JS Journal of Historical Syntax
Volume 5, Article 7: 1–38, 2021

INDEFINITES AND NEGATION IN ANCIENT GREEK*

Chiara Gianollo
University of Bologna

Abstract The history of Greek negation is interesting for our theoretical understanding of negation systems in at least two respects, which I will investigate in this contribution. First, Homeric Greek is a Double Negation system, while Classical Greek exhibits Negative Concord. Homeric Greek already shows signs of a diachronic development: there are two series of negative indefinites, an older, plain one and a newer, emphatic one. The emphatic series is formed by means of the focus-sensitive correlative negation *oudé*. The latter is the only negatively marked element to exhibit redundancy in the marking of negation in Homeric Greek: it can be argued to be responsible for the birth of Negative Concord items in the language. Furthermore, the system exhibited by Classical Greek is very relevant for our understanding of the syntactic factors that shape Negative Concord. Classical Greek is a non-strict Negative Concord language. However, differently from other well-studied languages of this type (e.g. Italian, Spanish, Portuguese), it shows extremely frequent cases of pre-Infl Concord among multiple Negative Concord items, a more constrained option in Romance. A study of their distribution may help shed light on the interaction between the syntax of Focus and Negative Concord.

1 Introduction

1.1 Research questions and outlook

This study focuses on two phenomena in the history of the Ancient Greek negation system, which I show to be empirically and causally connected: the existence of two series of indefinite pronouns-determiners used in negative

* I am grateful to the audience at DiGS 20 at the University of York, where I presented a preliminary version of this work, and to the anonymous reviewers for the *Journal of Historical Syntax* for their instructive comments and suggestions.

contexts and the development of Negative Concord from Homeric to Classical Greek.[1]

Concerning the first phenomenon, Homeric Greek shows two different series of indefinites in negative clauses (1). Both of them contain the negative particle *ou*, which corresponds to the plain sentential negative marker. In the first pattern (1a) the negative particle combines with the *wh*-pronoun. In the second pattern (1b) the negative particle is joined to the multifunctional particle *dé*, yielding a complex element that corresponds to the correlative negative particle (*oudé*), and the numeral 'one' represents the pronominal base.

(1) a. *oú tis* (οὔ τις) 'nobody'
b. *oudeís* (οὐδείς) 'nobody'

Apparently the two series share the same semantic and syntactic properties (see subsection 3.1 for examples and discussion). This situation raises the following question: are the two series of indefinite pronouns really overlapping from a functional point of view? I will show that the answer is negative, and that the two patterns can be distinguished in terms of their relative chronology and of their pragmatic properties: the combination of correlative negation and cardinal numeral is an innovative pattern originating as a strategy of negation strengthening (cf. Denizot 2014).

The second phenomenon concerns the emergence of Negative Concord from Homeric to Classical Greek. In Herodotus (5th cent. BCE, cf. (2)) we consistently observe it. But in the earlier Homeric poems negative indefinites negate by themselves and do not co-occur with the negative marker.

1 I use the label 'Ancient Greek' to subsume the two (idealized) stages that I will discuss in this paper: Homeric Greek and Classical Greek (5th–3rd cent. BCE). Homeric Greek is the language witnessed by the Homeric poems, which, as is well known, are very difficult to date (because of their composite nature and complex textual tradition); I will take them here to represent the most ancient documented stage of the literary language, whose latest layer goes back to the 8th cent. BCE. The fact that I consider Homeric Greek and Classical Greek to be two subsequent idealized stages should not mask two important points: (i) it is difficult to evaluate the extent of actual historical continuity between these two stages, given the nature of the Homeric corpus and the assumed chronological separation between the two stages; (ii) the texts that I use as representatives of Classical Greek are in fact manifestations of different dialects (chiefly, Ionic and Attic). The idealization might thus miss some finer distinctions across varieties. However, the systems I assume are coherently manifested in the individual texts and, at this level of analysis, result in a sufficiently accurate description.

(2) οὐκ ἐκάλεε ἐς ὄψιν ἑωυτῷ οὐδένα τῶν λογίμων Περσέων (Hdt. 3.68.2)

ouk *ekálee es ópsin heōutōi* **oudéna** *tōn logímōn*
not call:3SG in aspect himself:DAT nobody:ACC the:GEN notable:GEN
Perséōn
Persian:GEN

'he did not summon any notable Persian into his presence'

The diachrony of Ancient Greek thus offers the opportunity to investigate the motivations for the transition to a Negative Concord system (if not the specifics of its development, due to the gap in the transmission: cf. fn. 1).

My analysis will highlight the role of correlative negation in this transition (on the basis of observations first made in Willmott 2011), hence establishing a link with the existence of the indefinite series in (1b). Correlative negation, both as independent focus particle and as morphological building block of indefinites, functions as negation strengthener. In this respect, the birth of Negative Concord in Greek is similar to the parallel process in Romance (Gianollo 2018: ch. 5). This corroborates the hypothesis that in Greek and Romance the emergence of Negative Concord is related to Jespersen's Cycle in terms of functional motivations, since both are triggered by the competition between 'plain' and 'emphatic' strategies for the expression of sentential negation. Both phenomena analyzed in this contribution, therefore, point to a recurrent developmental cycle within negation systems, motivated by the functional pressure towards expressiveness and characterized by important structural consequences.

Classical Greek Negative Concord is interesting also from a synchronic, comparative perspective, since it manifests a type of Negative Concord that is different from the systems of other well-studied languages. As we will see in section 4, Classical Greek has a non-strict Negative Concord grammar: the possibility of co-occurrence of the indefinites and the sentential negative marker is sensitive to positional factors, which lead to an asymmetry between the area of the clause preceding the negative marker (hence, also preceding the finite verb) and the area following it (Willmott 2013, Horrocks 2014, Muchnová 2016). This type, which is quite rare cross-linguistically, on the one hand resembles the systems that have been studied in detail for Romance languages like Portuguese, Spanish, and Italian (see e.g. Zanuttini 1997, Herburger 2001, Poletto 2016, and references cited there). On the other hand, it differs from them because it allows to a much greater extent the co-occurrence of Negative Concord items in the Left Periphery of the clause. I will propose that the peculiarities of the Classical Greek system can be explained by the semantic and syntactic interaction between focus and negation in Negative Concord.

In subsection 1.2 I outline the theoretical prerequisites for my analysis. In section 2 I provide some basic information on the Ancient Greek system of negation and on its general sentence structure. In section 3 I deal with the morphosyntax of the indefinite series used in negative environments, and with the rise of Negative Concord, which I connect to the pragmatic properties of the innovative *oudeís*-series. In section 4 I describe the specificities of Negative Concord in Classical Greek, presenting data collected by means of a corpus study. Section 5 summarizes the general conclusions.[2]

1.2 A featural typology of negation

In Negative Concord systems multiple expressions of negation co-occur in a sentence yielding one single semantic negative operator: in other words, sentence negation is marked in multiple places in the sentence, on elements that have to be interpreted in the scope of the negative operator (pronouns, determiners, adverbs; cf. 3a). These elements are called n-words or Negative Concord Items (NCIs): they build an interpretive chain with other expressions of negation in the clause; however, they can also have negative import in isolation, most clearly in negative short answers, and this is what differentiates them from negative polarity items (NPIs) (3b).

(3) Negative Concord and NCIs

a. **Non** *ha visto* **niente nessuno**. *(Italian)*
not has seen nothing nobody
'Nobody saw anything.'

b. *A: Ci sono bambini tra i passeggeri? (Italian)*
there are children among the passengers

B: **Nessun** *bambino* / * **Alcun** *bambino*
no child any child

'A: Are there children among the passengers? B: No children.'

In some languages (like Classical Greek, but also Romanian and Italian in 5a,b and 6) the NCIs contain etymologically negative morphemes; in other languages (like Modern Greek, as shown in 5c,d, and the well-known case of Modern French) they have a non-negative etymological origin. I will

2 In this paper I use a number of abbreviations that are current in the literature on negation. I list them here for convenience: Infl = position of the finite verb; NCI = Negative Concord Item; NI = negative indefinite; NPI = negative polarity item; NM = negative marker. The abbreviations in the glosses follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules. Examples are provided in the original Greek script, followed by transliteration, glossing and translation. They follow the editions used in the TLG corpus (Pantelia 2014).

speak in both cases of 'negatively marked indefinites' since I will adopt Zeijlstra's analysis (Zeijlstra 2004 and following work; see also Penka 2011) and consider NCIs to be carriers of uninterpretable formal features for negation ([uNeg]), independently of their etymological origin. The [uNeg] feature has to be eliminated from the derivation, thereby triggering the establishment of negative syntactic dependencies within the clause.

The featural endowment of NCIs distinguishes them from Negative Indefinites (NIs) of so-called Double Negation languages (like Standard English or German, and Homeric Greek, as we will see), which have a truly negative import in all contexts (resulting in a double-negation reading if co-occurring with other expressions of negation).

The featural specification of NIs is [Neg], which is a semantic feature that needs no licensing from the surrounding environment; hence, NIs are inactive in the establishment of syntactic dependencies (Zeijlstra 2004, 2011). This triggers, as soon as they are merged, the immediate insertion of the semantic negative operator (due to earliness considerations, Gianollo 2018: 162–164), which takes sentential scope at LF.

The featural content of the elements making up negation systems cross-linguistically is summarized in (4).

(4) Features for Giannakidou's (2000) categories in Zeijlstra (2004):

Type	**Negative marker**	**Indefinites**
Double Negation	[Neg]	[Neg] (NIs)
Non-strict Negative Concord	[iNeg]	[uNeg] (NCIs)
Strict Negative Concord	[uNeg]	[uNeg] (NCIs)

Since Giannakidou (2000), the labels 'strict' and 'non-strict' are used to indicate two subtypes of Negative Concord. In strict systems the negative marker (henceforth NM) occurs in all negative sentences; if an NCI is present, it is always accompanied by an NM marking negation in the immediate proximity of the finite verb (cf. 5).

