On the Interaction between Aspect and Negation in Dialectal Italian[1]

Verner Egerland

(University of Lund)

1.   Introduction

The Italian adverb *ancora* is polysemous and polyfunctional. Its possible translations in English are at least the ones listed in (1)-(3).[2]

(1)   It.   Sta   ancora   parlando.

        is[3sing.]   ANCORA speaking

        'He/she is still speaking'

(2)   It.   Ha   parlato ancora.

        has[3sing.]   spoken ANCORA

        'He/she has spoken again'

(3)   It.   Non   ha   ancora   parlato.

        not   has[3sing.]   ANCORA spoken

        'He/she hasn't spoken yet'

[2] Throughout the paper, Italian *ancora* and its dialectal equivalents will not be translated in the English gloss, but are given in the generic form ANCORA. The choice between *still*, *yet*, or *again* will be made explicit only in the idiomatic translations.

In (1), ANCORA signals continuative aspect, whereas in (2), it expresses repetition of the eventuality. In (3), ANCORA is traditionally described as a negative adverb: it describes a situation in which the eventuality has not occurred but is supposed to do so.

There are Italian dialects in which ANCORA takes on a negative reading even if it is not under the scope of negation, as in (4).

(4)   Sam.   ngorə   escə

             ANCORA   goes-out[3sing.]

             'He/she has not left yet'

The phenomenon illustrated in (4) is attested in varieties of the regions of Molise and Abruzzo, areas where the dialectal usage is claimed to have some influence on spoken regional Italian as well (Giammarco 1960, 1976; Telmon 1993). For instance, authors seem to agree that the negative usage of ANCORA brings about the presuppositional semantics associated with *(not…) yet*: (4) is roughly paraphrasable as 'he/she has yet to leave'. However, though the phenomenon is well known, there does not seem to be any syntactic account and I am not aware of any exhaustive descriptive treatment.

The empirical generalisations presented below are based on speakers from the village of San Martino in Pensilis in the province of Campobasso, Molise, who refer to their own dialect as *Sammartinese*. I ignore whether the usage of ANCORA in Sammartinese is substantially different from that of other areas. Dialectal variation would certainly not be unexpected, though I believe that at least some core properties of the construction are shared by all the dialects in question.

The purpose of this paper is to provide a description and a principled analysis of the usage illustrated in (4). The discussion will incorporate the following hypotheses.

1. The various interpretations of ANCORA correspond to different positions in the syntactic tree.

2. In all of its readings, ANCORA introduces aspectual operation on the basic eventuality.

3. The negative interpretation of (4) is crucially dependent on word order. More precisely, in the case in which ANCORA receives negative semantics, it lexicalises two operators: one associated to a (lower) aspectual projection, the other to a (higher) negative projection where it is "spelled out". The difference between Sammartinese and standard Italian boils down to a difference in lexicalisation strategies.

4. ANCORA can realise the negation operator only if the grammatical aspect is imperfective. The negative interpretation is barred in perfective environments. Presumably, this is the result of an intervention effect that needs to be better understood.

The following analysis draws upon the cartographic approach to syntax. However, some concepts will be borrowed from Discourse Representation Theory (Kamp & Reyle 1993, de Swart 1998). In brief, the DRT assumes that the aspectual interpretation of a structure is provided by a set of aspectual operators, corresponding to *grammatical* or *view-point aspect*. These grammatical aspects operate on the basic eventuality (or the *eventuality description*), which contains the predicate and its arguments, including its *lexical aspect* or *Aktionsart*. (For discussion on these concepts I refer to Bertinetto 1986, for Italian, and Smith 1991, for English.)

The DRT is readily compatible with a cartographic approach to syntax. That is, the logic-semantic operators can be readily translated into a syntactic tree, and there may be some advantages in doing so. The crucial condition for such an enterprise, however, is that the cartographic theory of syntax is understood as being representational. In other words, no restriction operates on the derivation but only on the resulting structure. On the contrary, the DRT, formulated as a "macro theory" in which evaluation applies to the complete predicative-aspectual structure, is not compatible with a strictly derivational approach to syntax as in Chomsky (1995) and subsequent work in Minimalism.

