Language Optionality and Variation
Festschrift in Honor of Anna Cardinaletti
edited by Chiara Branchini, Gianluca Lebani,
Lara Mantovan, Francesca Volpato

Enclisis/Proclisis in Italian: Preferences and Restrictions
Some Considerations from the Written Italian of University Students

Elisa Di Domenico
Università per Stranieri di Perugia, Italia

Aurora Mastrangelo
Università per Stranieri di Perugia, Italia

Abstract In this work, we examine the distribution of two clitic pronouns – *ci* and *si* – in restructuring sentences. The relevant data are taken from the corpus Univers-ITA, which collects written texts elicited from university students. In previous work on the same dataset, we examined the distribution of *mi*, *ti*, *vi*, *lo*, *la*, *le*, *li*, *gli*, and *ne*. The present analysis thus completes the picture, allowing the formulation of two independent but related generalizations, relevant for the whole peninsula, with no significant differences among the North, the Centre and the South. The first one suggests that the preference for enclisis is significantly more robust for clitics endowed with a P(erson) feature. The second singles out IMP(ersonal) *si* – which almost always occurs in proclisis – from the other clitics. A proposal to account for these generalizations is finally sketched.

Keywords Enclisis. Proclisis. Written Italian. Ci. Si. Person. Subjecthood.

Summary 1 Introduction: Enclisis vs. Proclisis in Restructuring Sentences. – 2 The Present Study. – 3 Summary and Discussion. – 4 Conclusions.

Edizioni Ca'Foscari

LiVVaL 9
e-ISSN 2974-6574 | ISSN 2974-6981
ISBN [ebook] 979-12-5742-086-4 | ISBN [print] 979-12-5742-121-2

Peer review | Open access
Submitted 2025-11-10 | Accepted 2026-07-22 | Published 2026-11-17
© 2026 Di Domenico, Mastrangelo | CC BY 4.0
DOI 10.30687/979-12-5742-086-4/004

1 Introduction: Enclisis vs. Proclisis in Restructuring Sentences

It is a well-known feature of Italian that in complex sentences containing a main clause and an infinitive, clitics may occur either as proclitic to the finite verb or as enclitic to the infinitive, provided that the verb in the main clause belongs to a specific class of verbs, as shown in (1):[1]

(1)	a.	Lo=	voglio	fare	
		3.S.ACC=	want.P.1.S	do.INF	
		'I want to do it.'			
	b.	Voglio	far=lo		
		want.P.1.S	do.INF.= 3.S.ACC		
		'I want to do it.'			
	c.	*Lo=	penso	di	fare
		3.S.ACC=	think. P.1.S.	of	do.INF
		'I think I'll do it.'			
	d.	Penso	di	far=lo	
		think.P.1.S	of	do.INF=3.S.ACC	
		'I think I'll do it.'			

Following much current literature, we will label these verbs 'restructuring verbs', and the complex sentences as in (1a) and (1b) 'restructuring sentences'.[2] The choice between proclisis and enclisis appears as a genuine instance of optionality, although various proposals have been advanced along the years, suggesting for instance a preference for enclisis in the Northern varieties of Italian, a preference for proclisis in the Southern varieties of Italian, and true optionality only in the Central varieties (Benincà 1986), a preference which becomes a norm in the dialects (Egerland 2009). A more recent analysis on bilectal speakers (Cardinaletti, Giusti, Lebani 2025), however, shows that enclisis is accepted also in the South and that optionality is attested also in the dialects. Rohlfs (1968) assumes that enclisis is typical of literary Italian, and proclisis characterizes oral varieties, while Berretta (1986) suggests that the choice might be

1 We thank two anonymous reviewers for their careful and insightful comments on a previous version of this paper. This paper is dedicated to Anna Cardinaletti, a constant source of inspiration along the years: not only for her outstanding work, but also for her personal character, where strength and kindness are tightly and smoothly intertwined.

