

TEMPORAL PERIPHRAISIS AND CLITICS IN CENTRAL ROMANCE LANGUAGES

Franco Benucci

Università di Padova

The paper analyzes both the diachronic development and the synchronic syntactic behaviour of the temporal periphrasis (i.e. the compound tenses) in many non-standard, geographically central and syntactically advanced Romance varieties, with particular regard to clitic placement. It is argued that in the languages examined Aux+Pp constructions have a discentential constituency, i.e. they consist of a full-fledged participial CP embedded in the auxiliary clause, and that the syntactic change that led them to this situation is the last development of the general destructuring process that affected in previous centuries the modal and causative/perceptive constructions of the same languages.

1. Introduction

In Benucci (1989), (1990a) and (1990b) we presented an analysis of both the diachronic development and the synchronic situation of Romance periphrastic verbal constructions (i.e. modal and causative/perceptive structures) in connection with the phenomena of clitic placement, which accounted for the two basic types of clitic constructions (Cl+V+Inf vs. V+Cl+Inf/V+Inf+Cl) and for the related phenomena that differentiate the various Romance varieties, in terms of monosentential vs. discentential structures.

Namely, we suggested that in a monosentential construction like Italian (1), the two verbal items belong together as a complex predicate V*, heading the complex VP* of a single subject/predicate articulated S-structure sentence, derived (via VP raising and other morpho-syntactic adjustments) from a D-structure containing an embedded infinitival IP, complement to the main modal/causative/perceptive clause:

- (1) Te ne voglio/lascio/vedo dare due.
 to-you of-them (I) want/let/see (to) give two

On the other hand, we claimed that in the counterpart French constructions (2), each verbal item corresponds, at both D- and S-structures, to a full-fledged CP with its subject/predicate articulation, i.e. that the whole structure is a disentential embedding one:

- (2) Je veux/laisse/vois t'en donner deux.
 I want/let/see to-you of-them (to) give two

Furthermore, we pointed out that all the old Romance languages admitted only the Italian-like construction, and we proposed a diachronic mechanism of reanalysis, which we termed 'destructuring', responsible for the evolution of the monosentential structure into the disentential one in those languages that behave nowadays like French.

The examination of the various stages of diachronic development in the periphrastic constructions of French highlighted a chronological concatenation between the monosentential > disentential evolution of modal periphrasis and the analogous development of causative/perceptive ones, as if they were two (successive and staggered by one step, due to the increasing structural complexity) stages of the same destructuring process.

The cross-linguistic examination of the distribution of the various periphrastic phenomena confirmed this hypothesis: the Romance languages that share with French a disentential structure for modal periphrasis (Walloon, Franco-Provençal, Northern Italian Dialects, Rhaeto-Romance/Ladin varieties and Brazilian Portuguese) also present many clues of a very advanced destructuration in the causative/perceptive domain. We will term this group of languages the advanced Romance languages, referring particularly to the syntax of their verbal periphrasis.

On the other hand, the languages with still consistently monosentential modal constructions (Sardinian and Southern Italian Dialects)¹ display the same characteristics in the causative/perceptive domain too.

Between these two extremes, many languages (Standard Italian, Central Italian Dialects, Occitan, Norman and other Oïtanic Dialects, Catalan, Spanish, Galician and Portuguese) display a (more or less advanced) regime of free variation between mono- and disentential structures in the modal as well as in the causative/perceptive domains.

The concatenation of the diachronic evolution in the modal and causative/perceptive domains highlights a general and pervasive trend towards the deconstruction of monosentential structures, i.e. to the reanalysis of complex predicates into simple predicate, embedded disentential structures, each of them with its own autonomous argumental, thematic and Case-marking grids, its bunch of functional projection (including CP), etc.

The natural prediction of our analysis is that the same destructuring process should sooner or later affect also the very basic complex predicates of Romance languages, i.e. their compound tenses, which can be considered as 'temporal/aspectual' periphrasis consisting of an inflected auxiliary verb and a past participle. The goal of this paper is to review the syntactic behaviour of the compound tenses in Romance varieties and to provide an analysis of some phenomena that seem to instantiate a further step of the agelong destructuring process, with the 'breaking down' of the temporal periphrasis into two autonomous full-fledged sentential structures.

As in our previous works, clitic placement phenomena will be taken as a macroscopic evidence of the structure of participial constructions, although related phenomena will be considered as

¹ Romanian, that is monosentential in modal domain, has lost all the periphrastic phenomena in causative/perceptive structures, which evolved to a generalized pseudo-relative subjunctival type.

well. For the centrality of clitic placement in the analysis of verbal periphrasis, which relies on the conditions of possible clitic movement, the reader is referred to Benucci (1990a).

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we will survey the situation of participial clitic constructions in Romance, both in its synchronic distribution (§ 2.1) and in its diachronic evolution (§ 2.2). Furthermore, the data from language acquisition analysed in § 2.3 will confirm the claimed concatenation between the various kinds of verbal periphrasis and lead us into the structural analysis of the temporal ones, that is developed in section 3. We will do so by having first a closer look at the syntactic behaviour of clitics and related matter in participial constructions in Franco-provençal (§ 3.1) and in Piedmontese and other dialects (§ 3.2), before explicating our analysis in § 3.3. In section 4 we will summarize and draw the conclusion of the whole paper.

2. Romance Past Participle and Clitics

Temporal periphrasis constitute the very basic model for all the Romance derived complex predicates V* (i.e. the monosentential modal and causative/perceptive constructions); even if this model may be retraced to the reanalysis of an original (Latin) predicative embedding structure, such a derivational origin is by now completely opaque for the speakers and the V* has been completely grammaticalized in the inflectional paradigm of all the Romance verbs.

2.1. The Synchronic Situation of Clitic Placement in Compound Tenses

The general pattern of clitic placement in compound tenses of contemporary standard Romance languages has the clitic attached to the auxiliary, as it is instantiated by the examples in (3):²

² The position of clitics, i.e. whether they appear in proclisis or in enclisis, depends on specifications particular to the grammar of each language, including reference to tense and mood of the auxiliary and (in some varieties as Portuguese and Galician) to its structural position, which we will not pursue here. Participial absolute constructions like Italian *Salutatami, Gianni usci* (Greeted-me, Gianni left) are also beyond the scope of this paper.

- (3) a. Portuguese: Quando chegou, já *lhe tinha* contado um conto.
 b. Spanish: Cuando llegó, ya *le había* contado un cuento.
 c. French: Quand il arriva, je *lui avais* déjà raconté une histoire.
 d. Italian: Quando arrivò, *gli avevo* già raccontato una storia.
 when he arrived, I to-him had already told a story
 e. Romanian: *M-a* vazut.
 (he) me has seen

Yet, it is not infrequent, in the synchronic syntactic landscape of *România*, to come across non-standard(ized) varieties displaying a different behaviour of clitics in the context of temporal periphrasis. What we find in many Romance varieties is short movement of clitics (i.e. attachment to the past participle), as well as clitic repetition or clitic splitting (on the auxiliary and on the past participle),³ as in (4):

- (4) a. Walloon (Remacle (1952:264-5)):
 Tant k'i n'aront nin *su* *fouté* one pire.
 as-long as-they not-will-have themselves thrown a stone

³ Here again we will not deal with the specifications of cliticization in the considered varieties, yielding proclisis or enclisis to the participle, according to each particular grammar.

