

Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 32

The City University of New York
New York University

Volume Two

2002

Edited by
Masako Hirotsu

- Huang, C.T. J. 1982. *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Huang, C.T. J. and C.-S. L. Liu. 2001. Logophoricity, Attitudes, and Ziji at the Interface. In *Long-Distance Reflexives*, ed. P. Cole, G. Hermon, and C.-T. J. Huang. Syntax and Semantics 33. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Huang, C.T. J. and C.-C. Jane Tang. 1993. The Local Nature of Long-Distance Anaphora in Chinese. In *Long Distance Anaphora*, ed. J. Koster and E. Reuland pp. 263-282. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornstein, N. 2001. *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Koopman, H., and D. Sportiche. 1989. Pronouns, Logical Variables, and Logophoricity in Abe. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20.4, pp. 555-888.
- Lasnik H. 1991. On the Necessity of Binding Conditions. In *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, ed. R. Frieden, 7-28. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Lee, F. 1998. Evidence for Tense in a 'Tenseless' Language. *Proceedings of NELS* 29.
- Lee, F. 1999. *Antisymmetry and the Syntax of San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec*. Doctoral dissertation, UCLA.
- Munro, P. 1994. Coreference Phenomena in San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec. Ms., UCLA.
- Munro, P. 1996. Pronominal Reference in San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec. Ms., UCLA.
- Munro, P. and F.H. Lopez (with R. Garcia and O. V.Méndez). 1999. *Diccionario X'te'e'n Di'i'zh Sah Sann Luu'c: San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec Dictionary*. *Diccionario Zapoteco de San Lucas Quiaviní*. Los Angeles: UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center Publications.
- Nunes, J. 2001. Sideward Movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:2, pp 303-344.
- Reinhart, T. and E. Reuland. 1993. Anaphors and Logophors: An Argument Structure Perspective. In *Long Distance Anaphora*, ed. J. Koster and E. Reuland, 283-321. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sells, P. 1987. Aspects of Logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18.3, pp. 445-479.
- Thráinsson, H. 1993. Long-Distance Reflexives and the Typology of NPs. In *Long Distance Anaphora*, ed. J. Koster and E. Reuland, 49-75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Department of Linguistics
University of British Columbia
E270-1866 Main Mall
Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1Z1
Canada

leefa@interchange.ubc.ca

Negative Adverbs are Neither Adv nor Neg

M. Rita Manzini and Leonardo M. Savoia

Università di Firenze

In this paper we shall consider microvariation in the negation systems of Italian and Swiss dialects, with particular reference to Northern Italian ones. This domain of data has been made known within generative linguistics by Zanuttini (1991, 1997), whose conclusions are adopted by Cinque (1999) within his larger theory of adverbs and functional structure. Briefly, Zanuttini (1997) individuates four Neg categories within the sentential tree, namely Neg₁ which appears in the inflectional domain of the sentence and is lexicalized by negative clitics, and Neg₂ – Neg₄ which appear within the predication domain and are lexicalized by negative adverbs. In what follows, we shall concentrate on negative adverbs, arguing that they do not belong to a Neg category; nor are they specialized Adv(erbs), but rather nominal elements. We shall briefly indicate how these conclusions may extend to Adv(erbs) in general and argue that clitic negations are in turn nominal in nature.

1. Some basic data

Negation in Italian and Swiss dialects displays three fundamental typologies (Manzini and Savoia 1998b). In some dialects sentential negation is expressed by a negative clitic, as in standard Italian (1). A second typology corresponds to the doubling of clitic negation by a negative adverb, as in (2), while the third involves expressing sentential negation by a negative adverb, as in (3). In the two latter cases the negative adverb can take different lexical forms, roughly *neg*, *rej*, *neinta*, *nuta*, *pa* in Piedmontese-type dialects, as in (2a-b) and (3a-d), *bu(ka)* in Romsch dialects, as in (3e), *mejaj mia* in Emilia and Lombardy dialects, as in (2c) and (3f), *briza* in Emilia dialects, as in (2e) and finally *no* in Lombardy dialects, as in (2d) and (3g).

- (1) Non vengo
not I.come
'I am not coming'

©2002 by M. Rita Manzini and Leonardo M. Savoia
NELS 32

- (2)
- | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------|-----|--------|--------|---------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | e | n | te | 'tʃamu | 'neŋ | <i>Gareggio</i> (Piedmont) |
| | I | not | you | call | not | |
| | 'I am not calling you' | | | | | |
| b. | a | n | el | 'vig | 'neinta | <i>Oviglio</i> (Piedmont) |
| | I | not | him | see | not | |
| | 'I do not see him' | | | | | |
| c. | a | n | 'dɔrum | 'meja | | <i>Vezzano d. Crostolo</i> (Emilia) |
| | I | not | sleep | not | | |
| | 'I am not sleeping' | | | | | |
| d. | a | n | al | 'tʃæ:m | 'nɔ | <i>Viguzzolo</i> (Piedmont) |
| | I | not | him | call | not | |
| | 'I am not calling him' | | | | | |
| e. | a | n | al | 'tʃam | 'briza | <i>Stienta</i> (Veneto) |
| | I | not | him | call | not | |
| | 'I am not calling him' | | | | | |
- (3)
- | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------|---------|-------|------|--|-----------------------------------|
| a. | dʒə | d'dɔrə | 'pa | | | <i>Celle S. Vito</i> (Apulia) |
| | I | sleep | not | | | |
| | 'I am not sleeping' | | | | | |
| b. | al | 'dɔrm | 'nuta | | | <i>Forno V. Strona</i> (Piedmont) |
| | he | sleeps | not | | | |
| | 'He is not sleeping' | | | | | |
| c. | i | ru | 'tʃam | 'neŋ | | <i>Montaldo</i> (Piedmont) |
| | I | him | call | not | | |
| | 'I am not calling him' | | | | | |
| d. | lu | 'tʃamu | 'reŋ | | | <i>Stroppa</i> (Piedmont) |
| | him | I call | not | | | |
| | 'I am not calling him' | | | | | |
| e. | jau | 'dɔrməl | 'bo | | | <i>Mustér</i> (Grisons) |
| | I | sleep | not | | | |
| | 'I am not sleeping' | | | | | |
| f. | je | l | 'klam | 'mia | | <i>Casaccia</i> (Grisons) |
| | I | him | call | not | | |
| | 'I am not calling him' | | | | | |
| g. | a | m | 'vɔg | 'nɔ | | <i>Breme</i> (Lombardy) |
| | he | me | sees | not | | |
| | 'He doesn't see me' | | | | | |

