A Historical Change in the Syntactic Status of Not*
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English negative sentences developed as follows: (a) ic ne secge \(\rightarrow\) (b) I ne seye not \(\rightarrow\) (c) I say not \(\rightarrow\) (d) I not say \(\rightarrow\) (e) I do not say \(\rightarrow\) (f) I don't say. This transition is argued to be triggered by the change in the syntactic status of not. With ne in Neg, not was first an adverb in the adjunct position of INFL' and served to semantically strengthen ne in Neg. Then, as ne became phonetically weakened, not came to occupy \([\text{Spec, NegP}]\) in order to take over the function of ne expressing sentential negation. After the loss of ne, not came to occupy Neg and express sentential negation by itself. Finally, the contracted form of not, n't, appeared as a result of not being weakly stressed and encliticized onto do.

1. Introduction

This paper aims to examine how the syntactic status of not has changed in the history of English.\(^1\) The historical transition in sentential negation is shown in (1):\(^2\)

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad \text{form (a): } ic \text{ ne secge.} & \text{[OE]} \\
& \quad \text{form (b): } I \text{ ne seye not.} & \text{[ME]} \\
& \quad \text{form (c): } I \text{ say not.} & \text{[LME~EModE]} \\
& \quad \text{form (d): } I \text{ not say.} & \text{[LME~EModE]} \\
& \quad \text{form (e): } I \text{ do not say.} & \text{[LME~]} \\
& \quad \text{form (f): } I \text{ don't say.} & \text{[c. 1660~]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(cf. Jespersen (1917) and Ukaji (1992, 2000))

This transition seems to be related to the historical change in the syntactic status of not. This paper claims that not was first an
adverb in the adjunct position of INFL' and used to semantically strengthen ne in Neg. Then, with ne being phonetically weakened, not came to occupy [Spec, NegP] to express sentential negation. After the loss of ne, not came to occupy Neg and it has been located in the same position until PE. Not also came to function as a clitic in Neg, in the form of n't, which is preferred in PE, especially in colloquial style.

This paper is organized as follows: the syntactic status of not in PE is discussed in section 2, based on Pollock (1989) and Chomsky (1991) among previous studies on negation. Then, the syntactic status of not in form (a) to form (f) is discussed in section 3. The two historical corpora, The Second Edition of the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (henceforth, the PPCME2) and The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (henceforth, the PPCEME), are employed to test the validity of previous studies, which leads to an alternative analysis of sentential negation in the history of English. Finally, section 4 presents the conclusion of this paper.

2. Analysis of Negation in PE

The syntactic status of not in PE has been widely discussed in the generative literature since Pollock (1989), who first proposed a separate projection for not, namely NegP. Previous studies fall into three types of analyses with respect to the status of not: the head of NegP analysis, the specifier of NegP analysis, and other analyses. Before introducing the head of NegP analysis adopted here, let us first discuss the clause structure on which it is based. Along the lines of the split INFL hypothesis originally proposed by Pollock (1989) and later modified by Chomsky (1991), I assume that a sentence is an agreement phrase AgrP dominating a tense phrase TP. The assumption that AgrP dominates TP is supported by the verbal morphology in OE and ME:
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Table 1  The Inflectional Paradigm of Deem from OE to ME
Adapted from Tanaka (2000: 477–478)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OE: deem</th>
<th>ME: demen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg 1</td>
<td>dém-e</td>
<td>dém-d-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg 2</td>
<td>dém-(e)st</td>
<td>dém-d-est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg 3</td>
<td>dém-(e)p</td>
<td>dém-d-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl 1–3</td>
<td>dém-a+p</td>
<td>dém-d-on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dém-Agr</td>
<td>dém-T-Agr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, past tense forms in the inflectional paradigm of OE and ME are inflected for both tense and agreement, where agreement morphemes are attached outside tense morphemes. This is accounted for by assuming that AgrP dominates TP, with V first raising to T to form the complex [V + T], which in turn raises to Agr to form the complex [[V + T] + Agr] (see Belletti (1990) for a similar argument from Italian).

