When the SCl is an object clitic and vice-versa
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1 Introduction

Subject Clitics (SCls)—like *la* exemplified in (1)—are one of the most distinctive characteristics of North Italian Dialects (NIDs) and have been the topic of an ongoing discussion for the past 2 decades at least (see Benincà and Vanelli (1982; 1994), Renzi and Vanelli (1982), Brandi and Cordin (1981; 1986), Rizzi (1986), Poletto (1993; 1998; 2000), Roberts (1993), Manzini and Savoia (1998; 2004; 2005), Cardinaletti and Repetti (2004), De Crousaz and Shlonsky (2003)).

(1) La Maria la vegn
the Mary SCl-3.SG.FEM comes-3.SG
'Mary comes'

The two main approaches that have been developed for SCls can be summarized as follows. On the one hand, we have the approach according to which SCls are inflectional morphology (Brandi and Cordin (1981; 1986) and Rizzi (1986)). According to this view, SCls are an Agreement-like head that is merged higher than the verb. Their role is thus to identify the Phi-feature of *pro* (NIDs being *pro*-drop languages).

1As largely discussed in the literature (Benincà and Vanelli (1982), Rizzi (1986), a.o.), a SCl that co-occurs with an overt DP does not necessarily indicate that the subject DP is dislocated. In fact, in Bellinzonese, a 3rd person DP requires the SCl (i).

(i) La Maria *(la) vegn
the Mary SCl-3.SG.FEM comes-3.SG
'Mary comes'
On the other hand, we find the approach developed in Benincà and Vanelli (1982; 1994) and Poletto (2000) who analyze SCls as independent functional heads each occupying a distinct position within the functional field of the IP. Crucially, according to Benincà and Vanelli (1982; 1994) and Poletto (2000), SCls are not strictly speaking part of the inflectional morphology although a strong relationship between them and pro is preserved.

The notion of (subject) clitic that I will adopt in this paper is the notion found in Benincà and Vanelli (1982), according to which a clitic is an atonic element that has a fixed position in the sentence hierarchy. In modern Romance languages, a clitic always forms a unit with the verb, hence the impossibility of having anything intervene between the SCI and the verb (2).  

\[
\text{(2) La Maria \ la (*incôô/*cun al Gianni/...) vegn} \\
\text{the Mary \ SCI-3.SG.FEM \ today \ with the John \ comes-3.SG} \\
\text{‘Mary comes’}
\]

1.1 The problem

The problem the present paper deals with is twofold. On the one hand, it will supply an analysis for 3rd person SCls in Bellinzonese, where the series of 3rd person SCls is identical to the series of 3rd person object clitics; except for u, which can only be a SCI (see Table I).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>III.masc</th>
<th>III.fem</th>
<th>III.pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>l/u</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, this paper will explain why 3rd person masculine l cannot co-occur with any of the 3rd person object clitics, while u can.

\[
\text{(3) Al Gianni \ *l/^u \ la / \ l/ \ Cl-3.MASC.SG Cl-3.MASC.ACC Cl-3.FEM.ACC} \\
\text{the Gianni \ SCI-3.MASC.SG \ today \ to the John \ give-1.SG \ a book} \\
\text{‘John smells it/Them’}
\]

As we will see later on, the same holds for preverbal object clitics which do not allow anything but another clitic to intervene between them and the verb (i).

(i) a. A ga (*incôô/*a la Maria/...) dó un libro \\
SCI Cl-DAT today to the John give-1.SG a book \\
‘I give to him/her/them a book’

b. A ga l dó un libro \\
SCI Cl-DAT Cl-ACC give-1.SG a book \\
‘I give it to him/her/them’
(4) and (5) show that 3rd person feminine singular SCl la and 3rd plural SCl i are also perfectly compatible with any object clitic.

(4)  
L’ Adelina la / la /  
the Adelina SCl-3.FEM.SG Cl-3.MASC.ACC Cl-3.FEM.ACC  
i Cl-3.PL.ACC smells  
‘Adelina smells it/them’

(5)  
I tusan i / la /  
the girls SCl-3.PL Cl-3.MASC.ACC Cl-3.FEM.ACC  
i Cl-3.PL.ACC smell  
‘The girls smell it/them’

As I will show in the remainder of the paper, the explanation for the incompatibility of 3rd person masculine SCl l with 3rd person object clitics is morpho-syntactic.

2 The claim

I argue that 3rd person masculine singular SCl l is not a person SCl (see also Kayne (2000)) like in Poletto (2000) but rather belongs to a new category absent in Poletto (2000): l is a determiner subject/object clitic (see Kayne (2000)). It does not have a gender or a Kase feature. I propose that l encodes a deictic feature (here deictic is to be intended à la Poletto (2000) and à la Benincà and Poletto (2005)). More precisely, l encodes a [+ distal] (à la Benincà and Poletto (2005)) feature. The deictic feature must be checked against the relevant projection ([Distal]P).

I further argue that the incompatibility between 3rd person masculine SCl l and 3rd person object clitics stems from the fact that SCl l is the same exact morpheme that constitutes 3rd person object clitics. More precisely, I propose that object clitics merely consist of l. The gender and number agreement are acquired through movement. Since l is the same morpheme that constitutes 3rd person masculine SCl and object clitics, it is then not surprising that we cannot have more than one l per clause: the projection where l can check its feature is only one.

Finally, I argue that SCl la and i are of a different nature from the 3rd person masculine SCl. SCl la and i actually consist of la—which I argue is a gender person SCl—and plain i—which I maintain is a number person SCl.

3.1 **Poletto (2000) and 4 different types of SCl**

In this paper, I take Poletto's (2000) classification for NIDs SCls as the starting point for my classification of Bellinzonese SCls.

Poletto (2000) identifies 4 different types of SCls, which are all syntactically and morphologically distinct: *invariable* clitics, *deictic* clitics, *person* clitics, and *number* clitics. According to Poletto (2000), each type of SCl corresponds to a specific structural position: two within the Agreement field of the IP (*person* and *number* SCls) and two in the CP area (*invariable* and *deictic* SCls). More precisely, considering their different distribution, Poletto (2000) proposes that the four different types of SCls are merged as functional heads in different structural positions of the functional field within which they are able to move to some extent. On the one hand, invariable and deictic SCls precede pre-verbal negative markers and are said to occupy two specifier positions in the CP layer. On the other hand, person and number SCls follow negative markers. Poletto (2000) considers such elements as proper inflectional elements occupying two heads within the inflectional domain. Poletto’s (2000) structure is given in (6).

(6)  \[
\begin{array}{l}
LDP \text{ inv SCL} \{CP \text{ deic SCL} [FocP t; \{IP [NegP [Numb SCL [Hearer SCL [Speaker inflV [TP]]]]]]]]
\end{array}
\]

The *speaker* projection is where the inflected verb ends up and it is argued to be the projection that syntactically encodes the [+- speaker] distinction. Poletto argues for the existence of such projection because some NIDs (see Brandi and Cordin (1986)) show and eclitic 1st person SCl.

