From Double Negation to Negative Concord in the history of Latin

Göttingen, 18-19.09.2015

Gö-Neg Workshop on negation

Chiara Gianollo
Universität zu Köln
chiara.gianollo@uni-koeln.de

Outline

Overview of the main points

- **Classical Latin**: Double Negation language
- **Early Romance**: (optional) Negative Concord systems
- **Late Latin**?

Overview of the main points

- **Classical Latin**: Double Negation language
- **Early Romance**: (optional) Negative Concord systems
- **Late Latin**?
- Late Latin looks like a Double Negation language
- but –I will argue– only superficially: although negative indefinites look the same, they are in fact subject to different positioning requirements in the clause
- my proposal is that this is the consequence of a reanalysis affecting the phrase-structural status of the negative marker: from XP-adjunct to X^0 of a NegP

Overview of the main points

- **Classical Latin**: Double Negation language
- **Early Romance**: (optional) Negative Concord systems
- **Late Latin**?
- Late Latin looks like a Double Negation language
- but –I will argue– only superficially: although negative indefinites look the same, they are in fact subject to different positioning requirements in the clause
- my proposal is that this is the consequence of a reanalysis affecting the phrase-structural status of the negative marker: from XP-adjunct to X^0 of a NegP
- thus, Late Latin is a 'concealed (non-strict) Negative Concord language'

Two tendencies, one syntactic and one pragmatic in nature, may undermine the robustness of the evidence for a DN system:

- the syntactic one consists in a structure-minimizing tendency (Head Preference Principle), active in Jespersen's Cycle;
- the pragmatic one is rooted in the role of NPIs in bringing about focused readings (cf. Kadmon & Landman 1993, Krifka 1995, Chierchia 2013; Haspelmath 1997, Watanabe 2004 for focus morphology in NPIs and n-words; Kiparsky & Condoravdi 2006, Eckardt 2006 for the role of strengthening in Jespersen's Cycle).
- This may lead to the conventionalization of the licensing relation between the negative operator and NPIs in its scope, i.e. to the grammaticalization of n-words

In Late Latin we see:

- extension in use of old NPIs (*aliquis*, Gianollo 2013)
- formation of Romance indefinites with Latin additive particle *nec, neque* 'and-not' (= 'not even'): e.g. Sp. *ninguno*, Pt. *nenhum* <*nec unum* 'not (even) one'.

Negation: three common traits in Romance

Posner (1984), Zanuttini (1997, 2010), Parry (2013), Poletto (2014a)

- **N(egative) M(arker)**: lexical item and, especially, position: all the standard languages display a continuation of Latin ***nōn*** (e.g. It. *non*, Sp. and Cat. *no*, Pt. *não*, Fr. *ne*, Rom. *nu*), located pre-Infl, i.e. in front of the inflected verb and after the subject XP, in the area where pronominal clitics attach
- **Negative Concord**: Early Romance is characterized by N(egative) C(oncord). Varieties with no Negative Concord (e.g. Colloquial French, Milanese) are later developments.
  - Issue: (i) optionality of NM (Martins 2000, Parry 2013, Garzonio & Poletto 2012) and (ii) NPI-uses of n-words
- **Lexical renewal** in the area of indefinites belongig to the negation system **(n-words)**
  - e.g. *nemo* 'nobody': subst.= It. *nessuno*, Fr. *personne*, Sp. *nadie*
  - e.g. *nihil* 'nothing': subst. = It. *niente*, Fr. *rien*, Rom. *nimic*
  - e.g. continued (NI > n-word): Rom. *nimeni*, OF *nul*, OI *nullo*

The Classical Latin Double Negation System

(1) a. interiores plerique frumenta **non** serunt
inlander:NOM most:NOM corn:ACC not grow:3PL
'most of those living in the inland do not grow corn'
(Caes.BG5.14.1)

b. aperte enim adulantem **nemo** **non** videt
blatantly in.fact flattering:ACC noone:NOM not see:3SG
'no one does not recognize someone who is blatantly flattering'
(Cic.Lael.99)

c. **non** ante tibi **ullus** placebit locus
not before you:DAT any:NOM please:3SG place:NOM
'Before that (otherwise) no place will please you' (Sen.Mor.28.2)

d. quae non modo **numquam** nocet **cuiquam**, sed contra
which not only never harm anyone:DAT, but on.the.contrary
semper addit **aliquid**
always adds something:ACC
'not only does [Justice] never cause anyone harm, but on the contrary it always adds some benefit' (Cic.fin.1.50)

