

# Clitic Doubling and Agreement in French Hyper-Complex Inversion

Richard S. Kayne  
New York University

July, 2016

## 1. HCI

Standard French has, in root interrogatives:<sup>1</sup>

(1) Est-il heureux? ('is he happy')

This inversion applies only if the subject is a pronominal clitic:<sup>2</sup>

(2) \*Est Jean heureux? ('is J happy')

French also allows a variant of (1) in which a non-dislocated preverbal subject co-occurs with the post-verbal pronominal subject clitic. Kayne (1972) informally called this 'Complex Inversion' (henceforth CI):

(3) Cela est-il vrai? ('that is it true')

In the appropriate register, CI, as in (3), is productive. Relevant to this paper is the fact that CI is compatible with object clitics (henceforth OCLs):

(4) Cela la gêne-t-il? ('that her bothers it' = 'does that bother her?')

Central to this paper is an important observation due to Morin (1985), namely that alongside (sometimes instead of<sup>3</sup>) (4) a large number of speakers also accept, with the same interpretation as (4):<sup>4</sup>

(5) Cela la gêne-t-elle? ('that her bothers she' = 'does that bother her?')

in which the postverbal nominative subject clitic (here *elle*) agrees in gender (and number) with the preverbal accusative OCL (here *la*). This contrasts with ordinary CI, as in (3) and (4), in which the postverbal subject clitic *il* agrees with the preverbal subject *cela*. I shall use for (5) the informal term Hyper-Complex Inversion (henceforth HCI).

## 2. HCI as clitic doubling.

-----

<sup>1</sup>In what follows, 'standard French' is abbreviated as 'French'.

<sup>2</sup> French has another, distinct inversion construction informally called 'stylistic inversion' that sometimes (but not in yes-no questions) overlaps with subject clitic inversion - see Kayne and Pollock (2001) and references cited there.

<sup>3</sup>See note 19.

<sup>4</sup>For further background, see Kayne and Pollock (2012; 2014), from which early sections of this paper draw freely. HCI sentences are best when the lexical subject contains no lexical noun, as with *cela*; the HCI examples in the text have feminine SCL *elle*, but there are also acceptable examples of HCI that have masculine SCL *il* agreeing with masculine OCL *le* in the presence of a feminine lexical subject:

i) Cette affaire/chose le gêne-t-il? ('that business/thing him bothers *it*' = 'does that business/thing bother him?')

In many ways HCI and CI are similar,<sup>5</sup> so that one can think of HCI as a subcase of CI characterized by the agreement, in HCI, between subject clitic (henceforth SCL) and OCL (and by the non-agreement, in HCI, between SCL and preverbal subject).<sup>6</sup>

Both CI and HCI can be thought of as instances of clitic doubling, i.e. as having something in common with the well-known dative clitic doubling found across Spanish. One key difference is that CI and HCI centrally involve not dative clitics but rather nominative ones (SCLs).<sup>7</sup>

Let me now adopt the ‘complex constituent’ approach to French CI clitic doubling proposed in Kayne (1972, sect. 3).<sup>8</sup> Thus in a CI example like (4) the DP *cela* and the SCL *il* start out within a phrase (a complex DP, in more recent terms) that excludes the verb (and the object):<sup>9</sup>

(6) ...[cela il] gêne la

By extension, in HCI examples like (5), the SCL *elle* starts out paired with the OCL, rather than with the lexical subject:

(7) ...cela gêne [la elle]

The agreement seen in CI/HCI is in this way reduced to agreement (in gender and number) within a complex DP. (In both (4) and (5) the complex DP is split apart in the course of the derivation.)

Contrary to CI, simple SCL inversion (henceforth SCLI) of the sort seen earlier in (1) has no HCI-like counterpart that would correspond to (5). Note first that SCLI is compatible with an OCL:

(8) La gêne-t-il? (‘her bothers it/he’ = ‘does he/it bother her?’)

Here *la* and *il* correspond to distinct arguments. If there existed an HCI-like counterpart, then agreement between SCL and OCL would be possible, keeping the interpretation constant. That is not, however, possible in (8). The following is well-formed, but not with the interpretation of (8):

(9) La gêne-t-elle? (‘her bothers she/it’ = ‘does she/it bother her?’)<sup>10</sup>

The reason that (9) cannot be related to (8) in the way that (5) is related to (4) is the following. In (5), *elle* can be taken to be a double of *la* (both then being part of the object argument), since there is still *cela* to fill the role of subject argument. Whereas in (9), if we

-----

<sup>5</sup>For example, both are restricted to root contexts lacking any complementizer, both are limited to interrogatives and some affective contexts, both have the property that the postverbal pronoun must be a clitic. For additional details on CI, see Pollock (2006).

<sup>6</sup>There also exist instances of HCI in which the SCL agrees with a preposed wh-phrase; these will be set aside in this paper.

<sup>7</sup> On the nominative status of French subject clitics, see Napoli (1981) and Kayne and Pollock (2001, sect. 5).

<sup>8</sup>Cf. Uriagereka (1995, 81) on Spanish.

<sup>9</sup>This complex DP approach to clitic doubling has something in common with Szabolcsi’s (1983; 1994) proposal for simple possession sentences like (the Hungarian counterpart of) *John has a sister*, according to which (by transposition to English) the possessor *John* originates within a DP containing *a sister*. Cf. Kayne (1993) and Boneh and Sichel (2010).

<sup>10</sup>A counterpart of this example appears to be possible in the North Italian dialect (close to Paduan) discussed by Penello (2003; 2007 (11b)). The contrast with French might be related to that dialect’s being a partial pro-drop language; see also Roberts (1993) and Pollock (2006) on Valdôtain dialects.

were to take *elle* to be a double of *la*, there would be nothing left to fill the role of subject argument.<sup>11</sup>

### 3. A restriction concerning SCLs.

When the preverbal subject is itself a SCL, neither CI nor HCI is possible.<sup>12</sup> Thus alongside:

(10) *Ils la voient.* ('they her see')

with SCL *ils*, French allows SCLi:

(11) *La voient-ils?*

but neither CI:

(12) \**Ils la voient-ils?*

nor HCI:

(13) \**Ils la voient-elle?*

### 4. The *-t-* morpheme.

The sharp deviance of (12) and (13) can be thought of as reflecting the fact that French cannot license two SCLs in one simple sentence, as opposed to French being able, in CI/HCI, to license one (postverbal) SCL and one (preverbal) lexical subject DP at the same time. Setting aside left- and right-dislocation, we can see that such double licensing is possible only if the SCL is postverbal. This is shown using CI in the following pair of examples:

(14) *Cela est-il vrai?* ('that is it true')

(15) \**Cela il est vrai.*

Similarly for HCI we have:

(16) *Cela la gêne-t-elle?* ('that her bothers *t* she' = 'does that bother her?')

(17) \**Cela elle la gêne.*

Let us take (15) and (17) to be excluded for the following reason. Preverbal SCLs and preverbal non-dislocated lexical subject DPs are, in French,<sup>13</sup> Case-licensed by a functional head that can license only one of them in a given simple sentence.

If so, then postverbal SCLs, as in (14) and (16), must have access to an extra licenser, one that is not available to preverbal subjects of any type. In the spirit of Pollock (2006), let us take the *-t-* morpheme of CI and HCI (seen clearly in (16)) to play a key role in licensing the postverbal subject clitic.<sup>14</sup> This is plausible since there is without exception a pronounced *-t-* immediately preceding the postverbal SCL in both CI and HCI.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>Since French is not a null subject language of the Italian sort. The text proposal is in the spirit of Morin (1985, 796).

