Pronominal variation and layers in grammaticalization: The enclitic forms *-ello* and *-lo* in the Italo-Romance dialect of Lizzano in Belvedere

Chiara Cappellaro

Oxford University, United Kingdom <chiara.cappellaro@ling-phil.ox.ac.uk>

This study investigates the rare phenomenon of the co-occurrence (in Lizzanese, an Italo-Romance dialect spoken in the Tuscan-Emilian Apennines) of two types of enclitic pronoun in interrogative contexts: the unstressed monosyllabic forms *-lo* (3SG.M)/*-la* (3SG.F) and the stressed disyllabic forms *-ello* (3SG.M)/*-ella* (3SG.F). The coexistence of *-lo* and *-ello* is analysed as an instance of 'layering' (Hopper 1991) and it is claimed that a peculiar characteristic of Lizzanese historical phonology, the preservation of geminate consonants in posttonic contexts, played a crucial role in the emergence of layering. Moreover, following Loporcaro 2012, this study claims that *-ello* should be analysed as a syntactic clitic and *-lo* as a syntactic-and-phonological clitic and that these two clitic categories should be assigned distinct positions in a more refined and enriched cline of grammaticality.

KEYWORDS: Italian dialects; Lizzanese; personal pronouns; clitic pronouns; clitics; strong/weak pronouns; grammaticalization; interrogative; inversion; layering.

1. Introduction

It is widely acknowledged that grammaticalization, the process whereby lexical items become grammatical items or grammatical items become more grammatical over time, is a central notion in the analysis of the historical development of personal pronouns and of person markers more broadly (Heine & Song 2011; Siewierska 2004: 246f).

The development of Romance clitics[1] from tonic personal pronouns[2] is a case in point and the literature on the topic is vast (for a broad comparative review see Pescarini 2016 and references therein). This study focuses on the grammaticalization of subject (clitic) pronouns – which have received much attention particularly (but not exclusively, see Loporcaro 2012) from a synchronic perspective within the generative framework – and discusses a rare phenomenon found in the Italo-Romance dialect spoken in Lizzano in Belvedere (Tuscan-Emilian Apennines).

In Lizzanese two series of enclitic pronouns can fulfil the same morphosyntactic function (3SG) in interrogative constructions with so-called Subject Clitic Inversion (henceforth SCI): (a) the unstressed monosyllabic forms *-lo* (3SG.M)/*-la* (3SG.F) and (b) the stressed disyllabic forms *-ello* (3SG.M)/*-ella* (3SG.F) as exemplified in (1) with M.SG forms.

(1)	DECLARATIVE	a.	*El*[3]	*magna*	'He eats'
			SCL.3SG.M	eat.PRS.IND.3SG	
	INTERROGATIVE	b.	*Magn=lo?*		'Does he eat?'
			eat.PRS.IND[3SG]=SCL.3SG.M		
		c.	*Magn=ello?*		
			eat.PRS.IND[3SG]=SCL.3SG.M		

Both types of enclitic forms are recorded in Italo-Romance. But (Italo-)Romance varieties otherwise allow only one enclitic form, that is either the monosyllabic type *magn=lo* (1b) which is the most widespread in northern Italian dialects, or the less common stressed disyllabic type *magn=ello* (1c) which is also recorded in northern Tuscan varieties,[4] as illustrated in (2) with data from the Garfagnino dialect of Dalli di Sotto and in (3) with data from the peripheral Florentine dialect of Vaiano.

(2) Dalli di Sotto (from Manzini & Savoia 2005 I: 369):

	DECLARATIVE	a.	*a*	*d'dɔrma*	'He sleeps'
			SCL.3SG.M	sleep.PRS.IND.3SG	
		b.	*la*	*d'dɔrma*	'She sleeps'
			SCL.3SG.F	sleep.PRS.IND.3SG	
	INTERROGATIVE	c.	*dor'm=iɟɟə?*		'Does he sleep?'
			sleep.PRS.IND[3SG]=SCL.3SG.M		
		d.	*dor'm=ila?*		'Does she sleep?'
			eat.PRS.IND[3SG]=SCL.3SG.F		

(3) Vaiano (from Manzini & Savoia 2005 I: 370):[5]

	DECLARATIVE	a.	*e*	*'feʃe*	'He did'
			SCL.3SG.M	do.PST.IND.3SG	
		b.	*la*	*'feʃe*	'She did'
			SCL.3SG.F	do.PST.IND.3SG	
	INTERROGATIVE	c.	*fe'ʃ=eɟɟi?*		'Did he do?'
			do.PST.IND[3SG]=SCL.3SG.M		
		d.	*fe'ʃ=ella?*		'Did she do?'
			do.PST.IND[3SG]=SCL.3SG.F		

The coexistence in Lizzanese of two enclitic forms (*-ello/-lo*) for what is assumed to be one and the same function is atypical from a Romance comparative perspective (unique, to my knowledge) but is also rare typologically.[6]

The aim of this study is mainly descriptive, that is to provide new unpublished data[7] on the distribution of the *-ello* and *-lo* forms thus contributing to our comparative knowledge of (Romance) pronominal systems. I will propose however that the coexistence in Lizzanese of *-ello* and *-lo* is better understood if analysed as an instance of 'layering' (Hopper 1991) or the "synchronic result of successive grammaticalization of forms which contribute to the same domain" (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 124f). I also propose that phonological change and the development of a synchronic phonetic rule whereby geminate consonants are retained in posttonic contexts (cf. Loporcaro *et al.* 2006) must have played a crucial role in the emergence of the coexistence of *-ello/-lo* in Lizzanese.

The structure of this article is the following: §2 presents a brief outline of subject pronouns in Lizzanese and looks at previous studies on Lizzanese;[8] in §3 data on the *-ello/-lo* distribution are presented and discussed; §4 analyses *-ello/-lo* from the perspective of grammaticalization theory, before the conclusions are offered in §5.

2. Background

2.1 Lizzanese subject pronouns

Lizzanese is classified as a northern Italian dialect, as an eastern Emilian variety in particular because of the features that it shares with Bolognese and Modenese. It is described as being markedly different from neighbouring northern Tuscan varieties,[9] but as far as personal pronouns are concerned, Lizzanese and northern Tuscan dialects display the interesting similarities (having stressed disyllabic enclitics in interrogatives) illustrated in (2-3) above.

Like other northern Italian dialects, Lizzanese has two morphophonologically distinct series of subject pronouns, that is (i) a series of tonic or strong personal pronouns (cf. paradigms in Table 1) which have the same distribution as full NPs, and (ii) a series of non-tonic or clitic forms which occur preverbally in declarative sentences and are phonologically conditioned in shape depending on the initial segment of the host verb (cf. Table 2).

