1. The empirical data (i): a first survey

1.1. Bipartite negation and Jespersen’s cycle: introductory remarks

(1) Fr
a. Je (ne) connais pas cet homme. ne... pas
  I NE know not that man
b. Je (n’ai) rien acheté. ne... rien
  I NE have nothing bought
c. Je (n’ai) jamais rien dit à personne. (ne) jamais, rien, personne
  I NE have never nothing said to no one

(2) StD
a. Ik ken die man niet. niet
  I know that man not
b. Ik heb niets gekocht. niets
  I have nothing bought
c. Ik heb nooit iemand iets verteld. nooit iemand iets
  I have never anyone anything tell-PART
  (%Ik heb nooit iemand iets verteld. (*) nooit iemand iets

(3) WF
a. K’(en) kennen dienen vent niet. en... niet
  I EN know that man not
b. k’(en) een niets gekocht. en... niets
  I EN have nothing bought
c. k’(en) een nooit niemand niets verteld. (en) nooit niemand niets
  I EN have never to no one nothing tell-PART

Table 1: survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>StEng</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>WF</th>
<th>Fr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bipartite negation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observe:
en is not a necessary condition for NC; NC is possible in negative clauses in which en is * (see (6e,f) and (18c)).
Table 2. Jespersen’s cycle in English (See also Horn 1989: 455) Jespersen (1917:9-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage I Clitic</th>
<th>Stage II clitic+free morpheme</th>
<th>Stage III free morpheme</th>
<th>Stage I’ free morpheme &gt; clitic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ic ne secge</td>
<td>I ne seye not</td>
<td>I say not</td>
<td>I do not say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old English</td>
<td>Middle English</td>
<td>Early Modern English</td>
<td>Present Day English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completion of transition from Stage II to Stage III: variable:

- **English**: around 1350-1420 (Wallage 2005:195)
- **High German**: by 1300 (Dal 1966: 164; Lockwood 1968:207c.; Jäger 2006:211)
- **Dutch**: 1600 (Burridge 1993:190f)

**BUT:**

1.2. Language contact?

(W)F shows other traces of language contact with French.

(i) Lexicon:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Standard Dutch</th>
<th>West Flemish</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>Fiets</td>
<td>Velo</td>
<td>Vélo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fork</td>
<td>Vork</td>
<td>Fersette</td>
<td>Fourchette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Kop</td>
<td>Tasse</td>
<td>Tasse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrot</td>
<td>Wortel</td>
<td>Karote</td>
<td>Carotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift</td>
<td>Lift</td>
<td>Ascenseur</td>
<td>Ascenseur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move</td>
<td>Bewegen</td>
<td>Bougeren</td>
<td>Bouger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoy</td>
<td>Ergeren</td>
<td>Embeteren</td>
<td>Embêter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However</td>
<td>Echter</td>
<td>Pertank</td>
<td>Pourtant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In god’s name</td>
<td>godverdomme</td>
<td>Nondedju/tedju</td>
<td>Nom de Dieu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(iii) Grammar: e.g. (W)F, like French, retains a productive gender system on Ns, determiners and adjectives.

However, (W)F *en* has acquired specific interpretive values. If language contact may (?) have contributed to the retention of *en*, this has now acquired its own place in the dialect.

2. **The syntax of *en***

2.1. Restrictions on preverbal *en* in (West)Flemish

2.1.1. Finiteness restriction

(4) a. mee dan-k ik dat niet (en) wisten with that-I that not ‘because I didn’t know that’

b. mee ik dat niet te (*en) weten with I that not ‘because I didn’t know that’ to (*EN) know
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c. mee dan-k ik dat niet geweten (en) een
   with that-I I that not known (EN) have
   ‘because I didn’t know that’
d. mee ik dat niet geweten te (*en) een
   with I that not known to (*EN) have
   ‘Don’t walk on the grass!’
e. En loopt niet op het gras!
   (EN) walk not on the grass
   ‘Don’t walk on the grass!’
f. Nie op het gras (*en) lopen!
   (Infinitival imperative) not on the grass (*EN) walk
   ‘Don’t walk on the grass!’
g. Nie (*en) in voorraad.
   Not (*EN) in stock.
h. Nie (*en) beschikbaar.
   Not (*EN) available.