Turning now to negative sentences in PE, Chomsky (1991) proposes the structure in (2), where not as the head of NegP is positioned between AgrP and TP:

(2) \([\text{AgrP} \text{ Agr} [\text{NegP} [\text{Neg not/n't}] [\text{TP} \text{ T} \text{ [V P V ...]}]])\]

Consider the examples in (3) in the light of the structure in (2), basically along the lines discussed by Chomsky (1991):

(3)  
a. *John likes not Bill.
b. *John not likes Bill.
c. John does not like Bill.
d. John doesn’t like Bill.

As is obvious, (3a) violates the Head Movement Constraint (HMC), because the main verb like moves to Agr across not in Neg (note that it also violates the Θ-Criterion; see below). Next, consider the derivation of (3b) that involves both affix hopping and LF-raising.
Here, the agreement and tense morphemes are lowered onto the main verb like in V and the complex \([v \text{like}\text{-T-Agr}]\) is formed. At LF, the complex is raised to Agr via T to save the traces of Agr and T that would otherwise not be c-commanded by the lowered Agr and T, respectively. However, since not occupies Neg, the LF-raising violates the HMC, yielding ungrammaticality (or the complex in Agr cannot properly govern its trace in T across NegP, violating the Empty Category Principle (ECP)).

As for (3c), do is inserted into T and raised to Agr in order to support the stranded affixes in T and Agr. Extending Pollock's (1989: 385–386) explanation of why auxiliaries like be and have can raise to the inflectional domain, but not main verbs, I assume that do can also raise to T and Agr. The basic idea behind his explanation is that since the system of verbal inflection in PE is impoverished, it is weak and hence does not allow the thematic properties of main verbs to be transmitted to their traces after they raise to the inflectional domain. Therefore, main verbs, which have thematic properties, cannot raise to T and Agr due to the Θ-Criterion. On the other hand, auxiliaries like be, have, and do lack thematic properties, so that they can raise to T and Agr without violating the Θ-Criterion. Moreover, given that not functions as an incorporating head, the raising of do from T to Agr proceeds through Neg and hence does not violate the HMC (see section 3.3.5 for arguments for this derivation). If this is correct, the only difference in the derivation between (3c) and (3d) is that not is encliticized to do and don't is formed in the latter.9

3. Diachronic Analysis of Negation

3.1. Previous Studies

Previous studies on form (a) to form (f) are summarized in Table 2:10,11
### Table 2 Previous Studies on Form (a) to Form (f)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The present analysis of negative sentences is based on the proposals in Table 2, with some modifications introduced in the course of the discussion of each form in the next section.

3.2. Syntactic Operations Deriving Negative Sentences

Although PE only allows negative sentences with do-support, as we saw in section 2, Table 2 in the previous section shows that verb raising, affix hopping, and do-support have been proposed as the main syntactic operations to derive negative sentences in the history of English. Following Roberts (1985: 46), Vikner (1997), and Rohrbacher (1999: 156–157), I assume that verb raising is triggered by the strength of verbal inflection. Historically, main verbs had been raised to Agr until the rich inflectional system was lost around the 16th century. Furthermore, I assume that not in OE and ME was syntactically an adverb, since not was first used as an adverb (XP) to semantically strengthen ne (X°) in the OE and ME period. After the loss of ne, there were two possibilities for the status of not: an adverb or a functional head.

Once verb raising was lost, affix hopping was introduced to lower inflections onto main verbs. It is blocked by intervening heads such as not in Neg as in (4), but not blocked by other overt elements such as adverbs as in (5):

(4) a. *John not runs.
   b. $\text{[AgrP John [Agr t] [NegP [Neg not] [TP [T t] [VP [V runs]]]]]}$

(5) a. John never runs.
   b. $\text{[AgrP John [Agr t] [NegP [Neg ] [TP [T t] [VP never [V runs]]]]]}$

Therefore, once not changed from an adverb to a functional head and came to occupy Neg, affix hopping became impossible. I will discuss the time period when not became the head of NegP later.
Finally, when affix hopping became impossible, due to the change in the status of *not* from an adverb to a functional head, do-support was introduced. That is, the function of do-support is to support stranded inflections in the absence of verb raising and affix hopping.