As indicated at the outset, the present discussion will focus on negative adverbs. The various lexicalizations reviewed in (2)-(3) fall into two broad classes. On the one hand there are elements such as *neŋ*, *reŋ*, *neinta*, *nuta* which are at least etymologically connected with the negative polarity item/ negative quantifier 'nothing'. In many dialects the connection is not simply etymological, but the relevant lexical items have both the adverbial value of a sentential negation and the argumental value, as illustrated by the examples in (4), to be compared with (2)-(3). As expected, some of the examples in (4) are actually ambiguous, in particular the examples involving the verb 'eat', which can be

constructed both transitively and intransitively; in the first case the negative polarity item fills the internal argument slot, while in the other case it is equivalent to a sentential negation. By comparison, in (5) we illustrate a case in which the lexical entries for the sentential negation and the argument 'nothing' are distinct, an equally possible state of affairs.

- (4)
- | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|--------|-------------|-------------|------------------------|
| a. | u | n | 'mapdʒa | 'heinta | <i>Oviglio</i> |
| | he | not | eats | nothing/not | |
| | 'he eats nothing/ he doesn't eat' | | | | |
| b. | j | eŋ | 'fatʃ | 'nuta | <i>Forno V. Strona</i> |
| | they | have | done | nothing | |
| | 'They did nothing' | | | | |
| c. | i | 'mɔndʒ | 'neŋ | | <i>Montaldo</i> |
| | I | eat | nothing/not | | |
| | 'I eat nothing/ I don't eat' | | | | |
| d. | al | 'fai | 'reŋ | | <i>Stroppa</i> |
| | he | does | nothing | | |
| | 'He does nothing' | | | | |
- (5)
- | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----------|---------|-----------------|
| u | nn | a | neŋ | map'dʒau | 'pente | <i>Gareggio</i> |
| he | not | has | not | eaten | nothing | |
| 'He has eaten nothing' | | | | | | |

As we know, negative polarity items/ negative quantifiers can be combined with another, though sentential negations in many languages cannot. As we may expect, given the bias of our description so far, negative adverbs of the *nothing* type combine with other polarity items/ negative quantifiers in many dialects; this is true both for dialects where they preserve an argumental interpretation, as in (6), and in dialects where they don't, as already illustrated in (5). On the other hand, the case in which they apparently do not combine is also attested, as in (7).

- (6)
- | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|-------|-------|--------|-----------------|
| a. | i | 'tʃam | 'neŋ | 'nyŋə | <i>Montaldo</i> |
| | I | call | not | nobody | |
| | 'I call nobody' | | | | |
| b. | la | 'veŋ | (reŋ) | d'gyn | <i>Stroppa</i> |
| | it | comes | (not) | nobody | |
| | 'Nobody comes' | | | | |
- (7)
- | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|------------------------|----------------|
| a. | i | n | aŋ | tʃa'ma | 'nēl | <i>Oviglio</i> |
| | they | not | have | called | nobody | |
| | 'The called nobody' | | | | | |
| b. | a | 'dɔrm | 'nyŋ | | <i>Forno V. Strona</i> | |
| | it | sleeps | nobody | | | |
| | 'Nobody sleeps' | | | | | |

Let us now consider the other basic type of negative adverbs in Italian dialects. These are again etymologically related to nominal elements; in particular the series *mia* as well as the type *briza* correspond to 'crumb', *bu(ka)* to 'piece', *pa* to 'step'. Noting this correspondence, 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 also quotes Old French examples such as (8) where the 'negative adverb' *mie*, effectively a bare Noun, overtly cooccurs with the partitive.

- (8) de s'espee ne volt mie guerpir
of his sword not he.wanted not to abandon
'He didn't want to abandon his sword' (Chanson de Roland 465)

It is interesting to note that what bare-N adverbs do not generally combine with negative polarity items/quantifiers, as exemplified in (9); in other words, the presence of a negative polarity item/quantifier in the sentence excludes the adverb. Nevertheless the opposite situation is not unknown; in particular *pa* type sentential negation combines with other negative polarity items in a dialect such as (10):

- (9) b. e n 'tʃamen 'prɔpja ni'suŋ Vezzano del Crostolo
they not call right nobody
'They call nobody'
c. u n mæ 'tʃamæ in'ɔŋ Viguzzolo
it not me calls nobody
'Nobody calls me'
d. a n ɔ tʃa'ma ni'ɔuŋ Stienta
I not have called nobody
'I called nobody'
e. jau 'vezel ne'dʒin Mustér
I see nobody
'I see nobody'
g. je 'vets na'ʒyn Casaccia
I see nobody
'I see nobody'
i. j ø 'vyɛt an'tɔɣɲpa Breme
I have seen nobody
'I saw nobody'
(10) i 'mɪndʒə pa 'reŋə Celle S. Vito
I eat not nothing
'I eat nothing'

1.1 Negation and partitive

Before returning to the typology sketched above, we shall review in some detail evidence from Northern Italian dialects in favor of a connection between the bare-N type of sentential negation and partitive assignment to the internal argument of the verb. One of the simplest examples of selection of the partitive by a bare-N negative adverb is provided by a dialect like Forno, already exemplified in (3)-(4). In intransitive contexts, such as (3), this dialect lexicalizes the sentential negation by a 'nothing'-type adverb. However an indefinite object triggers a partitive construction; crucially, this does no longer involve *nuta*, i.e. the 'nothing'-type sentential adverb, as in (3), but rather *mia*, i.e. a bare-N adverb, as in (11).

- (11) a. 'maɲdʒa 'mia ad bisku'tin Forno V. Strona
he eats not of biscuits
'He doesn't eat biscuits'

Note that partitive noun phrases of the type in (11), consisting of the preposition/ complementizer *di* 'of' followed by a bare plural, are not found in non-negative contexts. This non-negative contexts admit only of partitives where the preposition/ complementizer is followed by a determiner and a noun. This type of partitive was first analyzed by Kayne (1984), in connection with French examples of the type in (12a), as we shall see below. It is itself not restricted to bare-N type negation, but can equally appear in dialects which only possess a sentential negation adverb of the 'nothing'-type, as in (12b).