2.   The distribution and the interpretation of ANCORA in Sammartinese

The properties of the construction that will concern us are summarised in 2.1-2.8.

2.1   ANCORA can appear in a lower position yielding continuative or repetive meaning, just as in standard Italian (and other typologically similar languages).

(5)   Sam.   escə   angorə

leaves[3sing.]   ANCORA

'He/she leaves again'

(6) Sam.   chiagnə   angorə

weeps[3sing.]   ANCORA

'He/she weeps again' / 'He/she is still weeping'

2.2   ANCORA can be under the scope of negation, as in standard Italian.

(7) Sam.   nə   escə   angorə

not   leaves[3sing.]   ANCORA

'He/she doesn't leave yet'

When ANCORA appears in the low position, it can only receive negative interpretation if the negation *nə* is spelled out.

2.3   Unlike standard Italian (8), the dialectal grammar allows for ANCORA to acquire negative interpretation when it appears in a preverbal position as in (9).

(8) It.   ancora   esce

ANCORA   leaves[3sing.]

'Again he/she leaves!'

(9) Sam.   ngorə   escə

ANCORA   leaves[3sing.]

'He/she doesn't leave yet'

In (9), according to the consultants, ANCORA can only receive the negative interpretation. My informants accept the word order illustrated in (10) in Sammartinese as well, providing a focal reading for ANCORA.

(10) Sam.   anGOrə   escə

ANCORA   leaves[3sing.]

'Again he/she leaves!'

In such an event, ANCORA is presumably raised to a high position in the Comp-field of Rizzi (1997). This option, which is generally available, is not directly relevant for the case at hand and is disregarded in the remaining discussion (see Poletto 2009 for discussion).

2.4   When ANCORA appears in the preverbal position, the negation *nə* cannot be realised.

(11) Sam.   *ngorə   nə   escə

         ANCORA   not   leaves[3sing.]

2.5   The negative reading associated to ANCORA in the preverbal position is attested with verbs of all aspectual categories. Along the lines of Mourelatos (1978), Bach (1986), de Swart (1998), and others, three basic such categories will be assumed: States, Processes, and Events.[3]

States

(12) a.   Sam.   ngorə è   a   Romə

                        ANCORA is[3sing.]   in   Rome

                        'He/she is not yet in Rome'

      b.   Sam.   ngorə   té   u   pensierə

                        ANCORA have[1sing.]   a   thought

                        'I don't worry yet'

Processes

(13) a.   Sam.   ngorə   magnə

                        ANCORA   eats[3sing.]

                        'He/she doesn't eat yet'

      b.   Sam.   ngorə   parlə

                        ANCORA   speaks[3sing.]

                        'He/she doesn't speak yet'

---

[3] The category Event includes what were two separate categories in Vendler's (1957) ontology: Achievements and Accomplishments. No distinction between Achievements and Accomplishments is called for in the following discussion.

Events

(14) a.   Sam.   ngorə   u   trovə   nu   lavorə

                  ANCORA it[obj.cl.] finds[3sing.]   a   job

                  'He/she doesn't find a job yet'

     b.   Sam.   ngorə   cə   sposə

                  ANCORA   *refl*[3sing.] marries[3sing.]

                  'He/she doesn't marry yet'

2.6   In the perfective past, i.e. in the compound tense, ANCORA cannot appear in the prever-bal position with the relevant interpretation (the a-examples of (15)-(17)). In such a case, AN-CORA remains in the lower position, under the scope of the explicit negation (the b-examples of (15)-(17)).

(15) a.   Sam.   *ngorə sieng   statə   a   Romə

                  ANCORA is[1sing.]   been in   Rome

     b.   Sam.   nge   sieng   angorə statə a   Romə

                  not-*loc*.   is[1sing.]   ANCORA been in   Rome

                  'I haven't been to Rome yet'

(16) a.   Sam.   *ngorə a   magnatə

                  ANCORA has[3sing.]   eaten

     b.   Sam.   n'a   magnatə   angorə

                  not-has[3sing.] eaten   ANCORA

                  'He hasn't eaten yet'

(17) a.   Sam.   *ngorə l'a   trəvatə nu lavorə

                  ANCORA it-has[3sing.] found a   job

     b.   Sam.   nə   l'a   trəvatə angorə nu   lavorə

                  not   it-has[3sing.]   found ANCORA a job

                  'He hasn't found a job yet'

Note that, in its lower position, ANCORA can actually appear both between the auxiliary and the past participle, as in (15b), as well as after the past participle, as in (16b) and (17b).

