

On Double Clitics in Interrogatives in a Northern Italian Dialect*

Nicoletta Penello
University of Padova

Abstract:

Following recent studies (see for instance Poletto 2000) on the higher functional field, in this paper I aim to give a contribution to the cartography of the CP projection, by examining the behaviour of subject and object clitics in the Northern Italian dialect of Carmignano di Brenta, in comparison with the nearby dialect spoken in Padua. I will examine the characteristics and restrictions of two particular patterns found in main interrogatives in Carmignano, more specifically the co-occurrence of proclitic and enclitic subject and object clitics in yes-no and *wh*-interrogatives: I will label these structures “Two-Subject-Clitics” (= 2-Scl) and “Two-Object-Clitics” (= 2-Ocl), respectively. I will also support a structural analysis of 2-Scl and 2-Ocl. The analysis of microvariation and the comparison with Paduan will permit us to refine the generalisations formulated on the observations of the data of Carmignano and to establish implicational scales. Moreover, once we deal with very subtle variation which brings forth new data and phenomena, we can further enrich theoretical proposals that are already very accurate.

1. Introduction

In this paper I will examine the behaviour of subject clitics in declaratives and in main interrogatives in the Northern Italian dialect of Carmignano di Brenta (henceforth ‘Carm’), of which I am native speaker. In particular, I will be concerned with the analysis of the ‘Two-Subject Clitics Pattern’ (henceforth ‘2-Scl’) and of the ‘Two-Object Clitics Pattern’ (henceforth ‘2-Ocl’) that is the cooccurrence of proclitic and enclitic subject clitics and object clitics in main interrogatives. I will describe characteristics and restrictions of both patterns and give a suggestion for a structural analysis of 2-Scl and 2-Ocl (see also Penello 2003, 2004). Due to space reasons, I will not give a summary of the general descriptive and theoretical discussion on Romance subject clitics found in recent literature: in this respect the reader is referred to seminal works done by Brandi and Cordin (1981, 1989) and Rizzi (1986), and in particular to Renzi and Vanelli (1983) and Poletto (1993). Another fundamental work on which I rely for my analysis is Poletto (2000), which is devoted to the relationships that exist between subject clitics, complementisers, and verbs in the CP field. In her book, Poletto explores the syntax of the higher functional area of the sentence, comparing data of about a hundred Northern Italian dialects.

* 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.

Since Carm gives a positive answer to Poletto's (2000) tests regarding the analysis of Subject-Clitic-Inversion (henceforth 'SCI') as the result of syntactic movement of V to C (see Penello 2003:103-ff), in the present work I will follow the analysis of inversion as movement of the finite verb to C.

As a foreword, I should also say that since the doubling of subject/object clitics is strictly related to S-V inversion and appears only in main interrogatives and not in subordinate clauses, and since SCI in Romance languages is traditionally associated to the functional area of CP, it follows that in discussing these structures, I will be concerned only with this area of the sentence structure.

2. Subject clitics in declaratives and main interrogatives in Carm

When looking at declarative contexts, we can observe that in Carm there are subject clitics for the 2nd person singular and the 3rd person (1a-b): the latter show a distinction for number and gender:¹

- (1) a. **EI / A** magna el pomo.
he / she eats the apple
 'He/she eats the apple.'
- b. **I / E** magna el pomo.
they.M/they.F eat the apple
 'They eat the apple.'

In canonical main interrogatives, i.e. without a particular pragmatic value, both *yes/no* (2a) and *wh-* (2b), we find SCI, which is a common pattern in Northern dialects. The inversion is possible for all persons although it is not always obligatory for 1st person singular and plural. In (2) I give examples of SCI in interrogatives with 3rd person subject clitics:

¹ In the 2nd person singular the subject clitic is always expressed, while in the 3rd person (singular or plural) the clitic may not be expressed if the position of the subject is occupied by a full DP subject or by a tonic pronoun. For our purposes, it is not necessary to examine further the conditions determining the absence or presence of 3rd person subject clitics; for further analysis, I refer the interested reader to Benincà and Vanelli (1982:37-50), where the authors give a detailed analysis of the behaviour of these clitics: their discussion on Paduan is valid, with minimal changes, for Carm as well.

- (2) a. Va- ^lo / -^la co lori?² (Y/N interrogative)
 goes-*he/-she* with them
 ‘Is he/she going with them?’
- b. Cossa fa -*i/-e* desso? (Wh-interrogative)
 what do-*they*.M/F now
 ‘What are they (M./F.) going to do now?’

