives. In positive imperatives and pronouns and object clitics occur always to the right of the verb, and pronouns must be heavy. In negative imperatives, pronouns and object clitics have to be in preverbal position and, moreover, pronouns must be weak.

(77) a. Regarde moi/*me!
Neg me watch
‘Don’t watch me’
b. Regarde le!
Watch it
‘Watch it’

(78) a. *Ne regarde moi/le pas!*\(^\text{190}\)
Neg watch me/it neg
‘Don’t watch me’
b. *Ne me/le regarde pas!*
Neg it watch neg
‘Don’t watch it’

Based on the differences between the examples in (77) and (78) I argue that French does not allow true negative imperatives. The negative imperative forms with weak pronouns are in fact surrogate imperative forms.

As has already been shown in chapter 3.5, Standard French also yields inverse readings in constructions in which an \(\forall\)-subject precedes the negative marker *ne*.

(79) Tous le monde *ne parle pas* votre langue
Everybody neg speaks neg your language
‘Not everybody speaks your language’

---

\(^{190}\) Data are from Rowlett (1998). In chapter 6.1 I will discuss these examples extensively.
To conclude, the generalisations that have been formulated also seem to hold for a prototypical Phase III language such as Standard French. Standard French has a preverbal negative marker and is an NC language. Furthermore, being an NC language, it gives rise to inverse readings in constructions in which the negative marker follows an \( \forall \)-subject. Finally, the fact that French is a Strict NC language (with respect to \( ne \)) and bans true negative imperatives, is in line with the general picture that the set of Strict NC languages can be divided in a set of languages that bans these imperatives, and a set of languages that do not.

### 5.4 Phase IV languages

As the number of Phase IV languages is relatively small as well (cf. Haspelmath 1997), and since I have already discussed several Phase IV varieties in Dutch (17\(^{th}\) Century Holland Dutch, Contemporary West Flemish, East Flemish and French Flemish varieties), I will restrict myself again to one language in this section: Colloquial French. Many speakers of French show \( ne \) deletion, and use \( ne \) only in a formal register. Hence \( ne \) has become an optional negative marker.

(80) Jean \( (ne) \) mange \( pas \)

Jean neg eats neg
‘Jean doesn’t eat’

Colloquial French is similar to Standard French with respect to NC. \( Ne \) may participate in all NC constructions and hence Colloquial French should be considered a Strict NC language with respect to \( ne \) and as a Non-Strict NC language with respect to \( pas \).

(81) a. Jean \( (ne) \) dit \(*pas\) rien a personne

Jean neg says neg n-thing to n-body
‘Jean doesn’t say anything to anybody’

b. Il \( (n)’y\) a \(*pas\) personne

It neg.PRT has neg n-body
‘There isn’t anybody’

c. Personne \( (ne) \) mange \(*pas\)

N-body neg eats neg
‘Nobody doesn’t eat’

PN constructions such as (82) are also allowed in Colloquial French.

(82) Sans \( rien \)

Without n-thing
‘Without anything’

Coll. French
Finally, the other phenomena, namely the ban on negative imperatives (83) and the interpretation on negative sentences containing \(^r\)-subjects (84), are similar in Standard and Colloquial French, apart from the fact that *ne* may be absent.\(^{191}\)

(83) a. Regarde le! 
   Watch it
   ‘Watch me’

   b. *(Ne) le regarde \(pas\)\(^ {192}\)
   Neg it watch neg
   ‘Don’t watch me’

(84) Tous le monde *(ne)* parle \(pas\) votre langue
   Everybody neg speak neg your language
   ‘Not everybody speaks your language’

It follows that Colloquial French does not contradict the generalisations that have been drawn on the basis of the Dutch microvariation and the other languages in 5.1-5.3.

### 5.5 Phase V languages

In chapter 4 I have shown that every Dutch variety that exhibits a preverbal negative marker is an NC language. In this chapter it has been shown that this generalisation also holds for all other languages that have been investigated in this study. In chapter 4 I have also argued that the relation between the availability of a preverbal negative marker and the occurrence of NC is uni-directional, i.e. not every language that lacks a preverbal negative marker is a DN language.

In this section I will show that this generalisation is not restricted to Dutch either: German, Norwegian and Swedish express sentential negation by means of a single negative adverb and these languages are DN languages; Quebecois, Bavarian and Yiddish on the other hand are languages which exhibit NC behaviour.

