Marcel den Dikken   *Negation Topicalisation*[*]

0 Introduction

Particles which indicate the polarity of a proposition have the entire pro-
position in their scope. Yet they typically occur clause-medially, not in sen-
tence-initial position. Consider the case of Dutch, the focus of this paper:

(1) a. *wel* zou   hij haar gekust hebben
         AFF   would   he   her   kissed   have
         'he IS said to have kissed her'

     b. * *niet* zou   hij haar gekust hebben
           NEG   would   he   her   kissed   have

        (1a) is grammatical but forces a *contrastive* reading: something in the
sentence must serve as a contrastive focus. Thus, (1a) works in a context in
which it is preceded by a statement such as *hij heeft haar niet betast* 'he has
not fondled her' (with contrastive focus in (1a) on *gekust*) or *hij heeft hem niet
gekust* 'he has not kissed him' (with contrastive focus in (1a) on *haar*).
Sentence-initial *wel* cannot be used for the purpose of simple denial of a
statement with the opposite polarity: in the context of (2A), (2B′) is imposs-
ible. But even on a contrastive reading, (1b) is unacceptable.

(2) A: hij heeft haar niet gekust
         he   has   her   not   kissed

     B: jawel,   hij heeft haar *wél* gekust!
         yes.AFF he   has   her   AFF   kissed
         'he *did* kiss her'

     B′: *jawel,   *wél* heeft hij haar gekust!
          yes.AFF AFF   is   he   been there

It is not strictly impossible, however, to place the negation particle *niet* in sentence-initial position by itself: sentences such as (3a,b) are well-formed (though typically restricted to elevated styles such as legal documents). Here we find a contrastive focus effect similar to that discovered for positive (1a). Thus, (3a) presupposes that there has been discussion of all sorts of other issues, and asserts specifically that the refugee crisis was not discussed.

(3)   a.   *niet* is   gesproken   over   het   vluchtelingenprobleem
           not   is   spoken   about   the   refugee.problem
           'there has been no discussion of the refugee crisis'

      b.   *niet* is de rechtbank gebleken dat een strafbaar feit   is gepleegd
           not is the court   appeared that a   criminal offence is committed
           'to the court, there are no indications that a criminal offence has been committed'

As in the case of (1a), it is impossible to use (3) as a simple denial of a statement with opposite polarity: for (3a), we see this in (4). For (3a) to be felicitous, it wants a preceding context in which it is affirmed that some other topics were discussed at the meeting: *er is wel over de eurocrisis en de situatie in Syrië gesproken* 'there WAS discussion about the euro crisis and the situation in Syria'. But though (1a) and (3) share their contrastiveness requirement, preposing of negative *niet* is subject to a more stringent restriction than fronting of positive *wel*: in *niet*-fronting cases, the contrastive focus can only be a *phrasal* constituent in clause-*final* position.

(4)   A: er   is   gesproken   over   het   vluchtelingenprobleem
           there   is   spoken   about   the   refugee.problem
           'there has been discussion of the refugee crisis'

      B: nee,   er   is *niet* gesproken over   het vluchtelingenprobleem
           no   there is not spoken   about the refugee.problem

      B′: ʾnee, *niet* is (er)   gesproken over   het vluchtelingenprobleem
           no   not is there spoken   about the refugee.problem

From a comparative perspective, (3) is quite unusual. English *neither* and *nor* can occupy the sentence-initial position, immediately followed by the finite verb; but under no circumstances can English front the simple negative polarity particle *not* all by itself, as we see in (5). Though Insular Scandinavian languages can place the negation particle in clause-initial position quite

freely, the stylistic inversion process that gives rise to this word order has properties that are diametrically opposed to the conditions under which Dutch (3) is grammatical: (6a) is characterised precisely by the fact that it does *not* have a contrastive or focus effect. Icelandic (6b), which is not derived via stylistic inversion, seems subject to a special information-structural restriction, judging from what Holmberg (2000) says; but in light of what Brandtler (2006) reports about an apparently similar example from Swedish, (6b) is also quite different from Dutch (3).

