

# On the (non-)expletive uses of the preverbal negative *ne/en* in the history of (Low) German and Dutch

Elisabeth Witzenhausen  
*Universiteit Gent/Ruhr-Universität Bochum*

## Abstract

This article presents novel data from Middle High German, Middle Low German and Middle Dutch showing that two phenomena which often have been treated as one, namely the single former negative marker *ne/en* appearing in adverbial and complement clauses, have to be treated as distinct phenomena. I argue that only in complement clauses, *ne/en* is a paratactic negation marker, while in adverbial clauses it functions as an exceptive and adversative discourse marker. In these contexts, I refer to *ne/en* as post-cyclical. Furthermore, I propose a scenario as to how the reanalysis from negation to exceptive marker proceeded.

Keywords: *paratactic negation, West Germanic, conditional clauses, exceptive clauses, adversative clauses*

## 1. Introduction

In the syntactic literature on negation in Middle High German (MHG), Middle Low German (MLG) and Middle Dutch (MD), there are mentions of paratactic or expletive – meaning semantically non-negative – uses of the preverbal negative *ne/en* < *ni*. This article presents new data retrieved from corpora of all three languages. The results show that these “non-negative” uses of *ne/en* appear in V2 clauses which either have an adverbial clause (1) or complement clause interpretation, in which case all of these complement clauses follow negated or non-assertive/negative implicative matrix predicates (2). In all of these V2 clauses, *ne/en* appears without other negative markers or (n-marked) indefinites.

### (1) MD, Corp.I, 1340, Brugge, 1294

Ende waren dese lakene te smal datmen hem ghenen loy souden gheuen het ne  
*and were the broadcloth too small that=one him no salary shall give it NE*  
dochte ghesuorne goed  
*seem sworn official good*

‘And if the broadcloth were too small he should not receive a salary unless the sworn official thought it was good.’

### (2) MHG, St. Pauler Predigten, early 13th century

wer solt nv zwiveln si ne sin alle heilich [...]  
*Who shall now doubt they NE are all sacred [...]*  
‘Who shall doubt that they are all holy [...].’

In the literature on MD, both contexts are often called paratactic negation (Burrige 1993, Van der Wouden 1997, Postma 2002, Hoeksema 2014). In contrast, the literature on MHG refers only to the latter complement clauses as paratactic negation, while the adverbial clauses are more generally labeled pleonastic or expletive negation (Jäger 2008:76) or asyndetic V2 subjunctive clauses ‘konjunktionslose Konditionalsätze mit Verbzweitstellung’ (Paul et al. 2007:393). The term ‘paratactic negation’ is first used by Jespersen (1917:75): “A negative is placed in a clause dependent on verbs of negative import like ‘deny, forbid, hinder, doubt.’” Hence, differentiating between asyndetic V2 subjunctive clauses and paratactic uses of negative

© Elisabeth Witzenhausen. *Nordlyd* 44.1: 173-191, *CGSW 34* Proceedings of the 34th Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop held in Konstanz in 2019, edited by Andreas Trotzke and George Walkden, University of Konstanz. Published at the University of Tromsø – The Arctic University of Norway. <http://septentrio.uit.no/index.php/nordlyd> <https://doi.org/10.7557/12.5281>

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons “Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported”](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/) license.



markers takes into account both clause type (complement) and negative trigger in the matrix clause. I will argue that the former are not pleonastic or expletive, however. Based on the results of the corpus study on MHG, MLG and MD, I will argue (i) that the differentiation between paratactic negation and *ne/en* asyndetic V2 subjunctive clauses is necessary, as ‘expletive’ (in my terminology ‘post-cyclical’ – cf. section 2) uses of *ne/en* in adverbial clauses do not meet the criteria from Jespersen’s (1917) and Van der Wouden’s (1997) definitions of paratactic negation. This means that it does not appear in complement clauses and does not necessarily have a negative trigger in the matrix clause; (ii) that the preverbal particle *ne/en* in complement clauses is an agreement marker, while it assumes the function of a discourse marker in adverbial clauses. I refer to these uses as ‘paratactic’. I argue that these two functions are the result of a lexical split of *ne/en* that occurred in the transition from Old High German (OHG), Old Saxon (OS) and Old Low Franconian (OLF) to MHG, MLG and MD.

The structure of the article is as follows: I will address the basic terminology used in this article in section 2 and discuss why I distinguish between paratactic and post-cyclical uses of *ne/en*. In section 3, I will describe the corpus studies I conducted before I present the results of the corpus studies in section 4. In section 5, I explain why post-cyclical *ne/en* in adverbial clauses cannot be taken to express sentential negation. Finally, section 6 discusses how the lexical split of negative and post-cyclical *ne/en* occurred.

## 2. Terminology

German, Low German and Dutch underwent Jespersen’s cycle, which describes the change of the expression of sentential negation.<sup>1</sup> First, the preverbal clitic *ni* appears on its own in OHG, OS and OLF (stage I). Towards MHG, MLG and MD, it is joined by the negative adverbial *nihthniet* (< *niowihth* ‘nothing’) (stage II). Later on, *ne/en* is replaced by *nihthniet* (stage III) (Burridge 1993, Jäger 2008, Breitbarth 2014, Hoeksema 2014). The languages under investigation show either stage II or stage III of Jespersen’s cycle.<sup>2</sup>

- (3) Stage I: OS, Heliand 915, cited from Breitbarth (2013:193)

‘ni bium ic’, quaðhe, ‘that barn godes [...]’  
 NEG *am I spoke=he the child God.GEN*  
 ‘I am not the child of God, he said.’

- (4) Stage II: MLG, Sachsenspiegel Oldenburg MS, 14th century (6r line 7/8)

Des ne kan ich alene nicht ghedon  
*that NE can I alone NE do*  
 ‘I cannot do this alone.’

- (5) Stage III: MLG, Herforder Rechtsbuch, 1375 (4ra line 14/15)

dar vmme nemet se der moder erve nicht  
*therefore take her the mother inheritance not*  
 ‘For that reason, she does not take the inheritance of the mother.’

<sup>1</sup>Miestamo (2005:42): A SN construction is a construction whose function is to modify a verbal declarative main clause expressing a proposition *p* in such a way that the modified clause expresses the proposition with the opposite truth value  $\sim p$  or the proposition used as the closest equivalent to  $\sim p$  in case the clause expressing  $\sim p$  cannot be formed in the language, and that is (one of) the productive and general means the language has for performing this function.

<sup>2</sup>Note about references to the examples: For texts which are not available in the current version of the ReN corpus, I provide page numbers ‘6r’ (page 6 ‘recto’) as well as line numbers ‘7/8’ as indicated in the diplomatic transcription underlying the annotation in the corpus. For texts available in the corpus, I provide a link to the query result in a footnote, as there is no diplomatic transcription available outside of the ANNIS search interface. For results from the MHG ReM corpus, I provide page and line numbers as represented in the PDF document “Diplomatischer Lesetext” on the homepage (<https://www.linguistics.rub.de/rem/corpus/texts.html>). Note that I used the annotation layer “tok\_anno” for the representation in all examples.

Observing this development might lead to the conclusion that the old preverbal marker simply disappears from a language when *nicht/niet* assumes its new function of expressing sentential negation, but this is not the case. Breitbarth (2014), Breitbarth and Haegeman (2014; 2015) and Breitbarth et al. (forthcoming) show that single *ne/en* continues to appear in contexts where it does not express sentential negation in present-day Flemish.<sup>3</sup>

I show in section 4 that in MHG, MLG and MD, single<sup>4</sup> *ne/en* continues to appear as a discourse marker, indicating an exceptive and adversative relationship between a matrix clause and the adverbial clause in which *ne/en* appears. These adverbial clauses always show V2 word order, with *ne/en* preceding the finite verb, as in (1). I argue that in these contexts, *ne/en* was reanalyzed and hence lost its function as a sentential negation marker. This is why I refer to these contexts as ‘post-cyclical’ because *ne/en* appears ‘outside’ of Jespersen’s cycle.

In section 6, it will be illustrated that the exceptive and adversative meaning that *ne/en* acquired is still associated with negative semantics. In a discourse relation between matrix and adverbial clause, it indicates the negation of the matrix clause or marks contrast, which is the opposition of two ideas or entities, expressing that one is not the other. These concepts of exception and contrast are not standard negation in the sense of Miestamo (2005). Non-negative in my terminology hence means ‘not expressing sentential negation’. Note furthermore that the terminology ‘expletive’ or ‘pleonastic’ negation would not be accurate, as *ne/en* in these contexts is not expletive in the sense that it is semantically vacuous (Yoon 2011:62ff). It contributes an exceptive and adversative/contrastive meaning to the clause it appears in.

