

Allocutive agreement through mesoclis

Virginia Hill – University of New Brunswick SJ/mota@unb.ca

This paper focuses on the mesoclis in (1b), which involves the 2nd person plural suffix and the reflexive clitic pronoun in Romanian imperatives. Romanian studies on these constructions attribute the mesoclis to morphophonology (Byck 1935; Morariu 1921; Mării 1969 a.o.).

- (1) a. *Duceți-vă în cel sătcel* **default**
 go.2PL=REFL.2PL in that hamlet
 ‘Go into that hamlet’ (NT {26v}; mid17th c.)
- b. *Duce-vă-ți de la mine* **marked/mesoclis**
 go.REFL.2PL= 2PL from at me
 ‘Go away from me’ (Antim {354}; mid18th c.)

The most influential formal and cross-linguistic studies on similar constructions also define this type of mesoclis as a PF only phenomenon (Harris & Halle 2005; Arregi & Nevins 2015).

The analysis proposed here counters a PF approach to (1b) by arguing that the mesoclis arises in narrow syntax, and that the relevant operations can be optimally captured in a framework that allows for the syntactization of speech act features. More precisely, the morpheme ți is a suffix marking the subject-verb agreement in (1a), but a clitic marking the allocutive agreement in (1b). Furthermore, the diachronic perspective applied to data as in (1) suggests that mesoclis may be reanalyzed outside narrow syntax (i.e. at PF) when semantic bleaching takes place by eliminating the allocutive agreement.

Data in diachrony. (1a) is the default imperative clause in Old and Modern Romanian. Before the emergence of (1b), the short-lived variation in (2) is attested (17th c.), where ți is absent, while the reflexive vă marks both reflexivity and subject-verb agreement for 2nd person plural.

- (2) *Întoarce-vă către mine*
 turn.IMP=REFL.2PL towards me ‘Return towards me’ (NB 10,211/10)

By mid-18th c., (1b) emerges in reflexive verbs and is preserved in modern regiolects. By mid 19th c., further variation develops, where (1b) applies not only to reflexives but also to active verbs, allowing for free substitution of the clitic vă plus ți reduplication, as in (3).

- (3) *cătați-le-ți*
 search.IMP.2PL=them=2PL ‘search for them’ (Frâncu 1981: 87)

In Modern Romanian, the alternation (1a/1b) is free for some speakers, while for others it involves a switch in the pragmatic interpretation (Morariu 1921; Istrătescu 1937; Mării 1969). I propose that the latter group uses (1b) when in need of allocutive agreement marking, because:

- The option for (1b) over (1a) arises when the speaker discriminates between men versus women addressees, or children versus adults; i.e., the switch concerns the biological properties of the addressee, which is the definition of allocutive agreement (Trask 1997)
- (1b) arises after the familiar attention drawing particle *ni* disappears from texts; i.e., it fills up a gap for a formula of direct address.
- A mismatch may arise between subject-verb agreement and mesoclitic ți – see (4) with the subject in singular while ți is plural; here, ți indicates a child as the addressee.

- (4) *mărturisește-te-ți la biserică*
 confess. IMP.2SG=REFL.2SG=2PL in church ‘Confess (your sins) in church!’

- Mesoclitic ți is also seen in the absence of verb inflection, i.e. on gerunds – see (5).

- (5) *bucurându-vă-ți*
 enjoying= REFL.2PL=2PL ‘enjoying yourselves’ (Frâncu 1981: 89)

Previous (formal) accounts. Formally, mesoclisism as in (1) has been discussed on the basis of Spanish imperatives, which show the clitic cluster variation in (6) for ‘Sell it!’.

