

Sentential negation in Piedmontese varieties

M. Rita Manzini – Leonardo M. Savoia

1. Introduction

In this contribution we focus on sentential negation adverbs in Piedmontese varieties. The standard approach to negation in Romance was inaugurated by Pollock (1989) who proposed that negation adverbs such as *pas* in French fill the Spec position of a NegP projection generated below the I position targeted by the verb. The head of NegP can in turn be filled by a negative clitic like *ne* in French, whose higher inflectional position depends on movement, i.e. cliticization. In other languages, which include colloquial French, no negative head is present.

A more complex set of data, involving Northern Italian varieties, is considered by Zanuttini (1997), who proposes that there are several Neg positions. Specifically, a Neg position is generated above I, while below I there are three Neg positions. The inflectional Neg position hosts negative clitics in languages like Italian which do not require a sentential negation adverb. On the contrary, languages which require a sentential negation adverb generate it in one of the lower Neg positions; if a clitic combines with the adverb, it is generated in the head of the relevant Neg position and moves to the inflectional domain via cliticization. In turn, the lower Neg positions are defined in relation to the general hierarchy of adverbs proposed by Cinque (1999). The three adverbial negation positions proposed by Zanuttini (1997: 99) are ordered with respect to this hierarchy as in (1).

- (1) [Neg₂ [*already* [Neg₃ [*no longer* [*still* [*always* ... [*well* [Neg₄

The three different Neg positions correspond to three different

types of sentential negation adverbs, which Zanuttini individuates in Northern Italian varieties on the basis of their distribution. The higher adverbial Neg position Neg₂ corresponds to sentential negation adverbs such as *pa* in Piedmontese varieties or the optional *mica* of standard Italian. In the same Piedmontese varieties in which *pa* occurs as Neg₂, the Neg₃ position is filled by sentential negation adverbs of the *nen* type. In turn, the lowest adverbial negation position Neg₄ corresponds to the Lombard type *no*.

In Piedmontese varieties, as in other Northern Italian varieties, sentential negation adverbs either take the same form as negative arguments such as ‘nothing’ or are bare nouns. In section 2 we argue that treating them as nominal elements, specifically connected to the internal argument of the predicate, is able to explain the fact that they trigger the partitive, as well as their sensitivity to the person (1st/2nd vs. 3rd) of the internal argument itself. Thus, we abandon the Neg categorization in favour of a reassignment of sentential negation adverbs to a nominal, argument-related category, tentatively labelled Q.

Our first explicit statement of this conclusion goes back to Manzini and Savoia (2002: 327, 334): ‘negative adverbs ... do not belong to a specialized Neg category; nor are they specialized Adv(erbs) ... The treatment suggested ... for bare-N adverbs categorizes them as straightforward nominal heads, i.e. N. In turn the negative polarity item/ negative quantifier status of ‘nothing’-type adverbs suggests that they are to be assigned to the category Q’. It is interesting to observe that a comparable conclusion is recently reached by Garzonio and Poletto (2009: 97, 107), who note: ‘the position of the negative marker *nen* in Piedmontese ... is a dedicated position to quantifiers’; ‘in the case of m[inimizer] negation a noun becomes a quantifier and then raises to a position dedicated to quantifiers’ so that ‘the positions where the negative markers occur are not to be labelled as NegP’.

Suppose then that sentential negations are nominal in nature and attached to the internal argument position of the verb – as argued in section 2. The question still arises of how the present theory can accommodate the evidence presented by Zanuttini (1997) and Cinque (1999) concerning the relative order of several types of adverbs and other adverbial material. In section 3 we examine the distributional

phenomena targeted by the hierarchy in (1). In sections 4-6 we reassess the hierarchy in the light of our nominal treatment of sentential negation adverbs, also keeping in mind the fact that recent literature (Ernst 2002, Svenonius 2002, Nilsen 2003) argues that they are sensitive not to syntactic hierarchies but to semantic constraints on selection and/or scope.

2. Sentential negation adverbs are neither Adv nor Neg.

In several Piedmontese varieties, sentential negation adverbs take the same form as the negative argument for ‘nothing’, as seen with *neŋ* in (2a), *neint(a)* in (3), *nota* in (4), and *reŋ* in (5). As a result of the variable valency of the verb, the (b) examples are ambiguous between the argumental and sentential negation interpretations; specifically, since the verb can be construed both transitively and intransitively, the negative item can fill the internal argument slot, or it can have a reading equivalent to a sentential negation. Conversely, it is only the valency of the verb that disambiguates the sentential negation readings in (a) (cf. (a’)).

