

On the syntax of the negative adverb *angorə* in Abruzzese

Clara Cuonzo

CHRIST'S COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Abstract. In Abruzzese, an upper-Southern Italo-Romance language, the adverb *angorə* is ambiguous between “still” and “(not)...yet”. When meaning “(not)...yet”, *angorə* is found in a high sentential position preceding the inflected verb and is only optionally associated with the negation, while nonetheless conveying a negative meaning. Although previous analyses by Biberauer & D'Alessandro (2009) and Garzonio & Poletto (2013; 2017) have claimed that *angorə* “(not)...yet” lies in the CP, I bring new data showing that *angorə* “(not)...yet” is lower in the sentential structure. More specifically, I argue that it is adjoined to NegP, engendering then a reanalysis of *angorə* “(not)...yet” as a proper negative element.

Introduction

The main aim of the present work is that of examining the syntactic behaviour of *angorə* in Abruzzese. Indeed, this adverb, when preceding the verb, means “not...yet” without any necessity of having the negation pronounced. Moreover, the verb that follows *angorə* is in the imperfective, despite the fact that one would normally expect the use of the perfective in a construction of the *yet*-type. Throughout the pages of this essay, the thorough examination of empirical data will result in an analysis aimed at explaining the specificity of *angorə* in Abruzzese. In particular, it will be argued that this adverb adjoins to the negation and it is subsequently re-analysed as a negation proper. As for the use of the imperfective, it will be related to issues of interpretation, more than to specific syntactic reasons. In order to advance a new proposal, the observation of linguistic data will be associated with the examination of previous analyses of the same phenomenon by Biberauer & D'Alessandro (2009) on the one hand, and Garzonio & Poletto (2013; 2017) on the other.

In the first section, an account of the syntax of adverbs in Abruzzese will be given: in particular, it will be shown how the ordering of adverbs respects the hierarchy found in Cinque (1999). A major focus will be put on the behaviour of negative adverbs *michə* and *mangħə*, and on the

possibility of adverb interpolation typical of *mangha*. Moreover, the third section will be dedicated to a closer analysis of the characteristics of *angora* in Abruzzese. More specifically, it will be underlined how *angora* conveys a negative meaning even in the absence of the negation and how the verb that follows is usually found in the imperfective. One subsection will be also devoted to the possibility for NPIs to be licensed by *angora*. In the third section, on the other hand, an overview of the past literature on the peculiarity of *angora* will be sketched, highlighting some data that are problematic for previous analyses. Finally, in the last section, a new proposal will be put forward in order to explain the syntactic behaviour of *angora*, also pointing out how the data support this new analysis.

Before moving on, it will be useful to make some brief remarks on Abruzzese. Abruzzese is an upper-Southern Italo-Romance language spoken in the Italian region of Abruzzo. Italo-Romance languages are derived from Latin, independently of Italian. In the literature, they are sometimes referred to as "dialects", but since this term can wrongly suggest that "dialects" of Italy are dialects of Italian, I prefer to use terms such Italo-Romance languages or varieties instead. Moreover, since Abruzzese is a largely oral language lacking any kind of standardisation, it is characterised by a great deal of micro-variation, both diachronically and synchronically. Thus, when I speak of Abruzzese, I am actually referring to the variety of Abruzzese spoken in the province of Chieti, namely the Adriatic Eastern Abruzzese (Loporcaro 2009, 68-69), and more specifically to the variety of the town of Lanciano, i.e. Lancianese. When not otherwise stated, examples are taken from Lancianese since, for the sake of the present work, I have interviewed native speakers coming from this town. Nevertheless, some data are coming from Teatino¹, the variety spoken in Chieti, because from time to time they were useful to fill some gaps showed by Lancianese.² It is worth noting that all the speakers I have interviewed are also native speakers of Italian, and obviously one must bear in mind the influence of this language on Abruzzese when analysing the following data. As for the interviews, they were conducted in Italian, both on the phone and in person, and consisted of elicitation of sentences that the interviewees were asked to translate from Italian into Abruzzese as well as grammaticality judgements on sentences in Abruzzese that I had tailored to test my hypotheses and other scholars' analyses. A final remark should be made on the transcription: it is not

1. Lancianese and Teatino (from the ancient name of the city, Teate) are the Standard Italian names for these varieties and I am using them since they obviously lack an English name.

2. As for Lancianese I have interviewed Adele A., Adele C., Luigi C., while for Teatino I resorted to Manuela S. I thank all the interviewees for their patience and willingness to answer some of those weird questions syntactician find themselves asking.

phonological, and it basically follows the conventions of Italian orthography; however, the phonetic symbol schwa has been employed in the transcription since this sound is found in Abruzzese, while it is absent in Italian.

1 The Syntax of Adverbs in Abruzzese

1.1 Adverbial hierarchy

Before analysing the peculiarity of *angorə* in Abruzzese, it will be useful to provide an overview of the syntactic behaviour of adverbs in this language. It will be shown that they basically respect the hierarchy identified in Cinque (1999), with some minor discrepancies. In this piece of work, I am assuming, after Cinque (1999), that adverbs lie in specifiers of designated functional projection, and the fact that they precede or follow the verb is to be attributed not to their own movement, but to verb movement. Thus, whether an adverb is found before or following the verb depends on how much a verb can raise in the clausal structure. The order of adverbs in Standard Italian, described in Cinque (1999) 8), is as follows:

- (1) solitamente (*usually*) > mica > già (*already*) > (non) più ((*not any longer*) > sempre (*always*) > completamente (*completely*) > tutto (*everything*) > bene (*well*)

The adverb *mica* is a presuppositional negation, which is used in particular pragmatic contexts, namely to negate something that is presupposed, more or less explicitly, in the discourse (Schifano 2015, 125; Zanuttini 1997, 61-62). In Standard Italian, it is found either in presence of the negation following the verb or, in its absence, in a higher position, as (2) shows. However, the difference between (2a) and (2b) can be connected to regional differences: indeed, (2b) is somewhat marginal for speakers of Northern Italian, i.e. the regional varieties of Italian spoken in Northern Italy and influenced in their syntax by Northern Italo-Romance languages.

- (2) a. Gianni non ci ha mica parlato.
John not CL has MICA spoken
“John has *not* spoken to her/him/them.”
- b. Gianni mica ci ha parlato.
John MICA CL has spoken
“John has *not* spoken to her/him/them.”

As for the Abruzzese adverbs corresponding to the Italian ones in (1), the former are usually linguistic cognates that take lexical forms historically related to the latter. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the formation of adverbs out of the feminine adjectives through the suffixation of *-mente* is not productive in Southern Italo-Romance languages (Rohlfs 1969, 243), and thus it is not found in Abruzzese. Moreover, the presuppositional negation *mica* is not found in Lancianese, while it is attested in Teatino as *micha*.³ Nonetheless, another kind of presuppositional negation is found both in Lancianese and in Teatino, namely *mangha*, which corresponds to Italian *neanche* “not even” and, according Cinque (1999) 11), occupies the same position as *mica* in the hierarchy described in (1).