(5) Strict Negative Concord

a. **Nimeni nu** *a cumpărat cartea.* *(Romanian)*
nobody not has bought book-the
'No one has bought the book.'

b. **Nimeni nu** *citeşte* **nimic**. *(Romanian)*
nobody not read nothing
'Nobody reads anything'

c. Κανένας δεν είδε το Σωκράτη. (Modern Greek)
kanénas den *íde to Sōkráti*
nobody not saw the Socrates
'No one saw Socrates.'

d. Δεν είπα τίποτα (Modern Greek)
den *ipa* **tipota**.
not said nothing
'I did not say anything.'

In non-strict systems there is an asymmetry related to word order, dividing the sentence in two areas: the area preceding the finite verb (Infl) and the area following it.

(6) Non-strict (= asymmetrical) Negative Concord

a. **Non** *è venuto* **nessuno**. *(Italian)*
not is come nobody
'Nobody came.'

b. **Nessuno** *legge* **niente**.
nobody reads nothing
'Nobody reads anything.'

c. **Nessuno** *è venuto.*
nobody is come
'Nobody came.'

d. **NESSUNO non** *è venuto.*
nobody not is come
'Everybody came.'

e. ***Non nessuno** è venuto.

In the post-Infl area the behavior of strict and non-strict systems is partly overlapping. The post-Infl NCI is always accompanied by another expression of negation in the pre-Infl area, which can be either the NM (as in strict systems) (6a), or another NCI (so-called 'negative spread'). Differently from strict systems, in this latter case there is no co-occurring NM in the single-negation reading: compare (6b) with (5b).

In the pre-Infl area of non-strict systems, the NCI is never accompanied by the NM in a single-negation reading (6c). If the NCI and the NM co-occur in the pre-Infl area, the result is a double-negation reading (6d), which is pragmatically marked and requires special prosody (focus prominence on the NCI, indicated by capitalization). Since only pronominal clitics can intervene between the NM and the finite verb in Italian, the NM > NCI order in the pre-Infl area is impossible (6e); we will see later that in Classical Greek,

by contrast, this option is allowed, with interesting consequences for our understanding of asymmetrical systems.

In Zeijlstra's analysis the establishment of negative syntactic dependencies within the clause, resulting in Negative Concord, is interpreted as (reverse) Agree (Zeijlstra 2004, 2008, 2014): the [uNeg] feature is eliminated from the derivation by agreeing with a hierarchically higher interpretable counterpart ([iNeg]).

Let us see how this works in non-strict systems. In the case of post-Infl NCIs, the [iNeg] feature is carried by the NM, which in a language like Italian (and Classical Greek, as I will assume) is merged in a functional projection for negation (NegP) above TP (7). In Italian the NM *non* is the head of the NegP projection (NegP-1 in Zanuttini 1997).

(7) pre-Infl N(egative) M(arker) + post-Infl indefinite:
[NegP NM_{iNeg} [TP finite verb ... [DP $indef_{uNeg}$]]]

If there is a pre-Infl NCI, the licensing [iNeg] feature is carried by an abstract operator, whose insertion is triggered by the presence of a [uNeg] feature in the TP-CP domain (as Last Resort). In (8) the phonetically empty operator $\emptyset_{iNeg}$ is merged in NegP, c-commanding the subject NCI in Spec, TP; $\emptyset_{iNeg}$ may be inserted higher if the indefinite reaches the Left Periphery (which is the case in Romance, where the subject always surfaces above NegP).

(8) pre-Infl indefinite:
[NegP $\emptyset_{iNeg}$ [TP [DP $indef_{uNeg}$] finite verb ...]]

In strict Negative Concord systems the insertion of the abstract operator is a generalized strategy that applies to each negative structure, since all the overt elements making up the system of negation bear [uNeg] features.

Negative Concord is a cross-linguistically widespread strategy. In the typological survey by van der Auwera & Van Alsenoy (2016), it is attested in 19 percent of the 179 languages in their sample, and it is particularly frequent in Eurasia. Even more frequent cross-linguistically are the types in which a verb-oriented NM combines with NPIs (47.5%) or with neutral, multifunctional indefinites (49.7%). Languages may display multiple strategies, and in this case they are counted multiple times by van der Auwera & Van Alsenoy (2016). Double Negation systems are famously very rare (only 11 languages in WALS, Haspelmath 2013). As I will argue, Homeric Greek belongs to this type; however, it also shows the strategy of combining the NM with a multifunctional indefinite, and this construction is indeed the source of the pattern seen in (1a).

The creation of the innovative indefinites in (1b) is a first step towards the development of the non-strict Negative Concord system of Classical

Greek. Interestingly, within Negative Concord systems the non-strict type is extremely rare: van der Auwera & Van Alsenoy (2016) count very few languages (only three in their sample, and a handful of other cases from the literature), even if their definition of non-strict Negative Concord is broader than the one adopted here. The addition of the Classical Greek data to the debate is, therefore, especially relevant in a comparative perspective.

2 Ancient Greek negation and clause structure

2.1 The Ancient Greek system of negation

The Ancient Greek system of negation has been the object of a number of recent studies, which have detailed the rich inventory of elements that express negation, as well as their syntax (Kiparsky & Condoravdi 2006, Klein 2011, Willmott 2011, Denizot 2012, Rijksbaron 2012, Muchnová 2013b,a, Willmott 2013, Denizot 2014, Horrocks 2014, Chatzopoulou 2015, Muchnová 2016, Chatzopoulou 2019). Here I will limit myself to summarizing only the information necessary to set the following discussion in context.

From the beginning of attestation, Greek displays a bipartite system of negation (Willmott 2013, Chatzopoulou 2019), in which the so-called objective *ou(k)* and the subjective *mḗ* negative markers alternate depending on the syntactic-semantic context. This bipartite system has been analyzed either in terms of illocutionary force and modality (Janda & Joseph 1999, Roussou 2000, Willmott 2013) or in terms of (non)veridicality (Chatzopoulou 2019). The dichotomy between an objective and a subjective negation is reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European (Delbrück 1879: 146), although the rules governing the context-sensitive alternation between the two markers are language-specific.

The particle *ou(k)* is attested already in Mycenaean (in the proclitic form *ou*, Vilborg 1960: 123).[3] Following Cowgill (1960), its etymology is reconstructed as **ne* H_2*oyu* k^{w}*id*, 'not ever' (NM + 'life, age' + indefinite pronoun), which is the outcome of a strengthening process targeting the original Proto-Indo-European NM **ne* (Jespersen's Cycle).[4]

The particle *mḗ* is not attested in Mycenaean, but this is plausibly a chance effect due to the documentary nature of the extant texts, which do not

3 In Ancient Greek the consonant *-k* (or *-kh*) is realized if the following word begins with a vowel (respectively with smooth and rough breathing).

4 The Proto-Indo-European negative particle **ne* only shows residues in Greek: besides supposedly forming the base for the reinforced NM *ou(k)*, it is cognate to the negative prefix *a-* (alpha privative, deriving from **n̥*). For further etymological information about Greek negatives see Moorhouse (1959), Landsman (1988–1989).

provide the relevant contexts (prohibitions, wishes, purpose clauses, etc.); see Vilborg (1960: 124).

Both negative particles may morphosyntactically combine with other elements of the functional lexicon, yielding two parallel series, shown in (9):

(9) Lexicon of negation in Ancient Greek (selection)

Objective NM *ou(k)*	*oudé*	*oú tis*	*oudeís*	*oúpote*	*oukéti*	*oúte*
	and not	nobody	nobody	never	no more	neither...nor
Subjective NM *mḗ*	*mēdé*	*mḗ tis*	*mēdeís*	*mḗpote*	*mēkéti*	*mḗte*
	and not	nobody	nobody	never	no more	neither...nor

The *mḗ*-system behaves like the *ou(k)*-system in all relevant respects (presence of two series of indefinites, Negative Concord properties); compare Willmott (2013), Chatzopoulou (2019: 88–91). For the present research, and especially for the questions surrounding the nature of Negative Concord in Classical Greek, the *mḗ*-system is less relevant, due to the high syntactic position of the NM (Roberts & Roussou 2003: 76–79, Willmott 2013), which results in minor variability in word order. Therefore I concentrate on the *ou(k)*-system in my discussion.

Traditional grammars have usually focused on the rules governing the distribution of the objective and subjective particles. They also contain numerous remarks on the co-occurrence of multiple negatively marked elements in a clause, usually under the heading of 'accumulation of negatives' (German *Häufung der Negationen*, cf. e.g. Kühner & Gerth 1898: §716). Textbooks often report the following rule for Classical Greek (formulated after Muchnová 2016: 183): 'negatives are rendered invalid when the last one is simple', whereas 'negatives are reinforced when the last one is compound', whereby a 'simple' negative is a negative marker (*ou(k)* or *mḗ*), and a 'compound' element is an element belonging to the series seen in (9). In section 4 we will see that this rule indeed captures in a pre-theoretical way an important generalization about Classical Greek Negative Concord.

2.2 *Ancient Greek sentence structure*

Ancient Greek word order is well known for its remarkable flexibility: establishing a basic word order is challenging, due to the numerous available displacement operations driven by information-structural principles, which have led many authors to treat Greek as a discourse-configurational language (see, among the most comprehensive studies, Dik 1995, Matić 2003, Goldstein 2016).

There is a general consensus positing a process of change from Object-Verb to Verb-Object (i.e. from an Infl-final to an Infl-initial grammar) during the history of Greek, although it is difficult to pinpoint the various stages (Taylor 1994, Kirk 2012, Celano 2014). Celano (2014) offers the estimate in (10) based on queries on electronic corpora and considering nouns and pronouns in matrix clauses.

(10) Verb–Object order in a sample of Ancient Greek texts; from Celano (2014: 107)

	OV	**VO**
Homer	4995	2451
Herodotus	804	753
New Testament	997	2084

The discussion on the basic structure of the Ancient Greek clause is still ongoing, and I will not attempt to summarize it here. The structure of the Left Periphery has been assessed more clearly and conforms to a large extent to what is known from contemporary languages: in (11) I present (omitting the details) the basic structure assumed by Goldstein (2016: 25, 215) on the basis of a wealth of previous observations and of his own corpus study.

