

# Locality and Agreement in French Hyper-Complex Inversion

Richard S. Kayne and Jean-Yves Pollock  
New York University and Paris Est Marne-la-vallée

November, 2010

## 1. HCI

Standard French has a root interrogative construction that looks a bit like English subject-aux inversion:<sup>1</sup>

- (1) Is he there?
- (2) Est-il là? ('is he there')

In a way related to Pollock's (1989) discussion, the fronted verb in French, as opposed to English, need not be an auxiliary:

- (3) Voit-elle quelqu'un? ('sees she someone')

A second difference between the two languages is that this inversion applies in French only if the subject is a pronominal clitic, as it is in (2) and (3). This can be seen clearly in French yes-no questions:<sup>2</sup>

- (4) \*Est Jean là? ('is J there')
- (5) \*Voit Marie quelqu'un? ('sees M someone')

A third difference is that French, unlike English, allows a variant of (2) and (3) in which a non-dislocated preverbal subject co-occurs with the post-verbal pronominal subject. Kayne (1972) called this 'Complex Inversion' (henceforth CI):

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

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

- (7) 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 (7) a large number of speakers also accept, with the same interpretation as (7):<sup>3</sup>

- (8) 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*).<sup>4</sup> This contrasts with ordinary CI, as in (7), in which the postverbal subject clitic *il* agrees with the preverbal subject *cela*. We shall use for (8) the informal term Hyper-Complex Inversion (henceforth HCI).

## 2. HCI as clitic doubling.

In many ways HCI and CI are very 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

<sup>1</sup> Colloquial French has lost the inversions discussed in this paper. In what follows, we abbreviate 'standard French' to '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> For further background, see Kayne and Pollock (to appear), of which the present paper is in effect a continuation.

<sup>4</sup> More marginally, the OCL in question can be dative - see (100) below.

<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 Kayne (1972) and Pollock (2006).

non-agreement, in HCI, between SCL and preverbal subject).<sup>6</sup> Of course there are sentences that are potentially ambiguous between HCI and CI, such as:

(9) *Cela le gêne-t-il?* ('that him bothers it' = 'does that bother him')

in which masculine *il* might be agreeing (in gender and number) either with the lexical subject *cela* or with the masculine OCL *le*. To facilitate bringing out the properties of HCI, then, one needs to study sentences in which, as in (8), the lexical subject and the OCL do not match in phi-features.

It should be noted that although the postverbal SCL in HCI/CI can agree with either the OCL (HCI) or with the preverbal subject (CI), the SCL does not have the option of not agreeing at all:

(10) \**Cette table la gêne-t-il?* ('that table her bothers it/him')

Here, both *cette table* and *la* are feminine, while *il* is masculine.

We propose to analyze both CI and HCI as instances of clitic doubling, i.e. to relate them to the better-known dative clitic doubling found in languages like Spanish. A key difference is that CI and HCI centrally involve not dative clitics but rather nominative ones (SCLs).<sup>7</sup>

More specifically, we will adopt the 'complex constituent' approach to clitic doubling proposed in Kayne (1972, sect. 3) for CI and in Uriagereka (1995, 81) for the Spanish type.<sup>8</sup> This amounts to saying that in a CI example like (7) *cela* and SCL *il* start out within a phrase (a complex DP) that excludes the verb (and the object):<sup>9</sup>

(11) ...[cela il] gêne la

In HCI examples like (8), the SCL *elle* starts out paired with the OCL, rather than with the lexical subject:

(12) ...cela gêne [la elle]

The agreement effect seen in CI/HCI is in this way reduced to agreement (in gender and number) within the complex DP. (In both (7) and (8) the complex DP is split apart in the course of the derivation.)

The impossibility of (10), in which the postverbal SCL agrees with nothing, is now excluded as follows. If that SCL is merged within a complex DP containing either *cette table* or *la*, there is a violation of the obligatoriness of DP-internal gender/number agreement in French. But if the SCL is not merged within some complex DP in (10), it has no viable source at all.<sup>10</sup>

Of interest now is that fact that, contrary to CI, simple SCL inversion (henceforth SCLI) of the sort seen earlier in (2) and (3) has no HCI-like counterpart that would correspond to (8). To see this, note first that SCLI is compatible with an OCL:

(13) *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. Such agreement is not, however, possible in (13). The following is well-formed, but not with the interpretation of (13):

(14) *La gêne-t-elle?* ('her bothers she/it' = 'does she/it bother her?')

The argument corresponding to the (postverbal) subject in (13) must be of masculine gender (whether animate or not), while the corresponding argument in (14) must be of feminine gender.

<sup>6</sup> There also exist instances of HCI in which the SCL agrees with a non-clitic - v. (96) below on wh-sentences.

<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. also Bianchini, Borgato and Galassi (1982) and Belletti (1999); also Boeckx (2003) and Šimík (2008) on resumptive pronouns in relatives and questions.

<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. Boneh and Sichel (2010).

<sup>10</sup> On the plausible assumption that it could not, in (10), correspond to any kind of expletive.

The reason that (14) cannot be related to (13) in the way that (8) is related to (7) is the following. In (8), *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 (14), if we 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>

The impossibility of (14) in the relevant reading is brought out by a sharp contrast between HCI and right dislocation:

(15) Ce scandale la gênera-t-elle? ('this scandal her will-bother she' = 'will this scandal bother her?')

