

# Three Types of Negation: A Case Study in Bavarian\*

Helmut Weiß

*University of Regensburg*

## 1 ■ INTRODUCTION

One of the few linguistic phenomena which seems to be universal in a very straightforward sense is negation: all human languages have means to overtly “deny the truth of a proposition” (Dahl 1993: 914). So not surprisingly, negation is one of the topics which have attracted much interest in recent linguistics from various perspectives. The semantics and syntax of sentence negation and especially the phenomenon called negative concord has been widely studied in the nineties (cf. Acquaviva 1994; Brown 1999; Haegeman 1995; Haegeman & Zanuttini 1991; Ladusaw 1992, 1994; Progovac, 1994; Ouhalla 1997; van der Wouden 1997; Weiß 1998a, b, 1999; Zanuttini 1997; Zwarts 1996, among many others). Some interest has also been contributed to special cases like presuppositional negation (Vanden Wyngaerd 1999, Zanuttini 1997) or expletive negation (Brown 1999, Espinal 1992). However, what is rather rarely found in literature is a thorough investigation of all three types of non-constituent negation in one and the same language which could probably shed more light on the complex syntax-semantics interface behaviour of negation in natural languages. The following paper is a first attempt to do so for Bavarian.<sup>1</sup>

My goal here is to present and investigate some data showing that there are three types of non-constituent negation in Bavarian which do not only differ semantically but syntactically as well (which does not seem to be the case in all languages, see section VI). The two types of (non-expletive) clausal negation differ

---

\* I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments. Special thanks to Janna Zimmermann and John Loutzenhiser for checking and improving my English.

in their syntactic position: negation 1 - as predicate negation it constitutes the unmarked case of sentence negation - immediately dominates VP, whereas negation 2 is located higher in the sentence structure.<sup>2</sup> There are some further differences, for instance that only Neg 1 induces negative concord, but not Neg 2, as the contrast between (1a) and (1b) shows: in the scope of Neg 1, weak indefinites have to appear as negative indefinites, but not so when in the scope of Neg 2, where they are licensed without being inherently negated. Thus in (1b) the Bavarian indefinite pronoun *ebba* corresponding to German *jemand* or English *someone* can occur within the scope of Neg 2 without forcing ungrammaticality or being interpreted as specific. This lack of specificity is an interesting point which will be discussed below.

- (1) a    *daß'ma koana ned furtgehd*  
           *that-me nobody not away-goes*  
       b    *damid ned ebba aaf dumme Gedankn kimmd*  
           *that not somebody on stupid ideas comes*

Both types of clausal negations contribute negative force to sentence meaning, putting them in clear contrast to expletive negation which contributes no negative meaning despite the presence of the negative particle. Expletive negation occurs, e.g., in questions (2a) or in *before*-sentences (2b).

- (2) a    *hamd's ned olle vo uns gsogd?*  
           *have-it not all of us said*  
       b    *bevorsd ned aaframs, dearfsd ned Fernsehschaun*  
           *before-2SG not tidy-up, may not TV-watch*

These different kinds of negation will be explored in more detail in the sections III, IV and V.

---

<sup>2</sup> As for the syntax of Bavarian in general, the reader is referred to Weiß (1998a).

First of all, I will briefly outline some theoretical and empirical assumptions which the following remarks on the three types of negation are based upon. Generally, in my account of negation, there are two fundamental assumptions regarding its syntactic and semantic nature. First, in accordance with the Neg-criterion (Haegeman 1995) or the NegP hypothesis (Ouhalla 1997), I assume that sentence negation corresponds to a functional projection of its own, the so-called negation phrase. In the case of Bavarian I further assume that it is Neg<sup>o</sup> rather than the Specifier of NegP which hosts the negative particle *ned* 'not', and the complement position is filled by VP in the unmarked case. Hence, a Bavarian sentence like the one in (3) has a simplified structure as indicated (cf. Weiß 1998a, b, 1999, 2002b):

- (3) S'Maral<sub>i</sub> woid an Hans<sub>j</sub> [<sub>NegP</sub> [<sub>Neg'</sub> ned [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub> hairadn]]]  
*the Mary wanted the John not marry*

Grewendorf (1990) or Ouhalla (1997) have proposed that the German negative particle *nicht* occupies the specifier of NegP, because it does not prevent the verb from moving to C<sup>o</sup> in main clauses, as is the case, for instance, in English, where verb-movement is blocked. This can be accounted for, if one assumes that *not* fills the Neg<sup>o</sup>-position and therefore it can block verb-movement due to the Head Movement Constraint. Though Bavarian *ned* also does not show any blocking effect, I nevertheless hold the Neg<sup>o</sup> analysis to be the correct one. The main reason for this is that the Neg<sup>o</sup> status of *ned* fits better into accounts of negative concord which rely on specifier head agreement, and I simply think that this mechanism could not be dispensed with in whatever special account one favours in the end. I will return to this issue below.

Second, I assume that negation is an ordinary quantifier and not just a propositional operator as logic treats it. Like Krifka (1989), Aquaviva (1994) and many others, I take the *event*-variable as being bound by the negative quantifier (cf. Weiß 2002a, b).<sup>3</sup> Thus, natural language negation consists - like any other quantifier

---

<sup>3</sup> Throughout this paper, I use the term *event* in its broadest sense, that is synonymous with Bach's (1986) *eventuality* which comprises states, processes, and events.

- of three parts: quantifier, restriction and scopal domain. Take, for example, a sentence like the one in (4a) and its paraphrase in (4b) - the example is taken from Beghelli (1997) -, which could be transformed into a semantic form like (4c): here the Neg quantifier binds the *event*-variable in its restriction and scopes over the predicate.