<sup>12</sup>As opposed to the dialect studied by Penello (2003; 2007). The popular French *-ti* mentioned by Morin (1985, 794) is also compatible with preverbal subject clitics.

<sup>13</sup>As opposed to various dialects in northern France and in northern Italy; on the latter, see Poletto (2000) and references cited there.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. also Schoorlemmer (2006).

<sup>15</sup>A more syntax-friendly French orthography would arguably write (14) as:

(i) '*Cela est-t-il vrai?*'

in which only one *t* would be pronounced, in a way consistent with general properties of French phonology.

## 5. Remnant movement and *-t-*.

Thinking of the limitation of this *-t-* to root contexts, of a partial similarity to Germanic complementizer agreement<sup>16</sup>, and of Shlonsky (1994), let us take *-t-* to be a morpheme located above IP, somewhere in the Comp area, in Rizzi's (1997) sense. Of importance now are two properties of *-t-*. The first, already briefly discussed, is that it participates in the Case-licensing of the following SCL (found in the projection just below it).

The second important property of this *-t-* is that it attracts to its Spec a phrase containing the lexical subject plus the finite verb (along with any intervening OCLs). In (16), for example, *-t-* attracts the phrase '[cela la gêne]', as indicated in the following derivation:

(18) cela gêne [la elle] --> OCL movement (pied-piping the SCL)<sup>17</sup>

cela [la elle]<sub>i</sub> gêne t<sub>i</sub> --> raising of SCL<sup>18</sup>

elle<sub>j</sub> cela [la t<sub>j</sub>]<sub>i</sub> gêne t<sub>j</sub> --> merger of *-t-*

t elle<sub>j</sub> cela [la t<sub>j</sub>]<sub>i</sub> gêne t<sub>j</sub> --> remnant IP movement

[cela [la t<sub>j</sub>]<sub>i</sub> gêne t<sub>j</sub>]<sub>k</sub> t elle<sub>j</sub> t<sub>k</sub>

with the last step involving remnant IP movement essentially as in Pollock (2006).<sup>19</sup>

## 6. HCI and clitic climbing.

All the CI and HCI examples given so far that contain an OCL have had that OCL (*la*) preceding the SCL (*il* or *elle*):<sup>20</sup>

(19) Cela la gêne-t-il? = CI

(20) Cela la gêne-t-elle? = HCI

CI readily allows a SCL to precede an unrelated OCL, given some embedding:

(21) Cela va-t-il la gêner? ('that is-going-to it her bother' = 'is that going to bother her?')

In (21), SCL *il* precedes OCL *la*, with which it does not agree and with which it is derivationally unrelated.

<sup>16</sup>For discussion, see, for example, Gruber (2008). Why Germanic 'complementizer agreement' is (apparently) limited to the 'OV' Germanic languages needs to be accounted for - see Koopman (2005a, note 25).

<sup>17</sup>On this step, see in part Kayne (2002, sect. 9). The subsequent SCL-raising step recalls Caha (2010).

<sup>18</sup>The raising of SCL across *cela* leads to a relativized minimality question. It may be that SCL and DP count as sufficiently different (which might lead to an alternative account of the double SCL restriction discussed earlier, if moving one SCL across another is prohibited).

<sup>19</sup>For HCI sentences in which the SCL is followed by other material, as in:

(i) Cela la remplit-elle de joie. ('that her fills-she of joy' = 'does that fill her with joy?')  
that material, here *de joie*, will need to be scrambled out prior to the remnant movement in question, much as in many derivations in Koopman and Szabolcsi (2000), though there's some tension with the use to which scrambling was put in Kayne (1998).

<sup>20</sup>Left open in this paper is the question why some speakers accept only the HCI variant of such pairs (cf. Morin (1985, note 13)). This may be related to the fact that Dominique Sportiche, who accepts (p.c.) both (19) and (20), finds the HCI variant less elevated than the CI one.

The question arises as to whether in a configuration like that in (21), HCI would be possible, i.e. whether or not a SCL can ever agree with an OCL that follows it. Morin (1985, 796) says no, but some speakers find acceptable HCI sentences such as:<sup>21</sup>

(22) *Cela va-t-elle la déranger?* ('that is-going-to *t* she her disturb' = 'is that going to disturb her?')

whose CI counterpart, without agreement between *il* and *la*, is:

(23) *Cela va-t-il la déranger?*

HCI examples such as (22) are not, however, possible if the OCL is within a finite embedding (with the SCL in the matrix):

(24) *Cela implique-t-il que Jean la voit souvent?* ('that implies it that J her sees often')

(25) \**Cela implique-t-elle que J la voit souvent?*

(24) is a well-formed CI example, in which SCL *il* agrees with subject *cela*. (25) shows that trying to turn (24) into an HCI example by having SCL *elle* agree with the following OCL *la* is not possible, contrary to (22) (for the relevant speakers).

More strikingly, HCI is possible to one degree or another with an infinitival embedding only with matrix verbs/predicates of the 'restructuring' type. Thus alongside (22) and the similar:

(26) ?*Cela pourrait-elle la gêner?* ('that could she her bother' = 'could that bother her?')

in which HCI is to some extent available, we have the fact that the following well-formed CI example:

(27) *Cela a-t-il l'air de la gêner?* ('that has *t* it the air of her to-bother' = 'does that look like it bothers her?')

has no well-formed HCI counterpart:

(28) \**Cela a-t-elle l'air de la gêner?*

The similarity holding here between HCI and, say, Italian object clitic climbing (with respect to sensitivity to 'restructuring') suggests that the SCL *elle* in (22) and (26) must have raised into the matrix from within the infinitive in French in a way parallel to OCL clitic climbing in Italian.

The derivation of (22), for example, will (for those speakers who accept it) be approximately as in (29) (cf. the derivation given in (18)):

(29) *déranger* [*la elle*] --> OCL movement (pied-piping the SCL)

[*la elle*]<sub>i</sub> *déranger t<sub>i</sub>* --> merger of matrix *va* and of subject *cela*

*cela va* [*la elle*]<sub>i</sub> *déranger t<sub>i</sub>* --> scrambling of infinitive phrase<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup>Especially in a CLLD (clitic left dislocation, as in Cinque (1990)) context:

i) *Cette personne, cela va-t-elle la déranger?* ('this person, ...')

which suggests the involvement of a pied-piping-like movement of *cette personne*.

Having the SCL agreeing with a following OCL is sometimes felt to be less good in the plural:

ii) ??*Cela va-t-elles les déranger?* ('that is-going-to *t* they them disturb' = 'is that going to disturb them?')

In raising past the OCL *la* that it agrees with, the SCL *elle* in (22) has something in common with the Italian agreeing past participle *offerta* in the following example (from Longobardi (1985, note 23)):

iii) *Offerta a sua moglie, credo che Mario ancora non le abbia.* ('offered to his wife, I-believe that M still not them has' = 'I believe that M still hasn't offered them to his wife')

in which *offerta* has, via remnant movement, moved past the OCL *le* that it agrees with.

<sup>22</sup>Cf. Collins (2005) on 'smuggling', which interacts here with the relativized minimality question mentioned in note 18.