	SG	PL
1	*mi*	*nuatri* (M) *nuatre* (F)
2	*ti*	*vuatri* (M) *vuatre* (F)
3	*lu* (M) *le* (F)	*lorre* (M/F)

Table 1. Subject tonic pronouns in Lizzanese

	SG	PL
1	*(e/_C)* *(j/_V)*	*e/_C* *j/_V*
2	*t*	*e/_C* *j/_V*
3	*el/_C* (M.SG) *la/_C* (F.SG) *l/_V* (M/F.SG)	*i/_C* *j/_V*

Table 2. Subject proclitics in Lizzanese

As regards proclitic subject forms we can observe that the only cells that are fully differentiated are 2SG and 3SG, and that in 3SG forms gender is overtly marked only before a consonant. The 1SG form is syncretic with 1PL and 2PL and is optional. The 3PL is differentiated before a consonant but it is syncretic with 1SG/PL and 2PL before a vowel. Examples are provided in (4) and (5) below.

(4) a. *mi*   *(e)*   *canto*   'I sing'
      I   SCL.1SG   sing.PRS.IND.1SG

     b. *ti*   *t*   *canti*   'You sing'
      you.SG   SCL.2SG   sing.PRS.IND.2SG

     c. *lu*   *el*   *canta*   'He sings'
      he   SCL.3SG.M   sing.PRS.IND.3SG

     d. *le*   *la*   *canta*   'She sings'
      she   SCL.3SG.F   sing.PRS.IND.3SG

     e. *nuatri*   *e*   *cantèn*   'We sing'
      we.M   SCL.1PL   sing.PRS.IND.1PL

     f. *nuatre*   *e*   *cantèn*   'We (female) sing'[10]
      we.F   SCL.1PL   sing.PRS.IND.1PL

     g. *vuatri*   *e*   *cantaa*   'You sing'
      you.PL.M   SCL.2PL   sing.PRS.IND.2PL

h. *vuatre*   *e*   *cantaa*   'You (female) sing'
   you.PL.F   SCL.2PL   sing.PRS.IND.2PL

i. *lorre*   *i*   *cantne*   'They sing'
   they   SCL.3PL   sing.PRS.IND.1PL

(5) a. *mi*   *(j)*   *o cantà*   'I have sung'
      I   SCL.1SG   sing.PRS.PRF.1SG

   b. *ti*   *t*   *a cantà*   'You have sung'
      you.SG   SCL.2SG   sing.PRS.PRF.2SG

   c. *lu*   *l*   *a cantà*   'He has sung'
      he   SCL.3SG   sing.PRS.PRF.3SG

   d. *le*   *l*   *a cantà*   'She has sung'
      she   SCL.3SG   sing.PRS.PRF.3SG

   e. *nuatri*   *j*   *aven cantà*   'We have sung'
      we.M   SCL.1PL   sing.PRS.PRF.1PL

   f. *nuatre*   *j*   *aven cantà*   'We (female) have sung'
      we.F   SCL.1PL   sing.PRS.PRF.1PL

   g. *vuatri*   *j*   *avidi cantà*   'You have sung'
      you.PL.M SCL.2PL   sing.PRS.PRF.2PL

   h. *vuatre*   *j*   *avidi cantà*   'You (female) have sung'
      you.PL.F SCL.2PL   sing.PRS.PRF.2PL

   i. *lorre*   *j*   *an cantà*   'They have sung'
      they   SCL.3PL   sing.PRS.PRF.1PL

In interrogative contexts with subject-verb inversion Lizzanese displays the paradigm of enclitic subject pronouns in Table 3 (see also examples in (6)). The co-existence of two forms is only found in the third person singular cell. The 1SG cell is defective, and all other cells are filled by one form which is monosyllabic and stressed (*-tu, -nu, -vu*), with the exception of 3PL (*-ni*) which is unstressed and syncretic for gender.

		SG	PL
1			*nu*
2		*tu*	*vu*
3	M	*lo* *ello*	*ni*
	F	*la* *ella*	

Table 3. Subject enclitics in Lizzanese

(6) a. *canto?*   'Do I sing?'
          sing.1SG
     b. *canti = tu?*   'Do you sing?'
          sing.2SG = SCL.2SG
     c. *cant = ello?*   c'. *cant = lo?*   'Does he/she sing?'
          sing.3SG = SCL.3SG.M   sing.3SG = SCL.3SG.M
     d. *cant = ella?*   d'. *cant = la?*
          sing.3SG = SCL.3SG.F   sing.3SG = SCL.3SG.F
     e. *cante = nu?*   'Do we sing?'
          sing.1PL = SCL.1PL
     f. *canta = vu?*   'Do you sing?'
          sing.2PL = SCL.2PL
     g. *cant = ni?*   'Do they sing?'
          sing.3PL = SCL.3PL

SCI is restricted to interrogatives in Lizzanese – in main clauses but not in embedded contexts – as illustrated in (7).[11]

(7) a. *Magn = lo?*
          eat.PRS.IND[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M
          'Does he eat?'
     b. *Magn = ello?*
          eat.PRS.IND[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M
          'Does he eat?'
     c. *En   so   perché el   magna   (*magn = lo / *magn = ello)*
          SCL.1SG-NEG know.1SG   why   SCL.3SG.M eat.PRS.IND.3SG
          'I do not know why he eats'

Moreover, SCI is not obligatory in Lizzanese,[12] as the following examples show. Interrogative sentences without inversion represent in fact around 50% of the total number of main interrogatives in my corpus, and this could be interpreted as a sign of recession of the SCI type, as noted by Parry (1999) for Piedmontese.

(8) DECLARATIVE   a. *Gianni*   *el*   *ve*
                            Gianni   SCL.3SG.M   come.PRS.IND.3SG
                            'Gianni comes'

     INTERROGATIVE   b. *El*   *ve*   *Gianni?*
     (without SCI)   SCL.3SG.M   come.PRS.IND.3SG Gianni
                            'Does Gianni come?'

     INTERROGATIVE   c. *Ve = lo*   *Gianni?*
     (WITH SCI)   come.3SG = SCL.3SG.M Gianni
                            'Does Gianni come?'

A caveat is in order regarding the use of the label Subject Clitic Inversion (SCI) in this study. Much work has been carried out on the topic particularly with regard to northern Italian dialects, see for example Rizzi (1986), Brandi & Cordin (1989), and Poletto (2000). Not all scholars agree that pronominal enclisis involves syntactic inversion and some (for example Fava 1998 and 2001) have proposed instead that interrogative enclitics are affixes of an interrogative conjunction or mood. This second interpretation of subject pronoun enclisis as a morphological phenomenon with no syntactic correlates is known as 'interrogative conjugation' (cf. Rohlfs 1968: 257 and Fava 2001: 366). I employ the label SCI here for descriptive convenience without committing myself to one specific analysis.

2.2 Previous studies on Lizzanese -ello

Malagoli reports the existence of both stressed personal pronouns *-ello/-ella* (alongside tonic forms *lu/le*) in interrogative clauses and enclitic forms *-lo/-la*. He also implies that *-ello* and *-lo* can co-occur (cf. quotation in (9c)).

