

OXFORD  
LINGUISTICS

# NEGATION AND NONVERIDICALITY IN THE HISTORY OF GREEK

KATERINA CHATZOPOULOU

casus 演变与变异 linguistica storica  
grammatica linguistica storica Sprachwandel legi fonetice reanalysis variació contact ordre des mots reconstruction  
reanalysis variació contact ordre des mots reconstruction casus flessione dialectologia exaptation supléció réglage  
dialectologia linguistica storica Sprachwandel legi fonetice reanalysis variació contact ordre des mots reconstruction  
casus flessione dialectologia exaptation supléció réglage des paramètres grammatica linguistica storica Sprachwandel  
fonetice reanalysis variació contact ordre des mots reconstruction casus flessione dialectologia exaptation  
legi fonetice reanalysis variació contact ordre des mots reconstruction casus flessione dialectologia exaptation  
supléció réglage des paramètres grammatica linguistica storica Sprachwandel legi fonetice reanalysis variació contact or  
reanalysis variació contact ordre des mots reconstruction casus flessione dialectologia exaptation supléció réglage des paramètres grammatica  
Sprachwandel legi fonetice reanalysis variació contact ordre des mots reconstruction casus flessione dialectologia exaptation  
supléció réglage des paramètres grammatica linguistica storica Sprachwandel legi fonetice reanalysis variació contact or  
ordre des mots reconstruction casus flessione dialectologia exaptation supléció réglage des paramètres grammatica l  
fonetice reanalysis variació contact ordre des mots reconstruction casus flessione dialectologia exaptation  
exaptation supléció réglage des paramètres grammatica linguistica storica Sprachwandel legi fonetice reanalysis gram  
linguistica storica Sprachwandel legi fonetice reanalysis variació contact ordre des mots reconstruction casus flessione  
exaptation

演变与变异

OXFORD STUDIES IN DIACHRONIC & HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS

## Negation and Nonveridicality in the History of Greek

---

OXFORD STUDIES IN DIACHRONIC AND HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS

GENERAL EDITORS: Adam Ledgeway and Ian Roberts, University of Cambridge

ADVISORY EDITORS: Cynthia Allen, *Australian National University*; Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero, *University of Manchester*; Theresa Biberauer, *University of Cambridge*; Charlotte Galves, *University of Campinas*; Geoff Horrocks, *University of Cambridge*; Paul Kiparsky, *Stanford University*; Anthony Kroch, *University of Pennsylvania*; David Lightfoot, *Georgetown University*; Giuseppe Longobardi, *University of York*; George Walkden, *University of Konstanz*; David Willis, *University of Cambridge*

RECENTLY PUBLISHED IN THE SERIES

25

*Transitive Nouns and Adjectives*  
*Evidence from Early Indo-Aryan*  
John J. Lowe

26

*Quantitative Historical Linguistics*  
*A Corpus Framework*  
Gard B. Jensen and Barbara McGillivray

27

*Gender from Latin to Romance*  
*History, Geography, Typology*  
Michele Loporcaro

28

*Clause Structure and Word Order in the History of German*  
*Edited by Agnes Jäger, Gisella Ferraresi, and Helmut Weiß*

29

*Word Order Change*  
*Edited by Ana Maria Martins and Adriana Cardoso*

30

*Arabic Historical Dialectology*  
*Linguistic and Sociolinguistic Approaches*  
*Edited by Clive Holes*

31

*Grammaticalization from a Typological Perspective*  
*Edited by Heiko Narrog and Bernd Heine*

32

*Negation and Nonveridicality in the History of Greek*  
Katerina Chatzopoulou

For a complete list of titles published and in preparation for the series, see pp. 259–62.

# Negation and Nonveridicality in the History of Greek

---

KATERINA CHATZOPOULOU

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Katerina Chatzopoulou 2019

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2019

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018950690

ISBN 978-0-19-871240-4

Printed and bound by  
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CRO 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and  
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials  
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

#### ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ

ὕμεις μέντοι, ἂν ἐμοὶ πείθησθε, σμικρὸν φροντίσαντες Σωκράτους, τῆς δὲ ἀληθείας πολὺ μᾶλλον, ἂν μὲν τι ὑμῖν δοκῶ ἀληθὲς λέγειν, συνομολογήσατε, εἰ δὲ μή, παντὶ λόγῳ ἀντιτείνετε, εὐλαβούμενοι ὅπως μὴ ἐγὼ ὑπὸ προθυμίας ἅμα ἐμαυτὸν τε καὶ ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσας, ὥσπερ μέλιττα τὸ κέντρον ἐγκαταλιπὼν οἰχήσομαι.

#### SOCRATES

But you, if you do as I ask, will give little thought to Socrates and much more to the truth; and if you, think what I say is true, agree to it, and if not, oppose me with every argument you can muster, that I may not in my eagerness deceive myself and you alike and go away like a bee, leaving my sting behind.