(16) \*La gênera-t-elle, ce scandale?<sup>12</sup>

(15) is an example of HCI parallel to (8). (16) is an (ill-formed) instance of right dislocation corresponding to the well-formed right dislocation in:

(17) La gênera-t-il, ce scandale? ('her will-bother it, this scandal' = 'will it bother her, this scandal?') in which the subject *il* is paired with the dislocated *ce scandale*. (16) is ill-formed for essentially the same reason as (the relevant interpretation of) (14) - having *elle* instead of *il* amounts to having *elle* merged in the same complex DP as object argument *la*. That causes no problem in (15), where (non-dislocated) *ce scandale* is available as subject argument, but in (16) there is no available subject argument once *elle* is paired with *la*. The reason is that a right-dislocated constituent cannot directly correspond to any argument and there is no available pronoun in (16) that can (help it to) fill that role, either (just as there wasn't in (14)).

### 3. A restriction concerning SCLs.

Preverbal SCLs are never compatible with either CI or HCI.<sup>13</sup> Thus alongside:

(18) Ils la voient. ('they her see')

with SCL *ils*, French allows SCLI:

(19) La voient-ils?

but neither CI:

(20) \*Ils la voient-ils?

nor HCI:

(21) \*Ils la voient-elle?

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

Informally speaking, the sharp deviance of (20) and (21) can be thought of as reflecting the fact that French cannot license two SCLs in one simple sentence,<sup>14</sup> as opposed to French being able, in CI/HCI, to license one SCL and one lexical subject DP at the same time. If we set aside left- and right-dislocation,

<sup>11</sup> Since French is not a null subject language of the Italian sort. French may allow (cf. Kayne (1972) and Kayne and Pollock (2001)):

i) *pro il/elle...*

but such a *pro* would have to be linked to the SCL and therefore could not correspond to a separate argument, as would be needed in (14).

The text proposal is in the spirit of Morin (1985, 796).

<sup>12</sup> Counterparts of both this example and (14) appear 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.

<sup>13</sup> In contrast, the distinct popular French *-ti* mentioned by Morin (1985, 794) is compatible with preverbal subject clitics.

There is also a contrast here between French and the dialect studied by Penello (2003; 2007).

<sup>14</sup> For some discussion of this restriction, see Kayne and Pollock (to appear).

however, we can see that such double licensing is possible only if the SCL is postverbal. This is shown using CI in:

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

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

and with HCI in:

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

(25) \**Cela elle la gêne.*

We can take (23) and (25) to be excluded by virtue of the fact that preverbal SCLs and preverbal lexical subject DPs are, in French,<sup>15</sup> Case-licensed by a functional head that can license only one of them in a given simple sentence.

If so, then postverbal SCLs must have access to an extra licenser, one that is not available to preverbal subjects of any type. In the spirit (though not the letter) of Pollock (2006), we shall claim that it is the *-t*-morpheme of CI and HCI (seen clearly in (24)) that plays a key role in licensing the postverbal subject clitic in these constructions.<sup>16</sup>

This 'extra' *-t*- is not clearly represented in the orthography in cases like (22) that contain a verb whose third person form otherwise ends in *-t*. But it is in (24) and in cases such as:

(26) *Marie a-t-elle une voiture?* ('M has *t* she a car')

as compared with the corresponding non-inversion examples:

(27) *Marie a (\*-t) une voiture.*

(28) *Elle a (\*-t) une voiture.*

In (26) (and (24) and (22)), the *t* must be pronounced; in (27)/(28) there cannot be a pronounced *t*.

When the verb has an orthographic *-t* as does *est* in (22), then that *-t* can (sometimes) be pronounced even in non-inversion contexts if followed by a word beginning with a vowel. Thus the following, in which the verb-final *-t* can be pronounced, contrast minimally with (27)/(28):

(29) *Ceci est une voiture.* ('this is a car')

(30) *Elle parlait à sa soeur.* ('she spoke to her sister')

(31) *Elles entendent une symphonie.* ('they hear a symphony')

French is thus 'irregular' in the following way. Some finite verb forms, such as those in (29)-(31), end in a third-person agreement *-t* morpheme.<sup>17</sup> Others, as in (27)/(28), normally do not, but are nonetheless followed by that *-t*- morpheme in root interrogative contexts in which the finite verb is itself followed by a SCL, as in (26).<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> As opposed to various dialects in the northern France and in northern Italy; on the latter, see Poletto (2000) and references cited there.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Schoorlemmer (2006).

<sup>17</sup> In at least one dialect in France, this third person *-t* has been generalized - see Morin (1985, note 30).

<sup>18</sup> The limitation to root contexts is sharp, but (to an extent as in English) there are some non-interrogative root contexts that allow *-t*- + SCL, e.g. with CI and HCI:

i) *Peut-être cela la gêne-t-il.* ('maybe that her bothers it')

ii) *Peut-être cela la gêne-t-elle.*

The fact that the *-t*- in question cannot precede a lexical DP:

iii) *Où va-t-il?* ('where goes *t* he')

iv) *Où va (\*-t-) Anne?*

(with (iv) an instance of stylistic inversion - see note 2) can be thought of in terms of a requirement that *-t*- have something to license the nominative Case of; alternatively (or in addition), there might be a link to languages like Irish, in which agreement with a postverbal lexical subject is excluded.

