Abstract

Double object clitic pronouns in Romance are often analyzed as clustering together to form a single unit. In many Romance languages, these clitics appear in the same order regardless of their position in relation to the verb: the indirect object, or dative, clitic precedes the direct object, or accusative, clitic. The order DAT-ACC is so widely attested in Romance that it is often taken as standard. New data from a dialect of Corsican, however, exhibits a mirror ordering of clitics that precede or follow their verbal host. Data from Ordóñez & Repetti (2011) indicate that in this dialect, speakers show the order cliticDAT-cliticACC postverbally and cliticACC-cliticDAT preverbally. Based on this data, I assert that double object clitics in this dialect of Corsican do not cluster together but adjoin at discrete heads as split clusters. Phonological and historical evidence support the analysis that these clitic groups do not begin as a single unit, but that they become a true cluster only in enclitic contexts after adjunction with the verb.
1. Introduction

Double object clitic pronouns in the Romance languages usually arise in a fixed order whether they appear in preverbal or postverbal position. However, in a dialect of Corsican, the clitics appear in a mirror order when affixed to either the beginning or the end of the verb. This is problematic for the analysis that Romance double object clitics adjoin to each other as a single unit that remains unchanged when interacting with the verbal host. In addition to displaying a different linear order, the pronouns utilized in proclisis and enclisis are also of different phonological forms. We will see that the tense information of the verbal hosts conditions both the difference in order and the difference in form. Furthermore, I will argue that, contrary to the analysis of Standard Italian and other major Romance languages, double object clitics in this dialect of Corsican constitute a split cluster in proclitic position and only form a true cluster in cases of enclisis.

1.1. Dialectal Corsican

This paper presents data collected on the island of Corsica, home of the minor Romance language Corsican. Corsica has historically existed under the jurisdiction of various powers and

---

1 Many thanks are due to my advisors, Dr. Lori Repetti and Dr. Francisco Ordóñez, for their countless pieces of advice and guidance in the production of this paper.
as a sovereign state; except for two brief periods of occupation, it has been part of the Republic of France since 1769 (Corsica, 2013). Corsican is closely related to other Romance languages such as Tuscan, Sardinian, Ligurian, and Gascon, which are spoken in the Mediterranean, Italy, and Southern France. These minority languages are all endangered, as the standard majority languages of the nations of Italy and France are supplanting them.

Because of the mountainous terrain of the island, Corsican communities have existed in sufficient isolation for the development of unique dialects of the language. The data discussed in this paper were collected from two speakers in the mountain town of Corte, located in the center of Corsica. Dr. Francisco Ordóñez of Stony Brook University collected the data in the summer of 2007. The interviews were conducted in English, French, and Italian, with Dr. Ordóñez eliciting utterances in the speakers’ native Corsican. These data now constitute a part of the large database of the Clitics of Romance Languages collected by Dr. Ordóñez and Dr. Lori Repetti in their study of the stress patterns of these languages’ clitic pronouns (Repetti & Ordóñez, 2011).

The speakers, one male and one female, were both adults at the time of the interviews and identified themselves as native speakers of Corsican. I selected the data from these speakers and not others interviewed in Corsica because these speakers, called “Speaker 42” and
“Speaker 43” in the database, display a consistent pattern of object clitics not seen in speakers of all dialects of Corsican.

1.2. Roadmap

Section 2 presents the facts of double object clitic ordering in this dialect of Corsican. Section 3 provides a morphological and syntactic explanation of pronoun forms, focusing on clitic forms. Section 4 provides background on the interactions between clitics, and Section 5 describes clitics’ interaction with their verbal hosts. Section 6 presents an analysis of the clitic forms and ordering observed in the dialect, and Section 7 gives concluding remarks.

2. The Facts: Double object clitic orders in the dialect of Corsican

This dialect of Corsican’s ditransitive verbs reveal an interesting pattern: the dialect’s double object clitic order varies depending on the clitics’ placement in relation to the verb. As is common across the Romance languages, clitics appear preverbally with normal, tensed verbs and postverbally with imperatives\(^2\) and infinitives. However, the pattern of preverbal and postverbal clitics in this dialect of Corsican is unlike that found in most Romance languages.

\[^2\] The standard Romance language prompts of some of the data from our speakers give imperative translations of what look like present tense constructions with proclitics. I suspect
In cases of enclisis, the clitic pronouns appear in the order Dative-Accusative (or Indirect Object-Direct Object), as example (1) shows. This order is widely attested in the Romance languages.

