

MARIA RITA MANZINI – LEONARDO MARIA SAVOIA

Morphology dissolves into syntax: Infixation and Doubling in Romance languages

1. Introduction

Halle – Marantz (1994) consider a mesoclysis phenomenon in Spanish varieties, whereby in imperatives a clitic cluster appears between a verb stem and its plural *-n* inflection. This contrasts with the simple enclitic pattern of standard Spanish. Halle – Marantz (1994) assume that the syntactic component generates structures where the clitic cluster is enclitic to the constituent formed by the verb stem and its plural inflection. It is only at M(orphological) S(tructure) that the clitic cluster is eventually moved between the verb stem and the plural inflection. The analysis of the same phenomenon proposed by Halle – Harris (2005) targets an even lower level of organization of the grammar, namely PF. Halle – Harris (2005) preliminarily deal with what they take to be a simpler case, in which the *-n* plural morphology is copied on the verb and on the clitic. In the view of Halle – Harris (2005), this is a case of partial reduplication. The substring formed by the *-n* inflection and by the clitic is reduplicated and the leftmost part of the reduplication is deleted, giving rise to the superficial effect of doubling at a distance. For Halle – Harris (2005), the inversion of the clitic constituent with respect to the *-n* inflection is obtained through a partial reduplication, whereby the leftmost part of the reduplicated material is deleted in the first copy and the rightmost part in the second copy. The superficial effect is that of an inversion or, in phonological terms, a metathesis.

Manzini – Savoia (1999; 2004a; 2007; 2008a; 2008b) argue against the Distributed Morphology analysis of imperative mesoclysis on the basis of data from Southern Italian and Arbëresh (Albanian) varieties that are strictly comparable (though not identical) to the Spanish ones. They present in detail the empirical and theoretical reasons that lead them to abandon a morphological-level analysis of the phenomenon for a syntactic level one – implying in effect the elimination of the traditional morphology-syntax divide and the postulation of a unified morphosyntactic component. It would certainly be relevant to address the same data in connection with Halle – Harris's (2005) proposal for a phonological treatment of the Spanish imperative mesoclysis. However the data themselves are already published in the (easily accessible) quoted sources. Furthermore the same considerations we advance in favor of a syntactic level analysis, and against a morphological level one, typically work against a lower level phonological analysis as well. Therefore, keeping in mind the limitations of space imposed on this article, we develop a similar discussion on the basis of a fresh set of data – namely the positioning of a clitic between the verb base and the *-n* plural inflection in some Lombard varieties; the phenomenon involves subject as well as object clitics and questions as well as imperatives. We then discuss the issue of parasitic

plurals – using as our empirical base Sardinian and Friulan varieties. In Sardinian, parasitic plurals of the Spanish kind trigger agreement with the perfect participle; in Friulan, the discontinuous realization of the *-s* plural morphology involves subject clitics and does not depend on suppletion.

2. Mesocclisis between a verbal base and its inflection: object clitics.

As noted by Ascoli (1873); Sganzini (1933), in the varieties of the Mesolcina Valley the feminine plural inflection *-ən* is lexicalized by all categories internal to the noun phrase, as in (1b) – except for the definite article, that displays instead the *-a* feminine inflection both in the singular and in the plural (1a). In the masculine, the plural is normally lexicalized by the determiner (and the noun) as in (2b) vs. (2a).

(1) *Soazza* (Grisons)

- a. *l-a* ʃkabel-*a*/ ʃkabel-*əŋ*
 the-f chair-f./ chair-fpl
- b. kwel-*əŋ*/ pək-*əŋ*/ tant-*ən*/ kwant-*əŋ* ʃkabel-*əŋ*
 those/ few/ so.many/ how.many chairs

(2) *Soazza*

- a. *el* *mε* *fra'del*
 the my brother
- b. *i* *mε* *fradei*
 the my brothers

The distribution in (1) can be described simply in terms of a lexical exclusion of the *-n* morphology by the *l-* base of the definite article. We may expect the same incompatibility of the *l-* base with the *-n* inflection to hold of 3rd person pronominal clitics, since in Romance languages the latter often coincide with definite determiners. Indeed though interpreted as plurals, the feminine subject clitic in (3a) and object clitic in (3b) are lexicalized by *la*; instead, it is the verb inflection that carries the (feminine) plural specification *-ən*. In the masculine, the latter is absent in connection with the object clitic in (4b) and the subject clitic in (4a).

(3) *Soazza*

- a. *la* *bev -əŋ*
 she drink-fpl
 ‘They drink’
- b. *la* tʃam-*i -əŋ*

- her call -1sg-fpl
 'I call them'
- (4) *Soazza*
- a. i be:f
 they.m drink
 'They drink'
- b. i tʃam-i
 them.m call-1sg
 'I call them'

A characterization of the *-ən* morphology would appear to be straightforward at least for (3a). Because the referential properties implied by *-ən* are attributed to the subject, it is reasonable to treat *-ən* as a subject agreement inflection on the finite verb. It seems then natural to treat the same morpheme in (3b) as an object agreement. Indeed it is independently known (Burzio [1986]) that there are forms of the verb which are inflected to agree with internal arguments, hence with objects (specifically clitic ones), namely perfect participles. As we may expect, in the *Soazza* variety they also present the *-ən* inflection in the context of a plurally understood object clitic *l(a)*, as in (5).

- (5) *Soazza*
- tu mε l a -i -ŋ portad-əŋ
 you me def have-2sg-fpl brought-fpl
 'You have brought them to me'

In the imperative, as shown in (6b), the masculine plural accusative clitic follows the verb base. As for the feminine plural, in principle we might expect that the verb base inflected with *-ən* is followed by the *la* clitic, as in (6a'). In reality, what happens is that the *l* clitic is infixated between the verbal base and the *-ən* inflection, as in (6a) – the crucial piece of data for present purposes.

- (6) *Soazza*
- a. tʃama -l -əŋ
 call -def -fpl
 'Call them!'
- a'. *tʃam-əŋ-la
 call-fpl-her

- b. tʃama- i
 call-them.m
 ‘Call them!’

As far as we can tell, no special problem arises in describing the pattern in (6a) in terms of either Halle – Harris (2005) or of Distributed Morphology. However the same kind of questions that Manzini – Savoia (2004a; 2007) ask of the Distributed Morphology treatment of mesocclisis in Spanish varieties also arise for (6a). Thus there is no principled reason why mesocclisis is restricted to enclitic contexts (as opposed to proclitic ones) and to agreement inflections (as opposed to modal, aspectual, temporal ones). It is true that in Halle – Harris’s (2005) model, phonological strings have to be adjacent in order for metathesis to apply – hence clitics have to be in enclisis. But there is no reason why metathesis should affect agreement inflections rather than, say, modal ones. Reference to enclisis again will not help, since enclisis characterizes for instance Romance infinitives, whose *-r* (modal) inflection is never split from the verb base under mesocclisis. In fact there is not even any reason why ‘metathesis’ should be restricted to clitics – so that for instance it doesn’t apply to two inflections, as in (3b), yielding (7).

