

# ON ENCLISIS AND PROCLISIS IN INTERROGATIVES IN A NORTHERN ITALIAN VARIETY<sup>1</sup>

Nicoletta PENELLO

## *0. Introduction*

Following recent studies on the higher functional field (in particular, Poletto 2000), this work aims at giving a contribution to the mapping of the CP projection, examining the behaviour of subject and object clitics in a Northern Italian variety near to Paduan, namely the dialect of Carmignano di Brenta (Carm.).

The paper is organized as follows: in section 1 we will see the system of subject clitics in declaratives and in main interrogatives in Carm. In section 2 we will examine a particular pattern shown by this variety, i.e. the co-occurrence of proclitic and enclitic subject clitics in ‘Yes/No’ main interrogatives: we will label this pattern the ‘Two Subject Clitics Pattern’ (2-Scl) and we will examine its characteristics and restrictions. Section 3 will be concerned with the description and the analysis of another interesting pattern shown by Carm., i.e. the co-occurrence of proclitic and enclitic object clitics in ‘Yes/No’ main interrogatives: we will label this phenomenon the ‘Two Object Clitics Pattern’ (2-Ocl). In section 4 we will examine the data on 2-Scl and 2-Ocl in *wh*-interrogatives and in section 5 we will give some suggestions for a structural analysis of 2-Scl and 2-Ocl.

Last, section 6 will be devoted to the description and the analysis of the data on the interrogative clitic *-i* used with 1st person singular and plural and 2nd person singular.

## *1. Subject clitics in declaratives and main interrogatives in Carm.*

In declaratives in Carm. we find subject clitics for the 2nd person singular (1a) and the 3rd person (1b-c); the latter are distinct for number and gender:

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Paola Benincà and Cecilia Poletto for the time they spent discussing with me this work, which has greatly benefited from their suggestions and positive criticism. Needless to say, all remaining errors and inaccuracies are entirely my own.





- (7) a. \***el** a magne-<sup>1</sup>**o** a minestra, el puteo ?  
**s.cl.3 sg.m./obj.cl.3 f.s./eats-s.cl.3 sg.m./the soup DO/the child**  
 “Is the child eating the soup ?”
- b. \***a** a magne-<sup>1</sup>**a** a minestra, a mama ?  
**s.cl.3 sg.f./obj.cl.3 f.s./eats-s.cl.3 sg.f./the soup (DO)/the mum**  
 “Is Mum eating the soup ?”
- c. \***te** a magni-**to** a minestra ti ?  
**s.cl.2 sg./obj.cl.3 f.s./eat-s.cl.2 sg./the soup (DO)/you-sg.**  
 “Are you eating the soup ?”

Secondly, there is a constraint on the form of the clitics, i.e. the proclitic has to be morphologically similar to the enclitic: the first is made up of a vowel (*i/e*), while the latter is made up of a consonant plus a vowel (<sup>1</sup>*i*/<sup>1</sup>*e*).

It has to be noted that the 2-Scl pattern is possible with unergatives and unaccusative verbs as long as there is at least another clitic (object, dative, locative, partitive) between the proclitic subject and the V. Sentences displaying sequences of clitics are more natural than those in which the proclitic subject is immediately followed by the V; see (8a) vs (8b) with an object clitic, and (8c) vs (8d) with a locative clitic:

- (8) a. ? **I** magne-<sup>1</sup>**i** a minestra, i putei ?  
**s.cl.3 pl.m./eat-s.cl.3 pl.m./the soup/the children**  
 “Are the children eating the soup ?”
- b. **I** a magne-<sup>1</sup>**i**, a minestra, i putei ?  
**s.cl.3 pl.m./obj.cl.3 f.s./eat-s.cl.3 pl.m./the soup/the children**
- c. ? **I** va-<sup>1</sup>**i** ?  
**s.cl.3 pl.m./go-s.cl.3 pl.m.**  
 “Are they going (there) ?”
- d. **I ghe** va-<sup>1</sup>**i** ?  
**s.cl.3 pl.m./loc.cl./go-s.cl.3 pl.m.**

Let us see the behaviour of *partire* (“to leave”): since *partire* does not subcategorize any argument which could be cliticised, the 2-Scl pattern with this verb is very marginal:

- (9) ??**I** parte-<sup>1</sup>**i** (to cugini) ? “Are they leaving (your cousins) ?”  
**s.cl.3 pl.m./leave-s.cl.3 pl.m./ (your cousins)**

Another important characteristic of 2-Scl is that the presence of the negation seems to influence the degree of grammaticality of the pattern, as we see in (10).

