

1 Andrea Calabrese and Diego Pescarini*

2 **Clitic metathesis in the Friulian dialect**
 3
 4 **of Forni di Sotto**

5
 6 **Abstract:** In this article we entertain the hypothesis that cliticization involves
 7 a rule of m-merge, which brackets a functional head with another constituent
 8 under linear adjacency to build a structure legible at the PF interface.

9
 10 We therefore argue for a division of labour between syntax and morphology
 11 in the spirit of Halle and Marantz (1993), although we depart from their model in
 12 rejecting a single post-syntactic Morphological Component, and instead assume
 13 that syntactic derivation and morphological operations such as m-merge are
 14 cyclically interleaved.

15 In the first part of the article, we focus on the behaviour of clitics in contexts
 16 of V-to-C movement. As object clitics and negation are pied-piped by the verb to C,
 17 crossing the position of subject clitics, we argue that subject clitics are m-merged
 18 after V-to-C movement.

19 The second part of the article deals with some puzzling permutations affect-
 20 ing the order of clitic elements. In particular, we focus on the Friulian dialect of
 21 Forni di Sotto (Manzini & Savoia 2005, 2009) to show that such permutations are
 22 due to morphological rules of fission and metathesis operating after m-merge. We
 23 therefore claim that the Forni pattern provides further evidence for syntactically
 24 void operations taking place at the Syntax/PF interface.

Please
supply
data

25 **Keywords:** ■ ■ 

26
 27 DOI 10.1515/probus-2014-0010

28
 29
 30
 31 **1 Introduction**

32
 33 When dealing with clitic placement, it is worth distinguishing two independ-
 34 ent, though related, concepts: clause-placement, i.e. the position of clitics in the
 35 structure of the clause, vs fine-placement, i.e. the position of clitics w.r.t. other
 36

37
 38 ***Corresponding author: Diego Pescarini:** University of Padua, Italy.

39 E-mail: diego.pescarini@gmail.com

40 **Andrea Calabrese:** University of Connecticut, USA. E-mail: 

Please
supply
data

clitic elements, including negation¹. Clause-placement is beyond the scope of this article, which entertains the hypothesis that fine-placement might be affected by non-syntactic operations. Our claim is that ‘cliticization’ is not a primitive of UG, but it encompasses two different kinds of procedures: *syntactic* movement, an instance of language-specific internal merge determining the position of the clitic in the structure of the clause, and *morphological merge(r)* (Marantz (1988), from now on, m-merge), bracketing a functional head with a nearby host in order to form a structure legible at the PF interface.

The first part of the article (sections 2–4) accounts for the position of subject and object clitics. In Northern Italian dialects, as in French, object clitics (OCl) are pied-piped by the inflected verb when the latter moves to C, as in interrogative and exclamative clauses, crossing the position of subject clitics (SCl):

- (1) a. **Ai** la mange (Forni di Sotto)
 they= it.F= eat.3PL
 ‘They eat it’
 b. La mangi **ai**?
 it.F= eat.3PL =they
 ‘Do they eat it’

Our explanation for (1) involves an interleaving of syntactic movement and m-merge and the assumption that subject and object clitics are m-merged at distinct stages: 1. Object clitics are moved from their thematic position in the VP area to their landing site in the TP area – we are not concerned with this movement in this paper. 2. The object clitic is m-merged with the inflected verb ~~forming a constituent with it~~. 3. The inflected verb is moved to C bringing with it the object clitic since they belong to the same constituent. 4. Only at this point is the subject clitic m-merged, thus generating the order in (1b). We therefore argue for a division of labour between syntax and morphology in the spirit of Halle & Marantz’s (1993) Distributed Morphology model, although we depart from their model in rejecting a single post-syntactic Morphological Component, and instead assume that syntactic derivation and morphological operations are cyclically *interleaved*.

The second part of the article (sections 5–6) deals with systematic though unexpected permutations affecting the order of clitic elements, including nega-

¹ For their helpful comments, we would like to thank Paola Benincà, Laura Vanelli, Andrew Nevins and Jonathan Bobaljik. The usual disclaimer applies.

Although the article is the result of close collaboration between the authors, Diego Pescarini carried the main responsibility for §§ 1–4, Andrea Calabrese for §§ 5–8.

1 tion. We focus on the Friulian dialect of Forni di Sotto (Manzini & Savoia (2005,
2 2009)) and, in particular, on the morphosyntax of 3p subject clitics. In Forni,
3 subject clitics (e.g. *al* ‘he’) are split by negation as the formative *l* appears after
4 the negative marker (*no*), as in (2b). Furthermore, with 1/2p object clitics (and
5 the 3p reflexive *se*), the formative *-l* may either precede or follow the object clitic,
6 as illustrated in (3a) and (3b), or, alternatively, occur in both positions, as
7 in (3c).

8

9 (2) a. *al* *duar*10 *he= sleep*

11 ‘he sleeps’

12 b. *a no l duar*13 *he= not= he= sleep*

14 ‘he does not sleep’

15

16 (3) a. *al mi dà chist*17 *he= me= give this*18 b. *a mi l dà chist*19 *he= me= he= give this*20 c. *al mi l dà chist*21 *he= me= he= give this*

22 ‘He gives this to me’

23

24 Things become more complicated when negation and an object clitic co-occur as
25 shown in the following examples, illustrating the attested combinations:

26

27 (4) a. *a no-l mi dà chist*28 b. *a no mi-l dà chist*29 c. *ʔa-l no mi-l dà chist*30 d. **a-l no-l mi-l dà chist*31 e. *a no-l mi-l dà chist*32 *he= not= me= give this*

33 ‘He gives this to me’

34

35 We account for the split of 3p clitics in terms of fission (Noyer (1997); Calabrese
36 (2002); Arregi & Nevins (2012)) and argue, following Harris & Halle (2005), that
37 the permutations in (3) and (4) are due to a rule of *metatheses* triggered by
38 edge constraints operating after m-merge. We therefore claim that the above pat-
39 tern is evidence for syntactically void operations taking place at the Syntax/PF
40 interface.


2 On cliticization

Syntactically, clitics are ‘free’ functional items like their strong XPs counterparts. Given their head status, however, clitics are bound to a *host* by means of an operation of *m-merge* (Marantz (1988)), which brackets a functional head with another constituent under linear adjacency to build a structure legible at the PF interface.

(5) $[\alpha \dots [\dots [\beta \dots]]] \rightarrow [\alpha \beta] \quad \text{m-merge}$

Before addressing m-merge, some basic assumptions concerning clitic placement are in order. For the sake of clarity, we will keep our syntactic representations to a minimum, but we do not exclude alternative models like ~~the one in~~ Tortora (2002; 2013).

First, we assume a *big-DP* analysis of clitics (Torrego (1992), Uriagereka (1995), Cecchetto (2000), Belletti (2005), Franks and Rudin (2005), van Craenenbroeck and van Koppen (2008), Arregi and Nevins (2012)). According to this hypothesis, clitics are pronominal elements generated in the head position of certain functional layers which dominate a null argument. In Uriagereka’s (1995) analysis, certain languages allow the clitic to co-occur with a doubled DP, which is generated in the specifier of the big DP; we adopt the same model to account for the co-occurrence of DP subjects and subject clitics in northern Italian dialects:




After extraction from the big DP (which, as argued below, is not a necessary step in the derivation of subject clitics), clitic elements have three potential landing sites in the structure of the clause, which Benincà & Tortora term the V-domain (in the low IP layer), the I-domain (in the T region) and the C-domain (above TP), see Benincà (2006); Tortora (2002); Benincà and Tortora (2009, 2010). In what follows we will focus on the I-domain (and, partly on the C-domain), which is the landing site of proclitic elements in finite clauses. For the sake of

1 simplicity, we assume that, in the I-domain, both object clitics and negation ad-
 2 join to finite T° (for the analysis of negation as a clitic, see Belletti (1992) a.o.):

3

4 (7)



10

11 As mentioned above, this movement (from the big-DP to T°) is followed by a mor-
 12 phological operation which m-merges the clitic to its host, as shown in (8). By
 13 contrast, enclisis with finite verbs results if the verb is moved further *before*
 14 m-merge², as shown in (9):

15

16

17

(8) Cl ... [T° V] → [Cl V] (proclitic)

18

19

(9) [C° V] ... Cl → [V Cl] (enclitic)

20

21

22

23


24

25

We can now turn to subject clitics. In line with the big DP-hypothesis, we will
 assume that subject clitics are not realization of dedicated AGRs positions (Rizzi
 (1986)), but instead generated and moved within the big-DP to the subject posi-
 tion, say spec,TP (for the sake of clarity, in the following graph we do not repre-
 sent the internal structure of the big-DP, which has been given in (6)). The result-
 ing configuration is as follows:

26

27 (10)



36

37

38

39

40

² The possibility of having the verb moving demonstrates the necessity of distinguishing
 between movement to T°, which accounts for the positioning of the clitic in the clause, and
 m-merger, which accounts for why the clitic forms a constituent with the preceding verb.

