Research in Generative Grammar
RGG 2023.01
Rivista di Grammatica Generativa

Modal negators in Romeyka Greek and the negative functional sequence

Lena Baunaz & Eric Lander
University of Geneva & University of Gothenburg

Abstract. In this paper, we argue that the negative sequence developed by De Clercq (2013, 2018, 2020) can be expanded to account for what we here term *modal negation* (that is, negators appearing in modal contexts like conditionals, prohibitions, and so-called 'subjunctive' contexts), and that the modal domain must be located above T-negation in De Clercq's hierarchy. We show that Romeyka, a variety of Greek spoken in northeastern Turkey (Sitaridou 2014a,b; Chatzopoulou & Sitaridou 2014), shows evidence that the modal domain in the negative sequence must be decomposed into at least four distinct layers, each one corresponding to a particular syntactico-semantic context (prohibitive, volitional, counterfactual conditional, and possibility conditional). Not surprisingly, the negators we investigate show crosslinguistic variation in their syncretism patterns; we consider data from English [IE], Modern Greek [IE], Hungarian [Uralic], Latin [IE], Albanian [IE], Mandarin Chinese [Sino-Tibetan], and Vietnamese [Austroasiatic]). Nevertheless, the expanded negative sequence for which we argue obeys the *ABA restriction, in line with nanosyntactic expectations (Caha 2009).

Cite as: Baunaz, Lena & Eric Lander. 2023. Modal negators in Romeyka Greek and the negative functional sequence. *RGG*, 45(1). 1–25. Lingbuzz Press.

1 Introduction

It is well-established that two distinct sentential negators should be reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European (e.g. Fortson 2010: 148; see also Joseph 2002, Joseph 2018: 1781–1782, and Chatzopoulou 2019, with references, for discussion). The first, PIE **ne/nē/n̥*, is the ancestor of most of the Indo-European negators (Lat. *nōn* < **ne oi̯nos* 'not one', Skt. *ná*, Go. *ni*, OE *ne*, AG *a-* < **n̥-*, Eng. *un-* < **n̥-*) and can be labeled NEG1. The second, PIE **mē*, is more restricted in form and distribution, typically associated with modal contexts, like prohibition (AG *mḗ*, Skt. *mā́*), and can be referred to as the *modal negator*, or NEG2.[1] Non-Indo-European languages like Hungarian also make a distinction between non-modal and modal negation. In this paper, we argue that the negative sequence developed by De Clercq (2013, 2018, 2020) can be expanded to account for modal negation, and that the modal domain must be located above T-negation in the hierarchy. We then demonstrate that Romeyka, a variety of Greek spoken in northeastern Turkey (Sitaridou 2014a,b, Chatzopoulou & Sitaridou 2014), shows evidence that the modal domain in the negative functional sequence must be decomposed into at least four distinct layers, each one corresponding to a particular syntactico-semantic context. Not surprisingly, there is crosslinguistic variation in the syncretism patterns of NEG1 vs. NEG2 in the languages we investigate (English [IE], Modern Greek [IE], Hungarian [Uralic], Latin [IE], Albanian [IE], Mandarin Chinese [Sino-Tibetan], Vietnamese [Austroasiatic]), but the expanded negative sequence for which we argue obeys the *ABA restriction, in line with nanosyntactic expectations (Caha 2009).[2]

1. We use the term *modal negator* as a cover term for a number of different (apparently) 'non-indicative' functions and contexts. Prohibition is one of them, but as we will demonstrate, the term also applies to so-called subjunctive contexts (we focus here on volitional contexts) and conditional contexts (counterfactual conditionals and possibility conditionals).

2. Unless otherwise indicated, examples are from our informants. Abbreviations: ACC = accusative, Cl = Class, Eng. = English, Foc = focus, AG = Ancient Greek, Go. = Gothic, IE = Indo-European, Lat. = Latin, MG = Modern Greek, NEG = negation, OE = Old English, PERF = perfect, PIE = Proto-Indo-European, PRT = particle, Q = (scalar) quantity, SG = singular, Skt. = Sanskrit, T = tense.

2 Background

De Clercq (2013, 2018, 2020) has argued that there are at least four structurally different kinds of negators: T-negators, Foc-negators, Class-negators, and Q-negators. We illustrate each one below for English, Modern Greek, Hungarian, Mandarin Chinese, Latin, and Albanian (where the last two languages are not discussed by De Clercq).

T-negators deny a tensed predicate, as shown in (1).

(1) a. Frank did**n't** come to the party. English

b. O János **dhen** írthe. Modern Greek
the J. NEG came.3SG
'John did not come.' (adapted from Chatzopoulou 2013: 2, her (1))

c. A kutya **nem** fogta meg a nyulat. Hungarian
the dog NEG caught PRT the rabbit.ACC
'The dog did not catch the rabbit.' (É. Kiss 2015: 220, her (2b))[3]

d. Hac quidem **non** venit. Latin
this.way in.fact NEG come.3SG.PERF
'Well, he didn't come this way.' (Plautus *Asinaria* 741)
(Pinkster 2015: 672, his (a), our glosses)

e. **Nuk/S'** vajta (më) në bibliotekë. Albanian
NEG went.1SG (anymore) in library
'I didn't go to the library (anymore).' (Turano 2000: 82, her (3ab))[4]

f. Tā **bú** shì kuàilé. Mandarin Chinese
(s)he NEG is happy
'She is not happy.' (De Clercq 2020: 99, her (196a))[5]

Foc-negators take lower scope, scoping over untensed predicates, such as with contrastive focus (2).[6]

3. The non-negated version of (1c) is *A kutya meg-fogta a nyulat* (É. Kiss 2015: 220, her (2a)). Sentential negation with *nem* preceding the VP involves obligatory inversion of the verbal particle with the verb.
4. In Albanian there are two interchangeable negative particles appearing in indicative contexts: *nuk* and *s'* (see Turano 2000, 2017, Joseph 2018: 1781–1782, among others). These negators also appear with conditionals (see below) and with admiratives (see Turano 2017 for details).
5. We follow De Clercq (2020: 101, fn. 71) in assuming *bù* to be the main negator in Mandarin Chinese, with the other commonly appearing negator, *méi yǒu* 'not (have)', in more restricted (i.e. perfective, existential, possessive) contexts.
6. Foc-negators are frequently used also as the word for 'no', as with MG *oxi* (see Chatzopoulou 2013: 16 and references cited there) and Alb. *jo* (Turano 2000: 88).

