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For Josef, who first taught me about negation, explanatory adequacy, and the value of small empirical puzzles.

1 Background

Languages employ a wide variety of constructions to express an exception to a matrix situation. Two common strategies in European languages are what we could label a comparative and a negative strategy, respectively:

(1) Comparative:
   a. English unless < on less (Traugott, 1997)
   b. French à moins que ‘to less that/than’
   c. German es sei denn < ez (en) si danne ‘it (NEG) be than’

(2) Negative:
   a. Portuguese a não ser ‘to NEG be’
   b. Dutch tenzij < het en zij ‘it NEG be’

The Dutch and German constructions are in fact, historically, two sides of the same coin: Derived from a biclausal structure involving a negative particle (het/ez ni sì/wari [CP dass/dat...] ‘it NEG be/were [CP that...]’ in OHG / ODu, this structure has evolved into a subordinating complementiser in the case of Dutch, complete with clause-final verb placement (3), but into a frozen expression (‘connector’, Pasch et al., 2003) in German, taking a dass- or V2-CP-complement (4).

(3) Wij zullen de trein niet halen, tenzij er een wonder gebeurt. we will the train not catch unless there a miracle happens

* This squib is a side product of work undertaken as part of the projects The development of negation in the languages of Europe and the Mediterranean (University of Cambridge, AHRC grant AR119272), Layers of Structure (Ghent University, FWO Odysseus grant Haegeman-G091409), and an FWO postdoctoral grant (Ghent University, FWO12/PDO/014).
In this squib I look at the development of the same construction in historical Low German (Old Saxon and Middle Low German), discuss the role of the negative particle, sketch a formal account, and speculate about the path of the development.

2 Development

In Old Saxon (OS), only biclausal exceptives are found, that is, there is a negated (subjunctive) form of ‘wesan ‘be’ followed by a subject that-clause containing the actual exception. In total, there are six occurrences, all in the Heliand (none in the other texts and fragments), (5).

(5) a. ni uuari [that it gibod godes selbes uuari]
   NEG were that it order God.GEN self were
   ‘unless (lit. were it not that) it were something ordained by God himself’ (Heliand: 205-206)
   b. ef nu uuerðen ni mag mankunni generid, quað he, ne si [that ik minan
   if now become NEG can mankind saved said he NEG be that I mine
   geƀe / liðan licham for liðio barn ]...
   give dear body for men.GEN children
   ‘If now mankind cannot be(come) saved, he said, unless I give my dear body for
   the children of men...’ (Heliand: 4760-4763)

OS, being a partial null subject language (Walkden, 2014), did not have overt expletives or correlates of subject clauses. Middle Low German (MLG) did, hence the expected form of the exceptive constructions should be a biclausal structure with a correlate of the subordinate clause containing the exception, thus either en si it dat/ en were it dat with verb-initial (like V1-conditionals) or it en si dat/ it en were dat with V2-order.

However, while there are biclausal V2-exceptives (all with past subjunctive were) in my MLG corpus (Breitbarth, 2014), as in (6), the vast majority of exceptive clauses (ca. 90%) are monoclausal. These monoclausal exceptives appear to be a structural blend of the biclausal ones: they are V2, the verb is in the subjunctive, preceded by the negative particle en/ne, but the verb (not always a copula, (9)) and preverbal constituent—not always a subject (7), not always a pronoun (8), more often a referential than an expletive pronoun (9)—clearly belong to content of the exception, that is, the subordinate clause in a biclausal structure.

(6) ...it ne were, dat he worde begrepen vppe der handhaftighen dat enes dodslaghes
   it NEG were that he were caught on the actual act of a manslaughter
   ‘...unless he were caught redhanded committing an act of manslaughter’ (Braun- 
   schweig: 29/06/1361)
... den genanten kalandes heren ensyn ersten sodane veirundevertich marck gensliken [...] betalt.
‘... unless those fourty-four marks have been paid first in their entirety to the named sirs of the kaland society’ (Uelzen: 1487)

It en scal nement enne nyen stenwech setten eder hoghen, de rad en it NEG shall no one a new stone way set or make higher the council NEG si darbi.
‘No one shall build a new stone way or make one higher, unless the council agrees.’ (Braunschweig: 1349)

Wy en=schullen ok nemande, de zy geistlik edder werlik, in unsen rad kezen we NEG=shall also no one he be clerical or secular in our council elect [...] de en=love und swere ersten ome zinen rad gelik unsem. [...] he NEG=vow and swear first on his council like ours
‘We shall also elect no one clerical or secular into our council, unless he vow and swear first on his council as he does on ours’ (Uelzen: 1457)

3 Analysis

The question now is how to analyse these ‘blended’ exceptives (which are also found in Middle Dutch (Burridge, 1993), and, to a lesser extent, in Middle High German (Jäger, 2008). What role does the negation particle play, and how is the exceptive interpretation derived? Wallmeier (2012: 38) surmises that the single preverbal negation particle together with the subjunctive mood on the verb function as a subordination marker. But how?