Now that we have an overview of the hierarchy of adverbs⁴, we can move on to analyse the position in which they appear in Abruzzese. In particular, instead of *soltamente* “usually”, which is not attested in Abruzzese, it is possible to investigate *di solitə* with the same meaning, and same position according to Cinque (1999) 24). This adverb precedes the verb as in (3), and cannot follow it.

- (3) a. Marijə di solitə cə va a la chiesə.
Mary usually CL.loc goes to the church
“Mary usually goes to the church.”
- b. *Marijə cə va di solitə a la chiesə⁵.
Mary CL.loc goes usually to the church
“Mary usually goes to the church.”

The fact that in Abruzzese the verb in the present tense cannot raise higher than *di solitə* is confirmed also by Schifano (2015), who argues that in Southern Italo-Romance varieties the inflected verb never raises higher than *mica*. In fact, the next section will be dedicated precisely to investigate the position of *micha* and *mangha*, and their quite peculiar behaviour with respect to the negation proper.

1.2 The case of *micha* and *mangha*

In order to analyse the syntactic properties of *micha*, it is necessary to resort to Teatino since, as has already been pointed out, no such an adverb as Italian *mica* is found in Lancianese. As is attested by (4), three

3. The presence of *micha* in Teatino may be due to the influence of Italian *mica*, more than to an actual difference from Lancianese.

4. These adverbs are referred in Cinque (1999) as “lower (pre-VP) adverbs”. In this paper, I am not concerned with other kinds of higher or lower adverbs.

5. (3b) becomes grammatical if *di solitə* is pronounced with a parenthetical intonation, but this reading is not relevant here.

positions are available for *michə*: a low position following the past participle, which is somewhat unusual according to my informants, then one preceding the past participle, and finally a very high one. This is the same pattern found in Italian, as seen in (2), and this could explain why in Northern varieties of regional Italian the high position of *mica* is considered marginal or even ungrammatical: this position is made available in Southern Italian (i.e. regional varieties of Italian spoken in the southern part of the country) by the influence of local Italo-Romance varieties.

- (4) a. ?Marijə nən c'a itə michə a la scolə.⁶ (Teatino)
 Mary not CL.loc-has gone MICA to the school
 “Mary did *not* go to the school.”
- b. Marijə nən c'a michə itə a la scolə.
 Mary not CL.loc-has MICA gone to the school
 “Mary did *not* go to the school.”
- c. Marijə michə c'a itə a la scolə.
 Mary MICA CL.loc-has gone to the school
 “Mary did *not* go to the school.”

Moving on to *manghə*, which is attested in both Lancianese and Teatino, it may seem, at a first sight, that its syntactic behaviour is identical to that of *michə*. Indeed, the sentences in (5) clearly show that, when a periphrastic verb is present, *manghə* can appear both before and after the past participle, as well as in the high position that we have already described for *mica*.

- (5) a. Marijə nən c'a itə manghə a la scolə.
 Mary not CL.loc-has gone even to the school
 “Mary did not even go to school.”
- b. Marijə nən c'a manghə itə a la scolə.
 Mary not CL.loc-has even gone to the school
 “Mary did not even go to school.”
- c. Marijə manghə c'a itə a la scolə.
 Mary even CL.loc-has gone to the school
 “Mary did not even go to school.”

6. Auxiliary selection in Abruzzese, contrarily to what happens in many other Romance languages, does not depend on the argument structure of the verb. Indeed, Abruzzese always employs auxiliary HAVE in the third person and the auxiliary BE in the first and second person. For an accurate account of split auxiliary selection in Abruzzese, see D’Alessandro & Roberts (2010).

Nevertheless, when the verb is not periphrastic, and only in this case, *mangħə* can intervene between the clitic and the main verb, as is visible from the different grammaticality pattern of (6a) and (6b). This is a case of adverb interpolation, a phenomenon already observed for other Southern Italo-Romance varieties (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005).

- (6) a. Marijə nən cə mangħə va a la scolə.
 Mary not CL.loc even goes to the school
 “Mary does not even go to school.”
- b. *Marijə nən cə mangħə a itə a la scolə.
 Mary not CL.loc even has gone to the school
 “Mary did not even gone to school.”

Obviously, the other two positions seen with the periphrastic form of the verb, the one following the verb and the very high one, are available also when the verb is not periphrastic, as (7) clearly shows:

- (7) a. Marijə nən cə va mangħə a la scolə.
 Mary not CL.loc goes even to the school
 “Mary does not even go to school.”
- b. Marijə mangħə cə va a la scolə.
 Mary even CL.loc goes to the school
 “Mary does not even go to school.”

However, what is even more interesting to note is that, when two clitics are present *mangħə* can still intervene between them and the main verb, but it cannot be found between the first and second clitic.

- (8) a. Mariə, tanta cosə, nə jə lə mangħə dice a
 Mary, many things, not CL.3s.dat CL.3s.acc even says to
 lu maritə.
 the husband
 “Mary does not even tell a lot of things to her husband.”
- b. *Mariə, tanta cosə, nə jə mangħə lə dice a
 Mary, many things, not CL.3s.dat even CL.3s.acc says to
 lu maritə.
 the husband
 Intended meaning: “Mary does not even tell a lot of things to her husband.”

The data just observed for Abruzzese are confirmed by similar data for Northern Italo-Romance varieties. In fact, Zanuttini (1997), comparing varieties of Piedmontese, Venetan and Ligurian, argues that the

highest NegP, the only one capable of negating a sentence on its own, is found higher than all clitics (except vocalic subject clitics which, however, behave differently from other subject clitics), while other NegPs lie lower than at least some clitics, and therefore the latter are interspersed with the former in the clausal structure. In this regard, it is necessary to note that *michə* behaves differently from *manghə* since it cannot be interpolated between the clitic and the main verb, as is visible from the ungrammaticality of (9):

- (9) *Marijə nən cə michə va a la scolə. (Teatino)
 Mary not CL.loc MICA goes to the school
 “Mary does not even go to school.”

Thus, there is evidence to maintain that *michə* is higher than *manghə* in the adverbial hierarchy. First of all, this explains the degree of marginality of (4a) compared to the complete acceptability (5a): being *manghə* lower than *michə*, it is more easily crossed by the past participle. Secondly, this accounts for the fact that *manghə* can surface between the clitic and the main verb, while *michə* cannot. The hypothesis that *michə* precedes *manghə* is, at least partially, confirmed by Italian data. Indeed, when *mica*, corresponding to Abruzzese *michə*, and *neanche*, corresponding to Abruzzese *manghə*, co-occur in the same sentence, *mica* must, if anything, precede *neanche* and not vice versa (Cinque, p.c.). The sentence in (10a) is somewhat unnatural and of difficult interpretation, but the difference with the completely ungrammatical (10b) definitely stands out to native speakers.

- (10) a. ?Gianni non ci ha mica neanche parlato.
 John not CL has MICA even spoken
 “John has *not* even spoken to her/him/them.”
- b. *Gianni non ci ha neanche mica parlato.
 John not CL has even MICA spoken
 “John has *not* even spoken to her/him/them.”