The fact that (v) contrasts with (iv) in allowing *-t* to be pronounced:

v) *Que fait Anne?* ('what does A')

The absence of any *-t* in (27)/(28) means that ordinary subject Case-licensing, whether of a preverbal lexical DP, as in (27), or of a preverbal SCL, as in (28), cannot in general depend on the presence of overt *-t*. On the other hand, there is without exception a pronounced *-t-* immediately preceding a postverbal third person SCL, as in (26). As stated above, this makes it plausible to take the licensing of a third person postverbal SCL to depend crucially on the presence of this *-t-*.<sup>19</sup>

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

Thinking of the limitation of this *-t-* to root contexts, of a partial similarity to Germanic complementizer agreement<sup>20</sup>, and of Shlonsky (1994), we take *-t-* to be a morpheme located above IP, somewhere in the Comp area, in Rizzi's (1997) sense. It may be an independent Agr head in the spirit of Pollock (1989), in which case it must require the nearby presence of a (silent) root interrogative head, or it may reflect the spelling out of (phi-features on) a root interrogative head.<sup>21</sup>

Of importance to the present paper are two properties of *-t-*. The first, already discussed to some extent, is that it participates in the Case-licensing of a following (third person<sup>22</sup>) SCL found in the projection just below it. Thus in the CI example (26) *-t-* participates in the Case-licensing of *elle*, and similarly in the HCI example (24).

The second important property of this interrogative *-t-* is that it attracts to its Spec a phrase containing the lexical subject plus the finite verb (along with any intervening OCLs). In (24), for example, *-t-* attracts the phrase '[cela la gêne]', as indicated in the following sketchy derivation of (24):<sup>23</sup>

(32) *cela gêne [la elle]* --> OCL movement (pied-piping the SCL)<sup>24</sup>

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

*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>25</sup>

reinforces the idea that there are two related but non-identical third person *t*-morphemes.

<sup>19</sup> A more syntax-friendly French orthography would arguably write (22) 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. In other words, we take this 'extra' *-t-* to be present in CI/HCI whether the verb has a *-t* of its own or not.

<sup>20</sup> For recent discussion, see Gruber (2008). Why Germanic 'complementizer agreement' is (apparently) limited to the 'OV' Germanic languages needs to be accounted for - see Koopman (2005, note 25).

<sup>21</sup> For discussion, see Pollock (2006).

<sup>22</sup> First and second person SCLs are arguably incompatible with both CI and HCI - cf. Kayne and Pollock (to appear, sect. 8) - so that their Case-licensing might well proceed differently, perhaps more as in English subject-aux inversion sentences.

On *-t-* and Case, see also Kayne and Pollock (to appear, sect. 10).

<sup>23</sup> Well-formed sentences with *-t-* have no counterpart with zero in place of *-t-*:

(i) *Cela a\*(-t-)il été important?* ('that has *t* it been important' = 'has that been important?')

A more careful formulation of the text derivation would not have subject *cela* present so early in the derivation.

<sup>24</sup> On this step, see in part Kayne (2002, sect. 9). The following SCL-raising step recalls Caha (2010).

<sup>25</sup> For sentences like (24) in which the SCL is followed by other material, as in:

(ii) *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).

# 6. HCI and clitic climbing.

All the CI examples and their HCI counterparts that we have given so far have had the OCL (here *la*) preceding the SCL (*il* or *elle*):

(33) *Cela la gêne-t-il?* = CI

(34) *Cela la gêne-t-elle?* = HCI

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

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

The question arises as to whether in this configuration HCI is possible, i.e. whether or not the SCL can double the following OCL instead of doubling the preverbal subject. Morin (1985, 796) says no, but we disagree to some extent, insofar as we find acceptable:<sup>26</sup>

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

whose CI counterpart is:

(37) *Cela va-t-il la déranger?*

HCI examples such as (36) are not at all possible if the OCL is within a finite embedding (and the SCL in the matrix):

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

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

More strikingly, HCI is possible to one degree or another with an infinitival embedding only with matrix verbs/predicates of the 'restructuring' type, i.e. only with matrix verbs/predicates of the sort that would allow object clitic climbing in Italian.<sup>27</sup> Thus alongside (36) and:<sup>28</sup>

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

we have the fact that the following well-formed CI example:

(41) *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 (even partially) well-formed HCI counterpart:

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

The similarity holding here between HCI and Italian object clitic climbing suggests that the SCL *elle* in (36) (and (40)) has crossed into the matrix from within the infinitive in a way that is subject to the same kinds of locality restrictions as OCL-movement.

A further striking example comes from examples with the verb *sembler* ('to seem'), which can act as (36) and (40) only in the absence of a matrix dative:

(43) ?*Cela semble-t-elle la déranger?* ('that seems *t* she her to-disturb' = 'does that seem to disturb her?')

(44) \**Cela te semble-t-elle la déranger?* ('that you seems *t* she her to-disturb' = 'does that seem to you to disturb her?')

This contrast recalls Pollock's (1978, 98) point about leftward movement of *tous* ('all'):

<sup>26</sup> Especially in a CLLD context, as in:

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

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

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

In the reporting of acceptability judgments, 'we' is to be understood as taking as antecedent only the author who is a native speaker of French.

<sup>27</sup> For discussion of the relevant class of verbs, see Rizzi (1982) and Cinque (2006).

