Rather: Notes on spiral development number 2
Remus Gergel, University of Graz

The present goal is to consider the type of development towards a modalizing element as the one undergone by rather in English and a path towards degree modification that appears to be parasitic on the modal outcome of the first development.

The word rather has witnessed a fair amount of investigative interest e.g. in syntax and historical linguistics (Dieterich/Napoli 1982, Rissanen 2008, among many others). The trajectory (or – as will be argued: trajectories) that it has taken seem, however, interesting enough to make it deserve more discussion for two primary reasons. Such trajectories are found in several languages (i) in forms that are quite close, but also (ii) displaying sufficient differences from one another to raise the question whether there are principled distinctions in the potential paths taken. I argue not only for significant differences cross-linguistically, but also that there are two distinct developments in one and the same language, e.g. English or German. In a nutshell, I will argue that there may be two spirals, rather than one complete cycle.

To begin, a spiral tendency often witnessed in semantic change is as in (1):

(1) Relations of temporal-based precedence can be re-interpreted as modal closeness of worlds/situations (typically, but not exclusively, as preferences, sometimes at a metalinguistic level).

The characterization holds to different degrees of the history of rather in English, eher (‘sooner’, ‘rather’) in German, plutôt in French, and other such markers, many of which bear the comparative relation on their sleeves. It is possible to give a structural semantic account of this type of development that predicts its observed unidirectionality (see Gergel 2009 capitalizing on temporal comparisons in the sense of von Stechow 2009).

But rather and some of its fellow ‘spiralists’ also follow an additional trajectory, which we can state in preliminary fashion as in (2):

(2) Relations of modal preference develop towards degree modification.

(3) a. [T]he president was in Arizona and he got a rather confrontational greeting from governor Jan Brewer. (COCA, Spoken)
    b. [S]he was a rather tall woman, maybe five foot eight or nine. (COCA, Fiction)

Interestingly, some of the early examples leading up to rather modifying properties appear with explicit antonyms and/or with a metalinguistic flavor; cf. the following property expressed through a (elliptical) PP in the late Modern English period:

(4) No; I really am not under my usual condition in that particular; rather above, I
    should say; (PPCMBE- CARLYLE-1835,2,274.301)

Together with a follow-up such as (2), the development in (1) might seem to be a neat cycle after all that started out with a standard semantics of degrees and ends up modifying degrees again. Both tall and confrontational are gradable predicates. I argue, however, that even though something like (1) plus (2) seems to fall together at least in some languages, the rise of such modal markers out of temporal markers, on the one
hand, and of such apparent degree modification, on the other, are best viewed as rather delimited developments in their own terms. The first path can feed the second, but so can many others. That is, there are other ways to achieve similar degree modifications that do not stem from obviously modalizing expressions. While (1) builds on different versions of temporal-based relations, development (2) requires a comparative relation that seems to be already high in the interpretative structure. It may seem puzzling, then, that the development ends up within a small lexical projection; that is roughly within the AP.

But the modifying *rather* is not quite as trapped in an adjectival phrase as it seems. In fact, it operates higher up. There is overt evidence that the place to which it attaches can in fact be higher than just the bare gradable predicate, as can be seen from its modification of the comparative relation itself:

(5) *After a moment's silence between them, without looking at him Dora says in a *rather more friendly* tone "..."). (COCA, Fiction)

*Eher* ('sooner', 'rather') in German can modify comparatives too:

(6) *eine eher schwächere Leistung*  
a *rather weaker* performance

Furthermore, while we will discuss whether the modifying type of *rather* developed from metalinguistic comparison, there are uses of it that are not easily to be accommodated as metalinguistic. As is well-known, short adjectives which regularly require an -er comparative in English display an analytic *more* comparative when they are used metalinguistically. But *rather* can attach to the regular -er forms of short adjectives:

(7) *Looking at it from his side, as I was conditioned to do, I saw that his presence next to me displayed a *rather larger* portion of parental loyalty than I deserved.* (COCA, Magazine)

