PCC Effects with Expletives and Non-Associate Post-Verbal Subjects in Bolognese
Edward J. Rubin, University of Utah, e.rubin@utah.edu
Going Romance 34, November 26, 2020

Goals:
- Highlight revealing differences in a Bolognese Free-Inversion construction that distinguishes it from more commonly studied Free-Inversion patterns in Romance, which are standardly analyzed as involving an expletive *pro* (*expl*) in preverbal subject position.
- Explain the lack of full agreement between the postverbal subject and the tensed verb, as well as the important nature of the clitic glossed below as AI.
- Motivate an extension of the ideas underlying Cyclic/Multiple Agree (Béjar & Rezac 2003, 2007, Nevins 2007, 2011) to explain the little discussed person restrictions in this Free-Inversion construction.
- Motivate a third type of expletive beyond the commonly assumed *there* and *it* (or its equivalents, French *il* or expletive *pro*.

Basic Data and Issues

(1) is a Free-Inversion construction, where the thematic subject appears in a postverbal position, in contrast with the data in (1'), where the subject is preverbal:

1) a. *expl* Ai=à   dscåurs   la dôna.   (Bolognese)
              AI=has.3S   spoken   the woman
        'The woman spoke.'
   b. *expl* Ai=à   dscåurs   äl dôn.
              AI=has.3S   spoken   the women
        'The women spoke.'

1') a. La dôna   la=   dscårr /   l'=   à   dscåurs.
        the woman SCL.3SF=   speaks.3s /SCL.3SF=   has.3S   spoken
        'The woman speaks / spoke.'
    b. Äl dôn   äl=   dscårren / äli=   an   dscåurs
        the women   SCL.3PF=   speak.3p / SCL.3PF=   have.3P spoken
        'The women speak.'

Note that Bolognese is what Roberts 2010:106 calls "a 'fully redundant' null-subject system," i.e. one which distinguishes all six person-number combinations via verbal suffixes together with subject clitics (SCL). Bolognese also distinguishes gender in its third person (3) verb forms via the relevant SCLs.

The construction in (1) doesn't permit first (1) or second (2) person (π) postverbal subjects, nor does a simple notion of "partial agreement" make adequate predictions. (2b-c) show partial agreement, but are ill-formed.

2) a. * *expl* Ai=à   dscåurs   mé / té / nó / vó.
                 AI=has.3S   spoken   I / you.S / we / you.P
         'I / you / we / you spoke.'
   b. * *expl* AI=è   dscåurs   té / vó.   (Partial Agreement in 2)
                 ai=have.2S   spoken   you.S / you.P
         'You spoke.'
   c. * *expl* AI=ò   dscåurs   mé / nó.   (Partial Agreement in 1)
                 ai=have.1S   spoken   I / we
         'I / we spoke.'

In more commonly studied Free-Inversion constructions like (3a-b), the postverbal subject and the tensed verb agree fully; agreement like that in Bolognese (1b) is ill-formed (3c); full agreement applies also where there postverbal subject is 1 or 2 (3d).

3) a. *expl* Ha   parlato   la donna   (Italian)
               have.3S   spoken   the woman.
        'The woman spoke.'

3) b.   *expl*   hanno   parlato   le donne.
                 have.3P   spoken   the women.
        'The women spoke.'

   c. * *expl*   Ha   parlato   le donne.   cf. Bolognese (1b)
                 have.3S   spoken   the women.
        'The women spoke.'

   d.   *expl*   Ho   parlato   io.   cf. Bolognese (1-2)
                 have.1S   spoken   I
        'I spoke.'

In this data, it is standardly held that *expl* and the postverbal subject share the normal properties of a preverbal subject (EPP, agreement, and Case-Licensing), via various mechanisms proposed over the years. Lasnik 1995, given his focus on the Case Licensing issues of postverbal subjects, called this situation "Case Transmission."

