

USES, LEVELS, AND SCOPES OF NEGATION

Yves-Ferdinand Bouvier (yvesferdi@wanadoo.fr)

1. INTRODUCTION

The terminology of negation is not uniform and not always adequate: often, a confusion of levels of analysis leads to incoherence and vagueness. Particularly illuminating for an overall understanding of negation is the difference between its uses and levels: LOGICAL vs. METALINGUISTIC instances are USES of negation; LOCAL (phrasal, constituent) vs. GLOBAL (predicate, sentential) scope are LEVELS of negation. The crossing of the two angles of analysis provides four slots:

(1)		LOGICAL	METALINGUISTIC
	LOCAL	x	x
	GLOBAL	x	x

This paper discusses the (in)existence of the four potential linguistic objects indicated by the crosses in table (1). Section 2 examines the metalinguistic negation, which is claimed to express a limited scope denoted by a distinctive stress, allowing it to apply to every level of grammatical analysis. Section 3 examines the logical negation, which is claimed to be in act either at the morphological level (§ 3.1), or at various syntactic levels (§ 3.2); within the syntactic levels, we argue for the need to draw a sharp distinction between local and global scope (§ 3.2.1), depending on the possibility to insert a scope marker (henceforth SM) that displays visible effects even when devoid of phonological realization (§ 3.2.2). Section 4 is a succinct summary made up of two synoptic tables.

2. METALINGUISTIC NEGATION

A basic distinction between two uses is often discussed in the pragmatic literature:¹ in broad outline, negation is defined as LOGICAL (also descriptive, representational, conceptual) when put on the same plane as the other words of the sentence, without conveying any particular emphasis; and as METALINGUISTIC (also procedural, computational) when used as a metalanguage able to intervene on a sentence portion by means of a distinctive stress.

The distinctive stress of metalinguistic negation has a contrastive function, often based on an echoic reprise of a preceding affirmation. As Horn (1989:402) emphasized, “metalinguistic uses of negation tend to occur in contrastive environments, either across speakers in a given discourse context or within a single speaker’s contribution”; thus the distinctive stress of metalinguistic negation presumably follows from the contrastive property of the focus projection (FocP, according to Rizzi (1997)). Now, if all metalinguistic uses do involve a focus, not all focuses are metalinguistic: a logical occurrence of a focused negative quantifier can be related to items outside of the focus as the negative particle *ne* in (2a); a metalinguistic one in (2b) cannot.

¹ See Moeschler (1997) for an overview.

- (2) a. ù PERSONNE (n')a été vu ce matin.
 NOBODY (*ne*) has been seen this morning
 'NOBODY was seen this morning.'
- b. ù C'est PERSONNE qui (*n')a été vu, pas quelqu'un!
 it is NOBODY that (**ne*) has been seen, not somebody
 'NOBODY was seen, not somebody!'

This is consistent with the observation of Tovena (1996:182), "Stress can be considered as processing information. [...] In relational terms, it signals that the stressed element has to be interpreted as outscoping any other scopal element. Or, in absolute terms, it signals that the element has to be interpreted as *se stante*". Under this analysis, one expects tangible computational consequences of (metalinguistic) contrastive stress; in fact, while the distribution of logical negation is confined within the syntactic domain and a sub-domain of the morphology (derivation and compounding), metalinguistic negation can freely select any type of constituent as a unit to negate, regardless of the level of grammatical analysis — phonology, morphology, syntax (phrase, predicate, sentence), or semantics (sentence):

(3) FIVE TYPES OF UNITS ACCESSIBLE TO METALINGUISTIC NEGATION:

- Phonological unit:* ù Pas ergot, Argot!
 'Not slant, slang!'
- Morphological unit:* ù Pas syntaxicien, syntaxOLOGUE!
 'Not syntactolog, syntactICIAN!'
- Phrasal unit:* ù Jeanne (n')a pas deux enfants, elle a TROIS AMANTS!
 'Jane has not two children, she has THREE LOVERS!'
- Predicate unit:* ù Je (ne) pars pas en vacances, je DEMENAGE DANS LES ILES!
 'I don't set off on vacation, I AM MOVING TO THE WEST INDIES!'
- Sentential unit:* ù C(e n)'est pas que l'argent (ne) fait pas le bonheur, c'est plutôt que LE BONHEUR (NE) FAIT PAS D'ARGENT!
 'It's not that money doesn't bring happiness, it's rather that HAPPINESS DOESN'T BRING MONEY!'

Metalinguistic negation, as a metalinguistic operator, can also take a logical negation as a (phrasal) unit to negate:

- (4) a. ù Je pensais ne pas venir...
 'I was thinking of not coming...'
- b. ù Puisqu'on t'a demandé de NE PAS ne pas venir!
 'We're telling you to NOT not come!'

Stressing a negative item in a sentence containing another negative item, as in (4), systematically leads to Double Negation reading (henceforth DN), namely the canceling of a negation by another, according to the mathematical principle "minus per minus equals plus"; this holds for every language, independently on its parameterization of Negative Concord (henceforth NC), namely the possibility to interpret once several occurrences of negation in a single sentence.

The stress associated with the expression of metalinguistic negation entails thus a DN reading either in 'NC languages' as Italian (5a), or in 'non-NC languages' as Standard English (5b); Tovena (1996:195(6.70)-(6.71)) emphasized, "As noted in Labov (1972), this device is used by speakers of standard and non-standard dialects of English":

- (5) a. NESSUNO non è venuto.
 NOBODY not is come
 b. NOBODY didn't come.

Since metalinguistic negation always applies to a constituent (even if intended in a broader sense than a syntactic partition), it seems reasonable to consider it as a metalinguistic use of the logical local negation. The behavior of negative quantifiers in cleft sentences supports this claim: according to Acquaviva (1996:308-309), cleft sentences bearing negative items in their focus are not characterized as negative — this is visible in Irish where negative tags are judged more plausible than positive tags before a cleft negative item. In French, such sentences require contrastive stress (the focused element is metalinguistic) AND they cannot be related to a SM (the focused element is a phrase, the focus is local):

- (6) (i) a. Û C'est PERSONNE que j(e *n)'ai vu, pas quelqu'un!
 b. * C'est personne que j(e *n)'ai vu.
 it is nobody that I (*ne) have seen, not somebody
 'I saw NOBODY, not somebody!'
 (ii) a. Û C'est RIEN que j(e *n)'ai fait, pas quelque chose!
 b. * C'est rien que j(e *n)'ai fait.
 it is nothing that I (*ne) have done, not something
 'I did NOTHING, not something!'

Giannakidou (1998:50) also referred to a fact suggesting that metalinguistic negation is a metalinguistic use of local negation: in Greek, the single item *oxi* expresses at once the constituent (local) negation and the metalinguistic negation, whereas the sentential negation has two distinct items—*dhe(n)* for the –Indicative contexts, *mi(n)* for the +Indicative contexts. We diverge nevertheless from Giannakidou (1998:51) on the interpretation of this fact: “I take it then that *oxi* expresses metalinguistic negation in Greek, and that the constituent negating reading can be subsumed thereunder. In itself, this fact is interesting because it provides empirical support to the distinction between logical and metalinguistic negation argued for in the literature”. We consider it more desirable to take metalinguistic operators as logical items deflected from their basic use: in fact, the metalinguistic use, even if it covers a broader set of units locally taken as ‘constituents’, cannot include as a proper subset the logical local negation, simply because metalinguistic and logical instances are parallel, not concurrent.