- (10) a. **I parte-<sup>1</sup>i o no i parte-<sup>1</sup>i ?** “Are they leaving or not ?”  
**s.cl.3 pl.m./leave-s.cl.3 pl.m./or/not/s.cl.3 pl.m./leave-s.cl.3pl.m.**  
 b. **No e rive-<sup>1</sup>e mia ?** “Aren’t they arriving ?”  
**not/s.cl.3 pl.f./arrive-s.cl.3 pl.f./mia-neg.**

It is interesting to notice that with unergative verbs, the pattern is grammatical when another clitic is present (11c-f), while it is less acceptable with negation as we see in (11b-e):

- (11) a. **\*I parle-<sup>1</sup>i de sta roba ?** “Are they talking about it ?”  
**s.cl.3 pl.m./talk-s.cl.3 pl.m./of/this/thing**  
 b. **? No i parle-<sup>1</sup>i mia de sta roba ?** “Aren’t they talking about it ?”  
**not/s.cl.3 pl.m./talk-s.cl.3 pl.m./mia-neg./of/this/thing**  
 c. **I ghin parle-<sup>1</sup>i ?** “Are they talking about it ?”  
**s.cl.3 pl.m./partitive cl./talk-s.cl.3 pl.m.**  
 d. **\*E dorme-<sup>1</sup>e qua ?** “Are they sleeping here ?”  
**s.cl.3 pl.f./sleep-s.cl.3 pl.f./here**  
 e. **? No e dorme-<sup>1</sup>e mia qua ?** “Aren’t they sleeping here ?”  
**not/s.cl.3 pl.f./sleep-s.cl.3 pl.f./mia-neg./here**  
 f. **E ghe dorme-<sup>1</sup>e qua ?** “Are they (f.) sleeping here ?”  
**s.cl.3 pl.f./loc. cl./sleep-s.cl.3 pl.f./here**

### 3. Proclitic and enclitic object clitics in Y/N main interrogatives

In Y/N main interrogatives in Carm. we also find the “2-Ocl pattern”, i.e. a preverbal object clitic co-occurring with an enclitic object clitic, the latter in complementary distribution with the enclitic subject; the enclitic is interpreted as object because of number and gender agreement with the DP-direct object:

- (12) a. **I o ga-<sup>1</sup>o fato, el lavoro ?** “Have they done the job ?”  
**s.cl. 3pl.m./obj.cl.3m.s./have-obj.cl.3m.s./done/the job (DO m.s.)**  
 b. **I a ga-<sup>1</sup>a fata, a torta ?** “Have they made the cake ?”  
**s.cl. 3pl.m./obj.cl.3f.s./have-obj.cl.3f.s./made/the cake (DO f.s.)**  
 c. **E compre-<sup>1</sup>e, e scarpe nove, to soera ?**  
**obj.cl.3f.pl./buys-obj.cl.3f.pl./the shoes (DO f.pl.)/new/your sister**  
 “Is your sister buying a pair of new shoes ?”  
 d. **I magne-<sup>1</sup>i,i biscoti, el puteo ?**  
**obj.cl.3m.pl./eats-obj.cl.3m.pl./the biscuits (DO m.pl.)/the child**  
 “Is the child eating the biscuits ?”

Let us examine the characteristics and restrictions of the 2-Ocl pattern shown in (12): first, the object clitic has to be 3rd person, either singular or plural, masculine or feminine; if the proclitic subject is present too, subject clitic and object clitic have

to be different (see (13a) vs (13b) and (13c) vs (13d)); in enclisis we find either one or the other, not both (see (13e) vs (13f) and (13g) vs (13h)):

