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1. Introduction

Enclitic sequences in French differ from proclitic sequences not only in ordering, but also in the range of variation they display among speakers, regions and levels of language. On the contrary, Italian and Spanish have a fixed and regular order of pronouns both in proclisis and enclisis. Compare the French pair in (1) with the Italian one in (2):

(1)  a. Jean me le donne.
    John gives it to me

    b. Donne-le-moi !
    Give it to me

(2)  a. Gianni me lo da.
    John gives it to me

    b. Dammelo !
    Give it to me

In this article I will propose an approch to enclitic clustering in the same vein as the syntactic account of proclitic sequences given in Laenzlinger (1993a). The case of French enclitic clustering will be analyzed in detail, notably with respect to the following points. First of all, the clitic(s) appear(s) in a postverbal position in
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positive imperatives, as shown in (3a), but not in their negative counterpart, as exemplified in (3b):

(3)  
a. Prends-le !
   *Take it*

   b. Ne le prends pas !
   *Don't take it*

Secondly, the facts in (1) show that the enclitic order of combinations involving an Accusative third person clitic and a Dative first/second person clitic is inverted with respect to the proclitic order. Thirdly, first/second person clitics, unlike third person clitics, surface in a strong form in enclisis, as illustrated by the contrast between (4a) and (4c):

(4)  
a. Regarde-moi !
   *Look at me !*

   b. Tu me regarderas.
   *You will look at me*

   c. Regarde-le/*loi/*lui !
   *Look at him/it !*

   d. Tu le regarderas.
   *You will look at him/it*

Finally, there are more co-occurrence restrictions in enclisis than in proclisis, not only on the types of combination (cf. (5) and (6)), but also on the number of clitics in the sequence (cf. (7)):

(5)  
a. ??Mènes-m'y !
   *Lead me there*

   b. Tu m'y mèneras.
   *You will lead me there*

(6)  
a. ??Conduis-les-y !
   *Drive them there*

   b. Tu les y conduiras.
   *You will drive them there*

(7)  
a. *Fais-moi/le-lui porter !
   *Make me bring it to him !*

   b. Tu me le lui feras porter.
   *You will make me bring it to him.*
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I will assume that French enclitic clustering displays variations and peculiarities for two main reasons. First, the tense projection (i.e. TP) is not represented in positive imperative clauses, as argued by Rizzi (1993) and Rooryck (1992). Since the tense head (i.e. T0) is a potential host for clitics in French according to Laenzlinger (1993a), it is expected that some change is involved in enclitic imperative contexts. Secondly, the fact that word stress is final in French is certainly responsible for the strong form of first/second person pronouns in enclisis. A crucial distinction will be made between true syntactic clitics, which incorporate in overt syntax (e.g. the clitic le) and weak pronouns, which incorporate in Logical Form (e.g. the pseudo-strong clitic moi). As T0 does not host clitics in Italian and Spanish (cf. Laenzlinger 1993a), and word stress is not final in these languages, enclitic clusters - which are not confined to imperative contexts - have the same ordering as proclitic clusters. This means that the sequences in enclisis are derived fundamentally in the same way as in proclisis. I will show that in French, on the contrary, the formation of enclitic clusters sometimes differs from that of proclitic clusters.

This article is organized as follows. In part 2 an overview of the ‘syntactic’ approach developed by Laenzlinger (1993a) provides the theoretical background of the present study. In part 3 the structure of imperatives is discussed on the basis of verb movement, on the one hand, and of Agrs-to-C movement triggered by the Imperative-Criterion, on the other hand. These movements have an effect on clitic placement (enclisis) and interact with negation in a particular way. Part 4 presents a distinction between syntactic clitics, which undergo a two-step movement (XP-movement followed by X0-movement) entirely in overt syntax and weak pronouns, which undergo their XP-movement in overt syntax and their X0-movement in Logical Form. The set of enclitic combinations attested in (normative, standard, colloquial)1 French is exposed and treated in the framework of the theory developed in the previous section. Part 5 addresses the very puzzling question of the epenthetic z, a marker of liaison within enclitic clusters, as in the sequence Donne-lui-z’en.

1 It is very difficult, or impossible, to draw a sharp distinction between the different levels of French. What is usually called ‘normative’ French corresponds to the quality of language advocated in grammar books like, for instance, Grevisse’s Le Bon Usage. ‘Standard’ French is the most commonly spoken French. It is the language of middle class par excellence. Finally, ‘colloquial’ French refers to a language which is usually spoken by lower/middle class people, and which shows a lot of variations according to social environments and regions. There is no doubt that the exact frontiers between these three levels of French are far from being well defined. For a matter of simplification I will make reference to normative French as opposed to colloquial French in the presentation of the data. Certainly, standard French is the intermediate level of language between normative French and colloquial French.
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'Give him/her some of them'. The presence of this clitic-internal type of liaison is specific to imperative constructions. For this reason I will assume that it represents the verbal mark of imperative. Finally, part 6 contains my conclusion.

2. Theoretical background.

Laenzlinger (1993a) sets up a syntax-based account of Romance pronominal sequences which relies essentially on four conditions:

1. Two clitics_{+k} cannot combine on the same node.
2. A clitic_{+k} must be closer to the host than a clitic_{-k}.
3. The succession of clitic incorporation must reflect the inherent Case hierarchy specified in the lexical entry of verbs, which is in its general form: ((_, GEN), DAT/OBL).
4. Two clitics with the same Referential value for Individuation cannot co-occur within the same derivational domain.

A preliminary distinction is made between the class of clitics_{-k}, which are underspecified for any (objective) Case (me, te, nous, vous in French), and the class of clitics_{+k}, which are lexically specified for Case (le, la, les, lui, leur, y, en in French). The movement theory of (non subject) cliticization adopted here is the following: the pronoun moves to AgrP(O) as a maximal position - either to its specifier or to an adjoined position - and then incorporates into Agrs^{0}, or exceptionally into T^{0} in French (given the clause structure proposed by Belletti (1990), Chomsky (1991) among others). It has to incorporate into this agreement node, because the head in question bears the set of features (person, gender, number) against which the clitic must check its own set of features.\(^2\) As argued by Rizzi (1993), the clitic pronoun cannot check its \(\phi\)-features within its own nominal projection, because this category is structurally deficient (i.e. it is an intransitive DP). The incorporation into Agrs^{0} proceeds by left adjunction for clitics_{-k}, and by

\(^2\) In the case of infinitival auxiliaries in French, which according to Pollock (1989) do not raise to the highest inflectional head, namely Agr^{0}, the clitic incorporates directly into the auxiliary, as shown in (i). Following the Strong Lexicalist approach to inflectional morphology advocated by Chomsky (1992), the verb/auxiliary is lexically inserted with all its morphological features (person, number, gender). Thus, checking operates between the clitic and the verb itself.

(i) \[ \text{[AgrP Ne [NegP pas [l avoir fait]]]} \]

\(\text{Not to have done it}\)
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selection for clitics\textsubscript{+k}. The selectional incorporation of clitics\textsubscript{+k} is triggered by morphological Case checking. Like any selectional operation it requires adjacency. The adjacency requirement underlies both conditions 1 and 2.

