

NO, YOU WOULDN'T WANT TO
NOT READ THIS PAPER:
*a working paper on a typology of negation
across the romance languages*

Bryan Fleming

Danielle Belko

Jeffrey Nagengast

I. INTRODUCTION:

SO YOU WON'T NOT KNOW WHAT WE'RE NOT GOING TO NOT DO

We know that the world's languages have different strategies for forming negative sentences, and these strategies can vary greatly from language family to language family. In this paper, we discuss negation in several languages of the same family—languages which are strikingly similar in many aspects but which use varying strategies to form negatives.

We begin our discussion by describing Rafaella Zanuttini's investigation into the typology of Romance languages (RL) in terms of how negation is formed. We follow with a more detailed description of negation strategies in several widely spoken romance languages, viz., Spanish, Italian, and French—bringing in information from other dialects when useful or interesting. Next, we attempt to discuss Zanuttini's typology vis-à-vis the corpora of data we have in the aforementioned languages, citing the (in)compatibility/(non-)compliance of these languages with her typological descriptions. Lastly, we will discuss some historical insight into why these differences exist and follow that with descriptions of languages and dialects not referenced in Zanuttini's article. We will also discuss any trends that these languages exhibit in relation to Zanuttini's generalizations.

No!



TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Meaning
**	ungrammatical
1,2,3	first, second, third person
ART	article
AUX	auxiliary
Ca	Used for numbering examples of Catalan
CL	clitic
COMP	comparative marker
COND	Conditional
EXPL	expletive
F	Feminine
F/Fr	Used for numbering examples of French
FUT	future tense
I/It	Used for numbering examples of Italian
IMP	imperative
IMPRF	imperfective
INF	infinitive
M	masculine
MSF	Modern Standard French
NEG	negative marker
NI	negative indefinite
OBJ	object
Pa	Used for numbering examples of Waldensian Patouà
P	plural
PART	partitive
PPL	past participle
PREP	preposition
PRES	present tense
PST	past tense
RC	Used for numbering examples of Roussillon Catalan
RFL	reflexive
RL	Romance Languages
S	singular
S/Sp	Used for numbering examples of Spanish
Si	Used for numbering examples of Sicilian
SUB	subject
SUBJ	subjunctive
Ve	Used for numbering examples of Venetian
W/Wa	Used for numbering examples of Walloon
X	Used for numbering examples in the Introduction

Who is Zanuttini; and why don't we not care?

In her article, *Negation and verb movement*, Raffaella Zanuttini (1997b) gives us a detailed typological description of several aspects of negation in RL. Her typology begins by dividing the negative markers found in RL into two classes: pre-verbal and post-verbal. From these two classes, she describes three strategies used by RL in forming sentential negation: Group 1 – negative markers in pre-verbal position, which can alone negate sentences; Group 2 – negative markers in post-verbal position, which can alone negate sentences; and Group 3 – negative markers co-occurring in both pre-verbal and post-verbal positions.¹

Group 1: *PRE-VERBAL*

X.1 (Zanuttini 1997a: 3ff)

a)	Gianni Gianni	non NEG	ha AUX	telefonato phone.PPL	a PREP	sua his	madre. mother	(Italian) ²
b)	Juan Juan	no NEG	ha AUX	llamado call.PPL	a PREP	su his	madre. mother	(Spanish)
c)	El DET	Joan Joan	no NEG	a AUX	trucat call.PST	a PREP	sa mare. his mother	(Catalan) ³
d)	João João	não NEG	ligou call.PST	para PREP	sua his	mãe. mother		(Portuguese)
e)	Jon Jon	nu-i NEG-AUX		telefona phone.PST		mamei mother	lui. his	(Romanian)

'John hasn't called his mother.'

Group 2: *POST-VERBAL*

X.2

Maria	a	mangia	nen. (Piemontese)
Maria	S.CL	eat.PRES	NEG
'Maria doesn't eat'			

X.3

Y	parle	pas	jamais. (Québécois)
He	talk.PRES	NEG	never.NI
'He never talks'			

X.4

Vôl	pas	venir. (Occitan)
want.PRES.3S	NEG	come.INF
'He doesn't want to come'		

¹ *Nota bene*: Zanuttini refers to Group 3 as "Pre-verbal negative makers, which cannot negate a clause alone."

² Throughout this document, the glosses have been provided by Belko, Fleming, and Nagengast; any mistakes are our own.

³ Per Prof. Sheila McIntosh, *sa* is attributed to people from the Balearic Islands—in contrast to the standard, *seva*.

Group 3: *CO-OCCURRING*

X.5

Je	n'ai	pas	parlé	de	toi. (French)
I	NEG-AUX	NEG	speak.PPL	of	you.

'I didn't talk about you.'

X.6

Po	n'mu	nin	tromper. (Walloon)
for	NEG-me	NEG	err.INF

'so that I don't make a mistake.'

In this paper, we would like to discuss four typological generalizations that Zanuttini presents in her article (1997b) regarding: 1) negatives and pronominal clitics; 2) negative imperatives; 3) negative indefinites; and 4) negation and yes-no questions. Although she initially breaks up the Romance Languages into the three groups listed above, she focuses her descriptions on languages in Groups 1 and 3. For organizational purposes, we will first discuss how languages in Group 1 and 3 accord with her suppositions, and later focus on Group 2 languages and how they fit into this system. Here, we introduce Zanuttini's typological descriptions.

Zanuttini first addresses the location of negative markers in relation to pronominal clitics in pre-verbal position. She claims that “the pre-verbal negative markers which can negate a clause alone, for example Italian *non*, Spanish *no* and Portuguese *não*, always occur to the left of a string of pronominal clitics in pre-verbal position” (Ibid.: 217). She exemplifies this with Spanish, a Group 1 language, that places its negative marker *no* before the indirect and direct pronominal clitics, *se* and *lo* respectively.

X.7

Maria	no	se	lo	dió	(Spanish)
Maria	NEG	him	it	give.PST	

'Maria didn't give it to him'

On the other hand, negative markers in Group 3 languages “do not systematically precede a string of pronominal clitics in preverbal position. While some do, others precede pronominal clitics of third person, the partitive, and the locative clitic, but follow pronominal clitics of first and second person as well as reflexives” (Ibid.: 217). She gives several examples of Cairese, a Piedmontese dialect, where the location of the negative marker is dependent on the person of the pronominal clitic. In (X.8), the negative marker precedes the third person pronominal clitic *li/la*, while in (X.9) it follows the first/second person marker *mi/ti*.

X.8

U	n	li/la	sent	nent	(Cairese)
S.CL	NEG	him/her	hear.PRES	NEG	

'He doesn't hear him/her.'

X.9

U	min/tin	sent	nent.	(Cairese)
S.CL	me-NEG/you-NEG	hear.PRES	NEG	

'He doesn't hear me/you.'

Her second generalization concerns negative imperatives for the informal second person singular. According to her article, the negative

marker in Group 1 languages “cannot occur in imperative clauses which employ a verbal form unique to the imperative paradigm” (Ibid.: 218). This means that the same verb form that is used to create a positive imperative (for the informal second person singular only) cannot be used to form the negative counterpart. Languages utilize verb forms such as the subjunctive when forming a negative command. In the Spanish example below (X.10), the verb form in the positive command, *habla*, renders a sentence ungrammatical in the negative command (X.10b). Instead the subjunctive form of the verb is used (X.10c).⁴

X.10

- a) *Habla!* (Spanish)
talk.IMP.2S
Talk!
- b)***No habla!*
NEG talk.IMP.2S
'Don't talk!'
- c) *No hables!*
NEG talk.IMP.SUBJ.2S
'Don't talk!'

Group 3 languages, contrastingly, do not show the same differences between the positive and negative second person singular imperatives. Zanuttini argues, “In some cases, [pre-verbal negative markers] co-occur with imperative verbal forms...[while] in other cases, as for example in Cairese (a dialect of Piemontese from Cairo Montenotte, cf. Parry 1985), they simply do not occur with non-finite forms, leaving the function of negating the clause entirely to the post-verbal negative element, which can freely co-occur with a verbal form unique to the imperative” (Zanuttini 1997b: 218-219). She gives the example in Walloon (X.11), where the pre-verbal negative *nu* does not require a change of the imperative verb form.⁵

X.11

- Nu** l'houke **nin!** (Walloon)
NEG him-call.IMP NEG
'Don't call him!'