The Classical Latin Double Negation System

The lack of co-occurrence between NM and NI is independent of the position of the NI before or after the finite verb, a fact that excludes an analysis in terms of non-strict NC:

(2) a. Ratione utuntur: ludis poscunt **neminem** (Infl > O)
reason:ABL use:3PL game:ABL ask:3PL no.one:ACC
'They are reasonable: during the games they don't demand from anyone' (Pl.Cas.27)

b. De lanificio **neminem** metuo (O > Infl)
about woolmaking:ABL no.one:ACC fear
'Concerning woolmaking I don't fear anyone' (Pl.Merc.520)

The Classical Latin Double Negation System

The lack of co-occurrence between NM and NI is independent of the position of the NI before or after the finite verb, a fact that excludes an analysis in terms of non-strict NC:

(4) a. Ratione utuntur: ludis poscunt **neminem** (Infl > O)
reason:ABL use:3PL game:ABL ask:3PL no.one:ACC
'They are reasonable: during the games they don't demand from anyone' (Pl.Cas.27)

b. De lanificio **neminem** metuo (O > Infl)
about woolmaking:ABL no.one:ACC fear
'Concerning woolmaking I don't fear anyone' (Pl.Merc.520)

Cf. instead pre-/post-Infl asymmentry in non-strict NC (Italian):

(5) a. **Nessuno** ha mangiato (S > Infl)
'no one ate'

b. **Non** ha mangiato **nessuno** (Infl > S)
'no one ate'

c. **Niente** ha mangiato! (O > Infl)
's/he did not eat anything (at all)'

Analysis of Double Negation

Jacobs (1982, 1991), Zeijlstra (2004, 2011), Penka (2007, 2011)

- Zeijlstra (2004, 2011 a.o.): DN languages lack a formal feature for negation [i/uNeg], thus they do not grammaticalize a Neg projection (no sufficient acquisitional evidence to acquire it)
- the negative import of NIs is largely independent of the syntactic context in which they occur
- N(egative) I(ndefinites): [Neg]; syntactic combination of two elements ($\neg\exists$) potentially taking scope independently
- debate on way of licensing / semantic status of negative component. I will assume that NIs impose the requirement that the variable they introduce be licensed as soon as possible by the negative operator (=PF-adjacency), whereas the variable introduced by a n-word must wait = difference in timing due to absence / presence of formal features

Difference wrt Negative Concord

Zeijlstra (2004, 2008, 2011), Penka (2007, 2011)

- main difference: presence of formal features for negation in NC systems = these features create morpho-syntactic doubling as the manifestation of a (clouse-bound, but nonetheless longer distance) dependency
- Whenever a mismatch between semantic import and morpho-syntactic encoding (as in NC) is detected, a pair [iF] - [uF] is assumed during acquisition (Zeijlstra 2004, 2014)
- n-words are highly grammaticalized concord elements, thus a separate phenomenon from NPIs (Krifka 1995, Zeijlstra 2004; but cf. Chierchia 2013): they have a [uNeg] feature and are able to evoke an abstract negative operator as Last Resort
- Romance-style NC: requirement that the negative operator be overtly realized in the CP-TP phase (consequence of the activation of a high NegP)

The role of the NM in Jespersen's Cycle

- Consequence: crucially, connection with the phrase-structural status of the Negative marker (NM)
- NM: connection between phrasal status (head/specifier) and syntactic behavior (Jacobs 1991: 573-574): a NM with head status is part of the inflectional complex of the verb. A phrasal NM may attach to any verbal projection.
- The X^0 status of the NM is explicitly related to the occurrence of NC in e.g. Haegeman & Zanuttini (1996), Déprez (1997), Rowlett (1998), Zeijlstra (2004 and following).

Thus the following prediction arises:

(6) **Phrase-structural generalization**: negative heads (X^0) are predicted not to be available in non-Negative-Concord languages. There is no language without Negative Concord that exhibits a negative marker that is a syntactic head (Zeijlstra 2011: 136).

