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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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>ungrammatical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,3</td>
<td>first, second, third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>Used for numbering examples of Catalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>comparative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPL</td>
<td>expletive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/Fr</td>
<td>Used for numbering examples of French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/It</td>
<td>Used for numbering examples of Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPRF</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSF</td>
<td>Modern Standard French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>negative indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>Used for numbering examples of Waldensian Patouà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>partitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>past participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Used for numbering examples of Roussillon Catalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>Romance Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/Sp</td>
<td>Used for numbering examples of Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Used for numbering examples of Sicilian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ve</td>
<td>Used for numbering examples of Venetian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/Wa</td>
<td>Used for numbering examples of Walloon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Used for numbering examples in the Introduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 | non | ha | telefonato | a | sua madre. (Italian)² |
| Gianni | NEG | AUX | phone.PPL | PREP | his mother |
| b) Juan | no | ha | llamado | a | su madre. (Spanish) |
| Juan | NEG | AUX | call.PPL | PREP | his mother |
| c) El DET | Joan | no | a | trucat | a sa mare. (Catalan)³ |
| Joan | NEG | AUX | call.PST | PREP | his mother |
| d) João DET | não | ligou | para | sua mãe (Portuguese) |
| João | NEG | call.PST | PREP | his mother |
| e) Jon | nu-i | telefonea | phone.PST | mamei | lui. (Romanian) |
| jon | NEG-AUX | |

'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

| He | parle | pas | jamais. (Québécois) |
| talk.PRES | | NEG | never.NI |

'He never talks'

X.4

| Vôl want.PRES.3S | pas | venir. (Occitan) |
| | NEG | come.INF |

'He doesn’t want to come'

¹ *Nota bene*: Zanuttini refers to Group 3 as "Pre-verbal negative markers, 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 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 hablan! (Spanish)
   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 Friulian, 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? | 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).
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II. Negation in LangX

1. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>Él</th>
<th>come</th>
<th>He</th>
<th>eat.PRES.3S</th>
<th>‘He eats’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Él</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>NEG eat.PRES.3S</td>
<td>‘He doesn’t eat’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>Él</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>Ha</th>
<th>comido</th>
<th>He NEG AUX.3S eat.PPL</th>
<th>‘He has not eaten.’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td><strong>Él</strong></td>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>comido</td>
<td>He AUX.3S NEG eat.PPL</td>
<td>‘He has not eaten.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 negator *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 falsas
Is-there who doubt.SUBJ.3S that NEG be.PRES.3P false 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
deberes laverle 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 AUX₃S 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.PRES₂S something tell.IMP₃S.me
‘If you find anything, tell me.’
b)**Si encuentras nada avísame
If find.PRES₂S nothing.NI tell.IMP₃S.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.SUBJ₂S
‘Don’t talk!’
b)**Hables no!
talk.IMP.SUBJ₂S 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.

1.2
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.

1.3
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.

1.4
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.).

1.5 (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.

1.6

a) **Non**  
   NEG  
   comparto  
   ho  
   niente.  
   AUX.tS  
   buy.PPL  
   ‘I didn’t buy anything.’ (Lit. ‘I did not buy nothing’)

b) **Ho**  
   AUX.tS  
   comparto  
   niente.  
   buy.PPL  
   ‘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 1.7a, is not very common in Standard Italian, although it is not considered incorrect.

1.7

a) **Niente**  
   Nothing.NI  
   comparto  
   ho  
   ‘Nothing I have bought’

b) **Nessuno**  
   no-one.NI  
   comparto  
   ha  
   il libro  
   ‘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. 1.8 below shows a variety of ways in which Italian can express ‘he arrived earlier than I expected.’ The *non* in 1.8a and 1.8b does not negate the verb *aspettassi*, but instead adds emphasis to the comparison.

1.8 (Lepschy: 107)

a) **è**  
   AUX.3S  
   arrivato  
   più  
   presto  
   che  
   non  
   comparto  
   mi  
   aspettassi  
   expect.IMPRF.SUBJ.1S

b) **è**  
   AUX.3S  
   arrivato  
   più  
   presto  
   di  
   quanto  
   (non)  
   comparto  
   mi  
   aspettassi  
   expect.IMPRF.SUBJ.1S

c) **è**  
   AUX.3S  
   arrivato  
   più  
   presto  
   di  
   quello  
   che  
   comparto  
   mi  
   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.
3.S.M NEG eat.3S NEG enough

‘He doesn’t eat enough.’