In a corollary manner, metalinguistic negation presumably obeys to analogous syntactic rules than logical negation, but crucially requests in addition a complete semantic and phonological theory of the nature and the functions of contrastive stress (and stress generally) to reach explanatory adequacy. In this connection, let us just observe that metalinguistic uses negation diverge from all the logical ones as regards their behavior with respect to the liaison rule. In the following examples, the (im)possibility of liaison can function as a test to distinguish between the two uses of negation: if the liaison is possible (s_), we are dealing with a logical instance of negation; if the liaison is impossible (*), we are dealing with a metalinguistic instance.

- (7) (i) LOGICAL NEGATION:
 Ü Je (ne) te donnerai pas une calotte!
 Ü Je ne² te donnerai pas_une calotte!
 I *ne* to-you will-give not a slap
 → { ‘I’ll give you no slap’/ ‘I won’t give you any slap.’ }
- (ii) METALINGUISTIC NEGATION:
 Ü Je (ne) te donnerai pas UNE CALOTTE!
 * Je (ne) te donnerai pas_UNE CALOTTE!
 I *ne* to-you will-give not A SLAP
 → { ‘I’ll give you zero slap’/ ‘I’ll give you more than one slap.’ }³

Leaving the phonological domain, various syntactic tests can help us to distinguish between the two uses of negation. A test that works for French is mentioned by Horn (1989:427): the presence of *non pas* forces the metalinguistic reading—thus “the negation in (8a) may be interpreted ‘contrastively’, but that in (8b) must be”:

- (8) a. Max n’a pas abattu un if, mais (il a abattu) ce pin.
 ‘Max didn’t fell a yew, but (he felled) this pine.’
 b. Max a abattu non pas un if, mais (*il a abattu) ce pin.
 ‘Max felled not a yew, but (*he felled) this pine.’

Horn (1989:ch.6.4) also proposed three crosslinguistic diagnostics. “The archetypal frame for metalinguistic negation is the *not X but Y* construction (p. 402)”, a coordinated structure that requires a semantic parallelism at logical level; nevertheless, at metalinguistic level, “semantic kinship is not a necessary criterion for the establishment of such contrast sets⁴ (p. 403)”:

- (9) a. The plate is not red but green.
 b. * The plate is not hot but green.
 c. The plate is not ‘hot’ but ‘hard’.
 [d. * The plate is not ‘hot’ but ‘green’.]

Since “the metalinguistic operator cannot incorporate morphologically as the *un-* or *iN-* prefix (p. 392)”, it cannot apply at a distance to a morphologically negated item:

- (10) I {don’t believe/ #disbelieve} they’ll win — I know they will.

Since the metalinguistic negation operates “on another level from that of the rest of the clause in which it is superficially situated, whence its impotence to trigger polarity items

² There is no *ne-drop* in the registers (formal, poetic, jocular) that make use of this type of liaison.

³ The latter implicature is used by Maurice Tillieux, *Les 3 taches*, Dupuis, 1965, plate 11:

- (i) A: “Très bien!... Je ne te donnerai pas une calotte.”
 ‘Okay!... I’ll not give you a slap.’
 B: “Bon!/ Alors je te délie.”
 ‘Alright! So I untie you.’
 A: “JET’EN DONNE TROIS!”
 ‘I’ll give you THREE slaps!’

⁴ In (9c), the “semantic kinship” is actually replaced by some ‘phonological kinship’, namely a level of analysis precisely excluded from logical negation: the ‘kinship’ requirement isn’t weakened in any way, even at metalinguistic level, since (9d) is not interpretable.

within that clause (p. 392)”, then “The negations in (11b) become more plausible when the context permits a metalinguistic interpretation (p. 401)” as in (11):

- (11) a. He is {pretty/ somewhat/ rather/ sort of/ kind of} tired (ill, tall).
 b. ?? He isn't {pretty/ somewhat/ rather/ sort of/ kind of} tired (ill, tall).
 [c. Ü He ISN'T {pretty/ somewhat/ rather/ sort of/ kind of} tired (ill, tall).

Alike, metalinguistic negation is available with idiomatic expressions of strong degree that don't allow logical negation:⁵

- (12) a. Ü Pierre a {cassé sa pipe/ largué les amarres}.
 Peter has {broken his pipe/ slipped the moorings}
 ‘Peter {died/ changed his life}.’
 b. * Pierre (n')a pas {cassé sa pipe/ largué les amarres}.
 Peter (*ne*) has not {broken his pipe/ slipped the moorings}
 c. Ü (NON,) Pierre (n')a PAS {cassé sa pipe/ largué les amarres}!
 ‘(NO,) Peter DIDN'T {die/ change his life}!’

To negate logically such expressions becomes possible only if the negative adverb scopes locally on the constituent expressing the temporality of an event, not on the event itself:

- (13) a. Ü [_{IP} Pierre [_I (n')a [_{TP} pas encore [_{VP} cassé sa pipe]]]].
 Peter *ne* has not yet broken his pipe
 ‘Peter is not yet dead.’
 b. Ü [_{IP} Pierre [_I (n')a [_{TP} jamais [_{VP} largué les amarres]]]].
 Peter *ne* has never slipped the moorings
 ‘Peter never changed his life.’

It's not surprising: the idiomaticity of the expressions in (13) is VP-internal. Since TP is higher than VP, negating the temporality isn't more difficult than emphasizing a non-negative temporality as in (14):

- (14) a. Ü [_{IP} Pierre [_I a [_{TP} déjà [_{VP} cassé sa pipe]]]].
 Peter has already broken his pipe
 ‘Peter is already dead.’
 b. Ü [_{IP} Pierre [_I a [_{TP} à plusieurs reprises [_{VP} largué les amarres]]]].
 Peter has on several occasions slipped the moorings
 ‘Peter changed his life on several occasions.’

⁵ See Bianchi (1993) for a syntactic scalar typology of idiomatic expressions. Those of strong degree which don't allow predicate negation no longer allow cleavage:

- (ii) a. * La pipe que Pierre a cassée.
 the pipe that Peter has broken
 b. * Les amarres que Pierre a larguées.
 the moorings that Peter has slipped

Those of weak degree which allow cleavage do also allow predicate negation:

- (iii) a. Ü Le lapin que Pierre a posé à Jeanne.
 the rabbit that Peter has put-down to Jane
 ‘The appointment with Jane that Peter missed.’
 b. Ü Pierre (n')a pas posé un/ de lapin à Jeanne.
 Peter (*ne*) has not put-down a/ PARTITIVE rabbit to Jane
 ‘Peter didn't stand Jane up.’