(1)  

a. kompra-mi-la  

buyIMP-meDAT-itACC  

‘Buy it for me.’  

b. da lle li  

giveIMP-himDAT-themACC  

‘Give them to him/her.’  

c. poɾta li lu  

bringIMP-themDAT-itACC  

‘Bring it to them.’  

d. di dir ti lu  

to tellINF-youDAT-itACC  

‘…to tell it to you’

that this may be due to communication errors during the interviews or post hoc transcription errors. If these structures truly are imperatives, then this dialect of Corsican may not require canonical raising of imperatives to high positions. This is not a claim I wish to make. Table A., appended, provides the proclitic data in question, with the Italian and French prompts as they appear in the CRL database.
e. komu lawa- tti- li

how to.washINF-youDAT-themACC

‘...how to wash them for you’

With proclitic placement, the object clitics come in the order Accusative-Dative. This order is widely unattested in other Romance languages, and is illustrated in example (2).

(2) a. u mi wendi

itACC meDAT sell.2.SG

‘You sell it to me.’

b. a li kompri

itACC himDAT buy.2.SG

‘You buy it for him/her/them.’

c. e ñi ñorta

themACC usDAT bring.3.SG

‘S/he brings them to us.’

The ACC-DAT-Verb and Verb-DAT-ACC orders are robust in the two speakers interviewed in Corte. While speakers from other areas of Corsica show flexible clitic order in both positions, these speakers produced only ACC-DAT preverbally and only DAT-ACC postverbally.
In addition to the pronouns' ordering, the examples above also illustrate the differing pronoun forms in proclisis and enclisis. An inventory of the clitics as they appear in each position is shown in Table (1). Blank cells are not attested in the limited data.

Table 1. Accusative and Dative Object Clitics in Proclisis and Enclisis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proclitic</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>Enclitic</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>ACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td></td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>1.SG</td>
<td></td>
<td>mi / me / ma*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.SG</td>
<td></td>
<td>di</td>
<td>2.SG</td>
<td></td>
<td>ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.SG.M</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>li / l'</td>
<td>3.SG.M</td>
<td>li / le</td>
<td>lu / lo*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.SG.F</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>3.SG.F</td>
<td>li / le</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>tfi / d̪i</td>
<td>1.PL</td>
<td>tfi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL.M</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>3.PL.M</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.PL.F</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>3.PL.F</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>le</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Speaker 42 gives one instance of [ma], in free variation with [me] (utterances 93a and 93b).
* 3.SG.M.DAT [l] is observed only once: Speaker 43, utterance 59 [e l 'aː man'da] ‘I want to send them to him’
* 3.SG.M.ACC [lo] is also observed only once; this may be influence from Standard Italian.
Both the dative and accusative clitic forms differ in proclitic and enclitic positions. Obstruents in the dative forms may be voiced in proclitic position, while they are voiceless in enclitic position (see 2.SG proclitic *di* and enclitic *ti*; and 1.PL proclitic *ʤi* and pro-/enclitic *ʧi*). Enclitic first person singular dative *mi* shows some variation in vowel quality where proclitic *mi* does not. There is also a difference between the accusative clitics found in proclisis and those in enclisis: while the proclitics consist of only a vowel, the enclitics have an additional [l]; it is possible that this *l*- is a marker of definiteness. That the Corsican clitics appear in a markedly different phonological form in proclisis than in enclisis suggests that these are different elements altogether. I will take up this discussion in the Analysis section to follow.

3. Pronoun classes: a background

Pronouns come in several classes, depending on the syntactic and semantic restrictions on their use in various contexts. While traditionally divided into strong and deficient pronoun classes, Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) draw at least a three-way partition: Strong pronouns, weak pronouns, and clitic pronouns are distinguishable in their syntax, semantics, morphology, and prosody. For the purposes of this paper we will focus on the syntactic structures and featural make-ups of clitic forms.
3.1. Morpho-syntax

The morphological structure of a pronoun often belies its syntactic structure. Across languages we see the trend that stronger pronominal forms are larger, with more morphological structure than their deficient counterparts (Cardinaletti & Starke, 1999). The makeup of these pronouns suggests that deficient elements contain fewer morphemes than their strong counterparts. Under the hypothesis that morphemes are heads of discrete syntactic projections, a strong pronoun form realizes more heads than a weak form, which in turn realizes more heads than a clitic (Cardinaletti & Starke, 1999).

Additional heads and structural layers are potential sites for housing featural information in the DP, so the size of the syntactic structure dictates the features that may be expressed by a pronoun. The absence of levels of structure triggers not only the morphological differences between pronoun forms but also the syntactic constraints that each pronoun is subjected to. Only strong pronouns may appear in base-generated position, while deficient pronouns are limited to derived positions (Cardinaletti & Starke, 1999). Clitics are often thought to occupy high functional heads around I° or C° (Kayne, 1991), and, as we will discuss later, clitics of different sizes may be attracted to different derived positions in the tree.
3.2. Economy

This selection of pronouns from different classes is motivated by a set of economy constraints (Cardinaletti & Starke, 1999). They say that Minimize Structure – a constraint that states that the smallest possible pronoun should be chosen that allows for interpretability of all necessary phi-features – dictates the choice among pronouns; only when a smaller form is precluded should a larger form be chosen. The syntax will choose the pronoun that possesses the necessary structure to successfully interpret all desired features, but no more. If the conditions for the most reduced clitic form are not met, the tree will select a larger form.