2.7   In the imperfective past, ANCORA has the same properties as in the present. That is to say, when ANCORA appears in the preverbal position, it receives negative interpretation.

(18) a.   Sam.   magnavənə   angorə

                          ate-IMP-[3plur.]   ANCORA

                          'they were still eating'

      b.   Sam.   ngorə   magnavənə

                          ANCORA ate-IMP-[3plur.]

                          'they didn't eat yet'

2.8   The progressive is distinctly different with regard to the interpretation of ANCORA. In Sammartinese, as well as in Italian, the progressive is formed out of the verb *stare* 'be' 'stay' and the gerund as in (19a). In this construction, ANCORA is not acceptable in the preverbal position with negative interpration (19b).

(19) a.   Sam.   stevə   angorə   dərmennə

                          was-IMP-[3sing.]   ANCORA   sleeping

                          'he/she was still sleeping'

      b.   Sam.   *ngorə stevə   dərmennə

                          ANCORA was-IMP-[3sing.]   sleeping

                          'he/she was not yet asleep'

I assume that the data presented under 2.1-2.8 constitute the core properties of the construction. The observations can be captured by three rather simple generalisations:

1.   In simple tenses, such as the present and the imperfect, ANCORA acquires a negative interpretation in a preverbal position.

2.   In this preverbal position, ANCORA is in complementary distribution with the negation *nə*.

3.   In the compound tense and in the progressive, ANCORA cannot receive a negative interpretation in the preverbal position.

In the following section, it will be argued that these properties follow from the interaction of semantic and syntactic restrictions.

3.   Analysis

3.1   The analysis depends on our general understanding of the syntax and semantics of ANCORA. To begin with, consider the three basic eventuality types. Their aspectual properties can be visually described as in the schemes in (20).[4]

(20)   *State*:   he/she is worried   ———

       Process: he/she speaks   >>>>

       Event: he/she gets married   >>>>│

For concreteness, following the line of thought of the above cited works, I assume that this classification is based on the dichotomy between *homogeneous* and *quantized* eventualities (Krifka 1989, de Swart 1998: 351). In brief, homogeneous eventualities (States and Processes) do not have an inherent end point, whereas quantized eventualities (Events) do have such an end point, marked with "│" in the scheme of (20).

    Then, we need to make a first distinction between ANCORA in the sense of 'still' and ANCORA in the sense of 'yet'.[5] I assume that ANCORA 'still' introduces an aspectual operator into the derivation (e.g. Tovena 1994). The operator translates into a view point, marked with "•" in the scheme of (21), and placed in the duration of the eventuality.

(21)   *State*:   he/she is still worried   ———

                                                      •

       Process: he/she still speaks   >>>>

                                                     •

       Event: he/she still gets married   … >>>>│ >>>>│ >>>>│

                                                            •

---

[4] Recall that, for present purposes, no distinction needs to be made between Achievements and Accomplishments. The scheme in (20) suggests that the event of *getting married* can be understood as having duration up until an end point (">>>>│") . Alternatively, such an event is interpreted as purely punctual ("│"). Nothing crucial hinges on this for the following discussion.

[5] This distinction will suffice for our discussion. Henceforth, I set aside the repetitive reading (ANCORA 'still') which, however, is the easiest one to associate to quantized eventualities like *get married*.

Such a view point is readily added to homogeneous eventualities, States and Processes, but induces coercion when operating on the quantized eventuality, the Event. The Event, which inherently implies an end point, is coerced into a homogeneous eventuality, roughly meaning that the situation described is continuously repeated. An utterance like *she still marries younger men* suggests that she is in the habit of doing so.[6]

In languages such as English or standard Italian, ANCORA 'yet' is a polarity item licensed by the negation operator (or, alternatively, in a yes-no question). Under the scope of negation, the view point is now shifted to a moment prior to the eventuality.

