Imperative Characteristics in Romance varieties spoken in Italy

Emily Romanello & Lori Repetti

We examine Romance varieties spoken in Italy to determine if a correlation exists between an imperative verb's morphology and the presence of characteristics unique to the imperative, as suggested by Rivero (1994a), Zanuttini (1994, 1997), and others. This paper calls into question the validity of considering unique morphology as the defining characteristic of 'true' imperatives (vs. 'surrogate' imperatives). The data show that there is no correlation between 'true' imperatives and imperative characteristics such as negative ineffability, postverbal position of clitic pronouns, stress shift in imperative verb + enclitic constructions, and the use of a special clitic pronoun. We find that forms with syncretic morphology also exhibit imperative traits, and forms with unique imperative morphology may lack imperative traits. However, another robust generalization emerges which holds for all of the data we examine: there is a hierarchy of participation in imperative characteristics. The 1PL form may exhibit imperative traits only if they are present in the 2PL, and the 2PL may exhibit imperative traits only if they are present in the 2SG. [*]

1. Introduction

There are a number of robust cross-linguistic generalizations regarding imperatives reported in the literature: imperative verbs often have an impoverished morphology, in some languages imperative verbs cannot be negated (so-called 'negative ineffability'), and the position of clitic pronouns in imperative clauses may be different from other clauses (1). [1]

(1) Imperative Characteristics
   a. imperative verbs have an impoverished morphology [2]
   b. imperative verbs cannot be negated ('negative ineffability')
   c. the position of clitic pronouns in imperative clauses may be different from other clauses

These three characteristics have been described for many languages. Impoverished verbal morphology, and in particular an affixless base form of the verb, is found with imperatives in over half of the languages surveyed by Sadock & Zwicky (1985: 172), and was a

Rivista di Linguistica 26.1 (2014), pp. 135-163 *(received July 2012)*

well-known fact even among the Indo-Europeanists of the 19th century (Meillet 1964: 235). (See also Birjulin & Xrakovskij 2001: 23, Bybee 1985: 172, Palmer 1986: 29.) Negative ineffability among imperatives is reported for ¾ of the languages in Sadock & Zwicky's sample (1985: 175-177). Special negation of imperatives is reported in van der Auwera and Lejeune (2011b) as well, who note that 55 of the 495 languages surveyed use a non-imperative verb form in negative imperatives when the negator is identical to that used in declarative sentences. (See also Miestamo and van der Auwera 2007.) Finally, clitic pronouns have a special position in imperative phrases in many languages, including Romance languages, Albanian, and Greek (Rivero 1994a, 1994b, Rivero & Terzi 1995, Zanuttini 1991, 1994).

Scholars have attempted to provide a unified account of these phenomena that, at first sight, might appear unrelated. [3] For example, the explanation for reduced morphology of imperative verbs has been sought in the impoverished structure of imperative clauses (van der Wurff 2007: 41-43). This has been connected to the factors that make negative imperatives impossible, namely, the absence of certain structural projections. [4] Alternative accounts for the unique characteristics of imperatives invoke the role of frequency, the conventionalization of strategies historically used to soften prohibitions, the interjectional and speech-rooted nature of imperatives, early L1 acquisition, etc. (Birjulin & Xrakovskij 2001, Floricic & Molinu 2003, 2012, Maiden et al. 2009, van der Auwera 2010a: 167-172, 2010b: 461-467).

Linguists studying Romance, Greek, and Slavic languages have found it useful to distinguish 'true' imperatives (which display the imperative characteristics in (1)) from 'suppletive' or 'surrogate' imperatives (which do not) (Rivero 1994a, Zanuttini 1994, 1997, and others). Zanuttini (1994: 119) defines the former as "verbal forms which are unique to the paradigm of the imperative, in the sense that they are different from any other verbal form used, for the same person, in any tense of the indicative, subjunctive, etc." A similar definition is used by Rivero (1994a: 103), who further notes that true imperatives are usually restricted to the second person. Surrogate imperatives, instead, are "verbal forms which are used in the imperative but are morphologically identical to a form used in another paradigm for that same person" (Zanuttini 1994: 119; see also Rivero 1994a: 103). [5] Note that the diagnostic of true vs. surrogate imperatives (i.e., 'unique' morphology) is not identical to the cross-linguistic observation in (1a) that most imperative verbs have a 'reduced' morphology.

In this paper we provide data from a group of Romance languages that exhibit the characteristics in (1) and other character-

istics unique to imperative constructions. The data suggest that the distinction between the two types of imperatives – true vs. surrogate – is not so clear-cut. In some languages both true and surrogate imperatives exhibit imperative characteristics, while in others only some (but not all) true imperatives have the imperative characteristics in (1). We conclude that the presence of distinct morphology in itself is insufficient as an indicator of a true imperative. Furthermore, we question the usefulness of the distinction itself. Instead, we show that there is a different robust generalization that holds across varieties: an implicational hierarchy among the different forms of the imperative regarding participation in imperative characteristics. If the first person plural (1PL) exhibits an imperative characteristic, the second person plural (2PL) form does as well; and if the 2PL form participates in one of the imperative traits, the second person singular (2SG) also does. The result is that any and all imperative characteristics in a particular variety are manifested in the 2SG form, supporting similar findings in van der Auwera et al. (2004), Aikhenvald (2010), and elsewhere.

This article is organized as follows. In 2 we review the literature on true vs. surrogate imperatives in Romance. In 3 we introduce our data set and present two additional characteristics associated with imperatives that have not been addressed in the literature. The correlations between imperative characteristics and true/surrogate imperatives are analyzed in 4, and we provide a discussion in 5. We conclude the paper in 6.

2. 'True' vs. 'Surrogate' Imperatives in Romance

The characteristics unique to imperatives (1) have been particularly well-studied in Romance languages. Rivero (1994a), Zanuttini (1994), and others correlate the distinction between true and surrogate imperatives (for which unique verbal morphology is the diagnostic) with negative ineffability [6] and position of clitic pronouns. Zanuttini (1994: 120) claims that "true imperatives cannot be negated by pre-verbal negative markers in Romance." Rivero (1994a) extends this observation to other languages, and Zanuttini (1997) provides evidence of the various strategies available to express negative imperatives. [7] Rivero (1994a, 1994b), Rivero & Terzi (1995), and Zanuttini (1994, 1997) note that true imperatives have a unique position for clitic pronouns, namely that clitics follow true imperatives. (See also Silva-Villar 1998.)

The correlation among the three characteristics in (1) is illustrated below for Italian. [8]

(2) Italian 2SG imperatives

a. impoverished morphology	di'	*dici	'say!'
b. negative ineffability	non dire	*non di'	'don't say!'
c. special position of clitics	di' + lo	*lo + di'	'say it!'

In (2a) we see that the 2SG imperative form of the verb *dire* 'to say' is *di'*, which has a unique and impoverished morphological form (cfr., 2SG present indicative *dici*, 2SG present subjunctive *dica*). Furthermore, that form cannot be negated (2b). Instead, the infinitive form is used as the 2SG negative imperative: *non dire*. [9] Finally, while clitic pronouns generally precede tensed verbs, this order is ungrammatical in positive imperatives (2c); instead, we find enclisis with positive imperatives: /dí + lo/ > *dillo* 'say it!' (the process of *raddoppiamento sintattico* causes the gemination of the /l/). Clearly, this verb illustrates all of the characteristics in (1), so Italian 2SG imperatives are 'true imperatives'.

It is claimed that only true imperatives exhibit imperative characteristics, while surrogate imperatives do not. Rivero (1994b: 93) analyzes French as lacking special imperative morphology (disregarding spelling and subject pronouns), i.e., French imperatives are surrogate. For example, the 2SG imperative form of the verb 'sing' (*chante*) is pronounced identically to the 2SG present indicative form of the verb (*tu chantes*): /ʃãt/. The same holds for the 2PL imperative (*chantez*) and indicative (*vous chantez*) forms: /ʃãté/. (See also Birjulin & Xrakovskij 2001: 24.) [10] As predicted, these surrogate imperative forms can be negated: *ne chante pas* 'do not sing.2SG', *ne chantez pas* 'do not sing.2PL'.

Rivero (1994a, 1994b), Rivero & Terzi (1995), Zanuttini (1994, 1997), Manzini & Savoia (2005c), and others provide a syntactic account of these characteristics and correlations, while other researchers investigate an approach in which morphology plays a central role. For example, Harris (1997, 1998) argues in support of the role of morphology within the framework of Distributed Morphology, and Swearingen (2011) studies the widespread syncretism among 2SG imperatives in Romance, and questions its relation to the morphome.