4. Clitics interacting with clitics

4.1. Clitics in combination

After being generated as full complements, objects of the verb may undergo the process of pronominalization. For reasons that will be discussed later in this section, object pronouns raise to higher positions in the tree. In their surface positions, object clitics occur in largely predictable combinations. Because I take all of our relevant Corsican object pronouns to be clitics, I will focus the discussion here on the interaction between clitics. This section will
provide a review of the commonly held hypotheses about clitic groups’ internal constituency structure, their ordering, and the factors motivating this ordering.

4.2. Internal constituency structure: Kayne’s bipartition

Kayne (1994) introduced some structural options for adjoining multiple clitics that have been widely adopted in the literature (Terzi, 1999; Cardinaletti, 2008; et al.). He proposed that the linear order in which double clitics arise must result from one of two structures: Either one clitic adjoins to the other and their complex to a functional head, as in (3), or each clitic adjoins to its own functional head, as in (4). Trees (3) and (4) are adapted from Terzi (1999); following her notation, $FP$ stands for functional projection.

(3)  
```
  cl1  F2  cl1
     /   |   /   |
    cl2  cl1 F2  VP
```

(4)  
```
  cl1  F1  F2
     /   |   |
    cl2  F1  VP
```

$$FP$$
The structure in (3) gives rise to what we call clitic clusters, because the clustered elements are dominated by a single head and in many ways behave as a unit; the structure in (4) does not give rise to true clitic clusters (Terzi, 1999).

4.3. Clitic-inherent factors driving movement

There are several factors inherent to clitics that drive their movement. As nominal elements, they must be assigned a case and phi-features. The clitics’ pursuit of checking these various features affects their surface order by dictating where each will land in its final position. I will discuss case and phi-features in turn.

4.3.1. Case features

Case checking motivates the first step of clitic movement (Laenzlinger, 1993; Cardinaletti & Starke, 1999; Cardinaletti, 2008; et al.) In general, direct objects are marked with accusative case and indirect objects with dative case, and they must move into local relationships with case features in order to be marked.
4.3.2. Phi-features

In addition to checking case features, pronouns must also check phi-features such as person, number, and gender. The functional heads bearing phi-features occur in the high portion of the clause (Cardinaletti, 2008) and may necessitate secondary pronoun movement(s) to the high position.

Different clitics have different featural make-ups. First and second person clitics carry person and number features but not gender features (Kayne, 2000). Third person clitics are marked for number and gender, but there is some debate as to whether they are marked for person or are assigned a default person feature (Cardinaletti, 2008). This dialect of Corsican appears to select clitics with different featural make-ups in proclitic and enclitic contexts. Proclitic third person accusative forms (u, a, i, and e) encode gender and number features; their enclitic counterparts seem to additionally encode definiteness. While third person accusative clitics make clear number distinctions, third person dative forms seem not to: the dative pronoun li is ambiguous with regard to gender and number.

4.4. Adjunction Sites/Domains

There are multiple domains at which clitics adjoin, and these multiple adjunction sites are the subject of current research. As I will discuss further in Section 6, a sentence’s tense
information has a large influence on the amount of functional structure available for elements such as negation or clitics; the availability of some cliticization sites swings with the presence of finite inflection, negation, and feature-attracting morphemes in the C-domain (Shlonsky, 2000), suggesting that these positions are made available when a tensed verb projects additional structure above TP. Additional functional sites may exist as well; Tortora (2010) proposes a low clitic adjunction domain above the VP in her cartographic study of Italian clitics.

5. Clitics interacting with verbs

5.1. Proclisis and Enclisis

Proclisis refers to structures in which clitics precede their verbal host linearly, while enclisis refers to structures in which clitics follow the verb. (5) provides examples of Corsican proclisis (5a) and enclisis (5b).

(5) a. [a li portate]

itACC himDAT bring.2.PL

‘You bring it to him/her/them.’
b. [porta- li- la]

bringIMP-himDAT-itACC

‘Bring it to him/her/them.’

Enclisis is formed by a single structural configuration and is the preferred structure cross-linguistically. Proclisis, on the other hand, is an umbrella term for several distinct structures which are obtained in contexts in which enclisis is disallowed (Shlonsky, 2000).

Clitic clusters formed on a single head, as in (6), can appear in both enclisis and proclisis; clusters formed on adjacent heads, as in (7), can only appear as proclitics (Kayne, 1994; Cardinaletti, 2008).