Condition 1 states that Agr\textsuperscript{0} may host only one clitic\textsubscript{+k}. French, Spanish and Italian make use of different strategies to circumvent this condition in third person object clitic combinations. French displays the inverted order ACC-DAT, as in (8a), as opposed to the order DAT-ACC in combinations containing a first/second person Dative clitic, as in (8b). In Italian a compound clitic is formed: the third person Dative gli isgraphically integrated into the Accusative clitic, as shown in (8c) in contrast to (8d). In Spanish the well-known spurious se rule substitutes the third person clitic\textsubscript{-k}\textsubscript{se} for the Dative clitic\textsubscript{+k}, as illustrated in (8e) and (8f)

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Jean le lui présentera.
\item \textit{John will introduce him to him/her}
\item b. Jean me le présentera.
\item \textit{John will introduce him to me}
\item c. Gianni glielo presenterà.
\item \textit{John will introduce him to him/her}
\item d. *Gianni le lo presenterà.
\item \textit{John will introduce him to her}
\item e. Juan se lo presentera.
\item \textit{John will introduce him to him/her}
\item f. *Juan le lo presentera.
\item \textit{John will introduce him to him/her}
\end{enumerate}

In the French example in (8a) the clitic le appears on Agr\textsuperscript{0}, while the clitic lui incorporates into a different head, which is the lower T\textsuperscript{0} according to Laenzlinger (1993a). In the Italian example in (8c) the compound glielo incorporates as a single clitic\textsubscript{+k} into Agr\textsuperscript{0}. Finally, in the Spanish example the clitic\textsubscript{-k} is adjoined to Agr\textsuperscript{0}, while the clitic\textsubscript{+k} incorporates by selection into the same head.

Condition 2 states that the order of incorporation must be [Cl\textsubscript{+k} [Cl\textsubscript{-k} [Agr\textsuperscript{0} ]]]]. This is the case in (8b) and in (8e), and also in the Italian and Spanish sequences below:

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Gianni [me [lo [Agr\textsuperscript{0} presenta]]].
\item b. Juan [me [lo [Agr\textsuperscript{0} presenta]]].
\item \textit{John introduces him to me}
\end{enumerate}

The clitic\textsubscript{+k} must be adjacent to the structural host, because it incorporates by selection.

Condition 3 dictates the order of incorporation of clitic\textsubscript{+k} into distinct heads. This condition is only relevant to French, because T\textsuperscript{0} in addition to Agr\textsuperscript{0} is a
(potential) clitic host in this language. The Case frame (__, GEN, DAT/OBL) imposes the linear order [DAT [GEN [Verb]]) on the sequence in (10a), the order [OBL [GEN [Verb]]) on the sequence in (10b), and also accounts for the ungrammatical sequence in (10c) (one Case slot for two Oblique/Dative clitics):

(10)  
   a. Jean lui en parlera.
       John will talk to him/her about it
   b. Jean y en a rencontré plusieurs.
       John met many of them there
   c. *Jean lui y a succédé.
       John replaced him/her at this position

Finally, condition 4 is an attempt at treating the traditional me lui/I-II Constraint uniformly. It is interpreted as a Relativized Minimality effect on the referential feature of Individuation associated with the pronominal chains. The clitics {me, te, nous, vous, lui, leur} are necessarily interpreted as animate. Once combined, as in (11), they are part of a referential chain in which they act as intervening antecedent-governors one with respect to the other (for a more detailed explanation, see Laenzlinger 1993a).

(11)  
   a. *Jean me te présentera.
       John will introduce me/you to you/me
   b. *Jean me lui présentera.
       John will introduce me to him/her.

I will demonstrate in the following parts of this paper that the four conditions proposed by Laenzlinger (1993a) for proclitic clustering also apply to enclitic clustering given some theoretical assumptions concerning the structure of imperatives and the phenomenon of enclisis.

3. The structure of imperative clauses and enclisis effects.

According to Kayne (1989) the phenomenon of enclisis is tightly related to verb movement past the cliticization site. Rizzi (1993) develops Kayne’s arguments by proposing a generalization that applies to all cases of enclisis:

(12)  
   We have enclisis only if
   a. the verb is morphologically complete under the cliticization site, and
   b. the verb must move at least as far as the cliticization site.

   (Rizzi 1993:11)

In the case of positive imperatives the verb moves to some functional node in the C system, where it checks some abstract feature. According to Rooryck (1992) such
a movement is morphologically triggered. Rizzi (op. cit.) assumes that V-to-C movement of the imperative verb is triggered by the Imperative-Criterion, i.e. the licensing of a null operator in the specifier of CP. Rejecting the possibility of right adjunction of the clitics to the verb (cf. Kayne 1989, 1993) Rizzi also stipulates that the landing site of clitics in positive imperatives is an agreement node (a V-related head) belonging to the CP system. The verb also moves to/through this Agr-C\( ^0 \) position. The order [V CL] - enclisis - is derived by left adjunction of the verb to Agr-C\( ^0 \) (or to the clitic on Agr-C\( ^0 \)), where it is morphologically complete (cf. 12 (i)). The clitic must be adjacent to Agr-C\( ^0 \) because of the checking process in which it is involved.

I will propose a slightly different view of enclisis in positive imperatives. Following Rooryck (op. cit) I propose that the clitics and the imperative verb have different landing sites. The verb lands in C\( ^0 \), a V-related head according to Chomsky's (1992) terminology, while the clitics land in Agrs\( ^0 \). The important generalization that I make now is that the landing site of enclitics is fundamentally identical to that of proclitics: a left-joined position to Agrs\( ^0 \). On the assumption that the imperative verb moves past the cliticization site (i.e. Agrs\( ^0 \)) two possible analyses come to mind: either the verb moves to Agrs\( ^0 \) from where it exorcipates leaving a trace and the clitic(s) behind, or the verb simply skips Agrs\( ^0 \) and moves beyond the clitic(s). The former approach must appeal to a theory of exocorporation, as in Roberts (1991) and Rooryck (op.cit). The latter approach must take into account a modified version of Travis/Baker's Head Movement Constraint. Note that either of the two analyses must formally distinguish between V-to-C movement of (positive) imperative verbs and V-to-C movement of interrogative verbs, since only the former involves enclisis. Compare (13a) to (13b):

(13) a. Donne-le à Marie!
   \textit{Give it to Mary}

b. Le donnes-tu à Marie?
   \textit{Do you give it to Mary}

In the interrogative clause in (13b) the verb moves with the object clitic to the C system, whereas in the imperative clause in (13a) the clitic is left behind. The traditional analysis of (13b) involves successive verb movement from V\( ^0 \) to Agrs\( ^0 \) and from Agrs\( ^0 \) (with the object clitics) to C\( ^0 \). As regards (13a) Rooryck (op.cit) assumes that the verb passes through Agrs\( ^0 \), and then exorcipates into C\( ^0 \) following a general principle of the grammar that disallows the verb to take the clitics with it. However, I will claim contra Roberts (1991) and Rooryck (op. cit) that a configuration of exocorporation, as in (14), is strictly prohibited by the grammar (cf. Baker 1988:73):

(14) \([z^0 X^0]...[y^0 \ell' X^0]...\ell_z^0\)
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As an alternative I propose that the verb skips Agr\(^0\) on its way to C in (13a), whereas the verb has to move through Agr\(^0\) in (13b). The skipping type of movement should not be allowed, if the Head Movement Constraint is strictly interpreted in terms of Chomsky’s (1993) Shortest Movement Condition on the economy of derivation. However, a relativized version of the Shortest Movement Condition may yield the expected result. Suppose that this derivational constraint must interact with Checking Theory (CT) in the sense that each step of head movement must be the shortest as far as feature checking of the moved head requires it. Thus, a head can skip another if they do not enter into a mutual checking relation.\(^3\) \(^4\) This is expressed by the following principle.\(^5\)

(15) \textit{CT-compatible Shortest Movement Condition: (on head movement)}

Move X\(^0\) to the next c-commanding head Y\(^0\) on which it is checking-dependent.

Rivero (1994) following Roberts (1993) suggests a Relativized Minimality version of the Head Movement Constraint to treat instances of Long Head Movement in the languages of the Balkans. Significantly, Albanian true imperatives display the same facts as French imperatives in that the verb moves to C\(^0\) across Agr\(^0\) and the clitic. For Rivero this type of movement is allowed in the constructions we are concerned with, because the intervening head (here Agr\(^0\)) is transparent to the antecedent-government relation between the moved verb in C\(^0\) and its trace below Agr\(^0\). In formal terms a distinction is made between two types

---

3 Zwart (1993) proposes a similar ‘minimalist’ approach to head movement in that economy of derivation does not involve a ‘shortest steps’ requirement, but a ‘fewest steps’ requirement. Thus, movement must proceed in a smallest number of step fashion, and each step must result in feature checking. This definition allows the verb to skip a head if there is no verb feature to be checked on that head. This is the case in V2 clauses in Dutch where the verb has moved to C\(^0\) past the clitics which are adjoined to some agreement position within the IP system.