Therefore, the hierarchy in (1) has to be updated as follows:

- (11) solitamente (*usually*) > mica > neanche (*not even*) > già (*already*) > (non) più ((*not*) *any longer*) > sempre (*always*) > completamente (*completely*) > tutto (*everything*) > bene (*well*)

It seems then plausible to maintain that in Abruzzese the head to which the clitic adjoins is lower than *michə*, but higher than *manghə*. Moreover, the reason for which *manghə* cannot appear between the clitic

and the auxiliary when the verb is in the periphrastic form is the fact that the auxiliary is generated in (or moved to) a position higher than the one to which the main verb moves. The former position is higher than *mangħa*, while the latter is lower.

1.3 The remaining adverbs

After this thorough overview of the behaviour of *michħa* and *mangħa*, we can move on to investigate the syntax of the remaining adverbs found in the hierarchy in (11). In particular, after *neanche*, there lies the adverb *già* “already”. Three positions are available for this adverb: it can appear before or after the past participle, but it can also surface in very high position, preceding the inflected auxiliary, as shown by (12).

- (12) a. Marijə c'a itə già.
 Mary CL.loc-has gone already
 “Mary has already gone there.”
- b. Marijə c'a già itə.
 Mary CL.loc-has already gone
 “Mary has already gone there.”
- c. Marijə già c'a itə.
 Mary CL.loc-has gone already
 “Mary has already gone there.”

The adverb that will be analysed next is *cchiù* “(not) any longer”, corresponding to Italian *più*. This adverb is always found after the past participle, while any higher position is ungrammatical, as visible from (13):

- (13) a. Marijə nən c'a itə cchiù.
 Mary not CL.loc-has gone any-longer
 “Mary has not gone there any longer.”
- b. *Marijə nən c'a cchiù itə.
 Mary not CL.loc-has any-longer gone
 “Mary has not gone there any longer.”
- c. *Marijə cchiù nən c'a itə.
 Mary any longer not CL.loc-has
 “Mary has not gone there any longer.”

The following adverb in the hierarchy is *sempre* “always”, appearing in Abruzzese in the historically related form of *sembrə*. Interestingly, two positions are available for *sembrə*, one preceding and one following the

past participle. Nonetheless, the position preceding the auxiliary that was optionally occupied by *già* “already” and the higher adverbs is not available for *sembra* “always”.

- (14) a. Marijə c'a itə sembrə a la scole.
Mary CL.loc-has gone always to the school
“Mary has always gone to school.”
- b. Marijə c'a sembrə itə a la scole.
Mary CL.loc-has always gone to the school
“Mary has always gone to school.”
- c. *Marijə sembrə c'a itə a la scole.⁷
Mary always CL.loc-has gone to the school
“Mary has always gone to school.”

The data in (14) confronted with the data in (13) seem to contradict the prediction made in Cinque (1999) that if the verb cannot go past a lower verb, by the same token it is unable to precede any higher adverb. The tendency to have *cchiù* “(not) any longer” following the verb and *sembra* “always” allowed to precede it is nonetheless confirmed by the data collected in Garzonio e Poletto (2017, 24) for different varieties of Abruzzese. I do not have any clear explanation to make sense of the data in (13) and (14) within the framework developed by Cinque (1999). Further research should be carried out to explain the idiosyncratic pattern typical of *cchiù* in Abruzzese, but since this is beyond the scope of the present work, I set this question aside and proceed to analyse the following adverbs found in hierarchy.

The adverb *completamente* “completely” is not attested in Abruzzese for the reasons illustrated previously (see subsection 1.1), therefore our attention will be focused on the last two adverbs, namely *tutto* “everything” and *bene* “well”. Abruzzese, as other Southern Italo-Romance varieties, uses the form of the adjective *bonə* instead of the a dedicated adverbial form (Rohlfs 1969, 243). At any rate, both *tuttə* (the Abruzzese for *tutto*) and *bonə* appear after the past participle and, when co-occurring, *bonə* follows *tuttə*, precisely as the hierarchy in (11) predicts.

- (15) a. So' fattə tuttə.
am done everything
“I did everything.”

7. If *sembra* is pronounced with a focal stress, then (14b) becomes grammatical, but we are not concerned with this reading here.

- b. *So' tuttə fattə.
 am everything done
 Intended meaning “I did everything.”
- (16) a. So' fattə bonə.
 am done good
 “I did well (in doing so).”
 b. *So' bonə fattə.
 am good done
 Intended meaning “I did well (in doing so).”
- (17) a. So' fattə tuttə bonə.
 am done everything good
 “I did everything well.”
 b. *So' fattə bonə tuttə.⁸
 am done good everything
 “I did everything well.”

1.4 Summary

In this section, we have established that the hierarchy of adverbs, as postulated by Cinque (1999), is found also in Abruzzese. However, it was necessary to partially update it, allowing for *neanche* to lie in a dedicated position just lower than *mica*. This was necessary, first of all, to account for the fact that in Abruzzese *micha* is less easily crossed by the raising participle than *mangha*, but especially for the possibility to have *mangha* in between the clitic and the verb, while this is not possible for *micha*, since this adverb is probably generated higher than the head to which clitics adjoin. The last section of the present section was dedicated to reviewing the order of the remnant adverbs: apart from the idiosyncrasy shown by *cchiù* “(not) any longer”, the order proposed in (11) was respected.

8. (17b) becomes grammatical if *tuttə* is pronounced with a parenthetical intonation, but this reading is not relevant here.

2 Angorə in Abruzzese

2.1 Angorə: position, optional negation and use of the imperfective

Having established that the order of adverbs in Abruzzese respects the hierarchy postulated in Cinque (1999), it is now possible to investigate the syntax of the adverb *angorə*. Indeed, its behaviour is even more peculiar precisely because, contrarily to the other adverbs, it does not fit the expected pattern. According to Cinque (1999) 8), in Italian *non... ancora*, “not... yet”, occupies the same position as *già* “already”, therefore lying between *neanche* “not even” and *più* “(not) any longer” in the revised hierarchy proposed in (11). Moreover, it is usually found with the perfective form of the verb, generally surfacing in between the auxiliary and the past participle, as visible from (18a). However, at least in Southern varieties of Italian, another position is available to *ancora* “(not)... yet”, namely a very high one, preceding the negation *non*, as shown by (18b). It is important to note that this position is somewhat marginal or even ungrammatical for Northern speakers.⁹ This high position could be the same as that of *già* “already” when the latter is found before the auxiliary in sentences like (12c), whose Italian version is given in (18c).¹⁰

- (18) a. Maria non ci è ancora andata.
Mary not CL.loc is yet gone
“Mary has not gone there yet.”
- b. Maria ancora non ci è andata.
Mary yet not CL.loc is gone
“Mary has not gone there yet.”
- c. Maria già ci è andata.
Mary already CL.loc is gone
“Mary has already gone there.”

On the other hand, in Abruzzese, *angorə* surfaces more frequently than not in a high position. The even more interesting fact is that in Abruzzese both the negation and the use of the perfective are optional. Indeed, the most usual way of expressing a sentence like “Maria has not gone there yet” is the one in (19a). where, clearly, the negation is absent

9. If asked a grammatical judgement on (18b), speakers of Northern Italian tend to say it is marginal or even ungrammatical, nevertheless when they speak freely they do produce sentences like (18b).