(6) \[ \text{FP}\]
    \[ \text{F}^\circ \]
    \[ \text{cl1} \]
    \[ \text{F}^\circ \]
    \[ \text{cl2} \]
    \[ \text{cl1} \]

(7) \[ \text{FP1}\]
    \[ \text{F}^\circ 1\]
    \[ \text{FP2}\]
    \[ \text{cl1} \]
    \[ \text{F}^\circ 1\]
    \[ \text{F}^\circ 2\]
    \[ \text{cl2} \]
    \[ \text{F}^\circ 2\]
5.2. Motivations

What motivates the ordering of clitics in relation to their verbal host? We have already seen that clitic-internal features force the clitics to raise out of their base positions, but features of the verb force it to move as well. In this section I will discuss the verb movement that contributes to proclisis and enclisis.

5.2.1. Tense/Finiteness

Verbs with normal tense are often analyzed as raising to T° to check their tense feature. However, verbs with so-called deficient tense – including infinitives, gerunds, and imperatives – do not have a finite tense feature at T° and must proceed higher in the tree in search of tense information. Many theories assume that enclisis arises by verb movement up across the clitic(s) for tense or illocutionary reasons (Kayne, 1991; Cardinaletti, 2008; et al.). The distribution of normally and deficiently tensed verbs correlates with the appearance of proclisis and enclisis; clitics in Spanish, Italian, and Catalan are generally realized as proclitics on finite verbs and as enclitics on non-finite verbs. Indeed, enclisis on imperative verbs occurs across language families (Rooryck, 1992). It appears that the successive movement of non-finite verbs beyond T° moves them over the clitic adjunction sites high in the clause. Following Terzi (1999) and
others, I assume a preliminary structure as in (8), where clitics adjoin to a set of functional projections at FP.

(8)

The raising of deficiently tensed verbs beyond $T^\circ$ has multiple potential motivations, notably “non-realization” and illocutionary features. Infinitive verbs’ movement to $C^\circ$ may be motivated by their *irrealis* modality, otherwise stated as [-realized] (Stowell, 1982; Rooryck, 1992). This modality applies to infinitives, whose actions are, by their nature, not temporally realized. Imperatives, on the other hand, involve head movement to $C^\circ$ for reasons generally attributed to illocutionary force (Kayne, 1991; Rooryck, 1992; Terzi, 1999).

5.3. Structural specifications

Clitics initially adjoin to the tree at a functional head to the left of (i.e. above) the verb. When the verb raises to adjoin to $Agr^\circ$ and $T^\circ$, it picks up agreement and tense features (Rooryck, 1992). The functional projections at which the clitics are adjoined are above this
realm. By Terzi’s (1999) *Shortest Move Requirement* in which heads stop at intervening heads on their way up the tree, a verb raising beyond T° must pass through these functional projections’ heads. Verbs left-adjoin (or left-incorporate) into the clitics housed at these heads. After this adjunction, the complex – verb-clitic and clitic-clitic alike – moves as a unit (Kayne, 1991; Terzi, 1999).

6. Analysis

There are two main issues to address regarding the Corsican dialect’s double object constructions: the forms of the pronouns and their ordering. In both of these respects, this dialect of Corsican diverges from Standard Italian and other regional languages. Italian exhibits what are often analyzed as uniform clitic clusters that remain unchanged regardless of their position in relation to the verb, as in (9).

(9)  

a. compramelo

buyIMP-meDAT-itACC

‘Buy it for me.’

b. me lo compri

meDAT itACC buy2.SG

‘You buy it for me.’
These clitic clusters likely adjoin to a single head, as in Kayne (1994), and may even enter the tree as a single lexicalized unit (Ordóñez & Repetti, forthcoming). However, the marked difference in the Corsican dialect’s clitic ordering suggests that this is not the structure found in Corsican. I argue that, based on evidence from their ordering and form, double object clitics form a cluster only in enclitic position and remain in separate functional projections in proclitic position. I will argue that the tense information encoded in the verb gives rise to different available functional projections, allowing for the selection of different clitic pronouns in different positions. Furthermore, the movement driven by this tense information gives rise to the observed reversal in clitic order.

6.1. Phonological form of the pronouns

The pronouns that occur in contexts of proclisis and enelisis are of different phonological forms, and, I propose, of different identities. Table (1), repeated below as Table (2), presents the proclitic and enclitic forms of the pronouns.
The dative pronouns exhibit two differences in proclitic versus enclitic positions. First, the first person dative clitic *mi* is constant in proclitic positions but shows variation in its vowel quality in enclitic position\(^3\). Second, obstruents in dative pronouns are voiceless in enclitic position (i.e. 2.SG *ti* and 1.PL *ʧi*), while they are voiced (2.SG *di*) or optionally voiced (1.PL *ʧi*, *ʤi*) in proclitic position.