[ [*la elle*]<sub>i</sub> déranger *t<sub>i</sub>* ]<sub>j</sub> cela va *t<sub>j</sub>* --> raising of SCL and merger of -*t*-  
*t elle*<sub>k</sub> [ [*la t<sub>k</sub>* ]<sub>i</sub> déranger *t<sub>i</sub>* ]<sub>j</sub> cela va *t<sub>j</sub>* --> remnant IP movement  
 [ cela va *t<sub>j</sub>* ] *t elle*<sub>k</sub> [ [*la t<sub>k</sub>* ]<sub>i</sub> déranger *t<sub>i</sub>* ]<sub>j</sub>

This yields (22), repeated here:

(30) *Cela va-t-elle la déranger?* ('that is-going-to *t* she her disturb' = 'is that going to disturb her?')

The SCL raising seen in (29) must be available only when the matrix predicate is of the restructuring type, not otherwise. A more general formulation is:

(31) Only in the case of restructuring predicates can pronominal clitics raise out of infinitival complements.

This statement is intended to hold even if, as in (29), the infinitive phrase has previously scrambled.<sup>23</sup>

The formulation in (31) leaves open the curious fact that in (29)/(30) the SCL *elle* has succeeded in escaping from the infinitive phrase despite French not normally (apart from causatives) allowing OCLs to escape from infinitive phrases, even those embedded under restructuring predicates,<sup>24</sup> as seen in the contrast between (30) and (32):

(32) \**Cela la va-t-elle déranger?*

Continuing to think in terms of the derivation (29), the key difference between SCL *elle* in (30) (and (32)) and OCL *la* in (32) may lie in the fact that the landing site of SCL-raising in these HCI inversion derivations is up in the Comp area in Rizzi's (1997) sense, i.e. above the normal position of the subject, as seen in both (18) and (29), whereas the landing site of OCLs is in French invariably below normal subject position.<sup>25</sup>

Another way of putting this is to say that SCL-raising in HCI derivations is A-bar-like, whereas OCL movement is not:

(33) Raising out of infinitival phrases (of the sort that crosses a subject position<sup>26</sup>) is possible in French with A-bar-like movements only.

## 7. A familiar problem for Agree.

Of further note is the contrast between (30) and the following:

(34) \**Cela va-t-elle déranger Marie?* ('that is-going-to *t* she disturb Mary' = 'is that going to disturb Mary?')

In both (30) and (34) the agreeing SCL *elle* precedes what it agrees with (*la, Marie*). Yet only in (30) is the result acceptable, indicating that derivation-final word order is not what is at issue.

<sup>23</sup> If SCL-raising were to precede infinitive phrase scrambling, then by the extension condition the infinitive phrase would, incorrectly, end up preceding the SCL in (30).

<sup>24</sup>For relevant discussion, see Kayne (1989a; 1991).

<sup>25</sup>One will need to bring in Portuguese OCLs here; for relevant discussion, see Uriagereka (1995).

<sup>26</sup>This is to allow for subject-to-subject raising and for raising of an ECM subject; see Pollock (1978; 1985). It will also allow for OCL-raising out of infinitives in (certain) causatives; cf. Kayne (1975, chaps. 4 and 6) and Rouveret and Vergnaud (1980). Also Kayne (1981) on the extra possibilities for the movement of *tout* (vs. OCLs); the fact that moved *tout* ('all') doesn't license HCI, as seen in:

i) \**Cette affaire gêne-t-il tout?* ('that affair upsets *t* it everything')  
 might be related to *tout* not licensing complementizer-like *qui*, as discussed in that paper.

Rather the contrast between (30) and (34) should be reduced to that holding between the following two simpler cases:<sup>27</sup>

(35) *Cela la dérange-t-elle?* ('that her bothers *t* she' = 'does that bother her')

(36) \**Cela dérange-t-elle Marie?* (= 'does that bother Mary?')

The agreeing SCL that characterizes HCI can only successfully agree, as it (*elle*) does in (35), with a direct object (*la*) that has moved leftward (to a sufficiently high position). In (36), the object *Marie* has either not moved at all, or else has not moved high enough to license SCL-agreement of the HCI sort.

The contrast between (35) and (36) strongly recalls a basic property of French and Italian past participle agreement,<sup>28</sup> as illustrated in French by:

(37) *Jean l'a repeinte.* ('J it(fem.) has repainted(fem.) = 'J has repainted it')

(38) *Jean a repeint/\*repeinte la table.* ('J has repainted (masc.)/(fem.) the table')

In (37), the direct object clitic *la* (which here loses its *-a*) has moved up past the auxiliary; the past participle *repeint* agrees in gender (and number) with that *la*. In (38), on the other hand, the direct object *la table* has not moved (far enough) up and agreement is impossible.

The contrast seen in (37) vs. (38) is unexpected if Agree need not be associated with movement (and if Agree is taken to underlie past participle agreement).<sup>29</sup> The same would hold for HCI if one took Agree to underlie the agreement found in HCI sentences. One might pursue that Agree possibility by having *-t-* in (35) act as a probe for *la*, inducing remnant IP-movement as in (29), with *elle* then being the spellout of the agreement relation. But in that case the impossibility of the agreement shown in (36) would be unexpected, if Agree could be dissociated from movement, insofar as *-t-* in (36) could find *Marie* as goal.

## 8. Pronominal clitics vs. agreement morphemes

On the other hand, one could try to maintain the availability of movement-less Agree in the face of (36) (though (38) would remain a challenge) by denying that Agree is relevant to HCI at all. That would in all likelihood lead to denying more generally that Agree is relevant to clitic doubling (which would, though, diminish the interest of Agree), and would in all likelihood lead to saying that there is a sharp difference between clitic doubling and agreement. Whether there is such a sharp difference is a question that can be asked independently of Agree. Let me now turn to that question.

The kind of agreement seen in (35), in which SCL *elle* agrees with feminine singular OCL *la*, does differ sharply from more familiar instances of agreement in French, which otherwise disallow *elle* as the spellout of feminine singular agreement. Thus in (37) the past participle agreement morpheme is *-e* and cannot be *elle*:

(39) \**Jean l'a repeintelle.*

Similarly, DP-internal adjective or indefinite article agreement in French shows *-e* for feminine singular (*grand+e*, *un+e*):

(40) *une grande maison* ('a(fem.) big(fem.) house(fem.)')

and cannot show *elle* instead:

(41) \**une grandelle maison*; \**unelle grande maison*; \**unelle grandelle maison*

<sup>27</sup>As pointed out by Morin (1985, 796).

<sup>28</sup>Cf. Kayne (1985; 1989b) and Belletti (2006).

<sup>29</sup>Cf. Kayne (2008; to appear) for an analysis of expletive *there* that doesn't need movement-less Agree; also Koopman (2003; 2005b). On Agree, see Chomsky (2000; 2001).

Conversely, feminine singular *-e* cannot replace *elle* in (35) or in any other example of HCI:

(42) \*Cela la dérange-t-e?

The same holds for CI:

(43) Marie a-t-elle une grande maison? ('M has -t- she a big house')

(44) \*Marie a-t-e une grande maison?

Following a long tradition, I take the postverbal SCL *elle* in question (in CI, in HCI, and also in SCLI (11)) to be a pronominal clitic, and the *-e* of (40) and (37) not to be a pronominal clitic. In French, this distinction goes with a difference in form. Third person non-reflexive pronominal clitics always contain an *l*, as seen in SCLs in:

(45) il (m.sg.), ils (m.pl.), elle (f.sg.), elles (f.pl.)

in accusative OCLs:

(46) le (m.sg.), la (f.sg.), les (pl.)

and in dative OCLs:

(47) lui (sg.), leur (pl.)

whereas the *-e* of (40) and (37) does not contain an *l*.

