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Abstract

Romance clitic pronouns appear to the left of the verb in I and to the right of the verb in C. This alternation correlates with: (a) allomorphy, specifically l- vs. zero; (b) stress shifts; and (c) reordering of the clitic string. The alternations in (a)–(c) are also observed between non-negative and negative contexts. The key points of our analysis are: (i) the l- segment is associated with definite content; (ii) interpretively, pronouns scope out of modal/non-veridical operators; (iii) syntactically, the exponent for modality/non-veridicality may have the pronoun in its domain; (iv) externalization of the l- segment is found when semantic scope (ii) and syntactic configuration (iii) are mismatched. Therefore allomorphies (including stress), far from being morphophonological quirks, contribute to the externalization of syntactico-semantic notions of non-veridicality. In dealing with clitic (re)ordering we propose a model based on the dissociation between Merge and linear order. Phrasal constituents are ordered to the right of the verb in Romance; clitics mirror them in that they are ordered to the left, while keeping the Merge relations constant.

1. Basic evidence and current accounts

In many Romance varieties, the preverbal and postverbal positions of clitics correlate with a number of morphophonological and order alternations. There are three main such alternations, namely: (a) segmental allomorphies; (b) stress shifts; and (c) internal reordering of the clitic string – which are illustrated in sections 1.1–1.3 below.

Some segmental alternations affecting Romance clitics are phonologically conditioned. For instance, in the Corsican variety of Zonza, vocalic proclitics, as in (1a), precede only consonantal onsets; vocalic onsets are preceded by an l form, as in (1b). This condition is phonological, involving presumably the resyllabification of the l segment with the following nucleus.

1 The research reported in this article was partially supported by the PRIN 2012 project grant on Long Distance Dependencies. We thank Adam Ledgeway and Diego Pescarini for detailed comments on the first version of this work. We use a broad transcription for the dialectal data. Word stress is indicated selectively, namely when it occurs on the antepenultimate syllable or on the last syllable of polysyllabic words. For the sake of clarity we indicate stress also in instances of enclisis where stress alternations are involved. Hyphens are introduced in IPA transcriptions and in the glosses to facilitate processing of the data; following the French orthographic conventions, they are used to separate the verb and its enclitics.
In this article, however, we argue for the conclusion that enclisis/proclisis segmental alternations, as well as stress alternations and reordering, are determined by syntactico-semantic conditions. Hauser et al. (2002) and Berwick & Chomsky (2011) conceive the human Faculty of Language (FL) as consisting of an inner core (the Narrow FL or FLN) which includes the recursive operations of syntax (the computational component) and of a number of components recruited by the FLN (the so-called Broad FL or FLB). The FLB includes both Conceptual-Intentional (CI) components (shared with general cognition, such as inferential and conceptual systems) and Sensory-Motor (SM) components, in practice articulatory and perceptual systems – which preside to the ‘externalization’ of the mental representations created by syntax and CI systems. In terms of this model, our thesis is that segmental and stress enclisis/proclisis alternations are not internal quirks of the SM system, but contribute to the externalization of syntactic computation and of the CI content entering into it.

A crucial role in these alternations is played by the lexicon. Thus the l- alternation in (1) must involve the existence of two lexical entries, namely l- and the u/a/i series (see also section 2.1). The reason is that there is no general process of l- insertion or l- deletion in Romance which could independently motivate it. This lexical fact is in itself arbitrary; for instance, in standard Italian, all 3rd person clitics involve l-. In other words, the child who learns Corsican or Italian must learn the list of clitics (and cannot infer it from Universal Grammar). This does not prevent us from looking for general SM (phonological) or syntactico-semantic principles that govern the distribution of lexical forms and of their allomorphs and that in innatist models, favour the acquisition of idiosyncrasies by the child who learns the language.2

We follow Distributed Morphology (DM; Halle and Marantz 1993), in assuming that the lexicon lists elementary units corresponding to morphemes and that the same Merge operation responsible for syntactic constituent structure also yields word formation from elementary morphemes.3 On the other hand, the conclusions on enclisis/proclisis alternations anticipated above can be read as supporting the idea that there is no morphological buffer component between the syntactico-semantic computational core and its SM externalization, of the type provided by such constructs as Morphological Structure and Late Insertion in DM.

In sections 1.1–1.4 we will use only a very elementary syntactic model. The fundamental sentential tree is defined in Chomsky’s (1995) terms by the category V(erb) – or technically by the complex v-V – dominated by the category I(nflexion) and by the category C(complementizer). Kayne (1991) proposes that proclisis on the finite verb in Romance, e.g. in Italian (2a), depends on the I position of the verb; enclisis on the infinitive, as in (2b), depends on the verb moving to C, while the clitic maintains the same position as in (2a). This is illustrated in structures (3a–b). Using enclisis/proclisis alternations as a diagnostics for

2 An anonymous reviewer mentions historical change as the sole source of explanation for the shape of the lexicon. This seems to us an oversimplification, insofar as the lexicon must present an internal organization suitable for being learnt by the children of each new generation.

3 The adoption of morpheme-based morphology automatically excludes paradigm-based approaches. This theoretical choice characterizes a larger spectrum of models than just generative ones.
verb movement, imperatives are also positioned in C in Romance (Rivero 1994), as in (2c), (3c).

(2) a. Lo mangio
    it I.eat
    ‘I eat it’
b. Voglio mangiarlo
    I.want eat-it
    ‘I want to eat it’
c. Mangialo
    eat-it
    ‘Eat it!’

(3) a. [CI lo [IP mangio [VP
b. . . . [CP mangiar [CI lo [IP mangiar [VP
[cP mangia [CI lo [IP mangia [VP

In sections 1.1–1.4, besides presenting the main phenomena as seen in Italo-Romance and neighbouring (Occitan) varieties, we argue that existing treatments are only partially adequate, opening the way to the search for alternative accounts. The presentation of the data does not rely on any formal apparatus beyond that defined in the brief remarks that precede. Summary tables of the data are provided at the end of sections 1.3 and 1.4. In sections 2–3 we will present the core of our argument that the morpho-phonological alternations presented in section 1 cannot be understood in terms strictly internal to the phonology or morphology; rather syntactico-semantic factors play a crucial role in shaping them. Section 3, devoted to reordering of the clitic string is longer and more complex, because reordering in enclisis requires a preliminary account of proclitic order.

1.1. l- allomorphy

In the Corsican variety in (1), vocalic 3rd person object clitics in preverbal position, as in (1a), repeated here as (4a), alternate with more complex CV (Consonant-Vowel) clitics in postverbal position, as in (4b). Note however that the dative clitic has CV structure in proclisis as well, as in (4c).

(4) a. u/a/i ‘cammaní
    him/her/them they.call
    ‘They call him/her/them’
b. ‘camma- lu/la/li
call- him/her/them
    ‘Call him/her/them!’
c. li dâni kwissa
to him they.give this
    ‘They give this to him’
    Zonza (Corsica)

Alternations are also found with 3rd person subject clitics in Northern Italian dialects, as in (5), where vocalic forms in proclisis (declaratives) in (5a) alternate with CV forms in enclisis (interrogatives) in (5b).

(5) a. u/a drömä
    he/she sleeps
    ‘S/he sleeps’
b. u/a  dröm- lu/la
   he/she sleeps- he/she
   ‘Does s/he sleep?’ Montaldo (Piedmont)

Is a phonological account possible? Cardinaletti & Repetti (2004; 2008) propose such an account for subject clitic alternations in the Donceto (Piacenza) variety. For them, there is a single lexical series corresponding to both proclitics and enclitics; surface alternations are therefore phonological. Based in part on Tranel & Del Gobbo (2002), Cardinaletti and Repetti (2004) provide a OT treatment for the Donceto alternation of i maja ‘they eat’ vs. mage-li ‘eat-they?’. They argue that i is preferred over li in proclisis because of the high ranking of *STRUCTURE (imposing economy of structure) over ONSET (imposing the preservation of onset). However in enclisis, *STRUCTURE is ranked lower than *HIATUS (disallowing hiatus) and *VG (Vowel-Glide, disallowing falling diphthongs); the latter constraints are violated if the sequence *maja is realized, triggering the form mage-li. There are open issues in such an account, beginning with the fact that it does not explain why the verb would itself show an allomorphy between maja and mage-. More to the point, the account cannot easily be generalized from Donceto to Zonza in (4) or Montaldo in (5).

Thus it is not obvious what the status of an economy restriction such as *STRUCTURE is; if construed as a strictly phonological constraint, it could lead us to have pre-tonic syllables consisting quite generally of the nucleus alone. Specifically, we would not expect li to appear in proclisis as the dative clitic of Zonza in (4c). In (5b) of Montaldo, substituting the enclitic with a vocalic form yields a final CV syllable, as in (6a), with no apparent violation of either *HIATUS or *VG. Furthermore, it is possible to show that in Montaldo, the *HIATUS constraint (ranked above *STRUCTURE) does not work, since the examples in (6b-c) are all wellformed.

(6) a. *dröm-u/a
    sleep-he/she
    ‘Does s/he sleep?’

b. i  o’fend
    I offend
    ‘I offend (somebody)’

c. u/ a  ofenda
    he/she offends
    ‘S/he offends (somebody)’ Montaldo

In general, phonological conditions are so finely graded from one variety to another, and so strictly intertwined with morphemic properties in each variety, that we cannot consider phonological constraints like those in Cardinaletti & Repetti (2004) as an adequate explanation of the clitic distribution. On similar bases, Ordóñez & Repetti (2004; 2014) conclude that allomorphies are involved in enclisis-proclisis alternations with object clitics. In short, phonology, as invoked by Cardinaletti & Repetti, is not sufficient to explain the alternation between proclitics and enclitics in (4)–(6). Rather a true lexical alternation, between different series of clitic pronouns, is involved.

More specifically, what the data in (2)–(4) show is that the enclitic realizes an l- segment absent in the proclitic. Pending a more detailed morphological analysis of the Romance clitic system in section 2.1, we assume that clitics such as lu/la in (4)–(5) can be segmented into a vocalic exponent for gender and number (-u, -a) and an l- morpheme which carries D(efiniteness) properties. In the words of Manzini & Savoia (2008: 44), ‘clitic pronouns . . . are not elementary lexical entries, but correspond to the merger of two separate morphemes, namely an l/dj allomorph, introducing definite reference, and inflectional endings introducing the properties
traditionally described in terms of number, gender and case’. The extent to which this analysis is
adopted in generative theories can be gleaned from the fact that Kratzer (2009: 221) draws
similar conclusions from the semantic analysis of full pronouns: ‘the alleged “3rd person”
features are in fact gender features, a variety of descriptive feature . . . If [a descriptive feature] is
to grow into a pronoun, it has to combine with a feature [def] that turns it into a definite
description. If [def] is the familiar feature that can also be pronounced as a definite determiner in
certain configurations, it should head its own functional projection, hence be a D. It would then
not originate in the same feature set as descriptive features, which are nominal, hence Ns’.
Therefore 3rd person clitics alternate between forms overtly endowed only with nominal class
and number specifications and forms overtly endowed with l- definiteness specifications.4

In conclusion, what needs to be borne in mind for present purposes is that the widespread l-
allomorphies of Romance cannot be reduced to a phonological explanation, but require two
(or more) distinct allomorphs in the lexicon. As far as we can tell, in enclisis/proclisis
alternations of the type considered here, even the trigger of l- allomorphies must be
syntactico-semantic, since it is difficult to isolate segmental or prosodic triggers.

1.2. Stress allomorphy

In some Romance varieties, enclitics differ from proclitics in that they are stressed. Because
traditionally, the term clitic bears a phonological connotation of lack of stress, this appears to
be a contradictory description. Yet generative work on clitics characterizes them in purely
syntactic terms. While full pronouns are DPs, with the same distribution as other (lexical)
DPs, the name of clitic is reserved for elements with a special distribution, special internal
order and special mutual exclusion patterns, generally taken to correspond to D heads. We
will therefore keep using the term stressed clitic, meaning a stressed D pronoun.

In (7) we exemplify an Occitan variety, Pomaretto, which has l- object clitics both in
preverbal and postverbal position; postverbal clitics (7a’) bear stress unlike preverbal ones
(7a). 1st and 2nd person clitics as well as oblique clitics (locatives, partitives) participate in
stress alternations, as in (7b-c).

(7) a. lu/la/li/la: mandu
    him/her/them.m/f I.call
    ‘I call him/her/them’

a’. mand- lu/lI/lI/la:
    call- him/her/them.m/f
    ‘Call him/her/them!’

b. mand- me
    call- me
    ‘Call me!’