(11) XP_{Topic} > Wh > Complementizer > XP_{Focus}

The structure of the lower part of the clause is more debated, and there is no consensus on the structure (and indeed the existence) of the v/VP and TP projections (cf. Goldstein 2016: ch. 2 for discussion). For the purposes of this paper, I will assume a basic Infl-final structure, derived by generalized vP-movement, as proposed by Biberauer & Roberts (2005) for Old English and by Danckaert (2012: 310–313) for Latin.[5]

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

In (12), the (remnant) v/VP is moved to the specifier of a projection in the split-TP (SubjP in (12)) in order to satisfy TP's EPP requirement. This operation moves the verb's arguments above the finite verb, and yields Infl-final word orders, assuming independent V-to-T movement. The basic (i.e. pragmatically unmarked) position of the NM is immediately adjacent to the finite verb.

5 This assumption is, I believe, relatively innocent in the context of this work, since, as we will see in section 4, the analysis of Classical Greek Negative Concord will capitalize on the position of the NM, rather than on the position of the finite verb.

I agree with Chatzopoulou (2019: 58–64) that empirical arguments point towards an XP-analysis for the NM *ou(k)*: the NM *ou(k)* can be separated from the verb by a number of elements (showing that it is not necessarily enclitic to the verb), can occupy the first position in the clause (where it is plausibly focus-moved) and can occur in isolation in elliptical structures.

Second-position particles and pronouns mark the boundary between the Left Periphery and the predicational core (on the position of Classical Greek particles in the Left Periphery see Arad & Roussou 1997).

Elements following the inflected verb (Infl) may in principle be accounted for by assuming either (i) further movement of the verb to the Left Periphery, or (ii) movement of the post-Infl element to the Left Periphery with subsequent remnant movement of the rest of the clause to a higher position (for an alternative Focus-in-situ analysis see Matić 2003), or (iii) optional satisfaction of the EPP requirement simply through movement of the verb, with arguments remaining low. In Gianollo (2019) I discuss this matter further. In this contribution I restrict my attention to the pre-Infl area.

Focused material is systematically preposed in Ancient Greek (although possibly not obligatorily, if Focus-in-situ has to be derived without movement), see Matić (2003), Goldstein (2016). The operation of focus preposing has been studied in detail by Goldstein (2016: ch. 6). For the present paper it is especially relevant to remark that emphatic preposing of the negative marker and other negative elements is observed: according to Goldstein (2016: 196–200), this operation has the effect of removing contextual restrictions on quantification (domain widening).

3 The rise of Negative Concord in Ancient Greek

3.1 Two series of indefinites in Homer

As introduced in section 1, Homeric Greek shows the co-existence of two different series for the indefinites taking narrow scope under the negative operator. The functional motivation for the existence of two series, and the substitution of the indefinite-based one with the numeral-based one, will be the focus of this section.

One series is formed by the NM (*ou(k)* or *mḗ*) and the indefinite / interrogative pronominal base **k^{w}i-/*k^{w}e-*: this yields m.f. *oú tis*, (οὔ τις) 'nobody', n. *oú ti* (οὔ τι) 'nothing', and the corresponding item in the *mḗ*-system (cf. 9). This series, whose elements have both pronominal and determiner-like uses, has many ancient Indo-European parallels (cf. Sanskrit *nakis*, Archaic Latin *nĕ quis*, Gothic *ni hvas*, Denizot 2014: 69). An example from the Homeric poems is given in (13).

(13) Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὔ τις σεῖο θεῶν ὀλοώτερος ἄλλος (Il. 3.365)

Zeũ *páter,* **oú tis** *seĩo* *theō̃n*
Zeus:VOC father:VOC no any:NOM you:GEN god:GEN
oloőteros *állos*
destructive:COMP.NOM other:NOM

'Father Zeus, there is no other god more destructive than you!'

In Homeric Greek, particles can occur in-between the NM and the indefinite (e.g. *ou gàr tis* (Il. 6.487), *ou mèn gár tis* (Od. 8.552)).[6] This attests to the fact that what is later written as a univerbated form originated quite transparently from the syntactic combination of a sentential NM and a multifunctional indefinite item, a strategy that was plausibly common to all ancient Indo-European languages. These diachronic and comparative facts support the hypothesis that this is the older series of the two. The series is continued in Classical Greek, but remains confined to poetical texts (Liddell & Scott 1996: s.v.).

The other series is formed by another negative morpheme, the correlative negation (*oudé* or *mēdé*) and the cardinal numeral for 'one' *heĩs*: m. *oudeís* (οὐδείς), f. *oudemía* (οὐδεμία) 'nobody', n. *oudén* (οὐδέν) 'nothing'.[7] The correlative negation *oudé* is, in turn, a complex item formed by adding to the NM the discourse particle *dè*, with a basic correlative-contrastive meaning (cf. Denniston 1954: 190).

The series formed by the correlative negation and the numeral 'one' is a real morphological compound, as shown by its accentual behavior: the numeral base carries an acute accent in the compound, instead of the circumflex accent of the numeral base in isolation. Throughout Ancient Greek, it coexists with the syntactic combination *oudè heĩs* 'not even one' (and *oudé tis* 'not even someone'), which is at the origin of the compound form. In Homer *oudeís* occurs mostly in the neuter nom./acc. form (cf. 14), often adverbially as a negation strengthener (cf. 15).

(14) οὐδὲν ἀκιδνότερον γαῖα τρέφει ἀνθρώποιο (Od. 18.130)

oudèn *akidnóteron* *gaĩa* *tréphei* *anthrő́poio*
nothing:ACC weak:COMP.ACC earth:NOM nurture:3SG man:GEN

'the earth nurtures nothing weaker than man'

6 This happens in particular when the NM is in sentence-initial position; particles like *gár* 'for' and *mén* 'indeed' are second-position particles (in a left-peripheral Focus position, according to Arad & Roussou 1997) that can interrupt constituents.

7 The Modern Greek NM *den* 'not' originates from the neuter form of this indefinite: see Roberts & Roussou (2003: 157–160), Willmott (2013: 299–307), Chatzopoulou (2019: chs. 5–6).

(15) ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ οὐδὲν σε ῥέξω κακά (Il. 24.370)

all᾽ egṑ **oudèn** *se* *réxō* *kaká*
but I:NOM nothing:ACC you:ACC do:1SG bad:ACC

'but I will do you no harm at all'

The *oudeís*-series is traditionally considered a Greek innovation; it is still quite rare in the Homeric poems, as shown by Denizot (2014); compare (16).

(16) Distribution of negatively marked indefinites in Homer (Denizot 2014)

	oú tis	*mḗ tis*	*oudeís*	*mēdeís*
Iliad	284	73	8	1
Odyssey	292	97	13	/

Of the 21 attestations counted by Denizot, 19 feature the neuter nom./acc. form *oudén*, sometimes – as seen above (cf. 15) – used adverbially ('at all'). This differs sharply from the distribution of *oú tis*, which is found in all genders and case forms. The masculine form of the *oudeís*-series is found only in two cases, both in the same formulaic expression (Il. 22.459, shown in 17; Od. 11.515); compare Chantraine (1953: §497).

(17) πολὺ προθέεσκε, τὸ ὃν μένος οὐδενὶ εἴκων (Il. 22.459)

polù *prothéeske,* *tò* *hòn* *ménos* **oudenì**
much run.before:3SG the:ACC his:ACC might:ACC nobody:DAT
eíkōn
give.way:PART.NOM

'(Achilles) runs far in front, yielding to no man in his might'

3.2 The role of correlative negation

By means of an analysis of all the occurrences in the Homeric poems, Denizot (2014) substantiates the observation, systematically made in traditional studies (Wackernagel 1928, Chantraine 1953, Moorhouse 1959, Landsman 1988–1989), that the *oudeís*-series is an emphatic variant. The correlative negation functions here as a focus particle ('not even') and yields an indefinite with the meaning 'not even one': the combination with 'one' (scalar endpoint) results in a focusing item that emphasizes negation. The same function of the correlative element *oudé* appears in the frequent combination *oudé + tis, ti*, attested in Homer in 95 cases (with adjacency between the two elements).

As mentioned, the particle *oudé* is a correlative negation. The fact that Ancient Greek correlative negation has a focalizing ('emphatic') nature has been frequently observed (Denniston 1954, Revuelta Puigdollers 2006, Lambert 2012, Fogliani 2016). Similarly to Latin correlative negation *nec* (Gianollo 2017), and according to a cross-linguistically frequent state of affairs (cf. Haspelmath 2007), it is often used as a stand-alone focalizing adverb (cf. co-occurrence *kaì oudé* lit. 'and not.even', where the coordinating function is taken by the conjuction *kaí*). The function as negative focus particle emerges under specific pragmatic conditions, namely when no explicit correlation in context is present (stand-alone use) and when the element in focus evokes alternative values ordered on a scale. For instance, in (18) the evoked scale is the probability of feeling wrath; a dead person is naturally taken to be the scalar endpoint, that is, the person that has the highest probability of being immune from wrath. The combination of the negation and the scalar endpoint results in an emphatic expression of negation.

(18) οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες οὐδὲ θανὼν λήσεσθαι ἐμοὶ χόλου (Od. 11.553–4)

ouk *ar' émelles* **oudè** *thanòn* *lḗsesthai* *emoì* *khólou*
not PT will:2SG not.even die:PART.NOM forget:INF me:DAT wrath:GEN

'you will not forget, not even dead, the wrath against me?'

In the case of the combination with 'one' found in the innovative *oudeís*-series, the relevant scale is the scale of natural numbers.

Particles meaning 'even' are frequently found as morphemes of emphatic indefinites (Haspelmath 1997: 222). Krifka (2007) speaks of 'scalar focus' in the case of 'even'. With scalar focus particles, as shown in (19), alternative propositions to the proposition in focus (p) are evoked for the context C; the alternatives are ordered along a scale built according to a contextually determined probability measure μ; the focus denotation is then the extreme of the scale.