According to this analysis, subject clitics, unlike object ones, end up being adjacent to the inflected verb and, since adjunction to T^0 would be vacuous, we assume that it is not needed. Consequently, only m-merge with T^0 applies in the case of subject clitics. It is worth recalling that m-merge ensures that every clitic has a host, even if they are not structurally adjoined to it. Thus, the subject clitic m-merges with the inflected verb even if the former occupies a dedicated position within the big-DP placed in spec,TP.

The hypothesis of the division of labour between movement and m-merge can shed light on the placement of subject and object clitics in sentences with verb-subject inversion. Inversion is normally viewed as evidence for V-to-C movement, i.e. the inflected verb with the object clitics moves to the CP area crossing the subject clitic, as shown in (11b):

- (11) a. **Ai** la mange (Forni di Sotto)
 they= it.F= eat.3PL
 ‘They eat it’
 b. La mangi **ai**?
 it.F= eat.3PL =they
 ‘Do they eat it’

Kayne (1994), within a strictly antisymmetric framework, argues that, in presence of an object clitic, V-to-C movement does not take place. However, under this analysis, the enclitic placement of the subject clitic remains unaccounted. Alternatively, we argue that the verb and the object clitic is m-merged with the verb before the latter moves to C, while the subject clitic is m-merged later (see below). The derivation is as follows: (12a) is the canonical structure of declarative clauses where the object clitic has been already m-merged with the verb; in (12b), the verb moves to C^0 crossing the subject clitic; then, the subject clitic is m-merged with the raised-to-C verb. We assume that m-merge takes place before Vocabulary Insertion, in (12d). More on this in the next section.

- (12) a. $[_{C^0} \dots [_{TP} [_{\text{bigDP}} \text{SCI}_{3rdPL}] [_{T^0} \text{la mange}]]$
 b. $[_{C^0} [_{T^0} \text{la mange}]] [_{TP} [_{\text{bigDP}} \text{SCI}_{3rdPL}] t_{T^0}]$ movement
 c. $[_{C^0} [_{T^0} \text{la mange}]] \text{SCI}_{3rdPL}] t_{T^0}$ M-merger of SCI
 d. $[_{C^0} [_{T^0} \text{la mange}]] \text{ai}] t_{T^0}$ Vocabulary insertion

A similar explanation has been proposed by Radkevic (2010) to account for extraordinary left-branch extraction (Boškovic (2005)) in Slavic. Slavic languages allow left-branch extraction out of NPs (a property of NP-languages according to Boškovic (2008)):

- 1 (13) a. Ivan kupil [_{NP} novyj dom]. (Russian)
 2 Ivan bought new house
 3 b. Dom Ivan kupil [_{NP} novyj t].
 4 house Ivan bought new
 5 c. Novyj Ivan kupil [_{NP} t dom]
 6 new Ivan bought house

7
 8 Another property of article-less Slavic languages is that they allow extraction out
 9 of PPs of what appear to be non-constituents, e.g. P+A or P+N:
 10

- 11 (14) a. Ivan sidel [_{pp} v bol'šoj komnate].
 12 Ivan sat in big room
 13 b. V bol'šoj Ivan sidel [_{pp} t komnate].
 14 In big Ivan sat room
 15 c. V komnate Ivan sidel [_{pp} bol'šoj t].
 16 In room Ivan sat big
 17 d. *Komnate Ivan sidel [_{pp} v bol'šoj t].
 18 Room Ivan sat in big
 19

20 Radkevic shows that this is possible only with simple clitic prepositions. By con-
 21 trast, the movement of P and adjective is ~~not fully acceptable~~/degraded with com-
 22 plex prepositions – prepositions which have two parts, e.g. *iz-pod* ‘from-under’
 23 and *iz-za* ‘from behind’ – and non-clitic preposition such as *cerez* ‘over, through’,
 24 which can form a prosodic word on its own.
 25

- 26
 27 (15) a. Ivan vylez iz-pod novoj mašyny.
 28 Ivan got.out from-under new car
 29 ‘Ivan got out from under a new car.’
 30 b. ??Iz-pod novoj Ivan vylez [_{pp} t mašyny].
 31 From-under new Ivan got.out car
 32 c. ???Iz-pod mašyny Ivan vylez [_{pp} novoj t].
 33 From-under car Ivan got.out new
 34
 35 (16) a. Ivan perelez [_{pp} cerez vysokij zabor].
 36 Ivan climbed.over over tall fence
 37 b. ??Cerez vysokij Ivan perelez [_{pp} t zabor].
 38 Over tall Ivan climbed.over fence
 39 c. ???Cerez zabor Ivan perelez [_{pp} vysokij t].
 40 Over fence Ivan climbed.over tall

According to Radkevic (2010), a clitic preposition forms a unit with the element ~~that follows it~~ and thus can undergo ordinary left-branch extraction out of NP with it (The cases where P+N undergo movement leaving an adjective behind are analyzed by proposing that Russian adjectives can be either pre-nominal or post-nominal). In our terms, the operation creating this unit is m-merger. Note that m-merger must have applied before left-branch extraction takes place.

- (17) a. ... [_{pp} P [A [NP]]] 8
 b. ... [_{pp} [_A P A] N] m-merge 9
 c. [_A P A] ... [_{pp} t N] extraction 10

To summarize, in this section we have argued that cliticization involves head movement and m-merge, bracketing a functional head – called clitic – with a host (which may in turn include another clitic). Our claim is that morphological operations and syntactic computations are interleaved. Specifically, in our case, clitics may be morphologically merged onto their host before syntactic movement. If so, the clitic is pied-piped to a higher position by its host. The general idea behind this assumption is the following: Universal Narrow Syntax generates hierarchical syntactic structures (universal “conceptual structures”) through external merge, while Morphology (including m-merger, Vocabulary Insertion, and other morphological operations, see below) and language specific syntactic operations (internal merge, object clitic movement and V-to-C movement in our analysis) then apply cyclically from bottom up (see Bobaljik (2003, 2012) for bottom up cyclic Vocabulary Insertion). It follows that, as mentioned above, morphological operations and syntactic ones are interleaved.

3 Subject clitics: evidence from vocabulary Insertion

Let us reconsider the pattern of V-S inversion in northern Italo-Romance. As observed in the previous section, object clitics are pied-piped above the subject clitic (we repeat the relevant minimal pair below):

- (18) a. **Ai** la mange (Forni di Sotto) 35
 they= it.F= eat.3PL 36
 ‘They eat it’ 37
 b. La mangi **ai?** 38
 it.F= eat.3PL =they 39
 ‘Do they eat it’ 40

1 We argued that this follows from the operation of m-merge, which binds the
 2 object clitic with the verb before V-to-C movement, while subject pronouns are
 3 m-merged later. This claim is supported by morphological evidence. We know
 4 that subject clitics are expressed by different exponents, depending on the posi-
 5 tion of the inflected verb, specifically on whether the subject clitic is proclitic or
 6 enclitic. There is no way to derive the different allomorphs of the 1sg and pl sub-
 7 ject clitics in (19) by means of phonological processes (*pace* Cardinaletti and
 8 Repetti 2008). In this case, we are dealing with a true case of suppletion that can
 9 be accounted for only by means of different Vocabulary Items (see Bobaljik 2012,
 10 Embick 2010). If the morphology of the subject clitic is sensitive to the position
 11 of the inflected verb, it means – under current assumptions on the status of allo-
 12 morphic alternations – that subject clitics are inserted *after* the verb has reached
 13 its target position and the subject clitic ~~underwent~~ m-merge.

14

15 (19) <u>declarative:</u>	<u>interrogative:</u>		
16 i duarmi	duarm=jo?	‘sleep.1SG’	(Forni di Sotto)
17 i tu duars	duar[mi]s=tu?	‘sleep.2SG’	
18 a l/a duar	duarm=al/e?	‘sleep.3SGM/F’	
19 i durmiN	durmin=os?	‘sleep.1PL’	
20 i durmis	durmis?	‘sleep.2PL’	
21 ai/a s duar	duarm=ai/es?	‘sleep.3PLM/F’	

22

23 This amounts to say that the subject clitic is inserted only once the object clitic
 24 has ~~been~~ already been m-merged and moved with the verb, as proposed in the
 25 preceding section. Below we display two derivations including cyclic vocabulary
 26 insertion: (20), unlike (21), has subject-verb inversion (the resulting sentences are
 27 *la mange-jo?* ‘Will I ate it?’ vs. *i la mange* ‘I will eat it’)

28

29 (20) a. ...	[_{TP} [_{bigDP} SCL]	[_T [<i>la mange</i>]]	m-merge of OCl and V.I.
30 b. [<i>la mange</i>]	[_{TP} [_{bigDP} SCL]	[_T t _v]	verb movement
31 c. [<i>la mange</i>	SCL]	[_T t _v]	m-merge of SCl
32 d. [<i>la mange</i>	<i>jo</i>]	[_T t _v]	V.I. for SCl

33

34 (21) a. ...	[_{TP} [_{bigDP} SCL]	[_T [<i>la mange</i>]]	m-merge of OCl and V.I.
35 b. ...	[SCL	<i>la mange</i>]	m-merge of SCl
36 c. ...	[<i>i</i>	<i>la mange</i>]	V.I. for SCl

37

38 To summarize, our theory of linearization is based on two assumptions:
 39 i. clitic material undergo m-merge with its host under linear adjacency
 40 (where linear adjacency can be obtained by clitic movement (cf. object clitics);

ii. syntactic computation is interleaved with cycles of morphological operations like m-merger and vocabulary insertion.