(5) a. it has *not* been demonstrated that a criminal offence has been committed
     b. *not has it been demonstrated that a criminal offence has been committed
     c. *not it has been demonstrated that a criminal offence has been committed

(6) a. þetta   ær   glæpamaðurinn   sem   *ekki*   hefur   verið   dæmdur
         this   is   the.criminal   that not   has   been   convicted
         'this is the criminal who has not been convicted'

     b. *ekki*   kann   ég   að   tala   rússnesku
         not   can   I   INF   speak   Russian
         'I certainly can't speak Russian'

Barbiers (2002) and Zeijlstra (2013) were the first to address some of the properties of Dutch sentences of the type in (3). Their examples of *niet*-fronting are reproduced in (7) and (8) (the latter slightly simplified from the original, to save space).

(7) ik had wel gezien dat Jan aankwam, maar *niet* had ik gezien *dat Ed vertrok*
     I had AFF seen   that Jan arrived   but NEG had I seen   that Ed left
     'I did see that Jan arrived, but I didn't see that Ed left'

(8) *niet*   moeten   worden   aangekruist   *de   planten   die   je   al   hebt*
     NEG   must   become   PRT.crossed   the plants   that you already   have
     'you must not mark the plants that you already have'

Barbiers' and Zeijlstra's papers address (7) and (8) obliquely, and only touch upon the tip of the iceberg. I will examine the properties of (3) in more detail, against the background of the syntax of negation and association to focus.

1 Signature properties of contrastive negation particle fronting

I will start by inventorying the signature properties of sentences of the type in (3) in more detail.

1.1 Obligatory extraposition

An important property of both (7) and (8), and also of the examples in (3), is that the focus associate of the sentence-initial negation particle is in extraposed position, at the very end of the sentence. For clausal arguments, as in (3b) or Barbiers' (7), this is not particularly remarkable: clausal arguments are almost always extraposed in Dutch. But for prepositional objects, as in (3a), and particularly for nominal ones, as in (8), the obligatory extraposition seen in these examples is unusual. PP-complements are normally quite flexible in their placement in Dutch: extraposition is easy — but except in sentences like (3a) (adapted as (9b)), it is never *forced*. The contrast in (9) brings this out.

(9) a. er   zal *niet* <over het vluchtelingenprobleem> worden gesproken
         there will not about the refugee.problem   become spoken

         <over het vluchtelingenprobleem>
         about the refugee.problem

         'the refugee crisis will not be discussed'

     b. *niet* zal <*over het vluchtelingenprobleem> worden gesproken
         not   will about the refugee.problem   become spoken

         <over het vluchtelingenprobleem>
         about the refugee.problem

　　　Zeijlstra's (8), repeated as (10b), confronts the fact that the focus associate of *niet* is in extraposed position with the fact that nominal objects do not otherwise extrapose very easily in Dutch (see (10a)). The marked nature of extraposition of nominal objects in Dutch lends a degree of unnaturalness to Zeijlstra's example. But while somewhat awkward, (10b) is much better than the alternative in (10b′), with the object in clause-internal position.

(10) a. je   moet *niet*   <*de planten die je al hebt*>   aankruisen
          you   must NEG   the plants that you already have   PRT.cross

          <$^?$**de planten die je al hebt*>
          the plants that you already have

      b. *niet* moeten worden aangekruist *de planten die je al hebt*
          NEG   must   become PRT.crossed the plants that you already have

      b′. **niet* moeten *de planten die je al hebt*   worden aangekruist
          NEG   must   the plants that you already have become PRT.crossed

1.2 The phrasal nature of the fronted material

There can be no doubt that sentence-initial *niet* is phrasal: it can, for instance, be coordinated with other phrasal material (*nauwelijks* 'hardly' in (11a)), or intensified (with *volstrekt* 'absolutely' or *in het geheel* 'totally' in (11b)).

