Object clitics for subject clitics and DOM phenomena in the Franco-Provençal dialects of Apulia[*]

Benedetta Baldi and Leonardo M. Savoia
Università degli Studi di Firenze
(<benedetta.baldi@unifi.it>; <lsavoia@unifi.it>)

Abstract:

The relation between auxiliaries and argumental properties of the lexical verbs is the question raised by the facts we will investigate. Other issues are posed by the role and the behavior of deictic clitic pronouns in different contexts and in the clitic string. The data examined in this contribution come mainly from the Franco-Provençal dialects spoken in the villages of Celle San Vito and Faeto in North Apulia; these dialects are the heritage linguistic use of ancient minorities dating back to the thirteenth century. We will briefly compare these data with the related data of the Franco-Provençal varieties of West Piedmont. The analysis we propose relies on the idea that auxiliary verbs are not functional elements but preserve their lexical properties, as shown by the identic syntactic behavior of *be* in its different occurrences. The theoretical frame we follow is the formulation proposed in Chomsky (2020a, b), based on the merge operation and the Labeling Algorithm, leading to a more appropriate treatment of "head movement" and agreeing syntactic structures.

Keywords: *Auxiliary, Copula, DOM, OCls for SCls, Participle*

1. *The distribution of SCls and OCls in Apulian Franco-Provençal*

In the villages of Celle and Faeto (North Apulia) a Franco-Provençal dialect is spoken, brought here by the people that, approximately in the 13th century, founded these settlements.

Apulian Franco-Provençal shows a system of pronominal clitics (Subject Clitics and Object Clitics) well documented for the dialects of their original area (Southern France, Aosta Valley and West Piedmont). Leaving aside for the moment the latter, we focus on the Apulian Franco-Provençal, where we find the paradigm for SCls in (1a) and for OCls in (1b), generally distinct except for the 2nd person, where the single common form *tə/və* 'you' is attested. As can be seen in (1a, b), the dative form is missing, and *sə* is the reflexive and includes the 1PL as well. In (1c) the stressed strong forms of personal pronouns are provided, for subject and object contexts. Only in the case of the 1st singular person an oblique form is present. In other cases, the same form occurs as the subject and the object of a verb or a preposition. As generally in Northern Italian systems, SCls can combine with expressed subjects, including the stressed pronouns.

(1)   a.   SCl   b.   OCl   Refl

            1st   dʒə   mə   (mə)
            2nd   tə   tə   (tə)
            3rd   i   l-u / l-a   sə
            1st pl   nə/ i   sə   sə
            2nd pl   və/ i   və   sə
            3rd pl   i   l-o / l-ə   sə

            c.   Oblique

            1st   ddʒi   'I'   mi   'me'
            2nd   ti   'you'
            3rd   ijə / iʎʎə   'he/ she'
            1st pl   nus   'we'
            2nd pl   vu   'you'
            3rd pl   isə   'they'

                                                              Celle

     With this scheme in mind we are able to illustrate the distribution of SCls and OCls in sentences. SCls are exemplified for unergatives in (2a) and for unaccusatives in (2b). Transitives with postverbal objects have the same distribution, as in (2c).

(2)   a   ddʒə ddɔ:rə   b.   ddʒə viŋŋə
                   tə ddɔ:rə   tə viŋŋə
                   i ddɔ:rə   i vində
                   nə durmuŋŋə   nə vənuŋŋə
                   və durmijə   və vənijə
                   i durmundə   i vənundə
                   'I slip, you slip,…'   'I come, you come, …'

            c.   ddʒə vajə   (tuttə kwandə)
                   tə vajə
                   i vajə
                   nə viuŋŋə
                   və vijijə
                   i viundə
                   'I see everybody, you see everybody, …'

As in many Northern Italian dialects (Manzini and Savoia 2005, 2011), OCls exclude SCls except 1ˢᵗ and 2ⁿᵈ singular persons, *dʒə* 'I' and *tə* 'you' respectively, as in (3i) and (3ii). In the case of a 2ⁿᵈ person subject and a 1ˢᵗ person object the reversed order appears and the SCl is realized by the objective form *mə*, as in (3ii.a), (3iii-vi) illustrate the exclusion of SCls by OCls in the other persons. The coinciding forms *tə*/*və* 'you' are specified as '2SG/PL'. Subjects are labeled S and objects O, and the six persons are indicated by Roman numerals.

(3) i.   ddʒə   l-u   / tə   vajə
            S.1SG   O.3-MSG   / 2SG   I.see
            'I see him/ you'

     ii.   ttə   l-u   / l-a   / sə   vajə
            2SG   O.3-MSG / O.3-FSG / 1PL   you.see
            'you see him/ her/ us'

     ii.a   mə   tə   vajə
            O.1SG   2SG   you.see
            'you see me'

     iii.   l-u   / mə   / tə   vajə
            O.3-MSG / O.1SG / 2SG   (s)he.sees
            '(s)he sees him/ me/ you'

     iv.   l-u   / tə   viuɳɳə
            O.3-MSG   / 2SG   we.see
            'we see him/ you'

     v.   l-u   / mə   vijijə
            3-MSG   / 1SG   you.see
            'you(pl) see him/ me'

     vi.   mə   / tə   / l-a   viundə
            O.1SG / 2SG   / O.3-FSG   they.see
            'they see me/ you/ her'

                                                                Celle

In the verbs with three arguments like *to give*, the proclitic order is the same as that of Italian, where the 1ˢᵗ/2ⁿᵈ OCls precede the 3ʳᵈ person OPCls, as in (4a, a'). Again, SCls are excluded, except 1ˢᵗ/2ⁿᵈ singular elements, and, the 1ˢᵗ person OCl precedes the SCl in the combination *2ⁿᵈ person SCl+1st person OCl*, as in (4b); see also (3ii.a) above:

(4) a.   (ijə)   mə   l-u   dde:nə
            he   me   O.3-MSG   he.gives
            'He gives it to me'

     a'.   (ti)   tə   sə   l-u   dde:nə
            you   you   us   O.3-MSG   you.give
            'You gives it to us'

     b.   (ti)   mə   tə   l-u   dde:nə
            you   me   you   O.3-MSG   you.give
            'You give it to me'

                                                                Celle

Reflexive/non-active forms exclude the specialized SCLs. We find the objective forms *mə* and *tə* for the 1ˢᵗ/2ⁿᵈ singular persons in (5i, ii) and the reflexive *sə* in all other forms. in (5iii-vi). So, 1ˢᵗ and 2ⁿᵈ person SCls are in turn prevented from combining with OCls.