- b. Franco-provençal⁴ (Olszyna-Marzys (1964:47-59), Keller (1958:140-1), Harris (1967, 1969), Roberts (1990, 1991)):

Y a *sarra-me* la gordze.

he has clenched-me the throat

Me chei pa *en-chwenae*.

myself am not about-it-remembered

- c. Piedmontese (Aly-Belfadel (1933:159-61), Rohlf's (1967:175), Burzio (1986:124, 417), Tuttle (1986:233, 276), Brero (1988:73-95), Parry (1990, 1991, 1992)):

V'a *purta-vvi*.

(he) you-has taken-you

Péna *ch'i sun védü-me*.

as-soon as I am seen-myself

⁴ Data from Oszyna-Marzys (1964) from the central Valais (Switzerland) variety are factually against Keller's (1958) hypothesis, further supported by Harris (1967, 1969), according to whom the construction Aux+Pp+Cl in Valdôtain would be due to a Piedmontese influence: "qu'il s'agisse bien d'une influence piémontaise, ceci ne fait pas de doute, car la postposition du pronom n'existe pas au-delà des Alpes. [...] D'autre part elle est courante en piémontais". In our opinion, speaking of the influence of a variety onto the other has no sense: rather both Piedmontese and Valdôtain (as well as the other Romance varieties analyzed here) have innovated in a parallel way, according to a general (Romance, at least) tendency, even if it is possible that the nearby prestigious dialect contributed to strengthen the incipient destructuring of temporal periphrasis in Valdôtain. See in section 2.2. the diachronic development.

- d. Rhaeto-Romance⁵ (Thöni (1969:78)):
Vous vez las scretgas.
 you have them written
- e. Friulian⁶ (Marchetti (1952:140,164), Benincà/Vanelli (1984:fn. 6)):
I ai dat-i.
 (I) to-him have given-to-him
'O veis contàdi-ur-al.
 you have told-to-them-it
- f. Brazilian Portuguese (Salvi (1990:fn.7), Bianchi/Figueiredo Silva (1993))
O José tinha realmente me decepcionado.
 the José had really me deceived

All the above phenomena of 'aberrant' cliticization are typical clues of a (more or less advanced) destructuring process, i.e. of a syntactic change in progress, consisting in giving full verbal

⁵ The referred phenomenon is to be found only in the Surmiran variety and in limited contexts (feminine accusative and reflexive clitics), since the use of clitics is generally speaking quite obsolete and 'literary' or has even completely disappeared in other Rhaeto-Romance varieties (cf. Thöni (1969:74-5, 78)). An exception to this is the reflexive clitic *se* —that is still used in the Sursilvan variety and generalized to all the grammatical persons- which also follows the pattern in (4d) (cf. Spescha (1989:384-98), Taraldsen (1993)):

(i) *Jeu sun seretratgs da tut mes uffecis.*
 I am self-dismissed from all my charges

In Putèr and Vallader varieties, both the complement clitics and the reflexive ones (differentiated by person) follow the 'standard Romance' pattern in (3), attaching to the auxiliary (cf. Ganzoni (1983a, b).

⁶ Data from Iliescu (1972:153-4), who collects witnesses of varieties coming from all over Friuli and dispersed in various areas of Romania, seem to belie Benincà/Vanelli (1984) and Marchetti (1952), who attribute the constructions in (4e) to "qualche varietà della Bassa Friulana" and define them as "estranee al friulano centrale comune [c alla] koinè friulana".

'dignity' to the non-temporalized element of the complex predicate,⁷ thus making it the nucleus of a new embedded sentential structure.

Indeed, the same phenomena are met in the history of French (and Romance) modal and causative/perceptive periphrasis, at the moment of their 'breaking down' into disentential constructions. It is then quite interesting to note that all the varieties in (4) belong to the group of Romance languages that share with French the disentential status of modal and causative/perceptive periphrasis (see section 1). This suggests that the constructions in (4) are actually further instantiations of the Romance general trend to destructuration of complex predicates, and that we are dealing here with another step of destructuring, namely with the dragging of compound tenses by the other types of periphrasis.

⁷ The idiosyncratic behaviour of the Romanian clitic *o* (feminine direct object) seems instead to be due to mere phonological reasons. While in modal periphrasis *o* climbs to the modal verb as all other clitics, in compound tenses *o* differentiates from other clitics in remaining attached to the past participle (cf. Lombard (1974:128-9), Radford (1977:305-6)):

- (i) a. *Le pot face = O pot face.* ((I) it_m/t can do)
b. *L-am cumparat ~ Am cumparat-o.* ((I) it_m-have bought-it_f)

In the latter case, given the Romanian phonological rule according to which $V > \emptyset / - V$ (cf. (i b): *Le > L-*), if *o* were to climb to the auxiliary, it would completely disappear: its permanence on the participle is then the only possibility for the object to be expressed. This does not necessarily mean that the temporal periphrasis of Romanian are currently evolving towards disentential status: when the same participle has several clitic complements, only *o* remains downstairs, while the other ones regularly climb to the auxiliary:

- (ii) *V-a dat-o ~ *V-o-a dat/A dat-v-o.* ((he) to-you-has given-it_f)

In spite of this, it is not implausible that this exceptional and independently motivated phenomenon (that yields clitic splitting anyway) may become the penetrating way of destructuring in other contexts of contemporary Romanian, as we hypothesized in Benucci (1990a:Ch. 3 fn. 4).

If this view is correct, then it can seem strange not to find any destructuring phenomenon in the temporal periphrasis of French, i.e. of the language we assumed (cf. Benucci (1989:333) to 'lead' the whole group and to summarize in its history the very differentiated contemporary situation of Romance languages). Yet, if this is true for standard French, which of course is a highly regulated language, a closer look at the popular language (*Français avancé* in Frei's (1928) terms) allows us to find a situation quite analogous to what we have seen in (4), as these examples, quoted by Frei (1928:166) from the letters of French soldiers of WW1, show:

- (5) a. Comme tu m'as déjà en envoyé une paire.
as you to-me-have already of-it sent a pair
- b. Cher fils je te dirai que j'avais vous envoyez un colit.
dear son I you will-say that I-had you sent a parcel
- c. Merci et a R. aici davoire me donné du tabac.
thanks and to R. too of-hav(ing) me given some tobacco

We can assume then that 'spontaneous' French, too, would have clitic splitting and short movement in compound tenses, i.e. that temporal periphrasis also underwent destructuring at some stage of its history, but the normative and scholastic pressure prevented the 'modern' pattern from spreading throughout the language.⁸

⁸ Such phenomena are not completely isolated and absent from contemporary standard French. As Foulet (1930:299) and Dauzat (1946:93-4) respectively point out, instead of the semi-idiomatic "ils s'en sont allés [...] la langue populaire [...] dit: ils se sont en allés; c'est du reste une façon de s'exprimer qui n'est pas inconnue à la langue familière et que certains écrivains même commencent à accueillir". "L'usage parlé n'est pas douteux (sauf chez les gens recherchés) en faveur de la soudure [...] voici maintenant l'usage des bons écrivains contemporains: [...] Flaubert 'il se serait peut-être en allé' (Salammbô XIII:265), A.Daudet 'quand le docteur se fut en allé' (Jack I:8) [...], Estaunié 'il s'est en allé, répéta Claire' (L'ascension de M. Balèvre II:7)".

As Mair Parry (p.c.) suggests, one could argue here for a lexical agglutination, leading to the formation of a verb *en-aller*. Even if this turned out to be true for the special case at issue, as the final consequence of the destructuring process we are studying (cf. on the other hand Dauzat (1946:93): "la particule, vidée peu à peu de son sens, tendait à s'agréger au verbe pour former un verbe nouveau"), this just confirms the vitality of the overall phenomenon in modern French.