Her third typological claim concerns the distribution of negative indefinites (*never, nothing, no-one, etc.*). In Group 1 languages, “negative indefinites in post-verbal position must co-occur with a negative element in

⁴ Zanuttini (1997b: 218) claims: “a negative marker can be followed by an auxiliary verb, in turn followed by the main verb in the form of an infinitive or a gerund.” She goes on to give examples of negative imperatives from Frulian, Portuguese and Tarantino, without, however, their positive counterparts. It would be helpful to see the positive imperatives, in order to determine if the auxiliary is always present, or simply added to the negative form. We do not have enough information, nor do we clearly understand her reasoning on this point to discuss it in great depth. We will therefore focus on imperatives without auxiliary verbs.

⁵ Again Zanuttini does not give an example of the positive imperative, therefore we must assume that the imperative verb form is the same for both positive and negative commands.

pre-verbal position” (Ibid.: 219). Accordingly, in Spanish, a Group 1 language, a negative indefinite that *follows* the verb, must co-occur with the pre-verbal negative marker *no* (X.12a). If the pre-verbal negative is absent, the resulting sentence is ungrammatical (X.12b).

X.12

- a) **no** he visto a nadie (Spanish)
 NEG AUX.1S see.PPL PREP no-one.NI
 ‘I have seen no-one’
- b)**He visto a nadie
 AUX.1S see.PPL PREP no-one.NI
 ‘I have seen no-one’

Contrastingly, languages in Group 3 do not adhere to the same constraints. “In these languages, it is possible to find them in post-verbal position in the absence of a negative element co-occurring in pre-verbal position” (Ibid.: 220). Languages in this group would be similar to Standard English in the sense that “I saw no one” would be grammatical, where no negative marker is needed before the verb in the presence of the post-verbal negative indefinite *no one*.

Zanuttini’s last point involves pre-verbal negative markers and yes/no questions. In Group 1 languages, the pre-verbal negative prevents subject-verb inversion in question formation, which is possible without the pre-verbal negative. “A question is formed by maintaining the same word-order found in non-interrogative clauses, where the negative marker precedes the subject clitic, which in turn precedes the finite verb” (Ibid.: 221). She uses a Paduan example, where in the absence of a pre-verbal negative, a question can be formed by inverting the subject (*e*)*l* and the verb, *vien* (X.13b). The pre-verbal negative, however, makes this inversion impossible, as seen in (X.13c). In order to form a question with a pre-verbal negative, the word order of the original declarative is maintained (X.13d).

X.13

- a) (*e*)*l* vien (Paduan)
 S.CL come.PRES
 ‘He comes.’
- b) Vien-lo?
 come.PRES-S.CL
 ‘Is he coming?’
- c)****No** vien-lo?
 NEG come.PRES-S.CL
 ‘Doesn’t he come?’
- d) **No** (*e*)*l* vien?
 NEG S.CL come
 ‘Doesn’t he come?’

Languages in Group 3, on the other hand, “show inversion of the verb around the pronominal subject” (Ibid.: 222). Indeed, in (X.14) below, we see that to form a question, the subject pronoun *il*, which is before the verb, *est*, in (X.14a), is inverted and follows the verb in (X.14b). This same inversion also occurs in the presence of a pre-verbal negative marker (X.14c).

X.I.4

- a) Il est heureux.
he be.3S happy
'He is happy'
- b) Est-il heureux?
Be.3S-he happy?
'Is he happy?'
- c) N'est-il pas heureux?
NEG-be.3S-he happy?
'Isn't he happy?'

II. NEGATION IN LANGX

I. Spanish

Basic Spanish negation is achieved by placing the sentential negator *no* at the beginning of the entire verb nucleus. This gives us the basic Spanish negation pattern of *no V*. Compare the following sentences:

S.1

- a) Él come b) Él **no** come
He eat.PRES.3S He NEG eat.PRES.3S
'He eats' 'He doesn't eat'

If the negative occurs in the subordinate clause, *no* still precedes the verb that is being negated within the clause. In (S.2) below, the matrix clause verb *querer* is not being negated. *No* acts only upon the main verb in the subordinate clause, *coma*.

S.2

- Beatriz quiere que él **no** coma.
Beatriz want.PRES.3S that he NEG eat.SUBJ.3S
'Beatriz wants him not to eat'

In verbal constructions that utilize an auxiliary, the *no* likewise precedes the entire verb nucleus and cannot separate the two-part verbal construction.

S.3

- a) Él **no** ha comido
He NEG AUX.3S eat.PPL
'He has not eaten.'
- b) **Él ha **no** comido
He AUX.3S NEG eat.PPL
'He has not eaten.'

In standard Spanish, the pre-verbal *no* generally co-occurs with post-verbal negative indefinites such as *nunca*, *nada*, *nadie*, ('never,' 'nothing,' 'no-one'), etc. The absence of the pre-verbal *no* renders the sentence ungrammatical.

S.4

- a) Alicia **no** trabaja **nunca**
 Alicia NEG work.PRES.3S never.NI
 'Alicia never works.'
- b) **Alicia trabaja **nunca**
 Alicia work.PRES.3S never.NI
 'Alicia never works.'

When the negative indefinite appears pre-verbally, the sentence negater *no* is not required. The presence of *no* would in fact produce a double negative reading (Giannakidou, 23).

S.5 (Giannakidou)

- a) **Nadie** ha visto a Pedro
 No-one.NI AUX.3S see.PPL PREP Pedro
 'No one has seen Pedro.'
- b) **Nadie** **no** ha visto a Pedro
 No-one.NI NEG AUX.3S see.PPL PREP Pedro
 'No one hasn't seen Pedro.'

While the addition of *no* in the above example produces a double negative, there are certain environments in which *no* can be present but not result in a negative reading. This expletive negation, similar to the pleonastic *ne* in French, is licensed under the scope of verbs of fear and doubt, for example, which are all nonveridical with respect to the proposition expressed in the subordinate clause (Espinal, 2000a: 61). In (S.6), the presence of *no* is optional and does not change the meaning of the subordinate clause.

S.6 (Espinal)

- Hay quién dude que **(no)** son
 Is-there who doubt.SUBJ.3S that NEG be.PRES.3P
- falsas las tales?
 false the stories
- 'Does anyone doubt the falseness of such stories?'

Returning to negative indefinites, it is interesting to note that, when in post-verbal position, they can appear as complements of negative prepositions, negative embedding predicates and adversative predicates, certain emotive predicates, and comparative-like contexts (Herburger, 297). It is suggested that they are to be interpreted merely as existential quantifiers as they cannot contribute to negation in their own right. As seen in the translations (S.7a-c), *nada*, *nadie*, and *nunca* are not interpreted as being overtly negative.

S.7 (Herburger)

- a) Antes de hacer **nada**,
 Before of do.INF nothing-NI
- debes lavarle las manos
 must.PRES.2S wash.INF.CL the hands
 'Before doing anything, you should wash his hands.'
- b) Prohibieron que saliera **nadie**
 Prohibit.PST.3P that leave.SUBJ.3S no-one.NI
 'They didn't let anyone leave.'

- c) Juan ha llegado más tarde que nunca
 Juan AUX.3S arrive.PPL more late than never.NI
 'Juan has arrived later than ever.'

In contrast, conditional sentences do not allow for the presence of negative indefinites, as seen in S.8b (Herburger, 299).

S.8 (Herburger)

- a) Si encuentras algo avísame
 If find.PRES.2S something tell.IMP.3S.me
 'If you find anything, tell me.'
- b)**Si encuentras nada avísame
 If find.PRES.2S nothing.NI tell.IMP.3S.me
 'If you find anything, tell me.'

With respect to negative imperatives, *no* functions as expected and always precedes the verb nucleus. In the second person informal singular imperative, the negator requires the presence of a form different than that of the positive imperative: in all cases, the subjunctive.

S.9

- a) ¡No hables!
 NEG talk.IMP.SUBJ.2S
 'Don't talk!'
- b)**¡Hables no!
 talk.IMP.SUBJ.2S NEG
 'Talk don't!'
- c)**¡No habla!
 NEG talk.IMP.2S
 'Don't talk!'