4 Negation

Given the above analysis, let us turn to negative sentences. In many dialects, preverbal negation behaves like an object clitic element: it is a clitic (NegCl) left-adjoined to T° and pied-piped to C°, crossing the position of subject clitics:

- (22) a. **Ai** **no** ven (Forni di Sotto)
they= not= come.3SG
‘They will not come’
b. **No** vegn **ai?**
not= come.3SG =they
‘Will not they come?’

As in the case of object clitics, the explanation resides in the order of m-merging and movement: when negation is m-merged, the subject clitic is not yet m-merged, as illustrated below.

- (23) a. [_{C°} ... [_{TP} SCl [_{T°} [NegCl V]]]
b. [_{C°} [NegCl V]] [_{TP} SCl [_{T°} t]]

As proposed in the preceding sections, the subject clitic is m-merged later, generating the orders in (24), depending of whether or not the verb moves to a higher position:

- (24) a. [SCl [NegCl OCl V]] declarative clauses, without inversion
b. [[NegCl OCl V] SCl] interrogative clauses, with inversion

The analysis is straightforward for languages like French, Ligurian and Tuscan dialects, where the order in declarative clauses corresponds to (24a), i.e. SCl > NegCl. However, the above explanation is far from straightforward in the case of Venetan and Friulian dialects, which display the opposite order, i.e. NegCl > SCl (leave the SCl *i* in (26b) aside for a moment):

- (25) a. **No** **te** dormi (Vicenza, Veneto)
not= you= sleep.2SG
‘You do not sleep’

1 b. **No** dormi **to** (mia)?
 2 not= sleep =you (not)
 3 'Don't you sleep?'

4 (26) a. i **no** **tu** du'ars (Forni di Sotto, Friuli)

5 you= not= you= sleep.2SG
 6 'You do not sleep'

7 b. **no** duarmis **tu**?
 8 Not= sleep =you
 9 'Don't you sleep?'

11 Given the order NegCl > SCl in declaratives, how can NegCl m-merge with the verb
 12 if the SCl intervenes between NegCl and T⁰? Our solution to the puzzle is to hy-
 13 pothesize that Venetan and Friulian dialects have the same syntactic structure
 14 of the others and that the order NegCl > SCl is due to an operation of *metathesis*,
 15 which, in certain dialects, reverses the order of subject clitics and negation after
 16 the subject clitics has been m-merged. We are therefore proposing the following
 17 extrinsic ordering of morphological operations:
 18

- 19 (27) a. m-merge of T⁰ clitics, i.e. OCl and NegCl
 20 b. m-merge of SCl
 21 c. metathesis of SCl and NegCl (subject to linguistic variation)
 22

23 We hypothesize that metathesis occurs due to a constraint holding in some dia-
 24 lects, requiring to have the pronominal clitics linearly adjacent to the verb or to
 25 other pronominal clitics.

26 The following section aims at clarifying the process of metathesis introduced
 27 above, while the analysis of the ordering of subject, object and negative clitics
 28 will be resumed in section 5.
 29
 30
 31

32 5 An aside on Morphological Metathesis

33
 34 In Distributed Morphology, morphological operations can modify the structure
 35 and composition of the exponence required by the syntactic structures without
 36 affecting the meaning derived from these structures and their feature composi-
 37 tion. This accounts for the mismatches between syntactic and morphological
 38 structures like the one illustrated in the following examples: Latin, for instance,
 39 exhibits two coordinators: *et* and *que*, the latter is enclitic to the leftmost word of
 40 second conjunct:

- (28) a. [boni pueri] et [pulchrae puellae] 1
 good boys and beautiful girls 2
 b. [boni pueri] [pulchrae =que puellae] 3
 good boys beautiful =and girls 4
 5

As noticed by Marantz (1989); Embick and Noyer (2001), the order in (28) does not result from any syntactic analysis of coordination. Furthermore, the distribution of *que* is sensitive to the morpho-phonological status of the following constituent. In fact, *=que* cannot attach onto monosyllabic prepositions (which, arguably, are clitic), while enclisis is allowed after the prepositions that constitute a prosodic word, e.g. *circum* ‘around’ (this resembles the behaviour of Slavic prepositions w.r.t. left-branch extraction, see section 2):

- (29) a. in (*=que) rēbus =que 14
 in (=and) things =and 15
 ‘and in things’ 16
 b. circum =que ea loca 17
 around =and those places 18
 ‘and around those places’ 19
 20

The data in (28) and (29) can be captured by a morphological operation of *metathesis*, which reverses the order of two clitic exponents:

- (30) Syntax: Morphology: 24
 & [X Y Z] → [X=& Y Z] 25
 26

Halle and Harris (2005) notice that there is a tight correlation between *permutation* like (30) and *reduplication*, i.e. given the expected order AB, if a language exhibits the unexpected order BA it is likely that the same language or a related dialect will display the pattern ABA(B). To account for this correlation, they argue for a unified framework based on a reduplication algorithm (Raimy (2000), Halle (2008), Frampton (2009)). In the proposed formalism, reduplication entails a bracketing procedure, which selects the elements to be reduplicated: for instance, the double square brackets [[]] in (31) delimit the linear sequence to be doubled.

- (31) Full Reduplication 37
 ABCDE → 38
 A[[BCD]] → 39
 A-BCD-BCD-E 40

1 Partial reduplication is obtained by inserting a diacritic: an angled bracket, as
 2 shown below, which triggers the deletion of part of the reduplicated material.

3

4 (32) $[[A\langle B]] \rightarrow ABA\langle B \rightarrow ABA$

5

6 Metatheses are obtained via the insertion of a doubled angle bracket, triggering
 7 the deletion of both the final and the initial part of the resulting chunk:

8

9 (33) $[[A\langle\langle B]] \rightarrow A\langle BA\langle A \rightarrow BA$

10

11 Arregi and Nevins (2013) adopt this mechanism to account for the mor-
 12 phology of Basque clitics. They notice that plural absolutive clitics are split, i.e.
 13 the Person exponent precedes T°, while the Number exponent follows it:

14

15 (34) Nik seuek ikus-i s- -aitu- -e- -t
 16 I.ERG you.PL.ABS see.PRF 2.ABS PRS.2.PL PL.ABS 1.SG.ERG
 17 ‘I have seen you(pl)’

18

19 They capture the above displacement via a metathesis operation like the
 20 following:

21

22 (35) a. $Cl_{Abs} Cl_{Pl} T$ expected order
 23 b. $Cl_{Abs} [[Cl_{Pl} \rangle T]]$ bracketing
 24 c. $Cl_{Abs} Cl_{Pl} \rangle T Cl_{Pl} \langle T$ reduplication
 25 d. $Cl_{Abs} \langle Cl_{Pl} \rangle T Cl_{Pl} \langle T$ deletion
 26 e. $Cl_{Abs} T Cl_{Pl}$ output

27

28 Furthermore, in several Biscayan dialects, the plural clitic surfaces further to the
 29 right than expected (what Arregi and Nevins term ‘Long-Distance Plural Metathe-
 30 sis’), as illustrated below with data from the dialect spoken in Ibarrangelu:

31

32 (36) s- -aitu- -t- -e (Ibarrangelu)
 33 2.ABS PRS.2.PL 1.SG.ERG PL.ABS

34

35 The order in (36) differs from that in (34) in exhibiting a further metathesis oper-
 36 ation, which is schematized in (37):

36

37 (37) $Cl_{Abs} T Cl_{Pl} Cl_{Erg} CAgr$
 38 $Cl_{Abs} T [[Cl_{Pl} \rangle \langle Cl_{Erg} CAgr]]$
 39 $Cl_{Abs} T \langle Cl_{Pl} \rangle Cl_{Erg} CAgr Cl_{Pl} \langle Cl_{Erg} CAgr$
 40 $Cl_{Abs} T Cl_{Erg} CAgr Cl_{Pl}$

The reduplication analysis in (37) is consistent with the data from another dialect, Kortezubi, in which the plural exponent *-e-* is doubled: one instance occurs immediately after T^0 , as in standard Basque, and the other is in cluster-final position, as in Ibarangelu:

(38) *s-* *-aitu-* *-e-* *-t-* *-e-* (Kortezubi)
2.ABS PRS.2.PL **PL.ABS** 1.SG.ERG **PL.ABS**

(39) $Cl\ X\ Cl_{pl}\ Y\ CAgr \rightarrow$
 $Cl\ X\ [[\ ClPl\ <Y\ CAgr\]]\rightarrow$
 $Cl\ X - ClPl\ Y\ CAgr - ClPl\ YCAgr \rightarrow$
 $Cl\ X\ ClPl\ Y\ CAgr\ ClPl$

As observed by Halle & Harris 2005, metatheses and (partial) reduplication are two faces of the same coin.