The role of the NM in Jespersen's Cycle

Changes affecting the negative marker according to Jespersen's Cycle have an effect on indefinites interacting with negation (cf. Willis, Lucas, Breitbarth 2013 for a recent survey): the featural specification and structural status of the NM change, making it potentially incompatible with some indefinites in a single negation reading.

(7) Jespersen's Cycle (cf. van der Auwera 2009 for discussion)

- **Stage I**: simple negative marker - head status (Old French *ne*)
- **Stage II**: reinforced negative marker - head + specifier (French *ne...pas*)
- **Stage III**: renewed simple negative marker - specifier status (Colloquial French *pas*) and later head status → back to Stage I !

Position of *nōn*

The NM *nōn* regularly precedes the finite verb, i.e. in analytical forms it appears immediately before the auxiliary, not before the participle:

(8) a. unmarked linear order: **S O Participle(V) - Aux(Infl)**
b. with negation: **S O Participle(V) - *non* - Aux(Infl)**

(9) Romanus equitatus ipsum quidem regem
Roman:NOM cavalry:NOM himself:ACC then king:ACC
Elatiae adsecutus **non** est
Elatea:GEN reached:PTCP not is:3SG
'but the Roman cavalry did not reach the king of Elatea himself' (Liv. 36.19.10)

Devine & Stephens 2006:183, Danckaert 2012, 2015 identify the position of *nōn* before Inflection.

Position of *nōn*

- Classical Latin satisfies the EPP requirement of TP by moving the (remnant) *v*/VP to a specifier of a projection in the split-TP that has to be higher than NegP (Danckaert 2012, 2015, cf. typology of EPP satisfaction in Biberauer & Roberts 2005).
- In turn, NegP is argued to be higher than the Infl part of TP. This yields Infl-final word orders, assuming independent V-to-Infl in synthetic forms, and derives the position of the NM between the lexical verb and the auxiliary in analytic forms.

(10) (Danckaert 2012: 313):
$[_{SubjP[EPP]}\ [_{VP}\ \text{S O V}\ ]\ [\text{Subj}^0\ [_{NegP}\ \text{Neg}^0\ [_{TP}\ \text{T}^0\ t_{VP}\ ]\ ]\ ]\ ]$

Position of *nōn*

- Classical Latin satisfies the EPP requirement of TP by moving the (remnant) *v*/VP to a specifier of a projection in the split-TP that has to be higher than NegP (Danckaert 2012, 2015, cf. typology of EPP satisfaction in Biberauer & Roberts 2005).
- In turn, NegP is argued to be higher than the Infl part of TP. This yields Infl-final word orders, assuming independent V-to-Infl in synthetic forms, and derives the position of the NM between the lexical verb and the auxiliary in analytic forms.

(12) (Danckaert 2012: 313):
[$_{SubjP[EPP]}$ [$_{VP}$ S O V] [Subj^0 [$_{NegP}$ Neg^0 [$_{TP}$ T^0 t_{VP}]]]]

My alternative proposal, safeguarding (6), is that *nōn* is a phrasal category sitting in a specifier attached to a projection in the TP-area, above the landing site for the inflected verb = no NegP.

(13) [$_{SubjP[EPP]}$ [$_{VP}$ S O V] [Subj^0 [XP [$_{TP}$ T^0 t_{VP}]]]]

Phrase-structural status of *nōn*

Origin of *nōn*

- Diachronic plausibility: a specifier status is diachronically plausible for the product of a recent Jespersen's Cycle: original negation *nĕ* <IE **ne* and a scale-evoking minimizer.

(14) ***nōn*** *<nĕ+*oinom = oenum (= ūnum)* 'not (even) one'

Archaic authors still witness *noenum*:

(15) si hodie **noenum** venis, cras quidem sis veneris
if today not.at.all come:2SG tomorrow then please come:2SG
'if you do not come (at all) today, then please do come tomorrow' (Varro apud Non. 144.2, cf. Fruyt 2011)

- The configuration taking to the grammaticalization of *noenum* to *nōn* must have involved a pre-Infl neuter indefinite object NP generalizing to an adverbial use with intransitive verbs (cf. Bayer 2009 for Germ. *nichts* and Garzonio & Poletto 2012 on It. *niente*).