(2) a. It was **not** Frank who wrote the book (but rather Gerald). English

b. Taxidhevi me treno, **oxi** me autokinito. Modern Greek
travels by train NEG by car
'He travels by train not by car.'

c. **Nem** A KUTYA fogta meg a nyulat. Hungarian
NEG the dog caught PRT the rabbit.ACC
'It was not the dog that caught the rabbit.'
(É. Kiss 2015: 221, her (4b))

d. **non** hostem auctorem, sed rem spectare Latin
NEG enemy.ACC authority.ACC but fact.ACC regard.INF
'(that) he did not regard the enemy, but the fact, as the authority'
(Caesar *de Bello Gallico* 5.29)
(Gianollo 2017: 55, her (7), our glosses and translation)

e. Ai udhëton me tren **jo** me makinë. Albanian
he travels by train not by car
'He travels by train not by car.' (Turano 2000, 86, her (20a))

f. Wo chi miantiao **bu** chi mifan. Mandarin Chinese
I eat noodle NEG eat rice
'I eat noodles, not rice.' (Li 2008: 761, her (8))

Class-negators are responsible for contradictory negation of a predicate term: in (3a), for instance, a role which is 'non-speaking' cannot also be 'speaking'.

(3) a. **non**-speaking role English
non-governmental

b. **mi** kivernitikós 'non-governmental' Modern Greek
mi antístasi 'non-resistance' (Efthimiou 2008: 61, her (11))

c. **nem** kereskedelmi termékek Hungarian
NEG commercial product.PL
'non-commercial products' (De Clercq 2020: 120, her (246))

d. Agri reliquit ei **non** magnum modum. Latin
land.GEN leave.3SG.PERF to.him NEG big.ACC measure.ACC
'He left him a not-big piece of land.' (Plautus *Aulularia* 13)
(Greco 2022: 3, his (5b))

e. **jo**fetar 'non-religious' Albanian
joqeveritar 'non-governmental'

f. **bu** gao 'not tall' Mandarin Chinese
bu nan 'not difficult'
(contradictory readings according to Teng 1974: 125, his (1a))[7]

Q-negators, on the other hand, are responsible for contrary negation of a predicate term: in (4a), for instance, it is possible to be neither 'disciplined' nor 'undisciplined' at the same time.

(4) a. **un**disciplined English
disenfranchised
b. **a**véveos 'uncertain' Modern Greek
akéfalos 'headless, acephalous'
aniperáspistos 'undefended' (Efthimiou 2008: 57, her (3–5))
c. pénz-**telen** 'money-less' Hungarian
állás-**talan** 'job-less'
boldog-**talan** 'unhappy' (É. Kiss 2015: 230, her (39))
d. **in**coctus Latin
'not completely, perfectly cooked, undercooked'
(see Cuzzolin 2021: 71 for discussion)
e. **jo**politik 'unpolitical/apolitical' Albanian
joorganike 'inorganic'[89]
f. **bu** fangbian 'inconvenient' Mandarin Chinese
bu shufu 'uncomfortable'
bu daode 'immoral'
(contrary readings according to Teng 1974: 125, his (1b))

In addition to her discussion of the scopal and semantic properties of these negators (see also Horn 2001), De Clercq observes differences when it comes to *stacking*. For instance, a T-negator can co-occur with a Foc-negator and a Q-negator, as in *They aren't NOT undisciplined*. However, Q-negators do not stack on Class-negators, as seen in **disnonenfranchised*, **un-non-happy* (Q-neg > Class-neg) vs. *nondisenfranchised*, *non-unhappy* (Class-neg > Q-neg) (De Clercq 2020: 34).

7. In more formal language, *fēi* is also used as both Class-neg and Q-neg (De Clercq 2020: 98–99, Pan, Lee & Huang 2016: 162–163). Cf. also Vietnamese *phi*, a loan from Chinese.
8. Albanian also has *mos-*, but this appears to be particularly correlated with deverbal nouns: *mosbesim* 'mistrust' (*besoj* 'I trust'); *mosnjohje* 'ignorance' (*njoh* 'I know'); *mosqeni* 'nonexistence' (*qeni* 'being'), but also *mosbarazi* 'inequality' (*barazi* 'equality') (Joseph 2002: 109, his (4gii)). We assume that this use of *mos-* is not the realization of Class-neg or Q-neg that we need here.
9. Interestingly, it seems that modern speakers tend to replace the Q-neg prefixes *a-*, *i-*, *in-* with *jo-*, so instead of *apolitik* 'unpolitical' or *inorganike* 'inorganic', Albanian speakers prefer to say *jopolitik* and *joorganike*. This is mentioned by Bekteshi (2019: 1682) and has been confirmed by G. Turano (p.c.). This suggests that *jo-* is the more natural or colloquial equivalent of the more formal or fossilized Greek and Latin prefixes, in the same way that *un-* is the homegrown choice in English, as opposed to loanmorphs like *a-*, *dis-*, or *iN-* (thanks to G. Turano for discussion).

On the basis of the combined evidence, De Clercq argues for a hierarchy wherein the four negators she distinguishes are related to one another in a nested fashion, as in (5) (see e.g. De Clercq 2018: 194), where Cl and Q are associated primarily with adjectival predicates.

(5) a. [T [Foc [Cl [Q [Neg]]]]] T-neg (denial of tensed predicate)
b. [Foc [Cl [Q [Neg]]]] Foc-neg (negation of predicate)
c. [Cl [Q [Neg]]] Class-neg (contradictory negation of term)
d. [Q [Neg]] Q-neg (contrary negation of term)

These four kinds of negation are realized in different ways crosslinguistically. Some languages, like (informal) English and Modern Greek, lexicalize each kind of negator with a distinct form. Other languages, like Hungarian and Latin, use the same form for more than one kind of negator, a phenomenon called *syncretism*.

Syncretism between negator types is restricted to adjacent layers in the sequence T > Foc > Cl > Q, as shown in Table 1 (see De Clercq 2020: 137, Table 6 for more data). This can be explained in terms of the *ABA theorem (for which see pioneering work by Bobaljik 2007, 2012 on adjective comparison and Caha 2009 on case), which is derivable by nanosyntactic principles of spellout or lexicalization, the details of which do not concern us here.