2. Italian

Italian also utilizes a pre-verbal negation system. The negative marker *non* always precedes the main verb of a clause. The basic structure, therefore, of sentential negation is *non* + V. In the example (I.1b) below, the negative *non* precedes the main verb *legge*. In standard Italian, placing the *non* after the main verb renders the sentence infelicitous.

I.1

- a) Lui legge.
 He read.PRES.3S
 'He reads well.'
- b) Lui non legge.
 He NEG read.PRES.3S
 'He does not read well.'
- c)**Lui legge non.
 He read.PRES.3S NEG
 'He reads not.'

It is interesting to note that it is possible to find the *non* following the verb if there is an adjunct such as an adverb, a direct object, or a prepositional phrase also following the verb. In these instances however,

the negative marker is acting upon the adjunct and not the verb, keeping the overall sentence positive. When adding the adverb *bene* ‘well’ to the above sentence, the negative marker can precede *bene*, but then the focus is shifted to the adverb (I.2b). (I.2c) and (I.2d) are also plausible utterances, with a negative marker following the verb but preceding a direct object or a prepositional phrase, respectively; however, they suggest the existence of a subsequent contrastive clause.

I.2

- a) Lui legge bene.
He read.PRES.3S well
‘He reads well.’
- b) Lui legge **non** bene.
He read.PRES.3S NEG well
‘He reads not well.’
- c) Lui legge **non** libri.
He read.PRES.3S NEG book.PL
‘He reads not books (but magazines, newspapers, etc).’
- d) Lui legge **non** con Paolo.
He read.PRES.3S NEG with Paolo
‘He reads not with Paolo (but with Maria).’

If the negative occurs in the subordinate clause, *non* still precedes the verb that is being negated within the clause. In the (I.3) below, the matrix clause verb *vuole* is not being negated, but rather the main verb in the subordinate clause *vada*. Therefore, *non* precedes *vada*.

I.3

- ‘Lei vuole che lui **non** vada via.
She want.PRES.3S that he NEG go.PRES.SUBJ.3S away
‘She wants that he not go away.’

When a sentence contains an auxiliary verb in addition to the ‘main’ verb, the negative marker precedes the auxiliary.

I.4

- a) Tomaso ha scritto un libro.
Tomaso AUX.3S write.PPL a book
‘Tomaso wrote/has written a book.’
- b) Tomaso **non** ha scritto un libro.
Tomaso NEG AUX.3S write.PPL a book
‘Tomaso has not written a book.’

One interesting aspect about Italian negation is that “*non* can follow verbs which do not take any overt complementizer in their complement” such as the modal verbs *potere*, *volere*, and *dovere*–‘can’, ‘want’, and ‘must’ (Kim: 164). Therefore, in a modal construction like (I.5), *non* can come in between the modal verb *potrebbe*, and the complement *aver* (Ibid.).

I.5 (Kim:164)

- Gianni potrebbe **non** aver **mai** parlato.
Gianni can.COND NEG have.INF never.NI speak.PPL
‘Gianni could not (to) have spoken ever.’

In standard Italian, the pre-verbal *non* MUST co-occur with post-verbal negative indefinites, such as *mai*, *niente*, *nessuno*, ('never,' 'nothing,' 'no-one'), etc. The absence of the pre-verbal *non* renders the sentence ungrammatical.

I.6

- a) **Non** ho comprato **niente.**
 NEG AUX.1S buy.PPL nothing.NI
 'I didn't buy anything.' (Lit. 'I did not buy nothing')
- b)**Ho comprato **niente.**
 AUX.1S buy.PPL nothing.NI
 'I bought nothing.'

When the negative indefinite is in *pre-verbal* position, however, the *non* is not necessary. Nota bene: inversion of the verb and the object, as seen in I.7a, is not very common in Standard Italian, although it is not considered incorrect.

I.7

- a) **Niente** ho comprato
 Nothing.NI AUX.1S buy.PPL
 'Nothing I have bought'
- b) **Nessuno** ha comprato il libro
 no-one.NI AUX.3S buy.PPL the book
 'No-one bought the book'

It is important to note that the presence of *non* does not always imply negation. There are a few instances where *non* acts as a pleonastic element in a sentence. One such situation is in comparative clauses, which is comparable to the pleonastic *ne* in French. In standard Italian there are several ways to construct a comparative clause. I.8 below shows a variety of ways in which Italian can express 'he arrived earlier than I expected.' The *non* in I.8a and I.8b does not negate the verb *aspettassi*, but instead adds emphasis to the comparison.

I.8 (Lepschy: 107)

- a) è arrivato più presto che **non** mi
 AUX.3S arrive.PPL more early COMP NEG me
 aspettassi
 expect.IMPRF.SUBJ.1S
- b) è arrivato più presto di quanto **(non)** mi
 AUX.3S arrive.PPL more early PREP COMP (NEG) me
 aspettassi
 expect.IMPRF.SUBJ.1S
- c) è arrivato più presto di quello che mi
 AUX.3S arrive.PPL more early PREP that COMP me
 aspettassi
 expect.IMPRF.SUBJ.1S
 'He arrived earlier than I expected.'

3. French

Sentential negation in Modern Standard French (MSF) is produced by using two co-occurring particles, *ne* and *pas*, which, in general terms, circumscribe an inflected verb. *Ne* is always preverbal, and *pas* is post-verbal in most cases. More succinctly, this description provides us with the following basic structure of sentential negation in French: *ne* V *pas*.

F.1

Il	ne	mange	pas	assez.
3S.M	NEG	eat.3S	NEG	enough

'He doesn't eat enough.'

Before vowels, *ne* is cliticized as *n'*.

F.2

Elle	n'y	va	pas.
3S.F	NEG-there	go.3S	NEG

'She doesn't go there.'

In compound tenses, *ne* precedes an AUX, which is, then, immediately followed by *pas*, in accordance with our description that *ne...pas* circumscribes an inflected verb.

F.3

Jean	n'a	pas	mangé.
Jean	NEG-AUX.3S	NEG	eat.PPL

'Jean didn't eat.'/'Jean hasn't eaten.'

With preverbal pronouns, the *ne* precedes the pronoun. If there is more than one pronoun (which occur in a string in a systematic order), *ne* precedes them all. The inflected verb is immediately followed by *pas*.

F.4

Pierre	ne	me	l'a	pas	dit.
Pierre	NEG	me	it-AUX.3S	NEG	say.PPL

'Pierre didn't tell me that.'/'Pierre didn't say it to me.'

Before an infinitive, both particles are preverbal.

F.5

Il	faut	me	rappeler	de	
EXP	be.necessary	1SG.OBJ	remind.INF	PART	
ne	pas	manger	du	fromage	demain.
NEG	NEG	eat.INF	PART.ART.M.S	cheese	tomorrow

'It is necessary to remind me not to eat any cheese tomorrow.'

F.6

Ne pas	manger	de	la	viande	le	vendredi,
NEG NEG	eat.INF	PART	ART.F	meat	ART.M	Friday,
c'est	normal	pour	les	catholiques.		
EXPL-be.3S	normal	for	the	catholics		

'Not eating meat on Fridays is normal for Catholics.'

With imperatives, the basic structure of negation in MSF is the same as discussed above.

F.7

- a) Fermez la porte!
close.IMP.2P ART.FEM door.
'Close the door!'
- b) **Ne** fermez **pas** la porte!
NEG close.IMP.2P NEG ART.FEM door.
'Don't close the door!'
- c) **Ne** la fermez **pas!**
NEG PRO.FEM close.IMP.2P NEG
'Don't close it!'
- d) Fermez-la!
close.IMP.2P-PRO.FEM
'Close it!'
- e)****Ne** fermez-la **pas!**
NEG close.IMP.2P-PRO.FEM NEG
'Don't close it!'
- f) ?Fermez-la **pas!**
close.IMP.2P-PRO.FEM NEG
'Don't close it!'

Both negative particles are required for grammatical negation in MSF.⁶

F.8

- a)**Il **ne** mange assez.
He NEG eats enough.
'He doesn't eat enough.'
- b) ?Il mange **pas** assez.
He eats NEG enough.
'He doesn't eat enough.'⁷

F.9

- ?Je sais **pas.**
rS know.1S NEG
'I don't know.'