2 The term goes back to Rizzi's (1976) proposal claiming that proclisis is possible whenever a rule called 'RISTR' (restructuring) applies. The rule in question transforms a complex sentence in a simple one, creating a unique complex predicate formed by the matrix and the infinitive verb.

tied to Information Structure reasons. Adult L2 speakers of Italian tend to avoid proclisis (Bennati, Matteini 2006), which is instead preferred by children (Bernardini, van der Weijer 2018), who are also more accurate with proclisis than with enclisis (Cardinaletti, Cerutti, Volpato 2024). In previous work (Di Domenico 2025) we examined the distribution of different clitics (*mi*, *ti*, *vi*, *lo*, *la*, *le*, *li*, *gli* and *ne*) in a written corpus (Grandi et al. 2023). Results revealed a general strong preference for enclisis (78%) throughout Italy, with no significant differences when considering the North (77%), the Centre (77%) or the South (79%) of the territory.[3] This general preference for enclisis could in part be due to the written and formal nature of the texts that make up the corpus, as discussed in Di Domenico (2025). Some differences were, however, observed when examining each clitic. Specifically, we observed that the preference for enclisis is significantly lower for *ne* (64%) when compared to the total (78%). In addition, contrary to all the other clitics examined, in the case of *vi*, proclisis is preferred to enclisis (63% vs. 37% respectively). Further scrutiny revealed that the preference for proclisis is specific for the locative/existential use of *vi*, while the preference disappears when *vi* functions as a 2nd person plural marker. That the specific value of a clitic should be considered when examining its distribution is already known since Berretta (1986), who observed that impersonal *si* only occurs in proclisis.

In addition, if one assumes that (partitive) *ne* lacks a person feature, as first proposed by Cardinaletti, Giusti (1992), the data on *vi* and *ne* could be taken as suggestive of the fact that the preference for enclisis is stronger for clitics that encode a person feature.[4]

The occurrences of *vi* in restructuring sentences in the corpus, however, were very few (N=27), and almost the same holds for *ne* (N= 66). Therefore, we will now proceed with the examination of the (much more numerous) occurrences of *ci* (N= 327) and *si* (N= 1765) in the same corpus.

3 It is worth noticing, however, that the labels North, Centre and South are referred to the university site, and this may not coincide with the geographical origin of the participants. The background survey contained in Grandi et al. (2023) allows to establish the place of birth of the participants but not of their previous/family residence. Therefore, unfortunately, the present study does not allow reliable considerations concerning the distribution of the preferences in different geographical varieties of Italian.

4 We postpone a discussion on the proper characterization of this feature to Section 2.3.

2 The Present Study

2.1 Materials and Procedure

The corpus Univers-ITA (Grandi et al. 2023) is a collection of 2160 elicited written texts produced by university students from different universities/faculties throughout Italy on a specific topic. Participants were asked to produce a written composition (between 250 and 500 words) using a style as formal and correct as possible. The topic concerned the advantages and disadvantages of online teaching during the SARS-COV-2 pandemics. The time allotted was 60 minutes.

For the identification of the relevant data, we first used an automatic procedure extracting the relevant clitic (*ci*, *si*) from the texts produced in three different areas of Italy: North, Centre, South (Step 1). In a second step, we manually extracted the cases in which the clitic occurred in a restructuring sentence. We then separated the cases of proclisis from those of enclisis, finally distinguishing the specific use of each clitic.[5]

2.2 Overall Analysis (Step1 and Step 2)

The automatic procedure extracted a total of 3879 occurrences of *ci* and 10658 occurrences of *si*. Some instances had to be excluded for various reasons, leaving a 'cleaned' data base of 3726 occurrences for *ci* and 10123 occurrences for *si*, as shown in Table 1 and Table 2.[6] Occurrences of *ci* in restructuring sentences are 327 in total, while for *si* we have a total of 1765.

Table 1 Occurrences of *ci* in the corpus

ci	Total occurrences	In restructuring sentences
North	1300	117
Centre	1171	103
South	1255	107
Total	**3726**	**327**

5 Additional analyses, as we shall see, considered whether the clitic occurred in a cluster and whether the restructuring verb was *riuscire*.

6 The system generated some empty strings and some strings not containing the clitic. In addition, the system does not distinguish accented from non-accented vowels, hence some instances of 'si' were indeed instances of *sì* (yes), and not of the clitic *si*.

Table 2 Occurrences of *si* in the corpus

si	Total occurrences	In restructuring sentences
North	4452	756
Centre	2977	547
South	2693	462
Total	**10122**	**1765**

In Table 3 and Table 4 we report the enclisis/proclisis distinction.

