Chapter 8.

Person Morphemes and Reflexives in Italian, French and Related Languages

1. Introduction

Helke (1973), Pica (1987), Iatridou (1988), Safir (1996) and others have emphasized the importance of the internal structure of reflexives of the English *himself* type and the Italian *se stesso* type. In this article, I would like to extend that line of thought to the apparently monomorphemic non-clitic reflexives found in French and Italian (and many other European languages). More specifically, I will argue that French *soi* and Italian *sé* are themselves bimorphemic and that each subcomponent makes a distinct syntactic contribution.

I will simultaneously argue that *soi* and *sé* form a natural class with (French) *moi/toi* and (Italian) *me/te*, the first and second person singular non-clitic pronouns. In all of these, there is a consonantal person morpheme *m-*, *t-*, or *s-* that is followed by a morpheme *-oi* (in French) or *-é* (in Italian) having the property 'singular'.[1]

The person morphemes *m-/t-/s-* themselves are arguably not intrinsically 'singular'. This is certainly true of reflexive *s-*, and perhaps even of *m-* and *t-*, as we will see later.

Part I. *m-* and *t-*

2. French possessives

Let us begin with French possessives. When the possessor is first or second person singular and the noun plural, we have:
  (1) mes tables ('my tables')
  (2) tes tables ('your tables')
Compare these with the corresponding definite article:
  (3) les tables ('the tables')
The definite article with feminine singular nouns beginning with a consonant is also very similar to the corresponding first and second person singular possessives:
  (4) ma table ('my table')
  (5) ta table ('your table')
  (6) la table ('the table')
It is natural to take these paradigms to indicate that possessive *mes* and *tes* should be analyzed as *m-/t-+-es*, where *m-* and *t-* are the first and second singular person morphemes and *-es* represents agreement with the plurality of *tables*.[2] The definite article *les* will then be analyzed as *l-* plus the same *-es*.

The possessives in (4)and (5) are then *m-/t-+-a*, with *m-* and *t-* again the person morphemes, and *-a* agreement with the feminine singular *table*. In (6), the definite article is the same *l-* as in (3) plus the *-a* of (4) and (5).

It is quite clear in these cases that the person morphemes are just the consonants *m-* and *t-*. With a masculine singular noun, things are a bit more complex:
  (7) mon livre ('my book')
  (8) ton livre ('your book')
  (9) le livre ('the book')
Comparing (7) and (8), we see that the person morphemes *m-* and *t-* are followed by a morpheme *-on* that does not appear with the definite article.[3] This *-on* is specific to possessives. A variant of it, *-ien*, occurs with possessives when there is no overt noun (in which case the possessive is preceded by the definite article):[4]
  (10) le mien ('the mine')
  (11) le tien ('the your(s)')
These examples have the understood noun as masculine singular. When the understood noun is feminine singular, we have:
  (12) la mienne
  (13) la tienne
and when the understood noun is plural (masculine/feminine):
  (14) les miens/les miennes
  (15) les tiens/les tiennes
The possessives forms in (10)-(15) are composed of the person morpheme *m-/t-* plus *-ien* plus an agreement ending sensitive to the gender and number of the phonetically unrealized noun.

In light of (10)-(15) and (7)-(8), I will take (1)-(2) and (4)-(5) to also contain a possessive morpheme (i.e. an abstract counterpart of -*on/-ien*), so that all the possessive forms will consist of 'person morpheme + possessive morpheme + agreement'.[5]

3. French non-possessives
    The person morphemes *m-* and *t-* occur as preverbal clitics:
    (16) Jean m'invite ('J me invites')
    (17) Jean t'invite ('J you invites')
When the verb begins with a consonant, there is an orthographic -*e* (a schwa that is sometimes not pronounced):
    (18) Jean me voit ('J me sees')
    (19) Jean te voit ('J you sees')
I will not take this -*e* to be a separate morpheme, but rather to be epenthetic, so that the clitic is syntactically always just *m-/t-*.[6]
    The epenthetic character of this -*e* may underlie the fact that it cannot appear postverbally in positive imperatives, where it might be expected to:
    (20) *Invite-me! ('invite me')
    (21) *Invite-te! ('invite you(rself)')
This could not be attributed to final stress falling on the -*e*, since these examples contrast with (***), which does have a final stressed -*e*:
    (22) Invite-le! ('invite him')
The -*e* of *le* must then not be epenthetic. It must rather be a masculine (singular) word marker (in Harris's (1991) sense), so that *le* here is bimorphemic.[7]
    The -*e* of *le* in (22) is thus parallel to the feminine singular -*a* of:
    (23) Invite-la! ('invite her')
In having -*a*, the third person accusative clitic of (23) is just like the definite article in (6) and (12)/(13). Both are *l-*+-*a*. The claim that the -*e* of (18)/(19) is distinct from that of (22) is therefore supported by the fact that there is no clitic in -*a* for *m-* and *t-*:
    (24) *Jean ma voit.
    (25) *Jean ta voit.
I will return below (cf. (77)) to this property of *m-/t-*.
    The way in which French expresses (20) is:[8]
    (26) Invite-moi! ('invite me')
and similarly for (***) (changing the verb to make it more natural):
    (27) Couche-toi! ('lie-down you(rself) = lie down')
The *moi* and *toi* (pronounced /-wa/) found here are identical to the form of these pronouns found in non-clitic environments, for example:
    (28) Jean parle de moi. ('J speaks of me')
    (29) Jean pense à toi. ('J thinks of you')
    (30) Moi, j'aime cela. ('me, I like that')
    (31) Toi, tu aimes cela. ('you, you like that')
    Thinking of Haiman's (1980, 215) analysis of pronouns in Hua and of the basic fact that *m-* and *t-* are person morphemes, I will take these to be bimorphemic, i.e. to be *m-/t-*+*oi*.[9]
    In conclusion so far, *m-* and *t-* are person morphemes that in French sometimes occur with -*oi*, sometimes with a possessive morpheme, as in section 2, and sometimes alone, as in (16)-(19).

4. Italian
    The Italian counterparts of (28) and (29) are:
    (32) Gianni parla di me.
    (33) Gianni pensa a te.
In the spirit of the preceding discussion, I take these non-clitic *me* and *te* in Italian to be bimorphemic, i.e. to be *m-/t-*+-*é* (cf. note 1). The clitic counterparts are (when no other clitic follows) *mi* and *ti*, as in:
    (34) Gianni mi vede. ('G me sees')
    (35) Gianni ti vede. ('G you sees')
I will take the vowel /i/ to be epenthetic, as suggested by Benincà (1998, note 11).
    These object clitics take the form *me/te* when followed by another clitic (of a certain type):[10]

(36) Gianni me lo dice. ('G me it says')
(37) Gianni te lo dice. ('G you it says')

I take this alternation not to reflect any change in the syntactic status of the object clitic - since in (34)/(35) it is monomorphemic, i.e. *m-/t-* with an epenthetic vowel, then it is in (36)/(37), too. The person morphemes in question are *m-* and *t-* in Italian, just as in French.

Italian possessives, while different from French in some interesting respects, also fit well with the idea that the person morphemes for first and second singular are *m-* and *t-*. Italian possessives cooccur for the most part with an article. Thus the Italian equivalents of (4) and (5) above are:

(38) la mia tavola ('the my table')
(39) la tua tavola ('the your table')

The final *-a* in each word is the feminine singular word marker. Its presence in *mia* and *tua* reflects agreement with the gender (and number) of the noun *tavola*.[11]

I take the fact that (38) has an *-i-* where (39) has a *-u-* to be an irregularity that is compatible with the analysis of *mia* and *tua* as trimorphemic, i.e. as *m-i-a* and *t-u-a*. This is supported (looking ahead a bit) by:

(40) la sua tavola ('the his/her table')

with the same *-u-*, but with *s-* instead of *t-*. Much as in the discussion of French above in section 2, I take this *-i/u-* to be a possessive morpheme. Again, the person morpheme is just *m-/t-* (or *s-*).

5. *m-/t-* and number

It is uncontroversial to say that French and Italian *m-* and *t-* are specified for person (first and second, respectively).[12] It is equally clear that they are not specified for gender. Somewhat less clear is their status with respect to number.

To say that they are singular is natural and perhaps correct. But it is worth pointing out a (cross-dialectal) way in which their singularity seems less rigid than their person feature. What I have in mind is the fact that in some Italian dialects the clitic form of *m-* can in some (accusative, more than dative) contexts also be first person plural. Thus in Milanese, as described by Nicoli (1983, 142, 146, 150, 358), the following are possible:[13]

(41) El me véd nun. ('he me sees us' = 'He sees us')
(42) La vegnarà a toeumm. ('she will-come to get-me' = 'She will come to get us')[14]

With the same initial *n-* as that of non-clitic *nun* in (41), Milanese also allows *ne* as a first person plural clitic:

(43) La ne dà... ('she us gives...')

In other words, Milanese has both *n-* and *m-* as object clitics for first person plural (again, I take the vowel of *ne* and *me* in (***) and (41) to be epenthetic).

Now *me* is also the (only) object clitic for first person singular:

(44) El me véd nò. ('he me sees not')

Thus it seems that in Milanese, *m-* is to be characterized as first person, without rigid specification for number.

Something rather similar is found in various French dialects, in the case of the subject clitic *je*, which in standard French is first person singular.[15] In these dialects, (the equivalent of) *je* can occur in the first person in both singular and plural (with differing verb forms). The following is from the dialect described by Fougeu-Fontaine (1986, 52):[16]

(45) J èm ('I love')
(46) J èmô ('I love-1pl' = 'We love')

In these dialects, then, *j-* seems to be first person, without specification for number.

We can now note an asymmetry between person and number, as far as *m-/j-* is concerned. Although in certain dialects, the specification for singular can be suspended, so that *m-* or *j-*, depending on the dialect, becomes compatible with both singular and plural, there does not seem to be any dialect that drops the specification for first person (which would have yielded, for example, neutralization between first and second person).

It may be, then, that these morphemes are fundamentally specified for (first) person, but not fundamentally specified for singular. In the languages (and contexts) in which *m-* or its variant *j-* is incompatible with plural, that must be a secondary effect.[17]

The phenomena discussed in this section, where *m-* or *j-* is compatible with plural, have involved object or subject clitics. I do not know of any Romance language/dialect in which something comparable is found with a non-clitic pronoun:

(47) Hanno visto me. ('they-have seen me')
(48) Ils ont parlé de moi. ('they have spoken of me')

In these two Italian and French examples, non-clitic *me* and *moi* are strictly singular. Assume that this holds across all of Romance without exception. The question then is: Why should there be such a difference between clitic

pronouns (in which first person *m-/j-* can sometimes be neutralized for number) and non-clitic pronouns (in which (by hypothesis) first person *m-(/j-)* cannot be so neutralized)?