The historical transition of the relevant syntactic operations is summarized in Figure 1:

![Figure 1: Rivalry among Verb Raising, Affix Hopping, and Do-support](image)

These changes occurred gradually and the three operations coexisted around EModE. Since only do-negation is grammatical in PE, the loss of the rich inflectional system and the change in the syntactic status of *not* are assumed to be the primary cause of the introduction of do-support in negative sentences.

### 3.3. Analysis of Negative Sentences

#### 3.3.1. Form (a): *ic ne secge*.

Form (a) is a common type of negative sentence frequently found in OE. Following the previous studies in Table 2, I assume that OE had verb raising and *ne* functioned as a clitic sentential negator occupying Neg. (6) is a typical negative pattern in which *ne* occurs before the finite verb:

(6) *ic ne toweorpe ða burg.*

'I didn't destroy the castle.'

(Frisch (1997: 22))
In support of the clitic nature of ne, Ishikawa (1995: 203) observes that ne loses its vowel and is combined with a range of finite verbs:

(7) a. ne + is → nis  
b. ne + wæs → næs  
c. ne + willan → nillan  
d. ne + agan → nagan  

(Ishikawa (1995: 203))

Furthermore, Ohkado (2005) suggests that ne can intervene between a nonfinite verb and a modal because ne can encliticize to the modal:

(8) ponne he hi dælan ne mæg  
when he them distribute not can  
‘when he cannot distribute them’  
(Ohkado (2005: 57))

Regarding the derivation of form (a), Ishikawa (1995: 204-206) postulates the structure in (9):

(9) \[ [Agr P] [Agr^0 [T [V] [T] ] [Agr^0] ] [Neg^0 P] [Neg^0 ne] [TP [T tT] [VP [v tv] [\ldots] ]]]]]  
(ishikawa (1995: 204))

He assumes that Agr and V are A-heads, while C and Neg are A'-heads. Under his analysis, the verb can raise through T to Agr over Neg, and ne is then cliticized to the verb in Agr, which would be incompatible with the HMC adopted here (see note 8). Therefore, I propose the different structure of form (a) in (10), where the verb raises to Agr through all intervening heads including Neg:
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This analysis is more plausible than Ishikawa's for the following reason: since *ne* was a clitic, it is more economical that *ne* is left-adjoined to the raised verb in Neg as an incorporating head before raising to Agr. This derivation is in conformity with the HMC.

3.3.2. Form (b): *I ne seye not*.

Form (b) is a common type of negative sentence found in ME, as illustrated in (11), where *not* occurs after the verb:

(11) the *ne-verb-not* order

*for he ne chastid noht hise childir*  
(a1425: CMBENRUL, 6. 177)

On the other hand, *not* is positioned before the verb in (12), though this pattern was rare, as we will see shortly:

(12) the *not-ne-verb order*  
*he hit naut ne stinkeð*  
(c1230 : CMANCRIW, II. 68. 746)

Following the previous studies in Table 2, I assume that form (b) was derived by verb raising and *ne* occupied Neg as a clitic.
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With regard to the position of not, there are two possibilities as shown in (11) and (12). In this respect, not showed a similar distribution to the negative adverb never, which was an XP category, as illustrated in (13):

(13) a. ac hi ne geendiað næfre. (ÆLS (Christmas) 30)
   but they ne end never
   'but they never come to an end.' (Ishikawa (1995 : 200))

b. ... & heo næfre ne beoð isceadde from þare
   ... and she never ne is separated from there
   each mirth
   '... and she never is separated from each joy.'
   (Bodley Homilies, 12 : 126)

Following Roberts' (1993) argument that sentential adverbs may be phrasal adjuncts of INFL', the preverbal not in (12) is analyzed as a left-adjunct of Agr' and the postverbal not in (11) is analyzed as a left-adjunct of T'. In order to examine the validity of postulating the adjunct positions of Agr' and T', I investigated the relative positions of ne and not in the PPCME2. The result is summarized in Table 3:

Table 3 The Number of the Ne-Verb-Not Order and the Not-Ne-Verb Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Time Period</th>
<th>Ne-Verb-Not</th>
<th>Not-Ne-Verb</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1 (1150 − 1250)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2 (1250 − 1350)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3 (1350 − 1420)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4 (1420 − 1500)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The not-ne-verb order was occasionally found in EME (i.e. seventy-three examples). It then follows that not in EME could have been in a higher position than Agr since ne in Neg functioned as an incorporating head and moved to Agr along with the verb. Therefore,
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It would be plausible to postulate the adjunct position of Agr’ for not in EME negation.

As for the not-ne-verb order, Trips (2002: sec. 7.4) suggests that stylistic fronting of not is involved that requires subject gaps or pronominal subjects, extending the standard analysis of Icelandic stylistic fronting. However, Table 4, which summarizes the investigation based on the PPCME2, shows that not only subject gaps or pronominal subjects but also DP subjects were found in sentences with the not-ne-verb order, though the number of the latter is small: 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Time Period</th>
<th>Subject gap or pronominal subject</th>
<th>DP subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1 (1150-1250)</td>
<td>68 (30)</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2 (1250-1350)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3 (1350-1420)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4 (1420-1500)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, it is reasonable to maintain the present assumption that not was an adjunct of Agr’ in sentences with the not-ne-verb order. This is desirable on the theoretical ground that it allows a unified treatment of EME negation, where not was an adjunct occupying the adjunct position of Agr’ in the not-ne-verb order and an adjunct occupying the adjunct position of T’ in the ne-verb-not order. The present analysis is also compatible with the Economy of Projection proposed by Speas (1994: 186).

(14) The Economy of Projection:

Project XP only if XP has content. (Speas (1994: 186))

Following the Economy of Projection, NegP is licensed by either the head of NegP or the specifier of NegP. Thus, although not occupies the adjunct position of INFL’, this requirement was satisfied by ne in Neg.

Returning to Table 3, it is clear that the ne-verb-not order became the only possibility in MME. This means that the position of not
became fixed in MME, which would suggest that it had changed from an adjunct of INFL' to an adverb occupying a single position, namely [Spec, NegP]. This change was promoted by the fact that *ne* was becoming obsolete in MME, with the result that *not* came to appear in [Spec, NegP] and license NegP under (14).

Based on the above discussion, it would be plausible to suggest that in EME *ne* occupied Neg and *not* occupied the adjunct position of INFL' (i.e. Agr' or T') as in (15), whereas in MME *ne* occupied Neg and *not* occupied [Spec, NegP] as in (16). Both derivations involve raising of the verb to Agr through T and Neg, and it combines with *ne* before raising to Agr:  

(15) Negation in EME

\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ne-verb-not} \\
& \text{AgrP} \\
& \text{DP} \quad \text{Agr'} \\
& \quad \text{I} \\
& \quad \text{Agr} \\
& \quad \text{NegP} \\
& \quad \text{neg seye} \\
& \quad \text{Neg} \\
& \quad \text{t_{ne}} \\
& \quad \text{TP} \\
& \quad \text{T'} \\
& \quad \text{T'} \\
& \quad \text{T} \\
& \quad \text{VP} \\
& \quad \text{V} \\
& \quad \text{t_{meye}} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{not-ne-verb} \\
& \text{AgrP} \\
& \text{DP} \quad \text{Agr'} \\
& \quad \text{I} \\
& \quad \text{Agr} \\
& \quad \text{NegP} \\
& \quad \text{neg seye} \\
& \quad \text{Neg} \\
& \quad \text{t_{ne}} \\
& \quad \text{TP} \\
& \quad \text{T'} \\
& \quad \text{T'} \\
& \quad \text{T} \\
& \quad \text{VP} \\
& \quad \text{V} \\
& \quad \text{t_{meye}} \\
\end{align*}
Form (c): *I say not.*

Form (c) first appeared in the LME period. It is the most common type of negative sentence during the 15th–17th centuries.