Cf. French:
(5) a. de (ne) pas marcher sur la pelouse.
   de (NE) pas walk on the grass ‘Do not walk on the grass!’
b. Article (ne) pas disponible.
   ‘Article out of stock.’
   Article (NE) pas available

(W)F Infinitival mee clauses are not structurally reduced (contra Haslinger 2006)
(6) a. Mee Valère-ie da nie gekocht te een overt (NOM) subject
   With Valère/he that not bought to have
   ‘Valère doesn’t know that book.’
b. Mee ze Valère-ie nie gekocht te een presubject clitic
   With them Valère/he not bought to have
   ‘that Valère does not know that book’
c. Mee ze Valère verzekerst /spytig genoeg nie gezien te een high modals
   With them Valère probably/sadly enough not seen to have
   ‘Valère probably didn’t even see that book’
d. Mee tet Valère da nie gekocht te een finite high particle
   with tet Valère that not bought to have
   ‘Don’t ever tell anyone.’

(W)F Infinitival clauses are compatible with NC:
(6) e. mee ze niemand nie meer gezien te een NC
   with them no one no more seen to have
   ‘If it doesn’t rain, you should water the flowers.’
f. Dat nooit an niemand nie zeggen!
   that never to noone not say
   ‘Don’t ever tell anyone.’

Clause types
(7) a. Valère (en)-kent dienen boek niet. main declarative
   Valère (EN) knows that book not
   ‘Valère doesn’t know that book.’
b. da Valère dienen boek niet (en)-kent embedded clause
   that Valère that book not (EN).knows
   ‘that Valère does not know that book’
c. Oat nie (en) regent, moe-j de blommen woater geven.
   If –it not (EN) rains, must-you the flowers water give
   ‘If it doesn’t rain, you should water the flowers.’
d. (EN)- ee-j gie doa niemand gezien? yes/no-question
   (EN) have,you you there no one seen
   ‘Did you (really) not see anyone there’ (from Haegeman 2007:fn.3)
2.1. Licensed by clause mate negative constituent with sentential scope

(8)  
a. Ik (*en) kennen dienen coureur.  
I (EN) know that cyclist

b. Ik (en) zeggen niet [dan-k dat (*en) kennen].  
I (EN) say not that-I that (*EN) know

‘I am not saying that I know him.’  
Clausemate condition

c. Z’(*en) eet dat gedoan [vu niets].  
She (*EN) has that done for nothing

‘She did that for free.’  
Neg. Const: not sentential negation

d. o-a-se dat *(niet) (en) eet,  
if she that *(not) (EN) has

‘if she doesn’t have that’  
conditional does not license en

2.1.3. Tense, V position and the distribution of en

V- positions (aux) in Infinitivus pro participio (Hoeksema 1988, van den Wyngaerd 1994, 1996)

(9)  
a. da Valère dienen boek gelezen eet  
that Valère that book read has

b. da Valère dienen boek gewild eet  
that Valère that book wanted has

(10)  
that Valère that book read want-PART has

b. *da Valère gewild [dienen boek lezen]] eet  
that Valère want-PART that book read has

c. da Valère [willen dienen boek lezen]] eet  
that Valère want that book read

IPP

(see below)

‘that Valère has wanted to read that book’

Factors determining the distribution of the auxiliary in IPP patterns:
(i) Finiteness,  
(cf. French: position of verb)
(ii) Tense: past (syntactically marked) vs. present (unmarked),
(iii) Presence of en.

2.1.3.1. Finiteness

(11)  
a. mee Valère te [willen dienen boek lezen] een  
with Valère to want that book read have

b. *mee Valère te een [willen dienen boek lezen ]

c. *mee Valère [willen dienen boek lezen ] te een

d. *IPP te IPP aux *IPP

‘Corpus of Spoken Dutch’: The effect of finiteness is statistically significant in the Flemish variant of Dutch. (Cf. Haegeman & Oosterhof 2012 for a corpus study.)

The IPP cluster does not pattern with the perfect participle: the IPP cluster follows te (11a-c); the
participle precedes *te* (11ef):

(11)  e.  mee Valère dienen boek gelezen te (*gelezen) een (*gelezen)  
       with Valère that book read to have
       f.  PART  te *PART  aux *PART

2.1.3.2. Tense

(12)  a.  *??da  Valère  [willen dienen boek lezen]  out  
       that Valère want that book read  have-PAST
       b.  da  Valère  oa  [willen dienen boek lezen]

‘Corpus of Spoken Dutch’: The effect of past tense-form is statistically significant in Flemish varieties. (Cf. Haegeman & Oosterhof 2012 for a corpus study and for discussion of the Irrealis reading associated with the past tense.)