- (4) a John didn't come  
 b 'there is no event of coming of which John was the agent'  
 c Neg(x) [event (x)] [come (J,x)]

On this account, negation is much like quantificational adverbs, which, e.g. in Chierchia's (1995) analysis, also quantify over events. So a sentence containing the frequency adverb *often* - such as (5a) - is analysable in exactly the same way as was the sentence (4a): the only difference is that this time it is the adverb which binds the *event*-variable in its restriction. But both semantic forms (4c) and (5c) share the same tripartite structure.

- (5) a John often drinks beer  
 b 'there is often an event of drinking beer of which John is the agent'  
 b often(x) [event (x)] y [beer(y) drink(J,y,x)]

### 3 ▪ NEG P1

#### 3.1 ▪ *Structural considerations*

Now let's return to negation in Bavarian and begin with the lower negation phrase NegP1. As said above, this is the unmarked case of clausal negation. In example (6a), we can see some of its fundamental characteristics. Given that Bavarian is a SOV language (as realized in non-root sentences), then NegP1 follows subject and object but precedes the verb. Despite the adjacency of negative particle and verb, I think that Bavarian is basically a NegSOV language because the VP containing the

verb and its arguments is as a whole the complement of NegP1. The correct structural analysis is thus something like (6b), where it is assumed that subject and object have left their VP-internal base position and moved to the left of negation.

- (6) a daß s'Maral an Hans ned hairadd  
       *that the Mary the John not marry*  
       b daß s'Maral<sub>i</sub> an Hans<sub>j</sub> [<sub>NegP</sub> [<sub>Neg'</sub> ned [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub> hairadd]]]

There are good arguments in favour of this analysis. First the theoretical argument that, if one adopts the NegP hypothesis in the version sketched above, then one is left only with the structural analysis as given in (6b), because NegP cannot take a non-maximal projection as a complement as would be the case with the verb alone. Other possibilities permitted on theoretical grounds are in conflict with empirical data. Assume for the moment that the negative particle *ned* is a clitic which adjoins to the verb either by lowering itself to it or by attracting the verb which raises to Neg°. The two possibilities are given in (7a) and (7b), where the latter is the somewhat simplified and modified structure which Haegeman (1998a) has developed for West Flemish negated sentences. Under both assumptions the negative particle would have to adjoin to the finite verb which is indeed the case in WF, but not in Bavarian where it is separated from the finite verb by the participle.

- (7) a daß [<sub>NegP</sub> [<sub>Neg'</sub> t<sub>i</sub>[<sub>VP</sub> s'Maral an Hans ned<sub>i</sub> hairadn woid]]]  
       b daß s'Maral<sub>i</sub> an Hans<sub>j</sub> [<sub>NegP</sub> [<sub>Neg'</sub> ned [<sub>hairadn woid</sub>]<sub>k</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub> t<sub>k</sub>]]]]]

Furthermore, there are some cases in which the adjacency of negation and verb is dispensed with. This is the case with argumental PPs (8a), r-pronouns (8b), and non-referring definite NPs (8c) which can intervene between negation and verb. With a clitic approach this should not be possible. However, the grammaticality of the sentences in (8) follows from the NegP hypothesis adopted here where intervening material poses no problems.

- (8) a ea mog ned in d'Schui geh  
       *he wants not in the-school go*

- b i han ned dran dengd  
*I have not there-on thought*
- c damois hod koana ned de Meglichkeid ghobt/kriagd  
*then have noone not the possibility had/got*

What many people find problematic in this account is that it relies on the notion of ‘obligatory scrambling’ (e.g., Grewendorf 1990), because, for instance, referring definite NPs must leave VP, as can be seen in (6a) above where both subject and object have to scramble out of VP. But I think there is a way to explain this strange behaviour. I will return to this issue below.

### 3.2 ▪ *Negative Concord (NC)*

There is another strange thing associated with NegP1. Consider the contrast between (9) and (10). To negate a sentence in Bavarian or German it normally suffices to add the negative particle. (9b) differs from (9a) in just this respect and is thus the negated version of (9a). The surprising point is that the insertion of the negative particle alone is insufficient in the case that the positive sentence contains a weak indefinite pronoun. As (10b) shows, in addition to this, the indefinite must be inherently negated. So besides the insertion of the negative particle in (10b), *neamd* ‘nobody’ has replaced *ebba* ‘somebody’.

- (9) a Otto hat gestern angerufen  
*Otto has yesterday called*
- b Otto hat gestern nicht angerufen  
*Otto has yesterday not called*
  
- (10) a Gesdan hod ebba angrufa  
*yesterday has somebody called*
- b Gesdan hod neamd ned angrufa  
*yesterday has nobody not called*

This phenomenon is called negative concord (NC): multiple occurrences of items overtly marked for negativity do not cancel each other, but form a single

negation. Logically speaking this does not make much sense. According to the law of double negation, patterns attested for standard English or German where only one item expresses negation - see (11a, b) - could be expected.

- (11) a nobody came  
b niemand kam

However, typological research has shown that this pattern does not occur very frequently in natural languages: it is mainly restricted to some standard languages (Haspelmath 1997, Weiß 2002a). Furthermore, there is good evidence that its development had to do with language external factors such as modelling languages after Latin grammar or logical considerations in the course of standardization (Weiß 2001a). So we can suppose that the pattern found in the standard varieties of English and German is an artificial phenomenon.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, negative concord constructions seem to be what some natural languages do in order to negate a sentence containing a weak indefinite.