- (7) *la tʃam-əŋ-i
 her call-fpl-I

Of course, we are not saying that the relevant constraints cannot be adequately stated; rather our point is precisely that that they have to be stated – and that there is no principled underlying reason for any one of them or for their clustering. It is perfectly possible that this state of affairs is exactly as it should be. However we doubt that this is the case – largely because we are not dealing with ‘curious idiosyncratic phenomena of Spanish varieties’ (Halle – Harris [2005]). Rather, the data reported in this article as well as in Manzini – Savoia (2004a; 2007) show that the relevant patterns affect different types of inflections – and they do so in different Romance varieties and in Albanian ones. Therefore an alternative to current theories is worth exploring. In particular, in our view the difficulties we mentioned depend on the fact that morphological or phonological level theories cannot manipulate *bona fide* syntactic notions and capture generalizations about them – which presumably pertain to the syntactic component. By contrast, we propose that patterns such as the *Soazza* one are entirely defined in the syntax – which means that a great deal (or all) of what is traditionally thought of as morphology is integral part of syntax.

2.1 LF-level analysis

In a noun phrase like (1a), we take it that the inflection of the noun represents the internal argument of the predicate base, whose reference is independently individuated by the determiner (Higginbotham [1985]). Since on this account the determiner and the inflection hook up to the same argument slot in the predicate they must have compatible referential specifications, i.e. (as one generally says) they must agree. Thus in (1a), and in the corresponding structure in (8) the feminine plural *-ən* on the noun is non-distinct from the feminine *-a* on the determiner. We take the step of identifying the inflection of the noun with the N category. Thus we embrace the idea, advocated by Marantz (1997), that the N categorization does not intrinsically associate with certain predicative bases, but is a product of their combination with inflectional material in the syntax. We take the category of the determiner to be D (for Definiteness), as is standard.

- (8) *Soazza*
[_D la [[√]kabel [_Nən]]

In a sentence like (3a), we identify the category projected by the subject clitic with D, following a suggestion by Chomsky (1995) concerning the nature of the nominative/ EPP argument, as in (9). We further take the so-called subject agreement inflection of the verb to be akin to a subject clitic within the word-level structure, hence D again. Note that here we label arguments according to the relation they bear to the predicate head; hence the same *-ən* morphology alternates between N in (8) and D in (9). Nothing hinges on adopting this way of labeling, except that it allows us to make certain relations more immediately evident – and it allows the present discussion to be directly compatible with Manzini – Savoia’s (2004a; 2007). The discussion goes through if the labels of the projections are provided by the lexical content of the terminals (à la Chomsky [1995]).

- (9) *Soazza*
[_D la [_I [√]bev [_Dən]]

Our analysis of (3b) proceeds along similar lines to (9) except that we take the step of identifying the *-ən* inflection with an N object agreement on the basis that it lexicalizes the internal argument, exactly as the N inflection of the noun does in (8). For the same reason the accusative clitic is also identified with N, as in (10).

(10) *Soazza*

[_N la [_I [√tʃam [_D i] [_Nən]]]

Since the same *-ən* element appears both as a subject agreement in (9) and as an object agreement in (10) we may expect that under the right circumstances, i.e. when both the subject and the object sentential clitics are *la*, ambiguity arises as to whether *-ən* should agree with one or the other, i.e. whether plurality should be attributed to the subject or object argument. This is indeed what happens in examples like (11a), where the *-ən* inflection of the verb can refer to the feminine subject clitic, to the feminine object clitic or to both at once. In particular we can impute the ambiguity between the subject and object reading to the existence of two possible structures, summarized in (11b). In one structure *-ən* is referred to the D subject, while the other possibility is to refer *-ən* to the N object. As for the third interpretation, with both object and subject pluralized, we take the fact that only one *-ən* surfaces to be akin to the mutual exclusion between two *l* (subject and object) clitics to which we shall return in connection with parasitic plurals (section 4).

(11) *Soazza*

a. la la tʃam -ən
 she her call -fpl
 ‘She calls them/ They call her/They call them’

b. [_D la [_N la [_I [√tʃami [_{D/N}ən]]]

We analyze the imperative in (6a) as involving mesoclysis of the clitic between the verb base and its stranded *-ən* inflection, as in (12). We cannot assume that the object clitic simply takes the fully inflected *lən* form for feminine plural, because this would contradict the lexical exclusion between the *l*- definiteness base and the *-ən* plural morphology postulated for (1a). In (12), then. the verb base appears in a high C position, notated C₁ (to suggest Irrealis). There it is followed by the *l* clitic and by the stranded *-ən* inflection corresponding to two separate lexicalizations of the object clitic. That pronominal clitics are not constrained to a single set of positions but have multiple dedicated slots, in different domains of the sentence, is a conclusion shared by Manzini – Savoia (2007) and by completely independent, often incompatible work such as Poletto (2000).

(12) *Soazza*

[_{C1} tʃama [_N l [_Nən

Note that we do not assume that the *-ən* inflection is stranded in the I position, as in (13). This is because we agree with Chomsky (2000) that verbs do not undergo movement/ chain formation. Hence whether their movement is a PF phenomenon (Chomsky [2000]) or they are merged directly in the position where they surface – as we assume here in a representational mode, no copy of the verb is present in I. In these circumstances the *-ən* inflection is, so to speak, automatically promoted to the syntactic-level N object clitic position, as in (12) above.

- (13) *Soazza*
 [C_I tʃama] [N *l*] [I [_V tʃama] [N_ən]]

The structure in (12) holds the key to the question that directly interests us here – namely why (rather than simply how) the *-ən* inflection finds itself stranded and the *l* clitic in mesocclisis. This configuration only occurs in the imperative, in that only insertion of the verb base in the high C_I position creates the conditions that are necessary and sufficient for it. We assume that the *-ən* element is unable to insert in the C_{I(realis)} position, making its stranding necessary, because of its definiteness properties (those same properties that make it an appropriate lexicalization for the clitic N slot). Second, the insertion of the verb base in the modal position leaves enough space to its right for what is effectively an instance of clitic doubling – by the pronominal *l* form in a higher domain and the inflectional *-ən* one in a lower domain. Third, the so-called agreement inflection can be stranded in that there is an independently defined position in the sentence available to host it, namely a clitic position. Though in principle one may think that the stranding of temporal/ modal/ aspectual inflections of the verb is possible, this does not happen – precisely because the structure underlying the stranding of the agreement inflection is (12) and not (13). In other words, verbal material cannot have discontinuous lexicalization in the potential verb positions of the sentence (C, I, etc.), because of the assumptions about head movement outlined in connection with (13). Crucially this generalization, stated in terms of syntactic constituency cannot be reproduced, as far as we can see, in morphological or phonological level analyses.

3. Mesocclisis between the verb base and its plural inflection: subject clitics

Varieties of the Bregaglia Valley provide interesting comparison with those like *Soazza* in what concerns the agreement structure of the noun phrase (Ascoli [1873]; Salvioni [1902]; Rohlfs [1968, § 363]). The nominal class (gender) inflection *-a* characterizes the noun both in the singular (14a) and in the plural (14b), while the plural *-n* is lexicalized only by the determiners, as in (14b). This is not a case of mutual exclusion between the plural inflection on the determiners and the noun. Thus the bare noun in predicative position in (14c) still lacks the *-n* plural inflection.