Plato, *Phaedo* 91c



# Contents

<i>Series preface</i>	xi
<i>Preface</i>	xiii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xv
<i>List of figures and tables</i>	xvii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 The two-negator system of Greek	1
1.2 Theoretical backgrounds: semantics, syntax, and agreement	3
1.3 Selection of texts and methodology	6
1.4 Periodization	7
1.4.1 Classical Greek (fifth to fourth centuries BC): the Attic dialect	7
1.4.2 Hellenistic and Roman times (third century BC to fourth century AD): Atticism and the Koine	8
1.4.3 Early Medieval Greek (fifth to tenth centuries AD)	8
1.4.4 Late Medieval Greek (eleventh to fifteenth centuries AD)	8
1.4.5 Early Modern Greek (sixteenth to nineteenth centuries AD)	9
1.5 Previous work	9
1.5.1 The Classical scholars	9
1.5.2 More recent contributions within linguistics	11
1.6 Markedness, the Nonveridicality projection, and pragmatic grounding	13
1.7 Roadmap	16
2. The (non)veridicality theory of polarity and negator selection	19
2.1 Negative polarity: precursors and (non)veridicality (Giannakidou 1998)	19
2.2 Polarity phenomena in Standard Modern Greek	22
2.2.1 Negative polarity items	22
2.2.2 The focus particle <i>ούτε</i> / <i>ύτε</i> /: an instantiation of a negative polarity EVEN	24
2.2.3 (Non)veridicality and mood choice	27
2.2.4 (Non)veridicality and negator choice	32
2.3 Crosslinguistic analogies	40
2.4 Beginning the journey: the oldest language relatives and the first attestations	45
2.4.1 Indo-European origins and affinities	45



2.4.2	Homeric Greek negators and traces of the Proto-Indo-European negatives	49
2.4.3	The homotics <i>vḥ</i> /ne:/ and <i>μᾶ</i> /ma/: remnants of (Proto-)Indo-European negators?	50
2.5	Summary	52
3.	Negation, mood, and (non)veridicality in Classical Greek (fifth to fourth centuries BC)	53
3.1	The Attic dialect	54
3.1.1	Morphology of verbs and verbals	54
3.1.2	Attic Greek word order	56
3.2	The syntactic status of the Attic Greek negators: phrasal	58
3.3	Negation and morphological mood: no consistent relation	64
3.4	Negator selection and (non)veridicality	70
3.4.1	The distribution of NEG1 <i>οὐ</i> (κ) and NEG2 <i>μή</i> in terms of (non)veridicality	70
3.5	The nonnegative uses of NEG2 <i>μή</i> /mɛ:/	78
3.5.1	NEG2 <i>μή</i> /mɛ:/ as a question particle	78
3.5.2	NEG2 <i>μή</i> /mɛ:/ as complementizer	81
3.5.3	NEG2 <i>μή</i> /mɛ:/ of pathos: NEG2 as an attitudinal	82
3.6	The morphologically negative indefinites of Attic Greek: NEG1-words and NEG2-words	85
3.6.1	Attic Greek Negative Concord	88
3.6.2	The syntactic analysis of Attic Greek Negative Concord	91
3.6.3	NEG1-thing and NEG2-thing as negative adverbs	95
3.7	Summary	96
4.	Developments in Hellenistic-Roman times and the Nonveridicality projection (third century BC to fourth century AD)	99
4.1	The Greek of the Hellenistic-Roman era	100
4.2	Analyticity linked to phonological change	102
4.2.1	Language developments: pro-analyticity	102
4.2.2	Phonological changes in the vowel system and repercussions	102
4.3	Changes in the mood and complementation system: the broadening of <i>ἵνα</i> /hina/	104
4.3.1	Loss of <i>consecutio modorum</i>	106
4.3.2	The broadening of <i>ἵνα</i> /hina/: reanalysis driven by homophony	108
4.3.3	The INA broadening and generative theories of syntactic change	116
4.3.4	The Nonveridicality projection (NONVERP)	123
4.3.5	Precursors and differentiation: Cinque (1999), Culicover (1991), Laka (1990)	126

4.3.6 Feature economy: what happens to the finite verb after the reanalysis of INA	127
4.4 Change in word order: from OV to VO	129
4.5 Negator distribution in Koine Greek	132
4.5.1 The distribution of NEG1 <i>οὐ(κ)</i> /u(k)/ in Koine Greek	133
4.5.2 The distribution of NEG2 <i>μή</i> /mi/ in Koine Greek	136
4.5.3 Statistics of NEG1 and NEG2 attestations and comparison with Attic Greek	138
4.6 The negative indefinites of Koine Greek: NEG1-thing and NEG2-thing	139
4.7 Summary	142
5. Late Medieval and beyond: the renewal of NEG1	145
5.1 Negation in Late Medieval Greek: basic developments	147
5.1.1 How many negators?	147
5.1.2 <i>Οὐδέν</i> /udhén/ and <i>μηδέν</i> /midhén/: diagnosing plain propositional negation	148
5.2 Change of syntactic status: from phrases to heads	155
5.2.1 Strict preverbal position	155
5.2.2 Unattested as DP internal or constituent/metalinguistic negation	157
5.2.3 Unavailability of True Negative Imperatives: a parameter reset	159
5.2.4 The van Gelderen (2004) Head Preference Principle	162
5.3 The ban of NEG2 from the conditional protasis	163
5.3.1 NEG2 fossilized in exceptive conditionals	165
5.3.2 An explanation: upward reanalysis of NEG2 on Cinque's (1999) hierarchy	166
5.3.3 Comparison to NEG2's persistency in purpose clauses: possible support for upward micromovement	168
5.4 Evidence from Early Modern Greek texts: the end of the journey	169
5.5 Summary	172
6. Renewal and stability: one full Jespersen's Cycle and one persistent polarity item	173
6.1 Traditional accounts of Jespersen's Cycle	175
6.2 Atypical negative cycles in Greek and beyond	178
6.2.1 The atypicality of Greek NEG1 and NEG2 developments: no doubling stage	178
6.2.2 Other atypical Jespersen's Cycle manifestations	180
6.3 Jespersens unite: a new definition for Jespersen's Cycle	183
6.3.1 Jespersen bleaching as scalar endpoint lexicalization	186
6.3.2 The representation of the Greek Jespersen's Cycle and word-order considerations	189

