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Abstract: This contribution addresses a set of phenomena attested in the dialects spoken in Piedmont, including Franco-Provençal and Occitan varieties, and in West Liguria, concerning the interaction between subject and object clitics. Complementarily to these phenomena, we find the interplay between the realization of the 3rd person clitic and the auxiliary. More specifically, we will investigate the object-for-subject mechanism in the Piedmontese and Franco-Provençal dialects, the one of subject-with-object in some Franco-Provençal dialects and their possible interaction with the auxiliary. In some Piedmontese dialects, the alternation between be and have affects the distribution of subject and object clitics; in particular, the 3rd person clitic can occur in all persons, where it can be ambiguous between the subject or the object reading. The relation between the verb and the realization of its argumental clitics, and the interaction between auxiliaries and clitics are the main topics of this work. Our approach relies on the idea that clitics are the realization of ϕ-features associated with v and T and that auxiliaries are not functional elements but verbs with lexical properties. The theoretical frame we follow is the formulation recently proposed by Chomsky, based on the operation Merge and the Labeling Algorithm, leading to a more appropriate conceptualization of morpho-syntactic structures.
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1. Introduction

In this article, we address the interaction between subject clitics (SCls) and object clitics (OCls) in some dialects spoken in Piedmont and Liguria. Two main issues will be investigated, that is the distribution of the 1st person SCI in some Franco-Provençal dialects, in Sections 3 and 4, and the distribution of the clitic of 3rd person l ambiguous between the reading of SCI and that of OCI in the Ligurian and Piedmontese dialects, in Sections 5 and 6.

Both phenomena have been examined in the previous literature, specifically the Franco-Provençal system by Roberts (1993, 2018) and Savoia and Manzini (2010), and the distribution of l by Poletto (2000), Manzini and Savoia (2005). The treatment of clitics specialized for auxiliaries has represented a problematic issue. Poletto (1993) formulates a first hypothesis assuming that they are subject clitics; this is also the conclusion of Manzini and Savoia (2005, p. 457) substantially because of the complementary distribution with the SCI of 2nd singular person and other similar distributional restrictions. The analysis of Paduan gh əz e in Benincà (2007) concludes that gh and z are to be considered as something like inflectional elements. Garzonio and Poletto’s (2011) analysis of phenomena similar to the ones seen for Villareggia in (23)–(24), speak of clitics of auxiliary, assigning them a special syntactic status connected to the interface interpretive level, also based
on phonological restrictions. The complementary distribution with object clitics and the combination with vocalic subject clitics or their complementarity highlights their availability to different interpretations. Moreover, both Manzini and Savoia (2005) and Garzoni and Poletto (2011) emphasize the relationship with the object-by-subject phenomena presented in Franco-Provençal, of the type that we examine in Sections 3 and 4. As we will see in the following discussion, our idea is that l in these dialects is a clitic of v, i.e., an instantiation of its agreement properties, an idea maintained also by Roberts (2010, p. 57), where Romance OCls are the agreement head of phase v. Our aim is to think about these phenomena within a strong minimalist morphosyntactic approach, specifically, as regards the relation between SCls and OCls in a framework lacking the pre-packaged cartographic representation of the clitics.

2. An Approach to Morpho-Syntax

Our approach to Morpho syntax is based on the idea that morphology is part of syntactic computation and in language there is no specialized component for morphology (Manzini and Savoia 2011, 2017a, 2018; Manzini et al. 2020; Savoia et al. 2018; Savoia and Baldi 2022a, 2022b; Baldi and Savoia, Forthcoming). An address that is now pursued also by other authors, such as Collins and Kayne (2020). Lexical elements, including functional morphemes, are endowed with fully interpretable content, and contribute to realizing the syntactic structure. Therefore, we detach ourselves from Distributed Morphology (DM) (Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994), in which morphology defines an independent level from syntax, and subword elements (affixes and clitics) are understood as ‘dissociated morphemes’ conveying an information ‘separated from the original locus of that information in the phrase marker’ (Embick and Noyer 2001). Typically, DM uses post-syntactic rules of re-adjustment and of linear adjacency (local dislocation) (Embick and Noyer 2001) able to manipulate features associated with syntactic categories. Hence, agreement and case morphemes are not represented in syntax, but they are added post-syntactically ‘during Morphology’.

In keeping with Chomsky (2019, 2020, 2021) and Chomsky et al. (2019), the combinatorial operation Merge is assigned the basic role in forming morpho-syntactic structures, complex words as well as phrases. Merge takes the items X and Y and creates the new syntactic object formed by the combination of X and Y,\(^1\) as suggested in (1).

\[(1) \quad \text{Merge} \langle XY \rangle \rightarrow \{X,Y\}\]

Chomsky (2020) sees in pair-Merge the way of treating labelled amalgams based on the affixation of elements endowed with $\phi$-features, typically in 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’. In discussing this point, Chomsky (2021, pp. 30 and 36 ff.) concludes that ‘The first step in a derivation must select two items from the lexicon, presumably a root R and a categorizer CT, forming \{CT, R\}, which undergoes amalgamation under externalization, possibly inducing ordering effects […]’. With head-movement eliminated, v need no longer be at the edge of the vP phase, but can be within the domains of PIC and Transfer, which can be unified. EA is interpreted at the next phase'. The amalgamation gives rise to complex forms like \[\text{INFL} [v, \text{Root}]\]. If morphemes are part of the vocabulary as elements endowed with content, the formation of complex words can be analyzed as the result of merging combining the inflection heads (affixes) with an uncategorized R lexical root, corresponding to a predicate. In the case of nominal elements, inflectional contents are gender and other classificatory properties such as number and case (Manzini and Savoia 2017b). In inflected verbal forms, agreement features and mood/tense/aspect and voice inflections are merged with R.

We conceptualize the traditional categorizer n for nouns and v for verbs as the bundles of $\phi$-features that characterize the functional content of words entering into the agreement
operations (Manzini 2021). Finally, agreement can be accounted for as the morphological manifestation of the identity between referential feature sets corresponding to the same argument in the sentence.

Let us consider the syntactic status of auxiliaries. The hypothesis that auxiliaries are the morphological exponents of functional heads is very familiar in the generative framework, starting from Chomsky (1957), Burzio (1986). It is a simple solution giving an answer to the fact that the auxiliary verb and the participle denote a single event (Manzini and Savoia 2011). Bentley and Eythorsson (2003, p. 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-sets of semantic features associated with verbal classes. D’Alessandro and Roberts (2010, p. 50 and ff.) assume that auxiliaries are raising verbs, substantially in line with Moro (1997) for be, and Manzini and Savoia (2005, p. 547). As to the past participle, there are different proposals, for example that it is a reduced verbal structure (Belletti 1990) or a structure endowed with the entire set of the functional projections of V (Kayne 1993). The systems in which past participles can take enclitic pronouns seem to argue for the latter conclusion, or, rather, 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; hence, an adequate theory of be and have should be able to treat their different occurrences in a unified way. Manzini and Savoia (2011, pp. 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 active have is restricted to selecting transitive and/or active predicates. Chierchia (2004, p. 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 in 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, p. 146), the contrast between be and have is related to a difference in their selection 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’. Substantially, have takes a two-arguments eventive structure, while be is associated with one argument. 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., the theta-structure associated with the root R.