However, the correlation among the characteristics in (1) is not perfect. In the chart below, we schematically show the correlation between the imperative characteristics in (1) with the different imperative forms in Spanish (3). [11]

(3) Spanish

	UNIQUE MORPHOLOGY	NEG. INEFF.	ENCLISIS
2SG (tú)	+ *'true imperative'*	+	+
2PL (vosotros)	+ *'true imperative'*	+	+
1PL (nosotros)	- *'surrogate imperative'*	-	+

In Spanish the 2SG (*tú*) and 2PL (*vosotros*) forms are considered true imperatives because of their unique morphology, while the 1PL form is a surrogate imperative since it is identical to the present indicative form. There is a perfect correlation between unique morphology (i.e., the defining characteristic of true imperatives) and negative ineffability, but there is not a perfect correlation between position of pronominal clitics and unique morphology or negative ineffability: the correlation exists only for the 2SG and 2PL (but not the 1PL). [12] This has been discussed by Rivero & Terzi (1995) who note that not all true imperatives have unique syntactic properties, by Zanuttini (1994: 127) who shows that some surrogate imperatives also have a special position for clitic pronouns, by Harris (1997, 1998) who points out that the morphological component (verb form) and the syntactic component (word order) have not been adequately integrated in the theoretical literature, and by others. [13]

Other problems with the characteristics in (1) and the true vs. surrogate imperative distinction remain. The first has to do with 'unique morphology', the defining characteristic of 'true imperatives'. Maiden et al. (2009: 99) notes that Romance imperatives "have become predictable and overwhelmingly syncretic with other present tense forms." In fact, while unique morphology is usually restricted to the second person (Rivero 1994a: 103), in most languages not every 2nd person form of the imperative is unique: the unique form of the imperative is restricted to a single declension class and/or a few verbs. For example, in standard Italian, while first conjugation verbs have a unique 2SG form in the imperative (i.e., the 2SG imperative form is not identical to any other 2SG verb form), second and third conjugation verbs do not (i.e., the 2SG imperative forms are identical to the 2SG present indicative forms). There are also a few irregular verbs with unique 2SG imperative forms: *sii* 'be.2SG!', *abbi* 'have.2SG!', *vogli* 'want.2SG!', *sappi* 'know.2SG!', *di'*

'say.2SG!', *da'* 'give.2SG!', *sta'* 'stay.2SG!', *fa'* 'do.2SG!', *va'* 'go.2SG!'. [14] The process of truncation, resulting in a unique (and impoverished) imperative form, is productive in some varieties of Italian, resulting in imperatives such as *gua'* < *guarda* 'look.2SG!' (Floricic & Molinu 2003, 2012). [15] Even though only a small subset of 2SG imperatives exhibit 'unique morphology' in Italian, the claim is that all 2SG imperatives are true imperatives.

Perhaps an even more serious problem with the 'unique morphology' diagnostic has to do with the fact that most imperative forms are not 'unique' at all, but are identical to verb forms found in different cells. For example, while the 2SG imperative of a first conjugation verb in Italian – *canta* 'sing.2SG!' – is considered a unique form according to Zanuttini's (1994: 119) definition, it is identical to the 3sg present indicative of the same verb: *canta* 's/he sings'. [16]

In this paper we investigate imperatives in a number of minor Romance languages spoken in Italy to see if true imperatives (as defined by Zanuttini 1994 and Rivero 1994a) exhibit one or more of the syntactic characteristics listed in (1b-c), and surrogate imperatives do not. Furthermore, we have identified two additional characteristics of some Romance imperatives: a unique form of clitic pronouns used only with imperatives, and a change in stress with enclitic pronouns in imperatives (3.2.). [17] We refer to the characteristics in (4) as imperative characteristics.

(4) Characteristics of 'true' imperatives (defined as having unique morphology)
   a. imperative verbs cannot be negated ('negative ineffability')
   b. the position of clitic pronouns in imperative clauses may be different from other clauses
   c. a unique form of clitic pronouns is used with imperatives
   d. stress is shifted in imperative verb + enclitic pronoun phrases

Are the characteristics in (4) associated with all and only true imperatives? If the distinction between true and surrogate imperatives is valid, we might expect to find that all of the characteristics in (4) are associated with the true imperatives but not with the surrogate imperatives. We will see that that is not the case. Instead, we find a different correlation among these characteristics.

3. Data Involving Imperatives

3.1. Romance Varieties Investigated

We have conducted an in-depth study of a number of minor Romance varieties spoken in Italy. [18] We have chosen this group to investigate since the density of language variation in Italy and the depth of knowledge accumulated in the literature about these languages are unmatched anywhere.

We have surveyed imperative formation throughout Italy, investigating hundreds of varieties, and we have discovered a range of patterns that differs from the patterns described in the literature. [19] In an attempt to keep the data sample as consistent as possible, we have chosen to limit our sample in the following ways.

First, we consider only informal (or familiar) imperatives (see Zanuttini 1997: 106-107 and references therein). We chose to exclude formal (or polite) imperatives in this study since they generally do not meet the definition of true imperatives, and they do not exhibit any imperative characteristics in (4). In standard Italian (and in many – although not all – of the minor varieties spoken in Italy) the formal imperative utilizes the present subjunctive form of the verb, can be negated in the usual way, and has the usual word order of clitic pronoun + verb.

Second, we have selected only varieties which have at least one unique morphological form of the imperative, i.e., varieties that can be identified as having true imperatives. We further limit our sample in the following ways: we include only varieties that have preverbal negation, and in our investigation of clitics we include only the third person masculine singular accusative enclitic, used alone (not in clusters), i.e., 'lo' in Italian. These last two points need further explanation.

Regarding negation, Zanuttini (1994: 120-121,1997: 150-153) shows that in contemporary and old Romance varieties, true imperatives are incompatible with preverbal negators, but are compatible with postverbal ones. [20] Therefore, we exclude varieties that have postverbal negation. For example, in the variety of Trepalle (province: Sondrio; region: Lombardy), the positive form of a true imperative (/kláma-l/ 'call.2SG him!') can be negated either with a preverbal negator (/miɣa klamé-l/ 'do not call.2PL him!') or a postverbal negator (/kláma-l miɣa / 'do not call.2PL him!'). Note that the positive imperative verb form is identical to the negative imperative form when there is postverbal negation, but not when there is preverbal negation. For

similar reasons we exclude varieties with double negatives, i.e., a preverbal and a postverbal negative marker. We also avoid varieties that use a periphrastic construction in negative imperatives, such as 'stay' + infinitive (for example, Stienta [province: Rovigo; region: Veneto]: /na stá tʃamáral/ 'do not call.2SG him!') or 'be' + gerund (for example, Ruvo di Puglia [province: Bari; region: Puglia]: /na u sí camánnə/ 'do not call.2SG him!'). Furthermore, we do not include varieties that employ more than one form of the negator. Some varieties use different negators for different persons: in Viano (province: Massa Carrara; region: Tuscany) we find preverbal /no(N)/ [21] with 2SG and 2PL negative imperatives (/no l camárə/=/no l cámə/ 'do not call.2SG him!', /no l camé/ 'do not call.2PL him!'), and preverbal /an/ (or /n/, if the /a/ is analyzed as an epenthetic vowel) with 1PL negative imperatives (/an əl camáŋ/ 'let's not call.1PL him!'). Some varieties employ different negators for the same person: in the variety of Mercato Saraceno (province: Forlì; region: Emilia Romagna), we find both /no/ and /na/ with imperatives: /no pɔ́rla/ 'do not speak.2SG!', /na dórma/ 'do not sleep.2SG!', but only /no/ in other contexts: /a t ɔ dét ad (no) tʃamɔ́-l/ 'I told you (not) to call him'. (See Birjulin & Xrakovskij 2001: 34-35 for special negative markers used only in imperatives.)