6.4 The diachronically stable uses of NEG2	197
6.4.1 Negative directives	198
6.4.2 The diachronic nonnegative uses of NEG2	202
6.5 Summary	206
Conclusion	209
<i>Appendix of texts</i>	211
<i>References</i>	213
<i>Index</i>	257

## *Series preface*

Modern diachronic linguistics has important contacts with other subdisciplines, notably first-language acquisition, learnability theory, computational linguistics, sociolinguistics, and the traditional philological study of texts. It is now recognized in the wider field that diachronic linguistics can make a novel contribution to linguistic theory, to historical linguistics, and arguably to cognitive science more widely.

This series provides a forum for work in both diachronic and historical linguistics, including work on change in grammar, sound, and meaning within and across languages; synchronic studies of languages in the past; and descriptive histories of one or more languages. It is intended to reflect and encourage the links between these subjects and fields such as those mentioned above.

The goal of the series is to publish high-quality monographs and collections of papers in diachronic linguistics generally, i.e. studies focusing on change in linguistic structure, and/or change in grammars, which are also intended to make a contribution to linguistic theory, by developing and adopting a current theoretical model, by raising wider questions concerning the nature of language change, or by developing theoretical connections with other areas of linguistics and cognitive science as listed above. There is no bias towards a particular language or language family, or towards a particular theoretical framework; work in all theoretical frameworks, and work based on the descriptive tradition of language typology, as well as quantitatively based work using theoretical ideas, also feature in the series.

Adam Ledgeway and Ian Roberts

*University of Cambridge*



## *Preface*

This book is an updated version of my doctoral dissertation, which was submitted to the Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago, in August 2012. A few changes were made in structure and content, in order to include more recent references and research insights. I would like to thank my dissertation advisor Professor Anastasia Giannakidou for her guidance throughout this project and also for her encouragement, stable yet discreet, to finish the present book. I am grateful to her above all else for her research and scientific insight, particularly regarding the theory of (non) veridicality, without which my contribution would not have been possible. I would furthermore like to thank for the same reasons professors Brian Joseph, Jason Merchant, Elly van Gelderen, and Johan van der Auwera, as it was a combination of their lifelong study and their devotion to the field of Linguistics that enabled me to understand and make some sense of the particular data examined in the present study. I am furthermore grateful to Jo Willmot and Hedde Zeijlstra for key suggestions and detailed advice regarding the restructuring of some parts of the dissertation, as well as providing more analytical discussion on some of the axioms of the analyses of the data. All deviations from a desirable outcome in this work are my own. I have tried to include most relevant studies that were published after 2012 and hope to have done justice to them and the proposed new analyses. Yet, although one could claim that the history of scientific and academic writing is a history of misunderstanding, I think that, nevertheless, we have done well so far. As a linguist and as a researcher I am proud of all the advances in Linguistics and all related fields. A particularly rewarding outcome of this endeavor for me was to witness the attempts in quite diverse fields, starting with the classical scholars of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and continuing up to the generative grammar theorists, typologists, and field linguists, to account for the same or similar language phenomena, in the present case the history of negation, using different terminology. It is the quest for regularity and the desire to make sense that unites all fields synchronically and diachronically and may reveal something like a team spirit. Whether it is the Classical scholars, more knowledgeable than anyone might credit, and profoundly insightful with a bare minimum of crosslinguistic data, or the brilliant, inventive, and determined semanticists and syntacticians, or the very respectable, devoted, and brave field linguists and typologists, it is always us against the data, and we will win.