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| <p>(2) a. i ru tʃam neŋ
I him call not
‘I don’t call him’</p> <p>b. i mɔndʒ neŋ
I eat nothing/not
‘I don’t eat (anything)’</p> | <p><i>Montaldo</i></p> |
| <p>(3) a. a n ɛl vig neinta
I not him see not
‘I don’t see him’</p> <p>b. u n maɲdʒa neinta
he not eats nothing/not
‘He doesn’t eat (anything)’</p> | <p><i>Oviglio</i></p> |
| <p>(4) a. tʃamu not -ɐt
I.call not you
‘I am not calling you’</p> <p>b. jɐ vɔg nota
I see not/nothing
‘I don’t see (anything)’</p> | <p><i>Quarna Sotto</i></p> |

- (5) a. lu tʃamu rɛŋ *Stroppo/Macra*
him I.call not
‘I don’t call him’
a’. al fai rɛŋ
he does nothing
‘He does nothing’

The common lexicalization of the sentential negation adverb and negative arguments is recognized in the historical literature, specifically in connection with a ‘grammaticalization’ process changing the negative argument into a functional category Neg. (cf. Roberts and Roussou 2003). In fact, there are many Northern Italian varieties in which the types *nen*, *neinta*, etc. for the sentential negation do not have the same form as ‘nothing’, so that the connection between the former and the latter appears to be purely etymological. However, varieties of the type in (2)–(5) seem to point to a *bona fide* lexical identity of negation and negative argument. Therefore we may wonder whether the best theory is one which posits two lexical entries for them, with the negation associated with the category Neg and the argument with the category N/Q.

In fact, only a subset of the negative elements reviewed so far contains the negative morphology *n-*; thus, the type *reŋ* is etymologically connected to a bare noun (<Latin *rem* 'thing'). Bare nouns represent another major class of non-*n* sentential negations, including in particular minimizers – i.e. nouns denoting the smallest possible unit of something – of the type of *mi(c)a* or *briza* 'crumb', *bu(ka)* 'piece', *pa* 'step', as in (6).

- (6) a drøm pa *Pramollo*
he sleeps not
'He doesn't sleep'

Interestingly, in relation to sentential negations of the type in (5)–(6) Meyer-Lübke (1899: §693–694) proposes that what we describe as sentential negation adverbs originate in a partitive construction. In support of his proposal he quotes Old French examples such as (7), in which the ‘negative adverb’ *mie*, a bare noun ‘minimizer’, overtly cooccurs with the partitive.

(7) (Chanson de Roland 465)

de s'espee	ne	volt	mie	guerpir
of his sword	not	he.wanted	not	to abandon

'He didn't want to abandon his sword'

Considerable interaction between the negation and case assignment to the internal argument of the verb is also found in Northern Italian varieties, including the Piedmontese ones in (8), where the negation triggers the partitive even in the presence of a definite interpretation. Thus, the partitive clitic in (8) doubles the proper name in topic position, and indeed can normally alternate with an accusative, as in (8a).

- (8) a. (a mmarju) tʃamum-ru/ -na mija *Treccate*
 the Mario we.call him/of.him not
 'We are not calling Mario'
- b. Marjo tʃama -n mea *Cerano*
 Mario call of.him not
 'Don't call Mario!'

The data in (8) shed a new light on a different, but fairly obviously connected phenomenon that has long been known for French. Thus, as discussed by Kayne (1984), in negative environments French allows for indefinite noun phrases (bare plurals and bare mass singulars) introduced by *de*; these same forms are not allowed in the absence of negation, as illustrated in (9). The same phenomenon is fairly widespread in Northern Italian varieties, as shown in (10) for a Piedmontese one.

- (9) Je *(ne) veux pas de cadeaux
 I not want not of gifts
 'I (don't) want gifts'
- (10) al beu rɛŋ de viŋ *Stroppio/Macra*
 he drinks not of wine
 'He doesn't drink wine'

For the object noun phrase in (9), Kayne (1984) proposes a structure of the type *je ne veux pas* [Q [*de cadeaux*]], where Q is a non-lexicalized negative quantifier. The presence of the empty Q quantifier means that the noun phrase as whole is subject to the Empty

Category Principle of Chomsky (1981); this in turn predicts that noun phrases of the type under consideration are restricted to the object position. Manzini and Savoia (2010), Savoia and Manzini (2010) argue in some detail against this type of analysis involving ‘silent’ categories on grounds of restrictiveness of the theory, as well as on specific empirical grounds.

Now, in *Stroppo* in (10) the sentential negation adverb *reŋ* has the same form as the negative argument, as illustrated in (5). Suppose that the fact that ‘not’ and ‘nothing’ in languages like *Stroppo* have the same form is not just a matter of homophony, but rather an indication of the fact that a single lexical entry is involved. If we take the negative argument content Q to characterize the lexical entry of *reŋ* as a whole, we obtain the Logical Form in (11) for (10). Quite simply, we can assume that the role of the negative quantifier licensing the partitive is played by *reŋ* itself.

(11) al beu [Q reŋ] [de viŋ] *Stroppo/Macra*

One may then wonder what the referential content may be for *pa* in (6) and for similar minimizers (*briza*, *mia*, etc). In fact, they have the only reference independently known to be compatible with bare singular count Ns, i.e. again that of negative (polarity) items. To illustrate, bare singular Ns, though generally excluded in Romance, become possible in the scope of a negative operator, as illustrated in (12) for standard Italian.

(12) *(Non) disse parola
 not he.said word
 ‘He didn’t say a word’

More evidence relating to the interaction of sentential negation adverbs with the argument structure of the predicate is provided by the variety of *Quarna Sotto* in (13), where *mia* and *nota* split according to person. In particular in transitive contexts *nota* occurs with 1st and 2nd person enclitic objects, as in (13a), while *mia* cooccurs with 3rd person objects, either in the form of a partitive, as in (13b) and (13c), or of an accusative lexical object, as in (13d). Accusative enclitics do not occur in negative contexts.