(19) Scalar particles:
even p
(1) p
(2) presupposition: $\forall q \in \mathrm{C}\ [q \neq p \rightarrow p <_{\mu} q]$
(3) alternatives come in an ordered set

When interacting with negation, 'even' has the effect of a strengthening strategy. In particular, an indefinite with the structure 'even [not x]' conveys

the following meaning: it is even the case that the most probable alternative does not hold.[8]

The Romance languages have negatively marked indefinites (e.g. Italian *nessuno*, Spanish *ningún* 'nobody') that are functionally and formally parallel to the Ancient Greek *oudeís*-series, since they are formed with 'one' and a negative morpheme deriving from Latin correlative negation *nec* 'not even': on this see Gianollo (2017, 2018). Modern Greek NCI *kanénas* 'nobody' does not contain a negative morpheme, but has an otherwise very similar structure: *kán* 'even' + *énas* 'one'.[9]

If this interpretation of the data is on the right track, in the Homeric poems we would witness the competition between a plain 'not-x' series (the older one) and an emphatic 'not-even-one' series (the innovative one).

The competition between a plain and an emphatic expression of negation is obviously remindful of the mechanism observed in Jespersen's Cycle, leading to the replacement of an old NM with a newer, originally more emphatic form (cf. Kiparsky & Condoravdi 2006, Roussou 2007, Chatzopoulou 2015, 2019 for instantiations of the cycle in Greek and its interrelation with indefinites and minimizers).

A family of approaches attributes Jespersen's Cycle to a pragmatic tendency towards negation strengthening, and to the ensuing inflationary effects leading to bleaching of the emphatic value in the course of time (a.o. Meillet 1912, Schwegler 1990: 151–174, Bernini & Ramat 1996: 30–34, Eckardt 2003, 2006, Kiparsky & Condoravdi 2006).

This perspective allows us to capture the functional parallelism between diachronic phenomena affecting the NM and those targeting indefinites in the scope of negation (Quantifier Cycle), on which see Willis (2011), Willis, Lucas & Breitbarth (2013: 36–38), Gianollo (2018: 132–135). Narrow-scope indefinites combining with negation may function as emphatic means for negation strengthening: in Ancient Greek, this causes the emergence of a new, emphatic series of negatively marked indefinites, which compete with the plain ones. In Classical Greek the *oudeís*-series has lost its emphatic value, through bleaching of the scalar component (similarly to what Chatzopoulou 2015, 2019 proposes for Jespersen's Cycle from post-Classical to Modern Greek). Besides the effects on the pragmatic contribution, the grammaticalization process can be argued to also have effects on the indefinites' syntactic

8 For comprehensive discussion on the role of scalarity in emphasis and in polarity sensitivity see Krifka (1995), Tovena (1998), Giannakidou (2007), Israel (2011), Chierchia (2013).

9 The particle *kán* (which Veloudis 2017 calls a 'concessive intensifier') derives from the combination of *kaí* 'and' and *án* 'if', and already existed in Ancient Greek. For the diachronic development (starting in Medieval Greek) and the distribution of *kanénas* see Horrocks (2014), Veloudis (2017).

behavior, as we will see in the next section.

Replicating the format that Gianollo (2018: 135) applies to the Romance cases, the cycles affecting the realization of indefinites in the scope of negation can be schematically summarized as in (20).

(20) Diachrony of Greek indefinites

Stage	Plain	Emphatic
I	*ou tis*	***oudeis***
II	***oudeis***	*kan enas*

Differently from what happens to older NMs in Jespersen's Cycle, the older *oú tis*-series does not disappear, although (as mentioned in subsection 3.1) it is confined to an archaizing formal register. Importantly, as remarked by Willmott (2011), the *oú tis*-series never develops Negative Concord properties in Classical Greek, preserving its archaic syntax. By contrast, the elements of the new *oudeís*-series behave as NCIs in Classical Greek.

3.3 The rise of Negative Concord

I agree with Willmott (2011) that the emergence of the emphatic *oudeís*-series is connected to the development of the non-strict Negative Concord system of Classical Greek.

To be sure, neither series exhibits Negative Concord in the Homeric poems (cf. Chantraine 1953: §493). As remarked above, the *oú tis*-series never enters Negative Concord throughout its history. But also the *oudeís*-series, which becomes an NCI-series in Classical Greek, is only found in structures compatible with a Double Negation grammar in Homer: compare (21a) and, especially (21b), where the (adverbially used) indefinite follows the verb and is still able to convey sentential negation by itself (no NM is present).

(21) a. ὁ δέ μ′ οὐδὲν ἀμείβετο (Od. 11.563)
ho dè m′ **oudèn** *ameíbeto*
he:NOM but me:ACC nothing:ACC answer:3SG
'He did not answer me anything'

b. νεμεσσῶμαί γε μὲν οὐδέν (Od. 19.264)
nemessõ̃maí ge mèn **oudén**
grudge:1SG PT PT nothing:ACC
'I would not grudge at all'

However, a diachronic link becomes plausible if we consider the behavior of the correlative negation *oudé*. The only contexts where we see Negative

Concord in Homer are contexts in which *oudé* appears, together with other negatively marked elements: in these cases multiple negatively marked elements in the same clause reinforce each other (Chantraine 1953: §494) building a single interpretive chain. Willmott (2011) counts 20 examples in the Odyssey where two negative words occur in the same sentence with the global meaning remaining negative; one of the co-occurring words is always *oudé*. The constructions in which it is found are remindful of Delbrück's *Ergänzungsnegation* or Jespersen's *resumptive negation*: in some examples the constituent introduced by *oudé* can be interpreted as an afterthought, syntactically not integrated in the clause. One such example is (22).

(22) οὐ γὰρ παυσωλή γε μετέσσεται οὐδ᾽ ἠβαιὸν (Il. 2.386)

ou *gàr* *pausōlé* *ge* *metéssetai* **oud**᾽ *ēbaiòn*
not indeed pause:NOM PT be:FUT.3SG nor in.the.least

'for there will be no pause, not even for a short while'

Also in the example we saw in (18), the constituent introduced by *oudé* is a parenthetical apposition modifying the subject.

A different example, in which the constituent introduced by *oudé* is more integrated in the syntactic structure, is (23): here the constituent is the direct object of the verb. The clause is introduced by the NM *ou*, which is separated from the verb by the rest of the elements in the clause; the direct object immediately precedes the verb; the emphatic nature of the clause is evidenced by the prominent position of the NM, as well as by the fact that the object is a minimizer ('a pinch of salt').

(23) οὐ σύ γ᾽ ἂν ἐξ οἴκου σῷ ἐπιστάτῃ οὐδ᾽ ἅλα δοίης (Od. 17.455)

ou *sú* *g᾽* *àn* *ex* *oíkou* *sõi* *epistátēi* **oud**᾽ *hála*
not you:NOM PT PT from house you:DAT suppliant:DAT nor salt:ACC
doíēs
give:2SG

'if you were in your own house you would not spare a poor man so much as a pinch of salt'

In (23) there is Negative Concord between the clause-initial NM *ou* and the focus particle *oudé*, since the interpretation requires single negation.

Interestingly, both Basset (1984) and Willmott (2011) remark that also the famous word play in Odyssey 9, where Ulysses calls himself *Oũtis* 'Noman' (cf. 24), requires that a Negative Concord interpretation be possible, in order to achieve the intended effect.

(24) ὦ φίλοι, Οὖτίς με κτείνει δόλῳ οὐδὲ βίηφιν (Od. 9.408)

ō̃ *phíloi*, **Oũtís** *me kteínei dólōi* **oudè** *bíēphin*
o friends Oũtis me:ACC kill:3SG guile:DAT and.not force:DAT

Polyphemus means: 'My friends, it is Noman that is slaying me by guile and not by force.'
The Cyclops understand: 'My friends no one is slaying me by guile or by force.'

Polyphemus is convinced that his prisoner, Ulysses, is called Oũtis 'Noman'. When Ulysses attacks him, he calls for help from the other Cyclops, who, however, misunderstand him: they do not intepret Oũtis as a proper name but as the indefinite *oú tis* (in spite of the different accent: a case of imperfect second-language learning?), and interpret the co-occurrence of *oú tis* and *oudé* as yielding a single semantic negation (where *oudé* is equivalent to correlative *nor*, not contrastive *and not*): the Cyclops' reading results from a Negative Concord structure, and allows them to go back to sleep without helping Polyphemus.

3.4 Analysis

I apply to cases like (22–23) the analysis formulated in Gianollo (2017, 2018) for similar structures in Latin, involving the correlative negation *nec*.

Also in Latin (a Double Negation language) cases of co-occurrence of negative elements with a single-negation reading are first found when one of the elements is represented by the correlative negation *neque / nec* 'and not, neither', which, similarly to *oudé*, also functions as a stand-alone focus particle 'not even'. An example from the *Vulgata* Bible translation (4th cent. CE) is given in (25).

(25) Late Latin

et **non** *dedit illi hereditatem in ea* **nec**
and not give:3SG that:DAT inheritance:ACC in it:ABL and.not
passum pedis
step:ACC foot:GEN

'He gave him no inheritance here, not even enough ground to set his foot on' (Acts 7.5)

In conformity with the Homeric Greek Double Negation system, *oudé* is a semantically negative element: if we exclude the cases discussed by Willmott, which I take to involve an innovation, *oudé* always introduces a semantic

negative operator; for Homeric Greek it has to be analyzed as a [Neg] element, endowed with a semantic negation feature.

In the cases seen above, however, *oudé* shows signs of a reanalysis that allows it to enter syntactic dependencies with other negatively marked elements. Classical Greek shows the completion of this process: *oudé* (together with the morphologically complex elements containing it) is an NCI.