4 An alternative analysis, espoused by Bernstein (2008), treats the l- segment (or the th- segment in English) as
embodying 3rd person reference. The advantage of the 3rd person treatment is that it circumvents the most
important criticism levelled at the definiteness approach, namely that ‘the presence of the definite article does not
always yield a definite interpretation’ (p. 1259) (though see Ramchand & Svenonius 2008 for an attempt at
sharpening the notion of D/definiteness, clarifying its internal articulation and the crosslinguistic variation it gives
raise to). The potential problem that Bernstein perceives for her approach is that it is at odds with the conclusion
drawn by many linguists that ‘third person does not form a natural class, unlike first and second person’ (p. 1261).
Importantly for present purposes, Bernstein (2008: 1257) argues that ‘definite nominal phrases, those displaying a
definite article (e.g., the), a demonstrative (e.g., this), or even a third-person pronoun (e.g., they) . . . share a feature,
third person, expressed through a th- morpheme in D’. In her terms as well, therefore, there is no doubt that the l-/ zero allomorphy is a D allomorphy and involves a semantic content – the dispute revolves only around the exact
nature of such content.
Pomaretto is also a subject clitic language, and the same alternation in stress patterns is found with subject clitics, where it also combines with \(-\) allomorphy, as in (8).

\[(8)\]  
\[\text{a. } i/(l)a:\quad \text{dørm} \text{ŋ} \quad \text{they.m/f. sleep} \]  
\[\text{‘They sleep’} \]

\[\text{b. } \text{dørm} -\text{'li:/'la:} \quad \text{sleep- they.m/f.} \]  
\[\text{‘Do they sleep?’} \]

The alternations in Occitan (7)–(8) cannot be accounted for in phonological terms, but are to be understood as allomorphies, in which an unstressed proclitic alternates with a stressed enclitic, where stress is directly associated with the vocalic nucleus of the clitic syllable. Therefore there are two series of clitics, segmentally identical, but differing as to whether they do or do not bear stress. Indeed Occitan is not like French where phrasal stress is assigned to the last full nucleus in a prosodic domain; for instance in (7a), the main stress falls on the first syllable of the verb, lu/la/li/la: 'mandu.\(^5\)

In Southern Italian varieties, the postverbal clitic does not take stress, but determines stress on the syllable that precedes it. The examples in (9) illustrate the proclitic forms of a Lucanian variety, coinciding in the singular with the vocalic inflection for nominal class (gender).

\[(9)\]  
\[\text{a. } \text{u/ a/ la } \quad \text{cæ:mm} \quad \text{him/her/them I.call} \]  
\[\text{‘I call him/her/them’} \]

\[\text{b. } \text{mu ðə:jə} \quad \text{to.me it he.gives} \]  
\[\text{‘He gives it to me’} \quad \text{Accettura (Lucania)} \]

In the same Lucanian variety, stress shift and \(-\) allomorphy takes place in enclisis. Special distributions often attach to these stress shifts, but not in the variety we are exemplifying. Stress shift characterizes both \(-\) and other clitics, for instance the 1P clitic in (10b). Stress shift further occurs with simple enclitics, as in (10a–b) and with clitic clusters, as in (10c). In (10a–b) the stress falls on the last syllable of the verb, where it is not found otherwise; in (10c) the stress falls internally to the clitic group.\(^6\) Furthermore, the stress shift pattern in the language under consideration is oblivious to whether a 2nd singular imperative is involved or a 1st/2nd

---

\(^5\) The stress is not notated in (7a) consistently with the general simplification of transcriptions indicated in footnote 1.

\(^6\) In segmenting, we attribute the stressed vowel of clitic groups to the final clitic, which is therefore bisyllabic, cf. Bafile (1994). In other words, we assume an 'a/la/'i:la/'illa 3P enclitic form which surfaces in clusters, though its initial elides when not in a cluster, presumably to preserve the final vowel of the verb. That this is the correct segmentation is confirmed by a number of independent clues. For instance in the variety in (i) the stressed vowel undergoes metaphony, surfacing as \(i\) in the masculine and as \(e\) in the feminine, and therefore reproducing full pronominal forms like the demonstrative kučco/kella/kicco/kello in all relevant respects.

\[(i)\]  
\[\text{da- } \text{t'if} -\text{i:ša/ella/i:ša/ella} \]  
\[\text{give- him/it.m/it.f/them.m/them.f} \]  
\[\text{‘Give it/them to him!’} \quad \text{Guardiaregia (Molise)} \]

Similar data to (i) are attested in diachrony. Thus in Old Neapolitan ‘masculine singular [-num] is distinguished from its plural counterpart [+num] because of the lack of metaphony, producing alternations such as –mello/-millo’ (Ledgeway 2009:306).
plural imperative; in this second instance the stress falls on the 1/2P inflection of the verb, as in (10d).7

(10) a. ca’mač-la
   call- him/her/them
   ‘Call him/her/them!’

b. ca’mač-ma
   call- me
   ‘Call me!’

c. dana:- ‘m/d’d- a:la
   give- to.me/to.him- it
   ‘Give me/him it!’

d. cama:’tɔ- :la
   call.2pl- him/her
   ‘Call(pl) him/ her’

Accettura (Lucania)

The Lucanian varieties of Senise and Terranova, have much the same stress allomorphies as Accettura. Note however that 1/2P clitic do not necessarily shift stress, as in Senise (11b).

(11) a. u/a/i ɛnɛnɔ
   him/her/them I.offend
   ‘I offend him/ her/ them’

b. ’puarato-ma
   bring- me
   ‘Take me (there)!’

c. ca’mæ: -la
   call- him/her/them
   ‘Call him/her/them!’

d. ra- ‘m/d’d- i:la
   give- to.me/to.him- it
   ‘Give me/him it’

Senise (Lucania)

(12) a. u/a/i ɣɔɐtɔ
   it.m/it.f/them I.lift
   ‘I lift it/them’

b. ywar’da- llɔ
   look.at-him/her
   ‘Look at him/her!’

c. dɔna- m’m/n’n- illɔ
   give- to.me/to.him- it
   ‘Give me/ him it’

Terranova Pollino (Lucania)

In Lucanian (10)–(12) the metrical structure of the language and its stress assignment parameters provide no grounds for the observed stress shifts. To take just one example, (11c)

7 In some varieties stress shift characterizes the 2nd person singular, but not the 1st/2nd person plural, see for instance Senise in (ii).

(ii) pur’teta- ɔ
   bring.2pl- it
   ‘Bring(pl) it!’

Senise (Lucania)
cannot be imputed to the unavailability of antepenultimate stress, which Senise generally admits. Indeed 1/2P clitics do not shift stress, as in (11b). Therefore the stress shift must be due to lexical properties of the enclitic, not present on the proclitic – effectively an allomorphy. Nevertheless, several phonological treatment of stress reassignment in Southern Italian varieties are extant in the literature – and need to be briefly discussed, despite the morphosyntactic focus of the present work.

In order to understand the literature, we need to introduce a further stress shift pattern, often imputed to Neapolitan, and illustrated in (13) with a Sicilian variety. In this instance, there is no stress shift with a simple enclitic in (13a), but the stress falls inside the clitic group in (13b).

(13) a. 'cama- lu/la/la/mə
call- him/her/them/me
‘Call him/her/them/me!'
b. ra- m’m- illu/illa/illə
give- me- it.m/it.f/them
‘Give it/them to me!’

Belmonte Mezzagno (Sicily)

Bafile (1993, 1994), writing on Neapolitan, treats stress reassignment in clitic groups Word+Clitic+Clitic as a repair of sequences that would otherwise be metrically illformed, not conforming to the constraints governing the structure of the foot. So, the reason why Neapolitan has the stress shift from [pɔɾta]-me-lo to [pɔɾta-ʃi-llo] is that this language cannot preserve the word internal stress pɔɾta in an extended clitic domain where an impossible final foot would be formed. Thus assigning stress involves two stages, whereby the word is first assigned a metrical structure and then, if necessary, stress is re-assigned in the enlarged domain. Specifically, in sequences created by the adjunction of two enclitics, Bafile assumes a postlexical application of the stress rule which gives rise to a regular trochaic sequence.

Bonet & Torres Tamarit (2011) propose OT metrical restrictions in order to account for stress shift with clitic groups in the Catalan varieties Formenter (Formentera) and Mallorquí (Mallorca). Formenter requires a final trochee, recalling Lucanian varieties, while Mallorquí favours a final iamb, recalling Occitan. For Formenter, Bonet & Torres Tamarit propose a constraint TROCHEE[l] on the sequence V+CL, while for Mallorquí, a IAMBL constraint is relevant. The different constraints/constraint rankings must be stipulated, since the stress patterns of the various Catalan varieties are otherwise essentially the same.

According to Peperkamp (1996), in languages without any stress shift, e.g. Italian, clitics adjoin to the Prosodic Phrase (PPh), no reassignment of stress is at work and the main word stress is preserved. In Lucanian, where stress is shifted even in contexts with a simple monosyllabic enclitic, clitics are inserted at the level of the Prosodic Word (PW), with the consequence that the main word stress rule computes the clitic as well. In Neapolitan-like varieties, where only clitic clusters cause stress reassignment, clitics are cyclically adjoined to the PW; the effect is the one independently described by Bafile, whereby the lexical word is first assigned stress and the necessity for stress reassignment arises only with two enclitics. Loporcaro (2000) points out that the contrast between non-stress shifting languages and stress shifting languages of the Neapolitan kind does not motivate having recourse to different prosodic constituents. He concludes that the parameter can be formulated more simply, contrasting languages in which the stress can be reassigned postlexically (Neapolitan) and languages that maintain the main stress assigned in the PW (Italian).
These phonological approaches provide a snapshot of relevant generalizations concerning the prosodic organization of the varieties considered and in particular they express the fact that a trochaic foot in final position is the preferred metrical option in Romance (except of course languages like French). However several empirical phenomena escape them, which can only be incorporated at the cost of morpholexical stipulations. First, we note that all of the Italian dialects exemplified admit antepenultimate stress: this means that a phonological block against these metrical structures does not exist, as illustrated in (14) with simple lexical items of Accettura.

(14) a. ‘feməna
   women
b. ‘lavanə
   they.wash

More to the point, antepenultimate stress characterizes enclisis on a noun rather than on a verb, in instances of kinship noun-possessive clitic combinations, such as (15). It may be interesting to consider what exactly the morpholexical difference is between (10) and (15); in any event (15) is a direct counterexample to a phonological/prosodic treatment of enclitics stress shift, given that the phonological conditions are identical.8 This strengthens the point we already made concerning (11b) vs. (11c); while different morphosyntactic conditions may attach to 1/2P vs. 3P clitics, they cannot but be treated alike from a phonological or prosodic point of view, leaving their contrasting behavior unexplained.

(15) ‘frato- ma/tə
    brother-my/your
   ‘my/your brother’          Accettura

Another relevant point arises in connection with Bafile’s (1994) observation that enclitics often select an allomorph including a geminate consonant. For instance, in Terranova in (12), the (3rd person) enclitic presents a realization of l as geminate. The heavy final foot therefore may be taken to attract stress; indeed in this particular metrical configuration, antepenultimate stress is generally excluded. Yet, to begin with, a segmental allomorphy must be involved in the alternation between proclitic l- and enclitic ll-. Conversely, in Accettura stress shift still takes place despite the fact that 3rd person clitics do not present a geminate, as seen in (10).

Summarizing, phonological analyses are not sufficient to determine the complex outcome of, say, Lucanian varieties – unless they are supplemented by lexically encoded information that feeds them. A different question is exactly what lexical information clitics may contain to determine stress shift and exactly how they interact with phonological rules – which (though not sufficient) are necessary to produce the desired outcome. We take the simplest option we can think of, namely that stress properties are directly embedded in the enclitic allomorph. Specifically, we have already assumed that Occitan enclitics inherently bear stress. In Lucanian varieties, we propose that a prosodic feature [FOOT] associated to the lexical entry governs stress assignment, along the lines of (16a). The requirement [FOOT] applies in an extended domain of the word including clitics, call it the postlexical domain, yielding representations of the type in (16b–c).9

---

8 Peperkamp (1996: fn 28) notes the existence of possessive enclitics, without providing an analysis.
9 The lengthening of the stressed nucleus seen in (16b–c) reflects a requirement generally holding in these varieties, whereby the nucleus heading the foot must govern a second position in its minimal domain (nucleus or rhyme/foot) as detailed in Savoia (2015) and references quoted there.
a. [FOOT]: Construct a binary left-headed foot starting from the last vowel of the postlexical string.

b. 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{F} \\
\text{N} \quad \text{N} \\
\text{x} \quad \text{x} \quad \text{x} \\
\text{cam} \quad \text{ə} \quad \text{l} \quad \text{ə} \quad \text{[Foot]}
\end{array}
\]  
(cf. (10a))

c. 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{F} \\
\text{N} \quad \text{N} \\
\text{x} \quad \text{x} \quad \text{x} \\
\text{danam} \quad \text{ə} \quad \text{l} \quad \text{ə} \quad \text{[Foot]}
\end{array}
\]  
(cf. (10c))

Next, languages of the type of Neapolitan or Belmonte in (13) do not allow for stress to shift in the presence of a single clitic, but they require it to fall on a clitic group. Though in general, it is not possible to correlate stress shift with lengthening of the clitic consonant, the correlation does hold in Neapolitan-type varieties. Thus in (13a), stress on the verb correlates with the presence of an \( l- \) clitic – whereas in (13b), stress on the clitic group corresponds to the presence of an \( ll- \) clitic. Now, the \( l- \) vs. \( ll- \) alternation can only be construed as an allomorphy, even in phonological accounts of stress shift. Therefore the simplest possible account of the pattern exemplified in (13) is that enclitics present a lu allomorph in isolation and an 'illu allomorph as part of a cluster. In other words stress is lexically associated with 'illa exactly as postulated for Occitan clitics.