The crucial role is played by the adjectival nature of past participle, selecting only the IA slot. Taking Manzini et al. (2016), 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 word with an adjetival nature, giving rise to a clause including one argument.

3. SCLs and OCLs in Piedmontese Franco-Provençal

The Franco-Provençal dialects of Western Piedmont\(^2\) show a distribution of SCLs sensitive to the context of occurrence (Roberts 1993, 2018; Manzini and Savoia 2005, 2010). In these dialects, the 1st person SCL, singular and plural, \(d_3\) / ‘I/we’ occurs before the auxiliary have in (2b), while it is excluded with lexical verbs with an initial consonant, in (2a) and optionally with an initial vowel, as in (2c). It is excluded with the auxiliary or copula be, as in (3a) and (3b)\(^3\).

It is of note that in the Gallo-Romance varieties in past participles (PP), the specialized etymological suffix -\(t\)- was lost. Therefore, PPs now coincide with the sequence root + thematic vowel (TV), where the latter is characterized by the stress (we will propose a more detailed analysis of participles in Section 6.1). For the sake of clarity, in the glosses, we will indicate this type of past participles with TV,PP.

(2) a. dyarm-u
   d dyor-s
   u/i dyor-t
dyrm-eŋ
u dyrm-eš
u dyor-unt
(SCI) sleep.1SG, etc.
’I sleep, etc.’

b. \(d_3\) e dyrm-i:
dyrm-i: /i i o dyrm-i:
dyrm-i: /i i e dyrm-i:
dyrm-i: /i i o dyrm-i:
SCI have.1SG sleep-TV,PP, etc . . .
’I have slept, etc.’

c. \((d_3)\) aus-u
   /\((d_3)\)
SCI.1SG lift.1SG/SCI.1SG
’I lift/we lift the table’
aus-e-ŋ
l-a taul-a
lift-TV-1PL
the table-FSG

(3) a. se
   /seq
be.1SG/be.1PL
’I have/we have come’
yy’-ŋ
come-TV,PP

b. ser-u
   /ser-unt
be.IMPF.1SG
/be.IMPF.1PL
kuntant
glad
Cantoira

In the presence of an OCL, the SCI \(d_3\) is excluded if a 3rd person OCl precedes the verb, both with lexical verbs in (4a) for the singular and (4a’) for the plural. In auxiliary contexts, the past participle agrees with the 3rd person object, which excludes \(d_3\), as in (4b) for masculine singular and plural OCLs, and (4b’) and (4b’’) for the feminine singular and plural. With the other OCLs, including also the 3rd person neuter \(u, d_3\) occurs as in (5a,a’), (5b,b’) and (5c) for \(u\) of 2nd plural and \(u\) of neuter of 3rd person, in (5c’).

(4) a. 1-u/1-o
   /i-i/al
3-MSG/3.FSG
’t call him/her/them’

b. 1
   /i
3SG
’I have called him/her/them’

b’. 1
   /i
3SG
have.1SG
’I have called her’

b’. 1z
   /i
3FPL
have.1SG
’I have called them (f)’

In the presence of auxiliaries, the OCL \(d_3\) is excluded if a 3rd person OCl precedes the verb, both with lexical verbs in (4a) for the singular and (4a’) for the plural. In auxiliary contexts, the past participle agrees with the 3rd person object, which excludes \(d_3\), as in (4b) for masculine singular and plural OCLs, and (4b’) and (4b’’) for the feminine singular and plural. With the other OCLs, including also the 3rd person neuter \(u, d_3\) occurs as in (5a,a’), (5b,b’) and (5c) for \(u\) of 2nd plural and \(u\) of neuter of 3rd person, in (5c’).
(5) a. dži           t           tjam-u
   SCL1PS         2SG          call-1SG
   ‘I call you.sg/pl’

   a’. dži m lav-u
   ‘I wash myself’

   b. dži           t           e-lj           tja m-a
   SCL1PS         2PSG         have.1PL          call-TV.1PL
   ‘We have called you’

    b’. dži           t           tja m-e-lj
   SCL1SG         2SG          call-TV-1PL
   ‘We call you’

   c. dži           u           tjam-u
   SCL1PS         2pl          call-1SG
   ‘I call you.pl’

   c’. dži           u           se
   SCL1PS         3rd          know-1SG
   ‘I know it’

Cantoira

Interestingly, the SCl of 1st person occurs systematically in post-verbal position in interrogatives in all clitic contexts, where we find the inverted order verb-SCI, as in French and in many northern Italian dialects (Poletto 2000; Manzini and Savoia 2005), as illustrated in (6a) for lexical verbs, also in the case an OCI is present, (6b), and in the auxiliary contexts, where the enclitic form dži doubles the proclitic one, in (6c).

(6) a. dyorm-u-džu?
   sleep-1SG SCL1PS
   ‘do I sleep?’

    a’. dyr m-e-gi-džu?
   sleep-TV-1PL SCL1PS
   ‘do we sleep?’

    b. l-u         tjam-u-        džu?
   OCI-MSG       call-1SG              SCL1PS
   ‘do I call him?’

    c. dži         e-         džu        dyr mi?
   SCL1PS have.1SG SCL1PS
   sleep-PP
   ‘have I slept?’

Cantoira

The distribution of dži shows that though certain phonological restrictions can have played a role in determining its exclusion, indeed now we find the allomorph dži before OCls beginning both with a consonant and a vowel, as in (5a,b,c), so that its insertion in the clitic string appears governed by syntactic criteria. Additionally, its association with the auxiliary have seems to respond to an internal property insofar as the SCI appears to be obligatory.

4. SCls and OCls in Apulian Franco-Provençal

The Franco-Provençal dialect spoken in the villages of Celle and Faeto (North Apulia; here we consider the data of Celle)\(^4\) shows the system of SCls in (7a) and that of OCls in (7b), generally distinct except for the 2nd person, where the single common form la/va ‘you’ is attested. As can be seen in (7a,b), a specialized dative form is missing, and so is the reflexive including the 1PL as well. In (7c), the stressed strong forms of personal pronouns are provided, for subject and object contexts. Only in the case of the 1st singular person is an oblique form present. In other cases, the same form occurs as the subject and the object of a verb or a preposition. As generally in Gallo-Italic varieties, SCls can combine with expressed subjects, including stressed pronouns.
4.1. Lexical Verbs

With this scheme in mind, we are able to illustrate the distribution of SCls and OCls in sentences. SCls are exemplified for unergatives in (8a) and for unaccusatives in (8b). Transitives with post-verbal objects have the same distribution, as in (8c).