- (13) a. \* **I i** ga-<sup>l</sup>**i** tolti ? “Have they taken them ?”  
**s.cl.3 pl.m./obj.cl.3pl.m./have-obj.cl.3pl.m./taken**  
 b. **I e** ga-<sup>l</sup>**e** tolte ? “Have they taken them ?”  
**s.cl.3 pl.m./obj.cl.3pl.f./have-obj.cl.3pl.f./taken**  
 c. \***E e** ga-<sup>l</sup>**e** compraie ? “Have they bought them ?”  
**s.cl.3 pl.f./obj.cl.3pl.f./have-obj.cl.3pl.f./bought**  
 d. **E i** ga-<sup>l</sup>**i** compraie ? “Have they bought them ?”  
**s.cl.3 pl.f./obj.cl.3pl.m./have-obj.cl.3pl.m./bought**  
 e. **I o** ga-<sup>l</sup>**o** fato, el lavoro ? “Have they (m.) done the job ?”  
**s.cl.3pl.m./obj.cl.3sg.m./have-obj.cl.3sg.m./done/the job(DOm.s.)**  
 f. **I o** ga-<sup>l</sup>**i** fato, el lavoro ? “Have they (m.) done the job ?”  
**s.cl.3pl.m./obj.cl.3sg.m./have-s.cl.3pl.m./done/the job(DOm.s.)**  
 g. **I a** ga-<sup>l</sup>**a** fata, a torta ? “Have they (m.) made the cake ?”  
**s.cl.3pl.m./obj.cl.3sg.f./have-obj.cl.3sg.f./made/the cake(DOf.s.)**  
 h. **I a** ga-<sup>l</sup>**i** fata, a torta ? “Have they (m.) made the cake ?”  
**s.cl.3pl.m./obj.cl.3sg.f./have-s.cl.3pl.m./made/the cake(DOf.s.)**

Second, it is not possible to have a 3rd person object clitic in enclisis without the presence of a proclitic subject; the latter has to be morphologically different from the object. If the proclitic subject is missing, the enclitic is interpreted as subject, not as object (see (14a-b)). This restriction is not active if the object clitic is 3rd plural; as we see in (14c-d), with 3rd plural object clitics, the presence of a proclitic subject is not necessary:

- (14) a. # **O** fa-<sup>l</sup>**o**, el lavoro, (\*to fradei) ? (-<sup>l</sup>**o** = necessarily 3rd sg subj cl)  
**obj.cl.3sg.m./do-obj.cl.3sg.m./the job (DO m.s.)/your brothers**  
 “Are your brothers doing the job ?”  
 b. # **A** fa-<sup>l</sup>**a**, a festa, (\*e to amiche) ? (-<sup>l</sup>**a** = necessarily 3rd sg subj cl)  
**obj.cl.3sg.f./do-obj.cl.3sg.f./the party (DO f.s.)/your friends**  
 “Are your friends having a party ?”  
 c. **E** compre-<sup>l</sup>**e**, e scarpe nove, (to soera/el puteo) ?  
**obj.cl.3pl.f./buys-obj.3cl.pl.f./the shoes (DO f.pl.)/new/**  
 (your sister/the child)  
 “Is your sister / the child buying a pair of new shoes ?”  
 d. **I** magne-<sup>l</sup>**i**, i biscoti, (to soera/el puteo) ?  
**obj.cl.3pl.m./eats-obj.cl.3pl.m./the biscuits (DO m.pl.)/**  
 (your sister/the child)  
 “Is your sister / the child eating the biscuits ?”

Also the 2-Ocl pattern is compatible with negation:

- (15) a. **I o fa-<sup>1</sup>o o no i o fa-<sup>1</sup>o**, el lavoro ?  
 s.cl.3pl.m./obj.cl.3m.sg./do-obj.cl.3m.sg./or/not/s.cl.3 pl.m./  
**obj.cl.3m.sg./do-obj.cl.3m.sg./**the job (DO m.s.)  
 “Are they doing the job or not ?”  
 b. **No e compre-<sup>1</sup>e mia e scarpe nove**, to soressa ?  
**not/obj.cl.3pl.f./buy-obj.cl.3pl.f./mia-neg./**  
 the shoes (DO f.pl.)/new/your sister  
 “Isn’t your sister buying a new pair of shoes ?”