In short, phonology alone cannot explain the phenomena reviewed in this section. That the alternating forms present in preverbal and postverbal position are bona fide allomorphs, not phonological alternants, is also the conclusion of Ordoñez & Repetti (2005; 2014), who following Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) take stress to be a key diagnostic for weak pronoun status. Manzini (2014), Manzini & Savaia (2014) argue that the strong-weak-clitic tripartition is not supported in Romance. This conclusion is motivated in relation to Italian loro, which is taken to be a full pronoun bearing oblique case (cf. Rossi & Garzonio 2016 on Old Tuscan). Nevertheless what is directly relevant here is whether stressed enclitics are just the conjunction of the syntactic notion of clitic (a D head with specialized distribution, cf. section 3) and of the SM notion of stress – or whether they require a weak pronoun categorization. For systematic testing of the two hypotheses we refer to Pescarini (2016), who concludes that 'the weak analysis of stressed enclitics is untenable under a syntactic point of view . . . the above stressed pronouns exhibit all the properties of fully-fledged clitics; they can resume a dislocated dative phrase, they cannot be omitted in coordinated structures, they are subject to the PCC'.

Here we briefly consider only how the weak pronoun idea is actually implemented by Ordoñez & Repetti (2014). In essence they propose that in some languages, when the verb is
in C, clitics cannot associate with it (technically C is not a probe). In that case deficient pronouns attach to the v-V complex (technically v acts as a probe) and therefore take the form of weak pronouns. This proposal is problematic for empirical reasons. There is a considerable amount of syntactic space between the C position taken by the verb in imperatives and the v position, that weak pronouns are associated with under Ordoñez and Repetti’s proposal. Therefore we expect material to intervene between them. This is not the case. On the contrary it is well-known that some Romance languages allow adverbs to intervene between proclitics and the verb, as exemplified in (17a–c) with the Lucanian variety of Terranova. No parallel data are available in the same varieties with postverbal clitics, as in (17d).

(17) a. u sembə vɪə pə nənəndo
   him always I.see in front
   ‘I always see him in front’

b. u dʒa vɪə kundəndo
   him already I.see happy
   ‘I see him happy already’

c. on tə maɪ vɪə
   not you ever I.see
   ‘I never see you’

d. cama-(*ddʒə/*sembə)-llə
   call-(already/always)-him/her/them
   ‘Call him/her/them!’

Terranova Pollino

Kayne (1991) takes interpolation in French infinitives to argue for the conclusion that clitics and verbs need not move as a single cluster, but each independently can move, targeting different landing sites (T for the clitic and a V-related position for the infinitive). More recently, Ledgeway & Lombardi (2005) working within the framework of Cinque (1999), argue that orders such as (17a–c) depend on the verb moving to a slightly lower position than in, say, Italian, namely a position within the adverbial hierarchy, where it may be preceded by some adverbs. If Ordoñez & Repetti (2014) are correct in assuming that stressed enclitics, qua weak pronouns, are also positioned in the v-V area of the sentence we expect them to be precedes by adverbs occurring between them and the imperative in C – which is not the case, as in (17d).

In short, we conclude that Romance languages have two series of pronouns, DPs (full pronouns) and Ds (clitics) – and D pronouns (clitics) are compatible with stress (as indeed syntactic heads normally are), alternating in some varieties between stress-less and stressed forms according to the context. We see no obvious advantage in identifying stressed clitics with the category of weak pronouns. Putting together this conclusion with those of section 1.1, the form of the allomorphy that we are considering involves either definiteness specifications (in the 3rd person) or stress.

1.3. Order of clitics

A third set of phenomena correlate with l- and stress allomorphy. In many Romance languages the order of clitics, preverbal or postverbal, is the mirror image of the order of lexical DPs, as illustrated in (18) for Italian. Otherwise stated, the V and its complements display the normal order expected in a head-initial language (like English), as in (18a). However clitics, independently of the position of the verb, have the order expected in head final languages, as in (18b–c) (cf. German ... dem Kind das Buch zu geben ‘to the child the book to give’).
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(18) a. Do il libro a Paolo
   I.give the book to Paolo
b. Glielo do
   to.him-it I.give
   ‘I give it to him’
c. Daglielo
give-to.him-it
   ‘Give it to him’

In other Romance languages, the preverbal order of clitics matches that of postverbal DPs; Corsican varieties are among those (Savoia & Manzini 2015 and reference quoted there). In (19a) the 3rd person Acc (henceforth Acc) precedes both the 3rd person dative (henceforth Dat) and the 1/2Person form (henceforth 1/2P). We will use the notation x>y for ‘x precedes y’; hence in (19a), we find Acc>Dat and Acc>1/2P. In postverbal position, the order of clitics is reversed, as in (19b).10

(19) a. u/a/i mmi/ɖɖi ɖani
   it.m/it.f/them to.me/to.him they.give
   ‘They give it/them to me/him’
b. ’da- mmi/ɖɖi- llu/lla/lli
   give- to.me/to.him- it.m/it.f/them
   ‘Give it/them to me/him!’
   Zonza

Recall that the variety of Zonza also has l-allomorphy, as illustrated in (4) above. That l-allomorphy and reordering correlate can be seen in the Corsican variety in (20). Reordered Acc in cluster final position requires the l-form, as in (20a); this alternates freely with non-reordered Acc, which is however compatible with both the l- and the l-less form, as in (20b–c).

(20) a. ’da- mmi/ɖɖi- llu/-lla/-lli
   give- to.me/to.him- it.m/it.f/them
   ‘Give it/them to me/him!’
b. ’da- llu/lla/lli- ɖɖi
   give- it.m/it.f/them- to.him
   ‘Give it/them to him!’
c. ’port- u/i- ɖɖi
   give- it/them-to.him
   ‘Give it/them to him!’
   Munacia d’Auddè (Corsica)

The West Liguria variety in (21) (on the border with Occitan), has l-allomorphy, stress allomorphy and reordering, since the preverbal Acc>Dat order of clitics as in (21a), alternates with the postverbal Dat>Acc order in (21b) (cf. Ronjat 1937). Reordering correlates with allomorphy, since in (21c), in the absence of reordering, the accusative clitics take the l-less, stressless form.

(21) a. el u/a/i/e i/mə duna
   he it.m/it.f/them.m/them.f to.him/to.me gives
   ‘He gives it/them to him/me’

10 The Acc>Dat order displayed by Corsica varieties is not to be related to contact with French but rather to the order attested in Medieval Italo-Romance, for instance in Old Florentine texts (Melander 1929; Lombard 1934; Rohlf 1968 [1949]; Pescarini 2014). Nevertheless Dat>Acc appears early on, both in Tuscan texts, and in other Old Italian varieties. For Neapolitan Ledgeway (2009:345) states that the order 1/2P/Dat>Acc is ‘characterized by extraordinary diachronic stability’.
b. duna- i- 'ri'/re'/ra'/ru
    give- to.him- them.m/they.m/f/it.f/them.f/it.m
    ‘Give it/them to him!’

c. duna- u/a/i- 'me'/ji
    give- it.m/it.f/them- to.me/to.him
    ‘Give it/them to me/him!’

Olivetta S. Michele (Liguria)

The reordering of clitics under enclisis has been studied in the generative literature for
French, in particular by Laenzlinger (1994), whose data we reproduce here. In preverbal
position the 1/2P clitic precedes the clitics with which it combines, yielding the order
1/2P>Acc, as in (22a). The Acc clitic precedes all clitics but the P clitic, yielding the order
Acc>Dat, as in (22b). When two obliques combine, the basic order has Dat/Loc(ative)
preceding Part(itive), as in (22c).

(22) a. Il me le/en/y donne/met
    he to.me/it/of.it/there gives/puts
    ‘He gives (some of) it to me/He puts me there’

b. Il le lui/y donne/met
    he it/it/to.him/there gives/puts
    ‘He gives/puts it to him’

c. Il y/lui en donne/met plusieurs
    He there/to.him/of.them gives/puts several
    ‘He gives/puts several of them to him/there’

In enclisis, normative French has the Acc clitic preceding all clitics that it combines with,
including the P clitic; this reverses the proclitic order, as in (23a). Similarly, the 1/2P clitic
precedes all clitics it co-occurs with except the accusative; nevertheless non-normative
varieties allow also for the order 1/2P>Acc, as in (23b). Among two oblique clitics, the order
Dat/Loc>Part remains unchanged, as in (23c). In French, allomorphy and reordering are also
connected, since stressless allomorphs like me cannot reorder and appear group finally; on the
contrary, their stressed counterparts, e.g. moi, can reorder, as (23a), or not reorder (in some
non-standard varieties), as in (23b’).

(23) a. Donne/mets- le- lui/mai/y
    give/put- it- to.him/to.me/there
    ‘Give/put it to me/to him/there’

b. Donne/mets- m- y/en/le
    give/put- me- there/of.it/it
    ‘Give (some of) it to me/Put me there’

b’. Donne- moi- [z]en/le
    Give- me- of.it/it
    ‘Give me (some of) it’

c. Donne/mets- lui/y- en
    give/put- to.him/there- of.it
    ‘Give/put some of it to him/there’

Proposals by Laenzlinger (1994) and Pescarini (2014; to appear) aim at explaining
specifically the connection between allomorphy and order. For Laenzliger the basic order of
clitics is Dat/1/2P>Acc, but this order is interfered with by weak pronouns. In enclisis moi/toi
are weak pronouns hence XPs; because of this, they never make the last step of clitic
movement reserved for heads, i.e. clitics proper, and are found string-finally. The same holds
of weak pronoun lui in both proclisis and enclisis. On the contrary, for Pescarini the basic
order is Acc>Dat/1/2P. This order, corresponding to the basic order of argument within the VP, is derived when clitics are sequenced as independent heads. The reverse order is derived when the Dat/P clitic is adjoined to the Acc clitic. This is constrained by Kayne’s (1994) LCA, under which one of the two clitics being adjoined must not non-branching. Thus French me le corresponding to me adjoining to le is possible because it involves a simplex clitic (me), while the branching clitic lui forces the base order le lui.

Comparison with the other Romance varieties reported here is quite useful in assessing these proposals. According to Cardinaletti & Starke (1999), clitic, weak and strong pronouns correlate with structures of growing internal complexity. Now in the u i cluster of Olivetta in (21a), Laenzlinger would need to construe the Dat element i as a weak pronoun, though it consists only of a nominal class vowel and displays minimal overt complexity. In the model of grammar endorsed by Cardinaletti & Starke (1999), involving a syntax consisting of abstract nodes and the insertion of actual terminals only postsyntactically (as in DM), Olivetta does not necessarily represent an argument against Laenzlinger (1994), since morphology can be arbitrarily removed from syntax (via such rules as Impoverishment etc.). However in more restrictive models, where syntax is projected from the lexicon (Chomsky 1995), the question of the mismatch between overt constituency and alleged underlying complexity can be meaningfully raised. The point is strengthened by the observation that in the enclitic cluster -i’ɾi in (21b), the Dat element i is presumably not construed as a weak pronoun, since it occurs in string internal position. One may of course have systematic recourse to homophones, as Cardinaletti and Starke do; however the account is considerably weakened as a result.