## 9. Person and *l*.

The pronominal clitic status of SCL *elle* in HCI examples like (35), repeated here:

(48) Cela la dérange-t-elle? ('that her bothers *t* she' = 'does that bother her')

combined with the pronominal clitic status of OCL *la* in the same example leads to the unsurprising conclusion that HCI (like CI) is to be thought of as an instance of clitic doubling. Conversely, since *-e* is not a pronominal clitic, past participle agreement examples like (37), repeated here:

(49) Jean l'a repeinte. ('J it(fem.) has repainted(fem.)')

are not instances of clitic doubling.

It is important to note, however, that all cases of clitic doubling themselves involve agreement. In particular, and without exception as far as I know, the following holds:<sup>30</sup>

(50) Clitic doubling invariably shows person agreement between the clitic and the other element or phrase in question.

This is true of HCI, as in (48) (in which the other element is a second clitic). It is true of CI. It is true of Spanish clitic doubling, both of the dative sort and of the (less widely found) accusative sort.<sup>31</sup>

What this means is that proposals to distinguish clitic doubling from agreement, as, for example, in Preminger (2009), must be understood, given (50), as shorthand for distinguishing clitic doubling (which itself involves agreement) from instances of agreement that do not involve pronominal clitics.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>30</sup>Colloquial Spanish allows number agreement not to hold with third person dative clitic doubling - v. Butt and Benjamin (1988, sect. 11.14.3)

<sup>31</sup>On Spanish *Nos vio a los lingüistas* ('us (s)he-saw to the linguists' = '(s)he saw us linguists'), arguably with a silent first plural non-clitic pronoun, see Torrego (1996, 124) and Ordóñez and Treviño (1999); also Kayne (2009).

<sup>32</sup>Preminger's (2009) use of intervention effects as a tool for distinguishing clitic doubling from agreement will need to be recalibrated, given that the French facts that he cites are not entirely representative; for example, Jean-Yves Pollock (p.c.) finds acceptable:

i) Jean semblait/avait semblé à Marie pouvoir faire l'affaire. ('J seemed/had seemed to M to-be-able to-do the trick')



The difference between clitic doubling, on the one hand, and non-clitic-doubling agreement, on the other, manifests itself in a striking way in French. There is a clear difference between HCI (an instance of clitic doubling) and past participle agreement (not an instance of clitic doubling) that involves person, in a certain way. In French a past participle can agree in gender (and number) with a first or second person pronoun accusative OCL:

(51) Jean t'a prise par le bras. (French: 'J you(fem.) has taken(fem.) by the arm')

In contrast, while CI in French can readily have a first or second person OCL, as in:

(52) Cela te gêne-t-il? ('that you bothers it' = 'does that bother you?')

HCI cannot.<sup>33</sup> Even if the OCL in (52) is understood to be feminine, the SCL must remain *il* (pairing with *cela*); this *il* cannot be replaced by feminine *elle* (which would be agreeing in gender with *te*):

(53) \*Cela te gêne-t-elle?

This contrast between HCI in (53) and past participle agreement in (51) can be understood as follows. In (53) there is a clash between *te* and *elle*. This clash is due to the morpheme *-l-* that is part of *elle*. A clitic doubling relation cannot hold of two elements one of which contains third person *-l-* and the other of which is (first or) second person. Person agreement must hold with clitic doubling, as stated in (50). On the other hand, the past participle agreement morpheme *-e* in (51) contains no third person *-l-*; consequently there is no person clash.<sup>34</sup>

#### 10. Missing persons.

Of related importance is a restriction on HCI not yet mentioned, namely that the SCL found in HCI sentences must itself be third-person. Alongside the well-formed HCI example (48), or the following similar one:

(54) Cela la gêne-t-elle? ('that her bothers *t* she' = 'does that bother her?')

there is no comparable well-formed HCI example with a first or second person SCL. We can see this by starting with (52), which is an example of CI with a second person OCL *te*. If we then try to shift to HCI by making the SCL agree in person with that OCL, we reach:

(55) \*Cela te gêne-(t-)tu? ('that you bothers *t* you')

which is impossible. Similarly, alongside the well-formed HCI example:

(56) Cela l'aurait-elle gênée? ('that her would-have she bothered' = 'would that have bothered her?')

with a third person SCL *elle*, there is no parallel first person SCL example.<sup>35</sup>

(57) \*Cela m'aurait-je gêné? ('that me would-have I bothered')

A key question that arises is whether this person restriction on SCLs in HCI sentences is specific to HCI, or rather extends to CI. That is, can the SCL in CI sentences be first or second person? At first glance, there might seem to be well-formed CI sentences that do fit this description, e.g.:

<sup>33</sup> As noted by Morin (1985, 795).

<sup>34</sup> Finite verb agreement shares with past participle agreement the absence of third person *-l-*; for some discussion, see Kayne (2003).

<sup>35</sup> I have switched to a conditional tense because of restrictions on postverbal *je* discussed by Pollock (2006, note 43).

In the first and second plural, the facts are the same:

i) \*Cela nous gêne-nous?

ii) \*Cela vous gêne-vous?

(58) Jean et moi avons-nous vu ce film? ('J and me have we seen that film')  
However, (58) can alternatively be analyzed as left dislocation. Interference from left dislocation can be dampened (and a CI analysis forced) by using sentences whose subject is quantified in a certain way.

In particular, Morin (1979, sect. 2.4) noted the contrast:

(59) Pourquoi lui seul a-t-il été prévenu? ('why him alone has *t* he been told')

(60) \*Pourquoi toi seul as-tu été prévenu?<sup>36</sup> ('why you alone have *t* you been told')

In these examples, the subject DP contains *seul* ('alone', 'only') and there is a clear third person vs. non-third person contrast. The second person SCL *tu* in (60) is not possible. In a similar spirit, Pollock (2006, 622) used examples with a contrastive pronominal subject and found facts pointing in the same direction as Morin's:

(61) Quel livre lui a-t-il apporté? ('which book him has *t* he brought' = 'which book did HE bring?')

(62) \*Quel livre moi ai-je apporté? ('which book me have *t* I brought')

Again, the non-third person (here first person) SCL *je* is not possible, with CI. Thus, both CI (as in (60) and (62)) and HCI (as in (55) and (57)) are impossible with a first or second person SCL.

The impossibility of CI and HCI with a first or second person SCL contrasts with first and second person examples of SCLI (in which the SCL is not doubling anything overt) as seen in:

(63) Aurais-je été prévenu? ('would-have I been told')

(64) As-tu été prévenu? ('have you been told')

(65) Avons-nous été prévenus? ('have we...')

(66) Avez-vous été prévenu(s)? ('have you...')

The well-formedness of (63)-(66) indicates clearly that CI and HCI are excluded from containing a first or second person SCL as a function of the clitic doubling that plays a central role in CI/HCI. The next question is why clitic doubling of the CI/HCI sort should be incompatible with first or second person.

## 11. SCL *ce*

There is another restriction on SCLs in CI/HCI that is not found in SCLI. This restriction concerns the subject clitic *ce* of sentences like:<sup>37</sup>

(67) Ce n'est pas vrai. ('that/it neg is not true')

which is related to the demonstrative *ce* of:<sup>38</sup>

<sup>36</sup>Pollock (1983, 96) gives this example '\*?'.  
-----

<sup>37</sup>SCL *ce* is as a first approximation possible only with the verb 'be'; for details, see Kayne and Pollock (2010).