#### 4. 2-Scl and 2-Ocl in *Wh-* interrogatives

In *wh-* interrogatives both patterns are possible, i.e. the 2-Scl as in (16a) and the 2-Ocl as in (16b-d):

- (16) a. Cossa **i ghe ga-<sup>1</sup>i fato** ? “What have they done to him ?”  
 what/s.cl.3 pl.m./dat.cl./have-s.cl.3 pl.m./done  
 b. Ndove **i o ga-<sup>1</sup>o (-<sup>1</sup>i) portà** ? “Where have they taken him ?”  
 where/s.cl.3pl.m./obj.cl.3s.m./have-obj.cl.3s.m.(s.cl.3pl.m.)/taken  
 c. Parcossa **i a ga-<sup>1</sup>a (-<sup>1</sup>i) fata**, sta roba ? “Why did they do it ?”  
 why/s.cl.3 pl.m./obj.cl.f.s./have- obj.cl.f.s.(s.cl.3 pl.m.)/done/this  
 thing  
 d. Quando **e o fa-<sup>1</sup>o (-<sup>1</sup>e)**, el lavoro ? “When are they doing the job ?”  
 when/s.cl.3pl.f./obj.cl.3m.s./do-obj.cl.3m.s.(s.cl.3pl.f.)/the job

In *wh-* interrogatives the restriction seen in (7) on the proclitic subject disappears; here the proclitic subject can also be 3rd person feminine singular:

- (17) Come **a o ga-<sup>1</sup>o (-<sup>1</sup>a) cuzinà**, el dolse, to soressa ?  
 how/s.cl.3 s.f./obj.cl.3s.m./has-obj.cl.3s.m.(s.cl.3 s.f.)/cooked/the cake  
 (DO m.s.)/your sister (subj.f.s.)  
 “How has your sister cooked the cake ?”

Interrogatives on the subject allow only the pattern of the double object clitic and not that of the double subject clitic (cf. (4)-(5) above on subject interrogatives):

- (18) a. \*Chi **i vien-li** ? “Who is coming ?”  
 who/s.cl.3 pl.m./come-s.cl.3 pl.m.  
 b. \*Chi **i o ga-<sup>1</sup>i tolto**, el pan ? “Who has bought bread ?”  
 who/s.cl.3 pl.m./obj.cl.3s.m./has-s.cl.3 pl.m./taken/the bread (DO)  
 c. Chi **o ga-<sup>1</sup>o tolto**, el pan ? “Who has bought bread ?”  
 who/obj.cl.3 s.m./has-obj.cl.3 s.m./taken/the bread (DO m.s.)  
 d. Chi **a ga-<sup>1</sup>a magnà**, a torta ? “Who has eaten the cake ?”  
 who/obj.cl.3 s.f./has-obj.cl.3 s.f./eaten/the cake (DO f.s.)  
 e. Chi **i ga-<sup>1</sup>i ciamai**, i tozi ? “Who has called the boys ?”

- who/**obj.cl.3 pl.m./has-obj.cl.3 pl.m./called/the boys (DO m.pl.)**  
 f. Chi **e** ga<sup>1</sup>**e** spedie, e lettere ? “Who has sent the letters ?”  
 who/**obj.cl.3 pl.f./has-obj.cl.3 pl.f./sent/the letters (DO f.pl.)**

The sentences in (18) with a compound tense are more natural than the counterparts with simple tenses, which are nevertheless possible:

- (19) a. ? Chi **o** fa<sup>1</sup>**o**, el lavoro ? “Who is doing the job ?”  
 who/**obj.cl.3 s.m./does-obj.cl.3 s.m./the job (DO m.s.)**  
 b. ? Chi **a** fa<sup>1</sup>**a**, a minestra, stasera ?  
 who/**obj.cl.3 s.f./makes-obj.cl.3 s.f./the soup(DO f.s.)/this evening**  
 “Who is preparing the soup this evening ?”  
 c. ? Chi **i** ciame<sup>1</sup>**i**, i tozi ? “Who is calling the boys ?”  
 who/**obj.cl.3 pl.m./calls-obj.cl.3 pl.m./the boys (DO m.pl.)**  
 d. ? Chi **e** spedisse<sup>1</sup>**e**, e lettere ? “Who is sending the letters ?”  
 who/**obj.cl.3 pl.f./sends-obj.cl.3 pl.f./the letters (DO f.pl.)**

The sentences in (19), however, become perfectly grammatical if there is another clitic (dative, locative, partitive, but not a subject clitic), as we see comparing (19b) vs (20a) and (19d) vs (20b):

- (20) a. Chi **te** a fa<sup>1</sup>**a**, a minestra, stasera ?  
 who/**dat.2 sg./obj.cl.3 s.f./makes-obj.cl.3 s.f./the soup (DO f.s.)/**  
 this evening  
 “Who is preparing the soup for you this evening ?”  
 b. Chi **ghe** e spedisse<sup>1</sup>**e**, e lettere, al papà ?  
 who/**dat.3 sg./obj.cl.3 pl.f./sends-obj.cl.3 pl.f./**  
 the letters (DO f.pl.)/to daddy  
 “Who is sending the letters to Daddy ?”