I would like to suggest that this difference is due to the bimorphemic character of the non-clitic first person pronouns in (47)/(48) (and in their counterparts in other Romance languages) vs. the monomorphemic character of the corresponding clitics. The non-clitic forms are composed of *m-* combined with another morpheme (*-oi* in French and *-é* (cf. note 1) in Italian). The corresponding clitics are, on the other hand, monomorphemic, i.e. *m-* plus at most an epenthetic vowel. The reason that the non-clitics always remain singular is that their second morpheme *-oi/-é/* is always itself specified for singular.[18] (This property of *-oi/-é* will play an important role in the discussion of reflexives below.)

6. *n-/v-* in French

In French, first and second person plural are associated with the consonantal morphemes *n-* and *v-*.[19] The possessive forms with a singular noun (there is no visible agreement with the gender of that noun) are:
  (49) notre livre ('our book')
  (50) votre livre ('your book')
With a covert noun, there is a change in vowel:
  (51) le nôtre ('the ours')
  (52) le vôtre ('the yours')
If the noun is plural:
  (53) nos livres ('our books')
  (54) vos livres ('your books')
If the noun is plural and covert:
  (55) les nôtres
  (56) les vôtres
  The subject clitic forms for first and second plural are *nous/vous*, and the object clitic forms are the same:
  (57) Nous partons. ('we leave')
  (58) Vous partez. ('you leave')
  (59) Jean nous voit. ('J us sees')
  (60) Jean vous voit. ('J you sees')
These are furthermore the same as the non-clitic forms:
  (61) Jean parle de nous. ('J speaks of us')
  (62) Jean parle de vous. ('J speaks of you')
In each of the above pairs, the first person plural form in *n-* is identical to the second person plural form in *v-*, except for the *n-* vs. *v-* difference itself.

This makes it plausible to take consonantal *n-* and *v-* to be first and second person plural morphemes. As in the case of *m-* and *t-*, each is specified for person and indifferent to gender. Number-wise, they seem to be less flexible than *m-* (perhaps because plural is more 'marked' than singular).

If *n-* and *v-* are separate morphemes, the question arises as to the status of the other parts of the words containing them. The *-ous* of (57)-(62) might be decomposable into a plural *-s*[20] and a morpheme *-ou-*, perhaps the plural counterpart of the singular *-oi* of (48). (The *-s* of *nos/vos/nôtres/vôtres* in (53)-(56), on the other hand, almost certainly reflects agreement with the possessed noun, rather than the plurality of the first/second person itself.) The other pieces are better understood, I think, by switching back to Italian.

7. Italian *n-* and *v-*.

First person plural *n-* in Italian fails to appear in the object clitic, which is instead *ci*.[21] Apart from that irregularity, *n-* parallels the second person plural *v-*. The non-clitic forms corresponding to French (61)/(62) are:
  (63) Gianni parla di noi.
  (64) Gianni parla di voi.
The final *-i* is plausibly the final plural *-i* found in all three words of a DP like:[22]
  (65) i ragazzi tristi ('the boys sad')
in which case the *-o-* of *noi/voi* would have the same status as the *-ou-* of the French examples.[23]

The feminine plural of the definite article and of many nouns and adjectives ends in *-e*:
  (66) le ragazze tristi ('the girls sad')
  (67) le ragazze piccole ('the girls small')
Noi and *voi* cannot end in *-e*. They retain their *-i* ending no matter what their referent:

(68) *noe/*voe

This is in all probability part of the more general fact, to which I will return below, that first and second person pronouns in French and Italian never inflect for gender.

The possessive forms with *n*- and *v*- in Italian are illustrated by:

(69) la nostra tavola ('the our table')
(70) la vostra tavola ('the your table')

The final -*a*s are the feminine singular word marker. The -*o*- is probably that of *noi/voi*, the -*s* an irregular (for Italian) plural morpheme. The -*tr*- might be a possessive morpheme like the -*i* and -*u* of (38)-(40), or it might be a reduced form of the root *altr*- ('other'),[24] in which case the possessive morpheme in (69)/(70) would be null.

8. *m-/t-* vs. *l-*

In preceding sections, I have claimed that *m*- and *t*- (and similarly *n*- and *v*-) are person morphemes that sometimes occur alone, as, for example, when they are object clitics (though there may be an epenthetic vowel). Sometimes they occur in combination with other morphemes, as in the case of non-clitic pronouns (and also possessives). To call these morphemes first and second person (singular and plural) raises by itself no severe problems.[25] But a question arises as to the term 'third person'.

Benveniste (1966,   ) argued that what is standardly called third person is best thought of as 'non-person'. Some third person pronouns are illustrated for Italian in:

(71) Gianni la vede. ('G her sees')
(72) Gianni vede lei. ('G sees her')

These are the feminine singular forms, clitic *la* and non-clitic *lei*. The question can be phrased as follows: Do *la, lei* and the other third person pronouns form a natural class with the first and second person pronouns discussed so far?

I think that Benveniste was right, and that the answer to this question is negative. If so, then the term 'third person pronoun' should be abandoned. I will (try to) use the term 'determiner pronoun' instead, thinking of Postal (1966) and later work that grew out of his.[26] The term 'determiner pronoun' is straightforwardly appealing for French since the accusative 'third person' clitics (*le, la, les*) are identical in form to the definite article:

(73) Jean le/la/les voit. ('J him-or-it/her-or-it/them sees')
(74) le livre, la table, les livres ('the book, the table, the books')

In Italian, the accusative clitics can likewise be paired with corresponding definite articles (although one form of the definite article (*il*) cannot appear as a clitic, and the clitic *li* corresponds only partially to the definite article *i*):[27]

(75) Gianni lo/la/li/le vede.
(76) lo zio, la tavola, i ragazzi, le ragazze ('the uncle, the table, the boys, the girls')

All the object clitics of (73) and (75) begin with an *l*-. So do the 'third person' dative clitics of French (*lui*(3sg), *leur*(3pl)) and two of the three dative forms in Italian (*gli*(3msg/3pl), *le*(3fsg), *loro*(3pl)). The non-clitic 'third person' pronouns also show an *l*- for the most part. French has *lui*(3msg), *elle*(3fsg), *eux*(3mpl), *elles*(3fpl). Italian has *lui*(3msg), *lei*(3fsg), *loro*(3pl).

Is this *l*- to be grouped with *m*- and *t*- (and *n*- and *v*-)? Four specific reasons to think that it should not be (i.e. to think that Benveniste was right) are the following: First, the singular accusative *l*-clitics in French and Italian always have a word marker reflecting gender, as seen in French *le, la* and in Italian *lo, la*.[28] There is no corresponding gender distinction with first or second person, e.g. in French:

(77) Jean me/*ma voit. ('J me sees')

The clitic *me* serves for both male and female speakers, there is no feminine object clitic *ma* (and similarly for *te*, *ta*).[29]

French dative clitics do not show a gender distinction, but Italian dative clitics do (*gli* ('msg') vs. *le* ('fsg')); again, there is no gender distinction in the first or second person. In the non-clitic forms, French distinguishes *lui* (msg) from *elle* (fsg) (*lui* vs. *lei* in Italian). Neither language shows any gender distinction in the first or second person non-clitic pronouns. There is thus a consistent difference between the determiner pronouns in *l*-, which often show gender distinctions, and the first and second person forms in *m*- and *t*-, which do not.

Second, the determiner pronouns in *l*- often express plural by adding the usual plural morpheme. This is true for French accusative clitic *les*, non-clitic *elles* (fpl) and subject clitics *ils* (mpl) and *elles* (fpl), as well as for the Italia accusative clitics *li* (mpl) and *le* (fpl).[30] But *m*- and *t*- have the notable property that they never combine with plural morphemes to express first or second person plural:[31]

(78) *Jean mes/tes voit. (French)[32]
(79) *Jean parle de mous/tous. (French)
(80) *Gianni ha parlato di mei/tei. (Italian)

Third, *l*- never combines with the possessive morpheme that can show gender agreement with the head noun. Thus alongside (7)/(8), repeated here as (81)/(82), one might expect to find (83) (with the meaning 'his/her book'):

   (81) mon livre ('my book')
   (82) ton livre ('your book')
   (83) *lon livre

The same is true of of the covert noun cases of, for example, (12) and (13), repeated here, which have no counterpart with *l*-:

   (84) la mienne ('the mine')
   (85) la tienne ('the yours')
   (86) *la lienne

Similarly, Italian has, corresponding to (38)/(39), repeated here, no form in *l*-:[33]

   (87) la mia tavola ('the my table')
   (88) la tua tavola ('the your table')
   (89) *la lia/lua tavola

   Fourth, in some Italian dialects, *m*- and *t*- act differently from *l*- with respect to accusative clitic doubling. For Trentino, Gatti (1989-90, 195n) has pointed out:[34]

   (90) I me vede mi ('they me see me')
   (91) I te vede ti ('they you see you')
   (92) 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*.[35]

   It seems clear, then, that *m*- and *t*- belong to a natural class that does not include *l*- (although it does include reflexive *s*-, as we will see below).

   As far as the clitic doubling facts of (90)-(92) are concerned, I think the difference in behavior seen there can be at least in part related to an Italian fact noted by Benincà (199 , 272): If the direct object of a psych verb is preposed (without there being a clitic double present), that direct object can be preceded by the preposition *a* if the direct object is first or second person:[36]

   (93) A me preoccupa il viaggio. ('to me worries the trip')

This *a* recalls the *a* that is found more widely in Spanish. The fact pointed out by Benincà can be interpreted as indicating that the appearance of this *a* with direct objects is favored by the object being first or second person.

   For a number of speakers, at least in the North of Italy, this predilection of direct object *a* for first and second person is seen even with non-psych-verbs:[37]

   (94) A me mi hanno visto. ('to me me they-have seen')
   (95) ??A lui lo hanno visto. ('to him him they-have seen')

   The contrast seen in (90)-(92) can be linked to these if the doubling construction of (90)-(92) contains an unpronounced *a*.

   That an unpronounced *a* may well be present in (90)-(92) is suggested by the fact that some North Italian dialects (e.g. Paduan and Venetian) allow sentences like:[38]

   (96) Ghe lo dago Giorgio. ('him$_{dat}$ it I-give George')

The proposal, then, is that (90)-(92) must have a similarly unpronounced *a*, which, like its overt counterpart in (93)-(95), is favored by first or second person.

   As to why this *a* should be favored by first and second person, there may be a link to Sardinian, as characterized by Jones (1993, sects. 2.2.6, 5.1; 1996).[39] The Sardinian accusative *a* is basically limited to appearing before proper names and (some) pronouns.[40] Jones's proposal is essentially that Sardinian *a* is required before all accusatives that lack a determiner position. (Indefinites of various kinds are assumed to have a null determiner.) Those pronouns which take *a* are NPs. Those that do not are DPs. In the spirit of Jones's proposal, it may be that Italian *a* favors first and second person pronouns because those are not DPs, whereas Italian third person pronouns are DPs.[41]

   If the locus of word markers is D, as suggested by Uriagereka (1995, note 4), then the absence of a feminine form for first and second persons seen in (77) would also follow from their non-DP status.