Coming back to the comparison with German, it is noticeable that both *rather* and *eher* develop their degree modification uses in the late Modern period. This appears to be a parallel trajectory and hence a potential argument for a natural follow-up development then, but it also raises some questions. Why is there such a delay towards the modifying uses in the development, after the modalizing uses of *rather* (and *eher*) have long developed? First sporadic modalizing uses of *rather* are available already in Old English and certainly systematically from Middle English onwards. Further, a difference between the modal and the modifying spiral runs as follows. While words or temporal precedence are more likely to display incipient tendencies towards reanalyzing their meaning (cf. *would sooner* which is reinterpretable as modal also synchronically), similar indicative tendencies towards degree modification do not seem to appear (e.g. *sooner tall[er]*). Finally, one can raise the question whether there was a contact influence due to writing traditions for some of the parallels in the European languages.

Summarizing, we will discuss how far the idea of two modular spirals (leading to modal comparatives and degree modification, respectively) can account for the developments that led to the makers available today at least in English and German.
All you need is another ‘need’:
On the need cycle in the history of German

Introduction: In this talk, I will examine a modal cycle in the history of German with special emphasis on *bedürfen* and its successor *brauchen* (both: ‘need’). It will be argued that as transitive V-heads, they grammaticalized into deontic quantifiers and then into modals being evaluated against an epistemic modal base. I will also illustrate, however, to what extent *bedürfen* and *brauchen* differ from one another and what these differences teach us on language change and linguistic cycles in general.

Background: In present-day German *brauchen* occurs as a polyfunctional verbal head. As a lexical V-head, it mainly embeds DPs marked for the accusative case (cf. 1). As for its functional use, *brauchen* is used as a modal verb. Semantically, it can take a deontic conversational background (cf. 2) or be evaluated against an epistemic modal base (cf. 3). Syntactically, it patterns with classical modal verbs in several respects; *brauchen* [i] cannot form the imperative mood (*Brauche nicht zu singen*!), [ii] displays the IPP-effect in a verbal complex (ich hätt mich bloß nicht einmischen brauchen), [iii] allows t-less variants in the 3rd person singular (er braucht vs. er braucht-a), to name but a few (cf. Kolb 1964, Maché 2013, Reis 2005 for more similarities).

Puzzles: First, despite abundant functional literature devoted to *brauchen*, its semantic development and structural changes have not been dealt with in a generative framework. Second, there is agreement in the literature that *brauchen* used as a Mod-head exemplifies a young grammaticalization process. It started gaining modal properties (be it deontic or epistemic) first in the 17th/18th century (cf. Lenz 1996 and references cited therein). Most of the approaches link the late development of *brauchen* to the miscellaneous core properties of classical modal verbs with that *brauchen* had to match. None of these approaches, however, has examined *brauchen*’s ancestor *bedürfen* that could be employed in different modal environments as well.

Analysis: In what follows, I will show how to accommodate the changes *brauchen* and *bedürfen* underwent in the history of German. First of all, I will briefly outline their grammaticalization process showing that both of them started out as lexical V-heads selecting DPs, developed into deontic modal verbs and then into epistemic quantifiers. I will illustrate that their changes are compatible both with the loss of movement (in the sense of Roberts & Roussou 2003) and with the Late Merge Principle (in the sense of van Gelderen 2004). The major claim is that both of them passed through the path given in (4). The main historical difference between *bedürfen* and *brauchen* is related to different language periods: whereas *bedürfen* occurred with distinct modal meanings already in Middle High German (1050-1350), *brauchen* started gaining modal properties first in the 17/18th century. In other words, *bedürfen* was replaced by *brauchen*. *Brauchen* appears slightly different from *bedürfen* though. The first striking difference refers to nominal complements: while *bedürfen* embeds DPs marked both for the genitive and for the accusative case (cf. Grimm & Grimm 1837), *brauchen* allows solely accusative DPs. As far as their modal readings and infinitival complements are concerned, two facts immediately spring to mind: first, both of the verbs can be used deontically (cf. 2 and 5). They differ, however, with respect to the kind of the
embedded infinitive clause; whereas *bedürfen* primarily licenses bare infinitives, *brauchen* prefers to-infinitives. This difference is due to the grammaticalization of the originally locative-allative preposition zu 'to' (cf. Abraham 2004). Second, it can be inferred from the literature that *brauchen* developed an epistemic reading and that it can embed both bare and to-infinitives. I will show that a similar situation holds for *bedürfen* too. The only difference being that *bedürfen* did not develop an epistemic reading on its own and that it could occur only in those environments in which a deontic reading was possible as well (cf. 6). More concretely, the movement of *bedürfen* from a lower position to Modepist did not get lost, as *bedürfen* started being replaced by *brauchen*.