- d. in- [also allomorphs im-, ir-, il-⁷]: C'est illégal. = C(e n)'est pas légal.
 'It's illegal.' = 'It's not legal.'
- e. mé-: C'est mécompréhensible. = C(e n)'est pas compréhensible.
 'It's misunderstandable.' = 'It's not understandable.'
- f. non-: C'est non-valide. = C(e n)'est pas valide.
 'It's non-valid.' = 'It's not valid.'

This systematic equivalence suggests that morphological negation constitutes a given level, on a par with the syntactic ones. Such analysis finds support in the fact that morphologically negative nouns select for a PP containing a negative operator⁸ able to combine with NPIs:

- (17) a. Û L'impossibilité de rencontrer qui que ce soit plaît à Pierre.
 the impossibility to meet whoever pleases to Peter
 'The impossibility to meet anybody suites Peter.'
- b. * La possibilité de rencontrer qui que ce soit plaît à Pierre.
 the possibility to meet whoever pleases to Peter
 'The possibility to meet anybody suites Peter.'

Morphologically negative adjectives can also satisfy the need of negative complement expressed by a negative coordination:

- (18) a. Û Jeanne est belle mais antipathique.
 'Jane is pretty but unpleasant.'
- b. * Jeanne est belle mais sympathique.
 'Jane is pretty but pleasant.'

Within the compounding domain, morphological negation faithfully reproduces the syntactic '*Ne*-insertion condition' (see (24) below). Since *ne* is a SM always indicating global negation, we can make the following prediction: if a compound does contain *ne*, it results from the lexicalization of an IP (or a CP); if a compound results from the lexicalization of a QP (or an NP), it cannot contain *ne*. The prediction is borne out by the data of Bouvier (1999):

⁷ The regressive assimilation rule is no longer in use: some old words lexicalized with the phonological allomorph coexist with new words prefixed with the base-particle (and the two manners do largely overlap):

- (iv) (i) a. irrémissible [1234], irrégulier [1283], irrationnel [1361], irrégieux [1406], irréfléchi [1784],
 irréal [1794], irremplaçable [1845]
 b. inracontable [1796], inratable [1928]
 (ii) a. illégal [1361], illicite [1364], illégitime [1458], illisible [1686]
 b. inlassable [1888]

No word beginning with m- is attested with the base-prefix, but it's a mere written convention — in fact, the pronunciation differs in an unpredictable way:

- (v) a. [imyabl] [1327], [imateRiEl] [1336], [imAÿyRabl] [1350], [imobil] [1370], [imakyle] [1400],
 [imeRite] [1455], [imodeRe] [xv^e], [imatyR] [1504], [imorAl] [1660], [imotive] [1866]
 b. [E]nAÿabl [1600], [E]marjabl [1611], [E]nAÿabl [1652], [E]netabl [1845]

⁸ This analysis was suggested by Rizzi [p.c.].

- (19) (i) LEXICALIZATION OF AN IP (OR A CP):
- Ü [je ne sais quel]_Q, [on ne sait quel]_Q⁹ ‘I don’t know what’
 - Ü un [je-ne-sais-quoi]_N, des [je-ne-sais-quoi]_N ‘a certain something’
 - Ü [naguère]_{Adv}¹⁰ † ‘not long ago’, ‘formerly’
 - † un [ne-m’oubliez-pas]_N, des [ne-m’oubliez-pas]_N ‘a forget-me-not’
 - Ü [n’empêche]_C ‘honestly!’
 - Ü [n’est-ce pas]_C ‘isn’t it’
 - Ü [n’importe]_Q¹¹ ‘any’
- (ii) LEXICALIZATION OF A QP (OR AN NP):
- ∪ un [pabô]_N, des [pabôs]_N ‘a not-pretty’
 - ∪ un [panoupanou]_N, des [panoupanous]_N¹² ‘an African black’
 - Ü un [pataquès]_N, des [pataquès]_N¹³ ‘a wrong liaison’
 - Ü un [pas grand-chose]_N, des [pas grand-chose]_N ‘a good-for-nothing’

3.2. Syntactic levels, or ‘external negation’

3.2.1. Toward local & global levels through scope contrasts

If internal negation is a morphological fact, conversely external negation is in act at some syntactic levels. In the footsteps of Klima (1964), two levels are traditionally individuated, namely CONSTITUENT vs. SENTENTIAL NEGATION. Horn (1989:184-185(33)) reviewed various tests elaborated throughout time to distinguish between them: “The construct of sentence negation [...] is standardly defined by reference to the diagnostics provided by Klima (1964), whose test frames include those in (20i-v), where only the (a) examples pass the test for SENTENTIAL (S-) negation; the (b) sentences contain CONSTITUENT negation”:

- (20) (i) *either* (vs. *too*) tags:
- Mary isn’t happy and John isn’t happy either.
 - Mary is unhappy and John is unhappy {*either/ too}.
- (ii) *neither* (vs. *so*) tags:
- Mary isn’t happy and neither is John.
 - Mary is unhappy and {*neither/ so} is John.

⁹ Fully lexicalized quantifier that has to modify a noun, but exhibits word atomicity:

- (vi) a. 1ST PERSON (SPOKEN REGISTER): Ü[je ne sais quel] problème, Ü[on ne sait quel] problème
 b. 1ST PERSON (FORMAL REGISTER): *[nous ne savons quel] N
 c. 2ND PERSON: *[tu ne sais quel] N, *[vous ne savez quel] N
 d. 3RD PERSON: *[il ne sait quel] N, *[elle ne sait quel] N, *[ils ne savent quel] N, *[elles ne savent quel] N

¹⁰ Lexicalized reanalyze of (*il*) *n’(y) a guère* ‘not long ago’.

¹¹ Has to combine with whatever wh-element — excepting compounded *pourquoi*, which is known to exhibit particular behavior in other contexts:

- (vii) Ü [[n’importe] {comment/ lequel/ où/ quand/ quel/ qui/ quoi}]
 * [[n’importe] pourquoi]

¹² It’s a piece of black humor in figurative and literal senses: during a safari, white hunters shot on black animals that were screaming *Pas nous! Pas nous!* ‘Not us! Not us!’. Serge Gainsbourg used this word in *La nostalgie camarade*, Philips, 1981:

(viii) “Qu’est-ce qui t’a pris bordel de casser la cabane/ De ce panoupanou puis sortir ton canif/ Ouvrir le bide au primitif/ Qui débarquait de sa savane// La nostalgie camarade”.

‘What drove you to break the shack/ Of this not-us-not-us and then take your knife/ Open the belly of the primitive/ Which turned up from its savanna?// The nostalgia, comrade.’

¹³ From (*je ne sais*) *pas-t-à qui est-ce* ‘(I don’t know) to whom it belongs’, with wrong liaison (*pas-t-a* for *pas_a*) which constitutes precisely a *pataquès*.

- (iii) negative appositive (e.g., *not even*) tags:
 - a. The attacks weren't successful, not even the last one.
 - b. * The attacks were unsuccessful, not even the last one.
- (iv) positive (vs. negative) confirmatory tag questions:
 - a. It isn't possible to solve that problem, is it?
 - b. It is impossible to solve that problem, {#is it/ isn't it}?
- (v) [subject-auxiliary inversion after fronted adverbials (Klima (1964:300)):]
 - a. Not even two years ago could you swim there.
 - b. Not even two years ago you could swim there.
- (vi) [idem (Charles Bird via Jackendoff (1972:364)):]
 - a. With no clothes is Sue attractive.
 - b. With no clothes Sue is attractive.