- (14) *Soglio* (Grisons)
- a. la donna
 the woman
- b. l-an/ kwel-aŋ/ tant-an/ pok-an/ kwant-aŋ donna
 the.pl/ those/so.many/few/how.many woman
 ‘the/ those/ so many/ few/ how many women’
- c. l en donna
 they are woman
 ‘They are women’

The distribution of the feminine plural *-n* morphology in (14) is akin to the distribution of the masculine plural *-i* morphology illustrated in (15) with another variety of the Bregaglia Valley. Roughly speaking, the relevant inflectional material is lexicalized on the Determiners and Quantifiers of the noun phrase, while it is excluded from the head noun.

- (15) *Casaccia* (Grisons)
- a. al kaŋ
 the dog
- b. i/ kw-i/ kwiçt-i/ taŋtʃ-i kaŋ
 the.pl/ these/ those/ so.many dog
 ‘the/ these/ those/ so many dogs’

Let us then turn to sentential contexts. Since the *-n* morphology of the feminine plural occurs on *l* determiners within the noun phrase, we expect it to appear on pronominal clitics as well, as is indeed the case with the objet clitic in (16).

- (16) *Soglio*
- i laŋ klam
I them.plf call
‘I call them’

Consider however the subject clitic. Here the feminine appears as *la* both in the singular and in the plural, in other words has a distribution reminiscent of *Soazza*. What is also reminiscent of *Soazza* is that the verb inflection bears an *-n* specification in the plural, as in (17a). However the *-n* inflection also combines with the plural masculine *i*, as in (17b).

- (17) *Soglio*
- a. la droməŋ
 she sleep.pl
 ‘They sleep’
- b. i droməŋ
 they.m sleep.pl
 ‘They sleep’

In other words, *Soglio*, contrary to *Soazza*, has an *-n* plural inflection on verbs which is gender independent. Furthermore this *-n* inflection of the verb is mutually exclusive with the *-n* inflection of the feminine plural subject clitic with which it agrees. For the better known mutual exclusion between two *l* clitics, Manzini – Savoia (2007, and references quoted there) argue that the *l* definiteness element takes scopes over the entire clitic string, with the result that it can and must be lexicalized only once (see section 4 below). Similarly, the exclusion of the *-n* inflection of the subject clitic by the *-n* inflection of the verb can be imputed to the latter taking the former in its scope if plurality, like definiteness, is treated as a quantificational property.

We have now set the stage for the apparent mesoclitisis phenomenon that is directly relevant here. In questions, the masculine plural clitic *i* appears in enclisis on the normally inflected form of the verb, as in (18a). In the feminine plural, however, the verb base is followed by the *la* subject clitic and then by the *-n* inflection as in (18b).

- (18) *Soglio*
- a. drom-ən-i
 sleep-pl-they.m
 ‘Do they sleep?’
- b. drom-l-aŋ
 sleep-she-pl
 ‘Do they sleep?’

The structure of the masculine plural example is soon disposed of. Quite simply the verb inserts in a position of the C field where it leaves the subject clitic (D in the present notation) to its right in the lower inflectional domain, as (19). Note that there is evidence that the verb in questions lexicalizes a C position lower than in imperatives. For instance, object clitics, that appear in enclisis on imperatives, appear in proclisis in questions. Again we will not insist on this point, since on the empirical reasons for the postulation of several C verbal positions we agree with works completely independent of (and not necessarily compatible with) the present one (Rizzi [1997]; Poletto [2000]):

- (19) *Soglio*
[C [√drom [D ən]] [D i]

In the feminine plural, the same analysis adopted for *Soazza* in the previous section could in principle apply; in other words, the verb inflection strands in a clitic position where it follows the *la* clitic. However, if infixation of the subject clitic between the verb stem and the *-n* plural inflection was involved in the feminine, there would be no reason why it wouldn't apply in the masculine as well, yielding the ungrammatical (20).

- (20) *drom-i-ən
sleep-they.m-pl

As it turns out, on the evidence provided so far, *lan* is the expected clitic form in the language for the feminine plural, and it is only the *-n* mutual exclusion that prevents us from seeing it in (17a). Therefore we can assume that in (18b) *lan* is indeed a clitic; in turn mutual exclusion will apply, leading in this case to the *-n* inflection of the clitic excluding the *-n* inflection of the verb, as in (21).

- (21) *Soglio*
[C drom [D [√l [N ən]]]

As before, the real point of the discussion is not so much accounting for the distribution of *-n* in *Soglio*, as for the reasons why it should hold. In particular, if we are correct in assuming that a clitic and an inflectional copy of *-n* exclude each other we still must explain why in (21) *-n* shows up on the clitic while in (17a) it shows up on the verb. The generalization seems to be that it is the lower copy of *-n* that is lexicalized; in other words the lack of lexicalization for the higher *-n* depends on the scope of the lower *-n* extending over it. It is a central theme of this article that the proper evaluation metrics for a theory includes how it accounts for the observed variation with respect to a given phenomenon. Even defining our empirical spread very narrowly – i.e. plural *-n* reordering in Romance – it seems to us that a syntactic level analysis is both more flexible and more restrictive than currently available theories at the morphological or phonological interface. Because of this, it is much better adapted at accounting for variation. In particular, if our analysis is correct, the same terminal string corresponds to an independently existing lexical item in *Soglio*, though not in *Soazza*, where it truly results from infixation.

Suppose that the empirical conclusion that *Soglio* has no mesoclitis but rather an enclitic *lən* is taken to be correct. The metathesis approach simply isn't seem equipped to deal with deletions

other than those dependent on reduplication – so that it seems to become irrelevant when it comes to deleting the *n* inflection of the verb in the presence of the *lvn* enclitic. A Distributed Morphology analysis could work out some mechanism of mutual exclusion between the *-n* verbal and clitic inflections, say an Impoverishment rule (of which more in the next section). But as far as we can tell, the two contexts for the Impoverishment of *-n* would have to be separately stated for the enclisis context in (21) and for the proclisis context in (17a), since the unifying notion of scope would not be available to restrict morphological Impoverishment. Our objection is at heart always the same: namely that a proper account of phenomena involving traditional morphological objects such as inflection requires syntactic-level notions. Hence a unified morphosyntax can be argued to be superior not only on general grounds of economy in the architecture of grammar – but also of its ability to predict the actual data.

3.1 Other subject clitics between verb base and plural inflection

The picture emerging from the discussion in the previous sections is roughly as follows. At the LF interface, where our morphosyntactic representations are defined, there are at least two structural representations for the superficial phenomenon of a clitic appearing between the verb base and an *-n* plural inflection. The first depends on the inflection itself being stranded in a lower position by the insertion of the verb in a higher one. This is the case of *Soazza* in section 2, but following Manzini – Savoia (1999; 2004a; 2005; 2007) it is also robustly attested by mesocclisis in the imperative in Southern Italian and Albanian dialects. The second structural possibility corresponds to the case in which the *-n* inflection can form a constituent with the verb or with the clitic, though they are never seen to cooccur for independent reasons. If the discussion that precedes is correct, this second pattern is instantiated by *Soglio*; in this section we shall consider the question whether it is replicated in other languages as well.

