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The causative construction in the dialects of southern Italy and the phonology-syntax interface

1 Introduction

It is customary in typological studies on causatives (see Comrie 1985: 165–184) to distinguish on the one hand between analytic constructions such as the English example in (1a), where the causative predicate make and the verbal complement fall constitute two independent words, and morphological constructions such as the Chichewa example in (1b) on the other, where the causative morpheme -ets- is directly combined with the verbal root -gw- ‘fall’:

(1) a. Mary made John fall. (Eng.)
   b. Mtsikana a-na-u-gw-ets-a mtsuko. (Chichewa)
      girl ACC.SUBJ.-PST.-ACC.OBJ.-fall-CAUS-ASP jug
      ‘The girl made the jug fall.’

However, it is well known (cf. Kayne 1975; Zubizarreta 1985; Burzio 1986; Alsina 1992; 1996; Guasti 1993; Sheehan 2016) that within this typology most Romance varieties occupy an intermediate position between the analytic and the morphological types.1 In particular, the Romance causative, although superficially of the analytic type transparently combining two independent predicates (cf. fece ‘did’ and cadere ‘to fall’ in 2a), nonetheless mimics the morphological type in that the causative predicate and lexical infinitive appear to form a single verbal complex (Vincent 2016: 43–44). As a consequence of the tight

---

1 An obvious exception here is Romanian and many dialects of the extreme south of Italy where, due to the general avoidance of infinitival complementation, the causative is generally expressed by a bi-clausal structure involving a finite subjunctive complement (Ledgeway 2013, 2016b: 1023–1027; Ciutescu 2015; Squillaci 2017; Ledgeway, Schifano, and Silvestri in press).
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structural cohesion exhibited by both verbal components of the verbal complex, it proves impossible to interpolate material such as Gianni in (2b) and local operations such as clitic climbing from the embedded infinitive to the higher causative predicate are readily licensed (2c).

(2) a. Maria [\textit{fece cadere}] Gianni. (It.)
   Maria made fall\textsc{.inf} Gianni
   ‘Maria made Gianni fall.’

b. *Maria \textit{fece Gianni cadere}. (It.)
   Maria made Gianni fall\textsc{.inf}

b. Maria \textit{lo fece cadere(*lo)}. (It.)
   Maria him= made fall\textsc{.inf}=him
   ‘Maria made him fall.’

Furthermore, in analyses of the Romance causative it is standard, following the seminal work of Kayne (1975), to recognise two causative subtypes. In the so-called \textit{faire-infinitif} construction (3a) we witness a complex predicate that selects for three arguments, the causer (Marie), the caused event (\textit{nettoyer les toilettes}), and a composite argument (Jean) simultaneously realizing the Recipient of the causation and the Agent of the caused event which is marked either as a direct or an indirect object in accordance with the intransitive vs transitive nature of the lexical infinitive. In the \textit{faire-par} construction (3b), by contrast, the complex predicate manifests just two arguments, the causer (Marie) and the caused event (\textit{nettoyer les toilettes}). However, unlike the \textit{faire-infinitif} construction, the infinitive in the \textit{faire-par} construction assumes a passive reading, despite the absence of typical passive morphology, with backgrounding of the Agent which, if expressed, is introduced by an oblique \textit{by}-phrase on a par with the canonical passive construction.

(3) a. Marie \textit{fait nettoyer les toilettes à Jean}. (Fr.)
   Marie makes clean\textsc{.inf} the toilets to Jean
   ‘Marie makes Jean clean the toilets / Marie forces Jean to clean the toilets.’

b. Marie \textit{fait nettoyer les toilettes (par Jean)}. (Fr.)
   Marie makes clean\textsc{.inf} the toilets by Jean
   ‘Marie has the toilets cleaned (by Jean).’

\footnote{Some Spanish and Catalan varieties also (optionally) allow a bi-clausal ECM structure in which clitics fail to climb and the infinitival subject intervenes between the causative and the infinitival verb (Sheehan 2016: 985–993). According to Davies (1995), the bi-clausal ECM option represents a relatively recent innovation in the history of Ibero-Romance.}
If we now consider the dialects of southern Italy, these largely appear to pattern on a par with standard Romance varieties such as French and Italian (Lombardi 1997; Ledgeway 2009: 896–900). For instance, we can distinguish once again between the *faire-infinitif* (a examples) and *faire-par* (b examples) constructions, although there is some lexical variation across dialects, as in the canonical passive, in relation to the choice of preposition that introduces the demoted Agent (viz. DE+AB ‘from, by’ vs DE ‘of’).

Neapolitan

(4) a. *Papà* facette *accuncià 'a machina a Ciccio.* (*faire-infinitif*)

dad made repair.INF the car to Ciccio

‘Dad made Ciccio repair the car.’

b. *Papà* facette *accuncià 'a machina ('a Ciccio).* (*faire-par*)

dad made repair.INF the car by Ciccio

‘Dad had the car repaired (by Ciccio).’

c. *Papà* *nce 'a facette (*nce 'a) accuncià /Papà 'a facette*

dad to.him= it=made to.him= it= repair.INF dad it=made

(*l’)accuncià ('a Ciccio).

it= repair.INF by Ciccio

‘Dad made him repair it/had it repaired (by Ciccio).’

Cosentino (northern Calabria)

(5) a. *Maria fa* pulizzà *u cessu a Cicciu.* (*faire-infinitif*)

Maria makes clean.INF the toilet to Ciccio

‘Maria makes Ciccio clean the toilet.’

b. *Maria fa* pulizzà *u cessu ('i Cicciu).* (*faire-par*)

Maria makes clean.INF the toilet of Ciccio

‘Maria has the toilet cleaned by Ciccio.’

c. *Maria cc’ 'u fa (*cc’ 'u) pulizzà / Maria*

Maria to.him= it= makes to.him= it= clean.INF Maria

*u fa (*u) pulizzà ('i Cicciu).

it= makes it= clean.INF of Ciccio

‘Maria makes him clean it/has it cleaned (by Ciccio).’

Mussomelese (south-western Sicily)

(6) a. *Maria fa* puliziari *i gabbinetti a Giuwanni.* (*faire-infinitif*)

Maria makes clean.INF the toilets to Giovanni

‘Maria makes Giovanni clean the toilets.’
b. Maria si fa puliziari i gabinetti
   Maria
   self= makes clean.INF the toilets
   (di Giuwnanni). (faire-par)
   of Giovanni
   ‘Maria has the toilets cleaned (by Giovanni).’

c. Maria ci-i fa puliziari(*ci-i) /Maria s’
   Maria
   to.him= them= makes clean.INF=to.him=them Maria
   self=
   ’i fa (*’i) puliziari (di Giuwnanni).
   them= makes them= clean.INF of Giovanni
   ‘Maria makes him clean them/has them cleaned (by Giovanni).’