(5)   i.   mə lla:və
        ii.   tə lla:və
        iii.   sə lla:və
        iv.   sə lavuˈə
        v.   sə laˀva
        vi.   sə lavundə
                'I wash myself, you wash yourself, …'

<div align="right">Celle</div>

The compatibility between clitics, as we noticed, is constrained by person, so that the only strings allowed are those in (6), where SCl precedes an OCl, limited to 1st/2nd person SCls.

(6)   SCl   +   OCl

                1st   dʒə   OCLs
                2nd   tə   OCls

Other combinations SCl+OCl(s) are not instantiated, considering that reflexive contexts in turn exclude all SCls.

1.1 DOM effects

Let us dwell now on the OCls of 1st and 2nd person, observing their occurrence in the sentence. In Apulian Franco-Provençal the paradigm of OCls does not include specialized forms for dative (vs. accusative). In the case of 1st and 2nd person forms this syncretism is present in most Romance varieties, whereby the same form occurs as the direct object, in (7a) and dative in (7a') (cf. Manzini *et al.* 2020). As for the 3rd person, we find that the accusative form occurring in transitive contexts in (7b, b') is used in dative contexts, with the consequence that the *3rd dative+accusative* reading is realized only by the accusative form corresponding to the IA/Object, as in (7c), a type of distribution attested in some Southern Italian dialects (Manzini and Savoia 2005).

(7)   a.   mə / tə   vi-undə
                me / you   see-3PL
                'they see me/ you'
                sə / və   viundə
                us/ you   see-3PL
                'they see us/ you'
        a'.   mə / tə / sə / və   denə   sett-a   tʃuɔsə
                me / you / us/ yo   give-3SG   this-FSG   thing
                'they give to me/ you/ us/ you this thing'
        b.   l-u/ l-a/ l-ɔ/ l-ə   vi-undə
                3-MSG/-FSG/-MPL/-FPL   see-3PL
                'they see him/ her/ them'
        b'.   mə / tə / sə / və   l -u/ l-a/ l-ɔ/ l-ə   dən-undə
                me / you / us/ you   3-MSG/-FSG/-MPL/-FPL   give-3PL
                'they give it/ them to me/ you/ us/ you'
        c.   ijə   l-u/ l-a/ l-ɔ/ l-ə   denə
                he   3-MSG/-FSG/-MPL/-FPL   give-3SG
                'he gives it (MSG/FSG)/ them to him/her/them'

<div align="right">Celle</div>

This distribution suggests that, while 3rd person clitics are accusative and realize the IA, 1st and 2nd forms are oblique, in so far as they realize the dative reading, as in (7a'). In other words, a DOM system shows up which contrasts the discourse participants with the participants to the event expressed by the verb. In the case of stressed personal pronouns, we note that in object contexts they are always governed by a preposition, including the object of a transitive, confirming the DOM treatment, as in (8a). The same forms occur in combination with the other prepositions, as in (8b). All the pronouns in (8a,b) can occur as subjects, except for the first person, which distinguishes *mi* from the subject element *dʒi*, in (8c).

(8) a. i   camm-undə   a   mmi /tti/ ijə / iʎʎə / nnus / vvu / isə
         SCl.3PL   call-3PL   to   me/ you/ him/ her/ us / you/ them
         'they call me/you/ him/ her/ us / you/ them'
     b. pə / dɔ   mmi /tti/ ijə / iʎʎə / nnus / vvu / isə
         for / with   me/ you/ him/ her/ us / you/ them
     c. dʒ-i   dʒə   dɔr
         1-INFL   SCl   sleep.1SG
         'I sleep'

                                                                                    Celle

It is natural to see in the prepositional accusative the result of the long-lasting contact between Franco-Provençal and Apulian surrounding dialects. Contact has brought about important re-organizations in Franco-Provençal systems, as discussed in Baldi and Savoia (2021). As for prepositional objects, definite IAs are introduced by the preposition *a*, on a par with the other Southern Italian dialects.

According to Manzini *et al.* (2020), DOM is a manner of embedding sub-sets of definite arguments of which the core-set is represented by personal pronouns and, within them, 1st and 2nd persons. In the typological literature the behaviour of 1st and 2nd person in comparison with 3rd person pronouns/demonstratives and NPs is treated in terms of referential properties (animacy or definiteness) expressed by means of a hierarchy regulating the distribution of grammatical functions in case systems (Dixon 1994, Kiparsky 2008).[1] Kiparsky (2008: 34) associates the referential hierarchy with definiteness, as the property that anchors the syntactic role of the nominal and pronominal elements. Languages vary by cutting the definiteness hierarchy at different levels, including all definite NPs, only kinship terms in possessive constructs and personal pronouns, only personal pronouns or, finally, only 1st/2nd person elements. The crucial insight is that a Participant internal argument reflects a complex organization of the event "where the Participant plays the role of possessor (locator) of the VP event" (Manzini *et al.* 2020: 242). Our idea is that "the surfacing of highly ranked (DOM) internal arguments as datives is no morphological accident […] DOM arises in the syntax, reflecting a slightly different structuring of the event with Participant internal arguments". However, differently from prepositional datives with *give*-type verbs, where the preposition is required by the predicate, in the case of DOM the preposition is required by the referential properties of the IA, which is treated as a sort of possessor of the event. In other words, in this perspective, DOM is not simply a surface fact, but corresponds to a structural obliquization of IA when being a high ranked referent.

---

[1] The referential hierarchy in (i) (Dixon 1994: 85; Kiparsky 2008: 34)
(i)   1P > 2P > 3P/ demonstratives > proper nouns/ kin terms > human > animate > inanimate
accounts for the relation between nominal elements and grammatical functions, whereby "a first person pronoun is more likely than any other NP constituent to be in A [subject of transitives] rather than in O [object of transitives] function. Next most likely as A is second person pronoun, then demonstratives and third person pronouns, followed by proper names" (Dixon 1994: 85).

