

“A Microparametric View of Imperatives and Pronouns”

Lori Repetti and Francisco Ordóñez

Stony Brook University

It has been widely noted that imperative verbs in Romance languages may exhibit a unique syntax for clitic pronouns (Rivero 1994, Zanuttini 1994, 1997, etc.). Romanello and Repetti (2014) conducted a typological investigation of various imperative characteristics of the Romance varieties spoken in Italy, including varieties with post-verbal pronouns and with stress shift with enclisis, and they identify the following generalization: if the first person plural (1pl) form of the imperative exhibits one of these characteristics, the second person plural (2pl) form exhibits that same characteristic; and if the 2pl has one of these traits, the second person singular (2sg) form also does. The result is that each imperative characteristic manifested in a particular variety appears in the 2sg.

(1) post-verbal clitic pronouns

	(a) Italian ‘call’ + him	(b) Luras (SS) ‘sell’ + it	(c) Scuol (Grisons) ‘call’ + him
2sg	kjáma-lo	béŋđi-lu	klóma-l / til klóma
2pl	kjamáte-lo	béŋđíte-lu	til klómái
1pl	kjamjámo-lo	lu béŋđímusu	til klómáin

(2) stress shift with enclisis (weak pronouns)

	(a) Accettura (MT)	(b) Aliano (MT)	(c) Pigna (IM)	(d) Italian
2sg	ca:mé:-lə	camá-llə	tʃamá-ru	kjáma-lo
2pl	cama:té:-lə	caməti-llə	tʃamá-ru	kjamáte-lo
1pl	cama:mé:-lə	camámə-lə	tʃamámu-ru	kjamjámo-lo

In some varieties we see the intersection of these two characteristics, with enclisis and stress shift in some forms and proclisis in others.

(3) stress shift with enclisis (weak pronouns) and proclisis (clitics)

	Siliqua (CA) ‘call’ + him
2sg	tserriáđđu
2pl	tserriéđđu
1pl	đu tserriáuzu

Romanello and Repetti (2014) propose the following implicational hierarchy to describe their findings.

(4) 2sg < 2pl < 1pl

This can be represented in terms of features as in Table 1.

Table 1	[addressee]	[plural]	[speaker]
2sg	+	-	-
2pl	+	+	-
1pl	+	+	+

In this talk, we provide a formal analysis of this hierarchy by considering verb movement (of affirmative informal imperatives) and the presence of the speaker head and the addressee head in the left periphery of the sentence (see Wiltsko, Poletto, etc.). This approach allows us to account for enclisis and the availability of a weak pronoun in enclisis. We assume that specific imperatives involve a relation with C in which illocutionary force is able to probe the verb (Rivero 1996, Kayne 1994). The feature checking of the illocutionary force can occur through agree or head movement. The relevant feature checked is a [+addressee] feature in the higher CP field. Following recent proposals by Hill (2014), Wiltschko (2021), etc., we adopt the existence of two heads, one related to the addressee and one related to the speaker. We assume that the addressee is the only head that contains imperative illocutionary force. Thus, all verbs will have to enter into an Agree relation with the Addressee head, or they move there overtly.

(5) [AddresseeP [SpeakerP [VP]]]

In order to account for the implicational hierarchy in (4), we will propose two different positions for clitics and weak pronouns. Clitics positions are always higher than weak pronoun positions (Ordóñez and Repetti 2014). This crucially interacts with head movement of the verb to the position of the clitic or weak pronoun. We also assume that when the verb reaches the clitic position, enclisis is required by antisymmetry. Finally, if a clitic position is available in a higher projection, the weak pronoun alternative is not permitted by Economy of Representations (Cardinaletti and Starke 1997). Here is how we explain the patterns in (1)-(3).

There are varieties with no clitic positions in imperatives, so that only weak pronouns are permitted, as in Accettura (2a).