A descriptive mesocclisis pattern in interrogatives whereby a subject clitic appears between the verb base and the plural *-n* inflection is also found in Northern Tuscan dialects. Consider for instance *Dalli* in (22). As it turns out, dialects like *Dalli* share at least one property with *Soglio* namely that the subject clitic is not differentiated for number but only for gender. The reading of the data is complicated by the presence of allomorphs for preconsonantal and prevocalic position. In any event, in (22) it can clearly be seen that the subject clitic for the masculine both singular and plural is *a* in preconsonantal position, as in (a), and *v* in prevocalic position, as in (c). In the feminine the clitic is essentially *la* – with the *l* phonological variant prevocalically, as in (b) and (d).

(22) *Dalli* (Tuscany)

a. a ddɔrma/ d'dɔrm-ənə

- he sleeps/ sleep-pl
'He sleeps/They sleep'
- b. la ðorma/ 'ðorm-ənə
she sleeps/ sleep-pl
'She sleeps/ They sleep'
- c. j a/ a-ŋ dormiðə
he has/ have-pl slept
'He has/ they have slept'
- d. l a/ a-ŋ dormiðə
she has/ have-pl slept
'She has/ they have slept'

Questions in the *Dalli* dialect are characterized by verb-subject clitic inversion. Thus in the singular, we find the masculine or feminine clitic after the verb as in (23a-b). In (23b) the feminine *ila* is recognizably a bisyllabic version of the proclitic *l(a)*; while *ijjə* compares in the same way to proclitic *j*. Note that for us a clitic is a pronominal whose distribution is different from that of the corresponding noun phrase; thus we keep referring to stress-bearing *ila* and *ijjə* as clitics – and not weak pronouns contra Cardinaletti – Starke (1999).

- (23) *Dalli*
- a. dor'm-ijjə
sleeps-he
'Does he sleep?'
- b. dor'm-ila
sleeps-she
'Does she sleep?'

We are now in a position to consider the form taken by questions in the plural. As anticipated above, the subject clitic, i.e. *ijjə* in the masculine and *ila* in the feminine, surface between the verb base and the plural verb inflection *-nə*, as in (24).

- (24) *Dalli*
- a. kə maŋ'ŋ-ijjə-nə?
what eat-he-pl

- ‘What do they eat?’
 b. kə mmaŋ¹ŋ-ilə-nə?
 what eat-he-pl
 ‘What do they eat?’

One reason that leads us to incline for a treatment of the data in (24) along the lines of *Soglio*, rather than of *Soazza*, has to do with the fact that they involve questions. As we saw in reviewing *Soglio*, in questions the verb is found in a position higher than I but lower than the high C position of imperatives. The evidence is that while object clitics typically follow the imperative (either in enclisis or in mesoclis), they precede the verb in questions, as can be seen in (25) for *Dalli*.

- (25) *Dalli*
 ai vvə^ʔ-ijjə-nə
 them see-he-pl
 ‘Do they see them?’

But if the verb is inserted in the lower C position, then the subject clitic position of the inflectional domain is taken by the inverted subject clitic, and it is not available for stranding the *-n* inflection in the way proposed for *Soazza*. Therefore we revert to the structural proposal independently developed for *Soglio*, whereby in enclisis it is the subject clitic that is inflected for plurality, as in (26), while the verb appears as a pure lexical base.

- (26) *Dalli*
-
- ```

 graph TD
 Root[] --- C[C]
 Root --- Node1[]
 C --- Clitic[maŋŋ]
 Node1 --- D[D]
 Node1 --- Node2[]
 Node2 --- I[I]
 Node2 --- N[N]
 I --- I_text[ijjə/ilə]
 N --- N_text[nə]

```

Now, the crucial argument in favor of a structure like (26) in the case of *Soglio* was that it allowed us to reconstruct a subject clitic form predicted to exist in the language though never found in proclisis. Having adopted (26) for dialects like *Dalli* we would expect at the very least that forms like *ijjənə* or *ilənə* are actually to be found if not in *Dalli* at least in similar dialects. Indeed it is

fairly well known that subject pronouns such as *ellino* or *eglino* clearly formed from the *egli* ‘he’ pronoun of 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular and the *-no* inflectional ending are found in Old Italian (effectively Old Tuscan) (cf. Rohlfs [1968, 135]).

As it turns out, the particular cliticization system attested to by both *Soglio* and *Dalli*, whereby the subject clitic is differentiated for gender but not for number is not a necessary prerequisite for the apparent mesocclisis pattern at hand. Thus Romantch dialects of the Sutselva such as *Donat* in (27a) present not only the full subject pronouns *elts* and *eləs* for the masculine and feminine respectively, but also a subject clitic *i* for plural, akin to the *i* of many Northern Italian dialects, and hence denoting plurality (cf. the masculine plural of *Soazza* and *Casaccia/ Soglio* in sections 2-3). In contexts where the verb inserts in C, *i* can be found in mesocclisis between the verbal base and the *-n* inflection, as shown in (27b) with a question. Because these Romantch varieties are verb-second (Manzini – Savoia [2005] and reference quoted there), the same effect is found also in topicalization contexts as in (27c).

- (27) *Donat* (Grisons)
- a.     ‘elts/’eləs/ i             ‘dɔrmən  
        they.m/they.f/they    sleep  
        ‘They sleep’
  - b.     ‘dɔrm-i-n  
        sleep-they-pl  
        ‘Do they sleep?’
  - c.     ‘osa    ‘dɔrm-i-n  
        now    sleep-they-pl  
        ‘Now they sleep’

Again we propose the same structure as in (26), on the basis of the same overall motivations. We then expect that forms such as *in* consisting of the nominal base *i* for plurality and of the further plural inflection *n*, also found on verbs, occur independently of the mesocclisis phenomena at hand. Indeed we have attestations of this possibility in a dialect like *Airole* in (28), where the *n* element forms both the 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural of monosyllabic verbs such as *sun* ‘they are’, *an* ‘they have’ and the plural of the subject clitic *in*.

- (28) *Airole* (Liguria)
- a.     iŋ     su-ŋ    ve’ŋy/ ve’ŋye  
        they   be-pl   come/come-fpl

- ‘They have come’
- b.    iŋ     l         a-ŋ            tʃa'mau  
       they   him    have-pl        called  
       ‘They have called him’

Despite the evidence that we have provided for the independent existence of 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural clitics formed with an *-n* inflection, the question still arises why their distribution would be so limited in the dialects considered. The key to the answer seems to us to lie in the allomorphies noted for *Dalli* in (23). As we indicated, there are no prosodic reasons that motivated the alternation between a more reduced form in proclisis and a richer form in enclisis; therefore Manzini – Savoia (2005) conclude that the reason for the alternation is due to the sensitivity of lexical tones of the argumental series to the declarative or modal environment.

#### 4. Parasitic plurals: object clitics

In its best known instantiation, the parasitic plural phenomenon depends on Spurious *se*. In the Spurious *se* phenomenon of Spanish the 3<sup>rd</sup> person dative – accusative cluster does not surface as a combination of the isolation forms, but rather the dative is apparently substituted by *se*. In several varieties of Spanish, the number properties of the dative that cannot be lexicalized on *se* are instead lexicalized on the accusative; this is the so-called parasitic plural. Instead of illustrating the pattern with Spanish, we refer to Sardinian varieties, which have all of the crucial phenomena – and more, as will become relevant later. Consider for instance *Siliqua* in (29). The isolation form of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person dative is given in (29a). However the combination of the dative form with the accusative is excluded; as can be seen in (29b), the dative is apparently replaced by *si*.