As for Pescarini, consider the orders of Zonza u ɖi in (19a) and ɖi lu in (19b). History and crosslinguistic comparison suggest that –i of ɖi is a bona fide oblique inflection, continuing Latin dative –i, much like French lu-i (see section 2.1). If so, simplex internal structure is not necessary for adjoinment, given the possibility of the order ɖi lu in (19b). Suppose on the contrary we account for this latter order by assuming that ɖi is a simplex clitic; we may then wonder why its simplex nature as a clitic is not sufficient to determine adjoinment in (19a), where the string is u ɖi. It seems to us therefore that both the notion of weak pronoun (on which we independently expressed doubts in section 1.2) and the notion of simple vs. internally complex structure, as they are currently used, are not free from stipulation.

This opens the way to yet another set of questions to be answered. Not only clitics alternate between stress-less forms endowed in the 3rd person only with nominal class specifications – and forms endowed with l- definiteness specifications in the 3rd person and/or with stress. The same contexts that trigger the relevant allomorphies, namely preverbal vs. postverbal position, also trigger the reordering of clitics with respect to one another. Thus first, we need to determine the internal mechanisms of (re)ordering; as we just saw, in reviewing Laenzlinger (1994) and Pescarini (2014; to appear), there is not even a consensus as to what the basic order of the clitic string is (if any). Second, we need to know why allomorphy and reordering occur in the same contexts. In the next section, we will consider specifically what the relevant contexts are.

Table 1. Allomorphy patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NID (Montaldo)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan (Pomaretto)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Ligurian (Olivetta)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucanian (Accettura,Terranova Senise)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsican (Zonza,Munacia)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a help in processing the data so far, we provide two summary tables. Table 1 shows the allomorphy patterns. As a help to memory, we individuate dialects with the name of their dialectological area. Northern Italian dialects (NID) are only partially exemplified above, but their values are indicated on the basis of Manzini & Savoia’s (2005) corpus. Stress allomorphy and $l$- allomorphy are fully independent, since either occurs without the other, cf. Occitan (stress only) and Corsican ($l$- only).

Table 2 summarizes the relation between allomorphies (of whatever type) and reordering either leading to a reversed Acc$>$P order (French) or to a reversed Dat$>$Acc order (Corsican). There seems to be a connection between the two, in the sense that reordering is not found without allomorphy, though of course allomorphy is found without reordering in Lucanian. Nevertheless this seems to be a property of Romance languages (or of the Central Romance sample at our disposal). Data on enclitic reordering are independently available for Greek, where the reordering yields Acc$>$Dat (Terzi 1999); Mavrogiorgos (2010), who ends up accepting a weak pronoun solution, nevertheless explicitly excludes the presence of overt allomorphies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>allomorphy</th>
<th>reorder$&gt;$Acc-Dat</th>
<th>reorder$&gt;$Dat-Acc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian/NID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucanian/Occitan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsican (Zonza)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Ligurian (Olivetta)/ Corsican (Munacia)</td>
<td>i)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4. Negative contexts and non-veridicality

In the presentation of the data so far we have addressed allomorphies and reordering in terms of proclitic vs. enclitic contexts or preverbal and postverbal contexts. The phonological characterization implied by reference to proclisis and enclisis is inadequate, but reference to the positioning of the verb is also insufficient. Indeed, in some, though not in all varieties, object clitic allomorphies also characterize negative contexts.

In Terranova in (24) the position preceding the verb but immediately following the negation activates $l$-allomorphy, as exemplified in (24a). Furthermore, in negative imperative contexts there is no movement of the verb to C (Rivero 1994), recreating conditions similar to those of declarative sentences, with V in T and pronominal clitics ordered between the negation and the verb, as in (24b); this also triggers $l$-allomorphy in Terranova.\textsuperscript{11} There is no stress allomorphy. On another matter, in clitic sequences Dat/1/2P$>$Acc, as in (24c), the vocalic form of the clitic is inserted, coinciding with the nominal class inflection $u$/ $a$/ $i$ which also occurs in positive preverbal contexts like (12a).

(24) a. ɔ llu vǐː’ə
      not- him I.see
      ‘I don’t see him’

b. ɔ llu $spət$τ$ə$ndə
    not- him wait.for
    ‘Do not wait for him!’

\textsuperscript{11} The form seen in the 2nd singular imperative in (24b–c) is morphologically an infinitive. Imperatives are generally licenced only in C forcing suppletion in T, often by the infinitive (Zanuttini 1997, Manzini & Savoia 2005).
c. mm/nn u ɗɛɗə
not to.me/to.him it give
‘Do not give it to me/to him!’

Terranova Pollino

Other Lucanian varieties with l- allomorphies in postverbal contexts treat all preverbal clitics alike, independently of whether a negation is present or not. This is illustrated with Accettura and Senise in (25)–(26). The clitic following the negation is characterized by the ordinary preverbal allomorph in declaratives (25a), (26a), with the imperative (25b), (26b), and in groups (25c), (26c).

(25) a. nunn u camæ:mə
   Not- him we.call
   ‘We don’t call him’

b. nunn u ɣwardæ:tə
   not- him look.at
   ‘Don’t(pl) look at him!’

c. num m u purtæ:tə
   not to.me it bring.2pl
   ‘Don’t(pl) bring it to me!’

Senise

(26) a. nɔn u caməmə
   not him we.call
   ‘We don’t call him’

b. nɔn u ca’ma
   not him call
   ‘Do not call him!’

c. nɔ mm u da
   not to.me it give’
   ‘Do not give it to me!’

Accettura

Similar parametrization in the context of negation can be observed in Corsican varieties. In Zonza we find both allomorphy and reordering of the clitic string between the negation and the verb. This distribution again concerns both declaratives, as in (27a–b), and imperative contexts, in (27c–d). Comparison between the Corsican data in (27) and the South Italian data in (24) shows that in Zonza the l allomorph is not restricted to the position immediately adjacent the negation, unlike in Terranova’s (24c).

(27) a. un lu/la/li 'cammani
   not him/her/them they.call
   ‘They do not call him/her/them’

b. um mi/ un ɗi lu/la/li ɗani mikka
   not to.me/not to.him it.m/it.f/them give not
   ‘They don’t give it/them to me/him’

c. un lu/la/li cam’ma
   not him/her/them call
   ‘Do not call him/her/them!’

d. um mi lu da
   not to.me it give’
   ‘Do not give it to me!’

Zonza

In the Corsican dialects of Munacia, l-allomorphy takes place once again between the negation and the verb both in declaratives (28a) and in imperatives (28b–c) – and both with
simple clitics (28b) and in clitic groups (28a, c). The point of interest is that reordering does not take place in (28a), (28c) – though it is at least possible in postverbal position, as in (20a).

(28) a. un lu/la/li mmi/ɖɖ ani mikka
   not it.m/it.f/them to.me/him they.give not
   ‘They don’t give it/them to him/me’

b. un lu cam’ma
   no him call
   ‘Do not call him!’

c. un lu ddi da mikka
   not it to.him give not
   ‘Do not give it to him/her/them!’

Leaving aside internal parametrization, the data so far show that postverbal position displays allomorphies and reordering in a more robust way than post-negation contexts. Yet in a subset of varieties, post-negation contexts trigger the same effects as postverbal ones, for instance in Zonza in (27). Importantly, we cannot say that the clitics following the negation are prosodically enclitic to it, since the negation is just another clitic. Instead the whole clitic group is prosodically proclitic to the verb.

Rather, the crucial question is what post-negation contexts have in common with postverbal contexts, i.e. imperatives for object clitics, and questions for subject clitics (in sections 1.1–1.2), from a syntactico-semantic point of view. The C position of the verb cannot be involved, for the simple reason that other correlates of the high positioning of verbs, including the postverbal position of clitics, are lacking in the negative examples. On the other hand, the contexts just listed, namely negation and modal verb contexts (imperatives, questions) are core instances of what Giannakidou (1998, 2011) calls non-veridical contexts, independently known to be relevant for the licencing of Negative Polarity Items and Free Choice Items, such as English any. Specifically, ‘veridicality is a property of sentence embedding functions: such a function $F$ is veridical if $Fp$ entails or presupposes the truth of $p$. If inference to the truth of $p$ under $F$ is not possible, $F$ is non-veridical’ (Giannakidou 2011: 1674). This unification of negation and V-in-C makes a prediction, namely that all (and only) non-veridical contexts (subject to appropriate restrictions) will trigger the allomorphy.

Before we check the prediction, it is important to point out that even if we propose that the presence of a non-veridical operator is a necessary condition on the allomorphies and reordering considered so far, we are not implying that it is a sufficient condition. Rather the exponent for the non-veridical operator (modal verb or negation) also needs to externalize a position higher than the clitic and hence preceding it (‘enclisis’). We illustrate this in (29). Recall that the language of Olivetta (West Ligurian) has l- and stress allomorphies with object clitics, as in (21) – and also has subject clitics. In interrogatives, however, Olivetta does not position V in C, but rather in I, as in (29a). This means that the syntactic context for allomorphy to arise (V-in-C) is not defined, even though it remains true that questions are non-veridical. Therefore subject clitics, surfacing preverbally, take the vocalic form.\footnote{The conditions that determine V-in-C in some languages and not in others go beyond the scope of the present article, and they are independently accounted for in the literature, see Hornstein & Lightfoot (1994) for early discussion.} As a further case in point, consider Pomaretto (Occitan). The logical operator negation is externalized via a negation adverb merged in the v-V domain of the sentence, $pa$ in (29b), rather than by a negation clitic in the inflectional domain. Even
though negation is non-veridical, the resulting configuration does not define a context for allomorphy because the exponent for negation is lower than the clitic field and follows it.

(29) a. hɔ k a fai
what that she does
‘What does she do?’ Olivetta

b. a drøm pa
the sleeps not
‘He doesn’t sleep’ Pomaretto

The prediction we now need to check is that every time a non-veridical configuration is defined, where a modal verb or other non-veridical exponent, surfaces higher than the clitic string (hence to its left) the phenomena of allomorphy and reordering described so far in connection with questions and imperatives will be reproduced. A case in point is infinitival structures. Based on the positioning of clitics after the verb, Kayne (1991) concludes that in several Romance languages, infinitives are in the C position. This correlates with the fact that a subset of infinitives is known to have a modal, irrealis interpretation – what Stowell (1982) calls a future infinitive (cf. Wurmbrand 2014), defining another core non-veridical environment. Infinitival complements of verbs of propositional attitudes are also non-veridical, in the same sense in which subjunctive complements of propositional attitude verbs are (Giannakidou 2011).

With Corsican varieties, which have the infinitive in C, clitics behave as predicted, displaying l-allomorphy and reordering, as in Zonza’s (30a); in Munacia, reordering is optional as expected, as in (30b). The Lucanian variety of Accettura also has enclisis in the infinitive and again displays the expected l-allomorphy; stress allomorphy cannot be checked because the (truncated) infinitive bears last syllable stress anyway, as in (31a). Finally enclisis is optionally attested in the variety of Pomaretto, where we find l-allomorphy and also stress allomorphy, at least in clitic clusters, as in (31b). Other varieties reported in tables (A)-(B) have proclisis in the infinitives – namely the Lucanian varieties of Senise and Terranova and the West Ligurian variety of Olivetta. In other words, the infinitive is positioned in I and the context for allomorphies and reordering is not defined.

(30) a. t äµu ôittu ði 'da-ːqqi- lu
to.you I.have said of give- to.him-it
‘I have told you to give it to him’ Zonza

b. t äµu ôittu ði 'da-ːqqi- lu/da-ːlu- qqi
to.you I.have said of give- to.him-it/give-it- to.him
‘I have told you to give it to him’ Munacia d’Auddè

(31) a. so vəntə a/ kə vəder- la
I.am come to/ for see- him/her
‘I came to/ in order to see him/her’ Accettura

b. seu vən'gy pər duñə- li- lu
I. am come for give- to.him-it
‘I came to give it to him’ Pomaretto

The second context to be considered is hypotheticals. In Northern Italian dialects (as in Germanic languages) counterfactuals/optatives can be expressed either by an if clause or by a sentence with the verb in C, followed by the inverted subject/clitic. In these contexts, l allomorphy applies to the subject clitic, as illustrated in (32) with a dialect similar to Montaldo in (5); in (32b) the postverbal clitic has an l-segment which is absent on preverbal clitics in (32a).
(32) a. u/a drømæ
   ‘He/she sleeps’

b. (armenu) u dru’mes- el
   at.least he slept- he
   ‘If he slept at least!’