   The general conclusion of this section, then, is that *l*- is separate from *m*- and *t*- (and *n*- and *v*-). This seems quite solid, and leads the way to consideration of reflexive *s*-.

Part II. *s*-

9. Reflexive *s*-.
   Virtually everything that we have taken into account so far points to the conclusion that there is a reflexive morpheme *s*- that patterns strongly with *m*- and *t*- (rather than with *l*-).[42]

In French, alongside object clitic *m'/t'* (before vowels - cf. (16)/(17)), we have reflexive *s'*:

(97) Jean m'invite. ('J me invites')
(98) Jean t'invite. ('J you invites')
(99) Jean s'invite. ('J refl. invites')

Before consonants:

(100) Jean me voit. ('J me sees')
(101) Jean te voit. ('J you sees')
(102) Jean se voit. ('J refl. sees')

There is no feminine form:

(103) *Jean ma voit.
(104) *Jean ta voit.
(105) *Marie sa voit.

And no plural in -*s*:[43]

(106) *Jean mes voit.
(107) *Jean tes voit.
(108) *Jean et Marie ses voit. ('J and M refl.pl. see')

The non-clitic forms are entirely parallel in form (cf. (28)/(29)):

(109) Quand on parle de moi,... ('when one speaks of me...')
(110) Quand on parle de toi,... ('...of you')
(111) Quand on parle de soi,... ('...of refl.')

This parallelism is found in Italian, too:[44]

(112) Parla di me. ('he-speaks of me')
(113) Parla di te. ('...of you')
(114) Parla di sé. ('...of refl.')

None of these allow a plural morpheme to be added (v. (80)):

(115) *Parla di mei.
(116) *Parla di tei.
(117) *Parlano di sei. ('they-speak of refl.pl.')

The parallelism in form carries over to the object clitics:

(118) Gianni mi vede. ('G me sees')
(119) Gianni ti vede. ('G you sees')
(120) Gianni si vede. ('G refl. sees')

including to the vowel change dependent on a following clitic, as mentioned above ((36)/(37)):

(121) Gianni me lo dice. ('G me it says')
(122) Gianni te lo dice. ('G you it says')
(123) Gianni se lo dice. ('G refl. it says')

Furthermore, the doubling facts of (90)-(92) group *se* with *me/te*, rather than with the determiner clitics. Thus in Paduan:

(124) El me ga visto mi. ('he me has seen me')[45]
(125) El te ga visto ti. ('he you has seen you')
(126) El se ga visto lu. ('he refl. has seen him')
(127) *I lo ga visto lu. ('they him have seen him')

The contrast between these last two examples shows that the earlier discussion of (90)-(92) was incomplete, since it attributed the deviance of (92) and now (127) to properties of the doubled non-clitic pronoun, which is the same *lu* in the grammatical (126). It may be that in the reflexive clitic example (126) no (unpronounced) *a* is needed (as opposed to the non-reflexive examples), for reasons having to do with the unaccusative-like status of reflexive clitic sentences.[46] Alternatively, or in addition, the contrast between (126) and (127) may indicate that the choice of clitic itself plays a direct role in determining the acceptability of doubling, with the D-clitic *lo* somehow making doubling more difficult to achieve (in these dialects - cf. note 34 above) than the non-D-clitic *se*.

I note in passing that the doubling parallel between *me/te* and *se* extends to the intriguing case of doubling in the 'neg...*che*' construction.[47] In Paduan, one has:

(128) Nol me vede che mi. ('neg he me sees than/but me' = 'he sees only me')

Burzio (1991, 90n) gives a comparable example with *se* for Piedmontese:

(129) Giuanin a s guarda mac chiel. ('G he refl. watches only him')

I conclude that reflexive *s-* forms a natural class with the person morphemes *m-* and *t-*.

10. Reflexive *s-* and number.

It would be natural to think, in light of the following (Italian) examples, that *s-* is neutral with respect to number:

(130) Gianni s'invita. ('G refl. invites')

(131) Gianni e Maria s'invitano. ('G and M refl. invite')

And in fact it is perfectly true that reflexive clitics in Italian (and French) occur productively with both singular and plural antecedents. (When the antecedent is plural, a reciprocal interpretation is also possible.)

However, if we turn to Italian non-clitic *sé*, we find an asymmetry:

(132) Il ragazzo ha parlato di sé. ('the boy has spoken of refl.')

(133) ?I ragazzi hanno parlato di sé. ('the boys have...')

With a plural antecedent, *sé* is somewhat less good than with a singular antecedent, on the whole.[48] (I have found one speaker for whom (133) is impossible.)

That *sé* should tilt toward the singular is not entirely surprising, given its resemblance to non-clitic *me* and *te*. In particular, all three should be analyzed as X+*é*, where X is *m-, t-* or *s-* and -*é* is a morpheme (cf. note 1) whose properties will be discussed just below. (Important also is the fact that this resemblance does not extend to the plural *noi* and *voi*.)

The obvious proposal, now, is that the tilt toward singular seen with *sé* (as opposed to the clitic *si*, which is neutral between singular and plural) is to be attributed to the morpheme -*é* that *sé* has in common with non-clitic *me* and *te* (and that clitic *si* lacks).[49] In other words, it is -*é* itself that is singular.

This would seem to lead us to expect (133) to be sharply unacceptable, which is not the case. My hypothesis is the following:

(134) *Sé* can have a plural antecedent only via the intermediary of a(n abstract) distributor.[50]

As for the question where that abstract distributor is (in, for example, (133)), consider the following fact brought to my attention by Luigi Rizzi, namely that a plural antecedent for *sé* is unacceptable if the antecedent is 'long-distance'. An example would be:[51]

(135) ?Il ragazzo mi ha convinto a parlare di sé. ('the boy me has convinced to speak of refl.=him')

(136) *I ragazzi mi hanno convinto a parlare di sé. ('the boys...')

The fact that (136) is worse than (135) suggests that the abstract distributor needed in (136) must be 'local' with respect to both *sé* and the antecedent of *sé*.[52] Representing it as *DB*, this gives for (133):

(137) I ragazzi hanno parlato *DB* di sé.

But given the double locality requirement, there is no satisfactory position available in the long-distance case (136):

(138) *i ragazzi mi$_i$ hanno convinto a PRO$_i$ parlare *DB* di sé

(139) *i ragazzi mi$_i$ hanno convinto *DB* a PRO$_i$ parlare di sé

In (138), *DB* is too far from the antecedent *i ragazzi* (cf. the general locality requirement on floated quantifiers (Sportiche (1988)). In (139), *DB* is too far from *sé* itself.

The conclusion that the -*é* of *sé* is singular (and that it therefore can never have a non-distributed plural antecedent) is supported by the fact that *sé* cannot be a reciprocal (as opposed again to the monomorphemic clitic *si*). Thus the contrast between (131) and (133) is mirrored by the (sharper) contrast (in interpretation) between:

(140) Loro si amano. ('they refl. love')

(141) ?Loro parlano di sé. ('they speak of refl.')

Whereas the first of these has a natural reciprocal interpretation (in addition to the reflexive one), the second is not possible as a reciprocal. The reason is that *sé*, because it contains -*é*, prohibits its antecedent from being a non-distributed plural. But a non-distributed plural antecedent is precisely what a reciprocal needs:[53]

(142) They're (*each) in love with one another.

In conclusion, the singularity of -*é* has significant effects in the case of *sé*, much as it did in the case of non-clitic *me* - cf. the discussion of (47) above.

11. Further restrictions on -*é*

To take non-clitic *me/te/sé* to form a natural class in Italian, representable as *m-/t-/s-*+*é* seems correct, yet there is clearly a difference that has so far been set aside, namely that the antecedent of *sé* can be a full DP, whereas the antecedent of *me/te* cannot be.[54] Assume that this restriction on the antecedent of *me/te* is not only a fact about *m-/t-*, but that it carries over to -*é* itself. Then Italian must be analyzed as containing a small discrepancy between the -*é* of *me/te* and the -*é* of *sé* (which are otherwise identical). That is, the -*é* of *sé* must be allowed to waive the antecedent restriction which it might otherwise be expected to take over from the -*é* of *me/te*.

Italian is evidently capable of bearing the burden of this discrepancy. French is not. The French counterpart of *sé* is non-clitic *soi* (cf. non-clitic first/second person *moi/toi*). The antecedent of *soi* generally cannot be a full DP:[55]

(143) Quand on parle de soi,... ('when one speaks of refl.')
(144) Chacun a parlé de soi. ('each has spoken of refl.')
(145) *Ce linguiste a parlé de soi. ('that linguist...')

For Jean-Yves Pollock, there is a clear contrast between (145) and:

(146) A ce colloque, chaque linguiste a parlé de soi. ('at that conference, each linguist...')

as well as between the following two:

(147) *Tous les linguistes parlent de soi. ('all the linguists speak of refl.')
(148) Tout linguiste parle de soi. ('every linguist...')

Thinking of Szabolcsi (1994) and Bartos (199), it may be that *chaque linguiste* and *tout linguiste* differ from *ce linguiste* and *tous les linguistes* in that the former pair lack a DP projection. If so, then a specific requirement on the antecedent of *soi*, namely that it lack a DP projection, in fact falls together with the basic requirement on the antecedents of *moi* and *toi*, if first and second persons lack a DP projection, as discussed above ((text to) note 41).

I therefore take French *-oi* to be broadly consistent across *m-, t-* and *s-* as far as choice of antecedent is concerned. Put another way, the restrictions on the antecedent of *soi* are now seen to be a property of its subcomponent *-oi*.

Since French clitic *se* lacks *-oi*, it is not surprising, either, that *se* (which just has an epenthetic vowel, when it has one at all) shows none of the restrictions to which *soi* is subject.

From this perspective, one might wonder if there is still not a discrepancy in French (smaller than in Italian) between *moi/toi* and *soi* concerning antecedents. Although *-oi* in all three cases has the property of needing an antecedent that is not a full DP, the antecedent taken by *moi/toi* is very particular, and not narrowly extendable to the antecedents of *soi*. If we again associate the antecedent of *moi/toi* not only with *m-/t-* but also with *-oi*, the discrepancy in question is of interest to the present discussion.

French evidently tolerates this small discrepancy. But Piedmontese and various other North Italian dialects arguably do not.[56] They have a clitic in *s-*, but no non-clitic in *s-*. It may be that these dialects do not allow their counterpart of French *-oi* or Italian *-é* to be generalized from *m-/t-* to *s-* at all, for reasons having to do with uniformity of antecedent.