<sup>38</sup>If the anti-homophony conjecture of Kayne (to appear) is correct, SCL *ce* and ordinary demonstrative *ce* must be exactly the same morpheme. The demonstrative character of SCL *ce* (suggested to me by Jean-Yves Pollock (p.c.)) underlies its being unable to appear in core expletive-containing sentences like:

i) Il est arrivé une lettre. ('*il* is arrived a letter' = 'a letter has arrived')

ii) \*C'est arrivé une lettre.

with this contrast recalling:

iii) There/\*it has arrived a letter.

and suggesting that English *it* might always be a (reduced) demonstrative.

(68) *ce* livre ('that/this book')

The SCL *ce* of (67) is sometimes fully compatible with SCLI, as in:<sup>39</sup>

(69) *Est-ce vrai?* ('is that/it true')

(70) *Etait-ce vraiment comme cela?* ('was that/it really like that')

Surprisingly (at first glance), *ce* is not possible with CI.<sup>40</sup> A relevant example, parallel to (60), is:<sup>41</sup>

(71) \**Pourquoi cela seul est-ce vrai?* ('why that alone is that/it true')

Let me, then, pursue the idea that this restriction against *ce* in CI sentences is closely tied to the restriction against first and second person SCLs in CI (and HCI) sentences noted earlier in (55), (57), (60) and (62).

## 12. Demonstratives and first and second person pronouns

Kayne (2010) proposed an account of the absence in English of a complementizer *this*. One component of that account was that *this* is invariably associated with a (perhaps unpronounced) first person morpheme.<sup>42</sup> Let me now complement that idea with the following:

(72) First and second person pronouns are invariably associated with demonstrative structure.

By 'demonstrative structure', I have in mind Leu's (2007) proposal<sup>43</sup> that demonstratives are phrasal and contain the definite article as a subpart. Combined with (72), this yields:

(73) First and second person pronouns are invariably accompanied by a (usually silent) definite article.

This is illustrated in:

(74) THE you/me/us PERSON(S)

where capitalization indicates silence.<sup>44</sup>

We are now in a position to return to the restriction against demonstrative-like SCL *ce* in CI sentences discussed in the previous section and to the closely related restriction against first and second person SCLs in CI (and HCI) sentences noted earlier in (55), (57), (60) and (62). If the proposal in (72) is correct, these two restrictions boil down to one:

-----

<sup>39</sup>Even when the verb is 'be', there are restrictions having to do with tense on *ce* in SCLI sentences that I take to be orthogonal to the present discussion.

<sup>40</sup>There are no instances of *ce* with HCI, either, in part at least because there is (for reasons not yet discovered) no OCL *ce*:

i) \**Jean ce sait.* ('J that/it knows')

This is so despite the fact that one finds, dialectally (cf. Bürge (1998)), sentences like:

ii) *Jean a ça vu.* ('J has that seen')

where *ça* has moved leftward in a way perhaps reminiscent of *tout* in standard French; on the movement of *tout*, v. Kayne (1975, chap.1), Pollock (1978), Starke (2001).

<sup>41</sup>Other such examples are given in Kayne (1972, 83).

<sup>42</sup>Cf. Leu (2007, note 2) and references cited there.

<sup>43</sup>Which has various antecedents - see his (2007, Introduction).

<sup>44</sup>On PERSON, cf. Kayne (2005a, Appendix). The definite article can be pronounced in:

i) That's not the you that everybody used to love.

The text proposal differs from Postal (1966), Ritter (1995) and Déchaine and Wiltschko (2002), who take first and second person pronouns to be determiners.

(75) CI and HCI are incompatible with SCLs associated with phrasal demonstrative structure

If we now ask why (75) should hold, a possible (beginning of an) answer is that the postverbal agreeing SCLs of CI and HCI must not be too complex. SCLs associated with phrasal demonstrative structure (*ce* and, by extension from (74), first and second person SCLs) would, then, be too complex to be compatible with HCI or CI,<sup>45</sup> while third person SCLs would not be, possibly because (postverbal) third person SCLs are not phrasal at all.<sup>46</sup>

### 13. Other types of clitic doubling

CI and HCI are subtypes of clitic doubling. French has another subtype involving OCLs, seen in:

(76) *Ils la voient elle.* ('they her see her')

in which there is a contrastive interpretation and intonation, such that (76) is distinct from right dislocation. The kind of OCL clitic doubling illustrated in (76) (which in French requires that the doubled phrase in argument position be a pronoun) differs from CI and HCI (as does Spanish clitic doubling) in being compatible with first and second person pronouns, e.g.:

(77) *Ils te voient toi.* ('they you see you')

French allows this kind of non-dislocation contrastive doubling with subject pronouns, too,<sup>47</sup> as in:

(78) *Elle partira elle.* ('she will-leave she/her')

and again allows it with first and second person pronouns, e.g.:

(79) *Je partirai moi.* ('I will-leave I/me')

The question now is why (79), with a first person SCL, should differ so sharply in acceptability from the unacceptable CI example (62), repeated here:

(80) \**Quel livre moi ai-je apporté?* ('which book me have *t* I brought')

as well as from the unacceptable HCI example (57), also repeated:

(81) \**Cela m'aurait-je gêné?* ('that me would-have I bothered')

(and similarly for other first and second person SCLs).

A possible answer goes as follows. CI and HCI involve a complex DP analysis of the sort indicated in section 2, in which the SCL and its double both start out within one DP. A complex DP of that sort is not compatible with SCLs associated with phrasal demonstrative

<sup>45</sup>Despite first and second person plural SCLs being able to cooccur, in SCLI, with distinctive suffixal agreement morphemes, as in:

i) *Partez-vous?*

ii) *Partons-nous?*

with *part-* ('leave') the verbal root, *vous* ('you') and *nous* ('we') the SCLs, and *-ez* and *-ons* the corresponding agreement morphemes.

<sup>46</sup>Since third person SCLs show gender and number morphology (on number, see Kayne and Pollock (2014, sect. 7)), they would then have to have been 'put together' by head movement.

For an argument, differing from Postal (1966), that pronouns (in Russian) are nouns, v. Franks and Pereltsvaig (2004). On the varying structural complexity of pronouns, v. Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) and Déchaine and Wiltschko (2002). On French *celui* ('that him') as an instance of (non-agreeing) determiner + third person (strong, non-clitic) pronoun, v. Kayne (2010, sect. 10).

<sup>47</sup>Cf. Ronat (1979).

structure, i.e. with *ce* or with first or second person SCLs, perhaps because they would be insufficiently D-like, whence the unacceptability of (80) and (81). On the other hand, (79) does not involve such a complex DP structure, and is therefore possible. (By extension, (77) will not involve a complex DP structure, either.)

As for the correct derivation of (77) and (79) (and, possibly, (76) and (78)),<sup>48</sup> one might consider extending to those sentences the kind of analysis envisaged in Kayne (1994, sect. 8.3) for:<sup>49</sup>

(82) He's real smart, John.

in which this right-dislocation derives from the biclausal:

(83) He's real smart, John is

Transposed to (77) and (79), this would amount to taking them to be something like:<sup>50</sup>

(84) *ils te voient ILS VOIENT toi*

and:

(85) *je partirai moi PARTIRAI*

with capitalization again indicating silence.