(17)  a. he acceptede not pis accusacioun;
     (c1400: CMAELR3, 44. 556)
     b. but he knew nat the cayse,
        (c1500: CMSIEGE, 80. 291)
     c. and still Jack forgat not the pie,
        (1608: ARMIN-E2-H, 13. 148)

Following the previous studies in Table 2, I assume that form (c) was derived by verb raising. Due to the loss of *ne* around 1400, Neg became empty, so that there were two possible positions for *not*: [Spec, NegP] and Neg. In (18), *not* is considered to occupy [Spec, NegP].

(18)  a. [Wyll] he not com here?  
      (Mankind, 162)
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‘Won’t he come near?’ (Frisch (1997: 44))

b. \[c \{c Will [AgrP he [Agr t] [NegP not [Neg t] [TP [T t\_will] [VP [V com ...]]]]\}\]

On the other hand, not seems to occupy Neg in (19), because not moves up to C along with am, functioning as an incorporating head:

(19) a. [Am not] I lord and kyng of the cuntre?

(diagby Plays, 100)

‘Aren’t I lord and king of the country?’

(Frisch (1997: 44))

b. \[c \{c Am not [AgrP I [Agr t\_am not] [NegP [Neg t\_not] [TP [T t\_am] [VP ...]]]]\}\]

Therefore, it is reasonable to postulate the following two structures of form (c):

(20)

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a. AgrP} & \text{b. AgrP} \\
\text{DP} & \text{DP} \\
\text{I} & \text{I} \\
\text{Agr} & \text{Agr} \\
\text{say} & \text{say not} \\
\text{not} & \text{Neg'} \\
\text{NegP} & \text{Neg} \\
\text{t\_not} & \text{t\_not} \\
\text{Neg'} & \text{Neg} \\
\text{TP} & \text{TP} \\
\text{T} & \text{T} \\
\text{VP} & \text{VP} \\
\text{t\_say} & \text{t\_say} \\
\text{V} & \text{...} \\
\text{t\_say} & \text{...} \\
\end{array}
\]
Historically, the structure in (20a) precedes that in (20b) since Neg was occupied by *ne* before 1400 and *not* as an adverb first came to appear in [Spec, NegP], as we saw in the previous section.

### 3.3.4. Form (d): *I not say*.

Form (d) first appeared around the 15th century. Its frequency gradually increased toward the 16th century, but it became almost obsolete by Shakespeare's time.

\[(21)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{And pus, sif Crist scornede here } \hat{\text{pat I afar not seye,}} \\
& \quad \text{scorning was leueful as hoo} \underline{\text{ly}} \text{ writ proue.} \\
& \quad (c1400: \text{CMWYCSER, 402. 3181}) \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{R. R. Shall I so breake my braine To dote vpon you, and ye not loue vs againe?} \\
& \quad (1552-53: \text{UDALL-E1-P2, L1401. 612}) \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{I give you leave to guess, and } \underline{\text{not forbid}} \text{ you ...} \\
& \quad (1681: \text{Dryden, Spanish Friar II, i; Visser 1969: 1533})
\end{align*}\]

As shown in Table 2, Roberts (1993: 304) and Ishikawa (1995: 208–210) analyze form (d) from different perspectives. To examine its derivation, I investigated its distribution in the PPCME2 and the PPCEME, and the result is shown in Table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Time Period</th>
<th>The Number</th>
<th>The Time Period</th>
<th>The Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1 (1150–1250)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E1 (1500–1569)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 (1250–1350)</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
<td>E2 (1570–1639)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3 (1350–1420)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E3 (1640–1710)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4 (1420–1500)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples with DP subjects are given in (22):

\[(22)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{And whils } \hat{\text{you may, do pryve penance, }} \hat{\text{hat al men par}} \\
\end{align*}\]
As is obvious from Table 5, examples with subject gaps or pronominal subjects outnumber those with DP subjects. However, in addition to the limited number of the former examples, the presence of the latter examples is incompatible with Roberts' (1993) analysis that stylistic fronting is involved in the derivation of form (d). In the light of the previous studies in Table 2, it is therefore reasonable to assume that *not* in form (d) was an adverb occupying [Spec, NegP] which did not block both affix hopping and LF-raising through Neg. Thus, the structure in (23) is postulated for form (d):