In contrast to these post-cyclical uses, *ne/en* also appears in V2 complement clauses which resemble the post-cyclical adverbial clauses, as in (2). In these cases, it does not contribute any semantic value to the clause it appears in. I refer to these cases as paratactic negation which I understand as Negative Concord (Giannakidou 2000) across clause boundaries following Van der Wouden (1997:196). He defines paratactic negation as “non-local negative doubling, i.e. a negative polarity item licensed by an operator in a higher clause.” Van der Wouden (1997) subdivides paratactic negation into two subtypes: (i) elements with ‘negative import’ triggering the occurrence of one or more negative morphemes in their complement clause, as in (6), and (ii) elements with ‘negative import’ selecting a special type of complementizer that may or may not be homophonous to a negation operator, as in (7).

(6) Chaucer, cited from Van der Wouden (1997:196)

Nature [...] forbedeth that no man make hymself riche  
*Nature [...] prohibits that no man makes himself rich*  
 ‘Nature prohibits that any man make himself rich.’

(7) Latin, cited from Van der Wouden (1997:196)

Timeo            ne            veniat  
*Afraid.1SG.PRES that.NEG come.3SG.SBJV*  
 ‘I am afraid that he may come.’

While verbs of negative import and negated matrix predicates can be argued to be elements of negative import, I will show that V2 adverbial clauses with exceptive and adversative semantics do not necessarily modify/restrict matrix clauses which contain a negation operator (cf. table 5). I use the term ‘modify’ for adversative adverbial clauses and ‘restrict’ for exceptive clauses, because I follow Kratzer’s (1986) account for conditional clauses. She argues that *if*-clauses restrict a modal operator located in the apodosis/main clause. Crucially, the idea that exceptive clauses also restrict modal operators does not imply that exceptive

<sup>3</sup>There are well-described contexts in MHG, MLG and MD in which *ne/en* continues to express sentential negation while *nicht* already appears as an additional or the only marker of negation in all three languages under investigation. These ‘stage I-preserving’-contexts are not addressed in this article (cf. (Witzenhausen 2019a:24–25) for a summary).

<sup>4</sup>Meaning without *nicht/niet* or (n-marked) indefinites.

clauses are negative conditionals. In restricting modal domains they are similar to conditionals, but they are not inherently negative, as will be discussed in 5.

Summing up, I argued that by the definition of paratactic negation, only instances of *ne/en* in complement clauses to negated or non-assertive/negative implicative predicates can be referred to as such. In the languages under investigation, only these cases can be analyzed as containing a truly expletive negative marker. Therefore, the terms ‘paratactic’ and ‘expletive’ negation will be used synonymously throughout this paper. For *ne/en* in adverbial clauses, I use the term ‘post-cyclical’ *ne/en*. Post-cyclical *ne/en* is the result of a lexical split, whereby parallel to negative *ne/en* that functions as an agreement marker (Negative Concord), a discourse particle *ne/en* developed that marks exceptive and adversative (contrastive) discourse relations. I will discuss this development in more detail in section 6.

### 3. Method

In order to investigate the functional change of the old sentential negation marker *ne/en*, I searched MHG, MLG and MD corpora for clauses containing the preverbal particle *ne/en*. In the corpora used for this study, the type and extent of tagging, as well as the genres and centuries covered, varies. While the reference corpora for MHG and MLG provide a lot of annotation, the MD corpora have less grammatical and lexical annotation. This is why I sampled differently in the MD corpora.<sup>5</sup> More precisely, I first searched through all clauses with a negative particle in MD, filtering out the ones with single *ne/en*, and then took a random sample of these instances. For MHG and MLG, I looked at samples that also contained the negative particle *nih/niet*.

For MHG, I used the fully lemmatized and PoS-tagged Referenzkorpus Mittelhochdeutsch (ReM)<sup>6</sup> to search for sentences containing single preverbal *ne/en*.<sup>7</sup> In this corpus, all instances of negative particles (PoS=“PTKNEG”) were retrieved. I then took a random sample of 20% (n=3 929) of all sentences containing a negative particle (n=19 645). The sample contains data from the 11th to the 14th century from 257 written records. The sample (n=3 929) was then searched for clauses with single preverbal *ne/en* (n=401), meaning *ne/en* without (n-marked) indefinites or *niet*.

For MLG, I used the texts of the Referenzkorpus Mittelniederdeutsch/Niederrheinisch<sup>8</sup> in the form in which they were available and lemmatized in April 2016 (25 texts, 305 382 lemmatized tokens). I searched for all clauses containing a negative particle (n=2 423) and manually sorted out the clauses with single preverbal *ne/en* (n=155).

The Middle Dutch corpora used for the study are the Corpus Gyseling (CGy) and the Corpus van Reenen-Mulder (CRM), which are both PoS-tagged and lemmatized. The CGy contains chancery and literary texts from the Middle Dutch period from 1200 until 1300 (1 600 000 tokens), and the CRM contains of chancery texts from the 14th century only (750 000 tokens). Hence, there is a lack of literary texts towards the later MD records used for this study. In the Corpus Gyseling (CGy), I found 6 507 instances of the lemma *ne/en*. Searching through the results manually, I found 698 sentences (12% of all clauses with preverbal *ne/en*) in which *ne/en* appears on its own. To provide a detailed picture of the clauses with single preverbal *ne/en* (n=689) in the CGy, I took a random sample of 25% (n=168). In the CRM, I searched for clauses with negative particles (n=2 340), of which 197 clauses show single preverbal *ne/en*. Again, I took a sample of 25% (n=50) which I analyzed in detail. In sum, there are 218 clauses with single *ne/en* that I analyzed for MD.

<sup>5</sup>See the appendix to this paper for a list of all texts/text-IDs of my samples.

<sup>6</sup><https://www.linguistics.rub.de/rem/>

<sup>7</sup>The corpus is not well-balanced, but allows users to search within a large amount of MHG texts, especially early and smaller texts from the MHG period that were not accessible before. (cf. <https://www.linguistics.rub.de/bla/019-klein-dipper2016.pdf>)

<sup>8</sup><https://www.slm.uni-hamburg.de/ren.html>

Table 1: Contexts in which preverbal *ne/en* appears

	MHG	MLG	MD
adverbial clauses (post-cyclical)	158	140	160
complement clauses (paratactic)	12	0	0
sentential negation	225	15	58
other	6	0	0
total	401	155	218

#### 4. The data

##### 4.1. Overview

Recall that I took a sample of  $n=3,929$  of all clauses containing a negative particle in the ReM corpus, which was searched for clauses with single preverbal *ne/en* ( $n=401$ ). In 225 clauses, mostly from the beginning of the MHG period, *ne/en* still marks sentential negation. The other clauses are either adverbial clauses with an exceptive or adversative interpretation, i.e. post-cyclical contexts ( $n=158$ ) or complement clauses to non-assertive/negative implicative or negated matrix predicates ( $n=12$ ). Six clauses do not fit any of these categories; they show a different word order or translate as a different type of adverbial clause. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss these examples.

In the MLG sample of clauses with a negative particle ( $n=2,423$ ), 155 clauses show single preverbal *ne/en*. In 15 clauses, *ne/en* still expresses sentential negation; in 140 clauses, we find post-cyclical *ne/en* in adverbial clauses with an exceptive or adversative interpretation.

In the MD corpora, I found 160 instances of post-cyclical *ne/en* ( $n=115$  in the CGy,  $n=45$  in the CRM); in 58 clauses, *ne/en* still expresses sentential negation. Most of these clauses ( $n=53$ ) appear in the older literary texts in the CGy; only 5 clauses with single *ne/en* in the CRM express sentential negation. There are no V2 complement clauses to negated or non-assertive/negative implicative matrix clauses in the MLG or MD samples.

Crucially, while post-cyclical *ne/en* appears almost evenly across the centuries in all three languages, stage I negation becomes less frequent after 1200, as table 2 shows. After 1200, literary texts are the most likely to still exhibit stage I negation. It is beyond the scope of this paper to describe the stage I data in further detail. Most importantly, all three languages exhibit stage II or stage III of Jespersen's cycle.