- (29)    *Siliqua*            (Sardinia)
- a.        d̥        ɔnanta        kussu  
           to.him they.give        this  
           ‘They give this to him’
- a’.        d̥ʒi     ɔŋgu     su ddʒɔrnalli  
           to.them I.give the newspaper  
           ‘I give them the newspaper’
- b.        si        d̥d̥        ɔnanta  
           SI        it        they.give  
           ‘They give it to him/them’

What is relevant here is that in Sardinian varieties, as in Spanish ones, in Spurious *se* contexts

the number properties of the dative can be lexicalized as an *-s* ending on the accusative clitic, as in (30).

- (30) *Siliqua*  
 su ddʒɔrnalli            si        dɔdʒuz    app(u) a ddɔnai  
 the newspaper        SI        them    I.have to give  
 ‘The newspaper I will give (it) to them’

Harris (1994) accounts for the relevant facts in terms of Distributed Morphology. A rule of Impoverishment deletes the dative feature present in the underlying representation of a sentence like (29b). When Vocabulary Insertion takes place the impoverished terminals are compatible only with insertion of the default clitic of the system, namely *si* (Harris [1994, 331f.]). Before Vocabulary Insertion, an adjunction operation (Harris [1994, 335f.]) can also take the plural property associated with the dative feature (and eventually with the accusative clitic) and adjoin it to the cluster. This property will be lexicalized cluster-finally, but it will be connected to either or both the clitics in the cluster, yielding the parasitic plural. Vocabulary Insertion after Morphological Structure (i.e. Late Insertion) is the reason why Halle – Harris (2005) cannot treat the *-s* ‘metathesis’ in (30) on the same basis as the *-n* metathesis in section 1. In other words the *si* form inserted after Impoverishment does not have a plural variant *\*sis*. Therefore there is no phonological string to which partial reduplication *à la* Halle – Harris (2005) can apply.

Manzini – Savoia (2007; 2008a; 2008b; to appear) discuss at length general conceptual and empirical problems with Late Insertion, Impoverishment and, even more fundamentally underspecification and default. Because this material is independently published and easily accessible, we proceed directly to the alternative analysis that Manzini – Savoia (2007) develop, based on a unified morphosyntax, hence on projection from the lexicon (early insertion), as well as on the avoidance of any notion of underspecification and default. We take it that the structure of a simple Spurious *se* sentence of the type of (29b) is as in (31). In order to understand the Q categorization for *si* it is necessary to keep in mind that we construe *si* as the indefinite of the clitic system, hence as a free variable (Manzini [1986]) interpreted as the impersonal under generic closure (Chierchia [1995]) and otherwise antecedent-bound in the reflexive or passive (Manzini – Savoia [2007]). As in other cases, nothing hinges on the particular labels we choose – only the characterization of the referential content of *si* matters.

- (31) *Siliqua*  
 [Q si    [N dɔdʒ]    [ɔnanta



The first key to our approach is that the *l/d* definiteness base has scopal properties. In some languages (say Italian) this has no consequences for the clitic string as a whole. In other languages, however, if we assume that the *l* morphology of the lower clitic takes the whole string in its scope, we predict that the lexicalization of the same morphology by any other clitic (say the dative) is redundant and hence excluded. In a way, what we are proposing is again that dative *l* is cancelled out by the presence of accusative *l*. Crucially however we need no specialized morphological rule, operating by what in effect is unrecoverable deletion of the dative feature. In the present account the exclusion of the dative (its ‘deletion’ in a manner of speaking) is ‘recoverable’ in the scope domain of the definiteness properties of the accusative. Because of this, our account can be embedded within (a minimalist) syntax without any need for the mediation of a morphological-level readjustment component.

The second key to our analysis is that something like the notion of second internal argument of a ditransitive is real and so is the repertory of lexical forms that it can be matched to – but crucially the matching does not depend on a morphological-level notion of dative. Some forms are of course specialized for the second internal argument such as *dizi* in (29a’). On the other hand, suppletion of the type in (31) (i.e. Spurious *se*) is simply the lexicalization of the second argument of ditransitives by *si*, when in the scope of *l* morphology. In this latter case, what we are saying is in a way that *si* is an interpretive default, representing only the most elementary referential content, i.e. that of a free variable, for an argument in the scope of the *l*- definiteness morphology. But the differences between an interpretive default and a morphological default proper are vast – above all that *si* in the string in (31) does not stand for some other item; rather it is inserted in (31) because of its positive specifications, sufficient to satisfy the relevant argumental position in the given configuration.

Because of space limitations, we will not dwell further on suppletion (and syncretism) phenomena (discussed in great detail by Manzini – Savoia [2002; 2007; to appear]), but we will turn directly to the crucial issue here, i.e. parasitic plurals. Within the present theory the same syntactic notions invoked in connection with Spurious *se* can account for parasitic plural as well. We begin by assuming – in agreement with Harris (1994) on Spanish – that in languages like *Siliqua* the accusative clitic, say *dquz* in (30) has an articulated internal structure, in which the N inflection *-us* consists of a nominal class *-u* base and a plural *-s* inflection, as in (32). The latter is categorized as Q because of the quantificational properties we impute to plurality.

- (32) *Siliqua*  
 [Q si [[√d] [N u]] [Q s]]

We assume that in (32), as in (31), the *q* definiteness element takes scope over the entire string implying the lexicalization of the second internal argument by the variable *si* clitic. If plurality is itself a quantificational property, we may assume that it can take scope over a clitic (sub)string as well. Therefore in (32) *si* can be in the scope of plurality, so that the string is potentially ambiguous between a plural interpretation of the first internal argument, or of the second internal argument, or of both. Once more, this may be seen as, the counterpart within the present framework of the rule adjoining the plural specification to the clitic cluster in Distributed Morphology. But, even if the syntactic level processes we suggest were only mimicking morphological level rules, the fact that they are able to do so would be worthy of note. As it turns out, the two analyses are anything but notational variants.

Sardinian, like Italian and unlike Spanish, has perfect participle agreement with the (first) internal argument when the latter is lexicalized by a clitic. In parasitic plural examples, the perfect participle agrees not only in nominal class (gender) but also in number with the *q* clitic; hence it is plural even if the accusative is interpreted as singular, as in (33), or in other words, plurality is a property of the second internal argument, i.e. the ‘dative’.