12. A restriction on reflexive *s-*

The preceding section considered certain restrictions on non-clitic *s*-forms in French and Italian and related dialects. Those restrictions were not shared by the corresponding clitic forms. There is, on the other hand, one class of restrictions that is common to both clitic and non-clitic French and Italian *s-*, having to do with the person feature of the antecedent.[57] In neither language can the antecedent be first or second person, e.g. in Italian:

(149) *Tu s'inviti. ('you refl. invite')
(150) *Io parlo di sé. ('I speak of refl.')

Taking *m-/t-/s-* to be strongly parallel, *m-* to be first person and *t-* to be second person, it would be natural to say that *s-* is itself neither first nor second person and therefore does not admit an antecedent that is. This would suffice for French and Italian, but not in general, as shown by various North Italian dialects that are less restrictive than French and Italian. For example, Nicoli (1983, 151/2) gives:[58]

(151) Nun se lavom. ('we refl. wash')

The question how to understand this kind of variation within Romance is complicated by the fact that some dialects sometimes allow sentences like:[59]

(152) Mi a ma sa lavi i man. ('me *a* me refl. wash the hands' = 'I wash my hands')

Mi here is a (non-clitic) subject pronoun and *a* a subject clitic.[60] Though there is only one other argument with 'wash' apart from the direct object *i man*, there are two further object clitics *ma* and *sa*.

How best to allow for this kind of 'doubling' (*ma* and *sa* together when we would expect just one of them) is not yet clear.[61] But the existence of (152) raises the possibility that in sentences like (151) the relation between *s-* and the first or second person subject is mediated by an abstract counterpart of the *ma* of (152).[62] If so, then it might be feasible to take *s-* never to directly have a first or second person antecedent. In (152) (and (151)), it would be *ma* that has *mi* as antecedent. *Sa* would itself not have *mi* as antecedent, though it would be in a (quasi-)doubling relation with first person *ma*.

13. Reflexive *s-* and Condition B

First and second person pronouns are standardly assumed to fall under Condition B of the Binding Theory:

(153) *I photographed me exactly twice yesterday.
(154) *Why did you photograph you only twice yesterday?

If I have been correct in emphasizing the systematic parallels between *m-/t-* and *s-*, we would expect *s-*forms to be subject to Condition B, too.[63] In the case of clitic *s-*, it looks as if the expectation is not met, since the following (Italian) sentence is perfectly acceptable:

  (155) Gianni si fotografa. ('G refl. photographs')

On the other hand, the same holds of clitic *m-/t-*:

  (156) Io mi fotografo. ('I me ...')
  (157) Tu ti fotografi. ('you you ...')

(***)/(157) show that there is no discrepancy here among *m-/t-/s-*.[64]

    Non-clitic *sé* does, however, display what I take to be clear Condition B effects. We can see this by taking, first, the following three sentences:

  (158) Gianni ha parlato di me. ('G has spoken of me')
  (159) Gianni ha parlato di te. ('...of you')
  (160) Gianni ha parlato di sé. ('...of refl.')

All three are acceptable. Consider now the direct object counterparts of these:

  (161) Gianni ha fotografato me. ('G has photographed me')
  (162) Gianni ha fotografato te. ('...you')
  (163) ??Gianni ha fotografato sé. ('...refl.')

    The contrast between (163) and (160), which was pointed out by Giorgi (1984, 328), varies in sharpness depending on the speaker. Judgments on (163) range from somewhat marginal to fully unacceptable. Giorgi correctly attributed the contrast to the presence of the preposition in (160). I would like to propose, now, that the deviance of (163) is to be interpreted as a Condition B effect (that can be neutralized by a preposition).[65]

    I note in passing that the plural counterpart of (163) is sharply impossible:

  (164) *I ragazzi hanno fotografato sé. ('the boys have...')

The reason is that (164) combines the Condition B violation seen in (163) with the reluctance of *sé* to admit a plural antecedent seen in (133). More precisely, *sé* can have a plural antecedent only via the intermediary of a distributor, as stated in (134). The fact that (164) is appreciably less acceptable than (133) (with plural antecedent and preposition preceding *sé*) suggests that the required distributor is facilitated by the preposition (which perhaps provides a Spec position for the distributor that is unavailable in (164)).[66]

    Returning to the contrast between (160) and (163), the idea that the preposition is playing a crucial role is suggested by the following judgments of Giuseppe Longobardi's: For him (160) itself is only acceptable in an 'elegant' stylistic register. In his colloquial Italian, he has (with coreference):

  (165) Gianni ha parlato di lui. ('G has spoken of him')

But he accepts (and prefers) *sé* when the subject is *ciascuno dei ragazzi*:

  (166) Ciascuno dei ragazzi ha parlato di sé. ('each of-the boys has spoken of refl.')

In other words, his colloquial Italian is (substantially) like French (cf. (text to) note 55). What is of primary importance here, though, is that he finds a sharp contrast between (165) and the following, which is impossible with coreference:[67]

  (167) *Gianni$_i$ ha fotografato lui$_i$.

Thus, the importance of the preposition seems clear.[68] (In the framework of Chomsky (1986b), one might take the PP to be capable, in Italian (and French, but not English), of counting as governing category for a pronoun.[69])

    Given the contrast between (167) and (165), and the fact that the former is certainly to be considered a Condition B violation, it is virtually certain that (163) should be considered a (weaker) Condition B violation, too. In which case, *s-* is visible to Condition B just as are *m-* and *t-*.

14. Pronominal *s-*

    Italian (and French) have in possessives a pronominal *s-*:

  (168) Io ho visto la sua tavola. ('I have seen the his/her table')

This *s-* is clearly not reflexive.[70] The question is whether this *s-* is closer to the *l-* of determiner pronouns or to the reflexive *s-*. One consideration has to do with the absence of *l-* is comparable possessives - *la lua tavola (cf. (89) above). If this absence is not accidental (it might be related to facts about compounding - *a pick-me-up* vs. *a pick-him-up[71]), then the *s-* of (168) cannot have too much in common with *l-*.

    A second consideration has to do with the distribution within Romance of such pronominal *s-*. Apart from possessives, where it is commonly found, pronominal *s-* is found in non-clitic (non-possessive) forms in some dialects. Thus:

  (169) Qu'ei se que parlo. ('that it's him that speaks')

(170) Ca ve de se. ('that comes from him')
(171) I fau coqui per se. ('I do this for him')
(172) I pèr sè ke d e travalò. ('it's for him that I have worked')

The first three are from the Limousin dialect studied by Chabaneau (1874, 453), the last from the Savoie dialect studied by Ratel (1958, 31).[72] In both of these dialects, this pronominal use of *se* seems to be limited to (some) non-clitic environments. In fact, with the one exception to be discussed shortly, pronominal *s-* seems never to occur as an object clitic.[73]

Taken together with the point of the previous paragraph, this suggests that the *s-* of (168)-(172) is, first, not at all a variant of *l-*, and second, that it is in fact the same *s-* as the reflexive one. Put another way, *s-* is not intrinsically specialized as anaphoric.[74] It is primarily anaphoric in Romance, but can also be pronominal.

The absence of any clitic pronominal *s-*, combined with my earlier proposals concerning the difference between (monomorphemic) clitics and (bimorphemic) non-clitics (in the case of *m-/t-/s-*) leads me to the more specific proposal that *s-* can be pronominal (non-anaphoric) only by virtue of amalgamating with a second morpheme, either *-é*, as in (169)/(172), or *-u*, as in possessives (or their counterparts in other Romance languages). (In effect, then, these morphemes *-é/-u* can be pronominal, at least in (168)-(172).)[75]

The antecedent of *se/sé* in the dialects illustrated in (169)/(172) seems to be limited to singular. Similarly, the antecedent of *su-* in (168) is necessarily singular. Thus, these pronominal instances of *s-* have the same bias toward singular that we saw in the case of reflexive non-clitic *s-* in section 10 above. This supports the idea that the two are basically the same *s-*,[76] in that both, when they combine with another morpheme, are restricted to combining with morphemes (*-é/-u*) that are inherently singular.[77]

15. A further question

The bias toward singular found with non-clitic *sé* was attributed in section 10 to a property of the morpheme *-é* with which *s-* combines. In a similar way, the singular bias of *su-* could be attributed to a property of the possessive morpheme *-u-*. The contrast with clitics in *s-*, which show no bias toward singular in either Italian or French, was attributed to the fact that those clitics are monomorphemic, so that if *s-* itself is neutral with respect to number, the contrast follows. There are, on the other hand, some dialects that seem to show some bias toward singular even in their reflexive clitics.

For example, Lepelley (1974, 113) gives clitic *s-* for dative reflexive singular and plural and for accusative reflexive singular, but not for accusative reflexive plural.[78] Thus, it may be that in that dialect *s-* itself is not entirely neutral with respect to number. Alternatively, it might be that the accusative reflexive in question is bimorphemic, contrary to those of Italian and French.[79]

16. Morphology and Anaphora

The main points that I have argued in this article are that non-clitic reflexive *sé* and *soi* in Italian and French are to be analyzed as *s-+-é/oi*, and that to a substantial extent *s-* patterns with first and second person *m-* and *t-*. These claims bear on Burzio's (1991) proposal concerning the relation between morphology and anaphora. Burzio proposed that the morphological poverty (lack of phi-features) of forms in *s-* implied their anaphoric status.

However, if I am correct, the fact that *s-* cannot combine with number morphology (cf. (108), (117)) is a property shared by *m-* and *t-* (cf. (106)/(107)) and (115)/(116)). Consequently, incompatibility with number morphology cannot be a sufficient condition for anaphoric status.

Similarly, gender morphology cannot combine either with *s-* (cf. (105)) or with *m-* and *t-* (cf. (103)/(104)). Thus, incompatibility with gender morphology cannot be a sufficient condition for anaphoric status, either.[80]

On the other hand, if we set aside complex reflexives of the English type (cf. Jayaseelan (1996) and Safir (1996) for recent discussion), then it still might be the case, in the spirit of Burzio's approach, that lack of number (and perhaps gender - cf. note 80) is a necessary condition for anaphoric status.[81]

This might account for the fact that *s-* has no plural counterpart in the way that *n-* and *v-* are plural counterparts to *m-* and *t-* (cf. (49)-(70) above). Thus no Romance language, to my knowledge, has, for example, a *z-* that would be the plural counterpart of *s-*:

(173) Il ragazzo si fotografa. ('the boys refl. photographs')
(174) *I ragazzi zi fotografano. ('the boys refl.pl...')

(Related to this is the fact discussed above (cf. (132)-(142)) that *sé* is singular, i.e. that the morpheme *-é* with which *s-* combines to form a non-clitic is singular.)

Jayaseelan (1996, note 11) suggests that it might be only the person feature whose absence implies anaphoric status. If we take *s-* to be a person morpheme lacking specification for first or second person (cf. above and the 0-

person (distinct from non-person) of chapter 7, sect. 3.6),[82] the question is, is that sufficient to imply anaphoric status? If I am correct in taking some non-clitic *s*- forms to be non-anaphoric (cf. (168)-(172)), then the answer is, not exactly. The status of *s*- with respect to person may imply anaphoric status, but only in those (clitic) cases where *s*- combines with no other morpheme.