- (12) a. Je ne veux pas de cadeaux
I not want not of gifts
'I don't want gifts'
b. al beu reŋ de 'viŋ Stroppo
he drinks not of wine
'He doesn't drink wine'

Some Lombard dialects, such as those in (13)-(14), present the same alternation as Forno between bare-N negation in indefinite and hence partitive contexts, as in the (a) examples, and a different negation, namely *no* as in the (b) examples, in contexts which present a definite object. The *no*-type negative adverb is the only one that we have disregarded in the discussion so far. Indeed we shall continue to do so, on the grounds that it has different properties from the two classes of sentential negation adverbs we are considering, coinciding in particular with the so-called deictic negation (see Manzini and Savoia forthcoming for an analysis).

- (13) a. al na 'maɲdʒa 'minga Casorezzo (Lombardy)
he of.them eats not
'He doesn't eat (any of) them'
b. l o maɲ'dʒa: 'no
it I.have eaten not
'I didn't eat it'
(14) a. al be: 'minga da 'viŋ Arconate (Lombardy)
he drinks not of wine
'He doesn't drink wine'
b. al be: 'no: ul 'viŋ
he drinks not the wine
'He doesn't drink the wine'

A more complex type of interaction between so-called negative adverbs and the lexicalization of the internal argument of the verb is provided by the two dialects of Quarna Sopra and Quarna Sotto, which both alternate between a 'nothing'-type adverb, i.e. *noia* and a bare-N adverb, namely *mia*, as illustrated in (15) and (16) respectively.

Consider first Quarna Sopra in (15). In this dialect *nota* appears in intransitive contexts, as in (a). In transitive contexts, *nota* appears where the object is a 1st or 2nd person pronoun, as illustrated by the (b) example. With 3rd person objects, *nota* cooccurs with lexical objects and with accusative clitics, whilst with partitive clitics and with lexical objects introduced by the partitive preposition/complementizer *di* 'of' we find *mia*, as in (c)-(d). Thus partitive objects cooccur only with the bare-N negation adverb, while the 'nothing'-type adverb cooccurs only with non-partitive objects. Interestingly, while the partitive in (15d) can have a partitive proper interpretation, it also admits of an interpretation that makes it equivalent to (15c).

(15) a. Quarna Sopra (Piedmont)

- a. əʎ 'drɔm 'nɔtɜ
he sleeps not
'He doesn't sleep'
b. əm/ət 'vəʒen 'nɔtɜ
me/you they.see not
'They don't see me/you'
c. əu 'vəʒen 'nɔtɜ
him they.see not
'They don't see him'
d. nɛ 'vəʒen 'mɪɜ
of.it/them they.see not
'They don't see (any of) it/ (any of) them'

In the dialect of Quarna Sotto, the distribution of *nota* in intransitive context and those with 1st and 2nd person objects, in (a) and (d) respectively, is as described above for Quarna Sopra. Furthermore, inaccusative contexts, as in (b)-(c), alternate between *nota* in the 1st/2nd person and the other sentential negation, i.e. the bare-N *mia*, in the 3rd person. Contrary to the situation described for Quarna Sopra, on the other hand, in the Quarna Sotto dialect the bare-N adverb *mia* always appears with 3rd person objects, being compatible with partitive clitics, as in (e) and with lexical objects preceded by the partitive preposition/complementizer *di* 'of' as in (f), but also with definite objects, as in (g). There is however a restriction in this respect, namely that in the Quarna Sotto dialect, no negation ever appears with an accusative clitic; therefore partitive examples such as (16e) cover also contexts which would have a definite object clitic in other Romance dialects. We disregard here and in what follows a further interesting parameter between the two Quarna dialects, which is irrelevant for present purposes; this is that while the Quarna Sopra dialect in (15) positions pronominal clitics before the finite verb, in the manner familiar from standard Italian, the Quarna Sotto dialect positions it after the finite verb and its adverbs, as in (16). The dialect in (17) below presents another example of this phenomenon of enclisis (see Manzini and Savoia forthcoming for an analysis).

(16) a. Quarna Sotto (Piedmont)

- a. əʎ/ʎə 'drɔmma 'nota
he/she sleeps not
'S/he doesn't sleep'
b. t i ju 'nota
you are come not
'You didn't come'

- c. in mia 'ju
they are not come
'The didn't come'
d. əʎ 'vɔʒ 'note-m
he sees not-me
'He doesn't see me'
e. əʎ 'vɔʒ 'mie-n
he sees not-of.it/them
'He doesn't see (any of) it/ (any of) them'
f. əʎ 'beu 'mie d 'viŋ
he drinks not of wine
'He doesn't drink wine'
g. 'lavu 'mia ɛʌ ka 'miz
I.wash not the shirts
'I don't wash the shirts'

The selection of the partitive by the negation is also attested in dialects where the negative adverb remains the same in all contexts, in particular in a group of Piedmontese dialects with *mia* sentential negation. As exemplified in (17), in these dialects *mia* can indifferently cooccur with an accusative or a partitive clitic; but the partitive clitic also admits of reference to a definite individual, making the (a) and (b) examples synonymous.

(17) a. Treccate (Piedmont)

- a. (a m'marju) tʃa'mum-ru 'mija
the Mario we.call-him not
'We aren't calling Mario'
b. (a m'marju) tʃa'mum-na 'mija
the Mario we.call-of.it not
'We aren't calling Mario'

This type of data recalls the phenomenon described by Pesetsky (1982) for Russian whereby the accusative object in non-negative contexts alternates in negative contexts with an object morphologized either in the accusative or the partitive, as in (18). The lexical alternations between types of negative adverbs that allow and do not allow for the phenomenon, and specifically the fact that it is attested only with what we have termed bare-N adverbs, makes Italian dialects especially interesting in this respect.

(18) a.

- a. Ja ne polucal pis'ma
I not received letters(acc.pl.)
'I didn't receive letters'
b. Ja ne polucal pisem
I not received letters(gen.pl.)
'I didn't receive letters'

2. Bare-N and 'nothing'-type negations

Let us begin by considering bare-N negations. The most parsimonious account compatible with the preliminary data is that elements such as *mia*, *briza*, *bu(ka)*, *pa* are

Let us begin by considering bare-N negations. The most parsimonious account compatible with the preliminary data is that elements such as *mia*, *briza*, *bu(ka)*, *pa* are indeed bare N's. A preliminary problem for such a categorization would seem to be that Determiner-less singular count N's are not normally able to surface in Romance languages (and in English). But in fact they normally do in negative polarity contexts, as in standard Italian (19).