In table (3) I give a summary of the behaviour of subject clitics in Carm in declaratives and main interrogatives:³

(3) Subject clitics in declaratives and interrogatives in Carm

	proclitic subject clitics in declarative clauses		enclitic subject clitics in main interrogatives	
1 st sg.	--	<i>magno</i> ‘I eat’	(-i)	<i>vago(-i)?</i> ‘do I go?’
2 nd sg.	Te	te <i>magni</i> ‘you eat’	-to	<i>ve-to?</i> ‘do you go?’
3 rd sg.	el (M.), a (F.)	el / a <i>magna</i> ‘he / she eats’	- ^l o (M.), - ^l a (F.)	<i>va-^lo / va-^la?</i> ‘does he / she go?’
1 st pl.	--	<i>magnemo</i> ‘we eat’	(-i)	<i>ndemo(-i)?</i> ‘do we go?’
2 nd pl.	--	<i>magné</i> ‘you eat’	-o	<i>ve-o?</i> ‘do you go?’
3 rd pl.	i (M.), e (F.)	i / e <i>magna</i> ‘they (M./F.) eat’	-i (M), -e (F.)	<i>va-i / va-e?</i> ‘do they (M./F.) go?’

3. Double subject clitics in Y/N main interrogatives

In addition to SCI, in Y/N main interrogatives in Carm we find the 2-Scl pattern, i.e. a proclitic subject clitic co-occurring with the canonical enclitic (4):⁴

² The small *l* in ^lo/^la indicates the so-called ‘vanishing l’, i.e. the *l* undergoes palatalisation and vocalisation when it is in intervocalic position: this phenomenon is present in several Veneto dialects (see Zamboni 1974:13, Penello 2003:17).

³ I will not enter further into the general conditions that regulate the occurrence of subject clitics in declaratives and main interrogatives. See Poletto (1993, 2000) for further details.

⁴ The tenses of the verb in these examples are the simple present or the present perfect. The phenomena described here are however grammatical also with other tenses.

- (4) a. **I** a magne-**i**, a minestra, **i** putei?
they.M it.F eat-they.M the soup the children
 ‘Are the children going to eat the soup?’
- b. **E** a fa-**e** a festa?
they.F it.F make-they.F the party
 ‘Are they (F.) going to have the party?’

Let us examine characteristics and restrictions of the pattern given in (4): first, the proclitic subject is always 3rd plural, either masculine (= *i*) or feminine (= *e*). 2-Scl is not grammatical with 2nd singular clitics (*te/-to*), or 3rd singular clitics, either masculine (*el/-lo*) or feminine (*a/-la*) (see 5):

- (5) ***el** magne-^l**o**? / ***a** magne-^l**a**? / ***te** magni-**to**?
he eats-he she eats-she you.2SG eat-you.2SG
 ‘Does he eat? / Does she eat? / Do you (2SG.) eat?’

Secondly, there is a restriction on the form of the two subject clitics. The proclitic has to be morphologically identical to the enclitic: they are both made up of a single vowel (*i/e*).⁵

The 2-Scl pattern is mainly found with transitive verbs. It is possible also with unergatives and unaccusatives as long as there is at least another clitic (object, dative, locative, partitive) between the proclitic subject and the verb. The sentences displaying clitic sequences or clusters are more natural than those in which the preverbal subject clitic is immediately followed by the verb. See for example the contrast between (6a) vs. (4a) above with an object clitic, and between (6b) vs. (6b’) with a locative clitic:⁶

⁵ This restriction then automatically excludes the cases seen in (5) in which the two clitics are different.

⁶ As a confirmation of the fact that the presence of another clitic between the proclitic subject and the V makes the sequence perfect, consider the modification of (6b-b’) in (ia) which has SCI with the modal verb *volere* ‘to want’ and where the complement clitic is enclitic on the infinitival. If the complement clitic does not form a cluster with the subject, the sentence is more or less ungrammatical, as in (6b) above. On the other hand, (ib) with clitic climbing of the locative to a position between the verb and the proclitic subject is perfectly grammatical:

- (i) a. ?* **I** vor-**li** ndar-**ghe**?
they.M want-they.M to go-there
- b. **I** **ghe** vor-**li** ndare?
they.M there want-they.M to go
 ‘Do they want to go there?’

- (6) a. ?**I** magne-**i** a minestra, i putei? (vs. (4a))
they.M eat-they.M the soup the children
 ‘Are the children eating the soup?’
- b. ?***I** va-**i**? (vs. (6b’))
they.M go-they.M
 ‘Are they (M.) going?’
- b’. **I** **ghe** va-**i**?
they.M there go-they.M
 ‘Are they (M.) going there?’