- (13) *Quarna Sotto*
- a. $\text{e}\gamma$ $\text{v}\text{ɔ}\text{g}$ $\text{not}\text{ɛ}$ -m/ -t/ -u
 he sees not me/ you/ you(pl)
 ‘He doesn’t see me/you’
 - b. $\text{e}\gamma$ $\text{v}\text{ɔ}\text{g}$ $\text{mi}\text{ɛ}$ -n
 he sees not-of.it/them
 ‘He doesn’t see it/ them’
 - c. $\text{e}\gamma$ beu $\text{mi}\text{ɛ}$ d $\text{vi}\eta$
 he drinks not of wine
 ‘He doesn’t drink wine’
 - d. lavu mia $\text{ɛ}\wedge$ ka ’ miz
 they.wash not the shirts
 ‘They don’t wash the shirts’

As for person split phenomena, which are well represented in many morpho-syntactic domains in the Romance languages (Manzini and Savoia 2005, 2007, 2008), we surmise that, although a 1st or 2nd person element and a 3rd person one can equally serve as arguments of a predicate, they do so through different syntactic means. In particular, morphology of 1st and 2nd person arguments is not necessarily sensitive to their anchoring in the event structure (i.e. whether they are the first or second internal argument of a ditransitive, etc.). In this sense, we speak of ‘discourse-anchored’ elements, i.e. elements whose position and morphology are sensitive only to their denotational content. By contrast, the morpho-syntactic properties of 3rd person elements reflect their argumental role (accusative vs. dative marking, etc.). In this sense, we speak of ‘event anchored’ elements.

In the case of *Quarna Sotto* in (13), *mia* selects for event-anchored internal arguments, including 3rd person accusatives and partitives. In turn, *nota* combines with discourse-anchored (i.e. 1st and 2nd person) internal arguments. The interaction of the negation adverb with the person split is hardly expected if the adverb corresponds to a functional category Neg – whose content presumably is that of the logical connective of negation. In other words it would be hard to find a reason why the logical operator of negation would be lexicalized in two different ways according to the argument structure of the verb. Suppose however, as outlined in this section, the sentential negation

adverb is in reality a nominal element bearing a particularly close relation to the internal argument of the verb (with which it can lexically coincide), and that it can be interpreted to the extent that it forms a partitive structure with the internal argument – eventually triggering an overt partitive case on it, as seen in *Quarna Sotto* itself. From this perspective, connecting the so-called sentential negation to the nominal, argumental set of categories, its interaction with the argumental structure of the predicate is not surprising and in fact expected.

On the basis of the preceding evidence, we assume that so-called negation adverbs are nominal categories. Furthermore, the interactions of the sentential negation with the internal argument of the verb reviewed above (the fact that the negation is lexicalised differently according to the person of the internal argument, the partitive under negation, the ambiguity between adverbial and argumental reading of 'nothing') point to the conclusion that the negation is connected to the internal argument slot. This conclusion is supported by the fact that from a purely truth-functional perspective, negating the internal argument, as in e.g. *I ate nothing*, is equivalent to negating the sentence, e.g. *I didn't eat*. At the same time negating the internal argument, as in e.g. *I ate nothing*, and negating the sentence as a whole, e.g. *I didn't eat*, cannot simply be identified.

Consider the case in which the sentential negation cooccurs with lexicalization of the internal argument by a noun phrase, as in *I didn't eat the apple*. The analysis that we propose is based on languages in which the negation selects a partitive rather than an accusative internal argument. In this case the sentential negation can be construed as introducing a quantification over the internal argument – which correspondingly is lexicalized as a partitive. In fact, sentences like English *I didn't eat an apple* are ambiguous. If the negation quantifies over the internal argument, we obtain the reading 'It was not an apple that I ate' or 'No situation of me eating something was a situation of me eating an apple' or 'I ate no apple'. But the negation can also quantify over the elementary event (Chomsky's (1995) VP) – itself the internal argument of the causation predicate introduced by the application of the external argument (Chomsky's (1995) vP). If so, we obtain the reading 'It was not eating an apple that I did' or 'No

situation of me doing something was a situation of me eating an apple'. As for intransitives (unaccusatives), since they reduce to elementary events, they or their internal argument (promoted to the EPP position) are again quantified over. As we shall see in section 4, the same ambiguity, connected by de Swart (1993) to the focus structure of the sentence, characterizes quantificational adverbs in general.

3. Ordering negation and other adverbs.

As mentioned at the outset, Zanuttini (1997) and Cinque (1999) seek to account for the relative order of negation and other types of adverbs by postulating three Neg positions ordered within the aspectual adverb hierarchy as in (1). Here we begin by reviewing the data. The evidence is somewhat complicated by the fact that many varieties have at least two different sentential negation adverbs, which Zanuttini (1997) characterizes as presuppositional vs. non-presuppositional. Given that all instances of negations, and more generally of focus, must have a presupposition as part of their interpretation, in what follows we will simply refer to what Zanuttini's presuppositional adverbs as *mica*-type adverbs, since *mica* lexicalizes this type of adverb in standard Italian.