Let us now consider the four types of SCls proposed by Poletto (2000). *Invariable* SCls do not encode any subject information at all—they have the same form for all persons (Poletto (2000): 12).

This kind of clitic always precedes the strong preverbal negative marker (7), can co-occur with *person* and *number* SCls (8), it must cluster with the complementizer (9), and is optional in the second conjunct of VP-coordinated constructions (Type 1 Coordination) (10).

(7)  \[
\text{A no vegno SCl not come 'I do not come'}
\]  (Poletto (2000): 18 (15a))

(8)  \[
\begin{array}{l}
a. \text{ A te vien SCl SCl come 'You come'}
\end{array}
\]  (Poletto (2000): 20 (21b))

---

3 The only possible way the complementizer can cluster with the SCl is via adjunction (*à la* Kayne (1975, onwards)).
b. A la vien
   SCI SCI comes
   ‘She is coming’
   (Poletto (2000): 20 (23a))

c. A i vien
   SCI SCI come
   ‘They are coming’
   (Poletto (2000): 20 (23b))

(9) a. Ara ch’a vegno
    look that + SCI come
    ‘Look, I am coming’

b. * Ara che a vegno
   (Poletto (2000): 21 (26a) – (26b))

(10) A canto co ti e balo co lu
    SCI sing with you and dance with him
    ‘I sing with you and dance with him’
    (Poletto (2000): 24 (36))

Since this type of co-ordination involves the highest part of the sentence, the fact that the SCI
can be omitted in the second conjunct suggests that invariable clitics are in the CP-layer, in a
position distinct from the position occupied by other SCls. Poletto follows Benincà (1983) and
argues that invariable SCls express “a theme/rheme distinction” (Poletto (2000): 23) and
occupy a topical position. Derivationally, Poletto postulates that invariable SCLs reach their
landing position passing through C° and Foc°. This allows her to structurally exclude their co-
ocurrence with focalized and left-dislocated elements. This “amounts to admitting that the
invariable SCL is a sort of expletive for LDP, FocusP, and interrogative CP” (Poletto (2000):
24).

Deictic SCls are clitics that are sensitive to the distinction “between the deictic persons who
are present in a conversation (first and second person) with respect to those who are absent
(third person). This class of SCls does not encode any singular versus plural distinction […]”

Deictic SCls always precede the strong preverbal negative marker (11), can co-occur with
person and number SCls (12), they must cluster with the complementizer (13), are not optional
in Type1 Coordination (14), are not related to a theme/rheme distinction and can co-occur with
dislocated elements (15), they are compatible only with some wh-words (16).

(11) a. No so sa vegno
    not know if + SCI come
    ‘I do not know whether I will come’
(12) a. It manges
   SCI SCI eat
   ‘You eat’

b. A la ven
   SCI SCI comes
   ‘She comes’

(Poletto (2000): 20 (24a-b))

(13) * No so se a vegno

(Poletto (2000): 21 (26c-d))

(14) * I cianti cun ti e bali cun lui
    SCI sing with you and dance with him

(Poletto (2000): 26 (42b))

(15) A ciasa o soi già laat
    at home SCI am already been
    ‘I have already been at home’

(Poletto (2000): 26 (41))

(16) a. Do (*a) vanu?
    where SCI go + they
    ‘Where are they going?’

b. Quant *(i) mangi-tu?
    when SCI eat + you
    ‘When are you eating?’

(Poletto (2000): 25 (38b), (39a))

Person SCls are only present for 2nd and 3rd person singular and only encode person features and have the form illustrated in Table IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table IV</th>
<th>Isg</th>
<th>IIsg</th>
<th>IIIsg.masc</th>
<th>Ipl</th>
<th>IIpl</th>
<th>IIIpl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>t+V</td>
<td>V+l</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This type of SCI encodes a [+/- hearer] distinction: “the 2nd person is the marked form specified as [+ hearer], and the third-person singular masculine is the unmarked form of the opposition and is specified [- hearer]” (Poletto (2000): 14). Notice that only 3rd person singular masculine is a person SCI.

Number SCls usually consist of a consonant plus a vowel. This clitic encodes a [- hearer] feature but also a number and a gender feature (Poletto (2000): 14). Here, only 3rd person feminine singular is present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table V</th>
<th>Isg</th>
<th>IIsg</th>
<th>IIIsg.fem</th>
<th>Ipl</th>
<th>IIpl</th>
<th>IIIpl.masc/fem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>l+a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(l)+i/l+e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of number clitic is illustrated here in (17) with Venetian.
(17) a. La \textit{magna} SCl-\textsc{numb}.fem eats ‘She eats’

b. I \textit{magna} SCl-\textsc{numb}.masc.pl eat ‘They eat’

c. Le \textit{magna} SCl-\textsc{numb}.fem.pl eat ‘They eat’

(Poletto (2000): 14 (7))

\textit{Person} and \textit{number} SCls always follow the strong preverbal marker (18), cannot co-occur with each other, they might cluster with the complementizer (19), cannot be omitted in Type1 Coordination (20).

(18) a. No ti \textit{vien} not SCl come ‘You do not come’

b. No la \textit{vien} not SCl come ‘She does not come’

(Poletto (2000): 19 (18))

(19) a. Ara che el \textit{vien} look that SCl comes ‘Look, he is coming’

b. Ara ch’el \textit{vien} (Poletto (2000): 21 (27))

(20) a. * La \textit{magna patate e beve vin} SCL eats potatoes and drinks wine ‘She eats potatoes and drinks wine’

b. * Ti \textit{magni patate e bevi vin}. SCL eat potatoes and drink wine ‘You eat potatoes and drink wine’

(Poletto (2000): 27 (47))

In order to determine whether these two clitics occupy the same position, Poletto (2000) considers them in another environment of coordination: “the same verb coordinated with a different prefix or tense with a shared object” (Poletto (2000): 18). By considering this kind of coordination, the author is able to determine that whereas \textit{number} SCls can be omitted in the coordinated conjunct, \textit{person} SCls can in no case be omitted (21) and (22).

(21) * Ti \textit{lesi e rilesi sempre el stesso libro}. SCL read and reread always the same ‘You read and reread always the same book’.
La lese e rilese sempre el stesso libro.
SCL reads and rereads always the same book
‘She reads and rereads always the same book’.

(Poletto (2000): 28 (48a) and (50))

Poletto (2000) who points out that in Paduan person SCLs can be omitted (23) and claims that (21) just shows that Paduan person SCls are able to climb within the functional field in Coordination3.

