

1. In this work we intend to investigate the interface between phonology (and, more specifically, syllable structure and assimilation) and the syntactic realization of heads. We will show that resyllabification phenomena can only apply under syntactic proximity. We will also observe how syntactic conditions for phonological phenomena can vary across time. This is a well known observation for phenomena like “Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico” (Loporcaro 1997 a.o.).

2. The empirical domain we investigate is the “clustering” between preverbal negation and proclitics. Modern Sicilian, as well as Old Florentine and Old Sicilian, displays interesting interaction phenomena between the preverbal negative marker *non/nun* and clitics. In (1) we see that the negative marker in Catania is usually *nun*:

- (1) a. S'avissi statu cchiu attentu, **nun** fussi a ssu punto. (Catania)
if had.2SG been more careful NEG would-be.2SG at this point
'Had you been more careful, you'd not be in this situation.'
- b. **Nun** ci su picciriddi.
NEG there are.3PL children 'There are no children.'
- c. **Nun** ti scantari, nenti fu.
NEG you worry nothing was 'Do not worry, nothing happened.'
- (2) Siccomu nuddu ava vistu a me muggheri, **n-a** spittasturu cchiu.
since no one had.3SG seen to my wife NEG-her waited.2PL anymore
'Since no one had seen my wife, you did not wait for her.'

(2) shows that the Rime of the negative marker is deleted and the initial /n/ is resyllabified with the object clitic (in these varieties object clitics are represented by the following vowels: *u, a, i*).

3. We propose that this phenomenon has both phonological and syntactic restrictions: the phonology takes care of syllable structure, and clustering only occurs when negation and clitic form a single well-formed syllable, therefore not in cases like (1b) and (1c) (an alternative analysis is that consonant clitics are located in a different structural position). The syntactic side of the phenomenon is that clustering does not apply randomly to any two words that are linearly adjacent, but only to adjacent heads, like 3rd person clitics and the negative marker. We will propose that a) the negative marker is bimorphemic, as already proposed by Parry (1998) for a few Ligurian dialects, in which preverbal object clitics (1st, 2nd and 3rd reflexive) are inserted between the two negative morphemes (see also Manzini 2008). The structure of preverbal negation can be represented as follows:

- (3) [Neg *n* [Neg *Vn*]]

b) the phonological clustering is only possible when the clitic actually moves in the syntax to occupy the position of the lower negative morpheme /un/ deleting it:

- (4) [Neg *n* [Neg *Vn* [Clit *V*]]] → [Neg *n* [Neg *V#* Clit *V* [Clit *V*]]]

That negation is bimorphemic in Sicilian is shown by the fact that in some varieties the higher negative morpheme can only occur when the complementizer position is spelled out, either by the complementizer or by verb when it moves to C in interrogative clauses:

- (5) a. Iddu (***n**)**un** curri mai. (Sciacca)
he NEG runs never 'He never runs.'
- b. Chirinu chi io **nun** sia capaci.
believe.3SG that I NEG am able 'They believe that I am not able to do that.'

Hence, the higher negative morpheme is only licenced by CP, a phenomenon which recalls the fact that in other languages negation can be marked in the CP (Latin, for instance, has negative complementizer). Furthermore, there are dialects that only have the lower negative morpheme:

- (6) Si fussi statu chiu attentu, **un** fussi accusi. (Corleone)
if had.2SG been more careful NEG would-be.2SG at this point 'same as (1a)'

This type of dialects displays a different type of clustering, where the nasal of the negation assimilates the initial liquid of the object clitic:

- (7) a. Di dū jorno, **unnu** vitti chiù. (Corleone)
 from that day NEG-him saw.1SG anymore ‘From that day I have not seen him anymore.’

We propose that the assimilation process is also sensitive to the syntactic adjacency of the two heads, though the clitic does not raise up to the position of the negative morpheme deleting it entirely.

- (8) [Neg *un* [Clit CV]]

This means that there must be a general condition blocking the entire deletion of the negative marker:

- (9) *[Neg \emptyset [Neg ~~##~~ Clit [~~Clit~~]...]

4. Further evidence that deletion of a negative morpheme is triggered by clitic movement is provided by Old Florentine, where not all clitics (even when the phonological restrictions are met) can cluster with the negative marker. The set of clitics which have this property varies across time. In the XIII century, clustering is observable with both object and dative clitics (examples in (10), from Bono Giamboni), while in the second half of the XIV century this happens only with 3rd person object clitics (examples in (11), from Boccaccio).

- (10) a. Il prossimo tuo **non** ucciderai e **no**l fedirai e **no** li
 the next your NEG will-kill.3SG and NEG-him will-hurt.3SG and NEG-to him
 farai in persona alcuno rincrescimento
 will-do.3SG in person any damage
 ‘Thou shall not kill your neighbour, nor hurt him, nor make any damage to his person.’
 b. **no** ti vo’ qui mostrare e aprire, perché (...) sarebe faticoso a mostrare
 NEG-to-you want.1SG show and open because would-be.3SG hard to show
 ‘I do not want to show and explain it here because it would be hard.’
- (11) a. io vi promisi di niuna cosa farne che io prima **no**l vi dicessi
 I to-you promised.1SG of no thing do-of-it that I before NEG-it to-you said.1SG
 ‘I promised you that I would have done nothing before telling you.’
 b. pregò Leonetto che grave **non** gli fosse il nascondersi
 prayed L. that heavy NEG to-him was the hiding
 ‘L. prayed that he could easily hide.’
 c. tu **non** mi scapperai delle mani che io **non** ti paghi sì
 you NEG to-me will-escape.2SG from-the hands that I NEG to-you pay.1SG so
 dell’opere tue
 of-the deeds your
 ‘You will not escape from my hands before I pay you for your deeds.’

We will analyze this change assuming that these clitics occupy different positions in the different stages of Old Florentine: all clitics were adjacent to negation in the older stages, but, in the later stages, only 3rd person object clitics occupied that position.

5. To summarize: we will analyze cases of negation-clitic clusters in different Italo-Romance varieties, where phonological phenomena such as resyllabification, are driven by the syntactic structure; we will also argue that in some varieties, like Sicilian, the negative marker is morphologically complex and some clitics can move in the structure. Furthermore the expression of negation is linked to the activation of the CP layer. Finally, we will discuss cases where clitics do not interact with negation, and our explanation will be based on the idea that the clitic layer has a complex internal structure.

References

- ♦ Loporcaro, M. (1997). *L’origine del raddoppiamento fonosintattico: saggio di fonologia diacronica romanza*. Basel and Tübingen, Francke Verlag. ♦ Manzini, M.R. (2008) “Doubling by clitics and doubling of clitics: The case of negation.” In Barbiers, S. (ed.) *Syntactic Doubling in European Dialects (Syntax and Semantics)*. Amsterdam, Emerald Group Publishers. 69-102. ♦ Parry, M.M. (1998) “On Negation in the Ligurian Hinterland”. *Quaderni di lavoro dell’ASIS* 2.