<sup>28</sup> Note the contrast with:

i) \*\**Cela pourrait-on nous gêner?*

(45) ?Elle a tous semblé les avoir lus. ('she has all seemed them to-have read' = 'she seemed to have read them all')

(46) \*Elle m'a tous semblé les avoir lus. ('she me has all seemed them to-have read' = 'she seemed to me to have read them all')

which movement is in general sensitive to the class of 'restructuring' verbs in French (despite French not allowing object clitic climbing the way Italian does). The contrast between (43) and (44) also recalls, even more minimally, facts about object clitic climbing itself that were pointed out by Cinque (2006, 22) for Italian:

(47) Gianni non lo sembra apprezzare abbastanza. ('G neg it seems to-appreciate enough' = 'G doesn't seem to appreciate it enough')

(48) \*Gianni non ce lo sembra apprezzare abbastanza. ('G neg us it seems to-appreciate enough' = 'G doesn't seem to us to appreciate it enough')

While (47) is accepted by many, (48) is accepted by none.

The doubling approach to HCI that we have been pursuing allows us to express the similarity between the HCI facts of (36)-(44) and the non-HCI facts of (45)-(48) as follows. The derivation of (36), for example, will (for those speakers who accept it) be approximately (cf. the derivation given in (32)):<sup>29</sup>

(49) 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  
 [ [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 (36), repeated here:

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

The question now is why the derivation in (49) cannot carry over to (42) or (44) or, more generally, to any matrix predicate that is not of the 'restructuring' type.

Keeping in mind that the infinitive phrase scrambling that takes place in (49) must be able to apply even with non-restructuring matrix predicates in CI derivations such as:

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

(52) Cela te semble-t-il la déranger? ('that you seems *t* it her to-disturb' = 'does that seem to you to disturb her')

it seems pretty clear that, from the perspective of (49), the key step at issue must be the raising of SCL in (49) in the transition from the fourth line to the fifth line.

This SCL raising must (for those who accept (36)) be available when the matrix predicate is of the restructuring type, but not otherwise. A(n informally) sufficient formulation is:

(53) 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 (49), the infinitive phrase has previously scrambled.<sup>30</sup>

This formulation leaves open, however, the curious fact that in (49)/(50) the SCL *elle* has succeeded in escaping from the infinitive phrase despite French not normally (apart from causatives) allowing OCLs

<sup>29</sup> As earlier, for ease of exposition, we oversimplify the role of subject *cela* in the derivation.

<sup>30</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 (50).

to escape from infinitive phrases, even those embedded under restructuring predicates,<sup>31</sup> as seen, for example, in the contrast between (50) and:

(54) \**Cela la va-t-elle déranger?*

Continuing to think in terms of the derivation (49), let us suggest that the key difference between SCL *elle* and OCL *la* in (54) is 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 (32) and (49), whereas the landing site of OCLs is in French invariably below normal subject position.<sup>32</sup> (As in the discussion following (25), we take the landing site of SCL in HCI (and CI) sentences to be licensed in some way by *-t-*.)

Another way of putting this is to say that SCL-raising in HCI derivations is A-bar-like, whereas OCL movement is not. If the movement of *tous* illustrated in (45) is A-bar-like in some comparable sense, then we can (informally) have, in a way that brings together (50) and (45):

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

## 7. HCI, number, and verbal agreement.

We have not yet discussed the finite verb agreement that holds in CI and HCI. In CI examples such as:

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

we can in principle ask whether the verb is agreeing with the lexical subject *cela* or with the SCL *il*. Finding a clear answer, though, is made difficult by the fact that the two subjects in CI themselves agree in phi-features.

HCI is more interesting, though in an HCI example like:

(57) *Cela la gênera-t-elle?* ('that her will-bother *t* she' = 'will that bother her?')

the two subject phrases (*cela* and *elle*) happen to both be third person and to both be singular. They disagree in gender, but gender is irrelevant to finite verb agreement in French. Moreover, person disagreement between the two subjects is not possible at all in HCI, since both must be third person. Fortunately, there remains number agreement as a probe of choice into the question of finite verb agreement in HCI.

It is possible to replace the singular object clitic *la* in (57) by plural *les*, keeping the singular verb constant:

(58) *Cela les gênera-t-elles?* ('that them will-bother(sg.) *t* they' = 'will that bother them?')

The object clitic *les* in (58) is clearly plural and the SCL *elles* appears to be agreeing with it. (We say 'appears to be' because the orthographic plural *-s* of postverbal *elles* can in general not be pronounced, in ordinary French.<sup>34</sup> We return briefly to this question later.)

Of more immediate note here is a question raised by Morin (1985, 796) concerning the status of:

(59) OK/\**Cela les gêneront-elles?* ('that them will-bother(pl.) they' = 'will that bother them?')

which he rejected. There is, however, (at least) one speaker who accepts such sentences and who actually prefers (59) to (58), i.e. who in the context of an HCI sentence with a plural OCL actually prefers a plural finite verb to a singular one.

<sup>31</sup> For relevant discussion, see Kayne (1989; 1991).

<sup>32</sup> One will need to bring in Portuguese here; for relevant discussion, see Uriagereka (1995).

<sup>33</sup> This is to allow for subject-to-subject raising and for raising of an ECM subject; see Pollock (1978; 1985). An alternative to the text proposal would be to look in the direction of Collins's (2005) notion of 'smuggling'.

<sup>34</sup> Even in the phonologically most favorable environments, such as:

i) *Ont-elles agi correctement?* ('have they acted correctly')



The speaker in question sharply rejects the corresponding declarative without the SCL, though:

(60) *Cela les gênera/\*gêneront.* ('that them will-bother(sg.)/will-bother(pl.)')