References

Authier, J.-M. and L. Reed (1992) "On the Syntactic Status of French Affected Datives," *The Linguistic Review* 9, 295-311.

Baptista, M. (1997) *The Morpho-syntax of Nominal and Verbal Categories in Capeverdean Creole*, Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Barnes, M.P. with E. Weyhe (1994) "Faroese," in E. König and J. van der Auwera (eds.) *The Germanic Languages*, Routledge, London, 190-218.

Barras, C. (1979) *Etude d'un patois Couètsou*, Mémoire de licence, University of Fribourg (Switzerland).

Bartos, H. (to appear) "Object Agreement in Hungarian - A Case for Minimalism," *The Minimalist Parameter*, John Benjamins.

Belletti, A. (1982) "On the Anaphoric Status of the Reciprocal Construction in Italian," *The Linguistic Review* 2, 101-138.

Belletti, A. and L. Rizzi (1988) "Psych-Verbs and Θ-Theory," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 6, 291-352.

Benincà, P. 199 . "Sintassi," in A.A. Sobrero, ed., *Introduzione all'italiano contemporaneo. Le strutture*, Laterza.

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.

Benincà, P. (1996) "Agglutination and Inflection in Northern Italian Dialects," in C. Parodi, C. Quicoli, M. Saltarelli and M.L. Zubizarreta (eds.) *Aspects of Romance Linguistics*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., 59-72.

Benincà, P. (1998) "Between Morphology and Syntax. On the Verbal Morphology of some Alpine Dialects," ms., University of Padua (earlier version appeared as Benincà (1996)).

Benveniste, E. (1966) *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, Gallimard.

Bernstein, J. (1991) "DP's in French and Walloon: Evidence for Parametric Variation in Nominal Head Movement," *Probus*, 3, 101-126.

Bevington, B. (1998)

Blinkenberg, A. (1948) *Le patois de Beuil* (Acta Jutlandica. Aarsskrift for Aarhus Universitet XX,3 (H34), Ejnar Munksgaard, Copenhagen.

Bonet, E. (1991) *Morphology after Syntax: Pronominal Clitics in Romance Languages*, Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Bonnaud, P. (1974) *Nouvelle grammaire auvergnate*, Cercle d'Auvergne, Clermont-Ferrand.

Bouchard, D. (1984) *On the Content of Empty Categories*, Foris, Dordrecht.

Burzio, L. (1986) *Italian Syntax. A Government-Binding Approach*, Reidel, Dordrecht.

Burzio, L. (1989) "Work in Progress," ms., Harvard University.

Burzio, L. (1991) "The Morphological Basis of Anaphora," *Journal of Linguistics*, 27, 81-105.

Butler, A.S.G. (1962) *Les parlers dialectaux et populaires dans l'oeuvre de Guy de Maupassant (Publications romanes et françaises LXXII)*, Droz, Geneva and Minard, Paris.

Cardinaletti, A. & M. Starke (1994) "The Typology of Structural Deficiency. On the Three Grammatical Classes," *Working Papers in Linguistics* 4, University of Venice, 41-109.

Chabaneau, C. (1874) "Grammaire limousine (suite)", *Revue des Langues Romanes*, 5, 171-196, 435-481.

Chauveau, J.-P. (1984) *Le gallo: une présentation (Studi n. 27, Volume II)*, Faculté des Lettres de Brest, Université de Bretagne Occidentale (Section de Celtique).

Chenal, A. (1986) *Le franco-provençal valdôtain*, Musumeci, Aoste.

Chomsky, N. (1986) *Knowledge of Language*, Praeger, New York.

Cinque, G. (1988) "On *Si* Constructions and the Theory of *Arb*," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19, 521-581.

Cochet, E. (1933) *Le patois de Gondecourt (Nord)*, E. Droz, Paris.

Coppens, J. (1959) *Grammaire aclote. Parler populaire de Nivelles*, Fédération wallonne du Brabant.

Cordin, P. (1988) "I pronomi riflessivi," in L. Renzi (ed.) *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione. Volume I. La frase. I sintagmi nominale e preposizionale*, il Mulino, Bologna, 593-603.

Corver, N. and D. Delfitto (1993) "Feature Asymmetry and the Nature of Pronoun Movement," *OTS Working Papers*, Research Institute for Language and Speech, University of Utrecht.

Ditchy, J.K. (1977) *Les acadiens louisianais et leur parler*, Slatkine Reprints, Geneva (Droz, Paris, 1932).

Dougherty, R.C. (1970) "A Grammar of Coordinate Conjoined Structures: I," *Language* 46, 850-898.

Dougherty, R.C. (1971) "A Grammar of Coordinate Conjoined Structures: II," *Language* 47, 298-339.

Féral, R. (1986) *Le patois de Saussey*, Association Bourguignonne de Dialectologie et d'Onomastique, Fontaine lès Dijon.

Fougeu-Fontaine, M. (1986) *Le patois de Chaumont Le Bois*, Association Bourguignonne de Dialectologie et d'Onomastique, Fontaine lès Dijon.

Francard, M. (1980) *Le parler de Tenneville: Introduction à l'étude linguistique des parlers wallo-lorrains* (Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain - 19), Cabay, Louvain-la-Neuve.

Gatti, T. (1990) *Confronto tra fenomeni sintattici nell'italiano e nel dialetto trentino: participio passato, accordo e ausiliari*, Tesi di laurea, University of Trento.

Gesner, B.E. (1979) "Etude morphosyntaxique du parler acadien de la Baie Sainte-Marie, Nouvelle-Ecosse (Canada)," Publication B-85, Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme, Québec.

Giorgi, A. (1984) "Toward a Theory of Long Distance Anaphors: a GB Approach," *The Linguistic Review* 3, 307-361.

Haiman, J. (1980) *HUA: A Papuan Language of the Eastern Highlands of New Guinea*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Hale, K. (1973) "Person Marking in Walbiri," in *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, eds. S.R. Anderson and P. Kiparsky, 308-344. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Harris, J. (1997) "Morphologie autonome et pronoms clitique en catalan et en espagnol," in A. Zribi-Hertz (ed.) *Les pronoms. Morphologie, syntaxe et typologie*, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, Saint-Denis, 35-55.

Harris, J.W. (1991) "The Exponence of Gender in Spanish," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 27-62.

Hauchard, V. (1994) *Vie et Parler traditionnels dans le canton de Condé-sur-Noireau, Calvados*, Presses Universitaires de Caen, Charles Corlet, Caen/Condé-sur-Noireau.

Heim, I., H. Lasnik and R. May (1991) "Reciprocity and Plurality," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 63-101.

Helke, M. (1973) "On Reflexives in English," *Linguistics* 106, 5-23.

Hervé, B. (1973) *Le parler de Plouguenast*, Mémoire de Maîtrise, Université de Haute Bretagne.

Hull, A. (1988) "The First Person Plural Form: *Je Parlons*," *The French Review* 62, 242-247.

Iatridou, S. (1988) "Clitics, Anaphors, and a Problem of Coindexation," *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 698-703.

Jayaseelan, K.A. (1996) "Anaphors as pronouns," *Studia Linguistica* 50, 207-255.

Jayaseelan, K.A. (1998) "Blocking Effects and the Syntax of Malayalam *Taan*," in R. Singh (ed.) *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, Sage, New Dehli, 11-27.

Jones, M.A. (1993) *Sardinian Syntax*, Routledge, London.

Jones, M.A. (1996)

Kayne, Richard S.: 1993, 'Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection', *Studia Linguistica* **47**, 3-31.

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

Kayne, R.S. (1986) "Thematic and Case-assigning Properties of Past Participles," (abstract of) paper presented at the Princeton Workshop on Comparative Grammar.

Kayne, R.S. (1991) "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement and PRO," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 647-686.

Kihm, A. (1997) "Wolof Noun Phrase Structure: Implications for the Position of Gender and the Merger vs. Fusion Contrast," ms. CNRS-LACITO.

Kupferman, L. (1986) "Le pronom réfléchi non-clitique existe-t-il en français?" in D. Kremer (ed.) *Actes du 19e Congrès de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes*, volume 2, Max Niemeyer, Tübingen, 485-494.

Legendre, G. (1997) "Secondary Predication and Functional Projections in French," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15, 43-87.

Lepelley, R. (1974) *Le parler normand du Val de Saire (Manche)* (Cahier des Annales de Normandie N[0] 7), Caen, Musée de Normandie.

Lurà, F. 1990. *Il dialetto del Mendrisiotto, terza edizione*. Edizioni Unione di Banche Svizzere, Mendrisio-Chiasso.

Mahajan, A. (1994) "The Ergativity Parameter: *have-be* alternation, Word Order and Split Ergativity," in M. Gonzalez (ed.) *Proceedings of NELS 24*, GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Manzini, M.R. and L. Savoia (199) "Clitics and auxiliary choice in Italian dialects: Their relevance for the Person ergativity split,"...

Marcellesi, J.-B. (1986) "Le 'complément d'objet direct' en corse: *à* + SN de GV, 0 + SN de GV," in *Morphosyntaxe des langues romanes* (Actes du XVIIe congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes, Vol. n° 4), Université de Provence, Aix-en-Provence, 127-138.

Mattesini, E. 1976. Tre microsistemi morfologici del dialetto di Borgo Sansepolcro (Arezzo). In *Problemi di morfosintassi dialettale*, Pacini, Pisa, 177-202.

Matthews, S. and V. Yip (1994) *Cantonese. A Comprehensive Grammar*, Routledge, London.

Maze, C. (1969) *Etude sur le langage de la banlieue du Havre*, Slatkine Reprints, Geneva (1903).

McGinnis, M. (199

Milner, J.-C. (1978) "Le système du réfléchi en latin," *Langages* 50, 73-86.

Miremont, P. (1976) *La syntaxe occitane du Périgord*, Cuers.

Montaut, A. (1997) "Les pronoms personnels, emphatiques et réfléchis dans les langues indiennes," in A. Zribi-Hertz (ed.) *Les pronoms. Morphologie, syntaxe et typologie*, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, Saint-Denis, 101-128.

Morin, Y.-C. (1979) "More Remarks on French Clitic Order," *Linguistic Analysis* 5, 293-312.

Nadahalli,   (199)

Nash, L. (1997) "La partition personnelle dans les langues ergatives," in A. Zribi-Hertz (ed.) *Les pronoms. Morphologie, syntaxe et typologie*, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, Saint-Denis, 129-149.

Nicoli, F. (1983) *Grammatica milanese*, Bramante Editrice, Busto Arsizio.