The crucial question to ask w.r.t. negative concord constructions is why weak indefinites have to be inherently negated. I admit that this does not imply the

---

<sup>4</sup> Besides typological and diachronic facts (as mentioned in the main text), there is a vast amount of empirical evidence that the incompatibility of n-indefinites and clausal negation in the standard variants of German, English, or Dutch is, to say the least, exceptional. Particularly striking is the fact, that all dialects of these Standard languages have NC (Weiß 2002b). Furthermore, even n-indefinites in these standard variants do not allways have a negative meaning, as can be seen in cases of VP-ellipsis such as (i). Given that the elided VP must be identical with an antecedent VP (in order to be recoverable), an appropriate antecedent VP for the elided one – [VP e] – would be [*einen Fisch mag*], that is, we must analyse *keinen Fisch* in the first conjunct as being under negation and VP-internal – what follows without any stipulation from the account of NC given here, and reveals Standard German to be a hidden NC language.

- (i) weil Peter keinen Fisch mag, und Hannah auch nicht [VP e]  
because Peter no fish likes, and Hannah also not

More arguments for analysing Standard German (English, etc) as hidden NC languages are given in Weiß (2002b).

usual approach to NC constructions. Negative indefinites are often treated as negated quantifiers which take sentential scope. My account of NC is based on the fact that their semantic import corresponds to that of non-negated existentials in positive sentences. To see this, let's consider examples (12a, b). The most appropriate paraphrases would be something like (13a, b).

- (12) a Gesdan han'e ebban gseng  
*yesterday have-I somebody seen*  
b Gesdan han'e neamd ned gseng  
*yesterday have-I nobody not seen*

- (13) a it was the case that yesterday I saw somebody  
b it was not the case that yesterday I saw anybody

The semantics of negative indefinites does not involve any negative meaning despite their negative morphology. It seems that they are weak indefinites in the sense of Discourse Representation Theory (in short: DRT), which introduces restricted variables which get bound by existential closure. Before explaining this in greater detail, let me show some further support for this hypothesis coming from cross-linguistic research (Weiß 2002a).

Though it might sound rather odd, it is nevertheless the case that most languages in the world do not possess words like *nobody* or *nothing* and yet they can express that 'yesterday I have seen nobody'. One of these 'strange' languages is Malayalam, a Dravidian language spoken in South India (cf. Hany Babu 2000).<sup>5</sup> In Malayalam, indefinites are made up of an interrogative stem and three suffixal 'indefinite markers'. Consider first example (14), a positive sentence, where an indefinite occurs consisting of the wh-word *aar-* meaning 'who', a case marker, and the suffix *-oo*. Now consider the negated version in (15): though Malayalam

---

<sup>5</sup> Very special thanks to Hany Babu for supplying me with data from Malayalam and discussing them with me.

lacks n-indefinites, it has special forms for indefinites within the scope of clausal negation: they are suffixed with *-um*.

(14) innale naan aar-e-oo kantu  
*yesterday I who-ACC-oo saw*  
 ‘Yesterday I saw someone’

(15) innale naan aar-e-um kantilla  
*yesterday I who-ACC-um saw-not*  
 ‘Yesterday, I did not see anybody’

The crucial point is now that (15) can be adequately paraphrased with (13b) above, just as (12b). Though (12b) and (15) differ from each other in that the former contains a negative indefinite and the latter does not, their semantics are identical and do not reflect the difference in morphology at all. A rather straightforward explanation for this comes from the quantifier approach to negation introduced in section 2: there I proposed that negation consists of three parts as can be seen in the formula given in (16a). Applying it to both (12b) and (15), the result is something like (16b): In each case the neg quantifier binds the *event*-variable in its restriction and the variable introduced by the indefinite is bound by existential closure in the scope of negation.

(16) a Neg(x) [event (x)] [\_\_\_\_\_]  
 b Neg(x) [event (x)] y [person (y) see (I, y,x)]

This analysis immediately follows from the syntactic assumptions made above and some additional semantic assumptions. As is standard within DRT style semantics, weak indefinites of the *somebody-anybody*-kind are taken to just introduce restricted variables which get bound by an existential quantifier, a default mechanism called existential closure. The syntactic domain of existential closure is the VP, which also establishes the scope of negation in negated sentences. The two strange properties of NegP1, namely obligatory scrambling and negative concord, follow from this scenario.

Consider first obligatory scrambling: according to DRT assumptions à la Diesing (1992) and others, definite NPs must leave VP in order to escape existential closure since they do not introduce new discourse referents. Thus the observed movement to the left of negation has nothing to do with negation proper, but is independent from it. If the notion of obligatory scrambling is problematic - and I think it is -, it is not w.r.t. negation alone. It is hard to imagine that avoidance of existential closure could trigger syntactic movement, at least if one tries to stick within the lines of the MP where movement is taken to be semantically myopic (Hornstein 1995: 69). Due to lack of space I cannot go into details, but I would like to offer a proposal which keeps within the lines of the MP. Note that NPs/DPs which can stay within VP - be they indefinites which get existentially closed or predicative nominals - have in common that they are non-referential and not presupposed, whereas all others which have to leave VP are either referential as definite DPs or at least presupposed as strong quantifiers.<sup>6</sup> One could assume that referentiality and/or presupposition is associated with, say, the D-feature and that this is a feature which has to be checked away before Spell-Out. Under this conception, the trigger for movement is the need for feature checking and leaving the domain of existential closure is a pure, but welcome side-effect. What is called obligatory scrambling out of VP could thus be reduced to A-movement to the appropriate AGR-projections and it is no kind of movement of its own (in analogy to Hornstein's (1995) dispensing with quantifier raising). For further arguments see Weiß (2001b).

The term scrambling should be restricted to optional movements which result in somehow marked constructions. This can be seen in the contrast between (17) and (18) or (19), respectively. Scrambling, e.g. inverting indirect and direct

---

<sup>6</sup> One of the reviewers objects that in Dutch definites can stay in VP if they are not presupposed, i.e. discourse new or contrastive. This is roughly the same in German (and Bavarian). However, such cases are marked constructions, requiring, e.g., contrastive accent. In Weiß (2001b), I have tried to give arguments for not considering marked and unmarked constructions on par with each other. The proposed distribution of definite and indefinite DPs holds only for unmarked constructions (with, e.g., grammatical accent).

object as in (17b vs. a) shows both optionality and markedness. As (18) and (19) demonstrate, VP-escape of definite NPs is neither optional nor marked, irrespective of whether it is the indirect or the direct object which has to leave VP.