	T	**Foc**	**Class**	**Q**
Modern Greek	dhen	oxi	mi	a-
Informal English	-n't	not	non-	un-
Formal English	not	not	non-	un-
Hungarian	nem	nem	nem	-tElEn
Latin	nōn	nōn	nōn	iN-
Albanian	nuk/s'	jo	jo-	jo-
Mandarin Chinese	bù	bù	bù	bù

Table 1: Syncretism patterns involving T-, Foc-, Class-, and Q-negators

De Clercq (2020) limits herself to the present indicative system, thereby excluding a range of negators which are conditioned by certain properties of tense, mood, and aspect. In any case, she makes the assumption, without going into detail, "that tense or mood-related negative allomorphs, and some aspect-related allomorphs, belong to … the T^{NEG}-marker group" (De Clercq 2020: 43, fn.23).

3 Locating modal negators in the hierarchy

We will show that De Clercq's assumption has merit, at least as far as "mood-related" negators go. Consider the class of *modal negators*, which belong to so-called 'subjunctive' (non-indicative) contexts. Whereas the English negator is still *not/-n't* in such contexts (6), other languages have a dedicated negator: Modern Greek *mi(n)* (7), Hungarian *ne* (8), Latin *nē* (9), and Albanian *mos* (10) (we return to Mandarin Chinese in Section 5). For now, we make use of two environments in order to identify such modal negators: volitional contexts ((a) examples) and negative imperatives/prohibitives[10] ((b) examples). Below we gloss the modal negator as NEG2, while NEG1 refers to De Clercq's T-negators.

(6) a. My greatest wish is that you **not**/do**n't** win. English
b. Do **not**/-**n't** touch that!

(7) a. Thelo na **min/*dhen** kerdisi o Janis.
want.1SG SUBJ NEG2/NEG1 win.PERF.NONPAST.3SG the John
'I don't want John to win.' Modern Greek
(adapted from Giannakidou 2009: 1887, her (10))
b. **Min/*Dhen** eísai vlakas!
NEG2/NEG1 be stupid
'Don't be stupid!'

(8) a. (Azt) óhajtotta, hogy **ne/*nem** menjünk el otthonról
(that) wish.PAST.3SG that NEG2/NEG1 go.SUBJ.1PL PRT home.DELAT
'He wished that we not leave home.' Hungarian
(Puskás 2017: 155, her (5))
b. **Ne/*Nem** engedd be a kutyát!
NEG2/NEG1 let.IMP.2SG in the dog.ACC
'Don't let in the dog!' (É. Kiss 2015: 222, her (7b))

10. Note that Modern Greek, unlike most of the languages discussed in this paper, has no 'true' negated imperative (the following examples here from Roussou 2015: 131, her (14)). While verbs in Greek do have dedicated imperative morphology (*graf-e* 'write-IMP.SG'), the combination **mi graf-e* is not grammatical; instead, to express 'do not write!', *mi(n)* must combine with a verb in the indicative (*mi graf-is* 'not write-2SG').

(9) a. tu tamen velim **ne** intermittas … scribere ad me
you however wish.1SG NEG2 interrupt.SUBJ.2SG write to me
'I would like you, however, not to stop writing me.' Latin
(Cicero *Epistulae ad Atticum* 11.12.4)
(adapted from Mari & Tahar (2020: 12), their (42a))

b. **Ne** sis plora!
NEG2 please cry.IMP.2SG
'Please don't cry!' (Tahar 2022: 34, her (8b), citing Pinkster 2015)

(10) a. Beni dëshiron që studentet të **mos** lexojnë librat.
Ben.NOM wants that students.the.NOM TË NEG2 read.3PL.SUBJ books.the.ACC
'Ben wants that the students don't read the books.' Albanian
(Turano 2017: 72, her (28))

b. **Mos** lexo!
NEG2 read.IMP.2SG
'Don't read!' (adapted from Turano 2000: 111, her (69a))

The question now is where in De Clercq's hierarchy the modal negators belong. Can they be integrated into her hierarchy as it is, simply by adding functional layers to it, or does it need to be dismantled and rethought in a more fundamental way?

The best way to probe the negative hierarchy is from the perspective of syncretism patterns. Consider again a few of the patterns from above, given in Table 2.

	T	**Foc**	**Class**	**Q**
Modern Greek	dhen	oxi	mi	a-
Hungarian	nem	nem	nem	-tElEn
English	not	not	non-	un-

Table 2: Negators in Modern Greek, Hungarian, and English

In Hungarian, the modal negator *ne* is quite informative: as Table 3 shows, it cannot be located between T or Foc, or between Foc and Class, as that would create ABA patterns of the type *nem* | *ne* | *nem* (the same reasoning applies to Latin).

(Mod)	T	(Mod)	Foc	(Mod)	Class	(Mod)	Q	(Mod)
ne	nem		nem		nem		-tElEn	
	nem	*ne	nem		nem		-tElEn	
	nem		nem	*ne	nem		-tElEn	
	nem		nem		nem	ne	-tElEn	
	nem		nem		nem		-tElEn	ne

Table 3: Possible and impossible positions for Hungarian *ne*

Languages like Hungarian, with a BBBA pattern (*nem* | *nem* | *nem* | *-tElEn*) in the negative fseq and a modal negator with a distinct form, rule out two positions for Mod in the sequence and leave three options available: above T, between Class and Q, or beneath Q.

Locating the modal negator at the juncture between Class and Q or beneath Q, however, would create problems for languages like English, where there is no special negator in modal contexts (see (6)). In other words, an ABA would arise for English if modal negation were placed between Class and Q, or even below Q. This is illustrated in Table 4.

(Mod)	T	(Mod)	Foc	(Mod)	Class	(Mod)	Q	(Mod)
not	not		not		non-		un-	
	not	not	not		non-		un-	
	not		not	not	non-		un-	
	not		not		non-	*not	un-	
	not		not		non-		un-	*not

Table 4: Impossible positions for English *not*

Thus we have ruled out the following options for the functional layer we have labeled Mod: between T and Foc, between Foc and Class, between Class and Q, and beneath Q. The only remaining option is above T.

	Mod	T	Foc	Class	Q
Modern Greek	min	dhen	oxi	mi	a-
Albanian	mos	nuk/s’	jo	jo-	jo-
Hungarian	ne	nem	nem	nem	-tElEn
Latin	nē	nōn	nōn	nōn	iN-
English	not	not	not	non-	un-

Table 5: Final position for modal negator

As seen in Table 5, locating Mod above T is perfectly compatible with the *ABA restriction.[11]

As a coda to this section, we would like to address MG *mi(n)*, which looks similar enough to the Class-negator *mi* that questions might be raised concerning a potential syncretism. Indeed, the *-n* at the end of modal *min* is sometimes deleted, making it homophonous with Class-negator *mi* (which can never take final *-n*). The realization of final *-n* in *mi(n)* is complex and overlaid by prescriptive and orthographic considerations (A. Roussou, p.c.), but some sort of phonological conditioning appears to be at work: if the first segment of the following word is a fricative or nasal, final *-n* is often (but not necessarily) absent (11a); if the following word begins with a vowel (11b) or a stop consonant (11c), then final *-n*, or an assimilated nasal /N/, is usually present (see Veloudis 1982: 2–3; Janda & Joseph 1999: 6; Joseph 2002, among others).

