HAL
open science

Pronoun systems across Romance

Diego Pescarini

To cite this version:

Diego Pescarini. Pronoun systems across Romance. Oxford Encyclopedia of Romance Linguistics., Oxford University Press, 2021, 10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.655 . hal-01763989

HAL Id: hal-01763989

https://hal.science/hal-01763989v1

Submitted on 11 Apr 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Diego Pescarini

69 Pronoun systems across Romance

Summary: this article deals with the syntax of personal pronouns and focuses on clitic pronouns, which are one of the major sources of variation across the Romance languages. For each parameter of variation (e.g. placement, climbing, doubling, interpretation, etc.) the article seeks to establish descriptive generalisations based on a rich array of data gathered from present-day varieties and historical vernaculars.

Keywords: pronoun, clitic, clitic placement, clitic climbing, clitic doubling, impersonal, Person Case Constraint

1. Introduction

This article focuses mainly on the syntax of personal pronouns and, to a lesser extent, the interplay between syntactic and semantic aspects (on the morphology of strong and clitic pronouns, see Cappellaro and Luís).

The article deals mainly with clitic forms, a hallmark of almost all Romance languages. Whereas strong pronouns have the same syntactic behaviour of nominal phrases, clitic pronouns exhibit several peculiarities regarding their syntactic placement, their interpretation, and their interaction with other function words.

The structure of the article is as follows: section 2 deals with the distinction between strong and clitic elements; section 3 illustrates clitic placement; section 4 is about clitic doubling; section 5 focuses on the interpretation of clitic pronouns; section 6 deals with mutual exclusion patterns resulting from the interaction of clitic elements.

2. Strong *vs* clitic pronouns

Most Romance languages exhibit a double series of pronouns: strong and clitic. From a syntactic point of view, strong pronouns have the same distribution of nominal phrases, while clitics are bound to a specific syntactic position. The alternation between strong and clitic forms is triggered by discourse factors, i.e. cliticisation is compelling, unless pronouns are focalised or topicalised. Furthermore, clitic pronouns, unlike strong forms, cannot be coordinated nor modified, and cannot occur in isolation. Strong and clitic forms may sometimes co-occur, yielding patterns of doubling (see section 4). Only clitics can double phrasal elements.

Besides the strong/clitic dichotomy, Cardinaletti & Starke 1999 argued for an intermediate class of pronominal forms, which exhibit the same properties of clitic elements, but have a different distribution. For instance, Italian *loro* ‘to them’ cannot be modified, coordinated, focalised, etc., but, unlike clitics, it always occurs postverbally:

(1) Carlo (*loro) ha telefonato (loro)
Carlo has called them
‘Carlo called them’

Similar considerations hold for other oblique forms in early Italo-Romance (Egerland and Cardinaletti 2010: 418-424, 427-429) and for the particles *i* and *ende* of old Portuguese and old Spanish (corresponding to the clitic *ci/y/hi*, *ne/en* of Italian/French/Catalan). Martins 2003 notices that *i* and *ende*, like clitics, cannot introduce new referents and cannot be coordinated; however, they do not exhibit the canonical distribution of clitics (see section 3). Most of the

above forms have never turned into fully-fledged clitics: they either disappeared, as in the case of locative particles in Portuguese and Spanish, or have been maintained in the system with their peculiar syntax as It. *loro*, which nowadays is confined to a very formal register.

3. Clitic placement

The section is organised as follows: §3.1 deals with interpolation, i.e. the occurrence of one or more constituent(s) between the clitic and the inflected verb; §3.2 deals with the conditions triggering enclitic or proclitic placement; §3.3 focuses on mesoclisis; §3.4 investigates the conditions allowing climbing in periphrastic constructions; §3.5 is about the syntax of subject clitics; §3.6 addresses the interaction between clitic formatives and negation; §3.7 illustrates the behaviour of clitic in coordinated structures.

3.1 Interpolation

Interpolation of phrasal constituents between a proclitic and the verbal form is allowed in medieval Ibero-Romance and old Romanian:

(2) a logo lhe el- rrei taxava que … (o.Port.)
soon 3.DAT= the king ordain.IPFV that
'The king ordained to him that…'
b Sy el físico la bien connosçe (o.Sp.)
if the physician 3.F.ACC= well know.3SG
'if the physician knows it well'
a așa ne tare pedepseş<ti> (o.Rom.)
like.this 1PL.ACC= hard punish.PRES.2PL
'you punish us hard'

In early Romance, interpolation is usually restricted to embedded clauses. Negation, subjects, and aspectual adverbs are interpolated more readily than other constituents. When two phrases are interpolated, their order is free; conversely, when one of the interpolated elements is the subject, it tends to precede other complements (Martins 2011: 145-147).

Present-day dialects do not exhibit phrasal interpolation anymore, but only *residual* interpolation, i.e. interpolation of aspectual adverbs, which are normally located between the auxiliary and the past participle of compound tenses (see Cinque 1999) and, in Ibero-Romance, of the negative marker. Residual interpolation is allowed in certain northern dialects of Portuguese, Galician, Asturian and certain dialects of Italy such as Triestino, Cosentino and other southern Italian dialects (see Barbosa 1986; Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005 and references therein; Manzini and Savoia 2005, III, 538-540).

(3) a I livro que lhe ainda não entreguei (Port. dialects)
The book that 3.DAT= yet NEG deliver.PST.1SG
'The book that I have not given to him yet'
b Un mi cchù parra (Cosentino)
NEG 1SG.DAT= anymore speak.3SG
'he does not speak to me anymore'

Interpolation almost always occurs when clitics precede the inflected verb; for a case of interpolation with postverbal pronouns, see section 3.4.

3.2 Enclisis vs proclisis

Enclitic vs proclitic placement is triggered by the following conditions:

- in medieval Romance and present-day western Ibero-Romance, clitic placement hinges on clause-level factors such as polarity and fronting; this distribution is usually subsumed under the so-called Tobler-Mussafia law (section 3.2.1);
- in most modern Romance languages, enclisis/proclisis depends on verbal features such as finiteness and, to a lesser extent, mood (section 3.2.2).
- in a few dialects of Abruzzo, clitic placement correlates with auxiliary selection, which in turn is person-driven (section 3.2.3).

3.2.1 The Tobler-Mussafia law

In early Romance, enclisis occurs in positive main clauses where either the verb occupies the first position, see (4), or the verb is preceded by one or more topic phrase(s) and no constituent is focus-fronted, see (5).