- (17) a weil er dem Lehrer die neue Sekretärin vorstellte  
*because he the teacher-DAT the new secretary-ACC introduced*  
 b weil er die neue Sekretärin dem Lehrer vorstellte  
*because he the new secretary-ACC the teacher DAT introduced*
- (18) a ??/\*weil er einem Lehrer die neue Sekretärin vorstellte  
*because he a teacher-DAT the new secretary-ACC introduced*  
 b weil er die neue Sekretärin einem Lehrer vorstellte  
*because he the new secretary-ACC a teacher-DAT introduced*
- (19) a weil er dem Lehrer eine neue Sekretärin vorstellte  
*because he the teacher DAT a new secretary-ACC introduced*  
 b ??/\*weil er eine neue Sekretärin dem Lehrer vorstellte  
*because he a new secretary-ACC the teacher DAT introduced*

Now let us consider negative concord. As said above, I assume that negative indefinites are weak indefinites in the sense of DRT, that is, they only introduce variables which get existentially closed. I hold indefinites generally to be semantically decomposable into three parts: a quantifier - in most cases delivered by the default mechanism of existential closure -, the restricted variable and an additional feature depending on the context in which they appear. This additional feature could be, e.g., [+/-Spec], [+wh] or [+Neg], as is shown in table 1 (taken from Weiß 2002a, b):

▪ TABLE 1

	FEATURE	QUANTIFIER	RESTRICTION
<i>Jemand</i> 'someone'	[ Spec] etc.		person (x)
<i>Wer</i> 'who'	[+wh]		person (x)
<i>Niemand</i> 'nobody'	[+Neg]		person (x)

The Neg-feature of negative indefinites is licensed by negation, but the variable is bound by existential closure, so licensing and binding have to be distinguished. Semantically, the negative morpheme is – intuitively speaking – an inclusion marker, just as the Malayalam suffix *-um* which means ‘also, even’: both indicate that the indefinite has to be interpreted in the scope of negation (Weiß 2002a). This approach differs from existing analyses in some respects (Weiß 2002a, b): for instance, SpecNegP is only a checking, but not a scope position (in contrast to Haegeman 1995 and others), it does not establish the restriction of the negative operator (as in Ladusaw’s 1992, 1994 account), and the variable introduced by n-indefinites is not bound by the negative operator (as proposed by Acquaviva 1994).

Syntactically, the Neg-feature can be thought of as an uninterpretable formal feature in the sense of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995). Therefore, n-indefinites have to move to SpecNegP, either overtly as in Bavarian or covertly as in Romance languages, in order to get their Neg-feature checked away, cf. (20a vs. b).

- (20) a    *i han neamd ned gseng*  
           *I have nobody not seen*  
       b    *non ho visto nessuno*

There are at least two ways to explain this overt-covert difference. The standard minimalist approach would be to resort to feature strength: the Neg-feature in Bavarian n-indefinites is strong, thus requiring it to be checked before Spell-Out, whereas it is weak in Romance, therefore permitting it to be checked after Spell-Out.

Another way would be to apply Chomsky's (1999) concept of *derivation by phase* in which feature strength is not needed any longer. Suppose for the moment that checking of the Neg feature need not take place before Spell Out in general, as indicated by Italian. The question to be answered is what forces n-indefinites in Bavarian to move before Spell Out if not feature strength. One major difference of Bavarian and Italian is that Bavarian is an OV language which in the case of presence of sentence negation would yield the order Neg > O > V (for ease of argumentation, I omit subjects in what follows).<sup>7</sup> Recall now that semantically I have conceived negation as an operator binding the *event*-variable, which is located in or associated with V°, and that binding means syntactically c-commanded by an appropriate antecedent, whereby the usual conditions like the minimal link condition (MLC, cf. Chomsky 1995) must be obeyed. This amounts to Neg° binding V°. Now consider what happens when the negated indefinite object stays in place as in (21): here the Neg-operator c-commands and thus binds the object yielding a 'logical' double negation reading (i.e. both negations cancel each other).

- (21)        wai'a ned mit nix zfriem is  
               *because-he not with nothing content is*  
               'because he is not content with nothing'

This reading follows immediately from the analysis of negation as a variable binding operator in the assumed syntactic framework. But pre-Spell-Out movement of negative indefinites cannot be forced by this semantic reason, since movement is "semantically myopic" (Hornstein 1995: 69), as said above. However,

---

<sup>7</sup> As one of the reviewers rightly objects, the proposed explanation cannot be maintained in a Kaynian style syntax which held all languages to be underlyingly SVO (for arguments in favour of SOV-languages being SVO-languages cf. Haegeman 1998b). According to this theory, the OV-order in languages like Bavarian can be derived through object raising to the specifier of the Agreement Object Phrase. In Weiß (2001b), I have tried to show that existentially interpreted indefinite DPs stay in their VP-internal base position in Bavarian – what the same reviewer claims to be roughly the case in Dutch, too. However, then the Kaynian SVO-analysis cannot be correct, since it predicts a VO-order in those cases, contrary to the facts!

there is a way to derive the (c)overt difference: The crucial difference w.r.t. the structural position of NegP is that it is above TP in Italian-type languages (Zanuttini 1997), but below it in Bavarian-type languages (Weiß 1999).<sup>8</sup> So it seems that NegP belongs to different *phases* (in the sense of Chomsky 1999) in both language types: in Bavarian NegP is the *edge* of VP so that Neg<sup>o</sup> has access to items inside VP and can attract them, whereas this is not possible in Italian (cf. the relevant definitions in Chomsky 1999: 9-11). Note if one of the two analyses is the correct one, it would reveal a further optimal solution in the minimalist sense: the computational system, though semantically (and/or functionally) “dumb” (Martin 1999) and “myopic” (Hornstein 1995), derives structures which optimally correspond to some semantic requirements of certain lexical items it could not know of.