If we follow Fillmore (1968) in assuming that cases are the inflectional equivalent of prepositions, the elementary introducers such as Italian *di/a* or English *of/to* would be equivalent to the genitive and the dative respectively. The oblique case, on a par with a preposition, is a predicate introducing a relation between the argument it selects and another argument. This means that we assign a relational content to cases, with the effect that the oblique case or prepositions are endowed with interpretable properties. This solution contrasts with the more traditional view that prepositions like 'of' or 'to' are devoid of interpretive content, or, in minimalist terms, uninterpretable (Manzini *et al.* 2020).

The idea we adopt, going back to Manzini and Savoia (2011), is that oblique case and prepositions such as 'of' or 'to' can be thought as elementary part/whole relators; in other words, a single property, namely inclusion/superset-of, formalized as [⊆], is associated with the conceptual cluster underlying oblique and/or of/to-like prepositions. This proposal is based on an insight present in the literature, whereby possession is the manifestation of the part-whole relation (Belvin and den Dikken 1997: 170). So, in the structure in (9), a preposition like Italian and Romance *a* (or English *to*), endowed with (⊆) content, takes as its internal argument its sister NP *ijə* 'he' and as its external argument the sister to its projection, i.e. the NP *lu livrə* 'the book'. The second internal argument of 'give', i.e. the dative, contributes to fixing the reference of the first internal argument, i.e. the accusative, by denoting a superset/domain/zone including it.

(9)   [v də′na [PredP [DP lu livrə [PP⊆ [P⊆ a [DP ijə]]]]]

Manzini and Savoia (2014), Manzini and Franco (2016) extend this analysis of dative/genitive as elementary relators, to DOM, so that the oblique of person in a transitive context will be characterized by the same structural representation, as in (10)

(10)   [T i cammundə [VP … [PP⊆ [P⊆ a [DP mi]]]]   'they call (to) me'

A connected question is the form of the pronoun, that, as seen, in the case of 1st singular element differentiates the subject *ddʒ-i* form and the oblique *m-i*. Taking into account the preceding discussion, we can think that *m-i* is lexically specified by the oblique property [⊆], as in (11).

(11)   [Infl [√ m [⊆]] -i]

In the case of all the other pronouns we find a single form for subject and oblique contexts, suggesting that this specialized specification has been lost. This recalls the paradigms of Northern Italian dialects where all the stressed pronouns have a single form for subject and object contexts.

2. Auxiliaries

Auxiliary selection separates unaccusatives and reflexives, with *be*, from unergatives and transitives, with *have*. While the latter have the same SCl system as the lexical verbs, in (12a,b), unaccusatives and reflexives select *mə* in SCl position, in (12c,d). As we can expect, passives match the other contexts with *be*, as in (12e).

(12)   a.   dʒ e(nnə) dur′mi   b.   dʒ   e   la′va   (lo ddra)
            t a(nnə) dur′mi   t   annə   la′va
            i attə dur′mi   i   attə   la′va
            n a′vuŋŋə dur′mi   n   avuŋŋə   la′va
            v a′vi dur′mi   v   avijə   la′va
            i andə dur′mi   i   antə   la′va
            'I have slept, …'   'I have washed the clothes, …'

c. mə sejə laˈva   d. mə sejə vəˈni
    tə sejə laˈva   tə sejə vəˈni
    s ettə laˈva   ʎ ettə vəˈni
    sə suŋŋə laˈva   nə suŋŋə vəˈni
    sə si laˈva və   və si vəˈni
    sə sundə laˈva   i sundə vəˈni
    'I have washed myself,…'   'I have come, …'

c'. mə sejə krəvɛrə / krəvɛrə-tə
    me I.am covered.MSG/ covered-FSG
    'I have covered myself'

e. mə sejə sta camˈma da isə
    i ettə sta camˈma da isə…
    'I have been called by him, she has been called by him, …'

<div align="right">Celle</div>

Interestingly, *mə* occurs instead of the SCl *dʒə* in the case of predicative constructs with *be*, regardless the individual- or stage-level interpretation, and with *stay/stand*, as illustrated in (13a) and (13b) respectively. We note that the 3rd singular person of *be* has two alternants, *e* and *ettə*.

(13) a. mə sejə kunˈteŋŋə / autə
          tə sejə kunˈteŋŋə
          ʎ e(ttə) kunˈteŋŋə
          nə suŋŋə kunˈteŋŋə
          və si kunˈteŋŋə
          i sundə kunˈteŋŋə
          'I am glad/ tall, …'

      b. mə/dʒə   stə kəˈtʃa   / kundeŋŋə   də   ti
          me/ S.1st   stay laid out / happy   of   you'
          'I am lying / happy with you'
          mə/dʒə   stə   iˈki
          me/S.1st   stand   here
          'I am here'

<div align="right">Celle</div>

stay as the progressive auxiliary selects, in turn, *mə*. This holds not only in unaccusative/reflexive contexts, in (14a), but also with agentive constructs, as in unergative and transitive contexts in (14b) and (14c).

(14) a. m   əstə   vənaŋŋə / lavaŋŋə
          me   stay.1SG   coming / washing
          'I am coming / washing myself'

      b. m   əstə   durmaŋŋə
          me   stay.1SG   sleeping
          'I am sleeping'

      c. mə   l   əstə   faʃaŋŋə
          me   it   stay.1SG making
          'I am making it'

The insertion of *mə* for *dʒə* with *be* and *stay* in (13) and (14) contrasts with the behaviour of SCls in modal and deontic periphrases, where the occurrence of *mə* for *dʒə* depends on the obligatory 'clitic climbing' on the modal/ deontic verb. As a consequence, we find *mə* (for *dʒə*) in reflexive contexts, (14'a), and in modal contexts also with the auxiliary *be*, as in (14'b). As to the deontic periphrasis, *have* selects the infinitive introduced by the preposition *a* 'to', as in (14'd) so that we find *mə* only in the case of the reflexive reading. Otherwise, *dʒə* occurs, as in (14'c).