**F.2**

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

‘She doesn’t go there.’

In compound tenses, *ne* preceeds 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* preceeds the pronoun. If there is more than one pronoun (which occur in a string in a systematic order), *ne* preceeds 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 *ne* *pas* manger du fromage demain.
EXP be.necessary 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.
I 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.1NF
‘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.11
Je ne osais venir.
NEG dare pst come inf
‘I don’t dare come.’ / ‘I dare not come.’

F.12
On ne peut vous aider.
NEG can 3s 2p help inf
‘We can’t help you.’

F.13
Ne peut être vendu.
NEG can 3s be inf sold ppl
(a notice on free newspapers.)
‘Cannot be sold.’

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

F.14
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 personne ‘nobody’ / ‘no one’
ne V nulle part ‘nowhere’
ne V aucun ‘none’
ne V plus ‘no more’
ne V point ‘none’
ne V rien ‘nothing’
ne V pas encore ‘(not) yet’

F.15
Jean ne nage jamais.
Jean neg swims never ni
‘Jean never swims.’

F.16
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.17
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.18
Personne ne voit Jean.
nobody ni neg see 3s john
‘No one/Nobody sees John.’
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F.19

Aucun de mes élèves ne font leurs devoirs.

'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 the door!'

F.21

Ne fermez pas la porte!

'Don’t close the door!'

F.22

Ne la fermez pas!

'Don’t close it!'

F.23

Fermez-la!

'Close it!'

F.24**

Ne fermez-la pas!

'Don’t close it!'

F.25

?Fermez-la pas!

'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?

'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.

avant que Maman ne rentre.

‘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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Juan no ha llamado a su madre. Juan NEG AUX call.PPL PREP his mother ‘Juan did not call his mother.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>En Joan no va entender tot ART Joan NEG AUX understand everything ‘Joan didn’t understand everything.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Lui non legge He NEG read.PRES.3S ‘He does not read well.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilian</td>
<td>Unn u capisciù NEG him understand.PRES.1S ‘I don’t understand him.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venetian</td>
<td>No ti vien NEG SUB.CL come.PRES.3S ‘You do not come.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group 2: Post-verbal negation only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milanese</td>
<td>L’a minga semper vincìu SUB.CL-AUX.3S NEG always win.PPL ‘He didn’t always win.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan</td>
<td>Völ pas venir. wants.3S NEG come.INF ‘He doesn’t want to come.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmontese</td>
<td>Gianni a capis pa/enen tut. Gianni SUB.CL understand NEG/NEG everything ‘Gianni doesn’t understand everything.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québécois</td>
<td>Il parle pas jamais. 3S speak.3S NEG never.NI ‘He never speaks.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldensian Patouà</td>
<td>Nû völèn pà li autri capisèn. 1P want.1P NEG ART.P other.P understand.3P ‘We don’t want the others to understand.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Il ne mange pas assez. 3S,M NEG eat.3S NEG enough ‘He doesn’t eat enough.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallon</td>
<td>N’estèut-c’ nin avou d’ l’angrêss ? NEG-bs.PST.3S-ART.EXPL NEG with PART ART- fertilizer ‘Wasn’t it with fertilizer?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Catalan</td>
<td>a) La Maria no ha pas vingut ART.F Maria NEG AUX.3S NEG come.PPL ‘Maria has not come’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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)
1. Negative markers in relation to pronominal clitics in pre-verbal position

Again, Zanutti (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 dio
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 capisci
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 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.’

Fr.2

Ne le lui 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 come!
   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 habla!
   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!'  

cf)**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!'  
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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 (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 adverbial 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 contarselo a nadie
Pedro buy.PST.3S the land without tell.1INF.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) María nunca había dicho algo/nada así María never.NI AUX.COND.3S see.PPL something/nothing as such ‘María never would have said something like that.’

g) Nunca habría dicho María algo/nada así never.NI AUX.COND.3S see.PPL María something/nothing as such ‘Never would María 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) María non avrebbe mai detto una cosa María NEG AUX.COND.3S never.NI say.PPL a thing del genere. sort de la ‘María would have never said anything like that.’