In non-HCI sentences with a singular subject such as (60), a plural OCL cannot trigger plural finite verb agreement. This clearly indicates that for her the plural finite *gêneront* in (59) must be agreeing with *elles* (in a sense to be made more precise below) and not directly with *les*, and moreover that *elles* in (59) must for her indeed be plural, despite the non-pronunciation of its -s.

Although (59), with singular subject *cela*, plural finite *gêneront* and plural *elles*, is acceptable to her, a striking restriction arises if we try to switch singular and plural. Strongly parallel to (59) itself (though a shade less acceptable for her<sup>35</sup>) is:

(61) OK/\**Ce bruit les gêneront-elles?* ('that noise them(fem.) will-bother they(fem.)' = 'will that noise bother them(fem.)?')

still with a singular lexical subject *ce bruit*, plural finite *gêneront* and plural SCL *elles*. Now, switching singular and plural yields the minimally different:

(62) \**Ces bruits la gênera-t-elle?* ('those noises her will-bother *t* she')

with plural subject *ces bruits*, singular finite *gênera* and singular SCL *elle*. This sentence, however, is sharply unacceptable even to the speaker who accepts (59) and (61).

Both (61) and (62) contain a preverbal lexical subject that apparently fails to agree with the finite verb. Yet (61) is acceptable to the speaker in question, while (62) is not. We can immediately rule out three conceivable proposals for allowing (61), the first being one in which the subject in (61) would have been Case-licensed by Tense despite the disagreement in phi-features. Allowing Tense by itself to license nominative, though, would equally well allow (62), incorrectly. Similarly, allowing the subject in (61) to receive nominative by default would overgenerate by incorrectly allowing (62) to get nominative by default, too. In probe-goal terms, a third attempt would be to somehow allow the subject in (61) to be probed by Tense despite the mismatch in phi-features; again, that would incorrectly allow (62), too.

It is essential to distinguish here between visible disagreement and the lack of visible agreement. In the Italian aux-to-C sentences discussed by Rizzi (1982), for example:

(63) *Ritengono non essere io...* ('they-consider neg. to-be I...')

the post-infinitival nominative subject *io* can be taken to have its nominative Case depend at least in part on first person singular agreement features (or on a corresponding independent agreement morpheme) that happen not to be pronounced in (63) in Italian.<sup>36</sup> This kind of solution to the licensing of nominative *io* in (63) rests, however, on the absence of any visible agreement at all on the infinitive in (63), which makes plausible the postulation of silent agreement.

Consequently, the same kind of solution would appear not to be available for the lexical subject in (59)/(61), since the verb in those two examples is visibly plural, and so visibly disagrees (apparently) with the singular lexical subject.

## 8. Plural verbal agreement -n-

Our proposal, which will revolve around the verbal agreement -nt visible in (59) and (61), runs as follows. French orthography makes in many cases a distinction between third singular -t and third plural -ent, e.g. for the verb whose infinitive is *écrire* ('to-write').<sup>37</sup>

<sup>35</sup> The best examples of HCI are those in which the lexical subject contains no lexical noun (*cela* is arguably demonstrative *ce* + deictic *là*), for reasons that we will not pursue here.

<sup>36</sup> As opposed to Portuguese, where agreement with infinitives is (often) pronounced - cf. Raposo (1987).

<sup>37</sup> Why non-interrogative -t is not found at all in the present (or simple past) tense third singular of first conjugation verbs is left an open question.

(64) Elle écrit. ('she writes')

(65) Elles écrivent. ('they write')

In both (64) and (65) the *-t* can be pronounced if followed by a vowel in certain syntactic contexts, even those not involving a postverbal SCL. It seems natural to take *-t* in both (64) and (65) to represent third person.<sup>38</sup> (The *-e-* of (65) is normally not itself pronounced, but it phonologically allows the preceding final *-v* of the stem to be pronounced. That *-v-* disappears both orthographically and phonetically in the singular.)

The *-n-* of (65) cannot be pronounced under any conditions, but there are four verbs where it is arguably the source of nasalisation on the vowel preceding it, as in:

(66) Elles ont/sont/vont/font... ('they have/are/go/do...')

We take this *-n-* to represent plural.<sup>39</sup>

We furthermore take the *-ent/-ont* alternation in (65) vs. (66) to be predictable, in the sense that there is a generalization to the effect that *-ont* occurs as third plural agreement in present tense forms if and only if the verbal root contains no vowel.<sup>40</sup> (The roots in (66) are 0-, *s-*, *v-*, *f-*.) Possibly the *-e-* of *-ent* (like the variant *-o-* in (66)) is a verbal theme vowel rather than (part of) an agreement morpheme. Let us assume that it is (in a way not central to the main lines of the analysis).