\(^3\) This variation appears more or less free, and I will not make any claims about its significance.
The accusative, or direct object, pronouns also take different forms in proclitic and enclitic positions: the [l] of the enclitic forms is conspicuously absent in proclisis. It is unlikely that this difference in form is the result of a phonological process enacted on a single pronoun form; cross-linguistically, a constraint against a consonantal onset is not attested, making it very unlikely that what surfaces as [u mi da] ‘he/she gives it to me’ has an underlying form of /lu mi da/. This phonological explanation is rendered even less likely in light of licit structures such as [li ditʃe a verita] ‘he/she tells him the truth’ in which no such deletion occurs.4

We are thus likely seeing two different clitic elements in these two contexts. While Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) discuss three classes of pronouns – strong, weak, and clitic – their analysis does not preclude further distinction into four or more classes. Italian and Neapolitan also possess (at least) two classes of clitic pronouns, as example (10)5 illustrates.

---

4 An alternative analysis is that an underlying /u/ receives an epenthetic [l] when following the dative clitic to avoid hiatus, such that the enclitic cluster /me-u/ is realized as [me-lu]. Because accusative enclitics almost invariably attach to word-final vowels, it is difficult to find evidence to dispute this possibility. However, on a large scale, Corsican does not appear to repair hiatus with insertion of an epenthetic [l]; vowel sequences such as [va:iʃi] ‘go there’ and [e li a] ‘(s/he) gives them to him’ are acceptable. Lastly, cross-linguistic similarities with other Romance clitics suggest that the l- is not epenthetic but is a contentful and inherent piece of these pronouns.

5 These examples are adapted from notes by Lori Repetti and Francisco Ordóñez for their talk entitled “On the morphological restriction of hosting clitics in Italian Dialects and Sardinian,” Italian Dialect Meeting at Leiden, the Netherlands, May 24-26 2012.
Following Cardinaletti and Starke (1999), we assume that different positions in syntactic structure may select different pronoun forms based on the collection of features that need to be realized in the given context.

Both the voicing of the obstruents in preverbal datives and the missing definite marking on preverbal accusatives may be signs of more deficient preverbal elements. The obstruent voicing in proclisis may be a sign of a weaker element, as intervocalic voicing affects it but not its stronger enclitic counterpart. If the l- in accusative enclitics is thought to contain information about definiteness, then the accusative enclitics probably contain definiteness, gender, and number information, whereas the proclitic forms only contain gender and number information; the /u/ and /lu/ of proclisis and enclisis are not items of the same kind. I propose
that in enclitic position with imperative verb forms a larger clitic is selected, whereas in tensed contexts more deficient proclitics appear. If Romance clitics generally cluster together and appear in the same order regardless of their orientation with the verb, the ordering and phonological differences observed in Corsican suggest both that the pronouns are of different form in proclitic and enclitic contexts and that they do not cluster together on the same head.

6.2. Adjunction to different functional projections

How do we explain the selection of different pronoun forms in proclitic and enclitic contexts? A possible answer is that the clitics have been attracted to different adjunction sites in the form of different functional projections.

The presence of these functional projections is likely conditioned by the tense information of the verb (Rizzi, 1993). We observe several constraints on non-finite constructions: Kayne and Pollock observe that infinitives never have a subject clitic, which is taken to be housed at a high projection (Kayne & Pollock, 2001); infinitives show a general lack of negation; and there are more possible clitic combinations in finite contexts than in non-finite ones. Finite contexts also seem to select the most reduced clitic forms: across the Romance languages, there is a strong trend that tensed verbs select smaller clitic forms than do tense-deficient verbs; this empirical observation is not well analyzed in the literature but is
robust and potentially telling. These facts about the distribution of clitics and other elements are sometimes explained by proposing that finite verbs project more available positions than do non-finite verbs, and that these positions are quite high in the structure, above the realm of T°. The absence of subject clitics and negation with non-finite verbs may be due to the verbs simply not projecting the necessary structure to house these elements.

High clitic projections with finite verbs may only attract clitics containing certain features, to the exclusion of others. A similar distribution of clitics to that found in the dialect of Corsican is found in Portuguese: preverbal direct object clitics may surface in the form of a single vowel, but enclitic direct objects with infinitives come in the forms lo, la, etc. The finite context’s high projection may attract a clitic containing only gender and number features, while the projection utilized by the infinitive attracts a larger clitic that probably additionally encodes definiteness. Cardinaletti and Starke’s (1999) economy conditions propose that the syntax selects the smallest pronoun available to the structure. Following this reasoning, the selection of larger pronoun forms in Corsican enclisis suggests the lack of a projection that could select the smaller, more deficient form.