Furthermore, in all the southern varieties above clitics dependent on the lexical infinitive are required once again to climb to the causative predicate (cf. c examples). In this respect, it is interesting to note that the usual Romance variation observed in the grammaticality or otherwise of clitic climbing (Kayne 1991; Manzini and Savoia 2005, III: 383–385; Cinque 2004, 2006; Tortora 2014: 135), as exemplified in the contrast between modern French and Italian in (7a-b), is systematically absent in the causative where in all varieties – though for some possible exceptions, see Tortora (2014: 150–153) and footnote 2 above regarding the Ibero-Romance ECM construction – clitics obligatorily climb to the causative predicate even in varieties such as modern French (8a-b).

(7) a. Marc (*le) doit le corriger tout de suite. (Fr.)
   Mark
   it= must it=correct.INF=it at.once
   ‘Mark must mark it at once.’

   b. Marco lo deve correggere(lo) subito. (It.)
   Mark
   it= must it=correct.INF=it at.once
   ‘Mark must mark it at once.’

(8) a. Marc le fera (*le) corriger tout de suite. (Fr.)
   Mark
   it= will.make it= correct.INF=it at.once
   ‘Mark will have it corrected at once.’

   b. Marco lo farà correggere(*lo) subito. (It.)
   Mark
   it= will.make it= correct.INF=it at.once
   ‘Mark will have it corrected at once.’

Limiting ourselves just to the facts of clitic climbing, we interpret the otherwise exceptional obligatory nature of climbing in the Romance causative as a superficial reflex of a restructuring process (though see Cinque 2004 2006 for an alternative analysis), whereby an underlying biclausal construction consisting of two distinct predicates (9a) is transformed into a monoclausal construction superficially characterized by a single verbal complex (9b).
As a consequence of such restructuring, we observe that (i) the respective argument structures of the two predicates are merged into one (cf. dative marking of the logical subject of the infinitive a Ugo ‘to Ugo’ in 9b); (ii) with the exception of some VP-adverbs, nothing can intervene between the causative predicate and the lexical infinitive (cf. 2b); and (iii) clitic pronouns semantically dependent on the embedded infinitive must climb to the causative predicate (cf. 8a-b). In light of these facts, we now turn to examine the causative construction in the imperative, the principal focus of our discussion in the remainder of this article.

2 Faire-infinitif vs faire-par in the imperative

Beginning with Italian, we note that, on a par with the other paradigms observed hitherto, any clitics in the imperatival causative construction must also raise to the causative predicate (10a), and are not allowed to remain on the infinitive, either in proclitic or enclitic position (10b):

(10) a. *Fatemela raccontare bene! (It.)

make.IMP.2PL=me=it tell.INF well

b. *Fate mela raccontare bene!/ *Fate raccontarmela

make.IMP.2PL me=it to.tell.INF well make.IMP.2PL tell.INF=me=it bene! (It.)

well

c. ‘Make/Let me tell it properly!’ (faire-infinitif)
d. ‘Have it told to me properly!’ (faire-par)

Furthermore, as expected, we note a formal ambiguity in example (10a) between the faire-infinitif and faire-par interpretations. More specifically, the clitic me ‘me’ can be understood either as the Agent or the Recipient of raccontare ‘to tell’, respectively licensing the faire-infinitif (10c) and the faire-par (10d) readings.

Turning now to the dialects of southern Italy, we observe that, in some dialects at least, in the imperative clitics may continue to climb to the causative predicate (11a) or remain on the embedded infinitive (11b). This is unambiguously
revealed in the Cosentino examples (11a-b) by the allomorphic alternation observed in the clitic clusters involving the third-person forms derived from ille: whereas the lateral is preserved in enclitic position (viz, -milla ‘=me.DAT=it.F.ACC’), it is absent in proclitic position (namely, m’a ‘me.DAT=it.F.ACC’).

(11) a. Facitimiella cuntà bbona! (faire-par; Cos.)
    make.IMP.2PL=me=it tell.INF well
    ‘Have it told to me properly!’ (??‘Make/Let me tell it properly!’)
b. Faciti m’a cuntà bbona! (faire-infinitif; Cos.)
    make.IMP.2PL me=it= tell.INF well
    ‘Make/Let me tell it properly!’ (*‘Have it told to me properly’)

As the translations in (11) highlight, such variation in clitic placement is, however, not free, but serves to mark a formal distinction between the faire-infinitif and faire-par interpretations: when enclisis to the causative predicate obtains as in (11a), the argument encoded by -mi- can only correspond to the Recipient of cuntà ‘to tell’, whereas when the clitic cluster attaches proclitically to the embedded infinitive as in (11b), the argument encoded by m’ marks the Agent of cuntà.

Superficially, on the basis of these facts we might be tempted to conclude that, in contrast to the faire-par construction in which clitics regularly climb to the causative predicate following a restructuring process (12a), the faire-infinitif construction instantiates a case of failed restructuring in which, given a biclausal construction, clitics remain on the embedded infinitive (12b).

(12) a. [Facitimiella cuntà bbona!] (Cos.)
    make.IMP.2PL=me=it tell.INF well
b. [Faciti + m’a cuntà bbona!] (Cos.)
    make.IMP.2PL me=it= tell.INF well

3 The faire-infinitif reading with clitics in enclitic position as in (11a) is not entirely excluded for some speakers, especially those of the younger generations, although even these consider it to represent the least natural and genuinely dialectal option. We therefore take this option to be due to influence from the grammar of Italian, in which younger speakers generally show a greater degree of active competence. Revealing in this respect is the observation that while these (typically younger) speakers do not entirely exclude the faire-infinitif reading in examples like (11a) in accordance with the corresponding Italian structure, they never associate the faire-par reading with structures like (11b) where pronouns appear in proclisis to the infinitive since this is an exclusively dialectal construction without any parallel in Italian.
In what follows, we present a complete description of the syntax of the southern Italian imperatival causative construction, a structure which to date has virtually gone unnoticed in the literature. On the basis of this description, we shall assess the evidence for the claim that the imperatival faire-infinitive construction involves a biclausal structure in which restructuring has failed to take place. In the final section we then outline a structural analysis of the southern Italian causative construction that is able to account for the structural distinction between the two causative constructions and the differences in clitic placement witnessed in the imperative.

3 Characteristics of southern causative in the imperative

3.1 Distribution

We begin by considering the lexical distribution of the southern Italian causative construction. Besides the prototypical causative predicate derived from FACERE ‘make’ (13a), many Romance varieties also license a monoclausal construction in conjunction with causative LAXARE ‘let’ (13b) and, to a lesser extent, with verbs of perception which, alongside a monoclausal construction (13c), also license a biclausal structure (13d).

(13) a. [La feci aprire a Ugo]. (It.)
   it.F.ACC= I.made open.INF to Ugo
   ‘I made Ugo open it.’

b. [La lasciai aprire a Ugo]. (It.)
   it.F.ACC= I.let open.INF to Ugo
   ‘I let Ugo open it.’

c. [La vidi aprire a Ugo]. (It.)
   it.F.ACC= I.saw open.INF to Ugo
   ‘I saw Ugo open it.’

d. [Vidi [Ugo aprirla]]. (cf. also Lo vidi aprirla)
   I.saw Ugo open.INF=it.F.ACC=it.F.ACC
   ‘I saw Ugo open it (I saw him open it).’