Table 2: Percentage of single *ne/en* expressing sentential negation across languages and centuries

	MHG	MLG	MD
1000–1100	56%		
1100–1200	4.30%		
1200–1300	3.70%	0.60%	3.00%
1300–1400	3.60%	1%	0.50%
1400–1500		0.4%	
1500–1550		0.20%	

Without providing numbers for the different centuries, table 1 may lead to the conclusion that stage I negation is more frequent than post-cyclical *ne/en*, but in all three languages, it is less frequent. In the MHG sample, 4% of all clauses with a negative particle are post-cyclical contexts, while only 3.2% are cases of sentential negation. Note that I excluded the 11th century from this comparison, as this is the transition period between OHG and MHG. In the ReN subcorpus, 1.4% of all clauses with a negative particle show *ne/en* as a sentential negation marker, while 5.5% are post-cyclical contexts. In the CGy, 68.5% of all clauses with single *ne/en* are post-cyclical contexts, while only 31.5% are cases of stage I negation. In the

CRM, only 10% of clauses with the single preverbal marker are cases of sentential negation. 90% of the clauses with single *ne/en* are post-cyclical contexts. The data suggests that the lexical split of *ni > ne/en* occurred in the transition from OHG/OS/OLF to MHG, MLG and MD. The result are two lexical items *ne/en*: (i) the negative (agreement) marker which co-occurs with other (n-marked) indefinites or *niht/niet* expressing sentential negation and (ii) the discourse marker which marks exception or contrast in adverbial clauses which I refer to as post-cyclical *ne/en*. Paratactic negation with *ne/en* as Negative Concord across clause boundaries exhibits an instance of the former *ne/en*, as it is an agreement marker to a negative operator. Before I describe paratactic *ne/en* in more detail, I discuss the data with post-cyclical *ne/en*.

#### 4.2. Post-cyclical *ne/en*

In all three languages, post-cyclical *ne/en* most frequently appears in exceptive clauses ('unless'-clauses)<sup>9</sup> that show a monoclausal (8) or biclausal structure (9) (Breitbarth 2015). Less frequently, *ne/en* appears in adversative clauses that translate as English 'but' (10).

- (8) MD, K094p37401, Dordrecht, 1375

die en zal met nyemende werken hi en heeft dien meester voldaan  
*they NE shall with no one work he NE have.PRES.SBJV the master fulfilled*  
 'They shall not work with anybody unless he has finished his master.'

- (9) MD, Jacob van Maerlant: Der Naturen Bloeme, 1287

het ne sij dat de euer ontfaet doodwonde hi es in vresen sekerleke  
*it NE be.PRES.SBJV that the boar receives deadly-wounds he is in trouble certainly*  
 'Unless the boar receives a deadly wound, he (the hunter) is certainly in trouble'

- (10) MHG, Salomons Haus, late 13th century (M337 IV 4b P\_SalH-097,16-02)

so salt v provin rechte frvntsaft [...] daz er nivt vor dier in sparit er n habe dier  
*so shall you prove right friendship [...] that he NEG for you NE save he NE have you*  
 z zv gvde gekerit  
*it to good turned*  
 'So you shall prove good friendship [...] that he does not spare you but changes it for the better for you.'

Usually, exceptive clauses follow the main clause they restrict, but as (9) shows, there are also instances where it precedes the main clause. All adversative adverbial clauses in my data follow the main clause they modify. Table 3 provides the frequency of the different adverbial clause types in all three languages. All of these clauses exhibit V2 word order with *ne/en* cliticizing to the finite verb in second position and almost exclusively appearing with a pronoun in first position. As will be shown in the remainder of this section, they only differ in verbal mood, with exceptive clauses having a verb in the subjunctive and adversative clauses having a verb in the indicative mood.

<sup>9</sup>Note that I only refer to 'unless'-clauses as *exceptive*. There are other exceptive constructions that are PPs, translating with English 'but' or 'except for'. These are not covered in this article.

Table 3: Post-cyclical contexts of preverbal *ne/en*

	MHG	MLG	MD
monoclausal exceptive clauses	116	105	109
biclausal exceptive clauses	16	29	45
adversative clauses	26	6	6

#### 4.2.1. *Exceptive clauses*

The most common post-cyclical use of single preverbal *ne/en* is in exceptive clauses. Monoclausal exceptives such as (8) are subjunctive V2 clauses appearing with the single preverbal clitic *ne/en*. Biclausal exceptive structures consist of a dummy-matrix clause with an expletive pronoun followed by the verb *sīn* ('to be') in the subjunctive mood followed by a complement clause introduced by the complementizer *daz* ('that') encoding the exception (9).<sup>10</sup>

Table 3 above shows that monoclausal exceptive clauses are the most frequent type in all three languages. Most monoclausal structures have a pronoun as first constituent preceding *ne/en*. The pronoun can be a personal pronoun, as in (8) or (11), or the indefinite *man* ('one'). There are only a few cases in the data where a full noun or noun phrase is located in clause-initial position (12).

##### (11) Die Lilie, late 13th century (IV 4a V\_Lilie–54,28–29)

dat si suolen iren uliz han [...] it in si grozliche inde offenbare  
*that they shall their enthusiasm have it NE be.PRES.SBJV grossly and openly*  
 wider got  
*against god*  
 'That they shall keep their enthusiasm unless it is grossly and openly against God.'

##### (12) Hartmann von Aue: Iwein, early 13th century (M312 III 0 V\_Iw–7415)

Got en welle mich s erlan  
*God NE want.PRES.SBJV me it release*  
 'Unless God released me from it.'

In MD, the monoclausal structure can appear with zero pronouns (15% in the CGy, 11.4% in the CRM), while there is only one example of a zero pronoun in an early biclausal structure in MHG. Another difference is that in the MD data from the CGy (1200-1300), the pronoun *het* ('it') is the first constituent in 56% of the monoclausal exceptive clauses, while in MLG and MHG *it/es* makes up around 20% only.

A peculiarity of the MHG exceptive clauses is the occurrence of the particle *denne*: a large number of MHG exceptive clauses and one MLG example appear with *denne* following the finite verb or the Wackernagel position (13). Later on in the MHG data, a structure only exhibiting *denne* replaces the exceptive clause with post cyclical *ne/en* (Breitbarth 2014:33).<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup>The dummy matrix clause is the root for the Modern Dutch subordinator *tenzij* (< *het en sij* 'it NE=be.SBJV') and the German connector *es sei denn* (both 'unless') that grammaticalized towards Modern Dutch and ENHG.

<sup>11</sup>In present-day German, exceptive clauses are introduced by *es sei denn* 'it be.SBJV DENN', but up until the early 20th century, a monoclausal exceptive structure with *denn* ('then') is attested (Witzenhausen 2019b:27).

(13) Mittelfränkische Urkunde, late 13th century (M544 MU13–N223–170,45–,45)

si in is vns des nit schuldich wider ze kerene si ne will et dan  
*she* NE *is us that* NEG *guilty back to come she* NE *want.PRES.SBJV it* DENNE  
 gerne duon  
*willingly do*

‘She does not owe us to come back unless she willingly does it.’

Table 4: Types of exceptive constructions in MLG, MHG and MD

Monoclausal constructions	
MLG	[XP ne=V.SBJV (denne)...]
MHG	[XP (ne)=V.SBJV (denne)...]
MD	[XP/∅ en=V.SBJV...]
Biclausal constructions	
MLG	[it ne were/si (denne)] [dat XP V.SBJV...]
MHG	[ez (ne) waere/si (denne)] [dat XP V.SBJV...]
MD	[het/∅ en ware/si] [dat XP V.SBJV...]

Table 4 summarizes the different forms of exceptive clauses which can appear in the languages under investigation. As noted above, I argue that *ne/en* in exceptive clauses is not negative, i.e. it does not express sentential negation and is not paratactic following Breitbarth (2014:32ff). In section 5, I discuss the literature on why the instances of *ne/en* in exceptive clauses cannot be taken to be negative and why ‘unless’-clauses are not similar to negative conditionals (‘if not’-clauses). There are three observations from my data which also support this argument: the first characteristic distinguishing *ne/en* in exceptive clauses from paratactic negation is that exceptive clauses in MHG, MLG and MD do not necessarily modify a matrix clause which contains sentential negation. Table 5 provides an overview of verb forms and negation in the matrix clauses which are restricted by the exceptive clauses.