(4) Mando-lli per li detti ambasciadori tre pietre nobilissime (o.It.)
sent=3.DAT through the aforementioned ambassadors three stones very.precious
'Then he sent him three gems through the ambassadors'

(5) a los otros acomendo los a dios (o.Sp.)
to the others commend.PST =3SG.M to god
'and he commended the others to god'

Conversely, proclisis is mandatory in subordinate and negative clauses, and in constructions exhibiting wh/focus fronting:

(6) a. Todo mundo sabe que a viste / *viste-a (Port.)
All world knows that 3SG.F=see.PST.2SG see.PST.2SG=3SG.F
'Everybody knows that you saw her'
b. O Paulo não me fala / *fala-me
The P. NEG 1.DAT= speak.3SG speak.3SG=1.DAT
'Paulo does not speak to me'
c. Quem me chamou / *chamou-me?
Who 1.ACC= call.PST.3SG call.PST.3SG=1.ACC
'Who called me?'
d. Só ele a entende / *entende-a
Only he 3SG.F= understand.3SG understand.3SG=3SG.F
'Only he understands her'

The above conditions triggering the alternation between enclisis and proclisis in early Romance (and, *mutatis mutandis*, in modern western Ibero-Romance) are usually subsumed under the so-called Tobler-Mussafia law (Tobler 1875, 1889; Mussafia 1886/1983), which has been subject to several empirical refinements and theoretical reformulations (see, among others, Benincà 2006; Martins 2011 and references therein).

Besides western Ibero-Romance, residues of the Tobler-Mussafia system are scattered across the Romance area (more on this in section 3.2.2). For instance, Pescarini and Benincà 2014 describe a peculiar pattern of clitic placement in which enclisis/proclisis alternations co-exist with optional climbing (on clitic climbing, see section 3.4): this yields a system in which clitics can stand either proclitic or enclitic to the finite verb or, if present, to the past participle.

(7) (mə l) 'ajə (mə lə) ddʒa (mə lu) məɲ'ɲɐtə (mə lə)
1DAT=3SG.M.ACC= AUX.1SG already eat.PST.PTCP
'I have already eaten it'

As in typical Tobler-Mussafia system, enclisis is constrained by clause-level factors: it cannot co-occur with fronting, topicalization, and in certain subordinate clauses:[1]

(8) a *lu 'pɐnə 'ajə lu dɐtə a m'marəjə
the bread, AUX.1SG=3SG.M.ACC give.PRTC.PST to Mario
'I have given M. the bread'
b *a ki 'ajə lu 'dɐtə?
Towhom AUX.1SG =3SG.M.ACC give.PRTC.PST
Who have I given it to?
c *'wojə kə 'mɪɲɲə te lu
want.1SG that eat.2SG =2SG.DAT =3SG.M.ACC
'I want you to eat it'

Crucially, enclisis to the past participle in compound tenses is forbidden in the same contexts: clitics cannot follow the past participle when the sentence contains a *wh* element, a topic, or the complementiser *kə*:

(9) a *a ki 'ajə 'dɐtə lu?
Towhom AUX.1SG give.PRTC.PST =3SG.M.ACC
Who have I given it to?
b *lu 'pɐnə, 'ajə 'dɐtə lu a m'marəjə
The bread, AUX.1SG give.PRTC.PST =3SG.M.ACC to M.
'I gave the bread to Mario'
c ?*wə'leʲrə kə nn a'vɛssə 'weʲʃtə lu k'kju
want.COND.1SG that NEG AUX.SBJV. 3SG seen.PRTC.PST =3SG.M.ACC anymore
'I wish they had not seen it/him anymore'

3.2.2 Clitic placement in modern Romance

With the exception of western Ibero-Romance, the Tobler-Mussafia pattern illustrated in section 3.2.1 progressively disappeared around the 16th century. Traces of the original Tobler-Mussafia system are attested in imperative and hortative contexts, which often exhibit enclisis save for contexts featuring canonical proclisis-triggers such as negation, coordination, fronting of certain adverbs, etc. (Hirschbühler & Labelle 2003), see (10). Analogously, several Romance languages exhibiting enclisis in infinitives turn to prolisis in negative and, to a lesser extent, wh infinitives (Roberts 2016: 792 on Italo-Romance; Raposo and Uriagereka 2005: 685 on Portuguese).

(10) a Dis-le. (Fr., 17th c.)
'Say it'
b Ne le dis pas.

[1] Sanvalentinese, like other southern dialects, exhibits two complementisers: *ca* vs *che*. D'Alessandro and Ledgeway (2010) have shown that these complementisers differ with respect to their position and to the kind of subordinate clause they introduce. The realis complementiser *ka* is compatible with enclisis, while enclisis is banned in clauses introduced by *kə*

‘Don’t say it’

c Prépare-toi et le dis.
‘Get ready and say it’

d Or le dis.
‘Now, say it’

In general, Tobler-Mussafia effects disappeared following an implicational scale: they first disappeared from yes/no interrogatives; then they disappeared from declaratives (initially, after certain conjunctions, then after left dislocated material, and, lastly, when the clitic occurs in sentence-initial position); eventually, enclisis is lost in (positive) hortative and jussive clauses.

The mechanism of clitic placement known as Tobler-Mussafia law has been progressively replaced by a mechanism whereby proclisis and enclisis occur in finite and nonfinite clauses, respectively:

(11) a lo mangiamo (It.)
it=we.eat
‘we eat it’

b mangiar-lo
to.eat=it
‘to eat it’

3.2.3 Clitic placement and auxiliary selection

In some dialects of Abruzzo (upper-southern Italy), clitic pronouns stand enclitic to *be* auxiliaries and proclitic to *have* forms, as shown in (12) with data from the dialect of Martinsicuro (Mastrangelo Latini 1981; for further Abruzzese data, see also Manzini & Savoia 2005, II: 111-3). It is worth noting that in the dialect of Martinsicuro, as well as in many other Abruzzese dialects, the perfect auxiliary is subject to a person split, i.e. *be* forms occur in the first and second person, while the *have* form *a* is used for the third person:

(12) a so llu dittə (Martinsicuro)
AUX.1SG=3SG.M.ACC say.PRTC.PST
‘I have said it’

b si llu dittə
AUX.2SG=3SG.M.ACC say.PRTC.PST
‘you have said it’

c lu a dittə
3SG.M.ACC= AUX.3 say.PRTC.PST
‘he/she/they has/have said it’

3.3 Mesoclisis

Future and conditional tenses are formed by combining the infinitive to an auxiliary *have* form, e.g. old Spanish *dar+hé* ‘I will give’, *hyr+hémos* ‘we will go’. While in most Romance languages the above combinations had been reanalysed as synthetic forms, in medieval Ibero-Romance they behaved as periphrastic constructions, thus allowing clitics to occur between the lexical and the auxiliary verb:

(13) Desir vos he cosa que … vos serà pro (o.Sp.)
tell.INF 2PL.DAT= AUX.FUT.1SG thing that … 2PL.DAT = be.FUT.3SG beneficial
'I will tell you something which … will be good for you'

Mesoclisis does not occur in context that, under the Tobler-Mussafia law, would trigger proclisis, i.e. in embedded, negative clauses or in sentences with wh/focus fronting such as (14):

(14) a. Señor, a quien nos dar édes por cabdiello? (o.Sp.)
Sir, to who 1PL.DAT= give.INF AUX.FUT.2SG as leader
'Sir, who will you give us as leader?'
b. Muito vinho lhe dar (*lhe) emos (Eu.Port.)
much wine 3SG.DAT= give.INF AUX.FUT.1PL
'A lot of wine we will give you'

3.4 Clitic climbing

In most Romance languages, complement clitics 'climb', i.e. clitics are usually attached to the inflected auxiliary of compound tenses and, to a lesser extent, of periphrastic constructions featuring progressive, modal, causative auxiliaries, or perception verbs.