**Conclusion:** Finally, I will demonstrate that the need cycle outlined above for German can be attested in other languages as well. Based on Loureiro-Porto's (2009) historical findings with respect to need-verbs in English, I will summarize the most striking renewal steps from its history and compare them with those from German.

**Data:**

1. *Er braucht [deinen Wagen]*
   he needs [your:ACC car:ACC]
   'He needs your car.'

2. *Glücklicherweise brauchte niemand evakuiert zu werden*
   luckily needed nobody evakuated to be:INF
   'Luckily, nobody needed to be evacuated.' (Maché 2013: 147, ex. 346)

3. *Das braucht nicht zu stimmen*
   that needs NEG to be:right:INF
   'That doesn't have to be correct.'
   (Maché 2013: 168; ex. 408)

4. *V > Moddeontic > (TP) > Modepistemic*

5. *Ihr bedürft nix angst han!*
   you need NEG fear have:INF
   'There is no need to be scared!'
   (Prosa-Lancelot 870:23)

6. *so bedarf din sele kein angst haben*
   so needs your soul NEG fear have:INF
   'so, your soul need not be scared'
   = 'so, your soul doesn't have to be scared'
   (Prosa-Lancelot 574: 16-17)

IS ANALYTICITY NORMAL?

John McWhorter

It is assumed among linguists that analyticity is a typological state that a language might develop into as the result of normal grammar-internal change, such that the traditional distinction between analytic and synthetic languages is one of mere synchronic description. It is also well-known that extensive second-language acquisition tends to make languages more, or even completely, analytic. Contact, however, is thought to be an alternate pathway towards analyticity, which a language like Mandarin or Twi can otherwise happen into without such contact processes.

However, diachronic theory has identified no mechanism via which a grammar would become completely analytic. Processes of phonetic erosion and rebracketing are well-known as erasing affixes, for example, but not to the point of rendering a grammar devoid of inflectional affixes altogether. Rather, while some affixes are worn away, inexorable processes of reconstitution operate at the same time, such as grammaticalization. No diachronic tenet specifies that this process is ever, under normal conditions, arrested. The commonly cited case of Egyptian’s inflectional “cycle” described by Hodge (1970) did not depict the language reaching anything approaching a completely analytic state. Rather, Late Egyptian was very much an inflected language—simply less so than its predecessors.

There is a growing awareness that the “natural” state of language, uninterrupted by adult acquisition, is massively complex, while large-scale population movements typical of post-Neolithic humans condition languages of a more moderate complexity (McWhorter 2007, Trudgill 2011). Following this work to its natural conclusion, traditionally cited analytic language groups become diachronically anomalous; specifically, Kwa in Niger-Congo and the languages of the “Sinosphere” Sprachbund in East and Southeast Asia, of the Sino-Tibetan, Hmong-Mien, Tai-Kadai, and Mon-Khmer families. Notably, these are the only radically analytic languages known in the world whose analyticity is not readily attributable to widespread second-language acquisition in the past (as opposed to creole languages and the increasingly studied analytic languages of the Austronesian family in Indonesia and Papua).

In this presentation, I will propose that sheer theoretical logic dictates the consideration that Kwa and Southeast Asian languages reached their state as the result of transmission disruptions in the deep past. Specifically, I will argue that such disruption created 1) the Kwa languages such as Akan and Gbe and 2) Proto-Sino-Tibetan, the latter of which developed into the Chinese varieties which seeded analyticity via areal influence (as well as second language acquisition effects) among other families in its environs as it spread southwards.