Table 5: Negation/verb forms in the main clause which is restricted by the exceptive clause

Element	MHG		MLG		MD	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Negation	58	45%	18	13.4%	35	22.7%
Modal verb	37	28 %	38	28.6%	38	24.7%
Neg. + modal verb	19	14.4%	62	46%	62	40.6%
Verb in the subjunctive mood	4	3 %	2	1.5 %	–	–
Semantically negative element	4	3%	–	–	–	–
Verb in the indicative mood	10	7.6%	14	10.5%	19	12.3%
total	132		134		154	

Modal verbs are quite frequent, but in each language, we also find verbs in the indicative mood. Mostly, these matrix clauses express a generic proposition, as in (14).



- (14) MLG, Spiegel der leyen, mid 15th century (9v, line 1–2)

Drunckenschap is een doetlike sunde sware Et en were dat wen dorste  
*Drunkeness is a deadly sin heavy it NE be.PAST.SBJV that someone thirst.SBJV*  
 vnde dan druncke mit luste  
*and then drank.SBJV with joy*

‘Drunkeness is a very deadly sin unless someone was thirsty and would then drink with joy.’

An argument against taking exceptive clauses to be inherently negative, i.e. translating them as ‘if not’, is that we do not find any (n-marked) indefinites or the particle *niht*, which co-occur with *ne/en* when expressing sentential negation in all three languages (Stoett 1923, Burridge 1993, Jäger 2008, Breitbarth 2014, Hoeksema 2014). This suggests that the discourse particle *ne/en* cannot appear in one clause together with a negation operator.<sup>12</sup> The last observation from the data supports this even more: when the excepted proposition is negative (n=4), as in (15), it is never expressed by a monoclausal exceptive clause, but always by a biclausal one. This suggests that the clause boundary between post-cyclical *ne/en* in the dummy-matrix clause and the negative operator in the complement clause is necessary to render the post-cyclical interpretation possible.

- (15) MHG, Pfaffe Konrad: Rolandslied, late 12th century (M205A-2555[1609]–[1610])

Thaz ih then rom erwerue Iz ne si thaz er niemer ne sule ersteruen Uon  
*That I the honor get it NE be.PRES.SBJV that he never NE shall die from*  
 neheiner slahte wafen  
*no battle weapon*

‘That I shall receive the honor unless he never dies from any battle weapon.’

Summing up, the most frequent context in which post-cyclical *ne/en* occurs are exceptive clauses. In these V2 clauses, *ne/en* is a proclitic to the verb in the subjunctive mood. I provided arguments against analyzing *ne/en* in these contexts as residual stage I negation and proposed that *ne/en* functions as a discourse marker, indicating the restrictive (exceptive) discourse relation between matrix and adverbial clause.

#### 4.2.2. Adversative clauses

Post-cyclical *ne/en* also appears in other V2 clauses with an adverbial interpretation, which can best be translated as adversative (16).

- (16) Frauenfelder Flore, early 13th century (M307 III 3 V\_Flor-7234–35)

do ne moht ir niet uirlazin er ne moste deste miltir sin  
*then NE could he NEG let=happen he NE must the=more kind be*

‘Then he could not let it happen, but he had to be even more kind.’

In contrast to exceptive clauses, the verb in these V2 structures always shows the indicative mood. Another difference is that the matrix clause it modifies is always negative. This is due to its corrective or contrastive meaning – the adverbial clauses express a positive contrast or correction to the proposition in the main clause. It seems that the particle can have a more general contrastive meaning, as there are few cases where it appears in a clause that translates as being introduced by ‘even though’ (17) or ‘so that’ (18).

<sup>12</sup>It is beyond the scope of this paper to review the different accounts for Negative Concord and negation in the languages under investigation. I refer to Zeijlstra (2004), Jäger and Penka (2012), and Breitbarth (2014) for detailed discussions.

- (17) F133p38701, Deventer 1387

dat die vorsejde aleyt sijn nichte [...] gheen ghemeyne werc daer doen en  
*That the aforementioned Adelheid his niece [...] no common work there do* NEG  
 darf [...] sie en wilt doen want sie hoers liues alse cranclie en onmechtich is  
*may [...] she NE want=it do because she her body too sick and weak is*  
 dat sie daer niet nutte to en is  
*that she there NEG use to NEG is*

‘That his niece the aforementioned Adelheid is not allowed to do common work, even though she wants to do it, because her body is too sick and weak so that she is of no use.’

- (18) Gottfried von Straßburg: Tristan, early 13th century (M342 III 0 V\_ Tris–18304–07)

daz mich dehein ander wip imer von dir gescheide wir n sin immer beide der liebe  
*that me any other woman ever from you separate we NE are always both the love*  
 unde der triuwe staete unde niuwe  
*and the faithfulness steady and new*

‘That no other woman ever separate me from you, so that/but we are always steady and fresh to both our love and faithfulness.’

Interestingly, present-day Flemish still shows single *en*. The particle marks polarity emphasis (Breitbarth and Haegeman 2014) and that the clause is unexpected in a given context. Unexpectedness is also a notion of contrast. The difference to the MD data is that Flemish *en* can appear in negated (19) as well as affirmative clauses (20). It seems as if the post-cyclical use still exists in present-day Flemish, but that it expresses contrast on a speaker-oriented level.

- (19) Dialect of Lapscheure, cited from Breitbarth and Haegeman (2014:70)

k=en al overal gezocht in us en k=en vinden ze nievers.  
*I=have already everywhere searched in house and I=EN find her nowhere*  
 ‘I have looked for it everywhere in the house and I just don’t find it anywhere.’

- (20) Dialect of Heist, p.c. from Liliane Haegeman

ik kom eenen tegen met buikgriep, k=en en der van.  
*I come one against with stomach bug I=EN have there of*  
 ‘I meet someone with a stomach bug: I pick it up.’

#### 4.3. Paratactic Negation

In the MHG data set, ten V2 structures with single *ne/en* translate as complement clauses. Ten clauses are complement to a matrix clause with a negated verb (21); two are complement clauses to a non-assertive/negative implicative verb (22).

- (21) MHG, Gottfried von Straßburg: Tristan, early 13th century (M342 III 0 V\_ Tris–18163–65)

nv was tristrande ein bote getan . daz er z dur niht solte lan er n  
*Now was Tristan a messenger done . that he to through NEG shall let he NE*  
 sprache die chungin ze stete  
*speak.PRES.SBJV the queen to spot*

‘Now Tristan was sent a messenger that he should not be allowed to speak to the queen directly.’

- (22) MHG, St. Pauler Predigten, early 13th century (M409 III 1 P\_PrPa–171,07–10)

wer solt nv zwiveln si ne sin alle heilich di mit dem plvte des almehtigen  
*Who shall now doubt they NE are all sacred who with the blood the almighty*  
 gotes werdent besprenget  
*God.GEN are splashed*  
 ‘Who shall doubt that they are all holy who were splashed with the blood of the almighty God.’

Formally, these structures resemble the post-cyclical adverbial clauses, but *ne/en* is not post-cyclical. First, there are examples in the literature and in corpora indicating that not only can *ne/en* function as a paratactic negation marker in complement clauses to negated and non-assertive/negative implicative matrix predicates, but also *niht* appears in these contexts.<sup>13</sup>

- (23) MHG, Schwabenspiegel, late 13th century (M339, IV 3 P\_SwSp–055vb,09)

wil aber er lovgenen dc er da niht were  
*wants but he deny that he there NIHT be.PAST.SBJV*  
 ‘but if he wants to deny that he is there.’

Secondly, *ne/en* in these complement clauses cannot be taken to contribute a contrastive or exceptive meaning. The marker is merely expletive, i.e. it does not encode sentential negation nor any other meaning. Hence, it is best accounted for by “non-local negative doubling, i.e. a negative polarity item licensed by an operator in a higher clause” (Van der Wouden 1997:204); this is Negative Concord across clause boundaries.<sup>14</sup> Even though the negative operator is located in the matrix clause, *ne/en* is a negative agreement marker and hence ‘cyclical’.

In this section, I presented data showing that *ne/en* in V2 adverbial clauses is a discourse marker. I call this exceptive/contrastive marker post-cyclical *ne/en*. In contrast, instances of *ne/en* in V2 clauses which function as complements to non-assertive/negative implicative or negated matrix predicates are paratactic negation markers, because they are agreement markers of negative operators in a higher clause. In the remaining sections, I will focus on post-cyclical *ne/en*, first describing how exceptive clauses in the languages under investigation differ syntactically from negative conditional clauses before I discuss the semantic literature claiming that ‘unless’-clauses are not negative conditionals. In section 6, I lay out how the negative marker *ni* was reanalyzed as a discourse marker.