10. Building on empirical data, I will argue that in Abruzzese *ancora* “not... yet” and *già* “already”, when preposed, actually occupy two different positions. For arguments and data, see subsection 3.3. and section 4

and the form of the verb is an imperfective, more specifically in present tense. Nevertheless, there is also the possibility to have the verb in the perfective, as shown by (19b).

- (19) a. Marijə ngorə cə va.
 Mary yet CL.loc goes
 “Mary has not gone there yet.”
- b. Marijə ngorə c'a itə.
 Mary yet CL.loc-has gone
 “Mary has not gone there yet.”

When the negation is indeed present, it can surface in two different positions, one preceding the *angorə* in the reduced form of *n'* (because the following word begins with a vowel), or after the *angorə* in the fully fledged form of *nən*, as visible from (20).

- (20) a. Marijə n'angorə cə va.
 Mary not-yet CL.loc goes
 “Mary has not gone there yet.”
- b. Marijə angorə nən cə va.
 Mary yet not CL.loc goes
 “Mary has not gone there yet.”

Furthermore, having the perfective when the negation is present is also a possibility. Nevertheless, a sentence like (21a) sounds somewhat strange to native speakers who feel the negation is unnecessary; while (21b) is completely acceptable and indeed is similar to the Italian data in (18b).

- (21) a. Marijə n'angorə c'a itə.
 Mary not-yet CL.loc-has gone
 “Mary has not gone there yet.”
- b. Marijə angorə nən c'a itə.
 Mary yet not CL.loc-has gone
 “Mary has not gone there yet.”

Finally, a sentence like (22) which closely mirrors the usual structure of Italian, as given in (18a), is acceptable but sounds very Italianised, as already noted by Biberauer & D'Alessandro (2009: 6).

- (22) Marijə nən c'a angorə itə.
 Mary not CL.loc-has yet gone
 “Mary has not gone there yet.”

The data which have been provided in this section may seem quite complex and even conflicting with each other. Nonetheless, we can make sense of them bearing in mind that the general tendency in Abruzzese *not-yet* sentences is the use of the imperfective form of the verb (instead of the expected perfective) and the absence (or at least the optionality) of the negation. Now, in order to have a clearer idea of the positioning of *angorə* in Abruzzese, it is necessary to investigate its behaviour when co-occurring with *michə* and *manghə*, which will be the focus of the next section.

2.2 Angorə with respect to *micə* and *manghə*

In Italian, when *non... ancora* “not... yet” occurs with either *mica* or *neanche* “not even”, it must follow them as shown in (23). This is correctly predicted by the hierarchy postulated in (11), where *mica* and *neanche* precede the position envisaged for *non... ancora* “not... yet” (recall that it is the same as that of *già* “already”).

- (23) a. Gianni non ci ha mica ancora parlato.
John not CL has MICA yet spoken.
“John has *not* spoken to her/him/them yet.”
- b. Gianni non ci ha neanche ancora parlato.
John not CL has even yet spoken.
“John has *not even* spoken to her/him/them yet.”

However, in Abruzzese the order is the exact opposite and, at least apparently, contradicts the hierarchy in (11). Before assessing the following sentences, it is important to recall that *mica* is not found in Lanicane, and the only source of data in this regard remains Teatino, while for *manghə* the data are the same in the two varieties.

- (24) Marijə angorə michə cə va. (Teatino)
Mary yet MICA CL.loc goes
“Mary has *not* gone there yet.”
- (25) Marijə angorə manghə cə va.
Mary yet even CL.loc goes
“Mary has *not even* gone there yet.”

It is interesting to note that adverb interpolation of *manghə* is possible also in a sentence containing *angorə*. In fact, a clitic can intervene between *angorə* and *manghə* when the form of the verb is not periphrastic, in the same way as a clitic could intervene between the negation and *manghə* in (6a), repeated here for the sake of convenience.

- (26) Marijə nən cə mangħə va a la scolə.
 Mary not CL.loc even goes to the school
 “Mary does not even go to school.”

- (27) I, nghə Marije, angorə cə mangħə parlə.
 I, with Mary, yet CL.loc even speak
 “I have not even gone spoken with Mary yet.”

Nonetheless, when the form of the verb is periphrastic and therefore the perfective is used, there is no possibility of adverb interpolation, as in (29), precisely in the same way as to what happened in (6b), presented once again in (28).

- (28) *Marijə nən cə mangħə a itə a la scolə.
 Mary not CL.loc even has gone to the school
 “Mary did not even gone to school.”

- (29) *I, nghə Marije, angorə cə mangħə so' parlatə.
 I, with Mary, yet CL.loc even was spoken
 “I have not even gone spoken with Mary yet.”

Furthermore, in parallelism with the ungrammaticality of (9), repeated here as (30), in Teatino clitics are not found between *angorə* and *michə*, as is visible from (31).

- (30) *Marijə nən cə michə va a la scolə. (Teatino)
 Mary not CL.loc MICA goes to the school
 “Mary does not even go to school.”

- (31) *I, nghə Marije, angorə cə michə parle. (Teatino)
 I, with Mary, yet CL.loc even speak
 “I have not even gone spoken with Mary yet.”

All the data presented in this section seem to point to a close similarity between the position of the negation and that of *angorə*, one which could also explain the unexpected order *angorə>mica/mangħa*. Moreover, it is worth noting that there is one last position for *michə* and *mangħa* when co-occurring with *angorə*, namely after the verb: this is somewhat marginal for *michə*, while fully grammatical for *mangħa*, confirming once again that *mica* is higher than *neanche*.

- (32) ?Marijə angorə cə va michə. (Teatino)
 Mary yet CL.loc goes MICA
 “Mary has *not* gone there yet.”
- (33) Marijə angorə cə va manghə.
 Mary yet CL.loc goes even
 “Mary has *not even* gone there yet.”

2.3 Angorə and NPIs

Until now, some of the structural similarities between the negation and *angorə* have been highlighted. In the following paragraphs, I will show one last interesting fact about *angorə*, that is to say its ability to license NPIs. In Abruzzese, *nisciunə* “no one” and *niendə* “nothing” are Negative Polarity Items (NPIs), i.e. they need to be c-commanded by a negation in order to appear in a sentence. Only two exceptions to this pattern are allowed: when NPIs appear in the first constituent of the sentence or when they are focussed, they do not need to be licensed. The following examples in (34) and (35) will make this property clear.

- (34) a. N'a minutə nisciunə.
 not-has come no-one
 “No one came.”
- b. *A minutə nisciunə.
 has come no-one
 Intended meaning: “No one came.”
- c. NISCIUNƏ a minutə.
 no-one has come
 “NO ONE came.”
- (35) a. Marijə n'a magnatə niendə.
 Mary not-has eaten nothing
 “Mary did not eat anything.”
- b. *Marijə a magnatə niendə.
 Mary has eaten nothing
 Intended meaning: “Mary did not eat anything.”
- c. Marijə, NIENDƏ, a magnatə.
 Mary nothing has eaten
 “Mary ate NOTHING.”