(11) a. *niet of nauwelijks* is gesproken over   het vluchtelingenprobleem
          not or hardly   is spoken   about the refugee.problem

      b. *volstrekt   niet/in het geheel niet* is gesproken over
          absolutely not/in the whole not is spoken   about
          het vluchtelingenprobleem
          the refugee.problem

From a theoretical perspective as well, the phrasality of initial *niet* is beyond dispute: the position occupied by fronted *niet* must be a specifier position in the high left periphery, in a run-of-the-mill Verb Second construction.

1.3 Sentential negation is involved

The point of Zeijlstra's (2013) paper is precisely to exclude, for languages that have Verb Second, the fronting of markers of sentential negation by themselves into sentence-initial position. Zeijlstra advocates an analysis of constructions with preposed *niet* as cases of constituent negation rather than sentential negation. But sentential negation must be involved.

      What we see in (12) is that sentence-initial *niet* can license the negative polarity items *meer* 'anymore', *ooit* 'ever' and *enig* 'any'. Unlike sentential negation, pure constituent negation does not license NPIs, as (13b) tells us.

(12) a. *niet* valt *meer*   te ontkennen dat het probleem
          not falls anymore to deny   that the problem
          uit de hand loopt
          out the hand runs
          'it cannot be denied anymore that the problem is getting out of hand'

      b. *niet* is *ooit/op enig moment* gebleken/aangetoond   dat
          not is ever/at any time   appeared/demonstrated that
          een strafbaar feit   is gepleegd
          a   criminal offence is committed
          'it has never turned out to be the case/been demonstrated that a
          criminal offence has been committed'

    c. *niet* is vast komen te staan dat hij hiermee *enige* bemoeienis
       not is fixed come   to stand that he herewith any   involvement
       heeft gehad
       has   had
       'it has not been determined that he has had anything to do with this'

(13) a. ik wil   niet meer   met hem samenwerken
       I   want not anymore with him collaborate

    b. ik wil   [*niet* dit jaar maar volgend jaar] (*meer) met hem
       I   want   not this year but next year   anymore with him
       samenwerken
       collaborate

And in (14a,b) we see that predicates like *zeker* 'certain' license interrogative clauses only in the presence of sentential negation. Constituent negation does not license an interrogative complement clause below *zeker*, as (15) shows. The *niet*-fronting construction in (14c) again behaves like a sentential negation construction in this respect.

(14) a. het is zeker   {dat/*of} het probleem verholpen kan worden
       it   is certain   that/if the problem fixed   can become
       'it is certain {that/*if} the problem can be fixed'

    b. het is *niet* zeker   of het probleem verholpen kan worden
       it   is not certain if the problem fixed   can be
       'it is not certain if the problem can be fixed'

    c. *niet* is zeker   of het probleem verholpen kan worden
       not is certain if the problem fixed   can be

(15) a. het is [*niet* zeker   maar waarschijnlijk] {dat/*of} het probleem
       it   is   not certain but   likely   that/if the problem
       verholpen kan worden
       fixed   can become

    b. ik weet [*niet* 60 maar 75%] zeker   {dat/*of} het probleem
       I   know   not 60 but 75%   certain   that/if the problem
       verholpen kan worden
       fixed   can become

    In principle, we should also be able to check that sentential negation is involved in *niet*-fronting constructions on the basis of the distribution of

affixes/clitics specifically marking sentential negation in negative concord varieties of Dutch. Unfortunately, bringing this distribution to light is difficult because of the formal register that sentence-initial *niet* is characteristic of: the construction type exemplified by (3), (7) and (8) does not occur naturally in negative concord dialects. But Liliane Haegeman (p.c.) points out that to the extent that she can say these things in her dialect at all, she certainly would include the marker *en*, the particle found only in sentential negation constructions — which goes along with the conclusion that *niet*-fronting constructions involve sentential negation.

1.4 Predicate pied-piping

Usually, not only does the negation particle *niet* fail to prepose by itself (16a), *niet* also cannot be taken along by fronting of the predicate (16b).