While the disruptions would have happened before written records, I will demonstrate that parallels beyond analyticity itself between these languages and creoles (and other second-language influenced varieties) suggest that it would be economical to trace these older languages’ analyticity to the same factors we see at work in historically documented cases that led to analyticity.

This would 1) resolve what stands otherwise as a diachronic conundrum, 2) constitute an extension of emerging language contact theories into the deductive, as opposed to the more inductive endeavor of description, and 3) would have the advantage of allowing linguistic analysis to point archaeologists and geneticists to population encounters for which they would be positioned to identify concrete evidence.
Reinforcement and renewal: Germanic so and such
The Linguistic Cycle Workshop II
Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, 25-26 April 2014
Johanna Wood engiw@hum.au.dk

The DP/Definiteness cycle has been well established as a microcycle within the Cycles framework: Lyons (1999), van Gelderen (2007; 2011), where the focus is development of the definite article. It has, however, since Ritter’s (1988, 1991, 1992) proposal that DPs contain a Num(ber) Phrase, become generally accepted that the DP contains functional structure ‘below’ the actual DP projection, represented, for example, by the indefinite article, numerals and certain quantifiers such as many. Additionally, several grammaticalisation processes have been observed in the extended DP (e.g. nouns becoming ‘determiner-like’: lot > lots of; numerals becoming indefinite articles: one > a). It is therefore not unreasonable to explore the areas of the nominal ‘below’ DP, in other words the functional categories represented by lexical items that follow the, in an attempt to identify other potential cycles.

The diachronic change from ‘kind’ to ‘degree’ was discussed by Bolinger (1975) but not investigated empirically. Several formal and functional synchronic discussions of English such, which can have both readings, have been published (e.g. Altenberg 1994, Wood 2002) but very little diachronic work has been done apart from a recent corpus based account (Ghesquière & van de Velde 2011) which compares the diachronic development of English such and Dutch zulk.

In this paper I give a brief overview of the relevant areas and lexical items within the extended DP. I then discuss the diachronic relationship between ‘kind/type’ (specific) and ‘degree’ readings in the DP, represented mainly by the etymologically related words such and so and their cognates in Germanic languages other than English, but also observed with this/that and thus.
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THE NEGATIVE EXISTENTIAL CYCLE REVISITED

Ljuba Veselinova

Based on cross-linguistic data and the postulation of six language types, the Negative Existential Cycle (NEC) was proposed by Croft (1991) as a way of modeling the evolution of standard negation (SN) markers from existential negators, cf. (1) and (2) for introductory illustrations of these different kinds of negators. The model as laid out by Croft puts forth a hypothesis about the evolution of SN from special existential negators as they gradually expand their use into negating verbs. Three of the types suggested in NEC are invariant in their expression of negation in both verbal and existential predications. In the model they are referred to as stable types. They alternate with languages that exhibit variation in their negation strategies in either SN or existential negation, (cf. (1) and (4) below for an illustration of different SN strategies in Bulgarian). Such languages fall into so-called transitional types. The terms stable and transitional are used in both Croft's work and here in a variationist sense. Thus they do not necessarily refer to diachronic stability or instability. Despite recent renewed interest in cyclical processes in language change and negative cycles in particular cf. (Hopper and Traugott 2003, van Gelderen 2008, van Gelderen 2009), the cycle suggested by Croft (1991) has received relatively little attention. It has never been put to scrutiny and continues to be quoted at face value, cf. also van der Auwera (2010), and Mosegaard Hansen (2011).

The current investigation tests this model by applying it to three language families, Slavonic, Uralic and Polynesian. The test involves (i) checking which of the types suggested in NEC are instantiated in these families, and (ii) outlining pathways of transition between different types. In Slavonic, we observe one type without variation and two types with internal variation. In Uralic, we observe two stable types and two transitional types. Finally, all types of NEC are instantiated in Polynesian, which is correlated with characteristics specific to this family.

