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0. INTRODUCTION

This article deals with independent and apparently irregular phenomena displayed by the clitic pronouns of several Romance dialects, namely *syncretism* and *synthetic clusters*.

A syncretic clitic is an exponent that, in a given dialect, marks syntactic functions that in other dialects are marked by different items. For instance, in Italian, the clitic *ci* is an object pronoun (1.a) and resumes locative PPs (1.b), while in the Veneto dialects, for example, these functions are represented by different clitics: *ne* in (2.a = 1.a) vs *ghe* in (2.b = 1.b).

(1) a. *A Roma ci porta Micol*  (Italian)
To Rome 1.PL.ACC brings Micol
‘Micol brings us to Rome’

b. *A Roma ci vado in macchina.*
To Rome LOC1 go-1.SG by car
‘I go to Rome by car’

(2) a. *A Roma 1a ne porta 1a Micol*  (Veneto)
To Rome CL-SUBJ 1.PL.ACC brings det Micol1
‘Micol brings us to Rome’

b. *A Roma ghe vao in macchina.*
To Rome LOC1 go-1.SG by car
‘I go to Rome by car’

Synthetic (or opaque) clitic clusters are sequences of clitics displaying an exponent that does not correspond to its syntactic function. For instance, in Italian, the reflexive morpheme displays an opaque exponent (*ci* instead of *si*) when co-occurs with an impersonal clitic, as shown in (3.d) vs (3.c).

(3) a. *I piatti si lavano spesso.*
The dishes IMP wash often
‘Dishes are often washed’

b. *Carlo si lava spesso.*
Carlo REFL washes often
‘Carlo often washes’

a. *In estate si si lava spesso.*

*Acknowledgments.*
In summer **REFL IMP** wash often  
‘In summer you often wash’

d. In estate *ci si* lava spesso.  
In summer **REFL IMP** wash often  
‘In summer you often wash’

These irregular patterns will be accounted for on the basis of two principles:


2. a universal principle like the *Subset Principle*, ruling the syntax/phonology interface (Halle & Marantz 1993, 1994; Halle 1997).

The Counter-Levelling constraint will be suggested to trigger both syncretisms and synthetic clusters, preventing:

a. the co-occurrence of identical personal clitics in the same inventory (where identity can be due to paradigm levelling processes);

b. the co-occurrence of identical clitics in the same cluster.

The Subset Principle will be suggested to be responsible for the insertion of an innovative or opaque exponent instead of the etymological/transparent one. It states that:

(4) the phonological exponent of a Vocabulary item is inserted into a morpheme <i.e. a terminal node of a syntactic tree> if the item matches all or a subset of the grammatical features specified in the terminal morpheme. Insertion does not take place if the Vocabulary item contains features not present in the morpheme. Where several Vocabulary items meet the conditions for insertion, the item matching the greatest number of features specified in the terminal morpheme must be chosen. (Halle 1997: 428)

According to (4), a syncretic item can be represented as an exponent matching a subset of the features that specify different morphemes, i.e. distinct syntactic functions. In section 2 I will suggest that syncretism can be historically due to paradigm levelling and counter-levelling processes. The former generate syncretism via homophony, while the latter is a counter-reaction preventing the co-occurrence of homophonic personal pronouns in the same inventory.

Secondly, the Subset Principle can account also for the syntax/phonology mismatches displayed by *synthetic* (or *opaque*) *clitic clusters*. They can indeed be due to the insertion of a potential candidate (i.e. an item matching a subset of the grammatical features specified in the terminal morpheme) instead of the best candidate, i.e. the item matching the greatest number of features. Following Grimshaw (1997) a.o., in section 3 I will suggest that the insertion of the best candidate can be blocked when two identical exponents are clustered.

On the basis of the analyses sketched above, synthetic clusters would be accounted for by the same principles dealing also with syncretism. It entails that there would be a deep relation between the phenomena exemplified in (1)-(2) and (3) and, finally, that *the opaque clitics inserted in*
clusters are also syncretic exponents. Italian is consistent with this prediction because the clitic \( ci \) that is inserted in the opaque cluster in (3.d) is also a syncretic marker, as shown in (1).

In this article I will test this prediction on the basis of the data shown by several Italian dialects. If the impressive variation displayed by Italian dialects does not falsify this prediction, it will be a strong piece of evidence supporting the hypotheses sketched here.

The article is organized as following: in section 1 I will outline the theory of Distributed Morphology that is based on the Subset Principle; in section 2 I will sketch an analysis of the patterns of syncretism displayed by the Italian dialects, in section 3 I will account for synthetic clusters suggesting that they undergo the same processes responsible for syncretisms, causing the insertion of a default (or elsewhere) item; in section 4 I will discuss deeply the role of this sort of items. In section 6 I will evaluate the prediction that the default marker appearing in synthetic clusters is also a syncretic exponent on the basis of the analysis of several Italian dialects and, finally, in section 7, I will discuss other data, sketching a map describing the distribution of elsewhere items among the dialects of Italy.

1. Distributed Morphology

The theory of Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994) is based on three main assumptions:

1. Late Insertion: syntax operates on features, while phonological exponents are inserted in the terminal nodes of the syntactic structure between SS and PF;

2. Syntactic Structure all the way Down: features can be manipulated after syntax, but these post-syntactic operations must respect syntactic locality conditions. Post-syntactic operations are:
   - fusion: features of different syntactic nodes are grouped into a single bundle (5.a);
   - fission: features of the same syntactic node are divided into distinct bundles (5.b);
   - impoverishment: a feature is deleted (5.c).

(5) a. \([A][B]\) b. \([A,B]\) c. \([A,B]\)

3. Subset Principle: before PF, syntactic nodes – containing only syntactic features, cf. Late Insertion – are filled by Vocabulary Items that are functions like (6) relating a bundle of syntactic features (called morpheme, cf. (4)) with a phonological string (called exponent, cf. (4)).

(6) \([+\text{speaker}, +\text{participant}] \leftrightarrow /\text{mi}/ \) (Italian)

The item (6) is inserted in the D node forming the syntactic representation of a first person singular clitic in Italian. The insertion is ruled by the Subset Principle:

(4) the phonological exponent of a Vocabulary item is inserted into a morpheme <i.e. a terminal node of a syntactic tree> if the item matches all or a subset of the grammatical features specified in the terminal morpheme. Insertion does not take place if the Vocabulary item contains features not present in the morpheme. Where several
Vocabulary items meet the conditions for insertion, the item matching the greatest number of features specified in the terminal morpheme must be chosen. (Halle 1997: 428)

On the basis of the Subset Principle, the item (6) can be inserted in a D node that is characterized at least by the features [+speaker, +participant] as show in the sentences (7.a) and (7.b).

(7) a. Giorgio *mi* presenta Mario.
    Giorgio 1.SG.DAT introduces Mario
    ‘Giorgio introduces Mario to me’

b. Giorgio *mi* presenta a Mario.
    Giorgio 1.SG.ACC introduces to Mario
    ‘Giorgio introduces me to Mario’

Since the inventory of Italian clitics does not display a 1st person clitic characterized also by case features, the Subset Principle allows the same item (6) to be inserted in both a dative (7.a) and an accusative morpheme (7.b) giving rise to a case of syncretism.