Tests (20i-iv) actually don't distinguish between sentential vs. constituent negation, but rather between syntactic vs. morphological negation: there is confusion between the scope of negation and the level of grammatical analysis; only the tests (20v-vi) match their aim. In fact, subject-auxiliary inversion has to be interpreted as an overt effect of global scope: since one negates an event, the inflection, if morphologically able to raise up in the structure, reaches some position in the CP-layer; in French translation, the scope of negation is made visible by the optional presence, vs. the obligatory absence, of the SM *ne*:

- (21) a. Ü Avec aucun habit Suzanne (n')est séduisante.
'With no clothes is Sue attractive.'
- b. Ü Avec aucun habit Suzanne (*n')est séduisante.
'With no clothes Sue is attractive.'

A further indication is the availability of *même pas* and *pas même* 'not even': the former has only local scope, the latter both local and global scope.

- (22) a. Ü {ÜPas même/ *Même pas} il y a deux ans on (ne) pouvait nager là.
'Not even two years ago could you swim there.'
- b. Ü Il (n')y a {Üpas même/ Ümême pas} deux ans, on (*ne) pouvait nager là.
'Not even two years ago you could swim there.'

Rizzi (1982:120) already observed that *ne* is an overt SM for every negation scoping on a wide constituent:

- (23) The negative particle *ne* thus seems to play the role of an overt scope marker: the scope of a negative quantifier is the S which immediately contains an occurrence of *ne* construed with the quantifier.

According to (23), we can formulate the following '*Ne*-insertion condition':

- (24) *NE*-INSERTION CONDITION:
 - (i) *ne* is banned if negation scopes locally on a single phrase, and

- (ii) if negation scopes globally on a wide constituent made up of several phrases, *ne* can optionally be inserted in the highest clitic position on the borderline of the relevant constituent.

It's just the possibility to insert *ne* that indicates global negation: in fact, *ne* is almost systematically dropped in colloquial French. A negative sentence at the present indicative is thus potentially ambiguous between the global negation in (25a) and the local negation in (25b):

- (25) a. \ddot{U} Je [(ne) suis pas bien] aujourd'hui.
 b. \ddot{U} Je (*ne) suis [pas bien] aujourd'hui.
 I (*ne*) am not good today
 'I feel not good today.'

If we insert a temporal auxiliary, we force the disambiguation of the structure: according to (24), only global negation allows *ne*-insertion, which finds a natural landing site in (26a), whereas local negation doesn't tolerate the occurrence of *ne*, which leads to the ungrammatical (26b):

- (26) a. \ddot{U} J(e [n]'ai pas été bien] hier.
 I (*ne*) have not been good yesterday
 'I didn't feel good yesterday.'
 b. \ddot{U} J(e *n)'ai été [pas bien] hier.
 I (**ne*) have been not good yesterday
 'I felt not good yesterday.'

In English, the cliticization of 'not' on the inflection unambiguously indicates global negation (27a); the absence of cliticization in (27b) allows both local and global scope:

- (27) a. Jane isn't ill.
 { \ddot{U} global negation/ *local negation }
 b. Jane is not ill.
 { \ddot{U} global negation/ \ddot{U} local negation }

UG allows expressing the distinction between these two levels of negation by morphological means. In Greek, as anticipated, one expresses local negation with *oxi* and global negation with *dhe(n)* or *mi(n)*. In one of the standard varieties of Italian (that of the central linguistic area, which makes use of seven vowels instead of five), a single item *non* is realized by two phonological allomorphs, [n•n] for the local negation and [non] for the global negation:¹⁴

- (28) (i) LOCAL NEGATION:
 A: 'Did all come?'
 B: a. \ddot{U} N•n tutti!
 b. * Non tutti!
 'Not all!'

¹⁴ Thanks to Adriana Belletti [p.c.] for these data.

- (ii) GLOBAL NEGATION:
- a. * N•n tutti sono venuti.¹⁵
- b. Û Non tutti sono venuti.
'Not all did come.'

This basic distinction in terms of levels can account in a simple way for a puzzle of the acquisitional domain. It has been observed that certain children use the negation only with the finite form of the verb; the truncating hypothesis of Rizzi (1992) predicts that in their linguistic system, the possibility of root infinitives is limited to non-negative sentences: if they truncate the CP-layer and the IP-layer, they have no landing site for the SM of global negation. A problem for such analysis is that some children produce nevertheless negative root infinitives. This fact is easily accounted for if we admit that such children just use the local negation to express both local and global scope — as expected if they truncate all functional layers. The inappropriate scope clearly appears in the following examples:¹⁶

- (29) a. “Moi j’ai été [pas à la mer].” [Clément, 2;11]
me I have been not at the sea
'I’ve not gone to the sea.'
- b. “Il [pas pleut]!... Il [pas pleut], on pourra sortir!” [Marie, 2;11]
there not rains!... There not rains, we can-FUT go-out
'There doesn’t rain!... There doesn’t rain, we will be able to go out!'
- c. “Moi aussi quand je va¹⁷ être [plus malade], je viendrai.” [Marie, 2;11]
me too when I FUT be no-longer ill, I come-FUT.
'I will come too, when I will be no longer ill.'
- d. “Regarde, j’ai tout [pas de manches]!” [Arthur, 2;11;21]
look, I have all not PART sleeves
'Look at me, I’ve quite no sleeves!'
- e. “J’arrive à la [ouvri¹⁸ pas].” [Camille, 3;0]
I succeed to it open not
'I don’t succeed in open it.'
- f. “Je vais à l’abri pour il [pleut pas].” [Chloé, 3;2]
I go at the refuge to it rains not
'I go under cover to it doesn’t rain.'
- g. “J’ai envie d’faire [pas pipi]!” [Clément, 3;4]
I have desire to do not wee-wee
'I don’t want to have a wee-wee.'
- h. “Adam il est déjà [pas là].” [Mégane, 3;8]
Adam he is yet not here
'Adam is not yet here'
- i. “C’est maman qui m’a mis [pas à l’école].” [Kevin, 3;9]
it’s mommy that me has put not at the school
'MOMMY put me not at school.'

¹⁵ Possible only under metalinguistic reading, if negation locally modifies the subject quantifier through some contrastive stress:

(ix) Û [N•N TUTTI]_{QP} sono venuti.

¹⁶ All children utterances in (29), (30) and (33) were noted by Agnès Lenoire in her class of the nursery school of Magland, Haute-Savoie, France, during the school year 1998-1999.

¹⁷ *Je va* for *je vais* 'I will'.

¹⁸ *Ouvri* for *ouvrir* 'to open'.

- j. “C’est l’anniversaire [pas à toi]!” [Adam, 3;11]
 it’s the birthday not to you
 ‘It’s not YOUR birthday!’
- k. “Et moi t’as [pas vu]?” [Marjorie, 3;11]
 and me you’ve not seen
 ‘And me? Haven’t you seen me?’