We note in passing that the interrogative *-t-* of (58), repeated here:

(67) Cela les gênera-t-elles? ('that them will-bother(sg.) *t* they' = 'will that bother them?')

though limited to occurring with 3rd person SCLs,<sup>41</sup> does not itself show number agreement. We can see this by thinking back to the discussion of (26)-(31) and in particular to the fact that the *-t* of verbal third plural *-ent/-ont* can be pronounced in certain cases, for example in:

(68) Elles ont applaudi. ('they have applauded')

as distinct, with the verb 'have', from the singular:

(69) Elle a(\*t) applaudi. ('she has applauded')

where there is no *-t* possible. In CI/HCI, though, interrogative *-t-* does (obligatorily) appear and is pronounced in the singular, with 'have':

(70) A-t-elle applaudi? ('has *t* she applauded')

The corresponding plural is written:

(71) Ont-elles applaudi? ('have they applauded')

with an obligatorily pronounced *-t*. Plausibly, the interrogative *-t* of (70) also occurs in the plural, so that a syntactically more faithful orthography would write (71) as:

(72) 'Ont-t-elles applaudi?'

with the two *ts* pronounced as a single *t*, in a way consistent with general properties of French phonology. What is clear, in any event, is that making the interrogative *-t-* of (72) plural is not possible:

(73) \*Ont-ent-elles applaudi?

(74) \*Ont-ont-elles applaudi?

<sup>38</sup> Cf. the third person *-t* of Russian.

The first and second person forms in French all lack *-t*:

i) J'écris ('I write')

ii) Tu écris ('you write')

iii) Nous écrivons ('we write')

iv) Vous écrivez ('you write')

<sup>39</sup> Cf. the verbal plural *-n* of Spanish discussed in Harris and Halle (2005) and Kayne (to appear).

<sup>40</sup> The verbs of (66) do not have *-o-* anywhere else in the present tense paradigm, so taking this *-o-* to be an inflectional suffix rather than part of the root is straightforward.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Kayne and Pollock (to appear, sect. 8).

Consider again (59), repeated here:

(75) OK/\**Cela les gêneront-elles?* ('that them will-bother(pl.) they' = 'will that bother them?')

and the similar:

(76) OK/\**Cela les rendent-elles tristes?* ('that them make-they sad' = 'does that make them sad?')

By the reasoning of the previous paragraph, plural *-ent/-ont* in these examples is not the plural of interrogative *-t*, but rather ordinary plural finite verb agreement. Again, a syntactically more perspicuous spelling would then be as in:

(77) ...*gêneront/rendent-t-elles?*

We are (finally) in a position to return to the striking contrast between (61) and (62), both repeated here (but using *rendent* to start with):

(78) OK/\**Cette nouvelle les rendent-elles tristes?* ('that piece-of-news them make-they sad' = 'does that piece of news make them sad?')

(79) \**Ces nouvelles la rend-elle triste?* ('those pieces-of-news her makes-she sad' = 'do those pieces of news make her sad?')

For speakers who accept (59) and (61), a plural finite verb, such as *rendent* in (78), is compatible in HCI sentences with a singular lexical subject such as *cette nouvelle*. No speaker, though, as far as we know, allows (79), with a singular finite verb (*rend*) and a plural lexical subject (*ces nouvelles*).

Our account of this asymmetry between singular and plural is the following. Sentences such as (78) are to be thought of as:

(80) *cette nouvelle les rend -ent-elles...?*

The plural SCL *elles* is agreeing (matching features) with *-(e)nt*. The singular lexical subject *cette nouvelle* is agreeing with the singular finite verb *rend*. Thus an even more perspicuous rendering of (78) is (omitting interrogative *-t*):<sup>42</sup>

(81) *cette nouvelle les rend-0 -ent-elles...?*

in which 0 is the third singular agreement morpheme 'seen' in:

(82) *Cette nouvelle me rend triste.* ('that piece-of-news me makes sad')

in which *rend* proper is the verbal root.

We are now in a position to understand why (79) is not possible. For it to be possible with an analysis parallel to that indicated for (78) in (81), we would have to have:

(83) \**ces nouvelles la rend-ent -0-elle...?*

with singular and plural agreement morphemes switching places, relative to (81). But that doesn't match (79), which lacks any visible plural *-ent*. The only alternative would be:

(84) \**ces nouvelles la rend-ENT -0-elle...?*

with a silent counterpart of *-ent*, which French otherwise never allows.

In effect, the asymmetry between (78) and (79) is traceable back to the asymmetry within French between third person singular agreement, which can be zero, as in (81) (and (82)) and third person plural agreement, which, morphologically speaking, cannot be zero.

This account must carry over to the contrast noted earlier between:

(85) OK/\**Ce bruit les gêneront-elles?* ('that noise them(fem.) will-bother they(fem.)' = 'will that noise bother them(fem.)?')

<sup>42</sup> Note that there is no:

i) \**Cette nouvelle les rendont-elles tristes?*

with *-ont* in place of *-ent*, for any speaker. This means that the generalization following (66), namely:

ii) *-ont* occurs as third plural agreement in present tense forms if and only if the verbal root contains no vowel.  
must be understood to mean that if there is no verbal root at all directly associated with *-ent/-ont*, as there is not in (81), then (ii) does not come into play.

and:

(86) \*Ces bruits la gênera-t-elle? ('those noises her will-bother *t* she')

The first of these can be analyzed, for those who accept it, as:

(87) ce bruit les gêner-0 0-ont-elles?

parallel to (81), whereas (86) will have no possible well-formed representation, just as (79)/(84) did not.

There are two extra points of complexity associated with (85), as compared with (78), however. While the representation for (78) given in (81) has a finite verb form that looks exactly like the one seen in the sentence (82), namely *rend*, the 'gêner-0' of (87) does not have an exact counterpart in:

(88) \*Ce bruit les gêner.