In this paper, we will adopt a simplified version of the just-discussed algorithm which involves simply copying a given element α , positioning the copy after/before an adjacent Y and deleting the original α .

(40) $X\ \alpha\ Y\ W$
 a. Generate a copy of α : $X\ \alpha\ \alpha_1\ Y\ W$
 b. Move the copy of α after Y: $X\ \alpha\ Y\ \alpha_1\ W$
 c. Delete original α : $X\ Y\ \alpha_1\ W$

In this way, morphological material is permuted as follows. Cases of copying involve non-application of the deletion operation in (41c):

(41) a. Morpheme₁ Morpheme₂ (expected order) 28
 b. Morpheme₁ Morpheme₂ Morpheme₁ (copying) 29
 c. Morpheme₂ Morpheme₁ (metathesis) 30

The permutations can be conceived as repair operations triggered by constraints on the linear positioning of certain given morphological elements. For example, as discussed below, one can hypothesize that some languages require subject agreement markers to appear at the end of the verbal complex. When there is an enclitic, this requirement would be violated and the permutation between a subject agreement ending and an enclitic pronoun would fix the problem. In other cases, permutations may be required to achieve adjacency between certain morphological elements; for example, pronominal clitics may want to be clustered together in some languages.

1 As a first example for the permutation procedures consider the pattern of me-
 2 soclisis displayed by several varieties of South-American Spanish. Harris & Halle
 3 (2005) report that, while standard Spanish displays the usual enclitic pattern in
 4 (42a)), these dialects allow the clitic to be placed between the verbal root and the
 5 suffix *-n*, as in (42b)):

- 6
 7 (42) a. Venda-**n** lo! (Standard Spanish)
 8 sell-3pl =it
 9 '(you pl.) Sell it!'
 10 b. Venda lo-**n**! (Spanish dialects)
 11 sell =it-3pl
 12 '(you pl.) Sell it!'

13

14 Furthermore, in some cases, the suffix *-n* is reduplicated as it can occur twice,
 15 before and after the enclitic pronoun:

16

- 17 (43) Venda-**n** lo-**n**! (Spanish dialects)
 18 Sell-3pl =it-3pl
 19 '(you pl.) Sell it!'

20

21 In the simplified model just outlined, the permutations between the enclitic and
 22 the ending */-n/* we see in (42) and (43) can be accounted for by the following rule:

23

- 24 (44) Given the following linear sequence: [_V V [_{phi} -part, +plur] CL];
 25 a. Copy [_{phi} -part, +plur].
 26 b. Move the copy after CL.
 27 c. Delete the base (Optional).

28

29 Following (44), we have the permutation in (45):

30

- 31 (45) [V [_{phi} -part, +plur] CL]
 32 a. [V [_{phi} -part, +plur] [_{phi} -part, +plur] CL]
 33 b. [V [_{phi} -part, +plur] CL [_{phi} -part, +plur]]
 34 c. [V CL [_{phi} -part, +plur]]

35

36 As deletion in (46c) is optional, the resulting sequences are either *venda-lo-nor*
 37 *orvenda-n-lo-n*.

38 A similar analysis can be proposed for the Grison dialect of Soazza (Salvioni
 39 (1902); Loporcaro and Vigolo (2003); Manzini and Savoia (2004)). In this dia-
 40 lect, there is a special exponent for the feminine plural marker */-n/* *[-əŋ]* in the

example is due to an independent phonological rule, vs. masculine plural /-i/), as shown in the following nouns.

(46) el mɛ fradel / i mɛ frade-i
the my brother the my brothers

(47) l-a ʃkabel-a / l-a ʃkabel-əŋ
the-F chair-f. the-F chair-FPL

In two Raetho-Romance dialects (Soazza and Soglio), the same exponent unexpectedly appears also in verbal morphology. Consider the sentence in (48) with a 3rd person masculine plural subject clitic.

(48) i be:f
they.m= drink
'They drink'

Given the morpho-syntactic pattern observed in this sentence, we should expect that its feminine counterpart have the shape in (49) with the Phi-ending adjacent to the clitic. However, this is incorrect. It, instead, has the shape in (50):

(49) La(*-ŋ) be:f
she-PL drink
'They.F drink'

(50) la bev-əŋ
she drink-PL
'They.F drink'

In (50), the ending is moved after the verb (although the diachronic analysis may go in the opposite way as /-n/ could be a reflex of the 3pl verbal ending /-nt/, cf. Salvioni (1902)). Evidence for this movement is also provided by the example in (51b) where the feminine plural ending of the object clitic is moved after the verb, regardless of the Person features expressed by the verbal ending:

(51) a. i tʃam-i
them.M= call-1SG
'I call them'
b. la tʃam-i-ŋ
her= call-1SG-FPL
'I call them'

1 Another clear case displaying this movement is given in (52) where the gender-
 2 number can either be moved from the subject clitic *or/and* the object, thus caus-
 3 ing ambiguity:³

4

5 (52) *la la tʃam-əŋ*

6 *she= her= call-FPL*

7 ‘She calls them/They call her/They call them’

8

9 The rule in (53) can account for the movement of this morpheme:

10

11 (53) Given the following linear sequence: [_x [_{phi} +fem, +plur] X] (X = N/V);

12 a. Copy [_{phi} +fem, +plur].

13 b. Move the copy to the right margin of the constituent].

14 c. Delete the original [_{phi} +fem, +plur].

15

16 Another final example of metathesis involves negation in Ligurian dialects.
 17 The preverbal negative marker *n* in these varieties is often reduplicated after cer-
 18 tain object clitics (Parry (1997), Manzini & Savoia (2005, III: 295)):

19

20 (54) *I n te (n) dan nent u libr*

21 *They= not= you= not= give not the= book*

22 ‘They do not give you the book’

23

24 In these varieties, the negation marker is the postverbal one (*nent*), while prever-
 25 bal *n* must be considered a clitic expressing negative spreading/concord (Zanut-
 26 tini (1997)). The rule in (55) can account for these cases. Note that in this rule the
 27 original negative clitic is not deleted and therefore systematic doubling of the
 28 morpheme occurs.

29

30 (55) Given the following linear sequence:

31 [_v Neg CL V];

32 a. Copy Neg.

33 b. Move the copy after CL.

34

35 Before ending this section, observe that above we have assumed that the
 36 metathesis rules apply before Vocabulary Insertion. In fact, in many cases,

37

38

39 **3** If /-n/ is moved from the subject and the object, we should get something like *la la tʃam-əŋ-əŋ*.

40 We assume that one of the morpheme /-n/ is deleted by haplology so that we get surface (52).

metathesis is allowed only with certain clitics and more rarely with others. Another possibility, however, is to apply the rules after vocabulary insertion. In this case the metathesis rules may be sensitive to the phonological shape of the targeted exponents. This may account for an apparent property of some of these rules: on the surface, the metathesized morpheme behaves as a syllabic coda in the morpho-phonological sequence as it is a low sonority segment (a sonorant, a sibilant or a glide) and appears at the right-edge of a morpho-phonological constituent (either the clitic cluster or the V-complex). Some of these morphological permutations could then be motivated by surface PF ‘edge-effect’, i.e. the need for certain “coda”-exponents to occur on the right-edge of a morpho-phonological constituent despite their original syntactic position. Further research will indicate whether or not this is a correct observation.

6 Diachronic analysis

This section resumes the analysis of the order of negation and subject clitics with the intent of providing diachronic evidence supporting the hypothesis of a syntactically-inert metathesis. First, we show that the order negation > SCl is an innovation displayed by a subset of north-eastern dialects. Second, we address dialects showing a mixed pattern with some clitics preceding and other following negation and explain why metathesis does not target certain clitic elements and why these elements may display peculiar syntactic behaviours.

In section 3, we observed that both the orders SCl > NegCl and NegCl > SCl are attested. To account for the order of subject clitic and negation, Poletto (2000); Benincà and Tortora (2009, 2010) a.o. propose that subject clitics have multiple placement domains: at least, one above negation, in the CP layer, and the other below negation, in the high IP area. The placement ultimately depends on the type of clitic (e.g. its φ -features) and is subject to cross-linguistic variation.

In rare cases, subject clitics can move from one layer to another. In the dialect of Loreo, for instance, the subject clitic *i* ‘they.m’ usually follows negation. However, in subordinate clauses, it can optionally precede negation and cluster with C, as shown in (57b):

- (56) a. N'I vien mina (Loreo, from Poletto 2000)
 Neg SCl come not
 ‘They are not coming’
 b. *I ne vien mina
 Scl neg come not
 ‘They are not coming’

- 1 (57) a. I m'ha dito **che n'i** vien mina
 2 Scl to.me have told that not SCl come not
 3 'They told me that they are not coming'
 4 b. I m'ha dito **ch'i ne** vien mina
 5 Scl to.me have told that SCl not come not
 6 'They told me that they are not coming'

7
 8 Poletto (2000) argues for an analysis in which subject clitics are base-generated
 9 either above or below negation. Cases like (57b) are therefore analysed as cases
 10 in which the subject clitic moves to the C layer from a position below negation.
 11 Poletto (2000) argues that in (57b) "the presence of a C° head realized by the com-
 12 plementizer permits raising of the SCl to a prenegative position".