Some verbs, however, viz., *savoir*, *pouvoir*, *oser*, can be negated by *ne* alone with co-occurring infinitival complements.

F.10 (Rowlett)

- Pierre **ne** savait que faire.
Pierre NEG know.PST what do.INF
'Pierre doesn't know what to do.'

⁶ cf. Rowlett: §1.2.5, pp. 34ff

⁷ *Nota bene*: these sentences (F.8b and F.9) are grammatical in colloquial French and are standard in some dialects, e.g., Québécois.

F.II

Je n'osais venir.
 1S NEG-dare.PST come.INF
 'I don't dare come.' / 'I dare not come.'

F.I2

On ne peut vous aider.
 3S NEG can.3S 2P help.INF
 'We can't help you.'

F.I3

Ne peut être vendu (a notice on free newspapers.)
 NEG can.3S be.INF sold.PPL
 'Cannot be sold.'

There are also some instances of *pas* standing alone in grammatical MSF.

F.I4

a) Tu viens ou pas?
 2S come.3S or NEG
 'Are you coming or not?'

b)**Tu viens ou ne pas?
 2S come.3S or NEG NEG
 'Are you coming or not?'

French also has other negative constructions, which are also formed with (at least) two co-occurring particles. In this paper, we are referring to these structures as “negative indefinites.” With negative indefinites, we see the same pattern as with *ne V pas*.

ne V jamais	'never'	ne V plus	'no more'
ne V personne	'nobody'/'no one'	ne V point	'none'
ne V nulle part	'nowhere'	ne V rien	'nothing'
ne V aucun	'none'	ne V pas encore	'(not) yet'

F.I5

Jean ne nage jamais
 Jean NEG swims never.NI
 'Jean never swims.'

F.I6

Jean ne voit personne.
 Jean NEG sees nobody.NI
 'Jean sees no one/nobody.'/'Jean doesn't see anyone/anybody.'/'Jean isn't seeing anyone/anybody.'

F.I7

Jean ne voyage nulle part.
 Jean NEG travel.3S nowhere.NI
 'Jean travels nowhere.'/'Jean doesn't travel anywhere.'

Certain NIs can be fronted and act as subjects, e.g., *personne*, *rien*, *aucun*; but, they must occur with the pre-verbal negative particle, *ne*.

F.I8

Personne ne voit Jean.
 nobody.NI NEG see.3S John
 'No one/Nobody sees John.'

F.19 **Aucun** de mes élèves **ne** font leurs devoirs.
 none.NI PART my student.P NEG do.3P their homework
 'None of my students do their homework.'

With imperatives, the basic structure of negation in MSF is the same as discussed above, i.e. *ne V pas*.

F.20 Fermez la porte!
 close.IMP.2P ART.FEM door.
 'Close the door!'

F.21 **Ne** fermez **pas** la porte!
 NEG close.IMP.2P NEG ART.FEM door.
 'Don't close the door!'

F.22 **Ne** la fermez **pas!**
 NEG PRO.FEM close.IMP.2P NEG
 'Don't close it!'

F.23 Fermez-la!
 close.IMP.2P-PRO.FEM
 'Close it!'

F.24** **Ne** fermez-la **pas!**
 NEG close.IMP.2P-PRO.FEM NEG
 'Don't close it!'

F.25 ?Fermez-la **pas!**
 close.IMP.2P-PRO.FEM NEG
 'Don't close it!'

Inversion

In French, a common strategy for forming yes/no questions is by using inversion.

F.26 Tu vas au théâtre.
 'You are going to the theater.'

F.27 Vas-tu au théâtre?
 'Are you going to the theater?'

In negative yes/no questions, *ne...pas* circumscribes the inverted verb-subject pronoun construction: *ne V-PRO pas*, as seen in (F.28).

F.28 **Ne** vas-tu **pas** au théâtre?
 NEG go.2S-2S.Q NEG to.the theater
 'Aren't you going to the theater?'

An interesting feature of the negative particle, ne, in French: Pleonastic ne.

In MSF, there is an aspect of the negative particle, *ne*, which leads us to question whether it is actually inherently negative. In MSF, *ne* can be used pleonastically in sentences that are not semantically negative. For example, this expletive usage of *ne* is found with some constructions employing the subjunctive (F.29). Pleonastic *ne* is also very common in (formal) comparative constructions (F.30) & (F.31).

F.29

Je	dois	finir	mes	devoirs
1S	must.1S	finish.INF	my.PL	homework
avant que	Maman	ne		rentre.
before	Mom	NEG.EXPL		return.3S.SUBJ

'I must finish my homework before Mom returns.'

F.30 (Price 1990)

Pierre est	plus	riche que	son père	ne	l'était.
Pierre be.3S	COMP	rich than	his father	NEG.EXPL	(PRO.rich)-was

'Pierre is richer than his father was.'

F.31

Ce	travail est	plus	difficile que	l'on	ne	le	croyait.
DEM	work be.3S	more	difficult REL	EXPL.3S	NEG.EXPL	PRO	thought.

'This work is harder than we thought.'

III. HOW THEY DON'T NOT COMPLY

In this section we will discuss a variety of Romance Languages and whether they are in accordance with Zanuttini's generalizations. The following charts show how these languages fit into Groups 1, 2, or 3, which were previously introduced. Whenever we refer to these languages regarding their negation strategies, we presuppose their membership in one of the groups below.

Group 1: Pre-verbal negation only

Language	Example
Spanish	Juan no ha llamado a su madre. Juan NEG AUX call.PPL PREP his mother 'Juan did not call his mother.'
Catalan	En Joan no va entendre tot ART Joan NEG AUX understand everything 'Joan didn't understand everything.'
Italian	Lui non legge He NEG read.PRES.3S 'He does not read well.'

Sicilian	Unn u capisciu NEG him understand.PRES.1S 'I don't understand him.'
Venetian	No ti vien NEG SUB.CL come.PRES.3S 'You do not come.'

Group 2: Post-verbal negation only

Language	Example
Milanese	L'a minga semper vinciü SUB.CL-AUX.3S NEG always win.PPL 'He didn't always win.'
Occitan	Vôl pas venir. wants.3S NEG come.INF 'He doesn't want to come.'
Piedmontese	Gianni a capis pa/nen tut. Gianni SUB.CL understand NEG/NEG everything 'Gianni doesn't understand everything.'
Québécois	Il parle pas jamais. 3S speak.3S NEG never.NI 'He never speaks.'
Waldensian Patouà	Nû vòlèn pà li autri capisèn. 1P want.1P NEG ART.P other.P understand.3P 'We don't want the others to understand.'

Group 3: Co-occurrence of pre- and post-verbal negation

Language	Example
French	Il ne mange pas assez. 3S.M NEG eat.3S NEG enough 'He doesn't eat enough.'
Wallon	N'èsteût-ç' nin avou d' l'angrês ? NEG-bs.PST.3S-ART.EXPL NEG with PART ART- fertilizer 'Wasn't it with fertilizer?'
*Catalan	a) La Maria no ha pas vingut ART.F Maria NEG AUX.3S NEG come.PPL 'Maria has not come' b.) No pas la Maria no ha vingut NEG NEG ART.F Maria NEG AUX.3S come.PPL 'It is Maria that hasn't come'

* Catalan can utilize the negative morpheme **pas** in both pre-verbal and post-verbal position. The presence of **pas** has several functions, including for emphatic purposes as well as to express an occurrence contrary to the expectations of the speaker. Unlike in French and Occitan, **pas** is not an independent lexical unit, but is lexically and syntactically inseparable from **no**. (Espinal, 1991: 39)

I. Negative markers in relation to pronominal clitics in pre-verbal position

Again, Zanuttini (1997b: 217) claims that “the pre-verbal negative markers which can negate a clause alone, for example Italian *non*, Spanish *no*, and Portuguese *não*, always occur to the left of a string of pronominal clitics in pre-verbal position.”

Standard Spanish functions accordingly, with *no* preceding the first person pronominal clitic *mi* in (Sp.1a). In (Sp.1b), the pronominal dative clitic *se* and the direct object clitic *lo* both follow the sentential negator *no*.