Several distinct pathways are outlined for the partial or complete transfer of negative existentials into the verbal domain. The first one, observed in all three families, is contingent on negative existentials being used in specific constructions. It is important to point out that this general pathway may cover different language processes in different languages. For instance, the Old Church Slavonic negated future construction was transferred directly into Modern Bulgarian negated future, cf. (3) and (4). Apart from the fusion between ne ‘NEG’ and imanost ‘have’ > njama ‘not.have’, no other change has actually taken place; whether the fusion between the negator and the habeo-verb in the negated future construction coincided with the fusion of the negator with the habeo-verb in existential constructions is a different question that remains to be answered. Negative existentials are commonly used in nominalized constructions; this is a major pathway for their expansion into the verbal domain. It is observed in both Uralic and Polynesian, cf. (5) and (6). Another pathway of transferring negative existentials into SN, documented for Polynesian only, involves subordination processes leading to the re-interpretation of negative existentials as general markers of negation. The third pathway of transfer involves negative existentials being used as emphatic negators external to the proposition and their subsequent reanalysis as clause internal negators without any additional pragmatic content.

Apart from specifying different transition scenarios within NEC, it also suggested that the cycle be expanded to cover other negative lexicalized verbs that appear to undergo similar cyclical processes and thus evolve into partial or full markers of SN. Finally, a time dimension needs to be added when modeling this cycle, as its completion, i.e. the negative existential turning into a full-fledged marker of standard negation, appears to take longer than 2 000 years.
EXAMPLES

(1) Bulgarian (South Slavonic), (Maria Avgustinova, p.c.): standard negator, non-future ne
a. Maria pee b. Maria ne pee
   Maria sing.3SG.PRS Maria NEG sing.3SG.PRS
   ‘Maria sings’ ‘Maria does not sing

(2) Bulgarian (South Slavonic), (Maria Avgustinova, p.c.): existential negator njama
a. Ima div-i kot-i b. Njama div-i kot-i
   have.3SG.PRS wild-PL cat-PL Not-have.3SG.PRS wild-PL cat-PL
   ‘There are wild cats’ ‘There aren’t any wild cats’

(3) Old Church Slavonic (South Slavonic) (Duridanov 1991: 418)
   ne ima ostati sude kamen na kamen-i
   NEG have.3SG.PRS leave.INF here stone on stone-ACC.PL
   ‘There will not be left here one stone on another.’

(4) Bulgarian (South Slavonic), (Maria Avgustinova, p.c.): standard negator, future: njama
a. Maria sthe pee b. Maria njama da pee
   Maria FUT sing.3SG.PRS Maria not-have.3SG.PRS to sing.3SG.PRS
   ‘Maria will sing’ ‘Maria will not sing’

(5) Selkup, Taz dialect (Uralic, Samoyedic), (Laakso et al. 2011) citing (Kuzneceva et al. 1980: 237)
a. man alta llo-k b. man ili-ga-mi cadaga
   1SG NEG live-1SG.S 1SG live-NMLZ-1SG be.absent.3SG.S
   ‘I don’t live.’ ‘I didn’t live’ lit. ‘my living [is] absent’

(6) Hawaiian (Polynesian, Nuclear, Eastern, Marquesian)
a. ‘a’ohe a’u keiki
   NEG.EX 1SG.POSS child
   ‘I have no children.’ (Elbert and Pukui 1979: 142)
b. ‘a’ohe o’u ike/lohe aku i ia in
   NEG.EX 1PASS see/hear DIR-AWAY.FROM.SPEAKER PART 3SG
   ‘I can’t hear him/her’ lit. ‘not-exist my seeing/hearing away from him/her’, (Kahananui and Anthony 1970: 346)

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC accusative NEG negative/negation PRS present
EX existential NMLZ nominalization S subject
FUT future PART particle SG singular
INF infinitive PL plural
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Non-cyclic Negation in the Mayan Languages
Clifton Pye
The University of Kansas

The Jespersen Cycle remains the prototype of the linguistic cycle. Sentence negation appears to invite strengthening by negative sensitive elements which gradually usurp the role of the original negation marking and eventually replace it. Negation cycles are attested in a wide range of language families including Indo-European, Chinese and Athabaskan (Hoeksema 2009). Indeed, negation cycles are so common that their absence is almost more in need of explanation than their presence. My presentation will examine the history of negation marking in the Mayan languages and show that while a negation cycle appears to have occurred in at least one of these languages, the majority of Mayan languages provide no evidence for such a cycle. The data provide primary evidence for triggering factors (and their absence) that initiate a negation cycle.