As for the type of pronoun used with imperatives, we limit our data to imperatives plus a single third person masculine singular accusative clitic. This is because the patterns may well be different with different clitics or with clitics in clusters. For example, in the variety of Oriolo (province: Cosenza; region: Calabria) the 2SG imperative undergoes stress shift with a third person enclitic, but not with a first person enclitic: /camá-llə/ 'call.2SG him!', /cámə-mə/ 'call.2SG me!'. In the variety of Luras (province: Olbia-Tempio; region: Sardinia) a single enclitic such as /mi/ (first person singular dative/accusative) or /lu/ (third person masculine singular accusative) is not involved in a shift in stress /tʃáma-mi/ 'call.2SG me!'; /tʃáma-lu/ 'call.2SG him!'), while we do find stress shift with a clitic cluster (/dá/ + /mi/ + /lu/ > /damíllu/ 'give.2SG it to me!').

Finally, in an attempt to keep the size of the data set manageable, for each pattern described, we only present one variety per province, although there may be many varieties in the same province that exhibit the pattern. As a result, the nearly 40 varieties presented in this article are from areas scattered throughout Italy. (A list of the varieties mentioned in this paper, their province and region, and the source of the data are given in the Appendices.)

3.2. Two Additional Imperative Characteristics

Before we examine the data, we will further describe two additional characteristics found in some imperatives. We have identified a number of Romance varieties spoken in Italy that employ one form of the clitic pronoun with certain imperative forms, and a different form with others. For example, in the variety of Agliano (province: Lucca; region: Tuscany) the third person masculine singular accusative enclitic used with the 2SG and 2PL forms of the imperative is /ḍə/, while the 1PL form of the imperative selects /lə/. [22]

(5) Agliano

a. /cámə-ḍə/	call.2SG him!
b. /camátə-ḍə/	call.2PL him!
c. /camjáŋ-l̲ə/	let's call.1PL him!

The enclitic pronoun used with the 1PL (/lə/) is the same form used in enclisis with an infinitive: /camá-l̲l̲ə/ 'to call him' (the /l/ is geminated for morpho-phonological reasons). The proclitic form also consists of /l/: /(nu) l̲ vɔʃə vedé/ 'I (do not) want to see him'. The /l/ clitic form is more common since it appears with the 1PL form of the imperative as well as in non-imperative constructions. We label the less common clitic form (/ḍ/) used only enclitically with the 2SG and 2PL imperative as the 'special' one used with true imperatives. [23]

Similar patterns in which the clitic used with surrogate imperatives is also used in non-imperative constructions, are found in varieties spoken in many widespread regions. In addition to Agliano, we find similar patterns in Castelvittorio (province: Imperia; region: Liguria), Rocca Imperiale (province: Cosenza; region: Calabria), and Anzi (province; Potenza; region: Basilicata).

The other characteristic associated with some imperatives is (what has been described as) stress shift with enclitic pronouns, a phenomenon that has been addressed at length in the Romance literature. (See Bonet 2009, Colantoni et al. 2010, Huidobro 2005, Kim & Repetti 2013, Loporcaro 2000, Monachesi 1996, Moyna 1999, Nespor and Vogel 1986, Ordóñez and Repetti 2006, 2008, Peperkamp 1997, Torres-Tamarit 2010, and references therein.) [24] For example, in the variety of Albano di Lucania (province: Potenza; region: Basilicata) the third person masculine singular accusative enclitic triggers a change in the stress pattern with the 2SG imperative but not with the 1PL or 2PL imperative. [25]

(6) Albano di Lucania

a. /cáma/ ~ /camíllə/	call.2SG! ~ call.2SG him!
b. /camátə/ ~ /camátələ/	call.2PL! ~ call.2PL him!
c. /camámmə/ ~ /camámmələ/	let's call.1PL! ~ let's call.1PL him!

Since the 2SG form is the anomaly (in other words, there appears to be no independent motivation for stress shift, since a non-shifted form does not violate any of the well-formedness conditions in the language: */cámalə/), we identify the stress-altering pattern as the one associated with true imperatives.

In the following section, we present the data. In order to test the validity of the 'true' vs. 'surrogate' imperative distinction (as defined by 'special morphology'), we examine the correlation between true vs. surrogate imperatives and the characteristics of imperatives identified above (4). Three groups emerge. Pattern 1 includes varieties in which imperative characteristics are present in all and only true imperative forms; Pattern 2 consists of varieties in which imperative characteristics are found in both true and surrogate imperatives; in Pattern 3 we find varieties in which imperative characteristics are exhibited in some but not all true imperatives.

4. True vs. Surrogate Imperatives and Imperative Characteristics

4.1. Pattern 1: All and only true imperatives exhibit imperative characteristics

We find that many varieties in our sample behave as expected, namely, only true imperatives have the special characteristics identified. These are Sardinian varieties; however, not all of the Sardinian varieties pattern this way.

In this group, the 2SG and 2PL forms of the imperative, but not the 1PL form, exhibit all characteristics of true imperatives: they have a unique morpheme and cannot be negated; the 2SG and 2PL have enclisis in positive imperative forms (the 1PL has proclisis); if stress is shifted in the presence of an enclitic pronoun, it does so with 2SG and 2PL. [26]

We illustrate this pattern with data from the variety of Siliqua (province: Cagliari; region: Sardinia), although the same pattern is found in many other Sardinian varieties, including Allai, Gavoi, Láconi, and Settimo San Pietro. In this variety, the 2SG and 2PL forms of the imperative differ from the corresponding forms of the indicative, while the 1PL form of the imperative is identical to the indicative. [27]

(7) Siliqua

	indicative		*imperative*
2SG	tsérri-aza	≠	tsérrj-a 'call'
2PL	tserri-áizi	≠	tserri-ái
1PL	tserri-áuzu	=	tserri-áuzu

Furthermore, the 2SG and 2PL forms cannot be negated, while the 1PL form can. (The 2SG and 2PL forms utilize the subjunctive for the negative imperative.) [28]

(8) Siliqua

	positive imperative	*negative imperative*
2SG	tsérrj-a	*nɔ tsérrj-a (*actual*: nɔ tsérri-isti)
2PL	tserri-ái	*nɔ tserri-ái (*actual*: nɔ tserri-éizi)
1PL	tserri-áuzu	nɔ tserri-áuzu

Regarding clitics (in particular, third person masculine singular accustive /ɖu/), the 2SG and 2PL forms require enclisis (with stress shift) with positive imperatives, while the 1PL does not permit enclisis. (All three forms require proclisis with negative imperatives.)

(9) Siliqua

	'call' + third person mas. sg. acc. clitic
2SG	tserriáɖɖu
2PL	tserriéɖɖu
1PL	ɖu tserriáuzu

This pattern is precisely what one might expect given the analysis presented in 2: true imperatives, as defined above, and only true imperatives, exhibit imperative characteristics (4), while surrogate imperatives do not. Any of the syntactic accounts provided in the literature could handle this basic pattern, even with the addition of the new facts involving stress shift.

Some historical background might shed light on the origin of this pattern. In Latin, the 2SG and 2PL forms of the present active imperative are morphologically unique: the 2SG consists of the root + thematic vowel, while the 2PL is formed from the stem + /te/ (Swearingen 2011: 123). [29] These Latin imperatives meet the criteria of true imperatives, and, as predicted, they exhibit negative ineffability. (It is important to note that a unique imperative form for the 1PL did not exist in Latin; instead, the subjunctive was used; Baldi 1999: 404-5).

(10) Latin

	positive imperative	*negative imperative*	
2SG	laud-ā	*non laud-ā	'praise'
2PL	laud-ā-te	*non laud-ā-te	

Pinkster (1990: 197) distinguishes among Latin sentence types (imperative vs. declarative/interrogative) based on the rules of negation: Latin imperatives (but not declaratives/interrogatives) cannot be negated in the usual way, and they require a special negator *ne* (vs. *non*). [30]

The pattern described above, in which all and only true imperatives manifest imperative characteristics, includes varieties in which the 1PL form of the verb also participates in all imperative characteristics. In a handful of Sardinian varieties, such as the varieties of Dorgali and Ittiri, the 2SG, 2PL, and 1PL forms of the imperative have a unique morpheme, all three exhibit negative ineffability, and all three have enclisis with positive imperatives.

4.2. Pattern 2: True and surrogate imperatives exhibit imperative characteristics

The cross-linguistic picture is not always as neat as the one presented above: the majority of the varieties in our sample exhibit mixed behavior. In some varieties, both true and surrogate imperatives have imperative characteristics (4.2.), while in others only some (but not all) of the true imperatives have imperative characteristics (4.3.). In this section we present the varieties in which both true and surrogate imperatives exhibit imperative characteristics.