#### 4.1. Summary

Let us summarize what we have seen so far. The patterns illustrated in sections 2-3-4 display the following characteristics and restrictions: as for the 2-Scl pattern we have seen that the proclitic element must be third plural, either masculine or feminine; that it has to be a single vocalic element (*I* “they-3...”). We have also seen that the presence of other preverbal clitics (object, dative, locative, partitive clitics) favours the presence of the proclitic subject and that the presence of the proclitic subject is also favoured in negative interrogatives.

As for the 2-Ocl pattern we have noted that the object clitic is 3<sup>rd</sup> person, either singular or plural, masculine or feminine (*o* “it-m./him”, *a* “it-f./her”, *i* “them-m.”, *e* “them-f.”) and that if the proclitic subject is also present, it must be different from the object clitic, and it is possible to encliticise either the subject or the object, not both. If the object clitic is 3<sup>rd</sup> sing., then the proclitic subject must be present too;

this restriction is not active with 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. object clitics. Last, in *wh*- interrogatives with “who” as subject, the 2-Ocl is more natural with a compound tense or with other preverbal clitics.

It is important to add that both patterns – 2-Scl and 2-Ocl – are possible in other clause types where SCI is used, i.e. in exclamatives with expletive negation (both *yes/no* and *wh*-; see (21)) and in wish-clauses referred to the past (see (22)).

SCI in Carm. is less natural in wish-clauses and this fact (and not the presence of 2-Scl or 2-Ocl) determines the lower degree of grammaticality of (22).<sup>3</sup>

- (21) a. No **i a** ga-<sup>l</sup>**i** (-<sup>l</sup>**a**) vista in piasa!  
 not/s.cl.3pl.m./obj.cl.3f.s./have-s.cl.3pl.m.(obj.cl.3f.s.)/  
 seen/in square  
 “(You won’t believe it) They have seen her in the square !”
- b. Quanto no **i me** ga-<sup>l</sup>**i** fato deventar mata, i putei !  
 how much/not/s.cl.3pl.m./me/have-s.cl.3pl.m./made/become/  
 mad/the children  
 “How the children have annoyed me !”
- (22) a. ? **I o** gavesse-<sup>l</sup>**i** (-<sup>l</sup>**o**) fato puito, el lavoro!  
 s.cl.3.m./obj.cl.3 m.s./had-s.cl.3.m.(obj.cl.3 m.s.)/done/well/the job  
 “If only they had done well the job !”

The characteristics and restrictions of 2-Scl and 2-Ocl patterns with exclamatives and wish-clauses are the same described for main interrogatives and summarised above.

### 5. Suggestions for an analysis of 2-Scl and 2-Ocl

Before suggesting an analysis it is important to compare the data of Carm. with those of Paduan shown in (23), which displays the two patterns though with stronger restrictions than in Carm:

- (23) a. **I** la magne-<sup>l</sup>**i**, la minestra, i putei ? (vs (6a))  
 b. \* ? **I lo** fa-<sup>l</sup>**o** o **no** i **lo** fa-<sup>l</sup>**o** ? (vs (15a))  
 c. \* ? Dove **i** lo ga-<sup>l</sup>**i** portà ? (vs (16b))  
 d. \* **I** magne-<sup>l</sup>**i** la minestra, i putei ? (vs (8a))  
 e. \* **I** va-<sup>l</sup>**i** to cugini ? / \* **I ghe** va-<sup>l</sup>**i** to cugini ? (vs (8c-d))  
 f. \* **I** parte-<sup>l</sup>**i** o **no** i parte-<sup>l</sup>**i** ? (vs (10a))  
 g. \* **I lo** ga-<sup>l</sup>**o** fato, el lavoro ? (vs (13e))  
 h. \* **I la** ga-<sup>l</sup>**a** fata, a torta ? (vs (13g))

---

<sup>3</sup> See Munaro (2002), who shows that SCI in exclamatives and wish-clauses is done in different projections of CP.