Viguzzolo (Piedmont)

The discussion so far has been devoted to verifying that all non-veridical contexts with the relevant positioning of V or negation yield allomorphy/reordering. A different question is whether all allomorphy/reordering are subsumed by the contexts we have defined. We know of a few potential sources of counterexamples. First, in many Piedmontese varieties, exemplified here with Montaldo, object clitics precede the finite verb, as in (33b), but follow the perfect participle, as in (33a) – where (33b) is veridical and so (33a), at least if we consider it monoclausal. In Montaldo, and in the two dozen or so similar languages exemplified by Manzini & Savoia (2005: §5.1.3), proclitics and enclitics belong to the same l- series (an r- series in (33)). Therefore they provide no counterexample to our prediction that l- allomorphy connects to non-veridicality. Similarly, Romansh varieties have generalized Verb Second (V2) with subject inversion triggered by first position Topics/Foci – a context not necessarily associated with non-veridicality. Manzini & Savoia (2005: §3.13.2) provide proclitic and enclitic paradigms for a dozen varieties, from which no allomorphy emerges. Once again therefore the present generalization remains unchallenged.

(33) a. ur a tʃam-r/-ra
   he has called-him/her
   ‘He has called him/her’

b. u r/-ra tʃom
   he him/her calls
   ‘He calls him/her’

Montaldo

In short, allomorphies and reordering are associated with non-veridical contexts, namely negation, imperatives, infinitive complements (object clitics), questions and hypotheticals (subject clitics). Note that apparent alternatives to this conclusion ultimately revert to it. For instance, one may assume that negation triggers allomorphies and reordering in that it is itself associated with the C position. Yet, leaving aside other considerations, there must be a common property that licenses either verbs or negations in C; this leads us back to a semantic characterization interacting with the configurational one. We summarize the data in Table 3. The gaps do not correspond to unattested data (notated by 0) – rather to the lack of relevant contexts (for instance absence of subject clitics, in questions). In some varieties allomorphy and/or reordering does not take place after the negation, though it does after a verb; the reverse is not attested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MainQuestion</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allom</td>
<td>order</td>
<td>allom</td>
<td>order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occitan (Pomaretto)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Ligurian (Olivetta)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucanian (Accettura)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucanian (Senise)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucanian (Terranova)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsican (Zonza, Macà)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsican (Munacia)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Allomorphy

Our key conclusion so far is that the internal constituency (allomorphy) and order of clitics depend on non-veridical contexts, as externalized by V in C or by negation clitics. Another way to put the same conclusion is that the order of verbs and negation contribute to the externalization of non-veridicality together with the internal constituency (allomorphy) and order of clitics. In this section we propose an implementation of this conclusion as it concerns allomorphy – we return to order in section 3.

2.1. Internal structure of clitics

Before we consider l- allomorphies, it is useful to briefly review our assumptions about the internal structure of clitics, which the allomorphies affect; some of the assumptions that we introduce will play a role in the discussion of (re)ordering as well. We exemplify just one clitic set, that of Zonza, given that the relevant phenomena are particularly robust in this variety. The full set of Zonza’s clitics is listed in (34).13

(34) pre-V post-V/Neg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>1/2P</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Locative/Instrumental</th>
<th>Middle-passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u, a, i</td>
<td>l-i (alone)/ɖ-i (clusters)</td>
<td>m-i, t-i, tj-i, v-i</td>
<td>n-i</td>
<td>tj-i</td>
<td>s-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clitics u, a and i coincide with the nominal inflections of Zonza, externalizing masculine N(ominal) class, as in (35a), feminine N class, as in (35b), and plural, as in (35a’-b’).

(35) a. tsiteɖ-u a’. tsiteɖ-i
    ‘boy-msg’ ‘boy-pl’
b. rot-a b’. rot-i
    ‘wheel-fsg’ ‘wheel-pl’

Therefore in the appropriate context, mere N class (gender) and number specifications are sufficient to externalize reference to the 3rd person. In the contexts that we have characterized as modal/non-veridical, exponents for N class and number must be supported by the l- lexical base, as schematized in (36) for the singular.14

(36) (D)
    (D) N
    (l) u/a

(36) leaves out one form in the 3rd person, namely l-i which can either be the plural accusative or the dative. Dative complements of ditransitive verbs can be characterized as

---

13 The data from Zonza (and Munacia) show two possible allomorphs for enclitics, with geminated or simple initial consonant. The allomorphs with initial geminates generally occur in clusters and after monosyllabic verbal forms (see also Dalbera-Stefanaggi 2001). There is also a degree of uncertainty by speakers, that can favour or disfavour the one or the other depending on the style of pronunciation.

14 Kihm (2005) and Ferrari-Bridgers (2008) construe nominal class as a different kind of N, namely an instantiation of Marantz’s (1997) n category.
entertaining a possessor relation to the theme of the verb, as proposed by Kayne (1984). Following Manzini & Savoia (2011a; 2014), we characterize possession in terms of a part-whole or inclusion relation, which we notate \((\subseteq)\), assigning it to dative \(l/ɖ\)-i, as in (37).

(37) \[
\begin{array}{c}
D \\
/ɖ \\
i \\
\end{array}
\]

In sentence (19a), repeated as (38a), the \(-i\) inflection, with content \((\subseteq)\), says that the definiteness specifications to which it attaches must be understood as possessors (or wholes) with respect to the theme argument (the part or possesum), as in (38b). This proposal can also be extended to other dative complements (Manzini & Franco 2016).

(38) a. u d[i] ɖani
it.m to.him they.give ‘They give it to him’ Zonza
b. they give [it \(\subseteq\) him]

For Manzini & Savoia (2011a; 2014), the syncretism between oblique and plural is not accidental – rather it is due to the fact that the same part-whole operator is involved in both environments. As a plural, \(-i\) takes in its scope the set of individuals denoted by the lexical base to which it attaches and says roughly that it is possible to split subsets (including singletons) off it.\(^{15}\) Thus \(rot-i\) ‘wheels’ in (35b’) has the interpretation in (39b).

(39) a. rot \([ \(\subseteq\) i]\]
b. \(\exists\) x \((\subseteq)\) \{wheel\}
there is an x such that x is a subset of the set of individuals with the property ‘wheel’

Other clitics in (34) can also be analysed as consisting of a consonantal lexical base and of a vocalic inflection. If we associate the vocalic inflection \(-i\) with \((\subseteq)\) content in the obliques \(n-i\) (genitive) and \(tʃ-i\) (locative), this amounts to saying that all obliques involve the \((\subseteq)\) relation. Thus \(tʃ-i\) is inclusion by a location, with deictic (‘here, there’) reference; \(n-i\) is inclusion between by a DP (as is genitive in general).

As for 1/2P arguments such as \(m-i, t-i\), the \(-i\) inflection is expected in dative contexts. The lack of a separate dative and accusative forms for 1/2P may be seen as an accidental syncretism; however Manzini & Savoia (2011a; 2014), whom we are following here, view it as a reflex of the fact that Differential Object Marking (DOM) applies to 1/2P clitics. Recall that in the majority of Romance varieties which have DOM, the latter treats direct objects as datives, introduced by the preposition \(a\).\(^{16}\) If 1/2P clitics get the DOM treatment, i.e. dative marking, we expect 1/2P clitics to show up in the dative even as direct objects.

\(^{15}\) If we understand it correctly, Borer’s (2005:95) Div(ider) conception of plural is compatible with \((\subseteq)\).

\(^{16}\) Relevant varieties include Ibero-Romance, Central and Southern Italian dialects, Sardinian, Romansh and Corsican. We only know of one exception to this state of affairs, namely Romanian, which has an inflectional dative case, but introduces DOM with the \(pe\) (‘on, over’) locative preposition.

We follow classical approaches in generative grammar (for instance Kayne’s generalization as reported by Jaeggli 1981) in seeing in DOM essentially a case phenomenon. An anonymous reviewer refers us to work by Stark (2008: 59) where DOM is treated as ‘a classification device in a broad sense, indicating a “contoured object”’. However Manzini & Franco (2016) provide considerable evidence supporting the continuity between oblique case and DOM, including their shared morphology and their similarities with respect to such syntactic phenomena as agreement.
One may wonder what happens in varieties like (normative) Italian which display a *mi/ti* 1/2P clitic but have no DOM. In fact, nothing prevents us from assuming that clitics are associated with DOM independently of what happens with full pronoun or lexical DPs. On the contrary, Romanian has DOM in the phrasal domain and has separate lexicalization for accusative and dative 1/2P clitics; therefore DOM in the phrasal domain is not sufficient to induce DOM in the clitic domain, forming a pendant to Italian, where it is unnecessary.

2.2. *D* and stress allomorphy

In terms of the structure in (36), the alternation between vocalic forms and *l*-forms of a clitic is an alternation between forms including a *D* constituent and forms not including it – in other words it is a *D* allomorphy. As we saw in section 1, *D* forms are required in the context of *V* in *C* or of the clitic negation, in other words they are required by the presence of non-veridical operators externalized higher than the clitic, hence to its left. When *D* forms are not required, the non- *D* short forms are inserted. The overall schema for allomorphies that emerges from this analysis is as in (40).17

(40) -higher modal/Neg +higher modal/Neg

+D clitic no yes

-D clitic yes no

The attested cells of the schema in (40) are depicted in structure (41) for Zonza’s (4a) and in structure (42) for Zonza’s (4b). In the context in (41), in the absence of either *V* in *C* or negation, the clitics *u/a* are inserted, bearing nominal class properties (or number in the case of *i*). In the context in (42), with *V* in *C*, a different clitic structure is inserted, joining the nominal class/number morphemes *u/a* to the definiteness morpheme *l*.

(41) cf. (4a)

```
N
 u  I
  cammani
```

(42) cf. (4b)

```
C
 cama  D
     U
   D  N
 l  u
```

Let us mention once again (as we did in section 1.4) that the presence of a non-veridical (modal etc.) operator is a necessary condition to trigger movement of the verb to *C*. However

---

17 Though (40) depicts a situation observed in a subset of Romance languages, it is not without crosslinguistic correlates. A *D* alternation conditioned by TMA categories characterizes for instance Blackfoot (Algonquian) clitics, as described by Bliss & Gruber (2015:175): ‘one series of Blackfoot proclitics consists of morphosyntactically simplex pro-KPs that only encode person features, while the other series are morphosyntactically complex pro-DPs composed of a KP plus a *D* head. The semantic contribution of the *D* head is temporal: it restricts the denotation of the proclitic to a contextually relevant stage of an individual … The short form proclitics, which lack this temporal restriction, appear in contexts that do not refer to specific stage’.
it is not a sufficient condition – in the sense that imperatives, and especially questions, infinitives, hypotheticals are compatible with a lower position of the verb as well. It is beyond the scope of the present article to provide an account of the parameters involved in the choice of one of the available alternatives. It is worth mentioning however, that according to Chomsky (2001) the surface position of verbs is itself determined by what he calls PF movement. In other words, while syntax regulates abstract relations between V and its functional projections, the overt positioning of the verb in one or the other of its extended projections is an externalization choice – not an instance of syntactic movement.

The crucial question for us is whether we can account for the correlation between the presence of a D segment in the clitic and the presence of a modal exponent c-commanding it in (42). We begin with the observation that while the l- segment in (42) finds itself within the c-command domain of the imperative verb, its definiteness content is evaluated outside the scope of the jussive operator. Seen from this perspective, definiteness is overtly lexicalized by l- in those contexts where the surface scope relations, i.e. D lower than the modal verb, do not correspond to the interpreted scope relations, i.e. definiteness scoping out of modals. The same analysis applies to negation contexts. Thus the overt lexicalization of the D segment is required when Neg is externalized in a higher position – which is the reverse of the wide scope reading of D with respect to Neg.

Thus the point to be borne in mind is that lexicalization of the l- segment strengthens the visibility of D properties in those contexts where D properties must be read outside the scope of some modal/non-veridical operator that is nevertheless externalized higher than D. We read this requirement as a device to optimize visibility at the SM interface of two key operators (D and C/Neg) interacting at the CI interface. The general picture we obtain is far from the idea that allomorphies and other devices traditionally considered to be morphological simply disrupt the underlying regularity of syntactico-semantic structure. On the contrary they are seen to contribute to the externalization of complex CI information, here the relative scope of modal/non-veridical operators and definiteness. In fact, it seems to us that the true contours of morphological l- alternations in so-called enclisi/proclisis contexts in Romance only emerge when they are considered against the CI interface structures they externalize. Otherwise they reduce simply to a list of idiosyncratic rules and constraints, as seen in more conventional approaches insulating morphophonology from the rest of grammar.

Before going on to consider order, we must ask whether the same schema of explanation can be applied to stress allomorphies, i.e. the alternations between unstressed and stressed forms of a clitic. We expect the answer to be positive, because of the existence of Lucanian varieties where D and stress allomorphy co-occur in the same contexts. Another reason is the patterns of parametrization seen in Table 1. It is possible for a language to have l-allomorphy and no stress allomorphy, like the Corsican dialects in (41)–(42); it is also possible to have stress allomorphy in the absence of l- allomorphy, as in the object clitic series of Pomaretto, where stress is added in enclisis to l- forms present in proclisis as well. However there is no variety where stress is added to vocalic clitics. In other words, a one way implication relates stress allomorphies to D allomorphies, in the sense that in the 3rd person, stress implies the presence of a D constituent within the clitic.