\((8)\)

\(a.\)  
\(\text{dd} \dd \text{dd} \dd \text{dd} \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \dd \d
(9) i. ddɔ̄ l-u
SCl1SG 3-MSG /2SG vaja
‘I see him/her/you’
ii. tɔ l-u /l-a /sɔ vaja
2SG 3-MSG /3-FSG /1PL see.2SG
‘you see him/her/us’
ii.a mɔ tɔ vaja
1SG 2SG see.2SG
‘you see me’
iii. l-u /mɔ /tɔ vaja
3-MSG /1SG /2SG see.3SG
‘(s)he sees him/her/you’
iv. l-u /tɔ vi-u-ŋŋɔ
3-MSG /2SG see-TV-1PL
‘we see him/her/you’
v. l-u /mɔ vij-iʃɔ̄
3-MSG /1SG see-2PL
‘you(pl) see him/her’
vi. mɔ /tɔ /l-a vi-u-ndɔ̄
1SG /2SG /3-FSG see-TV-3PL
‘they see me/you/her’

Celle

In the verbs with three arguments like give, the 1st/2nd OCls precede the 3rd person OCls, as in (10a,a’). Again, SCls are excluded, except for 1st/2nd singular elements, and the 1st person OCl precedes the SCl as in (10b); see also (9i.a) above:

(10) a. (iʃɔ̄) mɔ / tɔ l-u dde:nɔ̄
he 1SG / 2SG 3-MSG give.3SG
‘He gives it to me/to you’
a’. (ti) tɔ sɔ l-u dde:nɔ̄
you 2SG 1PL 3-MSG give.2SG
‘You gives it to us’
b. (ti) mɔ tɔ l-u dde:nɔ̄
you 1SG 2SG 3-MSG give.2SG
‘You give it to me’

Celle

Reflexive/non-active forms exclude the specialized SCls. We find the objective forms mɔ and tɔ for the 1st/2nd singular persons in (11i,ii) and the reflexive sɔ in all other contexts, in (11iii–vi). So, 1st and 2nd person SCls are prevented from combining with OCls.

(11) i. mɔ lla:vɔ
ii. tɔ lla:vɔ
iii. sɔ lla:vɔ
iv. sɔ lav-u-ŋŋɔ̄
v. sɔ la’va
vi. sɔ lav-u-ndɔ̄
‘I wash myself, you wash yourself, . . . ’

Celle

The compatibility between clitics, as we noticed, is constrained by person, so that the only strings allowed are those in (12), where SCl precedes an OCl, limited to 1st/2nd person SCls.

(12) SCI OCl
1st dɔ̄ OCl
2nd tɔ OCl
Other combinations SCI+OCl(s) are not instantiated, considering that reflexive contexts in turn exclude all SCIs.

4.2. Auxiliaries

The auxiliary selection separates unaccusatives and reflexives, with be, from unergatives and transitives, with have. While the latter have the same SCI system as the lexical verbs, in (13a,b), unaccusatives and reflexives select mő in SCI position, in (14a,a’,b). As we can expect, passives match the other contexts with be, as in (14c). It is of note that (14a’) highlights the fact that in participles with a sufficient inflection, the agreement with the subject is realized.

(13) a.  
   \[d₃ \text{ e(mnà) dur’}m\text{-i}\]  
   \[t \text{ a(mnà) dur’}m\text{-i}\]  
   \[i \text{ atto dur’}m\text{-i}\]  
   \[n \text{ a’v-u-ŋŋo dur’}m\text{-i}\]  
   \[v \text{ a’vi dur’}m\text{-i}\]  
   \[i \text{ a-ndò dur’}m\text{-i}\]  
   \[’I have slept, . . .’ \]  
   \[(lo \text{ ddra) } \]

b.  
   \[d₃ \text{ e l’v-a}\]  
   \[t \text{ annò l’v-a}\]  
   \[i \text{ atto l’v-a}\]  
   \[n \text{ av-u-ŋŋo l’v-a}\]  
   \[v \text{ avija l’v-a}\]  
   \[i \text{ a-ndò l’v-a}\]  
   \[’I have washed the clothes, . . .’ \]  

(14) a.  
   \[mő \text{ sejò la’v-a}\]  
   \[tò \text{ sejò la’v-a}\]  
   \[s \text{ etto la’v-a}\]  
   \[sò \text{ su-ŋŋo la’v-a}\]  
   \[sò \text{ si la’v-a}\]  
   \[sò \text{ su-ndò la’v-a}\]  
   \[’I have washed myself, . . .’ \]  
   \[a’. \text{ mő sejò }/\text{kroverò}\]  
   \[1SG \text{ be.1SG covered.PP.MSG/cover.PP-FSG}\]  
   \[’I have covered myself’ \]  

b.  
   \[mő \text{ sejò và’n-i}\]  
   \[tò \text{ sejò và’n-i}\]  
   \[sò \text{ etto và’n-i}\]  
   \[sò \text{ su-ŋŋo và’n-i}\]  
   \[sò \text{ si và’n-i}\]  
   \[sò \text{ su-ndò và’n-i}\]  
   \[’I have come, . . .’ \]  

The objective form mő occurs instead of the SCI d₃ in the case of predicative constructs with be, regardless the individual- or stage-level interpretation, as in (15a,b), and with stay/stand, as in (15c,d), respectively.

(15) a.  
   \[mő \text{ sejò kun} \text{endo}\]  
   \[1SG \text{ be.1SG glad}\]  
   \[’I am glad’ \]  

b.  
   \[mő \text{ sejò kun} \text{endo}\]  
   \[2SG \text{ be.2SG glad}\]  
   \[’you are glad’ \]  

c.  
   \[m \text{ astò kunde} \text{nda}\]  
   \[1SG \text{ stay.1SG happy of you’}\]  
   \[’I am happy with you’ \]  

d.  
   \[m \text{ astò i ki}\]  
   \[1SG \text{ stay.1SG here}\]  
   \[’I am here’ \]  

stay, as a progressive auxiliary, in turn selects mő. This holds not only for unaccusative/reflexive contexts, in (16a), but also for agentive constructs, as in unergative and transitive contexts in (16b) and (16c).
(16)  a. m asta van-a-ŋŋo /lav-a-ŋŋo
   me stay:1SG come-TV-GER /wash-TV-GER
   ‘I am coming/washing myself’

   b. m asta durm-a-ŋŋo
   me stay:1SG sleep-TV-GER
   ‘I am sleeping’

   c. ma l asta faj-a-ŋŋo
   me it stay:1SG make-TV-GER
   ‘I am making it’

4.3. The Distribution of SCls

In summary, in this dialect, the distribution of the 1st person CIs dʒə and mə depends not so much on the verbal class as on the auxiliary. In fact, mə in (17) is selected by be in passive, mid-reflexive and copular contexts, while dʒə by have. Moreover, lexical verbs select dʒə independently of their eventive class. Reflexives have mə, but, as suggested in Section 6.1, it is the occurrence of mə that excludes dʒə, as schematized in (17).

(17)  1st person SCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>transitive/unergative</th>
<th>unaccusative</th>
<th>have</th>
<th>reflexive</th>
<th>be/stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dʒə</td>
<td>dʒə</td>
<td>dʒə</td>
<td>mə</td>
<td>mə</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see that mə excludes the dʒə when the agreement features of the subject need to be independently realized in the syntactic string, i.e., in reflexives and with be.