Judging by the facts of clitic placement alone, in the dialects of southern Italy, however, an apparently biclausal causative construction is found with reflexes of FACERE (14a) and LAXARE (14b), but never with verbs of perception (14c):
(14) a. Facimu 'u ricoglia! (Cos.)
make.IMP.1PL him= return.INF
‘Let’s make him come back!’
b. Lassa 'u dorma! (Cos.)
let.IMP.2SG= him= sleep.INF
‘Let him sleep!’
c. Guardalu ballà / *Guarda 'u ballà! (Cos.)
watch.IMP.2SG=him dance.INF watch.IMP.2SG him= dance.INF
‘Watch him dance!’

As for its geographic distribution, investigations to date reveal that the biclausal causative construction is found in dialects of northern Calabria (15a–c; Ledgeway and Lombardi 2000) and the dialects of Campania 16a-c; Bichelli 1974: §191; Ledgeway 2009: 901–903).

(15) a. Lassa 'i sta na picca! (Cos.)
let.IMP.2SG them= stay.INF a little
‘Let them be for a while!’
b. Faciti cc”u spiegà chiru ca è successu! (Cos.)
make.IMP.2PL him=it= explain.INF that which is happened
‘Make him explain what happened!’
c. Facimu 'a scinna subbitu! (Cos.)
make.IMP.1PL her= descend.INF at.once
‘Let’s make her come down at once!’

(16) a. E facit’ 'o parlà! (Nap.)
and make.IMP.2PL him= speak.INF
‘And make him speak!’
b. 'Ass’ 'e ffa’! (Nap.)
let.IMP.2SG them= do.INF
‘Let them do (it)’!
c. Facite menn’ j’! (Nap.)
make.IMP.2PL me=thence= go.INF
‘Let me leave!’

The construction is not, however, universally available throughout the South, inasmuch as it appears to be absent from many other southern dialects including,
for example, Abruzzese, Pugliese and Sicilian varieties such as Ariellese (17a–b), Barese (18a–b) and Mussomelese (19a–b)\textsuperscript{4}:

(17) a. *Falle servi!* (Arielli (CH); faire-infinitif/foire-par)
    \[\text{make.IMP.2sg}=\text{him} \text{ serve.INF}\]
    ‘Make him serve / Have him served!’

   b. *Facetemele accundà bbone!* (Arielli (CH); faire-infinitif/foire-par)
    \[\text{make.IMP.2PL}=\text{me}=\text{it} \text{ tell.INF} \text{ well}\]
    ‘Let/make me tell it properly! / Have it told to me properly!’

(18) a. *Facitue sève!* (BA; faire-infinitif/foire-par)
    \[\text{make.IMP.2PL}=\text{him} \text{ serve.INF}\]
    ‘Make him serve! / Have him served!’

   b. *Fàmmela chend’ bbune!* (BA; faire-infinitif/foire-par)
    \[\text{make.IMP.2SG}=\text{me}=\text{it} \text{ tell.INF} \text{ well}\]
    ‘Let/make me tell it properly! / Have it told to me properly!’

(19) a. *Facitiliu servirì!* (Mussomelese (CL); faire-infinitif/foire-par)
    \[\text{make.IMP.2PL}=\text{him} \text{ serve.INF}\]
    ‘Make him serve! / Have him served!’

   b. *Fammilla cuntari bbona!*
    \[\text{make.IMP.2SG}=\text{me}=\text{it} \text{ tell.INF} \text{ well}\]
    \[\text{(Mussomelese (CL); faire-infinitif/foire-par)}\]
    ‘Let/make me tell it properly! / Have it told to me properly!’

In what follows, however, we shall restrict our attention to the northern Calabrian dialect of Cosenza, since it is the variety for which we currently have most data, although the empirical and theoretical generalizations that hold for Cosentino appear \textit{a priori} to hold of other northern Calabrian dialects and some Campanian varieties.

\textsuperscript{4} I thank Roberta D’Alessandro, Luigi Andriani and Silvio Cruschina for supplying the Ariellese, Barese and Mussomelese data, respectively. It should not, however, be concluded on the basis of these superficial investigations that the apparently biclausal causative construction is systematically absent from all dialects of these regions. For example, Antonio Lupis (p.c.) informs me that the construction is found in numerous dialects spoken in the province of Bari.
3.2 Structural distinctions between *faire-par* and *faire-infinitif*

Having identified a formal distinction between the *faire-par* and *faire-infinitif* imperative construction in Cosentino, we must now consider how this distinction is overtly manifested. As observed above, the most immediate formal indication of the distinction surfaces in the allomorphic variation witnessed in the third-person pronouns (<ille) which mark an overt distinction between enclitic and proclitic variants through the respective presence and absence of the lateral. This pronominal allomorphy is exemplified in Table 1 and the examples in (20)–(22):

**Table 1: Allomorphic variation in clitic paradigms.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enclitic position</th>
<th>Proclitic position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg + 3 acc</td>
<td>V + -míllu / -mílla / -mílli</td>
<td>m&quot;u- / m&quot;a- / m&quot;i + V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg + 3 acc</td>
<td>V + -tíllu / -tílla / -tílli</td>
<td>t&quot;u- / t&quot;a- / t&quot;i + V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 acc</td>
<td>V + -lu / -la / -lili</td>
<td>'u- / 'a- / 'i- + V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 dat + 3 acc</td>
<td>V + -ccíllum / -ccílla / -ccílli</td>
<td>cc&quot;u- / cc&quot;a- / cc&quot;i + V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl + 3 acc</td>
<td>V + -níllu / -nílla / -nílli</td>
<td>m&quot;u- / n&quot;a- / n&quot;i + V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl + 3 acc</td>
<td>V + -víllu / -vílla / -vílli</td>
<td>v&quot;u- / v&quot;a- / v&quot;i + V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(20) a. *Facitila*    *serva!* (Cos.; *faire-par*  
‘Have her served!’

b. *Facit*    ‘*a*    *serva!* (Cos.; *faire-infinitif*)  
‘Make/Let her serve!’

(21) a. *Fanníllu*    *vida!* (Cos.; *faire-par*  
‘Have it shown to us!’

b. *Fa*    *n’u*    *vida!* (Cos.; *faire-infinitif*)  
‘Make/Let us see it!’

(22) a. *Lassalu*    *fà!* (Cos.; *faire-par*  
‘Let it be done!’
b. **Lassa**  'u  fà! (Cos.; faire-infinitif)
    let.IMP.2SG  him=  do.INF
    ‘Let him do (it)!'