Sp.1

- a) Juan **no** me ha visto
 Juan NEG me AUX.3S see.PPL
 ‘Juan hasn’t seen me.’
- b) Maria **no** se lo dió
 Maria NEG PRO.DAT it give.PST.3S
 ‘Maria didn’t give it to him.’

This is consistent in Standard Italian. In the example (It.1a) below, *non* precedes the pronominal clitic *mi*, and the combined direct and indirect clitic *gliel-*.

It.1

- a) John **non** mi ha visto
 John NEG me AUX.3S see.PPL
 ‘John hasn’t seen me’
- b) Maria **non** gliel’ha dato
 Maria NEG him-it-AUX.3S give.PPL
 ‘Maria didn’t give it to him.’

Catalan follows suit, where *no* precedes the pronominal clitic *m’* in (C.1a). In (C.1b), the *no* again precedes the pronominal indirect object clitic *l’* as well as the direct object clitic *hi*.

Ca.1

- a) En Joan **no** m’ha vist
 ART Joan NEG CL.AUX.3S see.PPL
 ‘Joan hasn’t seen me.’
- b) La Maria **no** l’hi va donar
 ART Maria NEG PRO.it AUX.3S give.INF
 ‘Maria didn’t give it to him.’

This appears to hold true in Sicilian as well. The negative marker *unn* must come before any pronominal clitics that precede the verb.

Si.1(Privitera 1998)

- Unn** u capisciu
 NEG him.CL understand.PRES.1S
 ‘I don’t understand him’

The negative marker *no* in Venetian must also come before pronominal clitics preceding the verb.

Ve.1 (Poletto 2000)

- | | | | |
|----|----------------------|--------|--------------|
| a) | La | | mangia |
| | SUB.CL | | eat.PRES.3S |
| | 'She eats.' | | |
| b) | No | ti | vien |
| | NEG | SUB.CL | come.PRES.3S |
| | 'You do not come.' | | |
| c) | No | la | vien |
| | NEG | SUB.CL | come.PRES.3S |
| | 'She does not come.' | | |

Zanuttini suggests, however, that Group 3 languages' pre-verbal negative markers "do not systematically precede a string of pronominal clitics in preverbal position." She gives as evidence of this some data from the Piemontese dialect, Cairese (cf. X.8 and X.9). French gives evidence, however, that counters her statement. French does seem to systematically place its pre-verbal negative marker, *ne*, before a string of preverbal pronominal clitics.

Fr.1

Pierre	ne	<i>me</i>	<i>l'a</i>	pas	dit.
Pierre	NEG	me	it-AUX.3S	NEG	say.PPL
'Pierre didn't tell me that. / Pierre didn't say it to me.'					

Fr.2

Ne	<i>le</i>	<i>lui</i>	donne	pas.
NEG	it	3S.DAT	give.IMP	NEG
'Don't give it to him/her.'				

Fr.3

Pourquoi	n'en		prenez-vous	pas?
Why	NEG-PRO.PART.some		take.2P-2P	NEG
Why aren't you taking any?				

Zanuttini has not made a very strong (or convincingly correct) typological statement here. Perhaps Group 3 as a whole does not systematically place pre-verbal negative particles before clitics; but there are certainly languages in Group 3 that do, as seen in French above.

2. Negative imperatives

Again, according to Zanuttini (1997b: 218), the negative marker in Group 1 languages "cannot occur in imperative clauses which employ a verbal form unique to the imperative paradigm."

Standard Spanish adheres to Zanuttini's second generalization. The positive imperative forms of the second person singular (Sp.2a and Sp.2d) are not the same as their negative counterparts (Sp.2b and Sp.2e). (Sp.2c) and (Sp.2f) show the ungrammaticality of sentences formed in this way. When forming the negative command, the subjunctive form of the verb is used instead of the inflected form for present tense. This contrasts with the verb inflected for third person singular present that is utilized for the second person singular command

Sp.2

- a) ¡Come!
Eat.IMP.2S
'Eat!'
- b) ¡No comas!
NEG eat.IMP.SUBJ.2S
'Don't eat!'
- c)**¡No come!
NEG eat.IMP.2S
'Don't eat!'
- d) ¡Habla!
talk.IMP.2S
'Talk!'
- e) ¡No hables!
NEG speak.IMP.SUBJ.2S
'Don't talk!'
- f)**¡No habla!
NEG talk.IMP.2S
'Don't talk!'

Standard Italian adheres to Zanuttini's second generalization. The positive imperative forms of the second person singular (It.2a and It.2d) are not the same as their negative counterparts (It.2b and It.2e). When forming the negative command, the infinitive of the verb is used instead of the inflected form.

It.2

- a) Mangia!
Eat.IMP.2S!
'Eat!'
- b) **Non** mangiare!
NEG eat.IMP.INF.2S
'Don't eat!'
- c)**Non mangia!
NEG eat.IMP.2S
'Don't eat!'
- d) Parla!
Talk.IMP.2S
'Talk!'
- e) **Non** parlare!
NEG talk.IMP.INF.2S
'Don't talk!'
- f)**Non parla!
NEG talk.IMP.2S
'Don't talk!'

Standard Catalan likewise functions according to Zanuttini's claim and parallels Spanish in its use of the subjunctive for the negative imperative in second person singular informal.

Ca.2

- a) Menja!
eat.IMP.2S
'Eat!'

- b) **No** mengis!
 NEG eat.IMP.SUBJ.2S
 'Don't eat!'
- c)****No** menja!
 NEG eat.IMP.2S
 'Don't eat!'
- d) Parla!
 talk.IMP.2S
 'Talk!'
- e) **No** parlis!
 NEG talk.IMP.SUBJ.2S
 'Don't speak'
- f)****No** parla!
 NEG talk.IMP.2S
 'Don't speak!'

Accordingly, negative second person imperatives in Sicilian utilize a different verb form than the positive form.

Si.2 (Privitera 1998)

- a) Fallu
 Do.IMP.2S
 Do it!
- b) **Unn** u fari
 NEG it do.IMP.INF.2S
 'Don't do it!'

Group 3 languages, contrastingly, do not show the same differences between the positive and negative second person singular imperatives (cf., X.11).

In French, in accordance with Zanuttini's description, the imperative paradigm does not change in the negative vis-à-vis the positive.

Fr.4

Fermez la porte!
 close.IMP.2P ART.FEM door.
 'Close the door!'

Fr.5

Ne fermez **pas** la porte!
 NEG close.IMP.2P NEG ART.FEM door.
 'Don't close the door!'

Fr.6

Ne la fermez **pas!**
 NEG PRO.FEM close.IMP.2P NEG
 'Don't close it!'

Unrelated to the verbal paradigm – yet extremely interesting – there is, however, a constraint on inversion in the negation strategy when clitics are present in imperatives, as seen below in (Fr.7). The only way to grammatically produce the negative counterpart to (Fr.7a) is (Fr.6).

Fr.7

- a) Fermez-la!
close.IMP.2P-PRO.FEM
'Close it!'
- b)**Ne fermez-la pas!
NEG close.IMP.2P-PRO.FEM NEG
'Don't close it!'
- c) ?Fermez-la pas!
close.IMP.2P-PRO.FEM NEG NEG (colloq.)
'Don't close it!'

3. Negative Indefinites

In Group 1 languages, “negative indefinites in post-verbal position must co-occur with a negative element in pre-verbal position” (1997b: 219).

Accordingly, Spanish negation typically requires the sentential negator *no* before the appearance of a negative indefinite. The second example in (Sp.3b) is rendered ungrammatical in that a negator must appear before the inflected verb ‘to see’ in order for the negative indefinite *nadie* to appear. When the NI precedes the verb in (Sp.3c), however, no additional negator is required for the sentence to be grammatical.

Sp.3

- a) **No** he visto a **nadie**
NEG AUX.1S see.PPL PREP no-one.NI
'I haven't seen anyone.'
- b) A **nadie** he visto
PREP no-one.NI AUX.1S see.PPL
'No one I have seen.'
- c) **Nadie** lo ha visto
no-one.NI it AUX.3S see.PPL
'No one has seen it.'