#### 5.5.1 German, Swedish, Norwegian

Phase V languages such as German, Norwegian and Swedish express sentential negation by means of a negative adverb only, as is shown (85)-(87).

---

\(^{191}\) The sentence *("Ne) jregarde moi pas ‘Neg watch me neg’* is well-formed in colloquial French. However, this does not violate the conclusion, since *ne* is not optionally absent in this example. This sentence will be discussed in chapter 6.

\(^{192}\) Data are from Rowlett (1998). In chapter 6.1 I will discuss these examples extensively.
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(85) Hans kommt nicht
Hans comes neg
‘Hans doesn’t come’

(86) Ole går ikke
Ole walks neg
‘Ole doesn’t come’

(87) Hon har inte skrivit
She has neg written
‘She hasn’t written’

These languages are all DN languages, i.e. every two negative elements yield a DN reading. This holds both for cases in which a negative quantifier\(^{193}\) follows and for cases in which the negative quantifier precedes the negative marker.

(88) a. Hans sieht nicht Nichts
Hans sees neg n-thing
‘Hans doesn’t see nothing’

b. ... dass Niemand heute nicht kommt
... that n-body today neg comes
‘... that nobody doesn’t come today’

(89) a. Ole sier ikke ingenting
Ole says neg n-thing
‘Ole doesn’t say nothing’

b. Ingen går ikke
N-body walks neg
‘Nobody walks’

(90) a. Sven har inte skrivit ingenting
Sven has neg written n-thing
‘Sven didn’t write nothing’

b. Ingen har inte skrivit
N-body has neg written
‘Nobody hasn’t written’

PN is also forbidden in these languages. If a negative element occurs in a position in which it is the complement of a negatively connotated element, it remains semantically negative.

\(^{193}\) Since every negative element introduces a semantic negation in these languages, the term \textit{n-word} does not apply anymore.

\(^{194}\) Some varieties of German allow for EN constructions (see chapter 3.3.4).
(91) Ohne Nichts
   Without n-thing
   ‘Without nothing’

(92) Uten ingenting
   Without n-thing
   ‘Without nothing’

(93) Utan ingenting
   Without n-thing
   ‘Without nothing’

All these DN languages allow true negative imperatives. The ban on true negative imperatives appears to be related to the fact that the negative marker is a preverbal negative element.

(94) a. Mache es!
    Do it
    ‘Do it’
   b. Mache es nicht!
    Do it neg
    ‘Don’t do it’

(95) a. Kom!
    Come
    ‘Come’
   b. Kom ikke
    Come neg
    ‘Don’t come!’

(96) a. Kom!
    Come
    ‘Come’
   b. Kom inte
    Come neg
    ‘Don’t come!’

Standard German is ambiguous with respect to the interpretation of sentences in which an $\forall$-subject precedes the negative marker. It allows inverse readings of negative expressions in which an $\forall$-subject precedes the negative marker and readings in which the subject scopes over negation. The inverse readings are however the preferred ones. Norwegian and Swedish yield only the inverse reading. Standard Dutch, which allows the $\forall\neg$ reading only, differs with respect to the other DN languages with respect to the interpretation of this construction.
To conclude, the facts described in this subsection confirm the (uni-directional) generalisations that have been formulated so far. The absence of the preverbal negative marker allows these languages to be DN languages. Moreover, due to the absence of the negative marker, these languages do not ban true negative imperatives. Finally the generalisation that Phase V languages vary with respect to the interpretation of sentences as in (97) is confirmed: German, Norwegian and Swedish allow inverse readings, whereas Standard Dutch does not.

5.5.2 Quebecois, Bavarian, Yiddish

Similar to what has been found in the Dutch language-internal variation, other Phase V languages exhibit NC rather than DN. Three examples are given in this subsection: Quebecois, Bavarian and Yiddish. These languages express sentential negation by means of a single negative adverbial marker (100)-(102).

(100) Il parle pas de toi
He speaks neg of you
‘He doesn’t speak about you’

(101) S’Maral woid an Hans ned hairadn\(^\text{195}\)
The Maral wants to Hans neg marry
‘Maral doesn’t want to marry Hans’

(102) Yankl vil nit khasene hobn mit a norveger\(^\text{196}\)
Yankl wants neg marry with a Norwegian
‘Yankl doesn’t want to marry a Norwegian’

These languages are all Strict NC readings as n-words may occur to both the left and the right of the negative adverb. These languages also exhibit PN.