It follows from this that whenever the imperatival causative construction occurs in conjunction with the distinctive enclitic pronominal forms in Table 1, the Agent of the caused event can only be realized as a *by*-phrase (23a), while their proclitic variants only prove compatible with a *faire-infinitif* structure in which the Agent is variously realized as direct or indirect object in accordance with the transitivity or otherwise of the embedded infinitive (23b).

\[(23) a. Facitila  serva  'i  Giuvanni! (Cos.; faire-par)
    make.IMP.2PL=her  serve.INF  of  Giovanni
    ‘Have her served by Giovanni!'
\]

\[(23) b. Facit  'a  serva  (*'i  Giuvanni)! (Cos.; faire-infinitif)
    make.IMP.2PL  her=  serve.INF  of  Giovanni
    ‘Make/Let her serve (*by Giovanni)!'
\]

The two constructions are further distinguished by the fact that in the causative construction unergative infinitives are compatible with the proclitic forms of the pronouns, but not their enclitic variants (24a–c). This observation finds an immediate explanation in the fact that the passive necessarily acts on the underlying direct object (internal argument), whereas we have seen that the enclitic pronominal form is identified with the *faire-par* causative, in essence a passive construction and hence incompatible with an intransitive infinitive which fails to select an internal argument. The presence of a proclitic pronoun, on the other hand, identifies, as we have seen, an active *faire-infinitif* structure whose compatibility with inergative infinitives is fully expected since the single external argument of the latter corresponds to the Recipient of the caused event.

\[(24) a. Facit  'a  ballà!  /  *Facitila  ballà! (Cos.)
    make.IMP.2PL  her=  dance.INF  make.IMP.2PL=her  dance.INF
    ‘Make/Let her dance! / *Have her danced!’
\]

\[(24) b. Facim  'a  dorma!  /  *Facimulu  dorma! (Cos.)
    Make.IMP.1PL  him=  sleep.INF  make.IMP.1PL=him  sleep.INF
    ‘Let’s make/let him sleep! / *Let’s have him slept!’
\]

\[(24) c. Lassa  'i  cada!  /  *Lassali  cada! (Cos.)
    let.IMP.2SG  them=  fall.INF  let.IMP.2SG=them  fall.INF
    ‘Let them fall! / *Let them be fallen!’
\]
Finally, another area in which the distinction between the two causative constructions surfaces regards anaphor binding (Burzio 1986; Sheehan 2016: 988–989). In Italian, for example, anaphors like the third-person singular anaphor suo ‘his, her, its’ can be bound by the Agent of the faire-infinitif causative construction (25b), but not by the Agent of the faire-par construction (26b) where the Agent is realized as an oblique by-phrase. As highlighted by the underlying structural representations in (25a, 26a), this distinction is a consequence of the fact that only in the faire-infinitif construction is the anaphor preceded by its antecedent Ida which occurs in an appropriate position from which it can c-command and bind the coreferential possessive.

(25) a. [Feci] [+ [Ida]i chiamare il [suo]i avvocato] (It.)
   1.made Ida call.INF the her lawyer

   b. Feci chiamare il [suo]i avvocato [a Ida]i (It., faire-infinitif)
   1.made call.INF the her lawyer to Ida
   ‘I made [Ida]i call [her]i lawyer’

(26) a. [Feci] [+ [chiamare il [suo]i avvocato [da Ida]i] (It.)
   1.made call.INF the her lawyer by Ida

   b. *Feci chiamare il [suo]i avvocato [da Ida]i (It., faire-par)
   1.made call.INF the her lawyer by Ida
   ‘I had [her]i lawyer called [by Ida]i’

In a similar vein, these same considerations hold for the Cosentino examples in (27) where we observe that the third-person possessive sua can be bound by a proclitic (viz. cci ‘to her’) that references the Agent of the faire-infinitif construction (27a), but not by an enclitic (viz. nni ‘by her’) which references the oblique Agent of the faire-par construction (27b).

(27) a. Faciti [[cc]i 'u] chiamà a l'avvucatu
   make.IMP.2PL to.her= him call.INF to the.lawyer
   [sua]i! (Cos.; faire-infinitif)
   her
   ‘Make/Let her call her lawyer!’

   b. *Faciti[[nni]i llu] chiamà a l'avvucatu
   make.IMP.2PL=by.her=him call.INF to the.lawyer
   [sua]i! (Cos.; faire-par)
   her
   ‘Have by her her lawyer called!’
3.3 Properties and restrictions

Moving on to examine in greater detail other properties and restrictions of the Cosentino imperatival causative construction, we begin by observing that the formal distinction between the two causative subtypes surfaces in all three grammatical persons:

(28) a. \textit{Faccilu} dicia ('i Maria)! (Cos.; faire-par)
   
   make.IMP.2SG=to.him=it say.INF of Maria
   
   ‘Have him told it (by Maria)!’
   
   b. \textit{Fa cc”u} dicia! (Cos.; faire-infinitif)
   
   make.IMP.2SG to.him=it= say.INF
   
   ‘Make/Let him say it!’

(29) a. \textit{Facimula} cucinà ('i Maria)! (Cos.; faire-par)
   
   make.IMP.1PL =it cook.INF of Maria
   
   ‘Let’s have it cooked (by Maria)!’
   
   b. \textit{Facim} ‘a cucinà! (Cos.; faire-infinitif)
   
   make.IMP.1PL her= cook.INF
   
   ‘Let’s make/let her cook!’

(30) a. \textit{Facitiila} vesta ('i mamma)! (Cos.; faire-par)
   
   make.IMP.2PL=her dress.INF of mum
   
   ‘Have her dressed (by mum)!’
   
   b. \textit{Facit} ‘a vesta! (Cos.; faire-infinitif)
   
   make.IMP.2PL her= dress.INF
   
   ‘Make/Let her get dressed!’

However, an important exception which concerns all three grammatical persons is the negative imperative where the distinction between the two causative constructions is neutralized, inasmuch as all clitics are invariably required to climb to the causative predicate:

(31) a. \textit{Un cc”u fa} (*cc”u) dicia! (Cos.; faire-par / faire-infinitif)
   
   not to.him=it= do.INF to.him=it say.INF
   
   ‘Don’t have it told to him! / Don’t make him say it!’
   
   b. \textit{Unn’ ‘a facimu} (*’a)
   
   not it.F.ACC= make.IMP.1PL it.F.ACC= cucinà! (Cos.; faire-par / faire-infinitif)
   
   cook.INF
   
   ‘Let’s not have it cooked! / Let’s not let her cook!’
c. Unn’ ’a faciti (*’a) vesta! (Cos.; faire-par / faire-infinitif)
   not her= make.IMP.1PL her= dress.INF
   ‘Don’t have her dressed! / Don’t let her get dressed!’