In some Piedmontese varieties, negation adverbs precede the aspectual series including 'already', 'any longer', 'still/ yet' and 'always', as in *Castellazzo* in (14), where this position characterizes the *mica*-type adverb *mejv* in (14b) as well as the ordinary sentential negation adverb *neiv* in (14a). Other varieties have a single sentential negation adverb to cover the two contexts – and once again this occurs before the entire aspectual series of adverbs. This is illustrated in (15) for the variety of *Pomaretto*, where the negation adverb is *pa*. All of these adverbs would correspond to the Neg₂ position of Zanuttini (1997) and Cinque (1999).

(14) *Castellazzo Bormida*

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----|----|------|------|----------|-------------|----------|--------|-------|
| a. | a | ɲ | l | uə | neiv | zə/ | pi/ | anjkuɾə/ | dløŋk | fa:tʃ |
| | I | not | it | have | not | already/ | any longer/ | yet/ | always | done |
| | 'I haven't done it already/ any longer/ yet/ always' | | | | | | | | | |

- b. a ŋ l uə mɛjə zə/ pi /aŋkurə/ d ləŋk fa:tʃ
 I not it have not already/ any longer/yet/always done
 ‘I haven’t done it already/ any longer/ yet/ always’

(15) *Pomaretto*

- a. a drøm pa bəŋ/ pi/ ŋkarə/ sampre
 he sleeps not well/ any longer/ yet/ always
 ‘He doesn’t sleep well/ any longer/ yet/ always’
 b. al a pa dʒə dyr'mi
 he has not already slept
 ‘He hasn’t already slept’

The pattern in our data that provides the best match with Zanuttini’s (1997) Neg₃ is illustrated by *Mombercelli* in (16), where ‘already’ and ‘any longer’ precede the negation, and the other relevant adverbs follow it. This pattern is predicted by Zanuttini on the basis of an incorporation analysis for *pi nen* ‘no longer’, whereby *pi nen* is a single constituent placed in the position otherwise occupied by *pi* alone. The *mica*-type negation *pa* in the same language (and in all languages to follow) is unproblematic, preceding all relevant adverbs and thus falling under the Neg₂ pattern.

- (16)a. u drøm nəŋ aŋkura/ be *Mombercelli*
 he sleeps not yet/ well
 ‘He doesn’t sleep yet/ well’
 b. u drøm ʒa / pi nəŋ
 he sleeps already/ any longer not
 ‘He doesn’t sleep already/ any longer’
 c. i lu tʃəmu nəŋ səmp
 they him call not always
 ‘They don’t always call him’

Now, even if Zanuttini’s (1997) incorporation analysis for *pi nen* was correct, the position of the sentential negation adverb would not be consistent with Neg₃ in a language like *Cantoira* in (17), where it follows (*a)nku* ‘still/ yet’, besides *pi* and *dʒə* ‘already’.

- (17) a. u dyərt dʒə pi ɲiŋ *Cantoira*
 he sleeps already any longer not
 ‘He already doesn’t sleep any longer’

- | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|------------------|-----|---------------|
| a'. u | mindʒunt | an'ku | ɲiŋ | |
| they | eat | yet | not | |
| 'They don't eat yet' | | | | |
| b. u | mindʒunt | ɲiŋ biŋ / səmp | | |
| they | eat | not well/ always | | |
| 'They don't eat well/ always' | | | | |
| c. u | l | ont | ɲiŋ | səmpe tʃa'ma: |
| they | him | have | not | always called |
| 'They haven't always called him' | | | | |

In *Pamparato* in (18), ‘already’ precedes the *naint* negation and ‘any longer’ follows it, as expected for Neg₃ under the hierarchy in (1). What is not expected is that *naint* follows ‘still/yet’.

- (18) a. i dørmu naint tʃy
 they sleep not any longer
 ‘They don’t sleep any longer’
 a’. u dør̥m naint saimp
 he sleeps not always
 ‘He doesn’t always sleep’
 b. i dør̥mu ŋku naint
 they sleep yet not
 ‘They don’t yet slept’
 c. i aŋ naint tʃy dər'mi
 they have not any longer slept
 ‘They haven’t slept any longer’
 d. i aŋ ŋku/ zɒ naint dər'mi
 they have yet/ already not slept
 ‘They haven’t yet/alreadt slept’
- Pamparato*

A further pattern attested in our data is illustrated in (19), where *neη* precedes ‘already’ – which, in terms of the hierarchy in (1), would have to mean that we are in the presence of an exponent of Neg₂. Yet again *neη* follows both ‘any longer’ and ‘still/yet’.

- (19)a. i ru tʃam pi nɛŋ *Montaldo*
 I him call any longer not
 'I don't call him any longer'
 b. i ru vɛg nɛŋ sɛmp

- I him see not always
 ‘I don’t always see him’
- c. ir ø ŋku nɛŋ fɒ-ru
 I have yet not done-it
 ‘I haven’t yet done it’
- d. ir ø nɛŋ dʒɒ fɒ-ru
 I have not already done-it
 ‘I haven’t already done it’
- e. ir ø nɛŋ dɔr'mi bɛŋ
 I have not slept well
 ‘I haven’t slept well’

In the table in (20), we summarize the data that we have provided concerning the relative position of the negation and the other adverbs in the hierarchy in (1). In varieties of the type of *Castellazzo* and *Pomaretto*, the negation always precedes the relevant subset of adverbs closely matching Zanuttini’s and Cinque’s Neg₂. On the other hand, in varieties like *Cantoira*, *Mombercelli*, *Pamparato*, *Montaldo*, practically any relative order of the negation adverb with respect to ‘already’, ‘still/yet’ and ‘any longer’ is attested, with the striking exception of the order which should be the basic one given the hierarchy in (1), namely ‘already’ preceding the adverb, and all other members of the hierarchy following it.