13 Given the analysis we proposed in section 4, we argue that there is no raising
 14 of the SCl, but metathesis of the subject clitic and negation. When the metathesis
 15 rule applies, the sequence of clitic elements in (58a) is therefore turned into (58b).
 16

- 17 (58) a. C SCl NegCl V → b. C SCl NegCl SCl V
 18

19 According to this analysis, in (57b) metathesis is exceptionally blocked in sub-
 20 ordinate clauses, where the clitic can m-merge with an overt complementizer
 21 (more on this below).

22 We prefer our analysis – subject clitic are generated inside the regular subject
 23 position and then m-merged from there to a position after negation – to Poletto's
 24 one, which generates the subject clitics below negation, because the former is
 25 consistent with the historical evolution of these varieties.

26 Subject clitics derive from strong nominative pronouns, which, in declarative
 27 clauses, occupy the canonical subject position above negation. We can therefore
 28 argue that subject clitics were originally hosted by the same position and, later
 29 and in some dialects, they have been ~~displaced elsewhere~~. In fact, the order
 30 negation > subject clitic is an innovation displayed by certain north-eastern dia-
 31 lects of Italy (i.e. Veneto and Friulian dialects) since the 16th century (Vanelli
 32 1987/1998). By contrast, other northern dialects (like Ligurian and Tuscan vernac-
 33 ulars⁴) still exhibit the original order. Given this evolution, it is hard to image
 34 the base-generation site of subject clitics is below negation and from that position
 35 clitics are raised upwards. Rather, it seems to us that the diachronic facts sup-
 36 port the hypothesis of a syntactically void operation which, in certain dialects,
 37

38 _____
 39 ⁴ In the dialects of Lombardy, Piedmont and Emilia the order cannot be established as these
 40 dialects do not have any preverbal negative marker.

reversed the order of the subject pronoun and the negation marker once both had become clitic, i.e. X⁰s.

Things, however, are more complicated in modern Friulian, which exhibits a mixed pattern, with some subject pronouns preceding and other following negation. The 2sg subject *tu/te*, for instance, occurred in front of negation until the 16th century, as shown in (59), while in modern varieties the only possible order is negation > *tu/te*:

- (59) **Tu no** havarès la bielle fie (Orl. Fur. 237, 23, from Vanelli 1998:74)
 you= not= will.have the nice girls
 ‘You will not have nice girls’
- (60) a. No **tu** compre mai meil (Barcis)
 b. No **to** compra mei mei (Cimolais)
 c. No **te** crompa mai mei (Claut)
 d. No **te** compris mai pons (Cordenons)
 e. No **to** crompe mei pons (Erto)
 f. No **tu** cumpris mai melus (Moimacco)
 g. No **te** compris mai pons (Montereale Valcellina)
 h. No **tu** compris mai melucs (Nimis)
 i. No **tu** compris mai melos (Qualso)
 j. No **tu** ciolis mai miluz (Remanzacco)
 not= you= buy never apples
 ‘You never buy apples’

By contrast, the syncretic clitic expressing 1sg/1pl/2pl always precedes negation⁵:

- (61) **I no** sai sa ch’ al fedi Giani (S. Michele al Tagliamento)
 I= not= know what that= he= does Giani
 ‘I do not know what Gianni does’

At this point, it is important to note that the clitics that across the relevant dialects precede negation tend to be the 1sg. and pl, and the 2pl. These clitic do not form a natural class identifiable by a common set of features and it is quite problematic to assume that there is any syntactic position characterizable in terms of these person-number features. However, at the same time, it is important to note that these clitics are also targeted by syncretic processes or are simply

⁵ Interestingly, in several dialects it cannot co-occur with negation. It is unclear to us at the moment why it should be so.

1 missing from the clitic inventories (Calabrese (2012), Manzini & Savoia (2004),
 2 Renzi and Vanelli (1998). Calabrese (2012) proposes that the syncretism and dele-
 3 tion (what he calls **obliteration** following Arregi and Nevins (2012)) affecting
 4 these clitics are markedness-triggered morphological repairs removing idiosyn-
 5 cratic exponence in the case of marked morphological configurations (see Cal-
 6 abrese (2012) for discussion). He proposes the following markedness hierarchy
 7 for subject clitics (see Calabrese (2012) for motivations and further discussion)
 8 (The diagram $[[_{V} \text{ ____ } V]$ indicates that this ranking holds for subject proclitics.)

9
 10 (62) In the context $[[_{V} \text{ ____ } V]$

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| 11 | a. $*[+part., -speak, -plur.]_{Subj}$ | $*2^{nd}$ sg. | Less marked |
| 12 | b. $*[-part., -plur.]_{Subj}$ | $*3^{rd}$ sg. | |
| 13 | c. $*[-part., +plur.]_{Subj}$ | $*3^{rd}$ pl. | |
| 14 | d. $*[+speak, -plur.]_{Subj}$ | $*1^{st}$ sg. | |
| 15 | e. $*[+part, -speak, +plur.]_{Subj}$ | $*2^{nd}$ pl. | |
| 16 | f. $*[+speak., +plur.]_{Subj}$ | $*1^{st}$ pl. | More marked |

17
 18 As discussed in Calabrese (2012) there is variation across dialects with respect to
 19 what is considered to be marked and therefore repaired by syncretism or obliteration.
 20 Each dialect selects a cut-off point in the hierarchy under which clitics
 21 are repaired. In any case, the tendency is to avoid the clitics below c. In (62): the
 22 1sg and pl, and the 2pl clitics, which we call here the “marked” clitics.⁶

23 Now given the hypothesis proposed above that there is no special subject
 24 clitic position below negation and that clitics are moved there by a special meta-
 25 thesis operation, the facts that marked clitics precede negation, while unmarked
 26 ones do not, means that marked subject clitics are not targeted by metathesis. We
 27 propose that this is simply due to an extrinsic ordering of morphological opera-
 28 tions: specifically, m-merger of the marked clitics occurs after the m-merger of the
 29 other subject clitics, and crucially also after clitic metathesis. We therefore sup-
 30 pose that the ordering of morphological operations is as follows:

- 31
 32 (63) a. m-merger of the unmarked clitic
 33 b. metathesis
 34 c. m-merger of the marked clitic

35
 36
 37

 38 ⁶ As observed in Calabrese (2012), in some varieties, the cut-off point can be set lower, and
 39 only the 1st and 2 pl – or just one one of them – are considered “marked” and repaired. In some
 40 other, also the 3rd person clitics may undergo the same treatment (see Calabrese (2012) for more
 discussion).

The hypothesis that marked clitics are m-merged after metathesis is supported by the fact that these clitics may have a different domain of m-merging: in fact, in some dialects marked clitics must m-merge with a complementizer C, see (64), unlike unmarked clitics, which may optionally cluster with C⁰:

- (64) a. Ara ch(*e) a vegno (Loreo, Veneto)
 look that SCl come
 ‘Look, I am coming’
 b. Ara ch(e) i vien
 look that SCl come
 ‘Look, they are coming’

What is the reason for having two different ordered m-merger operations as in (63)? We propose that this reason must be found in history: the m-merger of marked pronouns occurred historically after that of the unmarked ones. Specifically, we submit that in the early stages of the development of the subject clitic system, there was resistance to m-merge marked pronouns. One of the possible effects of markedness is, in fact, that of blocking processes (see Calabrese (1995, 2005 and also Smolensky and Prince (2004)). In this case, m-merge of a pronominal would be blocked if it would lead to the generation of a marked clitic. In fact, there is evidence that 1sg and pl, and the 2pl overt pronouns were avoided in Renaissance varieties (Poletto (1995) on Veneto dialects, Cormany (2011) on Friulian). During the same period the other (unmarked) pronouns had already become clitic, i.e. m-merged with V. We hypothesize that in some dialects, metathesis occurred at this point. We can then assume that later there was analogical pressure to extend m-merge to all persons, so that also the marked pronouns became clitic undergoing the alternative morphological repairs of syncretism, or obliteration. It follows that in some varieties, in particular those that underwent metathesis, the newly formed clitics did not undergo metathesis, and in addition, in some dialect, they ended up clustering with the complementizer, instead of the inflected verb. This historical scenario explains the properties of the clitic systems of Veneto and Friulian varieties from a diachronic point of view. We assume that the ordering of processes in (63) accounts for these properties also synchronically.⁷

⁷ A difference in syntactic structuring may be associated with this ordering. However, here we will opt for the most minimal analysis of these facts which simply involves ordering of morphological operations, as motivated by the historical development of these phenomena.