Let us now observe the behaviour of the verb *partire* ‘to leave’: since this verb does not subcategorize any argument which could be expressed by a clitic, 2-Scl with this verb is quite marginal (see (7a)). However, the presence of negation seems to influence the degree of grammaticality of 2-Scl. In (7b) in particular, we see that the negative structure is a possible way to make 2-Scl grammatical with the verb *partire*:

- (7) a. ??**I** parte-**i**?
they.M leave-they.M
 ‘Are they leaving?’
- b. **No i** parte-**i** mia?
not they.M leave-they.M mia(=postVnegation)
 ‘Aren’t they leaving?’

We might suggest that the negation as well forms a clitic cluster that produces the same effect as the one produced by complement clitics. In this respect, it is interesting to notice a difference between the two cases that emerge with unergatives: while 2-Scl is grammatical when another clitic is present, as we see in (8a), it is less acceptable with the presence of negation (8b):

We see in (i) that in *vor-li* a full *l* emerges on the enclitic, thus showing that the proclitic and the enclitic forms are morphologically different: (i) would then represent a counter-example to the restriction formulated above on the identity of the two clitics. However, I consider the case of *vorli* an apparent exception which can be explained phonologically: the presence of the sonorant *r* makes the underlying *l* of the clitic emerge (see Penello 2003:114).

- (8) a. **E** ***(ghe)** dorme-**e** qua?
they.F (there) sleep-they.F here
 ‘Are they (F.) sleeping here?’
- b. ? **No e** dorme-**e** mia qua?
not they.F sleep-they.F mia.NEG there
 ‘Aren’t they (F.) sleeping here?’

From the contrasts seen in (8), it is quite clear that the presence of complement clitics is a factor which more than negation favours the realisation of 2-Scl.

4. Double object clitics in Y/N main interrogatives

In Y/N main interrogatives in Carm we can also encounter 2-Ocl, i.e. a preverbal object clitic co-occurring with an enclitic object clitic and the latter is in complementary distribution with the enclitic subject; the enclitic is interpreted as object and not as subject because of Number and Gender agreement with the DP-direct object:

- (9) a. **I o** ga-¹**o** fato, el lavoro?
they.M it.M have-it.M done the job.DO.M.S
 ‘Have they done the job?’
- b. **I a** ga-¹**a** fata, a torta?
they.M it.F have-it.F made the cake.DO.F.S
 ‘Have they made the cake?’
- c. **E** compre-**e**, e scarpe, to soresa?
them.F buys-them.F the shoes.DO.F.PL your sister
 ‘Is your sister going to buy a pair of shoes?’
- d. **I** magne-**i**, i biscoti, el puteo?
them.M eats-them.M the biscuits.DO.M.PL the child
 ‘Is the child eating the biscuits?’

The 2-Ocl pattern illustrated in (9) displays the following characteristics and restrictions. The object clitic must be 3rd person, either singular or plural, masculine or feminine. If the proclitic subject is present as well, subject clitic and object clitic have to be different, and either one or the other is enclitic, not both. These facts are illustrated by the examples in (10):

5. 2-Scl and 2-Ocl in Wh-interrogatives

In *wh*-interrogatives we can find both patterns, i.e. the doubling of the subject clitic (13a) and that of the object clitic (13b):

- (13) a. Quando **e** o fa-**e**, el lavoro? ---> 2-Scl
when they.F it.M do-they.F the job.DO. M.S
 ‘When are they (F.) doing the job?’
- b. Ndove i o ga-^l**o** portà? ---> 2-Ocl
where they.M it.M have-it.M taken
 ‘Where have they (M.) taken him?’

Wh-interrogatives with ‘who’ as subject allow only 2-Ocl, and not 2-Scl, as is shown in (14):

- (14) a. *Chi **i** o ga-**i** tolto, el pan? ---> *2-Scl
who they.M it.M has-they.M taken the bread.DO. M.S
 ‘Who has bought bread?’
- b. Chi o ga-^l**o** tolto, el pan? ---> 2-Ocl
who it.M has-it.M taken the bread.DO. M.S
 ‘Who has bought bread?’

The sentence in (14b) with a compound tense – with the auxiliary ‘to have’ – is more natural than its counterpart with a simple tense in (15), which is nevertheless possible:

- (15) ? Chi o to-^l**o**, el pan? ---> 2-Ocl
who it.M takes-it.M the bread.DO. M.S
 ‘Who is buying bread?’