(16) a. **niet* mag je   huilen
       not may you cry

     b. **[niet* huilen] mag je
         not cry   may you

But the *niet*-preposing constructions in focus in this paper allow both of these things. In all of the b–examples in (17)–(19), *niet* forms a constituent with the predicate of the extraposed material.

(17) a. *niet* is gesproken over het vluchtelingenprobleem
          not is spoken   about the refugee.problem

     b. [*niet* gesproken] is over het vluchtelingenprobleem
          not spoken   is about the refugee.problem
        both: '(though other topics HAVE been discussed) there has been NO discussion of the refugee crisis'

(18) a. *niet* is vastgesteld dat een strafbaar feit   is gepleegd
          not is firm.put   that a   criminal offence is committed

     b. [*niet* vastgesteld] is dat een strafbaar feit   is gepleegd
          not firm.put   is that a   criminal offence is committed
        both: '(though other things HAVE been determined) it has NOT been determined that a criminal offence has been committed'

(19) a. *niet* is komen vast te staan dat een strafbaar feit   is
          not is come firm to stand that a   criminal offence is
          gepleegd
          committed

     b. [*niet* vast] is komen te staan dat een strafbaar feit   is
           not firm   is come to stand that a   criminal offence is
          gepleegd
          committed
          both: '(though other things HAVE become clear) it has NOT become
          clear that a criminal offence has been committed'

The examples in (18b) and (19b) are particularly interesting, especially when considered in tandem. In (19b), *niet* forms a constituent with an adjectival predicate (*vast* 'firm') that is quite deeply embedded, under *is komen te staan* 'has come to stand', in a semi-idiomatic construction best rendered in English as *has become clear* or *has come to be determined*. Semantically, (19) is very much like (18). But in (18), though it is possible to front *niet* together with *vastgesteld*, as in (18b), it is impossible to front just *niet vast* 'not firm', stranding the participle *gesteld*: (18b′) is ungrammatical.

(18) b′. *[*niet* vast] is gesteld dat een strafbaar feit   is gepleegd
              not firm is put   that a   criminal offence is committed

       The contrast between (19b) and (18b′) can be related to another significant difference between *vaststaan* and *vaststellen*. The adjectival predicate *vast* that is part of *vaststaan* can be intensified, with an adverbial modifier or in a compound, as in (20b); but such intensification fails with the *vast* of *vaststellen*, as (20a) shows. The ill-formedness of (20a) suggests that *vaststellen* is a complex predicate, a lexical unit, whereas *vast* in *vaststaan* projects its own adjectival phrase. If this is correct, the *dat*-clause in (20a) is an argument of the complex predicate *vaststellen* as a whole, whereas in (20b) it is an argument of just the AP projected by *vast*.

(20) a. *het is *volkomen* vast/*muur*vast gesteld dat S
          it is totally   firm/wall.firm put   that S

     b. het staat *volkomen* vast/*muur*vast dat S
          it   stands totally   firm/wall.firm that S
          'it is totally clear/rock-solid that S'

This now leads me directly to my proposal for the syntax of *niet*-preposing constructions.

2 Proposal

What I propose as the analysis of *niet*-preposing constructions is summarised schematically as in (21):

(21) a. [$_{NegP}$ ¬ [Neg [$_{TP}$ [$_{RP}$ [*niet ec*$_i$] [R [PREDICATE]]]]]] [$_{XP}$ C-FOCUS]$_i$

 b. [$_{CP}$ [*niet ec*$_i$]$_{C\text{-}TOPIC}$ [C [$_{NegP}$ ¬ [Neg [$_{TP}$ [$_{RP}$ [*niet ec*$_i$] [R [PREDICATE]]]]]]]] [$_{XP}$ C-FOCUS]$_i$

The negative marker *niet* originates as a subpart of a constituent occupying an A-position related (by a RELATOR, 'R') to a predicate. Like a focus particle, *niet* modifies a contrastively marked constituent — but it does not do so directly: the contrastive constituent is a focus (C-FOCUS) in a position at the right edge of the sentence, linked to its predicate via the empty category (*ec*) to which *niet* is attached. In *niet*-fronting constructions, the constituent [*niet ec*] is what undergoes preposing to sentence-initial position, as a contrastive topic (C-TOPIC). *Niet*-fronting constructions are sentential negation constructions. The source of sentential negation is an abstract negation operator ¬ in a position scoping over the proposition as a whole. The particle *niet* indirectly forms a constituent with the focus, but it is not a constituent negation: the morphological form *niet* here is a focus particle that does not itself contribute negative semantics; it is the silent ¬ operator that delivers sentential negation.