(20) *Castellazzo*

nɛʔtɒ-mɛjɒ/	-zɒ	-pi	-aŋkuro	-d lɔŋk	
<i>Pomaretto</i>					
pa/	-dʒɔ	-pi	-ŋkarɔ	-sampire	-bɛŋ
<i>Cantoira</i>					
ɲiŋ/	dʒɛ-	pi-	aŋku-	-semp	-biŋ
<i>Mombercelli</i>					
nɛŋ/	zɛ-	pi-	-aŋkura	-semp	-bɛ
<i>Pamparato</i>					
naint/	zɒ-	-tʃy	ŋku-	-saimp	
<i>Montaldo</i>					
nɛŋ/	-dʒɒ	pi-	ŋku-	-semp	-bɛŋ

Correlations between the type and the position of negation adverbs have been noted more than once. Thus, Manzini and Savoia (2005: §6.3.1) state (our translation): ‘The *mica*-type sentential negation adverb, i.e. *pa* in the relevant varieties, precedes... aspectual and quantificational adverbs. Its distribution can be described by associating it to the R position’, on which more below; on the other hand ‘we may identify the relatively lower position of the sentential negation adverb *nen/ nint* ‘nothing’ with a Q position’. Similarly, Garzonio and Poletto (2009: 82) claim that ‘Neg2 markers derive from grammaticalized minimizers ... Neg3 markers derive from the bare inanimate quantifier corresponding to English ‘nothing’’. In reality it is evident that the higher position of the negation (‘Neg₂’) characterizes not only bare-N (minimizer) adverbs, but also a ‘nothing’-type adverb like *nẽitn* in *Castellazzo* in (14) - as well as *nen* in *Dego*, *nent* in *Garessio* and *nia* in the Ladin varieties of *Colfosco* and *La Pli de Mareo* (Manzini and Savoia 2005). By contrast the lower position of the negation (Zanuttini’s Neg₃) characterizes the Romansh minimizers *bo* in *Mustèr*, *bitf* in *Donat* and *buk* in *Trun* (Manzini and Savoia 2005).

4. Negation and aspectual adverbs.

Summarizing so far, the functional hierarchies for negation adverbs, and adverbs more generally, proposed by Zanuttini (1997) and Cinque (1999) do not seem to be sufficient to account for the spread of variation observed in Italian varieties. A separate question is whether they are necessary. The alternative generally suggested is that ‘adverb attachment is driven by interpretation’ (Svenonius 2002: 209), essentially as in the earliest treatments of adverb placement in generative grammar (Jackendoff 1972). We do not doubt that notions of positive and negative polarity (Nilsen 2003) or selection for events vs. propositions (Ernst 2002) play a role in adverb placement. Yet it seems to us that Cinque (1999) is correct in concluding that purely semantic constraints are not sufficient to explain the distribution of adverbs. This is particularly clear in the case of the negation adverbs which represent the focus of the present discussion, because the scope

of the logical negation is independent of their surface position with respect to aspectual and manner adverbs.

Let us consider, then, the relative orders illustrated above in which sentential negation adverbs appear internally to the substring of aspectual/manner adverbs individuated by Cinque's (1999) and Zanuttini's (1997) work. We begin with the aspectual adverbs *già* 'already', *ancora* 'still/yet' and *più* 'any longer'. In the varieties of *Cantoira*, *Montaldo*, *Pamparato* and *Mombercelli* as tabulated in (20) the negation adverb precedes only one of the aspectual adverbs, respectively 'already', 'any longer' and 'still/yet'. The rigid extrinsic ordering that characterizes Cinque's (1999) hierarchies is a clear liability here, since there is no way of interspersing Neg positions and adverb positions so as to make the different possible orders emerge. The incorporation of *pi* 'any longer' into the negation, suggested by Zanuttini (1997) as a way of making Cinque's (1999) hierarchy compatible with the data, is also insufficient.

Our idea is that the syntactic grids determining the relative order of adverbs are much coarser-grained than the functional hierarchies of Cinque (1999), and refer to the same nominal categories that are relevant for the ordering of argumental material. It is in this connection that the conclusion of section 1 – that the so-called negation adverb is in reality a nominal category connected to the internal argument of the predicate – becomes relevant for ordering as well. Our proposal is that the positioning of adverbs is sensitive to much the same categorizations (Definiteness/ referentiality (R), Quantification (Q), deixis (Loc), etc.) as the placement of arguments in the noun phrase (determiners etc.) or in the sentence (pronominal clitics, etc.). Let us begin with structures of the type in (21), where the negation adverb occupies a Q position. We impute to the adverbs that precede the negation in Q a 'left edge' position notated R (to generically suggest referentiality).

