

## Subject-Related Proclitics and Enclitics in all Persons

Subject Clitics (SCLs) in the grammars of N. Italy (GNI) are intensively studied for the fine detail they expose in syntactic structures and relations. A huge literature has arisen, providing details and broad theories of their characterizations (e.g. Poletto 2000 (P), Manzini & Savoia 2005, Cardinaletti & Repetti 2008 (C&R), Roberts 2010, Poletto & Tortora 2016 (P&T), etc). Since at least Benincà 1983 (B), we know that they include differing elements, some subject-related (s-r), others discourse-related (d-r). This paper examines SCLs in **Bol**(ognese) (the GNI of Bologna), in IPA in (1), revealing their lack of the diverse properties seen in other GNIs' SCLs (2-3). Bol SCLs instead behave uniformly, like other GNIs' low s-r SCLs (even those cognate with d-r ones in other GNIs). General GNI diachronic changes and Bol morpho-phonology explain differences in form between pro- and enclitic SCLs in this full set of Bol low, s-r SCLs. This analysis has important consequences for the analysis of the functional structure in which proclitic s-r SCLs arise.

(1) [dur'mir] 'to sleep'. Epenthesis, Reduction									(2)				
SBJ Φ	pro- SCL	Root	T <sub>AGR</sub>	DECL [Output]	Root	T <sub>AGR</sub>	en- SCL	INT'ROG [Output]	From P&T:778	OMIT IN COORD. 1 / 2 / 3	CLUSTER W/C	INTERACT W/L-PERI	ENCLISIS
1S	(j)a	–	–	a'do:rum	–	–	(j)a	'do:rmja?					
2S	t	↑	–	't do:rum	↑	–	t	'do:rmɛt?	SCL <sub>Person</sub>	- / - / -	-	-	-
3MS	(a)l	do:rm	–	al'do:rum	do:rm	–	(a)l	'do:rmɛl?	SCL <sub>Number</sub>	- / - / +	-	-	+
3FS	l(a)	do:rm	–	la'do:rum	do:rm	–	l(a)	'do:rmɛla?	SCL <sub>Deictic</sub>	- / + / -	+ / -	+	-
1P	(j)a	–	'æ:n	a'dur'mæŋ	–	'æ:n	(j)a	'dur'mæŋja?	SCL <sub>Invariable</sub>	+ / + / +	+	+	-
2P	(v)(a)	↓	'i:	a'dur'mi:	↓	'i:	(v)(a)	'dur'mi:v?					
3P	i	n	–	i'do:rmɛŋ	–	n	i	'do:rmni?	(3) Bol SCLs	- / - / -	(+)	-	+

**All Bol SCLs in (1) behave alike:** The SCLs in (1) are obligatory (one predictable exception, noted later), which differs from many GNIs, where SCLs can be absent, optional, and/or d-r, e.g. B's **Pad**(ovano) d-r [a], or C&R's **Don**(ceto) optional [ə] with 1S/P&2P forms. Bol SCLs are obligatory in all coordinate structures (4), like SCL<sub>Pers</sub> in (2). They never co-occur with any other (5). They all cluster with a preceding C, even the 2S (SCL<sub>Pers</sub>) (6), but this is phonological in Bol. In any case, no evidence like this distinguishes SCLs in Bol. No Bol SCL interacts with any (non-subj-)wh- or left-peripheral-elements, in P&T's sense. Instead, all Bol SCLs co-occur with them (7-8). No additional d-r SCL can occur in wh-examples, since none exists in Bol, but even proclitic 1S/P&2P SCLs must appear with a left-peripheral element, while the homophonous, clearly d-r Pad SCL can't, despite being cognate with Bol 1S&P SCLs. Position relative to NEG is a problematic criterion (P&T), but all Bol SCLs occur pre-NEG anyway (9). Bol [a] is, thus, quite distinct from Pad [a].

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(4) A= cant es *(a=) bâl.<br/>SCL.1S sing.1S and SCL.1S dance.1S<br/>'I dance and I sing'</p> <p>(6) S't= vû andèr vî, và pûr!<br/>if'SCL.2S want.2S to go away, go too<br/>'If you want to go away, just go!'</p> <p>(8) AL GÂT (mé) *(a=) vadd, brîša al can.<br/>the cat I SCL.1S= see.1S, not the dog.<br/>'The cat I see, not the dog.'</p> | <p>(5) (*A=) t= vén.<br/>SCL.2S= come.2S<br/>'You come.'</p> <p>(7) (*A=) Duv (*a=) sâggn=a andé?<br/>where be.1S=SCL.1S gone?<br/>'Where have I gone?'</p> <p>(9) t= an= î brîša andé?<br/>SCL.2S NEG be.2S not gone<br/>'You didn't go.'</p> |
|---|--|

In summary, all Bol SCLs behave like SCL<sub>Pers/Num</sub>s in (2). Moreover, B shows older Pad to be like Bol, with all SCLs pre-NEG and no distinctions among them. Later, Pad 2S&3S/P are post-NEG and [a] isn't: Pad [a] and NEG were reanalyzed as structurally higher, initiating [a]'s d-r properties.