(11) a. Mi/Min fijis! Modern Greek
NEG2 leave.2SG
'Don't leave!'

b. Min/*Mi eísai vlakas!
NEG2 be stupid
'Don't be stupid!'

c. Min/*Mi tros!
NEG2 eat.2SG
'Don't eat!'

Again, with Class-negator *mi,* final *-n* is never present, as seen in (12) (contrast especially with (11b), with the negator followed by a vowel-initial word).

(12) o mi/*min agathós Modern Greek
the NEG naïve
'the non-naïve' (Chatzopoulou 2013: 17, her (35a))

We claim, then, that the modal negator has a final nasal in its underlying form,[12] whereas the Class-negator *mi* does not (see also

11. We are making the assumption that Mod-negation is composed of functional features building on T-negation in a strictly cumulative way, without 'gaps' in the sequence. This could, of course, be incorrect, but until more data can be produced to prove otherwise, we stick to this default position.

12. There is still, admittedly, the remaining issue of why *mi(n)* appears as *mi* when nothing follows, as in *Mi!* 'Don't!' (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton 1997: 420; see also Joseph 2002, Roussou 2015) or in cases of ellipsis like *thelodas kai mi* 'want it or not', where final *-n* is always absent.

Veloudis 1982: 3–5). This means that *mi(n)* and *mi* are completely separate lexical entities, and there is no need for them to be adjacent in the table.[13] In other words, Modern Greek *mi(n)* does not help to reveal the location of modal negation in the universal functional sequence, and placing Mod on top of T, as suggested by the Hungarian and English facts, is the best available solution.

4 How to decompose 'Mod' according to Romeyka Greek

Romeyka, a Greek variety spoken in northeastern Turkey (Sitaridou 2014a,b, Chatzopoulou & Sitaridou 2014), has at least five distinct clausal negators. While it is tempting to make use of this morphological richness to decompose our 'Mod' layer into five or more distinct projections, in this paper we will limit ourselves to a more modest goal, although we expect future research to lead to an even more fine-grained sequence.

To start with, the so-called standard negator in Romeyka Greek has the form *utši* (with various allomorphs: *utš*, *tši*, *tš*, *u*; see Sitaridou 2014a: 121, Table 1), labeled NEG1 in (13a).[14] As discussed above, the Modern Greek equivalent here is *dhen* (13b).

(13) a. **Utš** eporesa mairepsini. Romeyka
NEG1 could.1SG cook.INF
'I could not cook.' (Chatzopoulou 2019: 44, her (64))

b. **Dhen** borousa na magirepso Modern Greek
NEG1 could.1SG PRT cook.1PSG
'I could not cook.'

Romeyka also shows a distinct negator in subjunctive contexts. To be more precise about the nature of 'subjunctive' as a syntactico-semantic category, we will restrict our discussion to clauses embedded under volitional verbs, as in (14) (see Section 6 for some further discussion). As seen in (14a), the Romeyka negator in this environment is *xe*, labeled NEG2, followed by the particle *na* (which in standard Modern Greek precedes the negator, as seen in (14b)).

13. Indeed, even if the item *mi(n)* is considered to morphologically contain *mi*, such that we have a bimorphemic *mi-n*, there is no adjacency requirement on morphological containment either.
14. Note that our numbering (NEG1, NEG2, etc.) does not reflect the system employed by Chatzopoulou & Sitaridou (2014).

(14) a. Esi thelis ego **xe** na trogo. Romeyka
you.NOM want.2SG I.NOM NEG2 SUBJ eat.1SG
'You want me not to eat.' (Chatzopoulou 2019: 44, her (67))

b. Esi thelis ego na **min** troo. Modern Greek
you.NOM want.2SG I.NOM SUBJ NEG2 eat.1SG
'You don't want me to eat.'
(Chatzopoulou & Sitaridou 2014: 28, their (18b))

Chatzopoulou (2019) also identifies *mi* as a dedicated prohibitive marker in Romeyka, labeled NEG3 in (15a).

(15) a. **Mi** tros! Romeyka
NEG3 eat.2SG
'Don't' eat!' (Chatzopoulou 2019: 44, her (65))

b. **Min** tros! Modern Greek
NEG2 eat.2SG
'Don't eat!'

An interesting fact about Romeyka Greek is that conditionals involve special negation, depending on semantic type. With counterfactual conditionals, Romeyka shows the particle *na* plus the negator *mutš*, labeled NEG4 in (16a). As seen in (16b), *an* 'if' is not an option in this context in Romeyka, in contrast with the situation in Modern Greek (16c).

(16) a. Na **mutš** ixa xasini ton paran, xar n' epina
SUBJ NEG4 had.1SG lose.INF the money, now SUBJ made.1SG
ospit.
house
'If I hadn't wasted the money, I would've built a house.' Romeyka
(Chatzopoulou 2019: 45, her (68))

b. *An **mutš** ixa xasini ton paran...
if NEG4 had.1SG lose.INF the money
'If I hadn't wasted the money ...' Romeyka
(Chatzopoulou & Sitaridou 2014: 32, their (22))

c. An **dhen** ixa xasi ta lefta, tha extiza spiti.
if NEG1 had.1SG lost the money FUT made.1SG house
'If I had not lost the money, I would have bought a house.'
Modern Greek
(Chatzopoulou & Sitaridou 2014: 18, their (8b))

With possibility conditionals involving *an* 'if', Romeyka uses *midhen*, labeled NEG5 in (17a), whereas Modern Greek uses *dhen* (17b).

(17) a. **Amidhen** pathanis u manthanis. Romeyka
if.NEG5 suffer.2SG NEG1 learn.2SG
'If you don't suffer, you don't learn.'
(Chatzopoulou 2019: 44, her (66))

b. An **dhen** pathis, dhen tha mathis. Modern Greek
if NEG1 suffer.2SG NEG1 FUT learn.2SG
'If you don't suffer, you will not learn.'
(Chatzopoulou & Sitaridou 2014: 18, (8a))

In sum, Romeyka shows distinct negators in the protasis of possibility conditionals (PC), in the protasis of counterfactual conditionals (CC), with prohibitives (Proh), and under volitional verbs (Vol). Modern Greek, on the other hand, shows *dhen* with both kinds of conditionals, whereas embedding under directive verbs displays negation by *mi(n)*, which is the negator also for prohibitives.