The first group that we will discuss has a unique morpheme and negative ineffability in the 2SG form; if the variety has stress shift or a unique pronoun with imperatives, it is found in the 2SG form only. So far, this group of varieties seems like the Sardinian ones discussed above, except that here the true imperatives are limited to 2SG forms. We might expect enclisis to be limited only to the 2SG form, but that is not what we find. In each of these varieties, all three forms (2SG, 2PL, 1PL) undergo enclisis in the positive imperative (but not necessarily in the negative imperative).

We exemplify this pattern with data from Senise (province: Potenza; region: Basilicata), but this pattern is found in many varieties throughout Italy (including standard Italian and varieties spoken in the regions of Liguria, Emilia-Romagna, Veneto, Tuscany, Umbria, Lazio, Campania, Calabria, Basilicata, etc.). [31] Note that the suffixes (used with first conjugation verbs) in (11) are different in the indica-

tive, positive imperative and negative imperative for the 2SG only, but they are identical for the 1PL and 2PL forms. [32] (The 2SG negative imperative employs the infinitive.)

(11) Senise

	indicative	*positive imperative*	*negative imperative*
2SG	-əsə	-ə	-ǽ
2PL	-ǽ:tə	-ǽtə	-ǽtə
1PL	-ǽ:mə	-ǽmə	-ǽmə

Enclisis is found in all three forms with the positive imperative (but not the negative imperative). However, only the 2SG form undergoes a change in stress.

(12) Senise

2SG	/púərtə/ > /purtǽ:+lə/	bring.2SG it!
2PL	/purtǽtə/ > /purtǽtə+lə/	bring.2PL it!
1PL	/purtǽmə/ > /purtǽmə+lə/	let's bring.1PL it!

This pattern can also be accounted for using any of the previously proposed analyses: the 2SG form is a true imperative which exhibits characteristics unique to the imperative, namely, negative ineffability and stress shift. The enclitic pattern found with all three forms has been discussed extensively in the literature (Manzini & Savoia 2005c, Rivero 1994a, 1994b, Rivero & Terzi 1995, Zanuttini 1994, 1997).

The next group consists of varieties with a distinct morphological form of the 2SG imperative, which cannot be negated. However, a unique enclitic pronoun and/or stress shift is found in both the 2SG and 2PL forms. In other words, characteristics that we have identified as special to imperatives are exhibited in both true and surrogate imperatives. Furthermore, enclisis is found with all forms of the positive imperative (while with negative imperatives we have proclisis).

In the variety of Agliano (province: Lucca; region: Tuscany) the 2SG imperative verb form has a unique morphological structure that cannot be negated; however, the enclitic pronoun used with the 2SG and 2PL forms differs from the enclitic pronoun used with the 1PL form (see (5) above). Note that the distribution of the special form of the enclitic pronoun used in imperatives does not correlate with other imperative characteristics. (This pattern is also found in other varieties throughout Italy, such as the varieties of Massa di Maratea [province: Potenza; region: Basilicata] and Platania [province: Catanzaro; region: Calabria]) [33].

4.3. Pattern 3: Only some true imperatives exhibit imperative characteristics

The last pattern includes varieties with unique forms of the 2SG and 2PL imperative. However, only the 2SG exhibits negative ineffability, stress shift with enclisis, and/or a special enclitic pronoun. (All three forms have enclisis in positive imperatives.) This is surprising because the 2PL form fits the definition for a true imperative, but it does not participate in the other special imperative characteristics listed in (4).

We illustrate this pattern with data from the variety of Verbicaro (province: Cosenza; region: Calabria) in which the 2SG and 2PL imperative suffixes of first conjugation verbs are different from the indicative suffixes. However, only the 2SG displays negative ineffability (the 2SG negative imperative uses the gerund), employs a special form of the enclitic pronoun (/ɖə/, rather than /lə/), and undergoes stress shift.

(13) Verbicaro

	indicative	positive imperative	negative imperative	imperative with enclitic pronoun
2SG	-əsə	-ə	-ɛ́nnə	-ádɖə
2PL	-átsə	-átə	-á:tə	-átələ
1PL	-á:mə	-ámə	-ámə	-ámələ

Similar patterns are also found in other varieties, such as Colobraro (province: Matera; region: Basilicata), and the Swiss Romantsch variety of Scuol. The latter variety provides a variation on this pattern: the 2SG and 2PL forms of the imperative are unique and cannot be negated, but only the 2SG has (optional) enclisis in positive imperatives.

In the next section we provide an explanation of the three patterns illustrated above, which calls into question the validity of the correlation between unique morphology and imperative morpho-syntactic characteristics.

5. 2SG > 2PL > 1PL

In Table 1 we provide a summary of the patterns identified in 4.

While the varieties which exemplify Pattern 1 support the prediction that there should be a correlation between true imperatives and the characteristics of imperatives in (4), the other patterns call into

Pattern	unique morpheme	negative ineff.	stress shift with enclisis	special enclitic	enclisis	varieties
1	2sg, 2pl	2sg, 2pl	—	—	—	Müstair
			—	—	2sg, 2pl	Luras
			2sg, 2pl	—	2sg, 2pl	Allai, Gavoi, Laconi, Orroli, Settimo San Pietro, Siliqua, Siurgus Donigala
	2sg, 2pl, 1pl	2sg, 2pl, 1pl	—	—	2sg, 2pl, 1pl	Dorgali, Ittiri
2	2sg	2sg	—	—	2sg, 2pl, 1pl	standard Italian
			2sg	—		San Marco Argentano, Senise, Albano di Lucania, Celle di Bulgheria, Frigento, Nocara
			2sg, (2pl)	—		Platania
			(2sg)	2sg		Anzi
			2sg	2sg		Rocca Imperiale
			2sg, 2pl	—		Aliano
			—	2sg, 2pl		Agliano
			(2sg, 2pl, 1pl)	—		Massa di Maratea
			2sg, 2pl, 1pl	—		Accettura
			(2sg, 2pl, 1pl)	2sg, 2pl		Castelvittorio
3	2sg, 2pl	2sg	2sg	2sg	2sg, 2pl, 1pl	Verbicaro
		2sg	2sg	—	2sg, 2pl, 1pl	Colobraro
		2sg, 2pl	—	—	(2sg)	Scuol

Table 1. Summary of patterns (extra rows within a pattern indicate subpatterns; forms in parenthesis indicate optionality)

question the validity of any correlation at all. We propose that the characterization of the relationship between morphological uniqueness and these other traits be altered. Unique morphology does not always correlate with the other imperative characteristics that have been identified. It does not always coincide with negative ineffability or with stress

shift: for example, Colobraro (Pattern 3) has a unique morpheme in 2SG and 2PL, but negative ineffability and stress shift in 2SG only. The same can be said for the special form of the enclitic: for example, Agliano (Pattern 2) has a unique morpheme in 2SG, but a special enclitic in 2SG and 2PL, while Verbicaro (Pattern 3) has a unique morpheme in 2SG and 2PL, but a special enclitic in 2SG only. The nearly total lack of correlation between unique morphology and enclisis has already been noted and discussed in the literature.

Perhaps most striking is the fact that varieties without a unique form of the imperative may still exhibit negative ineffability and other imperative characteristics. Rivero, Zanuttini, and others claim that imperatives which do not have unique morphology also lack negative ineffability. However, in our investigation, we found a number of varieties that lack special imperative morphology, yet they possess other imperative characteristics. In the variety of San Leucio del Sannio (province: Benevento; region: Campania) "[t]utte le persone dell'imperativo sono identiche alle corrispondenti persone dell'indicativo presente" ("all imperative forms are identical to the corresponding present indicative forms" (translation by ER & LR) (Iannace 1996: 58). In this variety, however, the 2SG form exhibits negative ineffability and optional stress shift. In the case of the variety of Pigna (province: Imperia; region: Liguria), it appears that there are no unique forms of the imperative; however, all three forms exhibit negative ineffability and optional stress shift with enclitics. [34] This is illustrated in (14) with suffixes for first conjugation verbs, and data with enclitics and a second conjugation verb ('sell').

(14) Pigna

	indicative	*imperative*	*neg. imp.*	*imperative with enclitic*
2SG	-a	-a	-ár	véŋdi+ɾu~veŋdí+ɾu~veŋdi+ɾú
2PL	-áj	-áj	-éj	veŋdéj+ɾu~veŋdej+ɾú
1PL	-ámu	-ámu	-ému	veŋdímu+ɾu~veŋdimu+ɾú

Note that the 2SG negative imperative employs the infinitive, even though the 2SG positive imperative is not a unique form. The 1PL and 2PL negative imperatives employ the present subjunctive forms, even though the 1PL and 2PL positive imperative forms are identical to the indicative.

