Germanic languages compares with the Middle English data presented here.

REFERENCES

Buccini, Anthony F. 1992. The development of umlaut and the dialectal position of Dutch in Germanic. Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.

Voyles, Joseph B. 1976. Old High German umlaut. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 90.271–289.

———. 1982. Old Norse *i*-umlaut. Linguistics 253/254.267–285.

———. 1991. A history of OHG *i*-umlaut. PBB 113.159–194.

———. 1992. On Old High German *i*-umlaut. On Germanic linguistics: Issues and methods, ed. by Irmengard Rauch, Gerald F. Carr, and Robert L. Kyes, 365–377. (Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs, 68.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Department of German
818 Van Hise Hall
1220 Linden Drive
University of Wisconsin–Madison
Madison, WI 53706
[rbhowell@facstaff.wisc.edu]

Negation in the history of English. Edited by Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Gunnel Tottie, and Wim van der Wurff. (Topics in English linguistics, 26.) Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1998. Pp. viii, 333. Hardback. € 98.00.

Reviewed by LAURENCE HORN, *Yale University*

In recent years, the study of negation has motivated an impressive amount of work devoted to the study of the grammatical representation of sentential negation and its implications for syntactic and semantic theory (see the bibliography in Horn and Kato 2000 for a reasonably exhaustive compilation). The current volume includes twelve papers, the majority presented at a conference in Leiden in late 1994, that examine a range of intersecting issues in the historical development of modern English negation. While the papers are ordered alphabetically in the volume, they fall into two natural classes as defined by theoretical or

descriptive orientation: four are explicitly directed to current issues in generative theory, while the remaining eight are of a more purely descriptive nature, although these papers contain sufficient detail to be of interest to practitioners of a variety of grammatical frameworks. I will briefly summarize the papers in the volume before commenting on selected points.

The theoretically oriented papers share an orientation within the principles and parameters/minimalist framework and in particular are all concerned with pursuing the consequences of the NegP analysis initiated by Pollock and refined in work by Haegeman and Zanuttini (see Haegeman 1995). On Pollock's "exploded Infl" account, functional elements like negation (along with agreement and tense) are analyzed in terms of a head projecting a full phrasal category; negation is the Neg^0 head of the functional category NegP. Various properties of negative polarity, negative concord, movement, scope, and word order phenomena have been dealt with in these terms. The shift in the expression of sentential negation as we move from Old through Middle to Modern English is a fertile field for the application of this theory (see, e.g., Pintzuk 1999, Ingham 2000), and several of the authors in this volume have been among the prominent contributors to these developments.

Following earlier work by Ukaji (1993), Frits Beukema, in his "Five ways of saying no," examines the role of prefinite verb negation *(I not know)* as an unstable bridge between the earlier standard postverbal negator *(I know not)* and the modern *do*-supported version *(I do not know),* finding a parallel in an evanescent developmental stage of negation among French children. Beukema attributes the differential behavior of lexical and auxiliary verbs with respect to movement across negation to the interaction of the former (θ-assigning) predicates with the "strength of Infl" parameter; the *I not know* structure requires different strengths for Infl and the Neg^0 head, hence its instability. (Note, however, that this structure does survive in the narrow focus construction *I not only know it, I wrote about it*.)

In "Negative concord and verb projection raising in Old English and West Flemish," Eric Haeberli and Liliane Haegeman present a comparative study of concord in these two languages. In particular, despite the superficial resemblance in the word order exhibited by the two languages (V2 in main clauses, verb-final in subordinate clauses) for so-called VPR structures, in which a finite modal precedes an infinitival complement, West Flemish blocks negative concord and allows only the true double-negation reading (with the negations canceling out to yield

an affirmative), while OE does allow the negative concord reading that results from the leftward movement of the modal and rightward movement of the infinitival clause. Their study provides another testing ground for the assumption that Germanic and Romance preverbal negatives *(ne, en, non)* are negative heads morphologically incorporating into the verb, while *not* and other neg-incorporating indefinites are maximal projections satisfying the Neg-Criterion.