It will now be interesting to investigate the behaviour of NPIs in relation with *angorə*. In particular, its mere presence makes it possible for an NPI to appear in the sentence, as (36) and (37) clearly reveal.

- (36) Angorə vé nisciunə.
 yet comes no-one
 “No one has arrived yet.”
- (37) Marijə angorə magnə niendə.
 Mary yet eats nothing
 “Mary has not eaten anything yet.”

The fact that *angorə* can license NPIs is particularly revealing since, as already shown, an NPI licenser must be a negation. Thus, the data in (36) and (37) provide evidence to consider *angorə* as a proper negation.

2.4 Summary

The main aim of this section was that of reviewing the syntactic behaviour of *angorə*, without trying to account for it (yet). First of all, we have tried to understand in which positions it can appear: it usually surfaces in a high position in the clausal structure. It has also been highlighted that both the presence of the negation and the use of the perfective are optional, and indeed the general tendency in Abruzzese is to avoid both. In order to have a better grasp of the syntactic characteristics of *angorə*, we have analysed its positioning with respect to *michə* and *mangħə*, pointing out that it closely resembles that of the negation, *nən*. In the third and last part, it has been highlighted how *angorə* is able to license NPIs, a property usually attributed to negations. Before making a proposal to account for the data presented in this section, it will be useful to review previous proposals.

3 Previous analyses

3.1 From PPI to negation: a story of movement and reanalysis

The peculiarity of *angorə* in Abruzzese did not go unnoticed in the literature. There have been at least two (partially) different attempts to provide a formal analysis of its syntactic behaviour. The first account was moulded by Biberauer and D'Alessandro (2009), while the second one, partially building on the former, aimed at giving a more general

account of adverbs found in high positions in the clausal structure in Southern Italo-Romance varieties and was put forward by Garzonio and Poletto (2013; 2017). In what follows, I will examine these two proposals, highlighting their strengths as well as those that appear to be some of their empirical shortcomings. In order to do so, I will provide examples from Abruzzese that seem to contradict the predictions made by these two analyses.

Biberauer and D'Alessandro's (2009) proposal is particularly interesting since it intends to relate the absence of the negation and the use of the imperfective (instead of the perfective), both typical characteristics of sentences containing *angorə* in Abruzzese. Indeed, Biberauer and D'Alessandro (2009) argue that the high *angorə* meaning "not... yet", which they call *angorə*2, is not derived from *nən... angorə*, "not...yet", but from a focussed *angorə* meaning "still", in their words *angorə*1, which then got re-analysed and came to mean "not...yet". This account builds on the fact that many languages¹¹ have the same word to express both "still" and "not...yet": in all these languages, the different meaning is provided by a different position in the clause, the higher one for "not...yet" and the lower for "still". In particular, Biberauer and D'Alessandro (2009) argue that *angorə*1 "still" is a Positive Polarity Item (PPI) endowed with a bundle of two uninterpretable negative (uNeg) features (after Szabolcsi's 2004 analysis of PPIs). On the other hand, *angorə*2 "not... yet", bearing negative meaning, would be characterised by an interpretable negative (iNeg) feature or by a semantic negative (SNeg) feature. In their proposal, although there has been a change in the internal features of *angorə*1 "still" that became *angorə*2 "not... yet", the process of re-analysis of this item has not completed yet and thus the external feature, i.e. the aspect of the verb associated with *angorə*2, is still [-perf], instead of the expected [+perf]. Biberauer and D'Alessandro (2009) argue that this uncompleted process of re-analysis would explain the use of the imperfective in a context in which we expect a perfective. In the next few paragraphs, I will try to assess the evidence brought by Biberauer and D'Alessandro (2009) to support their analysis, evaluating it in view of the data from Lancianese and Teatino.¹²

First of all, Biberauer & D'Alessandro (2009) apply a series of tests to prove that *angorə*1 "still" is a PPI. Szabolcsi (2004), quoted in Biberauer & D'Alessandro (2009: 7), claims that PPIs are not banned in all negative

11. See Biberauer and D'Alessandro (2009) for examples from Standard and Cypriot Greek, Andean Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese.

12. Abruzzese examples from Biberauer and D'Alessandro (2009) come from the variety spoken in Arielli, Ariellese. Arielli lies within the province of Chieti, just like Lanciano, but still there seem to be some salient differences between Lancianese and Ariellese.

contexts and that they can, for instance, appear in the scope of an anti-additive operator if the latter is itself in an NPI licensing context, as shown by the English examples in (38) and in (39).

(38) *I have not seen someone.¹³

(39) I *(don't) think that John didn't call someone.

not > not > some

(Szabolcsi 2004: 417)

The fact that *angorə1* is a PPI would be demonstrated, if it were not able to appear in standard contexts, but able to do so in a context similar to that in (39). According to Biberauer and D'Alessandro (2009), (40) is ungrammatical, while (41) is grammatical.

(40) *Ni mme te' fame angore.

not CL.1s.dat holds hunger still

"I am not still hungry."¹⁴¹⁵

(Biberauer & D'Alessandro 2009: 9)

(41) Nin crede ca ni magne angore.

not believe that not eats still

"I don't believe that he still isn't eating."

(Biberauer & D'Alessandro 2009: 9)

Nevertheless, my informants find (42), the same sentence as (41) but in its Lancianese version (there are only minor morpho-phonological differences between the two), utterly ungrammatical and tend to correct it with (43):

(42) *Nən credə ca nən magnə angorə.

not believe that not eats still

"I don't believe that he still isn't eating."

(43) Nen crede ca angorə magne.

not believe that yet eats

"I don't believe that he hasn't eaten yet."

13. Intended meaning "I have not seen anyone". Any other reading in which (38) could be grammatical is not relevant here, because of the obvious semantic differences.

14. Grammatical on the reading "I am not hungry yet.", even though very Italianised (Biberauer & D'Alessandro 2009: 6).

15. When the examples are taken from other scholars' papers, glosses have been reformulated in order to fit the conventions adopted in this work.

Therefore, (42) is not only ungrammatical, but the only interpretation available for it is the one where *angorə* means “not...yet”, explaining the tendency to correct it with (43). Thus, the ungrammaticality of (42) points against an analysis of *angorə1* “still” as a PPI, at least in Liancianese.

Furthermore, the fact that *angorə1* “still” is not a PPI seems to be confirmed by other data too. Indeed, if *angorə1* “still” were a PPI, it should not be able to appear in yes/no question because in this latter case one of the two uNeg feature would remain unvalued. Biberauer & D’Alessandro (2009: 9) take the ungrammaticality of (44) as evidence supporting an analysis of *angorə1* “still” as a PPI:

- (44) *A accattate *angorə* lu bijette?¹⁶
 has bought still the ticket
 “Has he bought a ticket still?” (Biberauer & D’Alessandro 2009: 9)

However, the ungrammaticality of (44) can be due to the fact that in this sentence *angorə1* “still” is used with the perfective, which as Biberauer & D’Alessandro (2009: 3) themselves point out, is incompatible with *angorə1* “still”. Thus, it will be useful to test the possibility for *angorə1* “still” to appear in yes/no questions if the verb is in the imperfective form. Moreover, it is important to set the context in order to avoid the reading in which *angorə* may mean “again”.

