**Correlative negation at the interfaces and in diachrony:**
**syntax, semantics and pragmatics of Latin *nec***

**The issue:** Many studies have shown the intricacies in the behavior of negative correlative particles, like English (*n*)*either*, French *ni*, Serbian *ni* (Horn 1989: 256-258, de Swart 2001, Doetjes 2005, Hendriks 2004, den Dikken 2006, Wurmbrand 2008, Ahn 2015, Gajić 2016). The distribution of these particles is dependent on the one hand on the negation system of the language in which they occur (Concord vs. non-Concord system), on the other hand on specific pragmatic conditions that the particles impose on the previous and the forthcoming context (in terms of their polarity requirements and of their additive or scalar nature). Syntactic, semantic and pragmatic factors are often difficult to disentangle from each other, a fact which has led to many different analyses. In this work I consider one such particle in its diachronic development, the Latin particle *nec* 'and not'; 'neither'; 'not even'. Latin *nec* (and its full form *neque*) was a highly multifunctional item, which became extremely successful diachronically, representing the source of Romance correlative negations (e.g. French and Spanish *ni*, Italian *né*, Romanian *nicĭ*) and a morphological component of many Romance n-words (e.g. Spanish *ninguno*, Portuguese *nenhum*, Italian *nessuno*). Observing its development sheds light on the relations between the various meaning components conveyed, as well as on their syntactic implementation. I define the different uses of *nec* on the basis of the contextual conditions determining its various readings: I show that in most uses it qualifies a focus-sensitive particle. I then propose a parsimonious syntactic implementation of this proposal: capitalizing on its bimorphemic nature (*ne-c*, *ne-que*), I propose that the particle has a complex internal structure, and I discuss how it is integrated in the clause.

**The distribution:** I distinguish three uses of *nec*: (i) discourse-structuring connective 'and not' (not shown); (ii) correlative particle 'neither', cf. (1); (iii) stand-alone focus particle with an additive or a scalar interpretation 'even not', cf. (2).

(1) Caput      dolet     **neque**   audio    **nec**   oculis   prospicio   satis.
    head:NOM   hurt:3SG   and.not   hear:1SG   and.not   eyes:ABL   see:1SG    well
    'I have a headache, I can't hear, and I can't see well with my eyes' (Pl. Amph. 1059, 3rd BCE)

(2) nemo      mundus,    **nec**      infans
    nobody:NOM pure:NOM    and.not   infant:NOM
    'No one is pure, not even an infant' (Leo M. Serm. 21, 5th CE)

The etymology of *neque* 'neither' is transparent: it originates from the combination of the prehistoric negative morpheme *\*ne* with the postpositive enclitic coordination particle *-que*.

It is functionally equivalent to its apocoped variant *nec* (cf. the pair *atque* / *ac* 'and').

The coordinative functions (i) and (ii) are historically primary for *neque* / *nec*. The use as stand-alone focus particle appears later in time (I cent. CE) and becomes particularly frequent in Late Latin. Latin is a Double Negation language: each negatively marked element introduces a semantic negative operator, independently of its position in the clause; *neque* / *nec* conforms to this system and typically suffices to negate a clause or a smaller constituent by itself.

**The analysis:** As a discourse-structuring particle (i), *nec* introduces a full clause belonging to a new discourse unit, which may be connected in the discourse to a previous clause independent of the polarity of the latter. In its function as correlative negation (ii), instead, *nec* relates two or more negative constituents, which can be of various sizes, comprising CPs. However, unlike with the discourse-structuring version, they belong to the same discourse unit. The discourse-structuring use, where the preceding conjunct can be positive, clearly shows that *nec* is the bearer of a semantic negation operator and can perform a switch in polarity, expressing sentential negation by itself. This possibility, which is still attested in the Old Romance varieties (Doetjes 2005 for Old French, Zanuttini 2010 for Old Italian), is lost in Modern Romance (Orlandini & Poccetti 2008: 5, Torrego 2009: 479). In the discourse-structuring use, *nec* has, therefore, the meaning ∧ ¬, where the negation is outscoped by the conjuction: this is consistent with the particle's etymology and ensures that the negation only