The proposal indicated in (85) can be maintained even though *moi* is not normally a possible subject by itself:

(86) \**Moi partirai.*

This is so (and similarly for (84)), since *moi* can be a subject by itself in gapping examples like:

(87) *Jean aime la physique et moi la chimie.* ('J likes the physics and I the chemistry')

in which there must be a silent verb in the second part of the sentence, as, then, in (85).<sup>51</sup>

#### 14. Silent pronouns

The difference in structure suggested in (72) between first and second person pronouns, which are associated with phrasal demonstrative structure, and third person pronouns, which

<sup>48</sup>Gatti (1989-90, 195n) pointed out for Trentino a difference between 1st/2nd and 3rd person with respect to clitic doubling:

(i) *I me vede mi* ('they me see me')

(ii) *I te vede ti* ('they you see you')

(iii) \**?I la vede ela* ('they her see her')

Non-clitic *mi/ti* can cooccur in Trentino with clitic *me/te*, but non-clitic *ela* cannot cooccur with clitic *la*. Cf. Burzio (1989) on Piedmontese. This contrast seems to hold for Paduan, too (Paola Benincà, p.c.); cf. Benincà (1983, note 8). On the other hand, it seems to be absent from the dialects studied by Nicoli (1983, 144, 359), Pelliciardi (1977, 93), Vassere (1993, 97, 102), and Spiess (1976, 209).

<sup>49</sup>Cf. also Ott (2014). This kind of analysis must then not be available to Cl/HCl. Though it must be available to contrastive doubling even with *ne...que* added in:

i) *Cela ne te plaît qu'à toi.* ('that neg you pleases than to you' = 'that pleases only you')

<sup>50</sup>And similarly for Spanish clitic doubling, at least with first and second person OCLs.

Possibly, there's a link here to sentences like the following, in some Italian:

i) *È andato a Parigi è andato.* ('he-is gone to P he-is gone')

For discussion, see Gulli (2003).

<sup>51</sup>If Johnson (2009) is correct, the silent verb in gapping comes about as the result of across-the-board movement.

are not, may find additional support in the behavior of certain silent pronouns, in a way that can be seen in French. For example, French allows:<sup>52</sup>

(88) *Tous chantaient.* ('all were-singing-3pl.')

in which there must be a silent third person pronoun within the subject DP. Of note is the fact that sentences like (88) are limited to third person subjects, as shown in:<sup>53</sup>

(89) \**Tous chantiez.* ('all were-singing-2pl.')

(90) \**Tous chantions.* ('all were-singing-1pl.')

All of (88)-(90) have distinctive verbal agreement endings. They can nonetheless be distinguished in acceptability if we take French to allow a silent third person pronoun as part of the subject in (88), but to disallow comparable silent first or second person pronouns.

English shows similar behavior in:

(91) Both/all five were behaving themselves yesterday morning.

There must again be a silent third person pronoun here, accompanying *both* and *all five*, within the subject DP:

(92) both/all five THEM were...

As in French, this silent pronoun cannot be first or second person:

(93) \*Both/all five were behaving ourselves/yourselves yesterday morning.

Similarly, we have:

(94) Five/most/not very many were behaving themselves/\*ourselves/\*yourselves yesterday morning.

again with a silent (OF) THEM that has no first or second person counterpart. Despite its pro-drop character, Italian shows similar behavior in the particular case of:

(95) *Quattro sono venuti.* ('four are-3pl. come')

(96) \**Quattro siete venuti.* ('four are-2pl. come')

The facts of (88)-(96) taken together support the following cautious statement:

(97) Silent pronouns are sometimes limited to third person.

The caution is warranted by the fact that Italian allows a silent first person pronoun in:

(98) *Vogliono che parta.* ('they-want that leave')

In this example, the embedded verb *parta* is present subjunctive and is notable in that its *-a* suffix is in all probability not an agreement morpheme (but rather a theme vowel). Despite the lack of any overt first person agreement morpheme, (98) can have the subject of *parta* interpreted as first person (singular). This leads to the conclusion that (98) can contain a silent first person singular pronoun. (There is also a possible third singular interpretation.)

One factor relevant to (98) vs. (88)-(96) is that in the latter set of cases, the silent pronoun is a subpart of the subject, not the whole subject, which suggests that a canonical pro-drop configuration provides an extra licensing possibility.<sup>54</sup> Setting that aside, let me propose that the limitation to third person in (88)-(96) is to be understood in terms of (72), i.e. in terms of the

<sup>52</sup>For additional details, see Kayne (2001).

<sup>53</sup>In a pro-drop language like Spanish or Italian, these could be possible with an analysis not parallel to that of French, but rather with an analysis in which *tous* is 'floated'/'stranded' and the first or second person pronoun is the verbal agreement suffix - cf. Taraldsen (1992).

<sup>54</sup>Somewhat similarly, all instances of PRO are apparently indifferent to person; the silent subject of at least non-agreeing imperatives might be PRO, thinking of Ross (1970). French *voici/voilà* might, exceptionally (for French), have a(n obligatorily) silent non-PRO second person subject; cf. Morin (1985, 817).

idea that first and second person pronouns are associated with a demonstrative structure, whose silence in contexts like those of (88)-(96) can evidently not be licensed in the way that the silence of less (or differently) complex third person pronouns can be.

#### 15. French *on*

The French SCL *on* (which in other cases can correspond to English generic subject *one*) can pair with *nous* ('we/us') in sentences like:

(99) *Nous, on va à Paris.* ('us *on* go to P' = 'we're going to P')

(100) *On va à Paris, nous.*

with a first person plural interpretation.<sup>55</sup> Yet alongside the CI example:

(101) *Cela nous gêne-t-il?* ('that us bothers it' = 'does that bother us?')

there is no HCI-like:

(102) \**Cela nous gêne-t-on?*

This is so even though *on* is compatible with SCLI:

(103) *A-t-on tous fait la même erreur?* ('has *on* all made the same mistake' = 'have we all...?')

The incompatibility of *on* with HCI can also be seen using so-called middle sentences like:

(104) *Cela se lit facilement.* ('this book se reads easily')

which is very close in interpretation to:

(105) *On lit cela facilement.*

Of interest here is the fact that middles are compatible with CI, with SCL = *il*:

(106) *Cela se lit-il facilement?*

but not with HCI:

(107) \**Cela se lit-on facilement?*

i.e. HCI-type doubling of *se* by *on* is prohibited.

Similarly, although the following two sentences are close in interpretation:

(108) *Quelqu'un vous attend.* ('someone you awaits' = 'someone awaits you')

(109) *On vous attend.*

we have, with HCI:

(110) *Quelqu'un vous attend-il?*

but not:

(111) \**Quelqu'un vous attend-on?*

The incompatibility of *on* with HCI seen in (102), (107) and (111) suggests that *on* should be grouped with *ce*, *je* and *tu* and that as with those SCLs we should attribute to *on* demonstrative structure.<sup>56</sup> Grouping *on* with first and second person pronouns (despite its triggering the same verb agreement as third singular<sup>57</sup>) is supported by the fact that no

<sup>55</sup>For relevant discussion concerning a comparable property of Italian *si*, see Cinque (1988).

<sup>56</sup>Suggesting that (99) and (100) be tied to the discussion of (77) and (79), which would lead in a different direction from Kayne (1972, 95)'s taking *nous* and *on* to be part of one DP-like phrase.