There are cases of level ambiguity with the sequence ‘inflection-*pas*’. However, even in this ambiguous configuration, the SM is crucially absent:

- (30) a. “On va pas se batter¹⁹!” [Camille, 3;0]
 we will not ourselves fight
 ‘Honestly, we will not fight!’
- b. “On met pas des chaussures à les chiens.” [Quentin, 3;4]
 one put not INDEF-PL-DET shoes to the dogs
 ‘One doesn’t put any shoes to the dogs.’
- c. “Mon pépé il les tue pas les malades.” [Mélanie, 3;4]
 my grandpa he them kill not the sick
 ‘My grandpa doesn’t kill the sick [ducks].’
- d. “Moi j’aime pas le café.” [Marjorie, 4;1]
 me I like not the coffee
 ‘I don’t like coffee.’

More precisely, the verb alone could be taken as the relevant constituent in (30); this particular case is possible even in the adult language, as suggested by the two possible implicatures of sentences containing a negation around the verb:

- (31) ù Pierre (n’)aime pas les femmes.
 Peter (*ne*) loves not the women
 ‘Peter doesn’t love women.’
- a. → It is not the case that “Peter loves women”. *({ne/ ¬})
- b. → It is the case that “Peter doesn’t love women”. ({ne/ ¬})

In implicature (31a), corresponding to the global negation, the SM is syntactically present and can optionally be phonologically realized. One negates the entire predicate: semantically, this is an anti-veridical proposition in the sense of Giannakidou (1998:106), namely $OP\ p \rightarrow \neg p$. This interpretation is adequate if Peter is not philogynous (and not even misogynous).

In implicature (31b), corresponding to the local negation, the SM is optional.²⁰ One negates the verb itself, and the meaning of (*n*’)aime-*pas* ‘doesn’t love’ is equivalent to that of *déteste* ‘hate’: semantically, this is a non-veridical proposition²¹ in the sense of Giannakidou (1998:116-117), namely $OP\ p \neg \rightarrow p$. This interpretation is adequate only if Peter is

¹⁹ *Se batter* for *se battre* ‘to fight’.

²⁰ When the SM is syntactically present, it’s an exceptional case of local negation with SM: such case obtains if and only if the phrase is an IP. An alternative view that would avoid weakening the ‘*Ne*-insertion condition’ (24) is to consider the hierarchy of the two implicatures. Since the (b) implicature is a proper subset of the (a) implicature, both are available in the presence of the SM; the reverse is not true: the (b) implicature isn’t a proper subset of the (a) implicature, so that the absence of ‘¬’ is incompatible with the (a) implicature.

²¹ Giannakidou (1998:116-117) used this term precisely to account for the semantics of the lexically negative verbs like ‘hate’.

misogynous.

Speaker-oriented verbs like ‘to love’ make the semantic ambiguity more apparent than non-speaker-oriented ones. Nevertheless, the same contrast can be reproduced with the descriptive verb ‘to drink’:

- (32) Ü Pierre (ne) boit pas de vin.
 Peter (*ne*) drinks not of wine
 ‘Peter doesn’t drink wine.’
 a. → It is not the case that “Peter drinks wine”. *({ne/ ¬})
 b. → It is the case that “Peter doesn’t drink wine”. ({ne/ ¬})

Implicature (32a) is adequate if Peter either is not drinking wine in the point of utterance (but perhaps he drunk before, or will drink after the point of utterance), or is abstemious; implicature (32b) obtains only if Peter is abstemious.

Children don’t associate different implicatures to different scope levels; if we assume that they simply don’t own the functional layers hosting the SM, according to the truncating hypothesis of Rizzi (1992), we have a good reason to think that even the ambiguous cases in (30) are in fact instances of local negation, used to express anyone of the two implicatures associated with the two scope levels. A further fact confirms that global negation isn’t available at all in children language: the systematical presence of the non-negative adverb *aussi* ‘too’ in negative contexts where adults use instead the negative adverb *non plus* ‘neither’.

- (33) a. “Moi je t’ai pas vu aussi!” [Sarah, 3;2]
 me I you have no seen too
 ‘Neither did I see you!’
 b. “Moi aussi j’ai pas peur!” [Laura, 3;4]
 me too I’ve no fear
 ‘Neither am I afraid!’

In adult language, examples in (33) are ungrammatical; their current counterpart is:

- (34) a. Ü Moi je (ne) t’ai pas vu non plus!
 me I (*ne*) you have not seen neither
 ‘Neither did I see you!’
 b. Ü Moi non plus j(e n)’ai pas peur!
 me neither I (*ne*) have not fear
 ‘Neither am I afraid!’

On the one hand, the fact that *non plus* isn’t attested in children language before the age of five years seems to indicate that it strongly requires global scope; on the other hand, *non plus* is allowed in the adult language also in absence of the SM. Now, since all adult French speakers have immediate intuitions on a potential landing site for *ne* in every sentence allowing a global negative scope, it’s quite natural to think that even when not spelled-out as *ne*, a Boolean negative operator ‘¬’ is syntactically present. This claim finds support in several empirical facts reviewed in the next subsection.

3.2.2. Some audible effects of a silent operator

In a colloquial register that exhibits *ne*-drop, a phonological rule optionally reduplicates the initial liquid, lateral, sonorant consonant that constitutes, after the schwa-drop, the third person singular accusative clitic, when it stays between two vowels in overt syntax (the former vowel being the last of a nominative clitic; the latter, the first of the verbal stem raised up to the inflection):

- (35) Ü Jel-l'aime.
 Ih-him love
 'I love him.'

Crucially, this phonological rule isn't available in negative sentences:

- (36) * Jel-l'aime pas.
 Ih-him love not
 'I don't love him.'

Marginally,²² reduplication becomes again available when *ne* is phonologically realized, in so that it provides another vowel able to host the reduplicated consonant:

- (37) Ü Je nel-l'aime pas.
 I neh-him love not
 'I don't love him.'

As expected, phonological reduplication is also possible with the local negation (characterized by the full lack of SM, realized or not):

- (38) Ü Jel-l'aime [pas beaucoup].
 Ih-him love not much
 'I do not much love him.'

It is naturally possible with metalinguistic negation:

- (39) Ü Jel-l'aime pas PASSIONNEMENT, jel-l'aime A LA FOLIE!
 Ih-him love not PASSIONATELY, Ih-him love TO THE MADNESS
 'I do not PASSIONATELY love him, I'm MADLY IN LOVE with him!'

We take this to mean that *ne*, even when not pronounced, is syntactically present—it might be the phonologically null 'NEG-operator' of Haegeman (1995), originally proposed under the strong hypothesis that the NEG-criterion is always satisfied at S-structure. The right representation of the ungrammatical (36) would thus be something like (40), with a clitic negative Boolean operator '¬' breaking the phrasal adjacency, and consequently blocking the

²² This is a rare combination owing to the large extent of *ne*-drop in colloquial register: (37) carries a tension between two language levels — reduplication is colloquial; SM is formal. Such examples are nevertheless attested, as in Edith Piaf, *Les prisons du roy* (Michel Rivgache), EMI, 1957:

(x) "Est-il vrai que je nel-l'entendrai jamais/ Jamais plus jamais/ Parce qu'il a volé un diamant plein d'éclats/
 Le plus beau des diamants pour moi?"
 'It is true that I will never hear he/ Never, never more/ Because he stole a sparkling diamond/ The most beautiful diamond for me?'

reduplication rule:

- (40) * Jel-¬-l'aime pas.
 Ih-¬-him love not
 'I don't love him.'