Not all the languages allowing climbing in compound tenses do allow climbing with other periphrastic constructions: for instance, French allows climbing in compound tenses and *fair*-causatives, but not elsewhere:

(15) a Te ne voglio/lascio/vedo dare due. (It.)
2SG.DAT= of.them= want/let/see.1SG give.INF two
b Je (*t'en) veux/laisse/vois t' en donner deux. (Fr.)
I= want/let/see.1SG 2SG.DAT= of.them= give.INF two

When several function verbs are concatenated, clitics must climb to the inflected auxiliary:

(16) lo voglio (*lo) poter vedere
it= want.1SG can.INF see.INF
'I want to be able to see it'

In Italian, climbing with certain modal and perception verbs is optional and correlates with auxiliary selection: with climbing, the modal takes the same temporal auxiliary of the embedded lexical verb (i.e. *be* with unaccusatives, *have* otherwise); conversely, without climbing, the temporal auxiliary is always *have*:

(17) a C' è voluto andare da solo (It.)
there= AUX.3SG want.PRTC.PST go.INF alone
'He wanted to go alone'
b Ha voluto andar-ci da solo
AUX.3SG want.PRTC.PST go.INF=there alone
'He wanted to go alone'

Furthermore, climbing (either optional or mandatory) may target only certain clitic forms. For instance, in some Franco-Provençal dialects the dative clitic climbs, while the accusative and the partitive clitic remain enclitic to the past participle, see (18). In Romanian, the feminine object clitic *o* 'her' does not climb in periphrastic tenses if the auxiliary begins with a vowel,

otherwise climbing is optional (Roberts 2016: 787, fn. 1). In French, climbing with causative verbs is blocked whenever the embedded lexical verb selects for an inherent clitic.

(18) a T' an-të prèdzà-nen? (Fr.Prv.)
2SG.DAT= AUX=3PL.NOM speak.PRTC.PST=of.it?
'Did they speak of it to you?'
b T' an-të deut-lo?
2SG.DAT= AUX=3PL.NOM tell.PRTC.PST=3SG.M.ACC
'Did they say it to you?'

Climbing sometimes correlates with auxiliary selection (Roberts 2016: §48.4.3). For instance, the Valdôtain dialect of Sarre (Roberts 2016: 793) displays enclisis to the past participle when the auxiliary is *have* and proclisis to *be*-auxiliaries.

Several Romance dialects has lost climbing in all periphrastic constructions, including compound tenses (see Manzini and Savoia 2005, II: 394-7). The change is witnessed by cases of *clitic reduplication* in dialects exhibiting two instances of the object clitic, one proclitic to the functional verb, the other attached to the lexical verb (see Parry 1995). For instance, several Lombard and Romansch dialects spoken in Grisons (southern Switzerland) exhibit proclisis either to the modal verb or to the infinitive, see 20a vs 20c. The evolution from 20a to 20c is witnessed by the dialect of Fex Platta – in 20b – which shows a clear pattern clitic reduplication.

(19) a iɐ lɐ ˈvøj taˈkɛːr (Stampa)
1SG.NOM= 3SG.F.ACC= want.1SG bind.INF
b ɛ lɐ ˈvøː lɐ taˈceːr (Fex Platta)
1SG.NOM= want.1SG 3SG.F.ACC= bind.INF
c ˈvøːj lɐ taˈka (Poschiavo)
want.1SG 3SG.F.ACC= bind.INF
'I want to bind it'

Patterns of clitic reduplication in compound tenses are attested in Piedmontese dialects such as Cairese, see (17) (Parry 2005: 179). Elsewhere, in other Piedmontese dialects, the proclitic copy does not occur anymore, giving rise to a pattern of generalised enclisis with compound tenses.

(20) A 'm sun fò-me in fazing (Cairese)
1SG.NOM= 1SG.REFL= AUX.1SG do.INF=1SG.REFL a cake
'I baked me a cake'

Furthermore, in certain dialects of the same area such as Borgomanerese (Tortora 2015; Manzini and Savoia 2005, III: 518-37), enclisis has been extended to simple tenses, yielding a system of clitic placement without proclisis. Crucially, in dialects without climbing, enclitics are not always adjacent to the inflected verb, as aspectual adverbs may in fact be interpolated:

(21) I voenghi piö-lla. (Borgomanerese)
1SG.NOM= see.1SG anymore=3SG.F.ACC
'I don't see her anymore.'

Similar conditions hold for climbing from prepositional phrases, i.e. when the pronominalized element is the complement of prepositions. In most Romance languages, climbing out of PPs is mandatory:

(22) Va-lle dietro (*le)!
go.IMP.2SG=3SG.F.DAT behind
'Follow her'

However, old Italian and certain Italian vernaculars – crucially, the dialects exhibiting enclisis to verbal forms – show cases of clitics following the preposition:

(23) a e l' altro dietro-gli (o.It.)
and the other behind=3SG.M.DAT
'and the other after him'
b u iè ina sc-trò própi lì dedré-te (Cairese)
EXPL= be=3SG a street just there behind=2SG
'there is a street just behind you'

3.5 Subject clitics

French and northern Italian dialects exhibit subject clitics. Subject clitics fall into at least two main classes with respect to three main properties:

- doubling of a non-dislocated phrasal subject (permitted in northern Italo-Romance, disallowed in (standard) French and most Rhaeto-Romance varieties);
- position with respect to negation (the order subject clitic > negation, attested in Gallo-Romance, has been reversed in most Northern Italian dialects since the 16th century; see section 3.6);
- omission under coordination (see section 3.7).