#### 4 ▪ NEG P2

Now let us turn to NegP2, which differs from NegP1 in that it is located higher in the clause structure. Whereas NegP1 rests between VP and the layer of functional projections which for convenience I will call IP, as was formerly common (22a), NegP2 dominates IP, as can be seen in (22b):

- (22) a [IP [NegP [Neg' ned [VP ]]]]  
 b [NegP [Neg' ned [IP [VP ]]]]

Resulting from the distinct positioning there are some differences in the syntax of both NegPs. First, the most obvious one is that NegP2 does not induce

---

<sup>8</sup> As one of the reviewers objects, such a structural difference would be excluded under the Universal Base Hypothesis. However, as far as I know, it is standard assumption in the literature on the syntax of negation that languages may differ with respect to the position of NegP. E.g., Rivero (1991) distinguishes – within the Slavic languages – between languages where NegP takes TP as complement and languages where NegP is the complement of TP.

NC, as already mentioned at the beginning of the paper. Consider the examples in (23) where the weak indefinites do not appear in inherently negated forms as was the case with NegP1.

- (23) a    *damid ned irgendwo ebba aaf dumme Gedankn kimmd*  
          *that not somewhere somebody on stupid ideas comes*  
      b    *damid ned a Linka d'Wäu gwind* (adapted from Grewendorf 1990)  
          *that not a left the election wins*

Note that this does not follow from distinct scopal behaviour since the indefinites in (23) are also within the scope of negation, syntactically as well as semantically. Otherwise they would get a specific interpretation as in (24a) where a certain somebody is meant who did not come. Regarding specificity or scope taking, the indefinites in (23) do not behave differently from n-indefinites. However, this does not mean that there is no semantic difference at all: for instance, the numeral *oana* 'one' can replace the indefinite *ebba* 'someone' without yielding a different meaning, cf. (24b) vs. (23a), thus indicating deviation from the 'normal' weak interpretation of the latter in (23a).

- (24) a    *Ebba is ned kema*  
          *somebody is not come*  
      b    *damid ned oana aaf dumme Gedankn kimmd*  
          *that not one on stupid ideas comes*

A second difference is that NegP2 precedes definite DPs, as can be seen in (25a). Note that it is not necessary to interpret the definite object as discourse new or contrastive in (25a) so it cannot be VP-intern (see footnote 6) and thus this NegP cannot be identical with NegP1 because it must be higher in the sentence structure. An important exception to the above generalization seem to be topics as in (25b) which precede NegP2. This can be accounted for if we assume a topic phrase which is above NegP2 and above the position of sentential adverbs (cf. Frey 2000), as illustrated by sentence (25c).

- (25) a    *damid'ma ned da Mare iban Weg laaffan*  
           *that-we not the Mary over the way run*
- b    *damid da Sepp ja ned an Fusel kaafd*  
           *that the Joe Prt not a rotgut buys*
- c    *da Sepp hod laida ned sei Schwesda mitbrood*  
           *the Joe has unfortunately not his sister with-brought*

A third difference comes from strong quantifiers and determiners which follow NegP2, as in (26a, b) where it even appears to be possible that negation scopes over all quantifiers present, and does not have narrow scope over only the first quantifier, thus showing not to be a constituent negation. For a Beghelli-Stowell style clause structure (Beghelli 1997, Beghelli & Stowell 1997) this would imply that NegP2 is above the functional phrases proposed as landing-sites for these quantifiers.

- (26) a    *ma ka laida ned owai oin ois rechd mocha*  
           *one can unfortunately not always all all right make*
- b    *wai leida ned a jeda ois vostandn hod*  
           *because unfortunately not an everyone all understood has*

A fourth difference concerns lower adverbs. Take as example the temporal adverb *schon* 'already' which divides the IP and VP domains, as the definite-indefinite test in (27) reveals since it precedes indefinites but follows definites. (28a) shows that NegP2 precedes *schon*.<sup>9</sup> The contrast to (28b) reveals furthermore that

---

<sup>9</sup> As (i) shows, (28a) cannot be interpreted as constituent negation, as one of the reviewers suggests. The only possible form of giving an alternative is (ii), showing that the subject plus the predicate constitute the scope of negation.

- (i)    *daß ja ned da Beda schō gejd, \*/??sondan da Hans*  
           *that Prt not the Peter already goes but the John*
- (ii)   *daß ja ned da Beda schō gejd, oba da Hans kann schō ge*  
           *that Prt not the Peter already goes but the John can already go*

some semantic difference between negating a sentence via NegP1 and via NegP2 must exist, since the former does not tolerate *schon*, whereas the latter does.<sup>10</sup> In presence of NegP1 only the adverb *noch* 'still' is permitted, as can be seen in (28c).

- (27) a Hosd an Hans schō troffa  
*Have-you the John already met*  
 b Hosd schō an Bekandn (\*schō) troffa  
*Have-you already an acquaintance met*
- (28) a daß ja ned da Beda schō gejd  
*that Prt not the Peter already goes*  
 b daß da Beda schō (\*ned) kema is  
*that the Peter already not come is*  
 c daß da Beda nō ned kema is  
*that the Peter still not come is*

To summarize the discussion so far, one can propose that the two negation phrases are inserted in the clausal structure as indicated in (29) where irrelevant aspects as, for instance, the position of particles, are omitted.