We can now add a new pattern to our inventory: Pattern 4 includes varieties that do not have unique imperative morphology; nonetheless, they exhibit other special imperative characteristics, as shown in Table 2.

PATTERN	UNIQUE MORPHEME	NEG. INEFF.	STRESS SHIFT WITH ENCLISIS	SPECIAL ENCLITIC	ENCLISIS	VARIETIES
4	—	2SG	(2SG)	—	2SG, 2PL, 1PL	San Leucio
		2SG	—	—		San Pietro in Campiano
		2SG, 2PL, 1PL	(2SG, 2PL, 1PL)	—		Pigna

Table 2. Pattern 4 (extra rows within a pattern indicate different varieties; forms in parenthesis indicate optionality)

We follow Harris (1997, 1998) who questions the relationship between the morphological component (verb form) and syntactic component (word order) of Spanish imperatives, and Manzini & Savoia (2005c: 389) who express doubts regarding the distinction between true and surrogate imperatives. We believe that the unique morphological structure of the verb form should not be used as the diagnostic of true imperatives. Most Romance imperatives are surrogate (not true) since they do not have a unique verb form. (See also Blasco-Ferrer 1988: 120-121.) In our sample, the unique form of the imperative is even less common than in other Romance varieties discussed in the literature because in many Romance varieties spoken in Italy, word-final vowels are reduced to schwa or apocopated, resulting in widespread syncretism of verb forms (for example, the variety of Naples). The unique imperative forms are often limited to a handful of verbs.

We propose that the morphological structure of imperatives (i.e., unique or surrogate morphology) is an accident of history and does not play a role in the grammar of imperatives. [35] Romance imperative verb forms are the result of historical phonological changes to the basic Latin pattern (Swearingen 2011: 123, see also Maiden 1996) and do not necessarily reflect a special status with regard to syntactic processes. While our data support the claim that, cross-linguistically, imperatives have an impoverished morphology, they do not support the claim that there is a distinction between imperatives that have a unique morphological structure and those that do not. We, therefore, propose that the list of imperative characteristics in (4) not be limited to imperative forms with unique morphology.

Are there any generalizations that can be made about imperatives in the languages studied? We have identified one generalization that holds across all of the languages in our sample: the 2SG participates in all of the imperative characteristics exhibited in a given variety. The 2PL form may or may not exhibit imperative characteristics, but does

so only if the 2SG does as well. Finally, the 1PL form only exhibits an imperative characteristic if the 2PL also exhibits that trait. [36] Hence, there is a hierarchy of participation in imperative characteristics. [37]

(15) generalization: 2SG > 2PL > 1PL

The hierarchy we propose here for Romance varieties spoken in Italy is consistent with the findings of van der Auwera et al. (2004: 55-57). [38] The result of their examination of 376 languages shows that a given imperative construction must be manifested in the 2SG if it also occurs in the 2PL; if it occurs in the 1PL, it must also occur in the 2SG and 2PL. More generally, imperatives are always realized in (at least) the second person (Birjulin & Xrakovskij 2001: 28, Comrie 1981: 111, Palmer 1986: 109).

We believe this hierarchy of participation in imperative characteristics is due to historical reasons and frequency. Historically, in Latin, the 2SG and 2PL imperatives behaved differently from the 1PL form. This pattern is reflected perfectly in the Sardinian forms discussed in 4.1. and has survived in a weakened version in many Romance languages.

(16) Latin imperatives: 2SG, 2PL > 1PL

In terms of frequency, it is commonly noted that 2SG imperatives have an extremely high frequency rate compared to other forms of the imperative (17a), and cross-linguistically the second person forms of the imperative are much more common than first person forms (17b) (Bybee 1985: 94). [39]

(17) frequency: a. **2SG > 2PL, 1PL**
b. 2SG, 2PL > 1PL

Based on the observation schematized in (15), we make a typological prediction: varieties that exhibit the following three patterns will remain unattested (18).

(18) Predictions:
a. We will not find varieties in which an imperative characteristic in (4) is found in the 2PL but not in the 2SG form.
b. We will not find varieties in which an imperative trait is exhibited in 1PL but not 2SG.
c. We will not find varieties in which an imperative trait is exhibited in 1PL but not 2PL.

6. Conclusions

From the data examined above, it is evident that morphology alone cannot be considered the defining characteristic of true imperatives. Previous studies have attempted to account for imperative characteristics (such as negative ineffability) based on the presence of special morphology; however, our investigation has revealed that this approach is wrong. We have identified many patterns which disprove the validity of this relationship. One such pattern includes varieties in which imperatives with and without unique morphology show imperative characteristics. If the presence of unique morphology were the defining factor of true (vs. surrogate) imperatives, this should not be possible. Another pattern includes varieties in which only some forms which exhibit the imperative characteristics have unique morphology. This again provides evidence that there is not a direct relationship between special morphology and other characteristics unique to the imperative. We believe that the unique morphology found in some imperative forms is a historical relic of Latin (modulo the truncated imperatives discussed in Floricic & Molinu 2003, 2012), an accident of history, and is not a reflection of a synchronically relevant correlation between syntax and morphology.

An empirically robust observation can be made: despite superficial diversity, in all of the data we analyzed the imperative characteristics identified in (4) may be found in the plural forms only if they are also present in the 2SG, and these characteristics appear in the 1PL only if they are present in both the 2SG and the 2PL forms. Our findings support and confirm those made elsewhere (Birjulin & Xrakovskij 2001, Comrie 1981, Palmer 1986, van der Auwera et al. 2004) and provide an explanation for this implicational hierarchy: namely, the history of these forms and the frequency of their occurrence.

We hope to have demonstrated the usefulness of casting a tightly woven empirical net in order to identify robust patterns. By studying minor variations among these closely related languages we have found a generalization that confirms those reported for other language groups, and that, we believe, will hold up to further cross-linguistic scrutiny.

Addresses of the Authors

Emily Romanello: University of Pennsylvania, 549 Williams Hall, 255 South 36th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305, USA <eroma@sas.upenn.edu>

Lori Repetti: Department of Linguistics, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794-4376 USA <lori.repetti@stonybrook.edu>

Appendix A
List of varieties discussed in paper (arranged by town name)

town (province, region): source of data
[or in the case of towns in Switzerland: town (canton, country): source of data]

M&S = Manzini & Savoia (2005a), (2005b), (2005c)

Accettura (Matera, Basilicata): M&S
Agliano (Lucca, Tuscany): M&S
Albano di Lucania (Potenza, Basilicata): M&S
Aliano (Matera, Basilicata): M&S
Allai (Oristano, Sardinia): M&S
Anzi (Potenza, Basilicata): Repetti & Ordóñez (2011: Speaker 32), field work
Castelvittorio (Imperia, Liguria): Repetti & Ordóñez (2011: Speaker 95), field work
Celle di Bulgheria (Salerno, Campania): M&S
Colobraro (Matera, Basilicata): Lausberg (1939), M&S
Dorgali (Nuoro, Sardinia): Blasco-Ferrer (1988), M&S
Finale Emilia (Modena, Emilia-Romagna): M&S
Frigento (Avellino, Campania): M&S
Gavoi (Nuoro, Sardinia): M&S
Ittiri (Sassari, Sardinia): M&S, Repetti & Ordóñez (2011: Speakers 5, 6), field work
Làconi (Oristano, Sardinia): M&S, Repetti & Ordóñez (2011: Speakers 8, 9), field work
Luras (Olbia-Tempio, Sardinia): M&S, Repetti & Ordóñez (2011: Speaker 10), field work
Massa di Maratea (Potenza, Basilicata): Repetti & Ordóñez (2011: Speaker 31), field work
Mercato Saraceno (Forlì, Emilia-Romagna): M&S
Müstair (Canton Grigioni, Switzerland): M&S
Naples (Naples, Campania): Bichelli (1974), field work
Nocara (Cosenza, Calabria): M&S
Oriolo (Cosenza, Calabria): M&S
Orroli (Nuoro, Sardinia): M&S
Pigna (Imperia, Liguria): M&S, Repetti & Ordóñez (2011: Speaker 93), field work
Platania (Catanzaro, Calabria): M&S
Rocca Imperiale (Cosenza, Calabria): M&S
Ruvo di Puglia (Bari, Puglia): M&S