More generally, the distinction between the two causative constructions is not only neutralized in the negative imperative, but is also absent from all other paradigms outside of the positive imperative, witness the representative examples in (32a-c):

(32) a. ’U facìa (*’u) vesta. (Cos.)
   him= I.made him= dress.INF
   ‘I used to have him dressed.’ (faire-par)/‘I used to make him get dressed.’ (faire-infinitif)

b. Cc”a facissiru (*cc”a) cuntà bbona. (Cos.)
   to.him=it= they.would.make to.him=it tell.INF well
   ‘They would have it told to him properly.’ (faire-par)/‘They would make him tell it properly.’ (faire-infinitif)

c. ’A facìi (*’a) rapa. (Cos.)
   it= you.made him= open.INF
   ‘You would have it opened.’ (faire-par)/‘You made her open (it).’
   (faire-infinitif)

Another interesting restriction concerns unaccusatives which only generally prove compatible with the active faire-infinitif construction (33a), but not with the passive faire-par construction (33b). At first sight, this distribution seems somewhat puzzling given the obvious similarities between unaccusative and passive structures which might otherwise lead us to expect unaccusative predicates to actually favour the faire-par construction.5

---

5 Among other things, in Romance both unaccusative (i.a) and passive (i.b) structures variously display non-Agentive subjects, unmarked postverbal position of the subject, selection of auxiliary BE, and participial agreement for number and gender with the surface subject (cf. Ledgeway 2012: 294–301):

i a. È affondata la nave durante una burrasca. (It.)
   is sunk.FSG the.FSG ship.F during a storm
   ‘The ship sank during the storm.’

b. Fu fondata la nave dalla marina italiana. (It.)
   was sunk.FSG the.FSG ship.F by.the navy Italian
   ‘The ship was sunk by the Italian navy.’
In light of the preceding examination of the principal characteristics of the Calabrian causative and assuming clitic climbing to be an overt reflex of the application of restructuring, we might be tempted to conclude that the imperatival *faire-infinitif* construction in the dialects of southern Italy represents the result of a failed process of restructuring (cf. 12b), namely the superficial output of a biclausal structure along the lines of the English analytic causative in (1b). However, attractive this analysis might initially seem, it would be rash to conclude that the absence of clitic climbing in such structures is the superficial reflex of a biclausal structure, as highlighted by the following considerations. First, if the relevant structures involved a biclausal, non-restructured construction, then we should expect the logical infinitival subject (namely, the Recipient of the causation and the Agent of the event) to be able to occur before the embedded infinitive not only when realized as a pronominal clitic (34a), but also when realized as a full lexical DP, contrary to fact (34b).

Second, whereas in declaratives (35a) and in imperatival *faire-par* structures (35b) pre-VP-adverbs such as *sempre* ‘always’ (Cinque 1999; Ledgeway in press a) can readily intervene between the causative predicate and embedded infinitive, it is surprising to observe that these same adverbs cannot be placed between the causative predicate and the embedded infinitive in the imperatival *faire-infinitif* construction (35c). Indeed, if in the positive imperative the *faire-infinitif*...
construction instantiates a biclausal construction (cf. 12b), then we should, on the contrary, expect the causative predicate situated in the higher clause to display an even greater degree of separability with respect to the embedded infinitive situated in the lower clause, including a concomitant greater accessibility of intervening adverbs. By the same token, given the presupposed monoclausal structure of examples such as (35a–b) we should also expect the causative predicate and embedded infinitive in such cases to exhibit a higher degree of structural cohesion.

(35) a. ’A faciti sempe serva. (Cos.) ⇒
    her= you.make always serve.INF
    ‘You have her always served.’ (faire-par)
    ‘You make/let her always serve.’ (faire-infinitif)

b. Facitila sempe serva! (Cos.; faire-par)
    make.IMP.2PL=her always serve.INF
    ‘Have her always served!’

c. *Faciti sempe ’a serva! (Cos.; faire-infinitif)
    make.IMP.2PL always her= serve.INF
    ‘Make/Let her always serve!’

Finally, another observation which highlights that we are dealing with a monoclausal construction comes from a consideration of the case properties of the imperatival faire-infinitif construction. More specifically, in a biclausal causative construction like that exemplified in (36a) for English, the case of the logical subject of the infinitive and that of the object of the latter are licensed by two separate verbs, namely by the causative predicate make and by the infinitive call, respectively. This explains the presence of two accusative-marked arguments (viz. him) within the same sentence. In the Italian monoclausal construction (36b), by contrast, the case of the subject and that of the object are licensed compositionally by the single verbal complex [fece+chiamare]. As a consequence, the former is marked dative (glie-) and the latter accusative (lo) according to a pattern which obtains in all Italian causative constructions, not just in the imperative. In light of these observations, we cannot fail to note that the case properties of the southern causative construction in (36c) do not replicate those of the English biclausal structure in (36a) but, rather, those of the Italian monoclausal construction in (36b), inasmuch as the subject and object of the infinitive bear dative (cc’) and accusative (’u) case, respectively.
(36) a.  [Make him [call him]]! (Eng.)
   b.  Faglielo! chiamare! (It.)
   c.  Fa cc”u chiamà! (Cos.)

4 Structural analysis

Having excluded the possibility that in the case of proclisis to the infinitive the southern causative construction instantiates an underlying biclausal structure, we shall now sketch a structural analysis of the southern Italian causative which takes account of the formal distinction between the faire-par and faire-infinitif constructions in their imperatival uses. We begin by asking what is special about the nature of the positive imperative such that the formal distinction between the two causative constructions surfaces only in this particular context. The solution that we propose here rests on the idea widespread in the literature (Rivero 1994a,b; Graffi 1996; Zanuttini 1997; Manzini and Savoia 2005, III: 388) that imperatival clauses display a reduced functional structure. In particular, while declaratives are standardly argued to project a full array of functional projections associated with the T-domain (37a), imperatival clauses (37b) are assumed to lack this same series of functional projections (cf. also Tortora 2014: ch. 3, §6). Not by chance, the absence of T-related functional projections in second-person singular imperatival clauses is correlated with the frequent traditional observation that one of the most notable characteristics of the imperative is its absence of any inflectional marking or, at the very least, very minimal inflectional marking in accordance with a widespread cross-linguistic tendency (Pott 1859: 613; Bybee 1985: 173; Floricic 2008: 10; Ledgeway 2014; cf. however Auwera and Lejeune 2011). In theoretical terms and, in particular, in relation to phase theory discussed below, we can interpret the observed inflectional impoverishment of the imperative in terms of the mechanisms of feature transmission and inheritance (Chomsky 2007; 2008). Whereas phi-features that originate on the phase head, viz. C°, are usually ‘transferred’ down to T° in root declaratives, in the absence of T° in imperatives these same features fail to be passed down – or, to borrow Ouali’s (2008) terminology are ‘kept’ – such that the imperatival verb is forced to raise to C° to licenses its inflectional features (see immediately below).