- (19) a. Si muove *(una) foglia
 itself stirs (a) leaf
 'A leaf is stirring'
 b. Non si muove (una) foglia
 not itself stirs (a) leaf
 'Not a leaf is stirring'

We have seen in section 1.1, that in some languages the presence of a bare N 'adverb' triggers the partitive on the object. We take it that the partitive structure is abstractly present in all cases of bare-N negation with an independently lexicalized object. Thus (3f), repeated in (20a), translates roughly as (20b). We generalize this approach by assuming that all verbal classes have at least (and perhaps at most) an object; that of unaccusatives is externalized and that of unergatives incorporated by the verb (Hale and Keyser 1993), but in either case the bare N negation can take it in its scope.

- (20) a. je l 'klam 'mia
 b. I call [N *mia*] [(of) [D him]]] *Casaccia*

'Nothing'-type adverbs can be treated in a similar fashion. In other words they can be seen as providing negative quantification over the internal argument of the predicate. The same holds if they are negative polarity items, in which case they will include a variable quantified over by an existential quantifier in the scope of the negative or more generally modal operator. The strongest support for this conclusion comes from the simple observation that in many languages the 'nothing'-type adverb indeed coincides with argumental 'nothing'. The treatment suggested above 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, as in (21).

- (21) a. i ru 'tʃam 'nen
 b. I call [Q nothing] [(of) [D him]]] *Montaldo*

2.1 Negation and partitive again

The peculiarity of a language like Quama Sotto in (16) is that at least in clitic structures the internal argument of the verb is overtly lexicalized by a partitive in contexts involving the bare-N negation *mia*, while the lexicalization of the internal argument by an accusative is excluded altogether. The 'nothing'-type negation adverb, *nota*, is lexicalized with 1st and 2nd person objects or subjects of inaccusative, as well as in intransitive (unergative) contexts.

An interesting exercise in itself is to determine the reasons underlying the distribution of *nota*. Even if we assume an analysis of unergative contexts in which the internal argument is incorporated by the verb, the net result is that it is not independently lexicalized. As for 1st and 2nd person arguments, they crucially differ from so-called 3rd person in that their reference is established directly by the universe of discourse, as speaker and hearer respectively; in this sense, we can refer to 1st and 2nd person elements as the P(person) elements of the grammar. Manzini and Savoia (1998a) argue that while the relation of so-called 3rd person to the event is mediated by their anchoring at the aspectual structure of the verb, this does not hold for P arguments. In other words it is only in the case of the so-called 3rd person that we can properly speak of an internal argument (perhaps a Measure in aspectual terms), and not in the case of P elements. This is reflected by the Case system of many languages; for instance, Romance languages have a unique P object form whereas they apparently differentiate dative and accusative in the 1st person elements.

Unaccusative contexts entail in classical terms the externalization of the internal argument, which is therefore lexicalized by the subject. The split between P subjects of unaccusatives and 3rd person ones suggests that the Quama Sotto language indeed treats subjects of unaccusatives as the objects of transitives. Therefore the distribution of *nota* can be restricted to the contexts in which there is no internal argument, meaning that it is not independently lexicalized (as in unergatives) or that there is a P lexicalization. In other words, the lexical properties of *nota*, i.e. of the 'nothing'-type adverb, are incompatible with those of the internal argument.

We have already proposed that the 'nothing'-type adverb is a negative quantifier or a negative polarity item, i.e. a variable bound by an existential in the scope of the negative (or other modal) operator. It differs from the bare-N negation essentially in its Q categorization. We take it that in the dialect at hand, this implies its mutual exclusion with internal arguments, because the Q element does not allow for a partitive construal of the internal argument. Therefore *nota* is restricted to contexts where it can itself be construed as the only internal argument. This is compatible with unergative contexts, and with P arguments, but not with other contexts, involving an independently lexicalized internal argument anchored at the event.

When an internal argument is independently lexicalized by a 3rd person accusative with transitive verbs or by a 3rd person nominative with unaccusative verbs, the language of Quama Sotto inserts *mia*. At least in the case of object clitics, this requires the creation of a partitive structure of the type already illustrated in (20b), thereby supporting the categorization of *mia* as a bare N. In the case of lexical arguments, on the contrary, the creation of a partitive structure is not obligatory as can be seen from the comparison between (16f) and (16g). We do not take this to contradict our proposal; rather we take it that in this case, the underlying partitive structure is not overtly lexicalized. Otherwise we would be in the impossibility of extending the partitive analysis precisely to languages such as Casaccia in (20) in which the bare-N adverb does not obligatorily trigger partitive morphology in any context.

Remember that examples like (16e) can correspond to the negation of a sentence that contains a partitive, i.e. 'He sees some of it/ some of them' but can also correspond to the negation of a sentence with an accusative, i.e. 'He sees it/ them'. Within the theory of clitics of Manzini and Savoia (2001b, in press) it is not possible to define a derivational relation from the accusative to the partitive, whereby partitive *n* would be the result of turning the accusative *l* clitics into the partitive Case. Nor does this relation hold representationally, in that *n* shares all phi-features with *l* clitics (3rd person in particular) and only differs from it by its Case. To briefly summarize their argument, Manzini and Savoia (2001b, in press) assume that clitics are inserted into the positions where they surface and are ordered in a universal hierarchy. The positions of this hierarchy are defined by categories which include for instance N, Q, D, as well as P, that we already mentioned. We identify N with the pure 3rd person property and we associate it with morphological 3rd person clitics such as the accusative *l* series. In turn, Q corresponds to impersonal clitics such as Italian *si*, whose interpretation can be that of a generic (Chierchia 1995, Manzini and Savoia 2001a). In this framework, furthermore, D, i.e. the Definiteness category, is associated with subject clitics, which in subject clitic languages satisfy Chomsky's (1995) EPP.

The partitive clitic does not directly denote an argument in the event structure, as the accusative clitic would do, but it contributes to the denotation of one such argument. For instance in standard Italian (22) the denotational content of partitive *ne* enables us to fix the reference of the internal argument of the verb, represented here by the numeral quantifier *tre* 'three'. Correspondingly we assume that its categorization is different from that of the accusative clitics. Specifically we connect the categorization of the partitive clitic to that of the preposition/ complementizer *di* 'of' which introduces partitive noun phrases in languages like Italian. The latter is best construed as the highest head of the noun phrase itself, corresponding roughly to the C position of the sentence (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999). We refer to the relevant category as D_{op} , assigning to it the partitive clitic as well.