Zanuttini fails, however, to address any instances in which a negative indefinite can occur in post-verbal position without the presence of *no* in preverbal position. Post-verbal negative indefinites can appear in the complements of negative prepositions, negative embedding predicates and adversative predicates, certain emotive predicates, and comparative-like contexts (Herburger, 297) (S.6a-b) provide additional examples similar to those seen earlier in (S.7a-c) The supposed inherently negative nature of the indefinite is put into question, as no negative meaning is extracted from the indefinite in translation.

Sp.3

- d) Pedro compró el terreno sin
Pedro buy.PST.3S the land without
contarselo a **nadie**
tell.INF.CL.it PREP no-one.NI
'Pedro bought the land without telling anybody'
- e) Dudo que vayan a encontrar **nadie**
Doubt.PRES.1S that go.SUBJ.3P to find.INF no-one.NI
'I doubt he will find anyone'

In Spanish, negative indefinite adverbs cannot occur between an auxiliary verb and its complement. A sentential negator is not necessary, though the negative indefinite adverb must appear pre-verbally. It is interesting to note that the subsequent negative indefinite in the examples (Sp.3f-g) is interchangeable with a positive indefinite.

Sp.3

- f) Maria **nunca** habría dicho algo/**nada** así
 Maria never.NI AUX.COND.3S see.PPL something/nothing as such
 'Maria never would have said something like that.'
- g) **Nunca** habría dicho Maria algo/**nada** así
 never.NI AUX.COND.3S see.PPL Maria something/nothing as such
 'Never would Maria have said something like that.'

Standard Italian complies with Zanutini's description as well. When the negative indefinite, such as *nessuno* follows the verb, *non* must precede it. However, when the NI precedes the verb, *non* is not needed. It should be noted, however, that sentences like (It.3b) are not very common, and the object of the verb is usually only inverted to add emphasis. Sentences such as (It.3c), where the NI is acting as a subject are much more acceptable.

It.3

- a) **Non** ho visto **nessuno**.
 NEG AUX.1S see.PPL no-one.NI
 'I have seen no one.'
- b) **Nessuno**, ho visto.
 No-one.NI AUX.1S see.PPL
 'No one I have seen.'
- c) **Nessuno** l'ha visto.
 no-one.NI it.CL-AUX.3S see.PPL
 'No one saw it'

Negative indefinite adverbs often occur between an auxiliary verb and its complement, as in (It.4a) where *mai* comes between the auxiliary *avrebbe* and the complement *detto*. When it follows the auxiliary, however, it is important that *non* is in pre-verbal position. Again, when the NI precedes the verb, *non* is not needed. Unlike (It.3b) above, where the NI acted as an object, the NI *mai*, which acts as an adverb, can frequently occur in preverbal position.

It.3

- d) Maria **non** avrebbe **mai** detto una cosa
 Maria NEG AUX.COND.3S never.NI say.PPL a thing
 del genere.
 of-the sort
 'Maria would have never said anything like that.'
- e) **Mai** Maria **non** avrebbe detto una cosa
 never.NI Maria NEG AUX.COND.3S say.PPL a thing
 del genere.
 of-the sort
 'Never would Maria have said anything like that.'

Standard Catalan functions accordingly, and a negative indefinite in post-verbal position typically cannot appear without a pre-verbal *no*. Post-verbally this is not the case, as the negative indefinite can appear without the presence of a prior *no*. An expletive negator *no* can appear after the indefinite, but it is purely optional.

Ca.3

- a) **No** he vist **ningú**
NEG have.1S see.PPL no-one.NI
- b) A **ningú** (**no**) he vist
PREP no-one.NI NEG have.1S see.PPL
- c) **Ningú** (**no**) m'ha vist
no-one.NI NEG me.AUX.3S see.PPL

'I haven't seen anyone.'

Additionally, like in Spanish, negative indefinites can be licensed in post-verbal negative indefinites, in the complements of negative prepositions, negative embedding predicates and adversative predicates, certain emotive predicates, and comparative-like contexts. See the example (Ca.3d).

Ca.3 (Espinal, 2000a:54)

- d) Abans que passi **res**, jo me
Before that happen.SUBJ.3S nothing 1S CL

n'aniria
CL.go.COND.1S

'Before anything happens, I would go.'

In the Roussillon dialect of Catalan, spoken in Northern Catalonia and in Southwestern France, negative indefinites do not require the presence of a pre-verbal *no*, rendering (RC.a-c) grammatical.

RC. (Espinal, 2000b:565)

- a) Jo he vist **ningú**
1S he have.1S seen no one
'I have seen no one'
- b) He menjat **res**
have.1S eaten nothing
'I ate nothing'
- c) En parla **mai**
of.it. speak.3S never
'S/he never talks about it.'

In (RC.a-c), unlike the example in (Ca.3d), the negative indefinites retain a fully negative value and cannot be interpreted as 'someone', 'something', and 'ever', respectively. This departs from Zannutini's claim that negative indefinites are universal quantifiers. To the contrary, it might be best to describe negative indefinites as indefinites having a variable quantificational nature (Matos, 563).

Sicilian also complies with this generalization. When a negative indefinite appears after the verb, the pre-verbal negative marker *unn* is

necessary (Si.3a). On the other hand, when the negative indefinite precedes the verb, *unn* is not needed (Si.3b)

Si.3 (Privitera: 34)

- a) **Unn** haiu vistu **nessunu**
 NEG AUX.1S see.PPL no-one.NI
 'I have seen nobody'
- b) **Nessun** populu u pussedi
 no-one.NI people it possess
 'No people possesses it'

No overt evidence was found regarding a compulsory pre-verbal negative marker in the presence of a post-verbal negative in Venetian. However, the negative imperative can stand alone when it is preverbal. Since Venetian seems to be following many of the Zanuttini's trends for Group 1, I would posit that a post-verbal negative indefinite requires a preverbal negative marker as well.

Ve.3 (Poletto:141)

- a) **Nisun** magna
 Nobody.NI eat.PRES.3S
 'Nobody eats' (P:141)

Zanuttini generalizes that languages in Group 3 do not adhere to the same constraints. "In these languages, it is possible to find [negative indefinites] in post-verbal position in the absence of a negative element co-occurring in pre-verbal position" (Zanuttini 1997b: 220). French does support this statement in that it is possible to find negative indefinites in such a position—however only in informal/colloquial language. Otherwise, in MSF, the pre-verbal negative particle is required.

Fr.8

- a) Je n'ai vu **personne.**
 1S NEG-AUX.1S see.PPL nobody.NI
- b) ?J'ai vu **personne.** (acceptable in colloquial French)
 1S-AUX.1S see.PPL nobody.NI
 'I have seen no one.'

As seen in (Fr.9), negative indefinites do not even seem possible in preverbal positions.

Fr.9

- a)****Personne** n'ai-je vu.
 nobody.NI NEG-AUX.1S-1S see.PPL
- b)****Personne** je n'ai vu.
 nobody.NI 1S NEG-AUX.1S see.PPL
- c)****Personne** j'ai vu.
 nobody.NI 1S see.PPL

'No one I have seen.' (= (Fr.8a,b) but with emphasis on *no one* in English)

However, (Fr.10) does show a grammatical instance of NI fronting with *jamais*. In both sentences below, *ne* is required in MSF despite the NI's position relative to the verb.

Fr.10

- a) Marie **n'**aurait **jamais** rien dit de tel.
 Marie NEG-AUX.COND.3S never.NI nothing say.PPL of such
 'Marie would have never said anything like that.'
- b) **Jamais** Marie **n'**aurait rien dit de tel.
 Never.NI Marie NEG-AUX.COND.3S nothing say.PPL of such
 'Never would Marie have said anything like that.'

It seems difficult to make a strong typological statement about this construction for Group 3 languages (except that these languages do not impose the same constraint as found in Group 1) since, on the surface level in these languages, NIs in post-verbal position appear in varying positions and with varying co-occurrence of pre-verbal negative particles with different degrees of acceptability.

4. Yes/No questions

Again in Group 1 languages, "A question is formed by maintaining the same word-order found in non-interrogative clauses, where the negative marker precedes the subject clitic, which in turn precedes the finite verb" (Zanuttini 1997b: 221).

