Negation and negative indefinites in the history of Latin

Chiara Gianollo, Universität zu Köln, gianollc@uni-koeln.de

(i) From Double Negation to Negative Concord I discuss two phenomena of Latin grammar with wide-ranging implications for the development of Romance varieties: the syntax of negation and the diachronic pathways followed by indefinites interacting with it. Latin is a double negation (DN) language, whereas early Romance exhibits negative concord (NC). I explore the possibility that this typological shift is linked to another major change from Latin to Romance, namely the change from OV to VO (cf. Danckaert 2012, Ledgeway 2012). Romance also witnesses extensive lexical renewal in the domain of n-words and negative polarity items (NPIs), and the newly grammaticalized elements are flexible wrt their polarity requirements in the early varieties (Martins 2000). I discuss how also these developments may be related to the changes in clausal syntax (and thus in the interaction with negation). I show that some of the Romance facts can be traced back to Late Latin (LL) innovations: I analyze LL as a 'concealed non-strict NC language', in which restrictions in the use of the 'old' negative indefinites emerge, as well as new patterns with (new) NPIs.
(ii) In **Classical Latin** (CL) there is a one-to-one correspondence between overt expression of negation and presence of a semantic negation operator. Negation is either marked by the negative marker (NM) or by a negative indefinite (NI) (1a) (*nemo* 'no one', *nihil* 'nothing', *nullus* adj. 'no'). With multiple negatively marked elements a DN reading results (1b).

(1) a. **neminem** reperies qui   neget
        noone:ACC find:3PL who:NOM deny:3SG
        'you will not find anyone who would deny it' (Cic. Verr. 2.2.152)

     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)

I adopt Zeijlstra's (2011) analysis for NIs, according to which the lexical entry of NIs is syntactically complex and can be decomposed into two elements: a negative operator and an indefinite, spelled out as a single unit but able to take scope independently. N-words of NC languages, instead, do not introduce a negative operator: they carry a [uNeg] feature which has to enter an Agree relation with the [iNeg] NM in NegP, if c-commanded by it (Zeijlstra 2004). Latin NIs always result in the insertion of an abstract negative operator, independently of position; as a fact, they mostly end up preceding the finite verb, above the site where the negative marker would be, if it were overt.
(iii) As for the **negative marker**, *nōn* regularly precedes the finite verb, i.e. in analytical forms (2a) it appears immediately before the auxiliary, not before the participle (cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.1,818). Devine & Stephens (2006: 183), Danckaert (2012a: 23), (2012b) locate the position of Latin *nōn* above Inflection, Latin being an Infl-final language (2b).

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

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

Unlike Danckaert (2012a,b), who treats *nōn* as the head of a NegP, I argue that *nōn* is a phrasal category in a specifier attached to a projection in the TP-area, above the landing site for the inflected verb. This safeguars Zeijlstra's 2004, 2011 generalization, according to which negative X^0 are predicted not to be available in non-NC languages, and is diachronically more plausible than a post-Infl analysis, given FOFC (Biberauer, Holmberg, Roberts 2014).

(iii) Late Latin The position of the NM remains stable in LL. In fact, all standard Romance languages display a continuation of *nōn* (e.g. It. *non*, Sp., Cat. *no*, Fr. *ne*, Rom. *nu*), located pre-Infl (Zanuttini 1997, Poletto 2014): I argue that this pre-Infl position of the NM is inherited from Latin, and that also its head status already develops in LL, in connection with the parametric resetting from Infl-final to Infl-initial. I follow Danckaert's (2012a: 310-313, 2012b) analysis of this change, according to which CL 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. 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 Infl in analytic forms.

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

In LL *v*/VP-movement is lost and the arguments start to move separately (to the effect that object movement is much less systematic); the *v*P remains in situ, resulting in the decline of Infl-final orders. The NM *nōn* stays in the the same pre-Infl position in the TP-area; however, it is reanalyzed as a head, following the structure-minimizing tendency known as Spec-to-Head principle (van Gelderen 2004). In a simple negation reading, the [iNeg] Neg^0 becomes incompatible with NIs in its c-command domain, since they bring about a negative operator of their own. It can only license NPIs, and this prompts the grammaticalization of new [uNeg] n-words. This reconstruction is supported by the fact that 'old' NIs become rarer and, despite the general drift towards VO (Ledgeway 2012), object NIs consistently surface pre-Infl, in order not to conflict with the new [iNeg] head. In the entire *Vulgata* (4th cent. CE), of the 35 acc. *neminem*, 33 show the OV order (despite general increase in VO order); all the 47 occurrences of adjectival *nullum/nullos/nullam/nullas* are preverbal. Similarly, in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* (4th cent. CE) all 20 instances of object NIs precede the verb.

(iv) Conclusions LL becomes a 'concealed non-strict NC language': in the pre-Infl area the surface behavior of non-strict NC and DN languages overlaps, despite the different featural composition; in e.g. Italian or Spanish, when the [uNeg] n-word is syntactically above NegP, the insertion of a covert negative operator licenses it (Zeijlstra 2004), and no NM appears. LL NIs are not necessarily reanalyzed in their feature composition: 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), as shown by the extensive lexical replacement in the domain of indefinites under negation taking place in Romance.

Selected references: **Danckaert**, L. 2012a, Latin embedded clauses. Benjamins. **Danckaert**, L. 2012b, The decline of Latin VOAux: Neg-incorporation and syntactic reanalysis. Presentation at DiGS 14, Lisbon. **Ledgeway**, A. 2012, From Latin to Romance. OUP. **Martins**, A.M. 2000. Polarity Items in Romance: Underspecification and Lexical Change, in Pintzuk, Tsoulas, Warner (eds.), Diachronic Syntax. Models and Mechanisms. OUP. **Poletto**, C. 2014. Negation, ms. for The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages: OUP. **Zeijlstra**, H. 2004, Sentential negation and Negative Concord, PhD thesis Amsterdam.