(14')   a.   mə   vuəʎʎə laˈva
                 me   I.want   wash
                 'I want to wash myself'
         b.   mə   sejə   pa   puˈti   vənijə
                 me   I.am   Neg   can.PPrt   come
                 'I could not come'
         c.   dʒ   e   pa   uˈli   durmijə
                 I   I.have   Neg   wanted   sleep
                 'I did'nt want to sleep'
         d.   m (e) a llaˈva   / dʒ (e) a ddurmijə
                 me (have) to wash / I (have) to sleep
                 'I have to wash-myself/ I have to sleep'

                                                                                          Celle

The variety spoken in Faeto is substantially identical to that of Celle, we could say the same one, except for some minor morphosyntactic and phonological discrepancies. As regards the phenomenon in question, we find the same distribution of SCls and OCls as in Celle, but the auxiliary is characterized by a partially different inflectional paradigm and, especially, by the single 1ˢᵗ person form ɛ for all verbal classes, as in (15a-d). *mə* for *dʒə* occurs also with stay as introducer of a gerund in (15e) and lexical verb in (15f).

(15)   a.   dʒ ɛ durˈmi   b.   dʒ   ɛ   laˈva   (lo ddra)
                t a durˈmi   t   a   laˈva
                i attə durˈmi   i   attə   laˈva
                aˈvunnə durˈmi   n   avunnə   laˈva
                v aˈvi durˈmi   v   avi   laˈva
                i andə durˈmi   i   antə   laˈva
                'I have slept, …'   'I have washed the clothes, …'
        c.   m ɛ laˈva   d.   m ɛ vəˈni
                t ɛ laˈva   t ɛ vəˈni
                s ɛ(ttə) laˈva   ʎ ɛ vəˈni
                nə suŋŋə laˈva   nə sunnə vəˈni
                və si laˈva və   və si vəˈni
                sə sundə laˈva   i sundə vəˈni
                'I have washed myself,…'   'I have come, …'
        e.   mə   l əstə   ləˈʃannə
                me   it stay.1sg   reading
                'I am reading it'
        f.   m   əstə   ikˈki
                me   stand   here
                'I am here'

                                                                                          Faeto

Moreover, this form occurs also in the 1st person of *be* in predicative contexts, as in (16a, b), where, according to a general contrast registered in Southern Italian dialects, (16a) illustrates the individual-level predicates with *be*, while (16b) illustrates the stage-level predicates with *stay*. This suggests that ɛ does not belong to the paradigm of *have* but is an exponent of *be*.

(16)   a.   m ɛ autə   b.   m əstə kundennə
              t ɛ autə   t əstə kundennə
              ʎ ɛttə autə   ʎ əstə kundennə
              nə sunnə autə   nə stunnə kundendə
              və si autə   və stijə kundennə
              i sundə autə   i sundə kundennə
              'I am tall, etc.'   'I am glad, etc.'

                                                                          Faeto

In summary, in these dialects, the 1st person displays the distribution in (17):

(17)   1st person SCl

transitive/ unergative	unaccusative	have	reflexive	be/ stay
dʒə	*dʒə*	*dʒə*	*mə*	*mə*

We conclude that auxiliaries have the same selectional properties as lexical verbs, as we may expect if auxiliaries are properly verbs, i.e. they correspond to an autonomous vP projection.

3. A comparison with the Piedmontese Franco-Provençal

The distribution of SCls sensitive to the context of occurrence is also attested in Franco-Provençal dialects of Western Piedmont (Roberts 1993, 2018, Manzini and Savoia 2005, 2010). In these dialects, the 1st person SCl *dʒə/i* 'I' does not combine with 3rd person OCls as in (18). (18a) and (18a') show the exclusion of the 1st person subject clitic *dʒ* in the presence of 3rd person OCls. This happens independently from the phonological context, i.e. we find the vocalic allomorph *dʒi* before OCls beginning both with a consonant and a vowel, as in (18b, b'). (18c, d) illustrate the lack of the clitic before *be*, auxiliary and copula respectively.

(18)   a.   l-u   / lə   / l-i   / əl   tʃam-u
              OCl-MSG / OCl.FSG / OCl.MPL / OCl.FPL   call-1SG
              'I call him/ her/ them'
        a'.   l-u   tʃa'meŋ
              him   call-1PL
              'We call him'
        b.   dʒi   t   / u   tʃam-u
              SCl.1SG   OCl.2SG   / OCl.2pl   call-1SG
              'I call you.sg/pl'
        b'.   dʒi   t   tʃa'meŋ
              SCl.1sg   OCl.2sg   call-1PL
              'We call you'
              dʒi   t   eŋ   tʃa'ma
              SCl.1P   OCl.2PSG   have.1PL   called
              'We have called you'

c.   se   / seŋ   vy'ny
      be.1SG / be.1PL   come
      'I have / we have come'
d.   ser-u   / ser-unt   kuntənt
      be.IMPF.1SG   / be.IMPF.1PL   glad

                                                                              Cantoira

Overall, this distribution resembles that of Celle and Faeto, both in the exclusion when 3rd person OCls occur, and before *be*. Reflexives in Piedmontese Franco-Provençal select *have*, and therefore they are aligned with transitives. It turns out then that this particular distribution of the 1st person SCls stems from the original system of these varieties, being shared by non-adjacent dialects belonging to the same group, and is not due to the effect of changes caused by contact in the Apulian Franco-Provençal.

4. *The analysis: auxiliaries and participles*

The assumption that auxiliaries are the morphological exponents of functional heads is very familiar in the generative framework, starting from Chomsky (1957), Burzio (1986), a simple solution giving an answer to the problem concerning the fact that the auxiliary verb and the participle denote a single event (Manzini and Savoia 2011). Bentley and Eythórsson (2004: 447) treat "perfective auxiliaries as morpho-syntactic markers of tense and aspect". Their idea is that the insertion of *be* or *have* is triggered by certain sub-set of the semantic features associated to the verbal classes. As to the participle there are different proposals, as a reduced verbal structure (Belletti 1990, 2005) or a structure endowed with the entire set of the functional projections of V (Kayne 1993). The systems in which participles can take enclitic pronouns seem to argue for the latter conclusion, or, however to support the autonomous nature of participles.

More in general, *be* is also the verb of copular sentences and *have* can occur as a full verb of possession and in deontic phrases, and an adequate theory of *be* and *have* should treat their different occurrences in a unified way. D'Alessandro and Roberts (2010: 50 and ff.) assume that auxiliaries are raising verbs, substantially in line with Moro (1997) for *be*, and Manzini and Savoia (2005: 547). Manzini and Savoia (2011: 222, 223) characterize auxiliaries as full verbal projections embedding the sentential domain of a lexical verb:

   […] a relevant observation is that in all Romance and Albanian varieties, the *be* auxiliary of the perfect is also the copula […] This has a single argument slot, that of the embedded predicate […], which becomes associated with the matrix EPP argument (represented by the finite inflection of the copula). […] the auxiliary selection patterns according to transitivity and/or voice can be described by saying that the 'defective' *be* is restricted to selecting 'defective' – i.e. intransitive and/or middle-passive – predicates; conversely, the transitive ctive *have* is restricted to selecting transitive and/or active predicates.