## 5. Exceptive clauses are not negative conditionals

### 5.1. Syntax

Breitbarth (2014:32ff) provides evidence against analyzing exceptive clauses as negative conditionals in MLG, which I take to hold for MHG and MD as well: (i) negative conditionals differ formally from exceptive clauses. Conditional clauses are syndetical with verb-final word order (24) or asyndetical with clause initial verb placement (25), while exceptive clauses always show V2 word order.

<sup>13</sup>Against the data presented in Petrova (2020), it seems that the polarity of the matrix clause does not determine which paratactic negation marker appears in the complement clause, as (22) and (23) suggest.

<sup>14</sup>It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss accounts for Negative Concord (NC). Haegeman and Lohndal (2010) provide an account for NC as binary Agree (against Zeijlstra (2004) who argues NC is Multiple Agree), which could be adapted to NC across clause boundaries assuming that the C-head in the complement clause carries negative features.

- (24) MHG, Sachsenspiegel, 13th century (I-LV)

darumme mot men wol kesen enen gogreven [...] of se des belenden richteres nicht  
*therefore must man well chose one earl [...] if they the liege judge* NEG  
 hebben en mogen  
*have NE can*

‘Therefore, one has to choose an earl if there is no liege judge.’

- (25) MLG, Sachsenspiegel MS Oldenburg, early 14th century (14v line 9/10)

ne es uader nicht, it nimpt sin moder  
*NE is father NEG it takes his mother*

‘If there is no father, the mother takes it.’

(ii) In contrast to exceptive clauses that only show preverbal *ne/en*, negative conditionals appear with *ne/en* and/or *niht/niet* or negative indefinites, as in (24) and (25) (Breitbarth 2014:32). This is substantiated by the observation mentioned in section 4.2.1 that a negated proposition in exceptive structures is always encoded by a biclausal structure.

(iii) Breitbarth (2014:33) notes that exceptive clauses begin to show *denne* in the middle field of monoclausal exceptive clauses or the dummy-matrix clause of the biclausal structure, while *ne/en* is gradually lost. This is not the case in negative conditionals.

(iv) Furthermore, Breitbarth (2014:34) argues that the canonical position of the exceptive clause mostly following the apodosis is atypical for conditionals. A conditional protasis tends to precede its consequent (Greenberg 1963).

Note that these arguments do not indicate that exceptive clauses semantically operate differently than conditionals. They also restrict an operator in the matrix clause (Kratzer 1986). What I argue is that they are not negative conditionals, as *ne/en* occurring in Jespersen’s cycle can be shown to behave differently and occur in different syntactic environments than post-cyclical *ne/en*. Hence, *ne/en* in adverbial clauses cannot simply be taken to be a residual stage I construction.

## 5.2. Semantics

Following Geis (1973) and Declerck and Reed (2000), I take the core meaning of an exceptive clause ‘Q unless P’ to be ‘Q (only) does not hold if P is true.’

Geis (1973) was the first to state that exceptive clauses are different from negative conditionals (*if not*). For English, Geis defines three main features that distinguish *unless* from negative conditional *if not*: (i) the subordinate clause in exceptives is inherently positive, i.e. there is no negative operator in the exceptive clause; (ii) exceptives encode a unique circumstance under which the proposition in the main clause does not hold (exhaustiveness). This is why coordination of *unless*-clauses is not possible. (iii) He argues that counterfactuality in exceptives is impossible.

Declerck and Reed (2000) discuss the arguments brought forward in Geis (1973) and point out that there is a clear distinction between the semantic meaning and the pragmatic interpretations of *unless*. They determine ‘Q in a case other than P’ as the basic meaning of exceptive clauses. This meaning results from two main characteristics of exceptive clauses: (i) exceptive clauses express domain subtraction (von Stechow 1993), paraphrased as ‘except if’, which is different from a negative condition ‘if not’ (Geis 1973). The only reason the two appear to be so similar is that ‘except if’ triggers a conventional implicature ‘if not’, i.e. the sentence *I will get a job unless I fail my final exam* implicates ‘If I do not fail my exams, I will get a job’. Therefore, both meanings have often been equated (Quine 1959). Characteristic (ii) discussed by Declerck and Reed (2000) is that a pragmatic effect triggers the interpretation that exceptive clauses encode

a unique circumstance under which Q does not hold (Geis and Zwicky 1971). They also provide corpus data against Geis' claim that counterfactuality does not occur in exceptive clauses.

The most important insight that I will need for the proposed reanalysis scenario is that in contrast to a negative condition, exceptives express a domain subtraction (von Fintel 1993). The excepted proposition is the circumstance under which the main clause proposition does not hold (Geis 1973, von Fintel 1993, Declerck and Reed 2000). Therefore, while in a negative conditional statement, P is internally negative  $\neg P \rightarrow Q$  ('if not P, then Q'), the exceptive clause expresses the condition under which Q, the apodosis, is negated  $P \rightarrow \neg Q$ . Therefore, trying to explain the reanalysis of *ne/en* as an exceptive marker, one has to ask how *ne/en* became reanalyzed from being a sentential negation marker, i.e. negating P, to negating the apodosis Q. I will address this question as well as the question whether the adversative/contrastive interpretation was first in the next section.

## 6. From negation to domain subtraction and contrast

In this section, I want to address two questions: (i) Why does *ne/en* express an exceptive as well as adversative discourse relation? (ii) How did *ne/en* become a marker of exception/contrast?

Already in OHG, certain prepositions appear to have both exceptive and adversative meanings, such as *suntar* ('except, but') (Holmberg 1967:87) and *uzzan* ('outside, except, but') (Abraham 1979:245). Example (26) shows an exceptive use, (27) translates as German *sondern* ('but').

(26) OHG, Weissenburger Katechismus (150r, line 28–29)

Nileitit got eomannan in ubilo thohheinaz uzzar thanne her then man farlazzit  
 NEG=lead God anyone in sin any except then he the man leave  
 'God does not lead anybody into any sin, except if he then gave up on the man.'

(27) OHG, St. Galler Pater Noster (MS page: 320, line 5–6)

enti ni unsih firleitit in khorunka uzzar losi unsih fona ubile  
 and NEG us lead in temptation but release us from sin  
 'And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.'

Abraham notes that *uzzan* translates as *aber* (contrastive 'but') or *sondern* (corrective 'but') depending on the main clause the subordinate clause modifies. Negative clauses followed by *uzzan* tend to translate as corrective adversative clauses. This is also true for the V2 structures found in all three corpora: the negative proposition in the main clause triggers a corrective reading of the adverbial clause.

Another example is OHG *newære*, which was already used as 'except' in OHG and developed towards exceptive *nur* ('only') in southeastern dialects and adversative *mêr* (present-day Dutch *maar*, 'but') in northwestern dialects of the OHG/OD dialect continuum (Holmberg 1967:42). As noted in Philippa et al. (2004), the contracted form *maer* already existed in early MD. In (28), the contracted *maer* is used as a conjunction introducing the clause ('but'), the second *maer* is an exceptive preposition meaning 'but' or the adverb 'only'.

(28) Jacob van Maerlant, Der Naturen Bloeme, 1287, MS D (26:22)

mar sine leuen der iare mar achte  
 but they=NE live the years only/but eight  
 'But they live only eight years.'

This is only schematic and one could find different patterns and uses depending on the different dialect areas. What these examples show is that exceptive and adversative meaning is often expressed using the same lexical items. This is also true from a cross-linguistic perspective. A lot of exceptive and adversative markers derive from spatial adverbials meaning ‘outside’, such as English *but* or Spanish *fuera* (Nevalainen 1990, Traugott 1997, Dekeyser 2012, Bremmer 2017). I want to argue that *ne/en* is just another example, which only stands out due to its peculiar syntactic behavior, never appearing as a conjunction in clause-initial position, but functioning as a discourse marker as a clitic on the verb in V2 structures. Exceptive and adversative meaning seem to be closely related, which is why the same lexical item can encode both relations. The present-day Flemish data presented in section 4 indicate that just like English *but*, *en* can be used as a contrastive marker on a speaker-oriented level (Bremmer 2017).