Page, L. (1985) *Le patois fribourgeois*, 2nd edition, La Sarine, Fribourg.

Pelliciardi, F. (1977) *Grammatica del dialetto romagnolo*, Longo, Ravenna.

Perlmutter, D. (1971) *Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Picabia, L. (1997) "Les traits du pronom-accord en grand-comorien," in A. Zribi-Hertz (ed.) *Les pronoms. Morphologie, syntaxe et typologie*, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, Saint-Denis, 151-179.

Pica, P. (1987) "On the Nature of the Reflexivization Cycle," in *Proceedings of NELS 17*, GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 483-499.

Picallo, M.C. (1994) "Catalan Possessive Pronouns: The Avoid Pronoun Principle Revisited," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12, 259-299.

Poletto, C. (1993) *La sintassi del soggetto nei dialetti italiani settentrionali* (Quaderni Patavini di Linguistica. Monografie. 12), Unipress, University of Padua/CNR.

Poletto, C. (1995) "Split Agr and Subject Clitics in the Northern Italian Dialects," *GLOW Newsletter* 34.

Poletto, C. (1998) *The higher functional field in the Northern Italian dialects*, ms., University of Padua/CNR.

Pollock, J.-Y. (1983) "Sur quelques propriétés des phrases copulatives en français," *Langue Française*, 58, 89-125.

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).

Postal, P.M. (1970) "On Coreferential Complement Subject Deletion," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 1, 439-500.

Postal, P.M. 1988. Anaphoric Islands. *The Best of CLS. A selection of out-of-print papers from 1968 to 1975*. E. Schiller et al. eds. 67-94. Chicago Linguistic Society.

Ratel, V. (1958) Morphologie du patois de Saint-Martin-la-Porte (Savoie) (Publications de l'Institut de Linguistique Romane de Lyon, 13), Les Belles Lettres, Paris.

Reinhart, T. (1983) *Anaphora and Semantic Interpretation*, Croom Helm, London.

Remacle, L. (1952) Syntaxe du parler wallon de La Gleize, Tome I, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fascicule CXXVI, Les Belles Lettres, Paris.

Reymond, J. and M. Bossard (1982) *Le Patois vaudois. Grammaire et vocabulaire*, third edition, Payot, Lausanne.Rizzi, L. (1986) "Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of *pro*," *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 501-557.

Rizzi, L. (1988) "Il sintagma preposizionale," in L. Renzi (ed.) *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione. Volume I. La frase. I sintagmi nominale e preposizionale*, il Mulino, Bologna, 507-531.

Roca,   (1992)

Rohlfs, G. (1977) *Le gascon. Etudes de philologie pyrénéenne*, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen.

Rooryck, J. (1992) "Romance enclitic ordering and Universal Grammar," *The Linguistic Review* 9, 219-250.

Rouffiange, R. (1983) *Le patois et le français rural de Magny-Lès-Aubigny (Côte-d'Or)*, Association Bourguignonne de Dialectologie et d'Onomastique, Fontaine lès Dijon.

Rouveret, A. (1997) "Les pronoms personnels du gallois: structure interne et syntaxe," in A. Zribi-Hertz (ed.) *Les pronoms. Morphologie, syntaxe et typologie*, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, Saint-Denis, 181-212.

Safir, K. (1996) "Semantic Atoms of Anaphora," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14, 545-589.

Saltarelli, M. (19) "VP-Nominative Constructions in Italian,"........

Salvioni, C. (1   ) *Fonetica e morfologia del dialetto milanese*, a cura di Dante Isella.......

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. (1988) "A Theory of Floating Quantifiers and Its Corollaries for Constituent Structure," <u>Linguistic Inquiry</u>, 19, 425-449.

Szabolcsi, A. (1994) "The Noun Phrase," in F. Kiefer and K. E. Kiss (eds.) *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*, Academic Press.????

Taljaard, P.C., J.N. Khumalo and S.E. Bosch (1991) *Handbook of Siswati*, J.L. van Schaik, Pretoria.

Tranel, B. (1981) *Concreteness in Generative Phonology. Evidence from French*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Uriagereka, J. (1995) "Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance," *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 79-123.

Vanelli, L. (1998) *I dialetti italiani settentrionali nel panorama romanzo. Studi di sintassi e morfologia*, Bulzoni, Rome.

Vassere, S. (1993) *Sintassi formale e dialettologia. I pronomi clitici nel luganese*, FrancoAngeli, Milan.

Vey, E. (1978) *Le dialecte de Saint-Etienne au XVIIᵉ siècle*, Laffitte Reprints, Marseille (Paris, 1911).

Villefranche, J.-M. (1978) *Essai de grammaire du patois lyonnais*, Slatkine Reprints, Geneva (Bourg, 1891).

Zribi-Hertz, A. (1980) "Coréférences et pronoms réfléchis: notes sur le contraste *lui/lui-même* en français," *Lingvisticae Investigationes* 4, 131-179.

Zribi-Hertz, A. (1998) "Les pronoms forts du français sont-ils [+animés]? Spécification morphologique et spécification sémantique," ms., University of Paris 8.

Zribi-Hertz, A. and L. Mbolatianavalona (1997) "De la structure à la référence: les pronoms du malgache," in A. Zribi-Hertz (ed.) *Les pronoms. Morphologie, syntaxe et typologie*, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, Saint-Denis, 231-266.

<label>1</label> Italian writes *sé* with an accent and *me/te* without one. This is a purely orthographic difference - the vowel is all these non-clitic forms is the same (an open /e/). When referring to the vocalic morpheme by itself, I will use *-é*.

French second singular *toi* and related forms with *t-* are restricted to 'familiar'; second singular polite uses the plural *vous* and related forms in *v-*, some discussion of which can be found below.

<label>2</label> Cf. Haegeman (1993, 63) on West Flemish pronouns and Picabia (1997) on the consonantal noun class morphemes of the Bantu language of Grande Comore. It is possible that *-es* itself is composed of two morphemes, with the *-e-* corresponding to Harris's (1991) word marker and the *-s* to number; on the status of number in French, cf. Tranel (1981, chap. VI) and Bernstein (1991).

<label>3</label> This *-on* also appears with feminine singular nouns beginning with a vowel:
  (i) mon intuition, ton intuition

<label>4</label> For further details, cf. Kayne (1975, sect. 2.20).

<label>5</label> It should be emphasized here that the agreement in question is with the head noun (which may be covert) and not with the possessor itself. For example, the difference between (174) and (174) (*ma table* vs. *mon livre*) with respect to the form of the possessive (*ma* vs. *mon*) depends solely on the gender of the noun, and is entirely independent of whether the speaker is male or female.

6 On treating (some) schwas as epenthetic in French phonology, cf. Tranel (1981, chap. VIII) and references cited there.

7 It should be noted that the usual French masc. sg. WM is 0, as it in fact probably is in:
  (i) Marie l'invite. ('M him invites')
Alternatively, (i) has an *-e* that has been deleted phonologically.
    Morin (1979b, 310) notes that the *-e* of *le* in (174) is a front rounded vowel, rather than a schwa. (174)/(***) is impossible with that pronunciation, too.
    The *l-* of (i) can also correspond to 'her', i.e. to *la*, with the fem. sg. WM *-a* of *la* failing to appear, just as in (ii) with the definite article:
  (ii) l'amie ('the friend (fem.)')

<label>8</label> Bare *m-* (and *t-*) can appear postverbally when followed by the clitic *en*:
  (i) Donne-m'en! ('give me (some)of-it')
Possible in certain varieties of French is:
  (ii) Donne-moi-z-en!
For interesting discussion, cf. Rooryck (1992) and Morin (1979b). Also Chenal (1986, 360).

<label>9</label> *M-* is replaced by (monomorphemic) *j-* in the subject clitic form, as seen in (174).

<label>10</label> The oft stated view that *mi/ti* gives way to *me/te* only in the presence of an immediately following clitic beginning with a sonorant cannot be completely right, given (i) (acceptable to some speakers):
  (i) Me ce ne vorranno due. ('me there of-them they-will-want two' = 'I will need two (of them)')
Similarly, Saltarelli (19 , 323) has examples with *me se ne* and *gliese ne*.

<label>11</label> As in French, this agreement morpheme does not and cannot reflect the gender of the speaker or hearer.
    Many Italian dialects have the equivalent of 'la mi/tu tavola', with no agreement on the prenominal possessive - cf., for example, Mattesini (1976, 190) and Pelliciardi (1977, 70).

<label>12</label> Further analysis of the notions 'first person' and 'second person' is certainly warranted, thinking, for example, of:
  (i) I don't like you, said John to Bill.
For relevant discussion, cf. Postal (1970, 494), Nadahalli (199) and Bevington (1998).

Note also (with a matrix subject interpreted as 'first person'):
  (ii) The person who is talking to you wants you to give him/*me some money.

13   Cf. also the dialects studied by Lura (1990, 160) and Spiess (1976, 206).

14   The double *mm* is an orthographic convention indicating a preceding short vowel, not a doubled consonant - v. Nicoli, p.49.

15   Cf. note 9 above.

16   Cf. Butler (1962, 39, 42), Chauveau (1984, 190), Ditchy (1977, 21), Gesner (1979, 17), Hervé (1973, 51), Maze (1969, 41, 66, 83, 85) (who notes that *je* cannot invert, and that *nous* can appear with inversion), Rouffiange (1983, 115), Vey (1978, 186), Villefranche (1978, 24), Féral (1986, 68, 73-5), Hauchard (1994, 137) and Hull (1988).

17   Cf. Harris's (1997, 40) proposal that *m-* 'loses out' to the more highly specified *n-*. The details of Milanese will require further work.

18   Cf. (174)-(174) below.

19   Cf. the second paragraph of note 1 above.

20   Cf. Harris (1997, 39) on Spanish.

21   The second person plural object clitic *vi* may be synchronically parallel in a regular way to *mi* and *ti*, as in (174)/(174); alternatively, it may be more like *ci* - v. Corver and Delfitto (1993, 21).

22   This *-i* is normally incompatible with the word marker *-o* that appears in the singular:
  (i) ragazzo ('boy')
  (ii) raggazzi/*ragazzoi
The two do cooccur in possessive forms:
  (iii) i tuoi ragazzi ('the your boys')
  (iv) i suoi ragazzi ('the his/her boys')
suggesting that *-i* is a pure number morpheme that normally causes the word marker not to be pronounced - cf. Khim (1997) on Wolof.

23   Note that the two morpheme *-oi* sequence in Italian *noi/voi* is pronounced approximately as written, as opposed to the single morpheme *-oi* of French *moi/toi*, pronounced /wa/.

24   Cf. Spanish *nosotros, vosotros* ('we others/you oters' = non-clitic 'we/you'), and similarly in many Italian dialects.

25   Cf. however note 12 above.

26   Cf. also Hale (1973).

27   Cardinaletti and Starke (1994, n.65) note that these discrepancies might indicate that clitics have more structure than determiners.