This is, admittedly, a simplification. We note, for instance, that Chatzopoulou & Sitaridou (2014) report another negator, *tšen*, labeled NEG6, which can appear in the future (18) and in possibility conditionals (19).

(18) a. As to naksemi **tšen** na troi. Romeyka
till the morning NEG6 FUT eat.3SG
'He won't be eating till the morning.'
(Chatzopoulou 2019: 45, her (69))

b. **Dhen** tha fighume. Modern Greek
NEG1 PRT leave.1PL
'We will not leave.' (Roussou 2015: 2, (3b))

(19) a. An **tšen** potiziz ta za na psofun. Romeyka
if NEG6 water.2SG the animals FUT die.3PL
'If you don't water the animals, they will die.'
(Chatzopoulou & Sitaridou 2014: 32, their (23))

b. An **dhen** potíseis ta zóa, tha pethánoun Modern Greek
if NEG1 water.2SG the animals FUT die.3PL
'If you don't water the animals, they will die.'

Moreover, the negator *utšas* appears with exhortatives, as shown in (20).

(20) Alis **utšas** erte. Romeyka
Alis NEG7(?) come.3SG
'Alis should not come.' (Chatzopoulou 2019: 45, her (70))

Since this negator is apparently composed of NEG1 *u(tš)(i)* plus a particle (MG hortative *as*[15]), i.e. *utš-as*, it is unclear if an entirely new layer for 'NEG7' is justified in our hierarchy, or if the regular T-negator is enough to account for this option. We leave both *tšen* and *utšas* for future research.

Table 6 shows one way in which the Mod-layers of the negative sequence can be arranged in such a way that *ABA is not violated.

	Proh	**Vol**	**CC**	**PC**	**T**	**...**
MG	mi(n)	mi(n)	dhen	dhen	dhen	...
RG	mi	xe	mutš	midhen	u(tš)(i)	...

Table 6: Modern Greek and Romeyka negators

Even so, the relative order of Proh and Vol could still be the other way around, as could the relative order of CC and PC, without violating the adjacency restriction on syncretism. Below we will present patterns from additional languages which confirm the hierarchy proposed in Table 6, but for now we can offer a weaker defense of this order on the basis of facts from Romeyka, specifically the behavior of the particle *na*. Consider Table 7.

	Proh	**Vol**	**CC**	**PC**	**T**	**...**
RG	mi	xe (+ *na*)	(*na* +) mutš	(*a-* +) midhen	u(tš)(i)	...

Table 7: Decomposing Mod with Romeyka negators

Table 7 shows that Vol and CC 'share' the particle *na* in Romeyka Greek. Thus, if Vol and Proh had been reversed, or if PC and CC had been reversed, this pattern would be disrupted, resulting in a kind of ABA, as seen in Table 8.

15. See Roussou (2015) and references cited there for work on Modern Greek's modal particles (hortative/optative *as*, 'futurate' *tha*, subjunctive *na*, and negative *mi(n)*).

Proh	**Vol**	**PC**	**CC**
---	*na*	*a-*	*na*
Vol	**Proh**	**CC**	**PC**
na	---	*na*	*a-*
Vol	**Proh**	**PC**	**CC**
na	---	*a-*	*na*

Table 8: ABA patterns if Vol > Proh and/or PC > CC

One might argue that the particle is orthogonal to the main issue of negator choice. That is, there could be any number of factors which might conspire to allow for two negators which are located at different ends of the negative sequence to nevertheless co-occur with the same particle. In other words, is there any reason to think that the internal structure of the negator and the internal structure of the particle should be directly related?

In short, the answer is yes, given the way that De Clercq's theory of negation works. In her system, the negative sequence is composed of a feature Neg plus functional features which are 'recycled' from other domains (Q, Class, Foc, T). As De Clercq (2020: 161) explains, the size of the negator determines where it is inserted. So a negator [T [Foc [Class [Q [Neg]]]]] would be inserted at the TP level of a clause, [Foc [Class [Q [Neg]]]] at the FocP level of a clause, and so on. Presumably, then, the Romeyka negators *mutš* and *xe* are composed of features which are merged in the upper-T/lower-Mo(o)d domain, an area of the functional sequence which is otherwise responsible for the realization of the subjunctive particle *na*. Since the clausal sequence into which the negator is inserted is directly relevant to the internal structure of the negator itself, it is reasonable – at least within De Clercq's framework – to assume that the syncretism between counterfactual-type *na* and volitional-type *na* reflects adjacent layers also in the internal structure of the negator. Again, this is somewhat speculative, but below we present more straightforward evidence from Mandarin Chinese, Vietnamese, Hungarian, and Albanian on the ordering of Proh/Vol and CC/PC.

5 Additional languages

Based on the Romeyka Greek data presented in Section 4, we have seen that we should distinguish between the negator appearing in subjunctive contexts (a category we have labeled Vol) and the negator appearing with Prohibitive negation (Proh). Second, we have shown that conditionals involve special negation, depending on semantic type: possibil-

ity conditionals (PC) vs. counterfactual conditionals (CC). Also, we have argued for a way to organize the Mod-layers of the negative sequence in such a way that *ABA is not violated. Table 6, which is repeated here as Table 9, sums up our results.

	Proh	**Vol**	**CC**	**PC**	**T**	**...**
MG	mi(n)	mi(n)	dhen	dhen	dhen	...
RG	mi	xe	mutš	midhen	u(tš)(i)	...

Table 9: Modern Greek and Romeyka negators

Let us now see how the negators of Mandarin Chinese, Hungarian, Albanian, and Latin behave with regard to prohibitives, volitionals, and the two types of conditionals discussed above. We also introduce some supplementary data from Vietnamese (Austroasiatic) on the prohibitive negator.

Mandarin Chinese shows a difference between Proh-negation (*bié* in (21a)) and Vol-negation (*bù* in (21b)). Note, however, that *bié* is essentially a colloquial contraction of *búyào* 'should not' (Pan, Lee & Huang 2016: 158–159), e.g. *Búyào chī!* 'Don't eat!'. Vietnamese, importantly, shows a clearer morphological distinction, with two forms which are not related to each other: "đừng" for Proh (22a) vs. "không" for Vol (22b).