Chierchia (2004: 47) connects the insertion of *essere* 'be' in languages such as Italian to the semantic properties of the lexical verb:

   Since auxs are property modifiers, they can be sensitive to the semantic make-up of what they modify. […] The choice of essere vs. avere in Italian, on the other hand, is sensitive to a different factor: subject affectedness. More explicitly, the range of subject-affecting operations […] constitutes the domain of essere;

Subject affecting operations include passives, reflexives and unaccusatives, all affecting the external argument by existentially quantifying over it (passives) or identifying it with the object (reflexive and unaccusatives). The result is that an argument, specifically the external one, has no morpho-phonological realization by the syntax, which, on the contrary, shows agreement properties identifying the IA as the subject of the clause. Along the same lines, in Manzini *et al.* (2016: 146) the contrast between *be* and *have* is related to a difference in their selectional properties, whereby *be* selects a "reduced" argument structure while *have* selects predicates with a closed argument structure, "in the sense that no free variables or generically closed ones are instantiated within it". The crucial role is played by the adjectival nature of past participle, selecting only the IA slot. Taking Manzini *et al.* (2015), and D'Alessandro and Roberts (2010) into account, our analysis is inspired by the idea that the past participle in Romance varieties and, generally, in Indo-European languages, is nothing but an aspectual item with an adjectival nature, giving rise to a clause including one argument.

4.1 A minimalistic approach to the auxiliary-participle periphrasis

In what follows we will analyze the auxiliary periphrases in the light of the recent proposals of Chomsky (2020a: 50, 51) based on the notion of (pair-)merge procedure and modification. Modification as in the case of an adnominal adjective expression such as *young man*, is the result of an operation of conjunction, that "contains elements, each of which is predicated of something. So we have a sequence of elements that looks like [19], with links L_i".

(19)   < CONJ, < S_1, L_1 >, . . . ,< $S_{n, Ln}$ > >

Along these lines, Chomsky (2020a: 51) identifies the Link with the categorizers *n* and *v*, with which R(oots) merge. We can conceptualize the categorizers *n* or *v* as the bundles of φ-features that characterize the functional content of words entering into the agreement operations. Drawing on Manzini *et al.* (2020) and their preceding work on nominal inflection, it seems natural to assume that *n* is the label for the class and number features of nominal agreement. In other words, in the case of items including nominal inflectional properties, as nouns and adjectives/participles, φ is the bundle of features corresponding to the nominal properties (see also Roberts 2018). Chomsky (2020a: 55) sees in pair-merge the way of treating head raising: "It's always described incorrectly. If a verb raises to inflection, say to T, it's always described as if the T-V complex becomes a T; but it's not, it's a V-the outcome of the adjunction is really verbal, not inflectional".

Consider now the auxiliary periphrases with *be* and *have*. We start from the elementary hypothesis that auxiliaries are full verbal projections, embedding a predicative relation between a noun and a participle selecting it as IA (Manzini and Savoia 2011). In the case of non-active *be* constructs, their coincidence with the copular constructs provides clear evidence in favour of the idea that the past participle and its argument form a small clause. More precisely, we treat the participle as a nominal form including a category-less lexical root R√ (in Manzini and Savoia 2017, Savoia *et al.* 2019), combining with the φ-features endowed with interpretive content (nominal gender, number properties); applying a proposal of Manzini and Savoia (2005) we associate the thematic vowel with a category of nominal class. In (20a,b) the analysis of Celle gender alternating past-participles such as *krəvɛrə* 'covered.MSG'/ *krəvɛrə-tə* 'covered.FSG' (cf.

(12c')), and of the invariant forms such as *la'v-a* 'washed' (cf. (12c)), is provided. We identify the element *-tə* in (20a) with Gender and the thematic vowel *-a* in (20b) with the exponent of Class.[2]

(20)   a.   [[krəvɛrə $_R$] tə $_{Gender}$]
         b.   [[lav $_R$] a $_{Class}$]

If the past participle has the properties of nouns and adjectives, as we assume, it selects only one argument. This can be due to its stative/resultative nature implying as a property-bearing referent, typically the IA. The lexical root can include agentivity, even if the EA is not realized by the structure hence causing some ambiguity, only solved by inserting an agentive complement.

In other words, *be*, both copula and auxiliary has the same lexical properties, embedding a predicative relation between a noun and an adjective/participle implementing the lexical properties of the verb, i.e. theta-roles associated with the root R. As a result, a sequence is yielded by pair-merging the clitic *mə* with the participle, on the basis of agreeing φ-features (Chomsky 2020a), as in (21). The referential properties of the 1st and 2nd person, *mə/tə*, are compatible with the φ-features of the participle, to which their deictic specification is added.

(21)   <mə, [[krəvɛrə $_R$] tə $_{Class/gender}$]>

Therefore, *be+adjective/participle* gives as a result a sentence in which the subject is the only argument of the nominal/participial item, i.e. the IA. *mə* and *tə* are merged with *v* and then with T, fixing the agreement properties of the verbal head, as in (22)[3]. This analysis closely recalls the proposal of Roberts (2010, 2018), whereby the Romance OCls can be understood as the morpho-phonological realization of the agreement φ-features of *v*.

(22)   CP [<mə,   T-sejə >[$_{vP}$ v [<R$_x$, PPrt/n> (mə$_x$)]]

Relying on the discussion in Chomsky (2020b: 166), we can conclude that [$_C$ mə- [T]] gives rise to a labelled construction "by shared and agreeing φ-features", where T inherits the features from C and *mə* is the only available nominal element (see also Roberts 2018)[4]. The same is true for copular contexts, where *mə* is inserted as the exponent of the φ-features corresponding to the

---

[2] In these varieties, similarly to French, the etymological morphology of the participle is lost. Thus, in the classes preserving the old stressed Thematic Vowel, *-a-* and *-i-*, we find invariable participles such as *la'v-a* 'washed' *cam'm-a* 'called', *dur'm-i* 'slept', *və'n-i* 'come', where the Thematic Vowel creates the adjectival form. In other classes, strong invariable participles occur, e.g. *viawə* 'seen', or, in the case of original…*Vr-tV* sequences, we find the gender alternation of the type of *mɔrə* [masc] vs. *mɔrə-tə* [fem] 'dead', *krəvɛrə* 'covered, masc' and *krəvɛrətə* 'covered, fem', as in (20). This type of alternation, which is attested also in adjectives, e.g. *kiərə* [masc] vs *kiərə-tə* [fem] 'short', in participles regularly appears in stative contexts but, at least for our informant of Celle, it is not excluded in transitive and mid-reflexive contexts where it agrees with the IA. In (20), the element *-t-*, giving rise to the feminine reading, can be now identified with the inflectional exponent.