1 Moreover, observe that the marked clitic of 1sg/pl and 2pl tend to have a pe-
 2 culiar phonological shape: they are onset-less and coda-less, thus containing
 3 a simple vowel. In the Italian literature on subject clitics, they are called the “vo-
 4 calic” clitics. A possible account for this phonological shape of the “vocalic” clit-
 5 ics is the following. Consider that if these clitics were not obliterated, they under-
 6 went syncretism. The most common syncretic pattern involved extension of the
 7 1stsg. exponent, etymologically EGO, to the other clitics (see Calabrese (2012) for
 8 an account). By regular phonological changes, this etymological base led to a
 9 single vowel in proclitic position, i.e., a vocalic nucleus without an onset and
 10 without a coda. One can speculate that the syllabic properties of this exponent
 11 were grammaticalized as characteristic features of the marked exponents. This
 12 led to the postulation of a “morpheme structure constraint”: the exponents of
 13 the marked clitics must be onsetless and codaless, i.e., “vocalic”⁸. Given this con-
 14 straint, the exponents of other marked clitic with other etymological bases were
 15 then also modified accordingly.

16 This reconstruction is confirmed by a survey on the distribution of subject
 17 clitics in Friulian texts of the 17th century: while subject clitic forms are commonly
 18 attested for 1sg (*o*), 2sg (*tu*) and 3p subjects (*a*, *al*, *l*, etc.), no clitic exponent occurs
 19 with 1pl and 2pl subjects.

20 Lastly, Poletto (2000) noticed that in some dialects “vocalic” clitics appear
 21 to differ from the other clitics in syntactic terms. First, vocalic clitics seem not
 22 undergo V-S inversion: they either disappear in interrogatives, see (65b), or, as
 23 shown in (66), they may occur in proclisis (see also Cardinaletti & Repetti (2010)):

24

25 (65) a. *i tu duars*
 26 *i= you= sleep.2SG*
 27 ‘You sleep’

28

29

30 ⁸ Cardinaletti and Repetti (2008) propose that these clitics are “vocalic” because they are in-
 31 serted by a special phonological repair operation that fills in functional heads not already filled
 32 by other lexical exponents. This phonological operation inserts a simple vowel and they call it
 33 “morphological” epenthesis. This proposal has various problems. First of all, it is unclear why
 34 this operation should insert a vowel, and not an unmarked CV syllable, or a consonant, a com-
 35 plex syllable or even a string of syllables. Whereas regular phonological epenthesis inserts a
 36 minimal syllabic component (a syllabic nucleus) that allows the resyllabification of a disallowed
 37 consonantal cluster, any type of morpheme/exponent could be used to fill in an empty func-
 38 tional head (in Distributed Morphology this would be called an elsewhere item, exponents that
 39 can potentially have all types of phonological shapes). Restricting this exponent to a vowel is
 40 fundamentally arbitrary. Secondly, this theory assumes only two levels of representations: a syn-
 tactic one and a surface phonological one. There is simply no morphology. This paper clearly
 shows that a morphological level of representation is needed.

b. (*i) duar[mi]s tu? 1
 i= sleep.2SG =YOU 2
 ‘Do you sleep?’ 3

(66) A ze lo ndà? (Loreo, Poletto 2000) 4
 a= is =he gone 5
 ‘Has he gone?’ 6
 7

Second, vocalic clitics, unlike the others, may be omitted in coordinated structures as shown in (67): 8
 9

(67) A canto co ti e (a) balo co lu (Loreo, Poletto 11
 a= I.sing with you and a= dance with him 2000) 12
 ‘I sing with you and dance with him’ 13
 14

The latter example is not problematic as the behaviour in coordination might be an orthogonal issue, depending on the nature of coordinated structures. For instance, one can argue that the coordination in (67) involves subject ellipsis, which is expected to target the subject clitic when it does not m-merge with the verb in T⁰ (recall that vocalic clitics can m-merge leftwards). 15
 16
 17
 18
 19

The data on inversion in (65)–(66), by contrast, are more puzzling and, ultimately, we agree with Poletto (2000) in hypothesizing that in some dialects, certain vocalic/marked clitics are in fact higher. Evidence supporting this hypothesis comes from the diachronic evolution, showing that in a few dialects vocalic/ marked clitics have been reanalysed as particles of the CP layer, which, in synchrony, are not directly related to the encoding of subject features (see Benincà, this volume). For instance, such a development, as argued by Benincà (1983), led to the particle *a* of Paduan, which expresses the pragmatic reading that the content of the sentence is all new information: 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

(68) a piove. (Paduan, Benincà 1983) 30
 a= rains 31
 ‘look, it is raining.’ 32
 33

According to Tagliavini (1952: 349); Rohlfis (1968: 140–141); Benincà (1983/1994); Vanelli (1987/1998: 97), Paduan *a* is a reflex of EGO, which was then reanalysed as being associated with a functional category higher the clausal subject and independent of it. The same explanation holds for other particles, which, with different interpretations, are found elsewhere in Northern Italy, see Ascoli (1876: 404); Salvioni (1884: 123); Floricic (2012). We can therefore argue that, historically, in some dialects, the clitics that escaped metathesis may have been reanalysed as 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40

1 being directly generated in higher positions with grammatical functions different
 2 from that of the subject, giving rise to different types of vocalic clitics, ~~only~~ some
 3 of which are probably located in the left periphery (Benincà (1983/1994), Poletto
 4 (2000), Cardinaletti (2004), Cardinaletti and Repetti (2010)).

5

6

7 Clitic metathesis in the dialect of Forni di Sotto

8

9 The hypothesis that morphological metathesis may affect the order of clitic ele-
 10 ments is strengthened by the data from the Friulian dialect of Forni di Sotto (Man-
 11 zini and Savoia 2005). This dialect differs from the other Friulian vernaculars in
 12 having a richer morphological system in which ~~many~~ subject clitics are expressed
 13 by a compound form, including a vocalic clitic followed by another clitic element
 14 as in the 2sg *i tu*, the 3sgm *a l*, the 3plm *a i*, and the 3plf *a s*.

15

16 (69) i		1sg
17 i tu		2sg
18 a l		3sg m
19 a		3sg f
20 i		1pl
21 i		2pl
22 a i		3pl m
23 a s		3pl f

24

25 As seen above, when they co-occur with negation, these exponents are split, i.e.
 26 the negative marker occurs between the two formatives of the same clitic:

27

28 (70) i	no	duarmi	'I do not sleep'
29 i	no tu	duars	'you do not sleep'
30 a	no l	duar	'he ...'
31 a	no	duar	'she ...'
32 i	no	durmin	'we ...'
33 i	no	durmi:s	'you (pl) ...'
34 a	no i	duar	'they (m) ...'
35 a	no s	duar	'they (f) ...'

36

37 As the forms *a-l*, *a-i*, *a-s* show, in this dialect the subject clitic seems to be split
 38 into two components: one realizing participant features and the other gender-
 39 number features. We assume that the same split occurs in the case of /i tu/ and in
 40 the case of the other persons between a component /i/ (for the 1st sg./pl. 2 pl.) or

/a/ (3sg.f) and a component \emptyset , and propose that this split is implemented by an operation of morphological fission (Noyer (1997), Calabrese (2002), Arregi and Nevins (2012) (also Calabrese (1988, 1995, 2005) for fission in phonology) applying to the feature bundle of all clitics.⁹

As formalized in Arregi and Nevins (2012) morphological fission targets terminal features (see Calabrese (2005) for discussion of the same assumption in phonology). Morphological fission in Forni di Sotto seems to target terminal nodes instead. We therefore modify their formalization of Fission as follows thus including also nodes in the structural description:

(71) Morphological Fission


- a. The structural description of a morphological fission rule has three terms: a category C, a feature/node α and a feature/node β .
- b. The structural change splits a morpheme of category C containing α and β as follows

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \\ \vdots \\ \mu \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \gamma \\ \vdots \\ \mu \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \beta \\ \gamma \\ \vdots \\ \mu \end{pmatrix}$$


The structural description of morphological fission in Forni di Sotto is that in (72). Fission as in (71) then splits the subject clitic feature bundle in (73) into the two in (74):

(72) Category: Subject clitic, Nodes: [Participant]-node and [Phi]-node.

(73)



⁹ A syntactic analysis of the compound forms of Forni di Sotto is also possible, but it leads to complex assumptions and stipulations. We prefer a simpler morphological analysis with fission. Adopting either analyses does not affect our analysis of the metathesis pattern in this dialect, which is our main concern here.



8 The exponents of the participant component are given in (77). The Phi-
 9 component has an overt exponent in the case of the 2sg, and the 3sg and pl. Fission
 10 in Forni di Sotto is probably due to an instance of “analogical levelling”: the
 11 generalization of the clitic /i/ to all [+participant], specifically to the 2sg clitic,
 12 which resulted into the form /i tu/ containing two components. This may have led
 13 to a re-analysis of 3rd person forms: /a l, a i, a s/ as also having two components,
 14 and therefore the postulation of the fission operation, as formulated above. By
 15 contrast, with 1sg, 1pl, 2pl, the Phi-component has the null exponent \emptyset . This is
 16 shown in (78) (D is fused with the following node, we assume that fusion is expressed
 17 by having a VI spanning over multiple heads as proposed by Radkevic
 18 (2007).