Table 3 Enclisis/proclisis distribution for *ci*

ci	Enclisis	Proclisis	Total
North	55 (47%)	62 (53%)	117
Centre	64 (62.13%)	39 (37.86%)	103
South	60 (56.07%)	47 (43.92%)	107
Total	**179** (54.74%)	**148** (45.25%)	**327**

Table 4 Enclisis/proclisis distribution for *si*

si	Enclisis	Proclisis	Total
North	173 (22.88%)	583 (77.11%)	756
Centre	154 (28.15%)	393 (71.84%)	547
South	133 (28.78%)	329 (71.21%)	462
Total	**460** (26.06%)	**1305** (73.94%)	**1765**

As shown in Table 3, for *ci*, we observe a slight overall preference for enclisis. When examining the different areas, however, the picture changes in the North, where we have more occurrences of *ci* in proclisis than in enclisis. A closer inspection, however, reveals that what differentiates the North from the Centre/South is in fact the number of occurrences of *ci* in cluster with *si*, as shown in Table 5:

Table 5 Instances of *ci* in cluster with *si*

	Proclisis	Cluster with *si*
North	62	41
Centre	39	21
South	47	17
Total	148	79

As is well known, the sequence *ci si*, as in (2) below, is an opaque form, with *ci* being in fact an instance of reflexive *si* (Wanner 1977; Bonet 1995):

(2) Bonet 1995, 609 (**si si*)
Ci= si= lava
ci= *si*= washes
'One washes oneself.'

These instances, therefore, should be excluded from the analysis of *ci*.[7] Excluding the instances of *ci* in cluster with *si*, we derive the following revised version of Table 3:

Table 3' Enclisis/proclisis distribution for ci revised

ci	**Enclisis**	**Proclisis**	**Total**
North	55 (72.36%)	21 (27.63%)	76
Centre	64 (78.04%)	18 (21.95%)	82
South	60 (66.66%)	30 (33.33%)	90
North+Centre+South	**179** (72.17%)	**69** (27.82%)	**248**

The preference for enclisis is now clear in the case of *ci* (72.17%), with no significant differences when examining the data from the North, the Centre and the South, and almost in line with the general trend observed in Di Domenico (2025) for the other clitics.

As an anonymous reviewer notes, the question is why we have more '*ci si*' clusters in the North: this is an interesting question that the present study cannot answer, also for the reasons outlined in fn. 2 above.

As far as *si* is concerned, the data in Table 4 show instead a preference for proclisis in general, and in each of the three areas considered.

7 Note that the 'clustering' ('*ci si*') strings are replicated in the *si* corpus. Interestingly, we found a few cases (5 in the entire corpus) in which we observed no *ci si* clustering, but two instances of *si* in the same string: one in proclisis (IMP) and one in enclisis (REFL). An example is given below:

(i) [568 South] Si può subito dopo mettersi a studiare
si.IMP can soon after put.siREFL to study
'One can immediately after start studying.'

In addition, we found one case of reduplication, i.e two REFL *si*, one in proclisis and one in enclisis:

(ii) Non è detto che una famiglia […] si
Not is said that a family si.REFL
possa permettersi la strumentazione tecnica adeguata
can afford.si.REFL the instrumentation technical adequate
'It is not to be taken for granted that a family can afford the adequate technical tools.'

2.3 Refining the Picture (Step 3)

As we said, this work aims to see whether we observe any differences in the preference for enclisis or proclisis according to the specific value that *ci* and *si* express, and if these possible differences within each of the two clitics can be treated similarly. A comparison with the data concerning *vi* and *ne* in Di Domenico (2025) will also be undertaken, to verify whether a preference for either enclisis or proclisis is tied to the presence/absence of a Person feature.

Different values of *ci* have been distinguished in the relevant literature.

For the present analysis, and in the spirit of Manzini, Savoia (2004; 2007), we will distinguish the cases in which *ci* encodes a first-person plural feature (which may also be reciprocal) from the cases in which it does not (locative, existential, comitative, instrumental, demonstrative). We will label the first 'P' and the latter 'non-P'.

As for *si*, although there is consensus in the relevant literature in recognizing a reflexive, benefactive, inherent, impersonal, middle, passive *si*, different criteria have been proposed to characterize these distinctions (see Pescarini 2015 a.o. for a review and a proposal). Some examples are given in (3) below:[8]

(3)	a.	Durante	le	feste	impersonal
		During	the	feasts	
		si=	mangia	troppo	
		si=	eat.P.3.S	too much	
		'During holidays we eat/one eats too much.'			
	b.	Questo	concetto	si=	middle
		This	concept	*si*=	
		definisce	facilmente		
		define.P.3.S	easily		
		'This concept can be easily defined.'			
	c.	Le	patate	si=	passive
		The	potatoes	*si*=	
		mangeranno	domani		
		eat.Fut.3.Pl.	tomorrow		
		'Potatoes will be eaten tomorrow.'			
	d.	Giulia	si=	lava	reflexive
		G.	*si*=	wash.P.3.S	
		'Giulia washes herself.'			