Finally, morphological inventories display evidence of items without specifications, that, on the basis of the Subset Principle, can be inserted everywhere more specific items cannot. These items are called elsewhere or default items and they are usually assumed in order to account for complex distributions of syncretic exponents. Elsewhere items will play a crucial role in the following discussion where their properties will be discussed more deeply.

2. SYNCRETISM: PARADIGM LEVELLING AND COUNTER-LEVELLING

Following Harris (1994) and Kayne (2000) I will suggest that clitics can be decomposed into a bi-morphemic structure of the CV type where C is an exponent of features like [± speaker] and [±participant] and V is a thematic vowel. For instance, the paradigm of Italian clitics – in (8) – can be captured by a list of consonantal items like (9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(8) Italian</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. obj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ci</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indir. obj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td>ci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (9) m-                             | ↔  |   |
|                                   | [+participant +speaker] |   |
| t-                                | ↔  |   |
|                                   | [+participant –speaker] |   |
| v-                                | ↔  |   |
|                                   | [+participant –speaker +pl] |   |
| λ-                                | ↔  |   |
|                                   | [–participant] / [–f dative] |   |
The distinctions among [-participant] clitics are captured through contextual restrictions: the $\lambda$-exponent is inserted when the clitic is masculine and dative, $ne$ when the clitic is ‘partitive’ (namely, extracted from an accusative DP), $l$- is inserted only before an agreement feature bundle ([±f]; [±pl]) while $s$- (used as reflexive/impersonal clitic) is a sort of bare third person exponent (cf. Reinhart & Reuland 1993 and Kayne 2000, a.o.).

Agreement features are marked by thematic vowels via a system of redundancy rules, described in Harris (1991, 1994), that will not be discussed here. It is worth noting that the thematic vowel marking gender and number features of the 3rd person accusative clitics corresponds to the endings of the Latin first and second nominal classes (cf. Halle & Vaux 1998): amic-o [m, sg] ~ amic-i [m, pl]; amic-a [f, sg] vs amic(h)-e [f, pl]. When a clitic is not followed by any agreement features, a default thematic vowel -i2 is automatically inserted. The default thematic vowel derives from the one labelling the Latin unmarked class (3rd class) and it is subject to linguistic variation: Italian dialects display indeed i, e, a, a (see examples below). The analysis of Italian is finally represented in (10).

(10) 
\begin{align*}
-o & \leftrightarrow [-f – pl] \\
-a & \leftrightarrow [+f – pl] \\
-i & \leftrightarrow [-f + pl] \\
-e & \leftrightarrow [+f] \\
-i & \leftrightarrow [elsewhere]
\end{align*}

It is worth noting that in the languages displaying a sigmatic plural (e.g. Spanish and Sardinian), the thematic vowel can be followed by the -s plural exponent creating a more complex structure formed by the person marker, the thematic vowel and the plural exponent, e.g. l-a-s = 3.ACC.F.PL. Moreover, in the Catalan dialect spoken in Barcelona, Bonet (1991) notices an instance of case marker (-i = dative) following the plural marker -s-. Therefore, the complete potential structure of clitics is formed by a CVCV template representing person, gender, number and case exponents whose order can be derived – in my opinion – via head to head movement from a split-DP architecture.

A general point has to be made on the distribution of the Italian $c$- exponent that cannot be accounted for by any syntactic/semantic evidence. It seems indeed impossible to pin down a subset of features capturing evenly its distinct syntactic functions because the so called locative clitic is syncretic with the 1st personal plural pronoun and, moreover, it resumes other non-locative adjuncts as comitative and instrumental PPs.

Such a distribution – that is paradigmatic in the Romance domain – can be theoretically accounted for by the Subset Principle in (4) suggesting that each morphological inventory bears a default (or elsewhere) item that can be inserted everywhere more specific items cannot. But, even if the distribution of $ci$ can be accounted for by this formal device, provided by the theory of Distributed Morphology, the morphological status of $ci$ still remains unexplained, since the notion of elsewhere cannot shed light on the causes that have determined this kind of syncretism.

---

1 the ‘partitive’ clitic resumes a quantified noun extracted from an accusative DP.

2 This thematic vowel is lowered before a clitic of the form $l+V$ or $ne$. 
The development of syncretic patterns is usually accounted for through the interplay of independent phonological changes and paradigm levelling processes (Kenstowicz 1995, Kiparsky 1997, Steriade 2000, Burzio 1996). For instance, the Latin 1st person plural pronoun nos has been levelled in accordance with the morphological structure discussed previously: in the dialects nowadays displaying a sigmatic plural it has maintained its Latin exponent (CV-s), while in the other dialects it has developed a bimorphemic CV structure, formed by a n-stem followed by a default thematic vowel3: the output of this process of analogy is the form ni/ne that is widely attested among the Romance paradigms.

The Veneto dialects, among others, show the ne form, that, in some cases, can undergo a further paradigm levelling change. Indeed, the clitic systems of the Veneto usually display a 1st person singular pronoun me (< Lat. me) and a 1st person plural ne (< *no < Lat. nos). Since these pronouns are morphologically consistent (i.e. they are both 1st person pronouns) and the distinction between the nasal stems /n/ and /m/ is perceptively low, a process of paradigm levelling can arise, causing the syncretism between the two forms.

For instance, the variety spoken by the old speakers of the Carmignano di Brenta dialect marks the distinction between these pronouns (11), while the young speakers (Nicoletta Penello, p.c.) use an innovative syncretic exponent me, as shown in (12).

(11) a. I me ga portà un libro (Carmignano, old speakers)
   They 1.SG AUX brought a book
b. I ne ga portà un libro
   They 1.PL AUX brought a book

(12) I me ga portà un libro (Carmignano, young speakers)
    They 1.SG/PL AUX brought a book

Therefore, the Carmignano pattern of syncretism in (12) resembles the one that is widely attested in the dialects of Lombardia, cf. (13).

(13) Bergamo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Obj.</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>ve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indir. Obj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lo/la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>se</td>
<td></td>
<td>ghe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitive</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td>ghe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, the 1st singular–plural syncretism can be accounted for through two cycles of paradigm levelling. The whole process is represented by the scheme (14): stage 1 represents the classical Latin system; stage 2 is a hypothetical Late Latin stage where sibilant endings had been already lost (the form no is attested in ..., cf. Rohlfs 1963); then the clitic vocalism underwent a paradigm levelling

---

3 Rohlfs (1963) records also an (intermediate?) *no form in some texts of the XIII century.
process extending the default thematic vowel to all the clitic of the paradigm; finally, stage 4 is due to the paradigm levelling attraction that can be seen in synchrony in the Carmignano dialect, cf. (11) vs (12).

(14) stage: 1. Latin 2. Late Latin 3. Veneto 4. Lombardia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.sg:</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>me</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>m-</td>
<td>m-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.pl:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nos</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, some dialects of the Lombardia type show a further change that is described in Spiess (1975) that analyses the clitic system of the dialect of Collina d’Oro (Switzerland: Ticino).

This dialect is originally characterized by the 1st singular–plural syncretism that, in the previous discussion, has been accounted for through a process of Paradigm Levelling like the one that is displayed in synchrony by the Carmignano dialect in (11) and (12).

But, the Collina d’Oro dialect shows in synchrony another change modifying the form of the 1st person plural clitic. Indeed the ma syneretic exponent, in (15), has been partially replaced in the 70s with an innovative exponent ga deriving from the locative Latin particle hic, in (16).