- (33) *Paulilätino* (Sardinia)
- |    |                                    |    |        |        |           |
|----|------------------------------------|----|--------|--------|-----------|
| a. | (su libbru)                        | si | q̄q̄z  | appɔ   | 'jaɔzɔ    |
|    | the book                           | SI | them.m | I.have | given.mpl |
|    | ‘I have given it/the book to them’ |    |        |        |           |
| b. | (sa 'makkina)                      | si | q̄q̄z  | appɔ   | 'jaðaza   |
|    | the car                            | SI | them.f | I.have | given.fpl |
|    | ‘I have given it/the car to them’  |    |        |        |           |

In a Distributed Morphology analysis, the syntax, say the minimalist rule of Agree of Chomsky (1995) will compute agreement between abstract feature bundles. But in (33) the abstract feature bundle associated with the accusative clitic reflects the referential properties of the internal argument; hence in the absence of morphological readjustments, it should show up as a singular on the participle. In order to capture the fact that the participle also agrees in the plural, one would have to admit that the morphology readjusts the participle as it does the clitic – but it is difficult to see how such ‘at a distance’ operation could be licenced at the MS level. Hence in Distributed Morphology, as far as we can tell, facts of the type in (33) are impossible to predict (in any principled way). In the account that we have given of parasitic plurals in (32), on the contrary, *q̄q̄z* is simply the plural masculine clitic independently occurring in accusative contexts. Therefore, we fully expect that agreement phenomena will affect the *q̄q̄z* clitic in a constant fashion, whether the

scope of plurality is restricted to it or it spreads over the string (hence over the dative).

#### 4.1 ‘Parasitic datives’

Sardinian varieties illustrate another morphosyntactic pattern in the Spurious *se* environment that does not appear to be attested in Spanish. This consists in the lexicalization not only of the *-s* morphology, but also of the *-i* morphology of the dative on the second clitic of the cluster; in other words *si* clusters with the isolation form of the dative plural, as in (34), with the interpretation dative plural - accusative. Note that in examples like (34) the perfect participle agrees in nominal class and number with the intended internal argument – hence it does not agree, not even in number, with the *qdiz* clitic.

(34) *Paulilätino*

- |    |                                    |    |         |        |         |
|----|------------------------------------|----|---------|--------|---------|
| a. | (su libbru)                        | si | qdiz    | appo   | jau     |
|    | the book                           | SI | to.them | I.have | given   |
|    | ‘I have given it/the book to them’ |    |         |        |         |
| b. | (sa 'makkina)                      | si | qdiz    | appo   | jaða    |
|    | the car                            | SI | to.them | I.have | given.f |
|    | ‘I have given it/the car to them’  |    |         |        |         |

In present terms, the structure corresponding to the ‘parasitic dative’ cluster in (34) is as in (35). As before, the *q* definiteness morphology takes scope over the entire string and the second internal argument of the ditransitive is lexicalized by the free variable *si* of the system, as discussed for (31). For the *-is* morphology as a whole we claim the same as we did for the *-s* morphology in isolation in (32), namely that it takes scope not only over the internal argument with which it is structurally associated, but also over *si*, i.e. the lexicalization of the second internal argument – so that it can be read as a property discontinuously assigned to *si*. In this perspective, the interpretation of (35) has *qd* as the sole lexicalization of the first internal argument, while the lexicalization of the second internal argument consists of three specification, namely *qd*, the *si* variable and finally the dative-number specifications *-is*. Our discussion suggests that it is because the *-s* plural property independently admits of a discontinuous interpretation with the *si* variable, over which it scopes, that the *-i* dative property also does. Indeed the pattern in (34) appears to require a dative plural – in other words, it is not attested (in our data) with a dative singular.

(35) *Paulilätino*

[<sub>Q</sub> si [[<sub>Q</sub>qd]<sub>[N i]</sub>] [<sub>Q</sub> s]]

In short, despite the surface similarity, the patterns in (32) and (35) turn out to be quite different. In effect (32) preserves all crucial properties of the accusative, while allowing the dative to be read from the free variable *si* and the definiteness morphology *d̥d̥* in whose scope it is. On the contrary (35) is analyzed as what it appears to be *prima facie* – i.e. a cluster where the dative morphology is fully lexicalized (in the way described) while the accusative is simply implicated by the *d̥d̥* definiteness base. These differences are reflected in the different patterns of perfect participle agreement. Thus in (34) the participle not only excludes the dative morphology *-i* but does not agree with the *d̥dis* clitic at all, not even with respect to the plural *-s* morphology – rather its ending corresponds to the nominal class (gender) specifications of the (first) internal argument.

Let us now consider how data of the type in (34) could be dealt with by Distributed Morphology. Adjunction of the plural feature to the clitic cluster à la Harris (1994) cannot simply be extended to the dative feature. For, this would inevitably depend on impoverishing the accusative feature which is contradictory with the dative one; but by this impoverishment we would obtain a feature matrix itself capable of being lexicalized only by the default of the system *si*. A possible alternative is of course that in the relevant examples only the accusative clitic is impoverished and hence lexicalized by *si*, while the dative clitic receives its full lexicalization. However it seems to us that under such an hypothesis one would expect to find independent attestations of the lexicalization of an impoverished accusative by *si* or by other defaults – which is definitely not the case.

Another possible account of data of the type in (34) is suggested by Kayne (2006), who quotes an example of the type of (34) with the locative in the place of *si* (his example is from Jones [1993]; systematic data can be found in Manzini – Savoia [2005]). As we reconstruct it, Kayne's (2006) analysis is that in (34) and the like the object clitic is simply empty, while the *si* (or locative) clitic and the dative clitic together lexicalize the dative. Note that Kayne's (2006) analysis presupposes one of the conclusions that we have been arguing for here – namely that suppletive clitics (*si*, locative, etc.) are not defaults, but instantiate properties that concur to the lexicalization of the clitic string. In other respects the present theory and Kayne's (2006) differ; in particular we reject the idea that there are empty clitics (Manzini – Savoia [to appear]; Savoia – Manzini [to appear]) – a point that is beyond the scope of the present paper. What is directly relevant is that the account prospected by Kayne (2006) predicts that patterns like (34) should be able to surface in any language which has suppletive *si*, or suppletive locative, etc. – which again is clearly not the case. In other words the pattern in (34) connects with the presence in a language of plural *-s* morphology (for the dative) and of parasitic plurals and an adequate analysis should reflect this fact.

## 5. Parasitic plurals and more: subject clitics

Friulan varieties preserve the Latin plural in *-s*, like Spanish and Sardinian ones, but unlike those also have subject clitics. The basic form of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject clitic paradigm in a variety like *Forni di Sotto* is shown in (36a), while (36a') shows the basic form of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person accusative clitic paradigm. As shown in (36b-c) the *-s* morphology of the feminine plural subject clitic can show up after an object clitic, including both a 1<sup>st</sup> person clitic like *mi* in (36 b-b') and an *l* clitic, like *li* in (36c) – either copied as in (36b') or simply displaced as in (36b)-(36c). Similarly the *-s* morphology can appear to the left and to the right of the negative clitic, as in (36d).