The above tests led to the distinction between *phonological* vs *syntactic clitics*, lately reinterpreted within the generative framework as an alternation between *unstressed phrasal constituents* vs *agreement heads* or, successively, as an alternation between *weak* and (fully-fledged) clitic pronouns (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999, see section 2). An analogous terminological distinction between *clitic subjects* and *subject clitics* has been proposed in Loporcaro 2012, which deal an the unparalleled subject clitic construction in Pantiscu, a southern Italian dialect where subject clitics mark progressive aspect.

A strict dichotomy, however, does not capture the high degree of cross-linguistic variation characterising the syntax of subject clitics. Rather, Renzi & Vanelli 1983 noticed a series of regularities and proposed some descriptive generalizations in the form of implicational statements, further refined or discarded in Poletto 2000 and Manzini & Savoia 2005, I, 69-196.

A first set of generalisations on the distribution of subject clitics regards the status of the clausal subject: subject clitics may or may not occur depending on whether the subject is preverbal, postverbal, clausal, or non-argumental. Some dialects such as Monnese require subject clitics to occur in all the above contexts, whereas in other dialects, such as Triestino, subject clitics never occur in impersonal contexts (i.e. clauses featuring a postverbal or non-argumental subject) and are optional when a third person preverbal subject occurs:

(24) a. Le matele le lavarà-zo i piacc (Monno)
The girls 3PL.F.NOM= wash.FUT the dishes
'The girls will wash the dishes'
b. El salta-zo le foe
EXPL= drop.3 the leaves
'The leaves are dropping'
c. El plof

EXPL= rain.3SG
'it rains'

(25) a. Le mule (le) laverà i piati (Trieste)
The girls 3PL.F.NOM= wash.FUT the dishes
'The girls will wash the dishes'

b. _ casca le foie
drop.3 the leaves
'The leaves are dropping'

c. _ piovi
rains.3SG
'it rains'

In impersonal contexts, expletive clitics are more readily found with weather verbs[2] and, to a lesser extent, with existential and impersonal *si* constructions. A few dialects require an expletive clitic to occur with the modal verb expressing impersonal necessity ('it is necessary to…'). When an overt subject occurs, the presence of the clitic is disfavoured with operator-like subjects like wh- elements or quantifiers, while the clitic is readily found with pronominal subjects (Poletto 2000).

A second bunch of generalisation regards the make-up of paradigms of subject clitics, which often exhibit systematic gaps and patterns of suppletion. Generally, languages exhibiting subject clitics in impersonal contexts have a full paradigm of clitics, although the exponent of the first person singular/plural and the second person plural are usually syncretic (this holds particularly true for proclitics, which are usually fewer than enclitics). Gaps and syncretisms are sensitive to person distinctions, e.g. dialects that have subject clitics for the first person also have it for second singular and third person. However, the above implications are robust trends rather than exceptionless constraints. For instance, in a few Trentino dialects third person clitics are attested despite the absence of first and second singular forms (Manzini and Savoia 2005: §2.3).

In declarative clauses, subject clitics precede object ones.[3] In interrogative clauses, object pronouns remain proclitic, while subject clitics undergo inversion:

(26) a Tu l' as fait
you= it=have done
'You did it'

b L' as-tu fait?
it=have=you done?
'Have you done it?'

Besides interrogatives, enclisis of subject clitics is attested in counterfactual, optative, exclamative, and disjunctive contexts (see Munaro 2010, who draws an implicational scale capturing the cross-linguistic distribution of subject clitics across these contexts). Diachronically, several varieties lost subject clitic inversion, which has been replaced by other syntactic strategies of interrogation, e.g. clefting, where inversion is eventually confined to the copular clause while the rest of the clause keeps the same word order of declaratives.

---

[2] This reminds one of partial pro-drop languages, but recall that here we are dealing with dialects which are pro-drop, although they have subject (expletive) clitics.

[3] In the Carnic dialect spoken in Forni di Sotto (Frl.), a formative of third person subject clitics can be doubled after the object clitic (*al mi* → *al mi-l* 'he me') and the leftmost copy of *l* may be deleted (*al mil* → *a mi-l* 'he me') giving the impression that the resulting order is object > subject clitic (Manzini and Savoia 2005).

Several northern Italian dialects exhibit a double series of subject clitic formatives, which co-occur yielding compound clitic forms (Poletto 2000: ch. 2; see Manzini & Savoia 2005 for a thorough overview): the leftmost formative is usually expressed by a vocalic exponent, which never shows gender and number distinctions, tends to precede negation (see section 3.6), and may be omitted under coordination (see section 3.7). In declarative clauses, the vocalic clitic is followed by another formative, in particular in the 2sg, 3sg, and 3pl person. Under interrogation, the latter exponent undergoes inversion, whereas vocalic clitics disappear, remain in proclisis, or are replaced by a suppletive form:

(27)	declarative:			interrogative:		
	i		duarmi	duarm=jo?	‘sleep.1SG’	(Forni di Sotto; Frl.)
	i	tu	duars	duarmis=tu?	‘sleep.2SG’	
	a	l	duar	duarm=al?	‘sleep.3SGM/F’	
	a		duar	duarm=e?	‘sleep.3SGM/F’	
	i		durmiŋ	durmin=os?	‘sleep.1PL’	
	i		durmis	durmis?	‘sleep.2PL’	
	a	i	duar	duarm=ai?	‘sleep.3PLM/F’	
	a	s	duar	duarm=es?	‘sleep.3PLM/F’	

Poletto 2000 (see also Poletto and Tortora 2016) argues that vocalic clitics fall into two classes: ‘deictic’ clitics, which vary depending on person features (e.g. *i* vs *a* in (27)) and ‘invariable’ clitics, which display no person-driven alternation. However, it is worth noting that, besides fully-fledged subject clitics, Romance languages display discourse particles that can be easily mistaken for invariable subject clitics as they have the same shape and distribution. The former, however, are optional and trigger peculiar pragmatic readings (Benincà 1983).

3.6 Clitic ordering with respect to negation

Negation may either precede or follow subject clitics. In origin, all Romance varieties displayed the order subject clitic > negation, but around the sixteenth century several northern Italian vernaculars began to display the opposite order, negation > subject clitic:

(28)							
	a	Tu	no	havarès	la	bielle	fie (o.Frl.)
		2SG.NOM=	NEG	have.FUT.2SG	the	nice	girl
		‘you will not have the nice girl’					
	b	No	tu=	compre	mai	meil (mod.Frl.; Barcis)	
		NEG	2SG.NOM=	buy.3SG	never	apples	
		‘You never buy apples’					

Compound forms (see section 3.5) are often split by negation:

(29)					
	i	no		duarmi	‘I do not sleep’
	i	no	tu	duars	‘you do not sleep’
	a	no	l	duar	‘he does not sleep’
	a	no		duar	‘she does not sleep’
	i	no		durmin	‘we do not sleep’
	i	no		durmi:s	‘you.PL do not sleep’
	a	no	i	duar	‘they.M do not sleep’
	a	no	s	duar	‘they.F do not sleep’

Negation usually precedes object clitics and only object clitics may occur between the

negative marker and the verb. This does not hold true for languages with interpolation (section 3.1), where the negative marker is readily interpolated in embedded clauses. Furthermore, Parry (1997) reports some cases from Ligurian dialects in which the preverbal negative marker *n* is reduplicated after first and second person clitics and the third person reflexive (see also Manzini and Savoia 2005, III: 295). It is worth noting that in these varieties, the preverbal negative marker doubles a postverbal one (*nent*), on negation systems, see X.