(15) Collina d’Oro (old speakers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg pl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. obj.</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indir. obj.</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(16) Collina d’Oro (young spkrs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg pl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. obj.</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indir. obj.</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paradigm (16) represents a new (and surprising) stage of the process (14), that is partially rewritten here in (17).
In the analysis above, the evolution from the Latin to the Lombardia type stage (number 4) has been accounted for through a paradigm levelling evolution. But the Collina d’Oro change (stage 4 to 5) shows a pattern that is not consistent with paradigm levelling since there is no phonological, morphological or syntactic analogy accounting for the evolution from a personal pronoun to a locative particle like $ga$.

This pattern of syncretism, that cannot be accounted for by Paradigm Levelling, is frequently attested in the Romance domain. For instance, the $ci$ exponent shown by Standard Italian, cf. (1) derives from the Latin locative particle $ince$ and nowadays it is both a locative and a 1st plural clitic like the $ga$ exponent of the Collina d’Oro dialect.

(2)  

a. A Roma $ci$ porta Micol  
To Rome $us.ACC$ brings Micol  
‘Micol brings us to Rome’

b. A Roma $ci$ vado in macchina.  
To Rome, $LOCi$ go by car  
‘I go to Rome by car’

These cases of morphological substitutions, attested in standard Italian and in the Collina d’Oro dialect, are not isolated. Indeed, clitics deriving from Lat. $ince$ have also replaced the third person dative clitic (< Lat. $illi$) in several Southern dialects (in Puglia, Calabria, Campania and Sicilia), while Northern dialects have replaced *$illi$ with clitics deriving from the locative particle $hic$. Moreover, $illi$ has been replaced by forms like $nde$ (< Lat. $inde$) in other Southern dialects and by the reflexive marker $se$ in the dialects of Ardore and Bianco (Calabria, Rohlfs 1963: 156, footnote 1). $Se$ is also used as the (reflexive) form of the first person plural pronoun (< Lat. $nos$) in Central and Northern Italy (Roma, Northern Toscana, Emilia-Romagna, Veneto, Lombardia, see Benincà & Poletto 2003). Moreover, *$nos$ has been replaced by the locative $inde$ in some dialects of Salento (Calabrese 1994, Loporcaro 1995, 2004) and Sicilia, while this substitution is not surely attested in Veneto, Emilia, Piemonte, Lombardia, Liguria, Umbria and Marche showing a syncretic form $ne$ that can be derived either from the substitution with $inde$ ($inde > *nde > *nne > ne$) or directly from the etymological form $nos$ ($nos > *no > ne$).

These apparently chaotic patterns of substitution can be captured according to a simple scheme like (18): *$nos$ and *$illi$ (on the right in the scheme) are the target of the syncretism, i.e. the exponents that are usually blocked and replaced, while the exponents on the left are the replacing items.
In other words, the heterogeneous patterns of substitution displayed by the Italian dialects can be accounted for assuming that *ince, *inde and *se have replaced one or two targets (*nos and *illi), for instance in the Bari paradigm\(^4\) in (19), nğə (< Lat. *ince) has replaced nos (1.pl) and illi (third person dative).

\[(19)\] Bari

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. obj.</td>
<td>mə</td>
<td>nğə</td>
<td>tə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indir. obj.</td>
<td>mə</td>
<td>nğə</td>
<td>tə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nncə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In another dialect of Puglia, Gallipoli, the replacing item is inde, because the clitic nde is used in three different contexts: partitive (20.a), first person (20.b), instead of the Lat. nos, and third person dative (20.c), instead of the Lat. illi.

\[(20)\] a. *Nd’ aggiu viste picca te case.* (Gallipoli)

PART have-1.SG seen few of houses
‘I have seen few houses’

b. *Dite-nde-lu!*

Tell-1.PL.DAT-3.ACC.SG
‘Tell it to us’

c. *Ti-nde cu telefona.*

Tell-3.DAT COMP phone-3.SG
‘Tell him/her to phone’

In Catanzaro, two different items (nci and ndi) have replaced two distinct targets (both nos and illi).

\[(21)\] Catanzaro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) From Calabrese (1994).
In these cases, several scholars (Calabrese 1994, Benincà & Poletto 2004, a.o.) have suggested that morphological items have been replaced by other clitics, even if etymologically unrelated (e.g. *ci pro *nos), on the basis of sets of universal markedness constraints.

In this paper I will suggest that these substitutions are due to a counter-levelling change aiming to prevent the co-occurrence of identical personal clitics in the same inventory. These counter-levelling strategies operate therefore in the context where paradigm levelling processes can create syncretic personal pronouns.

The counter-levelling process determines indeed the substitution of a (potentially) syncretic personal pronoun (that is usually the 1st plural or the 3rd dative exponent) with a non personal clitic like a clitic deriving from a locative particle (Lat. ince or inde) or with a bare third person clitic like the reflexive exponent.

This machinery can account for the frequent substitutions replacing the etymological form *nos with another clitic that in the Collina d’Oro is ga, standard Italian is ci, cf. (2), nř in Bari, cf. (9), nde in Gallipoli, cf. (10.c), nci/ndi in Catanzaro, cf. (21), etc.

(22) Proto-Romance

Contemporary dialects

![Diagram](image)

A similar counter-levelling change has probably been triggered by the levelling of third person dative (Lat. *illi) and accusative pronouns (Lat *illum, a, i, ae). According to my hypothesis, in a proto-Romance stage, both the accusative and the dative pronouns have been marked by a syncretic l- stem. In a following stage, the ambiguity due to this levelling has been repaired through the substitution of the etymological dative clitic ( l-) with another item that is nř in the Bari dialect, cf. (19), nde in Gallipoli, cf. (20.c), nci in Catanzaro, cf. (21), ghe in the dialects of Veneto, etc., see (23).
In conclusion, the counter-levelling hypothesis can account for the scheme (18) since it shows that the replaced items (nos and illi) are the personal pronouns that are (potential) subject to levelling processes like those in (22) and (23).

\[(18)\]

**replacing:**

- *ince*
- *inde*
- *se*

**replaced:**

- *nos*
- *illi*

Moreover, the counter-levelling hypothesis accounts for the form of the replacing items: they are indeed non personal pronouns (< Lat. ince, inde) or the bare 3rd person clitic.

The substitution is consistent with the general framework discussed in section 1, and in particular with the Subset Principle allowing substitutions when an optimal candidate (e.g. nos and illi) is blocked by an independent reason, i.e. counter-levelling. Finally, the pattern of substitutions entails that se, inde and ince – cf. (18) – are the less specific items in the inventories of Romance clitics, namely elsewhere clitics, cf. section 1. In the following sections I will refine this hypothesis on the basis of the analysis of other phenomena displayed by the Romance clitic systems and I will return on the analysis of syncretism in section 6.

3. SYNTHETIC CLUSTERS: LINEAR COUNTER-LEVELLING

This section deals with a phenomenon characterizing some irregular sequences of clitics. In order to account for them, I will suggest a model isomorphic to the one discussed above. Indeed my hypothesis is that the same principles operating in diachrony on the paradigmatic distribution of clitics, operates in synchrony on their linear distribution triggering counter-levelling effects.