Te lesi e rilexi sempre el stesso libro.
SCL read and reread always the same book
‘You read and reread always the same book’. (Poletto (2000): 29 (52))

3.2 Bellinzonese's ऐ is not a person SCl

Poletto (2000) argues that Venetian (a)l like 2nd person te are person SCls. Now, it is true that in Bellinzonese, 2nd person singular te and 3rd person masculine singular (a)l have the typical form (t + V; (V +) l) of Poletto (2000) person SCls and also share the same distributional properties. In (24) and (25), in fact, we see that te and al cannot be omitted in Type1 Coordination (24a) and (25a) nor in Type3 coordination (24b) and (25b).

4 There are good reasons to believe that both vowels constituting the two SCls are epenthetic (see Vanelli (1992) and Poletto ((2000): Ch1: fn2), and see also Cardinaletti and Repetti (2004), Chinellato (2005), and Cattaneo (to appear)).

5 Negation cannot be used as a criterion in Bellinzonese since in this language negation is only postverbal. In the specific case, incorporation into the complementizer is also not testable.

6 Belletti (2004), in fact, proposes that the left periphery of the high phase (CP) and the periphery of the lower vP are identical. In other words, the high (external) and the low (internal) periphery both come with a (set of ) TopicP followed by a FocusP. Not only, but Belletti maintains that her proposal can also be extended to the other phase, namely the DP (see also Jayaseelan 2001, Poletto 2005). Belletti (2001; 2004) points out that “Chomsky (2000) has singled out CP and VP as ‘(strong) phases’ [… (i.e syntactic units which share a certain amount of independence and which are the domain of syntactic operations […]’]. (Belletti (2004): 4). According to Belletti (2001; 2004), CP and VP are parallel in that VP has a CP-like periphery. Hence, the proposal that:

"the area immediately above VP displays a significant resemblance with the left periphery of the clause. In particular, a clause internal Focus position, surrounded by Topic positions, is identified in the low part of the clause (see also Brody (1990) and the references quoted above. For a first formulation of a similar proposal assuming the presence of a clause internal focus position see Belletti & Shlonsky (1995); see also Ndayiragije (1999), Jayaseelan (2001))’ (Belletti (2004): 3)
SCI eat and drink all a day  
‘He eats and he drinks the whole day’
b. * Al lecc e rilecc sempru la sctesa puesia.  
SCI reads and rereads always the same poem  
‘He always reads and rereads the same poem’

In (26), we see that al can optionally incorporate into the complementizer. If a is absent, l—which needs a nucleus—must incorporate into the complementizer. In (26b), what incorporates into the complementizer is $a + l$.

(26) a. Pensiche(*a)lvegnmia.  
think that SCI comes not  
‘I think that he is not coming’.
b. Pensich*'((a)lvegnmia

I believe that Poletto (2000) is correct in saying that 2nd person te is a person SCI. I argue that te is generated within the “big DP”, raises to AddresseeP and ends up in KP to check its nominative Kase feature. As for l, however, I maintain that Benveniste (1966) and Kayne (2000) are correct in arguing that the so called 3rd person l is not a person clitic. In particular, I follow Anagnostopoulou (2007) and I maintain that “1st, 2nd and reflexive pronouns are [+person] pronouns (Bonet 1991, 1995, Taraldsen 1995, Ritter 1995, Kayne 2000), while [...] Accusative-nominative/direct object 3rd person pronouns lack person features altogether, they are ‘determiner pronouns’ (Benveniste 1966, Postal 1966, Silverstein 1986, Bonet 1991, Johns 1993, Taraldsen 1995, Ritter 1995 and Kayne 2000 among many others). [...] On the other hand, 3rd person direct object pronouns are neither [+person] nor [–person], they simply lack person (Anagnostopoulou (2007): 4). As such, I argue that masculine object clitic l is not a person SCI but rather a determiner SCI with no person feature. I will show that SCI l also does not check Kase.

The fact that I argue that te and (a)l belong to different categories seems to be at odds with the fact that that the two SCls pattern in a similar way with respect to coordination. Poletto’s (2000) analysis proposed that the position (the same in her analysis) occupied by the SCls is too low to be eliminated in either Coordination 1 or 3. My proposal is somewhat very similar to Poletto’s original proposal. I argue that the Addressee projection reached by the person SCI te as well as DeicticP reached by l are both too low to be deleted in coordination configuration. This amounts to saying that in the second conjunct of a coordination structure the person SCI does not check nominative Kase.

4  *l…l, *l…la, *l…i: The Explanation

Recall that l cannot co-occur with any of the 3rd person object clitics, whereas 3rd person masculine u, feminine singular SCI la, and 3rd plural SCI i are compatible with any object clitic.
(27)  a. * Al Gianni l l/ la / i the Gianni SCI-3.MASC.SG Cl-3.MASC.ACC Cl-3.FEM.ACC Cl-3.PL.ACC
    udura
    smells
    ‘John smells it/them’

    b. Al Gianni u l/ la / i the Gianni SCI-3.MASC.SG Cl-3.MASC.ACC Cl-3.FEM.ACC Cl-3.PL.ACC
    udura
    smell-3.SG
    ‘John smells it/them’

    c. La Gianna la l/ la / i the Gianna SCI-3.FEM.SG Cl-3.MASC.ACC Cl-3.FEM.ACC Cl-3.PL.ACC
    udura
    smell-3.SG
    ‘Joan smells it/them’

    d. I fiöö i l/ la / i the guys SCI-3.PL Cl-3.MASC.ACC Cl-3.FEM.ACC Cl-3.PL.ACC
    udura
    smell-3.PL
    ‘The guys smell it/them’

The incompatibility illustrated in (27a) holds if a dative clitic is present (28) but not in a restructuring context (29) (thanks to J. Garzonio for drawing my attention to this fact). 7 (28) and (29) are perfectly well-formed if SCls la and i are substituted.

(28)  a. Al Gianni *l/ak u ga l lecc, al libru (.al Mario) the Gianni SCI Cl-DAT Cl-ACC reads, the book to.the Mario
    ‘He reads it, the book (to Mario)’

    b. Al Gianni *l/ak u ga la lecc, la riviscta (.al Mario) the Gianni SCI Cl-DAT Cl-ACC reads, the magazine to.the Mario
    ‘He reads it, the magazine (to Mario)’

    c. Al Gianni *l/ak u ga i lecc, i libri (.al Mario) the Gianni SCI Cl-DAT Cl-ACC reads, the book to.the Mario
    ‘He reads it, the books (to Mario)’

(29)  L/U dev töl SCI must-3-SG to.buy-Cl.ACC
    ‘He must buy it’

7 In Cattaneo (2008), I stated that (a)i is illicit in a context like (57). After conducting more field-work, however, I came to the conclusion that (a)i is in reality acceptable in (57).
Finally, \textit{l} is ungrammatical with the partitive (30). Here, only \textit{u} is available (as well as \textit{la} and \textit{i} which I do not illustrate).