<sup>57</sup>And despite its differing with respect to coordination (*on* can be dropped from a second conjunct less readily than *je*, *tu* - cf. Kayne (1975, chap. 2, notes 37, 40), Sportiche (1999, sect. 5.2)), in a way that may be linkable to the fact that Italian third person counterparts to French *on* sentences cannot be without *si*.

subtype of *on* ever varies in form for gender, just as first and second person pronouns never do, in Romance.<sup>58</sup>

This grouping of *on* with first and second person pronouns is also indirectly supported by the parallelism between French *on* and Italian impersonal *si* discussed by Cinque (1988, sect. 3.5). This is so if *on* is a nominative counterpart of French *se*, as suggested by Togeby (1982, 428), if all instances of *se* are the same element,<sup>59</sup> and if, as in Kayne (2003), *se* and *si* are themselves to be grouped with first and second person singular pronouns.<sup>60</sup>

## 16. Conclusion

French Hyper-Complex Inversion (HCI) is an instance of clitic doubling that is subject to a person restriction not found with more familiar cases of clitic doubling. This restriction is argued to result from an incompatibility between the postverbal subject clitic (SCL) of HCI and the demonstrative structure associated with first and second person pronouns. That demonstrative structure also plays a role in asymmetries that hold concerning the possible silence, in certain cases, of third person pronouns, but not first or second person pronouns.

HCI shares with past participle agreement the property that it is incompatible with an unmoved lexical direct object, in a way that presents a challenge to Agree, if Agree is taken to be available even in the absence of movement.

The SCL of HCI sentences can sometimes climb out of an embedded infinitive, in a way related to the Comp-area character of its landing site.

## References:

- Belletti (2006) "(Past) Participle Agreement," in M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Volume III*, Blackwell, Malden, Mass. and Oxford, 493-521.
- Benincà, P. (1983) "Il clitico *a nel* dialetto padovano," in *Scritti linguistici in onore di G.B. Pellegrini*, Pacini, Pisa, 25-35 (reprinted in Benincà (1994)).
- Benincà, P. (1994) *La variazione sintattica. Studi di dialettologia romanza*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Boneh, N. and I. Sichel (2010) "Deconstructing Possession," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 28, 1-40.
- Bürgi, A. (1998) *Le pronom ça en français vaudois, description et analyse*, Mémoire de Maîtrise, University of Sherbrook.
- Burzio (1989 "Work in Progress," ms., Harvard University.
- Butt, J. and C. Benjamin (1988) *A New Reference Grammar of Modern Spanish*, Edward Arnold, London.
- 

<sup>58</sup>This is completely clear for 1st/2nd singular (cf. Kayne (2003)). Spanish 1st and 2nd plural *nosotros*, *vosotros* have feminine counterparts *nosotras*, *vosotras*; rather than taking them to be exceptions, as in Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea (2011, 134), I take them to have a non-agreeing pronominal subpart *nos*, *vos* that is followed by an agreeing non-pronominal *otras*, the feminine plural form of *otro* ('other').

<sup>59</sup>Necessarily so if Kayne's (to appear, (17)) anti-homophony conjecture is correct.

<sup>60</sup>Which would suggest, from the present perspective, that all instances of *se/si* are associated with demonstrative structure, with the possibility then arising that all instances of *se/si* have something in common with expletive *there*, in particular if expletive *there* originates DP-internally, as in Kayne (2008).



- Caha, P. (2010) "The German Locative-Directional Alternation. A Peeling Account," *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 13, 179-223.
- Cardinaletti, A. and M. Starke (1999) "The Typology of Structural Deficiency: A Case Study of the Three Classes of Pronouns," in H. van Riemsdijk (ed.) *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 145-233.
- Chomsky, N. (2000) "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework," in R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka (eds.) *Step by Step: Essays in Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 89-155.
- Chomsky, N. (2001) "Derivation by Phase," in M. Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale. A Life in Language*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1-52.
- Cinque, G. (1988) "On *Si* Constructions and the Theory of *Arb*," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19, 521-581.
- Cinque, G. (1990) *Types of A'-Dependencies*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Collins, C. (2005) "A Smuggling Approach to the Passive in English," *Syntax*, 8, 81-120.
- Déchaine, R.-M. and M. Wiltschko (2002) "Decomposing Pronouns," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 33, 409-442.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. and I. Giurgea (2011) "Pronominal Possessors and Feature Uniqueness," *Language*, 87, 126-157.
- Franks, S. and A. Pereltsvaig (2004) "Functional Categories in the Nominal Domain," in O. Arnaudova et al. (eds.) *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 12. The Ottawa Meeting 2003*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 109-128.
- Gatti, T. (1989/1990) *Confronto tra fenomeni sintattici nell'italiano e nel dialetto trentino: participio passato, accordo e ausiliari*, Tesi di laurea, University of Trento.
- Gruber, B. (2008) *Complementiser Agreement - New Evidence from the Upper Austrian Variant of Gmunden*, Master's thesis, University of Vienna.
- Gulli, A. (2003) *Reduplication in Syntax*, Doctoral dissertation, Graduate Center, City University of New York.
- Johnson, K. (2009) "Gapping Is Not (VP-) Ellipsis," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 40, 289-328.
- Kayne, R.S. (1972) "Subject Inversion in French Interrogatives," in J. Casagrande and B. Saciuk (eds.) *Generative Studies in Romance Languages*, Newbury House, Rowley, Mass., 70-126.
- Kayne, R.S. (1975) *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kayne, R.S. (1981) "Binding, quantifiers, clitics and control," in F. Heny (ed.) *Binding and filtering*, Croom Helm, London, 191-211 (reprinted in Kayne (1984)).
- Kayne, R.S. (1984) *Connectedness and Binary Branching*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Kayne, R.S. (1985) "L'accord du participe passé en français et en italien," *Modèles Linguistiques*, VII, 73-90 (English translation in Kayne (2000), chap.2).
- Kayne, R.S. (1989a) "Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing", in O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.), *The Null Subject Parameter*, Reidel, Dordrecht, 239-261 (reprinted in Kayne (2000)).
- Kayne, R.S. (1989b) "Facets of Romance Past Participle Agreement", in P. Benincà (ed.), *Dialect Variation and the Theory of Grammar*, Foris, Dordrecht, 85-103 (reprinted in Kayne (2000)).
- Kayne, R.S. (1991) "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement and PRO," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 647-686 (reprinted in Kayne (2000)).
- Kayne, R.S. (1993) "Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection," *Studia Linguistica*, 47, 3-31 (reprinted in Kayne (2000)).
- Kayne, R.S. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