takes scope over the conjunct directly introduced by the particle. According to the analysis in (3), *-que / -c* is the head of a Conjunction Phrase &P, which takes the CP it introduces as its complement. The reverse surface order is due to prosodic factors, namely to the enclitic status of *-que / -c*, which forces prosodic inversion. The negative particle *ne-* is itself proclitic: the two elements together form a prosodically acceptable unit for Latin. Similarly, a meaning ($\neg$ x $\wedge \neg$ y) can be attributed to the correlation introduced by *nec*, which according to one of De Morgan's Laws, is logically equivalent to a reading where the correlation is interpreted as a disjunction outscoped by negation: $\neg$ (x $\vee$ y). However, in my analysis, the correlative particle itself does not contain a Boolean conjunction operator in its lexical entry. Rather, the correlative particle is a focus particle with an additive component: in the case of correlative *neque / nec*, the morpheme *-que / -c* realizes an additive Focus operator, not a conjunction. The proposed structure is shown in (4): the reverse surface order is due, as for (3), to prosodic restructuring. The conjuncts in correlative constructions like (1) are asyndetically coordinated.

(3) discourse-structuring particle

(4) correlative and focus particle

```
        &P                                    FocP
        |                                      |
        &'                                    Foc'
       /  \                                  /   \
     &⁰    Op¬P                           Foc⁰    Op¬P
      |    /  \                            |      /   \
  -c / -que   Op¬'                     -c / -que     Op¬'
            /    \                                  /    \
        Op¬⁰     CP                              Op¬⁰     XP
        [Neg]                                    [Neg]
          |                                        |
         ne-                                      ne-
```

The structure in (4) has the advantage of positing the same scope relation between the negative morpheme and *-que / -c* for both coordinative functions (i) and (ii). The difference resides in the meaning contribution of *-que / -c*, which is a conjunction in the discourse-structuring use and an additive focus particle in the correlative use. The proposal also allows us to treat *nec* as unambiguously negative across its uses. A further advantage is that it can account for the later development of the stand-alone focus particle (iii). In the use in (iii) *nec* can have an additive or a scalar interpretation, with the latter becoming more frequent with time. The internal syntax for the stand-alone use remains unchanged and conforms to the structure in (4). The precise meaning contribution of *nec* in (iii) depends on the way alternatives are retrieved, which in turn influences the structure that the set of alternatives has. The use as additive focus particle is possible only when suitable alternatives for the focus are explicitly provided in the context, by means of correlation or by anaphoric linking to the previous discourse. In the absence of these preconditions, only a scalar interpretation is possible: in that case alternatives have to be accommodated by evoking a scale, whose dimension is usually suggested by the element in focus. A process of presupposition accommodation may have been responsible for the development of a scalar meaning for *nec*: accommodation processes on the part of the hearer are costly and, if systematic enough, may lead to a reanalysis of the conditions imposed by the lexical entry (cf. Traugott & Dasher 2002, Eckardt 2006, and for presupposition accommodation especially Schwenter & Waltereit 2010).

**Selected references: den Dikken**, M. 2006. 'Either'-float and the syntax of co-'or'-dination. *NLLT* 24: 689-749. **de Swart**, H. 2001. Négation et coordination: la conjonction 'ni'. In Bok-Bennema, R. et al. (eds.), *Adverbial modification*, 109-124. Amsterdam. **Doetjes**, J. 2005. The chameleonic nature of French 'ni': negative coordination in a negative concord language. In Maier, E. et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of SuB* 9, 72-86. Nijmegen. **Schwenter**, S. & **Waltereit**, R. 2010. Presupposition accommodation and language change. In Davidse, K. et al. (eds.), *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*, 75-102. Berlin.