The data presented up to now suggest then that contemporary Romance languages are affected by a strong tendency to fix the sentential structures in several embedding levels, via the destructuring of all the complex predicates and the 'reduction to disentential status' of all the monosentential structures inherited from the past, with a sort of narrow application, even to compound tenses, of the principle 'one verb, one sentence' that already asserted itself in many languages for modal and causative/perceptive periphrasis.

2.2. *The Diachronic Evolution*

A quick examination of diachronic data in the above mentioned languages seem to confirm the suggested concatenation between the various types of verbal periphrasis.

Old and middle stages of the various Romance languages did not exhibit the constructions in (4) and (5): temporal periphrasis (as well as modal and causative/perceptive ones) showed everywhere clitic climbing to the auxiliary. Hardly ever can one find, in a very extended *corpus* of Old and Middle French texts, the following single example of clitic placement on the participle, dating back only to the 15th c., an age in which destructuring of French modal periphrasis had already begun (cf. Benucci (1990a), Gougenheim (1929:174)):⁹

- (6) As tu bien l'osé dire. (*Le débat de la nourrisse*, ATF II:423)
 have you even it-dared (to) say

Notice in (6) the 'half climbing' of the clitic, in a context of multiple periphrasis: the modal section still retains the old construction (Cl+V+Inf), while the temporal section has already moved to the modern construction (Aux+Cl+Pp).

⁹ In the Middle Ages, enclisis and proclisis to any verb (including auxiliaries) were regulated by the so-called Tobler-Mussafia Law: in short, clitics could never come first in a sentence and were then enclitics when the verb or auxiliary itself was the first element, proclitics in all other cases.

Analogous constructions appear in the 17th c. in Piedmontese, along with (rare) short movement (i.e. attachment to the participle) and (frequent) clitic repetition ones (cf. Parry (1991:8-9)):

- (7) a. I son *vèñü-ve* di. (G.B. Tana *Il Conte Pioletto* 55)
I am come-to-you (to) say
- b. A-*s* è *buta-sse* an testa. (*ib.* 75)
he-himself is thrown-himself in head
- c. Son *cata-me*. (*ib.* 17)
(I) am bought-myself

and in 18th century in Walloon (cf. Remacle (1952:266): 1742 'J'ai encore *lui fait faire* des souliers'). In all cases, the spreading of clitic repetition and short movement throughout temporal periphrasis is roughly parallel in time to the analogous phenomena occurring in modal contexts. Until the 19th c. the three possibilities of clitic placement (Cl+Aux+Pp, Cl+Aux+Pp+Cl, Aux+Pp+Cl) cooccur in Piedmontese texts (cf. Parry (1991:11-2)).

Yet, by the middle of the 19th c., when the destructuring was completed in the modal domain and well set out in the causative/perceptive one, the 'big change' took place in the temporal domain too, and clitics became only construable with the past participle. As Aly-Belfadel (1933:169, 273) points out for Piedmontese: "La costruzione è variata pei pronomi [...] da mezzo secolo in qua [i.e. since 1883]. [...] Forme italianamente disposte [i.e. Cl+Aux+Pp] sono poco usate nel dialetto perché sono eleganti, ma tuttavia antiquate ed ormai sono usate solo dai vecchi, specialmente se signori".

This chronological point is confirmed by the attestations of *Français avancé* in (5), dating back to 1914-18 (cf. also the 19th c. authors quoted at fn. 8) and by Keller's (1958:141) and Harris' (1967:181) statements concerning Franco-Provençal Valdôtain: "Cette construction 'piémontaise' existait déjà au XIXe s.: Biondelli l'a en effet notée en 1841 à Cogné [Aoste et

Bard/Donnas ...] mais elle ne s'est généralisée jusqu'à présent"; "Compar[ing] the information about this piece of syntax collected by Biondelli in 1841 [...] with that collected by Edmont in 1900 [...] and also with that collected recently by Professor Keller [...] it is possible to obtain a very [...] informative picture of three stages in the history of this development, at intervals of approximately half a century".

It is interesting to note that the transitional construction with clitic repetition, which is attested for Piedmontese by AIS (at the beginning of our century) and quoted by Rohlfs (1967) (cf. ex. (4c.1) here), is no longer current in Turinese and central and literary Piedmontese, that have almost completely¹⁰ evolved to disentential, destructured temporal periphrasis (cf. the examples in Burzio (1986), Tuttle (1986), Brero (1988)), but is still the norm in some peripheral dialects, as the Val Bormida ones (cf. Parry (1990)), which also display repetition in modal periphrasis:

- (8) a. U *m-a scrivu-me.*
 he me-has written-me
 b. I-*t duvisu de-te i duzi.*
 they-to-you should give-to-you the cakes

The same evolution from monosentential to disentential temporal periphrasis, through repetition constructions, is attested for Valdôtain, some of whose peripheral dialects still retained the transitional structure in 1966 (date of data collection for Harris (1969)). Analogously, the clitic splitting and clitic repetition constructions in Friulian, *Français Avancé* and Franco-Provençal

¹⁰ Actually, half climbing and clitic splitting are marginally admitted in modern Piedmontese in multiple periphrasis contexts, as in the following examples, from Parry (1991:9):

- (i) Un diavlot a l'ha *vorsu-je* buté la coa.
 a little-devil he has wanted-there (to) put the tail

Valésien in (4) and (5) may be considered as transitional steps in the destructuring process of temporal periphrasis in those varieties, even if continuous diachronic records are not available. Cf. fn. 22 for the analysis of these constructions.

2.3. Evidence from Language Acquisition

Further evidence for the naturalness and the psychological reality of the destructuring process (which tends to structural simplification and to argumental transparency) and of the suggested concatenation modal > causative/perceptive > temporal periphrasis comes from the data concerning language acquisition.

The learners of French (as L2) studied in Quaranta/Salvadori (1988:244-5) produced temporal periphrasis with 'wrong' clitic placement (between the auxiliary and the past participle) with a frequency varying, depending on the class and exercise considered, between 6,7% and 16,8% of the total utterances. Typical examples of this phenomenon are the following:

- (9) a. J'ai lui dit.
I have him told
- b. J'ai le mis.
I have it put

As the mentioned authors point out, this happens with pupils who are generally aware of the 'correct' position for clitic placement in French modal constructions (V+Cl+Inf). "Il fenomeno [in (9)] appare quindi sufficientemente esteso e rivela una zona di incertezza [...] per quanto riguarda la collocazione dei clitici in un gruppo verbale complesso", once the 'rule' for clitic placement in French modal periphrasis (i.e. their disentential syntactic constituency) has been acquired. In Benucci (1990b) we saw that the same is true, in the causative/perceptive domain, for French mother-tongue learners,¹¹ it seems then that no significant difference holds, from this point of view, between L1 and L2 acquisition.

¹¹ Antelmi (1991/2) adds to this the case of children acquiring Italian, who utter (i a) alongside with (i b):

As a matter of fact, the same correlation between clitic climbing in modal and in temporal contexts during the language acquisition process emerges from the data in Antelmi (1991/2:390-5), whence the following (mother-tongue) examples are taken: in that longitudinal study of an Italian child (Camilla, compared with other children acquiring Italian), it was observed that both the constructions Cl+V+Inf and Cl+Aux+Pp appear at the same time in the child's language, at about 30/33 months. Before that age, either both modal and temporal periphrasis are used without any complement clitic as in (10), a way of avoiding a complex syntactic process, or the clitic appears on the infinitive, in modal contexts only, as in (11b):

- (10) a. E invece io ho *levate*.
and instead I have took-off (them)
- b. Sì, e non posso *mettere*.
yes, and (I) not can put (it)
- (11) a. Perché hai *messo (*lo)* così?
why have (you) put(-it) like that?
- b. Posso *prenderlo*?
can (I) take-it ?