(22) *State*:   he/she is not worried yet   ———

                                                          •

      Process: he/she does not speak yet   >>>>

                                                          •

      Event: he/she does not marry yet   >>>> |

                                                          •

Note that ANCORA 'yet' is a negative adverb interpreted under polarity, while at the same time it introduces an aspectual operator translating into a view point.

The way these operators are lexicalised obviously varies cross-linguistically. Whereas in English, the interpretations are assigned to separate lexemes, in Italian one single lexical item covers both. The following account is compatible with the unified hypothesis argued for by Tovena (1994), in so far as semantics is concerned. ANCORA is here assumed to have aspectual content in all of its occurrences.[7]

---

[6] Note that the homogeneity of the eventuality correlates with the non-specificity of the DP object, hence the oddity of #*she still marries John*. In the progressive, where aspectual coercion has already operated on the basic eventuality, there is a further interpretation possibility. In *she is still marrying John* the view point is placed inside the duration of the single eventuality. The expression is then compatible with a situation in which their marriage in some sense is still going on (she is still set on marrying John, the preparations have started, or something of the like).

[7] In the terms of a checking version of syntactic theory, ANCORA is endowed with an aspectual feature in all of its uses. The question arises whether ANCORA 'yet', as well as ANCORA 'still', in some sense induces aspectual coercion of quantized eventualities. The scheme in (20) does not consider this possibility, quite simply because the eventuality of *get married* is no longer understood as being continuously repeated. However, it could be argued that the "moment" introduced by ANCORA 'yet' is actually a *state* prior to the eventuality. If so, this is true for all eventuality classes alike. This question can be left open for present purposes.

Suppose that, in Sammartinese, we have yet another lexicalisation strategy: not only can ANCORA express the two functions of still and yet, it also covers that of the negation operator itself. The possibile structures of Sammartinese, then, are listed under 3.2-3.3.

3.2   First, consider the case in which ANCORA appears lower than the finite verb, yielding the semantics of 'still' or 'again' as in (6), here repeated as (23).

(23) Sam.   chiagnə   angorə

           weeps[3sing.]   ANCORA

           'He/she weeps again' / 'He/she is still weeping'

Following Cinque (1999), the two readings of ANCORA are associated with different projections in the syntactic tree. The continuative reading expressed by *still* occurs when ANCORA is higher in the sentence structure than the repetitive reading associated to *again*. This difference is not detectable at the surface in (23), given that the finite V, in each event, raises to a higer position so as to appear higher than ANCORA.[8]

(24)   … [TP *pro* chiagnə … [AspP ANCORA … [VP ~~chiagnə~~]]]

In the compound tense, the participle optionally raises within VP-domain (i.e. the lower part of the sentence) giving raise to two possible word orders, AUX-ANCORA-participle and AUX-participle-ANCORA, as in (15b) and (16b), here repeated as (25a)-(b).

(25) a.   Sam. nge   sieng   angorə statə   a   Romə

                      not-*loc*.   is[1sing.]   ANCORA been in   Rome

---

[8] Accommodating the discourse semantic approaches into a cartographic theory enables us to make explicit claims about sequencing. As it stands, the account of Tovena (1994) does not handle word order facts with precision, and it is not quite clear whether it intends to. For instance, the different distribution of ANCORA 'still' and ANCORA 'again' in standard Italian is dealt with in the following terms:

«… the preferred positioning close to the element that bears the aspectual information may be due to the fact that in the 'still' reading ancora affects the eventuality from inside, i.e. it asserts the extension of its duration.» (Tovena 1994: 11)

Likewise, neither in Tovena (1994) nor in the DRT approaches to aspectual operations, is it obvious how to derive the correlation between negative semantics and word order attested in a system like Sammartinese.

b. Sam. n'a   magnatə   angorə

         not-has[3sing.] eaten   ANCORA

(26)   … [TP pro AUX … (participle) … [AspP ANCORA … [EventualityP (participle)]]]

3.2   Suppose that in Sammartinese, ANCORA can itself lexicalise the negative operator. Furthermore, recall that ANCORA always induces an aspectual operation on the eventuality, following Tovena 1994. Then, in environments such as (14b), here repeated as (27), ANCORA carries two interpretative elements, the aspectual one and the negative one.