- Kayne, R.S. (1998) "Overt vs. Covert Movement," *Syntax*, 1, 128-191 (reprinted in Kayne (2000)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2000) *Parameters and Universals*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (2001) "A Note on Clitic Doubling in French" in G. Cinque and G. Salvi (eds.) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, Amsterdam: North-Holland 2001 (North-Holland Linguistic Series: Linguistic Variations Volume 59), 189-212 (also in Kayne (2000)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2002) "Pronouns and Their Antecedents" in S. Epstein and D. Seely (eds.), *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, Blackwell, Malden, Mass., 133-166 (reprinted in Kayne (2005b)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2003) "Person Morphemes and Reflexives in Italian, French and Related Languages", in C. Tortora (ed.) *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, Oxford University Press, New York, 102-136 (also in Kayne (2000)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2005a) "On the Syntax of Quantity in English", in Kayne (2005b) (also in J. Bayer, T. Bhattacharya and M. T. Hany Babu (eds.), *Linguistic Theory and South-Asian Languages. Essays in Honour of K.A. Jayaseelan*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam).
- Kayne, R.S. (2005b) *Movement and Silence*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (2008) "Expletives, Datives, and the Tension between Morphology and Syntax" in T. Biberauer (ed.) *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 175-217 (reprinted in Kayne (2010b)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2009) "Some Silent First Person Plurals", in J.M. Brucart, A. Gavarró and J. Solà (eds.) *Merging Features. Computation, Interpretation, and Acquisition*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 276-292 (reprinted in Kayne (2010b)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2010a) "Why Isn't *This* a Complementizer?", in Kayne (2010b) (also in P. Svenonius (ed.) *Functional Structure from Top to Toe: A Festschrift for Tarald Taraldsen*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2014).
- Kayne, R.S. (2010b) *Comparisons and Contrasts*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (to appear) "The Unicity of *There* and the Definiteness Effect"
- Kayne, R.S. and J.-Y. Pollock (2001) "New Thoughts on Stylistic Inversion", in A. Hulk and J.-Y. Pollock (eds.) *Inversion in Romance*, Oxford University Press, New York, 107-162 (reprinted in Kayne (2005)).
- Kayne, R.S. and J.-Y. Pollock (2010) "Notes on French and English Demonstratives", in J.-W. Zwart and M. de Vries (eds.) *Structure Preserved: Studies in Syntax for Jan Koster*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 215-228.
- Kayne, R.S. and J.-Y. Pollock (2012) "Toward an Analysis of French Hyper-Complex Inversion", in L. Brugè, A. Cardinaletti, G. Giusti, N. Munaro and C. Poletto (eds.) *Functional Heads*, Oxford University Press, New York, 150-167 (also in *Comparisons and Contrasts*).
- Kayne, R.S. and J.-Y. Pollock (2014) "Locality and Agreement in French Hyper-Complex Inversion" in E.O. Aboh, M.T. Guasti and I. Roberts (eds.) *Locality*, Oxford University Press, New York, 32-57.
- Koopman, H. (2003) "The locality of agreement and the structure of the DP in Maasai," in W.E. Griffin (ed.) *The Role of Agreement in Natural Language: TLS 5 Proceedings*, Texas Linguistic Forum, 53, 206-227.
- Koopman, H. (2005a) "Korean (and Japanese) Morphology from a Syntactic Perspective," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 36, 601-633.

- Koopman, H. (2005b) "On the Parallelism of DPs and Clauses. Evidence from Kisongo Maasai," in A. Carnie, H. Harley and S.A. Dooley (eds.) *Verb First, On the Syntax of Verbal Initial Languages*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 281-302.
- Koopman, H. and A. Szabolcsi (2000) *Verbal Complexes*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Leu, T. (2007) "These HERE demonstratives," in T. Scheffler, J. Tauberer, A. Eilam and L. Mayol (eds.) *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium, Penn Working Papers in Linguistics vol. 13.1*, 141-154.
- Longobardi, G. (1985) "Connectedness, scope, and c-command," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 16, 163-192.
- Morin, Y.-C. (1979) "There is no Inversion of Subject Clitics in Modern French," ms., University of Montreal.
- Morin, Y.-C. (1985) "On the Two French Subjectless Verbs *Voici* and *Voilà*," *Language*, 61, 777-818.
- Napoli, D.J. (1981) "Subject pronouns: the pronominal system of Italian vs. French," *Chicago Linguistic Society* 17.
- Nicoli, F. (1983) *Grammatica milanese*, Bramante Editrice, Busto Arsizio.
- Ordóñez, F. and E. Treviño (1999) "Left Dislocated Subjects and the Pro-drop Parameter: A Case Study of Spanish," *Lingua*, 107, 39-68.
- Ott, D. (2014) "An Ellipsis Approach to Contrastive Left-Dislocation," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 45, 269-303.
- Pellicciardi, F. (1977) *Grammatica del dialetto romagnolo*, Longo, Ravenna.
- Penello, N. (2003) *Capitolo di morfologia e sintassi del dialetto di Carmignano di Brenta*, Tesi di dottorato, Università di Padova.
- Penello, N. (2007) "On Double Clitics in Interrogatives in a Northern Italian Dialect," *Nordlyd*, 34, 201-217.
- Poletto, C. (2000) *The Higher Functional Field in the Northern Italian Dialects*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (1978) "Trace Theory and French Syntax," in S.J. Keyser (ed.) *Recent Transformational Studies in European Languages*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 65-112.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (1983) "Sur quelques propriétés des phrases copulatives en français," *Langue Française*, 58, 89-125.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (1985) "On Case and the Syntax of Infinitives in French," in J. Guéron, H.-G. Obenauer and J.-Y. Pollock (eds.) *Grammatical Representation*, Foris, Dordrecht, 293-326.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (2006) "Subject Clitics and Complex Inversion," in M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Volume IV*, Blackwell, Malden, Mass. and Oxford, 601-659.
- Postal, P.M. (1966) "On So-Called 'Pronouns' in English," in F.P. Dineen, edl, *Report of the Seventeenth Annual Roundtable Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 177-206 (reprinted in Reibel, D.A. and S.A. Schane, eds., *Modern Studies in English* (1969), Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey).
- Preminger, O. (2009) "Breaking Agreements: Distinguishing Agreement and Clitic Doubling by Their Failures," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 40, 619-666.
- Ritter, E. (1995) "On the Syntactic Category of Pronouns and Agreement," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 13, 405-443.

- Rizzi, L. (1997) "The fine structure of the left periphery," in L. Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar. Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 281-337.
- Roberts, I. (1993) "The Nature of Subject Clitics in Franco-Provençal Valdôtain," in A. Belletti (ed.) *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, Rosenberg & Sellier, Torino, 319-353.
- Ronat, M. (1979) "Pronoms topiques et pronoms distinctifs," *Langue Française*, 44, 106-128.
- Ross, J.R. (1970) "On Declarative Sentences," in R.A. Jacobs and P.S. Rosenbaum (eds.) *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, Ginn, Waltham, 222-272.
- Rouveret, A. and J.R. Vergnaud (1980) "Specifying Reference to the Subject: French Causatives and Conditions on Representations," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 11, 97-202.
- Schoorlemmer, E. (2006) "Double Agreement in Complex Inversion," in J. Doetjes and P. González (eds.) *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2004. Selected papers from 'Going Romance', Leiden, 9–11 December 2004*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 275-295.
- Shlonsky, U. (1994) "Agreement in Comp," *The Linguistic Review*, 11, 351-375.
- Spieß, F. 1976. Di un'innovazione morfologica nel sistema dei pronomi personali oggetto del dialetto della Collina d'Oro. In *Problemi di morfosintassi dialettale*, Pacini, Pisa, 203-212.
- Sportiche, D. (1999) "Subject Clitics in French and Romance. Complex Inversion and Clitic Doubling," in K. Johnson and I. Roberts (eds.) *Beyond Principles and Parameters*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 189-221.
- Starke, M. (2001) *Move Dissolves into Merge: a Theory of Locality*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Geneva.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1983) "The Possessor that Ran Away from Home," *The Linguistic Review*, 3, 89-102.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1994) "The Noun Phrase," in F. Kiefer and K. E. Kiss (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics 27. The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*, Academic Press, San Diego, 179-274.
- Taraldsen, K.T (1992) "Agreement as Pronoun Incorporation", paper presented at the 15th GLOW Colloquium, *GLOW Newsletter*, 28, 50-51.
- Togeby, K. (1982) *Grammaire Française, Volume I: Le Nom*, Akademisk Forlag, Copenhagen.
- Torrego, E. (1996) "On Quantifier Float in Control Clauses," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 27, 111-126.
- Uriagereka, J. (1995) "Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance," *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 79-123.
- Vassere, S. (1993) *Sintassi formale e dialettologia. I pronomi clitici nel luganese*, FrancoAngeli, Milan.