3 Two key ingredients of the analysis under the microscope

3.1 Support for *niet* attaching to an empty category in an A-position

If (21) is right, the contrast between (18b,b′) and (19b) falls out immediately. *niet* attaches to an empty category in the argument position of the predicate of the extraposed clause. For (18), that argument position finds itself outside the projection of *vastgesteld* 'firm.put, determined', which forms a complex predicate; for (19), on the other hand, this A-position is right outside the projection of *vast* 'firm'. From (22b), we get a constituent *niet vast*, which is eligible for fronting, as in (19b). From (22a), we get no such constituent: the smallest constituent including both *niet* and *vast* also contains *gesteld*; that constituent is frontable, as in (18b), but it is impossible to put just *niet+vast* in sentence-initial position, as in (18b′), because that string is not a syntactic unit.

(22) a. [$_{RP}$ [*niet* $\underline{ec}_i$] [R [*vastgesteld*]]] [$_{CP}$ *dat* S]$_i$

  b. [$_{VP}$ [$_{RP}$ [*niet* $\underline{ec}_i$] [R [*vast*]]] *staan*] [$_{CP}$ *dat* S]$_i$

3.2 Support for the presence of an abstract sentential negation operator

Of the same general type as the examples in (17)–(19) are the alternations in (23)–(25). These introduce a novel problem, however, thanks to the fact that they include a modal.

(23) a. *niet* valt te controleren in hoeverre een strafbaar feit   is
      not falls to check   in how.far a   criminal offence is
      gepleegd
      committed

  b. [*niet* te controleren] valt in hoeverre een strafbaar feit   is
      not to check   falls in how.far a   criminal offence is
      gepleegd
      committed

      'it cannot be checked to what extent a criminal offence has been
      committed'

(24) a. *niet* mag worden uitgesloten dat een strafbaar feit   is
      not may become excluded   that a   criminal offence is
      gepleegd
      committed

  b. [*niet* uitgesloten] mag worden dat een strafbaar feit   is
      not excluded   may become that a   criminal offence is
      gepleegd
      committed

      'it cannot be ruled out that a criminal offence has been committed'

(25) a. *niet* kan worden volstaan met een samenvatting
      not can become sufficed with a   summary

  b. [*niet*] volstaan kan worden met een samenvatting
      not   sufficed can become with a   summary
      'a summary will not suffice'

In all these examples, *niet* has scope over the modal (*vallen*+*te*-infinitive is a modal construction; *mogen* 'may' and *kunnen* 'can' are lexical modals). Thus, (23) conveys that it is impossible to check: ¬◊. This means that *niet* does not belong below the modal. Nonetheless, *niet* can form a surface constituent with

the infinitive or participle in the modal's complement, as in the b–examples. Despite the fact that the negation scopes over the modal, it can be included in the fronted constituent that originates inside the modal's complement.

This contrasts with what we see in (26): a negation that scopes over a modal normally cannot be pied-piped by fronting of the modal's complement (as in (26b)); it must be stranded (as in (26a)).

(26) a. huilen mag je   *niet*
          cry   may you not
          'you mustn't cry'

     b. *[*niet* huilen] mag je   (= (16b))
          not cry   may you

These facts can be explained as follows. Ordinary, non-focus-related sentential negation involves the negation marker *niet* associated directly with ¬, the negation operator. The negation particle in this context is dependent on a c-command relation with the negation operator. A *niet* associated with the negation operator may not end up outside the c-command domain of the operator, which explains the ungrammaticality of (26b).