## *List of abbreviations*

2P	second position clitic (Wackernagel clitic)
ACC	accusative
AOR	aorist
CP	complementizer phrase
DAT	dative
DP	determiner phrase
ENC	enclitic (postpositive)
FEM	feminine
FUT	future
GDV	gerundive (verbal adjective with deontic meaning)
GEN	genitive
IMP	imperative
IMPER	imperfective
IND	indicative
INF	infinitive
INP	imperfective non-past
MASC	masculine
MP	mediopassive voice
NEUT	neuter
NOM	nominative
OPT	optative
PCPL	participle
PL	plural
PNP	perfective non-past
PP	perfective past
PRES	present
PROC	proclitic (prepositive)
QP	question particle
SG	singular
SUBJ	subjunctive
TNI	true negative imperative





# *List of figures and tables*

## **Figures**

2.1	The syntactic status of the Modern Greek negators	33
2.2	The Modern Greek NEG2 in complementizer position	37
2.3	Geographical distribution of languages with a distinct negator for prohibition (types 2 and 4)	41
3.1	The syntactic status of the negators in Standard French	60
3.2	The phrasal status of NEG1 <i>οὐ(κ)</i> /u:(k)/ and NEG2 <i>μή</i> /mé:/	63
3.3	Greenberg's realis–irrealis continuum	67
3.4	NEG1 and NEG2 DP internal in Attic Greek	77
3.5	The <i>μή οὐ</i> (NEG2 NEG1) construction	82
3.6	The <i>οὐ μή</i> construction (NEG1 NEG2)	84
3.7	Distribution of NEG1 and NEG2 in Attic Greek (1134 tokens)	84
3.8	Syntactic distribution of n-thing in NC and non-NC structures	91
3.9	The constellation of Attic NEG2 <i>μή</i> /mé:/	97
4.1	The vowel system of Attic Greek	103
4.2	Developments in the vowel system from Attic to Koine	103
4.3	The vowel system of Late Koine Greek	104
4.4	The <i>ἵνα</i> /hina/ complementizer in Attic Greek	109
4.5	The nonveridical space and the broadening of <i>ἵνα</i> /hina/	118
4.6	The <i>ἵνα</i> /hina/+Subjunctive mood reanalysis from Classical Greek to Koine	119
4.7	The Modern Greek Subjunctive: a product of reanalysis	119
4.8	Cross-clausal grammaticalization: INA from Attic to Koine	123
4.9	NEG1-thing reanalysis from Classical Greek to Koine Greek	131
4.10	The distribution of NEG1 and NEG2 in Koine Greek	139
4.11	Comparison of NEG1 and NEG2 distribution between Koine Greek and Attic Greek	140
4.12	Rates of Negative Concord in Koine Greek (Negative Spreading included)	141
4.13	Rates of Negative Concord in Attic Greek (Negative Spreading included)	141

5.1	Negator distribution and diversity in Late Medieval Greek	149
5.2	The functions of <i>οὐδέν</i> / <i>udhén</i> / in three major stages of spoken Greek	155
5.3	The phrasal status of NEG1 and NEG2 in Classical and Koine Greek	162
5.4	The head status of negators in Late Medieval Greek	162
5.5	Negator distribution in the conditional protasis in Attic, Koine, and Late Medieval	164
5.6	NEG1 and NEG2 percentages in eighteenth- to nineteenth-century folk songs (154 tokens)	171
5.7	Negator distribution in Early Modern Greek (folk songs)	171
6.1	Upward lexical micromovement of the Greek NEG1 indefinite	190
6.2	Upward lexical micromovement of the Greek NEG2 indefinite	191
6.3	Syntactic distribution of NEG1- and NEG2-thing in Attic Greek (Stage I)	192
6.4	Syntactic distribution of NEG1- and NEG2-thing in Koine Greek	192
6.5	NEG1-thing reanalysis from Attic Greek to Koine and Medieval Greek	194
6.6	Leftward lexical micromovement in the French Jespersen's Cycle	195
6.7	Leftward lexical micromovement in the Greek Jespersen's Cycle	196
6.8	The distribution of NEG2 <i>μη</i> / <i>mi</i> / in Attic Greek, in Koine, and in Late Medieval Greek	199

## Tables

1.1	The two-negator contrast from Proto-Indo-European to Standard Modern Greek	1
1.2	Periodization of the Greek language	7
2.1	Prototypical nonveridical environments	22
2.2	Tense and aspect combinations in Standard Modern Greek	27
2.3	The distribution of NEG1 and NEG2 in Standard Modern Greek	38
2.4	The seven negative markers of Romeyka	44
2.5	Negators in some of the oldest Indo-European languages	46
2.6	Negative particle distribution in Hittite	47
2.7	Negator distribution in Vedic Sanskrit	47
2.8	Environments of negative particles in Old Persian	48
2.9	Negative particles in Classical Armenian	48
2.10	Environments of negative particles in Albanian	49
2.11	Environments of negative particles in Homeric Greek	50
3.1	Paradigm of active third person singular of <i>λύω</i> (/ly:ɔ:/, 'set free') in Attic Greek	55

3.2	The mood sequence of Attic Greek ( <i>consecutio modorum</i> )	65
3.3	Prototypical environments of the Attic Greek moods	68
3.4	The distribution of NEG1 <i>οὐ(κ)</i> /u:(k)/ and NEG2 <i>μή</i> /mḗ:/ in Attic Greek	71
3.5	The n-words of Attic Greek	85
3.6	Zeijlstra's typology of (non)inherent negativity of negative markers and n-words	95
4.1	Homophony in the mood system of Koine Greek (active voice)	105
4.2	Homophony in the mood system of Koine Greek (mediopassive voice)	106
4.3	The loss of <i>consecutio modorum</i> from Attic Greek to Koine	107
6.1	The two-negator contrast from Proto-Indo-European to Standard Modern Greek	174