Bolognese also has this Case Transmission type Free-Inversion construction:

4) a.   *expl*   ai=ò   dscåurs   mé   (present tense: a=dscårr)
                 SCL.1S=have.1S   spoken   I
        'I spoke.'

   b.   *expl*   T=è   dscåurs   té   (present tense: t=dscårr)
                 SCL.2S=has.2S   spoken   you.S
        'You spoke.'

   c.   *expl*   Avän   dscåurs   nó.   (present tense: a=dscurän)
                 SCL.1P.have.1P   spoken   we
        'We spoke.'

   d.   *expl*   Avî   dscåurs   vó.   (present tense: a=dscurî)
                 SCL.2P.have.2P   spoken   you.P
        'You spoke.'

We need pick no particular analysis of Case Transmission, and assume only that some analysis applies. We focus instead on the differences observed in (1-2).

<u>Previous Work</u>

Brandi & Cordin 1989 note data in Fiorentino similar to (1) (though they do not discuss data like (2).)

5)   *expl*   Gli   ha   telefonato   delle ragazze.   (Fiorentino)
                      has   telephoned   some girls
        'Some girls have telephoned.'

- Brandi & Cordin 1989:121-3 describe this data as involving a verb in "an unmarked neutral form (third person masculine singular)" and a "neutral impersonal clitic ... strongly reminiscent of the French clitic **il**."
- They posit that *pro* occupies the subject position, and "the impersonal clitic of Fiorentino represents the spelling out of AGR features. ... the absence of a similar expletive agreement clitic in Trentino may simply be attributed to a gap in the morphological paradigm."
- They say "the preverbal subject is expletive *pro*, which, like other pleonastic elements, may be expected to bear neutral features (third person, masculine, singular); thus subject clitics and verbal agreement will also appear with neutral features in the inversion constructions."

In summary, Brandi & Cordin 1989 hold that the agreement in (5) is due to the *expl* in preverbal position, in modern terms, that Agree(T$_{u\phi}$, *expl*) holds. This idea remains standard. For example:

Belletti 2005:19 "Languages may vary as to the status of 'pro' in the nominative position of inversion structures. In some languages, or in some cases in in some languages [...], it could be an 'expletive'. [...] In those cases where 'pro' has an expletive status, and it is thus assimilated to French il type expletive, verbal agreement would not obtain with the postverbal subject. A possibility which is well known to occur in several languages/dialects."

Roberts 2010:113, discussing non agreement in Brandi & Cordin's 1989 data, "The obvious account of this is that SpecTP contains a deleted expletive pronoun, with which subject clitic and the verb agree."

But, then, there arise important questions previously raised in Lasnik 1995 about other data: If Agree(T$_{u\phi}$, *expl*) holds, then how is the postverbal subject Case Licensed? (Most researchers who address such data are focused on the agreement, but not on the licensing of the postverbal subject, so they do not discuss this question.) If Case Licensing is done in a normal way, i.e. via Agree(T$_{u\phi}$, postverbal subject), then why doesn't the postverbal subject value the feature of T (as 3PF, expressed on the V and by a SCL.3PF, which is available in Fiorentino)? This isn't straightforward Case Transmission with sharing of Case and agreement, so a simple statement that it is the expletive that determines agreement is not sufficient.

There are important and revealing empirical differences between Fiorentino and Bolognese, though we will show that a unified analysis is possible. Bolognese has a SCL.3SM in certain expletive constructions, though not in (1-2), where AI appears:

6) a. Al   naiva.   b. Naivel?   (Bolognese)
        SCL.3SM   snows   snows.SCL.3SM
        'It's snowing.'   'Is it snowing?'

7) a. I=é   bél ch'al=piôva a Bulåggna dåpp a tótt cal sacc.
        SCL.3SM=is   beautiful that SCL.3SM=rains in Bologna after to all that dry
        'It's great that it's raining in Bologna after all that dryness.'
    b. Ê=l   bél che ch'al=piôva a Bulåggna dåpp a tótt cal sacc?
        is=SCL.3SM   beautiful that SCL.3SM=rains in Bologna after to all that dry
        'Is it great that it's raining in Bologna after all that dryness?'
    c. Al=   pèr   che ...
        SCL.3SM=   seems   that
        'It seems that …'
    d. Pèr=el   che…
        seems=SCL.3SM   that
        'Does it seem that ... ?'