How does the [uNeg] feature that we have to assume for Classical Greek emerge? I propose that the interplay with focus plays a fundamental role. As we saw, correlative negation has focus-sensitive uses, which are in fact those exhibiting co-occurrence with other negative elements in a single-negation reading. In the early examples, also the co-occurring negative elements can be argued to be focused (cf. the clause-initial position of the NM in 22–23). Hence, the relation between the multiple negative elements is motivated not only in terms of negation, but also in terms of focus. Since in a clause there can only be one focus, and indeed, in the cases at hand, the focus is globally on the negative polarity of the clause, the co-occurring elements share their focus import besides their negative import.

I propose to model this as a form of Focus Concord, schematically represented in (26).[10]

(26) $ou_{[iFoc]}$.....$oudé_{[uFoc]}$

The proposal in (26) is intended to capture the fact that there is an interplay between the scope of negation and the background-focus partition of the clause. By default, the scope of sentential negation corresponds to the informational focus of the clause, that is, the scope of event quantification (cf. Herburger 2011).

I will assume that the same overlap between the two scope domains (of focus and of negation) obtains in the case of scalar focus on sentential negation: in order to reach the correct interpretation (emphatic sentential negation), all elements expressing negation will have to be connected in a unique Focus chain (cf. Puskás 2000 for Hungarian multiple foci as members of a unique Focus chain, under absorption).

The formulation in (26) rests on the hypothesis that focus creates syntactic dependencies (e.g. between a high, *ex situ* Focus landing site and and a low,

10 Alternatively, one could represent the Concord relation as in (i), where the bearer of interpretable focus features is an abstract Focus operator.

(i) $\text{FocusOp}_{[iFoc]}$.....$ou_{[uFoc]}$.....$oudé_{[uFoc]}$

However, in section 4 we will see that there are good reasons for assuming that Classical Greek NM *ou* sets the upper boundary of a focus domain: this means that the abstract Focus operator is inserted immediately above *ou*, which, at least for the aims of this work, is equivalent to assuming that *ou* itself realizes the Focus operator.

in situ one), similarly to *wh-* and negative dependencies: these dependencies are represented by assuming the presence of formal features motivated by focus, [uFoc] and [iFoc].

In turn, the syntactic dependency established by means of focus leads itself to reanalysis in terms of innovative formal negative features: this is my interpretation of the cases of Negative Concord involving *oudé* in Homer.

The uninterpretable formal negative feature [uNeg] enabling Negative Concord is parasitic on the uninterpretable formal focus feature [uFoc] involved in Focus Concord.

I therefore propose that, from Homeric to Classical Greek (with some early instances in the Homeric poems themselves), *oudé* undergoes the reanalysis in (27).

(27) Reanalysis of *oudé*

a. Homeric Greek: *oudé* before reanalysis: [Neg], [uFoc]

b. Classical Greek: *oudé* after reanalysis: [uNeg], [uFoc]

This means that Negative Concord becomes associated to Focus Concord.[11] The featural makeup of the involved elements is represented in (28) (the [iNeg] feature on *ou* will be more thoroughly motivated in section 4).

(28) $ou_{[iFoc,iNeg]}$.....$oudé_{[uFoc,uNeg]}$

Judging from the Homeric Greek data, the reanalysis happens first with *oudé* and afterwards also with the emphatic indefinites containing it. According to the scenario sketched above, the grammaticalization leading from negative indefinites to NCIs in the case of the *oudeís*-series can be interpreted as involving the conventionalization of the licensing relation between the negative operator and emphatic elements (i.e. elements expressing scalar focus) in its scope. In this case, conventionalization consists in the reanalysis of a semantic feature ([Neg]) as an uninterpretable formal feature ([uNeg]); compare analyses like Simpson & Wu (2002), Watanabe (2004). Emphasis is understood here as scalar focus; its bleaching at later stages consists in the loss of the scalar component, which may amount to the loss of association with focus and, hence, to the loss of the syntactic [uFoc] feature.

11 Cecilia Poletto (pers. comm.) suggests that the creation of a parallel chain may be needed also to avoid Relativized Minimality effects with the negative and the Focus operator, which belong to the same feature class (the Operator class in the terms of Rizzi 2004).

4 Classical Greek: A special type of non-strict Negative Concord

4.1 A corpus study of Classical Greek Negative Concord

Classical Greek is a full-fledged non-strict Negative Concord system: elements of the *oudeís*-series may co-occur with the NM *ou* in a single-negation reading, but this possibility is subject to word-order constraints. The aim of this section is to describe and analyze the conditions under which Negative Concord is possible in Classical Greek.

There are two main manifestations of the difference between strict and non-strict Negative Concord systems which are known from the literature on Romance. (i) In non-strict systems, the NM is not obligatory in all structures: when a NCI is in the pre-Infl area (i.e. the area preceding the inflected verb), the NCI negates the clause by itself. Hence, the NM only appears when nothing else is in the pre-Infl area (that corresponds to the CP-TP field, where the NegP projection is located in Romance). (ii) In non-strict systems, the co-occurrence of NM and NCIs in the pre-Infl area results in a double-negation reading.

More in general, in the non-strict Romance systems, which represent the 'canonical' type in the literature, Negative Concord in the pre-Infl area is severely limited. Classical Greek, however, quite freely allows for Concord among multiple negatively marked elements in the pre-Infl area of the clause, and not every combination of NM and NCIs in the pre-Infl area obeys the generalization in (ii). Rather, further contraints appear that are connected to the relative position of the involved elements. The structural analysis of this phenomenon that I propose corroborates the hypothesis that a form of Focus Concord (subsection 3.4) exists in Ancient Greek.

The data in this section result from a corpus study conducted on the sample of Classical Greek texts in (29). Selected forms of *oudeís* were retrieved in the electronic texts of the TLG (Pantelia 2014) and, when available, also in the PROIEL database (Haug & Jøhndal 2008).

(29) Corpus used in this work:

Author and texts	Genre
Herodotus	historical prose
Lysias, I–XV	oratory
Plato, 5 works (Ap. Cri. Cra. Phd. Smp.)	argumentative prose, dialogue
Aristophanes (excluding fragments)	comedy (partly metric)

The selected forms of the *oudeís*-series were the nominative and accusative masculine and (in some texts) feminine singular and plural forms. The choice of these case forms ensured that the indefinites had an argumental function in most instances. The neuter nom.-acc. form (*oudén*) was excluded due to the high frequency of adverbial uses, which could have blurred the picture in this explorative study.

Sentences containing the selected forms of the *oudeís*-series were manually annotated for characteristics relevant for the syntax of Negative Concord: number and type of co-occurring negative elements, and position of these elements with respect to the finite verb (Infl). For this reason, only sentences with finite verb forms were considered: besides non-finite predication, also structures containing verb ellipsis, standards of comparison, or short negative answers were excluded (they are indicated as not relevant in the 'not rel.' columns in tables 30–31).

The results are shown in (30) for the nominative forms and in (31) for the accusative forms.[12]

(30) Results of corpus study: **nominative** (tot: 191)

a. pre-Infl orders

pre-Infl				
Subj > Verb	**corr.neg** > **Subj** > **Verb**	Subj > NM > Verb	**NM** > **Subj** > **Verb**	**Subj** > **corr.neg** > **Verb**
102	**11**	1 (DN)	**2**	**4**

b. post-Infl orders and irrelevant orders

post-Infl			
NM/Adverb > Verb > Subj	corr.neg > Verb > Subj	**Verb** > **Subj**	not rel.
11	10	17	33

12 Numerous accusative forms had to be manually excluded since their frequency in non-finite structures (because of AcI, etc.) is higher.

(31) Results of corpus study: **accusative** (tot: 114)

a. pre-Infl orders

pre-Infl			
Obj > Verb	**corr.neg > Obj > Verb**	Adverb > Verb	**Adverb > Obj > Verb**
26	**3**	2	**1**

b. post-Infl orders and irrelevant orders

post-Infl				
Adverb > Verb > Obj	NM > Verb > Obj	corr.neg > Verb > Obj	**Verb > Obj**	not rel.
1	6	3	**4**	66

+ 2 **Verb** >**Adv** (where the adverb does not negate the event)

In the tables, corr.neg indicates correlative negation; NM the negative marker *ou(k)*; Adverb negatively marked adverbs other than the NM (e.g. *oudépote* 'never', or adverbial accusative forms); Verb the finite verb; and Subj and Obj the argumental function of the indefinite (NCI). Remarkable or unexpected combinations are highlighted in bold.

In what follows, I will first provide examples of the 'canonical' cases, that is, those that are expected in view of what we know from non-strict Negative Concord systems in Romance. Then I will move to the 'non-canonical' cases (those highlighted in bold in the tables), reserving my attention for those most clearly involving the Left Periphery.

4.2 Canonical cases

Among the expected configurations, we find ample evidence of Negative Concord between the pre-Infl NM and the post-Infl NCI(s). The basic position of the NM is in the slot immediately preceding the finite verb, as in (32), an example of the NM > Verb > Subj combination in the table in (30). However, the NM can also be separated from the verb by a number of constituents, as in Homeric Greek. In (32) the complex formed by the NM and the form of the verb 'to be' has plausibly been moved to the Left Periphery, deriving the post-verbal position of the subject.

(32) οὐκ ἦν ἄρ᾽ οὐδεὶς τοῦ Γλάνιδος σοφώτερος (Ar. Eq. 1097)

ouk *ēn* *ár᾽* **oudeìs** *toũ* *Glánidos* *sophṓteros*
not be:3SG PT nobody:NOM the:GEN Glanis:GEN wise:COMP

'Truly there is no man wiser than Glanis'

A further example of a configuration involving a pre-Infl NM and a post-Infl NCI was presented in (2), where the NCI is a direct object.

Another expected configuration is the presence of negative spread among NCIs, one of which is pre-Infl, whereas the other is post-Infl, as in (33); the appearance of the unusual Subj > Verb > Obj order in (33) is determined by the focused nature of the object (discontinuous with respect to its partitive specification 'of handicraft', which surfaces pre-Infl). See Matić (2003), Goldstein (2016: 36–42) on the existence of a post-verbal Focus position in Classical Greek.