4 Kayne (1991) also assumes a skipping-type of movement to deal with the order verb-clitic in Italian infinitival clauses. The clitic is left-adjoined to T\(^0\), and the verb moves past the clitic to some higher position. However, Kayne does not discuss the details of this derivation with respect to the Head Movement Constraint.

5 A very similar principle has been proposed by Ferguson & Groat (1994) in their GLOW talk to treat notably the case of Object Incorporation into the verb across a determiner in Southern Tiwa, a phenomenon discussed by Baker & Hale (1990). Ferguson & Groat’s Shortest Move Principle states that a category X (XP or X\(^0\)) moves to the closest c-commanding category that is able to check a given feature. This is exactly the spirit of the Condition formulated in (15).
of head (A-bar vs. A-heads), so that ECP, to which the Head Movement Constraint is reduced, combines with Relativized Minimality to yield the expected effects. However, Rivero/Roberts' relativized version of the Head Movement Constraint is a priori not compatible with the minimalist framework. Furthermore, the difference between (13a) and (13b), where V-to-C movement applies, is difficult to express in terms of transparency/non-transparency of AgrsO. Why is it transparent only in positive imperatives?

The imperative verb in (13a) moves to C0, because this node contains a modal feature (abstract in Romance, but overt in the languages of the Balkans, as shown by Rivero 1994) that attracts the verb. Rooryck (op. cit) also proposes that C0 has agreement features in the sense of Rizzi (1990). Thus, C0 in positive imperatives - possibly labelled as AgrC0 - is a V-related head. However, verb movement to C0 does not pass through Agrs0, because the agreement head does not attract the verb.6 This can be explained following Chomsky (1992:7), according to whom Agrs0 is viewed as a T-related head, not as a V-related head (T raises to Agrs for Case reasons independently of verb movement). As positive imperatives are deprived of the tense projection, Agrs0 is not a T-related head in such contexts.7 The possibility for the verb to move from V0 to C0 skipping Agrs0 is now interpreted in terms of Chomsky's (1992) economy of derivation. No feature checking process forces, and legitimates, verb movement to Agrs0. From this point of view the Head Movement Constraint is no longer an independent principle, but derives from an interaction of the Shortest Movement Condition with the Principle of Full Interpretation (checking requirement).8 In the interrogative sentence (cf. 13b) the presence of TP indirectly triggers verb movement through Agrs0. T0 attracts the verb, and Agrs0 attracts T0. It is the absence of TP in positive imperatives that allows the verb to move directly to C0.

---

6 Although the imperative verb does not move to Agrs0, it obviously bears subject agreement features. Therefore, I will assume that subject agreement operates between the verb and the null subject (presumably pro) in a Spec-head configuration at the level of AgrCP, an agreement node higher than AgrsP.

7 I would like to thank Ur Shlonsky for having pointed out this observation to me.

8 Excorporation is banned according to Baker (1988) by the Head Movement Constraint (or more generally by ECP). In a minimalist approach the reason why a trace cannot be left within a X0 element, as represented in (i), must be handled by some independent principle, which is not clearly defined yet. One possibility can be the Shortest Movement Condition - even the modified version proposed in this paper - which predicts that a head cannot excorporate from another, because this movement - even if it is compatible with Checking Theory - does not satisfy the 'shortest' step requirement (there is an intervening head).

(i)  *[\text{x}_0 \ldots \text{i}_0 \ldots]
I will also adopt Rizzi’s Imperative-Criterion which applies at the CP level. By analogy with the mechanics that Rizzi (1991) proposes for the Wh-Criterion, I assume that the Imperative feature is base-generated on IΦ, more precisely on AgrsΦ, and that a null imperative operator occupies the specifier position of CP. The Imperative-Criterion triggers AgrsΦ-to-CΦ movement: the head bearing the Imperative feature must occur in a Spec-head configuration with the null imperative operator in Spec of CP. The relevant configuration is represented in (16):

(16)
```
      CP
     /   \  
    OPimp C'  
     \   /   \  
      CΦ AgrsP
            /  
           /   
          /    
         Agrs'
            /  
           /   
          /    
         AgrsΦ
            /  
           /   
          /    
         AgrsΦ[+imp]i
            /  
           /   
          /    
         t_i
```

The Imperative-Criterion applies independently of verb movement. The verb moves to CΦ for reasons that do not concern the Imperative feature, nor subject-agreement.

Note that imperative verb movement to CΦ is a priori blocked in the presence of sentential negation:

(17) Ne le donne pas à Marie!
    Don’t give it to Mary

The object pronouns are realized in proclisis and maintain the usual ordering in such contexts:

(18) a. Ne le lui donne pas.
    Don’t give it to him/her

b. Ne me le donne pas.
    Don’t give it to me

Rizzi (1993) associates this proclitic situation with the occurrence of the tense projection in negative imperatives. The negative head ne selects TΦ, which in turn selects an agreement (object) position, the recursion of which provides a landing site for the clitic(s). I propose an alternative analysis according to which the presence of
the negation blocks enclisis, more precisely verb movement to $C^O$ beyond the clitics on $Agrs^O$. Recall that the cliticization site is identical in proclisis and in enclisis, which is a position left-adjointed to $Agrs^O$. In other words, the verb must move to $Agrs^O$, or more correctly through $Agrs^O$. The analysis proposed by Zanuttini (1991), Rooryck (op. cit) and others according to which the negative particle blocks verb raising to $C^O$ is not justified. Indeed, no formal mechanism prevents the whole verb cluster from moving to $C^O$, as in the negative interrogative sentence below:

(19) $[\exists^O \text{Ne le donnes}]$-tu pas à Marie ?

Don't you give it to Mary?

Thus, I assume that verb movement to $C^O$ operates both in positive and negative imperative structures.

Now, to understand why the imperative verb must move through $Agrs^O$ in negative contexts, but not in positive contexts, one needs to present in detail the derivational properties of the sentence in (17). Consider the clause structure in (20) following Belletti (1990), Chomsky (1991) and others:

(20)

```
CP
- C'
  - $C^O$
    - $Agrs^O$
      - $Agrs'$
        - $Agrs^O$
          - $NegP$
            - Spec
              - Neg
                - Neg$^O$
                  - TP
                    - VP
                      - V$^O$
```

The negative particle is base generated in Neg$^O$, and the negative adverb *pas* occurs in Spec of NegP. Two assumptions are required to obtain the order *[ne Verb pas]* displayed in (17). First, the verb skips Neg$^O$, which is not a V/T-related head.
Second, the negative head left-adoins to Agrs\(^0\) independently of the verb. These assumptions are also made by Belletti (1990) to account for the fact that the negative particle occurs to the left of object clitics: \([ne \ [le \ fais]]\) pas. The verb moves with the clitic(s) to Agrs\(^0\), and then the negative head adjoins to it. Suppose now that the verb moves directly to C\(^0\) skipping the nonV/T-related head Agrs\(^0\), which produces either of the strings in (21) depending on clitic placement:

(21)  
   a. \[^{*}[C^{0} Fais]-ne-le pas!\]  
   b. \[^{*}[C^{0} Le \ fais]-ne pas!\]

The ungrammaticality of both (21a) and (21b) shows that the verb must indeed move to Agrs\(^0\), the cliticization site of \(le\) and \(ne\). The complete derivation is as follows: the verb raises to Agrs\(^0\) skipping Neg\(^0\), then the clitic adjoins to Agrs\(^0\), and finally the negative head adjoins to the complex [Cl Verb]. This succession of derivations is required by the well-formedness conditions on (head) chains. The negative chain and the verbal chain are represented separately in (22):