Ans van Kemenade's "Sentential negation and clause structure in Old English" argues from patterns of embracing (pre- and postverbal) negation in OE, based on a meticulous corpus study that turns up 330 instances of the relevant *ne V na/no* structures, that pronominal and full NP subjects occupy different structural positions, to the left and right of the *na* negation, respectively, and that the pronoun subjects of OE must consequently be seen as clitics.

Wim van der Wurff's "On expletive negation with adversative predicates in the history of English" is a masterful conspectus of the syntax and semantics of expletive negation in late ME. This is the apparently superfluous negative marker appearing in the complement of adversative or inherently negative predicates of fearing, forbidding, denial, doubting, and so on, and other environments largely corresponding to the "downward entailing" contexts licensing negative polarity items. The bane of prescriptivists, expletive negation has receded in the post-ME period, but van der Wurff convincingly attributes the constraints on its occurrence to "a universal tendency in language to make the complement clause of an adversative predicate negative" that "must lie in the peculiar semantics of the triggering items" (302).

The other papers in the volume touch on the evolution of specific constructions involving negation and its satellites. Different aspects of the rise and (partial) fall of negative concord or noncanceling multiple negation are treated in "Multiple negation in Middle English verse" by Yoko Iyeiri and in "On the scope of Negative Concord" by Masatomo Ukaji. Ukaji's "wide scope negative concord," like van der Wurff's expletive negation, is what Jespersen calls paratactic negation, the occurrence of negation in a subordinate clause under certain predicates. (Iyeiri's discussion of the factors leading to the loss of preverbal *ne* in ME verse is prefigured by van der Wouden's study of the analogous loss of *en* in Middle Dutch; see van der Wouden 1998.) Two particular neg-concord constructions are explored by Ingrid Tieken-Boom van Ostade in "The origin and development of the "Neg…*neither*" construction and by Terttu Nevalainen in "*The facts and nothing but:* The

(non-)grammaticalisation of negative exclusives in English." The latter deals not with *not only (… but also)*, as its title might suggest, but rather with the *not… but* construction that, for reasons Nevalainen insightfully explores, failed to grammaticalize into the standard expression of exclusion in English paralleling *ne… que* in French. Gunnel Tottie tracks the alternation between particle and prefix negation as a stable variable in "Affixal and non-affixal negation"; as in much of Tottie's work, particular attention is devoted to the contrast between written and spoken language as a significant variable. The origin of neg-raising (the lower-clause understanding of higher-clause negation) in the post-OE period is the focus of Olga Fischer's "On Negative Raising in the history of English." Matti Rissanen, in "*Isn't it?* or *is it not?*," deals—as indicated by the subtitle, "On the order of postverbal subject and negative particle in the history of English"—with the positioning of subjects in inverted clauses with respect to the particle *not* that follows the main verb. The key factor here, as in van Kemenade's contribution, is the formal character of the subject: pronominal subjects immediately follow the verb, while nonpronominal inverted subjects tend to (though they need not) follow the negative adverb as well as the verb; focus, length, and the nature of the negative adverb are relevant factors in determining the word order. By Late ME (around 1500), the negative adverb is fixed in immediately postverbal position and not even personal pronouns can intervene; this gives rise, by Shakespeare's day, to contracted negation. Jenny Cheshire, in the one sociolinguistically oriented contribution to the volume, "English negation from an interactional perspective," examines the discourse conditions on the use of *never* as a negator for single past events in the speech of teenagers in Reading.

Any treatments of the diachrony of negation in English (and in other Indo-European languages) can be seen as variations on a theme by Jespersen, and in particular as studies in the implications of Jespersen's Cycle, the pattern in which preverbal negation weakens phonologically to a proclitic that must then, for semantic reasons, become reinforced by postverbal indefinites that eventually come to supplant the proclitic as the primary marker of negative force, after which the original weakened negative disappears.[1] Three recurrent themes in these papers relating to