(33) καὶ τούτων βαναυσίης οὐδεὶς δεδάηκε οὐδέν (Hdt. 2.165.1)

kaì *toútōn* *banausíēs* **oudeís** *dedáēke* **oudén**
and these:GEN handicraft:GEN nobody:NOM learn:3SG nothing:ACC

'None of these has learned any common trade'

Furthermore, the corpus provides us with one instance of a Subj > NM > Verb sequence, that is, of a structure where there is co-occurrence of the NCI and the NM (in this order) in pre-Infl position, as shown in (34): as expected from a non-strict system, this yields a double-negation reading ('there is no one who does not...', hence 'everybody does...').

(34) οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων ἀδικῶν τίσιν οὐκ ἀποτείσει (Hdt. 5.56.1)

oudeìs *anthrṓpōn adikṑn* *tísin* **ouk** *apoteísei*
nobody:NOM men:GEN do.wrong:NOM penalty:ACC not pay:3SG

'No man on earth does wrong without paying the penalty'

This distributional generalization (double-negation reading when the NCI precedes the NM, which is equivalent to the rule mentioned in subsection 2.1: 'negatives are rendered invalid when the last one is simple', that is, not a morphologically complex form) is cited as a rule in all grammars (e.g. Smyth 1956: §2760, van Emde Boas, Rijksbaron, Huitink & de Bakker 2019: 648). However, examples like (34) are in fact very rare: Denizot (2012) discusses in detail the cases provided in the literature and carries out her own corpus study, concluding that there are only four genuine examples in Classical Greek. Nonetheless, the generalization seems to capture an important fact

about the syntax of Classical Greek Negative Concord, as we will see in more detail when discussing the non-canonical cases.

The pragmatic function of expressing a universal predication through the denial of a negative one is more typically expressed by a cleft (bi-clausal) construction involving a relative pronoun ('there is nobody who...'), like in (35).

(35) τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ἡμέων ἐόντων τοιῶνδε οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐ παρήσει (Hdt. 3.72.3)

toũto mèn gàr hēméōn eóntōn toiõnde **oudeìs**
this:ACC PT in.fact we:GEN be:PART.GEN such:GEN nobody:NOM
hóstis **ou** *parḗsei*
who:NOM not let.pass:3SG

'There is no one who will not allow us to pass because of who we are'

Finally, it must be mentioned that in the majority of the cases (102 out of 158 for the nominative and 26 out of 48 for the accusative), the NCI occurs in the pre-Infl position with no co-occurrence of further negatively marked elements (cf. 36).

(36) Ἐπιδαυρίοισι ἡ γῆ καρπὸν οὐδένα ἀνεδίδου (Hdt. 5.82.1)

Epidauríoisi he gε̃ karpòn **oudéna** *anedídou*
Epidaurians:DAT the:NOM land:NOM produce:ACC none:ACC bear:3SG

'The Epidaurians' land bore no produce'

This is again an expected configuration in non-strict Negative Concord systems, which is, however, particularly frequent in Classical Greek due to its predominantly Infl-final nature, and which superficially overlaps with the behavior expected from a Double Negation language (indefinites negating by themselves).

4.3 Non-canonical cases

The peculiarities that distinguish the Classical Greek non-strict cases from the Romance ones, which I call 'non-canonical' cases, fall into two categories: (i) NCIs in post-Infl position negating by themselves; (ii) multiple negative elements in pre-Infl position with a single-negation reading (i.e. pre-Infl negative spread).

In this paper I limit the discussion to the cases in (ii). A preliminary analysis of the cases in (i) can be found in Gianollo (2019); see also Chatzopoulou (2019: 90).

First of all, there are cases in the corpus where multiple NCIs can be found in the pre-Infl area: for example, in (37) the finite verb is sentence-final, and both the subject and the direct object are realized by NCIs.

(37) οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν πενίᾳ δράσει (Ar. Ec. 605)

oudeìs **oudèn** *penía* *drásei*
nobody:NOM nothing:ACC need:DAT do:3SG

'No one will have to do anything (=work) because of need'

The absence of similar structures in Romance may simply be due to the Verb–Object nature of Romance systems. However, Romance is also characterized by limited possibilities of object preposing to the Left Periphery (either with the Subj > Obj or with the Obj > Subj order) when the subject is an NCI; in (38) capitalization indicates focus preposing (the only plausible operation in this context, since NCIs resist topicalization).

(38) a. ***Nessuno NIENTE** *ha fatto. (Italian)*
nobody nothing has done
b. ***NIENTE nessuno** ha fatto.
nothing nobody has done
intended meaning: 'Nobody has done ANYTHING (at all).'

The second non-canonical case is found when argumental NCIs and correlative negation (often in the stand-alone focus particle function) co-occur in the pre-Infl area; the example in (39) shows the order correlative negation > argumental NCI, but further instances in the corpus demonstrate that the respective order of the elements is irrelevant (cf. the strings Subj > corr.neg > Verb in 30).

(39) οὐδὲ νύκτα οὐδεὶς ἐναυλίζεται ἀνθρώπων (Hdt. 1.181.5)

oudè *núkta* **oudeìs** *enaulízetai anthrṓpōn*
nor night:ACC nobodyNOM dwell:3SG man:GEN

'nor does any human creature lie there for the night'

Again, this structure is excluded in the Romance type of non-strict Negative Concord (witness 40); however, it is attested at earlier stages of Italian and in some regional varieties (cf. Garzonio & Gianollo 2017).[13]

13 Moreover, it is marginally acceptable in correlative structures with coordinated DPs; consider, for instance, (i).

(i) ?**Né** Gianni **né nessuno** degli altri ci ha convinto.
'Neither Gianni nor any of the others convinced us.'

Here, the improved acceptability could be due to the fact that *né nessuno* is embedded in the coordination, and that the coordinated phrases occupy just one syntactic slot in the Left Periphery.

(40) ***né niente** *ci convincerà. (Italian)*
nor nothing us convince
intended meaning: 'nor will anything convince us.'

The third, more interesting non-canonical case is found in examples like (41), where the finite verb is preceded by several negatively marked elements belonging to different classes, but crucially including the NM: in (41) the pre-Infl sequence is represented by the NM, an argumental NCI and the correlative particle in the stand-alone focus particle function.

(41) ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν οὐδὲ τὰ δίκαια πώποτε ἐπεχείρησεν εἰπεῖν

all' **oukh** *hupèr humõn* **oudeìs** *autõn* **oudè** *tà*
but not for you nobody:NOM they:GEN and.not the:ACC
díkaia *põpote epekheírēsen* *eipeĩn*
right:ACC ever attempt:3SG say:INF

'Yet on your behalf not one of them has ever attempted to mention merely your just rights' (Lys. 12.86.7)

Negative Concord takes place also in cases where only one other negatively marked element occurs between the NM and the verb, as in the NM > Subj > Verb sequences retrieved from the corpus (cf. 30).

Crucially here, unlike in the cases exemplified by (39), the order of the NM with respect to the other elements of the sequence is relevant: for Negative Concord to take place, the NM must precede the whole series of negatively marked elements.

Importantly, thus, the sequence Subj > NM > Verb, as seen in (34), yields a double-negation reading; a sequence NM > Subj > Verb, however, as seen in (41), yields Negative Concord.

4.4 Generalizations and analysis

From the description of the data, the following generalizations emerge.

First of all, in Classical Greek multiple negative elements in pre-Infl position with a single-negation reading are attested throughout the corpus. The strings come in various forms: we find (a) sequences of argumental NCIs; (b) sequences of correlative negation, adverbial NCIs and argumental NCIs, with no apparent restriction on their relative order; (c) sequences containing the NM followed by adverbial NCIs, argumental NCIs, correlative negation. In the (c) sequences the relative order is not irrelevant, since the NM has to precede the other elements for a single-negation reading.

In the case of (a) and (b) we have [uNeg] Concord chains, which are licensed by the insertion of the abstract negative operator $\emptyset_{iNeg}$ seen in (8). In the case of (c) we have [iNeg] + [uNeg] Concord chains, in which the [iNeg] feature is carried by the NM. This conforms to the non-strict type, but represents a difference with respect to Romance non-strict Negative Concord, since in Classical Greek multiple negatively marked elements can precede the finite verb.

Secondly, there are two classes of sequences that do not show up as Negative Concord structures in my corpus: (d) sequences where argumental or adverbial NCIs precede the NM in the pre-Infl area – these sequences are indeed attested as such (albeit rarely), but they receive a double-negation reading; (e) structures where correlative negation precedes the NM in the pre-Infl area – these structures are unattested in my corpus (a broader corpus study should assess whether they are ungrammatical or just low-frequency structures), but we would expect them also to yield a double-negation reading, given what we see with (d).

The behavior of the sequences in (d) suggests that it is impossible to establish Negative Concord in a *[uNeg] > [iNeg] sequence. This is expected in the adopted framework, since such a sequence would result in the insertion of two negative operators: the [iNeg] operator expressed by the NM, and a higher, abstract negative operator $\emptyset_{iNeg}$ needed to license the [uNeg] feature of the NCI that falls outside the scope of the lower operator (assuming, of course, that linear sequences map onto hierarchical structures).

Therefore, we see that even in a language with very flexible word order like Classical Greek it is possible to draw some firm generalizations for the syntax of negation. The main observation is that the only element that carries [iNeg] in the Classical Greek system (as in canonical non-strict systems) is the NM. The insertion of the NM in a non-strict Negative Concord language blocks the creation of upward negative dependencies, unlike what happens in strict Negative Concord languages. The traditional textbook rule seen in subsection 2.1 ('negatives are rendered invalid when the last one is simple') captures this fundamental fact, since the only (morphologically) 'simple' element in the Classical Greek negative system is the NM (both in the objective and in the subjective subsystem seen in (9)). Obviously, however, the generalization has a syntactic nature: the connection with morphology (the 'simple' vs. 'compound' distinction) is just an epiphenomenon of Classical Greek.