The question remaining is how a former negative marker could be reanalyzed as an exceptive/adversative marker and whether negation was first reanalyzed as contrast or exception. I propose a cline of semantic change as given in (29) taking the contrastive as developing from the exceptive meaning, as has been proposed for the grammaticalization of English *but* (Dekeyser 2012:304).

(29) negation > exceptive > contrast

Reconstructing the reanalysis of the sentential negation marker *ni* to post-cyclical *ne/en* is difficult because there is only very little data from the transition period especially from OLG/OS to MLG/MD (Breitbarth 2013; 2014), but also from OHG to MHG. Therefore, the proposed scenario cannot be supported by a lot of data. For OHG, Holmberg (1967:111ff) provides some examples for asyndetic V2 clauses with ‘exceptive’ meaning. As *ni* in OHG still marks sentential negation on its own (stage I), I translate the clauses in (31) and (30) as a negative conditional.

(30) OHG, Otrid: Evangelienbuch, cited from Holmberg (1967:111)

Er ni werde wanne irboran [...] Then ingang er ni ruarit  
*He NEG be.PAST.SBJV then reborn [...] the entrance he NEG touch*  
 ‘If he is not reborn then [...] he does not touch the entrance.’

(31) OHG, Notker, cited from Holmberg (1967:112)

vnser truhten nezimberoe daz hus, ferlorne arbeite sint dero die iz ilton zimberon  
*our Lord NEG=build.SBJV the house, lost work is theirs who it self build*  
 ‘If our Lord does not build the house, the ones who built it on their own wasted their work.’

I want to argue that the negation of the protasis  $\neg P$  (negative condition) became reanalyzed as an exception  $P \rightarrow \neg Q$  ‘Q does not hold if P holds’ via an intermediate step in which *ni* was ambiguous between expressing sentential negation and metalinguistic negation (Horn 1985) in a conditional statement. To put it simply, the question is how the sentential negation marker *ni* in the protasis (a negative conditional) could be reanalyzed as negating the apodosis ( $\neg Q$ ) which results in an exceptive discourse relationship ( $P \rightarrow \neg Q$ , ‘Q unless P’).

According to Horn, negation is generally pragmatically ambiguous between internal negation and external or metalinguistic negation. Metalinguistic negation can negate a conversational implicature (Horn 1985), as shown in (32), cited from Horn (1985:132). In (32), the first part, ‘Some men aren’t chauvinists’, carries an implicature that there are a set of men that are not chauvinists. This implicature is negated. It is not the fact that some men aren’t chauvinists, but all men are.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup>Note that the example in (32) requires stress on ‘aren’t’ to trigger metalinguistic negation. This prosodic difference can be argued to correlate with syntactic differences.

(32) Some men aren't chauvinists – All men are chauvinists

I suggest that in a conditional statement, salient propositions can be metalinguistically negated. The implicatum of the proposition of the protasis is similar to the apodosis, which leads to the negative marker being reanalyzed as an exceptive marker, indicating that actually Q, the apodosis, does not hold if the proposition of the clause in which *ne/en* appears is true.

In (31) – taking aside the subjunctive morphology – we have two utterances: ‘Their work is lost’ (u1) and ‘Our Lord does not build the house’ (u2). U2, the protasis, ‘Our Lord does not build the house’ in this context conversationally implicates ‘Their work is lost’ (q<sub>u2</sub>). This conversational implicature is similar to u1, the apodosis. Hence, the protasis (u2) implicates the apodosis (u1/q):

u1: ‘Their work is lost’ Q  
 u2: ‘Our Lord does not build the house’ P  
 q<sub>u2</sub>: ‘Their work is lost’  
 q<sub>u2</sub> = u1

The negative conditional “If our Lord does not build the house, their work is lost” is reanalyzed as “It is not the case that their work is lost (only) if our Lord builds the house”. Due to this metalinguistic negation reading, the negation within the protasis can be interpreted as the negation of the apodosis: ‘Q if not P’ becomes ‘not Q (only)<sup>16</sup> if P’. Put simply, the negation originally negating the protasis negates the apodosis.

Once the particle *ni* > *ne/en* was reanalyzed as expressing exceptive discourse relations, similar to other such markers, it was used in adversative contexts as well. The fact that towards MHG, MLG and MD the particle lost its negative force must have made this reanalysis possible. This suggests that the change is a case of exaptation (Lass 1990, Haiman 2017). With single *ne/en* ceasing to be the marker of standard negation and the grammaticalization of *niet/niht*, the particle was prone to be reanalyzed as marking metalinguistic negation and consequently as an exceptive marker.

## 7. Summary

In this article, I presented the results of a corpus study on V2 clauses with preverbal *ne/en* in MHG, MLG and MD which have been described as expletive or paratactic negation. I argued that (i) only V2 clauses with a complement clause interpretation are paratactic negation proper, as they do not express a negative proposition. Instead, *ne/en* is an agreement marker of a negation operator in the matrix clause (Van der Wouden 1997). (ii) *ne/en* in adverbial clauses can be shown to contribute exceptive, adversative or more generally a contrastive meaning. Hence, it cannot be characterized as expletive. I referred to these cases as post-cyclical *ne/en*. I showed that certain prepositions in historical German and Dutch are used to encode both exceptive and adversative meaning and suggested that these meanings being related results in the development of *ne/en* from an exceptive to a contrastive marker, which still appears in present-day Flemish. Furthermore, I proposed that the reanalysis of negative *ni* to post-cyclical *ne/en* occurred in conditional statements in which a metalinguistic negation reading of *ni* resulted in ambiguity between negating the apodosis and the protasis. Further research has to investigate how MD post-cyclical *ne/en* developed into a contrastive marker appearing in present-day Flemish. Furthermore, the question remains whether *ni* was only reanalyzed in V2 structures with a conditional interpretation or whether also V1 conditionals could be a bridging context for reanalysis. If this were in fact the case, how did the V2 structure result from V1 input? Another question that remains open is why post-cyclical and single paratactic *ne/en* both only appear in V2 clauses.

<sup>16</sup>I cannot go into detail regarding the exhaustive semantics of exceptive clauses but refer to Declerck and Reed (2000) saying that the pragmatic effect of conditional perfection (Geis and Zwicky 1971) triggers the interpretation that exceptive clauses encode a unique circumstance. Note that OHG *newære* > present-day German *nur* ‘only’ as well as English *but* are also used as exhaustive markers.

## References

- Abraham, Werner, 1979. Außer. In *Die Partikeln der deutschen Sprache*, edited by Harald Weydt, pp. 239–255. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, Boston. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110863574.239>.
- Breitbarth, Anne, 2013. Negation in the history of Low German and Dutch. In *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean*, edited by David Willis, Christopher Lucas, and Anne Breitbarth, Oxford Studies in Diachronic and Historical Linguistics 5, pp. 190–238. Oxford University Press, Oxford. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199602537.003.0006>.
- Breitbarth, Anne, 2014. *The history of Low German negation*. Oxford Studies in Diachronic and Historical Linguistics 13. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Breitbarth, Anne, 2015. Exceptive negation in Middle Low German. In *Charting the Landscape of Linguistics: Webschrift for Josef Bayer*, edited by Ellen Brandner, Anna Czypionka, Constantin Freitag, and Andreas Trotzke, pp. 11–15.
- Breitbarth, Anne, Melissa Farasyn, Anne-Sophie Ghyselen, Liliane Haegeman, and Jacques Van Keymeulen, forthcoming. *Ge had dien een keer moeten en zien!* Neue Erkenntnisse zum Gebrauch der Partikel en im Gesproken Corpus van de (Zuidelijk-) Nederlandse Dialecten. *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* forthcoming.
- Breitbarth, Anne and Liliane Haegeman, 2014. The distribution of preverbal *en* in (West) Flemish: Syntactic and interpretive properties. *Lingua* 147: 69–86. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2013.11.001>.
- Breitbarth, Anne and Liliane Haegeman, 2015. ‘*En*’ *en is niet wat we dachten*: a Flemish discourse particle. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* pp. 85–102.
- Bremmer, Rolf H., 2017. Old English *būtan*/Old Frisian *būta*: From adverb to conjunction. *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 3-4: 601–615. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/18756719-12340094>.
- Burridge, Kate, 1993. *Syntactic Change in Germanic: Aspects of Language Change in Germanic, with Particular Reference to Middle Dutch*. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science 4. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/cilt.89>.
- Declerck, Renaat and Susan Reed, 2000. The semantics and pragmatics of “unless”. *English Language and Linguistics* 2: 205–241. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s136067430000023x>.
- Dekeyser, Xavier, 2012. From Old English ‘butan’ to present-day ‘but’: A textbook case of grammaticalization. In *Explorations in the English Language: Festschrift for Professor Jerzy Welna on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, edited by Joanna Esquibel and Anna Wojtys, pp. 297–307. Peter Lang, Berlin. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-02361-9>.
- von Fintel, Kai, 1993. Exceptive Constructions. *Natural Language Semantics* 1(2) 123–148. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/salt.v1i0.2967>.
- Geis, Michael, 1973. *If and unless*. In *Issues in Linguistics: Papers in Honor of Henry and Renée Kahane*, edited by Braj B Kachru, pp. 231–253. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Geis, Michael and Arnold Zwicky, 1971. On invited inferences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 2: 561–566.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia, 2000. Negative ... concord? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18: 457–523.
- Greenberg, Joseph, 1963. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In *Universals of Language*, edited by Joseph Greenberg. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Haegeman, Liliane and Terje Lohndal, 2010. Negative concord and (multiple) Agree: A case study of West Flemish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41 2: 181–211. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/ling.2010.41.2.181>.
- Haiman, John, 2017. Exaptation. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax*, edited by Adam Ledgeway and Ian Roberts, Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics, pp. 49–69. Cambridge