(23) 

```
AGrP
   /\                  /
   DP   Agr'         Agr
        /\                /
        I   Agr       NegP
             /\                /
             t_Agr  not      Neg'
                  \                     /
                   Neg   TP
                        /\         /
                        T   VP
                             /\         /
                             t_T   V
                                  /\   /
                                  say T-Agr
```

--- 68 ---
3.3.5. **Form (e): I do not say.**

Form (e) first appeared in the late 14th century and it became common by the 17th century.

(24) a. it doth not gyle . . .
   (c. 1380: Wycliff, ICor. 13, 3–7; Visser 1969: 1530)
   b. the mony . . . is so little that it doth not suffice
   (1417: Ellis, Orig. Lett. UU, I, p. 61; Visser 1969: 1530)

Ishikawa (1995: 209–210, 213–215) proposes that once verb raising was lost and *not* became a head, *do* came to be inserted into T and raised to Agr to rescue the stranded affix in Agr. He notes that raising of *do* across *not* is not blocked in (25), because Neg is an A’-head that does not interfere with the A-chain formed by raising of *do*.

(25) \[AgrP \ [Agr^o \ [T \ do] \ [Agr] \ [NegP \ [Neg^o \ not] \ [TP \ [T \ t\_do] \ [VP \ V \ [. . .]]]]] \]
   (Ishikawa (1995: 210))

However, his analysis does not take the two positions of *not* into consideration: *not* as [Spec, NegP] and *not* as Neg coexisted around EModE, as observed in forms (c) and (d). Furthermore, this is supported by the following examples of negative questions:

(26) a. Do you *not* hear every day how they upbraid each other with infamy of life, below the wildest savages?
   (1688: Aphra Behn, *Oroonoko*)
   b. \[CP \ [c \ Do] \ [AgrP \ you] \ [Agr^o \ [NegP \ [Neg^o \ not] \ [TP \ [T \ t\_do] \ [VP \ [v \ hear \ . . .]]]]] \]

(27) a. dyd *not* I send unto yow one Mowntayne that was both a traytor and a heretyke, . . .? (Mowntayne 210)
   b. \[CP \ [c \ dyd \ notI] \ [FP \ I] \ [NegP \ [Neg^o \ t\_i] \ [TP \ [T \ t\_i] \ [VP \ [v \ send \ . . .]]]]] \]
   (Kemenade (2000: 70))

In (26), *not* is considered to occupy [Spec, NegP], since it is not
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raised with do. On the other hand, in (27), not is considered to occupy Neg, since it is raised with do (see Kemenade (2000: 70) for arguments that not in examples like (27) is an incorporating head). Furthermore, Rissanen (1994: 340-342) argues that there are two patterns of word order, the do-pronominal subject-not order and the do-not-DP subject order, in negative questions of EModE. These arguments will lead us to assume that negative declaratives also had two positions for not, like negative questions. Therefore, the following two types of structures are postulated for form (e):

(28)

Historically, the structure in (28a) precedes that in (28b) since not first came to occupy [Spec, NegP] and then Neg. After the establishment of not as a functional head, only the structure in (28b) has survived into PE.
3.3.6. **Form (f): I don't say.**

Contraction of *do not* into *don't* was first observed in the late 17th century. The transition from form (e) to form (f) took place as a result of the fact that the negative *not* came to be weakly stressed and encliticized to *do*.