(30)	I	n	te	(n)	dan	nent	u	libr (Lig.)
	3SG.NOM=	NEG	2SG.DAT=		give.INF	NEG	the	book

'They do not give you the book'

In contexts of subject clitic inversion, the preverbal negative marker always remains proclitic to the verb:[4]

(31)	N'	as	=tu	pas	mangé? (Fr.)
	NEG	have.2SG	=2SG.NOM	NEG	eat.PRTC.PST

'Didn't you eat?'

Analogously, in languages subject to the Tobler-Mussafia law, the negative marker always occurs preverbally even if the inflected verb is at the beginning of the clause, before the subject:

(32)	Non	ha	la	divina	volontà	bisogno	d'	alcuno	uficiale (o.It.)
	NEG	has	the	divine	will	need	of	any	official

'The divine will does not need any official'

3.7 Coordination

The Romance languages vary with respect to the possibility of omitting clitics in conjoined phrases. In this respect, some generalisations hold crosslinguistically:

- omission is more likely when two verbs with the same root are coordinated
- enclitics are never omitted;
- in dialects with a double series of subject clitics, invariable formatives are omitted more readily than agreeing forms.

Kayne 1975 notices that object clitics in present-day Romance languages can be omitted when corradical verbs are conjoined, as in (33), otherwise omission results in ungrammaticality.

(33)	Jean	les	lit	et	relit	sans cesse
	Jean	3PL.ACC=	read.3sg	and	rereads.3sg	incessantly

'Jean read and read them again incessantly'

Medieval Romance languages are more liberal with respect to clitic omission (and, in general, with respect to object ellipsis). Besides cases of corradical coordination, clitic drop is allowed when the conjoined verbal phrases share the same argument and eventive structure (Egerland and Cardinaletti 2010: 463-467):

[4] In some northern Italian dialects, preverbal negation blocks or hinders inversion, while inversion is normally permitted with discontinuous or postverbal negation Benincà and Poletto 2004:37.

(34) E io vi dico e prometto che… (o.It.)[5]
And I 2SG.DAT= say and promise that
'And I say and promise to you that

In both modern and medieval Romance, regardless of the type of coordination, only proclitics can be dropped, while enclitics are never omitted:

(35) a lo leggo e (lo) rileggo
3SG.M.ACC= read.1SG and 3SG.M.ACC= reread
b voglio leggerlo e rilegger*(lo)
want.1SG read.INF=3SG.M.ACC and reread=3SG.M.ACC

Similar conditions hold for the omission of subject clitics, which depends on the type of coordination (corradical or not) and the type of subject clitic (section 3.5). Poletto 2000: 24-29 notices that invariable clitics, see (36), are omitted more readily than agreeing forms, shown in (37), which can be omitted – with a high degree of crosslinguitic variation – only in corradical coordinations.

(36) A canto co ti e (a) balo co lu (Loreo)
1SG.NOM= sing1SG with you and 1SG.NOM= dance1SG with him
'I sing with you and dance with him'

(37) La lese e (la) rilese sempre el stesso libro (Padovano)
3SG.NOM= read.3SG and 3SG.NOM= reread.3SG always the same book
'She reads and rereads always the same book'

5. Clitic doubling

All the Romance languages allow resumption of a dislocated phrase by means of clitic pronouns (in particular, resumption is mandatory with direct objects). Conversely, clitic doubling of non-dislocated elements is allowed only in a subset of the Romance languages:

(38) a. Le di un regalo a mi madre. (Sp.)
b.*Le diedi un regalo a mia madre. (It.)
3SG.DAT= gave.PST.1SG a gift to my mother
'I gave my mother a gift'

Doubling is found more readily in languages displaying *Differential Object Marking* such as Romanian or Spanish, although the correlation between DOM and clitic doubling (which is usually referred to as 'Kayne's generalisation') is challenged by several exceptions.

Doubling of direct objects in Spanish and Romanian is limited to specific or human noun phrases, see (39) (Suñer 1988: 394–395; Dobrovie-Sorin 1990). However, since specificity – along with other semantic effects – is a correlate of DOM, and since the correlation between DOM and clitic doubling is not solid, no direct correlation can be established between clitic doubling and specificity (Leonetti 2004).

(39) a La oían a Paca/ à la niña/à la gata. (Rioplatense Spanish)
3SG.F.ACC= listen.3PL to P./to the girl/to the cat

[5] Bono Giamboni, Orosio, libro 7, cap. 39, p. 504, rr 25-26

‘They listened to Paca/the girl/the cat.’

b *Lo alabarán al niño que termine primero.
3SG.M.ACC= praise.FUT.3PL to.the boy who finishes first
‘They will praise the boy who finishes first.

As for doubling of indirect objects, the doubled argument is usually interpreted as *affected*, “in the sense that it is taken either as the possessor or as an intrinsic part of the Theme argument” (Demonte 1995). For instance, the indirect object in 40 is normally interpreted as a (human) possessor, denoting a collection of human beings (as English shifted datives), rather than a location or an impersonal entity.

(40) #*Le* regalé un libro a la biblioteca
to.it I.gave a book to the library
‘I gave the library a book’

It is worth noting that, when they are not involved in patterns of doubling, accusative clitics can either resume or pronominalize non-specific referents. Dative clitics, conversely, are often restricted to human referents even in absence of doubling patterns, as discussed in section 5.1.

5. Semantic effects

5.1 Animacy

Cardinaletti & Starke 1999 argue that strong *pronouns* are interpreted as human, while weak *pronouns* can have any reference (but see Manzini 2014). The contrast is illustrated by the following minimal pair, showing that the weak subject pronoun *esse*, which cannot be coordinated, can reference nonhuman individuals:

(41) a Esse (*e quelle accanto) sono troppo alte [+/-human]
They.F (and those nearby) are too tall.F
b Loro (e quelle accanto) sono troppo alte [+human]
They (and those nearby) are too tall.F
‘They are too tall’

For several speakers, the above contrast is too slight, given also the fact that subject pronouns such as *esse* are confined to a very formal ‘written’ register (see section 2).