- i. ? **Le** compre-<sup>1</sup>**e**, e scarpe nove, to soera ? (vs (14c))  
 j. ? **I lo** ga-<sup>1</sup>**i** fato, el lavoro ? (vs (13f))  
 k. \* **No i la** ga-<sup>1</sup>**i** (-<sup>1</sup>**a**) vista in piasa ! (vs (21a))  
 l. \* **I lo** gavesse-<sup>1</sup>**o** (-<sup>1</sup>**i**) fato puito, el lavoro ! (vs (22a))

Analysing Paduan data, we can observe that the 2-Scl pattern is more natural than the 2-Ocl. The latter becomes more acceptable if the object clitic is plural (23i); 2-Scl is possible in *yes/no* interrogatives and almost impossible in *wh*-interrogatives (23c); 2-Scl is more natural with transitive verbs (23a); it is not acceptable with intransitive or unaccusative verbs, no matter if other clitics or the negation are present (23e-f); the co-occurrence of an object clitic with the proclitic subject influences the degree of grammaticality of the structure ((23a) vs (23d)); 2-Scl and 2-Ocl are not possible in exclamatives or wish-clauses (23k-l).

As Poletto has maintained analysing the data of the Piedmontese variety of Rodoretto di Prali, where a proclitic subject co-occurs with an enclitic (see (24)), the fact that they can co-occur is evidence in favour of the claim that they belong to two different series (cf. Poletto 1995; 2000: 51-54).

- (24) Sok **al à-lo** fait ? Rodoretto di Prali (TO)  
 what/s.cl.3 sg.m./has-s.cl.3 sg.m./done  
 “What did he do ?”

Moreover, it is important to notice that both in Carm. and in the variety of Rodoretto, proclitic and enclitic subjects are morphologically similar, but not identical (cf. section 2 above).

In her analysis of varieties displaying SCI, Poletto (2000: 65) hypothesises that only one projection in the CP area – namely AgrC – is activated in varieties displaying SCI (see (25)):

- (25) [C1 ch [ C2 deictic SCL [AgrC3 SCI [ CP4 [ SpecC4 pa ] [C°4 ch / lo ]]]]]

As we have seen, the data from Carm. suggest that CP projections higher than AgrC are also activated, but preferably when other clitics are present; it seems a phenomenon similar to that noted for Standard Italian by Benincà (1988) for dative clitics (see data in (26)):

“Benincà (1988) noted that, although standard Italian is not in general a language that permits doubling of a dative DP, when the dative clitic is combined with a direct object, clitic doubling of the dative becomes possible, as if the dative clitic (differently from the object clitic) were not “visible” anymore, in some respects” (Benincà/Poletto, 2001: 14)

- (26) a. \***Gli** regalo a Mario il mio violino  
 to-him/I-give/to Mario/the/my/violin  
 “I give Mario my violin”

- |  |    |  |
|--|----|--|
| b. <b>Glielo</b> regalo a Mario<br>to-him.it/I-give/to Mario<br>“I give this to Mario” | vs | * <b>Glielo</b> regalo il violino<br>to-him.it/I-give/the violin<br>“I give the violin to him” |
|--|----|--|

As has been noted for Standard Italian, in Carm. in 2-Scl the presence of other clitics (object, partitive...) activates a clitic field higher than AgrC and allows the presence of the proclitic subject.

Poletto’s structure can then be modified as in (27):

- (27) [CP<sub>n</sub> [SpecC<sub>n</sub> **wh**-[C<sub>n-1</sub> procl subj] [C<sub>n-2</sub> obj.cl] [...[AgrC SCI] ]]]]

The clitic field is activated in a bottom-up fashion: the activation of the lower projections allows the activation of the higher part of CP. This is confirmed by the comparison of Paduan data with Carm. data seen in (23): 2-Scl can be activated first by clitics, then by auxiliaries, then by the negation.