- (22) Ce ne mette tre
 there of.them he.puts three
 'He puts three of them there'

In short, in this theory there is no derivational or representational relation between the partive and the accusative, since they belong to two altogether different categories. Coming then back to the interpretation of (16e), we note that many languages allow for the insertion of partitives in combination with the negation, when a definite referent of some sort is intended. Thus for instance a question such as standard Italian (23a) admits the answer (23c) in addition to that in (23b). The difference between standard Italian and Quarna Sotto is only the range of denotations which allow for this lexicalization, including mass nouns in standard Italian, and any definite in Quarna Sotto. Similarly in the Trecate dialect in (17) the partitive construction with *mia* is compatible with reference to any definite object, even in the absence of alternation between different type of negation.

- (11) a (il vino) lo vuoi?
 the wine it you.want
 'Do you want the wine?'
 b no, non lo voglio
 no not it I.want
 'No, I do not want it'
 c no, non ne voglio
 no not of.it I.want
 'No, I do not want any'

We can now turn to the Quarna Sopra language, in which the distribution of *mia* and *miya* is sensitive not to the presence of an internal argument but rather to that of a partitive. Thus *mia* is found in structures with partitive internal arguments, while *miya* is found in structures where the internal argument is lexicalized by an accusative, as well as in intransitive structures and in those with a P argument. In other words, in the Quarna Sopra language *mia* effectively selects a partitive, thus providing even stronger support for the conclusion that *mia* is a bare N. In turn, the 'nothing'-type adverb, corresponding to a () element, turns out to be compatible with internal arguments as long as there is no overt instantiation of the partitive structure. Needless to say, the fact that 'nothing'-type adverbs can in principle be compatible with internal arguments is independently forced by the languages in (2)-(3) above, which have a 'nothing'-like adverb in all contexts, and indeed taken into account by the structure in (21) implying a non-overtly lexicalized partitive.

The argument in favor of the analysis of bare-N adverbs just presented for Quarna Sopra can be extended to the dialects in (11) and (13)-(14). Consider for example (14) above. The adverb *miya* cooccurs with partitive objects, while in the other contexts we find a different adverb, i.e. *no*; the conclusion that *miya* is a bare N and as such requires the partitive is therefore strengthened.

It remains for us to analyze the structures in which the partitive noun phrase is introduced by the preposition/ complementizer *di* 'of' not followed by a determiner, but just by a bare N. These structures occur in all the languages that we analyzed in this section but also in other languages, including standard French in (12a). For the French example, Kayne (1984) proposes a structure in which an empty negative quantifier heads the object noun phrase, within which it is followed by the partitive, as in (24). In the present theory, it is natural to propose that the partitive structure is justified not by an abstract Q element but by the so-called adverb itself.

- (24) je ne veux pas [Q [de cadeaux]]

2.2 Combinations of the negation and of negative polarity arguments

A considerable body of literature exists on questions involving the possibility of combining sentential negations with negative polarity items/ negative quantifiers. Some of the more articulated proposals are concerned with the status not of the sentential negation but rather of the elements it combines - or does not combine - with (see for

instance Acquaviva 1996, Deprez in press). It is interesting therefore to reexamine the problem in the light of the theory being proposed here, in which different lexical entries are being proposed for the sentential negation itself.

Let us consider first 'nothing'-type adverbs that normally combine with other polarity items in (6). As we anticipated above, the lexical entry for such elements can be taken to be the same as for argumental 'nothing'; indeed adverbial and argumental 'nothing' coincide, for instance in the Montaldo language. We assume that *neg* and the like are negative polarity items rather than negative quantifiers; in other words, they are indefinites whose internal structure includes a free variable position as well as a lexical restriction. This variable is bound by an existential operator, which we can conceive of as the operator of Existential Closure or as an existential operator introduced by an appropriate (modal) operator. Though we are considering negative contexts only, remember that one of the fundamental arguments in favor of the negative polarity status of negative words in languages like Italian is that they are licensed in many modal contexts, including questions and conditionals (Longobardi 1992).

On this basis, we obtain LF's of the type in (25b) for examples of the type in (4c), reproduced here in (25a). Remember that this example is actually ambiguous between the sentential negation reading and the argumental reading of *neg*; the LF that we associate to both of these meanings is identical.

- (25) a. i 'mɔndʒ 'nɛŋ
b. Neg [i 'mɔndʒ [E_y [[Q y nɛŋ] V]]]

Montaldo

When the negative polarity element *neg* combines with another N-word, we can assume that a structure is created where the same existential quantifier binds more than one variable, each corresponding to one of the negative polarity items. We illustrate this type of structure in (26b) for the example in (6a), repeated in (26a); the same structure would characterize contexts where argumental *neg* combines with a different argument.

- (26) a. i 'tʃam 'nen 'ɲyŋə
b. Neg [i 'tʃam [E_{x,y} [[Q y nɛŋ] [Q x ɲyŋ] V]]]

Montaldo

Let us then consider bare-N adverbs of the *mica*, *briza*, *pa*, *bu(ka)* series, which typically do not combine with negative polarity items. From a purely semantic point of view there is no reason to exclude that a bare N element functioning as a negative polarity element can combine with polarity items including a Q specification of the 'nothing' type. This point can be straightforwardly established by the existence of such combinations for instance in a language like standard Italian in (27).

- (27) Non mosse ciglio nessuno
not moved eyebrow nobody
'Nobody stirred'

Neither than a semantic incompatibility, therefore, it must be a formal property of the *nothing* series. On the basis of the discussion that precedes we propose that the latter is associated with a Q categorization, while the bare-N adverbs of course belong to the category N. We therefore propose that the binding of several variables by a single quantifier, which is involved in so-called negative concord structures (for instance in (26b)), requires that the variables be of the same syntactic type. This means that a Q polarity item does not normally combine with the bare-N polarity item corresponding to the so-called adverb.

In other words we assume that the interpretation of a bare-N negation involves the same basic LF as the interpretation of a 'nothing'-type negation, with an indefinite variable bound by an existential in the scope of a negative or other modal operator, as illustrated in (28) for the dialect of Mustér. However this quantification does not combine with the quantification over a 'nothing'-type element, with the structure illustrated in (29). Our analysis tentatively imputes this result to categorial heterogeneity.