28   In the plural, Italian *li, le* shows a gender distinction, but French *les* does not. Thus, the contrast with the first and second person plural (which never show gender - v. (174)) is a shade less striking than in the singular. I take the gender distinction in Spanish *nosotros, nosotras* to be a property of *otros, otras* ('others') and not a property of *nos*.
    The word marker can fail to appear in some cases in both French (cf. note 7) and Italian.

[29]   Recall that possessive *ma, ta* in French are composed of *m-, t-* plus a word marker *-a* that reflects agreement with the head noun only - cf. the discussion of (174)-(174) above.

[30]   The *-s* of the French forms is only pronounced in certain syntactic environments (cf. note 2). Plural *-s* on determiner pronouns is particularly robust in Spanish, which has accusative clitic *los, las*, dative clitic *les* and non-clitic *ellos, ellas*; Spanish supports the text discussion that follows, in that it does not allow plural *-s* to combine with *m-* or *t-*.

[31]   This appears to contrast with Cantonese, in which *deih* is added to *ngóh* (I) to yield *ngóhdeih* (we) (and similarly for second person), as described by Matthews and Yip (1994, 79). It may be that in Cantonese and comparable languages, the plural morpheme in question is not a plural in the sense of French or Italian, but rather something more like 'and company' (cf. Matthews and Yip (p.83)), thinking of Taljaard et al.'s (1991, 12) characterization of Siswati (prefixal) *bo-*; for recent discussion, cf. Cheng and Sybesma (to appear).
     Malagasy *-re-* appears in the second person, but not in the first person, according to Zribi-Hertz and Mbolatianavalona (1997, 245).

[32]   The *-s* of French possessive *mes, tes* does not express plurality of first or second person, but is rather an agreement morpheme reflecting the plurality of the head noun - cf. the discussion of (174)-(174) above.
     Italian does have:
  (i) Gianni mi/ti vede. ('G me/you(sg) sees')
But the *-i* here is not the plural morpheme, and the interpretation not plural. On this *-i*, cf. the discussion of (174)/(174) above.
     Some Walloon (cf. Remacle (1952, 243)) has a form *tès-ôtes* - cf. notes 24, 2 and 31, especially Tranel's (1981, 211) suggestion that plural /z/ in French might be a prefix on a plural noun or adjective.

[33]   Italian does have (without gender agreement):
  (i) la loro tavola ('the their table')
This *-or(o)* that combines with *l-* here must have a sharply different status from the *-on/-ien/-i/-u* of (174)-(174), i.e. *-or(o)* could be a Case/number ending, but not a possessive morpheme.

[34]   Cf. Burzio (1989) on Piedmontese. This contrast seems to hold for Paduan, too, as I have learned from discussions with Paola Benincà; 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), Spiess (1976, 209), and Salvioni (19 , 31).

[35]   And similarly for the other *l*-pronouns. The absence of a comma before the non-clitic object pronoun in Gatti's examples indicates that the doubling in question is non-dislocation doubling.
     The text discussion does not imply that *l*-pronouns have nothing in common with *me/te/sé*. In particular, they all (as opposed to full DPs) require or allow *di* with certain prepositions:
  (i) contro di me/te/sé/lui ('against of me/you/refl./him')
  (ii) contro il professore ('against the professor')
On this, cf. Rizzi (1988, 522).

[36]   With a doubled clitic preceding the psych verb, *a* would not be limited to the first or second person; cf. also Belletti and Rizzi (1988, note 27).

[37]   Conversely (for Raffaella Zanuttini) (i) is very marginal, while (ii) is fine and (iii) intermediate:
  (i) ???Me, mi hanno visto.
  (ii) Lui, lo hanno visto.
  (iii) ?Noi, ci hanno visto.
     This construction is compatible with past participle agreement:
  (iv) A me mi hanno vista.
The combination of past participle agreement with the presence of *a* (also found in Occitan and Gascon - Miremont (1976, 55) and Rohlfs (1977,   )) is not expected by Uriagereka (1995, note 70). Cf. note 45 below.
     Anna Cardinaletti (p.c.) points out that in Central and Southern dialects (174) is possible in addition to (174).

[38]   Clitic doubling with datives is usually obligatory in the North Italian dialects - Vanelli (1998, 134).
    On the fact that clitic doubling is more prevalent with datives than with accusatives, note Pollock's (1983b, 97) observation that dative clitic resumptives in French relatives (perhaps with an abstract dative *à*) are more possible than accusative.
    Paola Benincà points out (p.c.) that Friulian has clitic doubling of the (174) sort, but lacks the *a*-less (174).

[39]   Jones (1993, 202) observes that dative clitic doubling with a postverbal *a* is limited in Sardinian to first and second person pronouns. Whether this restriction can be integrated with the others under discussion remains to be seen.
    There also appear to exist cases of a preposition *a* preceding subject pronouns - cf. Tuaillon (1988, 295), Baptista (1997, 241).

[40]   Cf. Marcellesi (1986) on Corsican.

[41]   Although Sardinian accusative and dative clitics have *l*-, it is notable that the third person non-clitic pronouns that take *a* (*isse, issa, issos, issas*) (which for Jones are NPs) do not, although they are presumably related to the Sardinian definite article (*su, sa, sos, sas*), and perhaps to the (close to addressee) demonstratives *cussu, -a, -os, -as* (Jones (1993, 34)).
    Probably relevant, too, is the contrast (also found in French) between Sardinian *nois átteros* ('we others'), *vois átteros* ('you others') and the impossible **issos átteros* ('they others') - cf. Jones (1993, 208).
    For relevant discussion, cf. also Uriagereka (1995, sect. 4).
    There may be a further link between the non-DP status of first and second person pronouns and their failure to trigger Hungarian object agreement - cf. Bartos (to appear).
    On the special status of first and second person with respect to auxiliary selection, cf. chapter 7, and on the probably closely related person split with respect to ergativity, cf. Mahajan (1994), Nash (1997) and Manzini and Savoia (199).

[42]   Cf. Milner (1978) on Latin and Montaut (1997, 125) on Dravidian.

[43]   Recall that the vowel in object clitics is in general epenthetic. There is also no:
  (i) *Jean ms invite.
  (ii) *Jean ts invite.
  (iii) *Jean et Marie ss invite.

[44]   Recall that the *e/é* difference is just orthographic - v. note 1 above.

[45]   Here, however (cf. note 37 above), past participle agreement (which is normally optional with first and second person in Paduan) does not go well with doubling:
  (i) ??El me ga vista mi.
    Note that the auxiliary in (174) is 'have' (rather than 'be') - v. chapter 7 and references cited there.

[46]   Cf. Bouchard (1984, 68), Kayne (1986b).

[47]   On which, cf. Azoulay-Vicente (1985).
    In Paduan (and Venetian), at least, the doubling seen in (174) and (174)/(174) is obligatory, in the sense that removing the clitic would make the sentences ungrammatical. (The same is true of (174), though there for a different reason, thinking of (174) below.) This suggests that Paduan direct object non-clitic *mi* and *ti* are obligatorily preceded by an abstract *a*, in which case the need for the clitic may be linkable to the obligatoriness of dative clitic doubling (cf. note 38).

[48]   Lidia Lonzi tells me that for her *sé* with a plural antecedent is better in control structures such as (i):
  (i) Ho invitato i ragazzi a parlare di sé. ('I-have invited the boys to speak of refl.')
Cf. perhaps the discussion of Longobardi's judgments below.
    Probably related to (174) vs. (174) is a judgment given by Cordin (1988, 596), namely that a non-reflexive (non-clitic) pronoun can be a direct object coreferential with the subject in certain contexts, but only when the pronoun is

plural:
  (ii) Vestivano di pelli loro e le loro donne. ('they-dressed in furs them and the their wives')

[49]   Cf. Cardinaletti and Starke's (1994) idea (contested by Zribi-Hertz (1998)) that the extra structure associated with non-clitic 'third person' pronouns, as compared with their clitic counterparts, is responsible for the non-clitics' (relative) incompatibility with inanimate antecedents.

[50]   Cf. Heim et al. (1991). (174) carries over to French *soi* - cf. Kayne (1975, chap. 5, note 4) - although in French the distributor may have to be overt.
    Whether the plural uses of *m-/j-* in (174)-(174) and (174)-(***) involve an abstract distibutor is left an open question.

[51]   This fact is masked in the Italian of those who (unlike Giorgi (1984)) accept no long-distance reflexives at all.
    It may be that (174) improves if *i ragazzi* is replaced by a coordination of singulars.

[52]   Cf. also perhaps the locality effect pointed out by Burzio (1986, 199):
  (i) They gave John a dollar each.
  (ii) *They want John to give me a dollar each.
    Malagasy *izy/azy* looks similar to Italian *sé* in that, as discussed by Zribi-Hertz and Mbolatianavalona (1997, 253), it allows a plural antecedent (and in their terms is a bound variable - p. 255) only under restricted conditions. Why the restrictions are less severe than with *sé* remains to be investigated.

[53]   Note that *all* and *both* (the latter for some speakers) are not necessarily distributors - cf. Dougherty (1970; 1971).
    An interesting complication arises when we take into account:
  (i) Loro parlano di se stessi.
Here *sé* is accompanied by *stessi* ('same') (note that the accent on the -*é* is not used here). (On *stess-*, cf. Safir (1996), whose (p.567) discussion of reciprocals suggests the potential relevance of (174) below.) *Stessi* is *stess-* plus the mpl. -*i*. (With appropriate antecedents, there are also *stesso*, *stessa*, *stesse*.) (i) remains impossible as a reciprocal, like (174) and (174). But unlike those two, (i) is fully acceptable, i.e. there is no longer a problem with a plural antecedent (and a reflexive reading). It may be that the presence of plural *stessi* facilitates the licensing of a DB.
    The singularity of -*é* in Italian is mirrored by the singularity of the -*eg* of Faroese *seg*, to judge by Barnes's (1994, 212) example:
  (ii) Tey nokta seg sekan ('they deny refl. guilty')
with the adjective *sekan* in the accusative masculine singular agreeing with *seg* (and not with the plural *tey*).

[54]   Cf. however note 12 above.

[55]   Cf. Kayne (1975, sect. 5.1) and Legendre (1997, 56). For Anne Zribi-Hertz (174) is not possible in spoken French (nor is (174) or (174)), as opposed to (174).

[56]   Cf. Burzio (1991, 91); also the dialects described by Ditchy (1977, 22), Francard (1980, 209) and Remacle (1952, 223), among others.

[57]   Impersonal and middle *s-* (cf. Cinque (1988)) fall outside the scope of this article.

[58]   The first person plural non-reflexive object clitic in Milanese is *ne* (Nicoli, p.149). Similarly, the Veneto and Friuli dialects discussed by Vanelli (1998, 122) have *se* for first plural reflexive, but *ne* and *nus*, respectively, for first plural non-reflexive. Cf. also Blinkenberg (1948, 96), Remacle (1952, 224) and, on Catalan, Picallo (1994, 279).