---

<sup>10</sup> One of the reviewers rightly observes that *schon* is possible with NegP1 in (i) to which can be added (ii). In such cases, *schon* is licensed by an additional item, *mehr* in (i) and the repetitive adverb in (ii). Therefore, it may be that the claim made in the main text should be modified, as the reviewer suggests. However, the fact that NegP1 alone cannot license *schon*, whereas NegP2 can, still holds.

- (i) weil der Peter schon nicht mehr da war  
 because the Peter already not more there was  
 (ii) weil der Peter schon wieder nicht da war  
 because the Peter already again not there was

(29) [CP [TopP [S-Adv [NegP2 [IP [VP-Adv [NegP1 [VP ...]]]]]]]]]

This structural difference parallels with the fact that both NegPs obviously do not import the same kind of negativity into the sentence meaning, as shortly mentioned above w.r.t. (24b) and (28). Consider the following contrast: though the grammaticality of both (30a) and (30b) may suggest a kind of semantic equivalence of NegP1 and NegP2, the fact that (30c) - a root sentence with NegP1 - does not allow a parallel construction with NegP2 reveals a fundamental difference in meaning.

- (30) a damid da Sepp ja ned an Fusel kaafd  
*that the Joe Prt not a rotgut buys*  
b damid da Sepp ja koan Fusel ned kaafd  
*that the Joe Prt no rotgut not buys*  
c da Sepp hod koan Fusel ned kaafd  
*the Joe has no rotgut not bought*  
d \*da Sepp hod ned an Fusel kaafd  
*the Joe Prt not a rotgut bought*

In accordance with existing literature on other languages (cf. vanden Wyngard 1999, Zanuttini 1997), I will assume without further discussion that NegP2 is some kind of presuppositional negation in Bavarian as well. Since investigating the semantics of NegP2 in an appropriate manner is outside the scope of the present paper and deserves much further research, I will confine myself to mentioning just three points. First, NegP2 mainly occurs in embedded sentences. Second, it is not excluded from root sentences in general, as can be seen from (25c) above. Third, there seems to exist a relation between speaker-oriented adverbs at least of the evaluative type (cf. Cinque 1999) and NegP2, because the presence of the former increases the compatibility of NegP2 and root sentences, as the contrast between (31a) and (31b) clearly shows.<sup>11</sup> Especially this last point is strong

---

<sup>11</sup> Note that (31b) is fine when interpreted as contrast negation.

evidence for NegP2 negating certain presuppositions on the speaker- or hearer-side.

- (31) a da Sepp hod laida/ godsaidank ned sei Schwesda mitbrood  
*the Joe has unfortunately/thank-god not his sister with-brought*  
b \*da Sepp hod ned sei Schwesda mitbrood  
*the Joe has unfortunately not his sister with-brought*

Despite the structural and semantic differences discussed above, there is one fundamental property which they have in common: both NegPs can license negative polarity items (NPI) like *brauchen* 'need' as seen in (32). This is what could be expected since both have negative force.

- (32) a wai da Sepp ned sei Muadda um Erlaubnis frong brauchd [NegP2]  
*because the Joe not his mother for permission ask need*  
b wai koana ned kema brauchd [NegP1]  
*because noone not come need*

## 5 ■ NEG P3

Besides the two kinds of negation discussed so far there is a third whose main property is that it does not contribute any negative force to sentence meaning. This class of expletive or pleonastic negation presumably comprises several distinct kinds which, for example, occur in questions like (33a) or under certain conjunctions like German *bevor*, *solange*, *bis* (33b). I will restrict myself to expletive negation occurring in questions, leaving aside the type of negation found in (33b) (as Brown 1999 does for Russian, too).

- (33) a hamd's ned olle vo uns gsogd?  
*have-it not all of us said*  
b bevorsd/ solangsd/ bisd ned aaframs, dearfsd ned Fernsehschaun  
*before/as long/until-2SG not tidy-up, may not TV-look*

It is known that in many languages as diverse as Chinese and Italian, negation can function as a question marker. Consider the example of Chinese (cf. Zanuttini 1997): there, yes-no questions are formed either by addition of the question particle *ma* (34a) or the negative particle *meiyou* (34b), both in sentence final position. As (34c) shows, both cannot co-occur.

- (34) a Ta lai-le *ma*?  
       *he come-perf. y/n*  
       b Hufei qu-le *meiyou*?  
       *H. go-perf. neg*  
       c \*Zhangsan lai-le *meiyou ma*?

There is a similar question marker in Bavarian: the clitic particle (*a*)*n* corresponding to German *denn*. This particle occurs in yes-no questions (35a) as well as in wh-questions (35b), where it appears to be obligatory (at least in cases where the wh-item is not stressed as in 35c).

- (35) a Gesd'(an) schō ins Bedd?  
       *Go-you-Prt already in-the bed*  
       b Wos hosd'\*(n) gsogd  
       *what have-you-Prt said*  
       c WOS hosd gsogd

However, the distribution of question marker and expletive negation in Bavarian is rather different from Chinese. In yes-no questions it seems to be the case that true questions containing a negative particle can only be interpreted as negated questions, that is with non-expletive negation. This means that the negated question in (36a) does not have the same meaning as the non-negated one in (36b), which can be seen, for instance, from the fact that the positive answers to each question differ in their response particle (36c, d).<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> English possesses no real equivalent to the response particle *doch* which introduces positive

- (36) a Hosd'n'an ned gseng?  
*have(-you)-him-Prt seen*
- b Hosd'n gseng?
- c Doch, i hob'n gseng  
*yes, I have-him seen*
- d Ja, i hob'n gseng  
*yes, I have-him seen*

Sometimes it is maintained that “in questions, negation is neutralized [...]: *Can you hear nothing?* and *Can you hear anything?* have identical truth conditions” (Haspelmath 1997: 121).<sup>13</sup> As we have seen, this is definitely not the case in Bavarian, and it could easily be shown that it does not hold for other languages either. Take for example SHG and Italian which both exhibit the following illustrating contrast: whereas non-negated questions containing *jemand* ‘someone’ are construable with both *schon* ‘already’ and *noch* ‘still’ (37a, b) in SHG, corresponding negated questions are only compatible with the latter (37c vs. d). (38a, b) and (38c, d) display the same contrast for Italian.<sup>14</sup> This result is totally unexpected if negation would be neutralized in questions per se. Therefore, the neutralizing hypotheses could not be the correct one.