# Introduction

## 1.1 The two-negator system of Greek

The primary goal of this study is to provide a detailed investigation of the expression of sentential negation in the history of the Greek language. Greek preserves a contrast between two complementary negators in all its attested history, from Homeric Greek to Standard Modern. By tracking down the environments in which each of the two negators is licensed in a sequence of twenty-five centuries, the regularity behind negator choice can be identified: the second negator,  $\mu\eta$  / $m\epsilon$ :/ in Classical Greek and / $mi$ / after Koine Greek, is a polarity item in all stages of the Greek language; an item licensed by nonveridicality, in the sense of Giannakidou (1998 *et seq.*).

The history of the Greek negator system also bears witness to an interesting asymmetry regarding the individual courses of the complementary negators through time (table 1.1). The first negator is renewed, in that the functions of the Attic Greek  $u:(k^{[h]})$  are in Modern Greek taken over by the etymologically unrelated item *dhen*. The second negator, however, is not eventually renewed, but remains stable and can be traced back to the reconstructed Proto-Indo-European negative  $*me_{H1}$ .

The second negator of Classical Greek, the polarity item  $\mu\eta$  / $m\epsilon$ :/, undergoes only the phonological alterations pervasive in each synchronic linguistic stage ( $m\epsilon$ : >  $me$  >  $mi$  >  $mi(n)$ ) and basically remains stable in form and, from its exclusive presence in nonveridical contexts, most prominently in its uses (i) as the negator of prohibitions,

**TABLE 1.1 The two-negator contrast from Proto-Indo-European to Standard Modern Greek**

	NEG1		NEG2
Proto-Indo-European	$*ne$	vs	$*me_{H1}$
Homeric Greek	$u:(k^{[h]})$	vs	$m\epsilon$ :
Classical Greek	$u:(k^{[h]})$	vs	$m\epsilon$ :
Koine	$u(k)$	vs	$mi$
Late Medieval	$u(k)$ (and $udh\acute{e}n$ )	vs	$mi$ (and $midh\acute{e}n$ )
Modern Greek	$dhe(n)$	vs	$mi(n)$

and (ii) as a nonnegative complementizer, as a sort of expletive or paratactic (strictly, redundant) negation (in the sense of van der Wouden 1994, 1997).

Through qualitative and quantitative data from representative texts from three major stages of vernacular Greek (Attic Greek, Koine Greek, Late Medieval Greek), this study depicts the asymmetry in the diachronic development of the Greek negator system: the replacement of the first negator, NEG<sub>1</sub>, and the preservation of the second one, NEG<sub>2</sub> (Classical Greek *me*., Modern Greek *mi(n)*). The explanation provided relates to the particulars of the uses of NEG<sub>2</sub>, specifically the inertial forces drawn by the nonnegative uses of NEG<sub>2</sub>, which, being nonnegative, did not experience the renewal pressures predicted by the Jespersen's cycle: its use in introducing (i) *yes/no* questions, and (ii) *verba timendi* complements.

The exact developments of NEG<sub>1</sub> and NEG<sub>2</sub>, however, do not properly fall under the Jespersen's Cycle phenomenon (Jespersen 1917, 1924; term coined in Dahl 1979), as already observed in Willmott 2013, although studies of grammaticalization and language typology have included Greek in the discussion of Jespersen's Cycle (cf. Roberts and Roussou 2003, Roussou 2007). I propose that the history of the Greek negator system provides motivation for a refinement of the traditional understanding of Jespersen's Cycle, in a fashion that abstracts away from the morphosyntactic and phonological particulars of the phenomenon and explicitly places its regularities in the semantics. This is an intuition that is found in the Jespersen's Cycle literature (Horn 1989, van Kemenade 2000, Roberts and Roussou 2003, Kiparsky and Condonavdi 2006, van Gelderen 2011, de Cuypere 2008, van der Auwera 2009, 2010a). Our task is to state it explicitly, accommodating not only Greek, but a number of other languages that deviate in different ways from the traditional description of Jespersen's Cycle (cf. de Swart 2010: 114).

The viewpoint I introduce for Jespersen's Cycle is one that treats it as a phenomenon which targets intensified predicate negation and with time transforms it into propositional negation. In the history of Greek, NEG<sub>1</sub> participates in such a development: the Classical and Hellenistic Greek indefinite *udhén* ('nothing', morphologically: 'not.even.one', see also Roussou 2007) leads to the Late Medieval negator of propositions and by pervasive phonological alterations (loss of initial unstressed vowels, see Horrocks 1997/2010) develops into the Standard Modern Greek NEG<sub>1</sub> *dhen*. The surviving NEG<sub>2</sub> experienced a similar stage, in that the former NEG<sub>2</sub> indefinite *μηδέν* /*midhén*/ ('nothing', morphologically: 'not.even.one') had bleached to plain sentential negation by the Late Medieval stage. This form, however, did not persist to the Standard Modern Greek stage.