‘Who’-subject interrogatives with simple tenses, however, become perfectly grammatical when another clitic (dative, locative, not subject) is present, as we see when we compare the sentences in (16) with a dative clitic and a locative clitic vs. (15):

- (16) a. Chi **me** o to-^l**o**, el pan? ---> 2-Ocl
who to-me it.M takes-it.M the bread.DO. M.S
 ‘Who is buying bread for me?’
- b. Chi **ghe** e porte-**e**, e toze, sco^l**a**? ---> 2-Ocl
who there them.F takes-them.F the girls to school
 ‘Who is going to drive the girls to school?’

5.1 Summary

Summing up so far what we have seen on 2-Scl and 2-Ocl, which are both possible either in Y/N or in main *wh*-interrogatives, we have observed that the patterns described in sections 3, 4, and 5 display the following

characteristics and restrictions: with respect to 2-Scl, we have seen that the proclitic element must be 3rd plural, either masculine or feminine. It has to be a single vocalic element (*i* ‘they.M,’ *e* ‘they.F’), and there must be morphological identity with the enclitic element (*-i* ‘they.M,’ *-e* ‘they.F’). We have also seen that the presence of other preverbal clitics (object, dative, locative, partitive) and/or of the pre-verbal negation *no* favours the presence of the proclitic subject. As for 2-Ocl, we have shown that the proclitic object clitic must be 3rd person, either singular or plural, masculine or feminine (*o* ‘it.M/him,’ *a* ‘it.F/her,’ *i* ‘them.M,’ *e* ‘them.F’). Moreover, the enclitic object clitic must be morphologically similar (*-^lo* ‘it.M/him,’ *-^la* ‘it.F/her’) or identical (*-i* ‘them.M,’ *-e* ‘them.F’) to the proclitic. If the proclitic subject is also present, it must be different from the object clitic, and it is possible to find in enclisis either the subject or the object, not both. If the object clitic is 3rd singular (*o* ‘it.M/him,’ *a* ‘it.F/her’), then the proclitic subject must be obligatorily present, a restriction which is not active with 3rd plural object clitics. Last, in *wh*-interrogatives with *who* as subject, 2-Ocl is more natural with a compound tense or with the co-occurrence of other preverbal clitics.

5.2 2-Scl and 2-Ocl in exclamatives and in wish-clauses

As described in Benincà (1989), Poletto (2000:42 ff) and Munaro (2002), SCI is a syntactic strategy which can be used also in other sentence types than the interrogative.⁷ For example, Carm uses SCI also in exclamatives and optative clauses that refer to the past, and we might then expect to find 2-Scl and 2-Ocl in these clause types as well. This is indeed the case – both patterns are possible also in these sentence types, as shown by (17) for exclamatives⁸ (both Y/N (17a) and *wh*- (17b)) and by (18) for optative clauses:

- (17) a. No e o ga-e (^lo) pasà,
not they.F it.M have-they.F (it.M) passed
 l’esame! ---> 2-Scl (2-Ocl)
the exam
 ‘(You won’t believe it) They (F.) have passed the exam!’

⁷ Munaro (2002) shows that SCI in the several sentence-types considered takes place in different projections of CP:

(i.) ConcessiveP > HypotheticalP >>> ExclamativeP > InterrogativeP

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 the sentence in (18).

⁸ Notice that in exclamatives there is always an ‘expletive negation’ *no* present (cf. Benincà 1996).

- b. Quanto no **i** me fa-**i** deventar mata,
how much not they me make-they become mad
 i putei! ---> 2-Scl
the children
 ‘The children are really driving me crazy!’
- (18) ?**I** o gavesse-**i** (-¹**o**) fato puito,
they.M it.M had-they.M (it.M) done well
 ‘I wish they had done the job well!’
 el lavoro! ---> 2-Scl (2-Ocl)
the job
 ‘I wish they had done well the job!’

The characteristics and restrictions of 2-Scl and 2-Ocl in exclamatives and optative clauses are the same as observed for interrogatives and summed up in section 5.1.

5.3 A comparison with Paduan

Before proceeding to the analysis let us compare Carm data seen so far to data from the dialect of Padua. Also in this dialect we find both 2-Scl and 2-Ocl, however with stronger restrictions than in Carm. Consider the data in (19):

- (19) a. **I** la magne-**i**, la minestra, i putei? ---> 2-Scl (vs. (4a))
 b. ***I** magne-**i** la minestra, i putei? ---> 2-Scl (vs. (6a))
 c. *?**E** la fa-**e** la festa? ---> 2-Scl (vs. (4b))
 d. *?**Quando e** lo fa-**e** el lavoro? ---> 2-Scl (vs. (13a))
 e. ***E ghe** dorme-**e** qua? / ***No i** parte-**i** mia? ---> 2-Scl (vs. (8a-7b))
 f. ***E la** ga-¹**a** fata, la torta? ---> 2-Ocl (vs. (10c))
 g. ?**Le** compre-**e**, e scarpe, to soarea? ---> 2-Ocl (vs. (11b))
 h. ***No e lo** ga-¹**o** (-**e**) pasà l’esame! ---> 2-Ocl (2-Scl) (vs. (17a))
 i. ***I lo** gavesse-¹**o** (-**i**) fato puito, el lavoro! ---> 2-Ocl (2-Scl) (vs. (18))