(29) a. *I don't deceive my self thus far*, ...  
(1654: D. Osborne, L6, 136; Nakamura 2003: 13)  
b. *things don't go right in the House with Mr. Coventry*, ...  
(1663: Pepys, D10, IV 156; Nakamura 2003: 13)

Following the previous studies in Table 2, I assume that *n't* as a clitic occupies Neg. In Neg, the complex \[[Neg do + n't]\] is formed and then raises to Agr. This leads to the following structure for form (f):

(30)
3.4. Summary

The syntactic analyses of form (a) to form (f) are summarized in Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Syntactic Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Form (a): *ic ne secge.* [OE] | 1. *ne*: $X^0$ (a clitic)  
2. verb raising  
3. *ne* in Neg |
| Form (b): *I ne seye not.* [EME] | 1. *ne*: $X^0$ (a clitic), *not*: $XP$ (an adverb)  
2. verb raising  
3. *ne* in Neg and *not* in the adjunct position of INFL' |
| Form (b): *I ne seye not.* [MME] | 1. *ne*: $X^0$ (a clitic), *not*: $XP$ (an adverb)  
2. verb raising  
3. *ne* in Neg and *not* in [Spec, NegP] |
| Form (c): *I say not.* [LME~EModE] | 1. *not*: $XP$ (an adverb)  
2. *not*: $X^0$ (a functional head)  
3. *not* in [Spec, NegP] or *not* in Neg |
2. affix hopping + LF-raising  
3. *not* in [Spec, NegP] |
| Form (e): *I do not say.* [LME~] | 1. *not*: $XP$ (an adverb)  
2. *not*: $X^0$ (a functional head)  
3. do-support  
4. *not* in [Spec, NegP] in LME and ModE  
5. *not* in Neg in ModE and PE |
| Form (f): *I don't say.* [c. 1660 ~] | 1. *n't*: $X^0$ (a clitic)  
2. do-support  
3. *n't* in Neg |
The historical change in the syntactic status of *not* is summarized in Figure 2:

Figure 2 shows that *ne* was lost around 1400. With *ne* occupying Neg, *not* in EME occupied the adjunct position of INFL' (i.e. Agr' or T'). As a result of the loss of *ne*, NegP became empty and *not* came to occupy some position in NegP in MME. There were two possible positions for *not*: [Spec, NegP] and Neg. In form (c), *not* occupied either [Spec, NegP] or Neg. In form (d), *not* occupied [Spec, NegP], thereby allowing both affix hopping and LF-raising. Form (e) appeared around the late 14th century and *not* occupied either [Spec, NegP] or Neg. Therefore, in the light of the analyses of forms (c), (d), and (e), the two positions for *not*, i.e. [Spec, NegP] and Neg, have to be assumed in the periods when these forms coexisted, namely in LME and EModE. However, after the establishment of *not* as a functional head, *not* no longer occupied [Spec, NegP]. *Not* as a clitic in form (f), which first appeared in the late 17th century, occupied Neg and is still used in PE.

As pointed out in section 2, the head status of *not* can explain the ungrammaticality of *do*-less negation in PE: *not* in Neg blocks both raising of main verbs and affix hopping followed by LF-raising. Therefore, this supports the claim in Table 6 and Figure 2 that *not* always occupies Neg in PE.
4. Conclusion

This paper has examined how the syntactic status of not has changed in the history of English. The conclusion drawn from the above discussion is as follows: not was first an adverb in the adjunct position of INFL' and used to semantically strengthen ne in Neg. Then, with *ne* being phonetically weakened, not came to occupy [Spec, NegP] to express sentential negation. After the loss of *ne*, *not* finally came to occupy Neg, and in PE, *not* still occupies the same position. *Not* also came to function as a clitic in Neg, in the form of *n't*, which is preferred in PE, especially in colloquial style.

NOTES

* I gratefully acknowledge the valuable comments and suggestions of Masachiyo Amano, Tomoyuki Tanaka, Fujio Nakamura, Masayuki Ohkado and all of the members of Nagoya University. I am also grateful to three anonymous reviewers of Studies in Modern English for their helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this paper. Of course, all remaining inadequacies are my own.

1. This paper focuses on sentential negation of main verbs, putting aside the syntactic behavior of be, have, and modals as well as the historical change of word order, which might have some relevance in the development of sentential negation.