Overall, this study aims to offer more insight regarding the regularities that pertain to sentential negation both synchronically and diachronically with data primarily from the history of Greek, but the claims made are supported by a significant amount of crosslinguistic evidence. Synchronically, because it is shown that sentential negation itself, although a nonveridical operator, can be a polarity item licensed in

nonveridical semantic contexts, as predicted by the (non)veridicality theory, which places no categorial restrictions on the elements that exhibit polarity behavior (Giannakidou 1998: 2–3, 93–5). Diachronically, because the developments in the history of Greek are in agreement with current theories of diachronic change, in that major tendencies for up-the-tree movement (described also as loss of covert movement in Roberts and Roussou 2003, Roberts 2010), and anticipated syntactic status shifts (from Specifier to Head, see van Gelderen 2001, 2004) are found.

## 1.2 Theoretical backgrounds: semantics, syntax, and agreement

This study is located at the interface of historical semantics and historical syntax, and comes to assess how the theoretical claims and tools developed based on the synchronic analyses of negation and polarity bear on the description and explanation of the relevant evidence from the diachrony of Greek. Owing to the multidimensionality of the phenomena examined, as well as the still nascent stage of our understanding of historical syntactic and semantic change, distinct yet not contradictory theories are employed in order to state the proposed analyses and accommodate the evidence. Central is the (non)veridicality theory of polarity developed in Giannakidou (1998 *et seq.*), which accounts for the distribution of the Greek negators in all the attested history of the language: the second negator, NEG<sub>2</sub>, is licensed only in nonveridical environments, such as modal, intensional, generic, and nonassertive environments in general (e.g. imperatives, optatives, questions, and the protases of conditionals, see Chatzopoulou and Giannakidou 2011). There is variation from language stage to language stage regarding which of these environments license the Greek NEG<sub>2</sub>. The environments are not always identical, but they are always nonveridical. Crucially, no pragmatic manipulations can synchronically affect the licensing of NEG<sub>2</sub>. It is purely a grammatical phenomenon, as predicted by the (non)veridicality theory: this theory relies on entailments available and not just discourse relations.

Although the ultimate goal of this study is the unveiling of the semantic regularities that relate to the expression of sentential negation (both in the case of negator choice and in the semantic definition proposed for Jespersen's Cycle), these regularities have syntactic repercussions as well. For the syntactic analyses, the representational frameworks developed within generative grammar have been employed (Chomsky 1995), as an enriched system for mapping sentential meaning synchronically. It is through the generative perspective regarding the abstractness and the hierarchy of syntactic structures that the developments in the Greek negator system are accounted for. The Agree model since Chomsky (2000) has been of particular use regarding not only the syntactic treatment of negative concord structures in terms of agreement in the sense of Zeijlstra (2004, 2008), but also the syntactic representation of nonveridical marking with a goal and a probe, assuming a covert or overt (in the case of Koine Greek) nonveridical head that carries [iNonVer] and agrees with



elements such as nonveridical moods, evidentials, or in this study in particular with the Greek NEG2 and NEG2-words that are taken to carry a [uNonVer] feature. There can be different paths in the analysis and compositional treatment of multiple exponents in languages regarding e.g. locality considerations (see among others Haegeman and Lohndal 2010 for a binary agreement of negative concord structures in West Flemish), as well as regarding the challenge of determining which element is the goal and which is the probe. The present study is rather conservative in this sense, as flexibility of word order in Classical Greek and Koine does not add anything new to this discussion.

However, our findings are in support of the historical syntactic models of Roberts and Roussou (2003), and van Gelderen (2004), as the descriptions of syntactic change as ‘upward reanalysis’ and the notion of ‘Late Merge’ readily account for the transformation of predicate negation to propositional. The Head Preference Principle of van Gelderen (2004) also explains the change in syntactic status of the Greek negators from phrases in Classical Greek to heads in Late Medieval and Modern Greek, as well as the attestations of NEG2 in nonnegative complementizer positions (in its use as a particle introducing *yes/no* questions and as a complementizer selected by *timendi* predicates), where it has stayed inert, however, for more than twenty-five centuries.

The pretheoretical representations of language change that are included in this study<sup>1</sup> capture the notions of up-the-tree movement and reflect the independence between the lexical/morphological and the syntactic/semantic components, providing a better visualization of the diachronic developments as instances of *upward* (and in the case of Greek leftward) *lexical micromovement*, assuming the principle of syntactic inertia of Keenan (2002) and Longobardi (2001), which has been posited for diachronic change. However, as will be shown, what is actually inert is the semantics, since communicational needs among humans have not changed, at least in historical times. In particular the preservation of nonveridical marking appears to be a language priority (see Chatzopoulou 2017), which if jeopardized (as was the case during the Koine Greek stage, owing to the homophony in the mood system), other mechanisms will be employed in order for it to resurface.