Phrase-structural status of *nōn*

Tests for XP-status of *nōn*

- **Syntactic autonomy**: *nōn* is not a clitic: it counts as 'full word' for second-position phenomena and can itself host prosodically weak elements, like forms of *esse* 'to be' (Adams 1994).
- The NM always precedes, but is not necessarily adjacent to the finite verb. Many discontinuous instances seem to be cases where *nōn* undergoes Operator movement to a C-peripheral Focus position

(16) **non** edepol nunc [ubi terrarum sim] ***scio***
not by.Pollux now where lands:GEN be:1SG know:1SG
'I absolutely do not know where of all places I am' (Pl. Amph. 336)

Phrase-structural status of *nōn*

Tests for XP-status of *nōn*

- **Why not? test**: cf. Merchant 2006, Zeijlstra 2004: *nōn* can adjoin to other phrasal elements in elliptical constructions (cf. Germ. *warum nicht?*, Fr. *pouquoi pas?* vs It. **perché non?*):

(17) a. A: tibi ego credam? B: quor **non**? A: quia...
A: you:DAT I:NOM believe:1SG B: why not? A: because...
A: 'Should I believe you?' B: why not? A: because...'
(Plaut. Pseud. 318)

b. Vel adest uel **non**.
either come:3SG or not
'Either he comes or he does not' (Plaut. Miles 1019)

But *nōn* can also serve as negative answer to a question (alone or with repetition of main predicate); so, according to what observed in Merchant 2006 this test may be inconclusive:

(18) A: 'venitne homo ad te?' B: '**Non**!' (CL)
'Is the man not coming to you? No!' (Plaut. Ps 4.6)

Late Latin negative indefinites

(19) position of Classical Latin object negative indefinite pronouns

TEXT	FORM	TOT./**Relev.** HITS	OV	VO	OTHER
Plautus	*neminem*	26/**14**	6	7	1
Terence	*neminem*	10/**6**	2	4	
Cicero *Epist.*	*neminem*	65/**34**	20	13	1
Varro	all acc.	15/**8**	6	0	2
Vitruvius	all acc.	11/**6**	5	0	1
Livy	*neminem*	85/**31**	26	1	4
Celsus	*null*∗	11/**3**	3	0	
Celsus	*neminem*	7/**2**	2	0	
Petronius	*neminem*	4/**3**	2	0	1
Petronius	*nihil*	37/**24**	24	0	
Petronius	*null*∗	6/**2**	2	0	

Late Latin negative indefinites

(20) position of Late Latin object negative indefinite pronouns

TEXT	FORM	TOT./**Relev.** HITS	OV	VO	OTHER
Passio Perp.	all acc.	3/**2**	2	0	
Egeria	*null*∗	2/**2**	2	0	
Au-gust.*Serm.*	*nem-inem*	64/**48**	46	0	2
Vulgata	*null*∗	37/**21**	20	1	
Vulgata	*nem-inem*	25/**21**	19	2	
Evangelia	*nihil*	25/**22**	19	3	
Orosius *Hist.*	all acc.	51/**30**	30	0	
Greg.Tur.*Hist.*	*null*∗	43/**27**	27	0	

Late Latin negative indefinites

Many of these pre-V objects appear to be emphatic / focused; negative indefinites are very often found in replacive ('not x but y / y not x') and exceptive ('no one but x') negation. Often they are fronted with stranding of the remnant NP.

(21) a. levantes autem oculos suos **neminem** viderunt
raise:PTCP then eyes:ACC their:ACC no.one:ACC see:3PL
nisi solum Iesum
not.if alone:ACC Jesus:ACC
'When they looked up, they saw no one except Jesus' (Matth. 17.8)

b. ego **nullam** invenio in eo causam
I:NOM no:ACC find:1SG in he:ABL charge:ACC
'I find no basis for a charge against him' (Ioh 18.38)

The steady OV order for negative indefinites does not seem to be paralleled by similar phenomena affecting NPIs or other quantificational elements (e.g. *omnis* 'all').

What happens in Late Latin?

Proposal: the distributional restriction on NIs is connected to a change in the phrase-structural status of *nōn*: from adverbial XP to X^0 of a Neg projection

- Head Preference Principle (van Gelderen 2004, 2011):
  Be a head rather than a phrase

Concomitant changes (Devine & Stephens 2006, Ledgeway 2012, Danckaert 2012):

- decay of Infl-final: in later Latin (starting in the first centuries CE) the arguments start to move separately; the *v*P remains in situ, resulting in the decline of Infl-final orders.
- decay of OV: since arguments move separately, they may become subject to new conditions concerning referential features. The persistence of OV orders with negative objects during the shift from OV to VO is well known from the history of Germanic (cf. Jónsson 1996, Svenonius 2000, Pintzuk & Taylor 2006) and Romance (cf. Kayne 1975, Poletto 2014b).