Based on the cross-linguistic evidence and the existing conclusions about it, I take Corsican finite verbs to project more structure in the high part of the tree than tense-deficient imperative verbs. This additional structure may contain high clitic adjunction sites that select
the extremely deficient vocalic clitics. These positions being absent in non-finite contexts, the structure must make use of lower projections that select larger clitic forms.

6.3. Split Clusters

The second part of my proposal is that pronoun clitics in this dialect of Corsican adjoin at separate functional projections, and not at a single head as in Italian. There is historical precedence for the idea that Corsican clitics do not constitute clusters in the way that Italian clitics do. Old Italian and Old French exhibited the accusative-dative order of pronoun clitics that we see in modern dialectal Corsican. In the accusative-dative order, the two clitics were likely adjoined to separate heads and constituted a split cluster (Pescarini, 2013). However, many Italo- and Gallo-Romance languages underwent an evolution that targeted these clitics. In this historical change, the dative clitic began to move and left-adjoin to the accusative clitic, reversing the clitics’ order and forming a true cluster on a single syntactic head (Pescarini, 2013). Pescarini cites a pair of sentences from Old Italian from the 13th century, during the period in which both orders were synchronically documented; I adapt his example (1) as (11) below.
Some languages, but not others, evolved from the archaic accusative-dative order to the opposite dative-accusative order. Ligurian does not exhibit this diachronic change (Pescarini, 2013), and this dialect of Corsican also appears not to. Indeed, looking at historical evidence from older stages of the Romance languages, it seems plausible that this dialect of Corsican simply escaped this change and retains the archaic structure: the accusative clitic is adjoined in a separate projection above the dative clitic, and the two do not form a constituent. Monachesi (1996) predicts a mirror order of clitics in proclisis and enclisis if they were to adjoin to separate heads, and this is exactly what we see in this dialect.

6.4. Movement and linearization

Following this analysis, we can presume structures similar to (12) and (13) for the clitic adjunction sites in proclitic (12) and enclitic (13) contexts. Here I must explicitly note some
things. First, I have proposed that finite contexts project additional structure in the high part of the clause, and that this high position is able to select the most deficient clitic form. However, I do not make a claim about precisely where in the hierarchy the two clitic adjunction domains fall. My trees are simplified to include only the projections relevant to the particular structure; what are theoretically two fields of functional projections (FP) are collapsed for simplicity, and I depict only the field of FPs utilized by the particular structure\(^6\). While the trees look alike, they do not assume identical adjunction sites.

(12)

![Diagram of tree structure](image)

Tree (12) illustrates the proposed underlying structure of Corsican proclitic contexts. Here, the accusative and dative direct object clitics adjoin to a high functional field projected

\(^6\) See Figure D, appended, for another way of visualizing the proposed sets of functional projections utilized in tensed and tense-deficient contexts.
by the tensed verb. I take the accusative and dative clitics to adjoin to separate heads, with the accusative clitic superior to the dative clitic. Both the order of adjunction and the adjunction to separate heads are compatible with existing analyses of Romance languages such as Old French, Old Italian, and Ligurian (Pescarini, 2013). These high fields to which the clitics adjoin select highly deficient clitic forms. The verb is attracted from its base position to check the tense feature housed at T°. Once checked, the tensed verb remains at T°. It does not raise further and does not incorporate into the clitics, so the clitics are linearized in the order in which they adjoined to the structure: cliticACC-cliticDAT-Verb.

(13)

The imperative verb’s lack of tense information also causes the different surface order of the clitics in (13). When this verb raises to T° it is unable to check its tense feature and must continue higher in search of tense information (Kayne, 1991). By Terzi’s (1999) Shortest Move
Requirement, the verb must proceed through intervening head positions in its path up the structure; the verb left-adjoins to the first clitic it encounters, the dative clitic. Still unsatiated in terms of tense, the complex of verb-cliticDAT raises and adjoins to the accusative clitic. The entire complex of verb-cliticDAT-cliticACC raises to C° to check a sort of illocutionary feature associated with imperatives. This movement yields a cluster composed of the verb and its two object clitics and accounts for the observed surface order.

Both the forms and the ordering of the accusative and dative clitics are different in cases of enclisis, and I argue that these differences are both due to the lack of normal tense information. I propose that the clitics make use of a lower set of functional projections that are available to the deficiently tensed imperative verb (Rizzi, 1993). The selection of the most deficient clitics having been precluded by the absence of high functional heads that attract them, the choice of morphologically and syntactically larger clitic forms is allowed (Cardinaletti & Starke, 1999).