- | | | | |
|---------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| (21) a. | [_R dʒə/ pi/ aŋku | [_Q niŋ | <i>Cantoira</i> |
| b. | [_R za/ pi | [_Q neŋ | <i>Mombercelli</i> |
| c. | [_R ʒə/ ŋku | [_Q naint | <i>Pamparato</i> |
| d. | [_R pi/ ŋku | [_Q neŋ | <i>Montaldo</i> |

If the Q position of the negation remains constant, the aspectual

adverbs ordered after it occur in a lower position. Our general schema for nominal positions recognizes a series of positions below the left edge R position and the quantificational Q position, which are essentially linked to deixis, including locatives. We may want to assign the aspectual adverbs that follow the negation in Q to this set of positions – adopting, for instance, the label Loc for relations in space, as in (22), but keeping in mind that relations in time are being denoted.

- (22) a. [Q nɛŋ [Loc aŋkura *Mombercelli*
 b. [Q naint [Loc tʃy *Pamparato*
 c. [Q nɛŋ [Loc dʒɒ *Montaldo*

This analysis amounts to saying that the negations of the type being investigated generally have a Q position. There they are mostly followed by adverbs of the aspectual series in a deictic position (conventionally Loc). In some varieties, some aspectual adverbs are shifted to the left edge of the domain (here R) on a lexical basis. At this point languages like *Castellazzo* and *Pomaretto* in table (20), in which the negation adverb systematically precedes the aspectual series, can be analysed in the structural framework just proposed, by assuming that the negation adverb is relatively high in the R or Q position, with other aspectual adverbs following it in the deictic reference positions (i.e. Loc), as in (23).

- (23) [R/Q mɛjɒ/ nʒiɒ [Loc zɒ/ pi/ aŋkurɒ *Castellazzo*

That two different positions, presumably R and Q are needed for the negation is a conclusion motivated by independent evidence. For in many varieties the *mica*-type negation can actually combine with the ordinary sentential negation adverb, as in (24). In this case, the *mica*-type negation generally takes the higher position, and the ordinary negation takes the lower position, presumably Q.

- (24) ur ɒ pa nɛŋ tʃama-ru *Margarita*
 he has not not called-him
 ‘He has not called him’

In cases where two aspectual adverbs combine with the negation, both can precede it, as illustrated in (25) for varieties (*Cantoira* and

Mombercelli) in which we have shown that each of the aspectual adverbs involved can separately precede the negation.

- (25) a. u dyərt dʒə pi ɲiŋ *Cantoira*
 he sleeps already any.longer not
 ‘He doesn’t already any longer sleep’
 b. u drøm za pi nɛŋ *Mombercelli*
 he sleeps already any.longer not
 ‘He doesn’t already sleep any longer’

The application of the structural schemas already proposed leads us to assume that while the negation regularly appears in Q, the left edge position R of the system can be iterated for aspectual adverbs, as shown in (26).

- (26) [R dʒə [R pi [Q ɲiŋ *Cantoira*

If we put together the pattern in (24), where the *mica*-type negation precedes the ordinary negation, with the fact that several aspectual adverbs can precede the ordinary negation, as in (26), we may expect orders like (27a), where the *mica*-type negation is followed by an aspectual adverb and then by the ordinary negation. Similarly, since aspectual adverbs can also follow the ordinary negation, we may expect the pattern in (27b), where the *mica*-type negation is highest and the aspectual adverbs are on either side of the ordinary negation.

- (27) a. ur ɒ pa pi/ ŋku nɛŋ tʃama-ru *Margarita*
 he has not any.longer/yet not called-him
 ‘He hasn’t called him yet/ any longer’
 b. ir ø pɒ ŋku nɛŋ dʒa fɒ-ru *Montaldo*
 I have not yet not always done-it
 ‘I haven’t yet done it already’

The occurrence of the two aspectual adverbs on either side of the ordinary negation in (27b) in *Montaldo* corresponds to the structure in (28), where the position of the *mica*-type negation, in turn, is R.

- (28) [R pɒ [R ŋku [Q nɛŋ [Loc dʒa *Montaldo*

5. Negation, quantificational and manner adverbs.

Quantificational adverbs (‘always’) are found after the negation

adverb in all varieties. This ordering correlates with semantic requirements, since ‘always’ is obligatorily read in the scope of the logical negation. The Romance languages, like English, have a separate lexical item for a universal ‘always’ taking scope over the logical negation, i.e. *never* (standard Italian *mai* etc.). Evidently the reading in the scope of the logical negation requires ‘always’ to be lower than the negation adverb. Given the ordering of aspectual adverbs with respect to the negation adverb sketched in section 4 and the rigid ordering of the quantificational adverb with respect to negation, we predict that the three combine pretty much in a fixed order, as illustrated in (29).