2.1.3.3. En

(13)  a.  da  Valère  nie  [willen dienen boek lezen]  (*en)-eet  
       That Valère not [want that book read] (*EN) has
       b.  da  Valère  nie  en-e  [willen dienen boek lezen]
       c.  da  Valère  nie  en-oa  [willen dienen boek lezen]

2.2. A first antisymmetric analysis (Haegeman 2000)

(14)  a.  *V_[FIN]  IPP  V_[FIN]
       b.  V_[PRES]  IPP  V_[PRES]
       c.  V_[PAST]  IPP  * V_[PAST]
       d.  en-V_[FIN]  IPP  *en-V

(15)   .  
       Spec  FP
       F’  
       FP  IPP constituent  F’
       F  |  
       F  een_[FIN]  
       een_[PRES]  
       eet_[PRES]  
       * oat_[PAST]
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Haegeman (2000):

- FP1 : TP, FP2= PolP, FP3 : Aspectual projection; (FP3 could be Cinque’s low TP (T anterior)
- asymmetry in V position in WF:
  - en optionally spells out a uninterpretable polarity feature [uPol] in F1;
  - [uPol] is valued by sentential negation;
  - [uT] is valued by Tense;
  - en is a bound morpheme, it is a clitic on V;
  - V only moves to F1 when finite.
  - (since non finite V (lexical or aux) does not move to F1, en is not compatible with non-finite V).
  - En head adjoins to V in T

French : ne in French is not a clitic on (finite) V. (cf. (5))

2.3. Implications for the analysis of V2

The analysis outlined above (based on Haegeman 2000, 2002, 2003) has repercussions for the analysis of V2: if sentence final en+V is in T, the position of the finite verb in V2 sentences must be higher than T, regardless of whether the sentences is subject-initial or not. This is in line with Haegeman (1996) and Van Craenenbroeck and Haegeman and goes against for instance Zwart (1997) or Van Craenenbroeck’s 2011 analysis of Flemish V2.

2.4. Irrealis moest conditionals (See section 6.)

Observe: in spite of en being * in (18), NC remains fully available.
3. The empirical data: usage and frequency

3.1. Questionnaires

Barbiers et al. (2009): questionnaire based material: regional variation: 110 locations in Flanders

Table 4: SAND data on the distribution of en

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main declarative</th>
<th>Embedded declarative</th>
<th>imperative</th>
<th>V initial yes-no question</th>
<th>Maar+yes no question</th>
<th>Wh-question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110 locations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. Completing the data

3.2.1. L. Haegeman’s intuitions (Cf. above)

Table 5. LH’s intuitions on the distribution of en

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main declarative</th>
<th>Embedded declarative</th>
<th>imperative</th>
<th>V initial yes-no question</th>
<th>Maar+yes no question</th>
<th>Wh-question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2. Flemish corpora (1960s) (Breitbarth and Haegeman 2009)

Corpus material:

WF.
(i) Dudzele, 20 April 1964: +/- 6000 words
(ii) Moerkerke, 5 July 1965: +/- 9,500 words

EF
(i) Buggenhout Opstal: 2 transcribed recordings: 45 minutes (De Pauw 1973)
(ii) Gent (Leemans 1966: 186-193)
(iii) Geraardsbergen (Vergauts 1971)

Table 5. distribution of en in Flemish dialects (1960-70)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WF</th>
<th>EF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>en</td>
<td>Dudzele</td>
<td>Moerkerke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+en</td>
<td>Buggenhout1</td>
<td>Buggenhout2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gent</td>
<td>Geraardsbergen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>391</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12,2</td>
<td>10,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Bipartite negation in Middle English (Wallage 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Ne</th>
<th>Ne...not</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1150-1250</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250-1350</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1420</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420-1500</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3 Contemporary attested uses of en

3.2.3.1. WF

(19) Anecdotal evidence: 2007-2012:

a. K woaren al een eure bezig me kerstkoarten te moaken.
   I was already an hour busy with Christmas cards to make
Mo t'\textit{en} ging nie.
But it \textit{EN} went not (MV. Heist dialect, 05.12.07)

b. k'\textit{stungen der 5 meter van.} K'\textit{en} zagen em nog niet.
I stood there 5 meters off. I \textit{EN} saw him not yet
‘I was 5 meters away (from the car) and I still didn’t see it.’ (AH 11.09.2011, 18.00)

Context: on a field, it was dark and the car they had to return to was black.