(9) a. "Forme tòniche: […] m. *lu* lui, f. *lę* lei; m. *ęllo*, f. *ęlla* (si úsano soltanto in fine di frasi interrogative)" (1940: 194)
   b. "Enclítiche dell'infinito, dell'imperativo e delle frasi interrogative […] *-lo, -la*" (1940: 197)
   c. "nelle forme ossitone in *-ă*, in unione con le enclitiche *lo, la,* in frasi interrogative, senz'aggiunta del pron. *ello* ed *ęlla*: *śta|lo bę|n?* sta bene?, *śtara|lo bę|n?* starà bene?, *kom va|la?* come va?; ma *kom śtal ęllo?* come sta egli?, *kom śtaral ęllo?, kom val ęlla?* e sim. In ogni altro caso l'enclitica non muta la quantità della vocale a cui si unisce: *fnillo?* acc. a *fnil ęllo?* finì egli?" (1930: 164).

In the light of the data I collected in the field (presented and discussed in §3), it is clear that *-ello* is not a tonic or strong pronoun restricted to interrogative sentences and it is not a clitic since it cannot stand in isolation and fails traditional tests for clitic status (cf. Kayne 1975), as examples in (10) show.

(10) a. *Chi   el   ve?   Lu? (*Ello?)*
        who   SCL.3SG.M   come.PRS.IND.3SG   He?
        'Who is coming?' 'Him?'

   b. *Cant=ello   o   cant=ella?*   *(Cantello o *ella?)*
        sing.PRS.IND.3SG=SCL.3SG.M   or   sing.PRS.IND.3SG=SCL.3SG.F
        'Is he or is she singing?'

   c. *El   ve   anca lu?   (*anch'ello?)*
        SCL.3SG.M   come.PRS.IND.3SG   also he?
        'Is he also coming?'

So what is *-ello* synchronically in terms of syntax and phonology? And do *-ello* and *-lo* in fact co-occur synchronically? In order to address these questions, we must first look into the issue of the partial preservation of consonant length in Lizzanese.

2.2.1 *-ello* and consonant length preservation in Lizzanese

The first major study of Lizzanese phonology after Malagoli is Loporcaro *et al.* 2006. According to this study, a crucial characteristic of Lizzanese and one that makes it typologically distinct from northern Italian dialects but closer to Tuscan and Italian, is the partial retention of geminate consonants.

Malagoli (1930: 130f) had claimed that there are specific contexts (cf. (11) given in the IPA transcription used by Loporcaro *et al.* 2006: 493) where geminates have been retained. In paroxytones, posttonic consonants are geminate (11a) but not pretonic ones (11b). In proparoxytonic words there is consistent gemination (11c), which can occur together with syncope of the posttonic vowel (11d).

(11) a. ['fritːo] 'fry.PTPC'
   ['kreʃːe] 'grow.PRS.IND.3SG'
   [kaˈvalːo] 'horse'
   ['laʃːo] 'leave.1SG'
   ['donːa] 'woman'
  b. [laˈʃaːre] 'leave.INF'
   [doˈniːna] 'little woman'

  c. ['lagːrima] 'drop'
   ['tavːola] 'table'
   ['pegːora] 'sheep'
   ['pevːaro] 'pepper'
  d. ['dʒovːne] 'young'
   ['vedːvo] 'widower'
   ['pɛtːne] 'comb'
   ['ɛsːre] 'be.INF'

Loporcaro *et al.* (2006: 512) confirm this state of affairs[13] but observe that there are significant exceptions to these rules. For example, there are proparoxytones without geminates in two specified categories: (i) verb forms in the third person plural, as in [i ˈkrɔːdane] 'they.SCL believe', [i ˈbraːvane] 'they.SCL scold', and [i ˈmteːvane] 'they.SCL put. PST.IPFV'; and (ii) the cluster 'imperative verb plus enclitic object pronoun', as in ['spaːkalo] 'break it'. They add that there are no grounds to assume that either ˈVC: or ˈV:C are phonemic.

(12) Ma comunque, sia che il proparossitono abbia uniformemente vocale tonica breve e consonante postonica geminata sia che si comporti come il parossitono, ammettendo le due possibilità ˈVC: e ˈV:C, nell'uno e nell'altro caso non se ne ha alcun indizio circa il valore distintivo della durata vocalica e consonantica (Loporcaro *et al.* 2006: 512).

The data in (13a) [ˈpolːa] and (13b) [ˈpoːla] from my corpus (cf. §3.1 and §3.2) show that also in paroxytonic verbs followed by enclitic pronouns both ˈVC: and ˈV:C are possible.

(13) a. [ˈpolːa]   *Po=lla?*
                 can.PRS.IND.3SG = SCL.F.SG
                 'Can she?'

     b. [ˈpoːla]   *Po=la*   *gner*   *giò,*   *Barbara?*
                 can.PRS.IND.3SG = SCL.F.SG   come.INF   down   Barbara
                 'Can Barbara come down?'

Let us now briefly consider vowel length. In final position, vowels may be either short or long (Malagoli 1930: 139-141). The difference in vowel quantity appears to be phonemic as examples in (14) show, and as happens in some northern Italian dialects that have completely lost geminates (cf. Friulian [lat] 'milk' and [laːt] 'gone').

(14) a. [kaŋˈta]   'sing.PTPC'
         [aŋˈda]   'go.PTPC'

     b. [kaŋˈtaː]   'sing.PRS.IND.2PL'
         [aŋˈdaː]   'go.PRS.IND.2PL'

Loporcaro *et al.* claim therefore that Lizzanese reflects an intermediate stage in the diachronic process that brought about phonologization of vowel quantity in northern Italian dialects.

(15) I dati confermano […] l'esistenza di una distribuzione complementare delle quantità vocaliche e consonantiche: la vocale è lunga davanti a consonante breve e breve davanti a consonante lunga. Siamo dunque di fronte a un assetto che è parallelo a quello dello standard, ma contrasta d'altro canto con un dato di natura fonologica, ovvero la ricorrenza di vocali sia brevi che lunghe in posizione finale, che caratterizza invece le varietà romanze occidentali con quantità vocalica distintiva.
Il dialetto di Lizzano sembra quindi rispecchiare una tappa intermedia del processo diacronico che ha portato all'insorgere della quantità vocalica distintiva nelle varietà dell'Italo-Romània settentrionale [my emphasis]: l'avvenuta rifonologizzazione della quantità vocalica non ha ancora comportato, nella fase che il lizzanese rispecchia, la completa eliminazione della manifestazione fonetica della differenza di lunghezza consonantica, alla quale in proto-romanzo competeva, nelle coppie ˈCV:CV ≠ ˈCVC:V, funzione distintiva (Loporcaro *et al.* 2006: 491).

I propose that Lizzanese equally mirrors an intermediate stage in the grammaticalization path that brought about subject enclitics of the *-lo* type in northern Italian dialects, that is, the path that caused strong pronominal postverbal subjects to develop into fully-fledged subject enclitics. I shall return on this claim in §4.

Although further research is needed to establish the synchronic phonological status of *-ello* (as /elo/ or /el:o/), I propose that Lizzanese 'imperfect degemination' played a crucial role in the emergence of layering. It is likely that imperfect degemination was also one of the factors (but by no means the only factor – *ello*'s refential power must have played an important role) favouring the preservation of the older layer *-ello*. In particular, we could assume the diachronic path schematically outlined below.