---

[1] A proposed functional motivation for Jespersen's Cycle is given in Horn 1989: §7.1. See also Bernini and Ramat 1996: chapter 2 for a typological study of the reflexes of the Cycle on modern European languages, and Horn 2001: §3 for a

the development of sentence negation in Old, Middle, and Early Modern English are word order (including questions concerning the placement of *not* and the relation of canonical to inverted word order), the consequences of the disappearance of preverbal *ne,* and especially the status of negative concord. Almost half the papers touch on concord in one aspect or another, often in conjunction with Jespersen's Cycle and with respect to such variables as prose versus verse, formal versus informal register, Early versus Late ME, narrow versus wide scope (i.e., within and across clause boundaries). The authors are diligent in applying the results of sophisticated corpus study, drawing extensively from the renowned Helsinki Corpus in particular. The volume includes a brief introduction and a combined subject/language index (but no index of names).

The editing and proofreading of the volume is largely excellent, and the quality of the prose good, especially considering that the majority of authors are not native speakers. There are a few typos I detected, especially in some of the bibliographic entries, but nothing significant. More problematic are some of the substantive lapses to which I now turn.

Thus, to take one example, the longest paper in the volume is Fischer's treatise on the development of neg-raising. Fischer carefully investigates a variety of factors that may have been responsible for the rise of the relevant readings, persuasively linking it to the loss of negative concord, although one would want to know why other languages permit both concord and neg-raised readings. But Fischer, following Klooster, takes neg-raising to be a property of "epistemic status." (She also regards epistemic predicates like *think* and *believe* to be agentive (71), which is implausible in itself and clearly not a criterial factor in the light of the neg-raised readings of *it is not likely/probable*.) The literature on neg-raising (see Horn 1989: chapter 5 for summary and references) demonstrates that the phenomenon is not limited to the *believe/think* class of epistemic verbs, or even to verbs in general, but instead applies to a definable subset of mid-scalar predicates and operators ranging from desideratives like *want* and directives like *advise* to modals like *should,* adverbs like *usually,* and even determiners like

---

demonstration that the Cycle is alive and well in contemporary English, based on the distribution of "squatitives" in sentences like i.

(i)   He {knows/doesn't know} squat about it.
(ii) It's {worth/not worth} jack shit.

most; the essential generalization is that contradictory negation tends to take on contrary (strengthened) readings when the functional distinction between the two kinds of readings is relatively slender.

In her very interesting and subtle essay on the use of *never* as an episodic negator, Cheshire employs an ill-defined notion of scale (39) whereby just as *excellent* entails 'good' and *all* entails 'most', 'many', and 'some', so too "*never* can similarly be seen as the high point on a scale containing *never, often, sometimes* and *once*." But this cannot be right; the weaker sentences unilaterally entailed by *She never went to church* are *She rarely/infrequently/not always attended church*, but clearly not *She often/sometimes/once went to church*. It is *always*, not *never*, that occupies the slot Cheshire defines. Like van der Wurff, Cheshire has interesting things to say about the role of prescriptive edicts in language change, but I am not sure what she means in asserting that *never* in reference to a single past event "has been incorrectly labeled 'non-standard' by sociolinguists" (48); surely this is a correct (and nonjudgmental) application of the label. More significantly, when Cheshire writes in passing that "*not* has now become phonetically weakened to the clitic *-n't*" (30), she is sharing an assumption with several of her fellow authors (including Beukema and Rissanen, both of whom describe *-n't* as an enclitic) that has been questioned—and to my mind refuted—by Zwicky and Pullum (1983) in an important paper cited by none of the contributors to the present volume.

These writers, in describing the development of *Vn't* forms in their first appearance (in the late sixteenth century or a bit earlier) and in their implications for different syntactic accounts of negation and clause structure, simply take it for granted that such forms represent contracted or cliticized negation. Zwicky and Pullum (1983) show that *Vn't* forms in fact represent inflected negative forms of modals and other auxiliaries, and that *n't* is not a clitic in the English of today; as far as I know their findings, supported by an array of morphological, syntactic, and semantic evidence, remain unchallenged.