By contrast, a clear animacy distinction is at the basis of the distribution of dative clitics, at least in languages, such as Italian, Catalan, and French which exhibit also a locative clitic, e.g. Fr. *y*, It. *ci*, Cat. *hi*. In these languages, the dative clitic that does not denote a human entity is readily turned into a locative form (Rigau 1984):

(42) a A la meva filla, **li**= dedico molt de temps (Cat.)
To the my daughter, 3.DAT= devote.1SG lot of time
‘As for my daughter, I devote lots of time to her’
b A això, **hi**= dedico molt de temps.
Tothis, LOC= devote.1SG lot of time
‘As for this, I devote lots of time to it’

Elsewhere, animacy-related distinctions may give rise to patterns of syncretism dubbed *laísmo* and *loísmo*, i.e., the extension of accusative forms to dative complements when the latter reference human entities (patterns of *leísmo* will be addressed in section 6.1). The following minimal pair from Neapolitan shows that the accusative form *'a* can pronominalize a human dative, in 44a, while non-human datives are ronominalised by the locative form *ncə* (Ledgeway 2000):

(43) a ncə/'a= rispunneteno, a Maria (Nap.)
LOC/3SG.F.ACC= reply.PST.3PL to Maria
'They replied to her (Maria)'
b ncə/*'a= rispunneteno â lettera
LOC/3SG.F.ACC= reply.PST.3PL to.the letter
'They replied to it (the letter)'

5.2 Countability

Mass or clausal antecedent are normally pronominalized by the third person masculine clitic or, rarely, by the feminine one, as in Romanian. In certain Romance varieties, however, third person pronouns referencing countable, human entities are morphologically differentiated from pronouns referencing inanimate or abstract entities, mass nouns, events, and phrasal antecedents. In the descriptive literature, the latter pronouns are referred to as *neuter* pronouns because they derive from Latin neuter forms. Reflexes of Latin neuters such as ILLUD 'that', HOC 'this' are attested in Catalan, Provençal and southern Italian dialects:

(44) Pròbo m oc (Gsc.)
Prove.IMP.2SG =1.DAT =3SG.N
'prove it to me'

In many dialects of central and southern Italy, the contrast between the masculine and the neuter clitic is witnessed by 'consonant doubling', i.e. gemination of the consonant following the neuter clitic, e.g. Neapolitan [o ssattʃə] 'I know that fact' vs [o sattʃə] 'I know him'.

5.3 Impersonal/Arbitrary reading

The term 'impersonal construction' usually refers either to sentences lacking a phrasal subject or featuring a non-canonical (i.e. postverbal) subject (see section 3.5) or constructions featuring a pronoun referencing an arbitrary individual, or a set thereof.

This section focuses on the latter construction, by wondering about the syntax and interpretation of arbitrary pronouns. As for the interpretation, it is worth distinguishing *generic pronouns*, referencing any set of individuals, from *inclusive pronouns*, referencing a set containing the speaker.

The most common strategy of expressing an inclusive arbitrary argument is by means of the clitic *si/se*. Arbitrary *si/se* constructions fall into two main types:

i. the impersonal construction *stricto sensu*, with intransitive verbs or transitives licensing an accusative complement, cf. 45; in impersonal constructions, the verb is always third person singular.
ii. the so-called *passive-like* construction, in 46, in which an (active) transitive verb agrees with the thematic object.

(45) a. Si è partiti presto (It.)
ARB= AUX.3SG leave.PRTC.PST.PL.M early
'We left early'
b. Si dorme
ARB= sleep.3SG
'one sleeps'
c. Lo si mangia
3SG.M.ACC= *ARB*= eat.3SG
'one eats it'

(46) Questa sera si leggono due libri. (It.)
This evening *ARB*= read.3PL two books
'This evening we will read two books'

The Romance languages vary with respect to the syntax of impersonal *si/se* constructions, which in Romanian and western Italo-Romance are incompatible with unaccusative constructions such as passives or copular constructions (Dobrovie-Sorin 1991; Pescarini *forth*.). Furthermore, the impersonal *si/se* gives rise to a series of restrictions with pronominal arguments, which will be addressed in section 6.2.

Some Romance languages exhibit non-inclusive arbitrary pronouns. An example is *nome* (< Lat. HOMO), an impersonal weak pronoun found in Abruzzese (D'Alessandro & Alexiadou 2006). In other Romance languages, reflexes of HOMO may have an inclusive reading as well, cf. Fr *on*, and in several Lombard dialects the pronoun *om/on* us used to form the first person plural conjugation of all verbal forms, e.g. *umŋ bɛf* 'we drink' (lit. 'man drinks').

6. Agreement and combinatorial restrictions

Romance (clitic) pronouns are subject to several restrictions that do not affect the corresponding nominal phrases (and strong pronouns). §6.1 deals with the *Person Case Constraint* (PCC), first analysed by Bonet (1991); §6.2 deals with a restriction occurring with the impersonal *si/se*, which cannot co-occur with a first or second person thematic object and, in some languages, with accusative clitics; §6.3 illustrates the interaction of subject and object clitics.

6.1 The Person Case Constraint

Combinations such as 47, where a third person dative clitic co-occurs with a first or second person accusative clitic, are banned in most Romance languages, whereas the same argument configuration is acceptable if one or both pronouns are strong. Combinations of first and second person clitics are degraded in all the languages exhibiting the restriction in (47). The above mutual exclusion patterns are dubbed *Person Case Constraint* (PCC).

(47) *Giorgio gli ti ha presentato. (It.)
Giorgio 3.DAT= 2SG.DAT= AUX.3SG introduce.PRTC.PST
'Giorgio introduced you to him.'

Romanian is more liberal than the other Romance languages (Săvescu 2007) and the restriction is sensitive to the enclitic vs proclitic placement of pronouns.

The PCC has been related to animacy (section 5.1) as dative clitics, as well as first and second person clitics, normally references human individuals. Evidence for a correlation between animacy and the PCC comes from Ibero-Romance dialects in which the dative clitic

le (pl. *les*) pronominalises human direct objects. Crucially, the morphologically dative clitic *le* is subject to the PCC even if it stands for an accusative human argument (Ormazabal and Romero 2007):

(48) Te le di.
2.DAT= 3.DAT= give.PST.1SG
'I give him to you.'

PCC-like restrictions occur in causative constructions, where the causee occurs as either a dative complement headed by the preposition *a/à* or a PP adjunct headed by another preposition, e.g. *da* (It.), *par* (Fr.) etc. Only the former can be resumed by a dative clitic:

(49) a A Carlo, Micol gli fa pettinare Giulia.
to Carlo$_i$ Micol 3SG.DAT$_i$= make.3SG comb.INF Giulia
'Micol makes Carlo comb Giulia's hair.'
b Da Carlo, Micol (*gli) fa pettinare Giulia.
by Carlo$_i$ Micol 3SG.DAT$_i$= make.3SG comb.INF Giulia
'Micol makes Carlo comb Giulia's hair.'