7. Conclusion

Double object clitic constructions in a dialect of Corsican exhibit a Dative-Accusative order postverbally and an Accusative-Dative order preverbally. This pattern is unusual when we take Standard Italian and Castilian Spanish as models, as they both show the more common
Dative-Accusative order regardless of position. However, when we examine the Corsican clitic data syntactically, phonologically, and historically, a coherent picture of their structure emerges.

The ordering of clitic pronouns and their placement in relation to the verb correlate with the tense features of the verb: Accusative-Dative proclitics appear with normally tensed verbs, and Dative-Accusative enclitics appear with tense-deficient verbs. This distinction lends itself to the classic hypothesis that tense-deficient verbs raise higher in the tree than tensed verbs; it appears that as Corsican imperatives raise to C°, they pass through the clitic adjunction site and sequentially incorporate into the clitics, thereby reversing the clitics’ surface order.

This reversal of surface order would not be possible if Corsican double object clitics adjoined to a single functional head, as they are presumed to do in Standard Italian. Making use of Kayne’s (1994) second available double clitic structure, I propose that the accusative and dative clitics of this dialect of Corsican adjoin to the tree in separate functional projections, with the accusative superior to the dative. Historical evidence suggests that this may have been the standard double object clitic order in several nearby languages, not least of which is Old Italian. A historical change reversing the Accusative-Dative order seems not to have affected this dialect of Corsican.
Based on phonological evidence, I also propose that the clitic pronouns found in proclisis and enclisis are not of the same type; both the accusative and the dative proclitics appear to be more deficient than their enclitic counterparts. This fact, too, can be explained by the tense differences of their verbal hosts. It is often supposed that tensed verbs project more functional structure in the tree than deficiently tensed verbs, and that this high structure is a potential host site for small clitics. I propose that normally tensed Corsican verbs project high structure that selects extremely deficient pronouns, while infinitive and imperative forms lack the structure and must utilize larger pronoun forms at lower adjunction sites.
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Appendix

Figure A. Corsica Situated in the Mediterranean Sea

Source: http://ois.truman.edu

Figure B. Topography and Major Towns of Corsica

Source: http://www.worldatlas.com
Figure C. Major and Minor Romance Languages and their Territories

Figure D. Representation of Proposed Functional Projections Selecting Different Clitic Classes in Tensed (FP$_3$ and FP$_4$) and Tense-Deficient (FP$_1$ and FP$_2$) Contexts
# Tables A-C. Double Object Constructions in Dialect of Corsican