San Leucio del Sannio (Benevento, Campania): Iannace (1996), Repetti & Ordóñez (2011: Speaker 33), field work
San Marco Argentano (Cosenza, Calabria): M&S
San Pietro in Campiano (Ravenna, Emilia-Romagna): M&S
Scuol (Canton Grigioni, Switzerland): M&S
Senise (Potenza, Basilicata): Lausberg (1939), M&S
Settimo San Pietro (Cagliari, Sardinia): M&S
Siliqua (Cagliari, Sardinia): M&S, Repetti & Ordóñez (2011: Speaker 23), field work
Siurgus Donigala (Cagliari, Sardinia): M&S
Stienta (Rovigo, Veneto): M&S
Trepalle (Sondrio, Lombardy): M&S
Verbicaro (Cosenza, Calabria): M&S
Viano (Massa Carrara, Tuscany): M&S

Appendix B
List of varieties discussed in paper (arranged by region)
[or in the case of towns in Switzerland: arranged by country]

Basilicata: Accettura, Albano di Lucania, Aliano, Anzi, Colobraro, Massa di Maratea, Senise
Calabria: Nocara, Oriolo, Platania, Rocca Imperiale, San Marco Argentano, Verbicaro
Campania: Celle di Bulgheria, Frigento, Naples, San Leucio del Sannio
Emilia-Romagna: Finale Emilia, Mercato Saraceno, San Pietro in Campiano
Liguria: Castelvittorio, Pigna
Lombardy: Trepalle
Puglia: Ruvo di Puglia
Sardinia: Allai, Dorgali, Gavoi, Ittiri, Làconi, Luras, Settimo San Pietro, Siliqua, Siurgus Donigala
Tuscany: Agliano, Viano
Veneto: Stienta

Switzerland: Müstair, Scuol

Notes

* The authors would like to thank Mark Aronoff, Andrea Fedi, Francisco Ordóñez, and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions. This work was supported in part by NSF research grant #0617471 awarded to Francisco Ordóñez and Lori Repetti.

1 Other syntactic peculiarities of imperatives in many languages include their inability to appear in embedded clauses and the dropping of subjects (Comrie

1981: 110-111, Palmer 1986: 108, 113, Sadock & Zwicky 1985: 173). We hope to address these characteristics in future work.

[2] A similar, though not identical, observation is that many languages have a special or unique morphological form for the imperative. Special morphology for 2nd person imperatives is reported in 425 out of 547 languages surveyed by van der Auwera & Lejeune (2011a). This characteristic will be discussed further below.

[3] See van der Wurff (2007) for an excellent overview of the generative literature on imperatives.

[4] For generative accounts of negative ineffability, see Kayne (2000), Laka (1994), Rivero (1994a), Rivero (1994b), Rivero & Terzi (1995), Zanuttini (1991), Zanuttini (1994), Zanuttini (1997); see also Han (2000), Postma & van der Wurff (2007), Zeijlstra (2006). In addition, Kayne (1991) and Rooryck (1992) discuss clitic ordering in imperatives.

[5] For syncretism in morphology see Baerman (2004), and for suppletion see Veselinova (2006).

[6] A clarification is needed for the term "negative ineffability." In the Romance literature (and here), "negative ineffability" refers to the situation in which the positive form of the imperative cannot co-occur with a negative marker to form a negative imperative. Instead, a different form of the verb that is identical to the infinitive, gerund, or subjunctive is used instead. Periphrastic constructions are also used to negate imperatives.

[7] Postma & van der Wurff (2007) report a correlation between negative ineffability and the merger of the anaphoric negator and sentence negator. We do not discuss this correlation in our paper.

[8] This is an irregular imperative in Italian. However, we use it since it dramatically illustrates the "impoverished morphology" characteristic. See Floricic & Molinu (2003, 2012) for monosyllabic and subminimal imperatives in Romance.

[9] Note that while the negative imperative verb form is homophonous with the infinitive, it has the syntax of imperatives. In particular, clitic pronouns can precede or follow the 2sg negative imperative (*non dirlo* = *non lo dire* 'do not say.2sg it!'), while other infinitives allow enclisis but not proclisis (*per dirlo* ≠ **per lo dire* 'in order to say it').

[10] Hulk (1996) does not consider morphology in her analysis of the French imperative. Using syntactic patterns and diachronic facts, she argues that French has true imperatives and provides a syntactic account for the lack of negative ineffability.

[11] In this chart and all subsequent charts, "neg. ineff." stands for "negative ineffability" or the ungrammaticality of the negated form of the positive imperative, and "enclisis" stands for the verb + enclitic pronoun order with positive imperatives. We do not deal with the position of clitic pronouns relative to the verb in negative imperatives.

[12] Similarly, surrogate imperatives show enclisis in French and Ecuadoran Spanish. In the latter, the future tense verb form can be used for the 2SG imperative: *darás* 'give.2SG!' = 'you.SG will give'. These imperatives would not classify as "true"; however, they do exhibit special clitic pronoun placement: *darás-me-lo* 'give.2SG it to me!' (*'you.SG will give it to me') (Harris 1998).

[13] van der Wurff (2007: 80) claims that enclisis and negative ineffability are no longer considered to be directly related.

[14] The last 4 have another variant of the 2SG imperative which is identical to the 2SG present indicative: *dai* 'give.2SG!' = 'you.SG give', *stai* 'stay.2SG!' = 'you.SG stay', *fai* 'do.2SG!' = 'you.SG do', *vai* 'go.2SG!' = 'you.SG go'.

[15] See Floricic (2000) and Floricic & Molinu (2003), (2012) for monosyllabic and

reduced imperatives, and Huber-Sauter (1951: 65-73) for reduced imperatives in Italian literature. Floricic & Molinu (2012: 11-12) observe that enclitics are not found with monosyllabic truncated imperatives derived from polysyllabic roots.

[16] Another problem with the correlation between the characteristics in (1) and true imperatives has to do with clitic pronoun placement. In languages like Italian, clitics precede tensed verbs, but they follow positive imperatives, providing an illustration of characteristic (1c). However (because of the so-called Tobler-Mussafia effect), Old Italian allows clitics to follow inflected verbs (*fecemi* 'it made me' Dante, *Inferno* 3: 5) and to precede positive imperatives (*or mi dì* 'now tell.2SG me!' Dante, *Inferno* 19: 90). (Thanks to a reviewer for pointing this out.) Many modern Romance varieties also allow clitics to follow the inflected verb (see Munaro 2010, Tortora 2010, and references therein). For example, in northern Italian varieties, subject clitics follow the inflected verb in interrogative sentences: Piacentino: /ət be:v/ 'you.SG drink'; /be:v ət/ 'do you.SG drink?' (Cardinaletti & Repetti 2008). In these varieties, it is not clear if enclisis with imperatives constitutes a "different" or "special" position.

[17] Many other imperative peculiarities in Romance languages have been noted: immunity to analogical change, verbs that exist only in the imperative, imperatives as interjections, imperative compounds, etc. (Maiden 2007, Floricic 2000, Floricic 2012).

[18] Although they are grammatically distinct from standard Italian, and not mutually intelligible with it, we will refer to them as "varieties" in order to avoid the politically charged use of the term "language" or "dialect". Note, however, that some of the varieties we investigate, such as Sardinian, are recognized as 'minority languages' by the Italian government.

[19] The sources are listed in Appendix A. We primarily use Manzini & Savoia (2005a, 2005b, 2005c) for uniformity, and we supplement the data with other sources when needed.

[20] On negative imperatives in early Italian vernaculars, see Parry (2010).

[21] (N) is an optional nasal consonant whose place feature is unspecified: /no l camárə/ 'do not call.2SG him!', /non la camárə/ 'do not call.2SG her!', /nom mə camárə/ 'do not call.2SG me!'.

[22] In some varieties, in addition to two enclitic pronominal forms, a third form is found in proclisis. In Anzi (province: Potenza; region: Basilicata) the third person plural accusative pronoun can be realized as /ddə/ (/vənní:d̲d̲ə/ 'sell.2g them!'), /ɬə/ (/vənní:məɬə/ 'let's sell.1PL them!'), or /i/ (/nonn i̲ vennə/ 'do not sell.2PL them!'). (See also endnote 31.)