- (45) *Let us imagine there are two neighbours, Maria and Francesca. Francesca asks Maria for some milk since she has none left. Maria too does not have any milk left, so she cannot give it to Francesca. Half an hour later, Maria’s daughter comes back from the shopping and brings home some milk. So, Maria goes knocking on Francesca’s door and asks her:*
- Tə servə *angorə* lu latte?
 CL.2ps.dat needs still the milk
 “Do you still need the milk?”

Clearly, *angorə1* “still” can appear in yes/no questions, and thus this clearly points *against* an analysis under which *angorə1* “still” is a PPI.

Another interesting point raised by Biberauer & D’Alessandro (2009: 4) is an important difference between Abruzzese and other languages in which the same word is used to express both “still” and “not...yet”.

16. At least to me, as heritage speaker of Abruzzese, (44) is grammatical on the reading in which *angorə* is focussed and means “again”, so that the translation would be “Has he bought the ticket AGAIN?”. In any case, this reading is not relevant to the present discussion.

For instance, in Andean Spanish, *todavía* may mean either “still” or “not...yet” depending on its position in the clausal structure. However, when *todavía* is used as an answer to a question like “Have you prepared the dinner?”, it can only be interpreted as “not...yet”, as visible from (47):

- (46) Q: Has preparado la cena?
 have prepared the dinner
 “Have you prepared the dinner?”

- (47) A: Todavía
 still/yet
 “Not yet.” (Biberauer & D’Alessandro 2009: 10)

The same is not true for Abruzzese, and, indeed, in order to make the sentence grammatical it is necessary to add *no* after *angorə*, as shown by (48).

- (48) Q: Si preparatə a mmagna’?
 are prepared to eat
 “Have you prepared the dinner?”
 A1: *Angorə
 Still/yet
 “Not yet.” (Biberauer & D’Alessandro 2009: 9)
 A2: Angorə no.
 still no
 “Not yet.”

Biberauer & D’Alessandro (2009: 15) argue after Merchant (2001) that *angorə* cannot stand as an answer on its own, as in (48A1), since in fragment answers the omitted structure should be “identical to that in the preceding question”. Thus, since in Abruzzese the perfective is used in the question, while the answer requires the imperfective, this difference in aspect would yield the ungrammaticality. On the other hand, since in Andean Spanish, the aspect used in both the question and the answer is perfective, an answer like “*todavía*” is perfectly grammatical. However, this cannot be the reason why (48A1) is ungrammatical and (47) is not. Indeed, in section 3.1, it was shown that although in Lancianese the perfective after *angorə* is optional, it can nonetheless be used, as is visible from (19b), repeated here for the sake of convenience:

- (49) Marijə ngorə c'a itə.
 Mary yet CL.loc-has gone
 "Mary has not gone there yet."

In Lancianese, then, a construction with the perfective after *angorə* is possible, but (48A2) is ungrammatical also in Lancianese (and not only in Ariellese, the variety from which Biberauer and D'Alessandro (2009) take their data). Thus, some other explanation should be looked for in order to account for the fact that *todavía* can stand as a meaningful fragment answer in Andean Spanish, while *angorə* cannot do so in Abruzzese. In particular, the proposal that I will put forward in section 4 envisages an analysis of *angorə* as adjoining to NegP. Such an analysis seems to explain quite clearly the data in (48): since *angorə* adjoins to NegP in Abruzzese, it has to be followed by the negation in order to stand as a grammatical and meaningful fragment answer.

After having reviewed some data that seem to be problematic for Biberauer and D'Alessandro's (2009) analysis, I would like to point out one last issue. Indeed, as it has already been noted, Biberauer and D'Alessandro (2009) are inclined to claim that *angorə2* "not... yet" is derived from *angorə1* "still" instead that deriving from *nən... angorə*, in order to find a justification for the fact that *angorə2* "not... yet" is used with the imperfective in place of the expected perfective. Biberauer & D'Alessandro (2009: 15) also argue that no form similar to *nən... angorə* is found neither in Ariellese nor in neighbouring varieties. Nevertheless, as shown in section 3.1, a form *n'angorə* with the negation *nən*, reduced to "n" because it stands in front of a vocal, it is indeed found in Lancianese, as made clear by (50), repeated from above.

- (50) Marijə n'angorə cə va.
 Mary not-yet CL.loc goes
 "Mary has not gone there yet."

A sentence like (50) clearly shows that there is no one-to-one relation between the use of the imperfective and the absence of the negation, and thus it is not clear why it would be necessary to postulate that *angorə2* "not... yet" derives from a focussed use of *angorə1* "still", instead that from *nən... angorə*, as it is argued in Biberauer and D'Alessandro (2009).

3.2 Intermediate summary

In the previous subsection, Biberauer and D'Alessandro's (2009) account of the syntactic behaviour of *angorə* has been reviewed, also pointing out some of the issues that their analysis raises. First of all, it has been

shown that there is no uncontroversial evidence supporting the claim that *angorə1* “still” is a PPI: indeed, at least in Lancianese, it can never appear in the scope of a negation and, on the other hand, it can be used in yes/no questions. Secondly, it has been underlined that in Abruzzese the impossibility for *angorə* to stand on its own as a meaningful answer cannot be related to a difference in aspect between the question and the answer. Thirdly, we have seen that there is not a one-to-one relation between the absence of negation and the use of the imperfective. Even though, at a first sight, it seemed promising to look for a relation between these two phenomena, the fact that the imperfective is used also with the negation seems to hinder the same assumption on which Biberauer and D’Alessandro (2009) base their work.

3.3 A CP analysis of *angorə*

Now that we have a better understanding of Biberauer & D’Alessandro’s (2009) proposal, we can move on to examine Garzonio & Poletto’s (2013; 2017) analysis. In order to account for various cases in which adverbs like *già* “already”, *sempre* “always” and *mai* “never” could appear before the verb in Early Modern Italian (at a stage when Italian had already stopped being a verb second language), as well as for the fact that *già* “already” and *ancora*, “not... yet”, can precede the verb in Marchegiano, Garzonio & Poletto (2013; 2017) argue that these adverbs moved to the CP. The exact position is identified in Garzonio & Poletto (2013) as that of the Informational Focus at the right edge of the Left Periphery, while it is identified with IntP in Garzonio & Poletto (2017). Their analysis, without doing away with a fixed hierarchy of adverbs à la Cinque (1999), succeeds at explaining why in varieties that do not show differences in the height to which the verb can raise, there can still be differences in the position at which some adverbs surface. However, in the following paragraphs, I will show why their proposal cannot be extended to Abruzzese *angorə*, contrarily to what they argue (Garzonio & Poletto 2013; 2017).

In particular, Garzonio & Poletto (2017: 28) maintain that in the ASIt *angorə* or *n’angorə* is usually found in a high position when it is in questions, as is visible from (51).