On the basis of these examples we can make the following observations. In Paduan, 2-Scl is more natural than 2-Ocl ((19a) vs. (19f)). The latter becomes more acceptable if the object clitic is plural (19g). 2-Scl is possible in *Y/N* interrogatives but almost out in *wh*-interrogatives (19d); it is more natural with transitive verbs (19a), while it is out with unergatives or unaccusatives, no matter if other clitics or the negation are present, as shown by (19e). (19a) and (19b) show that the co-occurrence of an object clitic with the proclitic subject influences the degree of grammaticality of

the structure. Last, 2-Scl and 2-Ocl are not possible in exclamatives or optative clauses (19h-i).

6. Syntactic analysis of 2-Scl and 2-Ocl

Poletto (2000) examines the variation in main interrogatives in the domain of Northern Italian dialects adopting a split-CP perspective, i.e. assuming that each projection activated in the CP field in interrogatives has different syntactic properties correlated with different interpretations of the elements hosted in the projections. In particular, by analysing the co-occurrence of various elements such as the complementiser, the inflected verb, deictic clitics and sentence particles (as the *pa* of Rhaeto-Romance dialects), she identifies four active projections in interrogatives, proposing the structure in (20):

(20) $[C_1 \textit{ch}[C_2 \textit{deictic SCL}[AgrC_3 \textbf{SCI} [CP_4[\textit{Spec}C_4 \textit{pa}] [C^\circ_4 \textit{ch} / \textit{lo}]]]]]$

For dialects such as Carm and Paduan, which use SCI in interrogatives, Poletto (2000:65) makes the hypothesis that only one of the projections she has identified in the CP area – namely AgrC – is activated, and that this projection is correlated with the canonical interpretation of interrogatives, i.e. real request for information. Paduan and Carm do not have deictic clitics or complementisers higher than the inflected verb in interrogative sentences and therefore do not activate the projections CP1 and CP2. However, the data seen so far on 2-Scl⁹ and 2-Ocl suggest that also the projections higher than AgrC are activated, but preferably when other clitics are present; this seems to be a phenomenon similar to the one described by Benincà (1988) for Standard Italian regarding dative clitics:¹⁰

⁹ The co-occurrence of a proclitic subject with an enclitic has been noted also for the Provençal dialect of Rodoretto di Prali (in Western Piedmont) (Poletto 1995; 2000:54):

(i) Sok **al à-lo** fait? ‘What did he do?’ Rodoretto di Prali (TO)

Poletto maintains that the fact that they can co-occur is evidence in favour of the claim that they belong to two different series.

¹⁰ ‘Benincà (1988) notes that, although Standard Italian in general is not 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. It is as if the dative clitic (differently from the object clitic) is not “visible” anymore, in some respects’ (Benincà and Poletto, 2001:14).

- (21) a. ***Gli** regalo a Mario il mio violino.
to him I-give to Mario the my violin
 ‘I give Mario my violin.’
- b. **Glielo** regalo a Mario. vs.
to him-it I-give to Mario
 ‘I give this to Mario.’
- b’. ***Glielo** regalo il violino.
to him-it I-give the violin
 ‘I give the violin to him.’

The same phenomenon seen in (21) in Standard Italian takes place in Carm for 2-Scl: the presence of clitics other than subject clitics (object, partitive, dative, locative clitics) activates a clitic field higher than AgrC and allows the presence of the proclitic subject, as if it were not visible to the enclitic subject due to the ‘barrier’ constituted by the other clitics. We can then propose a first modification of Poletto’s structure (2000:65) in (22). Later we will see how we can refine this first proposal further:

- (22) [CP_n [SpecC_n wh-[C_{n-1} *procl subj* [C_{n-2} *obj.cl* [...[AgrC **SCI**]]]]]

The clitic area in CP is activated in a bottom-up fashion, i.e. from the lower projections up to the higher ones. This is confirmed by the comparison with Paduan data seen in section 5.3: 2-Scl can be activated first by clitics, then by auxiliaries, and last, but only for Carm, by negation. Once 2-Scl becomes possible and the clitic area in CP has become active, the morphological affinity between subject enclitics of 3rd singular and plural and object clitics of 3rd singular and plural triggers the activation of 2-Ocl: the checking of number and gender features can be done either by the object clitic or by the subject clitic. The fact that enclitic object clitic and enclitic subject clitics cannot co-occur (see section 4), indicates that there is not a dedicated position for enclisis of object clitics: enclitic objects are hosted in the canonical position of enclitic subjects. And it is to be underlined that this can happen *if and only if* there is morphological identity (or strict affinity) between subject clitics and object clitics.