It is more difficult to prove Zanuttini's final generalization in Standard Spanish as it is a pro-drop language and does not utilize mandatory subject clitics. Therefore the pronoun is optional in the following sentences, and no subject clitic is necessary. The only exception to this lies in certain reflexive clitics that obligatorily appear immediately preceding certain verbs. If the pronoun isn't dropped, it can appear on either side of the verb in positive or negative questions. The sentential negator *no*, however, must always appear pre-verbally.

Sp.4

- a) ¿Viene (él?) / ¿(él) viene?
 come.PRES.3S (he.SUB) (he.SUB) come.PRES.3S
 'Is he coming?'
- b) ¿No viene (él?) / ¿(él) no viene?
 NEG come.PRES.3S (he.SUB) (he.SUB) NEG come.PRES.3S
 'Isn't he coming?'
- c) ¿(Tú) te vas? / ¿Te vas (tú)?
 (you.SUB) RFL.2S go.PRES.2S RFL.2S go.PRES.2S (you.SUB)
 'Are you leaving?'
- d) ¿(Tú) no te vas? /
 (you.SUB.) NEG RFL.2S go.PRES.2S /
 ¿No te vas (tú)?
 NEG RFL.2S go.PRES.2S (you.SUB)
 'Aren't you leaving?'

Standard Italian functions similarly to Spanish in that it is a pro-drop language and does not require the presence of subject clitics. The pronouns appearing in the following sentences are optional and can appear on either side of the verb in positive and negative questions. If the pronoun is not dropped and is placed before the verb, it also comes before the negative marker *non* (It.4b and It.4d). It is clear, however, that, when used, the negative marker *non* must always precede the verb and is never inverted.

It.4

- a) Viene (lui)? / (Lui) viene?
Come.PRES.3S (he.SUB) / (he.SUB) come.PRES.3S
'Is he coming?'
- b) **Non** viene, (lui)? / (Lui) **non** viene?
NEG come.PRES.3S, (he.SUB) / (he.SUB) NEG come.PRES.3S
'Doesn't he come?'
- c) Parti, (tu)? / (tu) parti?
Leave.PRES.2S (you.SUB) / (you.SUB) leave.PRES.2S
'Are you leaving?'
- d) **Non** parti, (tu)? / (tu) **non** parti?
NEG leave.PRES.2S, (you.SUB) / (you.SUB) NEG leave.PRES.2S
'Aren't you leaving?'

We might not see the trends Zanuttini suggests due to Standard Italian's lack of subject clitics. Her argument becomes weaker since she does not explicitly define some of the prerequisites that make her claim valid.

Ca.4

- a) Ve (ell)? / (Ell) ve?
Come.PRES.3S (he.SUB) / (he.SUB) Come.PRES.3S
'Is he coming?'
- b) **No** ve (ell)? / (Ell) **no** ve?
NEG come.PRES.3S (he.SUB) / (he.SUB) NEG come.PRES.3S
'Isn't he coming?'
- c) (Tu) te'n vas? / Te'n vas (tu)?
(you.SUB) RFL.CL go.PRES.2S / RFL.CL go.PRES.2S (you.SUB)
'Are you leaving?'
- d) (Tu) **no** te'n vas? /
(you.SUB) NEG RFL.CL go.PRES.2S /
No te'n vas (tu)?
NEG RFL.CL go.PRES.2S (you.SUB)
'Aren't you leaving?'

Although no explicit examples of negative yes/no questions could be found for Sicilian, it appears to exhibit similar characteristics to Italian interrogatives. Sicilian appears to be a pro-drop language, since the person and number are reflected in the verb inflection, therefore no subject markers of any kind are necessary in either positive or negative questions. In negative question formation, it seems that the negative marker must still precede the verb.

Si.4 (Privitera: 38-41)

- a) Ha parratu di so patri?
AUX.3S speak.PPL of his father
'Has he spoken of this father?'
- b) Pirchì **unn** rispunni?
Why NEG respond.PRES.2S
'Why don't you respond?'

Languages in Group 3, on the other hand, “show inversion of the verb around the pronominal subject” (Zanuttini 1997b: 222). French is in accordance with Zanuttini’s description above as seen in (X.14) and in the examples below.

Fr.11

- a) Vient-il?
come.3S-he.Q
'Is he coming?'
- b) **Ne** vient-il **pas**?
NEG come.3S-he.Q NEG
'Isn't he come?'

Fr.12

- a) Pars-tu?
leave.2S-2S.Q
'Are you leaving?'
- b) **Ne** pars-tu **pas**?
NEG leave.2S-2S.Q NEG
'Aren't you leaving?'

Wallon also supports her supposition as seen in the example below.

Wa.1

- N'è-ç **nin** come dès cantikes ou cwè?
NEG-is-it.EXPL NEG like PART odes or what?
'Isn't it like odes, or what?'

IV. DISCUSSION OF GROUP 2 LANGUAGES

Jespersen's Cycle

The three groups we mention in this paper can be analyzed as having come from a diachronic change that Linguists often refer to as Jespersen's cycle—each group giving us a synchronic example of Languages at different stages in the cycle. We know that the Romance languages have Late Latin (*sermo vulgaris*) as their common root. So, why is it that there is disparity among the ways in which they form negatives? Jespersen's cycle gives us an historical perspective on these phenomena. Jespersen generalizes that many languages initially have one negative marker, which for one reason or another (often thought to be phonetic) weakens and is then bolstered by a second marker (often an adverb or NP). Eventually, the original marker becomes even weaker, rendering it optional. Finally the original marker is deleted altogether leaving the "new" particle to be the sole marker of negation in the language. From here, the cycle may start again. Jespersen (1924/1992) gives us examples citing Latin and one of its "offspring" languages, French. Latin *ne* became too weak and was then strengthened by *oenum*. This construction, *ne-oenum*, gave rise to Latin *non*, which subsequently (over centuries, of course) lost its stress and became French *ne*. French *ne* was the only negative marker for a while until it was thought to be too weak and was strengthened by *pas* (Zanuttini 1997a: 12).

This is the current state of Standard Modern French; however, in spoken French, *ne* is optional and is often deleted, while in colloquial French and certain dialects, e.g., Québécois, *ne* has been deleted altogether.

J.1⁸

- | | | | | |
|----|-----|------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) | Jeo | ne | di. | (up to 1600) |
| b) | Jeo | ne | dis (pas). | (1600 - 1700) |
| c) | Je | ne | dis pas. | (Standard written French) |
| d) | Je | (ne) | dis pas. | (Standard spoken French) |
| e) | Je | | dis pas. | (Colloquial French & some dialects) |

Recalling the groups of languages we outlined earlier, we can associate each group with a stage in Jespersen's cycle. Group 1 has pre-verbal negative particles. Group 3 languages are in the stage where pre-verbal and post-verbal markers co-occur; and, Group 2 languages have lost their pre-verbal marker leaving only the post-verbal one.

Many of the Northern dialects of Italy, such as Piedmontese, use only a post-verbal negative marker, instead of the pre-verbal or a co-occurrence of the two. Zanuttini cites several examples in her article (Zanuttini 1997), exemplifying various word-orderings of Piedmontese. There are two different negative markers in this language variety: *pa* and *nen*. *Nen* functions as the regular negation marker, while *pa* conveys some type of presuppositional knowledge. It appears that both always appear after the verb (J.2a). When there is an auxiliary verb, the negative marker comes between the auxiliary and its complement (J.2b).

J.2 (Zanuttini 1997b)

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------|------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| a) | Gianni | a | capis | pa / nen | tut. |
| | Gianni | SUB.CL | understand | NEG / NEG | everything |
| | 'Gianni doesn't understand everything.' | | | | |
| b) | Gianni | a | l'ha | pa / nen | capì tut. |
| | Gianni | SUB.CL | CL-AUX.3S | NEG / NEG | understand.PPL everything |
| | 'Gianni didn't understand everything.' | | | | |

Interestingly, when forming a negative imperative, both negative markers can be used but only in one order: *pa* + *nen*. Again, the negative marker is found after the verb.

J.3 (Zanuttini 1997b)

- | | | | | |
|----|------------------|-----------|------------|------|
| a) | Fa | pa | nen | sulì |
| | do.IMP.2S | NEG | NEG | that |
| | 'Don't do that!' | | | |

Milanese, spoken around Milan in Northern Italy, also exhibits similar tendency towards post-verbal negation. In the example below, the negative marker *minga* comes after the finite verb.