b. k’\textit{en} al overall gezocht in us
I have already everywhere searched in house
en k’\textit{en} vinden ze nievers.
and I=\textit{EN} find her nowhere
‘I have looked for it everywhere and I don’t find it.’
(MJL, Lapscheure dialect of, 11.06.2008)

c. Of danze neug zovele stappen lyk vroeger,
if that they now still so much walk like before,
k’ en peinzen ’t nie.
I \textit{EN} think it not (Dialect of Lapscheure, MJL, 10.01.10)

d. Zo een laag modder als t’ nie
such a layer mud, if it not
vriest!
freezes
‘Such a layer of mud when it isn't freezing!'
(CM, °1950, origin Ghent: 6.1.10, 10.45)

e. As-t da nie \textit{en} is, wat is’t dan,hé?
If it that not \textit{EN} is, what is it then, hé
(CM, °1950, Origin Ghent, 27.1.2010, 16:07)

data. Hij kan em zelf komen halen
he can him self come get
‘He can come get it himself’
as t den goejen nie \textit{en} is.
if it the good not \textit{EN} is‘if it’s not the right one.’
(CM, °1950, origin: Ghent, 26.05.09)

d. facturen die ingediend zijn maar
invoices that submitted are but
waarvan ze de facturen niet \textit{en} vinden…
of which they the invoices not \textit{EN} find-PL
g. Ze dacht dat ze in Baarle Klooster ging zijn.
She thought that she in Baarle convent would be
Ze komt daar in een omgeving dat ze niet \textbf{en} kent
She comes there in an environment that she not \textbf{en} knows

(Tussentaal MW, 19.08.08, 14.15, speaker of dialect of Erpe Mere)

h. ik zie gewoon dat hij er niet \textbf{en} staat
I see just that he there not \textbf{en} stands

‘All I can say is that I see it’s not on the list’
Newspaper vendor reports that \textit{The Observer} is no listed among the papers which were delivered. Normally \textit{the Observer} is delivered every Sunday and is on the list.
(Newspaper agent, 11.10.11, 10.15)

**Inventory of attested examples:**
Clause type: main (V2) & embedded, including conditional clauses and restrictive relative clauses

verb type: auxiliary: \textit{hebben, zijn}
modal: \textit{moeten, kunnen, mogen, willen}
no epistemic readings so far, cf. section 6.
lexical: \textit{doen (‘do’), eten (‘eat’), gaan (‘go’), (binnen) geraken (‘get (in)’), helpen (‘help’), horen (‘hear’), interesseren (‘interest’),
kennen (‘know’), krijgen (‘get’), peinzen (‘think’), pakken (‘succeed’), af-trekken (‘take off/deduct’), vinden (‘find’),
vriezen (‘freeze’), weten (‘know’), zien (‘see’), zitten (‘sit’)}

particle+verb: \textit{af-trekken, binnengeraken}

V2: Subject initial & non subject initial (22d), predominantly subject-initial.
Subject initial: pronoun (weak & strong), DP (19e), demonstrative, expletive

\textbf{● en} is not truth conditional: does not change the propositional content of the clause: semantically, a negative clause containing \textbf{en} remains a negative clause.

Question: If \textbf{en} is optional and functionally redundant in the dialects
\Rightarrow why does it continue to exist in Flemish dialects?
\Rightarrow Why does \textbf{en} get incorporated in the emerging Flemish regiolect?

4. Revisiting the data (ii): Flemish \textbf{en} is not optional
Based mainly on Breitbarth and Haegeman (2011: HO):

4.1. \textit{En} has expressive content


\textbf{● en} explicitly marks the negative clause as unexpected by selecting its positive counterpart as the most expected state of affairs

(21) A: Geef me nen keer Valère zenen telefoon!
give me once Valère his phone number ‘Give me Valère’s phone number.’

a. B: k(\textbf{en}) een-k ik Valère zenen telefon nie.
I (\textbf{EN}) have -I I Valère his phone not
‘I don’t have Valère's number.’
b. B: k-zeggen jen toch dan k em nie (en)-een. I say you particle that -I him not (EN) have ‘I am telling you I don’t have it.’ (Haegeman 2002:11)