Consider then Accettura’s (10a) with the structure in (43). We analyze stress allomorphy along the same lines as l- allomorphy in (42). In fact, we take it that both are instantiations of the same fundamental D allomorphy. In other words, in Lucanian varieties, clitics in the

---

18 This proposal raises questions on Determiners, which unlike clitics are unaffected by non-veridical contexts. A possible direction for explanation is that DPs define a phase (in the sense of Chomsky 2001), so that the spell-out of the D-NP complex is not sensitive to phase-external material (modals or negation) – though this is not true of D heads, i.e. clitics. The technical and empirical feasibility of such a proposal remain to be verified.
context of higher modal/non-veridical operators not only must include an \( l \)-segment; it must also be the case that the \( l \)-segment is immediately preceded by a stress prominence mark. For instance, in (43), the modal V-in-C context requires D properties to be externalized both by an \( l \)-segment and by prosodic prominence associated with the tonic nucleus immediately preceding \( l \). Alternatively, in Occitan/West Ligurian varieties (Pomaretto, Olivetta) stress prominence is associated directly with the nucleus of the clitic. 19

(43) (cf. (10a), (16b))

\[
\begin{array}{c}
C \\
ca:mə \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
D \\
l\overbar{\eta}_{[\text{foot}]} \\
\end{array}
\]

In the 1st/2nd person, clitics include a consonantal base with 1/2P denotation (\( m-, t- \)) both in enclisis and in proclisis. In other words, the \( m-, t- \) segments denoting 1/2P do not alternate with zero – in the way in which the definiteness segment \( l \)-alternates with zero in the 3P. Therefore 1/2P clitics only undergo stress allomorphies, or segmental allomorphies such as lengthening of the consonantal base (for instance in Terranova in (12) and Belmonte in (13)) and lengthening of the vocalic nucleus (for instance in French me vs. moi). We still construe these allomorphies as D allomorphies. Specifically in the presence of an invariant segmental content, stress on the clitic or on the immediately preceding nucleus provides SM salience for the deictic properties that need to be read outside the scope of syntactically higher modal operators. The same holds for segmental alternations involving the lengthening of the nucleus or of the consonantal onset. 20

3. Order

If the approach set up in section 2 for \( l \)- and stress allomorphies is on the right track, the different order of enclitics should respond to the presence of a higher modal/non-veridical operator and contribute to optimizing the legibility of the relative scope of the clitics and the operator. Before we consider reordering, however, we must clarify our analysis of clitic order.

A major generative approach to cliticization treats it as movement. Specifically, according to Kayne (1991, 1994), clitics move from an argument position to a position adjoined to I or to projections of I. The main objection to this type of approach is empirical. In the words of Manzini & Savoia (2007: 79), ‘it is hard to predict that [clitics] appear in a fixed number, in a fixed order and with fixed co-occurrence (or mutual exclusion) patterns which do not necessarily correspond to the number, order, co-occurrence (or mutual exclusion) patterns of corresponding arguments and adjuncts’. 19

19 Negation contexts do not present stress allomorphy, even in Lucanian varieties like Terranova, where they trigger \( l \)-allomorphy. We conclude that stress is associated with the clitic only when it is on the right edge of the prosodic domain, in keeping with the normal prosodic rules of the language, where main stress falls on the rightmost strong foot.

20 The fact that all clitic forms participate in D allomorphies is useful in understanding a fine grained parameter noted in connection with Terranova’s (24), where an \( l \)-alternant is present in post-negation position only if it is alone; in clitic groups the vocalic alternant is present. Evidently, in the environment defined by Neg, the presence of a deictic 1/2P/Dat clitic suffices to externalize D properties for the whole group so that the \( l \)-segmental content need not be lexicalized.

Looking back at the discussion on the content of D in section 1.2, we may want to say that D alternations in 1/2P clitics involve a Person (participant) content. What unifies the definiteness property of 3P and the Person (participant) property is some notion of deixis that D more properly embodies.
The alternative is to assume that clitics are base generated as inflectional heads (Sportiche 1996). This conception opens the way to a cartographic encoding of clitic hierarchies, where the order of clitics corresponds to the sequence of functional positions that host them. Thus Manzini & Savoia (2005; 2007) provide a single template of positions which underlies the different possible orders in the about 300 varieties they exemplify. As far as we can tell, there is no comparable systematization in the Kaynian tradition, despite the interest of the fragments developed by such authors as Kayne himself, Pescarini (to appear, see section 1.3). Nevertheless, general conceptual considerations disfavour the cartographic solution, since the clitic hierarchy is stipulated rather than derived from independent principles (but see fn. 24).

In this section we argue that clitics can be sequenced by reference to the order in which phrasal arguments are merged with the verb, hence without resort to stipulated hierarchies. We assume that order of Merge (i.e. direct object first, followed by low obliques/applicatives, etc.) is independently given by semantic composition. We then argue that the same order of composition observed in phrasal complements is found with clitics – except that phrasal complements are linearly ordered left to right (innermost to outermost), while clitics are ordered right to left. We then go on to consider the parameter involving the relative order of accusative and dative clitics (section 3.2) and finally their reordering in enclisis (section 3.3).

Before proceeding, we need to briefly introduce the theoretical notions of merger, and of the Merge rule. For Chomsky (2005; 2013) the operation Merge responsible for building phrase structure, yields non-ordered couples of the type \{X, Y\}. At the same time ‘one asymmetry imposed by the phonetic interface is that the syntactic object derived must be linearized. Optimally, linearization should be restricted to the mapping of the object to the SM interface, where it is required for language-external reasons. If so, then no order is introduced in the rest of the syntactic computation: the narrow syntax and the mapping to the C-I interface … If linear order is restricted to the mapping to the phonetic interface, then it gives no reason to require the basic operation Merge to depart from the simplest form … unstructured Merge, forming a set’ (Chomsky 2005: 15). Thus linear order of terminals belongs to the externalization procedure for syntax – exactly like the lexical alternations (allomorphies) and prosodic patterns (stress shifts) examined in section 2.

3.1. The order of proclitics in Dat>Acc languages

In many Romance languages, proclitics mirror the order of lexical DPs, at least in simple clusters of Accusative (Acc) and Dative (Dat). Thus (44a) illustrates the Acc>Dat order of complements and (44b) the Dat>Acc order of clitics, cf. (18) above. Here and throughout, we use the > symbol for ‘precedes’.

(44) a. Do il libro a Paolo
   I.give the book to Paul
 b. Glielo do to.him-it I.give
    ‘I give it to him’

We impute the order of constituents in (44) to the combination of two factors. In core syntax, the verb merges first with the internal/accusative argument, and then with the oblique/dative argument, yielding (45a), where the set notation corresponds to the presence of simple sisterhood relations, and implies no linear order. Next, an externalization parameter chooses the head-initial order for (44a), whereby the head is ordered before complements, as in (45b). In turn, the order of clitics in (44b) is reversed with respect to that of phrasal complements in (44a) – and so is the order of the verb. While the predicative domain of Romance sentences
has the verb initial order, the inflectional area of the sentence ordinarily presents argumental elements before the verbal head supporting them. It is tempting therefore to recognize in the order of clitics in (44b) the application of a different externalization parameter, i.e. a head final one, to the same fundamental order of merger (sisterhood) already postulated for the predicative domain. Thus the merger structure in (45a) yields the linearized structure (45c), corresponding to sentence (44b).

\[(45)\]

a. \{\{V, Acc\}, Dat\}] \\
b. [I \{[[ V, Acc] Dat]\}] cf. (44a) \\
c. [Dat [Acc [I [V cf. (44b

If the proposal in (45) is on the right track, there is a single order of merger of arguments in core grammar, namely (45a) – though a linearization parameter introduces a (superficial) asymmetry between phrasal and clitic complements. This raises both theoretical and empirical questions. From a theoretical point of view, we need to know what mechanism of Universal Grammar determines precisely the outcome outlined in (45). From an empirical point of view Italian and Italian dialects are noted for their rich clitic structures, being endowed with at least two extra obliques, namely a partitive and a locative – besides 3P accusatives and datives, 1/2P forms, si/se and finally subject clitics in Northern Italian dialects. The question we need to ask is: can the simple hypothesis in (45) account for the observed complexity? It is important to realize that this question is addressed here not just because of its inherent interest, but because it provides a necessary background to our examination of enclitic reordering. Specifically, against the backdrop of the present account of the proclitic order, we will be able to argue that enclitic reordering only affects accusative and dative clitics, leaving the rest of the string unaffected.

To begin with, Manzini & Savoia (2005: §4.2) individuate a major parameter involving the middle-passive (M-P) Voice clitic \(si\).\footnote{We assume that there is a single clitic \(si\), with a unitary syntax and interpretive content (see most recently Manzini et al. 2016). Thus in (47) we list both examples of what would be called impersonal/passive \(si\), as in (47a) and of what would be called reflexive \(si\), as in (47b). In normative Italian, impersonal \(si\) does in fact follow the accusative clitic, rather than precede it. However in all other Romance varieties listed by Manzini & Savoia (2005) the same order is observed, independently of interpretation.} In Italian, the \(si\) clitic precedes the accusative clitic, as in (47a) and follows the Dat clitic, as in (47b). Consistently with this, in more complex strings, like (47c), \(si\) has a string-medial position. Note that in the right-hand column schemas, we have suggested that the Partitive is connected to the Internal Argument (IA) slot – as is independently concluded by Burzio (1986). This justifies the fact that it appears to be ordered more or less like Acc.\footnote{In some varieties the \(ne\) clitic does not occupy the leftmost/lowest slot in the clitic string (Manzini & Savoia 2005; Pescarini 2014). Thus in Sardinian varieties \(nde\) as a directional locative precedes the accusative clitic; as a partitive, \(nde\) still precedes 1/2P and 3P datives. We will disregard this parameter, but note that the position of \(n(d)e\) is compatible with that of high obliques, i.e. the leftmost Dat in the hierarchy in (49a) or the leftmost Obl in the hierarchy in (52a).}

\[(47)\]

a. Se lo compra M-P it he.buys ‘He buys it to himself’ \\
b. Gli si compra M-P buys him ‘It is bought to him’ \\
c. Gli se ne compra M-P of.it buys him ‘Some of it is bought to him’
The string-medial position of si in Italian contrasts with that observed in several Italian dialects, including Agliano in (48), where the order sə-Dat holds, both in strings consisting of two clitics like (48a) and in more complex strings (48b).

(48) a. sə ədα kwefə Voice>Dat
    M-P him gives this
    ‘This is given to him’

b. sə ədα ərα trəppə Voice>Dat>IA
    M-P him of.it gives too.much
    ‘Too much of it is given to him’

Agliano (Tuscany)

If we put together the right hand columns in (47) and (48), we deduce the order of the clitic string in (49a). The interesting point for present purposes is that this directly translates into the normally assumed order of merger of constituents with V, at least if we adopt the idea that si connects to the External Argument (EA). As expected, the IA merges with V first. Next, we know that obliques, including Dat, can occur at different points of the syntactic tree – for instance as goal datives (low) or as benefactive datives (high). The study of this type of phenomenon has become recently associated with the hypothesis that these readings are supported by abstract Applicative (Appl) heads (Pylkkänen 2008). Therefore here we will use Appl as a label for the relevant positions on the verbal skeleton, i.e. to favour mapping to current generative theories. The low Appl follows the IA in the order of merger, followed in turn by the EA and by the high Appl, as in (49b).

(49) a. (Dat) > Voice > (Dat) > Part/Acc > I

b. [Appl] [EA] [Appl] [IA] [V]

1/2P clitics, which have not been discussed yet, interestingly pattern with obliques. Specifically, they precede si if Dat does, as in Italian. Crucially, this is true not only when they correspond to the Dat argument as in (50b), but also when they correspond to the IA, as in (50a). Recall that in section 2.1, in detailing the clitic system of Zonza, we proposed that the invariant –i morphology of 1/2P clitics is an oblique (⊆) inflection, in other words 1/2P systematically undergo DOM, where DOM implies oblique case at least in Romance. This automatically leads to the same positioning for 1/2P as for Dat. Finally, Italian has a locative oblique, which also distributes like Dat with respect to si, preceding it, as in (50c).