(21) a. Nǐ **bié** shuāi zhe le — Mandarin Chinese
you NEG2 fall.down suffer LE
'(Watch out!) Don't fall!' (Pan, Lee & Huang 2016: 161, their (41))

b. Ni ningke wo **bu** chi qiaokeli.
you prefer me NEG1 eat chocolate
'You prefer that I not eat chocolate.'[16]

(22) a. **Đừng** đọc cuốn sách đó! — Vietnamese
NEG2 read CLF book that
'Don't read that book!'[17]

16. Note that with verbs like 'want', Mandarin Chinese has the option of NEG-raising (Wenli Tang, p.c.), e.g. *Ni **bu** xiang wo chi qiaokeli* 'You don't want me to eat chocolate', an option which is not available with 'prefer' (we thank Xiang Kang for this example).
17. Note that *không* is the standard T-negator as well, as in *Tôi đang **không** ăn* 'I DUR NEG1 eat' (= 'I am not eating'). In Vietnamese, *chưa* is the standard negator in the perfect (see Phan to appear: Ch. 5). As with Mandarin Chinese *méi yǒu*, we abstract away from this aspect-based alternation for the purposes of this paper.

According to Nguyễn (1994), *không* may also serve as the prohibitive negator in the northern variety.

b. Bạn muốn tôi **không** ăn
you want me NEG1 eat
'You want me not to eat'

In Hungarian, Albanian, and Latin (23–25), Proh and Vol show syncretism.

(23) a. **Ne** egyél! Hungarian
NEG2 eat.IMP.2SG
'Don't eat!'

b. Azt akarod hogy **ne** egyek.
that.ACC want.PRES.2SG COMP NEG2 eat.SUBJ.1SG
'You want me not to eat.'

(24) a. **Mos** ha! Albanian
NEG2 eat
'Don't eat!'

b. Ti do që unë të **mos** ha.
You want that I.NOM SUBJ NEG2 eat
'You want me not to eat.'

(25) a. **Ne** male loquere apsenti amico. Latin
NEG2 bad say.IMP.2SG absent friend.
'Do not insult a friend in his absence.' (Plautus *Trinummus* 926)
(Mari & Tahar 2020: 2, their (2a))

b. tu tamen velim **ne** intermittas … scribere
you however wish.1SG NEG2 interrupt.SUBJ.2SG … write
ad me
to me
'I would like you, however, not to stop writing me.'
(Cicero *Epistulae ad Atticum* 11.12.4)
(adapted from Mari & Tahar 2020: 12, their (42a))

Although these languages show no morphological distinction between Vol and Proh, the Mandarin Chinese and Vietnamese facts have already demonstrated that these are two separate layers in the functional sequence.

With counterfactual conditionals ((a) examples below) vs. possibility conditionals ((b) examples below), languages again show different behaviors. First we note in (26) that Hungarian uses *nem* in both cases: in other words, CC and PC negators are syncretic (and they are also syncretic with T-neg, but not with Proh and Vol).

(26) Hungarian

a. Ha **nem** pazaroltam volna el a pénzt,
if NEG1 waste.PAST.1SG AUX PRT the money.ACC
épitettem volna egy házat.
build.PAST.1SG AUX a house.ACC
'If I hadn't wasted the money, I would've built a house.'

b. Ha **nem** szenvedsz, nem tanulsz.
if NEG1 suffer.PRES.2SG NEG1 learn.PRES.2SG
'If you don't suffer, you don't learn.'

Mandarin Chinese and Vietnamese are like Hungarian in this regard, with the same negator appearing in both CC and PC. For Mandarin Chinese the negator is *bù(-)* (27), while for Vietnamese it is *không* (28).

(27) Mandarin

a. yao **bu**shi Zhangsan jiu le Lisi Lisi jiu yan si
if NEG1.be Zh. saved PERF L. L. JIU drown dead
le
PERF
'If Zhangsan had not saved Lisi, Lisi would have been drowned.'
(Yang 2007: 166, her (17))

b. Ni **bu** jiang de qingchu, wo jiu shengqi.
you NEG1 speak DE clear I then angry
'If you don't speak clearly, I'll get angry.'
(Ernst 1995: 670, his (5b))

(28) Vietnamese

a. Nếu tôi **không** lãng phí tiền, tôi đã mua được một
if I NEG1 waste waste money I PERF buy RES one
ngôi nhà.
CLF house
'Had I not wasted the money, I would've built a house.'

b. Nếu bạn **không** đau khổ, bạn sẽ không học hỏi.
if you NEG1 hurt painful you will NEG1 learn ask
'If you don't suffer, you don't learn.'

Albanian, on the other hand, shows a difference between CC, which takes *mos* (29a), and PC, which takes *nuk* (29b).

(29) Albanian

a. Po të **mos** i kisha shkatërruar paratë, do të
if SUBJ NEG2 them.CL had.1SG wasted money will SUBJ
kisha ndërtuar një shtëpi.
had.1SG built a house
'If I hadn't wasted the money, I would've built a house.'

b. Nëse **nuk** vuan, nuk mëson.
if NEG1 suffer.2SG, NEG1 learn.2SG
'If you don't suffer, you don't learn.'

Lastly, Latin marks negative conditional clauses in different ways, such as *ni* 'supposing that not; except if', *nisi* 'except if; unless' and *si … nōn* 'supposing that not', where *ni* is the more archaic option, while *nisi* is the most common strategy overall (Pinkster 2021: 316). It has been observed that the difference between *nisi* and *si … nōn* is subtle (Bertocchi & Maraldi 2011: 118), but a few facts are notable for our purposes here. In their classification, Bertocchi & Maraldi (2011) claim that *nisi* tends to have a counterfactual reading (30a), while *si … nōn* can have a possibility reading (30b).