- (51) N’angorə li sə ccattatə? (Garzonio & Poletto 2017: 28)
 Not-yet CL.3.acc are bought
 “Haven’t you bought it/them yet?”

However, this can be a bias of the system since *angorə* or *n’angorə* are found in a high position also in non-interrogative sentences and most

frequently used in these contexts rather than in interrogatives. Moreover, Garzonio & Poletto (2017: 28) argue that in sentences like (51) *angorə* lies in IntP, the position where the interrogative force of the sentence is encoded. Thus, in such an analysis *angorə* would lie in the Focus space of the CP, where elements are moved through an operator (Garzonio & Poletto 2013: 30), and it should not be able to co-occur with *wh*-elements. However, *angorə* can appear in questions after a *wh*-element such as *addò*, “where”, as is visible from (52).

- (52) Addò *angorə* vi?
 Where yet go
 “Where haven’t you been yet?”

Interestingly enough, when *già* “already” is found in this same high position in a question, the resulting sentence is considered either ungrammatical or marginal (depending on the speaker), as shown by (53). Nevertheless, even native speakers that do accept marginally (53) vouch for a clear difference between (52) and (53).

- (53) ?/*Addò *già* si ite?
 Where already are gone
 “Where have you already been?”

The difference in grammaticality between (52) and (53) supports the idea that *già* “already” can indeed lie in a Focus or Interrogative position within CP, while *angorə*, at least in Abruzzese, must lie in some other position, most probably lower. Indeed, the data in (52) do not necessarily hinder the plausibility of Garzonio & Poletto’s (2013; 2017) proposal of a CP position for adverbs, which is indeed confirmed by the ungrammaticality/marginality of (53), but they do show that *angorə* has a different behaviour from other proposed adverbs and should be analysed differently.

3.4 Summary

In this section, I have taken into account two different proposal by scholars aiming at explaining the syntactic behaviour of *angorə* in Abruzzese. First of all, it has been pointed out that some empirical data argue against a PPI analysis of *angorə*1 “still” as proposed by Biberauer & D’Alessandro (2009). Moreover, it has been highlighted that the possibility to have the perfective is not restricted to cases in which the negation is absent, a piece of evidence somewhat problematic for a proposal of *angorə*2 “not... yet” as a re-analysed *angorə*1 “still”. In subsection 3.3, I have reviewed

Garzonio & Poletto's (2013; 2017) analysis of the possibility to have adverbs such as *già* "already" and *ancora* in a position preceding the main verb. It has been argued that even though their proposal can generally explain the behaviour of preposed adverbs, still adopting a framework such as that proposed by Cinque (1999) in which adverbs do not usually move, nonetheless it cannot account for the peculiar behaviour of *angorə* in Abruzzese. Indeed, the possibility for *angorə* to appear in questions in which also a *wh*-element is present argues for a position of *angorə* lower than IntP. After this overview, it is now possible to propose a new analysis to explain the syntactic behaviour of *angorə*.

4 Proposing a new analysis

4.1 Angorə adjoins to NegP

In the previous section, we have examined two different proposal aiming at accounting for the syntactic characteristics of *angorə*. In both analyses, *angorə* was regarded as a focussed element, even though in Biberauer & D'Alessandro (2009) *angorə* was then re-analysed as a negative element. However, maintaining that *angorə* lies in a focus position is at odds with the fact that it can co-occur with a *wh*-element in questions, as shown by (52). The fact that *angorə* behaves differently from other adverbs lying in a high position (such as for example *già* "already") suggests that it lies lower than these focussed adverbs. In particular, it will be argued that *angorə* adjoins to NegP, and in some cases it is re-analysed as a proper negation.

In order to determine in which position *angorə* lies, it is useful to analyse the elements that immediately precede and follow it. Indeed, *angorə* always follow the subject when the latter is present in a sentence. However, since the subject does not necessarily lie within IP and could be in some Topic position within CP, this fact is not very telling. As for the elements that follow *angorə*, those are the negation *nən* and the presuppositional negations *michə* and *mangħə*, as shown by the examples given above and repeated here.

- (54) a. Marijə angorə nən cə va. (Teatino)
Mary yet not CL.loc goes
"Mary has not gone there yet."
- b. Marijə angorə michə cə va.
Mary yet MICA CL.loc goes
"Mary has *not* gone there yet."

- c. Marijə angorə manghə cə va.
 Mary yet even CL.loc goes
 "Mary has not even gone there yet."

Since in Abruzzese the negation *nən* can negate a sentence on its own, it is plausible to argue, after Zanuttini 1997, that it lies in the head of NegP1, namely the highest negation present within IP. Moreover, when *michə* and *manghə* are found at the beginning of the sentence they are probably found in SpecNegP1, since in these cases they are able to negate the sentence without the necessity to have any other negative marker, as is visible from (55).

- (55) a. Marijə michə c'a itə a la scolə. (Teatino)
 Mary MICA CL.loc-has gone to the school
 "Mary did *not* go to the school."
 b. Marijə manghə c'a itə a la scolə.
 Mary even CL.loc-has gone to the school
 "Mary did *not even* go to school."

In sentences like (54) *angorə* is found just higher than the negation and no element can intervene between it and *nən* or *michə*. Thus, it is possible to maintain that *angorə* is generated in the usual position just lower than *neanche* "not... even" in the hierarchy given in (11), which is the same as that of *già* "already", but it then adjoins to NegP1. Indeed, *angorə* cannot move to SpecNegP1 since this would violate Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990), given that the final order *angorə > micHə/manghə* would be the opposite of the one postulated in Cinque (1990). Therefore, the fact that *angorə* in Abruzzese precedes *michə* and *manghə* is not an actual violation of the universal hierarchy, but a case in which a movement of adjunction generates an incorporation of *angorə* in the negation. The fact that no other element, apart from the clitic, can intervene between *angorə* and the following negation, be it *nən*, *michə* or *manghə*, clearly supports an adjunction analysis. The process of incorporation leads then to a re-analysis of *angorə* that thus acquires a negative feature and becomes able to negate a sentence on its own. The cases in which the negation is present but precedes *angorə* as in a sentence like (56) are to be understood as intermediate steps, in which the negation is still present but is attached to *angorə*.

- (56) Marijə n'angorə cə va.
 Mary not-yet CL.loc goes
 "Mary has not gone there yet."

It is important to recall that in sentences like (56) the negation is perceived as unnecessary by native speakers and this is easily explained assuming that this is a transition towards a complete re-analysis of *angorə* as a negation. Indeed, we have seen that the general tendency in Abruzzese “not... yet” sentences is to omit the negation, and the fact that *angorə* is endowed with a [+neg] feature is confirmed by the fact that it can license NPIs, as in (57), repeated from above.

- (57) a. Angorə vé nisciunə.
 yet comes no-one
 “No one has arrived yet.”
- b. Marijə angorə magnə niendə.
 Mary yet eats nothing
 “Mary has not eaten anything yet.”