[23] Evidence that this is not a case of phonologically-driven allomorphy comes from near minimal pairs. For example, the fem. sg. acc. clitic is realized as /ɖa/ or /la/ in postvocalic position: /cámə ɖa/ 'call.2SG her!', /lɔ́rə la cámənə/ 'they call her'.

[24] Stress shift with enclitics is attested in many Romance varieties and has been discussed at length in the phonological literature. Ordóñez & Repetti (2006) point out the problems with a purely phonological explanation of stress shift and propose that the postverbal pronouns involved in stress shift are of a different morpho-syntactic nature (i.e., they are weak pronouns) from the true clitics that are not involved in stress shift. Kim & Repetti (2013) further suggest that cases similar to these are not to be analyzed as a change in word-level stress, but as a change in the intonational contour of the entire phonological phrase. (See also Manzini & Savoia 2005c: 491-505.) Regardless of the analysis adopted, the relevant fact, for our purposes, is that some forms of the imperative participate in stress shift, while others do not.

[25] Note that the final vowel of the 2SG imperative without enclitics is different from the vowel found with enclitics. This is discussed in Manzini & Savoia (2005c: 490-491).

[26] Some Romantsch varieties, such as the variety of Müstair, appear to have a similar pattern.
[27] We indicate the theme vowel with the inflectional suffix(es), although Carstairs-McCarthy (2010:106) says that the theme vowel belongs to the stem. Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out to us.
[28] Bybee (1985: 173, 186-187) notes that cross-linguistically the subjunctive and imperative moods seem to have a special relationship.
[29] Latin irregular 2nd person imperatives were also morphologically unique: *dūc / dūcite* 'lead.2SG/2PL!'; *fer / ferte* 'bear.2SG/2PL!', etc. The loss of the final /e/ of the 2SG forms was due to their high frequency (Mańczak 1980). Deponent verbs have a unique 2SG imperative form (identical to the active infinite) but a syncretic 2PL form (identical to the 2PL present).
[30] Latin negative imperatives could also be formed with *noli / nolite* 'do not wish' + infinitive.
[31] Another example in this group is the variety of Anzi (province: Potenza; region: Basilicata), in which only the 2SG form has unique morphology, negative ineffability, (optional) stress shift with enclitics, and a unique enclitic form, while all three forms exhibit enclisis with positive imperatives. However, the accusative enclitic pronoun used with true imperatives is unique only in its plural form: /də/ is used with 2SG, and /ɬə/ with 1PL and 2PL: /vənní:+ddə/ 'sell.2SG them!', /vənní:mə+ɬə/ 'let's sell.1PL them!', /vənné:tə+ɬə/ 'sell.2PL them!'. (See also endnote 22.)
[32] In his study of South Lucanian varieties, Lausberg (1939: 152) reports that the 2SG imperative form is the bare stem, the 1PL imperative form is the same as the indicative, and the 2PL imperative is being replaced by the present indicative.
[33] Although we are not considering varieties with postverbal negatives (or double negatives), one variety is worth mentioning in this context. Finale Emilia (province: Modena; region: Emilia-Romagna) has both preverbal and double negation in the imperative. With the preverbal negator /bríza/, all three imperatives forms (2SG, 2PL, 1PL) have enclisis and negative ineffability (the infinitive is used in negative imperatives), but only the 2SG form has a unique morpheme.
[34] Repetti & Ordóñez (2011) report optional stress shift with enclitics in all three forms, while Manzini & Savoia (2005c) report stress shift with 2SG but not 1PL or 2PL.
[35] Maiden et al. (2009: 103-105) report a number of cases in which syncretic imperative forms acquired unique morphology. Southeastern Romanian varieties underwent stress changes in the 2PL form of the verb resulting in differentiation between the indicative and imperative which were previously identical; central Italian varieties have extended the 1SG present indicative root allomorph to the 2SG indicative but not to the 2SG imperative, eliminating originally syncretic forms, etc. These changes do not appear to be correlated with any syntactic changes in the imperative.
[36] Romanello (2012) reaches a similar conclusion: in some Romance varieties spoken in Italy the 2PL form of the imperative patterns with the 2SG, and in others it patterns with the 1PL.
[37] Manzini & Savoia (2005c: 389) classify the imperatives on the basis of the treatment of the 2SG form with regard to negative ineffability, the nature of negation, and enclisis.
[38] Although we are not considering the morphological makeup of the imperative verb as the defining characteristic of true imperatives, the hierarchy generally holds here as well. Aikhenvald (2010: 76-77) observes that languages with a special imperative form in the 2PL must have a special form in the 2SG; if there is an imperative form for the 1PL, unique forms also exist for the 2SG and 2PL. (And if there is an imperative form for the 1PL exclusive, a form also exists for the 1PL inclusive.) (See also Veselinova 2006: 136.) Despite Aikhenvald's (2010: 77) claim that no language has a syncretic singular form and a unique plural form of the

imperative, a number of exceptions to this generalization exist. Latvian and Apurina 2PL imperatives have unique morphology, but 2SG imperatives do not (van der Auwera & Lejeune 2011a). Some Romance varieties spoken in southern Switzerland (in the Mesolcina Valley) have unique imperative plural suffixes but not singular suffixes (Loporcaro 2006).

[39] See Floricic & Molinu (2012) for a discussion of the role (or lack thereof) of frequency in truncated (monosyllabic and subminimal) imperatives.

Bibliographical References

Aikhenvald Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Baldi Philip 1999. *The Foundations of Latin*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baerman Matthew 2004. Directionality and (Un)Natural Classes in Syncretism. *Language* 80. 807-827.

Bichelli Pirro 1974. *Grammatica del dialetto napoletano*. Bari: Pegaso.

Birjulin Leonid A. & Viktor S. Xrakovskij 2001. Imperative Sentences: Theoretical Problems. In Xrakovskij Victor S. (ed.). *Typology of Imperative Constructions.* München: Lincom Europa. 3-50.

Blasco-Ferrer Eduardo 1988. *Le parlate dell'Alta Ogliastra*. Cagliari: Edizioni della Torre.

Bonet Eulàlia 2009. Stem extensions in Catalan encliticized imperatives. Manuscript.

Bybee Joan L. 1985. *Morphology: A Study of the Relation Between Meaning and Form*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cardinaletti Anna & Lori Repetti 2008. The Phonology and Syntax of Preverbal and Postverbal Subject Clitic Pronouns in Northern Italian Dialects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39. 523-563.

Carstairs-McCarthy Andrew 2010. *The Evolution of Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Colantoni Laura, María Cristina Cuervo & José Ignacio Hualde 2010. Stress as a symptom. Paper presented at LSRL 40, University of Washington, March 26-28, 2010.

Comrie Bernard 1981. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Floricic Franck 2000. De l'imperatif italien *sii* et de l'imperatif en general. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 95. 227-266.

Floricic Franck 2012. On reduplicated «imperative compounds» in Sardinian. *Lingue e Linguaggio* 1. 71-96.

Floricic Franck & Lucia Molinu 2003. Imperativi 'monosillabici' e 'Minimal Word' in italiano 'standard' e in sardo. In Giacomo-Marcellesi Mathée & Alvaro Rocchetti (eds.). *Il verbo italiano: studi diacronici, sincronici, contrastive, didattici.* Roma: Bulzoni. 343-357.

Floricic Franck & Lucia Molinu 2012. Romance monosyllabic imperatives and markedness. In Stolz Thomas, Nicole Nau & Cornelia Stroh (eds.). *Monosyllables: from phonology to typology*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 149-172.

Han C. 2000. *The Structure and Interpretation of Imperatives: Mood and Force in Universal Grammar*. New York: Garland.

Harris James 1997. There is no imperative paradigm in Spanish. In Martínez-Gil Fernando & Antonio Morales-Front (eds.). *Issues in the Phonology and Morphology of the Major Iberian Languages*. Washington: Georgetown University Press. 537-557.

Harris James 1998. Spanish Imperatives: Syntax Meets Morphology. *Journal of Linguistics* 34. 27-52.

Huber-Sauter Margrit 1951. *Zur Syntax des Imperativs im Italienischen*. Bern: A. Francke.

Huidobro Susana 2005. Phonological constraints on verum focus in Argentinian Spanish. Manuscript.

Hulk Aafke 1996. How "greedy" is the French Imperative. In Cremers Crit & Marcel den Dikken (eds.). *Linguistics in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 97-108.