In the absence of the projection of T-related functional structure we therefore propose, following Manzini and Savoia (2005, III: 388), that the imperatival
verb raises to the only available functional projection, namely the $C^o$ head (cf. also Rivero, 1994a,b; Rivero and Terzi 1995). As a consequence, any clitics are stranded *in situ* within the $v$-VP complex from where they subsequently enclitize, not syntactically, but phonologically at PF to the imperatival verb now raised to $C^o$. Not by chance, this structural analysis corresponds to the analysis of absolute participle constructions such as (37c) which display the same superficial properties as imperatives, in that they too fail to exhibit any TP structure and require the participial verb to raise to $C^o$ (cf. Belletti 1990, 2005; D’Alessandro and Roberts 2008: 485–488).

(37) a. (So $[CP\ che]$ $[TP\ gli\ avete\ [v-VP\ servito\ la\ cena]]$). (It.)
   ‘(I know that) you served him dinner.’

b. $[CP\ Servite\ [v-VP\ gli\ servite\ la\ cena!]]$ (It.)
   ‘Serve him dinner!’

c. $[CP\ Servita\ [v-VP\ gli\ servita\ la\ cena],\ cominciai\ldots\ )$ (It.)
   ‘Having served him dinner, I began’

Another important factor in our analysis concerns the active vs passive distinction which, we have seen, transparently surfaces in the distinction between the *faire-infinitif* and *faire-par* causative constructions. In current theory this voice distinction is generally understood in terms of phase theory (Chomsky 2000, 2008; Frascarelli 2006; Gallego 2010): in contrast to active $vPs$ which involve the projection of an external argument and hence are argued to be thematically and phi-complete, passive $vPs$ fail to project an external argument and are said to be defective in the relevant sense. From this it is argued that active $vPs$ are phases which constitute autonomous structural domains for the operation of phonosyntactic rules, whereas passive $vPs$ are non-phasal and are necessarily inserted in the phonosyntactic domain of the entire clause, namely the CP phase. This distinction can be transparently seen in the Abruzzese dialect examples from Arielli in (38a-b), where in the present perfect auxiliary BE is licensed in the first and second persons and auxiliary HAVE in the third persons (D’Alessandro and Ledgeway 2010; D’Alessandro and Roberts 2010) according to a pattern widespread in the dialects of central and southern Italy (Ledgeway 2012: 297–299, in press b). As Biberauer and D’Alessandro (2010) highlight, while in the passive
example (38b) the passive auxiliary si ‘are.2sg’ licenses consonantal lengthening of the following passive participle viste (namely, [vː]iste), in (38a) the homophonous active auxiliary si fails to trigger consonantal lengthening of the following active participle, even though the auxiliary apparently continues to occur linearly adjacent to the participle.⁶

(38) a. \[TP \text{Si} \quad [\text{VP viste} \quad [\text{VP viste la casa}]].\] (Ariellese)
   ‘You have seen the house.’
   b. \[TP \text{Si} \quad [\text{VP viste} \quad [\text{VP viste allà}]].\] (Ariellese)
   ‘You are seen there.’

Adopting a cyclical approach to Spell-Out in terms of the phase theory sketched above, these facts immediately find a natural explanation. In the active example (38a) consonantal lengthening fails to obtain because active auxiliary and participle are sent to PF in separate cycles: whereas the active participle is transferred to PF in the lower cycle upon completion of the lower vP phase, the active auxiliary raises to T⁰ within the higher CP phrase from where it is sent to PF in the subsequent cycle. In the passive (38b), by contrast, both passive auxiliary and participle are contained within the same higher CP phase and are sent to PF together in the same cycle where the auxiliary, raised to T⁰, can license consonantal lengthening of the adjacent passive participle.

Similar considerations allow us to understand the observed distribution of enclisis and proclisis in conjunction with the imperatival uses of the faire-infinitif and faire-par causative constructions. In particular, we have established that in the absence of a T-domain the imperatival verb is forced to raise to the vacant C⁰ head (39a), stranding any clitics within the v-VP complex (cf. Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005). Given the unmistakably active and passive values of the faire-infinitif and faire-par constructions, respectively, it is legitimate to assume that the v-VP complex constitutes a phase in the former case, but not in the latter. Structurally, therefore, in the faire-infinitif construction clitics necessarily surface proclitically to the infinitive within the vP (39b), since the infinitive and any clitics are sent to PF together in the lower cycle, while the causative predicate facit’ under C⁰ is spelt out subsequently in the higher phasal cycle. In the faire-par construction, by contrast, clitics surface

⁶ Cf. also D’Alessandro and Roberts’ (2008) analysis of (Italo-)Romance participle agreement.
enclitically on the causative predicate under $C^o$ (39c) since they are sent to PF within the same single cycle.\footnote{It remains to be explained why in this case clitics must encliticize phonologically to the causative predicate, but cannot procliticize phonologically to the infinitive. The phase theory presented in the text only excludes the possibility of enclisis in the imperatival uses of the \textit{faire-infinitif} construction, but not the possibility of both enclisis and proclisis in the case of the \textit{faire-par} construction. However, in the northern Calabrian dialect of Verbicaro (G. Silvestri p.c.), this prediction is in fact borne out, inasmuch as enclisis to the causative predicate (i.a) and proclisis to the infinitive (i.b) are both found in the \textit{faire-par} construction:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \text{a} Faci\texti{tala} sè\texti{rav!} (Verbicarese)
  \begin{itemize}
    \item do.IMP.2PL=it.F.ACC serve.INF
  \end{itemize}
  \item \text{b} Faci\texti{st} aa sè\texti{rav!}
  \begin{itemize}
    \item do.IMP.2PL it.F.ACC= serve.INF
  \end{itemize}
  \item \text{c} ‘Have her served!’ (\textit{faire-par})
  \item \text{d} ‘Make her serve!’ (\textit{faire-infinitif})
\end{itemize}

Verbicarese also differs from Cosentino in that, alongside proclisis to the infinitive in (i.b), it also allows enclisis to the causative predicate (i.a) in the \textit{faire-infinitif} construction (i.d), hence the double reading observed in (i.a-b) above. This possibility is predicted, though not forced, by the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) which allows the raising of the clitic to the causative predicate on condition that it passes through the left edge of the infinitival phase. See also the discussion in note 11.
with obligatory movement (and/or co-indexation) of the internal argument to the surface subject position in the absence of accusative. Arguably, suppression of the external argument in the passive might be taken to indicate the failure of \( \nu P \) to project in line with our conclusion above that passive verb phrases are non-phasal, witness the modified representation of (39c) in (40a). By contrast, unaccusative structures are active, and not passive, and can legitimately be argued not to involve the suppression of the external argument position. Rather, unaccusative structures are characterized by an empty external argument position, hence the projection of the \( \nu P \) layer and their phasal status, as illustrated in (40b).