(22) a. [doctor:] ‘Kom gie binnen zes maanden ne keer terug.’ ‘Come back in six month’s time.’
M’en een wunder zelfs geen ofsproake gemoakt. (surprise)
we=EN have we even no appointment made.’ ‘We haven’t even made an appointment.’
(Dialect of Lapscheure, MJL, 15.05.2008)
b. (speaker is offered a sugarfree biscuit with margarine)
K’en eten da niet. Pak da mo were mee! (irritation, defiance)
I=EN eat that not. Pack that PRT again with
K’en moen da nie een, die Becel.
I=EN must that not have, that Becel.
‘I don’t eat that, you can take it back. I really don’t like this Becel.’
(Dialect of Heist, MV, 02.01.08)
c. K’gingen no de viswinkel en j’is gesloten. K stoegen do.
I=went tot he fish shop and it is closed. I was standing there.
K’en an geen vis vu morgen. (irritation)
I=EN had no fish for tomorrow.
(Dialect of Heist, MV, 04.12.07)
d. Goedkoop en is’t nie, maar ge hebt kwaliteit.
Cheap EN is=it not, but you have quality
‘Cheap it is not. But you do get quality.’
(Tussentaal, HDP, Origin Buggenhout, 15.11.07)

• depending on the discourse context, the presence of en may convey additional effects such as surprise, irritation, disappointment, defiance, apology, warning etc. on top of the basic contextual effect of contrast and elimination.

• ⇒optionality in finite negative clauses:
  Yes: in that en can always be deleted without loss of grammaticality
  No: in certain finite contexts en is inappropriate:

(W)Flemish (al)weer ‘again’: (i) repeated action or (ii) (in questions) request for information to be repeated (request for reminder). In its reminder use, weer signals that the information targeted by the wh-phrase is no longer sufficiently salient.

(23) Waarom heb je dat nu weer geweigerd?
why have you that now again refused
Repeated action: ‘Why did you refuse that for a second time?’
Information: ‘Remind me, what was your reason for refusing that?’

In negative questions: en cancels the information-repetition/reminder reading of weer.

(24) a. Waarom heb je dat nu weer niet gedaan?
why have you that now again NEG done
Repeated action: ‘Why did you fail to do this/’not do this’ for a second time?’
Information: ‘Remind me of the reason why you failed to/did not do that.’
b. Waarom en ee-j da nu were nie gedoan?
why EN have you that now again NEG done
Repeated (non)action: ‘Why did you fail to do this for a second time?’

See also section 6 on moest conditional.

4.2 Relevance Theory and the interpretation of en (Breitbarth and Haegeman 2011)

4.2.1. Relevance Theory: a summary

• Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson 1986, Wilson and Sperber 1990; 2006): communicative interactions rest upon an expectation of relevance

• **Principle of Relevance**: every utterance creates with the hearer a presumption of optimal relevance (Wilson and Sperber 1990:45)
  → hearers of an utterance (automatically) seek the most accessible and salient interpretation available.

• new information is **relevant** to a discourse participant if, in a given context, it interacts in a certain way with existing assumptions about the world, through ‘contextual effects’ (Wilson and Sperber 1990:43):
  (i) by combining with the context to yield contextual implications;
  (ii) by strengthening existing assumptions; and
  (iii) by contradicting and eliminating assumptions.

• an utterance is **optimally** relevant if it has the maximal number of contextual effects for the minimal amount of processing effort (Wilson and Sperber 1990:44)

• in Relevance Theory, utterance interpretation involves performing computations over conceptual representations

• concepts vs. procedures (Blakemore 1987):
  **Concepts** are constituents of the conceptual representations, input to inferential computations (leading to contextual effects)
  **Procedures** formulate restrictions on such computations, thereby reducing processing effort hence contributing to the relevance of an utterance

• discourse particles typically encode procedural meaning.

4.2.2. En as a discourse particle

Flemish *en* is a discourse particle and encodes procedural meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The presence of <em>en</em> in an utterance signals the need for the elimination of a salient and possibly preferred or expected positive proposition in the discourse context in favour of its negative counterpart in which <em>en</em> occurs, i.e., it triggers a contextual effect of type (iii).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

• depending on the discourse context, the conflict signalled by *en* may entail additional effects such as surprise, irritation, disappointment, defiance, apology, warning etc. on top of the basic contextual effect of contrast and elimination.

• The incompatibility of *en* with ‘request for reminder’ *weer* (‘again’): A request for a reminder presupposes that the information contained in the utterance IS already available, and therefore in the
case of a negative proposition, the elimination process has already taken place, hence there is no justification for the introduction of the procedural *en*.

### 4.3. A note on presuppositional negation

- some uses of *en* are reminiscent of ‘presuppositional’ negators like Italian *mica*. These negators are pragmatically restricted to (emphatically) negating propositions that are ‘discourse-old’ and ‘contextually activated’ (Cinque 1976, Zanuttini 1997, Schwenter 2005; 2006, Visconti 2009).