What still needs to be explained is what allows Classical Greek to manifest the non-canonical cases seen in subsection 4.3. These peculiar configurations seem to depend on the broader set of syntactic operations that in Classical

Greek target the clausal Left Periphery. More specifically, I propose that the cross-linguistic differences with respect to Romance are due to the interaction between the syntax of focus and Negative Concord.

In Classical Greek, all pre-Infl negatively marked elements belong to a single focus chain: as argued in subsection 3.4, the semantic focus targets just one logical element, negation, and the domains of focus and negation overlap. The various elements expressing negation are connected in a single chain by means of multiple Agree operations targeting their [uNeg] and [uFoc] features and the [iNeg] and [iFoc] features of a c-commanding operator (either realized as NM or phonetically empty). The NM, as a bearer of an [iFoc] feature, must c-command all the elements bearing [uFoc] features, if one single interpretive chain (for focus and negation) is to be established.

Accordingly, the structure of an example like (39), where the licensor is the abstract operator, could be represented as in (42).

(42) For (39):

$[_{ForceP}\ \emptyset_{iNeg,iFoc}\ [_{Force}$ oudè$_{[uNeg,uFoc]}\ [_{TopP}$ núkta
$[_{FocP}$ oudeìs$_{[uNeg,uFoc]}\ [_{FinP/TP}$ *verb*...

The structure in the presence of an overt NM, on the other hand, as seen in (41), could be represented as in (43).[14]

(43) For (41):

$[_{ForceP}$ oukh$_{[iNeg,iFoc]}\ [_{TopP}$ hupèr humõn $[_{FocP}$ oudeìs$_{[uNeg,uFoc]}$
$[_{Foc}$ oudè$_{[uNeg,uFoc]}\ [_{FinP/TP}$...

Differently from other well-known non-strict languages, Classical Greek shows a rich array of focus-driven displacement operations, which may account for the variety of syntactic patterns observed in the pre-Infl area (Devine & Stephens 1999, Matić 2003, Goldstein 2016 a.o.). In the pre-Infl area, a number of positions are available to NCIs in Classical Greek: the core argumental positions (which surface pre-verbally because of the *v*P-movement operation assumed in 12), the specifier of the NegP projection and the specifier(s) of the Focus projection (cf. 11). Moreover, sentence connectives (such as *oudé* in 39) may carry formal features for focus. In sum,

14 Note that I still assume just one Focus projection in the clause, in accordance with Rizzi (1997). However, multiple positions in the Focus projection may host constituents (for a similar proposal, cf. Arad & Roussou 1997: 18–19). Moreover, constituents outside of the Focus projection may be endowed with formal features for focus, and enter a syntactic dependency with the Focus projection.

thanks to its rich Left Periphery, Classical Greek allows for Negative Concord also *within* the pre-Infl area (i.e. the CP-TP phase).

In contrast, a language like Modern Italian, besides lacking the extra pre-Infl positions for arguments found in an Infl-final language like Classical Greek, has less space in the Left Periphery because, under normal pragmatic conditions, the syntactic positions for focus and negation have to coincide. Some authors (Frascarelli 2000, Isac 2004) have interpreted this state of affairs as due to syncretism between the two projections FocP and NegP in the CP-TP phase.

In fact, in Italian multiple [uNeg] elements in the pre-Infl area are sometimes possible, when one of them is an adverbial NCI (e.g. *mai* 'never' in 44a), as in structures like (44b,c). One could argue that here the multiple NCIs form in fact a single, complex constituent and occupy just one position (Spec, Foc/NegP). Their focus contribution is the same, namely the emphatic negation of the assertion: the Agree process involves both [uNeg] and [uFoc] features, and just one focused constituent is built.

(44) a. *Francesco* **mai** *mi convincerà di questa teoria.*
Francesco never me convince of this theory
'Francesco will never convince me of this theory.'

b. **Mai nessuno** *mi convincerà.*
never nobody me convince
'No one will ever convince me.'

c. **In nessun modo nessuno** *verrà a conoscenza dell' indirizzo.*
in no way nobody will.come to knowledge of.the address
'In no way will anyone get to know the address.'
(www.cdigorla.it/Newsletter.htm)

The comparison between the two forms of non-strict Negative Concord of Classical Greek and Modern Italian reaches only preliminary conclusions in this paper. There is however a general point that is worthy of attention, because it is instructive as to the motivations for Negative Concord. Classical Greek shows, more clearly than non-strict Romance varieties, that Negative Concord is not just a device to 'bridge' across phases, that is, between the *v*P and the CP-TP phase, and to express negation in the designated locus of syntactic expression and semantic interpretation (NegP). We see that, thanks to its rich Left Periphery, Classical Greek allows for Negative Concord also *within* the CP-TP phase, pointing, rather, to a motivation in terms of more general interpretive requirements (to form one single object interacting with one operator).

Thus, the limitation to one element in pre-Infl position (in the single-negation reading) often observed in non-strict modern Romance varieties is an epiphenomenon due to co-occurring, independent syntactic factors: the prerogatives of the Left Periphery and the (consequent) availability of more landing sites for [uNeg] elements in the CP-TP field in Classical Greek allow for the presence of multiple elements in pre-Infl position, in a single-negation reading.

Abstracting away from these more epiphenomenal aspects, the essence of non-strict Negative Concord, which is common to Classical Greek and Modern Italian, appears to reside in the special treatment reserved for the NM, which functions as a scope marker for both focus and negation (whose domains coincide). The fact that focus is relevant as well as negation, also for a language like Italian, is suggested by the observation that, in order to obtain a double-negation reading (cf. 6d), the pre-Infl NCI has to be focused (cf. Alonso-Ovalle & Guerzoni 2002): this operation amounts to the creation of a separate focus (and negation) domain for the NCI, which is licensed by a different instance of the negative operator (compare the notion of Focus shell in Biberauer & Roberts 2011).

In sum, the insertion of the NM in non-strict Negative Concord languages determines a focus domain and blocks Concord relations with [uNeg] elements above it; this results in a double-negation reading. Possibly, then, the distinction between [iNeg] and [uNeg] assumed by featural typologies of negation in the case of NMs (cf. 4) can be reduced to the difference between [iFoc] and [uFoc] NMs. This featural hypothesis seems to me more principled from the point of view of the syntax–semantics interface, since [iFoc] is equivalent to the formal instruction to build a focus domain, that is, to contribute to a pragmatically motivated partition of the clause.

5 Conclusions

The history of the Greek system of negation clearly shows a number of cross-linguistically recurrent diachronic patterns. We observe cross-linguistic parallels in the formal renewal of indefinites belonging to the negation system: in Greek, as in Romance, correlative negation plays a crucial role. This cyclic development affecting indefinites is analogous to Jespersen's Cycle in some important respects: both obey the functional pressures connected to the alternation between plain and emphatic meanings in the expression of negation.

We also observe a connection between changes affecting indefinites that belong to the negation system and the rise of Negative Concord, which I modeled as a form of Focus Concord. The nature of the non-strict Negative

Concord system of Classical Greek shows, moreover, that the prerogatives of the Left Periphery and the (consequent) availability of more landing sites for [uNeg] elements in the CP-TP field in Classical Greek allow for the creation of complex pre-Infl chains of elements that are endowed with formal features for focus as well as negation.

Corpora

TLG: Pantelia, Maria C. (ed.). [2014]. Thesaurus Linguae Graecae – A digital library of Greek literature. Irvine, CA: University of California, Irvine. http://www.tlg.uci.edu.

PROIEL: Dag T. T. Haug and Marius L. Jøhndal (eds.). [2008]. *Pragmatic Resources in Old Indo-European languages*. Oslo: University of Oslo. https://proiel.github.io.

References

Alonso-Ovalle, Luis & Elena Guerzoni. 2002. Double negatives, Negative Concord and metalinguistic negation. In *Proceedings of CLS 38.1 The Main Session*, 15–31. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Arad, Maya & Anna Roussou. 1997. Particles and C-positions in Classical Greek. Unpublished ms., UCL and University of Wales, Bangor. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332861680_Particles_and_C-positions_in_Classical_Greek.

van der Auwera, Johan & Lauren Van Alsenoy. 2016. On the typology of negative concord. *Studies in Language* 40(3). 473–512.

Basset, Louis. 1984. L'emploi des négations dans l'épisode homérique des Cyclopes ou les 'non-noms' d'Ulysse. *LALIES* 1. 289–292.

Bernini, Giuliano & Paolo Ramat. 1996. *Negative sentences in the languages of Europe: A typological approach*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Biberauer, Theresa & Ian Roberts. 2005. Changing EPP parameters in the history of English: Accounting for variation and change. *English Language and Linguistics* 9(1). 5–46.

Biberauer, Theresa & Ian Roberts. 2011. Negative words and related expressions: A new perspective on some familiar puzzles. In Richard Ingham & Pierre Larrivée (eds.), *The evolution of negation. Beyond the Jespersen Cycle*, 23–60. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Celano, Giuseppe. 2014. A computational study on preverbal and postverbal accusative object nouns and pronouns in Ancient Greek. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* 101. 97–110.