20 (75) /a/ ↔ [D, -part]

21 /i/ ↔ [D, +part]

23 (76) /tu/ ↔ [D, -plur] / [+part, -speak] ____

24 /s/ ↔ [D, +fem, +plur]

25 /i/ ↔ [D, +plur]

26 /l/ ↔ [D, -plur]

27 / \emptyset / ↔

29 Application of Fission and the Vocabulary Items in (73)–(74) and (75)–(76) gener-
 30 ates the compound clitics in (70). Observe that the output of fission is a linear
 31 sequence. In the case of the clitics m-merged to T⁰ (the unmarked 3rd person and
 32 2nd sg ones), the rightmost component (the formatives -l/-s/-i and /tu/) will then
 33 be adjacent to the negation and therefore can be moved by the rule of metathesis,
 34 repeated here as (77)–(78):

37 (77) Given a clitic cluster [CL_{subj} Neg V]

38 1. Copy CL_{subj}

39 2. Insert copy after Neg

40 3. Delete original CL_{subj}.

(78) (CL) [tu no V] → (CL) [tu tu₁ no V] → (CL) [tu no tu₁ V] → 1
 (CL) [~~tu~~ no tu₁ V] → (i) [no tu V] 2

Therefore from a basic structure such as that in (81a) we derive (81b) (surface 4
 (81c)): 5

(79) a. i tu no duars 6
 i= you= not= sleep 7
 ‘you do not sleep’ 8
 b. i ~~tu~~ no tu duars 9
 i= you= not= you= sleep 10
 ‘you do not sleep’ 11
 c. i no tu duars 12
 i= not= you= sleep 13
 ‘you do not sleep’ 14
 15

The same analysis accounts for the positioning of the 3rd person clitics: (82a) 16
 is order generated by Fission; (82b) illustrates metathesis; (82c) is the output 17
 sequence: 18

(80) a. a **l/i/s** no du’ar 20
 a= he/she/they= not= sleeps 21
 ‘he/they.m/they.f do(es) not sleep’ 22
 b. a **l/i/s** no **l/i/s** du’ar 23
 a= he/she/they= not= he/she/they= sleeps 24
 ‘he/they.m/they.f do(es) not sleep’ 25
 c. a no **l/i/s** du’ar 26
 a= not= he/she/they= sleeps 27
 ‘he/they.m/they.f do(es) not sleep’ 28
 29

By contrast, Manzini and Savoia (2005) argue that this variation is possible as 30
 subject clitics can lexicalize different syntactic positions, although they assume a 31
 less articulated structure than Poletto’s. Manzini & Savoia’s proposal is summa- 32
 rized as follows: 33

(81) a. [_Da(l) ... [_{Neg}no ... [_Dl (3msg) 35
 b. [_Da(s) ... [_{Neg}no ... [_Ds (3fpl) 36
 c. [_Da(i) ... [_{Neg}no ... [_Di (3mpl) 37

However, this account is not satisfactory under several respects. First, it does not 39
 account for the optionality of the pattern. Furthermore, it is not clear which cate- 40

1 gory is lexicalised by the formatives *-l/-s/-i*: in particular, it is not clear why *-l/-s/-i*
 2 stand for D° in the lower position, while in the higher position they are a sub-
 3 component of the complex D° *al/as/ai*.

4 Second, given the structure in (83), one wonders what prevents the 2sg clitic
 5 from exhibiting the same phenomenon. Like 3p clitics, the 2sg exponent is a com-
 6 pound (*i tu*) and, like 3p exponents, the consonantal item is expected to occur
 7 twice, but ~~the resulting combination is ungrammatical~~. If the pattern in (83) was a
 8 side-effect of the presence of multiple positions hosting subject clitics, it is not
 9 clear to us what impedes the 2sg clitic *tu* from occurring in the higher position.

10 Above all, however, the most serious challenge for syntactic approaches is
 11 represented by the following set of data, showing that in Forni ~~and, to the best~~
 12 ~~of our knowledge, only in Forni~~ the formatives *-l/-s/-i* are allowed to occur after
 13 object clitics:

- 14 (82) a. a l mi dà chist 'he gives me this'
 15 a= he= to.me= gives this
 16 b. a mi l dà chist
 17 a= to.me= he= gives this
 18 c. a l mi l dà chist
 19 a= he= to.me= he= gives this
 20

21 Following Poletto's and Manzini & Savoia's accounts, the data in (84b–c) would
 22 lead to postulate even a lower position below object clitics, as illustrated in (85).
 23 In actual fact, however, we have no evidence at all supporting the hypothesis
 24 that, in the Romance languages, subject clitics can be placed below object clitics.

- 25 (83) a(l) mi (l)
 26 SCI OCl SCI
 27

28 For this reason, we argue that, instead of supporting syntactic-based analyses,
 29 these data strengthen an account in which unexpected permutations between
 30 subject clitics and other clitic material is derived in Morphology via meta-
 31 thesis. Specifically we assume that another rule has developed in Forni on
 32 the model of rule (79). This rule applies to all cases in which the subject clitic
 33 is followed by a pronominal clitic (excluded 3p non-reflexive clitics¹⁰). It copies
 34
 35

36 ———
 37 ¹⁰ There is another property of Forni clitic clusters that should be mentioned. the formatives
 38 *-l/-s/-i* are omitted in combination with a 3p objet clitic, regardless of their position. Omission is
 39 optional before a 1/2p clitic, as in (24b) or when the subject is plural. We believe that this prop-
 40 erty is unrelated to the morphological processes discussed in this paper as it is attested in other
 41 dialects like those spoken in the Pesaro area. Space restrictions prevent us from discussing it.

the subject clitic and moves the copy of the subject clitic to the end of the clitic cluster. This rule does not require deletion of the original clitic so that doubling of the clitic may optionally occur. The rule is formalized in (86), the derivation is in (87):

- (84) Given a clitic cluster $[CL_{\text{subj}}CL_{\text{obj}} V]$
- a. Copy CL_{subj}
 - b. Insert copy at right edge of clitic cluster
 - c. Delete original CL_{subj} (Optional).

(85) $a l mi V \rightarrow a l l_1 mi V \rightarrow a l mi l_1 V \rightarrow a (l) mi l_1 V$

Rule (88) is optional, syntactically void and the resulting variants in (82) do not differ in meaning.

Lastly, the interaction of the two rules of metathesis – one applying before negation, active in all the dialects of Friuli; the other applying before object clitics, attested only in Forni – gives rise to long distance permutations of clitics, resembling those reported by Arregi & Nevins for Basque dialects:

(86) $a l no mi V \rightarrow a l l_1 no mi V \rightarrow a (l) no mi l_1 V$

The rules in (77) and (84) can interact in a derivation:

(87) $a l no mi V \rightarrow (\text{by (77)}) a no l mi V \rightarrow (\text{by (84)}) a no (l) mi (l)$

8 Conclusions

In this article we have explored the hypothesis that cliticization involves a rule of *m-merge*, which brackets a functional head with another constituent under linear adjacency to build a structure legible at the PF interface. In some cases, *m-merge* may take place before further syntactic movement. As a consequence, the clitic is pied-piped by its host to a higher position, giving rise to a mismatch between the surface position of the clitic and its expected syntactic site.

In the first part of the article, we focused on cases of V-to-C movement: we observed that object clitic and negation are pied-piped by the verb to C, crossing the position of subject clitics. We argued that subject clitics are *m-merged* after V-to-C movement: this explains while the complex object clitic + verb moves to C leaving the subject clitic behind. Morphological evidence (i.e. patterns of allomorphy) confirms the hypothesis that subject clitics are

1 m-merged after the complex object clitic + verb has reached its target position
2 in C.

3 This account, however, faces some problematic data, which we accounted
4 for by postulating further morphological rules of metathesis and fission. A syn-
5 tactic analysis of the same phenomena is also possible (see Poletto (2000) and
6 Manzini and Savoia (2005)), but ~~it requires a heavier theoretical apparatus and,~~
7 ~~in the end, the proposed solutions are as stipulative as ours. Furthermore,~~ it seems
8 to us that our analysis is more consistent with the historical evolution of these
9 varieties.

10 First, in Friulian and Venetan dialects, the subject clitic intervenes between
11 negation and the verb. Given this order, how can negation m-merge ~~onto~~^u the verb
12 (and move with the verb to C) leaving the subject clitic in its position? Our hypoth-
13 esis is that, in these dialects, the order of subject clitics and negation in declara-
14 tive clauses is reversed ~~after m-merge~~ by a morphological operation of *metathesis*
15 (Halle and Harris 2005). The above reconstruction is compatible with the histori-
16 cal evolution of these dialects, in which the order of negation and subject clitics
17 was reversed in the 16th century. Moreover, the hypothesis of a syntactically-inert
18 operation is supported by the data from the Friulian dialect of Forni di Sotto, in
19 which metathesis is extended also to object clitics, giving rise to sequences in
20 which SCl formatives occur after OCl. As the latter ordering cannot be due to the
21 presence of a dedicated syntactic position for SCl below OCl, the data from Forni
22 call for an extra-syntactic explanation.