5. Clitics of 3rd Person and Auxiliary in the Piedmontese Dialects

In several Piedmontese dialects, we find a special distribution of the SCI of 3rd person in the contexts with the auxiliary have. Before illustrating the data, it is of note that they present a syntactic property typical of the Piedmontese dialects, i.e., the position of OCls in enclisis on the past participle in the constructs with the auxiliary (Rohlf's [1949] 1968; Manzini and Savoia 2005).

First, we examine the dialects where both auxiliaries, have and be (cf. Baldi and Savoia 2019), are possible with transitives. Nevertheless, as shown by the dialect of Fara Novarese, have requires the double occurrence of OCls, on the auxiliary and the participle, contrary to be, that excludes the proclisis of the object. In other words, in contexts with be, the object clitic occurs only on the participle, as illustrated in (18a) for the transitive paradigm; (18b) illustrates the 3rd singular of the reflexive. In the 3rd singular context in (18a.iii), the pronominal element l preceding the verb can be identified with the specialized SCI for the 3rd person, as also in (18b). We note that in these dialects, only 2nd and 3rd singular SCIs have a specialized form, while in the other persons we find the SCI i or no SCI. Finally, we find the element a that precedes the clitic of 2nd person, (18a.ii), and the clitic l in (18a.ii), and in the examples in (19a.iii), (19a.ii), (19a.iii), (19b). The simplest hypothesis is that a is a non-specialized SCI that can double the specialized one.
In the system with have in (19), we find the doubling of the OCLs in proclisis on have and in enclisis on the past participle, as in (19a,b). Consequently, in this construct, the 3rd singular / in proclisis is to be identified with the object clitic, on the basis of the comparison with the other forms, where the OCl is inserted in proclisis.

At least two points emerge: the different distribution of OCLs with be or have; the positioning of the 3rd person element, indifferently readable as object or subject.

5.1. Ambiguous CIs of 3rd Person

The last point mentioned in the preceding section is systematically evidenced in some varieties spoken in the mountain dialects of Liguria and West-South Piedmont, where the SCI and the OCI of 3rd singular person share the same form in auxiliary contexts, so that this element can be interpreted as the object or the subject according to the thematic domain. Let us consider the data of Pigna (West Liguria). We will concentrate on the 3rd person, where the phenomenon is clearly evaluable. In these dialects, SCIs and OCls

Fara Novarese
have partially coinciding forms. (20a) illustrates the pre-vocalic alternants, (20b) the pre-consonant alternants that overlap on the same gender/number simple elements except for the feminine plural e in the object series. Finally, the element l occurs as the masculine and feminine singular object in (20a)', while the vocalic alternants occur as the singular in pre-consonant contexts in (20b') and the plurals i and e in all contexts, as (20b'') shows.

(20)  a. SCls  b. OCls
before vowels  before consonants
u-l  u/a
l  /a/i
l  u/a/i
l/e

a’ e  ai  tfam-o-u/a
1SG MSG/FSG have.1SG call-TV,PP-MSG/FSG
’I have called him/her’

b’. e  i/e  ai  tfam-o-i/e
1SG MSG/FSG have.1SG call-TV,PP-MPL/FPL
’I have called them’

b’’. e  u/a/i/e  veg-u
1SG MSG/FSG/MPL/FPL see-1SG
’I see him/her/them’

As to the SCls u-l ‘MSG-3’ and a-l ‘FSG-3’, we note that they combine the gender element with the definiteness base l, as usually in many Northern Italian dialects, even if in the reversed order. Such forms occur before verbs initiating in vowel, in (21a’,b), hence including auxiliaries and copula, as in (21c,d,d’) and transitive, in (21e). Before an initial consonant, we find the gender elements a FSG’ and u ‘MSG’, in (21f); the 3rd plural SCI is the element of number i, both before consonant and vowel, as in (21g). The examples also illustrate the position of the negative marker nu, which is inserted between the gender or number element and the definiteness element l.

(21)  a. u-l MSG-3 ‘he/she lifts the chair’
/a-l FSG-3 lift.3SG
ais-a / a MSG / FSG a kairega
the 3 have.3SG chair
nu 3 have.3SG nu 1 ai a
MSG / FSG NEG 3 lift.3SG nothing

b. u MSG / FSG NEG 3 have-3SG
/a (nu) 1 a msg / fsg neg 3 have-3SG
’he/she has/does not have it’

(21)  a. u-l MSG-3 ‘he/she lifts the chair’
/a-l FSG-3 lift.3SG
ais-a / a MSG / FSG a kairega
the 3 have.3SG chair
nu 3 have.3SG nu 1 ai a
MSG / FSG NEG 3 lift.3SG nothing

b. u MSG / FSG NEG 3 have-3SG
/a (nu) 1 a msg / fsg neg 3 have-3SG
’he/she has/does not have it’

b’. e  u/a/i/e  veg-u
1SG MSG/FSG/MPL/FPL see-1SG
’I see him/her/them’

Pigna
The point we focalize on is the fact that the element l can be read as the OCl of transitive verbs, as detailed in the data in (22). (22a) illustrates the OCl reading in contexts of verbs with an initial vowel; in (22a’) the occurrence of the clitics u, a, i as object are exemplified. (22b) illustrates the objective reading of l before the auxiliary have, in transitive. (22b’,c) show the 3rd plural OCls and the reflexive. The examples in (22a,a’,b,b’,c) show that l alternates in this context with the other OCls.

(22) a. u /a (nu) l/m ais-a
   MSG / FSG NEG 3 /1SG
   'he/she lifts it/him/her/me up/does not lift it/him/her/me up’

   a’. u /a /me tjam-a
   MSG / FSG NEG 3FSG/3FSG/1SG
call-3SG
   'he/she calls him/her/me/does not call him/her/me’

   b. u/a (nu) l/m a tfjam-a
   MSG / FSG NEG 3 /1SG
   have.3SG call-TV.PP-/call-TV.PP-FSG
   'he/she has (not) called him/her/me’

   b’. u /a (nu) i /e a tfjam-a
   MSG / FSG NEG MPL/1SG
   have.3SG call-TV.PP-MPL/call-TV.PP-FPL
   'he/she has (not) called them’

   c. u /a (nu) s e
   MSG / FSG NEG Refl be.3SG
   laŋ- u /laŋ- o- a
   wash-TV.PP-MSG/wash-TV.PP-FSG
   ‘he/she has (not) washed him/herself’

Pigna

As in the case considered in the preceding section, the crucial question is the ambiguous nature of l in the constructs in (21) and (22). A possible description is that l in the two contexts realizes two different positions or corresponds to two different pronominal elements in complementary distribution. We will see that another analysis is available, based on its ambivalence.