⁸ from Jespersen 1924/1992, pp 335-6 as quoted in Rowlett pp89-93

J.4 (Zanuttini 1997b)

a)	L'a	minga	semper	vinciü
	SUB.CL-AUX.3S	NEG	always	win.PPL
	'He didn't always win'			

It is interesting to note, however, that when using the negative marker *no*, it must come after the final verb. This means that in cases with the auxiliary + complement, the negative marker *no* comes after the complement.

J.5 (Zanuttini 1997b)

a)	El	l'ha	scrivuu	no
	SUB.CL	CL-AUX.3S	write.PPL	NEG
	'He hasn't written.'			
b)**El	l'ha	no	scrivuu	
	SUB.CL	CL-AUX.3S	NEG	write.PPL
	'He hasn't written.'			

In the dialect of Occitan spoken by the Valdese [val.'de.ze] in the valleys of the Italian Alps—as well as in Valdese ['væl.diz], North Carolina—sentential negation is formed by inserting the particle *pâ* after the verb—or in the case of compound tenses, following the AUX.

Pa.1 (Pons, C.)

Vöi	pâ	anar.
want.1S	NEG	go.INF
'I don't want to go.'		

Pa.2

E	d'aurâ	ocaziun	parlu	pâ	Patouà,	s'no chë	nü	völën
And	PART.other	occasion.P	speak.1S	NEG	Patouà,	unless	1P	want.1P

dire	düi	mus	chë	nü	völën	pâ	li	autri	capisën.
say.INF	two	word	REL	1P	want.1P	NEG	ART.P	other.P	understand.3P

'And on other occasions, I don't speak Patouà, unless we want to say something that we don't want the others to understand.'

However, the negative article precedes infinitival forms of the verb.

Pa.3

Ai	dësidrà	dë	pâ	partir.
AUX	decided.PPL	PREP	NEG	leave.INF
'I (have) decided not to go.'				

Negative Indefinites

The same structure is true with negative indefinites in this dialect (hereafter referred to as Waldensian Patouà or, simply, Patouà) i.e., the negative particle follows the verb.

zamá

Pa.4 (Pons, T.)

À	sorto	zamá.
3S	goes.3S	never.NI
'He never goes there.'		

Pa.5
 ĩ sun zamé anà vio.
 3P AUX.3P never.NI go.3S away
 'They don't ever go away.'

papì

Pa.6
 ĩ lu trobbën papì.
 3P him find.3P no more.NI
 'They don't find him anymore.'/'They find him no more.'

For the following two negative indefinites, the *pâ* is optional and, when used, is emphatic.

nün

Pa.7
 lh'èro (pâ) nün.
 there-was.3S (NEG) no one.NI
 'There wasn't anyone.'/'There was no one.'

rién

Pa.8
 Ā fai (pâ) rién.
 3S do.3S (NEG) nothing.NI
 'Je does nothing. / (He doesn't do *nothing*. {emphatic})'

Negative Imperatives

In negative imperatives in Patouà, the position of the negative particle relative to the verb does not change with the co-occurrence of pronominal clitics, i.e., it follows the verb AND any cliticized pronouns in keeping with the normal paradigm for forming imperatives—positive or negative.

Pa.9 (Pons, C.)
 Mùtrà-nù-li!
 show.IMP-us-them
 'Show them to us!'

Pa.10
 Parlo-li-nén pà!
 speak.IMP-to.them-about.it NEG
 'Don't talk to them about it!'

Negation in interrogatives with inversion

In Patouà, interrogative sentences can be formed by inversion. Their negative counterparts are negated by placing the *pâ* after the inverted pronoun, yielding V-PRO *pâ*.

Pa.11
 a) Vënê-tü?
 Come.2S-2S-(Q)
 'Are you coming?'

- b) Vènê-tù pà?
Come.2S-2S-(Q) NEG
'Aren't you coming?'

Pa.12

Î vénên-lò pà?
3P come.3P-3P NEG?
'Are they not coming?'

Pa.13

À di-lò pà riên?
3S say.3S-3S.Q NEG nothing.NI
'He isn't saying anything?'

As a sidenote, we also find evidence of the pleonastic negative in Patouà

Pa.14 (Pons, T.)

Ai tant dè vaccia cum (tù n'â) tù.
1S as.many PART cow.P as (2S EXPL-have.2S) 2S.
'I have as many cows as you (do).'

Québécois

Lastly, we have an interesting note on Québécois, which has lost its pre-verbal negative marker. In relation to French, we can see that Québécois has evolved into the next stage of Jespersen's cycle where the post-verbal particle now stands alone as the only negative marker.

Q.1 (Riverin)

Chu	pas	allé	à	l'école	aujourd'hui.
Be.1S	NEG	go.PPL	to	ART-school	today.

I didn't go to school today.

Q.2

Y	parle	pas	jamais.
3S	speak.3S	NEG	never.NI

'He never speaks.'

V. CONCLUSION: THIS IS NOT AN INTRODUCTION

In conclusion, we found that Zanuttini's generalizations, although true for several RL, cannot be applied to all. Even if some languages strategically fit into one of her three negation-groups, they did not always act in accordance with her predictions. We felt that she had a more clear-cut typological claim for Group 1, left room for too many exceptions in Group 3, and barely addressed Group 2. We also faced some difficulties in culling enough examples in various language varieties to make strong claims either for or against some of her arguments. In general, linguistic resources for less commonly spoken Romance languages are inaccessible outside of the region in which they are spoken. We based a good portion of our original proposal on native speaker informants. Unfortunately, due to the nature of fieldwork and working with informants, we did not get as much returned data as we had hoped. Due to the lack of relevant data, we

could not find any substantial trends for Group 2 regarding Zanuttini's generalizations, which we had hoped to do.

WORKS CITED

- Bernini, G., & Ramat, P. (1996). *Negative sentences in the languages of Europe: A typological approach*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Espinal, M.T. (1991). Negation in Catalan. Some remarks with regard to *no pas*. *Working papers in Catalan linguistics*, 1, 33-63.
- Espinal, M. T. (2000a). Expletive Negation, Negative Concord, and Feature Checking. *Working papers in Catalan linguistics*, 8, 47-69
- Espinal, M.T. (2000b). On the semantic status of n-words in Catalan and Spanish. *Lingua*, 100, 557-580.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. (2002). N-words and negative concord. (unpublished) *The Linguistics Companion*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Herburger, E. (2001). The negative concord puzzle revisited. *Natural Language Semantics*, 9, 289-333
- Hirsch, E. (1978). *Provenzalische Mundarttexte aus Piemont*
- Jespersen, O. (1992). *The Philosophy of Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kim, J. (1995). The grammar of negation : A lexicalist constraint-based approach.
- Lepschy, A. L. & Lepschy, G. C. (1977). *The Italian language today*. London: Hutchinson.
- Matos, G. (1999). Negative concord and the scope of negation. *Working papers in Catalan linguistics*, 7, 175-90
- Morvan, C. (2008). Personal communication with Bryan Fleming
- Muller, C. (1991). *La négation en français : Syntaxe, sémantique et éléments de comparaison avec les autres langues romanes*. Genève: Droz.
- Poletto, C. (2000). *The higher functional field : Evidence from northern Italian dialects*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pons, C. R. (1990). *Language Death among Waldensians of Valdese, North Carolina*. Unpublished PhD, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Pons, T. G. (1973). *Dizionario del dialetto valdese della val germanasca (Torino)*. Torre Pellice: Collana della società di studi valdesi.
- Price, S., (1990). *Comparative constructions in Spanish and French syntax*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Privitera, J. F. (1998). *Basic Sicilian : A brief reference grammar*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Riverin, P. (2008). Personal communication with Bryan Fleming, [text message from 24 April 2008].
- Rowlett, P. (1998). *Sentential negation in French*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zanuttini, R. (1997a). *Negation and clausal structure: A comparative study of romance languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zanuttini, R. (1997b). Negation and verb movement. In L. M. V. Haegeman (Ed.), *The new comparative syntax* (pp. 214-). London; New York: Longman.