The objects of this section are synthetic clusters that are sequences of clitics displaying a mismatch between their morphological form and their syntactic functions (Bonet 1991, 1995; Harris 1994, 1997) as the one in (3.d) and (24.d).
(3) a. *I piatti si lavano spesso. (Italian)
The dishes IMP wash often
‘Dishes are often washed’

b. Carlo si lava spesso.
Carlo REFL washes often
‘Carlo often washes’

c. *In estate si si lava spesso.
In summer REFL IMP wash often
‘In summer you often wash’

d. In estate ci si lava spesso.
In summer REFL IMP wash often
‘In summer you often wash’

(24) a. Juan le comprò un libro. (Spanish)
Juan 3.DAT bought a book
‘Juan bought a book for him/her’

b. Juan lo comprò.
Juan 3.ACC bought
‘Juan bought it’

a. *Juan le lo comprò.
Juan 3.DAT 3.ACC bought
‘Juan bought it for him/her’

d. Juan se lo comprò.
Juan 3.DAT 3.ACC bought
‘Juan bought it for him/her’

Bonet (1991, 1995) and Harris (1994, 1997) account for cases like (3.d) and (24.d) through post-syntactic operations modifying the output of syntax before PF.

Bonet (1991, 1995) accounts for the cluster in (3.d) by a linking-type operation transforming the feature geometry of an impersonal\(^5\) clitic (4.a) into the geometry corresponding to a first person plural item (ci) by the adjunction of the [+1] feature.

---
\(^5\) Even though Bonet assumes that the operated clitic is the impersonal (that in Italian triggers plural agreement) the template describing the order of Italian clitics (see below) suggests that the operated clitic should be the reflexive one, that precedes the impersonal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gli/le</th>
<th>mi</th>
<th>ti/vi</th>
<th>ci</th>
<th>si (refl.)</th>
<th>lo/la/li/le</th>
<th>si (imp.)</th>
<th>ne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rev. 25 del 24.08.06

Pagina 12 di 31
Harris (1994) analyzes the spurious se pattern in (24.d) postulating a post-syntactic operation like (25) deleting, namely impoverishing, cf. (5), the feature [dat]ive when co-occurs with the feature [acc]usative, like in the cluster (24.c).

\[(25) \quad [\text{dat}]^\downarrow[\text{acc}] \quad (\text{Harris 1994})\]

The impoverishment blocks the insertion of the *l*- marker – specified as a case exponent (cf. Harris 1994: 333) – and allows the insertion of the *s*- clitic (12.d) that is a third person exponent that does not bear any case specification. In Pescarini (2005) I criticized this analysis because there is no evidence supporting the hypothesis that *l*- is a case marker: indeed *l*-, that derives from the Latin demonstrative *ille*, *illa*, *illud*, marks both the direct and indirect object pronouns and, in some Romance dialects, even the subject third person clitics. Therefore, both the synchronic and the diachronic analysis do not support Harris’ account based on impoverishment and case underspecification.

Secondly, and more generally, such an analysis cannot identify any general condition causing synthetic clusters, indeed they are due to independent and language specific operations like (25) or (4) applying directly to the output of Syntax. On the contrary, in the following discussion, I will suggest that the substitutions causing synthetic clusters are due to the same machinery responsible for syncretism, namely counter-levelling, that, in order to prevent the occurrence of identical items in the same cluster, causes the substitution of a clitic with an elsewhere pronoun. This machinery accounts both for the contexts where synthetic clusters can arise and for the replacing process. In my opinion, this two-steps account is superior to the one-step analysis suggested previously (cf. Bonet 1991 and Harris 1994) based on post syntactic operations like (25) that are ex post assumptions that cannot generate any prediction.

The hypothesis concerning a principle preventing the co-occurrence of identical exponents is partially consistent with Grimshaw (1997) and Yip (1998) a.o. suggesting that synthetic clusters are mainly due to the Obligatory Contour Principle (OCP, Leben 1973, McCarthy 1986) disallowing the co-occurrence of identical exponents. But it is worth noting that the condition of phonological identity is not enough to replace a clitic: several Romance languages display indeed sentences like (26) where

---

\(^6\) In the Northern Italian dialects, cf. Poletto (2000).

\(^7\) The OCP is a markedness constraint, therefore it can be violated as shown by several Romance varieties displaying marked sequences of identical clitics. These clusters are not counter-examples, but just marked constructions that in other languages are blocked by the OCP. Indeed a markedness constraint does not predict which configurations must be ruled out, but which can be ruled out.
the reflexive clitic si/se (cf. footnote 2) cannot precede the homophonous impersonal marker (3.d), while it can follow a homophonous complementizer.

(26) **Se se** lo compra, è stupido.  
    **If REF** 3.ACC buy, pro is stupid  
    ‘If he buys it for him, he is stupid’

(3) c.  **In estate si si lava spesso.**  
    In summer **REFL IMP** wash often  
    ‘In summer you often wash’

Therefore, a principle operating on phonological strings like the OCP seems not to be enough to trigger opaque clusters that, on the contrary, seem to be due to a morpho(phonological) restriction blocking the occurrence of two clitics (namely two Vocabulary Items) iff they are morpho-syntactically consistent, i.e. iff they share a meaningful set of syntactic features.

Secondly, Romance languages show two contexts triggering synthetic clusters even if the two clitics are not perfectly homophonous: these sequences represent a counter-example for the application of a constraint such as the OCP suggested by Grimshaw (1997) and Yip (1998) among others. Some paradigmatic examples are listed in (27) and (28).

(27)  *le + lo → glielo (Italian)  
      *le + lo → se lo (Spanish)  
      *le + lo → nce lo (Napoli dialect, South Italy)  
      *li + lo → ni lo (Grottaglie dialect, South Italy)  
    3.DAT  3.ACC

(28)  *le + ne → gliene (Italian)  
      *ddi + ndi → si ndi (Sarroch dialect, Sardegna)  
      *le + ne → nce ne (Napoli dialect, South Italy)  
      *li + en → li (Barceloní, Catalan)  
    3.DAT  PART.

The clusters of the (27) type can be easily accounted for, on the basis of the decomposition suggested in section 2. Indeed, following Harris (1994) and Kayne (2000), the transparent (asterisked) clusters in (27) are characterized by the co-occurrence of two l- items because each clitic can be decomposed into a bi-morphemic structure formed by a ‘stem’ l- and a thematic vowel. Therefore, the co-occurrence of the l- exponent is enough to trigger a counter-leveling reaction causing the insertion of the allomorph gl- (Italian), the reflexive s- (Spanish), the locative nc- (Napoli) or the partitive n- (Grottaglie).

The cases in (28) are more complex than those in (27), because no morphological decomposition is enough to account for these opaque clusters. Indeed, even if these clitics share a meaningful set of syntactic features (a partitive clitic is a [-participant] pronoun, see the analysis in (9)), their phonological exponences (n- or nd- vs l-) are definitely different. I will discuss an ad hoc constraint aiming to capture these cases: I suggest that a cluster formed by a sequence of consonantal stems, divided by thematic vowels, can be constrained as a complex onset. In particular, I will adopt the same constraint suggested by Harris (1983) dealing with Spanish syllable. He claims that onset clusters must increase in sonority by a distance of two, according to the sonority hierarchy below (hereafter I will refer to this constraint as the Minimum Sonority Distance Constraint).
V(owels) > G(lides) > L(iquids) > N(asals) > O(bstruents)  
(Harris (1983); 15)

For example, while obstruent - liquid clusters are attested in onset position, obstruent - nasal sequences are not allowed. In my opinion a 3.DAT + PART cluster is blocked because violates the same constraint, on the basis of the hierarchy (30).