- (29) a. *uj øt pi niŋ sɛmp dyr'mi Cantoira*
 he has any.longer not always slept
 ‘He hasn’t always any longer slept’
 b. *j ø pa pi nɛŋ sɛmpre vist-je Margarita*
 I have not any.longer not always seen-them
 ‘I haven’t always seen them any longer’
 c. *i aŋ zɔ naint saimp dør'mi Pamparato*
 they have already not always slept
 ‘They haven’t always already slept’

Quantificational adverbs, including the negation as well as ‘always’, are related to the internal argument, namely by implying a focalization on it. Thus, one of the possible interpretations of *John always eats pizza* is ‘whenever John eats something, he eats pizza’; alternatively the entire elementary predicate can be in the scope of the focus operator as in the interpretation ‘all situations of John doing anything are situations of John eating pizza’. In the latter reading ‘always’ quantifies over the elementary event that can be construed as the internal argument of the causation (or other) relation introduced by the application of the external argument. In the former reading the negation quantifies over the internal argument of the elementary predicate, namely *pizza*. On this basis it is natural to conclude that these adverbs have at their disposal the N position connected to the internal argument. At the same time, another possibility is that the negation in Q precedes the quantificational adverb also in Q. Both possibilities are indicated in (30).

- (30) [R ʒɔ̃ [Q naint [Q/N saimp Pamparato

A similar connection with the internal argument of the event can be seen with manner adverbs such as English ‘quickly’ in sentences like *I ate a quick pizza*, meaning *I quickly ate a pizza/ I ate a pizza quick(ly)*. The manner adverb is connected to the internal argument position insofar as it is predicated either of an elementary event or of its internal argument. This is what makes it possible for an adjective (‘quickly’) agreeing with (or embedded under) an accusative argument to modify an entire (elementary) event. Indeed in several Southern Italian varieties, like *Orsomarso* in (31), ‘well’ translates as the adjective for ‘good’ (*buono* in standard Italian) which regularly agrees with the accusative internal argument, (31a), and with the internal argument of unaccusatives, in (31b). The nominal nature of manner adverbs is evident also in standard Italian and Northern Italian varieties in which *bene* is a noun, as in *il bene* ‘the good’, and so is *male* ‘badly’, as in *il male* ‘the evil’ (cf. *il bene e il male* ‘good and evil’).

- (31) *Orsomarso* (Calabria)
- a. (a kammissa/ i kavutsuni) aʃʃu lavæta/ lavæti bbɔna/ bbuni
the shirt.f/ the trousers.pl I.have washed.f/pl. well.f/ well.pl
‘The shirt/ the trousers I washed well’
- b. ar arrivætu/arrivæta bbunu/ bbɔna
s/he.has arrived.m/f. well.m/well.f
‘S/he has arrived well’

In the light of our hypotheses it is particularly interesting to consider data that show the position of ‘well’ not only with respect to negation, but also with respect to aspectual and quantificational adverbs, as in (32).

- (32)a. u dyɔrt ɲiŋ sɛmp biŋ Cantoira
he sleeps not always well
‘He doesn’t always sleep well’
- b. u parla pi nɛŋ bɛŋ Margarita
he speaks any.longer not well
‘He doesn’t speak well any longer’

- c. al dɔrm ŋku jɪŋ sɛmpɛ bɛŋ *Piverone*
 he sleeps yet not always well
 'He doesn't always speak well yet'

In each case 'well' closes the adverbial string, as in (33), which is what we expect if it takes the lowest N position in the domain.

- (33) a. [Q jɪŋ [Q sɛmp [N bɪŋ *Cantoira*
 b. [R pɪ [Q nɛŋ [N bɛŋ *Margarita*
 c. [R ŋku [Q jɪŋ [Q sɛmpɛ [N bɛŋ *Piverone*

6. Completing the picture: Milanese no

One final question implicit in the hierarchy in (1) concerns the low Neg₄ position that Zanuttini (1997) is led to propose for negation adverbs that follow low manner adverbs like 'well'. The logic of the hierarchy in (1) is that a sentential negation which follows 'well' should follow other aspectual adverbs. On the contrary, in the Lombard (Milanese-type) variety in (34), the sentential negation adverb *no*, which follows 'well', precedes relatively high aspectual adverbs such as 'always' and 'still/yet'.

- (34) a. al dɔrmi ben nɔ: se:mpɛr *Casorezzo*
 he sleeps well not always
 'He doesn't always sleep well'
 b. ly la vedi ben nɔ ŋka'mo
 he it sees well not yet
 'He doesn't see it well yet'

Zanuttini acknowledges the problem represented by the positioning of *no* in front of 'always' and 'still/ yet'. For the relevant examples she proposes that *no* actually fills a different position, namely the Neg₂ position. Yet this analysis would lead us to expect that when *no* precedes 'always' or the aspectual adverbs, it also precedes 'well'. Data of this type are indeed attested, as in (35). But the data already reported in (34) show that the orderings of *no* after 'well' and before 'still/yet'/'always' can also be combined.

- (35) a. al dɔrmi nɔ se:mpɛr ben *Casorezzo*
 he sleeps not always well
 'He doesn't always sleep well'

- b. ly la vedi nɔ ŋka'mo ben
 he it sees not yet well
 ‘He doesn’t see it well yet’

The alternative we propose is simply that the *no*-type adverb has the very same position as the other negation adverbs reviewed so far, namely Q, as indicated in (36). This position is compatible with quantificational, aspectual and manner adverbs following it, assuming that they take their canonical quantificational/deictic/nominal positions as in (36b). It is also compatible with the alternative order in (36a), in which only the manner adverb precedes *no*, on the assumption that in this case ‘well’ occurs in the left-edge R position of the system. Under this account, there is no difference in the positioning of Milanese-type *no* and Piedmontese *nen*; rather, there is a difference as to which types of adverbs are found in the ‘left-edge’ of the domain (here R), namely the manner adverb in Milanese varieties and aspectual adverbs in Piedmontese ones.