(40) a. \([\text{CP Faciti} \quad \nu P \quad -la \quad \text{serva!}] \) (Cos.; faire-par)
make.IMP.2PL \quad \text{her.ACC} \quad \text{serve.INF}

b. \([\text{CP Facit’} \quad \nu P \quad ‘a \quad [\nu P \quad \text{serva!}] \) (Cos.; faire-infinitif)
malke.IMP.2PL \quad \text{her.ACC} = \quad \text{serve.INF}

In this way, the absence vs presence of a \( \nu P \) layer and concomitant non-phasal vs phasal status now associated with the passive and unaccusative verb phrases in (40a-b) provides a straightforward explanation for the otherwise puzzling incompatibility of the faire-par construction with unaccusatives (41a) and their restriction to the faire-infinitif construction (41b).

(41) a. \(*[\text{CP Faciti} \quad \nu P \quad -la \quad \text{trasa \ la!}] \) (Cos.; faire-par)
make.IMP.2PL \quad \text{her.ACC} \quad \text{enter.INF} \quad \text{her.ACC}

b. \([\text{CP Facit’} \quad \nu P \quad ‘a \quad [\nu P \quad \text{trasa \ la!}] \) (Cos.; faire-infinitif)
malke.IMP.2PL \quad \text{her.ACC} = \quad \text{enter.INF} \quad \text{her.ACC}

‘Make/Let her come in!’

It now remains to explain our observation in (31a-c) above that proclisis to the embedded infinitive is excluded in the negative imperative, where the distinction between the faire-par and faire-infinitif constructions is neutralized through generalized enclisis to the causative predicate. This observation finds an immediate explanation in the presence of the sentential negator itself, a functional head whose presence in the clause necessarily forces the projection of the T-domain, otherwise absent in positive imperatives. As a consequence of the presence of the negator, negative imperative clauses are therefore predicted to be inflectionally richer than affirmative imperative clauses since they auto-
automatically come with T-related functional positions to host the inflected verb and any accompanying clitics, as exemplified by the Italian example in (42). 8

(42) [CP... [TP Non la servite [v-VF 'a servite!]]] (It.)

NEG her= you. serve

‘Don’t serve her!’

Further direct proof of this analysis can be seen in numerous Italian dialects where, in contrast to the positive imperative, the T° head is exceptionally lexicalized in the negative imperative through an overt auxiliary (Zanuttini 1994, 1997: 105–154; Manzini and Savoia 2005, III: §7.2). As illustrated in the following examples taken from Manzini and Savoia’s (2005, III: 453–461) wide-ranging survey, this auxiliary may in accordance with dialect variation be a reflex of STARE ‘stand’ (43), IRE ‘go’ (44) or ESSE(*RE) (45).

(43) a. sta miŋ tʃaˈmar-el (2sg; Revere, Mantua)
   stema miŋ tʃaˈmar-el (1pl; Revere)
   stɛ miŋ tʃaˈmar-el (2pl; Revere)
   STARE NEG call-INF=him
b. nɔn sta  l tʃaˈme (2sg; Alfonsine, Ravenna)
   nɔn staˈ ze  l tʃaˈme (1pl; Alfonsine)
   nɔn staˈ zi  l tʃaˈme (2pl; Alfonsine)
   NEG STARE him= call.inf
c. ni stɛ  l tʃaˈme (2sg; Sassello, province of Savona)
   ni stum le tʃaˈme (1pl; Sassello)
   ni stɛ  l tʃaˈme (2pl; Sassello)
   NEG STARE him= call.INF
d. nu fta  lu a tʃaˈma (2sg; Favale di Malvaro, Genoa)
   nu ftɛ me lu a tʃaˈma (1pl; Favale di Malvaro)
   nu ftɛ  lu a tʃaˈma (2pl; Favale di Malvaro)
   NEG STARE =him to call.INF

8 In this connection, consider also the distribution of do-support in modern English where, in contrast to affirmative declarative clauses (i.a), the presence of the negator not triggers the obligatory lexicalization of T° through the use of pleonastic do (i.b):

i a She (*does) dance
   b She *(does) not dance
(44) a. nɔ lu jì ca’manna (2sg; Acerenza, Potenza)
nɔ lu jàmə ca’manna (1pl; Acerenza)
nɔ lu jàtə ca’manna (2pl; Acerenza)
NEG him= IRE call.GER

b. nɔ c jìfi ca’manna (2sg; Gravina di Puglia, Bari)
nɔ c jìfimə ca’manna (1pl; Gravina di Puglia)
nɔ c jìfitə ca’manna (2pl; Gravina di Puglia)
NEG him= IRE call.GER

c. nɔ c jìtə ca’manna (2sg; Taranto)
nɔ c jà:tə ca’manna (1pl; Taranto)
nɔ c jàtə ca’manna (2pl; Taranto)
NEG him= IRE call.GER

(45) a. nɔ c sì ca’manna (2sg; Minervino Murge, Barletta)
nɔ c sìmmə ca’manna (1pl; Minervino Murge)
nɔ c scitə ca’manna (2pl; Minervino Murge)
NEG him= ESSERE call.GER

b. na wə sì ca’mɛnna (2sg; Giovinazzo, Bari)
nə wə se:ma ca’mɛnna (1pl; Giovinazzo)
nə wə se:ta ca’mɛnna (2pl; Giovinazzo)
NEG him= ESSERE call.GER

c. na u sì camanna (2sg; Ruvo di Puglia, Bari)
nə u səma camanna (1pl; Ruvo di Puglia)
nə u sə:tə camanna (2pl; Ruvo di Puglia)
NEG him= ESSERE call.GER

‘Don’t (let’s) call him!’

In the light of this evidence, we can conclude that in the faire-infinitif construction (46) it is the presence of a TP projection in the negative imperative which, once introduced by the presence of the negator, obligatorily attracts any clitics (as well as the imperatival verb) which in the positive imperative (cf. 39b) otherwise remain within the lower vP phase in the absence of the projection of TP.

(46) [CP...[TP Unn’ ’a faciti [v-VP ‘a
NEG her= make.IMP.2PL
serval]]] (Cos.; faire-infinitif(/-par))
serve.INF

‘Don’t have her serve(d)!’
4.1 Outstanding question

One final question which we still need to consider concerns the difference between northern Calabrian and Campanian dialects (47) on the one hand and all other Romance varieties (48)-(49) on the other which fail to formally distinguish between the faire-par and faire-infinitif constructions in the positive imperative.

(47) a. Facitilu serva 'i ll' atr! (Cos.; faire-par)
make.IMP.2PL=him serve.INF of the others
‘Have him served by the others!’

b. Facit ‘u serva! (Cos.; faire-infinitive)
make.IMP.2PL him= serve.INF
‘Make him serve!’