Let us now examine in detail the restrictions and the characteristics of the two patterns, in order to refine the structure in (22). First, let us consider the restriction on the type of subject clitics which can be doubled: 2-Scl is possible only with 3rd person plural clitics (*i/e*) which are made up of a single vowel as the corresponding enclitics (*-i/-e*) (see 4). I would like to explain this restriction by strictly linking the morphological aspect to the syntactic one: 3rd singular and plural subject clitics of Paduan and Carm are, in the classification proposed by Poletto (1993), argumental clitics, i.e. clitics absorbing the thematic role of subject assigned by the verb. In other

words they are elements which have to check agreement features. Moreover, they are the only clitics which are distinct for number (singular vs. plural) and gender (masculine vs. feminine). We can then entertain the idea that this richness of syntactic and morphological features is shared between the proclitic and the enclitic subject: this is however possible only because they are elements identical in form, which is very poor indeed (just a single vowel, both for 3rd plural proclitics and enclitics). When the form of the two elements is different, as e.g. for 3rd masculine singular (*el* vs. *-^lo*), syntactic redundancy is no longer possible: 2-Scl is allowed only thanks to an ambiguity generated by morphological identity. This is why the cases of 2-Scl seen in (5) are not grammatical.

Furthermore, we have to remember that 3rd plural object clitics (*i/e*) are those which can appear in 2-Ocl without restrictions: we can think that, their form being identical to that of the corresponding subject clitics, a syntactic ambiguity becomes possible (see (11b)). The positions in proclisis and in enclisis are occupied by clitic elements which are formally identical, which from an abstract point of view (in the inventory of clitics) share the same number and gender features, but they are not defined as subject or object: their interpretation is determined by the presence of dislocated DPs (subject or object) to which they are linked. A speaker cannot find 3rd plural subject clitics distinct from 3rd plural object clitics in the morphological inventory: the forms are unique and can be used either as subjects or as objects. As further evidence for this let us recall that in Paduan it is indeed with 3rd plural object clitics that 2-Ocl becomes possible (19g), while this pattern results in ungrammaticality with other object clitics (19f). Moreover, in Paduan 2-Scl with 3rd plural subject clitics is perfectly grammatical (19a).

We can no longer talk about identity, but about morphological affinity in order to explain the activation of 2-Ocl in Carm. with 3rd singular object clitics. They are indeed formally speaking almost identical to enclitic subjects: 3rd singular object clitics are made up of a single vowel (*o/a*) and are different from enclitic subjects only for the presence of the half-vocalised *l* (^l). There is then a morphological ambiguity between proclitic object clitics and enclitic subject clitics (*-^lo*, *-^la*) which in turn creates the conditions described above regarding 3rd plural proclitic and enclitic subjects and objects (*i/e*). The forms in proclitic and enclitic positions are codified with the same features ([+ 3rd person], [+/- plural], [+/- feminine]); the enclitics occupy the syntactic position which is dedicated to them and are disambiguated only at the interpretive level. We should remember that 2-Ocl seems to be a syntactic phenomenon which is more expensive and syntactically complex than 2-Scl: in Paduan it is very limited and it is

possible only with 3rd plural object clitics, for which the identity between the proclitic element and the enclitic one is crucial. In Carm, on the other hand, 2-Ocl is more extended because 2-Scl as well is wider than in Paduan. However, even in Carm, when the morphological affinity is less strong, as happens for example with 3rd singular subject/object clitics, the presence of a 3rd plural proclitic subject becomes necessary (11a).¹¹

As for the presence of other clitics (object, dative, etc.) favouring the activation of 2-Scl and 2-Ocl, this seems to be the primary condition for triggering the two patterns. In Standard Italian clitic doubling of a dative element becomes possible when the dative clitic is combined with an object clitic (cf note 10). In the same way, in Carm 2-Scl and 2-Ocl are favoured when subject/object clitics are combined with other clitics elements. The presence of one or more clitics makes a sort of ‘barrier’ between the proclitic and the enclitic element thus making the two invisible one to the other. So the redundancy of features becomes possible. Moreover, the activation of the clitic field runs along a rigorous implicational scale: first lower clitic heads are activated (= object clitics) and then we have the activation of higher heads (dative clitic, etc.). In fact in Paduan only the combination proclitic subject-object clitic is allowed (19a). The projections that host other clitics have not been activated yet in Paduan (19e), and this also explains the impossibility of 2-Scl with unergative verbs since they subcategorise arguments different from the direct object.