In focus-related sentential negation constructions, on the other hand, *niet* is associated with the focus alone, as a focus particle. The scope of negation is marked by the abstract negation operator. The negation particle *niet* is licensed through its association with the extraposed focus, not through a dependency on the negation operator. When focus-associated *niet* is fronted out of the c-command domain of the negation operator, no ungrammaticality results. And because the negation operator is structurally higher than the modal, it scopes over the modal, even in the b–sentences in (23)–(25), where the negation particle is inside the complement of the modal.

So both the grammaticality and the scope readings of (23)–(25) fall into place thanks to the abstract negation operator ¬ in the structure in (21).

4 Ellipsis

In *niet*-fronting constructions, everything between preposed *niet* and the contrastive focus to which it is linked must be discourse-old and unaccented:

(27) a. ik had wel gezien dat Jan aankwam, maar <u>zij</u> had *niet* gezien
          I had AFF seen   that Jan arrived   but   she had not seen

          dat Ed vertrok
          that Ed left

          'I HAD seen that Jan arrived, but she had NOT seen that Ed left'

      b. *ik had wel gezien dat Jan aankwam, maar *niet* had <u>zij</u> gezien
          I had AFF seen   that Jan arrived   but   not had she seen

          dat Ed vertrok
          that Ed left

Unaccented topic material is eminently suitable for ellipsis. And indeed, from (28a), the entire string *had ik gezien* can easily be removed, producing (28b).

(28) a. ik had wel gezien dat Jan aankwam, maar *niet* had ik gezien
          I had AFF seen   that Jan arrived   but   NEG had I   seen

          dat Ed vertrok
          that Ed left

          'I HAD seen that Jan arrived, but I HADN'T seen that Ed left'

      b. ik had wel gezien dat Jan aankwam, maar *niet* dat Ed vertrok
          I had AFF seen   that Jan arrived   but   NEG that Ed left

Sentences of the type in (28b) raise the interesting question of how best to analyse the ellipsis process involved in them.

An assumption that has been standard in the ellipsis literature for quite some time now is that ellipsis is an operation that generally targets only whole syntactic constituents (rather than contiguous PF strings). If this is correct, the question arises as to how ellipsis constructions such as (28b) could be derived. Sparing the negation while eliding the subject, finite verb, and past participle would seem to be difficult with the negation in its usual clause-medial position: in (29a), there is no single constituent that could be targeted by the ellipsis operation.

(29) a. ..., maar ~~ik~~ ~~had~~ *niet* ~~gezien~~ *dat Ed vertrok*

      b. ..., maar [CP [*niet* <u>*ec*</u>] [IP ~~ik had *t* gezien~~]] [CP *dat Ed vertrok*]

If, on the other hand, the underlier for (28b) is (28a), constituent ellipsis is straightforwardly possible, as shown in (29b). [*niet* <u>*ec*</u>] preposes to SpecCP. As is usual in sluicing constructions, I-to-C raising does not take place (so *had*

stays in IP). The extraposed focus is outside the clause. So (28b) can be derived by IP-ellipsis, immediately following a contrastive topic.

On an IP-ellipsis analysis of (28b), the incidence of *niet*-preposing suddenly increases dramatically: while *niet*-preposing in non-elliptical constructions is certainly quite marked and fairly rare, ellipsis cases of the type in (28b) are perfectly common.

5 English versus Dutch

The kind of ellipsis illustrated in (28b) is also possible in English, as we see in (30b). But unlike Dutch, English does not allow the negation particle *not* to prepose by itself: (30a) is impossible.

(30) a. *I saw that John arrived; *not* did I see that Ed left

  b. I saw that John arrived; *not* that Ed left

I would like to argue that the fact that English does not allow *not*-fronting, not even in the limited environments in which Dutch does, is related to the fact that constituent negation in English always wants to be directly attached to what it belongs to. Extraposition of just the associate of the negation particle, stranding the particle itself, as in (31a), is bad; but including *not* in the extraposed constituent is fine: (31b). The opposite is true for Dutch constituent negation: extraposition of a constituent-negated PP strands but cannot pied-pipe the negation. We see this in (32).