What happens to Negative Indefinites?

Why do Late Latin NI have a strict OV syntax?

- Late Latin NIs are not reanalyzed in their feature composition: they remain [Neg] = incompatible with a [iNeg] c-commanding element in a single-negation reading
- A clausal NegP becomes syntactically active: so, whenever sentential negation has to be conveyed, a semantic negation operator is inserted in NegP and requires overt realization in the CP-TP phase
- This can be achieved by inserting *nōn* or by moving the NI to Spec, NegP. This way, the consistent pre-verbal position of NIs is explained by the new requirement emerging with the activation of NegP in the CP-TP phase.
- being incompatible with a post-Infl position, *nemo* and *nihil* become obsolete in the new VO grammar, ousted by new, more flexible products of grammaticalization (n-words and NPIs) = lexical replacement

Conclusions

1. the pre-Infl position of the Romance NMs is inherited from Latin, as well as its head status, which already develops in Late Latin;
2. the Classical Latin negative marker *nōn* is an adverbial XP in a Specifier attached to a projection in the TP-area, above the landing site for the inflected verb; that means, NegP does not need syntactic licensing = no Neg projection is present;
3. the NM *nōn* is reanalized from a XP to the X^0 of a NegP in the TP area already in Late Latin = prerequisite for the development of a full-fledged NC system
4. combined with the change in the syntactic status of the negative marker, negative indefinites change distribution and regress in frequency in Late Latin, and new patterns involving NPIs emerge. These new NPIs give rise to Romance n-words.

Conclusions

- The prerequisites for NC (mainly, a negative marker at Stage I of a new Jespersen's Cycle) are already present in Late Latin; the absence of co-occurrence with the NM is linked to the fact that
  (i) no n-words have been grammaticalized yet, and
  (ii) negative objects may precede the inflected verb = Late Latin is a 'concealed Negative Concord language' and transmits these prerequisites to Romance
- In the pre-Infl area the surface behavior of non-strict NC and DN languages overlaps, despite the different featural composition of the indefinite items.

Thank you!

Thank you for your attention!

References

- Adams, J.N. 1994. Wackernagel's Law and the placement of the copula esse in Classical Latin, Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society.
- van der Auwera, J. 2009. The Jespersen Cycles, in E.van Gelderen, ed., 'Cyclical Change', Amsterdam: Benjamins, 35-71.
- Bayer, J. 2009. 'Nominal negative quantifiers as adjuncts', Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics 12, 5-30.
- Biberauer, T. & I. Roberts. 2005. 'Changing EPP parameters in the history of English: accounting for variation and change', English Language and Linguistics 9(1), 5-46.
- Chierchia, G. 2013. Logic in Grammar: Polarity, Free Choice, and Intervention. OUP.
- Danckaert, L. 2012. Latin embedded clauses. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Danckaert, L. 2015. The decline of Latin left peripheral presentational foci, in T.Biberauer &G. Walkden (eds.), 'Syntax over time: lexical, morphological and information-structural interactions'. OUP.
- Devine, A. M. & L. D. Stephens. 2006. Latin word order. Structured meaning and information. OUP.
- Déprez, V. 1997. A non-unified analysis of Negative Concord, in P. Hirschbühler & F. Martineau (eds), 'The syntax and semantics of negation' Amsterdam: Benjamins, 53-74.
- Eckardt, R. 2006. Meaning change in grammaticalization, OUP.
- Fruyt, M. 2011. Grammaticalization in Latin, in P.Baldi & P.Cuzzolin, eds, 'New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax', Vol. 4, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 661-864
- Garzonio, J. & C. Poletto. 2012. 'On *niente*: optional negative concord in Old Italian.', Linguistische Berichte 230, 131-153.
- van Gelderen, E. 2004. Grammaticalization as Economy. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- van Gelderen, E. 2011. The Linguistic Cycle: Language Change and the Language Faculty. OUP.