V(owels) > G(lides) > L(iquids) > N(asals) > F(ricatives) > S(tops)

In conclusion, linear counter-levelling seems to be triggered by a markedness constraint blocking clusters formed by clitic ‘stems’ that
1. share a meaningful set of syntactic properties and
2. a) are phonologically identical or
   b) violate the Minimum Sonority Distance Constraint.
Since the 2.b entails 2.a, I can formulate a single constraint like (31).

Counter-levelling Constraint
A clitic cluster is blocked when its consonantal stems share a meaningful set of syntactic and phonological features, violating the Minimum Sonority Distance Constraint.

This constraint – that has been partially postulated on the basis of the examples in (28) – entails some predictions that can be easily verified (or falsified) on the basis of the analysis of the Romance dialects.

Firstly, if a 3rd dative + partitive cluster is blocked because violates the Minimum Sonority Distance Constraint, dialects displaying the inverse order (partitive + dative) would not present instances of opaque clusters. This prediction is verified by some data due to Manzini & Savoia (2005). Indeed, those dialects where the dative clitic follows the partitive exponent (e.g. ne le), show synthetic clusters saving for this context.

Exx.

Secondly, since a markedness constraint entails, by definition, marked counter-examples, the Counter-levelling constraint entails that some (marked) dialects show processes levelling dative and partitive forms. In fact, Romance shows rare cases of paradigmatic and linear levelling: I will describe a case of paradigm levelling attested in the Lecce dialect and a case of linear levelling attested in some dialects of Toscana.

In the dialect of Lecce, in (33), – see Loporcaro (1995) a.o. – the Proto-Romance *li pronoun has historically collapsed on the ne form following a process of paradigm levelling. It is worth noting that the dative ni cannot be derived from the latin particle inde (as it is usually suggested) because the partitive maintains its conservative form ndi (< Lat. inde). Therefore, since ni (3.DAT) and nde (PART) cannot have the same etymology, the dative ni must derive from Lat.illi via a levelling process of nasalization.

---

8 S+N clusters are indeed allowed. This modification is orthogonal to the topic discussed here.
Rohlfs (1963) notices that also some dialects of Toscana display a dative clitic that, from the Latin form *illi*, has become *ni* or *gni* via paradigm levelling. Moreover, in other Tuscan dialects, the same levelling process operates on the clitics of the same cluster. For instance, in the dialect of Livorno, the dative form (34) becomes *ne* before a partitive clitic according to a process of sintagmatic levelling.

(34) a. *da-glie-ne* → *da-nne-ne*
   give-3.DAT-PART

   b. *glie-ne* *ha* *dato* → *ne n’ha dato*
   3.DAT-PART AUX give

In conclusion, clitic clusters seem to be constrained by a markedness principle like the one in (31). In my opinion, violations of this constraint would trigger a counter-levelling process replacing a clitic with another exponent and, therefore, causing a synthetic cluster. The machinery responsible for the substitution will be discussed in the following section.

4. COUNTER-LEVELLING: THE ROLE OF ‘ELSEWHERE’ CLITICS

In the last section I have discussed the hypothesis that clitic clusters are triggered by a counter-levelling process preventing the insertion of similar vocabulary items in the same cluster. This hypothesis allows us to predict the contexts where synthetic clusters can arise, as described in section 3.

The second step of the analysis of clitic clusters accounts for the substitution, i.e. how the blocked clitic is replaced by another exponent, e.g. *ci* in Italian (3) or *se* in Spanish (24). In this section I will show that if we postulate a machinery like the one in section 3, we will account for all the substitutions without any post-syntactic operations like those suggested by Bonet (1991, 1995) and Harris (1994, 1997).

Indeed, the patterns of substitution can be captured by a single, universal principle like the Subset Principle, in (4), due to Halle & Marantz (1993) and discussed in section 1.

(4) the phonological exponent of a Vocabulary item is inserted into a morpheme <i.e. a terminal node of a syntactic tree> if the item matches all or a subset of the grammatical features specified in the terminal morpheme. Insertion does not take place if the Vocabulary item contains features not present in the morpheme. Where several

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
<td>Sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. obj</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indir. obj</td>
<td></td>
<td>ne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vocabulary items meet the conditions for insertion, the item matching the greatest number of features specified in the terminal morpheme must be chosen. (Halle 1997: 428)

This principle predicts that, when two clitics violate the Counter-levelling constraint, one of them can be replaced by a less specific candidate, as shown in (34).

(35) \[ *\text{clitic A} + \text{clitic A} \]
\[ \downarrow \]
\[ \text{clitic B} \text{ (iff B features are a subset of A features)} \]

In particular, my hypothesis is that in each Romance dialect, a clitic can be replaced by an elsewhere clitic – cfr. (36) –, i.e. a clitic without any feature representation, see section 1. On the basis of this characteristic, an elsewhere clitic can be inserted everywhere more specific items are blocked.

(36) \[ *\text{clitic} + \text{clitic} \]
\[ \downarrow \]
\[ \text{elsewhere} \]

The hypothesis in (36) can be supported by an independent piece of evidence. Indeed, on the basis of the Subset Principle, I can formulate a diagnostic test detecting the elsewhere. I claimed indeed that an elsewhere can replace other clitics because it lacks a specification, but how can the Subset Principle repair the co-occurrence of two elsewhere clitics?

If we replaced an elsewhere with another clitic, we would violate the Subset Principle since, by definition, all the clitics that are not elsewhere are more specific than the elsewhere. Therefore, in (37) we would insert an over-specified clitic violating the Subset Principle.

(37) \[ *\text{elsewhere} + \text{elsewhere} \]
\[ \downarrow \]
\[ *\text{clitic} \]

Therefore, a context like (37) can be repaired only with the deletion of a clitic, as shown in (38).

(38) \[ *\text{elsewhere} + \text{elsewhere} \]
\[ \downarrow \]
\[ *\text{clitic} \]

Summing up, the Subset Principle states that an elsewhere clitic

a) cannot be replaced;

b) is deleted, when violates the counter-levelling constraint.

In fact, Italian is consistent with this test, indeed si is substituted by ci when co-occurs with another si – as in (3) – but when two ci co-occur, one of them has to be deleted as shown in (39.a) vs (39.b).

(3) a. \[ I \text{ piatti si lavano spesso.} \]
The dishes IMP wash often
‘Dishes are often washed’

b. \[ Carlo si lava spesso. \]
Carlo REFLEXIVE washes often
‘Carlo often washes’

c.  *In estate si si lava spesso.
In summer REFLEXIVE IMPRERATIVE wash often
‘In summer you often wash’

d.  *In estate ci si lava spesso.
In summer REFLEXIVE IMPRERATIVE wash often
‘In summer you often wash’

To Rome ACC.PL ACC.PL locates Micol
‘Micol brings us to Rome’.

b.  A Roma ci porta Micol.
To Rome ACC.PL locates Micol
‘Micol brings us to Rome’.

The examples in (40) show that the locative + accusative cluster is not ruled out in principle (for example by a filter constraining bundles of syntactic features), but it is blocked only in the case (39.a) where the same item ci has to be repeated in the same cluster.