- University Press, Cambridge. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/9781107279070.004>.
- Hoeksema, Jacob, 2014. The Middle Dutch negative clitic: Status, position and disappearance. *Lingua* 147: 50–68. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2014.02.004>.
- Holmberg, Märta Åsdahl, 1967. *Exzipierend-einschränkende Ausdrucksweisen: untersucht besonders auf Grund hochdeutscher Bibelübersetzungen bis zum Anfang des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Almqvist and Wiksell, Uppsala.
- Horn, Laurence R., 1985. Metalinguistic negation and pragmatic ambiguity. *Language* 61 1: 121–174. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/413423>.
- Jäger, Agnes, 2008. *History of German Negation*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/la.118>.
- Jäger, Agnes and Doris Penka, 2012. Development of sentential negation in German. In *Comparative Germanic syntax: The State of the art*, edited by Peter Ackema, Rhona Alcorn, Caroline Heycock, Dany Jaspers, Jeroen Van Craenenbroeck, and Guido Vanden Wyngaerd, pp. 199–222. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/la.191.07jag>.
- Jespersen, Otto, 1917. *Negation in English and other languages*. Historisk-filologiske meddelelser. A.F. Høst, København.
- Kratzer, Angelika, 1986. Conditionals. In *Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory*, edited by Anne M. Farley, Peter Farley, and Karl-Erik McCullough, pp. 115–135. Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Lass, Roger, 1990. How to do things with junk: Exaptation in language evolution. *Journal of Linguistics* 26: 79–102. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700014432>.
- Miestamo, Matti, 2005. *Standard Negation. The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110197631>.
- Nevalainen, Terttu, 1990. Modelling Functional Differentiation and Functional Loss: The Case of ‘but’. In *Papers from the 5th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics*, edited by Sylvia Adamson, Vivien Law, Nigel Vincent, and Susan Wright, pp. 337–355. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/cilt.65.20nev>.
- Paul, H., T. Klein, H.J. Solms, and K.P. Wegera, 2007. *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik Bd. 1*. Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte: Hauptreihe. Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- Petrova, Svetlana, 2020. Variation and change in the licensing of dependent V2 in German. In *V2 in Germanic and Romance*, edited by Horst Lohnstein and Antonios Tsiknakis, pp. 251–276. De Gruyter, Berlin. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9781501508141-008>.
- Philippa, Marlies, Frans Debrabandere, Arend Quak, Tanneke Schoonheim, and Noline van der Sijs, 2004. *Etymologisch woordenboek van het Nederlands*. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.5117/9789053566534>.
- Postma, Gertjan, 2002. De enkelvoudige clitische negatie in het Middelnederlands en de Jespersen-cyclus. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 7-2: 44–82.
- Quine, Willard Van Orman, 1959. *Methods of Logic*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Stoett, Frederik August, 1923. *Middelnederlandse Spraakkunst – Syntaxis*. Martinus Nijhoff, 's-Gravenhage.
- Traugott, Elizabeth, 1997. *Unless and but conditionals: A historical perspective*. In *On conditionals again*, edited by Angeliki Athanasiadou and René Dirven, pp. 145–167. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/cilt.143.09clo>.
- Van der Wouden, Ton, 1997. *Negative Contexts: Collocation, Polarity and Multiple Negation*. Routledge Studies in Germanic Linguistics 1. Routledge, London. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203437636>.
- Witzenhausen, Elisabeth, 2019a. *Negation - Exception - Contrast: The post-cyclical development of ne/en in Middle High German, Middle Low German and Middle Dutch*. Ph.D. thesis, Universiteit Gent.
- Witzenhausen, Elisabeth, 2019b. Von Negation zu Domänensubtraktion. *Beiträge zur Geschichte*

*der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 141 1: 1–30. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/bgs1-2019-0001>.

Yoon, Suwon, 2011. *'Not' in the mood. The syntax, semantics and pragmatics of evaluative negation*. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Chicago.

Zeijlstra, Hedde, 2004. *Sentential Negation and Negative Concord*. LOT/Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics 101. LOT, Utrecht.

#### Appendix: texts used

**ReM:** M538-N0; M520-N0; M508-N0; M503-N1; M068-N1; M303-G1; M011-N1; M012-N0; M013O-N1; M136-G1; M017-N1; M301-G1; M411-G1; M345-G1; M344-G1; M024-N1; M028-N1; M015-N1; M089-G1; M302-G1; M401-G1; M030-N1; M091-N1; M092-N1; M196-N1; M402-G1; M402y-N1; M032-N1; M038-N1; M040-N1; M357-G1; M403-G1; M403y-N0; M524-N0; M537-N0; M045-N1; M406-G1; M406y-N0; M049-N1; M055-N1; M539-N0; M531-N0; M405y-N1; M405-G1; M110-N1; M056-N1; M103-N1; M516-N0; M243-N1; M208-N1; M527-N0; M061B-G1; M306-G1; M112-G1; M119-N1; M327-G1; M354-G1; M238-N1; M304-G1; M064M-N1; M064R-N1; M064S-N1; M078-N1; M066-N1; M318-G1; M069-G1; M546-N1; M521-N1; M022-N1; M023-N1; M307-G1; M347-G1; M346-G1; M517-N0; M073-N1; M074-N1; M518-N0; M077-G1; M145-N1; M349-G1; M529-N1; M341-G1; M100-G1; M147-N1; M510-N0; M543-N1; M312-G1; M309-G1; M311-G1; M105-N1; M107G-G1; M107S-N1; M106-N1; M541B-N; M541H2-N; M541H1-N; NM541S-N; M407y-N0; M407-G1; M108M-N1; M108P-N1; M108S-N1; M331-G1; M111-N1; M165-G1; M506-N0; M006-G1; M523-N0; M317-G1; M513-N0; M334-G1; M114-N1; M408-G1; M340-G1; M528-N0; M547-N; M350-G1; M206-N1; M121F-N1; M121K-N1; M121N-N1; M121S-N1; M121V-G1; M121y1-N; M121V-G1; M121W-N1; M313-G1; M533-N0; M148-N1; M205M-N1; M505-N1; M315-G1; M351-G1; M305-G1; M167-N1; M536-N0; M168-N1; M501-N0; M065-G1; M159-N1; M316-G1; M320-G1; M246-N1; M352-G1; M319-G1; M310-G1; M139-N1; M140B-N1; M140D-N1; M142-G1; M143-G1; M509-N0; M329-G1; M221-N1; M193-N1; M156-N1; M161-N1; M328-G1; M330-G1; M544-N1; M199A-G1; M199B-N1; M199C-N1; M540-N0; M410-G1; M338-G1; M353-G1; M321-G1; M232-G1; M322-G1; M323-G1; M324-G1; M326-G1; M541H1-N; M151-N1; M205A-N1; M205E-N1; M205S-N1; M205W-N1; M226-N1; M155-N1; M158-N1; M172-N1; M163B-N1; M171-G1; M173-N1; M177-G1; M178-N1; M014-N1; M160H-N1; M241I-N1; M241y-N1; M241-G1; M185-N1; M333-G1; M404-G1; M514-N0; M152-G1; M530-N1; M335-G1; M160P-N1; M160R-N1; M359-G1; M410-G1; M337-G1; M308-G1; M187-N1; M339-G1; M332-G1; M209-G1; M507-G1; M522-N1; M194-N1; M214-G1; M214y-N1; M214W-N1; M525-N0; M532-N0; M218A-N1; M409-G1; M113y-N1; M113-G1; M008-G1; M224-N1; M225-N1; M228-N1; M188y-N1; M188-G1; M213-N1; M314-G1; M343-G1; M071U-N1; M222-N1; M234-N1; M198-N1; M027-N1; M087-N1; M116-N1; M138-N1; M149-N1; M512-N0; M223-N1; M356-G1; M239-N1; M240B-N1; M182A-N1; M182C-N1; M088-N1; M242-G1; M242Y-N0; M189-N1; M244-G1; M195y-N1; M195-G1; M355-G1; M325-G1; M249-N1; M104-N1; M358-G1; M005-G1; M013O-N1; M302-G1; M165-G1 M513-N0; M121V-G1; M156-N1; M163K-N1 M336-G1 M358-G1; M157-G1;