Another visible effect of '¬' is to allow the occurrence of proclitics with imperative form. In French, imperative is the sole mood that on the one hand triggers *pro*-drop of non-expletive pronouns, on the other hand leads to enclisis of clitic complements, whereas indicative and all other moods ever lead to proclisis of clitic complements, and (in common standard registers) don't allow *pro*-drop of non-expletive pronouns:²³

- (41) (i) INDICATIVE:
 a. * Tu fais-le.
 you do it
 b. Ü Tu le fais.
 you it do
 'You do it.'
- (ii) IMPERATIVE:
 a. Ü Fais-le!
 do it
 b. * Le fais!
 it do
 'Do it!'

French doesn't have a true imperative paradigm in the sense of Zanuttini (1996:187-189): it borrows by morphological suppletion the forms of the present indicative. For this reason, extrapolating from Zanuttini (1996:188), French imperatives have a TP and can be regularly negated, contrary to Italian where "*non* cannot occur with a true imperative form because it lacks a TP". A negated imperative allows both enclisis and proclisis, depending of the presence vs. absence of *ne*:

- (42) a. Ü (*Ne) Fais-le pas!
 (*ne*) do it not
 b. Ü (Ne) Le fais pas!
 (*ne*) it do not
 'Don't do it!'

If the syntactic function of *ne* is to assign global scope to negative adverbs, (42a) is an instance of local negation, and (42b) an instance of global negation. The (im)possibility of proclisis for pronominal clitics ((41.ii.b) vs. (42b)) suggests that the highest pronominal clitic attaches to the negative one (phonologically realized or not), the latter being able to attract and to host the former. Then the correct representation of sentences like (42b) would be the following:

- (43) a. Ü ¬ Le fais pas!
 ¬ it do not

²³ Kayne (1989) correlated the two properties through a strong inflection able to L-mark VP.

- b. * Le fais pas!
 it do not
 ‘Don’t do it!’

The existence of ‘¬’ directly accounts for the idiomatic behavior of some verbs like *s’inquiéter* ‘to worry’ or *s’occuper* ‘to (take) care of’, which negative imperative allows simultaneously both *ne*-drop and *pas*-drop with proclisis (‘¬’ being available at the global level), but crucially doesn’t allow *pas*-drop with enclisis (‘¬’ not being available at the local level):

(44) (i) NON-NEGATIVE IMPERATIVE:

- a. Û Inquiète-toi (bien)!
 worry you (good)
 b. * T’inquiète (bien)!
 you worry (good)
 ‘(Do) worry!’
- a.’ Û Occupe-toi *(de tes affaires)!
 take-care you of your business
 b.’ * T’occupe de tes affaires!
 you take-care of your business
 ‘Mind your own business!’

(ii) NEGATIVE IMPERATIVE:

- a. Û Inquiète-toi *(pas)!
 worry you not
 b. Û ¬ T’inquiète (pas)!
 you worry (not)
 ‘Don’t worry!’
- a.’ Û Occupe-toi *(pas) de mes affaires!
 take-care you not of my business
 b.’ Û ¬ T’occupe ((pas) (de mes affaires))!
 you take-care ((not) (of my business))
 ‘None of your business!’

Since *T’inquiète!* and *T’occupe!* unambiguously express the negated form of the (b) sentences of (44)(ii), and cannot express at all the non-negative form of the (b) sentences of (44)(i), pragmatic recoverability necessities suggest that their representations are $\neg T'inquiète!$ and $\neg T'occupe!$. It’s thus not the case that “the negative particle *ne* — a proclitic element — blocks enclisis”, as claimed by Laenzlinger (1998:147): it’s rather the case that the ‘negative’ clitic obligatorily attracts the argumental one(s), indirectly preventing their enclisis. In absence of ‘¬’, no proclisis can obtain: a proclitic imperative is thus always negative. This generalization has a unique counterexample:

- (45) a. Û Ferme-la!
 close it
 b. Û La ferme!
 it close
 ‘Shut up!’

A look at the etymology, reported by Duneton (1990:413), shows that this counterexample is only apparent; in fact, while (45a) is a sequence [V-enclitic], (45b) is not a sequence *[proclitic-V], but ù[D N], stemmed from a popular burlesque pun:

- (46) “As-tu vu la ferme ? - Quelle ferme ? - La ferme ta gueule!” [1900]
 ‘Did you see the farm? - What farm? - {The farm/ It close}²⁴ your trap!’

The existence of ‘-’ can be made visible in an independent context where the ‘negative’ clitic (phonologically realized or not) seems to provide a landing site for an argumental clitic. When an indicative sentence contains two clitics, two orders are possible: cluster accusative-dative is in use in the North and the West (and is assumed as the standard order); cluster dative-accusative is in use in the Southeast (up to Saint-Etienne) and in a part of Switzerland, namely more or less along the Italian border. The latter cluster is presumably derived from the former by an incorporation rule, in the (a) sentences of Regional French as in the (b) sentences of Standard Italian; the incorporation process is presumably the same in the two languages, but Italian applies a further readjustment rule inserting the linking vowel *e* between the two clitics:²⁵

- (47) (i) MASCULINE SINGULAR ACCUSATIVE:
 a. % Je lui-le <lui> donne.
 b. ù *pro* Glielo <gli> do.
 {I/ *pro*} to-him-it-M <to-him> give
 ‘I give it to him.’
- (ii) FEMININE SINGULAR ACCUSATIVE:
 a. % Je lui-la <lui> donne.
 b. ù *pro* Gliela <gli> do.
 {I/ *pro*} to-him-it-F <to-him> give
 ‘I give it to him.’
- (iii) MASCULINE PLURAL ACCUSATIVE:
 a. % Je lui-les <lui> donne.
 b. ù *pro* Glieli <gli> do.
 {I/ *pro*} to-him-them-M <to-him> give
 ‘I give them to him.’
- (iv) FEMININE PLURAL ACCUSATIVE:
 a. % Je lui-les <lui> donne.
 b. ù *pro* Gliele <gli> do.
 {I/ *pro*} to-him-them-F <to-him> give
 ‘I give them to him.’

²⁴ In French, sequences ‘the farm’ and ‘it close’ are homonymous.

²⁵ For Italian data, a detailed analysis is provided by Laenzlinger (1993:253-254(27)): “A morpho-lexical rule generates a clitic compound from the dative third person clitic, once it combines with an accusative third person clitic: *glielo*, *gliela*, *glieli*. Another piece of evidence in favor of this analysis concerns the behavior of the feminine dative clitic *le* in clusters. As shown in (xi), the clitic *le* is replaced by *gli* in combinations with third person accusative clitics. The impossibility of *le lo* — two clitics_{+K} — stems from an adjacency requirement on selected incorporation.