(30) \begin{tabular}{@{}l@{}}
Al Gianni *l’/\textit{a}k\textit{u} (a)n tō \\
the Gianni SCl Partitive buys
‘He buys of it/them’
\end{tabular}

The ungrammaticality of (30), also seems to indicate that Kase is not at issue in the interaction between subject and object clitics of 3\textsuperscript{rd} person (and of all persons more in general).

The data illustrated in (27) - (30) seem to suggest that SCl \textit{l} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} person OCl as well as the partitive compete for the same structural position. I argue that the incompatibility between 3rd person masculine SCl \textit{l} and 3rd person object clitics stems from the fact that 3rd person masculine singular SCl \textit{l} is the same morpheme that constitutes 3rd person object clitics. More precisely, I propose that object clitics merely consist of \textit{l}. The gender and number agreement are acquired through movement in the syntax.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Table VI} & \textbf{III.masc} & \textbf{III.fem} & \textbf{III.pl} \\
\hline
\textbf{Nom.} & \textit{l} & \textit{la} & \textit{i} \\
\hline
\textbf{Acc.} & \textit{l[Ø]}\text{MascAgr} & \textit{l[a/Ø]}\text{FemAgr} & \textit{L[i]}\text{NumAgr} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

In the case of the 3rd person masculine object clitic, I argue that we have a null masculine agreement morpheme. Also, the proposal summarized in Table VI leads me to conclude that 3\textsuperscript{rd} person plural object clitic also consists of \textit{l}—which, for reasons that I ignore, must be silent—whereas \textit{i} is the spell-out of the number agreement. The idea of a silent \textit{l} is obviously crucial for my theory to hold. As for the agreement on 3rd person feminine object clitic, it can be spelled out or no depending on the phonological environment, as (31) shows;

(31) \begin{enumerate}
  \item a. Gò ‘mmò una machina \\
       G-have again a car \\
       ‘I still have a car’
  \item b. G I*(\textit{a}) è mmò,(, la machina) \\
       G Cl-ACC.FEM.SG have.1sg again the car \\
       ‘I still have it, the car’
  \item c. L*(\textit{a}) g è mmò,(, la machina) \\
       Cl-ACC.FEM.SG G have.1sg again the car \\
       ‘I still have it, the car’
\end{enumerate}

The data in (31) seem to suggest that the realization of the feminine agreement is phonologically conditioned since \textit{a} is clearly prevented from being realized in a context like (31b) where its presence would entail the resyllabification of a superfluous nucleus.\footnote{Notice that, \textit{ceteris paribus}, for 3\textsuperscript{rd} person feminine singular, (31b) is favored in a situation where the context does not identify the clitic as being feminine.}

Now, since \textit{l} is the same morpheme that constitutes 3rd person masculine SCl and object clitics, it is then not surprising that we cannot have more than one \textit{l} per clause since the projection where \textit{l} can check its person feature is only one. This is why the SCl \textit{l} is
incompatible with 3rd person object clitic. This theory explains straightforwardly why in (27) \( l \) remains illicit and also makes some important prediction concerning the nature of restructuring contexts in Bellinzonese. The acceptability of (29) combined with my theory seems to point in the direction of a bi-clausal nature of modal contexts (contra Cinque (1999)). I will not take this further here, but I refer the reader to Cattaneo (to appear).

My analysis clearly raises questions about the nature of 3rd person feminine and 3rd person plural SCls \( la \) and \( i \). Despite what one could expect, I argue that SCI \( la \) and \( i \) are of a different nature from the 3rd person masculine SCI \( l \). I maintain that SCI \( la \) and \( i \) actually correspond to \( la \) and \( i \). \( La \) is a feminine gender clitic, that checks nominative Kase but has no person feature. \( l \) is a number SCI. It comes with no silent \( l \), checks a Kase feature and also does not have a person feature. That subject \( la \) and \( i \) are very different from SCI \( l \) and object clitics in general is clearly suggested by the data in (32) and (33).

(32) a. (A) \( l \) g ò ammò, al libru
SCI Cl\(_{sec}\) there have.1sg again the book
‘I still have it, the book’
b. (A) \( la \) g ò ammò, la machina
SCI Cl\(_{sec}\) there have.1sg again the car
‘I still have it, the car’
c. (A) \( i \) gh ò ammò, i libri
SCI Cl\(_{sec}\) there have.1sg again the books
‘I still have them, the books’

(33) a. A \( l \) udura
SCI SCI smells
‘He smells’
b. \* L udura
SCI smells
‘He smells’
c. \* A la udura
SCI SCI smells
‘She smells’
d. La udura
SCI smells
‘She smells’
e. \* A i udura
SCI SCI smell
‘They smell’
f. I udura
SCI smell
‘They smell’

\(^9\) My explanation is thus very different from the pro-drop account of similar facts that is given by Manzini and Savoia (1998).
The latter show that SCl $la$ and $i$ pattern differently from their object clitic counterparts: for example, only object clitics are all compatible with SCl $a$ (32). In the case of SCls (33), in fact, only $l$ is compatible with $a$. Although, I do not want to discuss the details here (see Cattaneo (to appear)), I maintain that $la$ and $i$ are incompatible with $a$ because they all end up in KP$_{nom}$, whereas $l$ does not (unless it is pied-piped by $a$).

4.1 What is a clitic?

I believe that any account put forward for SCls should also hold for object clitics and vice versa. I thus transpose Kayne’s (1975) idea that object clitics are generated as part of a DP along with their “associate” to SCls. More precisely, I espouse the notion of “big DP” introduced in Cecchetto (1999; 2000) and further developed in Belletti (2005; 2008). The idea of “big DP” was introduced by Cecchetto to account for CLLD in terms of a movement analysis. “According to this approach, CLLD involves a doubling movement derivation, starting out from an original big DP containing both the clitic and the dislocated phrase” (Belletti (2006): 129). The structure of the “big DP” is the one in (27).

$$[DP \ldots [XP Cl [DP]]]$$

Although I adopt the idea of “big DP”, I argue, contra Belletti (2005; 2008) and in harmony with Poletto (2006), that such DP is not particular to some languages, but rather that this structure is common to all languages and that the surface differences derive from the spell-out of different features. The fact that standard Italian, for example, does not have SCls, depends on the fact that it does not spell out the feature (Speaker, Addressee, etc.) that is spelled out by the SCl in other languages. From this perspective, the SCl does not have to play any role in licensing or identifying pro. I assume that the SCl does not identify pro, nor, contra DeCrousaz and Shlonsky (2003), that the SCl formal licenses pro. The SCl is present because it spells-out a certain feature that is generated along with the DP.  