(40)  a.  A Roma mi ci porta Micol.
To Rome ACC.SG ACC.PL locates Micol
‘Micol brings me to Rome’.

b.  A Roma vi ci porta Micol.
To Rome ACC.PL ACC.PL locates Micol
‘Micol brings you to Rome’.

c.  A Roma ti ci porta Micol.
To Rome ACC.SG ACC.PL locates Micol
‘Micol brings you to Rome’.

d.  etc.

Also Spanish is consistent with the elsewhere hypothesis. Indeed the dative le(s) is replaced by the reflexive clitic se before a third person object clitic – cfr. the spurious se pattern in (24) –, but when two se – a reflexive and an impersonal one – are clustered (41.a), one of them has to be deleted. Finally, the whole cluster results ungrammatical (41.b) because this repair would delete an argumental clitic9.

(24)  a.  Juan le comprò un libro.  (Spanish)
Juan DAT bought a book
‘Juan bought a book for him/her’

b.  Juan lo comprò.

9 In many languages the deletion of an argumental clitic results ungrammatical, while the deletion of a locative or ablative clitic is always unproblematic, see the Catalan and Italian cases.
Juan 3.ACC bought
‘Juan bought it’

b. *Juan le lo comprò.  
Juan 3.DAT 3.ACC bought
‘Juan bought it for him/her’

d. Juan se lo comprò.  
Juan 3.DAT 3.ACC bought
‘Juan bought it for him/her’

(41) a. *Cuando se come, se se lava las manos antes.  
When IMP eat, REFL IMP wash the hands before
‘You(imp.) have to wash your hands before eating’

b. *Cuando se come, se se lava las manos antes.  
When IMP eat, REFL IMP wash the hands before
‘You(imp.) have to wash your hands before eating’

It is worth noting that Spanish cannot repair the IMPERSONAL + REFLEXIVE by substitution because it does not display any non-personal clitic less specific than se, while in Italian the same sequence can be repaired by the insertion of the elsewhere clitic ci.

Finally, many clusters of Barceloní – the Catalan dialect spoken in Barcelona (Bonet 1991, 1995) – can be accounted for suggesting that the locative /i/ (hi) is the default exponent, since it replaces the /n/ (en) item (partitive and/or ablative) when it violates the Counter-levelling constraint in (31) – as shown in (42) and (43) respectively – and, at the same time, two occurrences of /i/ are ruled out. Indeed, according to Bonet (1991) the dative clitic li – in (44.a) – can be decomposed into a third person exponent l- plus an oblique marker -i that is syncretic with the locative clitic hi (pronounced /i/).

(42) a. El jersei, el trauré de l’armari després.  
The sweater, 3.ACC take-1.SG.FUT from the closet later

b. De l’armari, en /n/ trauré el jersei després.  
From the closet ABL take-1.SG.FUT the sweater later

The sweater, from the closet, 3.ACC ABL take-1.SG.FUT later

The sweater, from the closet, 3.ACC elsewhere take-1.SG.FUT later

‘I will take the sweater from the closet later’

(43) a. Del cine, en van sortir tres nens.  
From-the cinema, ABL came-out-3.PL three children

b. De nens, en van sortir tres del cine.  
Of children, PART came-out-3.PL three from-the cinema

c. *Del cine, de nens n’ en van sortir tres.  
From the cinema, of children PART ABL came-out-3.PL three
d. *Del cine, de nens i van sortir tres.*
   From the cinema, of children PART elsewhere came-out-3.PL three
   ‘three children came out from the cinema’

(44) a. *A Montserrat, hi/í/ faré un regal a la Gemma.*
   In Montserrat, LOC give-1.SG.FUT a present to the Gemma
b. *A la Gemma, li faré un regal a Montserrat.*
   To the Gemma, 3.DAT give-1.SG.FUT a present in Montserrat
c. *A la Gemma, A Montserrat, li hi faré un regal.*
   To the Gemma, in Montserrat, 3.DAT LOC give-1.SG.FUT a present
d. *A la Gemma, A Montserrat, li faré un regal.*
   To the Gemma, In Montserrat, 3.DAT LOC give-1.SG.FUT a present
   ‘In Montserrat I will give a present to Gemma’

In conclusion, the correlation between the patterns of substitution and the test illustrated above shows that se, i and ci are the (potential) elsewhere of Spanish, Barceloní and Italian respectively. Moreover, Italian shows another piece of evidence supporting the elsewhere hypothesis because ci is the only syncretic item in its paradigm, cf. section 2.

4.1. A note on Italian

Italian shows a palatalized allomorph of the pan-Romance third person exponent (*gl/-/λ/ vs l-*) that is usually inserted when the dative clitic is masculine. Therefore, when the indirect object is feminine (45.a) the clitic is formed by the unmarked [-participant] marker l-, while, when it is masculine, the palatalized item is inserted (45.b).

(45) a. *(Alla mamma) le presto un libro.*
   (To-the mum,) 3.DAT.F1 bring-1.SG a book
   ‘I lend a book to mum’

   b. *(Al papà) gli presto un libro.*
   (To-the dad,) 3.DAT.M1 bring-1.SG a book
   ‘I lend a book to dad’

Therefore, the feminine direct and indirect clitic display a syncretic stem (l-) that will be blocked when they co-occur (46.a) or when the dative precedes the partitive clitic (46.b), in accordance with the Counter-levelling constraint, cf. section 3. In these cases, the feminine dative is obligatorily marked by the masculine item gli, even if the indirect object is feminine, like in (46).

(46) a. *(A Maria, un libro) le lo presto.*
   (To Mary, a book) 3.DAT.F1 3.ACC.M lend-1.SG
   ‘I lend it to her’

   b. *(A Maria, di libri) le ne presto tre.*
   (To Mary, of books) 3.DAT.F1 PART lend -1.SG three
   ‘I lend it three of them to her’
(47) a. *(A Maria, un libro) glie lo presto.
    (To Mary, a book) 3.DAT.M, 3.ACC.M lend -1.SG
    ‘I lend it to her’

    b. *(A Maria, di libri) glie ne presto tre.
    (To Mary, of books) 3.DAT.M, PART lend -1.SG three
    ‘I lend three of them to her’

The sentences in (47) are apparent counter-examples contradicting the hypothesis discussed in the last section, according to which the syncretic clitic ci is the Italian elsewhere. Indeed, on the basis of (3) and the scheme (36), the clitic le in (46) should be replaced by the elsewhere ci – vs the allomorph gli as in (47) – giving rise to the clusters in (48).

(48) a. *(A Maria, un libro) ce lo presto.
    (To Mary, a book) elsewhere, 3.ACC.M lend -1.SG
    ‘I lend it to her’

    b. *(A Maria, di libri) ce ne presto tre.
    (To Mary, of books) elsewhere, PART lend -1.SG three
    ‘I lend three of them to her’

Clusters like (48) are actually attested in a substandard register, but they are banned in Standard Italian. In my opinion this restriction is consistent with the second part of the Subset Principle stating that the most specific vocabulary item (among the underspecified ones) is inserted. Indeed, when l- violates the Counter-Levelling Constraint in (31), it is substituted by its allomorph gli instead of the elsewhere clitic ci because the former is, by definition, more specific than the latter. On the basis of this remark we can set different strategies of substitution: when two clitics of the same cluster are tend to linear levelling, a clitic is substituted by

   a. an allomorph, e.g. the Italian gli, cfr. (47) and the scheme (35);
   b. an elsewhere clitic, e.g. the Italian ci, cfr. (3) and the scheme (36);
   c. ø, if the clitic is an elsewhere, cfr. (43) and the scheme (38).