[59]   Example from Spiess (1976, 207). Cf. also Nicoli (1983, 152), Lurà (1990, 161), Vassere (1993, 35, 48) and Salvioni (1 , 33).

Note that the -a of *ma* and *sa* in (174) is not a gender marker, and in all probability corresponds to no separate morpheme.

[60]   On this *a*, cf. Poletto (1993; 1995; 1998).

[61]   For proposals concerning a perhaps comparable phenomenon in Catalan, cf. Bonet (1991) and Harris (1997, 43).

[62]   If so, the question arises whether some comparable abstract doubling is present in Slavic languages.
    A related question is whether anything comparable to (174) could exist with a non-clitic *s*-form.

[63]   Much as Riny Huybregts suggested in Pisa in 1979 for Dutch *zich*. For recent discussion, cf. Jayaseelan (1996; 1998), among others.

[64]   On the question why there is no Condition B effect here (or in (174) or (174), with *s'* doubling an *l*-pronoun), cf. note 82 below; also Kayne (1986b) and McGinnis (199).

[65]   Fully acceptable, on the other hand, is:
  (i) Gianni ha fotografato se stesso. ('...refl. same')
Here there is no Condition B effect, probably much as in English *John photographed his children*, with the phrase *his children* (and similarly *se stesso*) counting as the phrase within which the pronoun *his/sé* has successfully failed to be bound - cf. Chomsky (1986b) and chapter 5 above.
    The fact that (174) is not fully unacceptable to all speakers is perhaps to be attributed to the possibility of an abstract *stesso*, in turn perhaps related to the fact that the object pronouns in (174)/(174) are contrastive. Alternatively, cf. Jayaseelan (1996, notes 9 and 18), who emphasizes a similarity between the Malayalam counterpart of *sé* and first and second person pronouns. A third possibility would be to look for some relevant property of -*é* that distinguishes it from the (different) morphemes that combine with *l*-.

[66]   Cf. perhaps Kayne (1975, sect. 5.3) and Belletti (1982) on French and Italian (non-clitic) reciprocals.

[67]   The contrast between (174) and (174) holds, too, for Guglielmo Cinque and for Cecilia Poletto. Anna Cardinaletti accepts, though:
  (i) Gianni è così egoista: ha fotografato LUI, non noi. ('G is so
       egotistical - he-has photographed HIM, not us')
  (ii) ...: ha fotografato solo lui. ('he-has photographed only him')

[68]   For those speakers who reject (174) (and accept (174)), such as Burzio (1991, 90), the effect of the preposition must be limited to the case of *sé*. Burzio (note 6) argues against the relevance of the preposition on the basis of (i) (from Zribi-Hertz (1980)):
  (i) Victor n'aime que lui. ('V neg loves but him')
    Kupferman (1986) has shown, however, that this example, although acceptable, is not typical, and that the direct object/prepositional object distinction is significant (datives pattern with direct objects - cf. also Authier and Reed (1992, 309)). Burzio's example given in (174) above is important, but is probably to be interpreted as showing that a doubled pronoun can receive special treatment - cf. note 64 above.
    The presence of a preposition seems to matter, too, for overlapping reference. Thus, (ii) seems better than (iii):
  (ii) ?Avete votato per te. ('you$_{pl}$-have voted for you$_{sg}$')
  (iii) *Avete scelto te. ('you$_{pl}$-have chosen you$_{sg}$')

[69]   Cf. Kupferman (1986, 493).

[70]   Some possessive *s*- may be reflexive - cf. Kayne (1975, chap. 2, note 154) on French.

[71]   Cf. Postal (1988).
    That the *s*- of (174) has more in common with *m*- and *t*- than with *l*- has been seen by Nash (1997, note 9).

[72] Cf. Bonnaud (1974, 29). Note that the demonstratives in (174)/(174) have a different consonant from *se*; in Ratel's (pp. 35-7) dialect, demonstratives are vowel-initial (initial *c*- was lost). Thus, it is not likely that these *se* are demonstratives.

Vey (1978, 191) seems to indicate that a form *set* can still be used for *lui* ('him') in the Limousin, Perigord, and Auvergne regions, but only as the object of a preposition or after *être* ('be'), a distribution which suggests that it is not a demonstrative.

[73] French prenominal possessives, although clitic-like in a number of respects (cf. Kayne (1975, sect. 2.20)), are bimorphemic (not even counting the agreement ending - cf. (text to) note (5)), whereas first and second person and reflexive clitics are monomorphemic, which is the heart of the matter.

The non-standard Spanish use of clitic *se* for non-reflexive second plural *os* mentioned by Picallo (1994, 280) might have *os-->se* via dropping of the *o*- plus an epenthetic *-e*, as suggested by Jones's (1993, 213) discussion of Campidanese. That is, this *se* might just be the plural *-s* of *os*, and be unrelated to the person morpheme *s*- that aligns with *m*- and *t*-.

Somewhat similarly, the Spanish spurious *se* (cf. Perlmutter (1971, chap. 2)) recently discussed by Harris (1997, 43-50) might not contain the *s*- of *m*-/*t*-/*s*-, but rather be an (expletive) locative parallel to that found in Sardinian (Jones (1993, 220)):
  (i) Bi l'appo datu. ('loc. it I-have given' = 'I gave it to him/her/them')
The impossibility of plural *-s* in (Spanish) (ii) could reflect the incompatibility of locatives with plural, as in (iii):
  (ii) Yo se(*s) lo doy. ('I *se*(+pl.) it give' = 'I give it to him/her/them')
  (iii) *I went theres.
Harris discusses varieties of Spanish that allow (iv) to be interpreted as having a singular direct object and a plural indirect object:
  (iv) Yo se los doy. ('I refl. it+pl. give')
Here the *-s* apparently belonging to accusative *los* actually reflects the plurality of the dative argument.

Assume that (i) and (ii) have a phonetically unrealized dative clitic. Then a plausible proposal is that (iv) has a plural dative clitic realized only as (plural) *-s* (rather than as the full form *les*). This will carry over to the parallel Sardinian case, from Jones (p. 220):
  (v) Narrabilos! ('tell+loc.+it+pl.' = 'tell it to them')
From this perspective, both (iv) and (v) have three clitics, in the order locative-accusative-dative.

In a proper subset of the preceding varieties, Harris notes, one can have *no-los* for an expected *nos-lo* ('us-it'). Perhaps the *-s* of this *no-los* is an instance of number agreement in a position lower than that of the first person clitic.

That there is more syntax going on in (ii) and (iv) than meets the eye is also suggested by Roca's (1992, sect. 2.10) observation that spurious *se* has a blocking effect on any binding from above of an immediately following accusative (human) clitic.

[74] Cf. the fact that clitic *m*-/*t*-, while normally pronominal, can also act as anaphoric, in (174)/(174) - cf. note (82) below.

I am not following Burzio's (1991) attempt (cf. Reinhart (1983)) to reduce Condition B to a 'by-product' of Condition A. That attempt takes as its starting point the existence of reflexives. Alternatively, one can take the existence of reflexives as something in need of explanation, and try to explain it as a 'by-product' of Condition B (whose independence is suggested by the phenomenon of overlapping reference - cf. note 68). The whole question is beyond the scope of this article.

[75] I am leaving open the question how this amalgamation takes place, i.e what the internal structure is. For relevant discussion, cf. Rouveret (1991, 364ff.), Haegeman (1993, 62ff.), Cardinaletti and Starke (1994, sect. 6) and Zribi-Hertz and Mbolatianavalona (1997).

[76] Cf. Picallo (1994, 280).

[77] Why exactly *s*- has this property (which it shares with *m*- and *t*- - cf. the discussion of (174)/(174) above) remains to be understood.

Although French is like Italian with respect to (174) allowing only a singular antecedent, Northern Italy has many dialects whose possessive *s*- can have either a singular or a plural antecedent. It may be that in sentences

where the antecedent of possessive *s-* is plural, an abstract distributor is involved - cf. note 50 above. Similarly for Spanish and Catalan - cf. Picallo (1994) (whose translation (p.281, (48a)) makes it look as if Italian *su-* could have a plural antecedent).

I know of no Romance language having any *s*-form, whether pronominal or anaphoric, that takes only a plural antecedent.

A special case is the reciprocal *s'ente* (=*s-*+'between/among') found in the Gallo dialect of French. The following are from Chauveau (1984, 203):
  (i) I s'ente taient mordus. ('they refl.+betw. were bitten' = 'They had bitten each other')
  (ii) On s'ente lë passët. ('one refl.+betw. it passed' = 'we were passing it back and forth to each other')

[78]   The coreferential clitic in the accusative plural is in *l-* (and is identical in form to the 'third person' dative plural clitic). Cf. in part Cochet (1933, 37); also Barras (1979, 9), Coppens (1959, 58), Page (1985, 108), Reymond and Bossard (1982, 82).

[79]   That would leave open the possibility that a related dialect could have an otherwise similar pronominal *s*-form (which would be more like a 'weak pronoun' in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke (1994)).

[80]   Although *m-* and *t-* cannot combine directly with a feminine word marker, as seen in (i), they can, in some Romance languages, sometimes trigger past participle agreement, as seen in (ii):
  (i) *Gianni ma vede. ('G me-fem. sees')
  (ii) Gianni mi ha vista. ('G me has seen-fem.')
(At least) in such cases, *m-* and *t-* presumably do have a gender feature, even though it cannot be spelled out on the pronoun itself.

S- can occur with past participle agreement, too:
  (iii) Maria si è vista. ('M refl. is seen')
Whether this requires *s-* to have a gender feature here is less clear than for *m-* in (ii), since the source of *-a* might be *Maria*; for relevant discussion, cf. chapter 7.

Note that none of *m-/t-/s-* have suppletive variants for feminine, either.

[81]   We would also have to set aside Malayalam *taan* - cf. Jayaseelan (1996). On the potential importance of number for argument status/independent reference, cf. Rizzi (1986a, 543), Kihm (1997) and Zribi-Hertz and Mbolatianavalona (1997). Rouveret (1997, 195) argues that number is not sufficient for independent reference.

For me, the number of the pronominal part of the English reflexive need not match the number of *self*:
  (i) If someone buys themself a new car,...
  (ii) (?)We should each get ourself a new car.

[82]   This difference in feature content between *s-* and *m-/t-* arguably allows *m-* and *t-*, but not *s-*, to be ordinary object clitics linked only to object position - cf. (text to) note 46. (In all probability, that in turn plays a role in various instances of special behavior of *s-*.) If *m-* and *t-* in reflexive clitic contexts are not ordinary object clitics, but rather more like *s-*, then sentences like (i) may not interact with Condition B in any simple way:
  (i) Je me vois. ('I me see')