The absence of constructions like (11a) with a post-participial clitic ((11a) without clitic is an actual utterance of Camilla's) may be considered as a consequence of the fact that standard Italian has not completely undergone destructuring yet: it can afford disentential modal (and causative/perceptive) periphrasis, but not (yet) disentential temporal ones. The passage from the \emptyset -constructions like (10a) to the correct ones is then direct, without the intermediate step (11a), as some cases of selfcorrection (at about 30 months) show:

-
- (i) a. Si fa *girarlo*?
we make turn-it?
- b. Posso *prenderlo*?
can (I) take-it?

- (12) Io ho comprato insieme co te, io l'ho comprato insieme, questo.
 I have bought together with you I it-have bought together this

If the analysis informally suggested for the phenomena we considered in this section is correct, it means that the syntactically advanced Romance varieties in (4) and (5) have gone (are going) over to a more or less complete reanalysis of compound tenses as disjunctive structures, which, in a first and approximate formulation of its final results, may be schematized as follows ((13) is the provisionally proposed simplified structure of a sentence like (5b), which we will refine in section 3.3.):

- (13) Je te dirai [CP que [IP j'avais [CP [IP PRO vous_i envoyez un colit t_i]]]]

If this is correct, then the traditional analysis of auxiliaries as mere lexical realization of the Infl features of the sentence, and of past participles as [+N] aspectual items is to be revised. A correct analysis should rather assume a full verbal status (with all the consequences in terms of thematic selection, Case assignment, etc.) for both auxiliaries and participles. Each of them would be, then, the nucleus of an independent sentential structure, linked by some sort (to be further specified) of binding relation holding between the matrix (i.e. auxiliary) subject and that of the embedded participial clause.

3. The Structure of Temporal Periphrasis in Advanced Romance Languages

In this section we will try to implement the analysis suggested above, starting from a closer examination of the distribution of various kinds of clitics in the temporal periphrasis of Piedmontese and Franco-provençal (both Valdôtain and Valésien) varieties, that offer some useful elements for the understanding of the structural situation and of the nature of verbal items in constructions like (4) and (5).

3.1. *Franco-provençal*

The morphological and syntactic characteristics of clitics in Franco-provençal varieties are extensively studied in Olszyna-Marzys (1964) and Roberts (1990, 1991). If one disregards the extreme fragmentation of local dialects and tries to lead the often conflicting and disparate data to a consistent analysis, the following paradigm can be established (examples from Roberts (1990), Ayas dialect):

- (14) a. (Ou) mīndja la pomma.
(HE) eats the apple
- b. L'a mīndja la pomma.
he-has eaten the apple
- c. Mīndje-él la pomma?
eats-HE the apple?
- d. L'a-él mīndja la pomma?
he-has-HE eaten the apple?

As shown in (14a), the simple tenses of Franco-provençal verbs are generally used without any form of subject pronoun;¹² in the cases and in the varieties where such a subject pronoun is used, it is anyway a full subject pronoun (which we render here with capital HE).

In the compound tenses (14b), on the contrary, a reduced subject pronoun (which we render here with lower case he) obligatorily appears with all the verbal persons. The relevant paradigms are given in (15a,c).

¹² With the exception of the 2nd person singular, always attested with an obligatory pronominal form *te/tu/teu*, in accordance with a pattern common to many Romance varieties: cf. Renzi and Vanelli (1983).

A subject pronoun obligatorily appears (in post-verbal position) also in simple tense interrogative constructions (14c): in this case, too, the inverted pronoun has the full form (with some morphological variants due to the different phonological contexts, cf. (15b)):¹³

- | | | | | | | | | |
|------|----|---------------------|-----------|----------|----------------|-------|-------|-----------|
| (15) | a. | PreV full pronouns | Dze/yo | Tu/te | Ou/(r)lui/(y)é | No | Vo | I/(r)lou |
| | b. | PostV full pronouns | Dzo/yo/eo | Tu/(t)hu | I/él(a) | No(j) | Vo(j) | I |
| | c. | Reduced pronouns | Dz/y/l | T/l | (l)l/(i/e) | N/l | V/y/l | (l)l/y/le |

Finally, in interrogative compound tense constructions (14d), both the full pronoun in inverted position and the reduced one in pre-auxiliary position appear. What is crucial to notice here is that the reduced forms only appear with compound tenses (i.e. temporal periphrasis), and that they never invert in interrogative contexts, but always keep the position before the auxiliary, in assertive as well as in interrogative sentences, thus giving rise to a sort of reduplication of subject pronoun in the latter case.

Roberts (1990, 1991) analyzes these alternances by assuming that full forms are argumental pronouns occupying the Spec-AgrP position, completely comparable to French subject clitics also in being affected by a merely phonological cliticization. On the contrary, reduced forms would be in Roberts' analysis true syntactic clitics, i.e. just spelling-outs (or default markers) of Agr⁰, 'present when nothing blocks them'.¹⁴ The reason of the latter proviso is connected with the fact that such syntactic clitics are only allowed to surface when auxiliaries are present,

¹³ We disregard here the form *ti* (and variants) that can be used in interrogative contexts with all the verbal persons in all the Franco-provençal varieties (as well as in *Français populaire*). We assume with Roberts (1991 and 1993:220-4) that these morphemes are not subject clitics at all, but rather simple interrogative markers (in contexts of non-inversion), coming from a lower position in the structure.

¹⁴ More specifically, since Roberts' (1991) analysis includes two AgrP's (i.e. AgrP1 immediately dominating AgrP2), full forms should be occupiers of Spec-AgrP2, and reduced ones default markers of Agr⁰1. As these details are irrelevant for the purposes of our analysis here, in what follows we will collapse the two AgrP's into a single one, as in Roberts (1990).

since they should function as a sort of theta-role absorber: according to Roberts' analysis, these clitics would always be generated in Agr⁰ but would have a different fate according to the kind of verb incorporating to that head. Lexical verbs, which are theta-role assigners, should incorporate to Agr⁰ by substitution (thus eliminating the clitic), while auxiliaries should do so by right-adjunction to Agr⁰, i.e. to the clitic itself: this would create a complex Head Cl+V correctly blocking theta-role assignment.¹⁵ In both cases, the item in Agr⁰ (V or Cl+V according to the cases) will move as a whole to C⁰ in interrogative sentences, thus yielding the inversion phenomena seen in (14c,d).

Data in (16) seem indeed to show that these subject clitics share the behaviour of the Agr-clitics of many Northern Italian Dialects, coexisting with all kinds of preverbal subjects, including quantifiers, which cannot be dislocated (as (16d) shows, the clitic appears in compound tenses only, also with quantifier subjects):

- (16) a. *Dzyan l'a* konta de kónte di mó.
 Dz. he-has told some stories of dead-people
- b. *Rlui l'e* ju ina.
 HE he-is up(stairs) gone
- c. *Nyun l'an* bala kakye tsóuja.
 nobody he-have given any thing
- d. *Nyun* dújave léi demanda.
 nobody dared him (to) ask

Roberts concludes from this that Franco-provençal varieties have both series of subject clitics, thus summing up in the relevant syntactic contexts the properties of French and Northern Italian

¹⁵ We should point out that this assumption is quite an ad hoc one, and contrary to Kayne's suggestion that all head-to-head movement places the raised Head to the left of any material already present in the host, an analysis that Roberts (1990:fn. 3) claims to adopt though.