8 Of course, the choice of the examples cannot be theory-neutral. As for middle *si* in particular, we adopt, as Pescarini (2015), Cinque's (1988) idea that middle *si* expresses a property of the subject rather than an event, and, as such, it is incompatible with a specific time reference.

e.	Giulia	si=	beve	benefactive
	G.	*si*=	drink.P.3.S	
	un	caffè		
	a	coffee		
	'Giulia drinks a coffee.'			
f.	Giulia	si=	è	inherent
	G.	*si*=	is	
	arrabbiata			
	angry			
	'Giulia got angry.'			

Following a tradition that has recognized the passive value of some impersonal constructions (Belletti 1982, 2), the present analysis distinguishes, on one hand, an IMP *si* (with an impersonal, middle or passive reading according to the specific case, i.e. as in (3a), (3b), and (3c), respectively). On the other hand, we distinguish a REFL *si* (with a reflexive, inherent or benefactive reading depending on the specific case, i.e. as in (3d)-(3f), respectively). As first proposed by Manzini (1986), we assume that IMP *si* is interpreted as a free variable, while REFL *si* is anaphoric.

2.3.1 On *ci*

In the following lines, we analyze the enclisis/proclisis distribution of the instances of *ci* according to their P or non-P value. This analysis does not consider the cases in which *ci* clusters with *si* **[tab. 5]** for the reasons discussed above: note, by the way, that in all those cases *ci* (=*si*) occurs in proclisis and has a reflexive value.

The data concerning the remaining cases are reported in Table 6:

Table 6 Distribution for different uses of *ci*

ci			
North	non-P	P	Total
enclisis	18 (72%)	37 (72.54%)	55
proclisis	7 (28%)	14 (27.45%)	21
Total	**25**	**51**	**76**
Centre			
enclisis	14 (53.84%)	50 (89.28%)	64
proclisis	12 (46.15%)	6 (10.71%)	18
Total	**26**	**56**	**82**

South			
enclisis	14 (56%)	46 (70.76%)	60
proclisis	11 (44%)	19 (29.23%)	30
Total	**25**	**65**	**90**
North+Centre+South			
enclisis	46 (60.52%)	133 (77.32%)	179
proclisis	30 (39.47%)	39 (22.67%)	69
Total	**76**	**172**	**248**

Personal instances of *ci* are more numerous than non-personal ones in all the three geographical areas considered. The preference for enclisis is significantly higher for P(ersonal) *ci* than for non-P(ersonal) *ci*. This trend is particularly clear in the Centre. It is also attested in the South and in the whole peninsula, but not in the North.[9] Even in the case of P(ersonal) *ci*, in the Centre, in the South and in the whole country, however, we can see that the preference for enclisis is a preference, i.e. an optional phenomenon, since there is a substantial number of occurrences also in proclisis.

2.3.2 On *si*

A different picture emerges with *si*, as shown in Table 7 below:

Table 7 Distribution for different uses of si

si			
North	**IMP**	**REFL**	**Total**
enclisis	11 (2.14%)	162 (66.66%)	173
proclisis	502 (97.85%)	81 (33.33%)	583
Total	**513**	**243**	**756**
Centre			
enclisis	12 (3.48%)	142 (69.95%)	154
proclisis	332 (96.51%)	61 (30.04%)	393
Total	**344**	**203**	**547**
South			
enclisis	5 (1.67%)	128 (78.53%)	133
proclisis	294 (98.32%)	35 (21.47%)	329
Total	**299**	**163**	**462**

9 To highlight possible statistically significant differences we used Pearson's Chi-Squared Test.

North+Centre+South			
enclisis	28 (2.42%)	432 (70.93%)	460
proclisis	1128 (97.57%)	177 (29.06%)	1305
Total	**1156**	**609**	**1765**

With REFL *si*, we observe a clear preference for enclisis (North 66.66%; Centre 69.95%; South 78.53%; the whole country 70.93%). We also observe, however, that REFL *si* is well attested also in proclisis.

In the much more numerous cases of IMP *si*, instead, we observe that almost all occurrences are in proclisis (North 97.85%; Centre 96.51%; South 98.32%; the whole country 97.57%).