(16)   Phase 1
    • *ello* (<ILLU(M)) is a full subject tonic pronoun
    • gemination is still phonemic at this point; [el:o] is underlyingly /el:o/
    • *ello* is syntactically unrestricted, occurring in pre-verbal and postverbal position in both declaratives and interrogatives

    Phase 2
    • *ello* is still a subject tonic pronoun
    • gemination is still phonemic
    • *ello* becomes syntactically restricted to interrogatives (postverbally)

    Phase 3
    • *ello* is variably realized as both [el:o] and [e:lo]
    • the system of geminates is undergoing change
    • both [el:o] and [e:lo] are syntactically restricted to interrogatives, postverbally, and are presumably in free variation

    Phase 4
    • two distinct series emerge
    • *-ello* < [el:o] without phonological erosion and with preservation of semantic (referential) content; despite the general dephonologization of geminates, [el:o] has stably maintained its full form; underlyingly /el:o/ or /elo/
    • the further grammaticalized *-lo* < [elo] < [e:lo] which did undergo phonological and semantic reduction

2.2.2 -ello *and* -lo *co-occurrence*

Let us return to the issue of the status of [l] in the type *velello*. Is the segment /l/ really the enclitic form *-lo* as Malagoli suggests (cf. (9c))? I explore an alternative analysis for /l/.

Malagoli's claim refers explicitly to oxytonic words (followed by

enclitic pronoun). What Malagoli analyses as (-*lo*) + (-*ello*)[14] is restricted also in my corpus to high frequency monosyllabic oxytonic verbs such as *fa* 'do.PRS.IND.3SG', *va* 'go.PRS.IND.3SG', *sta* 'stay.PRS.IND.3SG', *sa* 'know.PRS.IND.3SG' and *ve* 'come.PRS.IND.3SG'. Constructions such as **canta-l-ello* < *canta* [ˈkanta] (17f) or **magna-l-ello* < *magna* [ˈmaɲa] (17g) are neither spontaneously produced by informants nor accepted as possible in their grammaticality judgements.

(17) a. *C*   *fal = ello?*
       what   do.PRS.IND.3SG = SCL.3SG.M
       'What does he do?'

     b. *Quand*   *val = ella?*
       when   go.PRS.IND.3SG = SCL.3SG.F
       'When does she go?'

     c. *Com*   *stal = ello?*
       how   stay.PRS.IND.3SG = SCL.3SG.M
       'How is he?'

     d. *Le*   *sal = ella?*
       it.OBJ.CL   know.PRS.IND.3SG = SCL.3SG.F
       'Does she know it?'

     e. *Vel = ello?*
       come.PRS.IND.3SG = SCL.3SG.M
       'Does he come?'

     f. *Cant = ello?*   **Cantal = ello*
       sing.PRS.IND[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M
       'Does he sing?'

     g. *Magn = ello?*   **Magnal = ello*
       eat.PRS.IND[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M
       'Does he eat?'

There is only one example in Malagoli of a disyllabic but oxytonic verb form (cf. *starà* [staˈra] in (18)).

(18)   *Staràl = ello?*
       stay.FUT.IND.3SG = SCL.3SG.M
       'Will he stay?'

I propose that /l/ is the result of reanalysis and analogical extension of the [-l-ello] chunk in interrogative contexts. We may envisage the emergence of a proportional analogical process as exemplified in (19).

(19)   *vole* (want.PRS.IND.3SG) : *sta* (stay.PRS.IND.3SG) = *volello* > *stalello*

In this hypothesis forms like *vol = ello* were reanalysed as *vo[l = ello]* because there are a number of high-frequency verbs that are monosyllabic (hence oxytonic) in the third person singular. By analogy, [-*l = ello*] has then been extended to all oxytonic verb forms (which are monosyllables in the main).

It follows from this analysis that in the type *stalello*, *-lo* and *-ello* do not coexist. This could represent a problem if one was to consider *-ello* as a 'weak' pronoun *à la* Cardinaletti & Starke 1999, since one of the defining properties of weak forms is precisely that they can co-occur with clitics. And this leads us to the question of what the syntactic status of *-ello* in fact is.

In the literature on Romance (en)clitic pronouns, two approaches have been adopted to deal with cases in which a strong/clitic bipartition does not account fully for the complexity of the data. One approach, often embraced by generative syntacticians, is the strong/weak/clitic tripartition proposed by Cardinaletti & Starke 1999 (cf. 'stressed enclitics' in Ordoñez & Repetti 2006 for example). However, as discussed in Manzini 2014, the category 'weak' pronoun is problematic and the author's position is that "Romance pronouns can be accounted for (without loss of empirical adequacy or theoretical generality) by ignoring such schemas of organization" (2014: 199).

An alternative approach, which, to the best of my knowledge, has not yet been adopted for the analysis of enclitic pronouns, is based on the notions of strong/syntactic clitic/syntactic-and-phonological clitic as discussed within a grammaticalization framework in Loporcaro 2012. Within this approach (to which I will return in §4) the Lizzanese pronoun *-ello* would be analysed as a syntactic clitic by virtue of it being disyllabic, carrying lexical stress and thus being prosodically non-deficient (cf. (20)).

(20)	STRONG	SYNTACTIC CLITIC	SYNTACTIC-AND-PHONOLOGICAL
	non-deficient both syntactically and prosodically	syntactially deficient prosodically non-deficient	deficient both syntactically and prosodically
	lu	= *ello*	= *lo*
	le	= *ella*	= *la*

3. Data presentation and discussion

3.1 Data collection methodology

The data collection occurred between 2007 and 2008 through (i) face-to-face interviews with two informants in Lizzano in Belvedere and (ii) postal written questionnaire (subdivided into four short parts) with the same informants. The questionnaire involved the translation of short sentences from standard Italian to Lizzanese (cf. Benincà & Poletto 1991: 84f). Questions were designed to test the following syntactic variables with the aim of identifying the contexts of occurrence of *-ello* and *-lo*:

a. presence (or absence) of overt subject in preverbal and postverbal position:
    i. overt subject is a full nominal
    ii. overt subject is a pronoun
    iii. non-overt subject
b. type of subject
    i. referential
    ii. expletive
c. type of interrogative sentence
    i. yes/no question
    ii. *wh-* question
d. type of verb
    i. transitive and intransitive (unergative and unaccusative)
    ii. lexical and functional (auxiliaries)

The data presented in §3.2 will show that *-ello* and *-lo* cannot co-occur. Both can occur with non-overt subjects: *-lo* can occur with both postverbal and preverbal subjects; *-ello* can only occur with preverbal subjects if left-dislocated. Both *-ello* and *-lo* can occur with weather verbs but *-ello* cannot occur with auxiliaries. A schematic summary will be provided in §3.2.6.

