Negation in Salentino

Simone Barco (Università degli Studi di Trento)

New data from Northern and Central Salentino revealed a previously unnoticed feature of negation. In these varieties the negative clause is formed by the addition of the particle ci to the negative marker *non*, as the example in (1a) shows.

(1)

a. Non ci mangiu NEG CI eat.1SG 'I don't eat'

It is noteworthy to underline that Northern and Central Salentino do not allow the switch from (1a) to (1b):

(1)

b. * Non mangiu NEG eat.1SG 'I don't eat'

That seems to suggest that ci is mandatory in clausal negation. As a consequence, addressing the issue of the morphosyntactic nature of ci in the Salentino negative sentence would be worthwhile. This talk aims to report on the early findings of an ongoing research project in order to explain this doubling negation's behaviour.

Essentially, in Salentino, (n)ci is a third-person singular dative clitic (<HINCE) (Rohlfs 1968). However, in the gathered negative sentences, ci cannot have this function. At the same time, the possibility that Salentino ci is a homophone of the Italian locative clitic ci can be ruled out since Salentino is notoriously lacking locative clitics (Avolio 1995: 89). Indeed, if the ci found in the negative sentence was a locative pronoun, we should find it in the corresponding affirmative sentence as well, which it is not. As a matter of fact, the negative sentence in (2a) cannot be turned into the affirmative in (2b).

(2)

a. Non ci sta vvau NEG CI AUX RF.go.1SG 'I will not go'
b. * Ci sta vvau CI AUX RF.go.1SG 'I will go'

Similarly, the sentence in (3a) cannot be rendered in negation as in (3b) as the negative form requires the presence of ci.

(3)

a. Sta vvau AUX RF.go.1SG 'I will going' b. * Non sta vvau NEG AUX RF.go.1SG 'I will not going'

These data suggest that ci is a marker of negation. However, in its interaction with *non*, this particle appears to syntactically act as a clitic, even though it has no pronominal function. For example, as a clitic, ci follows the preverbal negation *non* (Zanuttini 1997: 18). At the same time, it is relevant to investigate the response of ci to Clitic Climbing (Rizzi 1982), because the particle can move and be split from the other negation marker if the verb *want* is present. Hence, (4a) and (4b) are both possible.

(4)

- a. Non ci voju pparlu NEG CI want.1SG RF.talk.1SG 'I don't want to talk'
- b. No bboju nci parlu NEG want.1SG CI talk.1SG 'I don't want to talk'

The analysis that will be presented will also take into account the behaviour of this non + ci in connection with the minimizer *filu* (Ledgeway 2017), the negative marker *mancu* (Garzonio & Poletto 2014), the complementizers ca/cu (Ledgeway 2012).

The aim is to introduce such a negation pattern previously unnoticed in the literature, discussing preliminary data collected in eight cities of the Northern and Central Salento.

Selected References

- Avolio, Francesco. 1995. Bommèspro. Profilo linguistico dell'Italia centro-meridionale. San Severo: Gerni.
- Garzonio, Jacopo and Cecilia Poletto. 2014. 'The Negative Marker that Escaped the Cycle: some Notes on *manco*'. In C. Contemori and L. Dal Pozzo (eds.), *Inquiries into Linguistic Theory and Language Acquisition. Papers offered to Adriana Belletti*. Siena: CISCL Press, 181–97.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. 'Contatto e mutamento: Complementazione e complementatori nei dialetti del Salento'. Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata, 41(3): 459–80.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2017. 'Marking Presuppositional Negation in the Dialects of Southern Italy'. In S. Cruschina, K. Hartmann and E. Remberger (eds.), *Negation: Syntax, Semantics, and Variation.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 105–30.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. Issues in Italian syntax. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1968. Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Morfologia. Torino: Einaudi.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997. Negation and Clausal Structure: a Comparative Study of Romance Languages. Oxford: Oxford University Press.