**ReN:** Göttinger Liebesbriefe (Stadtarchiv Göttingen), 1451-1500.; Münster, Johannes Veghe, 3 Urkunden 1483, 1494, Autographe (LA NRW, Abt. WF).; Cronecken der sassen, Druck: Mainz, Peter Schoeffer, 1492 [BC 197].; Duisburg: Chronik Wassenberch, 1518, Hs. (Haus Ruhr bei Senden, nahe Münster).; Freckenhorster Legendar, Hs., spätes 15. Jahrhundert. (BAM, PfA Freckenhorst, Hs. 310).; Griseldis (nebst Sigismunda und Guiscardus, Druck: Hamburg, [Drucker des Jegher], 1502 [BC 362].; Henselynsboek, Druck: Lübeck, Mohnkopf, um 1498 [BC 305].; Herford, Rechtsbuch, um 1375 (Stadtarchiv Herford) [Faksimile-Edition].; Qvatuor Evangeliorum versio Saxonica, 2. H. 15. Jahrhundert.; Bibel, Druck: Köln (Ku), Heinrich Quentell, um 1478 [BC 26] (Detmold, Lippische Landesbibliothek, Exp. Th 75.2o).; Niederdeutsche Apokalypse, Tf, um 1400 (StadtB. Trier).; Oldenburger Bilderhandschrift des Sachsenspiegels, Kloster

Rastede 1336.; Osnabrück, Sühne (= Koldenbeker Urkunde), ca. 1288 (LA NRW, Abt. WF, Grafschaft Ravensberg Urkunden Nr. 11a.); Ravensberger Urkunde, 1292 (LA NRW, Abt. WF, Grafschaft Ravensberg Urkunden Nr. 32).; Reynke de Voss, Druck: Rostock: Ludwig Dietz, 1539 [BC 1312].; Rütten, Statutarrecht, Hs L, um 1300 (London, British Museum, Add. 21174).; Soest, Schrae im Statutenbuch, ca. 1367.; Spieghel der leyen, Hs., Münster 1444.; Stader Stadtrecht, 1279.; Südwestfälische Psalmen, um 1300.; Urkunde Hermanns von Neheim (= Werler Urkunde), 1294 (LA NRW, Abt. WF, Kloster Himmelpforten Urkunden Nr. 47).; Sächsische Weltchronik, Bremer Hs. der Rezension B (Hs. 16), um 1275.;

**CGy:** Aiol by onbekend (1220); Corp.I, 0003, Gent, 1236 (kort na 14 november) by onbekend (1236); Corp.I, 0009AA, Gent, 17 maart 1253 by onbekend (1253); Corp.I, 0012, Middelburg, 11 maart 1254 by onbekend (1254); Corp.I, 0029, Gent, 1263 april of 1 april 1264–18 by onbekend (1263); Corp.I, 0093, Gent, kort vóór 22 augustus 1270 by onbekend (1270); Corp.I, 0097, Mechelen, 29 september 1270 by onbekend (1270); Corp.I, 0198, Oudenburg?, 17 juli 1277 by onbekend (1277); Corp.I, 0201AA, Brugge, 1 augustus 1277 by onbekend (1277); Corp.I, 0201AB, Brugge, 1 augustus 1277 by onbekend (1277); Corp.I, 0236, Brugge, 24 september 1278 by onbekend (1278); Corp.I, 0347, Brugge, (25 mei 1281) by onbekend (1281); Corp.I, 0395, Brugge, (kort voor 17 maart 1282) by onbekend (1282); Corp.I, 0419, Brugge, (1281 september—26 mei 1282) by onbekend (1281); Corp.I, 0438, Brugge, 1282 (juli-september) by onbekend (1282); Corp.I, 0531, Gent, 1284 april (24–30) by onbekend (1284); Corp.I, 0566(ABCDE)\_some\_sentences\_double, Brugge, 1284 ± november 1 by onbekend (1284); Corp.I, 0638, Brugge, 1285 by onbekend (1285); Corp.I, 0663, Brugge, (24 maart 1285–12 april 1286) by onbekend (1285); Corp.I, 0778A', Holland, grafelijke kanselarij, 21 maart 1288 by onbekend (1288); Corp.I, 0803, Gentbrugge, 23 juni 1288 by onbekend (1288); Corp.I, 0897, Haastrecht?, 30 december 1289 by onbekend (1289); Corp.I, 0913a, Assenede, 6 april 1290 by onbekend (1290); Corp.I, 0969a, Holland, grafelijke kanselarij, 30 oktober 1290 by onbekend (1299); Corp.I, 1067, Gent, 6 september 1291 by onbekend (1291); Corp.I, 1124, Brugge, 25 februari 1292 by onbekend (1305); Corp.I, 1226, Brabant, hertogelijke kanselarij, 5 april 1292–27 maart 1293 by onbekend (1292); Corp.I, 1243, Brugge, 9 mei 1293 by onbekend (1293); Corp.I, 1277, Gent, 13 september 1293 by onbekend (1293); Corp.I, 1293, Holland, grafelijke kanselarij, 21 december 1293 by onbekend (1293); Corp.I, 1340, Brugge, 1294 ± juni 7 by onbekend (1294); Corp.I, 1367, Holland, grafelijke kanselarij, 25 oktober 1294 by onbekend (1294); Corp.I, 1398, Holland, grafelijke kanselarij, 15 januari 1295 by onbekend (1295); Corp.I, 1437, Hemiksem, 19 juni 1295 by onbekend (1295); Corp.I, 1475, Brugge, eind 1295 by onbekend (1295); Corp.I, 1496d, Holland, grafelijke kanselarij, 1 mei 1296 by onbekend (1299); Corp.I, 1632A, Holland, grafelijke kanselarij, 30 september 1297 by onbekend (1297); Corp.I, 1926, Petegem, 4e kwart 13e eeuw by onbekend (1276); Der Naturen Bloeme, handschrift D (Detmold) by Maerlant, Jacob van (1287); Der Naturen Bloeme, handschrift M (München) by Maerlant, Jacob van (1276); het Luikse Diatessaron, Brabant-West, 1291-1300 by onbekend (1291); Nederbergse geneeskundige geneeskundige recepten by onbekend (1250); Nederrijns Moraalboek by onbekend (1270); Nederrijns Moraalboek by onbekend (1270); Rijmbijbel by Maerlant, Jacob van (1285); Sente Lutgart, handschrift A (Amsterdam) by Onbekend (1276); Sente Lutgart, handschrift K (Kopenhagen) by Affligem, Willem van (1265); Wrake van Ragisel by onbekend (1260)

**CRM:** C108p37004; C608r35501; E043p36301; E192p34101; E192p34101; E192p34101; E192p34101; E192p34101; E563r38101; E597r33101; F133p38701; F590r38501; F596r37502; F679r39903; G574r37501; I241p32801; K016p37601; K094p35503; K094p36701; K094p36701; K094p36702; K094p36708; K094p37401; K094p38601; K094p38601; K094p38601; K150p37801; K150p37801; K150p37801; K325a39901; K516r37601; K538r37701; K602r31301; K602r31301; K809r31601; L207p38601; L530r36901; L534r34201; O052p30501; O152p36101; O228p34803; O228p35301; P051p34401; P051p37401; P051p37401; P065p31401; P176p34501; P565r35001; Q158a39701; Q599r38501