(22) 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
Agrs' \\
\_ \\
Agrs_{ij} \\
\_ \\
Neg_i \\
\_ \\
Agrs_i \\
\_ \\
NegP \\
\_ \\
V+T_j \\
\_ \\
Agrs \\
\_ \\
Neg' \\
\_ \\
TP \\
\_ \\
T \\
\_ \\
VP \\
\_ \\
_t_i \\
\_ \\
_t_j \\
\end{array}
\]

The two chains are well-formed for the reasons suggested by Belletti (1990): Agrs carries the two indexes \(i\) and \(j\), hence functions as the antecedent of both the negative trace and the verb-tense trace. There is no blocking effect, since there is no Relativized Minimality violation. In minimalist terms this means that the Minimal Chain Link condition on the economy of representation is respected.\(^9\) Moreover, T

\(^9\) Note that from a derivational point of view the Shortest Movement Condition would be violated, unless the condition is relativized through the checking requirement, as I
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must raise to Agrs in this case, because Agrs is a T-related head (TP is realized in negative imperatives). Consider now the chains in (23). The longer chain is formed by verb movement skipping Neg\(^0\) and Agrs\(^0\), and the shorter chain by negative head movement to Agrs\(^0\).

(23) 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
C' \\
| \\
C \\
| \\
V+T_i \\
| \\
Agrs' \\
| \\
Agrs \\
| \\
Neg_j \\
| \\
Neg \\
| \\
Neg' \\
\end{array}
\]

Although the negative chain is well-formed in (23) (shortest link/no Relativized Minimality effect), the verb-tense chain is blocked for two reasons: first the intervening Neg chain has a blocking effect due to a Relativized Minimality violation; second, the fact that Agrs\(^0\) is a T-related head in negative imperatives forces V/T movement to pass through Agrs\(^0\), and not to raise directly to C\(^0\), hence a violation of the Shortest Movement Condition (and also a Minimal Chain Link violation) in (23) arises.

To sum up, the imperative verb in negative contexts must move to Agrs\(^0\) because of the negative particle, which is the head of an intervening head chain. I propose in this article. The verb does not need to move through Neg\(^0\), because this head is nonV-related.
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also assume that the complex Agrs\textsuperscript{0}, which contains the negative head, the verb, the clitic(s), and most importantly the Imperative feature, further raises to C\textsuperscript{0} in order to satisfy the Imperative-Criterion.\textsuperscript{10} The complete derivation of (17) is represented in (24):

\begin{equation}
\text{(24)}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{OP_{imp}} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{AgrsP} \\
\text{[Agrs ne; le donne]}_i \\
\text{Agrs'} \\
\text{Agrs} \\
\text{NegP} \\
\text{t}_i \\
\text{pas} \\
\text{Neg'} \\
\text{Neg} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{t}_j
\end{array}
\end{equation}

The negative particle ne is optional in colloquial/spoken French. Interestingly, the null variant of ne in imperative contexts may trigger either proclisis or enclisis. In (25a) the pronoun is realized in proclisis, whereas in (25b) the pronoun appears in a postverbal position.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(25)]
\begin{itemize}
\item a. Le fais pas!
\item b. Fais-le pas!
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

Don't do it

As regards (25b), I assume that the negative head is absent both phonologically and structurally. This implies that no Neg\textsuperscript{P} is realized within the clause (the adverb

---

\textsuperscript{10} Agrs-to-C movement of the verb in negative imperatives is not assumed by Rooryck (1992). Following Zanuttini (1991) he claims that negation blocks movement of the verb to C\textsuperscript{0}. However, I argue against this analysis, firstly because no principle should block this movement if the verb takes the negative head with it, as is the case in negative interrogative inversion in French (Ne viens-tu pas ? "Don't you come"), and secondly because the Imperative operator requires Agrs-to-C movement in order to be licensed.
pas is adjoined to VP). A consequence of this is that TP cannot be licensed. The
verb moves directly to CO skipping the clitic on Agrs0, exactly as in positive
imperative contexts. In (25a), on the contrary, the negative head is structurally
active, hence behaves like the negative particle by triggering proclisis.

4. Syntactic clitics vs. weak pronouns.

In French first/second person pronouns are realized in their strong form in
enclisis, as illustrated in (26a). The facts in (26b) show that Accusative third person
clitics keep their weak form:

(26)  a. Regarde-moi ! / Tu me regardes.
       Look at me        You're looking at me

       b. Regarde-le/*loi/*lui ! / Tu le regardes.
          Look at him       You're looking at him

Foulet (1924) is right in relating the diachronic evolution from the weak form
(me, te) to the strong form (moi, toi) to a change in the accentuation rule of French,
which is the setting of a regular final word stress (on the last syllable). Thus,
pronouns in enclisis are accentuated provided that the verb and the clitic form a
phonological word. Despite their strong appearance (Pense à moi ! 'Think about
me') these enclitics still have properties of clitichood according to Kayne's (1975)
criteria. They cannot bear contrastive stress (cf. 27a), they cannot be modified (cf.
27b) nor coordinated11 (cf. 27c):

(27)  a. *Donne-le-MOI, pas (à) LUI !
       Give it to me, not to him.

       b. *Donne-le seulement moi !
       Give it only to me

       c. *Donne-le-moi et lui !
       Give it to me and to him.

---

11 Interestingly, a disjunctive conjunction between two Dative third person enclitics, as in
(i), does not sound as bad as between two Accusative third person enclitics, as in (ii), or
between a first/second person pronoun and a third person pronoun, as in (iii).

(i)  ?(?)Donne-lui ou leur une chance !
       Give him or her a chance

(ii) *Donne-lui ou moi une chance !
       Give him or her a chance

(iii) *Regarde-le ou la venir !
       See him or her coming
Foulet (1924) explains the resistance of Accusative third person enclitics to a change from a weak to a strong form (cf. 26b) in these terms: if a change had been performed from *le* to *lui* (by analogy with *me*→*moi*), the Accusative third person clitics would have lost the Gender distinction, which is essential to their distinctive referential function. Alternatively, a change from *le* to *lui* - the present strong form of third person masculine pronoun (*Pense à lui*! ‘Think about him’) - would have yielded an unwanted confusion between the Accusative clitic and the Dative clitic (*i.e.* *lui*). Thus, the pronoun *le* can be accentuated without change of form, although its vowel - the *shwa* in (28a) - must always be pronounced:

(28) a. Regarde-*le*!
   b. *Regarde(e)*'l!
   
   *Look at him/*it

Based on the above discussion I adopt Cardinaletti & Starke’s (1994) distinction between clitic pronouns and weak pronouns, and apply this distinction to French (*en)*clitics. Hence, I distinguish between the two classes of postverbal (*object*) clitics in (29):

(29) Syntactic clitics: me, te, nous, vous, lui, leur, en, le, la, les, y.
    Weak (accentuated) pronouns: moi, toi, nous, vous, lui, leur, en.

Syntactically the two classes of pronouns behave differently, as predicted by Cardinaletti & Starke’s analysis. On the one hand, the syntactic clitics undergo their two-step movement in overt syntax. In other words, they XP-move and incorporate into *Agr* before Spell-Out. On the other hand, the weak pronouns undergo XP-movement in overt syntax, and incorporate later in Logical Form (*i.e.* after Spell-Out). Concretely, an enclitic like *moi* first XP-moves to the maximal projection that is the closest to its cliticization point (optimally the XP sister of the hosting head), and then incorporates in a short move into *Agr*.