e) Mai María non avrebbe detto una cosa never.NI María NEG AUX.COND.3S say.PPL a thing del genere. sort de la ‘Never would María 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.tS see.PPL no-one.NI
b) A ningú (no) he vist
    PREP no-one.NI NEG have.tS 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 tS CL

n’aniria
    CL.go.COND.tS

‘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
    tS have.tS seen no one

‘I have seen no one’

b) He menjar res
    have.tS eaten nothing

‘I ate nothing’

c) En parlar 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 Zannutinti’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* haiv *vistu* *nessunu*

   NEG AUX.1S see.PPL no-one.NI

   ‘I have seen nobody’

b) *Nessun* populu *u* *pussédi*

   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 pre-verbal. 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.*

   iS NEG-AUX.1S see.PPL nobody.NI

b) *J’ai* vu *personne.* (acceptable in colloquial French)

   iS-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**

   nobody.NI

   *n’ai-je* vu.

   NEG-AUX.1S-1S see.PPL

b)**Personne**

   nobody.NI

   *je* *n’ai* vu.

   iS NEG-AUX.1S see.PPL

c)**Personne**

   nobody.NI

   *j’ai* vu.

   iS 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.
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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? / ¿(Tú) 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
   ¿(Tú) no te vas? / ¿(Tú) vas (tú)?
   (you.SUB) 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) Pirichi 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” (Zanittini 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
   NEG come.3S-he.Q
   ‘Isn’t he coming?’

Fr.12
a) Pars-tu?
   leave.2S-2S.Q
   ‘Are you leaving?’

b) Ne pars-tu
   NEG leave.2S-2S.Q
   ‘Aren’t you leaving?’

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

Wa.1
N’è-ç
NEG-is-it.EXPL
min come dés cantikes ou cwè?
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.1

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* capi 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 do.IMP.2S *pa* neg *nen* suli
   ‘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 (Zanutini 1997b)

a) L’a minga semper vinciu
   SUB.CL-AUX.3S  NEG  always win
   ‘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.

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

J.5 (Zanutini 1997b)

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.zè] in the valleys of the Italian Alps—as well as in Valdese [’val.diz], North Carolina—sentential negation is formed by inserting the particle pà after the verb—or in the case of compound tenses, following the AUX.

Pa.1 (Pons, C.)

Vòi pà anar.
   want.1S NEG go.INF
   ‘I don’t want to go.’

Pa.2

E d’autrà ocazziun parlu pà Patouà, s’no chë nù vòlën
   And PART.other occasion.P speak.1S NEG Patouà, unless 1P want.1P

dire duì mus chë nù vòlën pà li autri capisèn.
   say.INF two word REL 1P NEG 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 pà 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.

zamé

Pa.4 (Pons, T.)

À sorto zamé.
   3S goes.3S never.NI
   ‘He never goes there.’
I sun zamé anà vio.
3P AUX.3P never.NI go.3S away
'They don’t ever go away.'

papi

I lu trobbèn papi.
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 pà is optional and, when used, is emphatic.

nùn

lh’èro (pà) nùn.
there-was.3S (NEG) no one.NI
'There wasn’t anyone./’There was no one.’

rién

À fai (pà) rién.
do.3S (NEG) nothing.NI
’He 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-lì!
show.IMP-us-them
‘Show them to us!’

Pa.10
Parlo-li-nén
speak.IMP-to.them-about.it pà!
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 pà after the inverted pronoun, yielding V-PRO pà.

Pa.11
a) Vënh-tù?
Come.2S-2S-(Q)
‘Are you coming?’
b) Vênê-tù pâ?
Come.2S-2S-(Q) NEG
'Aren't you coming?'

Pa.12
I vênê-lò pâ?
3P come.3P-3P NEG?
'Are they not coming?'

Pa.13
À di-lò pâ rièn?
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 dê vaccia cum (tù n’â) tû.
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

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, 1000, 557-580.


Language Semantics, 9, 289-333


Chicago Press.

approach.

Hutchinson.

papers in Catalan linguistics, 7, 175-90


comparaison avec les autres langues romanes. Genève: Droz.


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.


N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press.

Riverin, P. (2008). Personal communication with Bryan Fleming, [text
message from 24 April 2008].

University Press.


Haegeman (Ed.), The new comparative syntax (pp. 214-). London; New
York: Longman.