(27) Sam. ngorə cə   sposə

         ANCORA *refl*[3sing.]   marries[3sing.]

         'He/she doesn't marry yet'

The natural way to capture this under a syntactic account is to say that ANCORA is associated both to the Aspect Phrase and to a higher Negation Phrase, perhaps identical to the ΣP of Laka (1990), where it is spelled out (also, Zanuttini 1997).

(28)   … [NegP ANCORA … [TP pro V … [AspP ~~ANCORA~~ … [EventualityP V]]]]

This treatment diverges from that of Belletti (1990: 29-32) for standard Italian. In Belletti (1990), negative adverbs like ANCORA, (*non…*) *più* '(no…) more', or (*non…*) *mai* '(not…) ever' are generated in [Spec, Neg] and are licensed by the negative head of the NegP. In Sammartinese, however, ANCORA can raise to a higher position and replace negation. This is not a property of negative adverbs such as *più* and *mai*, but is, rather, similar to that of a negative quantifier like *nessuno* 'nobody' in standard Italian. In standard Italian, *nessuno* is licensed under the scope of the negation *non* (29a). *Nessuno* optionally raises to a preverbal position (29b) yielding the same meaning as in (29a). In this higher position, however, *nessuno* cannot cooccur with the negation, witness (29c).

(29) a.   It.   non   esce   nessuno

                          not   leaves[3sing.] nobody

b.	It.	nessuno		esce
		nobody		leaves[3sing.]
c.	It.	*nessuno	non	esce
		nobody	not	leaves[3sing.]

Therefore, judging from its distribution, ANCORA in Sammartinese appears to be more similar to a negative quantifier than to a negative adverb.[9]

Why, then, is raising of ANCORA to the NegP barred in a compound tense? From a purely semantic point of view, it is not obvious why this restriction should hold. Recall that, in Sammartinese, (30a) and (30b) are both acceptable as roughly synonymous expressions.

(30)	a.	Sam.	nə	candə	angorə
			not	sings[3sing.]	ANCORA
	b.	Sam.	ngorə	candə	
			ANCORA	sings[3sing.]	
			'he doesn't sing yet'		

Given this optionality, it is not obvious why (31a)-(b) could not in a similar way be interpreted as free variants of the same expression.

(31)	a.	Sam.	n'a	candatə	angorə
			not-has[3sing.]	sung	ANCORA
			'he hasn't sung yet'		

---

[9] There is a difference between ANCORA and the other negative adverbs in standard Italian as well: ANCORA can raise higher in the structure so as to precede the negation *non*. The example is from Belletti (1990: 127 n. 7):

(i)	It.	Il	bambino	ancora	non	parla
		the	child	ANCORA	not	speaks
		'the child doesn't speak yet' / 'the child still doesn't speak'				

Belletti suggests that ANCORA in this structure adjoins to the negative head which itself raises and adjoins to the finite verb. This hypothesis might be supported by the fact that there is an adjacency requirement: in (i), ANCORA and *non* cannot be separated by other elements. However, the analysis of ANCORA as a syntactic head, a clitic, is problematic for morphophonological reasons (e.g. Cardinaletti & Starke 1999). Though the analysis of standard Italian is beyond the scope of this paper, I propose extending the analysis of Sammartinese to Italian, saying that in (i), ANCORA targets a higher (non-clitic) position in the tree.

b.	Sam.	*ngorə a	candatə
		ANCORA has[3sing.]	sung

I suggest, instead, that the restriction we are trying to understand is syntactic in nature and stems from locality. Following the DRT, the compound tense itself introduces an aspectual operator (PERFECTIVE) into the structure (de Swart 1998: 353-354). Translating this claim into syntactic structures, (32a) is the structure of a compound tense, while (32b) is the structure of (31a). (32c) is the structure corresponding to (31b).[10]

(32) a.   … [$_{AspP}$ PERF … [$_{EventualityP}$ Eventuality]]

  b.   … [$_{NegP}$ NEG [$_{AspP}$ PERF [$_{AspP}$ ANCORA [$_{EventualityP}$ Eventuality]]]]

  c.   *… [$_{NegP}$ ANCORA [$_{AspP}$ PERF [$_{AspP}$ ~~ANCORA~~ [$_{EventualityP}$ Eventuality]]]]

In brief, we can state that (32c) violates minimality. In order for ANCORA to be interpreted, its two contributions to the interpretation need to be syntactically connected. The structure of (32c) cannot receive an interpretation because the PERF operator intervenes between the two possible sites of ANCORA.