12 The LF-incorporation of weak pronouns, as opposed to the overt incorporation of syntactic clitics, should stem from the intrinsic properties of these two types of pronoun. The structural (phrasal) differences between clitics and weak pronouns and the consequences on their derivational properties are extensively discussed in Cardinaletti & Starke’s work. As already pointed out, syntactic clitics project an intransitive DP, which forces their overt movement to *Agr* for checking purpose. Suppose now that weak pronouns

---

12 Following a suggestion by Ur Shlonsky, weak pronouns in general (as in German or Hebrew, for instance) XP-move maximally in order to undertake the shortest X0-movement (at LF). This shortest X0-movement requirement is a consequence of some version of the Head Movement Constraint such as the one I propose in the paper.
project a transitive DP in which the NP complement is realized as pro, as represented in (30).

(30)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\mid \\
\text{D}' \\
\mid \\
\text{D}^0 \quad \text{NP} \\
\mid \\
\text{moi} \quad \text{pro}
\end{array}
\]

Checking of nominal φ-features in this case may operate within the DP between the pronominal head and pro. The LF-incorporation into Agrp° of weak pronouns is triggered by another checking requirement on a specific (referential) feature, say person. On the assumption that this feature is absent on the NP pro in (30) the weak pronoun on D° cannot check its own person feature within the nominal phrase. For this reason the weak pronoun must move to the subject-agreement head, a head containing the relevant feature (person). As weak pronouns are associated with a weak person feature, they can - and must - incorporate at LF. Although syntactic clitics also bear a weak person feature (in the same way as determiners, which check their φ-features after Spell-Out), they must incorporate overtly because of their strong gender and number features. Since weak pronouns like determiners have weak gender and number features, they check all their φ-features after Spell-Out (cf. Laenzlinger forthcoming and Shlonsky forthcoming) for further developments of this approach to weak pronouns, and also Cardinaletti & Starke (1994) for a slightly different approach.

In the next section I will demonstrate that the distinction made among enclitics between syntactic clitics (e.g. le), which incorporate in overt syntax, and LF-clitics (e.g. moi), which incorporate in covert syntax successfully accounts for the (various) enclitic ordering attested both in normative and popular French.

13 The absence of person feature on NP pro is related to the fact that person feature is specific to the D system. There is no doubt that a DP pro in null subject languages, for instance, contains a person feature. Since a pronoun is of category D, it must be associated with a person feature. On the contrary, a lexeme of category N like ‘man’, ‘house’ or ‘dog’ is deficient in this respect

14 Overt XP-movement of weak pronouns is triggered by their strong Case feature. In other words, a weak pronoun must XP-move to AgrpD before Spell-Out in order to check its strong Case feature.
4.2. Object enclitic clusters.

Combinations of Accusative third person clitics (*le, *la, *les) with first/second
person clitics take the shape of (31a) in normative French, and of (31b-c) in
popular/regional French.

(31)  a. Donne-le-moi !  
       b. Donne-moi-le !  
       c. Donne-moi-le !  

      Give it to me

First, consider the derivation of (31a). The syntactic clitic *le incorporates into
Agrs°, whereas the pseudo-strong pronoun moi does not move further than AgroP in
 overt syntax. Its clitization operates in Logical Form. Once the verb raises to C°
past the clitics, the sequence surfaces as (31a) with the structure represented in (32).

(32)  [C° [C forme] [C' [AgrsP [Agrs' [Agrs° le ] [AgroP moi [Agro' ...]]]]]]

      The Dative pronoun moi is presumably in an adjoined position in (32).
Following a restrictive view of phrase structures as in Laenzlinger (1993b), I will
assume that no additional element can adjoin to AgroP (one adjoined position per
projection), which prevents an adverb from intervening between the verb and the
weak pronoun:

(33)  *Donne-le donc moi !  
      Just give it to me

      Colloquial French has a marked preference for the sequence in (31b), specially
when a monosyllabic adverb like donc follows the imperative form, as in (34).

(34)  Donne-moi/nous-le donc !  
      Just give it to me/us

      As pointed out by Foulet (1924), there are two rythmic units in (34): a first stress
falls on the pseudo-strong form moi/nous, and a second stress on the adverb donc.
From a derivational point of view, the precedence of the pronoun moi over the
pronoun le indicates that the first person pronoun is (re)analyzed as a syntactic clitic.
Thus, both pronouns moi and le incorporate overtly into Agrs°. As expected, the
clitic le is closer to the structural host (i.e. Agrs°) than the clitic_k moi.¹⁵,¹⁶

---

¹⁵ Foulet (1924 88-90) observes that the colloquial order moi le is a "logical" attempt to
preserve the usual order in proclitic contexts (me le), even if that sequence affects the
standard rule of accentuation.
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A sequence like (31c) is less common in colloquial French. However, it strongly contrasts with the strictly impossible inverted sequence in (35):

(35) *Donne-le-me !

The sequence in (31c) is derived in the same way as in (31b): both clitics incorporate into Agrs⁰ in syntax. The ungrammaticality of the sequence le me in (35) is expected given the requirement on the clitic le to be adjacent to its host, here Agrs⁰.

As regards combinations of third person pronouns in enclisis, they are subject to the same ordering constraint as in proclisis:

(36) a. Tu le lui/leur donneras.
   You will give it to him/her
b. Donne-le-lui/leur !
   Give it to him/her

The cluster in (36b) is common to both normative and colloquial French. The fact that a positive imperative clause is deprived of a tense projection implies that the enclitic cluster in (36b) is derived in a different way from the proclitic sequence in (36a), where the Dative clitic incorporates into T⁰.

Recall that the status of the pronoun lui is ambiguous with respect to the classification proposed in (29). It may function either as a syntactic clitic if nonaccentuated, or as a weak pronoun if accentuated. As the Dative pronoun lui/leur in (36b) bears the word stress, it behaves as a weak pronoun that adjoins to AgroP in

------------------------------------------
16 Recall that the shortest step requirement on X⁰-movement forces the pseudo-strong pronoun moi to XP-move to the maximal projection which is the closest to the cliticization point. This maximal projection is not necessarily AgroP. Consider the negative imperative construction in (i), in which the negative particle is not expressed and the clitic is postverbal:
(i) Regarde-moi pas !
   Don't look at me

If the negative adverb is in the specifier of a Negative Phrase realized between AgrsP and AgroP, the weak pronoun moi has to adjoin to NegP overtly before incorporating into the closest c-commanding head (i.e. Agrs⁰) at LF. A further nontrivial assumption I will make is that a chain must be entirely processed at the same level of syntax, that is before Spell-Out or after Spell-Out. This means that a X⁰-derivation or a XP-derivation must apply either entirely in overt syntax or entirely in the syntax of LF.

17 Morin (1979) mentions that Gallo Regional French and Saint-Etienne French show the order lui le both in proclisis and enclisis. As discussed in Laenzlinger (1993a), the cluster lui le, like its Italian counterpart gliela, is formed by a rule of clitic compounding. Presumably such an analysis also holds for the enclitic sequence lui le.
Christopher Laenzlinger

overt syntax, and incorporates at LF.\(^{18}\) Thus, the derivation of le lui is identical to that of le moi in (31a): the syntactic clitic le is attached to Agr\(^0\), while the weak pronoun lui/ moi is attached to AgroP.

The co-occurrence restrictions on object clitic clustering traditionally called the me lui/i-II Constraint(s), also hold for enclitics, as illustrated below:

(37) a. *Présente-toi/te-moi !
    b. *Présente-moi/me-toi !
       Introduce me to yourself
       Introduce yourself to me
    c. *Présente-moi/me-lui !
    d. *Présente-lui-moi !
       Introduce me to him/her

These restrictions have been explained by Laenzlinger (1993a) in terms of a Relativized Minimality application to the Individuation referential feature (i.e. [+Animate]) associated with the pronouns in combination (see part 2 of the paper). As the condition applies to the DP pronominal chain - the argumental chain represented in (38) - it should also be at work in enclisis.