\(^{195}\text{Example taken from Weiss (2002).}\)
\(^{196}\text{Example is from Ellen Prince (p.c.).}\)
(103) a. Je juge pas personne
   I judge neg n-body
   ‘I don’t judge anybody’

b. Il y a pas personne en ville
   He is there neg n-body in town
   ‘There is nobody in town’

c. Personne est pas capable de parler français à Montréal?
   N-body is neg capable of speak French in Montréal
   ‘Is nobody able to speak French in Montréal?’

(104) a. Gestan han’e neamd ned gseng
   Yesterday have.I n-body neg seen
   ‘Yesterday I didn’t see anybody’

b. … daβ’ma koana ned furtgehdu
   … that.me n-body neg leaves
   ‘… that nobody is leaving’

(105) a. Ikh hob nit gezen keyn moyz
   I have beg seen n-mice
   ‘I haven’t seen any mice’

b. Keiner efnt nit mayn tir
   ‘Nobody opens neg my door’
   ‘Nobody opens my door’

Similar to all other NC languages discussed in this chapter Quebecois, Bavarian and Yiddish also exhibit PN, as is shown in (106)-(108).

(106) Sans rien
   Without n-thing
   ‘Without anything’

(107) Ohne nix
   Without n-thing
   ‘Without anything’

(108) On gornit
   Without n-thing
   ‘Without anything’

---

197 For independent reasons, subjects always occur to the left of the canonical position of the negative adverb in Bavarian.
198 Yiddish does not allow subjects to occur in a position to the right of the canonical position of the negative adverb for independent reasons.
In these languages there is no ban on true negative imperatives either. Quebecois differs from other varieties of French with respect to the position of clitics in imperatives. In Standard French clitics occur to the right of the verb in positive imperatives and to the left of the verb in negative imperatives (109).

(109)  a.  \textit{Fais le!}  \\
\ \\  Do it  \\
\ \\  ‘Do it’  \\
\ \\  b.  \textit{Ne le fais pas!}  \\
\ \\  Neg it do neg  \\
\ \\  ‘Don’t do it’

In Quebecois, clitics occur in postverbal position in both positive and negative imperatives. Consequently I assume that true negative imperatives are allowed in Quebecois (110).

(110)  a.  \textit{Vas-y!}  \\
\ \\  Go-there  \\
\ \\  ‘Go there’  \\
\ \\  b.  \textit{Vas-y pas!}  \\
\ \\  Go-there neg  \\
\ \\  ‘Don’t go there’

The examples in (111)-(112) illustrate that true negative imperatives are also allowed in Bavarian and Yiddish.

(111)  a.  \textit{Geh grad so fort}  \\
\ \\  Go straight PRT away  \\
\ \\  ‘Leave straight away’  \\
\ \\  b.  \textit{Geh ned grad so fort!}  \\
\ \\  Go neg straight PRT away  \\
\ \\  ‘Don’t leave straight away’

(112)  a.  \textit{Kuk!}  \\
\ \\  Look  \\
\ \\  ‘Look!’  \\
\ \\  b.  \textit{Kuk nit}  \\
\ \\  Look neg  \\
\ \\  ‘Don’t look’

Finally, Quebecois and Bavarian allow inverse readings of negative sentences in which the subject is a universal quantifier.\footnote{The results of the Yiddish investigation to the grammaticality of these sentences were not clear enough to present them in this section.}
Hence all generalisations hold: Phase V languages can be divided in NC and DN languages. If an $\forall$-subject precedes the negative marker, an inverse reading is yielded in which negation outscopes the subject. Being Strict NC languages, the fact that Quebecois, Bavarian and Yiddish do not ban true negative imperatives is in line with the generalisations.

5.6 Phase VI languages

The final set of languages to be discussed in this chapter is the set of Phase VI languages, i.e. the set of languages that allow either a preverbal negative marker or a negative adverb to express sentential negation. As an example I will use three varieties of English, Standard English and two substandard varieties.

Standard English has two different ways of expressing sentential negation: by means of the negative adverb *not* and by means of the contracted negative marker *n’t*. Although *n’t* is attached to the right of the auxiliary, I consider it as a negative marker that attaches to $V_{in}$ just as the preverbal marker in the Slavic languages and therefore it falls under the same category as preverbal negative markers. In the following chapter I demonstrate that all preverbal negative markers and markers such as English *n’t* have a similar syntactic status (they are syntactic heads).