(xi) * Gianni le lo presenta. → [ù]Gianni glielo presenta.
 ‘John introduces him to her.’

The clitic complex *glielo* is formed during the syntactic derivation of the two pronominal object complements.”

According to the analysis of Laenzlinger (1993), the motivation for incorporation is to bypass the ban on clustering of two case-marked (+K) clitics; its result is a compounded clitic occupying a single syntactic slot, internally opaque to agreement rule. At the singular, the opacity is not apparent in French, where *lui* is unspecified for gender, but surfaces in Italian, where the alternation *gli* (dative masculine) *-le* (dative feminine) is replaced by the unspecified for gender *glielo*:

- (48) \ddot{u} *pro* Glielo <le> do.
 pro to-him-it-M <to-her> give
 ‘I give it to her.’

At the plural, Italian dative pronoun of third person is not clitic in formal register:

- (49) \ddot{u} *pro* Lo do a loro.
 pro it give to them
 ‘I give it to them.’

The colloquial strategy to supply this morphological lack is to use the singular compounded clitic also for the plural:

- (50) \ddot{u} *pro* Glielo <gli> do.
 pro to-them-it-M <to-them> give
 ‘I give it to them.’

Unfortunately, it says us nothing on the opacity of the compounded clitic, since *gli* alone is colloquially used for both numbers. It’s time to turn to French, where the plural bluntly blocks the incorporation process:

- (51) * Je leur le donne.
 I to-them-it give
 ‘I give it to them.’

Since singular *lui* cannot be used instead of plural *leur* in any register of Southeast French, the Italian strategy isn’t available. However, French has another strategy: the incorporation process can be done if another target –K is available. Crucially, the negative clitic is –K, and can thus qualify as a valid landing site:

- (52) a. % Je leur (ne) le donne pas.
 I to-them-*ne* it give not
 ‘I don’t give it to them.’
 b. * Je (ne) leur le donne pas.
 I *ne* to-them-it give not
 ‘I don’t give it to them.’

This contrast induces to mean, according to the \pm K characterization of Laenzlinger (1993), that the +K dative clitic needs to incorporate, but cannot do so into the +K accusative clitic in (52b), because the morphological opacity of the compounded cluster would thwart its syntactic need of agreement. On the other hand, it can incorporate into the –K negative clitic in (52a) if no other landing site is available. Note that if another landing site is available, as arises at the singular form where no syntactic agreement is required, then the dative clitic has

to incorporate into the accusative one:²⁶

- (53) a. % Je ne lui-le donne pas.
 I *ne* to-him-it give not
 b.?(?) Je lui-ne le donne pas.
 I to-him-*ne* it give
 ‘I don’t give it to him.’

However measurable can be the syntactic effects of ‘ \neg ’, one might wonder what is the morphological status of such unpronounceable particle. Haeberli (1999) observed that syntactic effects of morphological changes are not immediate: after the lack of a given morphological property, syntactic information available for the children, like word order or type of complement, is sufficient to maintain for a while, in a given linguistic system, the syntactic effects of a lost morphology.

Under this view, colloquial ‘ \neg ’ could be analyzed as a syntactic survival of a lost lexical SM, used by speakers knowing, but not using, a dying *ne* embalmed by scholar lectures and written matter; the progressive transformation from *ne* to ‘ \neg ’ would then be the first step toward the disappearance of every negative SM. From a synchronic standpoint, the morphological nature of ‘ \neg ’ doesn’t really matter: it suffices to retain that French has a null negative clitic, whose visible effects are to block a phonological reduplication rule, and to host +K clitics. A most important issue is whether ‘ \neg ’ does exist in other languages — and such issue could indirectly answer to the question on its nature.

Roughly speaking, the Italian counterpart of *ne* is *non*, which occupies the scopal position of French *ne*; but *non* actually owns the full featural set of French (*ne...*) *pas*, and negates thus the sentence on its own. On the other hand, *non* is also the counterpart of *pas* in case of local negation and the morpheme expressing the morphological negation, as appears in the (b) French translations of the (a) Italian data in examples (54) and (55):

- (54) (i) a. $\dot{\cup}$ A non implica B.
 A $\neg \rightarrow$ B
 b. $\dot{\cup}$ A (n’)implique pas B.
 A $\neg \rightarrow$ not B
 ‘A doesn’t imply B.’
- (ii) a. $\dot{\cup}$ A implica non-B.
 b. $\dot{\cup}$ A implique non-B.
 A $\rightarrow \neg$ B
 ‘A implies non-B.’
- (55) (i) a. $\dot{\cup}$ L’inglese è una lingua non a soggetto nullo.
 b. $\dot{\cup}$ L’anglais est une langue pas à sujet nul.
 the English is a tongue not to subject null
 ‘English is a tongue without null subject.’
- (ii) a. $\dot{\cup}$ L’inglese è una lingua a soggetto non-nullo.
 b. $\dot{\cup}$ L’anglais est une langue à sujet non-nul.
 the English is a tongue to subject not null
 ‘English is a tongue with non-null subject.’

²⁶ One could try to derive the ungrammaticality of (53) as following from the order of derivational steps, so that the incorporation *lui-le* would be done before the raising of the negative clitic, preventing its intervention.

There exist nevertheless two approximate Italian counterparts of *pas*: the colloquial emphatic *mica*, and the literary emphatic ††*punto*. Since *non* has more featural richness than *ne*, it cannot be dropped:

- (56) a. Ü Non ho visto Pietro stasera.
 non I-have seen Peter tonight
 ‘I didn’t see Peter tonight.’
 b. Ü Non ho mica visto Pietro stasera.
 non I-have at-all seen Peter tonight
 ‘I didn’t see Peter at all tonight.’
 c. †† “siccome non mi avvilito punto le critiche”...²⁷
 since not me degraded at-all the critics...
 ‘Since the critics didn’t degrade me at all...’

On the other hand, when *non* assigns scope to temporal adverbs like *mai* ‘never’ under NC, it is pronounced in spoken Italian, but can be dropped in particular registers like songs:

- (57) Ü “È soltanto la forza di insistere ancora/ E di arrendersi mai”.²⁸
 it-is only the force to insist still/ And to surrender-REFL never
 ‘It’s only the strength to still insist/ And to never surrender.’

Example (57) induces to mean that also Italian *non* can marginally be realized as ‘¬’ in particular registers—so that its representation would be the following:

- (58) È soltanto la forza di insistere ancora, e di ¬ arrendersi mai.

The same might hold for Italian dialects where no equivalent of Standard *non* is spelled-out, as in the following Milanese examples taken from Zanuttini (1997:87(90a)-(91a)):

- (59) a. [¬] L’han vist pü.
 [¬] S.CL’have seen no more
 ‘They haven’t seen him anymore.’
 b. [¬] L’u minga truà.
 [¬] it’have NEG found
 ‘I haven’t found it.’

If the SM can marginally remain unspelled-out in particular registers or varieties of languages that don’t standardly allow its drop, one could think that ‘¬’ has a real lexical content conveyed by unpronounceable features, rather than being a mere syntactic survival.