(38) \[
\text{DP}_{+[\text{Animate}]} \quad \text{DP}_{+[\text{Animate}]} \quad \text{Agro'}
\]

\[
\text{VP} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{DP}
\]

\[
t \quad t
\]

4.3. Prepositional pronouns in enclitic clusters.

French has two prepositional pronouns, y and en, which also occur in enclitic clusters. Consider first the Genitive pronoun en. Its combination with a first/second

---

18 Note that the adjacency requirement on clitic+\(_k\) incorporation does not hold at LF. Indeed, morphological Case checking is not relevant at this level. Thus, two clitics+\(_k\) are allowed to incorporate into the same head in the syntax of LF, i.e. after Spell-Out.
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person object pronoun is realized differently in normative French and colloquial French, as shown below:

(39)  a. Parle-m’en !
      b. Parles-en-moi !
      c. Parle-moi-z’en !

Talk to me about it

The normative sequence in (39a) contains two syntactic clitics. Both incorporate into Agr$^0$ in the same order as in proclisis: *Tu m’en parles* ‘You talk to me about it’. The pronoun en, unlike me, is a clitic$_{+k}$ and, as such, must be adjacent to its structural host. Hence, the inverted order does not yield a grammatical result, as illustrated in (40).

(40) *Parles-en-me !

The colloquial sequence en-moi in (39b) stems from the overt incorporation of en into Agr$^0$ and from the adjunction of moi - a weak pronoun - to AgroP. The sequence in (39c) is also attested in colloquial French. It displays a notable peculiarity: the euphonic element of liaison /z/. This phenomenon is particularly relevant to the present study, because it is characteristic of enclitic clusters, say, of imperatives. The question as to the exact status of this element - is it only an agreement marker or an imperative mark? - is discussed at length in the next part of the paper. As regards the derivation of the sequence moi en in (39c), I adopt an analysis according to which the pronoun moi is treated as a syntactic clitic incorporating into Agr$^0$, and the pronoun en is treated as a weak pronoun attached to AgroP in overt syntax. Verb raising to CO produces the sequence [V-moi-(z’)en].

The Genitive pronoun is also found in combination with Dative third person clitics. The norm imposes the sequence in (41a), whereas colloquial French displays either of the two clusters in (41b-c).

(41)  a. Donne-lui-en deux !
      b. Donnes-en-lui deux !
      c. Donne-lui-z’en deux !

Give him/her two of them

Given that positive imperative structures do not contain a tense projection, and that the two clitics$_{+k}$ in (41) are not allowed to co-occur on the same head, clitic clustering in these cases is made possible by the behaviour of the left-hand pronoun as a syntactic clitic and of the right-hand pronoun as a weak pronoun. In (41a) the clitic lui incorporates overtly into Agr$^0$, while the pronoun en adjoins to AgroP, and cliticizes only at LF. The status of the pronouns in (41b) is inverted with respect to that in (41a): en functions as the syntactic clitic and lui as the weak accentuated pronoun. The colloquial sequence in (41c) is identical in ordering to the normative
sequence in (42a), but differs from it by having a euphonic /zl/. So far I assume that the sequence in (41c) is formed according to the same derivational mechanism as in (41a). The epenthetic liaison is discussed in section 5.

The combination of the Genitive pronoun with an Accusative third person clitic is rarely attested in enclisis. Morin (1979) and Grevisse’s *Le Bon Usage* mention the following cases:

(42) a. Retire-l’en!
    Remove it from there

b. Empêche-l’en!
    Prevent him/her from doing it

Inexplicably, I find the sequence l’en in (42) and more particularly in (43) quite weird. The norm tries to impose this sequence, although most speakers preferably avoid using it.

(43) a. ?Informe-l’en!
    *Inform* him/her about it

b. ??Persuade-l’en!
    *Persuade* him/her of it

Nevertheless, the plural form of the Accusative third person pronoun yields grammatical sequences in general, as exemplified in (44a-c).

(44) a. Retire-les-en!
    *Remove* them from there

b. Empêche-les-en!
    *Prevent* them from doing it

c. Informe-les-en!
    *Inform* them about it

The grammaticality of the sequences in (42) and (44) is expected given the syntactic incorporation of the Accusative clitic into Agro and the adjunction of the Genitive weak pronoun to AgroP in overt syntax. However, the restriction on (43) is left unexplained. Note that the inverted order, as in (45), is not possible at all, because the Accusative clitic cannot behave as a weak pronoun\(^{19}\) (it is a syntactic clitic) and the two clitics may not incorporate overtly into the same head.

\(^{19}\) However, Marc-Ariel Friedemann has pointed out to me that (45a-b), and also (48a), do not sound for him as bad as indicated, and are much better than (i) and (ii) (and also (48b));

(i) **Empêches-en-le!
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(45) a. *Empêches-en-les !
   \textit{Prevent them from doing it}

   *Informes-en-les !
   \textit{Inform them about it}

   The other prepositional clitic - \textit{y} - is reluctant to appear in enclitic clusters. Its combination with a Dative third person pronoun is prohibited in enclisis (\textit{cf. (46c-d)}), presumably for the same reasons as in proclisis (\textit{cf. (46a-b)}). The two pronouns are syntactic clitics (\textit{i.e.} they must incorporate overtly into Agrs\textsuperscript{0}) and, as such, compete for the same structural clitic position according to the Case frame ((\_, GEN), OBL/DAT): there is a single Case slot for two Oblique/Dative clitic pronouns.

(46) a. *Je lui/leur \textit{y} ai parlé
   \textit{I have talked to him/her/them there}

   *Je leur \textit{y} ai fait penser
   \textit{I made them think about it}

   *Parle-lui-(z')-\textit{y}/leur-\textit{y} !
   \textit{Talk to him/her/them about it}

   *Faites-leur-\textit{y} penser !
   \textit{Make them think about it}

   The combination of \textit{y} with an Accusative third person clitic is fully acceptable only when the latter is plural, as in (47c).\textsuperscript{20} The sequence \textit{l'y} (with a singular Accusative clitic) is as marginal in enclisis (\textit{cf. (47b)}) as it is in proclisis (\textit{cf. (47a)}) .

   Probably the oddity of the sequence is due to a phonetic confusion between \textit{l'y} and \textit{lui}.

\hspace{1cm} \textit{Prevent him from doing it}
\hspace{1cm} (ii) \hspace{1cm} *Informes-en-le !
\hspace{1cm} \textit{Inform him about it}

   The difference of grammaticality between \textit{le} and \textit{les} in a cluster final position is certainly linked to the fact that \textit{les} has more phonological weight than \textit{le}, which means that \textit{les} contrary to \textit{le} can marginally function as a weak pronoun which incorporates at LF. The pronouns \textit{en} and \textit{le} (and also \textit{y}) have to behave as syntactic clitics.

20 The degree of acceptability of the enclitic sequence \textit{les-\textit{y}} seems to be dependent on the type of verb involved. For instance, the oddity of (i) contrasts with the grammaticality of (47d). Such variations certainly rely on some idiosyncratic properties of ditransitive verbs.

   (i) ??Conduis-les-\textit{y} !
   \textit{Drive them there}
(47) a. ??Tu l’y amèneras.
   You will bring it there
b. ??Amènê-l’y !
   Bring it there
c. Tu les y amèneras.
   You will bring them there
d. Amène-les-y !
   Bring them there

The possibility of (47d) requires an analysis of the pronoun \( y \) as a weak accented pronoun. Both pronouns \emph{les} and \( y \) are clitics, and, as such, are not allowed to incorporate overtly into the same head.\textsuperscript{21} Although the pronoun \( y \) is not a strong form \emph{per se} (i.e. does not belong to the class of weak pronouns), I assume that its liaison with the preceding consonants generates a pseudo-strong form (\( z’y \)), which may behave as a weak pronoun once accented. Thus, the Accusative syntactic clitic incorporates into Agrs\textsuperscript{0}, and the Oblique pronoun adjoins to AgroP and cliticizes later at LF. The inverted order in (48) is expectedly ungrammatical\textsuperscript{22}, since the two clitics cannot co-occur on the same head before Spell-Out.