**Differences in pro- vs. enclitic forms** often led to what C&R call “two-paradigm hypotheses”. Like C&R, we reject this, and show that all Bol SCLs appear as pro- and enclitics. For Bol 2S&3S/P, our analysis is like that in C&R for Don: they occur in both positions, with epenthesis in enclitic 2S,3MS (1). For Bol 1S/P&2P, however, it differs. C&R argue that these only appear as enclitics in Don; we argue they all appear in both positions in Bol. Their lack of d-r traits and their diachronic development strongly support this: GNI SCLs derive from Lat(in) NOM pronouns (Vanelli 1984, 1987), and 1S often spread to 1P (Rolfs 1968). C&R show that Lat EGO > Don /i/ for both 1S and 1P; in Bol, we propose that EGO > /(j)a/, proclitic [a] and enclitic [ja], both clearly visible across all paradigms. (Bol [n+j] always → [ɲ], as in INTERROG 1P.) [a] derives from Lat O:, also in Lat NON > Bol /an/ (9), and is distinct from the Bol epenthetic vowels; /j/ derives from G, as in C&R. SCL.2P is often seen as a clear case of unrelated forms, but isn’t so for Bol. By the same vowel change, Lat VOS > /(v)(a)/ with proclitic [a] and enclitic [v], each with the segment adjacent to the phonological phrase (PhP) edge deleted. Bol /v/ is often very weak: Canepari & Vitali 1995 say “/v/ often vanishes: [fɛrɐˈvɛjɲɔ, vɲɔ] ‘guinea fowl, come<sub>pst-prtcpl</sub>’ (or even [fɛrɐˈvɛjɲɔ]).” Thus, the first segment, essentially the glide [v] (as in Padgett 2002), is like the /j/ of 1S&P, not surfacing in PhP-initial position. [v] appears after the typical 2P suffix, a stressed vowel. Relating SCL2P’s two forms this way is further supported by the one case where it may not occur (alone among all SCLs): in all INTERROG imperfect/conditional forms, e.g. [(\*)a ˈdɛ:vi(\*v), (\*a) ˈdesi(\*v)] ‘give.IMPF.2P?, give.COND.2P?’, because these are the only 2P forms in the grammar without final stress.

Many works correlate **functional structure** with patterns of SCLs within and across GNIs. Like P, C&R derive increases in the number of s-r proclitic SCLs in a GNI from higher V-movement in the “subject field”. Comparatively higher numbers of enclitic SCLs in INTERROG structures, with even higher V-movement, supports this idea. This approach posits a hierarchy of heads in the subject field (3P ≫ 3S ≫ 2S) to capture important GNI patterns and generalizations in Renzi & Vanelli 1983 (R&V). This hierarchy of heads, however, doesn’t directly correlate with how many SCLs a GNI has, only with which ones can appear as proclitics. Don has all the SCLs as enclitics, but only three as proclitics. P:39 notes an alternative understanding, proposed by Giorgi & Pianesi 1997: “UG encodes only semantic features in a given order, and languages differ in the way they encode semantic features on one projection or on more than one.” We combine this with the minimal version of C&R’s account needed to capture whether or not proclitics appear. Specifically, features that license SCLs in GNIs are introduced in their ranked order. They occur in the head to which V moves unless reassigned, in the same order, to the (one) next head up, as in C&R’s (42). When there, that feature attracts V to it, making possible its related proclitic SCL. The same ranking, used two ways, explains cross-GNI patterns of availability of SCLs and possibilities for their proclitic appearance, and R&V’s generalizations. Don has SCLs of all persons, but only three of the features occur on the higher head, so only three SCLs can appear as proclitics. Bol also has SCLs of all persons, but has all the features assigned to the higher head, so all of its SCLs can appear as proclitics. The account generalizes to other s-r SCL patterns in GNIs.

---

B Il clítico *a* nel dialetto padovano. *B et al* 1993. B et al 1993 *Scritti linguistici in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini*. Canepari & Vitali 1995 *Pronuncia e Grafia del Bolognese*. *RIdD* 19. C&R The Phonology and Syntax of Preverbal and Postverbal Subject Clitics in Northern Italian Dialects. *LI* 39. Giorgi & Pianesi 1997 *Tense and Aspect*. P *The higher functional field*. P&T Subject clitics: syntax. *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Ledgeway & Martin. R&V I pronomi soggetto in alcune varietà romanze. *B et al* 1993. Roberts 2010 *Agreement and head movement*. Rolfs 1968 *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. Vol. 2, *Morfologia*. Vanelli 1984 *Pronomi e fenomeni di prostesi vocalica nei dialetti italiani settentrionali*. *RdLR* 48. Vanelli 1987 *I pronomi soggetto nei dialetti italiani settentrionali dal Medio Evo ad oggi*. *MR* 12.