(6) [AddresseeP V [SpeakerP [weak pronouns]]] *weak pronouns with 2sg, 2pl, 1pl*

There are varieties with a clitic position in the Addressee head, and we find consistent verb movement to AddresseeP, resulting in enclisis in all forms, as in Italian (1a).

(7) [AddresseeP V+CL [SpeakerP []]] *enclisis with 2sg, 2pl, 1pl*

In other cases, there is verb movement to SpeakerP in 1pl, resulting in proclisis, but the verb moves to the Addressee head in 2sg and 2pl, resulting in enclisis in those forms. This is illustrated in Luras (1b).

(8) [AddresseeP CL [SpeakerP V []]] *proclisis with 1pl*

[AddresseeP V+CL [SpeakerP []]] *enclisis with 2sg and 2pl*

If there is no verb movement to SpeakerP or AddresseeP, we find consistent proclisis, as in Scuol (1c).

(9) [AddresseeP CL [SpeakerP [V]]] *proclisis with 2sg, 2pl, 1pl*

Finally, there are mixed systems with both clitics and weak pronouns. The speaker head may or may not be activated. When it is activated (1pl), a clitic position becomes available. When it is not activated (2sg and 2pl), there is no clitic position and weak pronouns are found, as in Aliano (2b).

(10) [AddresseeP [SpeakerP V+CL [weak pronouns]]] *enclisis with 1pl*

[AddresseeP V [SpeakerP [weak pronouns]]] *weak pronouns with 2sg and 2pl*

When the verb does not move (1pl), we find proclisis; however, the verb moves to AddresseeP in 2sg and 2pl, the SpeakerP is not activated resulting in weak pronouns, as in Siliqua (3).

(11) [AddresseeP [SpeakerP CL [V]]] *proclisis with 1pl*

[AddresseeP V [SpeakerP [weak pronouns]]] *weak pronouns with 2sg and 2pl*

We explore the possibility that there is a plural head between Addressee and Speaker, and we propose that that head can host clitics, so it is not only the Speaker head that licenses clitics, but also Addressee plural. This would predict that post-verbal clitics are found with 1pl and 2pl, and weak pronouns with 2sg. This prediction is borne out in the dialect of Pigna (2c).

(12) [AddresseeP V [SpeakerP +CL [weak pronouns]]] *enclisis with 1pl*

[AddresseeP V [Plural +CL [SpeakerP [weak pronouns]]] *enclisis with 2pl*

[AddresseeP V [SpeakerP [weak pronouns]]] *weak pronouns with 2sg*

Predictions of the system: If the higher addressee singular licenses a clitic position, clitics are permitted through all persons by Economy of Representations (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999). When addressee plural licenses clitics, then 1pl also licenses clitics. Clitic licensing positions follow the cartography of the clause from highest to lowest. We predict there are NO systems with weak pronouns in 1pl and clitics in 2sg and 2pl (mirror image of Aliano). We also explain why there are NO varieties with weak pronouns 2pl and clitics 1pl and 2sg, and no varieties with clitics in 2sg and weak pronouns for 2pl and 1pl (mirror image of Pigna).

REFERENCES: **Cardinaletti & Starke**. 1999. "The Typology of Structural Deficiency: A Case Study of the Three Classes of Pronouns" In Riemsdijk, Henk van (ed.) *Clitics in the Languages of Europe* Berlin: Mouton, 145-233 • **Hill**. 2014. *Vocatives: How syntax meets with pragmatics*. Leiden: Brill. • **Kayne** 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax* Cambridge: MIT Press • **Ordóñez & Repetti**. 2014. "On the morphological restriction of hosting clitics in Italian and Sardinian dialects" *L'Italia dialettale* 75: 173-199 • **Romanello & Repetti**. 2014. "Imperative Characteristics in Romance Varieties Spoken in Italy" *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 26: 135-163. • **Wiltschko** 2021. *The grammar of interactional language*. Cambridge: CUP.