In some cases the distinction between the inflectional and clitic analyses may not affect the arguments in a particular paper, but the inflectional analysis actually brings up an interesting question that would be quite germane to these articles: if a relatively free postverbal negative adverb, serving to reinforce the original proclitic *ne*, gradually became fixed in position to immediately follow the finite verb (preceding even pronominal postposed subjects as shown by Rissanen) as the preverbal negative dropped out, it is plausible to suspect that this fixed,

lexicalized—Rissanen (196) points to a variety of sixteenth-century spellings including *willnot, didnot,* and of course *cannot*—and eventually reduced form may have originated as an enclitic which was then reanalyzed as an inflected form listed in the lexicon. If the diagnostics Zwicky and Pullum employed to demonstrate the current status of, for example, *can't* as a lexical form were applied to the English of the early seventeenth century, at least some of them might yield different results. But if *Vn't* forms are assumed without argument to represent clitics, the question of reanalysis can never even be posed.

Despite the critical commentary offered here, *Negation in the History of English* is an invaluable resource for anyone interested in the history of negation or in the forces that collaborated to give rise to modern English clause structure. Its papers are rich in data, eminently readable, and often provocative. While it might be claimed that the semantic factors in the development of negative concord and their relation to negative polarity licensing (see, e.g., Ladusaw 1992, 1996 and van der Wouden 1997) have been largely neglected here, it might be more helpful to view this volume as offering a superb complement to that work by investigating the possibilities and limits of morphosyntactic analysis in this domain.

<div align="center">REFERENCES</div>

Bernini, Giuliano, and Paolo Ramat. 1996. Negative sentences in the languages of Europe. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1995. The syntax of negation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horn, Laurence. 1989. A natural history of negation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2001. Flaubert triggers, squatitive negation, and other quirks of grammar. Perspectives on negation and polarity items, ed. by Jack Hoeksema et al., 173–200. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

———, and Yasuhiko Kato (eds.). 2000. Negation and polarity: Syntactic and semantic perspectives. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ingham, Richard. 2000. Negation and OV order in Late Middle English. Journal of Linguistics 36.13–38.

Ladusaw, William. 1992. Expressing negation. SALT II: Proceedings of the Second Conference on Semantics and Linguistic Theory, ed. by Chris Barker and David Dowty, 237–259. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Department of Linguistics.

———. 1996. Negative concord and "mode of judgment." Negation: A notion in focus, ed. by Heinrich Wansing, 127–144. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Nuyts, Jan. 1990. Neg-raising reconsidered: Arguments for a cognitive-pragmatic approach. Journal of Pragmatics 14.559–588.

Pintzuk, Susan. 1999. Phrase structures in competition: Variation and change in Old English word order. New York: Garland.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, UG, and the structure of IP. Linguistic Inquiry 20.365–424.

Ukaji, Masatomo. 1993. "I not say": Bridge phenomenon in syntactic change. History of Englishes: New methods and interpretations in historical linguistics, ed. by Matti Rissanen et al., 453–462. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

van der Wouden, Anton. 1997. Negative contexts: Collocation, polarity, and multiple negation. London: Routledge.

———. 1998. On the development of marked negation systems: The Dutch situation in the seventeenth century. Historical linguistics 1995, vol. 2, ed. by Richard M. Hogg and Linda van Bergen, 311–329. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Zwicky, Arnold M., and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs. inflection: English *n't*. Language 59.502–513.

Department of Linguistics
P.O. Box 208236
Yale University
New Haven, CT 06520-8236
[laurence.horn@yale.edu]

Sprachformen: Deutsch und Niederdeutsch in europäischen Bezügen; Festschrift für Dieter Stellmacher zum 60. Geburtstag. Edited by Peter Wagener (Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik Beihefte, 105.) Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999. Pp. 374. Paper. €75.00.

Reviewed by BRUCE H. SPENCER, *The University of Iowa*

This volume contains thirty-five articles dedicated to Dieter Stellmacher, professor for Low German language and literature at the Universität Göttingen. The articles address a wide range of topics with an emphasis on German and Low German philology and linguistics. A number of articles are also devoted to literature and to linguistic topics in languages other than German or Low German. Most of the articles in this