Dative causees, regardless of their clitic or phrasal status, cannot cooccur with first or second person clitic pronouns and the third person reflexive clitic, whereas no restriction occurs when the causee is an adjunct PP or the object clitic is third person (Postal 1989):

(50) a. Micol *mi/*si/la fa pettinare a Carlo.
Micol 1SG/3.REFL/3SG.F.ACC= make.3SG comb.INF to Carlo
b. Micol mi/si/la fa pettinare da Carlo.
Micol 1SG/3.REFL/3SG.F.ACC= make.3SG comb.INF by Carlo
'Micol makes Carlo comb my hair.'

6.2 Agreement restrictions with the impersonal si/se

In the passive-like arbitrary *se/si* the verb agrees with the thematic object (section 5.3). However, first or second person arguments are excluded from the passive-like construction, see 51b (Burzio 1986):

(51) a Si applaudono i cantanti/loro
ARB= cheer.3PL the singers/they
'The singers/they are cheered'
b *Si applaudo io
ARB= cheer.1SG I.NOM
'I am cheered'

First and second person thematic objects are allowed only in the impersonal *si/se* construction, where the thematic object is licensed as an accusative argument and the verb exhibits default third person inflection:

(52) Si applaude me
ARB= cheer.3SG me.ACC
'I am cheered'

Furthermore, the accusative argument in 52 may be pronominalized by means of an accusative clitic, e.g. *mi si applaude*. However, several Romance languages do not allow the cliticisation of the internal argument of *si/se* constructions. In Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin 1998) and north-western Italian dialects (Parry 1998), the impersonal *si/se* cannot co-occur with an accusative clitic, see 53. Mendikoetxea & Battye 1990 point out that in Genovese (Ligurian) the restriction targets only third person accusative clitics, see (55):

(53) *(Stiinţele umane) le se predă în această universitate (Rom.)
(the humanities) 3PL.ACC= *ARB*= study.3SG in this university
You can study the humanities in this university'

(54) a Finalmente me/te se vedde (Genovese)
At last 1/2SG.ACC=*ARB*= see.3SG
'At last, one sees me'
b *I se leza
3PL.ACC= *ARB*= read.3SG
'one reads them'

In Spanish, first or second person clitics can freely combine with *si/se*, see 55a, while several restrictions, subject to a certain degree of crosslinguistic varation, target third person clitics: feminine pronouns (*la, las*) are allowed if the cliticised argument is marked by DOM, see 55b; the latter condition holds for masculine objects as well, but in this case the accusative clitic *lo/los* is replaced by *le/les* even in dialects that do not exhibit *leísmo*, see 55c (Ordoñez and Treviño 2016):

(55) a Se me/te llama (Spanish)
ARB= 1/2SG.ACC= call.3SG
'One calls me/you'
b *(A) las niñas, se las ha visto contentas
To the girls *ARB*= 3PL.F.ACC= AUX.3SG see.PRTC.PST happy
'one has seen the girls happy'
c A los niños, se les/*los veía felices.
To the kids, *ARB*= 3PL.M = see.PST happy
'one saw them (the kids) happy'

6.3 Interaction between object and subject clitics

Several Romance languages exhibit restrictions on the co-occurrence of subject and object clitics (what Roberts 1993 dubs 'object clitic for subject clitic'). Subject clitics tend to be dropped in the presence of object clitics:

(56) a O vin cantá:t (Friul.)
1PL.NOM= AUX sing.PRTC.PST
'We sang'
b (*O) lu vin cantá:t
1PL.NOM= 3SG.M.ACC= AUX sing.PRTC.PST
'We sang it'

The same holds for Romagnol dialects such as the one spoken in Tavullia (Manzini & Savoia 2005:356-357, 363-364), where the restriction targets third person clitics.

(57)	a.	el/la	te	cema	'he/she calls you' (Tavullia)
	b.	el/la	ce	cema	'he/she calls us'
	c	(*el/la)	el/la/i/le	cema	'he/she call him/her/them'
		3.NOM=	ACC=	call.3	

It is worth noting that in this dialect subject and object clitics are identical, but the restriction occurs even if subject and object pronouns are separated by a dative pronoun, which means that the ban does not result from haplology:

(49)	(*el/la)	m	el	dà (Tavullia)
	3SG.NOM=	1.DAT=	3SG.M.ACC=	give.3SG
	'He/she gives it to me'			

The above restriction does not always hold when either the subject or the object clitic is plural. However, sometimes the resulting combination may be expressed by an invariable form, which is morphologically opaque as it does not correspond to the expected combination, see 52. For further remarks on the morphological make-up of clitic combinations, see Luís.

(52)	a	*i	le	ha	pers (Pesaro)
		3PL.M.NOM=	3PL.F.ACC=	AUX.3	lose.PRTC.PST
	b	li	ha	pers	
		3PL.NOM_3PL.ACC=	AUX.3	lose.PRTC.PST	
		'they (males) have lost them (females)'			

7. Further Readings

Poletto, Cecilia & Christina (2016). 'Subject clitics: syntax' in Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 772-785.
Roberts, Ian (2016). 'Object clitics' in Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 786-801.

References List

Benincà, P. (2006). 'A detailed map of the Left Periphery in Medieval Romance', in R. Zanuttini/H. Campos/E. Herburger/P. Portner (eds.), Negation, Tense, and Clausal Architecture: Crosslinguistic Investigations, Washington D.C.:53–86.

Benincà, P. & Poletto, C. (2004). 'Topic, focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers' in Rizzi, L. (ed.), The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 52-75.

Bonet, Eulalia (1991). *Morphology after syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance*. MIT: Doctoral dissertation.