Turning to imperatives, one can see that the Italian paradigm closely reflects the French one, aside from the previous considerations on the necessity of *non*. With a non-negative imperative, only enclisis is allowed:

- (60) a. Ü Fallo!
 do it
 b. * Lo fa!
 it do
 ‘Do it!’

²⁷ Vittorio Alfieri, *Vita* (1803), Mursia, 1983, p.170.

²⁸ Pippo Pollina, *Cambierà*, Sound Service, 1997 (also Sony, 1998).

With a negative imperative, since *non* is the counterpart of *ne*, both (61a) and (61b) correspond to the global negation:

- (61) a. \ddot{U} Non farlo!
 not do it
 b. \ddot{U} Non lo fare!
 not it do
 ‘Don’t do it!’

On the one hand, the (b) form seems to confirm the analysis given in (43) for French (42b): it’s the negative clitic, *non* in Italian and $\{ne/ \neg\}$ in French, which attracts the clitic complement. On the other hand, the (a) form, corresponding to French (42a), contrasts with it, since *non* can precede the sequence ‘imperative-clitic complement’, whereas *ne* cannot. The relevant difference might reside not in the properties of the negative clitic, but in that of the verbal form. In fact, Italian shows a peculiarity in the imperative form of the second singular person: the non-negative guise *fa’* has the morphological specification of an imperative; the negative guise *fare* has the morphological specification of an infinitive — that holds for all verbs. Since infinitives regularly lead to enclisis, one could see (61a) as a remainder, in the imperative form, of the behavior of the infinitive form. A diachronic look seems to confirm this intuition: in fact, (61a) appears to become more and more formal, and the colloquial (61b), which was normatively condemned, tends to gain ground up to become the unmarked form.

One might also wonder whether the local allomorph $n \bullet n$ is allowed in imperatives. It seems not possible:²⁹

- (62) a. * $N \bullet n$ farlo!
 no do it
 b. * $N \bullet n$ lo fare!
 no it do
 ‘Don’t do it!’

This is not surprising: $n \bullet n$ can locally modify elements like the QP *tutti* in (28a); either the inflection in (62a), or the clitic complement in (62b), are heads, not phrases — and one just cannot modify a head.

²⁹ Thanks to Adriana Belletti [p.c.] for these judgments.

4. SUMMARY: SYNOPTIC TABLES CROSSING LEVELS & USES

To summarize, the five levels of negation are distributed across the two uses of negation in the following manner:

(63)		LOGICAL USE	METALINGUISTIC USE
	PHONOLOGICAL LEVEL	* ³⁰	Ü
	MORPHOLOGICAL LEVEL	Ü	Ü
	PHRASAL LEVEL	Ü	Ü
	PREDICATE LEVEL	Ü	Ü
	SENTENTIAL LEVEL	Ü	Ü

The five levels of negation are productive, as shown in the paradigm below where the (a) examples denote logical uses, and the (b) examples metalinguistic uses:

(64)	<i>Phonological:</i>	a. *	
		b. Ü	(Non,) Pas Ergot, Argot! '(No), not slanT, slanG!'
	<i>Morphological:</i>	a. Ü	C'est un pabô. it is a not-pretty. 'He's a not-pretty.'
		b. Ü	Pas syntaxicien, syntaxOLOGUE! 'Not syntactolog, syntactICIAN!'
	<i>Phrasal:</i>	a. Ü	Il est [_{AP} pas beau]. 'He is not pretty.'
		b. Ü	Jeanne (n')a pas deux enfants, elle a TROIS AMANTS! 'Jane has not two children, she has THREE LOVERS!'
	<i>Predicate:</i>	a. Ü	Il [_{IP} n'est pas beau]. he (<i>ne</i>) is not pretty. 'He isn't pretty.'
		b. Ü	Je (<i>ne</i>) pars pas en vacances, je DEMENAGE DANS LES ILES! 'I don't set off on vacation, I AM MOVING TO THE WEST INDIES!'
	<i>Sentential:</i>	a. Ü	Personne (n')est beau. nodody <i>ne</i> is pretty. 'Nobody is pretty.'
		b. Ü	(NON,) Il n'est PAS beau. (NO,) he (<i>ne</i>) is NOT pretty. '(NO,) He is NOT pretty.'

REFERENCES

- Acquaviva, P. (1996) "Negation in Irish & the representation of monotone decreasing quantifiers". In Robert Borsley & Ian Roberts eds., *The syntax of the Celtic languages: a comparative perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bianchi, V. (1993) "An empirical contribution to the study of idiomatic expressions". *Rivista di linguistica* n° 5.2.
- Bouvier, Y.-F. (1999) "Comment reconnaître & classifier les mots composés". Ms.,

³⁰ The fact that the phonological level isn't available for the logical negation isn't surprising: the entire phonological domain is opaque to the syntactic rules (though the reverse isn't true).

- University of Geneva.
- Bouvier, Y.-F. (2000) "Définir les composés par opposition aux syntagmes". *Generative Grammar in Geneva*, 1:165-188.
- Duneton, C. (1990) *Le bouquet des expressions imagées. Encyclopédie thématique des locutions figurées de la langue française*. In collaboration with Sylvie Claval, Paris, Seuil.
- Giannakidou, A. (1998) *Polarity sensitivity as (non)veridical dependency*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Haerberli, E. (1999) "Features, categories and the syntax of A-positions. Synchronic and diachronic variation in the Germanic languages". Doctoral dissertation, University of Geneva.
- Haegeman, L. (1995) *The syntax of negation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horn, L. (1989) *A natural history of negation*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jackendoff, R. (1972) *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. (1989) "Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing". In Jaeggli & Safir, *The Null Subject Parameter*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Klima, E. (1964) "Negation in English". In *The structure of language. Readings in the philosophy of language*, J. A. Fodor & J. J. Katz eds., Englewood Cliffs (New Jersey): Prentice-Hall.
- Labov, W. (1972) "Negative attraction and negative concord in English grammar". *Language* n° 48.
- Laenzlinger, C. (1993) "A syntactic view of Romance pronominal sequences". *Probus* n° 5.3.
- Laenzlinger, C. (1998) *Comparative studies in word order variation. Adverbs, pronouns, and clause structure in Romance and Germanic*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Moeschler, J. (1997) "La négation comme expression procédurale". In *Negation and polarity. Syntax and semantics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Rizzi, L. (1982) "Negation, Wh-movement and the null subject parameter". In *Issues in Italian syntax, Studies in Generative Grammar* n°11, Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rizzi, L. (1992) "Early null subjects and root null subjects". *Geneva Generative Papers* n° 0.1.
- Rizzi, L. (1997) "The fine structure of the left periphery". In Liliane Haegeman, *Elements of grammar: handbook in generative syntax*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Tovena, L. (1996) "Studies on polarity sensitivity". Doctoral dissertation, ms., University of Edinburgh.
- Zanuttini, R. (1996) "On the relevance of tense for sentential negation". In A Belletti & L. Rizzi eds., *Parameters and functional heads. Essays in comparative syntax*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zanuttini, R. (1997) *Negation and clausal structure. A comparative study of Romance languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.