Chantraine, Pierre. 1953. *Grammaire homérique.* II *Syntaxe*. Paris: Klincksieck.
Chatzopoulou, Katerina. 2015. The Greek Jespersen's cycle: Renewal, stability and structural microelevation. In Chiara Gianollo, Agnes Jäger & Doris Penka (eds.), *Language change at the syntax-semantics interface*, 323–354. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Chatzopoulou, Katerina. 2019. *Negation and nonveridicality in the history of Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Chierchia, Gennaro. 2013. *Logic in grammar: Polarity, free choice, and intervention.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Cowgill, Warren. 1960. Greek *ou* and Armenian *oč'*. *Language* 36. 347–350.
Danckaert, Lieven. 2012. *Latin embedded clauses*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Delbrück, Berthold. 1879. *Syntaktische Forschungen. Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*, vol. IV. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
Denizot, Camille. 2012. La double négation et le tour οὐδεὶς οὐκ ἦλθεν. *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 86(2). 65–90.
Denizot, Camille. 2014. 'Personne' et 'rien' dans les poèmes homériques: emplois de οὔ τις et de οὐδείς. In Camille Denizot & Emmanuel Dupraz (eds.), *Latin* quis/qui*, grec* τις/τίς*: parcours et fonctionnements*, 69–88. Rouen: PURH.
Denniston, John D. 1954. *The Greek particles.* 2nd edn. rev. by K.J. Dover. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Devine, Andrew M. & Laurence D. Stephens. 1999. *Discontinuous syntax: Hyperbaton in Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Dik, Helma. 1995. *Word order in Ancient Greek: A pragmatic account of word order variation in Herodotus.* Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.
Eckardt, Regine. 2003. Eine Runde im Jespersen-Zyklus. Negation, emphatische Negation, negativ-polare Elemente im Altfranzösischen. Ms. KOPS, University of Konstanz. http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bsz:352-opus-9910.
Eckardt, Regine. 2006. *Meaning change in grammaticalization. An enquiry into semantic reanalysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
van Emde Boas, Evert, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink & Mathieu de Bakker. 2019. *The Cambridge grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fogliani, Giorgio. 2016. *Particelle e periferia sinistra in greco antico. Il ruolo di* δή *nella prosa erodotea*: University of Padua dissertation.
Frascarelli, Mara. 2000. *The syntax-phonology interface in Focus and Topic constructions in Italian*. Berlin: Springer.
Garzonio, Jacopo & Chiara Gianollo. 2017. From 'nec' to 'né': The interaction of focus and negation. Paper presented at the 43rd Incontro di

Grammatica Generativa, Pavia.
Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2000. Negative...concord? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18. 457–523.
Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2007. The Landscape of EVEN. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25(1). 39–81.
Gianollo, Chiara. 2017. Focus-sensitive negation in Latin. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 16: Generative approaches to Latin syntax (special issue). 51–77.
Gianollo, Chiara. 2018. *Indefinites between Latin and Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Gianollo, Chiara. 2019. Peculiarities of Negative Concord in Classical Greek. Paper presented at the 45th Incontro di Grammatica Generativa, University of Padua.
Goldstein, David. 2016. *Classical Greek syntax. Wackernagel's Law in Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill.
Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Haspelmath, Martin. 2007. Coordination. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and linguistic description,* 2nd edn., 1–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Haspelmath, Martin. 2013. Negative indefinite pronouns and predicate negation. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The World atlas of language structures online*, chap. 115. http://wals.info/chapter/115. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
Haug, Dag & Marius Jøhndal. 2008. Creating a Parallel Treebank of the Old Indo-European Bible Translations. In Caroline Sporleder & Kiril Ribarov (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Language Technology for Cultural Heritage Data (LaTeCH 2008)*, 27–34. Marrakesh: ELRA.
Herburger, Elena. 2001. The Negative Concord puzzle revisited. *Natural Language Semantics* 9. 289–333.
Herburger, Elena. 2011. Negation. In Klaus von Heusinger, Claudia Maienborn & Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics. An international handbook of natural language meaning* XXXIII(II), 1641–1660. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2014. Ouk ísmen oudén: Negative Concord and negative polarity in the history of Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 14(1). 43–83.
Isac, Daniela. 2004. Focus on Negative Concord. In Reineke Bok-Bennema, Bart Hollebrandse, Brigitte Kampers-Manhe & Petra Sleeman (eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2002: Selected papers from 'Going Romance'* Groningen, 28-30 November 2002, 119–140. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Israel, Michael. 2011. *The grammar of polarity. Pragmatics, sensitivity, and the logic of scales*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Janda, Richard D. & Brian D. Joseph. 1999. The Modern Greek negator *mi(n)* as a morphological constellation. In Georgios Babiniotis (ed.), *Greek linguistics: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, 341–351. Athens: Ellinika Grammata.

Kiparsky, Paul & Cleo Condoravdi. 2006. Tracking Jespersen's Cycle. In Brian Joseph & Angela Ralli (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, 172–197. Patras: University of Patras.

Kirk, Allison. 2012. *Word order and information structure in New Testament Greek*: University of Leiden, LOT Dissertation Series 311 dissertation.

Klein, Jared. 2011. Negation and polarity in the Greek, Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavic Gospels. In Eirik Welo (ed.), *Indo-European syntax and pragmatics: contrastive approaches.* III(III) *Oslo Studies in Language*, 131–154. Oslo: University of Oslo.

Krifka, Manfred. 1995. The semantics and pragmatics of polarity items. *Linguistic Analysis* 35. 209–257.

Krifka, Manfred. 2007. Basic notions of information structure. *Working Papers of the SFB632, Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure (ISIS)* 6. 13–56.

Kühner, Raphael & Bernhard Gerth. 1898. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache.* II *Satzlehre*. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

Lambert, Frédéric. 2012. *Oude* en grec ancien, du pareil au même. *Linguarum varietas* 1. 99–109.

Landsman, David M. 1988–1989. The history of some Greek negatives: phonology, grammar and meaning. *Glossologia* 7–8. 13–31.

Liddell, Henry G. & Robert Scott. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Matić, Dejan. 2003. Topic, focus, and discourse structure. Ancient Greek word order. *Studies in Language* 27(3). 573–633.

Meillet, Antoine. 1912. L'évolution des formes grammaticales. *Scientia* 12. 384–400; repr. 1921 in *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, 130–148. Paris: Champion.

Moorhouse, Alfred C. 1959. *Studies in the Greek negatives*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Muchnová, Dagmar. 2013a. Negation. In *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek language and linguistics.* Online edition, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214--448X_eagll_COM_00000245. Leiden: Brill.

Muchnová, Dagmar. 2013b. Negation (morphology). In *Encyclopedia of Ancient*

Greek language and linguistics. Online edition, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214--448X_eagll_COM_00000246. Leiden: Brill.

Muchnová, Dagmar. 2016. Negation in Ancient Greek: a typological approach. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 21(2). 183–200.

Pantelia, Maria C. (ed.). 2014. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae – A digital library of Greek literature*. Irvine, CA: University of California, Irvine.

Penka, Doris. 2011. *Negative indefinites*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2016. Negation. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*, 833–846. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Puskás, Genoveva. 2000. *Word order in Hungarian: The syntax of Ā-positions*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Revuelta Puigdollers, Antonio. 2006. Los adverbios en griego antiguo. Las partículas. In Maria Dolores Jiménez López (ed.), *Sintaxis griega*, 1–38. Madrid: Portal Liceus.

Rijksbaron, Albert. 2012. Does Ancient Greek have a word for 'No'? The evidence from οὐκοῦν ... οὐ questions. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 12. 140–160.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the Left Periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. Locality and the left periphery. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and beyond: The cartography of syntactic structures*, 223–251. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, Ian & Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic change: A minimalist approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roussou, Anna. 2000. On the left periphery: modal particles and complementisers. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1. 65–94.

Roussou, Anna. 2007. Minimalism and diachronic syntax: the development of negative expressions. In Eleni Agathopoulou, Maria Dimitrakopoulou & Despina Papadopoulou (eds.), *Selected papers on theoretical and applied linguistics: Festschrift for Prof. E. Panagopoulos* XVII(I), 11–27. Thessaloniki: Monochromia.

Schwegler, Armin. 1990. *Analyticity and syntheticity: A diachronic perspective with special reference to Romance languages*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Simpson, Andrew & Zoe Wu. 2002. Agreement, shells and Focus. *Language* 78(2). 287–313.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. 1956. *Greek grammar*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Taylor, Ann. 1994. The change from SOV to SVO in Ancient Greek. *Language Variation and Change* 6. 1–37.

Tovena, Lucia. 1998. *The fine structure of polarity sensitivity*. New York: Garland.

Veloudis, Ioannis. 2017. How languages acquire new grammatical elements: The story of *ka(n)-* series in Modern Greek retold. *Linguistics* 55(1). 117–152.

Vilborg, Ebbe. 1960. *A tentative grammar of Mycenaean Greek*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Wackernagel, Jakob. 1928. *Vorlesungen über Syntax* II. Basel: Birkhaüser.

Watanabe, Akira. 2004. The genesis of Negative Concord. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35(4). 559–612.

Willis, David. 2011. Negative polarity and the Quantifier Cycle: Comparative diachronic perspectives from European languages. In Pierre Larrivée & Richard Ingham (eds.), *The evolution of negation. Beyond the Jespersen Cycle*, 285–323. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Willis, David, Christopher Lucas & Anne Breitbarth. 2013. Comparing diachronies of negation. In David Willis, Christopher Lucas & Anne Breitbarth (eds.), *The history of negation in the languages of Europe and the Mediterranean* I. *Case studies*, 1–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Willmott, Jo C. 2011. Outis and what he can tell us about negation in Homeric Greek. In Paul Millett, S.P. Oakley & R.J.E. Thompson (eds.), *Ratio et res ipsa: Classical essays presented by former pupils to James Diggle on his retirement*, 63–79. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.

Willmott, Jo C. 2013. Negation in the history of Greek. In David Willis, Christopher Lucas & Anne Breitbarth (eds.), *The history of negation in the languages of Europe and the Mediterranean* I. *Case studies*, 299–340. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997. *Negation and clausal structure: A comparative study of Romance languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2004. *Sentential negation and Negative Concord*: University of Amsterdam dissertation.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2008. Negative Concord is syntactic agreement. Ms. University of Amsterdam. http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/000645.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2011. On the syntactically complex status of negative indefinites. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 14. 111–138.

Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2014. On the uninterpretability of interpretable features. In Peter Kosta, Steven L. Franks, Teodora Radeva-Bork & Lilia Schürcks (eds.), *Minimalism and beyond: Radicalizing the interfaces*, 109–128. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Chiara Gianollo
Department of Classical Philology
and Italian Studies
University of Bologna
Via Zamboni 32
Bologna
Italy
chiara.gianollo@unibo.it