Dialects. Now, while we will follow Roberts' analysis concerning full (French-like) subject pronouns, we would like to propose here an alternative one for the supposed (North Italian-like) subject clitics.

Notice first, by comparing (16) and (17), that the pseudo Agr-clitics in cooccurrence with lexical subjects behave exactly as the complement clitics of paradigm (18), and observe then in (19) the possible behaviours of complement clitics (CCI) and pseudo Agr-clitics (SCI) interacting in the same compound tense sentence:

(17) a. *I pare l'a tapa.*

the father him-has beaten

b. *Yò li é pa balya.*

I to-him have not given

c. *Gnunc m'a viu.*

nobody me-has seem

(18) Person/Case	1st	2nd	3rd/Acc	3rd/Dat	3rd/Refl
Singular	m(e)	t(e)	(l)(o/a)	l(e)i/ye/gli	ch(e)
Plural	no	vo	(l)e	(lo)u/lei	ch(e)

(19) a. *I m'a dona de pùksa blantsì.* (SCI+CCI+Aux+Pp)

he me-has given some powder white

b. *Y'èn douna euna pomma.* (CCI+Aux+Pp)

him-have (we) given an apple

c. *L'a bala ùna poera.* (SCI+Aux+Pp)

he-has thrown a stone (to me)

d. *Y at douna-te ina poma.* (SCI+Aux+Pp+CCI)

he has given-you an apple

The construction in (19a), where the two clitics cooccur on the auxiliary, is quite rare and represents a by now obsolete state of language: this example dates back to 1900, while most

similar examples come from texts and inquiries of the first quarter of 20th c. or from the dialect of Isérables, that Olszyna-Marzys (1964:120) defines 'très archaïque'. Examples (19b-d) show instead the nowadays most frequent constructions, pointing out the existence of a sort of complementary distribution of 'subject' clitics and complement clitics in the pre-auxiliary position. The only possibility of expressing both clitics in the same utterance is to place each of them on a different verbal item, as in (19d). Also quite common is the construction in (19c), where the complement clitic is omitted. Constructions like (19b), where the omitted clitic is the 'subject' one are mainly attested in most conservative dialects, like that of Ayas (whence the given example comes), defined as 'ancien' by Roberts (1991).¹⁶

As Roberts (1990:fn. 3) observes, this form of complementary distribution, as well as the constant pre-auxiliary position (also in inversion contexts) of the pseudo Agr-clitics, seem to show that "the subject clitic raises from some lower position to the position of the inflected verb, [...] rather like an object clitic [...], in such a way as to prevent the other [object] clitics from moving to this position".

A further reason for considering the clitics (15c) as complement clitics rather than subject ones or spelling-outs of Agr⁰, is their morphological difference from the full subject pronouns, and their relative resemblance to complement clitics: the most frequent form of these clitics is in fact *l* for all persons, which is strongly reminiscent of the consonantal form of the 3rd person object clitics (cf. (18)). As Olszyna-Marzys (1964:30, *passim*) points out, "la forme réduite de la 1^e p.

¹⁶ The same kind of alternance is to be observed in Franco-provençal Valésien with reflexive clitics, too (cf. Olszyna-Marzys (1964:*passim*):

- (i) a. *L'e metu a raada.*
 he-is put (himself) to watch
 b. *Che chon enpacha de dire.*
 themselves are prevented from say(ing)
 c. *Y é ché demunta.*
 he is self got-off

sg. [...] *l* ne rappelle yo ni par sa forme, ni par son emploi. De plus, [elle] s'identifie à la forme consonantique de la 3^e pers. [ct] est sans doute [...] d'origine analogique".

We are then led to formulate the hypothesis that the clitics in (15c), which are only found before the auxiliaries and in complementary distribution with other complement clitics, represent a 'special' object of the auxiliary (from which they receive Case), while maintaining a specific grammatical relation with the subject. In order to verify and detail such a hypothesis, we will have a look at the facts of Piedmontese and other dialects, where the situation is possibly clearer than in Franco-provençal.

3.2. *Piedmontese and Other Dialects*

The situation of Piedmontese is very similar to what we have seen in the previous section. All the phenomena we have seen in Franco-provençal also occur in Piedmontese, while many of them are present in other Northern Italian dialects. For reasons of space, we will show each phenomenon in all the varieties it occurs, even if not all of these present the whole pattern. The relevant phenomena are the following.¹⁷

In compound tenses, a special clitic appears before the auxiliary, which does not occur in simple tenses. If a subject pronoun of some sort appears, the two items can cooccur (in some varieties), but no person agreement holds between them, nor between the special clitic and the auxiliary. In some varieties (cf. (20)), the auxiliary clitic has an invariable form *l*, identical to the 3rd person accusative clitic.¹⁸ In other varieties (cf. (21)), the form corresponds to the 3rd person dative/locative clitic.¹⁹

¹⁷ In spite of their striking sharpness, at least in Piedmontese central variety, and of the copious descriptive and normative literature on the matter, it seems to us that the relevant data remained up to now unaccounted for. Even Poletto (1993:78-90), who mentions the constructions at issue in the frame of an overall account of subject pronouns in Northern Italian Dialects, offers, however, no specific analysis for the relevant phenomena.

¹⁸ In Piedmontese, the *l* clitic appears with all the persons of all the tenses and finite moods of auxiliary *avej* 'have' and with 3rd person singular of present and imperfect indicative of auxiliary *esse* 'be' (cf. Aly-Belfadel

- (20) a. Piedmontese (cf. Brero (1988)):
 Lòn che it dise e chi a l'ha dit, a mérito nen la pen-a.
 what that YOU say and who HE cl-has said, THEY deserve not the trouble
- b. Ligurian (cf. Battye (1990)):
 I lampezzan i feùgi/! lan lampezzou i feùgi.
 THEY explode the fires/THEY cl-have exploded the fires
- c. Trentino and Northern Venetian (cf. Poletto (1990, 1993)):
 Bepi magna senpre qua /Bepi l'a magnà qua ieri.
 B. eats always here/B. cl-has eaten here yesterday
- (21) Central Venetian: Te magni senpre pomi/ Te ghe magnà pomi.
 YOU eat always apples/YOU cl-have eaten apples

Whichever form the auxiliary clitic has, it does not invert in interrogative contexts, while 'normal' subject clitics do (cf. (22)). This is the same behaviour of complement clitics, which never invert in interrogative contexts in these varieties. This similarity is confirmed by the cooccurrence (in compound tenses only) of our special clitics with quantifier subjects, which is not the case for normal subject clitics (but is the norm for complement clitics), (cf. (23)):

- (22) a. Piedmontese: Còs l'hai-ne fat ?
 what cl-have-I done ?
- b. Ligurian: Quanti omi l'e arrivou ?
 how-many men cl-is arrived ?

(1933:167), Brero (1988:75)). A similar situation seems to hold for Ligurian, judging from the available data (Battye (1990), Parry (1990)). For the non-auxiliary uses of 'have' cf. fn. 26.