The main point is that the ranking of these strategies is not a stipulation, but it is directly due to the Subset Principle in (4).

(35) *clitic A + clitic A
     ↓
    clitic B (iff B features are a subset of A features)

(36) *clitic + clitic
     ↓
    elsewhere

(38) *elsewhere + elsewhere
     ↓
    *elitie

5. INTERMEDIATE SUMMARY

---

10 This substitution can be accounted for suggesting that the replacing process – based on the Subset Principle – is independent from any phonological constraint, even if triggered by the Counter-Levelling one. Indeed, even if the palatalized allomorph l- increases the sonority distance between the clitic stems, the sonority hierarchy is still violated.
In the previous sections I have discussed two independent phenomena, namely syncretisms and synthetic clusters, that can be accounted for by the same theoretical machinery:

1. a Counter-Levelling Constraint, preventing the co-occurrence of similar items in the same inventory (namely, paradigm counter-levelling, section 2) or in the same cluster (namely linear counter-levelling, section 3);
2. the Subset Principle (cf. Distributed Morphology, section 1) allowing a clitic to be replaced by an elsewhere item in order to avoid violations of the counter-levelling constraint (both of the paradigmatic and linear versions). Moreover, the Subset Principle entails that an elsewhere clitic is deleted when violates the constraint in 1, cf. section 4.

These isomorphic analyses would entail a high level of correlation between these distinct phenomena and, in conclusion, the results of the previous analyses would be able to be grouped into a single prediction:

(49) in each Romance language there is a default (or elsewhere) clitic that
   a. replaces the clitic of a cluster that violates the Counter-Levelling Constraint;
   b. is deleted when violates the Counter-Levelling Constraint;
   c. is a syncretic exponent.

In the next section I will test the prediction in (49) on the basis of the data due to some Italian dialects. If the impressive variation displayed by Italian dialects does not falsify this prediction, it will be a strong piece of evidence supporting the analyses based on the principles 1 and 2.

6. Data

6.1. Varieties displaying an elsewhere deriving from Lat. ince/hic

The Vailate dialect (spoken in the province of Cremona, North Italy) shows a clear case of syncretism since the clitic ga – that derives from the Latin locative particle hic – is used as locative, 1st person plural and 3rd person dative, as shown in (50).

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Dir. obj.} & \text{Indir. obj.} & \text{Reflexive} & \text{Partitive} & \text{Locative} \\
\hline
\text{ma} & \text{ga} & \text{sa} & \text{na} & \text{ga} \\
\text{sg} & \text{pl} & \text{sg} & \text{pl} & \text{Sg} & \text{pl} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

In this dialect a reflexive + impersonal cluster is realized as ga sa (51.a) where the reflexive clitic is marked by an unexpected ga exponent as in the Italian example in (3). At the same time two ga cannot co-occur (50.b) as in the Italian example in (42), therefore I conclude that in the Vailate dialect ga is the elsewhere Vocabulary Item.
In some dialects of Northern Puglia and Molise (especially in the Campobasso province, see Rohlfs 1968: 185-186) like Poggio Imperiale, S. Paolo di Civitate, Pàstena, Monteroduni (data from Manzini & Savoia 2005: 135-138) the elsewhere *ce (< Lat. *ince) is even more pervasive than in the dialect above. Indeed it is used as impersonal (53), locative (54), 4th person object – direct and indirect (55) –, 3rd and 4th person reflexive (56), but not as third person dative (57)\(^\text{11}\).

### (52) Poggio Imperiale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
<td>sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. obj.</td>
<td>mә</td>
<td>cә</td>
<td>tә</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indir. obj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cә</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nә</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(53) *Allà cә magnә bonә* (Poggio Imperiale, Manzini & Savoia 2005)

There IMP eat.3 well

(54) *ce mettә u salә*

LOC put DET salt

(55) *ce da quistә*

1.PL.DAT give this

(56) cә *lavә*

3.REFL wash.3.SG
cә *lavәmә*

1.PL.REFL wash.1.PL
cә *lavәnә*

3.REFL wash.3.PL

(57) *i da quistә*

3.DAT give.3.SG this

Moreover, when the 3rd person dative *i* co-occurs with the 3rd person accusative clitic, it is replaced by the elsewhere clitic *cә*, as shown in (58).

\(^{11}\) The paradigm is not complete because it is based on the data collected by Manzini & Savoia (2005: 135)
The Napoli paradigm in (58) shows the same pattern of syncretism of Italian.

But the Neapolitan synthetic clusters in (60) differ from those displayed by Standard Italian and discussed in section 4.1.

Indeed, Napoli replaces the le exponent with the elsewhere (ce) following the repairing strategy in (36), while Standard Italian replaces it with the third person allomorph gli – as shown in (467) – following the strategy (35). This asymmetry can be accounted for since the Napoli dialect does not present any third person allomorph and therefore it must exploit its elsewhere in order to avoid identity.

Finally, in the Napoli dialect a cluster formed by a locative and a personal ce is not allowed, as shown by the scheme in (61): therefore, even in Napoli, pieces of evidence from the paradigm and the clusters converge on the same clitic ce.

The next dialect shows two syncletic clitics in their paradigms (namely two potential elsewhere items). Therefore a clear prediction about the elsewhere cannot be made, even if it allows us to exclude the non syncletic item among *inde, *ince and *se from the set of potential elsewhere.

Indeed, in the Arce dialect – spoken in South Italy (62) – the reflexive exponent is not syncletic, therefore – on the basis of the hypotheses discussed above – the possibility that it will be inserted in
synthetic clusters can be excluded. The contrary would be a strong counter-example falsifying my prediction and weakening the general hypothesis discussed in the previous sections.

(62) **Arce**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. obj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indir. obj.</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>ci</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistently with my prediction, the Arce dialect does not show clitic clusters where an unexpected reflexive marker is inserted, therefore there is a correlation between the clitic appearing in the clusters and one of the two candidates indicated by the paradigm (*ci* and *ne*).

(62) a. \( \text{glie} + \text{glie} \rightarrow \text{ce glie} (*\text{glieglie}) \)
    
    3.DAT 3.ACC

b. \( \text{glie} + \text{ne} \rightarrow \text{ce ne} (*\text{gliene}) \)
    
    3.DAT PART

Since even in the Arce dialect two clitics *ce* cannot co-occur, I conclude that the data are consistent and that the elsewhere is again the locative *ce*.

A slightly different pattern of syncretism is displayed by some dialects of Abruzzi and Molise that show frequently cases of synthetic clusters of the type represented above, even if their paradigms display two syncretic exponents: *cə* (< Lat *ince*) and *zə* (< Lat. *se*). In the Guardiaregia and Miranda dialects (Manzini & Savoia 2005: 141) *cə* is only a 4th person and locative clitic (like in the standard Italian paradigm), while in the dialects of Vastogirardi and Roccasicura its distribution is more narrow – see the paradigm in (63) – because it is a 4th person (non reflexive) and locative exponent. However, in both these kinds of dialects, *cə* replaces the 3rd person dative that in isolation is characterized by the form *rə*.