A closer inspection, furthermore, reveals that in the rare cases in which an IMP *si* occurs in enclisis, it always takes a passive reading, as in the example below:

(4) [1259 Centre]	In	questa	didattica	a	distanza
	In	this	teaching	at	distance
	potrebbero	anche	veder=si	dei	vantaggi
	could	also	see.INF.=IMP	some	advantages

'In this online teaching some advantages could also be seen.'

Some cases are ambiguous between a REFL interpretation and an IMP-passive one, although they have been classified as IMP not to underestimate this possibility:

(5) [1754 Centre]	[…] affinché	la	DAD	possa	svolger=si
	so that	the	OT	could	take-place.INF.=*si*
	senza	problemi			
	without	problems			

'So that OT can proceed/be realized without problems.'

3 Summary and Discussion

The data presented so far highlight that, as far as *ci* is concerned, a clear preference for enclisis is observed when the pronoun is endowed with a P feature, while for non-P *ci* the preference for enclisis is not clear. As we mentioned, an exception to this generalization is found in the North **[tab. 6]**, where the preference for enclisis is strong also for non-P *ci*.

The data on *ci* partly differ from those on *vi* (Di Domenico 2025), where for non-P *vi* we observed a preference for proclisis.[10] However, the data on *ci* reveal a trend, also when compared to the data on *ne* of Di Domenico (2025), which revealed for this clitic a preference for enclisis significantly lower than the total preference (64% vs 78%). Assuming, with Cardinaletti and Giusti (1992; 2017), that *ne* lacks a person feature, the generalization can be drawn that in clitics endowed with a P(erson) feature, the preference for enclisis is stronger.

Additional data coming from Di Domenico (2025) go in the same direction. In specific, we observed that the preference for enclisis was significantly stronger for *mi* with respect to the total (87% vs 78%).

This raises the issue of what we mean by P. Manzini and Savoia (2004; 2007) clearly distinguish 1st and 2nd person clitics (P in their frame) from 3rd person clitics (N in their frame, a category in which also *ne* is included), Loc (*ci* in its non-personal use) and Q (*si*, variable).[11] With respect to the enclisis/ proclisis preference, the relevant distinction, instead, seems to single out clitics that refer to individuals from clitics referring to places, things, events or parts. The preference rates reported in Di Domenico (2025) for accusative and dative 3rdperson clitics, indeed, do not differ significantly from the total.

With this in mind, let us now consider the data concerning *si*. As shown in Table 7, a clear divide emerges between REFL *si* and IMP *si*. As for REFL *si*, we basically observed a proclisis/enclisis alternation, with a significant preference for enclisis.

A comparison with the data from Di Domenico (2025) reveals that the preference rate does not differ from that of *ne*, while it is significantly lower (p=.05) than the overall rate. In other words, REFL *si* can be grouped with non-P clitics.[12]

10 The data are reported here below (adapted from Di Domenico 2025, Table 4):

vi	**non-P**	**P**	**Total**
enclisis	5	5	10
proclisis	13 (72.22%)	4 (44.44%)	17
Total	18	9	27

As the table shows, the data on *vi* are very few. In addition, as discussed in Di Domenico (2025, 146), the use of locative *vi* is limited to a very formal variety of Italian, a variety that the participants do not seem to master entirely.

11 The labels, which also include D (for subject clitics) and R (which has specificity properties, and can host all clitics when they precede *si*), are ordered [D R Q P Loc N] in a clitic 'string' which repeats itself before V, I, and C in the clausal spine, accounting for ordering restrictions in a number of Romance varieties.

12 Both IMP and REFL *si* are assumed to have a 3rd person feature (see e.g. Manzini 1986), although a 1st person plural interpretation may be associated with IMP *si*. To this end, we believe that the person feature of *si* is the one of the element it is interpreted in coreference with.

The generalisation that comes from the data is thus the following:

(6) Clitics endowed with a P feature preferably occupy a lower position (enclisis), while other clitics (referring to places, things, events, parts, or having a dependent variable interpretation) alternate more freely between proclisis and enclisis.

Assuming a monoclausal structure for restructuring sentences (Cinque 2004, 2006) and Cardinaletti, Shlonsky's (2004) proposal that there are two clitic positions in the clausal architecture to which clitics move (Kayne 1975; 1991), the generalization in (6) can be interpreted as follows: clitics endowed with a P feature tend to match the first available probe.[13] This in turn could be due to a sort of 'Earliness Principle', as the one proposed in Manzini (2022) for a different range of phenomena, which concerns the P feature only.[14] Clitics not endowed with a P feature, indeed, can more freely alternate between the two positions.