On the other hand, in Carm also dative, locative and partitive clitics can activate 2-Scl and the structure becomes possible also with unaccusative and unergative verbs ((7)-(8)). It is worthwhile to briefly discuss the role of preverbal negation (*no*) as well: the fact that in Carm it can influence the acceptability of 2-Scl (see *partire* ‘to leave’ in (7)) makes us think that negation could be interpreted as a clitic element of the CP area. Zanuttini (1997) proposes that preverbal negative elements are of two types, i.e. independent heads or clitic elements. The negation as independent head blocks the movement of V to C, while the clitic negation does not¹². The negation that influences the grammaticality of 2-Scl is clearly a negation with clitic status. When we observe that the reciprocal position of *no* with respect to the other clitics of the field, e.g. of a dative clitic, as in (23) (which seems to be one of the highest clitics) we see that the negation is even higher than the dative clitic, whereas in Paduan – which has not

¹¹ 3rd singular feminine clitics display a significative morphological affinity (*a* vs. *-la*), which is however insufficient to legitimate both 2-Scl and 2-Ocl: this case deserves a specific discussion, for which I refer to Penello (2003:135-136).

¹² On clitic negation see also Benincà and Poletto (2001:27-ss). For the discussion on Zanuttini’s hypothesis regarding Carm and Paduan data see Penello (2003:137-138).

activated yet clitics higher than the object – it is clear that the projection hosting *no* is too high to be active and thus influence 2-Scl. In Carm, on the other hand, the clitic area has been activated in a complete fashion, reaching also the projection of the negation.

- (23) **No i ghe a ga-i mia dà a medaja?**
not they.M to-him it.F have-they.M mia.NEG given the medal
 ‘Didn’t they gim him the medal?’

Clearly, the negation is not influential in the case of 2-Ocl since the clitic field has already been activated by the object clitic. The role of *no* becomes crucial only in 2-Scl when we cannot have the presence of other clitics, as in the case of *partire* ‘to leave’. The greater naturalness of 2-Ocl with compound tenses in Carm (14b) can be explained with the fact that SCI takes place on the auxiliary, which can move higher than a lexical verb and thus contribute to the activation of the clitic area.

As for the fact that 2-Scl and 2-Ocl are not allowed in exclamatives and optative-clauses in Paduan, even though SCI in this dialect is a productive strategy in these sentence types, is easily explained by the fact that, as Munaro (2002) shows, the exclamative SCI and the optative-clause SCI take place in projections which are hierarchically superior to the CP projection in which the interrogative SCI takes place (see the hierarchy in note 7). Only when 2-Scl and 2-Ocl are *completely* activated in all their aspects in the interrogative area of CP, as happens in Carm, can the two structures be realised also in sentence types which are codified in higher CP projections. Since in Paduan 2-Scl and 2-Ocl are still at the initial phase in the interrogative area of CP, it follows that they are not allowed in higher areas of CP, and this is due also to their rigorous implicational nature. Last, as for the fact that 2-Scl and 2-Ocl are not allowed in *wh*-interrogatives in Paduan, I have not a convincing explanation at the moment. We could suggest that *wh*-interrogatives are codified in a projection which is higher than the one in which Y/N interrogatives take place and that would be a projection not yet activated in 2-Scl and 2-Ocl in Paduan: *wh*-elements would then not be hosted in the specifier of AgrC, but in the specifier of a higher projection. Also this aspect remains to be investigated further however. I want to conclude this section by repeating the structure already given in (22), but further refined by taking into account the reciprocal order of clitics and negation in the sentences which have been analysed so far: the projections are not numerated since it is not possible to compare the elements that Poletto (2000:65) collocates in the various projections of CP with 2-Scl and 2-Ocl of Carm. The elements in CP1, CP2, CP4 have in fact been systematised by Poletto (2000) this way on the basis of data coming from dialects other than Carm and Paduan. Only if we were to find data on

the doubling of subject/object clitics comparable to those of Carm¹³ in dialects also possessing elements such as *pa* or deictic subject clitics could we define the structure more precisely. For the moment, we limit ourselves to give an indefinite, albeit hierarchical, numeration of the projections.