(115) a. John doesn’t come  
    b. John does *not* come

In substandard English the negative adverb *not* is hardly used in colloquial speech. The only cases in which *not* is still uttered is when negation is focussed. In all other cases the negative marker *n’t* is used.

(116) a. Mary isn’t ill  
    b. *Mary is not* ill

The distinction between the standard and substandard varieties of English is not only manifested in the expression of sentential negation, but also with respect to the occurrence of NC. Standard English is a DN language as two negative elements cancel each other out.
Chapter 5 - Typological checking

(117) a. John does not / doesn’t see no one
   ‘It is not the case that John sees no one’

b. Nobody doesn’t / does not come
   ‘It is not the case that nobody comes’

This seems to run against the observation that all languages with a preverbal negative marker are NC languages. However, in English indefinite expressions are generally replaced by an any-term in a negative context. Especially if the expression uses the weaker negative marker, the appearance of an any-term is preferred. Whereas in negative expressions with the negative adverb not the usage of any-terms emphasises negation, this is not the case with the negative marker n’t.

(118) a. John didn’t buy anything
   ‘John bought nothing’

b. John did not buy anything
   ‘John bought nothing at all’

Hence it seems that the English expressions with n’t exhibit more NC-like behaviour than expressions with not or negative expressions in Phase V languages such as German or Norwegian. This observation is confirmed by taking substandard English into account. Ladusaw (1992) shows that most substandard English varieties exhibit NC behaviour. Ladusaw shows furthermore that these varieties can be divided in Non-Strict and Strict NC varieties, which he refers to as A and B varieties respectively.

(119) a. John didn’t see nothing
   ‘John saw nothing’

b. Nobody hasn’t*(n’t) come
   ‘Nobody came’

(120) a. John didn’t see nothing
   ‘John saw nothing’

b. Nobody hasn’t come
   ‘Nobody came’

PN is also allowed in substandard English, as has already been shown by Labov (1966).

(121) Hardly no money, hardly no bread.
   ‘Hardly any money, hardly any bread.’

Hence, most substandard varieties of English are Strict or Non-Strict NC languages, whereas Standard English is a DN language that shows NC-like behaviour and can be considered as a pseudo-NC language.
English also bans true negative imperatives, as it only expresses negative imperatives by means of do-support.

(122)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>Come!</th>
<th>Standard English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*Come not!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, older versions of English (15th century English), in which the negative marker not was already present but the negative marker n’t and do-support were lacking, allowed true negative imperatives.

(123)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear not!</th>
<th>15th Cent. English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Don’t fear!’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apparently, the ban on true negative imperatives is not related to the occurrence of the negative adverb not, but rather to the phenomenon of do-support or the availability of the contracted form n’t.

Finally, expressions in which an V-subject precedes the negative marker are ambiguous with respect to the interpretation: both the V->a and the ->a reading are available.

(124)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Everybody doesn’t / does not speak French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-&gt;a: ‘Nobody speaks French’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-&gt;a: ‘Not everybody speaks French’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To conclude, English seems to be a transit language between Jespersen Phase V, exhibiting DN, and Jespersen Phase I, exhibiting NC. Although English behaves in some respects as a Phase V language, in many other respects and in its substandard varieties it is on its way of becoming a Phase I language and can be considered as an NC language: in that respect the English data support the generalisations that have been drawn thus far: languages with a preverbal negative marker (or in this case a negative marker such as n’t) are NC languages, the ban on true negative imperatives occurs only in a subset of NC languages and NC languages are able to assign inverse interpretations to sentences in which an V subject precedes a negative marker.