## Table A. Normally Tensed Verbs* with Proclitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
<th>Standard Romance Lang. Prompt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>41b</td>
<td>u mi 'borta</td>
<td>you bring it(M) to me</td>
<td>portaglielo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>e ti 'borta</td>
<td>you bring them(F) to us</td>
<td>portacele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>u mi ven'dite</td>
<td>you sell it(M) to me</td>
<td>vendetemelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>a mi ven'deta</td>
<td>you sell it(F) to me</td>
<td>vendetemela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>u mi kum'prate</td>
<td>you buy it(M) for me</td>
<td>compratemelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>a mi kum'prate</td>
<td>you buy it(F) for me</td>
<td>compratemela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>i mi kum'prate</td>
<td>you buy them(M) for me</td>
<td>compratemeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>e mi kum'prate</td>
<td>you buy them(F) for me</td>
<td>compratemele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>a li por'tate</td>
<td>you bring it(F) to him/her/them</td>
<td>comprateglielo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>a li 'olu man'da</td>
<td>I want to send it(F) to him/her/them</td>
<td>voglio mandarglielo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>u mi 'kompri</td>
<td>you are buying it(M) for me</td>
<td>me lo compri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>a li 'kompru</td>
<td>you are buying it(F) for him/her/them</td>
<td>glielo compri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>a li 'kompri</td>
<td>s/he is buying it(F) for him/her/them</td>
<td>gliela compri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>u mi ‘”endi</td>
<td>you sell it(M) to me</td>
<td>me lo vendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>a mi ‘”ende</td>
<td>you sell it(F) to me</td>
<td>me la vendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>e mi ‘”endi</td>
<td>you sell them(M) for me</td>
<td>me li vendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>e mi ‘”endi</td>
<td>you sell them(F) to me</td>
<td>me le vendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>e mi ‘”endi</td>
<td>you sell them(F) to me</td>
<td>vendimele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>34b</td>
<td>a mi ‘kompri</td>
<td>buy it(F) for me</td>
<td>compramel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>e di o</td>
<td>I give them(F) to you</td>
<td>je dois te le donner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>e l 'aja man'da</td>
<td>I want to send them(F) to him</td>
<td>je veux les lui envoyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>e li a</td>
<td>he gives them(F) to him/her/them</td>
<td>il les lui donne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>a li a</td>
<td>she gives it(F) to him</td>
<td>elle la lui donne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>a dji a</td>
<td>he gives it(F) to us</td>
<td>il nous la donne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Footnote 2 for explanation of potential disparities in English glosses and standard Romance translations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
<th>Standard Romance Lang. Prompt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>'dammelu</td>
<td>give it(M) to me</td>
<td>dammelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>10a</td>
<td>dammili</td>
<td>give them(M) to me</td>
<td>dammeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>10b</td>
<td>dettimeli</td>
<td>give them(M) to me</td>
<td>dammeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>dammila</td>
<td>give it(F) to me</td>
<td>dammela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>dammile</td>
<td>give them(F) to me</td>
<td>dammele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>dalleli</td>
<td>give them(M) to him</td>
<td>dà i libri a Gianni/daglieli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>dallele</td>
<td>give them(F) to him</td>
<td>dà le borse a Gianni/dagliele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>dimmila</td>
<td>tell it(F) to me</td>
<td>dimmela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>dammilu (short [l])</td>
<td>give it(M) to me</td>
<td>dammelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>37b</td>
<td>kompramelu</td>
<td>buy it(M) for me</td>
<td>compramelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>kompramela</td>
<td>buy it(F) for me</td>
<td>compramela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>kompramili</td>
<td>buy them(M) for me</td>
<td>comprameli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>kompramile</td>
<td>buy them(F) for me</td>
<td>compramele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>mettitila</td>
<td>put it(F) on (yourself)</td>
<td>mettiti la giacca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>portamelu</td>
<td>bring it(M) to me</td>
<td>portamelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>portalilu</td>
<td>bring it(M) to us</td>
<td>portacelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>dammilu</td>
<td>give it(M) to me</td>
<td>dammelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>dammili</td>
<td>give them(M) to me</td>
<td>dammeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>dammila</td>
<td>give it(F) to me</td>
<td>dammela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>dammile</td>
<td>give them(F) to me</td>
<td>dammele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>dallilo</td>
<td>give it(M) to him/her/them</td>
<td>daglielo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>dallile</td>
<td>give them(F) to him/her/them</td>
<td>dagliela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>dallile</td>
<td>give them(F) to him/her/them</td>
<td>donne-les lui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>kompramilu</td>
<td>buy it(M) for me</td>
<td>compramelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>34a</td>
<td>kompramila</td>
<td>buy it(F) for me</td>
<td>compramela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>portalilu</td>
<td>bring it(M) to him/her/them</td>
<td>portaglialeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>portalilu</td>
<td>bring it(M) to him/her/them</td>
<td>portaglialeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>portalili</td>
<td>give them(M) to them</td>
<td>porta loro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>datfilia</td>
<td>give it(F) to us</td>
<td>donne la nous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>dallilu</td>
<td>give it(M) to him</td>
<td>donne le lui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C. Infinitive Verbs with Enclitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
<th>Standard Romance Prompt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 92a</td>
<td>par 'diṭilu</td>
<td>in order to say it(M) to us</td>
<td>per dircelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 92b</td>
<td>pa 'diṭilu</td>
<td>in order to say it(M) to us</td>
<td>per dircelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 93a</td>
<td>par kum'pramalu</td>
<td>in order to buy it(M) for me</td>
<td>per comprarmelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 93b</td>
<td>pa kum'pramelu (short [l])</td>
<td>in order to buy it(M) for me</td>
<td>per comprarmelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 94</td>
<td>par 'dattilu</td>
<td>in order to give it(M) to you</td>
<td>per dartelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 95</td>
<td>par 'dallilu</td>
<td>in order to give it(M) to them</td>
<td>per darglielo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 99</td>
<td>ě in 'traʧa di 'vamelu</td>
<td>s/he is doing it(M) for me</td>
<td>me lo sta facendo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 100</td>
<td>ě in 'traʧa di 'dirtilu</td>
<td>s/he is saying it(M) to me</td>
<td>me lo sta dicendo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 136</td>
<td>ku'menʧi a 'skrivemilu (short [l])</td>
<td>you are beginning to write it(M) to me</td>
<td>cominci a scrivermelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 141</td>
<td>un a so 'mikka 'komu la'wattili</td>
<td>I don't know how to wash them(M) for you</td>
<td>je ne sais pas comment te les laver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 142</td>
<td>un a so 'mikka 'komu kum'prattilu</td>
<td>I don't know how to buy it(M) for you</td>
<td>non so come comprartelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 89</td>
<td>un sɔ 'nikka 'kume 'attili</td>
<td>I don't know how s/he gave them(M) to you</td>
<td>je ne sais pas comment il est donné</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 91</td>
<td>un sɔ 'kume a'ja la'wattili</td>
<td>I don't know how to wash them(M) for you</td>
<td>je ne sais pas comment te les laver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 93</td>
<td>sentsa 'dallili</td>
<td>without giving them(M) to him</td>
<td>sans le lui donner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>