- (24) [_{C_{n-5}} **negation** [_{C_{n-4}} **dative clitic** ...
 [_{C_{n-3}} **proclitic subject** [_{C_{n-2}} **dative clitic/locative clitic** ...
 [_{C_{n-1}} **object clitic / partitive clitic** [AgrC_n **SCI**]]]]]¹⁴

7. Conclusions

The present work has tried to demonstrate that when the dialectological survey brings to light new data, some consequences for the theory follow, which force us to revisit existing proposals. In the current case, the data on subject/object clitics in 2-Scl and 2-Ocl in main interrogatives in Carm and Paduan show that the structure proposed by Poletto (2000) for main interrogatives is no longer sufficient, but it has to be developed further: since SCI co-occurs with 2-Scl and 2-Ocl, this means that projections higher than AgrC, in which SCI takes place, are activated. The microvariation comparison has been crucial to demonstrate that the functional area of CP in 2-Scl and 2-Ocl runs along a rigorous implicational scale.

References

- Benincà, Paola. 1989. 'Friaulisch: Interne Sprachgeschichte I. Grammatik,' in *Lexicon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, vol.III. Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, 563-585.
- Benincà, Paola. 1996. 'La struttura della frase esclamativa alla luce del dialetto padovano,' in Benincà Paola, Guglielmo Cinque, Tullio De Mauro, and Nigel Vincent (eds.) *Italiano e dialetti nel tempo: Saggi di grammatica per Giulio C. Lepschy*. Bulzoni, Roma, 23-43.
- Benincà Paola. 1988, 2001². 'L'ordine degli elementi della frase,' in Lorenzo Renzi, Giampaolo Salvi, and Anna Cardinaletti (eds.), *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione*. Il Mulino, Bologna, I, 137-139.
- Benincà, Paola and Cecilia Poletto. 2001. 'On some descriptive generalizations in Romance,' in Guglielmo Cinque and Richard Kayne (eds.) *Handbook in Comparative Syntax*. Oxford UP, Oxford, 221-258.

¹³ Given the infinite richness of data offered by Italian dialects we can safely say "when we find" instead of "if we were to find"!

¹⁴ From this analysis another interesting aspect regarding dative clitics emerges, since these clitics can occupy two positions in the hierarchy (see (25)), one of which is higher than that of the subject (for the relevant data about this and for a general discussion on dative clitics in Carm see Penello (2003:142-143)).

- Benincà, Paola and Laura Vanelli. 1982. 'Appunti di sintassi veneta,' in Manlio Cortelazzo (ed.) *Guida ai dialetti veneti IV*. Padova, CLEUP, 7-38 [reprinted in Benincà 1994, *La variazione sintattica. Studi di dialettologia romanza*. Il Mulino, Bologna, 29-66].
- Brandi, Luciana and Patricia Cordin. 1981. 'Dialetti e italiano: un confronto sul parametro del soggetto nullo,' in *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 6, 33-87.
- Brandi, Luciana and Patricia Cordin. 1989. 'Two Italian dialects and the Null Subject Parameter,' in Osvaldo Jaeggli and Ken Safir (eds.) *The Null Subject Parameter*. Foris, Dordrecht, 111-142.
- Munaro, Nicola. (2002): 'Splitting up subject-clitic verb inversion,' in Claire Beyssade, Reineke Bok-Bennema, Frank Drijkoningen, and Paola Monachesi (eds.) *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2000*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 233-252.
- Penello, Nicoletta. 2003. *Capitoli di Morfologia e Sintassi del dialetto di Carmignano di Brenta*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Padova, supervisor Paola Benincà.
- Penello, Nicoletta. 2004. 'On enclisis and proclisis in interrogatives in the Northern Italian variety of Carmignano di Brenta,' in *Proceedings of the XXIX Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, Cocchi G. and Donati C. (eds.) *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 27, 59-72.
- Poletto, Cecilia. 1993. *La sintassi del soggetto nei dialetti italiani settentrionali*. Unipress, Padova.
- Poletto, Cecilia. 1995. 'Pronominal Syntax,' ms, University of Padua.
- Poletto, Cecilia. 2000. *The Higher Functional Field*. Oxford U.P., Oxford.
- Renzi, Lorenzo and Laura Vanelli. 1983. 'I pronomi soggetto in alcune varietà romanze,' in *Scritti Linguistici in onore di G.B. Pellegrini*. Pacini, Pisa, 121-145.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. 'On the Status of Subject Clitics in Romance,' in Osvaldo Jaeggli and Carmen Silva-Corvalan (eds.) *Studies in Romance Linguistics*. Foris, Dordrecht, 391-419.
- Zamboni, A. 1974. *Veneto*. Pacini, Pisa.