(50) a. ti si vede 1/2P>EA
    you M-P sees
    ‘You are seen’

b. ti se ne compra 1/2P>EA>IA
    you M-P of.it buys
    ‘Some of it is bought to you’

c. ci se ne mette poco Loc>EA>IA
    there M-P of.it puts little
    ‘One puts a little of it in there’

In Agliano, given that Dat follows sə, Loc is also expected to follow it, as it does in (51a). In addition, subject (EPP) clitics occur at the beginning of the string as illustrated in (51b).

23 We do not know of other accounts able to predict that 1/2P clitics have the same morphology and distribution as datives. However note that the explanation that we are adopting here is orthogonal to the main issue being debated.
Everything considered, Italo-Romance varieties present the order in (52a). This is essentially the same order as in (49a), though we have now seen that Obl in (52a) should be read as encompassing obliques proper (Dat, Loc) and 1/2P pronouns. The parentheses around the Obl category mean that languages choose one of the two Obl positions (or set of positions). Crucially, the sequence of clitics in (52a) replicates the sequence of functional projections of the verb to which DP/PP arguments are attached. The latter are reproduced in (52b) in accordance with currently standard assumptions in the minimalist model of generative grammar (Chomsky 1995ff.). The correspondence between (52a) and (52b) is worth illustrating point by point. The rightmost position of accusatives and partitives (Part) corresponds to the merger of internal arguments within the VP. The lower ApplP in (52b) provides us with a convenient notation for the fact that an oblique position is available within the VP-shell before insertion of the EA; however nothing depends on the presence of an Appl head, as opposed to simple adjunction of obliques. Insertion of the EA closes the core predicative domain, corresponding in current generative frameworks to vP (Chomsky 1995) or VoiceP (Harley 2013 and many others). The second oblique position in the string corresponds to the assumption that obliques (as circumstantial modifiers) are available outside the core predicative structure (we use ApplP again to notate it). The EPP argument, hence the subject/nominative clitic, closes off the sequence in TP.

(52) a. EPP > (Obl) > EA > (Obl) > Acc/Part
   b. [TP [ApplP [vP/VoiceP [ApplP [VP

In short, the clitic hierarchy in (52a) reproduces the order of merger of arguments within the extended projection of the verb in (52b). The other crucial ingredient of the present proposal is that the order of clitics is the mirror image of the order of phrasal constituents merged in these projections. Phrasal constituents are ordered to the right of the verb in a head-initial structure. Clitics however are ordered before the verb, realized in T, yielding a head-final structure. In other words, the Dat/1/2P>Acc>I order, characteristic of most Italian varieties, implies the same set \{V, Acc\} Dat as the [[V DP] PP] linearization as full complements; only externalization procedures differ.

24 At the same time it has an almost one-to-one correspondence with the sequence proposed by Manzini & Savoia (2005), as in (iii), which they stipulate as a cartographic functional sequence. (iv) reproduces (52a), and shows the alignment with (iii). Manzini and Savoia’s (2005) idea is that their order of categories in (iii) is aligned with the internal structure of the DP.

(iii) D R Q P Loc N
(iv) EPP > (Obl) > EA > (Obl) > Acc/Part

25 Thus clitic order preserves the OV linearization characteristic of Latin complementation, while phrasal complemental changes it to VO. According to Zamboni (2000: 101–2) ‘the so-called free word order of Latin, which is preferentially anchored to an (S)OV complementation schema, i.e. a leftward oriented one, evolves towards a rightward oriented linearization of the VO type, prospectively rigid’. Zamboni argues that this order emerges in the earliest documentation of Latin (Plautus); in the first centuries CE, VO is prevalent in contexts where a complex DP follows. This latter observation is in reality consistent with the OV status of Latin, since it is well-known that the postverbal position of complements emerges under Heavy NP Shift (e.g. Kayne 1994). A recent discussion of these issues from a generative perspective is provided by Ledgeway (2012). Ledgeway connects the Romance clitic innovation to a shift towards a head marking syntax.
To the extent that the order of merger of phrasal arguments and clitics is the same, and only left-to-right (phrasal arguments) vs. right-to-left (clitics) linear order varies, our account makes predictions on the clitic string. Yet from a theoretical point of view, what we have provided is at best an intermediate generalization. It needs to be explained why there is the reversal of order noted. Another question that needs to be answered is why clitics are merged with an I projection, as opposed to phrasal arguments merged with v-V projections.

As for the second question, some Piedmontese varieties with generalized enclisis show that clitics need not be merged/externalized at I – but can also occupy a lower position in the sentence. Some core distributions are seen in (53)–(54). In the relevant varieties, clitics follow the verb, as in (54a), (54b’), and may also follow the negation adverb, as in (53a), other adverbs, as in (53b), and locative adverbial expressions, as in (53c), (54b–c).

(53) a. ie dai mi- vt/jj- en
   I give not- you/to.him- of.it
   ‘I don’t give any of it to you/to him’

b. ie vɔg not- et admenŋ/ note admen- et
   I see not- you tomorrow/ not tomorrow- you
   ‘I am not seeing you tomorrow’

c. ie mæt kilo- _PROGRAM_CODE yŋ/ a post- yŋ
   I put here- it/ in place-it
   ‘I put it here/in its place’

(54) a. a da- v- ru/ra/ja
   he gives- to.him-it.m/it.f/them
   ‘He gives it/them to him’

b. i bytu (mia) dɔs- am- ru (mia)
   they put not on- me- it not
   ‘They (don’t) put it on me’

b’. i bytə- v- ru (mia) dɔs
   they put- there- it not on
   ‘They (don’t) put it on there’

c. i pɔrtu ka- m- ru
   they bring home- me- it
   ‘They bring it home to me’

(55) [IP i [I byta [(_C) v [D ru [ v/VP byta]]](cf. (54b’))

Pursuing the line of analysis sketched in (55) one may further adopt the conclusion of Tortora (2014) that adverbs may intervene between the verb and the clitic sequence, or even between two clitics, for instance in (53b), because clitics are in fact part of the adverbial/
locative hierarchy of Cinque (1999). Manzini & Savoia (2005) provide some counterevidence. In any event, what is relevant here is that the Piedmontese data enable us to conclude that clitics do not have a unique association with I; in principle they can be merged with other heads, in particular v. Using the technical notion of phase (Chomsky 2001) one may say that clitics can be found in any of the phasal domains of the sentence, namely that defined by the phase head C (and including I) and that defined by the phase head v (and including V).

Finally then the question why clitics would externalize in a mirror image sequence with respect to phrasal argument remains to be addressed. If the structure in (55) is on the right track (but see fn. 26), this question is strengthened by the fact that the same reversal holds in Piedmontese data, despite the different overall positioning of the clitic string. One obvious line to take exploits the observation that in head-initial languages like the Romance ones, complements are ordered to the right of the heads to which they attach, but specifiers are ordered to their left. Therefore the leftward ordering of clitics would follow from their treatment as specifiers. The real problem is why there would be an ordering asymmetry between complements and specifiers. Theories that try to explain this asymmetry all assume that linear order is in fact embedded in core syntax, including Kayne (1994), but more to the point Brody (2000), which has mirror effects (spec vs. complement) at its core. However this range of issues is beyond the scope of the present article.

3.2. The Acc> Dat order

In section 3.1 we laid out one fundamental restriction on the clitic string – namely that it should preserve the order of merger independently observed and accounted for for phrasal argument, with only linearization as an open parameter. Enclisis, in so far as it reorders at least Dat/Obl and Acc clitics (section 1.3), presents us with an obvious problem. At the same time, the discussion in section 3.1 allows us to check whether reordering is indeed constrained to the Obl>Acc portion of the string or it involves other categories. The same issues arise when we compare proclitic orders in the Italian varieties considered so far to the Dat/Obl order of French or Corsican varieties. We will address them first in this section.

Consider Corsican varieties. Despite the fact that Acc clitics are ordered before Dat and 1/2P clitics, we can now show that all other aspects of the string are regulated by the hierarchy in (52). Oblique clitics precede si, as in (56b), (56d), and both obliques and si precede partitive objects, as in (56c–d), though as a consequence of the Dat>Acc order, Acc clitics (like Dat clitics) appear before si, as in (56a). The data therefore are compatible with the hypothesis

26 Manzini & Savoia (2005) show that in some Piedmontese varieties, clitics can follow full phrasal complements, as in (v)–(vi). In the light of data like (v) – (vi) it is tempting to speculate that clitics may not form a dedicated sequence, but rather freely order with phrasal material, yielding merger structures like \{[V DP] cl\} or \{[V cl] PP\} which undergo linearization on the same (right) side of the verb. This point however is left open here for further research.

(v) in dai au liber- ut
    I give the book-to.you
    'I give the book to you'
(vi) in dai a lyj-ry
    I give to him-it
    'I give it to him'

Quarna Sotto

27 In the same vein, it is worth noting that though we have implied that the clitic string is independently merged – there is no fundamental incompatibility between the present proposal and a movement derivation, as long as the hierarchical order of arguments (what we have called the order of merger) is kept constant under dislocation. This result in turn can be obtained if only crossing movement dependencies are allowed and not nested ones (see Bianchi 2006 for a Relativized Minimality solution, and many others).
that no overall modification of the model is involved, but just a rearrangement of the position of Acc. Thus for instance the three clitics sequence in (56d), not involving Acc, is identical to that of Italian.

(56) a. \( \text{idu a z a llawata} \) Acc>EA
   \( \text{he it M-P has washed} \)
   ‘He has washed it for himself’
b. \( \text{idu li zi po ddi kkussi} \) Dat>EA
   \( \text{to him to.him M-P can say so} \)
   ‘One can say so to him’
c. \( \text{si nni komp \( \delta \)ui} \) EA>IA
   \( \text{M-P of.them he.buys two} \)
   ‘He buys himself two of them’
d. \( \text{li ssi nni } \delta a \text{ ttr oppu} \) Dat>EA>IA
   \( \text{to.him M-P of.this gives too much} \)
   ‘Too much of this is given to him’

French on the other hand is a language where \( \text{se} \) occurs first in the string (like Agliano in section 3.1), so that \( \text{se} \) precedes accusative and partitive clitics, as in (57a), as well as the obliques with which it combines, in practice the locative, as in (57b).

(57) a. \( \text{Jean s’ en/ se l’ achète} \) EA>IA/Acc
   \( \text{Jean M-P of.it/ M-P it buys} \)
   ‘Jean buys (some of) it for himself’
b. \( \text{Jean s’ y achète la viande} \) EA>Loc
   \( \text{Jean M-P there buys the meat} \)
   ‘Jean buys his meat there’

On the evidence of (57), the clitic string of French occupies in the portion of the sequence in (52a) included between the EA position (\( \text{se} \)) and the final IA position. As indicated by the data in (22), the intermediate space hosts obliques (Dat and Loc), which undergo a Person split. Specifically, 1/2P clitics precede all IA, as schematized in (58). However Acc clitics precede 3\(^{rd}\) person Obl, as in (58a). What is interesting about (58a) is that the Dat>Acc order is revealed to be just a local reordering of the clitic sequence, highlighted by italic.

(58) a. \( \text{EA > 1/2P > Acc > Obl} \) cf. (22b)
b. \( \text{EA > 1/2P / Obl > IA} \) cf. (22a, c)

Let us then analyse French first. On the basis of the discussion in section 3.1, the order of Merge required by (59a) is \{Acc \{Dat, V\}\} with Dat closer to the verb than Acc. The question we need to ask, is whether this order can be independently justified in the phrasal domain. Let us go back once again to ditransitive sentences, for instance (59a). The line of analysis initiated by Kayne (1984) takes the complement of a ditransitive verb like ‘give’ to be a possession relation between the Acc direct object (the possessor) and the Dat goal (the possessor) (see Pesetsky 1995; Harley 2002 and many others for updated versions). In terms of our characterization of dative case in section 2.1, the preposition \( \text{a ‘to’} \) that mediates this relation is a P(\( \subseteq \)) element saying that its complement includes/possesses the theme of the verb. So far we have assumed structures like (59b), where Acc is merged with the verb first and Dat is merged with the resulting predicate. Yet Kayne’s original treatment involves a structure like (59c) where Acc is the subject of Dat in a predicative small clause (cf. \( \text{le livre est à Paul} \) lit: ‘the book is to Paul’). The order of phrasal complements implies that \( \text{Paul and le livre} \) are ordered around the \( \text{à head}, \) namely complement to the right and specifier to the left.
What we are interested in is what happens when the structure of merger in (60b) is linearized leftward, and specifically whether it can yield the clitic order in (60). The complement of the verb, i.e. the small clause predication as a whole is linearized to the left of I and within the small clause, the lowest merged argument, i.e. Dat is linearized closest to the verb, as in (61) – corresponding to the observed surface order of clitics in French.