- (36) *Forni di Sotto* (Friuli)
- a.     al/     a/     ai/     as     du'ar  
        he/ she/ they.m/ they.f     sleep  
        'S/he sleeps/ They sleep'
- a'.    i       tu     li/     la/     i/     las     klames  
        ClS   you   him/ her/ them.m/ them.f     call  
        'You call him/her/ them'
- b.     a       mi     s       daŋ   kist  
        she   me   pl.   give   this  
        'They give me this'
- b'.    az     mi     z       klame  
        they.f me   pl     call  
        'They call me'
- c.     a       li     z       klame  
        she   me   pl     call  
        'They call me'
- d.     as     nɔ     s       du'ar  
        they.f not   pl     sleep  
        'They don't sleep'

One aspect of the data in (36) is worth emphasizing immediately, namely that in the case of *Forni* the copying and displacement of the *-s* morphology does not depend on the cooccurrence with a suppletion phenomenon, as in the case of Spurious *se*. In other words, it doesn't depend on the feminine plural subject clitic being substituted by a default clitic. Because of this, there is no technical impossibility in deriving these examples through partial reduplication *à la* Halle – Harris

(2005). It is evident on the other hand that such a derivation would separate the phenomenon under discussion from the parasitic plurals of Spanish and Sardinian, which would be accounted for in a different component of grammar – i.e. Morphological Structure. In the absence of arguments in its favor, this separation must surely count as yet another reason not to adopt a ‘metathesis’ account.

A second notable property of the variety of *Forni* is that not only the plural *-s* but also the *l* definiteness base of the masculine singular has the distribution just illustrated. Thus *l* can be copied as in (37a’) or displaced as in (37a) after non-*l* clitics or it can show up after the negation, as in (37b). It will be noted that (37) does not replicate (36) in one important respect – namely that *l* does not appear after an accusative clitic of the *l* (3<sup>rd</sup> person) series. In fact *Forni* does not allow us to verify whether such a sequence is possible, simply because an accusative clitic of the *l* series excludes the nominative *l* clitic altogether as discussed in detail by Manzini – Savoia (2004b; 2007) for many Northern Italian dialects.

(37) *Forni di Sotto*

- |     |     |                      |    |        |      |
|-----|-----|----------------------|----|--------|------|
| a.  | a   | mi/ tʃi/ si/ vi      | l  | klame  |      |
|     | CIS | me/ you/ us/you.pl   | he | calls  |      |
|     |     | ‘He calls me/you/us’ |    |        |      |
| a’. | al  | mi                   | l  | da     | kist |
|     | he  | me                   | he | gives  | this |
|     |     | ‘He gives me this’   |    |        |      |
| b.  | a   | nɔ                   | l  | du'ar  |      |
|     | CIS | not                  | he | sleeps |      |
|     |     | ‘He doesn't sleep’   |    |        |      |

Remembering the discussion of the parasitic plural of Sardinian varieties in the previous section, we may wonder whether the repositioning of the plural morpheme or of other subject clitic morphology after the object string has consequences on perfect participle agreement. The data in (38a) display the agreement paradigm of the *Forni* participle with the feminine accusative clitic. Example (38b) shows that the displacement of the *-s* plural ending of the feminine does not trigger feminine plural agreement on the perfect participle; the latter simply shows up in the uninflected form corresponding to the presence of a 1st/2nd person internal argument.

(38) *Forni di Sotto*

- |    |    |                   |     |                     |
|----|----|-------------------|-----|---------------------|
| a. | a  | l/ laz            | a   | klamade/ klamades   |
|    | he | her/them.f        | has | called.f/called.fpl |
|    |    | ‘S/he called her’ |     |                     |

- b. keʃ femines a mi z aŋ kla'mat  
those women CIS me fpl have called  
'Those women called me'

We may usefully begin our analysis of *Forni* with negative clitic examples like (36d) or (37b), where syntactic analyses are available not only from Manzini – Savoia (2005); Manzini (2008) but also from the completely independent work of Poletto (2000). Despite their differences, these works agree on the conclusion that where the negative clitic appears between two subject clitics, the latter lexicalize two different subject clitic positions available in the sentence. On this basis, we assume that in (36d) the *as* clitic and its partial copy *-s* occupy a higher and a lower D position respectively, as in (39a). A version of the same structure can be adopted for (37b), where the *l* morpheme is involved, and it is displaced rather than copied, as in (39b).

(39) *Forni di Sotto*

- a. [D as [nɔ [D s [I duar  
b. [D a [nɔ [D l [I duar

If the structure of the negative examples is as in (39), then the account that suggests itself for the other examples in (36)-(37) has the two copies of the subject clitic material generated again in the higher and lower D positions respectively. Any object clitic appears between the two copies of the subject clitic, yielding structure like (40) for the copying and stranding case alike. Note that the P label for the 1st person clitic *mi* is simply intended to suggest P(erson), or participant in the discourse (Manzini – Savoia [2007]).

(40) *Forni di Sotto*

- a. [D a(s) [P mi [D s [klame  
b. [D a(l) [P mi [D l [da

The analysis in (40) correctly predicts that perfect participle agreement will not be conditioned by the presence of subject clitic material, say the (feminine) plural *-s*, adjacent to an object clitic. For, structurally speaking, the subject clitic material is stranded in an independent subject clitic position. By contrast, the *-s* plural morphology agreeing with the perfect participle in the parasitic plural of Sardinian varieties is embedded inside the accusative clitic, as in (32). In other words, in the Sardinian case, the surface configuration includes what is a *bona fide* accusative plural clitic, for instance in (32) – while of course this is not true of the sequences *mi-s* or *li-s* or *mi-l* of *Forni* in (40). Suppose that Distributed Morphology tried to account for the Friulan data

through some version of the ‘adjunction’ analysis of Spanish/ Sardinian parasitic plurals. In this case, adjunction would involve not only the feature ‘plural’ eventually lexicalized through the *-s* morphology, but also some feature or feature cluster lexicalized through *-l*. The crucial question is whether a morphological-level treatment could make the right distinction in constituent structure between the Spanish/ Sardinian and the Friulan case – keeping in mind that the empirical difference in perfect participle agreements depend on this.

In fact, the Sardinian parasitic plurals in section 4 and the phenomena at hand configures a contrast similar to that observed between *Soazza* in section 2 – where in the present analysis the mobile *n* morphology occupies an autonomous slot in the clitic sequence – and *Soglio* in section 3, where the mobile *n* morphology is clitic internal. We capture both contrasts through the same constituency mechanisms – providing some evidence that the very same lexical material can attach either at what is conventionally treated as the syntax (*Soazza*, *Forni*) or the morphology (*Soglio*, *Paulilâtino*). Note that it would be useless for a Distributed Morphology treatment of Sardinian to retreat into saying that the plural property de-linked from the impoverished dative is relinked to the accusative clitic (à la Bonet [1995]). For, this could yield a different constituency for Sardinian and Friulan – but too late in the derivation for agreement to take it into account, since agreement as a core syntactic process precedes morphological readjustment in minimalist/ Distributed Morphology architectures. This problem does not affect the present account precisely because we assume a unified morphosyntax.