Concerning the role of the negative particle, it is first of all remarkable that it occurs on its own in these clauses, at a time when MLG was already in the transition to stage III of Jespersen’s Cycle, i.e., from a bipartite (ne/en ... nicht) to a unipartite (nicht alone) construction (Breitbarth, 2014). It is evident, however, that ne/en in exceptive clauses is not a negative marker with sentential scope: None of the regular expressions of sentential negation ((ne/en ... nicht or (ne/en) ... negative indefinite) is ever found in an exceptive clause in the corpus used, and NPI indefinites (e.g. enig ‘any’) are not attested in exceptives either. On the other hand, I do not subscribe to Härd’s (2000: 1460) claim that ne/en in MLG exceptives is a purely pleonastic negator. I will argue that it does negate something, only that it does not have sentential scope. Rather, I claim that the construction derives the exceptive semantics in a compositional fashion.

The preverbal negative particle in MLG exceptive clauses in fact shows formal and semantic parallels with preposed negation in English yes-no questions (Romero & Han, 2004) (cf. also Cormack & Smith’s 2000 EchoNeg) in that (i) it doesn’t have sentential scope, but rather appears to be C-related, (ii) it is a clitic, not a full negation particle and (iii) because of a semantic similarity: both English yes-no questions with preposed negations and (MLG) exceptive clauses invoke a positive (epistemic) implicature.
Romero & Han (2004) argue that the clitic negation marker takes scope over the World operator, in case of yes-no questions, it quantifies over the actual world (VERUM / realis). The whole clause is in the scope of another operator, in this case, a question operator Q.

(10) Isn’t Jane coming too? = Jane is coming too, isn’t she?
(11) [CP Q n’t [ VERUMF [ IP Jane is coming too ]]]

Analogously, I propose to analyse MLG exceptives as in (12). The clitic negation marker takes scope over the World operator, but here, it quantifies over a possible world (potentialis). The whole clause is again in the scope of another operator, this time, an exceptive operator OPexc, operating on the restriction of a universal quantifier introduced in the main clause (von Fintel, 1992: 144; von Fintel, 1993).

(12) .. derad ensi darbi.
[CP OPexc en [ W [IP de rad BE darbi ]]]
(13) ∀x.(EXCEPT the council agree [to x’s plans]) → ¬(x shall set a new stone way or make one higher)

I detail, I propose to situate the exceptive operator in SpecForceP, while I locate the world operator in SpecMoodirrealisP (Cinque, 1999; Kempchinsky, 2009; Haegeman, 2010) (just) below C. I argue that it is lexicalized by the subjunctive morphology on the finite verb of the exception clause. The negative particle ne/en is in Fin. Due to its clitic nature, it needs a host and therefore attracts the finite verb. As in declarative V2-clauses, any constituent can occupy SpecFinP.

(14) [ForceP OPexc [ForceP de rad], [FinP ne=si] [MoodPirr W [MoodPirr tij [TP ti tj darbi ]]]]

Regarding the diachronic development, sketched in (15), I propose that in the original bi-clausal structure, the negated copula (sî/wari) of the higher clause would move through Moodirrealis to Fin. This movement was lost, and the negative marker was reanalysed as merging directly in Fin. Under adjacency, the complementiser of the subordinate clause could be reanalysed as occupying the higher Fin, too. Once the lower Fin was identified with the higher Fin through the reanalysis of that, the lower verb could target the higher Fin, now reanalysed as the Fin head of the same clause, as well. Once verb movement was possible, V2, that is, occupying SpecFinP became possible as well.

(15) a. [ForceP OPexc [FinP ni=suari, .. [VP tij [CP that [TP .. ]]]]] →
 b. [ForceP OPexc [FinP ni(+si)=that [MoodPinr W [MoodPinr MoodPirrealis [VP V ]]]] →
 c. [ForceP OPexc [FinP XPj [Fin’ en=Vij [MoodPinr tij [tij tij ]]]]

Thank you Josef for introducing me to syntax, to negation, and for helping me in every possible way to start a career in linguistics. It is thanks to you that I am still able today to enjoy puzzling over things like MLG exceptives, and am even paid to do it. Happy birthday, and many happy returns.
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