(60) Je le lui donne
I it to.him give
‘I give it to him’

(61) [le [lu [C]]] donne

The point to be borne in mind is that the Italian linearization in (52), which we have taken as basic so far, and the French linearization in (61) both reflect structures that can be posited independently of clitics. Thus both orders of clitics can be considered basic – in other words, the Italian order in (52) is basic (underived), as we have maintained so far, but so is the French order. Note that we do not necessarily imply that Italian and French phrasal syntaxes differ along the lines of (59b) vs. (59c), given that the two structures yield equivalent rightward ordering. However the discussion implies that only one of the two is linearized as part of the clitic string. In a nutshell, any model has access ad hoc parameters specialized for clitic order and we can also in principle fall back on them. However they should be considered as a last resort. Therefore our proposal is that the Acc>Dat vs. Dat>Acc parameter is a reflex of the richness of structuring available to Dat arguments independently of cliticization.

Let us then briefly go back to Corsican. The example in (56c) shows that in the absence of Acc clitics, the clitic sequence responds to the basic generalization in (52), obeying the order Obl>EA>IA, as schematized in (62b). On the other hand, Acc precedes Obl, and since Obl is positioned higher than EA (si), Acc finds itself pretty much string initial, as schematized in (62a).

(62) a. Acc > Obl / EA
cf. (19a), (56a, b)
b. Obl > EA > IA
cf. (56c, d)

Following the discussion of French in (58), the sequence in (62a) must reflect the independently possible order of merger in which Obl (i.e. the possessor) is more deeply embedded than Acc (i.e. the possessum), yielding the structure in (63) for example (19a).

(63) [u/a/i [mm/d [C]]] ñani

In short, clitics mirror phrasal complements in Romance, because phrasal complements are linearized after the head they merge with, while clitics are linearized before it. The reordering of Acc and Dat reflects independently available ways of structuring these arguments in phrasal syntax.

3.3. Reordering in enclisis

The fact that originally prompted us to look at clitic order is that in the varieties that display enclisis/proclisis segmental or stress alternations, proclitic order may also not preserved in
enclisis. This is true independently of proclitic order parameters. Thus French has 1/2P>Acc in proclisis; this order is reversed in enclisis yielding Acc>1/2P. Vice versa Corsican has generalized Acc first in proclisis – except that it switches to Acc last in enclisis. Thus the problem we are faced with is that enclitic reordering is apparently arbitrary. On the contrary, if the approach set up in section 2 for l- and stress allomorphies is on the right track, the different order of enclitics should respond to the presence of a higher modal/non-veridical operator and contribute to optimizing the legibility of the relative scope of the clitics and the operator.

Let us begin by considering French. The externalization procedure orders clitics according to the schema in (61), not only when Dat clitics are involved, but also when 1/2P clitics are, as illustrated in (64) for example (23a) above. In order to understand this example it must be remembered that though the verb has moved to a higher C position, we still assume that the leftward linearization of clitics is with respect to the I head.

(64) \[ CP \text{ donne} [le [I_(c)\text{lui/moi}]] [IP\text{ donne} \text{ (cf. (23a))}] \]

If we are to connect the structural analysis in (64) with the conclusions of section 2, we need to know how linearization, like the allomorphies considered in section 2, contributes to externalizing the relative scope of the definite/deictic clitic and the modal/non-veridical operator represented here by the imperative verb. Now, we note that the result of the reordering, at least in French, is to make the accusative clitic immediately adjacent to the verb, as indeed in (64). In the spirit of section 2, we can take the adjacency of Acc to the verb, as yet another means by which the grammar makes the D properties of clitics easily recognizable in the presence of a higher modal/non-veridical operator, which the D clitic must scope out of.

The mixing of internal and processing (external) considerations in this analysis is in keeping with Chomsky’s (2005; 2013) recent work, who refers to the latter as ‘third factor’. Clitics are governed by core syntactic constraints, notably concerning the order of Merge of predicate-argument structures. At the same time, externalization is charged with facilitating the recognition of core syntax and CI relations at the SM interface. The allomorphies considered in section 2 are SM devices, enlisted to insure the readability of the relative scope of D and modal/non-veridical operators – and so is reordering, at least in French (64).\(^\text{28}\)

Now, reordering in Corsican proceeds in the opposite direction. Thus, Corsican varieties with generalized Acc>Obl order in proclisis, switch to the Obl>Acc order in enclisis. In what follows we review some evidence that in Corsican reordering takes the opposite direction with respect to French in that it depends on a mesoclisis of some sort. Specifically, Savoia & Manzini (2015) note that in the Corsican variety of Sartè in (65), negative contexts can either maintain the ordinary proclitic order Acc>Dat/1/2P, as in (65a-b) or reverse it. However reversal depends on the negation being doubled, as in (65c-d). This means that the clitic cluster is split, and that in particular the 1/2P or Dat clitic finds itself sandwiched between two copies of the negation (a mesocosis of sorts), as in (65c–d).

(65) a. unn a/u mmi rani mikka not it.f/m to.me they .give not ‘They don’t give it to me’

\(^{28}\) The same limitations hold on reordering as on allomorphy. Recall that, as discussed in section 2, D is overtly lexicalized by l- in those contexts where the surface scope relations, i.e. D lower than the modal, do not correspond to the interpreted scope relations, where definites are read outside the scope of modals. Therefore, despite the fact that we have treated infinitives as modal (cf. section 1.4), the context for the application of reordering is not defined in French infinitives, since the verb is externalized lower than the clitic, i.e. to its right. Thus clitics in French infinitival sentence have the expected proclitic order, as in Je veux [le lui donner] ‘I want to give it to him’.
For comparison’s sake, we provide a canonical example of mesoclisis in (66), from one of the Lucanian dialects considered in sections 1-2. In the 2P plural imperative in (66a) Dat and 1/2P clitics are found in mesoclisis between the verb stem and the verb inflection -(t)ə; the Acc clitic follows the verb inflection. Manzini & Savoia (2011b) propose that the clitic that follows the inflection is merged with a I projection, but the clitic in mesoclisis is merged with a C projection, as schematized in (66b) (see Kayne 2010 for a different syntactic account, Harris & Halle 2005 for a DM account). The two clitics are therefore divided by the C head, which may provisionally be assumed to host the -(t)ə inflection; the verb base is in a higher C( imperative) position.

(66) a. tfirka- d'di/m'mi- tə - lə  
   ‘Bring(pl) it to him/me’  
   Senise  

   b. [CI tfirka [C] ddi/mmi [C tə [D lə [ I

The split observed in Sartè’s clitics in (65c–d) is like the mesoclisis split in (66), in that 1/2P and Obl clitics surface in a higher position, i.e. above the second negation; by contrast, Acc clitics appear lower, after the second negation. Proceeding by analogy with (66b) we are led to assume that in (65c–d) the 1/2P/Dat clitic merges with a C projection, while the Acc clitic merges with an I projection, as in (67); in turn the two negations are merged in the two different syntactic domains. In the presence of a single negation (presumably the lower one), as in (65a–b), the clitic group does not split and the same order Acc>1/2P/Dat is observed as in proclisis.

(67)

Thus in Sartè’s (67), reordering is the effect of the splitting of the clitic cluster. If we want this analysis to hold, we must account for this split, characterizing the two different sets of clitics and their association with I and C in a more principled way. This question has been addressed by the literature in relation with examples like (66). Manzini & Savoia (2011b: 1117) conclude that ‘the fundamental clitic split is . . . between event-anchored clitics and the inflectional I
domain on the one hand (enclisis) and... discourse-anchored/quantificational clitics and the modal C domain on the other’. In their terms, 1/2P arguments are discourse-anchored in that the denotational properties of speaker and hearer are represented in the universe of discourse; 3P arguments are event-anchored in that 3P reference is solely represented in the participants to the event (Manzini & Savoia 2005: §5.6).

Recent literature provides independent support for the connection between 1/2P reference and the C area of the sentence. For Zanuttini (2008) the imperative is the head of a JussiveP projection. This JussiveP has an operator in its specifier which connects the predicative content of the sentence in its scope to the 2P referent, i.e. the hearer. Giorgi (2010: 7) proposes that ‘there is a syntactic position in the left-most periphery of the clause, and precisely in the Complementizer-layer, that encodes the temporal – and presumably spatial as well – coordinates of the speaker’. Delfitto & Fiorin (2011: 201) consider an altogether different set of phenomena, namely shifting indexicals, but come to similar conclusions namely that ‘first person pronouns must move to the specifier of a dedicated functional head’ that they identify with Force, i.e. the higher C position in Rizzi’s (1997) hierarchy. In (66) and in (67) the connection of 1/2P reference to C triggers the attraction to the same domain of clitics that share oblique (⊆) properties with 1/2P. On the other hand, Acc and in general IA clitics are found in the domain of the event/situation (IP).

In a nutshell, we are proposing that the reordering of the clitic string in enclisis in Corsican varieties is the effect of a core syntax phenomenon that merges two different sets of clitics (roughly Obl and IA clitics) with two different projections (C and I). What this core syntax (merger) configuration has in common with the externalization procedures considered so far (allomorphies, linear reordering in French) is the context defined by a modal/non-veridical operator. The result of each computation is univocal; however their combined results create the surface effect of arbitrary variation.

Our analysis of Corsican reordering rests on a rather small empirical basis; however it is consistent with all of the Corsican data. In (68) we display two further environments which share with (67) reordering in enclisis – namely the imperative in (68a) and the infinitive in (68b). No splitting of the clitic group on either side of extraneous material is visible in (68). Yet on grounds of continuity with (67), we conclude that such as split does take place, based on the different denotational properties of the clitics involved, namely 1/2P and Obl clitics (i.e. clitics with a (⊆) content) vs. D clitics (Acc/IA clitics). The split depends on the presence of a modal/non-veridical operator in C – in the absence of which clitics are attached to I. The analysis in (67) can further be extended to other Corsican varieties that display reordering in enclisis in imperatives and infinitive of the type in (68), for instance Zonza in section 1.3.

(68) a. ‘porta- mi/ddi- lu/la/li
   bring- to.me/to.him- it.m/it.f/them
   ‘Bring it/them to me/him!’

b. t aµu rittu ri ḏa- ddi- lu
   you I.have told of give- him- it
   ‘I told you to give it to him’

Sartè

In conclusion, the Corsican enclitic reordering is an epiphenomenon of the splitting between different types of clitics endowed with different referential content – which attach to I (IA clitics) and to C (Obl clitics) respectively. The enclitic reordering observed in French takes a different form, because it depends on an externalization procedure generalizing adjacency of Acc to the verb.
4. CONCLUSIONS

In this article we discussed phenomena concerning the lexical form and order of clitics:

i. allomorphs: *l*- vs. vocalic (3rd person) and stressed vs. unstressed;

ii. clitic orders: Dat > Acc vs. Acc > Dat; and

iii. reordering in enclisis.

Romance varieties presents both allomorphies and reordering though not necessarily all three of them in the same variety, see tables (A)–(C). The phenomena correlate, in the sense that they take place in the syntactic scope of a modal verb or negation. We have proposed that the modal/non-veridical operator triggers the lexicalization of the *l*- base and/or of word stress, as an externalization procedure for the required interpretation of these contexts, with the definite/deictic referent escaping the scope of the operator.

Furthermore we have argued that the fundamental order of clitics, as seen in a particularly perspicuous way in languages with a rich series of clitics like Italian varieties, reduces to the order that is expected of arguments when they are sequenced to the left of the verbal head. If the approach is correct, we eliminate the need for a pre-encoded functional hierarchy of clitic heads. On the other hand, we need to account for the variation that arises specifically between different Romance varieties. Of particular relevance here are attestations of both the order Obl>Acc, predominant in modern day Romance languages, and the order Acc>Obl, which to this day characterizes Corsican varieties as well as French. We have proposed that Acc>Obl and Obl>Acc are both basic orders, reflecting two different ways of structuring oblique complements of triargumental verbs.

Enclisis triggers alternations between the two orders in many languages, including French and Corsican. In French the reversal in order results in a generalization of Acc>Obl – while in Corsican the effect is the reverse, namely of introducing the Obl>Acc order. Adjacency of Acc to V (French) is another consequence of the procedure aimed at optimizing the externalization of definite referents in the syntactic domain of modal/non-veridical operators, out of which they must scope interpretively. On the other hand we have argued that the Corsican alternation is the reflex of cluster splitting phenomena most clearly seen in mesoclisis. The splitting of the clitic cluster into different positions – corresponding to their degree of connection with the universe of discourse (1/2P, Obl attached to C) and the event (IA attached to I) – is itself connected to the presence of modal/non-veridical operators in C.
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