¹⁹ Analogous to this are Franco-provençal *y*, occurring with many verbal persons (cf. (15c)), and Piedmontese *j*, that occurs with all the persons of the indicative imperfect of *esse* except the 3rd sg. (cf. Brero (1988:75)):

- (i) I j'era volà da ti.
 I cl-was flown to you

- c. Venetian: *Cossa gheto magnà?*
 what cl-have-YOU eaten ?
- (23) a. Piedmontese: *Gnun (*a) l'ha parlà/ Gnun (*l)parla.*
 nobody (HE) cl-has spoken/nobody (cl)speaks
- b. Ligurian: *Nisciün (*o) l'e arrivou/Nisciün (*l)riva.*
 nobody (HE) cl-is arrived/nobody (cl)arrives
- c. N.Venetian: *Nisun (*el) l'a parlà/ Nisun (*l)parla*
 nobody (HE) cl-has spoken/nobody (cl)speaks

These clitics are incompatible with complement clitics. Several solutions are possible when different clitics (an auxiliary one and a (cluster of) complement one(s)) should cooccur in the same sentence: only one of the two kinds appears (before the auxiliary), or both kinds appear, but on distinct verbal items. This is the same complementary distribution between auxiliary clitics and complement clitics we have found in Franco-provençal (cf. ex. (19)):²⁰

- (24) a. Piedmontese: **A m'l'à scrit/A m'a scrit/A l'a scritme.*
 HE (me-)(cl-)has written(-me)
- b. Ligurian (cf. Parry (1990:11-2):
*Quande o s(*e l)'è regiù o (*se) l'è arestù.*
 when HE self-(cl-)is turned HE (self) cl-is stood-still
- c. N.Venetian: *Nisun (*l)m'a visto.*
 nobody (cl-)me-has seen

²⁰ In Central Venetian the situation is not so clearcut, as auxiliary clitics can cooccur, in some varieties, with complement ones. But this is not the only possibility, as the auxiliary clitic can (and in some southern varieties must) drop when a complement clitic is present:

- (i) *Ea m(e g)a visto in piassa.*
 she me-(cl-)has seen in square

d. Friulian (cf. Marchetti (1952:140), Benincà (1986:468));²¹

**O j'e ài puartât/O ài puartât/J'e ài puartât/O ài puartâdial.*

(I) (him-it) have brought (him-it)

Diachronic data also confirm the complementary distribution of auxiliary clitics and complement clitics in pre-auxiliary position we have just seen for Gallo-italic synchronic varieties. As we have pointed out in section 2.2, constructions like *A m'a scrit* were considered "antiquated" in Piedmontese already by Aly-Belfadel (1933:169), while peripheral conservative dialects (both Piedmontese and Valdôtain) still retain the 17/19th c. construction, with repetition of clitics (cf. (8)).

On the other hand, we know that auxiliary clitics did not generalize in Piedmontese and in Franco-provençal Valdôtain till the 19th c. (cf. Parry (1991), Harris (1967:185)). Old Venetian texts up to the 18th c. (e.g. Ruzante and Goldoni) also show that auxiliary clitics generalized only afterwards, and suggest the same distributional pattern: once the auxiliary clitics appear, they tend to prevent complement clitics from climbing to the pre-auxiliary position and to replace them in that position.

Again, the appearance of the special clitic only in compound tenses and in complementary distribution with complement clitics suggests that it is somehow linked to the argumental grid of the auxiliary, while entertaining some grammatical relation with the subject.

²¹ This is attested in some Friulian varieties, even if not as systematically as in Franco-provençal and Piedmontese (the 'subject' clitic of 2nd person singular never disappears in Friulian, that of 3rd person singular only drops in the presence of a dative clitic). However, it seems significant to us that several languages which are geographically non-contiguous, but share many of the syntactic features analyzed here and in Benucci (1990, 1991a,b), have a similar behaviour also in this particular form of clitic distribution. In our perspective, the differences between Venetian, Gallo-romance and Rhaeto-romance varieties are only a matter of degree in the spreading of destructuring in the temporal domain of all these languages that already have disjunctive modal and causative/perceptive periphrasis. This allows us to disregard any hypothesis of mutual influence and to adopt rather an analysis of parallel development also in the case of Franco-provençal and Piedmontese (cf. fn. 4).

3.3. *The Analysis*

In order to determine the structural configuration of these constructions and the exact relation of auxiliary clitics with the subject, the examination of the different constructions in (19) and (24) and of their diachronic specifications is helpful. The linear orders of the different constructions is schematized in (25), where ACI stands for auxiliary clitic and CCI stands for complement clitic (Pp and CCI ordering in (25d) irrelevant: cf. fn. 2 and 3):

- (25) a. b. c. d.
 CCI+Aux+Pp ACI+CCI+Aux+Pp ACI+Aux+Pp ACI+Aux+Pp+CCI

(25a) represents the archaic construction, with no ACI and no barrier for CCI between auxiliary and past participle. (25b) is the transitional construction, also quite obsolete, with both an ACI and CCI climbing: the auxiliary has its own 'object', but still no barrier for participle clitics holds. In (25c,d) such a barrier arose, preventing CCI from appearing (on the auxiliary).

In this perspective, the structural sequence would be the following (parallel to what we proposed in previous works for modal and causative/perceptive periphrasis): 1. basic complex predicate Aux+Pp > 2. auxiliary with AgrP participial complement (VP raising and CCI climbing possible) > 3. auxiliary with full-fledged participial complement. The latter would be a CP preventing NP movement (i.e. CCI climbing) from inside it.

In our view, this constitutes the last development of the destructuring process that has been affecting through the centuries all the periphrastic verbal constructions of geographically central and syntactically advanced Romance languages. All the phenomena we have observed in previous sections can then be accounted for in terms of diachronic 'breaking' of the verb complex, ending up in a situation where each verbal item is synchronically associated with an independent set of functional projections (relevant for clitic placement) and finally with a full-fledged sentential structure.

The existence of a participial AgrP (dominating AspP and VP) in central Romance has been established at least since Kayne (1989). It seems to us that the AgrP > CP diachronic evolution we are proposing for embedded participial clauses in advanced (i.e. destructured) Romance languages parallels Kayne's (1993) analysis of such clauses as (prepositional) DP's (which he compares to Romance infinitival prepositional CP's).

Furthermore, our analysis of Aux+Pp+Cl constructions as embedded participial CP's meets the implicit prediction of Guéron and Hoekstra's (1991) analysis of temporal chains. According to that analysis, standard Romance participles cannot bear clitics because their clause lacks a T projection due to the absence of a licensing C⁰. For past participles to keep their CCl, then, Kayne's (1989) Asp projection should change to TP, which is only possible, in Guéron and Hoekstra's terms, if a licensing CP is projected between the participial clause and the auxiliary one. Indeed, this is exactly what we are proposing, since destructuring is, in our terms, nothing but the reanalysis of complex predicate structures as autonomous, single predicate, embedding clauses, with an embedded CP projection.

There remains to specify the exact configurational situation of the embedded CP, the nature of the embedded subject and of the 'special' (clitic) object of the auxiliary, as well as the relation between them, in order to refine the structure provisionally proposed in (13) and to have a better understanding of the proposed diachronic evolution. The following analysis elaborates on a suggestion by Jacqueline Guéron (p.c.).

Notice first of all that the (object) ACI often looks like an expletive, which is quite odd, since expletive objects have never been pointed out in the literature, and only expletive subjects are assumed, in order to meet the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) requirements. Also, if an auxiliary verb has any argument at all, it must be the participial clause itself, which leaves it no theta-role to assign to any other object, if it is not an expletive. We assume then that ACI represents the subject of the embedded clause and that it receives Case from the auxiliary under

ECM. This is quite straightforward if the participial clause is an AgrP (stage 2 above), but requires an extra assumption at stage 3, when the embedded CP is projected.