---

10 Kayne’s (1975) proposal for object clitics is of course also reminiscent of the Sportiche’s (1992) analysis of object clitics. Sportiche argues that the clitic is base-generated in a clitic projection and from there it control a pro. A similar approach is adopted in Belletti (1999) as well.

11 The same proposal has been put forward in Cardinaletti and Repetti (2004). Contrary to Cardinaletti and Repetti (2004), however, I argue that SCls do not compete with null subjects, i.e. pro. In fact, as I will argue shortly, pro as such does not exist.

12 “Grewendorf (2002) has also developed a similar approach to Left Dislocation in German; he assumes Left Dislocation to involve movement as well as doubling, where the doubling pronominal element can be a “d-pronoun” (Belletti (2006):129).

13 De Crousaz and Shlonsky “take the formal role of [i] […] to be that of licensing a null pronominal subject. […] We follow Rizzi 1986a and much subsequent work in arguing that the licensing of pro—in addition to the recovery of its person and number features—depends on the existence of a structural, formal licensing relationship with a head. The distribution of [i] can be made sense of in these terms: [i] lexicalizes a head whose grammatical role is to formally license pro, where formal licensing is the checking of a formal feature of pro on whose content we remain agnostic. This formal licensing should be thought of as a visibility condition rendering pro identifiable by verbal inflection” (DeCrousaz and Shlonsky (2003): 418).
In particular, I argue (following Cardinaletti and Starke (1999), Giusti (1993; 2007) and Poletto (2006)) that the DP has a left periphery complete with Focus and Topic. The highest projection in the left periphery is a projection of Kase. I maintain that the clitic—whether a SCl or an OCl—is generated within the left periphery of the DP as a specifier of one of the relevant functional heads (person, gender, number, …). The clitic will then raise within the DP left periphery an check all the relevant features associated with it. In (28), I give a tentative and simplified derivation (the clitic would move as an XP within the DP) of the 1st person object clitic ma. Ma is generated in PersonDeictic, then has to check a Proximal feature, a 1st person feature that corresponds to SpeakerP, and finally Kase (whether it be nominative or accusative).

(28)  $[KP[K^oCl[Topic[Focus[SpeakerPti[ProximalPti[PersonDeicticti[DPD[NP]]]]]])]]$

Here, I maintain that there is an identity that holds among phases (see Torrego and Pesetsky (2001), Poletto (2006) and Giusti (2007)), hence the movement that took place within the DP will have to be replicated in the other phases, i.e. within the IP and/or CP layer. Specifically, in the case of $l$, what is the nature of the KP? Recall that I argued that SCl $l$ is not related to person. Here, I would like to push the claim further and argue that SCl $l$ is not related to Kase, gender or person. The feature that is encoded by $l$ is a [+ distal] feature, which in Bellinzonese turns out to be the same feature that is checked by the locative clitic $ga$. This explains why (29) —which becomes acceptable with $u$—and (30) are ungrammatical under the locative reading of $ga$: $l$ and $ga$ compete for the same distal feature.

---

14Pushing this idea further, I would then like to claim, somewhat in line with Manzini (1986) and subsequent work, that there is no such thing as a subject null pro. Languages vary along a spectrum of features realization within the KP. So called pro-drop languages are thus languages that not only do not spell out SCI information but also allow their DPs to remain silent. Interestingly, there is no language, nowadays, that exhibits both a SCI and a DP, which must be obligatorily realized. I am not yet sure why this is the case. Contra Cardinaletti and Repetti (2004), then, I argue that there is no competition whatsoever between pro and SCls. The idea that I am assuming here, namely the one of “big DP”, forces me to admit more than one subject position in IP. Hence, I will follow Cardinaletti (1994; 1997; 2001) and I argue that the IP has two subject positions: SubjP for strong pronouns and full DPs and AgrsP for weak pronouns. In her original proposal, Cardinaletti argues that AgrSP not only hosts weak pronouns but pro as well. Given my current proposal, AgrSP only hosts weak pronouns. Now, as for the obvious relationship between the richness of the paradigm and the possibility of dropping the subject (see standard approaches like Taraldsen (1978), Rizzi (1982)), I argue that the rich verbal morphology is nothing else but a SCI that has become part of the verbal morphology. This seems to be suggested by the comparison of two dialectal varieties like Bellinzonese and the one spoken in Sonogno (Ticino, Switzerland). Consider (i).

(i) Sonogno           Bellinzonese
  um senta          (a) sentum
  SCl feel/hear.1pl    SCl feel/hear.1pl
  ‘We feel/hear’    ‘We feel/hear’

We see that the SCl of the variety of Sonogno is now the verbal morphology of Bellinzonese which now lack a 1st person plural SCl. It could thus be that pro-drop and rich morphology are related in this sense. A language like Italian would thus have subject clitics that have become part of the verbal morphology. Once this verbal morphology is lost, then the DP part of the “big DP” must be spelled out.
(29)  * Al Gianni l ga va duman
the John SCI Cl-LOC go-3.SG tomorrow
'John will go there tomorrow'

(30)  Al Gianni u ga l mèt dent
the John SCI Cl-LOC Cl-3.MASC.SG put-3.SG inside
'John puts it in for him/her/them'

Hence, I propose that when \( l \) is a SCI it is generated as the specifier of a \( DistalP \) and from there then raises to the SCI subfield to a position (\( SCI_{masc}P \)) dedicated to a SCI that has no feature other than the distal one (I am assuming that in this case there is not even a null masculine agreement). In (31), I give a simplified representation of the SCI's KP. I am assuming that in this case the DP is null and corresponds to \( PERSON \) or \( THING \).

(31)  \[
[KP [K° ... [DistalP \( l \)][DP \( PERSON/THING \)]]]
\]

In the case \( l \) is an OCL, it is also generated as the specifier of \( DistalP \)—which explains why we cannot have a 3\(^{rd}\) person masculine SCI and 3\(^{rd}\) person OCls cooccurr. From \( DistalP \) the OCL will then raise to the relevant number or gender projection and finally to KP to check Accusative. In (32), I give a simplified representation for 3\(^{rd}\) person feminine \( la \).

(32)  \[
[KP \( l \) [K° ... [Cl.femP \( t \) ... [DistalP \( t \)][DP \( PERSON/THING \)]]]]
\]

4.2 The clitic placement domain within the IP

In Cattaneo (to appear), I propose that the Agreement field of the sentence accommodates a very fine grained hierarchy of functional projections that accommodate the clitics moving from the VP to the IP domain. The hierarchy is given in (33). The projections are the same as the one found within the left periphery of the DP. In the IP, however, the two subfields are in reality separated by modal projections (see Cattaneo (to appear)).