5.2. l in All Persons

The extension of the element l throughout the paradigm characterizes many Piedmontese varieties (Manzini and Savoia 2005), as in the case of the dialect of Villareggia (Turin), in (23b). The comparison with the present indicative in (23a,c) shows that the occurrence of the clitic l is restricted to the auxiliary have and to the 3rd singular form e of be (auxiliary or copula) in the present indicative, in (23e,e’); the imperfect of be selects an initial locative clitic i, as in (23e’) that however prevents l from being inserted. Like many Piedmontese dialects, the variety of Villareggia has a syncretic paradigm of clitics, where we find i for the 1st singular and plural and the 2nd plural, and a for the 3rd person, singular and for the plural in variation with i. The 2nd singular a l combines a with the specialized deictic form l. In the pluperfect with the auxiliary have, between the SCl and the auxiliary, the 3rd person/definiteness element l (3PS) is inserted, again save in the context of the 2nd person SCl at, as in (23b). This element appears also between the SCI and the possession verb have, in contexts with a lexical object, as in (23d).
(23) a.  
i dorm
  a t dorm-i
  a dorm
i durm-u-mm a
i dorm-i
  a/i dorm-u
SCI sleep.1SG, etc.
'I sleep, etc.'

b.  
i.  
i 1 o dur'm-i
SCI 3PS have.1SG sleep-TV.PP
  a t e dur m-i
SCI2SG have.2SG sleep-TV.PP
 ii.  
  a l a dur'm-i
SCI 3PS have.3SG sleep-TV.PP
 iii.  
  i l u-mma dur m-i
SCI 3PS have-1PL sleep-TV.PP
 iv.  
  i l ei dur m-i
SCI 3PS have.2PL sleep-TV.PP
 vi.  
  a l a-ř dur m-i
SCI 3PS have.3PL sleep-TV.PP
'I have slept, etc.'

c.  
a aus-a/i au's-u-mm a/i aus-u la kadrrga
SCI lift-3SG./SCI
وث(3)he lifts/we lift/they lift the chair
lift-TV-1PL./SCI lift-3PL. the chair

d.  
i 1 o fam
SCI 3PS have.1SG hunger
  at e fam
SCI2SG have.2SG hunger
 a l a fam . . .
SCI 3PS have.3SG hunger
'I am hungry, etc.'

e.  
  a l e ji-i /ji-uw-a
SCI3 3PS be.3SG come-TV.PP.MSG ./-FSG
'she has come'

e'.  
  a i er-a ji-i
SCI Loc be.1MPF-3SG come-TV.PP.MSG
'she had come'

e".  
  a l e kuntent/kuntenta
SCI 3PS be.3SG content.MSG./-FSG
'she is content'

Villareggia

In the contexts with have of possession otherwise lacking the lexical realization of the internal argument, the element l is interpreted as an OCI as in (24a). Obviously, in this case, l occurs also between the SCI of 2nd singular and the form of have. (24b) illustrates the occurrence of the OCI of 3rd person in the other contexts; in auxiliary constructs OCIs are in enclisis. Again, the element of 3rd singular l is inserted before have. Finally, (24c) shows the 3rd person singular OCI before lexical verb; as we may see, the single form la emerges for masculine and feminine.
(24) a. i. il /i 0
SCI 3PS /PL have.1SG
‘I have it/them’
ii. at I /i 0
SCI2SG 3PS /PL have.2SG
‘you have it/them’
iii. a il /i 0
SCI 3PS /PL have.3SG
‘you have it/them’
iv. i il /i 0-mma
SCI 3PS /PL have-1PL
‘we have it/them’

b. ii. at /e tja m-/> me /l-u /l-a /ie
SCI2SG have.2SG call-TV.PP-1 SG/3-MSG/3-FSG/3.PL
‘you have called me/him/her/them’
iii. a I a tja m-/> me /l-u /l-a /ie
SCI 3PS have.3SG call-TV.PP-1 SG/3-MSG/3-FSG/3.PL
‘(s)he has called me/him/her/them’
iv. i l o-mma tja m-/> l-u /l-a /ie
SCI 3PS have-1PL call-TV.PP-1 SG/3-MSG/3-FSG/3.PL
‘we have called him/her/them’

c. i l-a /i tfam /ausu
SCI 3SG/PL call.1SG/lift.1SG
‘I call/lift her/him/them’

Villareggia

The data we have examined show that the clitic l has a special distribution in the contexts of the auxiliary, where it can, again, have the reading of SCI or OCI. Moreover, its occurrence in contexts like (23b), (23d), (23e) and (23e”) could suggest a subject role, even if its association with persons different from the 3rd renders a little obscure this conclusion.

6. l in the Auxiliary—Participle Constructs

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 past participle selecting it as IA. 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 clause, a predicative relation. More precisely, we treat the participle as a nominal form including a category-less lexical root R, enlarged by the thematic vowel TV followed by the aspectual suffix, -t/-d- in weak past participles in Italian and other Romance varieties. Inflection including ϕ-features (gender, number), that we assume fully interpretable, closes the derivation. If the past participle has the properties of nouns and adjectives, it selects only one argument. This may be due to its stative/resultative nature implying an argument to which to assign the predicate, namely AI. The lexical root can include agentivity, even if the EA is not realized in the structure, so that some ambiguity can be caused, only solved by inserting an agentive complement.

Resuming Manzini and Savoia (2005), we associate the thematic vowel TV with a nominal category which takes an argumental variable identified by the subject. More precisely, the hypothesis we apply here, is that TVs introduce an indefinite variable ‘x’, whose value is fixed by the subject. Thus, TVs are nominal inflections making the verbal root available to be inserted in the aspectual/modal head. As in many Northern Italian dialects, as well as in general in Gallo-Romance languages, the weak past participles no longer present the participial suffix, so that the TV is immediately followed by the inflection. In other words, the nominal properties of the latter are sufficient to characterize the nominal attributive nature of the past participle.

In (25), the analysis of the past participle alternants for gender and number of Pigna (cf. (22b,b’)) such as tja m-/> ‘called, i.e., call-TV-MSG’, is provided. The result is the complex form in (25).

(25) [[Tfam R] a TV] u ϕ]
Let us now address the auxiliary construct and focus on the ambiguous reading of \( l \) in the dialects such as Pigna, as illustrated for instance in (21e) and (22b), \( \text{u/a l a t} \) \( \text{Sam-A} \) \( \phi \) \( \text{‘he/she has called him’} \). As to the relation between arguments and the two Phase heads C and v, Chomsky et al. (2019, p. 240) characterize vP as the thematic domain and CP as the propositional domain. If, as indicated, in the construct auxiliary-participle, \( \text{have} \) and \( \text{be} \) are full verbal projections, the small clause encoding the predicative relation between the participle and its IA is included in the vP string. Based on the discussion around (1) in Section 2, EA is realized by the inflection of the verb and its SCI in T, in the terms specified by Chomsky (2021), as in (26).

