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- 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;


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


- **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. 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
   blatant: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:

\[(2)\]

\[a.\quad \text{Ratione } \text{utuntur: ludis } \text{poscunt neminem} \quad (\text{Infl} > \text{O})\]

\[\text{reason:ABL use:3PL game:ABL ask:3PL no.one:ACC}\]

‘They are reasonable: during the games they don’t demand from anyone’ (Pl.Cas.27)

\[b.\quad \text{De } \text{lanificio neminem metuo} \quad (\text{O} > \text{Infl})\]

\[\text{about woolmaking:ABL no.one:ACC fear}\]

‘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 \textbf{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 \textbf{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 asymmetry in non-strict NC (Italian):

(5) a. \textbf{Nessuno} ha mangiato (S $>$ Infl)
    ‘no one ate’

    b. \textbf{Non} ha mangiato \textbf{nessuno} (Infl $>$ S)
    ‘no one ate’

    c. \textbf{Niente} ha mangiato! (O $>$ Infl)
    ‘s/he did not eat anything (at all)’
Analysis of Double Negation


- 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


- main difference: presence of formal features for negation in NC systems = these features create morpho-syntactic doubling as the manifestation of a (clause-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)

Position of *nôn*

- 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):
   
   \[ [SubjP[EPP] [VP S O V ] [Subj^0 [NegP Neg^0 [TP T^0 t_{VP} ] ] ] ] ] \]
Position of \textit{nōn}

- Classical Latin satisfies the EPP requirement of TP by moving the (remnant) \textit{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 \textit{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 *nē* <IE *ne* and a scale-evoking minimizer.

\[(14) \quad nōn <nē+*oinom = oenum (= ūnum) \text{‘not (even) one’}\]

Archaic authors still witness *noenum*:

\[(15) \quad \text{si hodie noenum venis, cras quidem sis veneris} \text{‘if today not.at.all come:2SG tomorrow then please come:2SG ‘if you do not come (at all) today, then please do come tomorrow’ (Varro apud Non. 144.2, cf. Fruyt 2011)\]

- 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*


  (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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Tot./Relev. hits</th>
<th>OV</th>
<th>VO</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plautus</td>
<td>neminem</td>
<td>26/14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>neminem</td>
<td>10/6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero <em>Epist.</em></td>
<td>neminem</td>
<td>65/34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro</td>
<td>all acc.</td>
<td>15/8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitruvius</td>
<td>all acc.</td>
<td>11/6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy</td>
<td>neminem</td>
<td>85/31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celsus</td>
<td>null*</td>
<td>11/3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celsus</td>
<td>neminem</td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius</td>
<td>neminem</td>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius</td>
<td>nihil</td>
<td>37/24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius</td>
<td>null*</td>
<td>6/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Late Latin negative indefinites

(20) position of Late Latin object negative indefinite pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>TOT./Relev.</th>
<th>OV</th>
<th>VO</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passio Perp.</td>
<td>all acc.</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egeria</td>
<td>null*</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August. Serm.</td>
<td>nem-*</td>
<td>64/48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulgata</td>
<td>null*</td>
<td>37/21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulgata</td>
<td>nem-*</td>
<td>25/21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelia</td>
<td>nihil</td>
<td>25/22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orosius Hist.</td>
<td>all acc.</td>
<td>51/30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg. Tur. Hist.</td>
<td>null*</td>
<td>43/27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 X₀ of a Neg projection.

  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 vP 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).
Latin negation in light of Romance
Classical Latin Double Negation
CL non
Late Latin
Conclusions

What happens to Negative Indefinites?
Why do Late Latin NIs 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 non 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 reanalyzed 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!
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