Burzio, Luigi (1986). *Italian Syntax. A Government-Binding Approach.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Cardinaletti, Anna and Michal Starke (1999). 'The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns', in H. van Riemsdijk (ed.), Clitics in the languages of Europe. Berlin and New York:145-233
Demonte, Violeta (1995). Dative alternation in Spanish. Probus 7.1: 5-30.
Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen (1990). Clitic doubling, wh-movement, and quantification in Romanian. Linguistic Inquiry 21, 351-398.
Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen (1998). 'Impersonal se Constructions in Romance and the Passivization of Unergatives' Linguistic Inquiry 29, 399-437.
Dragomirescu, Adina & Alexandru Nicolae (ms). 'Syntactic archaisms preserved in a contemporary romance variety: interpolation and scrambling in old Romanian and Istro-Romanian'
D'Alessandro, Roberta (2007). *Impersonal si constructions*. Berlin – New York: De Gruyter.
D'Alessandro, Roberta, and Adam Ledgeway (2010), 'At the C-T boundary. Investigating Abruzzese complementation', Lingua 120: 2040–2060.
D'Alessandro, R. and Alexiadou, A. (2006). The syntax of the indefinite pronoun 'nome'. Probus 18:189–218
Egerland, Verner and Anna Cardinaletti (2010). 'Il pronome personale obliquo' in G. Salvi and L. Renzi, Grammatica dell'italiano antico, vol. I Bologna: il Mulino, 414-450
Hirschbühler, Paul and Marie Labelle (2003). Residual Tobler-Mussafia in French Dialects. In Romance Linguistics: Theory and Acquisition. Selected papers from the 32nd Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Toronto, April 2002, Edited by Ana Teresa Pérez-Leroux and Yves Roberge. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 149–164.
Kayne, R. (1975). French syntax: the transformational cycle. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Ledgeway, Adam (2000). A comparative syntax of the dialects of southern Italy: a minimalist approach. Oxford: Blackwell.
Ledgeway, Adam, and Alessandra Lombardi (2005) 'Verb Movement, adverbs and clitic positions in Romance', Probus 17: 79-113.
Leonetti, Manuel (2004). Specificity and differential object marking in Spanish. Catalan Journal of Linguistics 3: 75-114.
Loporcaro, Michele (2012). A new strategy for progressive marking and its implications for grammaticalization theory: the subject clitic construction of Pantiscu. Studies in Language, 36(4):747-784.
Manzini, Maria Rita (2014). 'Grammatical categories: Strong and weak pronouns in Romance'. Lingua, vol. 150, pp. 171-201.
Manzini, Maria Rita and Leonardo Savoia (2005). *I dialetti italiani e romance. Morfosintassi generativa.* Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso.
Martins, Ana Maria (2003). 'Deficient pronouns and linguistic change in Portuguese and Spanish'. Romance Language and Linguistic Theory 2001: Selected Papers from 'Going Romance', Amsterdam, 6-8 December 2001, ed. by J. Quer, J. Schroten, M. Scorretti, P. Sleeman and E. Verheugd, 213-230. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Martins, Ana Maria (2011). 'Scrambling and Information Focus in Old and Contemporary Portuguese' Catalan Journal of Linguistics 10: 133-158.
Mastrangelo Latini, Giulia (1981), 'Note di morfologia dialettale', Quaderni di filologia e lingue romanze 3: 241-249.
Mendikoetxea, Amaya & Adrain Battye (1990). 'Arb se/si in transitive contexts: a comparative study' Rivista di grammatica generativa 15: 161-195.
Munaro, Nicola (2010). Towards a hierarchy of clause types. In Paola Benincà, Nicola Munaro (eds.), Mapping the Left Periphery. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 125-162.

Mussafia, A. (1886). ‘Una particolarità sinttatica della lingua italiana dei primi secoli’. Miscellanea di Filologia e Linguistica in Memoria di Napoleone Caix e Ugo Angelo Canello, ed. by G. I. Ascoli et alii, 255-261. Firenze: LeMonnier.

Ordóñez F. & E. Treviño (2016). ‘Agreement and D.O.M. with se: A comparative study of Mexican and Peninsular Spanish’ in Kato, Mary and Francisco Ordóñez (eds), The Morphosyntax of Portuguese and Spanish in Latin America, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ormazabal, J. and J. Romero (2007). The Object Agreement Constraint, Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 25.2, pp. 315–347.

Parry, Mair (1995). “Some Observations on the Syntax of Clitic Pronouns in Piedmontese.” In Martin Maiden and John C. Smith (eds.), Linguistic Theory and the Romance Languages: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory (pp. 133–60). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Parry, Mair (1997). ‘Preverbal negation and clitic ordering, with particular reference to a group of North-West Italian dialects’, Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, 113.2: 243–70.

Parry M. (1998). ‘The Reinterpretation of the Reflexive in Piedmontese: 'Impersonal' SE Constructions’, in Transactions of the Philological Society 96, pp. 63-116.

Parry, Mair (2005). Parluma ‘d Coiri. Sociolinguistica e grammatical del dialetto di Cairo Montenotte. Savona: Editrice Liguria.

Pescarini, Diego (in press). Parametrising arbitrary constructions. Probus.

Pescarini, Diego and Paola Benincà 2014 ‘Clitic placement in the dialect of S. Valentino in Abruzzo citeriore’ Archivio Glottologico Italiano 101: 37-65

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

Postal, P. (1989). Masked Inversion in French. Chicago, Il: The University of Chicago Press.

Raposo, E. and Uriagereka, I. (2005). Clitic placement in Western Iberian: A minimalist view. In The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax, G. Cinque 81 R. Kayne (eds.), 639—697. Oxford: OUP

Renzi, Lorenzo & Laura Vanelli (1983). ‘I pronomi soggetto in alcune varietà romanze’, In Paola Benincà et al. (eds.), Scritti in onore di G.B. Pellegrini, Pisa, Pacini, 120-145.

Rigau, Gemma (1984). Inanimate Indirect Object in Catalan, Linguistic Inquiry 13: 146-150.

Rivero, Maria Luisa (1993). ‘Long Head Movement vs V2 and Null Subjects in Old Romance’ Lingua, 89:217-245, 1993.

Roberts, Ian (1993). The Nature of Subject Clitics in Franco-Provençal Valdôtain. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), Dialects of Italy, 319—353. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Roberts, Ian (2016). ‘Object clitics’ in Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 786-801.

Săvescu Ciucivara, Oana (2007). ‘Challenging the Person Case Constraint: Evidence from Romanian’, in J. Camacho, N. Flores-Ferran, L. Sanchez, V. Deprez, and M. Jose Cabrera (eds.), Romance Linguistics 2006. Selected Papers from the 36th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 255–269.

Suñer, Margarita (1988). The role of agreement in clitic-doubled constructions. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 6, 391-434.

Tobler, A. (1875). Review of ‘ J. Le Coultre, De l’ordre des mots dans Chrétien de Troyes’. Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen, Stück. 34: 1057-1082. Reprinted in: Vermischte Beiträge zur Französischen Grammatik V. 1902 & 1971 [Amsterdam: Rodopi].

Tobler, A. (1889). ‘Pronominales Objekt zu Infinitiv oder Partizipium’. Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 13: 186-191. Reprinted in: Vermischte Beiträge zur Französischen II. 1902 & 1971 [Amsterdam: Rodopi].

Tortora, Christina (2015), *A Comparative Grammar of Borgomanerese*, New York - Oxford: Oxford University Press.