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{SCI} & T & v & \text{participle} \\
\text{u/aEA} & a & l_{IA} & t_{am-\alpha-u} \\
\end{array}
\]

In the past participle clause, the argumental variable introduced by the TV in (26) is closed by the internal argument, given the unaccusative nature of past participle, typically expressed by the specialized exponent \(-t/-d-\) in Romance languages. As noticed, the absence of this morphological mark forces the verbal base to realize this reading in auxiliary contexts, as suggested in the derivation in (27). In (27a), the Root and the TV merge, giving rise to the complex form which, when combined with the inflection \(-u\) in (27a’), gives rise to the participle amalgam which includes, therefore, the properties of agreement. These latter realize the IA of \( v \), in (27b) and, in the form of the OCl, in (27c). As to the distribution of \( l \) in Pigna, following Roberts (2010, p. 57), the OCl realizes the IA agreement for \( v \) phase. We know that \( v \) is never visible except insofar as it forms an amalgam with the Root, where \( v \) is adjoined to R (Chomsky 2015, p. 12). The OCl can be introduced on the verbal form including \( v \), i.e., the auxiliary in T, as indicated in (27c).

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{a.} & < [r \text{[am]}, \omega_{TV/\phi}] > [\phi t_{am-\alpha}] \\
\text{a’} & < [t_{am-\alpha}, u_{MSG}] > [ [ \phi t_{am-\alpha}] u_{MSG}] \\
\text{b.} & < a_{T}, [v/MSG [\phi t_{am-\alpha}] u] > [r a [v/MSG [t_{am-\alpha}] u_{MSG}]] \\
\text{c.} & < l_{\phi}, [v/T a [v/MSG t_{am-\alpha-u}]] > [r [v/T l_{\phi}, [a [v/MSG t_{am-\alpha-u}]]] \\
\end{array}
\]

Pigna

The first conclusion is that \( l \) realizes the \( \phi \)-features of \( v \), as in (26). This explains its distribution, whereby it admits all the readings, and specifically can be coreferential with the subject in intransitive and copular contexts, or can introduce the IA, in transitives. In dialects like the one of Pigna, endowed with specialized SCls, this means that in the case of intransitives, in (28a) (from (21c) repeated here), the overlapping of the agreement properties of \( v \) and \( T \) implies that \( l \) expresses the same reference of the SCls, as in (28b). If following Manzini and Savoia (2005) and Roberts (2018), SCls are the doubling of the features of \( T \), we conclude that \( u/a \) and \( l \) encode the same referential features, as in (28c), as a consequence of the amalgamation between \( T \) and \( v \) (here represented. For the sake of clarity, by \( T(+v) \)). As to negation, in the Ligurian dialects the proclitic negative element \( \text{nu}^{b} \) occurs, it can be assumed, by complying with scope requirements. So, it takes the verb and at least its internal role within its scope, as suggested in (28b).

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{a.} & u/a & (nu) & l \text{a} & d\text{orm-i-u} \\
\text{MSG} & /FSG & \text{NEG} & 3 \text{have.3SG} & \text{sleep-TV,PP-MSG} \\
\left(\text{‘he/she has (not) slept’}\right) \\
\text{b.} & \text{SCI} & \text{(Neg)} & \text{OCl} & T(+v) \ldots \text{participle} \\
\text{u/aEA} & \text{nu} & l_{\phi} & a \ldots \text{dorm-i-u} \\
\text{c.} & < u_{\phi}, [T_{/T} l_{\phi}, [a [MSG d\text{orm-i-u}]]] > [r [T u l_{\phi}, [T_{/T} a [MSG d\text{orm-i-u}]]] \ldots > \\
\end{array}
\]

Pigna

The dialect of Villareggia extends this structure in all contexts in correspondence of the post-participial insertion of OCl, and, what is more, throughout the paradigm, in other
words in combination with all persons except for the 2nd singular. In fact, the specialized SCl \( at \) is not compatible with \( l \), whereas the other SCls have unspecialized forms compatible with \( l \). We can tentatively refer the different behavior to the contrast between the clitics associated with the generic content of Definiteness, and the specialized property of 2nd person, obtaining the split between (29a) and (29b):

(29) a. \( a, i = \) Definiteness, according to the person  
    b. \( at = \) Recipient

The result is that \( a, i \) are compatible with \( l \), that can be characterized as the realization of a referent definite with respect to the discourse. In contrast, the 2nd person SCL sets the reference deictically. What we are suggesting is that \( l \) exactly as in the dialect of Pigna in (28), also in dialects in which it is extended on more forms of the paradigm, realizes the agreement properties of \( v \), associated with the amalgam realized by the inflected verbal form, as in (30a,b) (from (23b.iv)) for the unergatives.

(30) a. \( i \quad l \quad o\text{-mma} \quad durm\text{-i} \)  
    \( \text{SCl 3} \quad 3 \text{ have-1PL} \quad \text{sleep-TV,PP} \)  
    ‘we have slept’  

b. \( \text{SCl} \quad \text{OCl} \quad T(+v) \quad \text{participle} \)  
   \( i_{\text{EA}} \quad l_{\varphi} \quad \text{omma} \quad \text{durm-i} \)  
   \( \text{Villareggia} \)

In transitive contexts with enclisis on the participle, as in (31a) (from (24b.iv)), the enclitic element is merged to the past participle in (31b) based on the agreement between \( \varphi \)-features of the participle and those of the OCl. As reminded by Chomsky (2021), \( v \) remains invisible; the OCl amalgamates with the participle yielding the form \( tfam\text{-}o\text{-}l\text{-u} \) ‘called-him’. The amalgamation is able to map the inflectional properties of \( v \), as in (31c), onto the representation accessed by C-I and SM systems. The result is that this copy of the agreement property of \( v \) needs to be identified with the content of \( l \).

(31) a. \( i \quad l \quad o\text{-mma} \quad tfam\text{-}o\text{-}l\text{-u} \)  
    \( \text{SCl 3} \quad \text{have-1PL} \quad \text{call-PP- 3-MSG} \)  
    ‘we have called him’  

b. \(< l_{\text{uMSG}}, [l_{\varphi} \ tfam\text{-}o]\ > \rightarrow [l_{\varphi} \ tfam\text{-}o\text{-}l_{\text{uMSG}}] \)  
   \( \text{Villareggia} \)

c. \( \text{SCl} \quad \text{OCl} \quad T(+v) \quad \text{participle-OCl} \)  
   \( i_{\text{EA}} \quad l_{\varphi} \quad \text{omma} \quad tfam\text{-}o\text{-}l_{\varphi} \)  
   \( \text{Villareggia} \)

It is no accident if in the systems with \( l \) extended to the entire paradigm, as the dialect of Villareggia, its clear realization as object clitic is tested with have of possession, in the examples in (24a).

The third distributional pattern of object clitics we have considered is the one attested in (18) and (19) for Fara Novarese. In this dialect, the auxiliary have doubles the clitic in proclisis and in enclisis on the past participle, while the auxiliary be excludes the proclitic form, as repeated in (32a) and (32b), respectively. (31c) exemplifies the 2nd person where the specialized SCl \( at \) excludes have.
Relying on the precedent discussion, we can connect the two structures to the different auxiliary. More precisely, be, differently from *have*, introduces only one argument, which coincides with the subject. Other arguments may be selected by the participle. In these dialects, this difference is made manifest by the inability of *be* to take an IA as an OCl in proclisis, instead admitted on the participle. We can think that the 2nd person SCI (a)t requires the auxiliary *be* because only *be* makes it recognizable as the subject, whereas in the contexts with *have* it is inserted as the agreement head of v. as in (32b).