The methodology used has the obvious limitations of questionnaire administration and translation tasks: data are not produced in a natural environment and the test format is rather mechanical and repetitive. In this case, moreover, informants had to write their answers down even though their dialect does not have official orthographic conventions. Because the sentences to translate were rather short, there is no narrative structure which could allow an investigation into the semantic-pragmatic differences among *lu, -ello* and *-lo*. With this regard, there are some predictions that we can make about the relative status of *-ello* and *-lo* in terms of cognitive activation or Accessibility (Ariel 1988) which will need to be substantiated in future research by further data collection and analysis (cf. Demol 2007). For example, the fact that *-ello* can co-occur with overt preverbal subjects (NPs or tonic pronouns) only if these subjects are dislocated suggests that its referential power is higher than that of *-lo* which

can on the other hand co-occur with preverbal subjects. The fact that *-lo* has undergone a more profound degree of 'semantic bleaching' than *-ello* is consistent with *-lo* being the further grammaticalized layer on the cline.

3.2 Data

The data presented in this section are a small representative sample of the whole corpus of data collected in the field. The presentation is organized as follows: §3.2.1 shows examples of *-ello/-lo* in sentences with full noun phrases as overt preverbal or postverbal subjects in yes/no questions and *wh*-questions, while §3.2.2 focuses on sentences with tonic pronouns *lu/le* as overt subjects. §3.2.3 looks at sentences without the presence of an overt subject; §3.2.4 at those with expletive subjects (weather verbs) and §3.2.5 considers the behaviour of *-ello/-lo* with auxiliaries. A summary is then provided in §3.2.6 (Table 4).

For each numbered example, the sentence in bold is that produced by the speaker in the written questionnaire and reported in the original orthography which is based on that of standard Italian. The example is glossed using the Leipzig Glossing Rules (but see note 3 on the glossing of subject clitics). In brackets the grammaticality judgement given by the speaker [✓ = grammatical, * = ungrammatical] is also provided. On some occasions, informants provide two translations for the same Italian sentence, as in the case of 'Mangia?' ('Does she eat?') which is translated in (27c) as both *Magnla?* and *Magnella?*. These instances of 'minimal pairs' are presented under the same example entry (cf. (27c) and (27c')).

3.2.1 Presence of overt subject (full NP)

(21)   Preverbal – yes/no questions

    a. *La   Luisa,   fal = ella   la   mnestra?*
       the   Luisa   do.3SG = SCL.3SG.F   the   soup
       'As for Luisa, does she make the soup?'
       (✓La Luisa, fa = la la mnestra?)

(22)   Preverbal – *wh*-questions

    a. *Gianni,   c   fal = ello?*
       Gianni   what   do.3SG = SCL.3SG.M
       'As for Gianni, what does he do?'
       (✓Gianni, c fa = lo?)

    b. *El   fiolin,   quand   magn = lo?*
       the   kid   when   eat[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M
       'As for the kid, when does he eat?'
       (✓El   fiolin, quand magn = ello?)

(23)   Postverbal – yes/no questions

   a. *Magn = lo   el   fiolin?*
       eat[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M   the kid
       'Does the child eat?'
       (*Magn = ello el fiolin?)

   b. *Magn = lo   Gianni?*
       eat[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M   Gianni
       'Does Gianni eat?'
       (*Magn = ello Gianni?)

   c. *Vo = lla   la   torta   la   Lucia?*
       want[3SG] = SCL.3SG.F   the cake   the   Lucia
       'Does Lucia want the cake?'
       (*Vol = ella la torta la Lucia?)

   d. *Ve = lo   Mario?*
       come.3SG = SCL.3SG.M   Mario
       'Does Mario come?'
       (*Vel = ello Mario?)

   e. *Fistc = lo   chel   ragazin?*
       whistle[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M   that   boy
       'Does that boy whistle?'
       (*Fistc = ello/Fistcl = ello chel ragazin?)

   f. *Scia = lo   ben   to   fradello?*
       ski.3SG = SCL.3SG.M   well   your   brother
       'Does your brother ski well?'
       (*Sci = ello/Scial = ello ben to fradello?)

   g. *Dorm = la   la   nonna?*
       sleep[3SG] = SCL.3SG.F   the   grandmother
       'Does grandmother sleep?'
       (*Dorm-ella/Dorm-l = ella la nonna?)

(24) Postverbal – *wh*-questions

   a. *C   fa = la   la   Luisa?*
       what   do.3SG = SCL.3SG.F   the Luisa
       'What does Luisa do?'
       (*C fal = ella la Luisa?)

   b. *Quand   magn = lo   la   torta   to   marì?*
       when   eat[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M   the cake   your husband
       'When does your husband eat the cake?'
       (* Quand magn = ello la torta to marì?)

c. *C   fa＝lo   Gianni?*
   what   do.3SG＝SCL.3SG.M   Gianni
   'What does Gianni do?'
   (*C fal＝ello Gianni?)

d. *Dov'   magn＝la   la   mamma?*
   where   eat[3SG]＝SCL.3SG.F   the mother
   'Where does mum eat?'
   (*Dov' magn＝ella la mamma?)

e. *Quand   va＝lo   to   marì?*
   when   go.3SG＝SCL.3SG.M   your husband
   'When does your husband go?'
   (*Quand val＝ello to marì?)

3.2.2 Presence of overt subject (tonic pronoun)

(25) Preverbal – *wh*-questions

a. *Lu,   c   magn＝ello?*
   he   what   eat[3SG]＝SCL.3SG.M
   'As for him, what does he eat?'
   (✔Lu, c magn＝lo?)

b. *Le,   quand   magn＝ella?*
   she   when   eat[3SG]＝SCL.3SG.F
   'As for her, when does she eat?'
   (✔Le, quand magn＝la?)

c. *Lu,   c   fa＝lo?*
   he   what   do.3SG＝SCL.3SG.M
   'As for him, what does he do?'
   (✔Lu, c fal＝ello?)

(26) Postverbal – yes/no questions

   Ve＝lo   lu?
   come.3SG＝SCL.3SG.M   he
   'Does he come?'
   (*Vel＝ello lu?)

3.2.3 Non-overt subject

(27) Yes/no questions

a. *Magn＝la   la   pasta?*
   eat[3SG]＝SCL.3SG.F   the pasta

'Does she eat pasta?'
(✓*Magn = ella la pasta?*)

b. *Fa = la   la   mnestra?*
do.3SG = SCL.3SG.F   the   soup
'Does she make the soup?'
(✓*Fal = ella la mnestra?*)

c. *Magn = la?*
eat[3SG] = SCL.3SG.F
'Does she eat?'

c'. *Magn = ella?*
eat[3SG] = SCL.3SG.F
'Does she eat?'

d. *Magn = lo   con   nuatri?*
eat[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M   with   us
'Does he eat with us?'
(✓*Magn = ello con nuatri?*)

e. *Giug = la?*
play[3SG] = SCL.3SG.F
'Does she play?'

e'. *Giugh = ella?*
play[3SG] = SCL.3SG.F
'Does she play?'

f. *Abbai = lo?*
bark[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M
'Does it bark?'
(✓*Abbai = ello?*)

g. *Dorm = lo?*
sleep[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M
'Does he sleep?'

g'. *Dorm = ello?*
sleep[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M
'Does he sleep?'

h. *Po = la?*
can[3SG] = SCL.3SG.F
'Can she?'

h'. *Pol = ella?*
can[3SG] = SCL.3SG.F
'Can she?'

