



Clitic Allomorphy

• Bolognese (Gallo-Italic; Bologna) 3MS.NOM clitic allomorphy: [l] prevo-cally (1), [al] preconsonantly (2).

- (1) l= ar'spand (2) al= 'vad / 'se:lta
SCL.3MS.NOM responds SCL.3MS.NOM sees / jumps
'he responds' 'he sees/jumps'

• However, in combination with certain clitics, it seems to surface as [a].

• When followed by DAT and ACC clitics:

- (3) a= t= la= 'da
3MS.NOM= 2S.DAT= 3FS.ACC= gives
'he gives it to me.'

• And optionally when followed by one DAT/ACC and a C-initial verb:

- (4) a. al= v= 'di:z c. a= v= 'di:z
3MS.NOM= 2P.DAT= says 3MS.NOM= 2P.DAT= say
'he says to you.p' 'he says to you.p'
b. al= s= 'tsa:ma d. a= s= 'tsa:ma
3MS.NOM= 1P.ACC= calls 3MS.NOM= 1P.ACC= call
'he calls us' 'he calls us'

The Puzzle

- Why is [al] not required in (3)–(4)?
• If [a] is an available allomorph, why is [al], which introduces a viola-tion of NOCODA, obligatory elsewhere?
• Our argument: Lexical Selection (LS; Mascaró 2007, McCarvel 2016) provides answers to these questions.

Related data we won't account for here:

• Before 1S.DAT, [a] alternates with [l]:

- (5) a. l= um= 'di:z b. a= m= 'di:z
3MS.NOM= 1S.DAT= says 3MS.NOM= 1S.DAT= says
'he says to us' 'he says to us'

• A V-initial verb precludes [a]:

- (6) a. al= m= ar'spand b. al= v= ar'spand
3MS.NOM= 1S.DAT= responds 3MS.NOM= 2P.DAT= responds
'he responds to me' 'he responds to you'

• NEG clitic introduces further complications.

Analysis

- [av] = 3MS.NOM + 2P.DAT
• [as] = 3MS.NOM + 1P.ACC
• [at] = 3MS.NOM + 2P.DAT
our claim: [av], [as], [at] are single lexical items, not strings of clitics

• Other clitic combinations with 3MS.NOM work similarly.

• Revised transcriptions:

- (7) a. av= 'di:z
3MS.NOM + 2P.DAT= say
'he says to you.p'
b. as= 'tsa:ma
3MS.NOM + 1P.ACC= call
'he calls us'

• LS: all allomorphs are listed hierarchically.

• PRIORITY penalizes allomorphs lower on the hierarchy.

• Our hierarchy: {[av], [as]} > [l] > [al]

• Other constraints:

- REALIZEMORPHEME (RM; Kurisu 2001): each input morpheme must be realized phonologically.
- DEP-MorphFeat (DEP-MF): each morphological feature in the output must be present in the input. (I.e. don't insert morphological features.)
- SONSEQ: enforces Bolognese's sonority sequencing requirements.
- *FUSION: penalizes items bearing incompatible morphosyntactic features. (E.g. [av] bears both NOM and DAT.)

(8) /'di:z, 3MS.NOM, 2P.DAT/ RM DEP-MF SONSEQ PRIORITY *FUSION

- a. av='di:z *
b. l=v='di:z *! *,*
c. al=v='di:z *!*,*
d. al='di:z *! **

(9) /ar'spand, 3MS.NOM/ RM DEP-MF SONSEQ PRIORITY *FUSION

- a. av=ar'spand *! *
b. l=ar'spand *
c. al=ar'spand **!

(10) /'vad, 3MS.NOM/ RM DEP-MF SONSEQ PRIORITY *FUSION

- a. av='vad *! *
b. l='vad *! *
c. al='vad **

Discussion

• Optionality: a variable ranking between PRIORITY and *FUSION (Anttila 1997).

- *FUSION >> PRIORITY -> [al=v='di:z] in (8), e.g. (4a), (4b)

• This analysis solves several puzzles that arise if we assume 3MS.NOM's allomorphs are derived from a single underlying form:

- No phonological processes in Bolognese account for [l]~[al]~[av]~[as] alternations.

- Even [l]~[al] is puzzling:

* /al/ -> [l]/_V avoids an onsetless syllable, but Bolognese generally tolerates onsetless syllables.

* /l/ -> [al]/_C: [al] is inferior to *[a] from a syllabification point of view, and [a] is not a productive epenthetic vowel in Bolognese (Rubin & Kaplan 2021).

• Remaining issues:

- [al] variant unavailable in (3): perhaps resulting [ltl] sequence is illicit.

- [l], not [al], in (5a): [u] may epenthetic, causing different clitic allo-morphy.

- [a] variant unavailable in (6): the need for an onset for the verb may trigger appearance of simplex [m]/[v] before 3MS.NOM enters the pic-ture.

Conclusion

• Bolognese's 3MS.NOM allophony is better understood as suppletion. LS provides an appropriate formalism.

• Our analysis requires two innovations:

1. The fused allomorphs must be listed in the hierarchy for 3MS.NOM even though their morphosyntactic features are a superset of 3MS.NOM.

2. The fused allomorphs must appear in the hierarchies of multiple lexical items: [av] must satisfy RM for both 3MS.NOM and 2P.DAT.

References

• Anttila, A. 1997. Deriving Variation from Grammar, Variation, Change and Phonological Theory, edited by F. Hinskens, R. van Hout, & W. L. Wetzels, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, vol. 146, 35–68, Philadelphia: John Ben-jamins. • Kurisu, K. 2001. The Phonology of Morpheme Realization, Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz. • Mascaró, J. 2007. Exter-nal Allomorphy and Lexical Representation, LI 38:715–735. • McCarvel, M. 2016. Harmonic Serialism with Lexical Selection: Evidence from Jèrri-ais Allomorphy, Ph.D. thesis, University of Utah, Salt Lake City. • Rubin, E. J. & A. Kaplan. 2021. Segmental and Prosodic Influences on Bolognese Epenthesis, Paper presented at Epenthesis and Beyond, Stony Brook Uni-versity, Sept. 17.