[3] This solution recalls the one adopted in Roberts (2018), which, however, derives the participle by incorporating v within the Part category and introduces an Aux position including Part.

[4] Roberts (2018) proposes a very similar solution for the OCl-for-SCl phenomena in which the crucial idea is that the OCl is nothing but the instantiation of the φ-features contained in *v*: *v* incorporates with the Part(iciple) head and the OCl with Aux, where it values its features.

IA, so that [R, PPrt] is nothing but R+φ. This holds also in the case of reflexives, where again *v* includes φ agreeing with IA, whereas IA coincides with EA or the latter is excluded.[5] Non-active verbal forms demote the external argument, which can be possibly licensed by means of a specialized preposition/case, or can be simply not realized (Manzini *et al.* 2015).[6] In the progressive contexts introduced by 'stay' exemplified in (13b) and (14), as *mə l əstə faʃaŋŋə* 'I am doing it' (14c), *stay* selects *mə/tə* as clitics, behaving like *be*. The problem is that the gerunds can correspond also to transitives and unergatives. We must conclude that *stay* realizes its subject as an IA; the subject of *stay* is coreferential with an argument of the gerund, that, if its IA is independently realized, is the external argument of the gerund.

The selection of the external argument makes recourse to another licenser, i.e. the auxiliary *have* in T, as in (23). This nominal element is merged to *v* and then to T, fixing the person and number agreement of the latter. The past participle retains its nature of modifier of the IA.

(23)   CP [<NP, T> [$_{vP}$ NP$_y$[$_v$ have$_y$] [$_{vP}$ [<R$_x$, PPrt/n> (NP$_x$)]]]

(21)-(23) allow us to account for the contrast between the unaccusative contexts with *be* in which the subject is the IA agreeing with the participle, and the contexts with lexical unaccusatives. In the contexts with *be*, *mə(/tə)* are inserted excluding the 1st/2nd person SCl, while with lexical verbs *dʒə* occurs as the subject clitic. The result is that lexical unaccusatives go together with unergatives and transitives while reflexives behave like predicative constructs. In other words, auxiliaries encode selectional capabilities autonomous with respect to the verb. 3rd person is not involved in this opposition, insofar as shown in section 1.1 it does not differentiate auxiliary and lexical contexts.

In the contexts of lexical verbs, only the agreement of T expresses the referential content of the argument selected by the verb, so requiring the usual SCl form *dʒə*, as in (24). The SCl is merged with the amalgam [T, v] on the basis of its agreeing φ-features. as in (24).

(24)   dʒə$_φ$ [T - viŋŋə$_φ$ ... [$_{vP}$ [$_R$ vin-$_x$]]] (from (2b))

It is no accident if in deontic constructs in (14d), we find the usual clitic system, with *dʒə*, save for the 1st person clitic of reflexives, where *mə* is inserted, exactly as in the contexts of lexical verbs. Before closing this pf., few words are needed about the 2nd person form *tə* ambiguous for object and subject contexts. We must assume that this is the only lexical entry available for the 2nd person agreement of T or *v*, simply coinciding with the deictic content. Turning now the to the Franco-Provençal dialect of Cantoira, in (18b), we see that in unaccusative and copular constructs with *be* the 1st person excludes the realization of the SCl *dʒi*. Again, agreement with the IA is satisfied by the φ-features realized by the participle/adjective, the same that in the dialects of Celle and Faeto determine the insertion of *mə/tə*.

---

[5] Not surprisingly, this distribution recalls the contrast between ergative and nominative systems, reducible to the contrast between systems in which *v* licenses the subject (ergative) and systems where it is T that agrees with and licenses the external argument as the subject (D'Alessandro and Roberts 2010).

[6] An anonymous reviewer wonders if it is "possible to assume (on the basis of the data outlined above) that (at least some) unaccusatives are endowed with a little *v* layer". Indeed, we assume that unaccusatives, on a par with other verbal classes, have the layer v (cf. Franco *et al.* 2021). Chomsky (2020a) argues for the proposal that unaccusatives have a "weak" *v*, allowing the IA to be mapped in the C-T domain. This solution fits with our data, whereby the IA is expressed in *v* and in T domains.

4.2 OCls for SCls

Consider the Phasal distribution of clitics in these dialects, as depicted in (25a,b), where in the CP phase SCls are licensed by agreement on the verb in T, as usually in Romance languages. As already suggested for OCls in the vP phase, it is reasonable to assume that SCls are the real heads of agreement in the CP phase (Manzini *et al.* 2020, Savoia *et al.* 2019).

(25)   a.   CP phase: C   SCl   OCl   T   vP

         b.   vP phase: OCl   v   [$_{VP}$ R OCl]

In our dialects, when OCls occur in the T domain, the SCls are excluded except for 1st and 2nd person elements, as illustrated in (3). We can see in this partial complementary distribution an effect of DOM. In fact, the 1st/2nd person elements are interpreted independently of the structure of event and can be merged with [R-v], where the OCl agrees with/realizes the φ-features of *v*. Then OCl is merged to [T, R-v], giving rise to (26). If the IA is realized by an OCl merged to T, the procedure terminates, as also suggested by Roberts (2018).[7] We must conclude that 3rd person SCls realize φ-features associated with *v*, with the consequence that only OCls are necessary for the argumental requirements, while SCls realize a property required by T and occur only if φ-features of are not independently expressed.

(26)   <OCl$_φ$, [T, R-v$_φ$] >

Coming back now to 1st and 2nd person SCls, they are saved and inserted, encoding the EA. We can relate this to the fact that, as being discourse-anchored, they do not involve the φ-features of *v* but are merged directly with T, as suggested in (27) (cf. (25a)).