- (37) a ist *schon* jemand gekommen  
*is already someone come*
- b ist *noch* jemand gekommen  
*is still someone come*
- c ist *noch* niemand gekommen  
*is already noone come*

---

answers to negated questions. So French *si* or Norwegian *ju* would be more appropriate translations (cf. Askedal 2000)

<sup>13</sup> See also Bernini & Ramat (1996: 127): „In these [i.e. interrogative] contexts the optional nature of the sentence negation morpheme *non* in Italian, is such that the pronouns *qualcuno/qualcosa* and *nessuno/niente* are functionally equivalent.“

<sup>14</sup> Thanks to Ilaria Cicchetti and Sara Dassatti for supplying me with the Italian data.

d \*ist *schon* niemand gekommen  
*is still noone come*

- (38) a è già arrivato qualcuno  
b è ancora arrivato qualcuno  
c non è ancora arrivato nessuno  
d \*non è già arrivato nessuno

Now let us return to expletive negation which is only permitted in rhetorical questions like the one in (39a) or questions expressing a request like (39b).

- (39) a Hamd's ned olle von uns gwiast  
*have-it not all of us known*  
b Kand ned ebba s'Fensda zumocha?  
*Could not somebody the window shut*

Wh-questions show an identical picture. Whereas true questions do not permit expletive negation, it can occur in wh-exclamative clauses, see (40a, b):

- (40) a Wos hosd'n (\*ned) am Sepp vosprocha?  
*what have-you-Prt not the Joe promised*  
b Wos hod'a eam ned vosprocha!  
*what has-he him not promised*

The incompatibility of expletive negation and true questions may be due to semantic reasons. I take this kind of expletive negation to be a modal particle, as particles like *ja*, *doch*, *denn* and so forth, and for these items it is not unusual to be restricted to certain sentence types. For example, the above mentioned question marker is - trivially - only licensed in questions in Bavarian. Therefore, I will assume that expletive negation occupies the same position as modal particles do.

There is additional empirical evidence for this structural analysis. Putting aside the special case of NC, two occurrences of negation within the same sentence always cancel each other in Bavarian as well. Consider (41a) which simultaneously

contains NegP1 and NegP2: though being far from stylistically well-formed or easy parseable, if it can receive an interpretation at all, it must be one where both negations have a cumulative reading according to the law of double negation. This interpretation sharply contrast with (41b) where the two negations do not cancel each other. (41b) conveys more or less the same question as (41c) where the expletive negation is replaced by the adverb *wirkle* 'really'. So we have strong evidence for the expletiveness of 'modal' negation as well as for that it does not occupy the same position as NegP2.

- (41) a Da Sepp hod laida ned sein Buam ned enterbt  
*the Joe has unfortunately not his son not disinherited*
- b Hamd's ned olle von uns ned gwiast  
*have-it not all of us not known*
- c Hamd's wirkle olle von uns ned gwiast  
*have-it really all of us not known*

However, things are not that straightforward. There is contrary evidence as well. Given the diagnostics of response particles, expletive negation must convey some kind of negativity, since a rhetorical question like (39a), here repeated as (42a), requires a positive answer introduced by the particle *doch* (cf. 42b) which usually introduces positive answers to *negated* questions (see above). Thus, a somewhat paradoxical situation in Bavarian seems to exist: there is simultaneously strong empirical evidence for both the presence and absence of negativity in questions with expletive negation.

- (42) a Hamd's ned olle von uns gwiast  
*have-it not all of us known*
- b Doch, olle hamd's gwiast  
*Yes, all have-it known*

However, this situation seems not to be unique to Bavarian since a similar situation holds in Russian as well: whereas sentential negation can license both

genitive of negation and inherently negated indefinites, expletive negation can only license the latter, but not the former (Brown 1999).

Putting the problem of negativity aside for further research, one can assume a final sentence structure like (43), where expletive negation generates in the particle position.

(43) [CP [Prt [TopP [S-Adv [NegP2 [IP [VP-Adv [NegP1 [VP ...]]]]]]]]]]

## 6 ■ CONCLUSION

To end my paper I will point out the fact that more than one type of clausal negation, for which I have tried to give evidence in Bavarian, can be attested in other languages as well. Take for example English: Vanden Wyngaerd (1999) refers to the fact that in English it is sometimes possible to have an indefinite NP in the object position of negated sentences without a specific meaning, see (44a) in contrast to (44b) where the indefinite object has the regular NPI *any* as determiner. In his explanation Vanden Wyngaerd resorts to presuppositions which are involved in (44a), but not in (44b): so it is assumed in societies like ours that, if one has a wife, it is no more than one, and that men of a certain age do have a wife. However, “there is no presupposition that the children one has should amount to one, in contrast to the numbers of wives” (Vanden Wyngaerd 1999: 217). He concludes that cases like (44a) can be analyzed as negating this existing presupposition.

- (44) a Sam doesn't have a wife  
b Sam doesn't have any children

Though English possesses semantically different negations, there is no difference on the structural or lexical level. However, this is the case in Italian, as Zanuttini (1997) has shown. In dialects which have two distinct negative markers, one is used as presuppositional negative marker and the other as regular clausal negation. This is, for instance, found in Piedmontese: the particle *pa* is the

presuppositional negative marker which is structurally higher than the regular negative marker *nen*. As we have seen, Bavarian exhibits a third type: Though it does not have lexically distinct negative markers, it has two NegPs from which sentences can be negated. And it strongly appears to be the case that NegP2 is a kind of presuppositional negation, but this issue deserves further research.