(48) a. ??Amènes-y-les !
   b. ??*Amènes-y-le !

The combination of \( y \) with a first/second person object pronoun displays various forms. Sequences like \( m’y \) and \( t’y \) are imposed by the norm, but most speakers tend to avoid them. Colloquial French prefers the clusters in (49a) and (49b) over the odd sequence in (49a).

(49) a. ??Mets-t’y, à sa place !
   b. Mets-y-toi, à sa place !
   c. Mets-toi-z’y, à sa place !
   Put yourself in his/her place

The sequence \( t’y \) sounds inexplicably odd to my ear. However, the use of a plural first/second person pronoun generates more acceptable sequences, as shown

---
\textsuperscript{21} According to Laenzlinger (1993a) the proclitic sequence \emph{les y}, as in (47c), is formed by an incorporation of \emph{les} into Agrs\textsuperscript{0} and of \( y \) into the lower head T\textsuperscript{0}. As there is no tense projection in positive imperatives, the enclitic sequence \emph{les y} in (47d) must be derived in another way.

\textsuperscript{22} see footnote 11.
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in (50). This is expected, since the two pronouns are allowed to incorporate into the same head, namely Agrs₀. The cliticₙₖ nous/vous must precede the cliticₚₖ, the latter having to be adjacent to Agrs₀.

(50) a. Mettez-vous-y, à leur place!
   Put yourselves in their place

   b. Menez-nous-y!
   Lead us there

Observe that the sequence in (51) is totally unacceptable. The pronoun te as a syntactic clitic has to incorporate overtly into Agrs₀. However, it may not be closer to the host than the cliticₚₖ because of the selectional incorporation of the latter.

(51) *Mets-y-te, à sa place!
   Put yourself in his/her place

The colloquial form in (49b) is the result of an incorporation of the Oblique clitic into Agrs₀, and of an attachment of the weak pronoun toi to AgroP. The other colloquial sequence in (49c) involves the type of clitic-internal liaison mentioned earlier. Independently of an analysis of this phenomenon (cf. section 5), I assume that the pronoun moi in (49c) functions as a syntactic clitic, and thus incorporates into Agrs₀. The pronoun y gets a pseudo-strong appearance by liaison with the epenthetic z, and as a weak accentuated pronoun adjoins to AgroP. Thus, the precedence of toi over z' y is correctly derived.

Finally, the two prepositional pronouns cluster in enclisis in the same order as they do in proclisis, as illustrated below:

(52) a. Mettez-y-en une!
   Put one of them there

   b. Vous y en metterez une.
   You will put one of them there

   c. Apportez-y-en une!
   Bring one of them there

   d. Tu y en apporteras une.
   You will bring one of them there

In Laenzlinger (1993a) the proclitic sequence in (52b) and (52d) is derived as follows: the Oblique cliticₚₖ y incorporates into Agrs₀, while the Genitive cliticₚₖ incorporates into T₀. This order of incorporation is dictated by the Case hierarchy ((_, GEN), OBL). As TP is absent in positive imperative structures, the pronoun en occurs in overt syntax in a position distinct from T₀. Being accentuated, it behaves as a weak pronoun, hence adjoins to AgroP before incorporating into Agrs₀ at LF.
As to the syntactic clitic y, it incorporates overtly into Agrs^0. Verb raising to C^0 past the two pronouns yields the correct output in (52a) and (52c).

So far I have shown that the approach to proclitic clustering proposed by Laenzlinger (1993a) makes the correct predictions for enclitic clustering given the following assumptions: 1) there is no tense projection in positive imperatives 2) a weak accentuated pronoun adjoins to the maximal projection which is closest to the head into which the pronoun incorporates at the level of Logical Form. In the following section the phenomenon of epenthetic liaison peculiar to enclitic contexts in (colloquial) French will be discussed in detail. The question is to determine if the epenthetic /z/ has a morpho-syntactic significance with respect to imperative environments, or if it is simply a PF phenomenon of euphony without any syntactic relevance.

5. The epenthetic z: the mark of imperative?

The idea according to which the clitic-internal connector of liaison /z/ is linked to imperatives is supported by the absence of this phenomenon in proclitic contexts, for instance in declarative contexts. The contrast between (53a) and (53b) is telling:

(53) a. Donne-lui-/z/-en !
   Give him/her some of them
b. *Tu lui-/z/-en donnes.
   You give him/her some of them

To be more precise, I should say in the light of (54a-b) that this type of clitic-internal liaison is dependent on verb raising in imperatives, rather than the imperative itself.

(54) a. *Ne lui-/z/-en donne pas !
b. Donne-lui-/z/-en pas !
   Don't give him/her some of them

Rooryck (1992:240-42) suggests that this phoneme of liaison represents the imperative morphology associated with the node AgrC^0. Only when the verb moves to this position (i.e. in positive imperatives) does the mark of liaison emerge from the cluster. However, Rooryck does not propose a detailed analysis of this phenomenon, nor does he discuss the respective structural positions of clitics in combination. In his analysis, an enclitic left-joins to Agrs^0, and the verb moves to some higher functional position called AgrC^0. If the epenthetic /z/ is indeed a reflex of the imperative morphology in AgrC^0, the reason why it may appear between two clitics lower down is left unexplained.

Following Rooryck I claim that the euphonic /z/ is the mark of imperative. However, I do not assume that it is related to the C system. Instead, I assume that it
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is involved in the Agrs system. More precisely, it is the phonological realization of the imperative feature realized on Agrs⁰. This feature is usually nonovert, except in the contexts requiring liaison. The imperative feature on Agrs⁰ plays a crucial role in the Imperative-Criterion proposed in section 3: Agrs-to-C movement is triggered in order for the imperative operator in Spec of CP to be in a Spec-head configuration with the head containing the [+imp] feature, and reciprocally.

An analysis according to which the clitic-internal liaison /zl/ in (55) is realized on Agrs⁰ makes interesting predictions on the derivation of the clusters below.

(55)  a. Donne-lui-z’en !
       *Give him/her some of them
b. Donne-moi-z’en !
       *Give me some of them
c. Mène-moi-z’y !
       *Lead me there

Clitic ordering in (55) proceeds as follows: the left-hand clitic is left-adjointed to Agrs⁰, whereas the right-hand pronoun is adjoined as a maximal projection to AgroP. As to the verb, it moves to C⁰ skipping Agrs⁰.23 If the phoneme /zl/ is a morphological realization on Agrs⁰ (lexically inserted in this position), its intervention between the two pronouns is predicted. The relevant configuration is given in (56).

---

23 Rivero (1994) presents a similar fact in Albanian affirmative imperatives, where an (object) clitic may intervene between the verb and the person ending (but only in the second person plural):

(i) Tregoj-i-ni!
       tell-him-Pres/2pl

According to Rivero (p. 109) the verb raises to C⁰ leaving behind the clitic and the imperative morpheme on Agrs⁰. The account I propose for the French imperative mark -z- may extend to the Albanian case in (i), if the morpheme ni is analyzed as the overt realization of the imperative feature on Agrs⁰.
In view of (55) the Imperative-Criterion must apply after Spell-Out, i.e. in the syntax of Logical Form. Agrs-to-C movement must operate covertly in order for the liaison marker to surface between the two clitics. However, it seems that the Imperative-Criterion is satisfied before Spell-Out in the cases of verb liaison in (57), since the imperative mark appears on the verb in $C^0$. Now, the question is: should we conclude on the basis of (57) that Agrs(-z-)to-C movement has actually applied in overt syntax?

(57) a. Manges-/i/ en !
   
   Eat some of it

b. Penses-/z/-y !
   