(33)

\textit{SCIs Subfield}

\begin{align*}
\text{TopP} & > \text{FocP} > \text{FinP} > \text{SubjP} > \text{AgrSP} > \text{NegP} > \text{KP}_{\text{nom}} > \text{FemGenderP} > \text{MascGenderP} > \text{PlNumbP} > \text{SCI}_{\text{masc}}P > \text{AddresseeSP} > \text{SpeakerSP} > \text{ProximalSP} > \text{DistalSP} > \text{OCls Subfield}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{PersonKP}_{\text{dat}} & > \text{PersonKP}_{\text{acc}} > \text{ImpersP} > \text{KP}_{\text{dat}} > \text{KP}_{\text{acc}} > \text{AddresseeOP} > 1/2\text{PIP} > \text{SpeakerOP} > \text{ReflP} > \text{IO}_{\text{fem.sg}}P > \text{IO}_{\text{masc.sg}}P > \text{IO}_{\text{pl}}P > \text{DO}_{\text{fem.sg}}P > \text{DO}_{\text{masc.sg}}P > \text{DO}_{\text{pl}}P > \text{PartitiveP} > (\text{ProximalP} > \text{ReciprocalP} > \text{DistalP} > ) [\text{PresentDeictic}P] > [\text{PastDeictic}P] > \text{SpatialProximalP} > \text{SpatialDistalP} > [\alpha \text{PersonDeictic}P] > [\alpha \text{TimeDeictic}P] > [\alpha \text{SpatialDeixis}P] > \text{TP} > \text{vP} > \text{VP}
\end{align*}
Here, I will not dwell on the exact description of each projection in the hierarchy (I refer the reader to Cattaneo (to appear)). It is not the point of the present paper. What matters here, is that (31) should not be regarded as a template in Perlmutter’s (1971) spirit. Crucially, Perlmutter’s templates are post-syntactic, whereas the structure in (31) is intended as a cartographic hierarchy of projections which are activated by movement of different element through or to such projections. A cartographic ordering as the one in (31), if transposed to bare phrase structure, becomes a set of statements about what is merged with what. That is, about what head is merged with what phrase. I will argue that, along the lines of Cinque’s (1999) proposal for adverbial heads, the projections are always merged even though they can remain silent if not used.

Moreover, I argue that clitics—whether they be subject or object—all move as XPs. In particular, I argue that clitics are the specifier of the XP where they are generated. Hence, contrary to Sportiche (1989; 1992), Cardinaletti and Starke (1999), Belletti (1999), Poletto (2000), and Cardinaletti and Repetti (2004; 2006), I argue that SCI movement is crucially not decomposed into XP-movement followed by head-movement, but only consists of XP-movement. I maintain that the clitics, along with the XP where they are generated, raise within the DP in order to check the relevant features. Consider the simplified derivation for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person singular SCI te in (34).

---

\textsuperscript{15}For a similar proposal reached on different grounds, see Săvescu-Ciucivara (2006).

\textsuperscript{16}This type of movement is admitted as an alternative analysis by Sportiche (1992; 1993) himself. Sportiche (1992) claims that the clitic itself does not move into the clitic projection, rather that it is generated as the head of the latter.
The simplified derivation for SCI / is illustrated in Figure I. The SCI KP starts off in the vP and then raises to the hierarchy in the Agreement field of the sentence repeating the same movements that took place within the KP.

Figure 1
KP nom > FemGenderP > MascGenderP > PlNumb > AddresseeSP > SpeakerSP > SCI mascP > [ProximalS]P >

[DistalS]P > PersonKP dat > PersonKP acc > KP dat > KP acc > AddressseeOP > ImpersP > [DistalNonPerson]P > SpeakerOP >


ProximalP > DistalP > [α PersonDeictic]P > [α TimeDeictic]P > [α SpatialDeixis]P > [α Animacy]P > TP > vP > VP
The derivation for 3rd person feminine singular *la* is given in Figure 2. Crucially, 3rd person masculine Scl and 3rd person Ocls all go through DistalP, hence their incompatibility.

Figure 2

\[ \text{… KP}_\text{nom} > \text{FemGenderP} > \text{MascGenderP} > \text{PlNumbP} > \text{AddresseeSP} > \text{SpeakerSP} > \text{Scl}_\text{masP} > \] 
\[ [\text{ProximalP}] > [\text{DistalP}] > \text{PersonKP}_{\text{mas}} > \text{PersonKP}_{\text{acc}} > \text{KP} > \text{AddresseeOP} > > \text{ImpersP} > [\text{DistalNonPersonP}] > \] 
\[ \text{SpeakerOP} > \text{RefP} > \text{Cl}_{\text{fem.sg}} > \text{Cl}_{\text{mas.sg}} > \text{Cl}_{\text{pl}} > \text{PartitiveP} > [\text{HumanP}] > [\text{InanimateP}] > [\text{PresentDeicticP}] > [\text{PastDeicticP}] > \] 
\[ \text{ProximalP} > [\text{DistalP}] > [\alpha \text{PersonDeicticP}] > [\alpha \text{AnimacyP}] > [\alpha \text{TimeDeicticP}] > [\alpha \text{SpatialDeixisP}] > \text{TP} > \text{vP} > \text{VP} \]

Clearly, we cannot have two elements that go through the same projection—DistalP—in the IP domain.

5 WHAT ABOUT BELLINZONESE *u*?

In the case of 3rd person singular masculine *u*, two possible classifications come to mind given Poletto’s (2000) classification: the form of the clitic would in fact fit both the deictic and the number Scl form. If *u* were a deictic Scl, one would expect to find the same form for 3rd person plural — this is not the case. Moreover, if it were indeed a deictic clitic, *u* should co-

---

17 The form *u* for the 3rd person masculine singular is not limited to Bellinzonese and in general to some Lombard dialects. This clitic is found in Liguria varieties (like the one of Savona (i)), Romagna varieties, and Piedmont varieties. Here, I will limit myself to illustrate the data from Savona. The reason is that the Ligurian and Piedmontese variety seem to pattern alike, whereas in the case of the Romagna data, the information on the distribution of *u* is only partial. What is important to notice is that the *u* found in those dialects however, is not like Bellinzonese *a*. It can in fact co-occur with the trace of a *wh* subject. In this sense, Ligurian *u* is more like Bellinzonese *a*. A finer study is however in order here, but I will leave it for future research.

(i)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{a.} & \quad \text{U figio } u \quad \text{mangia } u \quad \text{mei} \quad \text{(Savona)} \\
& \quad \text{the child SCl}_{\text{lig.masc}} \quad \text{eats} \quad \text{the apples} \\
& \quad \text{‘The child eats the apples’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{U } \quad \text{ciove} \quad \text{SCl}_{\text{lig.masc}} \quad \text{rains} \quad \text{‘It is raining’} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{Chi } u \quad \text{mangià } e \quad \text{patate?} \quad \text{who SCl}_{\text{lig.masc}} \quad \text{eats} \quad \text{the potatoes} \quad \text{‘Who eats potatoes?’} \\
\text{d.} & \quad \text{U } \quad \text{g } \quad \text{è un figio} \quad \text{SCl}_{\text{lig.masc}} \quad \text{there is a } \quad \text{child} \quad \text{‘There is a child’} 
\end{align*} \]
occur with other SCls (as in other Lombard and Veneto varieties) – once again, this is not borne out (35).