Let us now move to the data concerning IMP *si*. As we saw, a completely different picture emerges, summarized in (7):

(7) a. IMP *si* almost always occurs in proclisis
b. In the rare cases in which it does not, it entails a passive interpretation.

We may partially explain (7b) as the result of a 'default' interpretation. As Manzini (1986) noted, REFL *si* cannot be interpreted as co-referential with a derived subject. Whenever a derived interpretation of the subject is forced (as in (4) above), a REFL *si* interpretation is excluded. In the enclitic position, furthermore, *si* cannot be assigned nominative case, hence its passive interpretation.[15]

The a) part of (7) confirms what was observed by Berretta (1986). Instances of IMP *si* in the corpus are quite numerous, as we saw, so we may conclude that this observation is quite robust and reliable.

Two additional facts support it. The first one comes from the analysis of this same corpus and concerns the strings containing

13 There are indeed alternative proposals on each of these issues, as the idea that restructuring sentences are bi-clausal (e.g. Manzini, Savoia 2004; 2007), that there are more than two clitic positions in the clause (e.g. Cinque 2006; Benincà, Cinque 2024), and that clitics are base-generated in the position where they surface (e.g. Manzini, Savoia 2004; 2007). For reasons of time and space, we will not review those proposals, nor justify our choices in the present lines.

14 Earliness: Complete operations as early as possible in the derivation (Manzini 2022, 8).

15 Along the lines of Belletti (1982), the active and passive impersonal constructions can be characterized in terms of the different case features (nominative and objective, respectively) of *si*.

the verb *riuscire* ('can, be able to, succeed'), which we analyse as an aspectual predicate (of the 'accomplishment' sub-class of Vendler 1967). Considering its distribution in the entire corpus, proclisis is always observed in sentences with 'riuscire' and IMP *si* (75 sentences), while there are only two occurrences in proclisis when considering clitics different from IMP *si*, in one case with *le* (8) and in one case with REFL *si* (9):[16]

(8) [South 2070]	Le=	riusciamo	a	sfruttare	meglio
	3.S.ACC=	be able.P.1.Pl	to	take advantage.INF	better

'We are able to take advantage of them in a better way.'

(9) [North 589]	Si=	è	riuscito	a	creare	un
	3.REFL=	is	be able.PsP.M.S.	to	create.INF	a
	rapporto	umano	tra	professore	e	studente
	relation	human	between	professor	and	student

'A good relation between a student and a professor could establish itself.'

The other fact that supports the generalization that IMP *si* occurs (only) in proclisis comes from those varieties with (optional) clitic reduplication in restructuring sentences, which show a sharp dissociation in this respect: IMP *si* is the only clitic that cannot reduplicate. One such case is Perugino, a Central Italian dialect:[17]

(10) [Adapted from Di Domenico 2022, 6]

a.

M=	eva	da	di=mme
1.S.DAT=	have.PS.3.S	to	tell.INF.=1.S.DAT
na	cosa		
a	thing		

'(S)he had to tell me something.'

b.

Te=	voleo	chiede=te	questo
2.S.DAT=	want.PS.1.S	ask.INF.=1.S.DAT	this

'I wanted to ask you this.'

16 In (9), *si* is analyzed as REFL because of the agreement on the participle, masculine singular as *un rapporto umano*. If *si* were IMP, the agreement on the participle would be *riusciti*, an instance of default masculine plural, unspecified for number/gender according to Manzini (1986, 242).

17 However, other varieties (e.g. Cairese, Parry 1995) with object clitic reduplication allow reduplication also with IMP *si*. However, to our knowledge, they do not allow a single occurrence of IMP *si* in enclisis.

c.	Alora	j=	ebbe	da
	So	3.S.DAT=	have.PS.3.S	to
	pia=je	n	colpo	
	take. INF.=3.DAT	a	stroke	
	'So (s)he was going to collapse.'			
d.	Se=	volea	riposa=sse	
	3.REFL=	want.PS.3.S	rest.INF.=3.REFL	
	'(S)he wanted to have a rest.'			
e.	N	ne=	posso	fa=nne
	Not	PART=	can.P.1.S	do.INF.=PART
	tante			
	many.F			
	'I can't do many of them/I can't do many things.'			
f.	C=	evo	da	gi=cce
	LOC=	have.PS.1.S	to	go.INF.=LOC
	'I had to go there.'			
g.	* S=	a	da	fa=sse
	IMP=	have.P.3.S	to	do.INF.=IMP
	'One must do it.'			
h.	* A	da	fa=sse	
	have.P.3.S	to	do.INF.=IMP	
	'One must do it.'			
i.	S=	a	da	fa
	IMP=	have.P.3.S	to	do.INF
	'One must do it.'			