▪ BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acquaviva, Paolo (1994). Representation of Operator-Variable Dependencies in Sentential Negation. *Studia Linguistica* 48 (2): 91-132.
- Askedal, John Ole (2000). Mysteries of response particles in Norwegian and German. Toward a comparative study. Talk given at Making Sense, Groningen, November 6-8.
- Bach, Emmon (1986). The Algebra of Events. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9, 5-16.
- Bayer, Josef (1990). What Bavarian Negative Concord Reveals about the Syntactic Structure of German. In *Grammar in Progress. Glow Essays for Henk van Riemsdijk*, ed. J. Mascaró, and M. Nespó, 13-23. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Beghelli, Filippo (1997). The Syntax of Distributivity and Pair-List Readings. In *Ways of Scope Taking*, ed. Anna Szabolcsi, 349-408. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer.
- Beghelli, Filippo, and Tim Stowell (1997). Distributivity and Negation: The Syntax of *each* and *every*. In *Ways of Scope Taking*, ed. Anna Szabolcsi, 71-107. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer.
- Bernini, Giuliano, and Paolo Ramat (1996). Negative Sentences in the Languages of Europe. A Typological Approach. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, Sue (1999). The Syntax of Negation in Russian. A Minimalist Approach. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Chierchia, Gennaro (1995). Dynamics of Meaning. Anaphora, Presupposition, and the Theory of Grammar. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA, and London: The MIT Press.
- (1999). *Derivation by Phase*. MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18. Cambridge, Mass.: MITWPL.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dahl, Östen (1993). Negation. In *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*. 1. Halbband. Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 9.1, ed. Joachim

- Jacobs, Achim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann, 914-923. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Espinal, Maria Teresa (1992). Expletive Negation and Logical Absorption. *The Linguistic Review* 9: 333-358.
- Frey, Werner (2000). A Medial Topic Position in German. Talk given at GGS 2000, Potsdam.
- Grewendorf, Günther (1990). Verb-Bewegung und Negation im Deutschen. *GAGL* 30: 57-125.
- Haegeman, Liliane (1995). *The Syntax of Negation*. Cambridge: University Press.
- (1998a). Verb Movement in Embedded Clauses in West Flemish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29: 631-656.
- (1998b). V-Positions and the Middle Field in West Flemish. *Syntax* 1: 259-299.
- Haegeman, Liliane, and Raffaella Zanuttini (1991). Negative Heads and the Neg Criterion. *The Linguistic Review* 8: 233-251.
- Hany Babu, M. T. (2000). What the Indefinites tell us about Clause Structure: Evidence from Malayalam. Talk given at GGS2000, Potsdam.
- Krifka, Manfred (1989). Nominal Reference, Temporal Constitution, and Quantification in Event Semantics. In *Semantics and Contextual Expressions*, ed. Renate Bartsch et al., 75-115. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Ladusaw, William A. (1992). Expressing Negation. In *SALT II Proceedings from the Second Conference on Semantics and Linguistic Theory Held at the Ohio State University May 1-3, 1992*, ed. Chris Barker and David Dowty, 237-259. The Ohio State University, Ohio.
- (1994). Thetic and Categorical, Stage and Individual, Weak and Strong. In *SALT IV Proceedings Proceedings from the Fourth Conference on Semantics and Linguistic Theory Held at the Cornell University*, ed. Mandy Harvey and Lynn Santelmann, 220-229. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University.
- Martin, Roger (1999). Case, the Extended Projection Principle, and Minimalism. In *Working Minimalism*, ed. Samuel David Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 1-25. Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press.
- Ouhalla, Jamal (1997). The Structure and Logical Form of Negative Sentences. *Linguistic Analysis* 27: 220-244.
- Progovac, Ljiljana (1994). *Negative and Positive Polarity. A Binding Approach*. Cambridge: University Press.

- Rivero, María Luisa (1991). Long Head Movement and Negation: Serbo-Croatian vs. Slovak and Czech. *The Linguistic Review* 8: 319-351.
- Weiß, Helmut (1998a). Syntax des Bairischen. Studien zur Grammatik einer natürlichen Sprache. Tübingen: Niemeyer (Linguistische Arbeiten 391).
- (1998b). Logik und Sprache: der Fall der doppelten Negation im Bairischen. *Linguistische Berichte* 175: 386-413.
- (1999). Duplex negatio non semper affirmat. A Theory of Double Negation in Bavarian. *Linguistics* 37 (5): 819-846.
- (2001a). On Two Types of Natural Languages. Some Consequences for Linguistics. *Theoretical Linguistics* 27: 87-103.
- (2001b). Information structure meets Minimalist syntax. On argument order and case morphology in Bavarian, in: Geert van der Meer, Alice ter Meulen (eds.): *Making Sense: From Lexeme to Discourse*. Center for Language and Cognition, University of Groningen (GAGL 44), pp. 21-34.
- (2002a). Indefinite Pronouns. Morphology and Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective, to appear in: Heike Wiese, Horst Simon (eds.): *Pronouns: Grammar and Representation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins
- (2002b). A Quantifier Approach to Negation. Or Why Negative Concord is Necessary. Ms., University of Regensburg.
- Vanden Wyngaerd, Guido (1999). Positively Polar. *Studia Linguistica* 53: 209-226.
- van der Wouden, Ton (1997). *Negative Contexts. Collocation, Polarity and Multiple Negation*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella (1997). *Negation and Clausal Structure. A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zwarts, Frans (1996). A Hierarchy of Negative Expressions. In *Negation. A Notion in Focus*, ed. Heinrich Wansing, 169-194. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
-