(30) Latin

a. an L. Antonium aspicere potero, cuius ego
PRT L. A. look.on be.able.FUT.1SG whose I
crudelitatem effugere non potuissem,
cruelty escape not be.able.PLUPERF.SUBJ.1SG
nisi me moenibus et portis et studio
NEG.CC myself walls.ABL and gates.ABL and zeal.ABL
municipi mei defendissem?
of.township my defend.PLUPERF.SUBJ.1SG
'Shall I be able to look on Lucius Antonius, whose cruelty I could not have escaped had I not defended myself with walls and gates and the zeal of my own borough?' (Cicero *Philippicae* 12.20)
(Bertocchi & Maraldi 2011: 115, their (55), our glosses)

b. **si** id **non** fecisset, sibi consilium
if it NEG1 do.PLUPERF.SUBJ.3SG for.themselves measure
capturos
about.to.take
'if he did not do so they would take measures for themselves'
(Caesar *De Bello Civili* 2.20.3)
(Bertocchi & Maraldi 2011: 118, their (60), our glosses)

Still, Bertocchi & Maraldi (2011: 115) point out that *nisi* does not always have such an "exclusive" reading, usually associated with counterfactuality, rather "when *nisi* has an exceptive value (similar to *unless* in

English) it is incompatible with counterfactuality" (2011: 117). This use of *nisi* has more to do with hypotheticals and appears to express, in our terms, PC. To make the situation even more complicated, *si* … *nōn* with the pluperfect may also express counterfactuality (Bertocchi & Maraldi 2011: 117, fn.30). Thus we might characterize the situation in Latin as follows: the primary marker of PC is *nōn* but in some cases *ni-(si)* (where we can, on a par with Romeyka *a-midhen*, segment out the morpheme *si* 'if'), while the main marker of CC is *ni-(si)* but in some cases *nōn*, neither of which causes a problem as far as the *ABA theorem is concerned.

Table 10 shows how the Mod-layers of the negative sequence discussed in the last two sections are ordered.

	Proh	**Vol**	**CC**	**PC**	**T**	**…**
Romeyka Greek	mi	xe	mutš	midhen	u(tš)(i)	…
Mandarin Chinese	bié	bù	bù-	bù	bù	…
Vietnamese	đừng	không	không	không	không	…
Hungarian	ne	ne	nem	nem	nem	…
Modern Greek	min	min	dhen	dhen	dhen	…
Latin	nē	nē	ni-	nōn	nōn	…
Albanian	mos	mos	mos	nuk	nuk / s'	…

Table 10: Modal negators across languages

Romeyka shows that we are dealing with at least four distinct contexts for modal negation: prohibition, embedding under volitionals, counterfactual conditionals, and possibility conditionals. The syncretism patterns of the languages under discussion carve up this space in slightly different ways, with the switch from 'NEG1' to 'NEG2' occurring between PC and CC in Albanian, between Vol and CC in Modern Greek and Hungarian, and between Vol and Proh in Mandarin Chinese and Vietnamese. Latin has a three-way system, with CC distinguished from Proh/Vol and PC/T. Table 10 shows that we now have clear evidence for Proh > Vol and CC > PC: if we switched the order of Proh and Vol, then an illicit ABA pattern would arise for Mandarin and Vietnamese; if we switched the order of CC and PC, illicit ABA patterns would arise for Latin and Albanian.

6 Summary and loose ends

We have argued that De Clercq's (2013, 2018, 2020) theory of negation can absorb the data on modal negators. We have shown that De Clercq's functional sequence simply needs to be expanded beyond the TP level (perhaps as an extension of the TP 'zone', though we remain agnostic on the precise nature of the relationship between our Mod-layers and TP) in order to capture the morphological distinction between standard negation and modal negation displayed by languages like Modern Greek, Hungarian, Latin, Albanian, Vietnamese, and especially the Romeyka variety of Greek. Romeyka shows a highly fine-grained system of negators. The grammaticalization of distinct negators for prohibitives, embedded clauses under volitional verbs, and in the protasis of counterfactual and possibility conditionals warrants the positing of separate functional layers in the functional sequence, which we have labeled Proh, Vol, CC, and PC. (In (31) we do not take a stand on the semantic content of the functional heads Proh, Vol, CC, or PC.)

(31) $[_{\text{ProhP}}$ Proh $[_{\text{VolP}}$ Vol $[_{\text{CCP}}$ CC $[_{\text{PCP}}$ PC $[_{\text{TP}}$ T … $[_{\text{NegP}}$ Neg]]]]]]

Crosslinguistic comparison shows that the heads Proh, Vol, CC, and PC must be arranged in the particular order provided in (31) if we are to account for the attested syncretism patterns in terms of the *ABA theorem. Importantly, while most of the languages we considered make a simple two-way distinction between a standard negator and a modal negator, the exact cutoff between the two differs slightly from language to language, providing crucial clues to the internal structure of negation.

Various loose ends remain. For one, it is clear that 'Vol', i.e. embedding under volitional verbs, is a poor substitute for the many complexities underlying the phenomenon known as 'subjunctive'. We are convinced that additional layers will be needed to account for different subjunctive contexts, and most likely even Vol itself will need to be decomposed further, but to what extent that project will alter the negative sequence in (31) is not yet known. Furthermore, as touched on above in connection with the hortative marker *as* in Modern Greek, we are aware that imperatives as a category are more complex than suggested here. Finally, we have completely left out the fact that Modern Greek *mi(n)* and Albanian *mos* can serve as negators of active participles (gerundives) and as dubitatives in interrogatives (see Joseph 2002), but without more detailed data from Romeyka on these environments, such issues could not be incorporated into the current work.

We end on the observation, which we are not the first to make (see Chatzopoulou 2019), that Greek negators can be analyzed using Cinque's

(1999) cartographic theory of the inflectional domain. For instance, conditionals can perhaps be located or merged at the level of Cinque's $\text{Mood}_{\text{irrealis}}$ (see e.g. Haegeman 2010), and it also seems likely that prohibitives and other imperatives belong at the $\text{Mood}_{\text{SpeechAct}}$ layer, meaning that these layers would also be relevant for the corresponding negators.[18] That is to say, in order for a negator to be merged at these levels of the clause, it would need to contain the matching functional layer. Now, in Cinque's hierarchy, there are a number of layers between $\text{Mood}_{\text{irrealis}}$ and $\text{Mood}_{\text{SpeechAct}}$, such as $\text{Mood}_{\text{evidential}}$ and $\text{Mod}_{\text{epistemic}}$, but these do not appear in our negative sequence. It could be the case that more data and more detailed analysis will eventually lead to these layers being incorporated into the negative sequence, but this is not a necessary outcome, since we already know that negation does not 'care' about every single layer in an fseq, only certain ones, such that the features merged on top of Neg are a subset of the full inflectional sequence (i.e. T and Foc are included, but not *v* for instance). Nevertheless, it is still an open issue to what extent the negative and inflectional sequences will mirror each other. We should not be surprised if more empirical work will find negators that fill in many of the 'gaps' we currently observe when comparing the two sequences.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Nikos Angelopoulos, Anne-Li Demonie, Hai Doan-Nguyen, Trang Phan, Genoveva Puskás, Anna Roussou, Wenli Tang, Tue Trinh, and Giuseppina Turano for their help with the data. We are also very grateful to Karen De Clercq for her help in clarifying a number of issues, to Tom Leu for sharing his insights with us, as well as to Genoveva Puskás for endless discussions about Hungarian. Finally, we would like to thank Michal Starke for his encouragement.