23 Second, we accounted for the fact that not all subject clitics undergo meta-
24 thesis. The so-called “vocalic” clitics tend in fact to occur above negation or
25 be dropped in combination with negation. Our explanation resides in the order-
26 ing of m-merge and metathesis, which in turn reflects the historical evolution of
27 Friulian. We argued that m-merge of the “vocalic” clitics follows metathesis be-
28 cause, in the historical evolution of the Friulian system (Cormany 2011), 1sg, 1pl
29 and 2pl pronouns became clitic (i.e. X⁰) after the other clitics had already under-
30 gone metathesis.

31 Lastly, we addressed composite SCl, e.g. *i tu* ‘you, a l’he’, etc., in which the
32 pronoun is split in a vocalic formative, which usually precede negation, and a
33 lower exponent, expressing number and gender features. We accounted for the
34 split by means of a fission operation, applying to the feature bundle of all clitics.
35 The fission operation in this case develops from analogical processes which, in
36 dialects like Forni, made “vocalic” formatives occur before etymological clitic
37 forms like 2sg *tu*.

38 ~~As previously said, some of the above phenomena may be accounted for~~
39 ~~under either syntactic or morphological analyses. Adopting either analyses, in~~
40 ~~fact, does not challenge our view. In this work,~~^u we argued that the account of the

micro-placement of clitic material requires a fine-grained theory of the syntax/
 morphology interface in which syntactic and morphological operations are
 interleaved, rather than confined in different modules of UG ~~or dissolved one into~~
~~the other.~~

References

- Ascoli, Graziadio Isaia. 1876. Ricordi bibliografici. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 2. 395–458.
- Arregi, Karlos & Andrew Nevins. 2012. *Morphotactics: Basque Auxiliaries and the Structure of Spellout*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Belletti, Adriana. 1990. *Generalized Verb Movement*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Belletti, Adriana. 2005. Extended Doubling and the VP periphery. *Probus* 17(1). 1–36.
- Benincà, Paola. 1983. Il clitico *a* nel dialetto padovano. In Benincà, Paola *et al.*, *Scritti Linguistici in Onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini*, 25–32. Pisa: Pacini. [Reprinted in Benincà 1994, *La variazione sintattica*. Bologna: Il Mulino].
- Benincà, Paola & Christina Tortora. 2009. Towards a finer-grained theory of Italian participial clausal architecture. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 15. 17–26.
- Benincà, Paola & Christina Tortora. 2010. On clausal architecture: Evidence from complement clitic placement in Romance. In Vicenç Torrens, Linda Escobar, Anna Gavarró and Juncal Gutiérrez, *Movement and Clitics: Adult and Child Grammar*, 219–237. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2012. *Universals in Comparative Morphology: Suppletion, superlatives, and the structure of words*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.
- Bošković, Željko. 2008. What will you have, DP or NP?. In *Proceedings of NELS 37*, 101–114. Amherst (Mass.): GSLA.
- Calabrese, Andrea. 2011. Investigations on markedness, syncretism and zero exponence in morphology. *Morphology* 21. 283–325.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Lori Repetti. 2008. The Phonology and Syntax of Preverbal and Postverbal Subject Clitics in Northern Italian Dialects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39(4). 523–563.
- Anna Cardinaletti & Lori Repetti. 2010. Preverbal vowels in wh-questions and declarative sentences in Northern Italian Piacentine dialects. In Sonia Colina, Antxon Olarrea and Ana Maria Carvalho (eds.), *Romance Linguistics 2009: Selected papers from the 39th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)*, 353–368. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Cecchetto, Carlo. 2000. Doubling Structures and Reconstruction. *Probus* 12(1). 93–126.
- Cormany, Ed. 2011. *Changes in Friulano Subject Clitics: Conflation and Interactions with the Left Periphery*. Paper presented at DiGS 12, Cambridge, 14–16 July 2010. <https://www.dropbox.com/s/3ibf7e3wk3yg9xl/Cormany-DiGS-Friulano-SCLs.pdf>
- van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen and Marjo van Koppen. 2008. Pronominal doubling in Dutch dialects: big DPs and coordinations. In S. Barbiers, O. Koenenman, M. Lekakou & M. van der Ham (eds.), *Microvariation in syntactic doubling*, 207–249. Bingley: Emerald.
- Embick, David. 2010. Stem alternations and stem distributions. UPenn: ms.
- Embick, David & Rolf Noyer. 2001. Movement Operations after Syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(4). 555–595.

- 1 Floricic, Franck. 2012. Opacity, Defectiveness and Reanalysis in North Italian Subject Clitics
2 Paradigms. Université de Paris III: ms.
- 3 Frampton, John. 2009. *Distributed Reduplication*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.
- 4 Franks, Steven & Catherine Rudin. 2005. Bulgarian Clitics as K^o Heads. In S. Franks, F. Gladney
5 & M. Tasseva-Kurktchieva (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Columbia
6 Meeting*, 104–116. Ann Arbor (MI): Michigan Slavic Publications.
- 7 Halle, Morris. 2008. Reduplication. In Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero, Maria Luisa Zubizarreta
8 (eds.), *Foundational issues in linguistic theory: Essays in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*,
9 325–358. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.
- 10 Halle, Morris & James Harris. 2005. Unexpected Plural Inflections in Spanish: Reduplication and
11 Methatesis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36(2). 195–222.
- 12 Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection.
13 In Kenneth Hale and S. Jay Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20*, 111–176. Cambridge
14 (Mass.): MIT Press.
- 15 Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.
- 16 Loporcaro Michele & Maria Teresa Vigolo. 2003. *Accordo per genere del verbo finito in
17 italo-romanzo: l'arco alpino orientale*. *L'Italia Dialettale* 63–64. 7–32.
- 18 Manzini, Maria Rita & Leonardo Savoia. 2004. Clitics: Cooccurrence and mutual exclusion
19 patterns. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP*, 211–250. New York-Oxford: Oxford
20 University Press.
- 21 Manzini, Maria Rita & Leonardo Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi
22 generativa*. Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso.
- 23 Manzini, Maria Rita & Leonardo Savoia. 2009. Morphology dissolves into syntax: Infixation and
24 Doubling in Romance languages. *Annali Online di Ferrara – Lettere* 1. 1–28.
- 25 Marantz, Alec. 1988. Clitics, morphological merger, and the mapping to phonological structure.
26 In Michael Hammond & Michael Noonan (eds.), *Theoretical Morphology: Approaches in
27 Modern Linguistics*, 253–270. San Diego: Academic Press.
- 28 Marantz, Alec. 1989. Clitics and phrase structure. In Mark Baltin and Anthony Kroch (eds.),
29 *Alternative conceptions of phrase structure*, 99–106. Chicago: University of Chicago
30 Press.
- 31 Parry, Mair. 1997. Preverbal negation and clitic ordering, with particular reference to a group of
32 North-West Italian dialects. *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 113(2). 243–270.
- 33 Poletto, Cecilia. 1995. The Diachronic Development of Subject Clitics in North-Eastern Italian
34 Dialects. In Ian Roberts & Adrian Batty (eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*,
35 295–324. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 36 Poletto, Cecilia. 2000. *The Higher Functional Field. Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*.
37 Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.
- 38 Radkevich, Nina. 2010. *On Location: the structure of case and adpositions*. University of
39 Connecticut: Doctoral dissertation.
- 40 Raimy Eric. 2000. *The Phonology and Morphology of Reduplication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Renzi, Lorenzo & Laura Vanelli. 1983. I pronomi soggetto in alcune varietà romanze. In Paola
Benincá et al. (eds.), *Scritti linguistici in onore di G.B. Pellegrini*, 120–145. Pisa: Pacini.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. On the status of subject clitics in Romance. In Jaeggli, O. and Silva Corvalan,
C. (eds.), *Studies in Romance Linguistics*, 137–152. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1968. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Morfologia*.
Turin: Einaudi.
- Salvioni, Carlo. 1884. *Fonetica del dialetto moderno della città di Milano*. Torino: Loescher.

Salvioni, Carlo. 1902. Del plurale femminile di 1a declinazione esposto per -a ed -an in qualche varietà alpina. <i>Rendiconti Istituto Lombardo</i> 35(2). 905–919.	1
	2
Prince, Alan & Paul Smolensky. 2004. <i>Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar</i> . London: Blackwell.	3
	4
Tagliavini, Carlo. 1952. <i>Le origini delle lingue neolatine</i> . Bologna: Patron.	5
Torrego, Esther. 1992. Case and agreement structure. University of Massachusetts: ms.	6
Tortora, Christina. 2002. Romance Enclisis, Prepositions, and Aspect. <i>Natural Language and Linguistic Theory</i> 20(4). 725–757.	7
Uriagereka, Juan. 1995. Aspects of Clitic Placement in Western Romance. <i>Linguistic Inquiry</i> 26(1). 79–123.	8
	9
Vanelli, Laura. 1987. I pronomi soggetto nei dialetti settentrionali dal Medio Evo a oggi. <i>Medioevo Romano</i> 12. 191–192. [Reprinted in: Laura Vanelli 1998, <i>I dialetti italiani settentrionali nel panorama romanzo. Studi di sintassi e morfologia</i> . Roma: Bulzoni]	10
	11
Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997. <i>Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages</i> . Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27
	28
	29
	30
	31
	32
	33
	34
	35
	36
	37
	38
	39
	40