The Mayan language family contains thirty languages spoken by people living in Mexico, Guatemala, Belize and Honduras (Kaufman 1974). The language family is divided into four main branches with a linguistic history of four thousand years and a written history of over a thousand years (England 1994; Kaufman 1990). Mayan languages have a predominantly verb-initial word order and are morphologically ergative, head-marking languages. The verb complex uses a set of ergative morphemes to cross-reference the subject of transitive verbs and a set of absolutive clitics to cross-reference the subject of intransitive verbs as well as the objects of transitive verbs.

Kaufman (2001:384) reconstructs three Mayan negation markers for Proto-Mayan. He claims that the marker with the shape *yAb’ is Proto-Mayan based on its reflexes in Wasteko and Ixil. Kaufman reconstructs two other negation markers for Late Proto-Mayan, i.e. after Wasteko’s separation from the rest of Mayan family. These markers have the shape *maa’ and *mi. Kaufman claims that the last two markers cannot be derived from one another by any recurrent (morpho)phonological process. Kaufman notes that longer negation forms based on *maa’ are widespread in Mayan languages and result from the addition of aspectual particles. Negation occupies the sentence-initial position in Mayan sentences and precedes the verb complex, notably any aspectual particles, adverbs or auxiliaries at the beginning of the verb complex. Their position seemingly set the stage for a negation cycle in the descendent of Proto-Mayan.

This presentation will reconstruct the negation markers for proto-Mayan and note the resulting absence of negation cycles. Negation marking interacts with aspect and mood marking in the Mayan languages and sometimes replaces the aspect markers. The Mayan languages have strengthened negation marking in different ways, including the addition of the existential verb, dubitative particles and irrealis markers. It is only in the case of modern K’iche’ that the irrealis marker has taken over the function of negation marking. The presentation will document negation marking on verbal and non-verbal predicates, the negative sensitive items that appear with negation, and the absence of negative cycles. I will propose that the sentence-initial position of the verb complex in Mayan languages is the main factor that prevents the initiation of negation cycles in Mayan languages.
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Jespersen Cycles in the Americas - Johan van der Auwera & Frens Vossen

Jespersen Cycles - 'Jespersen Cycle' ('Negative Cycle', 'Meillet Spiral') is meant in the sense of a change from a single negative marker to either (i) another single negative marker through a stage in which negation is expressed twice, both by the old negative and by the new one, or (ii) to a triple (and even quadruple) marking, which adds a third (and even fourth) negative marker to the doubling pattern (van der Auwera 2009). The addition of a negative marker is first optional, then obligatory, after which the original negative marker(s) may disappear, first optionally, then obligatorily. The origin of double (and multiple) negation is either the repetition of the first and oldest negation marker (not ... not), motivated by a desire for clarity, or the reanalysis of something that is not originally negative in meaning, but either serves to emphasize the negation or is a frequent or obligatory collocate of negation. This understanding of the Jespersen Cycle is wider than what Jespersen (1917) or Meillet (1912) had in mind, for one thing because we allow for triple (and even quadruple) negation, but less wide than the notion in van Gelderen (2011), who does not require double (or, more generally, multiple) negation stages (though she allows for it).