By contrast, recall that ANCORA can appear in the higher position in imperfective environments. This holds true for (18b) here repeated as (33):

(33) Sam.   ngorə magnavənə

      ANCORA ate-IMP-[3plur.]

      'they didn't eat yet'

As a matter of fact, this difference between the perfective past and the imperfective past follows straightforwardly from the DRT analysis of de Swart (1998: 368). According to de Swart, the imperfective past of French, the *imparfait*, which I assume to be essentially similar to the Italian *imperfetto*, is to be understood as aspectually neutral, open for whatever aspectual interpretation that is given by the basic eventuality, and hence «transparent»: in a case such as (33), the sentence inherits its aspectual character from the embedded eventuality de-

---

[10] For concreteness, the PERF operator of the DRT is presumably to be identified with the Tense Anterior projection of Cinque (1999: 106).

scription.[11] In other words, in (33) there is no aspectual operation on the basic eventuality, hence no intervention effect arises.

In the progressive, however, things are different. I assume that the Italian and Sammartinese progressive is similar to its English equivalent in the sense that it is the outcome of an aspectual operation on the basic eventuality, and more precisely by the presence of a PROGRESSIVE operator (de Swart 1998: 354-355). Consider, again, the contrast between (19a)-(b), here repeated as (34a)-(b).[12]

(34) a. Sam. stevə angorə dərmennə

was-IMP-[3sing.] ANCORA sleeping

'he/she was still sleeping'

b. Sam. *ngorə stevə dərmennə

ANCORA was-IMP-[3sing.] sleeping

'he/she was not yet asleep'

The progressive reading stems from a PROG operator, as stated in (35a), which is the structure of (34a), while (35b) corresponds to (34b).

(35) a. … [$_{AspP}$ PROG … [$_{EventualityP}$ Eventuality]]]]

b. *… [$_{NegP}$ ANCORA [$_{AspP}$ PROG [$_{AspP}$ ~~ANCORA~~ [$_{EventualityP}$ Eventuality]]]]

As in the case of the perfective past (32c), the aspectual operator in (35b) intervenes between the lower and the higher positions of ANCORA and, hence, blocks the dependency. I conclude that all crucial properties listed in *2.1-2.8* can be derived under the present account.

---

[11] In fact, the simple tenses *passé simple* and *imparfait*, in de Swart's treatment, both encode tense as well as aspect, while the compound tense introduces aspectual operation into the structure. In several Italian dialects, including Sammartinese, the simple perfective tense (the *passato remoto*, equivalent to French *passé simple*) has entirely disappeared from usage. Therefore, in Sammartinese, de Swart's claim can only be tested on the imperfective past, which clearly behaves as predicted.

[12] (34b) is unacceptable under the relevant reading, that is, the negative one. However, (34b) is acceptable with a "high" reading associated to ANCORA, see § 2.3 above.

4.   More on the syntactic status of *ngorə*

As may have become obvious from the examples, there is a further issue concerning the morphophonology and the distribution of ANCORA: when ANCORA appears in ΣP / NegP position receiving a negative interpretation, it is realised in a phonologically reduced form, *ngorə*, whereas in the lower part of the structure it is always spelled out as *angorə*.