Regarding the broad notion of grammaticalization, our understanding takes into consideration the criticism it has received (Newmeyer 1998, 2001, Joseph 2001a, 2004, 2006, Campbell 2001, Campbell and Janda 2001, Janda 2001, Norde 2004, Joseph and Janda 2003) as a putative theory or process distinct from general mechanisms of language change. In this study, grammaticalization is viewed neither as a process, nor as a theory, but as a phenomenon: as a tendency in endogenous

---

<sup>1</sup> Inspired by the philosophy of Autolexical Grammar (Sadock 1991, Sadock & Schiller 1993, Sadock 2012) regarding the notion of mismatch across components as something which is diachronically verified.

language change that is usually described as loss of semantic features, based on frequently attested crosslinguistic patterns. One such pattern is Jespersen's Cycle. Thus, although several conspiratorial forces from different linguistic levels can be involved, and the 'processes' of grammaticalization can indeed be accounted for through other mechanisms of language change (e.g., reanalysis, phonological erosion), in this study grammaticalization is viewed as a phenomenon, in that it happens. A phenomenon whose end result (or side effect) is the upward reanalysis of lexical elements in the syntactic domain (Roberts and Roussou 2003). This may not be the heart or the most defining property of grammaticalization, but it is a secure diagnostic, with robust crosslinguistic support.

In the case of propositional negation the endogenous change is represented here as *upward lexical micromovement*, where instances of predicate negation are reanalyzed as propositional, and therefore higher in the hierarchical structure. The *micro-* part of our 'micromovement' terminology refers to fine shifts, especially on the Cinque expanded CP approach, that account for changes in the distribution of the Greek NEG2, and captures furthermore the gradualness of the changes described, which is in agreement with outlooks on grammaticalization and language change that highlight the gradual nature of the phenomenon (Lichtenberk 1991, Haspelmath 2004, Hopper and Traugott 2003, Lehmann 2004, Roberts 2010, Traugott and Trousdale 2010; but see Lightfoot 1999 for the notion of 'catastrophic' change); but most importantly it is in agreement with our historical data.<sup>2</sup> This diachronic movement correlates also with changes in word order from SOV, which is claimed to be the tendency of unmarked word order in Classical Greek (cf. Ebeling 1902, Devine and Stephens 1994, Taylor 1994, Dik 1995, 2007) to VSO in Hellenistic Greek and later stages (Haug 2009, Horrocks 2010, Deligianni 2011a), right up to Standard Modern Greek (Philippaki-Warbuton 1987, 1989, Tsimpli 1990, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998), where we see that the verb itself has been elevated in a direction which observes vertical structure: the verb has moved to a position higher in the structural domain. Greek is a left-branching language. The prediction of Roberts and Roussou (2003), as well as that of van Gelderen (2004) from a similar perspective, is that in right-branching languages grammaticalization processes will follow the opposite direction in their linear representation, as instances of *rightward lexical micromovement*, according to the terms proposed here.

<sup>2</sup> See in the same spirit but from a syntactic point of view the dissertation of De Clercq (2013), building on Starke (2009), regarding the *nanosyntax* of negation crosslinguistically, with the identification of subatomic features into which negation can be decomposed and then a detailed examination of the role of syncretism among features that gives rise to typological diversity. Such *micro-* and *nano-* terminology reflects the quest for primitives and indivisible syntactic or semantic features, which so far seems to be a promising direction for capturing crosslinguistic regularities and providing plausible accounts for empirical evidence.

### 1.3 Selection of texts and methodology

In this section I present the stages of the Greek language examined, along with the texts and resources used for each stage. A thorough overview of the entire history of Greek is given by Horrocks (1997/2010) in his book *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, earlier in the historical grammar of Jannaris (1897) and more recently by Christidis (2007). The purpose of my investigation is to study the expression of negation in the ancestral lineage of Standard Modern Greek. The criteria used for the selection of the stages of the language and texts included in this study are three:

- (i) The selected stage must be included in the ancestral lineage of Standard Modern Greek with some degree of certainty.
- (ii) The stage must be documented in a sufficient number of texts that we can draw secure conclusions.
- (iii) The selected texts must represent or be close to the vernacular of the time.

Therefore, although surviving texts in Greek can be found as early as the Linear B syllabary (fourteenth century BC) from the Mycenaean civilization—where NEG1 is in fact attested as an o-u- verbal prefix (see Rijksbaron 2012)—these texts are not included in this study, as it cannot be claimed with any certainty that they hold an ancestral relation to Attic Greek, which is among the precursors of Standard Modern Greek. Homeric Greek (eighth century BC) is discussed to a narrower extent (although written in an artificial language particular to epic songs), because Homeric Greek was intelligible to the speakers of the Classic era and most importantly it contains the first occurrences of the two negative markers of the Greek language, NEG1 *u:(k<sup>[h]</sup>)* and NEG2 *me:*. Furthermore, Homeric Greek negators have been extensively studied most recently in Willmott 2007, which provides a taxonomy of their uses that is in agreement with what is proposed here. The above criteria regarding text selection exclude dialectal variation in Ancient Greece, (i.e. dialects other than Attic) and the vast atticizing literature of the Hellenistic and medieval periods, as well as postmedieval, modern Greek dialects such as Pontic and Cypriot (with the exception of Romeyka Greek, discussed briefly in section 2.3 for its typological relevance and uniqueness).