Cinque (1976: 314):

... [i]l *mica* aggiunge qualcosa di più specifico. Più che rafforzare la negazione logica, ne amplia le presupposizioni. La mia tesi è che, affincando il *mica* al semplice *non*, il parlante vuol negare una *aspettativa* da parte di qualcuno piuttosto che una *asserzione*. Mica, cioè, ha un contenuto puramente presupposizionale.

[... *mica* adds something more specific. More than reinforcing the logical negation, it amplifies its presuppositions. I hypothesize that by appending *mica* to the simple *non*, the speaker wishes to negate an *expectation* on the side of someone rather than an *assertion*. That is, *mica* has a purely presuppositional content.]

(25) a. A. Chi viene a prenderti?
   ‘Who’s coming to pick you up?’
   B. Non so. Ma Gianni non ha (# *mica*) la macchina.
      ‘I don’t know. But Gianni doesn’t have the car.’ (Schwenter, 2006:(6a))

b. Questa non è *mica* una festa data in nostro onore, ma in onore di Ada e Guido! Parla di loro!
   This is not *mica* a party given in our honour, but in honour of Ada and Guido! Talk about them!’ (I.Svevo, La coscienza di Zeno, 6 [LIZ XX]; from Visconti, 2009:944)

- but presuppositional negator *mica* : restricted to root clauses, (25c), while *en* can occur in conditional and restrictive relative clauses and a number of other contexts that usually resist root phenomena, (26)

(26) a. *anteceod of a conditional clause* (20b,c,d)

   [Oa-t nie *en* regent] moe-j de bloommen woater geven.
   if=it not *EN* rains must=you the flowers water give
   ‘If it DOESN’T rain, you have to water the plants.’
   (Haegeman 2002: 181)

b. *restrictive relative clause: eg*; (20e,f,g)

### 4.4. Further diachronic development?

Rare dialectal instances of *en* being used in non-negative contexts:

(27) a. *Me kwamen doa toe. K’en zoagen ’t al…*
   We came there on. I *EN* saw it already
   ‘We arrived there and I immediately saw it…’
   (Dialect of Lapscheure, MJL, 5.12.08 16.00)

b. *Wachte, wachte, wachte… K’en zyn ier, wè.*
   Wait, wait, wait… I *EN* am here, wè
   ‘Wait, I’m coming.’
   (Dialect of Heist, MV 16.08.2009)
5. Revisiting the syntax of en

How does the syntax encode the interpretative effect (‘polarity emphasis’) of en?

5.1. Polarity focus?

An analysis of en as expressing left peripheral polarity emphasis is unlikely: LP expressions of polarity emphasis are systematically root phenomena (cf. Haegeman to appear, Breitbarth & Haegeman to appear).

5.1.1. Sentence-final emphatic negation in Italian dialects

Veneto dialect (Poletto 2009, Zanuttini 1997): a sentence-final stressed particle NO (‘no’) serves to express emphatic negation.

(28) a. No ghe so ndà NO.
   ‘I did NOT go there.’ (Poletto 2009: (9))

b. Credo che non venga NO.
   ‘I think that he is not coming at all’ (Poletto 2009: (38a))

c. Mi ha detto che non viene NO.
   ‘He told me that he is not coming at all’ (Poletto 2009: (38b))

To derive sentence-final NO in, Poletto (2009:6) proposes:

According to this analysis, NO is always moved from within the NegP where it originates [note omitted] to a Focus position, which, following standard assumptions on the structure of the clause in Italian, is located low in the CP area. When NO is in first position in the sentence, there is no TP fronting. When NO is in sentence-final position, this is the result of a movement of the whole TP to a position, GroundP, which is located in the Topic field, higher than Focus (again following standard assumptions on the CP layer) [note omitted].

(28) d. [Ground [TP no ghe so ndà] [Ground [CPFocus NO]]
   [FinP [TP no ghe so ndà]] [Fin [TP no ghe so ndà]]] (Poletto 2009:6, (13))

Poletto (2009) : sentence-final NO incompatible with domains that resist Main Clause Phenomena³:

(29) a. Dovrebbe aver finito il suo lavoro per stasera.
   *Quando non lo aveva finito NO,
   when non it have-PAST-3SG finish-PART NO
   l'ho fatto io.
   it-have-1SG do-PART I

b. Dovrebbe finire il lavoro per stasera.
   *Se non lo finisce NO,
   If non it finish-3SG NO
   lo faccio io.
   it do-1SG I
   (C. Poletto, pc. 22.10.08)

c. *Se non viene NO,…
   if not come-3SG NO,
   ‘If he doesn’t come,…’ (Poletto 2009: 9, (37b))
5.1.2. **Emphatic polarity bien/si in the Spanish left periphery (Hernanz 2007)**