IMP *si*, thus, seems to be tied in a special way to the sentential subject position. We may characterize this special linking assuming a [Subjecthood] feature for IMP *si*. This feature should also be part of the higher clitic position/string, differentiating it from the post-infinitival one. The two strings/positions, thus, cannot be identical (see fn. 10 above). When *si* is in enclisis, the only possible interpretation is passive, *si* bearing objective case.[18]

18 Of course, a passive reading of *si* is also possible when *si* is not in enclisis:

(i) Le patate si dovranno mangiare domani
'Potatoes shall be eaten tomorrow'

We assume that also in this case passive *si* bears objective case, following Belletti's (1982) proposal for non-restructuring impersonal constructions.

4 Conclusions

In this work, we have examined the occurrences of *ci* and *si* in restructuring sentences in a corpus containing written texts produced by Italian university students in different areas of the country. The data on *ci* and *si* have been compared to previously collected data (Di Domenico 2025) concerning *vi* and *ne*, as well as accusative and dative 3rd person clitics. The question addressed here is whether the preference for enclisis or proclisis would differ depending on the kind of clitic involved, in its specific value. The present analysis, thus, adds a novel factor (kind of clitic, in its specific value) to the debated issue of the preference for enclisis or proclisis and of the factors related to it. To this end, we have distinguished a *ci* endowed with a P feature from a *ci* not endowed with it. In the case of *si* we have distinguished an IMP(ersonal) *si* (subsuming also its middle and passive value) and a REFL(exive) *si* (subsuming also its benefactive and inherent value). The data analysis has highlighted two independent (but related) generalizations. The first one suggests a distinction between clitics endowed with a P feature and clitics not endowed with it. Clitics endowed with a P feature show a consistent preference for enclisis, while for the clitics not endowed with a P feature the preference for enclisis is less consistent or absent. We have interpreted this observation as suggesting that clitics endowed with a P feature tend to match the first available probe.

The other generalization concerns IMP(ersonal) *si*. Besides confirming, on a more robust data base, Berretta's (1986) observation that impersonal *si* almost always occurs in proclisis, it highlights that whenever IMP *si* does not occur in proclisis (few cases in the corpus, indeed) it invariably entails a passive reading. We have proposed therefore that IMP *si* is endowed with a [Subjecthood] feature that must be checked/valued in the sentential subject position to which IMP *si* is forced to move, or to be in chain with, the latter case driving its passive interpretation. The two generalizations highlight, on the one hand, some preferences within an essentially optional phenomenon (enclisis vs. proclisis) and, on the other hand, the sharp restriction concerning IMP *si*.

Bibliography

Belletti, A. (1982). "'Morphological' Passive and Pro-Drop: The Impersonal Construction in Italian". *Journal of Linguistic Research,* 2, 1-34.

Benincà, P. (1986). "Punti di sintassi comparata dei dialetti italiani settentrionali". Holtus, G.; Ringger, K. (eds), *Raetia Antiqua et Moderna: W. Theodor Elwert zum 80. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 457-79.

Benincà, P.; Cinque, G. (2024). "The Syntax of Romance Clitics and Selective Clitic Climbing". Bocci, et al. (eds), *Rich Descriptions and Simple Explanations in Morphosyntax and Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 305-33.

Bennati, E.; Matteini, S. (2006). "Object Clitic Climbing in L2 Learners of Italian". Belletti, A. et al. (eds), *Language Acquisition and Development. Proceedings of GALA 2005*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, 35-48.

Bernardini, P.; van der Weijer, J. (2018). "On the Direction of Cross-Linguistic Influence in the Acquisition of Object Clitics in French and Italian". *Language, Interaction and Acquisition*, 8(2), 204-33. https://doi.org/10.1075/lia.16005.ber.