Once 2-Scl becomes possible and the clitic field in CP is activated, the morphological affinity of 3<sup>rd</sup> person subject clitics and object clitics allows the 2-Ocl pattern: the checking of the features of number and gender can be done either by the object clitic or by the subject clitic. The fact that enclitic object clitics and enclitic subject clitics cannot co-occur (see above in (13)) indicates that there is not a dedicated position in enclisis for object clitics: object enclitics are hosted in the canonic enclitic position of clitic subjects.

#### 6. The “pragmatic” clitic *-i*

Another interesting phenomenon concerning SCI in Carm. regards the clitic *-i*, which is the interrogative enclitic subject for 1<sup>st</sup> person singular and plural.

SCI with 1<sup>st</sup> singular is obligatory with the verbs “to be” and “to have”, no matter if they are used as lexical verbs (28a) or as auxiliaries or deontic (28b); SCI with 1<sup>st</sup> singular is optional with other verbs (28c-d):

- |   |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
| (28) a. So- <b>i</b> co lu in machina ? | “Am I with him in the car ?” |
| am- <b>s.cl.1 sg.</b> /with/him/in/car  |                              |
| b. Cossa go- <b>i</b> da comprare ?     | “What do I have to buy ?”    |
| what/have- <b>s.cl.1 sg.</b> /from/buy  |                              |
| c. E mi, cossa magno- <b>(i)</b> ?      | “What am I eating ?”         |
| and/I/what/eat- <b>s.cl.1 sg.</b>       |                              |
| d. Vago- <b>(i)</b> anca mi co lori ?   | “Am I going with them too ?” |
| go- <b>s.cl.1 sg.</b> /also/I/with/them |                              |

On the other hand, SCI with 1<sup>st</sup> person plural is always optional:

- |   |                                |
|---|--------------------------------|
| (29) a. Semo- <b>(i)</b> co lu in machina ? | “Are we with him in the car ?” |
| are- <b>(s.cl.1 pl.)</b> /with/him/in/car   |                                |
| b. Ghemo- <b>(i)</b> sbaglia a comprarlo ?  |                                |

- have-(**s.cl.1 pl.**)/made-a-mistake/to/buy-it  
 “Have we made a mistake in buying it ?”
- c. Ndemo(-**i**) anca noaltri ?                    “Are we going too ?”  
 go-(**s.cl.1 pl.**)/also/we
- d. Cossa femo(-**i**) desso ?                    “What are we doing now ?”  
 what/do-(**s.cl.1 pl.**)/now

When *-i* is present with 1<sup>st</sup> plural, it may add to the question a particular pragmatic emphasis, that is “impatience” on the part of the speaker (see (30)):

- (30) a. (Ma a<sup>l</sup>ora), a che ora magnemo-**i** ?  
 (but then)/at what time/eat-**s.cl.1 pl.**  
 “Well, at what time are we going to eat?”
- b. (Ma a<sup>l</sup>ora), cossa femo-**i** desso ?  
 (but then)/what/do-**s.cl.1 pl.**  
 “Well, what are we going to do now ?”

The clitic *-i* may assign also another value to the question, i.e. it can appear in wh- interrogatives in which the speaker can’t find an adequate value for the variable expressed by the wh-element (= “can’t find the value (cfv) questions”, see Obenauer (1994)), as in (31):

- (31) Dove e gavaremo-**i** mese, e ciave ?  
 where/obj.cl.3pl.f./will have-**s.cl.1 pl.**/put/the keys (DO pl.f.)  
 “Where on earth have we put the keys ?”

The *-i* clitic can optionally occur in enclitic position following also the 2<sup>nd</sup> singular enclitic subject (32), obligatorily assigning to the question the pragmatic flavours illustrated above in (30) and (31); the structure is far more natural with a compound tense with SCI on the auxiliary (32), than with simple tenses (33):

- (32) a. (Ma a<sup>l</sup>ora), ghe-**to-i** finio niancora el to lavoro ?  
 (but then)/have-**s.cl.2 sg.-cl.‘i’**/finished/et/the your job  
 “Well, have you finished your job ?”
- b. (Ma a<sup>l</sup>ora), ghe ghe-**to-i** parlà de sta roba ?  
 (but then)/dat. cl./have-**s.cl.2 sg.-cl.‘i’**/told/of this thing  
 “Well, have you told him about it ?”
- c. Dove e gavare-**to-i** mese, e ciavi ?  
 where/obj.cl.3pl.f./will have-**s.cl.2sg.-cl.‘i’**/put/the keys (DO pl.f.)  
 “Where on earth have you put the keys ?”
- (33) a. ?? (Ma a<sup>l</sup>ora), quando finissi-**to-i** sto lavoro ?  
 (but then)/when/finish-**s.cl.2 sg.-cl.‘i’**/this job  
 “Well, when are you finishing your job ?”
- b. ?? (Ma a<sup>l</sup>ora), ghe parlare-**to-i** de sta roba, sì o no ?