- (28) a. jau 'dɔrməl 'bo Mustér
b. Neg [jau dɔrməl [E_x [v [N bo x] V]]]
(29) a. jau 'vezəl ne'dʒiŋ Mustér
b. Neg [jau vezəl [E_x [v [Q nedʒiŋ x] V]]]

On the other hand not only the standard Italian example in (27) but also an example such as (10) in the Celle S.Vito dialect indicate that such categorial heterogeneity is not an absolute bar to combining negative polarity items; rather it is parametrized, so that (10) actually results from combining quantification over the bare-N negation and the 'nothing'-type polarity item, as in (30).

- (10) a. i 'mɪndʒə pa 'reŋə Celle S.Vito
b. Neg [i 'mɪndʒə [E_{x,y} [[Q y pa:] [Q x reŋə] V]]]

Finally, recall that among the dialects that do not admit of the combination between the sentential negation and other negative polarity item, there are several in which the sentential negation apparently corresponds to a 'nothing'-type element, as in (7). Note that in the dialects in (7), the 'nothing'-type negation coincides with the negative argument 'nothing', as seen by the comparison with the data in (4). Therefore there is an especially good reason to assume that the lexical entry for 'nothing', as sentential negation and as argument, is the same as was postulated in the discussion of (25)-(26). In other words, 'nothing' as a sentential negation and as an argument corresponds to a negative polarity item, belonging to the Q category. According to what precedes, then, this type of lexical entry determines the possibility for the 'nothing' type negation to combine with other negative polarity elements of the Q category.

In reality, the data in (7) need to be refined; it is not true that, say, *nuta* in the Lom V. Strona language does not combine with other polarity items. Rather there are syntactic constraints on the possible combinations, as can be seen in (7a) and (31). Thus

nuta is excluded by a negative polarity element corresponding to a subject, as in (7a), or a direct object, as in (31a)-(31b). However in (31c), where the argumental polarity item corresponds to the indirect object, the sentential negation *nuta* is again lexicalized.

- (31) a. i trou nyɲ
I find nobody
'I find nobody'
- b. i g dag nuta a nyɲ
I to.him give nothing to nobody
'I don't give anything to anybody'
- c. i g lu dag nuta a nyɲ
I to.him it give not to nobody
'I give it to nobody'

Forno V.Strona

Indeed even in a language such as Montaldo in (25)-(26) there is at least one context in which the sentential negation and an argumental polarity item are in complementary distribution, namely when the two lexical entries coincide. This point is illustrated by (25) itself, where the occurrence of argumental *ney* is in complementary distribution with that of *ney* as a sentential negation. In other words, even the language of Montaldo excludes a sentence like (32).

- (32) *i mɔndʒ neɲ neɲ
I eat not nothing

Montaldo

For cases of mutual exclusion such as the one in (32), it is sufficient to assume that the same element cannot be inserted twice on economy grounds. In other words, even assuming that they have different positions at their disposal, as can be desumed from the possibility of (26), two *ney* elements cannot be inserted at once in that each of them would lexicalize exactly the same properties as the other. The case of Forno V.Strona can be accounted for along the same lines. In present terms, the insertion of a 'nothing'-type element like *nuta* succeeds in negating the sentence by actually introducing a negative quantification over one of the arguments of the verb, i.e. informally by negating one of the arguments of the verb. But suppose that one such argument is lexicalized by a negative polarity item, as in (7a) or (31a)-(31b); in such case the sentence is independently negated through the negation of its arguments, so that the insertion of *nuta* can be excluded on economy grounds. The appearance of *nuta* in (31c) can then be interpreted as a result of the negative polarity *nyɲ* being construed as an argument not of the verb, but rather of the separate prepositional predicate *a*, essentially a locative/possessive.

3. (Non-)problems and some consequences

The main thrust of the argument is that the properties of elements categorized by both traditional and current grammars as negative adverbs can be explained without reference to categories actually specialized for negative adverbs, such as Neg in Zanuttini's (1997) and Cinque's (1999) framework. On the contrary, on the basis of their interaction with partitives and with argumental polarity items, we have argued that so-called negative

adverbs are construed as arguments of the verb themselves. The differences among them are captured by the fact that they can belong either to a Q category, as is the case for nothing type elements, or to an N category, as is the case for bare-N elements.

This perspective on so-called negative adverbs is not without apparent problems. From the work of Zanuttini (1997), Cinque (1999) implies that the position of adverbs in the sentence is different from that of argumental material. Without getting into issues concerning the relative order of adverbs with respect to one another or with respect to arguments, we can illustrate this point with sentences like (33), involving auxiliary + past participle structures. In (33a), *ney* interpreted as 'nothing' is positioned after the auxiliary, in the position where we find ordinary arguments. On the other hand in (33b), *ney* giving rise to the sentential negation appears between the auxiliary and the participle.

- (33) a. i r ø mɔndʒa neɲ
I it have eaten nothing
'I ate nothing'
- b. i r ø neɲ mɔndʒa
I it have not eaten
'I didn't eat'

Montaldo

The analysis of the distribution in (33) depends on that of the auxiliary + past participle itself. Contrary to most of the literature on the topic, but in agreement with Kayne (1993), we take it that these structures are bi-clausal; the interpretation attaching to these structures as involving a single event is the results of some syntactic restructuring processes. Therefore the contrast between (33a) and (33b) does not concern different positions for *ney* within the same sentence, but rather the positioning within two different sentences. In (33a) *ney* appears within the participial clause, while in (33b) it appears within the main clause, as roughly illustrated in (34).

- (34) a. [IP i r ø [CP mɔndʒa neɲ]]
b. [IP i r ø neɲ [CP mɔndʒa]]

Montaldo

The reanalysis of the problem introduced in (34) actually makes it more easily tractable. Indeed the raising of the non-subject non-clitic argument embedded in the participial clause is excluded even if restructuring applies. On the contrary, we can equally assume that negating the matrix clause results in negating the whole (restructured) sentence. In the same way the position between the auxiliary and the past participle, i.e. a position internal to the auxiliary sentence in terms of the analysis in (14b), characterizes both temporal negative polarity items such as *mɔjə* 'never' in (35a) and non-negative aspectual 'adverbs' such as *dʒa* 'already' in (35b).