(48) a. Faites-moi (Laissez-moi) servir (par les autres)! (Fr.)
make.IMP.2PL=me let.IMP.2PL=me serve.INF by the others
‘Have me (/Let me be) served by the others! (faire-par)
‘Make (/Let) me serve!’ (faire-infinitive)

b. *Faites (*Laissez) me servir (Fr.; faire-infinitive)
make.IMP.2PL=me let.IMP.2PL=me serve.INF

(49) a. Facitilu serviri! (Mussomelese, Sicily; faire-infinitif/faire-par)
make.IMP.2PL=him serve.INF
‘Have/Let him (be) served! (faire-par)
‘Make/Let him serve!’ (faire-infinitive)

b. *Faciti ‘u serviri! (Mussomelese, Sicily; faire-infinitif/faire-par)
make.IMP.2PL him= serve.INF

The relevant facts can be explained by appealing to independently established differences in V-movement and clitic placement in the two groups of varieties. As argued in Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005) and Ledgeway (2009: 319–320; 2016a: 265), in southern varieties such as Calabrian and Campanian lexical verbs and clitics exhibit very low movement in that they remain in the lower adverb space (informally labelled here as vP) before the clitic can cliticize to the verb. This is shown in examples such as (50a) where: (i) the clitic and verb follow most low adverbs (Cinque 1999) such as ggià ‘already’ which mark the left margin of the verb phrase; and (ii) clitic and verb are separated from each other by the interpolation of lower adverbs of this same class such as ammalap-pena ‘hardly’ (for a different analysis of these facts, see Manzini and Savoia
2005, III: 537–541). In other varieties such as Italian (50b) and French (50c), by contrast, the lexical verb has to raise together with the clitic (which already cliticizes to the verb within the vP as shown by the ungrammaticality of interpolation structures) to T°, as shown by the fact that the verb and clitic must always precede all low adverbs.

(50) a. [TP Maria Ø [vP ggià mi ammalappena]] (50b) [TP Maria mi parla [vP già a malapena]] (50c) [TP Maria me parle [vP déjà à peine]] Maria me= speaks already me hardly

‘Maria already hardly speaks to me.’

Quite independently, these facts therefore highlight a significant structural difference concerning the nature of clitics in the two groups of languages: while clitics in languages like Italian and French must always vacate (together with the lexical verb) the vP to cliticize to a higher functional head, this is not the case in southern varieties like Cosentino where clitics usually remain within the vP.9 It follows that also in the positive imperative of the faire-infinitif construction clitics in varieties such as Italian and French are forced to cliticize to a head above vP, namely the causative predicate under C° to which they phonologically encliticize from the left margin of the vP in accordance with the locality restrictions imposed by the Phase Impenetrability Condition,10 whereas

9 In southern varieties such as Cosentino, clitics only vacate the v-VP complex if T° is lexicalized by a functional predicate (or by negation):

  a. [TP Maria mi pò / addi [vP ggià mi [vP parrà mi]]]] (Cos.) Maria me= can must already speak.INF
  b. [TP Maria m’ a / avia [vP ggià mi [vP parratu mi]]]] (Cos.) Maria me= has had already spoken
  c. [TP Maria mi fa / facia [vP ggià mi [vP parrà mi]]]] (Cos.) Maria me= makes made already speak.INF

10 The Phase Impenetrability Condition (Chomsky 2008) predicts that a constituent of a lower phase may only be available to, and feed, phonosyntactic processes of a higher phase if it targets, and possibly passes through, the left edge (Head or Specifier positions) of its own containing phase.
in Cosentino they legitimately continue to remain within the vP where they procliticize phonologically to the infinitive.11

5 Conclusions

In this article we have highlighted a phonosyntactic peculiarity of the Romance causative construction limited to the positive imperative which, in specific Calabrian and Campanian dialects of southern Italy, formally distinguishes between the faire-par and faire-infinitif constructions by means of an enclitic vs proclitic alternation of clitics on the causative predicate and embedded infinitive, respectively. Despite appearances, we have shown that proclisis in the case of the faire-infinitif construction is not the outcome of a process of failed restructuring but, rather, continues to represent to all intents and purposes a monoclausal structure. In particular, the enclitic vs proclitic alternation observed in the two causative constructions has been shown to relate to the voice distinction between the two constructions which, in turn, directly correlates with the structural architecture and possible opacity

11 From this perspective, modern Verbicaresi behaves, not like Cosentino, but more like Italian, such that any clitics usually raise, together with the lexical verb, to the T° head above vP (i.a-b; G. Silvestri p.c.). This observation explains, in part, the possibility of enclisis to the causative predicate in the Verbicaresi faire-infinitif construction observed in note 7 above, whereas possible proclisis to the infinitive in the same context is most probably to be understood as a residue of a more archaic Cosentino-style Calabrian grammar in which clitics and verbs could remain within the vP. Indeed, given a grammar in which it is increasingly more natural for clitics to raise to T°, original proclisis to the infinitive in cases like (ii.a) can be readily reinterpreted as an example of enclisis to the causative predicate (ii.b) with concomitant reanalysis of originally exclusively proclitic forms such as aa ‘her.ACC’ now also as (optionally) enclitic forms, namely ‘=her.ACC’.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{i a} & \quad [\text{TP } \text{Maria } \text{ma} \text{ chiama } [\text{VP } \text{sempa } [\text{VP } \text{ma} \text{ chiama}]]]] \quad (\text{Verbicaresi}) \\
& \quad \text{Maria } \text{me=} \text{ calls } \text{always} \\
\text{i b} & \quad [\text{TP } \text{Maria } \text{u} \text{ sapiva } [\text{VP } \text{ggia } [\text{VP } \text{u} \text{ sapiva}]]]] \quad (\text{Verbicaresi}) \\
& \quad \text{Maria } \text{him.ACC=} \text{ knew } \text{already} \\
\text{ii a} & \quad \text{Faciat } [\text{VP } \text{aa} \text{ serva!}] \quad (\text{Verbicaresi, faire-infinitif}) \\
& \quad \text{make.IMP.2PL } \text{her.ACC=} \text{ serve.INF} \\
\text{ii b} & \quad \text{Faciat-aa} [\text{VP } \text{aa} \text{ serva!}] \quad (\text{Verbicaresi, faire-infinitif}) \\
& \quad \text{make.IMP.2PL=her.ACC } \text{serve.INF} \\
& \quad \text{‘Make/Let her serve!’}
\end{align*}
\]
of the verbal domain containing the infinitive and any clitics. On the one
hand, the verbal domain of passive clauses is characterized by a reduced
clausal structure, namely a simple lexical VP constituting a permeable phono-
syntactic domain such that in the faire-par construction clitics dependent on
the embedded infinitive are able to enter into a syntactic dependency with el-
ements situated outside of the VP, witness the observed enclisis to the causa-
tive predicate. On the other, the verbal domain of active clauses involves the
projection of a richer clausal structure, namely a vP constituting an imperme-
able phonosyntactic phasal domain, such that in the faire-infinitif construc-
tion clitics dependent on the embedded infinitive are unable to enter into
syntactic dependencies with elements outside of the vP, hence the observed
proclisis to the embedded infinitive. Finally, the distinction between these
southern Italian dialects and other Romance varieties was interpreted as
a consequence of an independent property regarding the low placement of
cлитics in northern Calabrian and Campanian which generally remain within
the verbal domain.
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