The second, related point has to do with the presence of *-ont* in (85)/(87) vs. *-ent* in (78)/(81). It is this presence of *-ont* in (85) that has led us to postulate the second zero morpheme in (87), in accordance with the discussion of (66). As in (66), this zero morpheme must be one of the possible roots of the verb *avoir* ('to-have').

This brings our proposal in line with Pollock's (2006, note 43) linking of synchrony and diachrony, and in particular with his proposal that the future tense forms of French are built on the combination of an infinitive plus a finite form of 'have'. In other words, future forms like *gêneront* are always (not only in HCI sentences) to be understood as:

(89) gêner(-0) 0-ont

with the second 0 a root of 'have' and the first 0 a silent third singular agreement that is essential in (87) to license the singular lexical subject.

Normally, as seen in (88), third singular agreement in future forms cannot be zero. The acceptable counterpart of (88) is:

(90) Ce bruit les gênera. ('that noise them will-bother')

with an *-a* that corresponds to the third singular present tense form of 'have', as in:

(91) Elle a compris. ('she has understood')

A natural proposal, now, is to say that the silent third singular agreement in (89) (the first 0) is available only to some speakers. Those who have access to it allow (87) and therefore (85). Those who do not allow neither (87) nor (85). The precise reason is as follows. For (90), all speakers have:

(92) ...les gêner a+0

where *gêner* ('to bother') is the infinitive and *a* (= 'a'+0) is a root of 'have' plus the silent third singular agreement also 'seen' in (91), as well as in (82). Since (90) has only one nominative subject, the one (silent) agreement in (92) is sufficient.

In (85), on the other hand, there are in a very real sense two nominative subjects, singular *ce bruit* ('that noise') and plural *elles* ('they'), which doubles the OCL *les* ('them'). For (85) to be acceptable, then, there must be two distinct agreement morphemes, as shown in (87)/(89). Furthermore, while the second of these agreements, plural *-ont*, is associated with (a silent root of) finite 'have', as it was in (66), in a way that is uniform in all French, the first of these agreements, whose job it is to license the preverbal subject *ce bruit*, must be associated with the infinitive *gêner* ('to bother').

Like Italian (and unlike Portuguese), French never shows overt agreement following an infinitive. Unlike Italian, French does not normally even allow silent agreement following an infinitive, i.e. French does not have the aux-to-Comp possibility seen earlier in (63). This is shown by the general unacceptability in French of:

(93) \*Ils considèrent ne pas être moi/je/Jean capable de... ('they consider neg not to-be me/I/John capable of...')

Our proposal amounts to the claim that those speakers who accept (85) are doing so via the limited use of exactly such a silent infinitival agreement, as in (87)/(89).

There is, however, a question as to whether this silent agreement is, in the French of such speakers, specific to infinitives. The acceptability for them of (at least some) sentences like (78), repeated here:

(94) OK/\**Cette nouvelle les rendent-elles tristes?* ('that piece-of-news them make-they sad' = 'does that piece of news make them sad?')

with the analysis in (81), also repeated:

(95) *cette nouvelle les rend-0 -ent-elles...?*

suggests not, insofar as the *rend* here is not an infinitive, but a root.<sup>43</sup> Yet the zero agreement 0 must be present to license the singular lexical subject (in addition to the plural agreement *-(e)nt* that licenses the SCL *elles*).

The same point concerning the availability of singular 0 agreement in combination with overt plural agreement even in non-infinitival contexts is made by the following interrogative counterpart of (94), which if anything is more widely accepted than (94):<sup>44</sup>

(96) OK/\**Combien de personnes cette nouvelle rendent-elles tristes?* ('how-many of persons that piece-of-news make-they sad' = 'how many people does that piece of news make sad?')

As in (94), the subject *cette nouvelle* here is singular, yet the verb *rendent* looks plural. As in the earlier discussion of (79), switching singular and plural leads to sharp unacceptability:

(97) \**Quelle personne ces nouvelles rend-elle triste?* ('which person these pieces-of-news makes-she sad')

which strongly suggests that (96) requires an analysis like that of (94)/(95), namely:

(98) *combien de personnes cette nouvelle rend-0 -ent-elles...*

with the zero agreement 0 licensing the singular subject *cette nouvelle*, even though *rend* is not an infinitive.

The form *rend* is otherwise found in ordinary present tense sentences, for all speakers, as in:

(99) *Cela nous rend tristes.* ('that us makes sad')

giving the impression that (98) is more straightforward than (87), whose infinitival agreement, possible for those who accept (85), is clearly special relative to French as a whole. Yet there is an interesting twist to (96)/(98), too, which can be seen by bringing into consideration HCI sentences in which the OCL is dative, rather than the accusative it was in earlier examples.

Dative HCI seems to be marginal compared with accusative HCI, but differential intuitions are clear. An example is:

(100) ?/\**Cela lui a-t-elle fait mal?* ('that her has *t* she done bad' = 'has that harmed her?')

The SCL *elle* in (100) is agreeing in gender with the OCL *lui*. The more usual CI sentence, in which the SCL agrees with the subject *cela*, is:

(101) *Cela lui a-t-il fait mal?*

A second example of dative HCI, with auxiliary 'be' (which will allow us to make the new point in question) is:

<sup>43</sup> Present tense forms in French arguably have no overt present tense morpheme, though there may be a silent one, not indicated.