2. The historical periods of English are assumed as follows: Old English (OE: 450–1100), Middle English (ME: 1100–1500) and Modern English (ModE : 1500–1900), and Present-day English (PE : 1900– ). For a more detailed analysis, ME is divided into three: early ME (EME : 1100–1250), middle ME (MME : 1250–1420), and late ME (LME : 1420–1500). ModE is also divided into two: early ModE (EModE : 1500–1700) and late ModE (LModE : 1700– 1900).

3. I will not deal with a variant of form (c), *I say it not*, due to space limitation.

4. Jespersen (1917) does not deal with form (d).

5. The PPCME2 is a linguistically annotated corpus of ME texts, among which the only text that is not prose is *The Ormulum*. 
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6. The PPCEME is a linguistically annotated corpus of prose texts in EModE.
7. A detailed examination of each analysis is omitted, due to space limitation.
8. Travis (1984: 131) proposes the Head Movement Constraint (HMC), which is defined as follows.

   (i) The Head Movement Constraint: A head category must move to the head position immediately preceding it.

As is obvious, the HMC forces $X^0$ to move successive-cyclically.
9. An anonymous reviewer suggests the possibility that the structure in (i) is more appropriate than (2) for negative sentences:

   (i) $[\text{Agr} \ [\text{Agr do}] \ [\text{TP} \ [\text{T} \ [\text{NegP} \ [\text{Neg not}] \ [\text{VP} \ ...]]]]$

There are two types of negative questions in PE: those with not as an incorporating head as in (ii a) and those with stranded not as in (ii b) (cf. Quirk et al. (1985: 809), Rissanen (1994: 339), and Kemenade (2000: 71)). If we adopt (i) as the structure for negative sentences, it might be easier to derive negative questions like (ii b) without facing the problem of HMC violation, because the raising of do from T to Agr would not cross not.

   (ii) a. Didn't they warn you?
   b. Did they not warn you? (Quirk et al. (1985: 809))

Rissanen (1994: 340–346) argues that there have been two types of not throughout the history of English: emphatic not and reduced not. Along these lines, it would be plausible to assume that (ii b) involves emphatic not expressing constituent negation which occupies some position lower than NegP, while (ii a) involves reduced not expressing sentential negation which occupies the head of NegP. Since this paper is only concerned with sentential negation, (ii b) would be irrelevant for the present discussion. Therefore, I will not pursue the structure in (i) any further here. See section 3.3.5 for discussion of examples like (ii b) in LME and EModE, where not may be analyzed as occupying [Spec, NegP], the possibility which is unavailable in PE.

10. As for Table 2 and Table 6, the circled 1, ①, indicates the syntactic status of ne and/or not, the circled 2, ②, indicates the syntactic operations to derive the relevant form, and the circled 3, ③, indicates the base-generated position of ne and/or not.

11. As for forms (e) and (f), only studies focusing on their historical aspects are
12. Roberts (1993: 302–303) suggests another possibility: the positive declarative do took over the function of the strong inflection triggering verb raising, but this usage of do was lost at the end of the 16th century. This possibility is not discussed further in this paper.

13. Mitchell (1985: 478) observes that OE had the following negative expressions: ne; na, no (ni + a, o); næfre (ni + æfre); nœs, nalles, nealles (ni + ealles); and naht, noht, nawiht (ni + awiht). Among them, ne was most commonly used and the finite verb was most commonly negated by ne immediately preceding it. Instead of using ne alone, negative constructions like ne + V + naht/noht and nœfre/nœnig + V were also used.

14. The numbers in the brackets show the numbers of examples from The Ormulum, which is verse. For example, 68(30) means that the total number of examples is sixty-eight and thirty of them are from The Ormulum.

15. Following the argument by Travis (1988) and Bowers (1993) that adverbs can be licensed at the X’ level, this paper assumes that not in EME is licensed in Agr’ or T’.

16. Another possibility is that not occupies some position lower than TP, as in the case of PE questions like Do they not warn you? (see note 9).

17. The numbers in the brackets show the numbers of examples with DP subjects. For example, 4 (1) means that the total number of examples is four and one of them involves a DP subject.
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