- (35) a. i r ø mɔjə 'fɔ-ru
I it have never done-it
'I have never done it'

Montaldo

- b. u r e dʒa yv'ny
he it is already come
'He has already arrived'

More interestingly, the ideas introduced in this article open some novel perspectives on the analysis of both adverbs and negations in general. As for adverbs, the results achieved with respect to so-called negative ones suggests that a nominal characterization, in terms of such categories as (bare) N, Q(quantifier), may be appropriate for other adverbs of the descriptive aspectual, temporal, modal classes, and so on. Indeed there is at least one class of adverbs for which the bare-N(P) analysis has been independently proposed (Larson 1985). Though reasons of space prevent us from pursuing this line of research in any detail, we take it that it is possible to hold that there is no specialized category Adv(erb). The interesting question is then whether there are aspectual, temporal, modal categories of the type envisaged by Cinque (1999) or the intrinsic (nominal) properties of the so-called adverbs are rich enough to determine in particular their relative order. If Manzini and Savoia (forthcoming) are correct, this latter conclusion is not implausible.

The only consequence of our discussion on which we shall dwell at some length concerns the nature of sentential negation. As we saw at the outset, as well as languages where the sentential negation is lexicalized by a so-called adverb as in (3), there are languages where the sentential negation is lexicalized by a clitic head of some sort, as in (1), and of course languages combining the two lexicalizations, as in (2). If so-called negative adverbs are analyzed as Q or N elements, rather than as specialized Neg elements, we may expect the same analysis could hold true of the clitic negation. In other words, the latter is not to be conceived of as the lexicalization of the negative or more generally modal operator that licences negative polarity items, but as a negative polarity item itself.

Indeed there is evidence that in Romance languages the negative clitic is essentially nominal in nature. A first piece of evidence is provided by the fact that the negative clitic appears in the middle of the pronominal clitic sequences, often after the subject clitic and before the object ones as in standard French (36), but also internally to the sequence of subject clitics or object clitics (Manzini and Savoia 1998a, 2001b and references quoted there).

- (36) Je ne l'aime pas
I not him love not
'I am not in love with him'

The set of phenomena described in Semitic linguistics in terms of agreement properties of the negation (Shlonsky 1997, Benmamoun 2000) can perhaps be mentioned in the same bracket. In particular, according to Benmamoun (2000), negation in Arabic varieties includes *ma* and *š* morphemes which can combine, in particular in nominal sentences, to give rise to a *ma+š(i)* form. In Moroccan Arabic a pronoun *ca* be inserted between these two elements, yielding for instance (37). Superficially at least the configurations in (37) appear to be analogous to Romance configuration where the

negative clitic is inserted somewhere in the sequence of pronominal clitics; here however it is pronominal element to be intercalated among negative ones.

- (37) a. ma-huwa-š
neg-3psm-neg,
b. ma-hiya-š
neg-3psf-neg

The best piece of evidence in favor of the nominal nature of clitic negation comes from some Italian dialects which, like Roggio in (38)-(40), are characterized by a phenomenon of mutual exclusion between subject and object pronominal clitics. Thus (38) shows that Roggio has subject clitics at least in the 3rd person and 1st and 2nd person singular. The insertion of an object clitic excludes that of subject clitic as illustrated in (39) for the 3rd person singular, though the phenomenon is optional in the 2nd person singular, as in (39a). Insertion of the clitic negation as in (40) provokes an entirely parallel exclusion of the subject clitic, which turns out to also be optional in the 2nd person singular and obligatory in the 3rd person.

Roggio (Tuscany)

- (38) a. (i) 'camə 'tutti
I call all
'I call all of them'
b. tu 'cami 'tutti
you call all
c. i c'ama/lə 'cama 'tutti
he calls/she calls all
d. i c'aməne/lə 'caməne 'tutti
they-m. call/they-f. call all
(39) a. (tu) mə 'cami
you me call
'You call me'
b. ə/lə/ʃə/lə/mə 'cama
him/her/them-m./them-f./me he.calls
'He calls him/her/them/me'
(40) a. nun 'dormə
not I.sleep
'I don't sleep'
b. (tu) nun 'dormi
you not sleep
c. nun 'dorma
not he.sleeps
d. nun 'dorməne
not they.sleep

To begin with, we can straightforwardly exclude that the mutual exclusion observed in (39)-(40) is to be imputed to purely phonological properties. Indeed all of the subject and object clitics in (38) and (39) are fully syllabic; and exactly as *tu* 'you' can

optionally combine with *mə* 'me' in (39a), so we could expect the other combinations to be possible as well. Another theory that can be discarded is that there aren't enough positions in the clitic template, whether syntactic or morphological in nature, to allow for the insertion of both subject and object clitics. The existence of one or more dedicated positions for subject clitics is commonly accepted in the literature (Manzini and Savoia 2001b, in press and references quoted there); and of course the combinability of the 2nd person singular clitic once again shows that the relevant positions are in principle available in the grammar of Roggio. On the other hand this point is not crucial for present purposes since if the subject clitic and the negation actually competed for the same position, this would only go to show that the negation is nominal.

Mutual exclusion phenomena between clitics are well-known in the literature on Romance, especially in the form of mutual exclusions between 3rd person clitics, of the *l* series. That between the accusative and the dative, apparently giving rise in Spanish to substitution of the dative by *se* has received both morphological treatments (Bonet 1995) and optimality ones (Grimshaw 1997). Manzini and Savoia (to appear) show that the phenomenon is much more extensive, including in particular systematic mutual exclusions between 3rd person subject and object clitics. In a language like Roggio the mutual exclusion between subject and object clitics potentially extends to all persons. The idea developed by Manzini and Savoia (in press, to appear) is that these mutual exclusions are syntactic in nature, and are due to the same type of economy reasons that we explored above in connection with data such as (32). In particular, we may assume that in language like Roggio, the insertion of the subject clitic satisfies essentially the need for general D (Definiteness) properties to be lexicalized in the clitic domain between I and C. Remember indeed that in a subject clitic language like Roggio, the verbal inflection actually contains nominal information as to the reference of the subject, in the shape of number and person. But the insertion of any object clitic in the clitic domain is also sufficient to lexicalize the D(efiniteness), making insertion of the subject clitic unnecessary and hence impossible (Manzini and Savoia forthcoming).