(63) **Roccasicura**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. obj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indir. obj.</td>
<td>mə</td>
<td>cə</td>
<td>tə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1. Varieties displaying an elsewhere deriving from Lat. sibi
The dialects I will analyse are characterized by a single syncretic exponent, therefore, in accordance with the discussion in section 1, the analysis of the paradigm allows us to detect immediately the potential elsewhere. For example, the paradigm of the dialect spoken in Sarroch (province of Cagliari, Sardinia) shows a syncretic clitic deriving from the Latin reflexive pronoun se. Indeed in the Sarroch dialect si is used as third person reflexive and first and second person plural object.

This pattern of syncretism correlates with the patterns of synthetic clusters shown in (66).

(65) Sarroch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dir. obj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indir. obj.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n)ci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(66) a. ddi + ddu → si ddu (*ddi ddu)

b. ddi + ndi → si ndi (*ddi ndi)

c. si + si → * (*si si)

In the variety of Sarroch the transparent form of these clusters would be ddi ddu and ddi ndi, but – like in Spanish – the dative clitic is replaced by the reflexive one. At the same time the co-occurrence of two si markers is ruled out as predicted by my hypothesis, cf. section 4. Indeed the translation of an Italian sentence with a reflexive si and an indirect object si is impossible.

Therefore, consistent pieces of evidence from the paradigm (66), the synthetic clusters (66.a/b) and the test (66.c) indicate that si is the elsewhere clitic of the Sarroch inventory.

6.3. Varieties displaying an elsewhere deriving from Lat. inde
The individuation of the dialects displaying an elsewhere item deriving from Lat. inde is really puzzling. Indeed, the substitution of a dative clitic of the form l+V with a n+V item can be due to paradigm levelling (see section 3). For example, in some dialects of Tuscany, the dative le becomes ne before the partitive clitic ne.
This pattern is not due to the contextual substitution of a clitic, but to the spreading of the nasal feature in a context of linear levelling.

However, some Southern dialects display cases of synthetic clusters in the usual context 3.dative + 3.accusative where the dative clitic is replaced by the ne exponent that is a syncretic clitic realizing both the partitive and the 1st plural pronoun, see, for example, the paradigm of Rocca Imperiale (from Manzini & Savoia 2005: 291).

| Rocca Imperiale |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| Dir. obj.       | mә | nә | tә |
| Indir. obj.     |    | tә | vә |
| Reflexive       | sә | nә | sә |
| Partitive       | ә  |    |    |
| Locative        | tә | ә  |    |

Third person clitics are realized by a single vowel, but, when clustered, the dative exponent i is replaced by the partitive n- (< Lat. inde) as shown in (69).

(69) \( i + i \rightarrow n̄i \) (*ii) 3.DAT 3.ACC.PL

Moreover, it is worth noting that a sequence formed by the 1.pl and the partitive clitic is not realized by a sequence of two nә, but with a single exponent, cf. (70).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.SG</th>
<th>2.SG</th>
<th>2.PL</th>
<th>1.PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mә nә</td>
<td>tә nә</td>
<td>vә nә</td>
<td>#ә nә</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>PART</td>
<td>PART</td>
<td>PART</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1. A map of Italian elsewheres

On the basis of the data discussed above, the locative item (< Lat. *ince*) seems the most widespread elsewhere clitic in Romance, as shown by the Italian and Catalan dialects. In Sardinia we can find dialects characterized by either the locative (71.a-c) or the reflexive elsewhere (< Lat *se*) like Sarroch (65)-(66) and Baunei (71.d) that pattern with Spanish.

(71) a. "Nende-*bi- lu* appo fattu un *ibbagliu* (Ossi - SS)
b. "Nanne-*bi- lu* appo attu unu *irbagliu* (Bitti - NU)
c. "Nende-*bi- lu* appo *isbagliadu* (Posada - NU)
d. "Narando-*si-ddu* hoppo fattu unu *s bagi lu* (Baunei - NU)

Telling-3.DAT-3.ACC AUX make a mistake

Instances of *si* elsewhere are shown also by many dialects of Emilia Romagna that have not been analyzed here because they do not display evident cases of synthetic clusters.

Several dialects of Puglia, Calabria and Sicilia show pieces of evidence of a partitive elsewhere (< Lat. *inde*), for instance in Castrovillari, (72).

(72) *li* + *lu* → *ni lu* (*li lu*) (Loporcaro 1995)
3.DAT 3.ACC

The dialects of Puglia are a representative sample of the patterns displayed in Romance: indeed they provide examples of each pattern as shown in (73) that is a list of synthetic clusters where the conservative dative *li* (< Lat. *illi*) is replaced by another clitic (locative *nci*, partitive *ni* and even reflexive *si*)\(^\text{12}\).

(73) dialect 3.DAT+3.ACC, 3.DAT+PART
     Vico Garganico *ce le*
     Vieste *cille*
     Monte S. Angelo *Celle*
     S. Marco la Catola *Cele*
     Trinitapoli *ce/nge le*
     Cerignola *ce li*
     Candela *ngille, nge ne*
     Molfetta *ngiuue, nger e*
     Spinazzola *Nille*
     Laterza *ngi-i/ci le*
     Martina Franca *ngille, ce ne*
     Grottaglie *nilo*

\(^\text{12}\) These clusters can be found in the texts collected by Melillo (1981).
7. CONCLUSIONS

In this article I have explored the correlation between syncretism and synthetic clusters in the clitic systems of some Romance dialects. The data show that apparently irregular patterns can be accounted for by the hypothesis that a single elsewhere (or default) item replaces other clitics when their insertion is blocked by independent markedness constraints.

In particular, synthetic clusters are suggested to be due to a principle constraining the linearization of clitic items, disallowing the co-occurrence of similar items in the same cluster. When the insertion of a specific item is blocked in order to avoid this constraint, the Subset Principle in (4) rules the insertion of a default item instead of the blocked clitic.

The same analysis can account for syncretisms too: indeed, a markedness principle seems to constrain clitic inventories displaying identical personal pronouns. When a process of paradigm levelling gives rise to an inventory bearing two homophonic personal pronouns, one of them is replaced – via the Subset Principle – by a default marker.

In conclusion, the analysis of syncretism patterns with the one of clusters, leading to the same conclusion that both syncretism and synthetic clusters are due to the insertion of an elsewhere item. Therefore, the previous analyses (and the principles on which they are based on) can be verified if each Romance dialect the clitic inserted in synthetic clusters is also a syncretic item.

Italian and Catalan dialects confirm this prediction and, finally, provide a strong piece of evidence supporting the Counter-levelling hypothesis and the Subset Principle (Halle & Marantz 1993, 1994; Halle 1997).

It is worth noting that the previous sections do not provide any suggestion accounting for the target of the substitution, i.e. why in a cluster formed by two clitics, the replaced clitic is systematically the one on the left. According to the theory of Distributed Morphology, only a deduction can be derived. Indeed, since a clitic is replaced when another identical item has already been inserted, it means that the right clitic is inserted before the left one. Therefore, since Vocabulary Insertion proceeds outward following the syntactic structure (Bobaljik 2000), it entails that the replaced clitic is higher than the transparent one (74).

(74) [repaired-CL [FP transparent clitic]]

If this asymmetry will be confirmed by independent pieces of evidence, it will be a strong point in favour of the model of vocabulary insertion suggested by Bobaljik (2000).
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