- (6) a. *Véndan-lo* b. *Vénda-lo-n* c. *Véndan-lo-n*
 sell.IMP.2PL=it sell.IMP=it=2PL sell.IMP.2PL=it=2PL

The exclusive PF approach in Harris & Halle 2005 relying on Generalized Reduplication was countered by a morphosyntactic approach in Kayne 2010; Manzini & Savoia 2011. Arregi & Nevins 2012, 2015 reinforce the PF approach but import Kayne’s Restriction rule on clitic distribution. Briefly, while the PF analysis relies on clitic alternations, the morphosyntactic analysis considers that (6) arises at the sub-word/lexical level by rules of constituent Merge previous to the Merge of the clitic cluster with C/I. Crucially, both approaches rely on free alternation, morpheme ordering outside narrow syntax, and involve identity of the enclitic and mesoclitic morpheme. So they fail to grasp the main properties of (1)-(5), i.e.: (a) the change in interpretation re: allocutive agreement; and/or (b) the mismatch in phi-features (see 4,5).

Proposal. This paper proposes, instead, that (1)-(5) arise from narrow syntax computations that map speech act features at the left periphery of clauses. This can account for the switch in interpretation and for the use of *ti* independently of subject-verb agreement.

Analysis. I start from the assumption that imperative clauses involve V-to-C (Rivero & Terzi 1995; Isac & Jakab 2004 a.o.) and that a speech act field (saP/SAP) is mapped above CP (Speas & Tenny 2003), introducing the speaker’s point of view and the addressee (2nd) features. The latter subsumes the allocutive agreement (Miyagawa 2012), as needed, and is responsible for licensing the phi-features of imperative C/T (Zanuttini 2008; Isac 2015). Accordingly, (1a) has the structure in (7), where the addressee [2nd] and the subject are coreferent.

- (7) [_{saP} [pOV] [_{SAP} [2nd] [_{CP} *Duce~~ti~~* [_{KLP} *vă* [_{TP} *Duce~~ti~~* [_{VP} *Duce~~ti~~*]]]]]]]

The construction in (2) treats *vă* as a suffix for both reflexivity and phi-features in C/T, so (8) follows from (7) minus CliticP (KLP), and allows for the reanalysis of *ti* outside C/T.

- (8) [_{saP} [pOV] [_{SAP} [2nd] [_{CP} *Întoarce~~vă~~* [_{TP} *Întoarce~~vă~~* [_{VP} *Întoarce~~e~~*]]]]]]]

(1b) arises from the reanalysis of *ti* upward the tree, as a clitic in SA, and V-to-sa takes place:

- (9) [_{saP} *Duce~~vă~~* [_{SAP} *ti* [_{CP} *Duce~~vă~~* [_{TP} *Duce~~vă~~* [_{VP} *Duce~~e~~*]]]]]]]

The allocutive/clitic status of *ti* depended on the affixal analysis of *vă*. Once the allocutive function is established (19th c.), affixal and clitic *ti* can concur (see 3), so *vă* counts as a clitic only and can be replaced with other clitic pronouns (e.g., *le* in 3); [pov] in sa-head probes for CP to Spec,saP (see 10), as V remains in C and supports the clitics in KLP (V-oriented clitics).

- (10) [_{saP} *căta~~ti~~-le* [_{SAP} *ti* [_{CP} VP [_{CP} *căta~~ti~~* [_{KLP} *-le* [_{TP} *căta~~ti~~* [_{VP} *căta~~ti~~*]]]]]]]]]

PF variation. Speakers for whom the alternation in (1a/b) is free have lost the allocutive agreement analysis of *ti*. For these speakers, the clitic cluster can contain more than one clitic pronoun (e.g., *căta~~ti~~-mi-le-ti* ‘search.IMP.2PL-for.me-them-2PL’) but generalized reduplication does not apply within the cluster (compare Sp. *venda(n)-me-(n)-lo-(n)* with Rom. *căta*(~~ti~~)-mi-(~~ti~~)-le-(~~ti~~)*), despite the favourable syllabic environment (i.e., onset-nucleus). Hypothesis: the mesoclisism is being reanalyzed as a PF phenomenon, but the process is in the beginning stages.

Conclusions. Allocutive agreement and morpheme selection in Romanian data as in (1) cannot be grasped under PF or lexical approaches to mesoclisism, but only under a narrow syntax analysis that integrates the mapping of speech acts. This analysis does not invalidate the previous approaches to similar cross-linguistic phenomena where mesoclisism is independent of interpretation, but points out that this phenomenon may have originated as a narrow syntax operation, with further reanalysis at PF when the allocutive agreement was lost.