Namely, we assume that at this stage both the participle and its subject raise from AgrP to CP, in C⁰ and Spec position respectively.²² This way, ECM still holds, under argument selection by the auxiliary and Spec-Head Agreement (SHA), and the embedded subject cliticizes upwards, onto the first available tense-bearing node, i.e. onto the auxiliary, with which the participle subject entertains an object-like relation. Since the cliticized embedded subject agrees with the embedded T⁰ (via successive participle raising to Agr⁰ and C⁰ and SHA), the matrix Tense and the embedded Tense also agree and form a single T-chain, and a compound tense.

The proposed evolution²³ is represented in (26), where V⁰ movement to Agr⁰ is omitted for simplicity, possible derivations are in parenthesis and --- represents the trace of V⁰/VP movement. (26c) replaces the provisional structure in (13) (see also fn. 25):

²² Agreement between embedded Spec-C and C⁰ turns then the whole CP into an A projection (cf. Rizzi (1991)), so that an embedded *wh*-word will extract directly to the matrix Spec-C, as in (i), without any minimality violation:

- (i) Franco-provençal: Dou l'et-él ala ?
 where cl-is-HE gone ?

²³ The evolution from (26b) to (26c) (i.e. from (25b) to (25c,d)) passes through the repetition construction exemplified in (8), i.e. CCl+Aux+Pp+CCl. We can consider this as an effect of the progressive spreading of destructuring: the barrier arising between auxiliary and past participle makes it difficult, then impossible, to form a long chain between climbed clitics and their trace in the original position. The first strategy is then to 'strengthen' this chain by spelling it out in full, i.e. by repeating the clitic in all the derived position. The same strategy was observed in our previous works in many other Romance languages at the set off of destructuring in modal and causative domains. Example in (i), quoted from Parry (1992:fn. 17), with triple repetition of the clitic in a multiple periphrasis context is very significant in this respect. Clitic splitting of the sort seen in (5a) may then be viewed as an analogous strategy of linking together different chain positions by spelling them out:

- (i) I maveisi pusciume giteme.
 you me-have could-me help-me

- (26) a. [_{AgrP} NP [_{VP}* [_V* Aux Pp] NP_i]]
 (cliticization > [_{AgrP} NP [_{VP}* [_V* Cl_i Aux Pp] t_i]])
- b. [_{AgrP} NP [_{VP} Aux [_{AgrP} NP_i [_{VP} Pp NP_j]]]]]
 (VP raising > [_{AgrP} NP [_{VP}* [_V* Aux Pp] NP_j] [_{AgrP} NP_i ---]]]
 cliticization> [_{AgrP} NP [_{VP}* [_V* Cl_i Cl_j Aux Pp] t_j] [_{AgrP} t_i ---]]])
- c. [_{AgrP} NP [_{VP} Aux [_{CP} NP_i Pp [_{AgrP} t_i [_{VP} --- NP_j]]]]]]]
 (cliticization > [_{AgrP} NP [_{VP} Cl_i Aux [_{CP} t_i Pp Cl_j] [_{AgrP} t_i [_{VP} --- t_j]]]])]

As we can see in (26b,c) the structure of the participle clause in the second stage is different from that of the third stage: in both cases there is a complete identification between ACl and the embedded subject, under ECM; but in (26c) the embedded CP, being an A projection (see fn. 22), creates a minimality barrier for CCl climbing.

Notice that the embedded subject is not coreferent with the matrix one. The overwhelming occurrence of 3rd person singular ACl's (*l, g* and the like), even with 1st and 2nd person, singular and plural, verbal forms, both in AgrP (26b) and CP (26c) embedded contexts (as in (27a,b) respectively) shows that this pronoun has no referential link with the subject of the auxiliary: it can then be adequately analyzed as an expletive (EPP) subject of the action expressed by the past participle,²⁴ which, in Kayne's (1990) informal terms, is the abstract possession or state of the auxiliary subject:²⁵

²⁴ The alternance between accusative and dative/locative forms (cf. ex. (19), (20) and fn. 19) can probably be explained in the framework of Kayne's (1993) analysis of participial clauses as prepositional DP's and of abstract P Incorporation onto the auxiliary as source of the alternance 'have'/'be' in central Romance (cf. also the semantic equivalence of *avoir* and *être à* in French and related languages). The presence of an abstract P in auxiliary constructions can well account for the oblique form of the auxiliary clitic in some varieties.

It is also interesting to note that in Kayne's (1993) framework the prepositional DP projection is absent in passive participial constructions, in which the auxiliary clause directly dominates the participial AgrP. In our terms, this corresponds to a structure like (27a), thus predicting that CCl climbing should be possible in passive participial constructions. In fact, this is what we actually find in Piedmontese passive constructions (cf. (i)), which did not undergo destructuring and still display Cl+Aux+Pp construction (cf. Parry (1992:3)). This

- (27) a. *Wi l'é pa pariò de ché afire.*
 him cl-have (I) not spoken of this affair
- b. *L'ae üblo de chawa sta chùpa.*
 cl-have (you) forgotten to salt this soup

structural difference between active and passive participles in Piedmontese (whether the same holds in other advanced Romance languages remains to be ascertained) is then to be added to other well known morphosyntactic differences in Iberic participles (active invariable vs. passive variable) and in rural Venetian ones (alternance of active *-sto* vs. passive *-uo* endings):

- (i) *La litra a't sarà mandà(*te) stasera.*
 the letter IT-to you will-be sent tonight

²⁵ In the languages of (4) and (5) displaying no auxiliary clitic at all, we assume that the expletive embedded subject, is an arbitrary *pro*.

Yet, what we have seen in the text is not the only reference possibility for the participle subject, and one can think of cases of coreference between the auxiliary subject and the participle one, under SHIA of the matrix Agr⁰ (containing ACI) and subject, then binding between the two subjects. In the ECM context we are assuming, the (cliticized) embedded subject must then be an anaphoric element, i.e. a reflexive clitic. In fact, it has been noticed by Parry (1992:5-6, 20-1) that reflexive clitic *se* sometimes appears in modern spoken Piedmontese in what seem to be "residual instances" of the clitic repetition construction, as in (i a). In our analysis, the two instances of *se* in (i a) are not a case of clitic repetition, but rather two distinct anaphoric (and coreferential) clitics: the first is the ECM object of the auxiliary, the second the real object of the participle.

The same analysis of the reflexive clitic holds then for cases where no repetition, but rather apparent clitic splitting, is found, as Franco-provençal (4b.2) and (i b) and the French sentences quoted at fn. 8:

- (i) a. *Ed bot an blan [...] a s'e trovasse ant na leja*
 and suddenly HE self-is found-self in an avenue
- b. *Datro ché chòn endala alyùr.*
 others self are hence-gone away

4. Conclusion

In this paper we have dealt with clitic placement and related phenomena in the temporal periphrasis of contemporary advanced Romance languages, and we put forth an analysis of the involved (compound tenses) constructions as disentential structures, where both the auxiliary and the past participle have full verbal status and head a full-fledged (i.e. CP) sentential projection preventing complement clitic climbing from the auxiliary clause.

We also proposed that the embedded participial clause has an expletive subject, which in many varieties is spelled out as a clitic with a special behaviour, in complementary distribution with participle complement clitics.²⁶

We have assumed this 'breaking' of the temporal complex predicate to be the last development of the destructuring process that has been affecting in the course of centuries all the verbal periphrasis of central Romance languages, and we have seen that both the diachronic evolution of these phenomena in the concerned languages and the data from language acquisition give supporting evidence for the proposed analysis.