(28) *Wh*-questions

    a. *C*   *magn＝ello?*
        what   eat[3SG]＝SCL.3SG.M
        'What does he eat?'
        (✔ C magn＝lo?)

    b. *C*   *dis＝ello?*
        what   say[3SG]＝SCL.3SG.M
        'What does he say?'
        (✔ C dis＝lo?)

    c. *C*   *fal＝ello?*
        what   do.3SG＝SCL.3SG.M
        'What does he do?'

    c'. *C*   *fa＝lo?*
        what   do.3SG＝SCL.3SG.M
        'What does he do?'

    d. *Quand* *magn＝ello?*
        when   eat[3SG]＝SCL.3SG.M
        'When does he eat?'

    d'. *Quand*   *magn＝lo?*
        when   eat[3SG]＝SCL.3SG.M
        'When does he eat?'

    e. *Quand* *val＝ella?*
        when   eat.3SG＝SCL.3SG.F
        'When does he go?'

    e'. *Quand*   *va＝lo?*
        when   go.3SG＝SCL.3SG.M
        'When does she go?'

    f. *Quand* *sci＝ello?*
        when   ski[3SG]＝SCL.3SG.M
        'When does he ski?'
        (✔ Quand scia＝lo?)

3.2.4 Expletive subject. Weather verbs

(29) a. *Piov＝ello?*
       rain[3SG]＝SCL.3SG.M
       'Does it rain?'

a'. *Piov = lo?*
rain[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M
'Does it rain?'

b. *Piov = lo   da tanto?*
rain[3SG] = SCL.3SG.M   for long
'Has it been raining for long?'
(✔ *Piov = ello da tanto?*)

3.2.5 Auxiliaries

(30) a. *T'   a = lo   scritto?*
you.SG.DAT   have.3SG = SCL.3SG.M   write.PTPC
'Has he written to you'?
(* *T a-l = ello scritto?*)

b. *A = lo   letto   il   libro?*
have.3SG = SCL.3SG.M   read.PTPC the book
'Has he read the book?'
(**A-l-ello letto il libro?*)

c. *E = lo   vgnu?*
be.3SG = SCL.3SG.M   come.PTPC
'Has he come?'
(**E-l = ello vgnu?*)

d. *E = lo   partì   ieri   Giorgio?*
be.3SG = SCL.3SG.M   leave.PTPC yesterday Giorgio
'Did Giorgio leave (yesterday)?
(**El = ello partì ieri Giorgio?*)

e. *A = lo   fisctià?*
have.3SG = SCL.3SG.M   whistle.PTPC
'Has he whistled?'
(**Al = ello fisctià?*)

3.2.6 Summary of -ello/-lo distribution

From the data presented above and summarized below in Table 4 below, it is clear that *-ello* and *-lo* have different although overlapping properties and cannot co-occur. Both enclitic forms can be used in the absence of an overt subject and with expletive subjects: the fact that informants could produce two different translations (one with *-lo* and one with *-ello*) for the same Italian sentence is revealing of the degree of interchangeability of the two forms in these contexts. Moreover, *-lo* can occur with both postverbal and preverbal subjects; *-ello* can only occur

with preverbal subjects if they are left-dislocated. Both *-ello* and *-lo* can occur with weather verbs but *-ello* cannot occur with auxiliaries.

	OVERT SUBJECT		NON-OVERT SUBJECT	WEATHER VERBS	AUXILIARY VERBS
	PREVERBAL	POSTVERBAL			
-ello	* (✓ if left-dislocated)	*	✓	✓	✓
-lo	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 4. Summary of *-ello/-lo* distribution

4. Cliticization and 'layering' effect

The developmental path of Romance subject clitics has been thoroughly investigated (cf. Vanelli 1998 [1987], Parry 1993 and Poletto 1995 among others) and is well understood. Forms that were once strong pronouns (with the properties of full NPs) first acquired a fixed position adjacent to the verb and then over time were reanalysed as a property of the verb. This type of change from grammatical word (strong pronoun) to clitic (or even affix)[15] is an instance of grammaticalization.

The Lizzanese enclitic pronoun *-ello* was once a strong pronoun (<ILLU(M)) and as such it had the same properties that are now the exclusive domain of *lu* (<ILLUI, *CIL* X.2564) namely the possibility of standing in isolation, being modified or co-ordinated. The difference between *ello* and *lu(i)* was originally one of syntactic function (subject *vs* direct object and object of preposition) but we can see that at some point the *ello/lu(i)* opposition lost any distinction originally related to Latin case (nominative/accusative *vs* dative respectively).

The aspects of grammaticalization relevant to the present issues (cf. Hopper & Traugott 2003 and Brinton & Traugott 2005) are the following.

a. FUSION AND COALESCENCE (Brinton & Traugott 2005: 27): changes affect constructions, and not words in isolation. "Prototypical examples of grammaticalization involve boundary loss and morphological/phonological fusion [my emphasis], or 'bonding' (Bybee 1985, and Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca 1994). Grammaticalization may also involve the loss of phonological segments, or coalescence". Not all grammaticalization "involves overt fusion and coalescence". Contrary to *-lo*, the form *-ello* did not undergo loss of phonological segments. In Lizzanese loss of phonological segments in the subject pronouns (e.g. *-lo*) correlates with a higher degree of grammaticalization.

b. BLEACHING: bleaching refers to the loss of (lexical) meaning and the acquisition of a new, more grammatical and abstract meaning. In the case of Lizzanese, the strong pronoun *ello,* which was fully referential, underwent bleaching over time. I hypothesize that the weak form *-ello* is more referential and less 'bleached' than *-lo*. This claim is in line with the synchronic behaviour of the two forms, since *-ello* cannot co-occur with overt subjects (unless preverbal and left-dislocated) and cannot co-occur with functional verbs like auxiliaries.

c. CLINE OF GRAMMATICALIZATION: change[16] does not have to happen, but it has been empirically observed that cross-linguistically, when changes do happen, they tend to follow a path, also referred to as the 'cline of grammaticality': CONTENT ITEM > GRAMMATICAL WORD > CLITIC > INFLECTIONAL AFFIX. Each item to the right is more grammatical than the item to its left.

Loporcaro (2012) suggests that the cline should be refined and that the 'clitic' position should be in fact split into two in order to allow for cases where syntactic (but not phonological) cliticization occurs and cases where cliticization affects both the syntactic and the phonological levels.

(31)   Grammaticalization cline (Loporcaro 2012: 769)
        content item > grammatical word > syntactic clitic > syntactic-and-phonological
        clitic > inflectional affix

The data presented here on *-ello* and *-lo* fully support Loporcaro's claim. The existence of both forms is material evidence for the existence of two distinct grammaticalization stages. We know that *ello* developed from Latin accusative ILLU(M) and as such it must have started off as a fully tonic subject pronoun (*lu(i)* was syntactically restricted to the non-subject function at the time). Presumably this system was still in place in the 14th century, when grammatical case was still (although minimally) preserved in the Florentine system of third person pronouns (cf. *egli/lui* in Boccaccio's *Decameron* discussed in Boström 1972 and Cappellaro 2018).