(30) a. Pepito *bien* ha comido pasta.  
‘Pepite so eat pasta.’ (Hernanz 2007b: 113)  

b. \[\text{[FocP [TopP Pepito] [FocP bien ] [VpP t, [TP e...]]]]}\]

(31) a. Como Julia (*bien*) fuma,  
since Julia (*well*) smoke--3SG,  

b. Si Pepe (*bien*) acaba a tiempo su tesis,  
if Pepe (*well*) finish--3SG on time his thesis  

5.2. **En (FP2) as a VP Foc?**

Viewed as encoding contrast/elimination one might reinterpret the syntax of *en*: it might be located in a focus head in the vP periphery (see Jayaseelan 1996, 2000, and esp. 2010: 321 note 20 for such a proposal).

Problem: Belletti (2004): VP periphery is associated with new information focus, not with contrastive focus

5.3. **Breitbarth and Haegeman (2011): en as an NPI discourse particle**

- Flemish *en* is an NPI, hence restriction to negative clauses (or, in some dialects, weaker NPI contexts)
- morphologically, Flemish *en* is a bound morpheme merged in T
- Originally: head movement of Neg/Pol to V-on-T, from there, it was reanalysed as bound morpheme merged with (V+)T
- adjunction to finite T (but lexically restricted to finite verbs), moves with the V+T complex to C.
- Implications for V2 are the same as those in 2.3

**Question**: in cartographic perspective: should *en* be associated with a distinct functional head?

6. **Irrealis conditionals in Flemish and the syntax of *en***

6.1. **The problem**

(32)(=18)a. Oa-j t nie (*en*) weet, goan-k et zeggen.  
If you it not (*EN*) know, go-I it say  
‘if you don’t know it, I’ll tell you.’

b. Oa-j-t nie (*en*) moest weten, goan-k et zeggen.  
if you it not (*EN*) should know, go-I it say

c. (*en*) moest-je-t nie weten,...  
(*EN*) should you it not know
6.2. Conditional moest

-Many Flemish dialects: conditional auxiliary: *moest* (‘had to’), used in conditional antecedents (cf. Boogaert 2007) (33a). IRR *moest* can also move to the left periphery (33b), and can be used in main clauses (33c) with a conditional reading: ‘what if’?

(33) a. Als hij dat moest weten, dan zou hij boos zijn.
   if he that must-PAST-3SG know then will-PAST-3SG he angry be
   ‘If he knew that, he would be angry’.

b. Moest hij dat weten, dan zou hij boos zijn.
   must-PAST-3SG he that know then will-PAST-3SG he angry be
   ‘Were he to know that, he would be angry.’

c. Hij moest een keer bellen!
   he must-PAST-3SG one time call
   ‘What if he calls?!’

- Used in temporal clauses *moest* cannot have the Irrealis reading:

(34) a. Voordat ze dat moest doen, werkte ze in de showroom.
   before.that she that must-PAST-3SG do, work-PAST-3SG she in the showroom.
   ‘Before she had to do that, she worked in the showroom.’

b. Oa ze dat moest doen,…
   when.that she that must-PAST-3SG do
   ‘When she had to do that,’


(35) MoodPspeech act > MoodPepistemic > MoodPepistemic > TP (Past) > TP (Future) > [MoodPirrealis moest ] > ModPalethic > AspPhabitual > AspPfrequentative > ModPvolitional > AspPcelerative > TP (Anterior) > AspPterminative > AspPcontinuative > AspPretrospicive > AspPproximative > AspPdurate > AspPgeneric/progressive > AspPprospicive > ModPobligation > ModPpermission/ability > AspPcompletive > VoicePAspPcelerative > AspPfrequentative > AspPfrequentative (based on Cinque 2004:133, (3))

6.2.1. IRR moest patterns with modal auxiliaries

(36) a. He moet dat weten.
   ‘He must know that.’

b. Hij moest dat weten.
   ‘He had to know that.’

-Verb (Projection)Raising

(37) Conditional moest

a. Als hij zijn tekst moest vergeten,…
   if he his text must-PAST-3SG forget
   ‘If he should forget his text,…’

b. Als hij moest [zijn tekst vergeten],…
   if he must-PAST-3SG his text forget
   ‘If he should forget his text,…’

(38) Deontic moet

a. Als hij zijn tekst moet meebrengen,…
   if he his text must-PAST-3SG with-bring
b. Als hij moet zijn tekst meebrengen,… Verb Projection Raising
   if he must-3SG his text with- bring
   ‘If he has to bring his text,…’

(39) Epistemic moet
a. Ik denk dat hij die tekst moet gekend hebben. VR
   I think-1SG that he that text must-3SG know- PART have
   ‘I think he must have known that text.’
b. Ik denk dat hij moet die tekst gekend hebben. VPR
   I think-1SG that he must-3SG that text know-PART have
   ‘I think he must have known that text.’

