French Subject Clitics in France and Canada

1. Introduction
   1. Some constraints & facts about French subject clitics to open up the essay
      1. French subject clitics have properties of both bound and free morphemes
         1. Can’t be by itself (like a bound morpheme) but can have more than one position (like a free morpheme); only other clitics may intervene between the subject and the verb.
            1. Je prépare le dîner – appears with verb
            2. \*Je – can’t stand alone
            3. (In response to something like “Est-ce que tu as mangé ?”) Ai-je mangé ? has more than one position
            4. \*Ils deux appellent ma mère – nothing can interfere except other clitics
            5. \*Ils vitement courrent – nothing can interferecne except other clitics
            6. J’y vais – nothing can interefere except other clitics
            7. Je te le dis – nothing can interfere except other clitics
            8. But pretty much anything can interfere between an NP and VP eg: “Mon frère seul peut le faire”
            9. Prépare-je le dîner? – can appear after the verb, but the clitic doesn’t necessarily have to leave its original position; also, this is extremely rare & mostly restricted to questions.
            10. Ai-je préparé le dîner? – can appear after AUX, rare & restricted to questions
      2. Coordination with other NPs
         1. “Tu et je pensons” (French) vs “You and I think” (English) – can’t be coordinated with other subject clitics
         2. “Jean et je” (French) vs “John and I” (English) – can’t be coordinated with NP
         3. “Mon frère et je” (French) vs “my brother and I” (English) – can’t be coordinated with NP
      3. Liaison
         1. Obligatory with clitic+V, but not with NP+V
            1. Il(s ͡o)nt un chien
            2. Les enfant\*(s ͡o)nt un chien
      4. Subject doubling
         1. Lui, il pense qu’on doit partir – with strong pronoun + subject clitic
         2. Jean, il pense qu’on doit partir – with NP
         3. Mon frère, il pense qu’on doit partir – with NP
2. Two major theoretical approaches to explain these phenomena (include the trees “inflectional affix hypothesis” and “phonological clitic hypothesis”
   1. Syntactic analysis
      1. De Cat 2005
         1. Subject doubling
            1. Discourse context (pragmatic)
         2. Prosodic evidence
         3. Conjunction
   2. Morphological analysis
      1. Culbertson 2010
         1. Subject doubling
            1. Discourse context (pragmatic) 110
         2. Prosodic evidence pg 106
         3. Conjunction
   3. Developmental Hypothesis
      1. Proposed by Gotowski 2015, that children go through a morphological analysis and then reach a synactic analysis that they retain through adulthood
3. Subject Doubling in French & crosslinguistically (Coveney, Auger, Poletto&Tortora)
   1. Reiterate some examples with strong pronoun, NP, another clitic, etc.
   2. Coveney’s frequency of subject doubling in French
      1. finds that subject doubling is not the norm in colloquial French, but that it occurs often
      2. it should be how frequent a certain variety displays subject doubling, not a binary question of whether it does or not.
      3. Other studies overestimate the amount of subject doubling because they count too many constructions (ie: strong pro+clitic).
   3. Picard subject doubling (Auger)
      1. Introduce Picard – closely related to French
      2. Quasi-obligatory rule that all subjects are doubled
      3. Quantified subject + clitic allowed in Picard, but not in French (examples all from Auger)
         1. “tout l’monne I s’a rbéyè” ~ tout le monde s’est regardé
         2. “parsonne I n’poroait mie vnir ll’értcheure” ~ personne ne pourrait venir le chercher
         3. N’importé tchèche i s’doute bién qu’oz a un lit quique pèrt ~ n’importe qui se doute bien qu’on a un lit quelque part
      4. This isn’t left dislocation, most likely, because it doesn’t have prosodic evidence of left dislocation
   4. Northern Italian languages (Poletto & Tortora)
      1. Analyzed as null subject languages & subject clitic languages
         1. NSL & SCL because the clitics are an overt instantiation of Agr(eement) rather than full phrases & the clitics are heads, not phrases
         2. Obligatory overt AGR:
            1. “(Te) \*(tu) parli” (Fiorentino) ~ “(Ti) \*(te) parli” (Trentino) – the subject clitics “tu” and “te” in F & T are obligatory, unlike “te” and “ti” which are strong subject pronouns.
            2. “El Mario el parla” ~ “La Maria la parla” (Trentino) – so in this language, the subject clitic is declined for gender & person in agreement with the subject.
   5. Doubled subjects as topics
      1. De Cat explain her view on doubled subject licensing via topicalization; doubled subjects cannot occur w/ a focus interpretation
      2. Poletto & Tortora footnote 16 “In some dialects a subject clitic can only occur if the subject is a topic (topics are always the first case in which subject clitic doubling occurs).”
         1. Paduan clitic “a” pragmatic function to mark entire sentence as new information
            1. “piove” ~ “a piove” (Paduan) – “a” is not optional, but “obligatory when the sentence is to be marked as new information” – proposed to be a “morphosyntactic instantiation of a Topic head, in the left periphery of the clause” (Poletto & Tortora)
4. Prosodic evidence
5. Conjunction
6. MY STUDY
   1. Design
      1. Conditions
         1. Quantified subject + clitic
         2. Conjunction +/- resumptive clitic
      2. Participants
         1. Reddit & social networking, Google Forms
      3. Some sample sentences
         1. Quantified subject +/- clitic
         2. Conjunction +/- resumptive clitic
   2. Results
      1. All the graphs!
      2. All the t-tests!
      3. Focus on Canada/French
   3. Discussion
      1. Discuss the results 😊
   4. Situating it within what we know
      1. Does it support a syntactic or morphological analysis?
7. Conclusion