6.1. Franco-Provençal

Let us now turn the OCls-for-SCls phenomena in the Franco-Provençal dialects, beginning with the distribution illustrated for the Apulian variety of Celle. As discussed in the previous section, *be*, both copula and auxiliary, embeds a predicative relation between a noun and an adjective/participle implementing the lexical properties of the verb, i.e., the theta-roles associated with the root R. The past participles generally lack the agreement inflection, except for a sub-class of strong forms in which it is possible to distinguish the gender exponent -*tô* in (33a), as *kraôva* ‘covered.MSG’/ *kraôva-tô* ‘covered.FSG’ (cf. (14a’)). On the contrary, weak forms, such as *la’v-a* ‘washed’ (cf. (13b)), include only the TV, as in (33b).

(32) a. a l V Cl be.3SG call-TV.PP- l-u/-mi
   SCI SCL3SG be.3SG call-TV.PP- 3-MSG/1SG
   ‘he has called him/me’
   b. i l/1/t uma V Cl have.1PL call-TV.PP- l-u/ti
   SCI 3sg/2sg have.1PL call-TV.PP- 3-MSG/2SG
   ‘we have called him/you’
   c. a t ei V Cl be.2SG call-TV.PP- l-u/mi
   SCI SCL2SG be.2SG call-TV.PP- 3-MSG/1SG
   ‘you have called him/me’

   Fara Novarese

In the Celle dialect, *be* entails the insertion of *ma* instead of *d* in all non-active contexts, as in the reflexive in (14a’), and in the copular context in (15a), repeated in (34a,b), where *ma* realizes the *φ*-features of the subject.

(33) a. [ [kro✈a R] tô Gender]
   b. [ [lav R] a TV]

   In the Celle dialect, *be* entails the insertion of *ma* instead of *d* in all non-active contexts, as in the reflexive in (14a’), and in the copular context in (15a), repeated in (34a,b), where *ma* realizes the *φ*-features of the subject.

(34) a. ma sejo kraôva/kraôva-tô
   1SG be.1SG cover.PP/cover.PP-FSG
   ‘I have covered myself’
   b. ma sejo kunteyô
   1SG be.1SG glad
   ‘I am glad’

   Celle

In the sentence *be*+adjective/past participle in (34), the subject is the only argument of the participial item, i.e., its IA. *ma* (and *tô*) are merged to the verbal amalgam of which they realize the agreement *φ*-features, as in (35a). The referential properties of *ma/tô* are compatible with the *φ*-features of the participle or adjective. These clitics saturate the agreement properties of inflected verbal amalgam and so, the insertion of a SCI is no longer necessary, as in (35b).

(35) a. <ma, [τ sejo] > [φ ma [φ sejo ] ]
   b. (S)Cl T(+v) participle-OCl
   maIA sej kraôva/kunteyôφ
That explains the fact that \( m_3o \) is the only clitic with lexical reflexives, as in (11), and also that it is the only clitic with all mono-argumental verbs such as be or stay, as in (35). In other words, the contrast between cases, i.e., between a nominative clitic (SCI) and an accusative clitic (OCI) is irrelevant, while syntactic distribution depends on the contrast between IA and EA.

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 SCI form \( d_5o \), as in (36).

\[
(36) \quad d_5o_{\varphi} [T \, v_\varphi \, [v \, \ldots \quad (\text{from (2b)})]
\]

Hence, only \( d_5o \) and \( t_o \) are able to realize the \( \varphi \)-features of \( T \). Naturally, they can combine with OCls, as in (37), where the SCI \( d_5o \) is merged to \( T \), fixing the person and number agreement of the features of the IA of the Root.

\[
(37) \quad \begin{array}{llll}
1SG & 3-MSG & 2SG & \text{see.1SG} \\
\text{dd}_5o & l-u & v\_a\_j & \text{(from (9i))} \\
\text{I see him/you} & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
(37) \quad \begin{array}{llll}
1SG & 3-MSG & 2SG & \text{see.1SG} \\
\text{dd}_5o & l-u & v\_a\_j & \text{(from (9i))} \\
\text{I see him/you} & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

This allows us to account for the contrast between the unaccusative contexts with be, in which it is \( b_e \) that selects \( m_3o \) as the realization of the subject, and lexical unaccusatives, in which we find \( d_5o \). The result is that lexical unaccusatives go together with unergatives and transitives while reflexives behave like the predicative constructs since \( m_3o \) is necessary to realize the AI. In other words, auxiliaries encode selection capabilities autonomous with respect to the verb.

An interesting question is raised by the inversion between the object \( m_3o \) and the subject \( t_o \) in contexts in (9;i,i.a), repeated in (38), where \( t_o \) realizes the subject (EA).

\[
(38) \quad m_3o \quad t_o \quad v\_a\_j \\
1SG & 2SG & \text{see.2SG} \\
\text{you see me} & & & \\
\]

If the two deictic pronouns combine, in (39), a cluster is built reflecting the usual order where \( m_3o \) precedes all other clitics. We have seen that the 2nd singular clitic has only one realization, i.e., \( t_o \). When there are object clitics of 3rd person or 1st plural a cluster is formed as in the case of (39a) for 1st and 2nd person objects and (39b) for 2nd person subject (from (10a,b)).

\[
(39) \quad \begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{he} & 1SG & \text{to} & 2SG & 3-MSG & \text{give.3SG} & \text{(39b)} \\
\text{He gives it to me/to you} & & & & & & & \\
\text{you} & 2SG & 1PL & \text{3-MSG} & \text{give.2SG} & \text{You gives it to us} & \text{3-MSG} \\
\text{1st and 2nd singular persons} & & & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

We can wonder why 1st and 2nd singular persons behave in a special manner, whereby a specialized SCI of 1st singular can precede all OCls and \( t_o \) can realize the agreement inflection associated with the head \( T \), as in (39b), in the presence of OCls. The simplest answer is that the deictic, discourse anchored, properties of the 1st and 2nd singular persons allow them to be realized in the work space of \( T \), substantially independently from the thematic properties associated with \( v \) and \( R \). In the case of the 1st person, a specialized SCI, i.e., \( d_5o \), is provided by the lexicon, while in the case of the 2nd singular it is the only available form \( t_o \) that has this role, except behave like a clitic object in all other contexts. In other words, the inverted order in (38) is only apparent, in the sense that \( m_3o \) can precede
the inflected verb independently from its role, as in (35). The order *mo to, is, therefore, predictable, as a particular instantiation of the PCC (Person Case constraint), whereby in a clitic cluster the 2nd person OCl cannot precede the 1st person OCl.

Passing now to the reflexive element so, we see in (11) that in the reflexive paradigm, it occurs in all persons except for 1st and 2nd singulars, where it is in complementary distribution with all SCls. We conclude that its content is that of a variable, that finds its referential properties in the agreement features of the verb, its antecedent (Manzini et al. 2016). In the case of *mo and *to, 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. We note that 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 (Manzini and Savoia 2005). The element *se/*si introducing the variable is generally associated with the nominal ϕ-features of the subject. Such nominal properties work as the lexical restriction of se, excluding the co-reference with 1st/2nd person elements. This can explain why 1st and 2nd plural persons, insofar as they also encode the 3rd person reference, have the reflexive se in many dialects, including the Celle one.