(31) a. *there was a lot of discussion *not* at the meeting yesterday
      [about the euro crisis but about the refugee crisis]

  b. there was a lot of discussion at the meeting yesterday
      [*not* about the euro crisis but about the refugee crisis]

(32) a. er   is *niet*   gesproken [over de eurocrisis maar over   het
      there is spoken not   about the euro.crisis but   about the
      vluchtelingenprobleem]
      refugee.probleem

  b. *er   is gesproken [*niet* over   de eurocrisis maar over   het
      there is spoken   not about the euro.crisis but   about the
      vluchtelingenprobleem]
      refugee.problem

English for some reason cannot adjoin *not* to an empty category linked to an extraposed associate: since it cannot make (31b), it cannot make (30a) either. English CAN, by contrast, associate its negation particle directly with the contrastive constituent itself.

In light of this, it seems reasonable to suppose that examples such as (30b) come about differently in English from the way they arise in Dutch: while in Dutch (28b) the string *niet dat Ed vertrok* is not a single constituent, it is likely that in English (30b) *not that Ed left* IS one constituent, similar to *not even two years ago* in (33a) (which, tellingly, Dutch can only render by stranding the negation particle clause-internally, as in (33b)).[1]

(33) a. [*not* even two years ago] could you swim there

 b. [zelfs <*niet> twee jaar geleden] kon je hier <*niet*>
  even two year ago could you here not

  zwemmen
  swim

Preposing the string *not that Ed left* as a unit will then provide the basis for ellipsis in (30b).

A reviewer suggests that the difference between Dutch and English, at least in the realm of *niet/not*+clause constructions, may have to do with the position of the particle *niet/not*: whereas in Dutch *niet* is in an adjunction position, and may thus associate with the *ec* linked to an extraposed clause, in English *not that S* constructions the particle *not* finds itself in SpecCP, reducing the string *that S* to a mere C′, ineligible for extraposition. The reviewer relates to this suggestion the fact that when *not* immediately precedes a clause, the complementiser *that* is obligatory in contexts in which it would have been optional in the absence of *not* (*I know/saw (that) John arrived but not *(that) Ed left*): this, the reviewer points out, could be a residual Verb Second effect (i.e., C must be filled because SpecCP is filled, by *not*). I find these ideas very interesting, but must leave a fuller evaluation (and the possibility of an extension to the non-clausal examples) for another occasion.

6 Concluding remarks

I have discussed a pattern of negation found in Dutch in which the negation particle is in sentence-initial position followed by the finite verb, in a Verb

---

[1] A reviewer points out that constructions of the type *not that it's any of my business, but…* might support the text hypothesis that we are dealing in (30b) with a single constituent *not that Ed left*. What muddies the water is that Dutch has this construction type as well: *niet dat het me wat aangaat, maar…* 'not that it concerns me anything, but…'.

Second pattern. This construction type, in which the negation is a contrastive topic that must be associated with a contrastive focus in extraposed position, has things in common both with sentential negation (in particular, the presence of a logical negation operator) and with constituent negation (its contrastiveness) — but it does not directly reduce to either.

References

Barbiers, Sjef. 2003. Microvariation in negation in varieties of Dutch. In Sjef Barbiers, Leonie Cornips & Susanne van der Kleij (eds), Syntactic microvariation. Meertens Institute Electronic Publications in Linguistics. 13–40.

Brandtler, Johan. 2006. On Aristotle and baldness: Topic, reference, presupposition of existence and negation. Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 77. 177–204.

Holmberg, Anders. 2000. Scandinavian stylistic fronting: How any category can become an expletive. Linguistic Inquiry 31. 445–83.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2013. Not in the first place. Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 31. 865–900.

Marcel den Dikken
Department of English Linguistics, Eötvös Loránd University
&
Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences
marcel.den.dikken@nytud.mta.hu