Iannace Gaetano 1996. *Il dialetto di San Leucio del Sannio*. Stony Brook, NY: Forum Italicum.

Kayne Richard S. 1991. Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22. 647-686.

Kayne Richard S. 2000. Italian Negative Infinitival Imperatives and Clitic Climbing. In Kayne Richard (ed.). *Parameters and Universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 98-106.

Kim Miran & Lori Repetti 2013. Bitonal Pitch Accent and Phonological Alignment in Sardinian. *Probus*. 25. 267-300.

Laka Itziar 1994. *On the Syntax of Negation*. New York: Garland.

Lausberg Heinrich 1939. *Die Mundarten Südlukaniens*. Halle: Max Niemeyer

Loporcaro Michele 2000. Stress Stability Under Cliticization and the Prosodic Status of Romance Clitics. In Repetti Lori (ed.). *Phonological Theory and the Dialects of Italy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 137-168.

Loporcaro Michele 2006. Crossing Form and Function: First and Second Person Plural Imperatives in the Dialect of Mesocco. *Folia Linguistica* 40. 135-154.

Maiden Martin 1996. On the Romance Inflectional Endings –i and –e. *Romance Philology* 50. 147-182.

Maiden Martin 2007. On the morphology of Italo-Romance imperatives. In Bentley Delia & Adam Ledgeway (eds.). *Sui dialetti italoromanzi: Saggi in onore di Nigel B. Vincent* (The Italianist 27, Special supplement 1). Norfolk: Biddles. 148-164.

Maiden Martin, Andrew Swearingen & Paul O'Neill 2009. Imperative morphology in diachrony evidence from the Romance languages. In Dufresne Monique, Fernande Dupuis & Etleva Vocaj (eds.). *Historical Linguistics 2007*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 99-108.

Mańczak Witold 1980. Irregular Sound Change due to Frequency in Latin. *Language Sciences* 2. 62-68.

Manzini Rita & Leonardo M. Savoia 2005a. *I dialetti italiani e romanci: Morfosintassi generativa. Vol. I*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manzini Rita & Leonardo M. Savoia 2005b. *I dialetti italiani e romanci: Morfosintassi generativa. Vol. II*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

MANZINI Rita & Leonardo M. SAVOIA 2005c. *I dialetti italiani e romanci: Morfosintassi generativa. Vol. III*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
MEILLET A. 1964. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
MIESTAMO Matti & Johan van der Auwera 2007. Negative declaratives and negative imperatives: Similarities and differences. In AMMANN Andreas (ed.). *Linguistics Festival, May 2006 Bremen* (Diversitas Linguarum 14). Bochum: Brockmeyer. 59-77.
MONACHESI Paola 1996. On the representation of Italian clitics. In KLEINHENZ Ursula (ed.). *Interfaces in Phonology*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 83-101.
MOYNA María Irene 1999. Pronominal clitic stress in Rio de la Plata Spainish: An Optimality account. *The SECOL Review* 23. 15-44.
MUNARO Nicola 2010. Toward a Hierarchy of Clause Types. In BENINCÀ Paola & Nicola MUNARO (eds.). *Mapping the Left Periphery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 125-162.
NESPOR Marina & Irene VOGEL 1986. *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
ORDÓÑEZ Francisco & Lori REPETTI 2006. Stressed enclitics? In MONTREUIL Jean-Pierre & Chiyo NISHIDA (eds.). *New analyses in Romance linguistics. Volume II: Phonetics, Phonology and Dialectology* (Selected Papers from the 35th LSRL 35). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 167-181.
ORDÓÑEZ Francisco & Lori REPETTI 2008. Morphology, phonology and syntax of stressed enclitics in Romance. Paper presented at the Conference on Romance Clitics, New York University, May 2-3, 2008.
PALMER Frank R. 1986. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
PARRY Mair 2010. Prohibition and Romance: negative imperatives in the early vernaculars of Italy. In D'ALESSANDRO Roberta, Adam LEDGEWAY & Ian ROBERTS (eds.). *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 153-170.
PEPERKAMP Sharon 1997. *Prosodic Words*. The Hague: HAG.
PINKSTER Harm 1990. *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. London: Routledge.
POSTMA Gertjan & van der Wurff, Wim 2007. How to say *no* and *don't*: Negative imperatives in Romance and Germanic. In VAN DER WURFF Wim (ed.). *Imperative Clauses in Generative Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 205-249.
REPETTI Lori & Francisco ORDÓÑEZ 2011. *Clitics of Romance Languages Database*. http: crl.railsplayground.net.
RIVERO María-Luisa 1994a. Clause structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12. 63-120.
RIVERO María-Luisa 1994b. Negation, imperatives and Wackernagel effects. *Rivista di Linguistica* 6. 39-66.
RIVERO María L. & Arhonto TERZI 1995. Imperatives, V-movement and logical mood. *Journal of Linguistics* 31. 301-332.
ROMANELLO Emily 2012. *L'imperativo vero e suppletivo nei dialetti italiani*. Master thesis. Stony Brook University, New York.
ROORYCK Johan 1992. Romance Enclitic Ordering and Universal Grammar. *The Linguistic Review* 9. 219-250.

SADOCK Jerrold M. & Arnold M. ZWICKY 1985. Speech act distinction in syntax. In SHOPEN Timothy (ed.). *Language Typology and Syntactic Structure. Vol. I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 155-196.

SILVA-VILLAR Luis 1998. Morphology and syntax of Romance imperatives: An incomplete history. *Probus* 10. 115-138.

SWEARINGEN Andrew 2011. The Romance Imperative, Irregular Morphology, Syncretism, and the Morphome. In MAIDEN Martin, John Charles SMITH, Maria GOLDBACH & Marc-Olivier HINZELIN (eds.). *Morphological Autonomy: Perspectives from Romance Inflectional Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 119-134.

TORRES-TAMARIT Francesc 2010. Stress shift under encliticization in Formenteran Catalan: A case of an unmarked stress pattern. Manuscript.

TORTORA Christina 2010. Domains of clitic placement in finite and non-finite clauses: evidence from a Piedmontese dialect. In D'ALESSANDRO Roberta, Adam LEDGEWAY & Ian ROBERTS (eds.). *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 135-149.

VAN DER AUWERA Johan 2010a. Vers une typologie du prohibitif. In FLORICIC Franck & Renée Lambert-Brétière (eds.). *La négation et les énoncés non susceptibles d'être niés*. Paris: CNRS. 155-172.

VAN DER AUWERA Johan 2010b. Prohibition: constructions and markers. In SHU Dingfang & Ken TURNER (eds.). *Contrasting meaning in languages of the East and West*. Tübingen: Narr. 443-475.

VAN DER AUWERA Johan, Nina DOBRUSHINA & Valentin GOUSSEV 2004. A semantic Map for Imperative-Hortatives. In WILLEMS Dominique, Bart DEFRANCQ, Timothy COLLEMAN & Dirk NOËL (eds.). *Contrastive Analysis in Language. Identifying Linguistic Units of Comparison*. Houndmills & NewYork: Palgrave Macmillan. 44-66.

VAN DER AUWERA Johan & Ludo LEJEUNE (with Umarani Pappuswamy & Valentin Goussev) 2011a. The Morphological Imperative. In DRYER Matthew S. & Martin HASPELMATH (eds.). *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 70. http://wals.info/chapter/70.

VAN DER AUWERA Johan & Ludo LEJEUNE (with Valentin Goussev) 2011b. The Prohibitive. In DRYER Matthew S. & Martin HASPELMATH (eds.). *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 71. http://wals.info/chapter/71.

VAN DER WURFF Wim 2007. Imperative Clauses in Generative Grammar: An Introduction. In VAN DER WURFF Wim (ed.). *Imperative Clauses in Generative Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1-94.

VESELINOVA Ljuba 2006. *Suppletion in Verb Paradigms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

ZANUTTINI Raffaella 1991. *Syntactic Properties of Sentential Negation: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. PhD dissertation. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

ZANUTTINI Raffaella 1994. Speculations on Negative Imperatives. *Rivista di Linguistica* 6. 67-89.

ZANUTTINI Raffaella 1997. *Negation and Clausal Structure. A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zeijlstra Hedde 2006. The Ban on True Negative Imperatives. In Bonami Olivier & Patricia Cabredo Hofher (eds.). *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 6*. http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss6. 405-424.