As proposed in the schema in (16) we should then assume that grammaticalization started with the tonic subject pronoun *ello* becoming restricted to interrogative contexts. This may involve positing a further position in the cline (grammatical word with fixed position in the clause, but still strong in the sense of Kayne 1975).

A further step involved a change from grammatical word to syntactic clitic. At this stage we should also assume a variable realization of *ello* as [elːo] and [eːlo] due to phonetic variation and phonological restructuring. The variant [eːlo] underwent phonological reduction

([elo] > [lo]) and further cliticization reaching the status of syntactic-and-phonological clitic, while the variant [elːo] did not. At this stage the preservation of geminate /lː/ must have played a role in the survival of the disyllabic and stressed *-ello* form. We can also assume that phonological reduction correlated positively with semantic bleaching and marked a semantic contrast between *-ello* and *-lo*.

d. DECATEGORIALIZATION (Brinton & Traugott 2005: 25): when an item moves along the cline of grammaticality, the shift from one category to another correlates "with a shift from prototypical membership of a category to less prototypical membership, and maybe eventually to prototypical membership of a new category". In Lizzanese, *-lo* is a more prototypical member of the category 'clitic pronoun' than *-ello*. Clitics for example are by definition unstressed elements and are generally monosyllabic.

e. GRADUALNESS[17] (Brinton & Traugott 2005: 6, 26): changes in grammaticalization are not abrupt (A > B) but gradual. They "occur in very small structural steps, typically with innovative uses coexisting alongside older ones" (Brinton & Traugott 2005: 26). "Earlier patterns [sometimes] only become r e s t r i c t e d or f o s s i l i z e d [my emphasis], not entirely lost" (Brinton & Traugott 2005: 6). When this happens the effect is referred to as 'layering' (Hopper 1991).

f. LAYERING (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 124f): "Older layers are not necessarily discarded, but may remain to coexist with and interact with new layers" (Hopper 1991: 22). "Layering is the synchronic result of successive grammaticalization of forms which contribute to the same domain. […] Some of the most obvious cases are those where a full and a reduced form coexist, with related forms and only minimally different functions" (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 124f). And this is the situation we have in Lizzanese with *-ello* and *-lo*. The two forms are related: *-lo* is the phonologically reduced counterpart of *-ello*. They are interchangeable in some syntactic contexts (with non-overt and expletive subjects, for example) and they appear to have minimally different functions in these contexts.

5. Conclusion

This study has provided new data on the phenomenon of the coexistence of stressed (disyllabic) and unstressed (monosyllabic) enclitics *-ello* and *-lo* in Lizzanese. I have highlighted that this phenomenon does not have parallels elsewhere in (Italo)-Romance.

I have claimed that, diachronically, the development of subject (en)clitics in Italo-Romance is better conceived in terms of grammaticali-

zation (grammatical word > clitic); the coexistence of *-ello* and *-lo* can be analysed as an instance of 'layering' (Hopper 1991), i.e. "the synchronic result of successive grammaticalization of forms which contribute to the same domain" (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 124f). I have proposed that Lizzanese 'imperfect degemination' played a crucial role in the emergence of layering.

Following Loporcaro 2012, I have also claimed that we should analyze *-ello* as a syntactic clitic and *-lo* as a syntactic-and-phonological clitic. Moreover, the coexistence and distribution of the two enclitics in Lizzanese support Loporcaro's proposal for a more refined and enriched cline of grammaticality.

Abbreviations

1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3= third person; CL = clitic; DAT = dative; F = feminine; FUT = future; IND = indicative; INF= infinitive; IPFV = imperfective; M = masculine ; NEG= negation; OBJ = object; SCI = Subject Clitic Inversion; SCL = subject clitic; SG = singular; PL = plural; PRF = perfect; PRS = present; PST = past; PTPC = past participle.

Notes

[1]   As is well known, while all Romance languages have developed a series of object clitic pronouns (direct and indirect), only a subset of varieties (northern Italo-Romance including northern Tuscan varieties, Rhaeto-Romance and Gallo-Romance) have developed subject clitic pronouns. Subject clitics are preverbal (proclitic) in declarative clauses but there are contexts (interrogative, for example) in which they undergo subject-verb inversion (i.e. they become enclitic).

[2]   The fact that clitic pronouns evolve from independent person markers is unquestioned for Romance languages and, according to Siewierska (2004: 251f), is generally assumed to be 'typical' and to occur cross-linguistically even in the absence of clear phonological similarity.

[3]   A note on the glossing of clitics in this article is in order. The Leipzig Glossing Rules recommend the use of the symbol '=' to show clitic boundary. I have only employed '=' when the pronoun is enclitic and by convention orthographically attached to the preceding host. When the pronoun is proclitic on the other hand, I have used the abbreviation 'SCL' standing for subject clitic. For consistency, I have also used 'SCL' after '=' in the glossing of enclitic pronouns.

[4]   Disyllabic enclitics are not uncommon in northern Italy (cf. for example forms like *-ela* and *-ele* in the rich data-set provided by Manzini & Savoia 2005 I: 360f) but they differ substantially from the Lizzanese *-ello* type in that they are well-behaved clitics, so unstressed, and they do not co-exist with either stressed disyllabic or unstressed monosyllabic counterparts.

[5]   See also Brandi & Cordin (1981: 34f).

6   See Siewierska (2004: 67f).
7   The data were collected by me through fieldwork in Lizzano in Belvedere, partly in September 2007 in face-to-face interviews and partly in August 2008 through question-naires by mail. The data collection methodology is described in §3.1. I would like to thank my informants Liliana and Giorgio Vai for their kind help and generosity.
8   The first description of Lizzanese was carried out by Malagoli in a series of articles (1930, 1940, 1941), which have been republished in one single volume edited by Filipponio & Loporcaro (2011). Malagoli (1930) provides an extremely careful account of the phonology of Lizzanese, while subsequent articles look at its morpho-syntax (1940) and lexicon (1941). The dialect did not receive a great deal of linguistic attention until Loporcaro *et al.* (2006) carried out a detailed measurement and analysis of consonant and vowel length in Lizzanese.
9   "Lizzano in Belvedere è un comune […] nell'Appenino bolognese, diocesi di Bologna, in confine con la Toscana e con la provincia di Modena. Da questa la divide a ovest il Rio Dardagna, oltre il quale è il frignanese Fanano che con la provincia di Bologna à facili rapporti di belle e comode strade. La cresta, invece, dell'Appennino, che separa a sud Lizzano dalla Toscana, è coperta di folte macchie ed è di difficile passaggio. Anche linguisticamente Lizzano s i stacca in modo notevole dai dialetti toscani [my emphasis], e va ascritto al gruppo emiliano, nel quale oscilla tra il bolognese e il modenese dell'alta zona, tenendo tuttavia maggiormente del primo che del secondo" (Malagoli 1930: 125).
10   In Lizzanese, as in Italian, masculine is the default in case of gender resolution, so while *nuatre* must refer exclusively to female referents, *nuatri* need not refer exclusively to male referents. The same holds for 2PL forms.
11   In northern Italian dialects more generally SCI does not have to be restricted to interrogatives but it can also be found in exclamative, hypothetical and counter-factual clauses (see Poletto 2000: 43).
12   There are varieties of northern Italian dialects where SCI is in fact obligatory when permitted: see for example (a) *Cossa fa-lo?* but (b) **Cossa (che) el fa?* in the variety spoken in Cereda (Poletto 2000: 42-3).
13   Loporcaro *et al.* is almost entirely based on the analysis of words in isolation (cf. 2006: 494). A more recent empirical study, based on measurements of consonantal length in words within utterances, has suggested however that degemination has progressed further than previously thought and is already at a very advanced stage (cf. Filipponio 2012: 246-7).
14   Filipponio (personal communication) rightly observes that Malagoli's transcription of vowel length (long vowels are indicated with '|') in these cases is incoherent: see *k fa|l ello* (1930: §27) but also *kom stal ello* (1930: §126).
15   This issue is crucial to a theory of clitics (cf. in particular Anderson 2005, Spencer & Luís 2012) but is beyond the scope of this study.
16   In this paragraph, by changes I mean those sub-types of change that can be conceived of as grammaticalization. I am not claiming that all types of linguistic change are instances of grammaticalization.
17   "Gradualness" is "the historical correlate of gradience […] which is a synchronic term characterizing the continuum between one linguistic category and another" (Brinton & Traugott 2005: 27).