In this perspective, we will have to assume that the fact illustrated in (40) above, that the negative clitic also determines the exclusion of the subject clitic, argues in favor of the negation itself having nominal properties, sufficient to satisfy the D lexicalization requirement. In particular, following on our analysis of so-called negative adverbs in section 2., we may assume that *nun* in the Roggio language is categorized as either N or Q. Given its *n*-lexical base, Q may be a more appropriate categorization.

With this much background, we can also return to the parameter in (1)-(3), whereby some languages like standard Italian (1) or Roggio itself lexicalize only a clitic negation, while other languages lexicalize only an adverbial negation, as in (3), and others still lexicalize both. We take it that the basic distinction between the clitic negation and the so-called adverbial one is that the former is pronominal-like in lacking a predicative content, in other words a lexical restriction. On the other hand the phrasal negation, both of the bare-N(P) and of the 'nothing'-type have a lexical content proving a restriction on their variable. Languages can lexicalize negation in either way or they can actually double the phrasal negation by means of a clitic one, in a manner not dissimilar from the doubling of a lexical DP by a pronominal clitic.

The research reported in this article has been financed partially through the Programma di ricerca cofinanziato of the MIUR 'Categorie linguistiche: dalla mappatura strutturale all'architettura delle rappresentazioni mentali' for the years 2001-2003. The article is a result of the collaboration of the two authors in all respects. Nevertheless, for administrative purposes, Rita Manzini takes responsibility for section 2. and 3. and Leonardo Savoia for sections 1.

References

- Aquaviva, P. 1996. The Logical Form of Negative Concord. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 6.2: 1-27.
- Benmamoun, E. 2000. *The Feature Structure of Functional Categories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bonnet, E. 1995. Bonnet, E. (1995). 'Feature structure of Romance clitics'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13: 607-647.
- Cardinaletti, A. and M. Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of three classes of pronouns. In *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, ed. H. van Riemsdijk, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 145-233.
- Chierchia, G. 1995. Impersonal Subjects. In *Quantification in natural languages*, eds. E. Bach, E. Jelinek, A. Kratz, B. H. Partee, Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 107-143.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge Mass: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1998. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. Ms., MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Clague, G. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads - A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Impey, V. In press. Two Types of Negative Concord. *Probus*
- Grimshaw, J. 1997. The best clitic: Constraint conflict in morphosyntax. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. L. Haegeman, Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 169-196.
- Hale, K. and S. J. Keyser. 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of of syntactic relations. In *The view from Building 20*, eds. K. Hale and S. J. Keyser, Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Keyser, R. 1984. *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Keyser, R. 1993. Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection, *Studia Linguistica* 47: 3-31.
- Larson, R. K. 1985. Bare-NP adverbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 595-621.
- Longobardi, G. 1992. In defence of the correspondence hypothesis: island effects and parasitic constructions in Logical Form. In *Logical Structure and Linguistic Theory*, eds. J. Huang e R. May, Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 149-196.
- Manzini, M. R. and L. M. Savoia. 1998a. Clitics and auxiliary choice in Italian dialects: Their relevance for the Person ergativity split. *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes* 27: 115-138.
- Manzini, M. R. and L. M. Savoia. 1998b. Negation parameters and their interaction in Italian dialects. *Quaderni di lavoro dell'ASIS* 2: 39-60, Università di Padova.
- Manzini, M. R. and Savoia, L. M. 2001a. The syntax of object clitics: *si* in Italian dialects. In *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays to Honour Lorenzo Renzi*, eds. Cinque, G. and G. Salvi, Amsterdam: North Holland, pp. 234-264.

- Manzini, M.R. and Savoia, L.M. 2001b. Parameters of Subject Inflection. In *Subjects, Expletives and the EPP*, ed. P. Svenonius, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Manzini, M.R. and L.M. Savoia. In press. Clitics: lexicalization patterns of the so-called 3rd person dative. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 1
- Manzini, M.R. and L.M. Savoia. To appear. Clitics: Cooccurrence and mutual exclusion patterns. In *Proceedings of the 'Cartography etc.' workshop (Siena november 1999)*, eds. A. Belletti and L. Rizzi, New York: Oxford University Press
- Manzini, M.R. and L.M. Savoia. Forthcoming. *Morfosintassi dei dialetti italiani*. Bologna: Il Mulino
- Meyer-Lübke W. 1899. *Grammatik der Romanischen Sprachen. Dritter Band: Syntax*, Leipzig
- Pesetsky, D. 1982. *Paths and Categories*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Shlonsky U. 1997. *Clause Structure and Word Order in Hebrew and Arabic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zanuttini, R. 1991. *Syntactic properties of sentential negation*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia
- Zanuttini, R. 1997. *Negation and clausal structure*. New York: Oxford University Press

Dipartimento di Linguistica
Università di Firenze
Piazza Brunneschi
50121 Firenze

rmanzini@unifi.it, lsavoia@unifi.it

The Morphosyntax of Finno-Ugric Case-marking: a DM account

Thomas McFadden

University of Pennsylvania

1. Theoretical Background

A recurrent theme of generative morphological theorizing is the attempt to relate morphological processes to syntactic ones, sometimes going so far as to deny the existence of an independent morphology. In the framework of Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994), a single derivation is postulated, with both syntactic and morphological operations distributed across it. The crucial insight is that word formation is not a privileged process which can be properly distinguished from clause formation, rather the two occur simultaneously and according to the same basic (syntactic) principles.¹ Of course, this does not imply that the syntactic machinery previously proposed to account for clause formation will be sufficient to handle the full array of morphosyntactic processes. Rather, it is a matter for empirical investigation to what extent the familiar types of movement will have to be augmented to handle the larger kind. Crucially, however, for the hypothesis of a unified derivation to remain interesting, there must be a set of central principles which all of the operations obey. In this paper, I discuss these issues in terms of the theory of movement types proposed by Embick and Noyer (2001) and derive a structural diagnostic that can be used to distinguish the effects of syntactic Raising from the those of the post-Syntactic movements they propose. I then present data on the behavior of case marking in two Finno-Ugric languages which satisfy this diagnostic. This lends support to the thesis that a theory with Raising alone, though simpler, is not adequate to power a unified morphosyntactic derivation.

I would like to thank Rolf Noyer, David Embick, Tony Kroch and the audiences at NELS 32 and the Penn In-House Session for comments and discussion on the material presented here.

¹ In other words, DM explicitly rejects the Lexicalist Hypothesis. See Marantz (1997) for a detailed exposition of the failings of Lexicalism.