## 5. Conclusions

In what precedes we have tried to show that infixation and copying of clitic material are not ‘curious idiosyncratic phenomena of Spanish varieties’ (Halle – Harris [2005]), but actually show up in several different domains and languages within the Romance fold. In fact it is possible that some degree of mobility of, say, the plural *-s* morphology is the normal state of affairs for Romance languages that have it (for recent evidence on French, see Starke [2008]). Though we are aware that superficially similar phenomena can correspond to different schemas of explanation, the burden of proof is on theories such as Halle – Harris’s (2005) that imply that a different treatment must exist. We also do not believe that Halle – Harris (2005) provide a ‘new theoretical framework’, since many of the characteristics of their system are those that have dominated morphological analyses in the past. The basic approach is the same as in Distributed Morphology – namely one in which the morpho(phono)logical component ends up manipulating primitives that are extraneous to it and only find a justification at the syntactic LF interface. We would surmise that it is the present approach that contains true elements of novelty. In particular, we propose that the traditional connection of morphology to phonology should give way to the recognition that morphological-level phenomena may be best treated by a unification of morphology with syntax. The present



theory needs neither Impoverishment nor Late Insertion – nor even more basically, notions of underspecification and default. Not only such devices are unnecessary, but if we are correct, they actually obscure the overall empirical pattern rather than helping in its explanation.

It is true that an overall generalization of a prosodic nature appears to hold of all of the phenomena that we have dealt with, namely that they involve prosodically weak material. But this is simply due to the fact that any phrasal ‘metathesis’ would be automatically dealt with under the heading of ‘movement’. In fact, what we have proposed here is precisely an extension of the ‘movement’ treatment to the morphology. As for copying, it typically involves partial copies. Thus phrasal material will not be entirely duplicated but its copies will show up as pronominal and other reduced material, hence as clitics and the like. Again the true nature of the generalization is non-prosodic.

Maria Rita Manzini

Università degli Studi di Firenze

Dipartimento di Linguistica

Piazza Brunelleschi, 4

I – 50121 Firenze

[mariarita.manzini@unifi.it](mailto:mariarita.manzini@unifi.it)

Leonardo Maria Savoia

Università degli Studi di Firenze

Dipartimento di Linguistica

Piazza Brunelleschi, 4

I – 50121 Firenze

[lsavoia@unifi.it](mailto:lsavoia@unifi.it)

## References

- Ascoli, G.I. (1873) Saggi ladini. In *Archivio glottologico italiano*. 1. 1-556.
- Bonet, E. (1995) Feature structure of Romance clitics. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. 13. 607-47
- Brody, M. (2003). *Towards an elegant syntax*. London. Routledge.
- Burzio, L. (1986). *Italian syntax*. Dordrecht. Kluwer.
- Cardinaletti, A., Starke, M. (1999) The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of three classes of pronouns. In van Riemsdijk, H. (ed.) *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter. 145-233.
- Chierchia, G. (1995) Impersonal Subjects. In Bach, E., Jelinek, E., Kratz, A., Partee, B.H. (eds.) *Quantification in natural languages*. Dordrecht. Kluwer. 107-14.
- Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA. MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2000) Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Martin, R., Michaels, D., Uriagereka, J. (eds.) *Step by Step*. Cambridge, MA. MIT Press. 89-155.
- Halle, M., Harris, J. (2005) Unexpected plural inflections in Spanish: Reduplication and Metathesis. In *Linguistic Inquiry*. 36. 195-222.
- Halle, M., Marantz, A. (1993). Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In Hale, K., Keyser, S.J. (eds.) *The view from Building 20*. Cambridge, MA. MIT Press. 111-76.
- Halle, M., Marantz, A. (1994) Some Key Features of Distributed Morphology. In Carnie, A., Harley, H., Bures, T. (eds.) *Papers on Phonology and Morphology, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*. 21. 275-88.
- Harris, J.W. (1994). The syntax-phonology mapping in Catalan and Spanish clitics. In *Papers on Phonology and Morphology, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*. 21. 321-53.

Higginbotham, J. (1985) On semantics. In *Linguistic Inquiry*. 16/4. 547-93.

Jones (1993) *Sardinian Syntax*. London. Routledge.

Kayne, R.S. (2006) Expletives, Datives and the Tension between Morphology and Syntax. In <http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/lingu/people/faculty/kayne/papers/Kayne1006Expletives.pdf>

Manzini, M.R. (1986) On Italian *si*. In Borer, H. (ed.) *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics, Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. XVIII. New York. Academic Press. 241-62.

Manzini, M.R. (2008) Doubling by clitics and doubling of clitics: The case of negation. In Barbiers, S. (ed.) *Syntactic Doubling in European Dialects (Syntax and Semantics)*. Amsterdam. Emerald Group Publishers. 69-102.

Manzini, M.R., Savoia, L.M. (1999) The syntax of middle-reflexive and object clitics: a case of parametrization in arbëresh dialects. In Mandalà, M. (ed.) *Studi in onore di Luigi Marlekaj*. Bari. Adriatica. 283-328.

Manzini, M.R., Savoia, L.M. (2002). Clitics: Lexicalization patterns of the so-called 3rd person dative. In *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*. 1. 117-55.

Manzini, M.R., Savoia, L.M., (2004a) The nature of the agreement inflections of the verb. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*. 47. 149-78.

Manzini, M.R., Savoia, L.M. (2004b) Clitics: Cooccurrence and mutual exclusion patterns. In Rizzi, L. (ed.) *The structure of CP and IP*. Oxford. Oxford University Press. 211-50.

Manzini, M.R., Savoia, L.M. (2005). *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*. 3 Vols. Alessandria. Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manzini, M.R., Savoia L.M. (2007) *A unification of morphology and syntax. Studies in Romance and Albanian varieties*. London. Routledge.

Manzini, M.R., Savoia, L.M. (2008a) *Worknotes on Romance morphosyntax – Appunti di morfosintassi romanza*. Alessandria. Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manzini, M.R., Savoia L.M. (2008b). Uninterpretable features are incompatible in morphology with other minimalist postulates. In Freidin, R., Otero, C., Zubizarreta, M.L. (eds.) *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*. Cambridge, MA. MIT Press. 43-72.

Manzini, M.R., Savoia L.M. (to appear) Syncretism and suppletivism in clitic systems: underspecification, silent clitics or neither? In D'Alessandro, R., Ledgeway, A., Roberts, I. (eds.) *Syntactic variation: The dialects of Italy*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Marantz, A. (1997) No Escape from Syntax: Don't Try Morphological Analysis in the Privacy of Your Own Lexicon. In Dimitriadis, A., Siegel, L. *et al.* (eds.) *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*. Vol. 4.2. 201-25.

Poletto, C. (2000) *The Higher Functional Field*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Rizzi, L. (1997) The fine structure of the left periphery. In Haegeman, L. (ed.) *Elements of grammar*. Dordrecht. Kluwer. 281-337.

Rohlf, G. (1968) *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Morfologia*. Vol. II. Torino Einaudi (ed. or. [1949] Bern. Francke).

Salvioni, C. (1902) Il plurale del femminili di 1° declinazione esposto per –a ed –an in qualche varietà alpina di Lombardia. In *Rendiconti del reale Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere*. Serie II. 35/851. 905-19.

Savoia L., Manzini M.R. (to appear) Lexicalization of 3rd person object clitics: clitic enclisis and clitic drop. In D'Alessandro, R., Ledgeway, A., Roberts, I. (eds.) *Syntactic variation: The dialects of Italy*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Sganzini S. (1933) Di alcune forme verbali nella parlata di Mesocco. In *L'Italia dialettale*. 9. 259-63.

Starke, M. (2008) *Spurious* se. Tarald Taraldsen Celebratory Workshop (June 9-10). Tromsø. University of Tromsø.