<sup>44</sup> In an embedded context French interrogatives lack SCL inversion of whatever type, e.g.:

i) *Je sais combien de personnes cette nouvelle rend(\*-elle) tristes.*

In the absence of SCL inversion, a plural verb in examples like (96) seems to be impossible:

ii) \**Je sais combien de personnes cette nouvelle rendent tristes.*

even for those who accept (96). In this respect, French differs from the variety of English that allows:

iii) *I know which people John think should be invited*

on which see Kimball and Aissen (1971) and Kayne (2003).

(102) ?/\**Cela lui est-elle déjà arrivé?* ('that her is-she already arrived' = 'has that already happened to her?')

If we replace singular OCL *lui* by plural OCL *leur*, we get:

(103) ?/\**Cela leur est-elles déjà arrivé?* ('that them is-they already arrived')

Of importance is the fact that the speaker who accepts plural verb agreement in accusative HCI sentences like (96), (94) and (85) also accepts plural verb agreement here, i.e. she accepts:

(104) ?/\**Cela leur sont-elles déjà arrivé?* ('that them are-they already arrived')

with plural *sont* in place of singular *est*. Following (95), the analysis of (104) must be:

(105) *cela leur s-0 ont-elles...*

in which 0 is the silent singular agreement that licenses the singular subject *cela* (and *ont-* the plural agreement that is paired with plural *elles*).<sup>45</sup>

What is new here relative to earlier discussion is that *s-* is a root of 'be' that normally does not cooccur with 0 agreement.<sup>46</sup>

(106) *Ils s\*(ont) heureux.* ('they are happy')

(107) \**Il s'heureux.* ('he *s* happy')

We conclude that those speakers who accept (104), (96), (94) and (85) are allowing 0 third singular agreement to cooccur not only with (certain) infinitives, as in the last of these, but also with some (present tense) roots that otherwise disallow 0.

## 9. Conclusion.

HCI constitutes a new probe into questions of locality related to clitic climbing, and shows that (some) French actually allows clitic climbing out of non-causative infinitive phrases in cases not studied previously. A distinction of the A-movement vs. A-bar-movement sort may be a relevant factor (see (55) and the associated footnote). HCI also constitutes a new probe into questions of number agreement involving the licensing of two distinct subjects in what looks like a simple sentence. The correct analysis appears to necessarily involve, in at least some cases, two distinct agreement morphemes, in a way that sharply distinguishes singular from plural.

## References:

- Belletti, A. (1999) "Italian/Romance Clitics: Structure and Derivation," in H. van Riemsdijk (ed.) *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 543-579.
- Bianchini, S., G. Borgato and R. Galassi (1982) "Raddoppiamento del pronome in basso-mantovano/ferrarese," in D. Calleri and C. Marengo (eds.) *Linguistica contrastiva. Atti del XIII Congresso internazionale di studi, Asti, 26-28 maggio 1979*, Bulzoni, Rome, 371-389.
- Boeckx, C. (2003). *Islands and chains: Resumption as stranding*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Philadelphia, PA.
- Boneh, N. and I. Sichel (2010) "Deconstructing Possession," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 28, 1-40.
- Caha, P. (2010) "The German Locative-Directional Alternation. A Peeling Account," *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 13, 179-223.
- Cinque, G. (2006) *Restructuring and Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 4*, Oxford University Press, New York.

<sup>45</sup> We leave open the question whether HCI always need two 'agreements' (even when there is no discrepancy in phi-features) and if so, why exactly.

<sup>46</sup> Indirectly relevant here is Postma's (1993) idea that reflexive *s-* might be the same as the text *s-*.

- Collins, C. (2005) "A Smuggling Approach to the Passive in English," *Syntax*, 8, 81-120.
- Gruber, B. (2008) *Complementiser Agreement - New Evidence from the Upper Austrian Variant of Gmundener, Master's thesis*, University of Vienna.
- Harris, J. and M. Halle (2005) "Unexpected Plural Inflections in Spanish: Reduplication and Metathesis," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 36, 195-222.
- 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. (1989) "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. (1991) "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement and PRO," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 647-686 (reprinted in Kayne (2000)).
- 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. (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 (2005)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2003) "Some Remarks on Agreement and on Heavy-NP-Shift", in M. Ukaji, M. Ike-Uchi and Y. Nishimara (eds.) *Current Issues in English Linguistics* (Special Publications of the English Linguistic Society of Japan, volume 2), Kaitakusha, Tokyo, 67-86 (reprinted in Kayne (2005)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2005) *Movement and Silence*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (to appear) "Toward a Syntactic Reinterpretation of Harris and Halle (2005)"
- 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 (to appear) "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.
- Kimball, J. and J. Aissen (1971) "*I Think, You Think, He Think*," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 2, 242-246.
- Koopman, H. (2005) "Korean (and Japanese) Morphology from a Syntactic Perspective," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 36, 601-633.
- Koopman, H. and A. Szabolcsi (2000) *Verbal Complexes*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- 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.
- 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. (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. (1989) "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20, 365-424.

- 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.
- Postma, G. (1993) "The Syntax of the Morphological Defectivity of *BE*," *HIL Manuscripts*, 3, 31-67.
- Raposo, E. (1987) "Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: The Inflected Infinitive in European Portuguese," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 18, 85-109.
- Rizzi, L. (1982) *Issues in Italian syntax*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- 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.
- 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.
- Šimík, R. (2008) "The Source of *Wh*-Morphology in Questions and Relative Clauses," *ConSOLE XV*, 2008, 273-294.
- 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.
- Uriagereka, J. (1995) "Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance," *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 79-123.