18. Note that the basic ingredients required for the conditional involve both Past and Future according to Cinque (1999: 62, 73, 190 fn. 27), both of which appear right above $\text{Mood}_{\text{Irrealis}}$. See also Iatridou (2000) for discussion of counterfactuals.

References

Bekteshi, Arta. 2019. An overview of negative markers in English and Albanian. *Knowledge – International Journal* 31(6). 1677–1682.

Bertocchi, Alessandra & Mirka Maraldi. 2011. Conditionals and concessives. In Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.), *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax, vol. 4: complex sentences, grammaticalization, typology*, 93–193. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2007. On comparative suppletion. Unpublished manuscript, University of Connecticut.

Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2012. *Universals in comparative morphology: suppletion, superlatives, and the structure of words*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Caha, Pavel. 2009. *The Nanosyntax of case*. University of Tromsø dissertation.

Chatzopoulou, Katerina. 2013. The history of the Greek NEG2: Two parameter resets linked to a syntactic status shift. *Journal of Historical Syntax* 2(5). 1–48.

Chatzopoulou, Katerina. 2019. *Negation and nonveridicality in the history of Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chatzopoulou, Katerina & Ioanna Sitaridou. 2014. Negator selection in Romeyka conditionals: Jespersen's cycle for NEG2 and conditional inversion. Slides for talk given at DIGS 16, Budapest. July 4, 2014.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: a cross-linguistic perspective*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cuzzolin, Pierluigi. 2021. Negative adjectival morphology in Latin. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 20(1). 53–74.

De Clercq, Karen. 2013. *A unified syntax of negation*. Ghent University dissertation.

De Clercq, Karen. 2018. Syncretisms and the morphosyntax of negation. In Lena Baunaz, Karen De Clercq, Liliane Haegeman & Eric Lander (eds.), *Exploring Nanosyntax*, 180–204. New York: Oxford University Press.

De Clercq, Karen. 2020. *The morphosyntax of negative markers: A Nanosyntactic account*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2015. Negation in Hungarian. In Matti Miestamo, Anne Tamm & Beáta Wagner-Nagy (eds.), *Negation in Uralic languages*, 219–238. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Efthimiou, Angeliki. 2008. Negative morphemes in Modern Greek: The case of *a-* and *mi*. In Bernard Fradin (ed.), *La raison morphologique*, 55–68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ernst, Thomas. 1995. Negation in Mandarin Chinese. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 13(4). 665–707.

Fortson, Benjamin W. 2010. *Indo-European language and culture: An introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 2nd ed.

Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2009. The dependency of the subjunctive revisited: temporal semantics and polarity. *Lingua* 119(12). 1883–1908.

Gianollo, Chiara. 2017. Focus-sensitive negation in Latin. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 16. 51–77.

Greco, Matteo. 2022. From Latin to modern Italian: Some notes on negation. *Languages* 7(46). 1–23.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2010. The movement derivation of conditional clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41(4). 595–621.

Holton, David, Peter Mackridge & Irene Philippaki-Warburton. 1997. *Greek: a comprehensive grammar of the modern language*. London/New York: Routledge.

Horn, Laurence. 2001. *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 2nd ed.

Iatridou, Sabine. 2000. The grammatical ingredients of counterfactuality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31(2). 231–270.

Janda, Richard D. & Brian D. Joseph. 1999. The Modern Greek negator $\mu\eta(\upsilon)$(-) as a morphological constellation. Downloaded from: wpmucdn.com.

Joseph, Brian D. 2002. Balkan insights into the syntax of **mē* in Indo-European. In Mark R. V. Southern (ed.), *Indo-European perspectives*, 103–120. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

Joseph, Brian D. 2018. The syntax of Albanian. In Jared S. Klein, Brian D. Joseph, Matthias Fritz & Mark Wenthe (eds.), *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics*, vol. 3, 1771–1788. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Li, Kening. 2008. Contrastive focus structure in Mandarin Chinese. In Marjorie K. M. Chan & Hana Kang (eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th North American conference on Chinese linguistics (NACCL-20)*, vol. 2, 759–774. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Mari, Alda & Chloé Tahar. 2020. On prohibitive and expletive negations. HAL archive (halshs-02865961).

Nguyễn, Phu Phong. 1994. Quelques aspects de la négation en vietnamien. *Cahiers de Linguistique – Asie Orientale* 23. 231–239.

Pan, Haihua, Po Lun Peppina Lee & Chu-Ren Huang. 2016. Negation. In Chu-Ren Huang & Dingxu Shi (eds.), *A reference grammar of Chinese*, 143–168. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Phan, Trang. to appear. *The syntax of Vietnamese tense, aspect, and negation*. Routledge.

Pinkster, Harm. 2015. *The Oxford Latin syntax, vol. 1: The simple clause*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pinkster, Harm. 2021. *The Oxford Latin syntax, vol. 2: The complex sentence and discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Puskás, Genoveva. 2017. Negation and modality: on negative purposive and 'avertive' complementizers. In Enoch Aboh, Eric Haeberli, Genoveva Puskás & Manuela Schönenberger (eds.), *Elements of comparative syntax: Theory and description*, 153–183. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Roussou, Anna. 2015. Is particle a (unified) category? In *Linguistik aktuell/linguistics today*, 121–158. John Benjamins Publishing Company. `https://doi.org/10.1075/la.226.06rou`.

Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2014a. Modality, antiveridicality and complementation: The Romeyka infinitive as a negative polarity item. *Lingua* 148. 118–146.

Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2014b. The Romeyka infinitive: Continuity, contact and change in the Hellenic varieties of Pontus. *Diachronica* 31(1). 23–73.

Tahar, Chloé. 2022. *La négation explétive: des impératifs aux connecteurs. Approche diachronique et formelle*. PSL, préparée à l'Ecole Normale Supérieure dissertation.

Teng, Shou-Hsin. 1974. Negation in Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 2(2). 125–140.

Turano, Giuseppina. 2000. On clitics and negation in Albanian. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 25. 81–117.

Turano, Giuseppina. 2017. Modal particles in Albanian subjunctive, infinitive and supine constructions: Presence vs absence of clitic climbing. *Working Papers in Linguistics and Oriental Studies* 3. 61–86.

Veloudis, Ioannis. 1982. *Negation in Modern Greek*. University of Reading dissertation.

Yang, Fan-Pei Gloria. 2007. *A cognitive approach to Mandarin conditionals*. University of California, Berkeley dissertation.