Berretta, M. (1986). "Struttura informativa e sintassi dei pronomi atoni: Condizioni che favoriscono la 'risalita'". Stammerjohan, H. (ed.), *Tema/Rema in italiano*. Tübingen: Narr, 71-83.

Bonet, E. (1995). "Feature Structure of Romance Clitics". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13, 607- 47. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992853.

Cardinaletti, A.; Cerutti, S.; Volpato, F. (2024). "On the Acquisition of Clitic Placement in Restructuring: A Study on Monolingual Italian Children". *Isogloss*, 10(4), 1-30. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/isogloss.312.

Cardinaletti, A.; Giusti, G. (1992). "Partitive *ne* and the QP- Hypothesis". Fava, E. (ed.), *Proceedings of the XVII Meeting of Generative Grammar.* Torino: Rosemberg & Sellier, 121-41.

Cardinaletti, A.; Giusti, G. (2017). "Quantified Expressions and Quantitative Clitics". Everaert, M. and van Riemsdijk, H. (eds), *The Wiley Companion to Syntax*. London: John Wiley & Sons, 1-61. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118358733.wbsyncom063.

Cardinaletti, A.; Giusti, G.; Lebani, G. (2025). "Clitic Climbing across Italy. Variation, Optionality, and the Role of Bilectalism". *Linguistic Variation*, 26(1), 76-96. https://doi.org/10.1075/lv.24065.car.

Cardinaletti, A.; Shlonsky, U. (2004). "Clitic Positions and Restructuring in Italian". *Linguistic Inquiry*, 35, 519-57. https://doi.org/10.1162/0024389042350523.

Cinque, G. (1988). "On Si Constructions and the Theory of Arb". *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19, 521-81.

Cinque, G. (2004). "Restructuring' and Functional Structure". Rizzi, L. (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP.* New York: Oxford University Press, 132-91. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195171976.003.0005.

Cinque, G. (2006). *Restructuring and Functional Heads: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures vol. 4.* New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195179545.001.0001.

Di Domenico, E. (2022). "Object Clitic Reduplication in Perugino". *Languages*, 7, 262. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7040262.

Di Domenico, E. (2025). "Preferenze per enclisi o proclisi nelle frasi complesse con verbi a ristrutturazione". Grandi, N. (ed.), *L'italiano scritto degli studenti universitari. Quadro sociolinguistico, tendenze tipologiche, implicazioni didattiche*. Milano: FrancoAngeli, 133-50.

Egerland, V. (2009). "La doppia base della ristrutturazione". Cardinaletti, A.; Munaro, N. (a cura di), *Italiano, italiani regionali e dialetti.* Milano: FrancoAngeli, 99-114.

Grandi, N.; Ballarè, S.; Chiusaroli, F.; Gallina, F.; Pascoli, M.; Pistolesi, E. (2023). *Corpus Univers-ITA.* https://doi.org/10.60760/unibo/univers-ita.

Kayne, R. (1975). *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Kayne, R. (1991). "Romance clitics, verb movement and PRO". *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 647-86.

Manzini, M.R. (1986). "On Italian *Si*". Borer, H. (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 19: The syntax of pronominal clitics*. New York: Academic Press, 241-62. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004373150_011.

Manzini, M.R. (2022). "Romance Pronominal Clitics as Pure Heads". *Journal of Linguistics*, 1-31. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226722000159.

Manzini, M.R.; Savoia, L. (2004). "Clitics: Cooccurrence and Mutual Exclusion Patterns". Rizzi, L. (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 211-50. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195159486.003.0008.

Manzini, M.R.; Savoia, L. (2007). *A Unification of Morphology and Syntax: Investigations into Romance and Albanian Dialects.* London; New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203968154.

Parry, M. Mair (1995). "Some Observations on the Syntax of Clitic Pronouns in Piedmontese". Maiden, M.; Smith, J.C. (eds), *Linguistic Theory and the Romance Languages: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 133-60. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.122.06par.

Pescarini, D. (2015). *Le costruzioni con 'si'. Italiano, dialetti e lingue romanze.* Roma: Carocci.

Rizzi, L. (1976). "Ristrutturazione". *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 1, 1-54.

Rohlfs, G. (1968). *Grammatica storica dell'italiano e dei suoi dialetti. Morfologia.* Torino: Einaudi.

Vendler, Z. (1967). "Verbs as Times". *Linguistics and Philosophy.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Wanner, D. (1977). "On the order of clitics in Italian". *Lingua*, 43, 101-28. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(77)90007-9.