For the area that is documented best, viz. Europe and the Mediterranean (Willis et al eds., 2013), with much more than chance frequency the oldest negative marker is preverbal and the newer ones are postverbal, both the second and, in a rare case, a third one. But these languages are all VO, in the sense that main declarative clauses have VO as their most frequent order. The generalization about the position of the negatives relative to the verb is confirmed for other predominantly VO families in the world – families for which we have Jespersen Cycles as well as sufficient historical evidence (most clearly the Bantu languages, De Vos & van der Auwera 2013, but also the Austronesian languages of Vanuatu). Schematically and somewhat simplistically:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Neg1} \ V & \rightarrow \ \text{Neg1} \ V \ (\text{Neg2}) \rightarrow \ \text{Neg1} \ V \ \text{Neg2} \\
\rightarrow \ \text{Neg1} \ V \ \text{Neg2} (\text{Neg3}) & \rightarrow \ ...
\end{align*}
\]

It is much less clear how to interpret double negation in a OV language. If the negative has a verbal origin, one should be ready for the postverbal negative marker to be the older one, and to that extent the cycle may run in reverse. However, the OV character of a language should not be assumed to imply that the original negative be postverbal: not every negative has a verbal origin and there is arguably a universal tendency to put the negative early in the sentence, explainable by a version of another idea of Jespersen's, viz. his 'Negation First' principle (Jespersen 1917).

The Americas - In this presentation we will confront what we now know about the Jespersen Cycles, as defined in the above paragraph, with the languages of the Americas. This is interesting, in part because these languages have a good mix of VO and OV languages. Our database consists of 527 languages, which makes it reasonably representative and which also surpasses the hitherto biggest database of Dryer (2011, 125 languages). We found there to be optional triple negation in 4 languages, and double negation in 110 languages (optionally in 45 languages, and obligatorily in 65 languages). Of the 110 languages with double negation, 104 have one negative marker in preverbal position and the second one in postverbal position. The remaining 6 languages have both negatives on the same side of the verb. The rare triple negation is illustrated in (1), the common Neg V Neg manifestation of double negation in (2), and the rare constellation with 2 negatives on both sides of the verb in (3).

(1) Mandan (Siouan, USA, Mixco 1997: 38)

\[\text{wa}=\text{wa}=\text{ra}=\text{sa}=\text{ta}=\text{ta}=\text{a}=\text{t}\]

\[\text{NEG1-NEG2-PV=2-DO-NEG3-IND-MASCADDRESSEE}\]

'You didn't work.'
(2) Cuiba (Guahiban, Colombia, Berg & Kerr 1973: 55)

*jopa* xae-yo
NEG1 eats.3SG.MASC-NEG2

'He doesn’t eat food.'

(3) Mohawk (Iroquoian, USA and Canada, Baker 1996: 59)

*te-yah te-ha-yéna-Ø ne takós*
Peter NEG1 NEG2-NOM.MASC/ACC.FEM-catch-STAT ?? cat

'Peter didn’t catch the cat.'

Of the 104 double negation languages with the negatives on opposite sides of the verb we can classify 73 as either VO or OV. 19 languages are VO, and given the very strong tendencies found in European, Mediterranean, Bantu and Vanuatu Austronesian languages, we expect that this kind of double negation to be a stage in the 'classical' Jespersen Cycle, coming from Neg V and going to V Neg. Thus a VO Neg V Neg language is Copainalá Zoque, and we take its close relative Chiapas Zoque with just one, preverbal negative marker to show the more conservative negative strategy.

(4)

| Neg V Neg | Chiapas Zoque | ja V |
| Neg V Neg | Copainalá Zoque | jan V-e/-a |

There are 54 OV languages (with, again, two negatives, one on each side of the verb). In these languages we also find chains such as that in (4) – for Quechua we can even detail 5 stages.

(5)

| Neg V (Neg) | Quechua de la Unión (Arequipa) | mana V |
| Neg V Neg | Chimborazo Quechua | mana V-chu |
| Neg V Neg | Cajamarca Quechua | mana V-chu |
| (Neg) V Neg | Quechua de Huamalles | (manam) V-su |
| V Neg | Corongo Quechua | V-tsu |

For about half of these 54 languages we cannot tell whether the oldest negative was preverbal or postverbal. For the other half, there is some evidence to think that most of them (in three families) go through the cycle in the classical direction, a case in point being the Quechua languages set out in (5). But there is evidence for the opposite direction, too.

In the talk we will flesh out each of these claims.
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