Regarding the methodology, lexical statistics were calculated on samples of at least 1,000 instances of negation per synchronic linguistic stage: from Classical Greek, Koine Greek, and Late Medieval. The goal was to examine a potential correlation between the frequency of each negator in each use and its diachronic stability. No such correlation was found, in that there appears to be no relation between diachronic stability and the frequency of each negator or each individual use of NEG1 and NEG2. This finding may be surprising for theories of language change that rely on frequency, but it is consonant with Chomsky's (1962) observation that

‘probabilistic considerations have nothing to do with grammar’ (Chomsky 1962: 128, see also van Gelderen 2004: 14–15). They are merely the reflection of preservation or change, not the driving force behind either.

## 1.4 Periodization

The periodization of the Greek language that I follow here (table 1.2) is that of Markopoulos (2009), who conducted a similar diachronic study regarding the expression of the future tense in Greek, much broader in terms of examination of textual evidence. Markopoulos (2009), however, ends at the Late Medieval stage, while here sentential negation in Early and Standard Modern Greek is examined as well. By contrast, negation in Early Medieval is mostly excluded, though I do present examples from this stage for the sake of completeness. The evidence we have for the Early Medieval stage is neither securely chronologized, nor close to the vernacular (see also Willmott 2011) and is thus ruled out according to the principles of this investigation.

Some basic facts regarding each chronological stage and the texts from which qualitative and quantitative data are drawn are presented in the following sections.

### 1.4.1 *Classical Greek (fifth to fourth centuries BC): the Attic dialect*

Attic Greek was the most influential of the Ancient Greek dialects. It was spoken mainly in the region of Athens during the fifth and fourth centuries BC (and for some texts written in the third century BC) and it was intelligible to speakers of other dialects. It is the language in which the works of Demosthenes, Isocrates, Lysias, Plato, Aristoteles, Aristophanes, Euripides, Sophocles, and other well-known authors were written. The surviving texts of all these writers and of many of their contemporaries are included in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG) database, a digitized database of literary texts written in Greek which covers the phases of the Greek language until the fifteenth century. This is the database that is used for this phase of Greek.

TABLE 1.2 Periodization of the Greek language

Language stage	Time span
Classical Greek: The Attic dialect	Fifth to fourth centuries BC
Hellenistic Greek: Koine	Third century BC–fourth century AD
Early Medieval Greek (only some examples)	Fifth to tenth centuries AD
Late Medieval Greek	Eleventh to fifteenth centuries AD
Post-Medieval/Early Modern Greek	Sixteenth to nineteenth centuries AD

*1.4.2 Hellenistic and Roman times (third century BC to fourth century AD):**Atticism and the Koine*

Although the TLG database contains surviving linguistic material with no substantial gap until the fifteenth century AD and therefore covers the Hellenistic-Roman stage as well, this material is treated with more caution, owing to the rise of Atticism during the first century BC. ‘Atticism’ is a term applied to the intellectual movement which considered the classical Attic language of greater value than the koine, the lingua franca of the time that depicted, or was at least very close to, the vernacular. Atticism encouraged the mimicking of Classical Greek, especially in writing, resulting in a diglossia between the learned writers and the writers whose texts were closer to the vernacular. This diglossia in various forms was to follow the Greek language into the twentieth century. For these reasons, non-atticizing texts were selected for this study, such as Strabo’s *Geographica*, the Greek New Testament, and Epictetus’ *Dissertationes ad Arriano*, along with some examples from papyri.

Regarding the language of the Greek New Testament, I consider the discussion on the presence of Aramaisms and their extent in the Greek text (Winer 1855/1882, Viteau 1893, Cremer 1892, Torrey 1936) resolved toward the conclusion that ‘the Greek of the New Testament is basically the vernacular Greek of the Hellenistic world’ in the phrasing of Voelz (2010: 179), a conclusion supported as early as Deissmann (1908), through a comparison of the Greek New Testament with the language of the papyri of the time. Although the Greek New Testament is a translation from Hebrew to some extent, it depicts a non-atticizing variety that can be identified with the spoken language and it is included in the ancestral lineage of Standard Modern Greek also for its impact on posterity, being in addition the language of the Greek Orthodox church.

*1.4.3 Early Medieval Greek (fifth to tenth centuries AD)*

This period of the Greek language is the most scarcely documented in comparison to the stages that precede and follow. A number of political, religious, and social factors contributed to this situation, so that the rarity of texts, especially from the seventh until the ninth centuries led to the labeling of this period the “Dark Ages” of Byzantium (see Markopoulos 2009: 87). From this stage only a small sample of examples are included, for the sake of completeness, from the *Chronicle* of Johannes Malalas (sixth century) and the *Chronicon Paschale* (seventh century), while the Suda dictionary (tenth century) is used for metalinguistic evidence in chapter 5.

*1.4.4 Late Medieval Greek (eleventh to fifteenth centuries AD)*

Although this too was a period of cultural and political turbulence, marked in particular with the two captures of Constantinople, one by the Franks in 1204, one by the Turks in 1453, there is a variety of textual evidence of the vernacular of the