As seen, this SCL.3SM inverts in questions, though AI does not (8), which is evidence that AI is not a SCL (see Rubin 2019 for more evidence):

8)   Ai= vén   la Carólla e la Deléṅna?
        AI= come.3S   the Carólla and the Deléṅna
        'Are Carólla and Deléṅna coming?'

AI and the SCL.3SM are clearly different. If 3SM is default/neutral, and if the expletive in (1-2) and (6-7) are the same, why doesn't SCL.3SM appear in (1-2) and (8)? We propose below that that in addition to an expletive that is SCL.3SM, there is also an expletive that is simply SCL.3S (and participates in Cyclic/Multiple Agree).

Unlike the research above, Tortora 1999 discusses similar data in other varieties (9) and makes a proposal for the person restrictions.

9) a. Ngh è rivà-gghi   la Maria   (Borgomanerese)
        LOC is arrived-LOC the Maria   Tortora 1999
        'Maria arrived.'
    b. *Ngh è rivà-gghi   mé / njau
        LOC is arrived-LOC   I   we
    c. I   summa rivà   njau
        SCL be.1P arrived   we
        'We arrived.'

She also relies on the two expletives approach (*it* and *there*), but ties the person restriction to a mismatch in features on the (*it* type) expletive and the non-3 post-verbal subjects, which was inspirational for this current work. Unfortunately, her analysis relied on the checking of a feature without its deletion in such data, for which she herself "find[s] no convincing principled reason why this should be so." I am grateful for her inspiring work and for recent personal communications, but we cannot adopt this approach.

Cyclic/Multiple Agree

We propose that the person restrictions in (1-2) derive from the same notions underlying the Person Case Constraint effects seen in (10), namely from Cyclic/Multiple Agree mechanisms (Béjar & Rezac 2003, Béjar &

Rezac 2009, Nevins 2007, 2011). Either of these approaches is compatible with our proposals, though of course some aspects of the structures would be different under the two. A full discussion of the differences goes beyond the scope of this presentation, and would not impact the main claims being made here. Important shared notions include the relevance of c-command, the separate probing by individual phi-features (π and #), and the relevance of π to Case Licensing.

10) a.

		m=	(DCL.1S=) /		(Bolognese)
		s=	(DCL.1P=) /		
		t=	(DCL.2S=) /	al (OCL.3SM=) /	
		v=	(DCL.2P=) /	i (OCL.3P=) /	
	Pèvel al=	i=		la=	dà.
	Pevel SCL.3SM=	DCL.3=		OCL.3SF=	gives

‘Pevel is giving {it,them} to me/us/you/you/{him,her,them}.’

b.

			m=	(OCL.1S=) /	
*			s=	(OCL.1P=) /	
*			t=	(OCL.2S=) /	
*					
*Pèvel al=	i=		v=		dà.
Pevel SCL.3SM=	DCL.3=		OCL.2P		gives

‘Pevel is giving me/us/you/you to {him,her,them}.’

PCC effects hold in Bolognese as in many other Romance varieties, so the underlying mechanisms are operative. Although our data in (1-2) is not about clitics, and PCC normally is, the underlying mechanisms have a broader application. Cyclic/Multiple Agree is about Agree, which underlies agreement, obviously, clitics (Suñer 1988, Roberts 2010, etc), Case Licensing (Chomksy 2008, etc), and PCC. Perhaps the overlap in restrictions on clitics in (10) and postverbal subjects (2) is entirely co-incidental. This presentation is an argument that they are not.

<u>Analysis</u>

- Cyclic/Multiple Agree applies in (1-2) where the clitic AI appear.
- The *expl* in (1-2) is 3S and independent of the postverbal subject, which it c-ecommands. It is thus different from the expletives in Case Transmission, which shares the feature of its associate, and the expletive in (6-7) which is 3SM. (In these two types, Cyclic/Multiple Agree doesn't apply.)
- In accordance with Cyclic/Multiple Agree, a single probe, T, relates to two goals, the *expl* and the postverbal subject. It can license both (1), but not when the direct object isn't 3 (2).