(35) * A u vegn al Gianni
   SCI SCI comes the John
   'John comes'

If we were to pursue the hypothesis that \( u \) is a *number* clitic, it would mean that Bellinzonese differs from all the dialects cataloged by Poletto (2000) in that it would have the masculine singular counterpart of *number* clitics. Although this would be somehow unprecedented (at least in the varieties in Poletto (2000)), it turns out that \( u \) has the same distributional properties that characterize *number* SCls. Hence, Bellinzonese \( u \) does not obligatorily incorporate into the complementizer (36a) and this clitic can be omitted in Type 3 coordination (36b-c).

(36) a. Pensi ch(e) u vegn mia
   think that SCI comes not
   ‘I think he does not come’

b. * U mangia e bef tüt un dì
   SCL eat and drink all a day
   ‘He eats and he drinks the whole day’

c. U scrif e riscrif sempru la stesa puesia
   SCL eat and drink all a day
   ‘He writes and rewrites the whole day’

The evidence taken into consideration so far seems to suggest that \( u \) is a *number* SCI. In fact, the distribution is identical to the distribution of *la* and *i* which are *number* SCls in Poletto’s (2000) terms. In (37), we see that *i* can but does not have to incorporate into the complementizer (*la* is clearly not testable in this environment). In (38), we see that *la* and *i* cannot be omitted in a Type 1 Coordination, although they can be absent in a Type 3 Coordination (39).

(37) a. Pensi che i vegn mia.
   think that SCL come not
   ‘I think that they are not coming’.

b. Pensi ch’i vegn mia.

(38) a. * La mangia e bef tüt un di.
   SCL eats and drinks all a day
   ‘She eats and she drinks the whole day’.

b. * I mangia e bef tüt un di.
   SCL eat and drink all a day
   ‘They eat and they drink the whole day’.
(39) a. La lecc e rilecc sempru la sctesa puesia.
   SCL reads and rereads always the same poem
   ‘She always reads and rereads the same poem’
   b. I lecc e rilecc sempru la sctesa puesia.
   SCL read and reread always the same poem
   ‘They always read and reread the same poem’

I conclude that $u$, $la$, and $i$ are number clitics in terms of Poletto’s (2000). Although I believe that these clitics belong to the same category, I think that the classification in terms of number SCls is infelicitous in that it collapses gender and number under the same label to the actual exclusion of gender information. I thus propose that $u$ and $la$ are gender SCls that check nominative Kase, while $i$ is an actual number SCI that also check a nominative Kase feature. Gender and number clitic do not properly have a person feature.

The fact that the three SCls have the same distribution with respect to coordination despite the fact that they target different positions is accounted for by maintaining that the three different projections all occupy a region of the hierarchy that is high enough to allow the omission in coordination. The difference between gender and number SCls with person and determiner SCls depends on the relative positioning of the projections within the hierarchy. Once again, I must assume that the SCI in the second conjunct does not raise towards the Kase projection. This explains why $u$ can co-occur with any of the 3rd person object clitics, in the same way as feminine singular SCI $la$, and 3rd plural SCI $i$ are compatible with any object clitic.

(40) a. Al Gianni $u$ ga l lecc, al libru (,al Mario)
   the Gianni SCI Cl-DAT Cl-ACC reads, the book to.the Mario
   ‘He reads it, the book (to Mario)’
   b. Al Gianni $u$ ga la lecc, la riviscta (, al Mario)
   the Gianni SCI Cl-DAT Cl-ACC reads, the magazine to.the Mario
   ‘He reads it, the magazine (to Mario)’
   c. Al Gianni $u$ ga i lecc, i libri (,al Mario)
   the Gianni SCI Cl-DAT Cl-ACC reads, the book to.the Mario
   ‘He reads it, the books (to Mario)’

(41) U dev töl
   SCI must-3-SG to.buy-Cl.ACC
   ‘He must buy it’

Finally, $u$ is compatible with the partitive (42) (as well as $la$ and $i$ which I do not illustrate).

(42) Al Gianni $u$ (a)n tö
    the Gianni SCI Partitive buys
    ‘He buys of it/them’
After the DP leaves the “big DP”, u, la, and i check a feature in [DistalS]P, their relevant gender/number feature in Fem/MascGenderP and PlNumbP respectively. The all finally raise to KP_{nom} (I maintain that there is no distinction for nominative person and non-person clitics because a is as much incompatible with person SCls as it is with non-person SCls). Consider (43).

(43) \[KP[K^c u/la/i;...[FemGenderP (t_i) ...[MascGenderP (t_i) [PlNumbP (t_i) ...[DistalP t_i [DP PERSON/THING]]]]]]

Finally, the fact that u—like la, and i—is incompatible with SCI a (44), is due to the fact they all end up in KP_{nom}, whereas SCI l does not.

(44) a. * A u udura  
    SCI SCI smells  
    'He smells'

b. U udura  
    SCI smells  
    'He smells'

9 Conclusion

My analysis casts new light on the nature of SCls in Northern Italian Dialects and has some important implications for the general theory of Null Subject Languages. I proposed that SCls are generated within a “big DP” and that pro does not exist. I argue for a very complex nature of the DP and I proposed a strong identity of phases. In my theory only crossing dependencies are allowed.

I showed that the incompatibility between 3rd person masculine SCI l and any 3rd person object clitic is due to the fact that the all consist of the same morpheme. Hence the impossibility of having two instances of the same clitic within the same clause.

The data presented also have so important repercussions on the theory of restructuring and show that there exists implicational scales across different dialects.
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Appendix I

1. The case of Tavullia, Friulian and Valdôtain

1.1 Not only Bellinzonese SCl / is peculiar

Importantly, notice that the ungrammaticality 3rd person masculine singular SCl / and 3rd person OCl in Bellinzonese is not limited to Bellinzonese. There are in fact many dialects which display some incompatibility of some sort. For instance, Bellinzonese is identical to Milanese (Nicoli (1983)) and Venetian (Cardinaletti and Repetti (2004; 2006)). In the case of the variety of Tavullia discussed in Manzini and Savoia (2004), on the other hand, "the presence of a third-person object clitic excludes that of a third-person singular SCl [(1b)] [...] In contrast, [...] the combination of the third-person plural SCl i with the whole third-person series of object clitics [(1d) is allowed]" (Manzini and Savoia (2004): 226).