(but then)/dat. cl./will tell-**s.cl.2 sg.-cl. 'i'**/of this thing/yes or no  
“Well, are you going to tell him or not about this thing?”

### 6.1. *The analysis of the clitic -i*

The ban on the co-occurrence in enclitic position of a subject clitic with an object clitic (see data in (13) above) may bring to the conclusion that there exists only one position for enclitic elements, but the data seen in (32) for the clitic *-i* show that we can have more than one position in enclisis, as long as they are occupied by clitics of a different nature and with different pragmatic values: our hypothesis is that there is an enclitic position for argumental clitics and one for pragmatic clitics.

The clitic *-i*, having become a marker of a pragmatic value and no longer being a subject clitic, is hosted in a higher position in CP, which can be reached only by auxiliaries and not by lexical verbs: this explains the contrast between (32) vs (33): SCI with the 2<sup>nd</sup> singular clitic is done in AgrC, then the auxiliary with the enclitic climbs higher to encliticise also the clitic marker *-i*.

(34) [Cn *-i* [...[AgrC SCI ]]]]

Why the clitic *-i* can encliticise on 2nd person singular clitic subjects and not on 3rd person subjects has to be explored further: maybe the kind of questions marked by *-i* are more easily addressed to a ‘you’ than to a third person for pragmatic reasons (see also Poletto/Munaro (2002)).

### 7. *Conclusions*

The data of Carm. on subject/object clitics suggest that we have to postulate two different series of subject clitics: since enclitics co-occur with proclitics it can be claimed that they are not one and the same series (cf. also Poletto 2000: 51).

We have seen that CP projections higher than AgrC are activated in varieties such as Carm. and Paduan displaying SCI and the 2-ScI/2-Ocl patterns, but this higher field is activated preferably when other clitics are present.

The data seen in section 6 for the clitic *-i* show that we can have more than one position in enclisis, as long as they are occupied by clitics with different pragmatic values: there is an enclitic position for argumental clitics (the canonical SCI) and one for ‘pragmatic’ clitics, which is activated in a higher portion of CP.

### *References*

- Benincà, P. (1988, 2001<sup>2</sup>) ‘L’ordine degli elementi della frase’, in: L.Renzi, G.P. Salvi and A. Cardinaletti (eds.), *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione*, Il Mulino, Bologna, vol.1: 137-139.
- Benincà, P. and C. Poletto (2001) ‘On some descriptive generalizations in Romance’, to appear in: G. Cinque and R. Kayne (eds.), *Handbook in Comparative Syntax*, Oxford UP, Oxford.

- Munaro, N. (2002) 'Alcune ipotesi sulla struttura del CP alla luce dell'inversione dei clitici soggetto', talk delivered at the *Ottava Giornata di Dialettologia* (Padova, 2 luglio 2002).
- Obenauer, H.-G. (1994) *Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre. Effets d'intervention et mouvements des quantifieurs*, thèse de doctorat d'état, Univ. de Paris VIII.
- Poletto, C. (1995) 'Pronominal Syntax', ms, Università di Padova.
- Poletto, C. (2000) *The Higher Functional Field*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poletto, C. and N. Munaro (2002) 'Distribuzione ed uso delle particelle frasali in alcune varietà venete', to appear in: *Quaderni Patavini di Linguistica* 18.
- Poletto, C. and L. Vanelli (1995) 'Gli introduttori delle frasi interrogative nei dialetti italiani settentrionali', in: E. Banfi et alii (eds.), *Italia Settentrionale: crocevia di idiomi romanzi. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi* (Trento, 1993), Tübingen, Niemeyer: 145-58. [reprinted in P. Benincà and C. Poletto (eds.), *Quaderni di Lavoro ASIS, 1*, 'Strutture interrogative dell'Italia Settentrionale', 1997, CNR, Università di Padova.].