   Think about it

Observe that the graphic convention of French only imposes the presence of the consonant $s$ on singular second person ending of imperative verbs in -er (manger, penser) in contexts of liaison. Compare (57) to (58):

(58) a. Mange-le !
   
   Eat it

b. Pense seulement à cela !
   
   Think only about that
The graphic output of imperative morphology partly obscures its phonological relevance. Indeed, the sound [z] is audible in imperative endings only in liaison environments. For instance, a verb ending in -er displays three imperative morphemes -es(s), -ons and -ez, the phonological representation of which are /o/ (second person singular); /o/ (first person plural); /e/ (second person plural) respectively. The consonant s/z is realized as a separate phoneme, once a vowel follows the verb in contexts of (obligatory) liaison, as in (57a-b). This is also the case in (59a). In (59b) there is no incompatibility between the graphic consonant z on the verb and the connector /z/ within the cluster: the former is only a graphic support (no phonetic reality), whereas the latter is the imperative mark.

(59)  a. Donne/z/-en-lui !
     b. Donnez-lui /z/-en !
     \textit{Give him/her some of them}

The link of clitic-internal liaison to imperative morphology is shown by the incompatibility of clitic-internal liaison with verb liaison. The relevant fact is the following:

(60)  Mettez /z/-y-(*/z/)-en une !
     \textit{Put one of them there}

The analysis of verb liaison in (60) as a manifestation of imperative morphology makes the right prediction concerning the impossibility of clitic liaison - also a manifestation of imperative morphology - in this case. There cannot be two imperative marks expressed within a single clause.

So far I assume the euphonic connector /z/ in positive imperatives to be a morphophonological realization of the imperative feature on Agrs^0. The fact that the imperative mark is realized on the verb in (57), (59a) and (60) does not necessarily mean that it appears on C^0 with the verb. Let's assume that the Imp-Criterion uniformly applies after Spell-Out, even in (positive and negative) imperatives where no clitic-internal liaison is required (e.g. \textit{Mange-le ! 'Eat it'} \textit{Donne-le-lui ! 'Give it to him/her'}, \textit{Ne le mange pas ! 'Don't eat it'}). Thus, the constructions in (57), (59a) and (60) do not exhibit overt Agrs-to-C movement. The imperative mark remains in Agrs^0 in syntax and moves to C^0 at LF. The consequence of this analysis is that the pronouns in these structures cannot be left-joined to Agrs^0. In other words, they are not syntactic clitics, but weak pronouns adjoined to AgroP in overt syntax before incorporating in covert syntax. I have proposed in section 4 that the pronoun \textit{en} belongs to the class of weak (accentuated) pronouns. As regards the pronoun \textit{y}, it is a syntactic clitic in its bare form, but can acquire the status of weak pronoun by liaison with a preceding consonant like z, as in the enclitic sequence \textit{les-\textit{z}/y} in (47d). The same explanation holds for (57b) and (60). The derivation of an imperative construction like (61) is represented in (62).
The analysis of the epenthetic /z/ in positive imperatives as an agreement-like marker has some independent motivation that concerns the phenomenon of fausse liaison in (popular) French. Morin & Kaye (1982) discuss this phenomenon and mention that (post)verbal environments exhibit two pataquès consonants: z and t. The former is associated with 1st and 2nd person, as shown in (63a-b), and the latter with 3rd person, as illustrated in (63c-d).

(63)  a. J'irais/tu iras/nous irons finalement-/z/-à Paris.
I would/you will/we will go to Paris, finally

b. Donnez/donne/donnons-le-/z/-à Marie!
Give it to Mary/Let's give it to Mary

c. Il ira/ils iront seul(s)-/t/-à Paris.
He/they will go alone to Paris
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d. Il devra-/t/-y avoir du monde.
   There must be many people

However, the distinction between /z/ as a first/second person marker and /t/ as a third person marker is not as sharp as expected. There are some revealing exceptions, such as il reviendra-z-à Pâques ‘He will come back at Easter’, or Donnez-moi-t-un conseil ‘Give me an advice’ for instance. Tentatively, I propose that /z/ is a plural marker in general and a second person marker in particular, while /t/ is a third person marker. This is now compatible with an analysis of /z/ in positive imperatives as an element in agreement position. Importantly, the fact that the epenthetic /z/ is linked to plural agreement environments is supported by its occurrence (in popular French) in agreement-COMP configurations in the sense of Rizzi (1990:51-60). The paradigm in (64a-f) show that the insertion of /z/ is possible when the subject of the relative clause is plural (although (64c) does not seem as acceptable as (64a-b)), while it is impossible when the subject is singular (cf. (64d-f)).

(64) a. Ceux [C+agr qui/-z/-] ont des lunettes.
   Those who have glasses

b. Vous [C+agr qui/-z/-] avez fait cela.
   You who have done this

c. ?Nous [C+agr qui/-z/-] avons fait cela.
   We who have done this

d. *Celui [C+agr qui/-z/-] a des lunettes.
   That (man) who has glasses

e. *Toi [C+agr qui/-z/-] as fait cela.
   You who have done this

f. *Moi [C+agr qui/-z/-] ai fait cela.
   I who have done this

The cases of fausse liaison (or pataquès) in (64a-c) are triggered by the presence of a (plural) agreement feature in C⁰ which functions as a proper governor for the trace of the subject following Rizzi’s analysis.

In positive imperatives the marker of liaison /z/ originates in an agreement position, namely Agrs⁰. As opposed to Rooryck (1992) I do not assume that this phonological connector represents an imperative agreement in C⁰. Instead, it corresponds to the specific imperative morphology which bears the imperative feature on Agrs⁰. This feature is nonovert in neutral morphological contexts. Thus, the relation of the euphonic /z/ to agreement is more functional than strictly morphological or phonological.
6. Conclusion.

In this article I have proposed that enclitic clustering in French differs from proclitic clustering for two main reasons:

1. The tense projection is not realized in positive imperative clauses.

2. Word stress is final in French.

The first observation implies that $T^0$ is not available as a potential host for clitics+k. The impoverished structure of positive imperatives affects clitic combinations both in ordering and size (cf. (1) and (8)). The consequence of the second fact is that a pronoun in enclisis is accentuated. Those pronouns displaying a pseudo-strong form (moi, toi, nous, vous, lui, leur, etc) do not cliticize in overt syntax, but in the syntax of LF. They are final in clusters, because they do not move as far as syntactic clitics (nonaccentuated clitics) in overt syntax (le, la, les): Donne-le-moi ! 'Give it to me', Donne-le-lui ! 'Give it to him/her'. Since $T^0$ does not host clitics in Italian and Spanish, and word stress is not final in these languages, enclitic clusters (which are not confined to imperative contexts) show the same ordering as proclitic clusters.

Enclisis in positive imperatives has been analyzed in terms of verb movement to $C^o$ skipping $Agrs^o$, a nonV/T-related head. This type of movement is allowed by virtue of a version of the Shortest Movement Condition which interacts with Checking Theory (CT-compatible Shortest Movement Condition). The result of this analysis is that the imperative verb does not take the clitic(s) with it, the latter being either left-adjoined to $Agrs^o$ (syntactic clitics) or left-adjoined to $AgroP$ (weak pronouns).

Finally, I have discussed the phenomenon of cluster-internal liaison, and argued for an analysis according to which the epenthetic /ə/ is the mark of imperative, viz the overt realization of the abstract imperative feature on $Agrs^o$. The Imperative-Criterion triggers $Agrs$-to-$C$ movement, which operates after Spell-Out, as shown by the possibility of having clitic-internal liaison. This movement is performed independently of verb movement, except in the case of negative imperatives: the presence of a negative particle and of a tense projection forces the verb to pass through $Agrs^o$ (a T-related head) and to raise up with the clitic(s) to $C^o$. As $TP$ is realized in negative imperatives and the verb moves to $Agrs^o$, the pronouns appear in proclisis in the same ordering as in nonimperative contexts.
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