Cooperativity, Jussivity and the Left Periphery. Evidence from Sicilian, Lombard and Brazilian Portuguese

Valentina Bianchi (Università di Siena), Salvatore Menza (Università di Catania) valentina.bianchi@unisi.it salvatore.menza@unict.it

1. *The phenomenon*. In Sicilian (variety of Catania), the wh-word *quantu* (lit. 'how much') has a use as discourse particle in main declarative clauses, as exemplified in (1a). Its distribution is constrained as follows: the host clause must have (i) a first person singular subject ((1a) vs. (1b)), (ii) an agentive predicate ((1a) vs. (1c)), and (iii) a present *pro futuro* tense ((1a) vs. (1d)).

(1) a. Quantu	mi ttrasu i rrobbi.	b. *	Quantu ti ttrasi	i rrobbi.
quantu	1sG=take-in the washing		quantu 2sg=take-in	the washing
'I'm going t	to take in the washing.'			
c.* Quantu	mi siddiu.	d. *	Quantu mi ttrasìi	i rrobbi.
quantu	1sg=get-angry.		quantu 1sg=took-in	the washing

In Lombard Italian (variety of Como), the equivalent of (1a) has the expression *cià vah* [tfa 'va] (presumably *cià* < lat. *ecce-hac*: Rohlfs 1968, §897): cf. (2a). This element has a wider distribution than *quantu*: it can also cooccur with second person and inclusive first person plural subjects in imperative (2b) and exhortative clauses (2c). Like *quantu* it requires an agentive predicate ((2a) vs. (2d)) and a future-oriented tense/mood ((2a) vs. (2e)):

(2)a. Cià vah, stendo la lavatric	b. <i>Cià vah</i> ,	siediti	un attimo.	
hang.1SG the wash		sit.IMP.2SG	a moment	
Well then, I'm going to ha	'Come on, sit down a moment.'			
c. Cià vah, fumiamoci n	una sigaretta.	d. * Cià vah	, sono stanco.	
smoke.SBJV.1PL a	a cigarette	be.1SG tired.MSG		
'Come on, let's smoke a cig				
e. * Cià vah, ho steso la	la lavatrice.			
have.1SG hung t	he washing			

At the pragmatic level, both expressions are disallowed when the action described in the clause is *non-cooperative* with respect to the hearer(s) – compare the context in (3):

(3) [Context: Lucia and Mario just finished eating and someone should wash the dishes. Lucia wants to let Mario know she doesn't want to be the one who will wash the dishes:]

a. L: # <i>Quantu</i>	mi ò	ссисси.	(Sicilian)
quantu	1sG=go.1sG.to	go_to_bed.1sG	
b. L: # <i>Cià vah,</i>	vado	a dormire.	(Lombard Italian)
	go.1sG	to sleep	

Outside the Italian domain, Brazilian Portuguese *bora* (presumably derived from *embora* 'away', by aphaeresis) may introduce an infinitive root clause with imperative/exortative import (4a); the implicit subject is restricted to first/second person, and non-agentive predicates are disallowed (4b):

(4) a.	Bora lavar	a louça.	b. * Bora	ficar bravo.
	bora wash.INF	the dishes	bora	get-angry.INF
	'wash/let's wash the dishe	s!'	'get/let	's get angry!'

2. Syntactic aspects. Quantu and bora are clearly integrated in the following (respectively finite or non-finite) clause: (i) they must be adjacent to the verb, and cannot be separated from it by an overt pronominal subject (cf. (5a), (6a)) or by a topic phrase (cf. (5b), (6b)); (ii) they can be preceded by a topic phrase (5c), (6c); (iii) they cannot cooccur with a fronted focus in either order (cf. (5d) (6d)):

(5)a.	* Quantu	iù <i>mi ttrasu</i>	i rrobbi.	b. * <i>Quantu</i>	i rrobbi _i	m' i _i ttrasu.
	Quantu	1sg 1sg=take-in	the washing	quantu	the washing	1SG 3PL take
с.	I rrobbi _i	quantu m'	i _i ttrasu.	d. (*I rrobb	I <i>) quantu</i> (*I R	ROBBI) <i>mi ttrasu</i>
	the washir	ng quantu1sg_3pl	take-in	the w.	quantu (the	ew.) 1SG take-in
(6) a.	*Bora eu	lavar a louça.		b. * Bora	o lixo	levar
	bora 1sG v	wash.INF the dish	les	bora	the trash	get_out
с.	O lixo	bora levar.		d. (?*0 LIXO)) bora (?*0 LI	x0) <i>levar</i>
	the trash	bora get-out		(the trash) b	pora (the tras	h) get-out

Building on Zanuttini et al. (2012: §3.2), we assume a Jussive head (corresponding to Fin of Rizzi 1997) specialized to encode preferential meanings (imperatives and exhortatives). This head selects for irrealis Tense and attracts it; we propose that *quantu* is hosted in its Specifier:

(7) [Force⁰ [Top⁰ ... [Foc⁰ ... [JussP quantu Juss[1P]_n+T⁰ mi ttrasu [TP t_{T^0} [vP $pro_{[1P]n} t_v i rrobbi$]]]]]]]

This accounts for the necessary adjacency between *quantu* and the verb (5a-b). Moreover, in *quantu*structures Juss⁰ carries an inherent [speaker] person feature, and Agrees with *pro* in Spec,vP, thus licensing a null agentive first person subject (1b-c). The TopP layer above JussP can host a left dislocated phrase, cf. (5c). As for the impossibility of focus fronting (5d), we propose that JussP is an operator projection (see section 3), and by featural Relativized Minimality it blocks focus fronting to the higher FocP, another operator projection (Rizzi 2010). Similarly, BP *bora* is in Spec of Juss° carrying 2P sing./1P pl. (see *cià vab*, below), with Juss° selecting an infinitive.

The Lombard marker appears to be more peripheral than *quantu/bora*: it can be followed by a preverbal subject or a topic phrase (8a-b), whereas it cannot be naturally preceded by a topic phrase, cf. (8c). Like *quantu/bora*, however, it is incompatible with focus fronting, cf. (8d):

(8)a.	Cià vah,	io	stendo	la lavatric	е.	b.	Cià vah,	la lavatrice _i <i>la</i> _i stendo io.	
		1sg	hang	the wash	ing			the washing it hang.1SG I	
c.	?? La lavatr	ice _i ,	<i>cià vah,</i> la _i	stendo	io.	d.	(*LA LAV.) <i>cià vah</i> (*LA LAV) <i>stendo</i> .	
	the washing	ng	it	hang,18	G I		the w.	(the w.) hang.1SG	

We propose that the Lombard structures also involve the Jussive Phrase, whose head can here be specified for [speaker], [hearer], or a combination of both (like BP *bora*): when combined with irrealis Tense, it also allows for first person plural exhortatives and for imperatives (cf. Zanuttini et al. 2012, 1249). The presence of JussP accounts for the impossibility of focus fronting in (8d), parallel to (5d)-(6d) above. As for the location of the discourse marker, building on Moro (2003, §3) we assume that it is hosted in a projection located above ForceP specialized for addressee-oriented speech acts (see also Wiltshko & Heim 2016, 321). This high position accounts for the possibility of a topicalized phrase following the discourse marker, as in (7a-b) (we assume that the subject pronoun in (7a) is topicalized).

3. Semantic and pragmatic aspects. Following Zanuttini et al. (2012), Juss⁰ binds the null subject it Agrees with, yielding a speaker/hearer-property of extensional type $\langle e,t \rangle$:

(9) [[$[J_{uss'}, Juss[1P]_n \ [vP \ ... pro_n ... vP] \ Juss']$]] = [λx : x = speaker. [[vP]] ^{x/n}]

Building on Condoravdi & Lauer (2012) and Lauer (2013), we propose that Sicilian *quantu* conveys the conventional meaning that the property denoted by its sister node Juss' is the best action choice w.r.t. a shared effective preference structure of *both speaker and hearer* at the utterance moment *i*. The effective preference structure must be realistic and consistent w.r.t. the Common Ground at *i*, where:

- (a) A preference structure is a pair (P, \leq) , P is a set of propositions and \leq a binary relation on P that is reflexive, transitive and total (Lauer 2013, 113);
- (b) A preference structure (P, ≤) is *realistic* relative to an information state B_i iff for all p ∈ P: p∩B_i≠ Ø (Lauer 2013, 114: No preference is incompatible with the relevant information state);
- (c) A preference structure (P, ≤) is *consistent* with respect to an information state B_i iff for any set of propositions X⊆P, if B_i∩(∩X) = Ø then there are two propositions p, q ∈ X such that p<q (Lauer 2013, 114: When two preferences are incompatible, they must be strictly ranked).</p>

The anchoring to a shared preference structure rules out the 'cooperation marker' in contexts where the interlocutors' preferences are not aligned, as in (3) above. As for the Lombard marker, we assume that, like a vocative, it conveys an independent speech act that is conjoined to the imperative/exhortative speech act conveyed by the following clause (cf. Krifka 2001, 25-26): specifically, it conveys an instruction to the hearer to interpret the subsequent clause w.r.t. the subset of preferences that (s)he shares with the speaker.

Selected references. <u>Condoravdi, C. & S. Lauer. 2012</u>. *Empirical issues in Syntax and Semantics* 9. <u>Lauer, S.</u> <u>2013</u>. *Towards a dynamic pragmatics*. PhD diss., Stanford University. <u>Moro, A. 2003</u>. In J. Quer et al. (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2001*, 247-261. John Benjamins. <u>Wiltschko, M. & J. Heim. 2016</u>. In G. Kaltenböck et al. (eds.), *Outside the clause*, 305-340. John Benjamins. <u>Zanuttini, R. et al. 2012</u>. *Nat. Lang. and Linguistic Theory* 30, 1231-1274.