(27)   SCl$_φ$ [$_{Tφ}$ OCl R-v]

The surface result is that 1st and 2nd person SCls are obligatorily externalized, while in the other persons the rich agreement inflection is sufficient to express the subject (cf. Chomsky 2015). DOM is involved in the case of the co-occurrence of 2nd person SCl and 1st person OCl, illustrated in (3ii.a), where the order between the clitics is reversed, and we find *mə tə* … in the place of the expected *tə mə*. The reversed order characterizes also contexts with two objects, as in (4b), where *mə* precedes the sequence *tə lu*. The unspecialized nature of *tə* seems to be at the root of the phenomenon, to the effect that *mə* is merged to the usual structure in which *tə* combines with T-v, possibly already merged with *lu*, <mə, [tə, [(lu-)T-vφ]>. The sequence of pronominal exponents externalizes the order 1st – 2nd revealing the interpretive role of the referential hierarchy discussed by Kiparsky (2008; cf. fn. 1).

In many Romance languages with SCls, agreement relations in simple contexts include the agreement exponent of the verb and the SCl, understood as a sort of a discontinuous exponent of the T head. Nevertheless, in the presence of OCls we have at least two possibilities (in relation to the person), namely SCls combine with OCls or only OCls occur (Manzini and Savoia 2005). Tentatively, we can suggest the generalization on the distribution of agreement in (28) (cf. Roberts 2018).

---

[7] Roberts (2018: 261) explains the OCl-for-SCl distribution in the Valdôtain and Piedmontese dialects, through two steps: clitics are generated by a process of morphological fission (Halle and Marantz 1996), " 'splitting off' of (a subset of) features of a head to form a separate morpheme"; in OCl-for-SCl dialects the fission process is applied to Aux-level. The lack of a rule fusing OCls and SCls excludes the realization of the SCl under Aux. Interestingly, our approach implies a similar conceptualization, based on the role of the OCl as mapping the φ-features of Aux.

(28)   Agreement generalization: Agr T a.   introduces a specialized sub-set of φ-features
                                             b.   copies the set of φ-features associated with *v*

(28a) introduces SCls as a sort of duplicate of the agreement on the verbal head, as generally in Northern Italian dialects. (28b) corresponds to the IM of φ-features of *v* as inflectional morphemes (unaccusatives, passives, reflexives) and possibly OCl. In our dialects, (28b) is generally applied. In dialects such as that of Cantoira in (18), (28b) is applied except for the 1st person SCl combining with the 2nd person OCl. We conclude that in the particular context the necessary properties of the deictic elements have a full realization.

Finally, consider the other clitics. The 2nd person OCl and SCl share the same forms *tə* and *və*, while the 1st person plural is *sə*, i.e. the reflexive element. The reflexive element *sə* occurs in all the persons except for 1st and 2nd singulars, in the reflexive paradigm, cf. (5), where it is in complementary distribution with all SCls. We follow the proposal of Manzini *et al.* (2016), whereby *sə* satisfies the IA but its content is that of a variable, that finds its referential properties in the agreement features of the verb, its antecedent. In the case of *mə* and *tə* the reflexive interpretation derives from their coincidence with the verbal inflection-the subject. In other words, the exclusion of SCls can be traced back to the same mechanism working in the case of accusative clitics, except for 1st and 2nd person contexts. An anonymous reviewer raises the question why "this isn't possible with other pronouns. Or conversely, why the specialised 'se' form cannot extend to 1/2P". Indeed, the generalized occurrence of 'se' in reflexive for all persons is attested in Northern Italian and Rhaeto-Romance varieties where yet the clitic of 1st person tends to be however inserted (cf. Manzini and Savoia 2005: §4.3). The insertion of the element *se/si* introducing the variable is generally associated with the nominal φ-features (D) of the subject, including also definiteness/specificity, able to fix the denotation of *se/si*. Along these lines, we can suggest that such nominal properties work as the lexical restriction of *se*, excluding the coreference with 1st/2nd person elements. This can explain why 1st and 2nd plural persons, insofar as encoding also the 3rd person reference, have the reflexive *se* in many dialects, including the Celle and Faeto ones.

A final point concerns the special 1st person form ε of the auxiliary/copula in (14)-(15) for Faeto. In this variety the paradigms of the present of *be* and *have* are distinct except for the 1st person, where only the form ε occurs independently of the nature of the predicate. Systems with totally or partially overlapping paradigms of auxiliaries are discussed in Manzini and Savoia (2011), which propose to identify them with forms of *be*. This analysis suggests that in the case of agentive verbs *be* is obliged to select the EA of the lexical verb, thus excluding the insertion of *mə*.

5. Final remarks

In this article we started from two main points: the syntax of auxiliaries and the occurrence of clitics in Apulian Franco-Provençal. In this language object and subject clitics are in a partially complementary distribution related to DOM constraints and show an unexpected occurrence of the object clitics *mə, tə* instead of the SCl in copular and non-active contexts. The coincidence between *be* as auxiliary and copula provides evidence in favor of the analysis of auxiliaries as verbs in the proper sense, embedding a predicative clause. The participle has nominal inflectional properties associated with the argument organization of unaccusatives and passives. Our analysis is based on the recent formalization of modification structure proposed in Chomsky (2020a, b), where units of agreeing lexical elements are created by (pair-)merge. This framework makes a more natural and interesting treatment of cliticization possible; in our case, *mə/ tə* are the exponents of 1st/2nd person IA, which are merged to *v* and then to T, interpreting the agreement of the verb instead of SCl.

References

Baldi, Benedetta, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2019. "Auxiliary Selection in Italian Dialects: Person Split, OCls and *Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico*." *Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali* QULSO, 5: 55-105.

Baldi, Benedetta, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2021. "Possessives, from Franco-Provençal and Occitan Systems to Contact Dialects in Apulia and Calabria." *Languages*, 6 (63): 1-28.

Belvin, Robert, and Marcel den Dikken. 1997. "There, *Happens*, to, Be, Have." *Lingua*, 101 (3-4): 151-183.

Belletti, Adriana. 1990. *Generalized Verb Movement*. Torino: Rosenberg and Sellier.