²⁶ Non-auxiliary uses of 'have' and 'be' (as possessive verb and as copula, respectively) also present, in many of the varieties we considered here, a sort of clitic, analogous to what we have found with auxiliaries (Piedmontese, Franco-provençal and Ligurian *l'hal'è*, Venetian *ga/xe*, etc.). This could be considered as a further evidence of the structural parallelism between the auxiliary and the full verbal uses of 'have' and 'be' in Romance languages, proposed by Kayne (1990, 1993). Yet, we will assume that the similarity is only superficial, since a similar clitic also appears with possessive 'have', but not with auxiliary, in Lombard varieties and in sub-standard Italian (cf. Poletto (1993:84-85)), and such a clitic obligatorily coexists with other complement clitics, contrary to the behaviour of auxiliary clitics (cf. fn. 20 and Aly-Belfadel (1933:167) for Piedmontese):

- (i) a. C'ho un gatto / *C'ho mangiato una mela
(I) cl-have a cat / (I) cl-have eaten an apple
b. Ea me *(g)a mi come moroso / Ea m'a visto in piassa
she me cl-has me as boyfriend / she me-has seen in square

Finally, we saw that our proposals reach Kayne (1993) and Guéron and Hoekstra (1991) in their analyses of Aux+Pp constructions and of Temporal Chains respectively.

References

- Aly-Belfadel, A. (1933) *Grammatica Piemontese*, Guin, Noale.
- Antelmi, D. (1991/92) 'L'ipotesi maturazionale nell'acquisizione del linguaggio: indagine longitudinale su una bambina italiana', Ph.D. Dissertation, Università di Padova.
- Battye, A. (1990) "'Quirky Agreement" in Genoese', Ms. University of York.
- Benincà, P. (1986) 'Punti di sintassi comparata dei dialetti italiani settentrionali' in G. Holtus and K. Ringger (eds.) *Raetia Antiqua et Moderna*, Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- Benincà, P. and L. Vanelli (1984) 'Italiano, veneto, friulano: fenomeni sintattici a confronto', RID, 8, 165-194.
- Benucci, F. (1989) "'Ristrutturazione", "destrutturazione" e classificazione delle lingue romanze', *Medioevo Romanzo*, 14, 305-337.
- Benucci, F. (1990a) *Destrutturazione: Classi verbali e costruzioni perifrastiche nelle lingue romanze antiche e moderne*, Unipress, Padova.
- Benucci, F. (1990b) 'Ancora la destrutturazione: le perifrasi "fattitivo/percettive" in francese e nelle lingue romanze', Ms. Università di Padova.
- Bianchi, V. and M.C. Figueiredo Silva (1993) 'Su alcune proprietà dell'Accordo-Oggetto in italiano e in portoghese brasiliano', Ms. SNS Pisa and Université de Genève.
- Brero, C. (1988) *Grammatica della Lingua Piemontese*, Piemont/Europa, Torino.
- Burzio, L. (1986) *Italian Syntax, A Government and Binding Approach*, Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Dauzat, A. (1946) *Études de Linguistique Française*, D'Artrey, Paris.
- Foulet, L. (1930) *Petite syntaxe de l'ancien français*, Champion, Paris.
- Frei, H. (1928) *La grammaire des fautes*, Gauthner, Paris.
- Ganzoni, G.P. (1983a) *Grammatica Ladina [Putèr]*, Lia Rumantscha, Samedan.
- Ganzoni, G.P. (1983b) *Grammatica Ladina [Vallàder]*, Lia Rumantscha, Samedan.

- Gougenheim, G. (1929) *Études sur les périphrases verbales de la langue française*, Nizet, Paris.
- Guéron, J. and T. Hoekstra (1991) 'Chaînes temporelles et phrases réduites', Ms. Université Paris X.
- Harris, R. (1967) 'Piedmontese influence on Valdôtain syntax', RLR, 31, 180-189.
- Harris, R. (1969) 'Pronominal postposition in Valdôtain', RLR, 33, 133-143.
- Iliescu, M. (1972) *Le frioulan à partir des dialectes parlés en Roumanie*, Mouton, Paris.
- Lombard, A. (1974) *La langue roumaine: une présentation*, Klincksieck, Paris.
- Kayne, R.S. (1989) 'Facets of Romance past participle agreement' in P. Benincà (ed) *Dialect Variation and the Theory of Grammar*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Kayne, R.S. (1990) 'Anaphoric Clitics and PRO', Ms. CUNY.
- Kayne, R.S. (1993) 'Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection', Ms. CUNY.
- Keller, H.E. (1958) *Études linguistiques sur les parlers Valdôtains*, Francke V., Bern.
- Marchetti, G. (1952) *Lineamenti di grammatica friulana*, Società Filologica Friulana, Udine.
- Olszyna-Marzys, Z. (1964) *Les pronoms dans les Patois du Valais central*, Francke V., Bern.
- Parry, M. (1990) 'Innovazione e conservazione nell'entroterra savonese: appunti di sintassi valbormidese', Ms. University College of Wales.
- Parry, M. (1991) 'Posizione dei clitici complemento nelle costruzioni verbali perifrastiche del piemontese', Ms. University College of Wales.
- Parry, M. (1992) 'Some Observations on the Syntax of Clitic pronouns in Piedmontese', Ms. University College of Wales.
- Poletto, C. (1990) 'Diachronic development of Subject Clitics', Paper delivered at WSCRL1.
- Poletto, C. (1993) *La sintassi del Soggetto nei dialetti italiani settentrionali*, Unipress, Padova.
- Quaranta, O. and L. Salvadori (1988) 'L'acquisizione dei pronomi personali in Francese L2' in A. Giacalone Ramat (ed) *L'italiano tra le altre lingue*, Mulino, Bologna.
- Radford, A. (1977) 'La teoria della traccia, la CSS e la Salita dei pronomi Clitici', RGG, 2, 241-315
- Remacle, L. (1952) *Syntaxe du parler wallon de La Gleize*, I, Les Belles Lettres, Paris.

- Renzi, L. and L. Vanelli (1983) 'I pronomi Soggetto in alcune varietà romanze' in P. Benincà et al. (eds.) *Scritti linguistici in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini*, I, Pacini, Pisa.
- Rizzi, L. (1991) 'On the A vs. A' distinction', *GLOW Newsletter*.
- Roberts, I. (1990) 'Inversion and Subject Clitics in Valdôtain', Ms. Université de Genève.
- Roberts, I. (1991) 'The nature of Subject Clitics in Franco-provençal Valdôtain', Ms. Université de Genève.
- Roberts, I. (1993) *Verb and Diachronic Syntax*, Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Rohlf, G. (1967) *Grammatica Storica della Lingua Italiana*, II, Einaudi, Torino.
- Salvi, G.P. (1990) 'La sopravvivenza della Legge di Wackernagel nei dialetti occidentali della Penisola Iberica', *Medioevo Romano*, 15, 177-210.
- Spescha, A. (1989) *Grammatica Sursilvana*, CEMI, Cuera.
- Taraldsen, T. (1993) 'I Clitici riflessivi in due dialetti retoromanzi', Paper delivered at IGG19.
- Thöni, G.P. (1969) *Rumantsch-Surmeir, Grammatica per i gl' idiom surmiran*, LR, Coira.
- Tuttle, E.F. (1986) 'The Spread of ESSE as Universal Auxiliary in Central Italo-Romance', *Medioevo Romano*, 11, 229-287.

Dipartimento di Linguistica

Università di Padova

Via Beato Pellegrino, 1

35137 Padova PD

Italy