(36)   a.   Sam.   cə sposə angorə

             b.   Sam.   ngorə cə sposə

It can be argued that, on certain assumptions, such a reduction corroborates the present analysis. First, assume that the negation *nə* in Sammartinese is a clitic element in the head of NegP, as is commonly assumed for Italian *non* and French *ne*. Then, recall that the precise position of ANCORA within the ΣP / NegP was not made explicit above. Given that ANCORA in ΣP / NegP cannot cooccur with nə, suppose that ngorə in this position actually occupies the head Σ / Neg. This means, essentially, that *ngorə* has the distribution of a head. It has been argued that syntactic clitic-hood is reflected in morphophonological "deficiency" (Cardinaletti & Starke 1999). Clitics and weak pronouns are generally deaccentuated (though not always) and, furthermore, are morphophonologically reduced as compared to strong pronouns. In particular, clitics are generally monosyllabic (while bisyllabic weak pronouns are attested). I suggest that, in this dialect, *ngorə* is structurally deficient in a way parallell to clitic pronouns.

Such a solution is probably preferable to its alternative, namely that the negative head is morphologically represented in *ngorə*. Paola Benincà (p.c.) points out to me that in pado-vano the form *gnancora* (< NON ANCORA) is attested, resulting from the overt incorporation of the negative head into ANCORA. Considering, however, that the only phonologically visible effect in Sammartinese is the fall of the initial *a*, the incorporation hypothesis does not straightforwardly apply to Sammartinese.

Verner Egerland

5.   Summary

This paper has revealed some correlations between word order and interpretation concerning the adverb ANCORA in a South Italian dialect. The dialectal data are partly similar, partly different from standard Italian. The account of these correlations, it has been argued, is crucially dependent on the combination of two different though compatible frameworks: on the one hand, some version of the cartographic approach to syntax and, on the other, some version of a discourse semantic approach to aspect, in the present case the DRT. While the cartographic approach provides an explicit analysis of word order facts, and hence the basics for an explanation of the distribution of ANCORA, the DRT gives a principled account for certain intervention effects which would otherwise remain unexplained. The combination of these approaches is not only fruitful, but essential for our understanding of the correlation of the syntactic and semantic properties of expressions such as ANCORA. Arguably, such a result would not be as easily achieved within a derivational approach to syntax.

References

Bach, E. (1986) *The Algebra of Events.* Linguistics and Philosophy 9: 5-16.

Belletti, A. (1990) *Generalized Verb Movement. Aspects of Verb Syntax*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Bertinetto, P. (1986) *Tempo, Aspetto e Azione nel verbo italiano. Il sistema dell'indicativo.* Firenze: Accademia della Crusca.

Cardinaletti, A. & M. Starke (1999) 'The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns'. In Riemsdijk, H. (ed.) *Clitics in the Languages of Europe. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*, 145–233. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Giammarco, E. (1960) *Grammatica delle parlate d'Abruzzo e Molise*. Pescara: Artigianelli.

Giammarco, E. (1976) 'Incontro tra lingua e dialetto'. In Pisani, V. & C. Santoro (eds.) *Italia linguistica nuova ed antica. Studi in memoria di O. Parlangeli*, 495-511. Galatina: Congedo.

Kamp, H. & U. Reyle (1993) *From Discourse to Logic*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Krifka, M. (1989) 'Nominal reference, temporal constitution and quantification in event semantics'. In Bartsch, R., J. van Benthem and P. van Emde Boas (eds.), *Semantics and Contextual Expressions*, 75-115. Dordrecht: Foris.

König, E. & C. E. Traugott (1982) 'Divergence and apparent convergence in the development of *yet* and *still*'. *BLS* 8, 170–179

Laka, I. (1990) *Negation in Syntax: On the nature of functional categories and projections*. Ph.d Dissertation, MIT.

Mourelatos, A. (1978) 'States, Processes, and Events'. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2: 415-434.

Poletto, C. (2009) 'I quantificatori e la negazione nei dialetti calabresi del progetto ASIt'. Ms. Università di Venezia.

de Swart, H. (1998) 'Aspect Shift and Coercion'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, 347-385.

Telmon, T. (1993) 'Varietà regionali'. In Sobrero, A. (ed.) *Introduzione all'italiano contemporaneo. La variazione e gli usi*, 93-149. Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Tovena, L. M. (1994) 'The context sensitivity of the Italian adverb *ancora*'. *Proceedings of Console 3*, Rijks Universiteit Leiden, 231-246.

Vendler, Z. (1957) 'Verbs and Times'. *The Philosophical Review*, 143-160.

Zanuttini, R. (1997) *Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.

verner.egerland@rom.lu.se