Belletti, Adriana. 2005. "(Past-)participle Agreement." In *Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. III, ed. by Martin Everaert, and Henk C. van Riemsdijk, 493-521. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bentley, Delia, and Thórhallur, Eythórsson. 2004. "Auxiliary Selection and the Semantics of Unaccusativity." *Lingua* 114 (4): 447-471.

Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax. A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Pub Co.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 2004. "A Semantics for Unaccusatives and its Syntactic Consequences." In *The Unaccusativity Puzzle. Explorations of the Syntax-Lexicon Interface*, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou and Martin Everaert, 22-59. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. "Derivation by Phase." In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language,* ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1-54. Cambridge, MA-London: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2015. "Problems of Projections." In *Structures, Strategies and Beyond. Studies in honour of Adriana Belletti*, ed. by Elisa Di Domenico, Cornelia Hamann, Simona Matteini, 3-16. Amsterdam-Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chomsky, Noam. 2020a. *The UCLA Lectures.* (April 29-May 2, 2019). <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/005485> (06/2021).

Chomsky, Noam. 2020b. "Puzzles About Phases." In *Linguistic Variation: Structure and Interpretation: Contributions in Honor of M. Rita Manzini*, ed. by Ludovico Franco and Paolo Lorusso, 163-167. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Chomsky, Noam, Ángel Gallego, and Dennis Ott. 2019. "Generative Grammar and the Faculty of Language: Insights, Questions, and Challenges." In *Generative Syntax: Questions, Crossroads, and Challenges, Catalan Journal of Linguistics. Special Issue*, ed. by Ángel Gallego, and Dennis Ott, 229-261.

D'Alessandro, Roberta, and Ian Roberts. 2010. "Past Participle Agreement in Abruzzese: Split Auxiliary Selection and the Null-Subject Parameter." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 28 (1): 41-72.

Dixon, Robert M.W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge, MA-New York, NY: Cambridge UP.

Fillmore, Charles. J. 1968. "The Case for Case." In *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, 1-88, ed. by Emmon Bach, and Robert T. Harms. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Franco, Ludovico, M. Rita Manzini, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2021. "Locative PS as General Relators. Location, Direction, DOM in Romance." In *Into Adpositions. New Formal Perspectives on the Structure of the PP and its Variation, Linguistic Variations, Special Issue.* 135-173, ed. by Víctor Acedo-Matellán, Theresa Biberauer, Jaume Mateu, and Anna Pineda. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1996. "Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection." In *The View from Building 20. Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. by Kenneth L. Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 111-176. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kayne, Richard S. 1993. "Toward A Modular Theory Of Auxiliary Selection." *Studia Linguistica*, 47 (1): 3-31.

Kiparsky, Paul. 2008. "Universals Constrain Change; Change Results in Typological Generalizations." In *Linguistic Universals and Language Change*, ed. by Jeff Good, 23-53. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Manzini, M. Rita, and Ludovico Franco. 2016. "Goal and DOM Datives." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 34 (1): 197-240.

Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2005. *I Dialetti Italiani e Romanci*, vol. III. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2010. "Syncretism and Suppletion in Clitic Systems: Under-specification, Silent Clitics or Neither?" In *Syntactic Variation. The Dialects of Italy*, ed. by Roberta D'Alessandro, Adam Ledgeway, and Ian Roberts, 86-101. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2011. *Grammatical Categories: Variation in Romance Languages*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge UP.

Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2014. "Linkers in Aromanian in Comparison to Albanian and Romanian." *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 36: 83-104.

Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo, M. Savoia. 2017. "Gender, Number and Inflectional Class in Romance: Feminine/Plural -a." (Olomouc, Czech Republic, 7-9 June 2018). In *Language Use and Linguistic Structure. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2018*, ed. by Joseph Emonds, Markéta Janebová and Ludmila Veselovská, 263-282. Olomouc: Palackỳ University Olomouc.

Manzini, M. Rita, Anna Roussou, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2016. "Middle-Passive Voice in Albanian and Greek." *Journal of Linguistics*, 52 (1): 111-150.

Manzini, M. Rita, Leonardo M. Savoia, and Benedetta Baldi. 2020. "Microvariation and Macrocategories: Differential Plural Marking and Phase theory." *L'Italia Dialettale*, vol. LXXXI: 189-212.

Manzini, M. Rita, Leonardo M. Savoia, and Ludovico Franco. 2015. "Ergative Case, Aspect and Person Splits: Two Case Studies." *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 62 (3): 297-351.

Manzini, M. Rita, Leonardo M. Savoia, and Ludovico Franco. 2020. "DOM and Dative in (Italo-) Romance." In *Case, Agreement, and their Interactions: New Perspective on Different Argument Making*, ed. by András Bárány and Laura Kalin, 219-268. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Moro, Andrea. 1997. *The Raising of Predicates: Predicative Noun Phrases and the Theory of Clause Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Roberts, Ian G. 1993. "The Nature of Subject Clitics in Francoprovençal Valdotain." In *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy,* ed. by Adriana Belletti, 319-353. Torino: Rosenberg et Sellier.

Roberts, Ian G. 2010. *Agreement and Head Movement: Clitics, Incorporation, and Defective Goals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Roberts, Ian G. 2018. "Object Clitics for Subject Clitics in Francoprovençal and Piedmontese." In *Structuring Variation in Romance Linguistics and Beyond*, ed. by Mirko Grimaldi, Rosangela Lai, Ludovico Franco, and Benedetta Baldi, 257-267. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Savoia, Leonardo M., and M. Rita Manzini. 2010. "Lexicalization of 3rd Person Object Clitics: Clitic Enclisis and Clitic Drop." In *Syntactic Variation. The Dialects of Italy*, ed. by Roberta D'Alessandro, Adam Ledgeway, and Ian G. Roberts, 102-118, Cambridge-New York, NY: Cambridge UP.

Savoia, Leonardo M., Benedetta Baldi, and M. Rita Manzini. 2019. "Asymmetries in Plural Agreement in DPs." (Olomouc, Czech Republic, 7-9 June 2018). In *Language Use and Linguistic Structure. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2018*, ed. by Joseph Emonds, Markéta Janebová, and Ludmila Veselovská, 204-224. Olomouc: Palacký University Olomouc.

Savoia, Leonardo M., and M. Rita Manzini. 2010. "Les clitiques sujets dans les variétés occitanes et franco-provençales italiennes." *CORPUS*, 9: 165-189.