In the following extremely simplified structures, we ignore issues concerning movement of the participle and the postverbal subject, as they are irrelevant to our arguments.

```
        expl
    Controls # on T
        EPP
              T
    π probes and licences expl and
  VS. No failure of Cyclic/Multiple Agree.
      # finds expl (more local).

    [TP expl.3S  T   [ (expl.3S)  ai=à      [ dscåurs äl dôn   ]]]
              ai=à
```

1) b.   *expl* Ai=à   dscåurs äl dôn.
                 AI=has.3S spoken   the women
      ‘The women spoke.’

expl
Controls # on T
　　EPP

　　　　　　　T
　　π probes, but fails　　　　　　non-3 VS fully values
　　Cyclic/Multiple Agree.　　　　　π, or or Contiguous
　　# finds expl (more local)　　　　Agree is broken

　　[TP *expl*.3S　　T　　[(*expl*.3S) ai=à　[dscåurs mé / té / nó / vó]]]
　　　　　　ai=à

2) a. * *expl* Ai=à　　dscåurs mé / té / nó / vó.
　　　　　AI=has.3S spoken I / you.S / we / you.P
　　'I / you / we / you spoke.'

Reminder: Case Transmission is also available in this grammar (4), with a different expletive that shares properties with its associate.

<u>Conclusions</u>

• Lack of agreement with VS is agreement with the expletive, but this is not stipulated and without concern for Case Licensing, which is another facet of Agree. It follows from the mechanisms of Cyclic/Multiple Agree.
• It arises in grammars where there is an *expl* that is entirely independent of the VS. In Bolognese, this is *expl*.3S while in Fiorentino it is *expl*.3SM.
• This *expl* determines number agreement on the tensed verb.
• The two nominals require Licensing, achieved by Cyclic/Multiple Agree with the single Probe, T.
• Grammars may include this construction alongside Case Transmission, whose *expl* and associate VS are essentially treated as the same syntactic entity.

<u>References</u>

Béjar & Rezac 2003. Person licencing and the derivation of PCC Effects. In Pérez-Leroux, A. & Y. Roberge (eds) Romance Linguistics: Theory and Acquistion (LSRL 32). Benjamins. 49-62.
Béjar & Rezac 2009. Cyclic agree. Linguistic Inquiry 40.1:35-73.
Belletti 1988. The Case of Unaccusatives. Linguistic Inquiry 19.1:1-34.
Belletti 2005. Extended doubling and the VP periphery. Probus 17:1-35.
Burzio 1986. Italian syntax: A government-binding approach. Reidel.
Cardinaletti 1997. Subjects and clause structure. In Haegeman (ed) The New Comparative Syntax. 33-63.
Cardinaletti 2004. Toward a cartography of subject positions. In Rizzi 2004, The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2. Oxford.
Chomsky 2008. On phases. In Foundational issues in linguistic theory: Essays in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud, ed. by Robert Freiden, Carlos Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 133–166. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Lasnik 1995. Case and Expletives Revisited: On Greed and Other Human Failings. Linguistic Inquiry 26.4:615-633.
Nevins 2011. Multiple agree with clitics: person complementarity vs. omnivorous number. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 29.4:939-971.
Rizzi 1982. Issues in Italian syntax. Foris.
Rizzi 1986. On the status of subject clitics in Romance. In Jaeggli & Silva-Coravalan (eds) Studies in Romance linguistics. 391-420.
Roberts 2010. Agreement and Head Movement: Clitics, Incorporation, and Defective Goals. MIT Press.
Rubin 2019. Free Inversion with Blocking of Agree by Low Foc[0]: Evidence from Bolognese. In M. Baird and J. Pesetsky (Eds.) North East Linguistic Society (NELS) 49, Volume 3:97-106. Amherst: GSLA.
Tortora 1999. Agreement, Case, and i-subjects. In Tamanji, P., M. Hirotani, N. Hall (eds) NELS 29. 397-408.