References

- Gianollo, C. 2013. Latin *aliquis* as an epistemic indefinite. In S. Chiriacescu (ed.), Proceedings of the VI Nereus international workshop 'Theoretical implications at the syntax/semantics interface in Romance', 55-81. Universität Konstanz: Arbeitspapier 127.
https://www.academia.edu/5411603/Latin_aliquis_as_an_epistemic_indefinite
- Haegeman, L. & R. Zanuttini. 1996. Negative concord in West Flemish, in A. Belletti & L. Rizzi (eds.), 'Parameters and functional heads: Essays in comparative syntax', OUP, 117-179.
- Haspelmath, M. 1997. Indefinite Pronouns. OUP
- Jacobs, J. 1982. Syntax und Semantik der Negation im Deutschen, München: Fink.
- Jacobs, J. 1991. Negation, in A.von Stechow & D.Wunderlich, eds, 'Semantik. Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung', Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 560-596.
- Jónsson, J. 1996. Clausal architecture and Case in Icelandic, PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Kadmon, N. & F. Landman. 1993. *Any*. Linguistics and Philosophy 15: 353-422.
- Kayne, R. 1975. French syntax: The Transformational Cycle. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Kiparsky, P. & C. Condoravdi 2006, Tracking Jespersen's Cycle. In B. Joseph & A. Ralli (eds), Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of Modern Greek dialects and linguistic theory, Mytilene: Doukas, 172-197.
- Krifka, M. 1995. The semantics and pragmatics of polarity items. Linguistic Analysis 25: 209-57.
- Ledgeway, A. 2012. From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change. OUP.
- Martins, A.M. 2000. Polarity Items in Romance: Underspecification and Lexical Change, in S.Pintzuk, G.Tsoulas & A.Warner, eds, 'Diachronic Syntax. Models and Mechanisms', OUP, 191-219.
- Merchant, J. 2006. 'Why No(t)?', Style 40(1-2), 20-23.
- Parry, M. 2013. Negation in the history of Italo-Romance, in D.Willis, C.Lucas & A.Breitbarth, eds, 'The history of negation in the languages of Europe and the Mediterranean', Vol. 1: Case studies, OUP, 77-118.

References

- Penka, D. 2007. Negative Indefinites. Dissertation, Universität Tübingen.
- Penka, D. 2011. Negative Indefinites. OUP.
- Pintzuk, S. & A. Taylor. 2006. The loss of OV order in the history of English, in A.van Kemenade and B.Los, eds, 'The Handbook of the History of English', Oxford: Blackwell, 249-278.
- Poletto, C. 2014a. Negation. Unpublished ms, in prep. for The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages, OUP.
- Poletto, C. 2014b. Word Order in Old Italian. OUP.
- Posner, R. 1984. 'Double negatives, negative polarity and negative incorporation in Romance: a historical and comparative view', Transactions of the Philological Society 82(1), 1-26.
- Rowlett, P. 1998. Sentential negation in French. OUP.
- Svenonius, P. 2000. Quantifier Movement in Icelandic, in P.Svenonius, ed., 'The Derivation of VO and OV', Amsterdam: Benjamins, 255-292.
- Watanabe, A. 2004. The genesis of Negative Concord. Linguistic Inquiry 35(4). 559-612.
- Willis, D., A. Breitbarth & C. Lucas. 2013. Comparing diachronies of negation. In D. Willis et al (eds.), The history of negation in the languages of Europe and the Mediterranean, vol. 1, OUP, 1-50.
- Zanuttini, R. 1997. Negation and clausal structure: A comparative study of Romance languages. OUP.
- Zanuttini, R. 2010. La negazione, in G.Salvi & L.Renzi, eds, 'Grammatica dell'italiano antico', Vol. 1, Bologna: Il Mulino, 569-582.
- Zeijlstra, H. 2004. Sentential negation and Negative Concord. Universiteit van Amsterdam dissertation.
- Zeijlstra, H. 2008. Negative Concord is syntactic agreement. Ms. University of Amsterdam, available at `http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/000645`.
- Zeijlstra, H. 2011. 'On the syntactically complex status of negative indefinites', Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics 14, 111-138.
- Zeijlstra, H. 2014. On the uninterpretability of interpretable features, in P. Kosta, S. L. Franks, T. Radeva-Bork & L. Schürcks (eds.), 'Minimalism and beyond: Radicalizing the interfaces', Amsterdam: Benjamins, 109-128.