Bibliographical References

Anderson, Stephen R. 2005. *Aspects of the Theory of Clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ariel, Mira 1988. Referring and Accessibility. *Journal of Linguistics* 24. 65-87.

Benincà, Paola & Poletto, Cecilia 1991. Un'indagine sintattica. *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 15. 77-95.

Boström, Ingemar 1972. *La morfosintassi dei pronomi personali soggetti della terza persona in italiano e in fiorentino*. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.

Brandi, Luciana & Cordin, Patrizia 1981. Dialetti e italiano: un confronto sul parametro a soggetto nullo. *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 6. 33-89.

Brinton, Laurel J. & Traugott, Elizabeth Closs 2005. *Lexicalization and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bybee, Joan 1985. *Morphology. A study of the Relation between Meaning and Form*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan; Perkins, Revere Dale & Pagliuca, William 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cappellaro, Chiara 2018. Genesis and Persistence of Overbundance: Data from Romance Languages. In Dammel, Antje; Eitelmann, Matthias & Schmuck, Mirjam *Reorganising Grammatical Variation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. SCLS 203. 119-149.

Cardinaletti, Anna & Starke, Michal 1999. A typology of structural deficiency. A case study of the three classes of pronouns. In van Riemsdijk, Henk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 145-233.

Demol, Annemie 2007. Accessibility Theory applied to French: The case of *il* and *celui-ci. Folia Linguistica* 41,1-2. 1-35.

Fava, Elisabetta 1998. Mood as a feature of interrogation in some Romance languages: some considerations on the descriptive adequacy of the illocutionary force devices. Paper presented at the Conference 'Fragen über Fragen', Innsbruck, 1-3 October.

Fava, Elisabetta 2001. On word, clitic and affix distinctions in some north eastern Italian dialects. In Muller, Claude & de Carvalho, Paulo (eds), *Clitiques and cliticisation. Actes du Colloque de Bordeaux, octobre 1998*. Paris: Honoré Chapion Éditeur.

Filipponio, Lorenzo 2012. *La struttura di parola dei dialetti della valle del Reno. Profilo storico e analisi sperimentale*. Bologna: Arnaldo Forni.

Filipponio, Lorenzo & Loporcaro, Michele (eds) 2011. *Giuseppe Malagoli. Il dialetto di Lizzano in Belvedere*. Lizzano in Belvedere: Gruppo Studi Capotauro.

Heine, Bernd & Song, Kyung-An 2011. On the grammaticalization of personal pronouns. *Journal of Linguistics* 47,3. 587-630.

Hopper, Paul 1991. On some principles of grammaticalization. In Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Heine, Bernd (eds), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam / Philadephia: Benjamins.

Hopper, Paul & Traugott, Elizabeth Closs 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kayne, Richard 1975. *French Syntax. The transformational cycle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Loporcaro, Michele 2012. A new strategy for progressive marking and its impli-cations for grammaticalization theory: the subject clitic construction in Pantiscu. *Studies in Language* 36,4. 747-784.

Loporcaro, Michele; Delucchi, Rachele; Nocchi, Nadia; Paciaroni, Tania & Schmid, Stephan 2006. La durata consonantica nel dialetto di Lizzano in Belvedere (Bologna). In Savy, Renata & Crocco, Claudia (eds), *Analisi prosodica. Teorie, modelli e sistemi di annotazione, AISV 2005*. Torriana (RN): EDK. 491-517.

Malagoli, Giuseppe 1930. Fonologia del dialetto di Lizzano in Belvedere. *Italia Dialettale* 6. 125-96.

Malagoli, Giuseppe 1940. Appunti di morfologia e sintassi del dialetto di Lizzano in Belvedere. *Italia Dialettale* 16. 191-211.

Manzini, Maria Rita 2014. Grammatical categories: Strong and weak pronouns in Romance. *Lingua* 150. 171-201.

Manzini, Maria Rita & Savoia, Leonardo Maria 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa.* Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

McMahon, April 1994. *Understanding Language Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ordóñez, Francisco & Repetti, Lori 2006. Stressed enclitics? In Montreuil, Jean-Pierre (ed.), *New Perspectives on Romance Languistics, vol. II: Phonetics, Phonology and Dialectology.* Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins. 167-81.

Parry, Mair 1993. Subject clitics in Piedmontese: a diachronic perspective. *Vox Romanica* 52. 96-116.

Pescarini, Diego 2016. Clitic pronominal systems: morphophonology. In Maiden, Martin & Ledgeway, Adam (eds), *The Oxford Guide to Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 742-757.

Poletto, Cecilia 1995. The Diachronic Development of Subject Clitics in North-Eastern Italian Dialects. In Roberts, Ian & Battye, Adrian (eds), *Clause Structure and Language Change.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 295-324.

Poletto, Cecilia 2000. *The Higher Functional Field: Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rizzi, Luigi 1986. On the status of subject clitics in Romance. In Jaeggli, Osvaldo & Silva-Corvalán, Carmen (eds), *Studies in Romance linguistics.* Dordrecht: Foris. 391-419.

Rohlfs, Gerhard 1968. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Morfologia.* Torino: Einaudi.

Siewierska, Anna 2004. *Person.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spencer, Andrew & Luís, Ana R. 2012. *Clitics. An Introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vanelli, Laura 1998 [1987]. I pronomi soggetto nei dialetti settentrionali dal Medio Evo a oggi. In Vanelli, Laura 1998. *I dialetti italiani settentrionali nel panorama romanzo.* Roma: Bulzoni. 51-89.