- (36) a. [_R ben [_Q nɔ [_{Q/Loc} se:mpər/ ŋkamo Casorezzo
 b. [_Q nɔ [_{Q/Loc} se:mpər/ ŋkamo [_N ben

Assuming that the account in (36) is on the right track, it raises the question of why there should be variation of the kind observed, with some languages putting ‘well’ before negation (to the exclusion of aspectual adverbs) and other languages (i.e. the Piedmontese varieties of section 3) showing the reverse distribution. An obvious observation is that languages that allow the order in (36a) have a negation adverb of the *no* type. This has the same form as the deictic negation. On the other hand, the varieties that allow aspectual adverbs before negation have negation adverbs either of the ‘nothing’ type or of the bare N type reviewed in section 2. From this perspective, we may describe Piedmontese varieties by saying that nominal (i.e. manner) adverbs must remain in the domain of the nominal-type negation. By contrast, we may describe Milanese varieties by saying that deictic (i.e. aspectual) adverbs must remain within the domain of the deictic negation. As for the general principles under which the parallelism indicated may fall, they could perhaps be identified with a requirement for the negation (of a certain type) to close off certain

types of adverbial subdomains (the deictic domain for the deictic negation, the nominal domain for the nominal negation).

6.1 Summing up

Shaping the adverbial space purely through interpretive notions of scope (Nilsen 2003) or selection for events, facts, etc. (Ernst 2002) seems to be insufficient to account for the fine variation in the positioning of the adverbial range. At the same time, a syntactic theory along the lines of Cinque (1999) or Zanuttini (1997) contains elements of rigidity that prevent it from accounting for various data.

From the present perspective, manner adverbs close the adverbial string in that they are connected to the N internal argument – understood as the internal argument of the event or as the elementary event itself, that the higher-level specifications of the sentence select. Next, the aspectual series of adverbs is essentially connected to deixis, in the same way as demonstratives in the structure of noun phrases, or locatives as arguments of the elementary predicate – though in the case of aspectual adverbs the connection is to temporal rather than spatial deixis. On the basis of what we know about deictic categories in noun phrases and in arguments, we expect aspectual adverbs to appear between quantificational adverbs and manner/nominal adverbs, which they do. Still proceeding from bottom to top, quantificational adverbs close the aspectual – manner range; by and large, all that needs to be said about the sentential negation adverb is that it belongs to the quantificational series. At the same time, the (re)positioning of certain adverbs to its left, namely aspectual adverbs in Piedmontese varieties and manner adverbs in Milanese-type varieties, provides evidence for a left-edge position of sorts within the adverbial field.

References

- Chomsky, N (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Dordrecht, Foris
- Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge Mass, The MIT Press.

M. Rita Manzini - Leonardo M. Savoia

- Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads - A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford, OUP.
- Ernst, T. (2002) *The syntax of adjuncts*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Garzonio, J. and C. Poletto (2009) 'Quantifiers as negative markers in Italian dialects', *Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 19, 81-109
- Jackendoff, R. (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. (1984) *Connectedness and binary branching*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- Manzini, M. R. and L. M. Savoia (2002) 'Negative Adverbs are neither Adv nor Neg', in M. Hirotani (ed.), *Proceedings of NELS 32*, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 327-346.
- Manzini, M. R. and L. M. Savoia (2005) *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Manzini, M. R. and L. M. Savoia (2007) *A unification of morphology and syntax*, London, Routledge.
- Manzini, M. R. and L. M. Savoia (2008) *Work notes on Romance morphosyntax*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Manzini, M. R. and L. M. Savoia (2010) 'Syncretism and suppletivism in clitic systems: underspecification, silent clitics or neither?'. In: D'Alessandro, R. et als. (eds.), *Syntactic variation: The dialects of Italy*, Cambridge, CUP, 86-101.
- Meyer-Lübke, W. (1899) *Grammatik der Romanischen Sprachen. Dritter Band: Syntax*, Leipzig
- Nilsen, Ø. (2003) *Eliminating positions*, Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Utrecht.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (1989) 'Verb movement, Universal Grammar and the Structure of IP', *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 365-424.
- Roberts, I. and A. Roussou (2003) *Syntactic Change*, Cambridge, CUP.
- de Swart, H. (1993) *Adverbs of Quantification*. New York, Garland.

Sentential negation in Piedmontese varieties

- Savoia, L. M. and M. R. Manzini (2010) 'Lexicalization of 3rd person object clitics: clitic enclisis and clitic drop'. In: D'Alessandro, R. et als. (eds.), *Syntactic variation: The dialects of Italy*, Cambridge, CUP, 102-118
- Svenonius, P. (2002) 'Subject positions and the placement of adverbials'. In: P. Svenonius (ed.) *Subjects, Expletives and the EPP*. Oxford, OUP, 201-242.
- Zanuttini, R. (1997) *Negation and clausal structure*, New York, OUP.