At this point, one could wonder why, if *angorə* adjoins to NegP1, a clitic can be inserted between it and *mangħə*, but not between it and *michə*. In the former case, the clitic attaches to *mangħə* and the latter then moves to SpecNegP1 together with the clitic. In the latter, as it has been already argued, the clitic cannot raise as high as *michə*. Therefore, when *michə* raises to NegP1, the clitic, which could not attach to *michə* already before it moved to NegP1, cannot be found between *angorə* and *michə*. This explains why adverb interpolation is possible with *mangħə* and not with *michə*. At this point, it should be clear why arguing that *angorə* adjoins to the negation explains better than maintaining it lies in CP the characteristics of its positioning within the clausal structure and also its development as an element carrying negative features.

4.2 Possible reasons for the use of the imperfective

Now that we have an explanation for the syntactic behaviour of *angorə*, we still have to account for the use of the imperfective instead of the expected perfective. In Biberauer and D’Alessandro (2009) the use of the imperfective followed by the fact that the *angorə* “not...yet” in their analysis was derived by *angorə* meaning “still” which is never found with the perfective. Nevertheless, as shown in section 3.1, there are some empirical data which are problematic for their analysis. Thus, I am inclined to think that a semantic motivation instead of a syntactic one should be looked for when trying to account for this aspectual mismatch. In order to do so, I will take into account some cases in which also in Italian and in English the imperfective can be used with “not...yet”. One of these peculiar cases is the one represented in (58).

- (58) Maria non va ancora a scuola, (perché ha solo 5 anni).
 Mary not goes yet to school because has only 5 years
 “Mary doesn’t go to school yet, (because she is only 5).”¹⁷

The only meaning available for (58) in Italian (as well as in the English translation) is the one referring to the fact that Maria does not go to school, because she is not obliged to do so due to her young age. Nevertheless, the fact that the imperfective is sometimes allowed with *non...ancora* and *not...yet* even in languages different from Abruzzese seems to provide evidence that the aspect of the verb is influenced by the meaning, and therefore the use of the present in Abruzzese could be related to some kind of overgeneralisation of the facts in (58). Moreover, the fact that many languages use two homophonous adverbs to express “still” and “not...yet” can be once more related to their semantic relatedness. In fact, not having bought a book yet equals to state that you still have to buy the book, or else that you are yet to buy the book. So, even in English, a language in which there is a clear lexical distinction between “still” and “not...yet”, there is some degree of interchangeability between the two lexical items. However, the explanation given in this section is to be considered tentative and in no way exhaustive. Surely, further research, especially comparative one, should be carried out in order to determine if the use of the verb is indeed a semantic issue.

4.3 Summary

In this last section, it has been argued that *angorə* is not focussed in the CP and *tha*, instead, it adjoins to NegP1. The evidence brought in favour of this proposal is related to the fact that *angorə* in Abruzzese precedes elements like the negation or the negative adverbs *michə* and *manghə* which are otherwise higher in the clausal structure. Therefore, in order to avoid a violation of Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990) and of the hierarchy of adverbs postulated in Cinque (1999), an adjunction analysis was proposed. This is confirmed by the fact that nothing can intervene between *angorə* and the following negation. It is also supported by the fact that *angorə* cannot stand on its own as a meaningful, grammatical fragment answer and needs to be followed by the negation *no* to do so (see subsection 3.1). Moreover, I have tried to account for the only exception to this general rule, namely the adverb interpolation of *manghə*, arguing that the clitic attaches to *manghə* before the latter moves to SpecNegP1. The fact that *angorə* adjoins to the negation is also supported by the fact that the incorporation of *angorə* to NegP1 engenders a process of re-analysis in which the adverb becomes itself a negation. Moreover, in

17. I thank Nicole M. for her English native speaker judgement on this sentence.

the second subsection, some reasons for the fact that the imperfective is used instead of the perfective have been provided, arguing that this can simply be a semantic issue, not related to the syntactic peculiarity of *angorə*.

5 Conclusions

Before concluding, it would be useful to offer a brief review of the previous sections. In section 1, it has been determined that the hierarchy proposed by Cinque (1999) was easily applicable to Abruzzese. Moreover, particular attention was payed to the revealing behaviour of the negative adverbs *micha* and *mangha*, and also oto the possibility of adverb interpolation typical of *mangha*. The second section, on the other hand, was devoted to a thorough examination of the syntactic characteristics of *angorə* in Abruzzese. In particular, it has been shown that *angorə* carries a negative feature, as proved by the fact that it can license NPIs. It was also noted that the imperfective can be used in Abruzzese yet-sentences, and that indeed this remains the aspectual form preferred by the speakers, although there is the possibility to use the perfective. In the third section, works by Biberauer & D'Alessandro (2009) on the one hand and Garzonio & Poletto (2013; 2017) on the other were reviewed, illustrating how some of the data presented in this work are problematic for their analyses.

Finally, in the last section, I put forward an alternative analysis of the syntactic behaviour of *angorə*. In particular, it has been highlighted how an adjunction analysis is able to explain the Abruzzese data without violating the hierarchy of adverbs provided in Cinque (1999) and the principle of Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990). The adjunction of *angorə* to NegP triggers a process of re-analysis that makes it possible for the adverb to acquire a negative feature, explaining both its negative meaning and its ability to license NPIs. Finally, it has been argued, at least tentatively, that the use of the imperfective in place of the expected perfective is a semantic issue and not a syntactic one. However, there remain some areas to be analysed further. In particular, it would be interesting to understand the relation between the preposing of higher adverbs such as *già* “already” in Abruzzese and other Southern Italo-Romance languages and the preposing of *angorə* in Abruzzese, at least in its early stages. Indeed, an examination of texts dating to previous stages of the language could shed light on the process of re-analysis of *angorə*. On the other hand, it would be necessary to have a clearer comparative prospective in order to understand the relation between the position of adverbs of type of *angorə*, ambiguous between a “still” reading and a “not...yet”

one, and their semantic reading. It would also be interesting to determine whether the two forms *angorə* and *ngorə* are completely interchangeable or if the difference in phonological content singnals also syntactic differences. I leave all these issues for future research.

References

- Biberauer, Theresa & Roberta D'Alessandro. 2009. Syntactic change in progress: insights from the case of angore. LAGB 50, Edinburgh, and CIDS 4, Cambridge.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- D'Alessandro, R. & I. Roberts. 2010. Past participle agreement in abruzzese: split auxiliary selection and the null-subject parameter. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28. 41–72.
- Garzonio, J. & C. Poletto. 2013. Sulla posizione degli avverbi nella struttura frasale in alcune varietà delle marche. *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt* 15. 23–43.
- Garzonio, J. & C. Poletto. 2017. When low adverbs are high: on adverb movement in abruzzese. *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt* 17. 19–34.
- Ledgeway, A. & A. Lombardi. 2005. Verb movement, adverbs and clitic positions in romance. *Probus* 17. 79–113.
- Loporcaro, Michele. 2009. *Profilo linguistico dei dialetti italiani*. Roma & Bari: Laterza.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: sluicing, islands and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti: sintassi*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Schifano, N. 2015. Il posizionamento del verbo nei dialetti romanzi d'italia. *The Italianist* 35. 121–138.
- Szabolcsi, A. 2004. Positive polarity – negative polarity. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22. 409–452.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997. *Negation and clausal structure: a comparative study of romance languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.