

## PCC Effects with Expletives and Non-Associate Post-Verbal Subjects in Bolognese

Edward J. Rubín – University of Utah

This paper contrasts a little noted or discussed post-verbal subject (VS) construction, found in Bol(ognese) (1-2), the Gallo-Italic grammar of Bologna, Italy, and other grammars, with the much better studied VS constructions of other Romance grammars, including Italian (3) and Bol (4). In the common constructions (3-4), tensed verbs agree with VSs, whether full DPs or strong pronouns (Bol also displays an agreeing subject clitic (SCL), like in many grammars of the region). In (1), agreement is absent. We propose a distinction in the null expletive pronouns (*expl*) in the two data types that results in Person-Case Constraint (PCC) effects (Permuter 1971, Bonet 1991, Béjar & Rezac 2003, 2009, Nevins 2011) only in (1-2) as well as the other observed differences.

- |                                                                                        |                                                                                                         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (1) a. Ai=à      dscàurs la dôna .<br>AI=has.3S spoken the woman<br>'The woman spoke.' | (2) a.*Ai=à      dscàurs mé/té/nó/vó .<br>AI=has.3S spoken.3S I/you.S/we/you.P<br>'I/you/we/you spoke.' |
| b. Ai=à      dscàurs äI dôn .<br>AI=have.3S spoken the women<br>'The women spoke.'     | b.*Ai=è      dscàurs té/vó .<br>AI=have.2S spoken you.S/you.P<br>'You spoke.'                           |
| (3) a. Ha      parlato la donna .<br>has.3S spoken the woman<br>'The woman spoke.'     | (4) a. T=è      dscàurs té .<br>SCL.2S=have.2S spoken you.S<br>'You spoke.'                             |
| b. Hanno parlato le donne .<br>have.3P spoken the women<br>'The women spoke.'          | b. A=dscurän      nó .<br>SCL.1P=speak.1P we<br>'We are speaking.'                                      |

The data in (3-4) is commonly analyzed as associated with an *expl* in SpecT for EPP (Rizzi 1982, 1986, Burzio 1986, Cardinaletti 1997, 2004, Belletti 2005, Roberts 2010, etc). *Expl* and VS share the normal properties of a pre-verbal subject (Case, agreement, EPP), which Lasnik 1995 labels "Case transmission". Unlike in (3-4), where the V and VS agree, in (1), V is always 3S. Descriptively, this matches VS's person feature; but number feature matching isn't required (1b). Finally, the Bol clitic AI is invariable, and incompatible with a VS of first or second person (2).

Treating (1-2) as identical to (3-4) is of course impossible, given their differences, though many researchers hint that we can just conclude that the *expl* in (1) is the source of non-agreement there (among many others, see Belletti 2005:19 or Roberts 2010:113), and data like (2) is often ignored (cf. Tortora 1999). Such assertions leave too much unexplained, including why the *expl* in (1) would induce non-agreement but the one in (3-4) wouldn't, why there would be a person restriction on the VS when non-agreement occurred, why Case and agreement would be dissociated in (1) but not in (3-4), how the Case on the VS in (1) would be licensed, etc. (And note: a partitive Case approach following Belletti 1988 or Lasnik 1995, the latter of which earlier noted similar problems to those just mentioned, is impossible here, since they focus on VSs with limitations not found here, including indefiniteness, status as internal arguments, or others. As seen in (1), the Bol VS can be definite and can occur with unergative Vs, and, thus, such analyses are non-starters here.) Furthermore, a general approach based simply on partial (person-only) agreement would, without additional stipulations, miss the person restriction, mistakenly predicting well-formedness for examples like in (2b), i.e. for examples in which a V.1S co-occurred with a first person VS or a V.2S co-occurred with a second person VS.

As noted, our proposal for these data is based on the existence of PCC effects, and these can in fact be shown to be independently present in Bol grammar, as they are in many other Romance

varieties. PCC effects are generally ascribed to a restriction on multiple nominals within a single domain. A particular formalization is not crucial to our proposal, only that a single licenser relates to the distinct nominals (Béjar & Rezac 2003, 2009, Nevins 2011). The typical examples of relevance here involve a pair of cliticized indirect and direct objects (DCL=OCL=V); the restriction in such pairs, descriptively speaking, and simplifying without obscuring the point for our purposes, is that the direct object, normally held to be c-commanded by the indirect object, cannot be other than third person. We see examples of this in Bol (5), where judgments remain the same regardless of the OCL's gender or number in (a) or any feature of the DCL in (b), including person:

- (5) a. Pèvel al= {m= , s= , t= , v= , i= } la= dà .  
 P. SCL.3SM= DCL.1S= DCL.1P= DCL.2S= DCL.2P= DCL.3= OCL.3SF= gives.3S  
 'Pèvel gives it to me/us/you/you/him/her/them.'
- b.\*Pèvel al= i= {m= , s= , t= , v= } dà .  
 P. SCL.3SM= DCL.3= OCL.1S= OCL.1P= OCL.2S= OCL.2P= gives.3S  
 'Pèvel gives him/her/them me/us/you/you.'

We see that Bol exhibits the typical PCC effect: the OCL must be third person when c-commanded within the same domain by the DCL (first and second person OCLs are otherwise fine).

We extend this same idea to the explanation of the Bol data in (1-2), holding that a single licenser relates to two elements, the *expl* and the VS, that are within a single domain. In brief, the *expl* c-commands the VS, and thus the VS cannot be other than third person in data like (1-2), like the OCL in (5). In detail, we propose that the clitic AI introduces the *expl* as a nominal that is independent from the VS that it c-commands, and this *expl* is thus distinct in nature from the *expl* that shares properties with the associate VS in Case transmission constructions like (3-4). The *expl* introduced by AI in (1-2) is inherently 3S (and not, to be explicit, 3SM, as is a third *expl* type present in *al piòv* 'it rains' or *al pèr che ...* 'it seems that ...'), and because it c-commands the VS, it is closer to T, and will both raise to satisfy EPP there and will value the  $\varphi$ -features of T as 3S. The T head will license both nominals in (1), since there is no PCC violation in such data. In (2a), on the other hand, PCC effects arise, because the lower nominal is not third person. (2b) has the same problem, but in addition, the more local *expl*.3S fails to control agreement on T.

In this account, all effects arise from a single distinction present in a grammar like Bol, but absent in one like Italian. Bol allows the introduction into a numeration of an *expl* that is not in association with a thematic subject via Case transmission mechanisms. That *expl* is responsible for agreement on T, and its presence in the same domain as the VS induces the PCC effects that underlie the person restrictions observed. Both the *expl* and the VS are licensed by T.

---

**Béjar & Rezac 2003.** Person licencing and the derivation of PCC Effects. In Pérez-Leroux, A. & Y. Roberge (eds) *Romance Linguistics: Theory and Acquisition (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. **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-Corvalan (eds) *Studies in Romance linguistics*. 391-420. **Roberts 2010.** *Agreement and Head Movement: Clitics, Incorporation, and Defective Goals*. MIT Press. **Tortora 1999.** Agreement, Case, and i-subjects. In Tamanji, P., M. Hirotani, N. Hall (eds) *NELS 29*. 397-408.