(1) a. el/la/i/le te 'cema
   he/she/they.masc/they.fem Clacc call(s)
   'He/She/They call(s) you'

b. * el/la/le el/la/i/le 'cema
   he/she/they.fem Clacc call(s)
   'He/She/They call(s) him/her/them'

c. el/la/i/le 'cema
   Clacc call(s)
   'He/She/They call(s) him/her/them'

d. i el/la/i/le 'cema
   they.masc Clacc call(s)
   'They call him/her/them'

(adapted from Manzini and Savoia (2004): 226 (24-26))

Bellinzonese is also somehow similar to Friulian. However, in Friulian

"Escluso il tu di 2. sing., e, in alcune varietà anche 'l di 3. sing. m., i rimanenti clitici sogg. possono o debbono essere eliminati se il verbo è accompagnato da un altro clitico, compresa la negazione [Except for tu of 2nd singular, and in some varieties 'l of 3rd singular, all SCls can or have to be dropped if the verb combines with another clitic, including the negative marker]" (Benincà and Vanelli (2005): 67).18

18 Truth be told, the situation in Friulian is much more delicate and the micro-variation actually suggests the presence of implicational scales, which I will however not discuss here (thanks to Franco Finco for the questionnaires).
In (2), I illustrate the case of 1\textsuperscript{st} person plural, the same distribution holds however for the other relevant persons. Notice that the SCl $o$ (or $i$ in some varieties) is a \textit{deictic} SCl \textit{à la} Poletto (2000) and it is found for 1\textsuperscript{st} singular and 2\textsuperscript{nd} plural as well.\footnote{Deictic SCls are clitics sensitive to the distinction “between the deictic persons who are present in a conversation (first and second person) with respect to those who are absent (third person). This class of SCls does not encode any singular versus plural distinction […]” (Poletto (2000): 13).}

\begin{itemize}
\item[(2)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. O vin cante:t \\
SCl have.1pl sing.PastPart \\
'We sang'
\item b. Lu vin cante:t \\
Cl\textsubscript{acc,masc} have.1pl sing.PastPart \\
'We sang it'
\item c. * O lu vin cante:t \\
SCl Cl\textsubscript{acc,masc} have.1pl sing.PastPart \\
'We sang it'
\item d. E viôt simpri i fruts \\
SCl sees always the boys \\
'\textit{She always sees the boys}’
\item e. Ju viôt simpri (i fruts) \\
Cl\textsubscript{acc} sees always the boys \\
'\textit{He/She always sees them (, the boys)’}
\item f. * E ju viôt simpri (i fruts) \\
SCl Cl\textsubscript{acc} sees always the boys \\
'\textit{She always sees them (, the boys)’}
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

As for Valdôtain (see Roberts (1993)), the latter differs form Bellinzonese in that any SCl is incompatible with any object clitic (3). Hence, a 3\textsuperscript{rd} person SCl is incompatible with a 1st person singular object clitic (4).

\begin{itemize}
\item[(3)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. N \èn dona-lèi euna pomma \\
SCl have.1pl given-her a apple \\
'We gave her an apple’
\item b. Y \èn dona euna pomma \\
Cl\textsubscript{dat} have.1pl given a apple \\
'We gave her an apple’
\item c. * N y \èn dona euna pomma \\
SCl Cl\textsubscript{dat} have.1pl given a apple \\
'We gave her an apple’
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item[(4)]
\item a. Gnunc l’ a viu-me \\
nobody SCl has seen-Cl\textsubscript{acc} \\
'Nobody has seen me'
\end{itemize}
b. Gnu̥c m’ a viu
nobody Clacc has seen
'Nobody has seen me'

c. * Gnu̥c l m’ a viu
nobody SCl Clacc has seen
'Nobody has seen me'

(adapted from Roberts (1993): 330 (22a) and (24a))

In Bellinzonese, however, other person clitics, whether direct object pronouns (5a) or indirect object pronouns (5b) are compatible with any 3rd person SCl.

(5) a. Al Gianni l ma/ta/ga/va ved
the Gianni SCI Clacc sees
'Gianni sees me/you/us'

b. Al Gianni l ma/ta/ga/va dà un libru
the Gianni SCI Cldat gives a book
'Gianni sees me/you/us s book'

The data from Tavullia, Friulian and Valdôtain seem to suggest that we face a two-folded implicational scale.

On the one hand, the data seem to indicate that the incompatibility of SCls with object clitics first starts out as an incompatibility between 3rd person masculine singular (Bellinzonese), then we have the incompatibility of 3rd person masculine and feminine singular (Tavullia), the more complex case of the of Friulian, and finally the incompatibility of any SCl with any object clitic (Valdôtain). Of course, we expect to find many more intermediate stages but the implicational scale we can tentatively develop here is given in (6).

(6) 3rd masc.sg SCl with 3rd object clitics >

3rd masc/fem.sg SCl with 3rd object clitics >

any SCl, BUT 2nd sg., with any object clitic/ any SCl, BUT 2nd sg. and 3rd masc.sg, with any object clitic >

any SCl with any object clitic

On the other hand, the implicational scale is also in terms of syntax: from Bellinzonese where the incompatibility can be accounted in pure syntactic term to Valdôtain where the explanation cannot be purely syntactic but must involve a morpho-syntactic treatment of the clitic cluster (subject and object). In Bellinzonese, Tavullia, the data can be explained resorting to the idea that the clitics must go through one and the same projection at one point of the derivation. In the case of Friulian varieties where only 2nd person singular tu is not dropped, we can argue that for deictic o/i and 3rd person SCls (3rd masc. sg, ’l, 3rd fem.sg. e, and 3rd pl. a) we can also say that they all must go through the projection [+/- Deictic]P and are thus
incompatible with object clitics (3\textsuperscript{rd} masc. sg, \textit{lu}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} fem.sg. \textit{le}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} masc.pl. \textit{ju}, and 3\textsuperscript{rd} fem.pl. \textit{lis}). This amounts to say that 3\textsuperscript{rd} person SCls all have an overt or covert \textit{l}. However, we still need to account for those cases where a 1\textsuperscript{st} person plural object clitic forces 3\textsuperscript{rd} pl. SCl to drop. It is here that morpho syntax must come into play.

In those varieties of Friulian where both \textit{tu} and \textit{'l} do not drop, we can argue that \textit{'l} is the marked form that encodes a masculine singular \textit{person} feature and that it does not get through \([+/- \textit{Deictic}]P\). For the other cases we would resort to a morpho-syntactic effect on the cluster. The idea of the single projection through which both subject and object clitics must go through cannot suffice for Valdôtain. In the case of Valdôtain, the incompatibility is not purely syntactic but involves an extra level (which I will not develop here) that acts on morpho-syntactic constraints on the cluster. It looks like the cluster ends up behaving as a \textit{phase} (thanks to Jacopo Garzonio for pointing this out to me) (on this see also Cardinaletti (2008)).