-Expletive subject (hence raising V):\(^5\)
(40) a. Het moet meer regenen (anders sterven de planten). deontic
   it must-3SG more rain (otherwise die the plants)
   ‘It has to rain more, otherwise the plants will die.’
b. Het moet/kan geregend hebben (want de baan is nat). epistemic
   it must/can-3SG rain-PART have (because the road is wet)
   ‘It must/may have rained, ’cos the road is wet.’
c. Als het moest regenen,… IRR
   if it must-PAST-3SG rain…
   ‘If it should rain,…’
d. Moest het regenen,… IRR
   must-PAST-3SG it rain…
   ‘Should it rain,…’

6.2.2. IRR moest is located higher than root modals

(41) a. Als hij dat moest moeten doen,… IRR>deontic
   if he that must-PAST-3SG must do
   ‘If he were obliged to do that, …’
b. Moest hij dat moeten doen,…
   must-PAST-3SG he that must do
   ‘Were he obliged to do that,…’

IRR(conditional) moest is incompatible with epistemic moeten. This is expected because conditional clauses are intrinsically incompatible with high modals such as epistemic moeten: in (42) the epistemic reading is not available for either the first or the second occurrence of moest.

(42) Als hij moest moeten komen,… IRR >* epistemic
   if he must-PAST-3SG must come
   ‘If he should have to come,…’

6.2.3. IRR moest patterns with high modals and differs from low modals


(43) a. Hij wilde niet komen, maar hij moest Ø. (deontic)
   he want-PAST-3SG not come but he must-PAST-3SG
   ‘He did not want to come but he had to.’
b. Hij moest komen maar hij kan niet Ø. (ability)
   he must-3SG come but he can-3SG not
   ‘He has to come but he cannot.’
(44) A: Is Jan thuis?
   is Jan home
   ‘Is Jan at home?’
B: Hij moet *(thuis zijn), zijn fiets staat voor.
   he must home be, his bicycle stands in front
   ‘He must be, his bicycle is standing in front of the house.’

(45) a. Hij zou al vertrokken zijn.
   he would already left be
   ‘Allegedly, he’s already left.’

b. A Wanneer vertrekt Jan?
   when leaves Jan
   ‘When is Jan leaving?’
B Hij zou al *(vertrokken zijn).
   he would already left be

(46) a. Hij zal niet komen, denk ik.
   he will-3SG not come think I
   Maar als hij moest *(komen),…
   But if he should come’
   ‘He won’t come, I think, but if he should come…’

b. Maar moest hij *(komen),…
   but must-PAST-3SG he come
   ‘He won’t come, I think. But should he,…’

(47) a. Gianni non ha deliberamente lasciato cadere la sua candidature.
    Gianni non has deliberately let-PART fall the his candidature
    non>deliberamente

   non have-1SG frankly other to add-INF
   francamente >non
   ‘I haven’t frankly anything else to add.’

c. Gianni non è probabilmente in grado di aiutarci.
   Gianni non be-3SG probably able to help-us
   probabilmente >non
   ‘Gianni isn’t probably able to help us.’

6.3. Flemish en and conditional moest

(48) a. Oa-se da nie (en-) moet doen,…
   if-she that not EN- must-PAST-3SG do
   ‘If she doesn’t have to do that,…’

b. Oa-se da nie (*en) moest geweten een,…
   if-she that not EN must-PAST-3SG know-PART have
   ‘If she hadn’t known that,…’

En: NPI: must be in the scope of negation

⇒ conflicting requirements:
(i) en: as NPI must be in the scope of sentential negation,
(ii) moest: as PPI must be outside scope of sentential negation.
Problem: if $moest = PPI$, how come it can itself occur in the conditional clause (which are incompatible with PPI (cf. Nilsen 2004))?

Haegeman (2010): $moest$ IS Mood$_{IR}$ and the operator that derives the conditional clause is its specifier. So technically $moest$ is not in the c-command domain of the operator.

Speculation: speakers who allow $en$ in non-negative context (27) might also allow $en$ in $moest$-conditionals. (No attestations (yet).)
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