6.2. Piedmontese Franco-Provençal

Turning now to the Franco-Provençal dialect of Cantoira in (4), we see that in unaccusative and copular constructs with *be, the 1st person excludes the realization of the SCI *zi. More precisely, the insertion of *zi is mandatory only with the auxiliary *have. This suggests that both the lexical verbs and the auxiliary *be realize the agreement properties of T, while the doubling by the 1st person SCI can be connected to the ability of *have to realize the EA properties independently of the thematic roles associated with the past participle. This solution may be extended to the contexts with 3rd person OCls where *zi is not admitted. We can think that *zi is inserted only in contexts that require it, precisely before clitics of 2nd person and 1st person, as in (40a) (from (5a)).

(40) a. *zi t tfjam-u
   SCl.1PS 2SG call-1SG
   ‘I call you.sg/pl’

   b. SCl OCl T v . . .
   *zi ϕ y t ϕ i S tfjam-u ϕ y ϕ i

In other words, since deictic clitics can realize the inflection of T or v, we see that *zi combines with another deictic clitic with the result that the mapping of the ϕ-features of T is distinct from the one of v, as in (40b). As to the OCl neuter *u, cf. (5c’), we can only conclude that it is treated as a deictic element.

A context where the 1st person SCI is systematically inserted in enclisis on the verb is the interrogative one, independently of the presence of OCls in proclisis, as in (41a) (from (6b)) (41b) illustrates the amalgamation operation, which yields a complex form that realizes the ϕ-features of the subject and the object of the verb, as in (41c).

(41) a. l-u tfjam-u- *zi7
   3-MSG call-1SG SCl.1PS
   ‘do I call him?’

   b. < [T *zi5, [T l-u [tfjam-u]]] → [T l-u [tfjam-u]] *zi5 . . .

   c. Q OCl T SCl v . . .
   l-u ϕ tfjam-u ϕ y *zi5 ϕ y

We know that the interrogative operator introduces possible worlds, to which, however, the SCI escapes. In other words, the order V+SCI is only the morpho-syntactic
realization of the scope of the interrogative modality\textsuperscript{8}, from which referential elements are excluded. We only note that the modal context requires a richer morphological realization of the arguments (Manzini and Savoia 2017b).

7. Final Remarks: The Distribution of Agreement

Resuming the previous discussion, two main mechanisms are necessary in yielding syntactic structures, both complex words and phrases, as indicated in (42) (Manzini et al. 2020):

\begin{equation}
\text{(42) Syntactic mechanisms:} \\
\quad \text{Merge (+ Amalgamation)} \\
\quad \text{Agreement}
\end{equation}

(42) accounts for the distribution of clitics, whereby SCls double the agreement features of T(+v), OCls realize IA, associating with the inflected verb. In these dialects, 1st and 2nd person clitics present idiosyncratic types of occurrences as the reflex of their being intrinsically Discourse-linked. In the Piedmontese and Ligurian varieties with ambiguous \textit{l}, in Section 4.1, the interpretation of \textit{l} in accordance with the selection of auxiliary in transitive strings has been traced back to the selection properties of \textit{be}, which introduces only an argument. In the case of the Franco-Provençal of Celle, we have assumed that \textit{mo} and \textit{to} are sufficient to saturate the agreement of T. \textit{d3i} is inserted only in contexts of lexical verbs. The conditions of Cantoira are partially similar, insofar as in this dialect \textit{d3i} is required by \textit{have} to encode the EA and the distribution of \textit{d3i} is determined by its deictic force.

Summarizing, in this article, we have addressed two main points: the syntax of clitics and their interaction with auxiliaries investigated in reference to a complex of phenomena characterizing Piedmontese, North Ligurian and Franco-Provençal varieties. In these languages, object and subject clitics present a partially complementary distribution. In the Franco-Provençal dialect spoken in Apulia, an unexpected occurrence of the object clitics \textit{mo} and \textit{to} instead of the SCI, in copular and non-active contexts, shows up. We have identified auxiliaries with verbs in the proper sense, embedding a predicative clause. Following Chomsky (2019, 2020, 2021), Merge is the operation that yields complex syntactic objects based on the sharing of agreement features.
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Notes

1. Very synthetically, Merge can be External, in the simple case that an item is added taking it from Vocabulary or External, when an existing element is combined with another. A question, discussed by Chomsky, concerns the category assigned to the new item. (Labelling). In this case, the head and sharing of features (agreement) fix the category. EM is connected to the argument structure, while IM is connected to movement.

2. As requested by an anonymous reviewer, we note that the empirical data presented in this and the following sections, were all collected by the authors through field research with native informants. The data of Cantoira, Villareggia and Celle have been collected in specific recent investigations. The others were partially published in Manzini and Savoia (2005), where both presentation and discussion were, however, very different from this article. We think that a detailed presentation of phenomena is a part of the explanation, insofar as it is able to highlight the structural mechanisms.
In the glosses, SCI = subject clitic, OCl = object clitic, FSG/PL = feminine singular/plural, MSG/PL = masculine singular/plural, TV = thematic vowel, SG = singular, PL = plural, Ps = person, 1 = 1st person, 2 = 2nd person, 3 = 3rd person, IMPF = imperfect, PP = past participle, GER = gerund, NEG = negation.

Groups of Franco-Provençal speakers founded the settlements of Celle and Faeto approximately in the 13th century.

Roman numeration refers to the usual articulation in six persons of verbal paradigms. Because the 2nd person SCI presents two different realizations according to the clitic contexts, we are induced to insert the second realization in ‘i.i’a.’

In general, the negative head precedes the object clitics in Romance languages. However, varieties are attested where the negative marker occurs also between the OCI and the verb. Examples are provided by, for instance, some dialects of Southern Piedmont, where we find a distribution like the one in (i) (cf. Manzini and Savoia 2005):

(i)  
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>call.3SG NEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘he does not call me’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oviglio

In many dialects, the negative marker interacts with OCIs requiring special forms, as discussed in Manzini and Savoia (2017a), Savoia and Baldi (2022b).

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 va ‘washed’ cam m-a ‘called’, dur mi ‘slept’, vo n-i ‘come’, where the Thematic Vowel creates the adjectival form. In other classes, strong invariable participles occur, e.g., viam ‘seen’, or, in the case of original … Vr-V sequences, we find the gender alternation of the type of mario [masc] vs. mario-fa [fem] ‘dead’, krovera ‘covered, masc’ and Kroversa ‘covered, fem’, as in (20). This type of alternation, which is attested also in adjectives, e.g., kiros [masc] vs. kiros-fa [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.

The analysis of inverted interrogatives we outline here is different from the treatment generally applied in cartographic literature (Poletto 2000; Manzini and Savoia 2005), whereby the verb moves to C.
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