5.7 Conclusion

The results of this chapter can be summarised as follows as in (125).
(125) Overview of the results of the typological study

| Language         | Phase | PNM\(^{200}\) | NAM\(^{201}\) | NC | PN | Strict NC\(^{202,203}\) | Neg Imp | \(\rightarrow\)  \\
|------------------|-------|----------------|----------------|----|----|-------------------------|---------|--------- \\
| Czech            | I     | +              | -              | +  | +  | +                       | +       | +       \\
| Polish           | I     | +              | -              | +  | +  | +                       | +       | +       \\
| Russian          | I     | +              | -              | +  | +  | +                       | +       | +       \\
| Serbo-Croatian   | I     | +              | -              | +  | +  | +                       | +       | +       \\
| Greek            | I     | +              | -              | +  | +  | +                       | -       | +       \\
| Romanian         | I     | +              | -              | +  | +  | +                       | -       | +       \\
| Hungarian        | I     | +              | -              | +  | +  | +                       | -       | +       \\
| Hebrew           | I     | +              | -              | +  | +  | +                       | -       | +       \\
| Italian          | I     | +              | -              | +  | +  | +                       | -       | +       \\
| Spanish          | I     | +              | -              | +  | +  | +                       | -       | +       \\
| Portuguese       | I     | +              | -              | +  | +  | +                       | -       | +       \\
| Berber           | II    | +              | +              | +  | +  | +                       | +       | +       \\
| Catalan (I)      | II    | +              | +              | +  | +  | +                       | -       | +       \\
| Catalan (II)     | II    | +              | +              | +  | +  | +                       | -       | +       \\
| St. French       | III   | +              | +              | +  | +  | +                       | -       | +       \\
| Coll. French     | IV    | +              | +              | +  | +  | +                       | -       | +       \\
| Quebeccois       | V     | -              | +              | +  | +  | +                       | +       | +       \\
| Bavarian         | V     | -              | +              | +  | +  | +                       | +       | +       \\
| Yiddish          | V     | -              | +              | +  | +  | +                       | +       | ?       \\
| German           | V     | -              | +              | -  | -  | -                       | +       | +       \\
| Swedish          | V     | -              | +              | -  | -  | -                       | +       | +       \\
| Norwegian        | V     | -              | +              | -  | -  | -                       | +       | -       \\
| Standard English | VI    | +              | +              | -  | -  | -                       | -       | +       \\
| English (A)      | VI    | +              | +              | -  | -  | -                       | -       | +       \\
| English (B)      | VI    | +              | +              | +  | +  | +                       | -       | +       \\

In order to draw the correct generalisations I will not take into account the results for Standard English as it behaves more like a pseudo NC language than a DN language. This has been illustrated by the results of the different substandard varieties that are typical NC varieties. On the basis of (125) and the results presented in chapter 4 the following generalisations can be drawn:

\(^{200}\) PNM: Preverbal Negative Marker.

\(^{201}\) NAM: Negative Adverbial Marker.

\(^{202}\) The distinction between Strict and Non-Strict NC does only apply to NC languages.

\(^{203}\) In languages with two negative marker, only Strict NC with respect to the preverbal negative marker is taken into account.

\(^{204}\) I take English n't to be a preverbal negative marker. As I have argued in this chapter, n't behaves as a preverbal negative marker despite its occurrence at the right of the auxiliary.
The set of Non-Strict NC languages is a strict subset of the set of languages that bans true negative imperatives;

The set of languages that ban true negative imperatives is a strict subset of the set of languages that express sentential negation by means of a negative marker that is a syntactic head (i.e. Jespersen Phase I-IV and Phase V languages);

The set of languages that express sentential negation by means of a negative marker that is a syntactic head is a strict subset of the set of NC languages;

The set of NC languages is a strict subset of the set of languages in which constructions in which an $\forall$-subject precedes the negative marker can be assigned a reverse interpretation (with respect to the subject and the negation).

These generalisations constitute the Venn-diagram in (126).

The typological checking procedure confirms the generalisations that have been drawn on the basis of the Dutch microvariation. Moreover, this chapter provides a more complete overview, as the set of studied languages contains more Phase I and II languages than the Dutch data set does.

I take the generalisations that have been formulated above to be valid and these generalisations will form the input in the following theoretical chapters.
(126) Venn diagram containing all studied languages

Set of studied languages:  
*Standard Dutch*

Set of languages that allow for an inverse reading when an ∀-subject precedes the negative marker:  
*German, Swedish, Norwegian*

The set of NC languages:  
*Quebecois, Bavarian, Yiddish*

The set of languages that exhibit sentential negation by means of a preverbal negative marker (Jespersen Phase I-IV; VI):  
*Czech, Russian, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, Berber*

The set of languages that ban true negative imperatives:  
*Greek, Romanian, Hungarian, Hebrew, Catalan (I/II), St. French, Coll. French, English (A/B)*

The set of Non-Strict NC languages:  
*Italian, Spanish, Portuguese*