

The Syntax of Suppletion

Richard S. Kayne
New York University

NYU Syntax Brown Bag
December 14, 2018

0.

Starting from my 2008 "Expletives, Datives, and the Tension between Morphology and Syntax" on the expletive *ghe* that appears in dative sentences in many Italian dialects, I will pursue a general hypothesis about suppletion that takes suppletion to involve silent elements and additional structure, rather than to involve substitution of one overt element by another.

1.

Many Veneto dialects in Italy have an object clitic *ghe* that seems to cover both locative and third person dative, e.g. in Paduan:

(1) *Ghe meto el libro.* ('there I-put the book')

(2) *Ghe dago el libro.* ('there I-give the book' = 'I'm giving him/her/them the book')

The use of *ghe* in (2) is systematic for Paduan - there is no distinct dative clitic form for third person, singular or plural. One might be tempted to say that this is a case of two pronominal clitics that happen to be spelled out in the same, syncretic way. Yet Paduan third person pronouns typically have, like those of French and Italian, an *-l-* (sometimes pronounced as a *y*-glide, sometimes not pronounced), and never otherwise have a *g(h)-* (the *h* in *ghe* is just orthographic). Or one might think of (2) as involving a suppletive *ghe* substituting for the expected pronoun in *l-*. But neither syncretism nor suppletion gets us very far into the question of (2).

We need, I think, a more resolutely syntactic approach. Chomsky (1957) showed that English tense (and related) morphology needs to be understood in syntactic terms. In part that consisted in showing that the syntactic transformation Affix-hopping plays a key role. But in part, and this part is often not fully appreciated, Chomsky's analysis showed that an understanding of (English) (tense) morphology requires integrating its study with that of multiple other facets of (English) syntax, such as *do*-support, negation, emphasis, subject-aux inversion and VP-deletion.

Returning to (2), the first thing is to undo the notion that *ghe* is inherently locative. Rather *ghe* is akin to English *there*, which occurs in *Let's go there*, *There's a problem here*, *You thereby made a serious error*, *Gimme that there book*. As in Kayne (2004), the way to think about these multiple cases of *there* is to take them all to be instances of the same *there*, with the differences then to be attributed to differences in the surrounding syntactic environment. What we call locative *there* is to be understood, much as in Katz and Postal (1964), as in:

(3) let's go TO THAT there PLACE

with the locativity due to the presence of PLACE, and not to the presence of *there*.

Paduan *ghe* in (1) and (2) is like *there* in also occurring as an expletive in existentials, as well as in counterparts of *thereby*, *thereof*... (except that in Romance

languages the adposition in such combinations is silent). So by extension from (3), *ghe* in (1) is accompanied by silent PLACE (for recent discussion of silent PLACE, v. Dékány (2018)).

The question, then, is why *ghe* occurs in (2), and why this happens in these dialects and not in, say, French. The answer proposed in Kayne (2008) is that the occurrence of *ghe* in (2) rests on its occurrence in simple possessive sentences (cf. Moro (1997, 237)), in the dialects in question, e.g.:

(4) Gianni ga (= *ghe*+a) na sorela. ('G *ghe* has a sister')

The expletive *ghe* in this possessive sentence in turns rests on the presence of expletive *ghe* in existentials. In effect, Paduan possessive sentences inherit expletive *ghe* from existentials, insofar as possessives are built on existentials, as in Szabolcsi (1983).

The continuation of this idea is that any (Romance) language having expletive *ghe* in its possessive sentences will automatically carry this *ghe* over to its double object sentences, as in (2), on the long-standing assumption that double object sentences are closely related to possessives.

If *ghe* in (2) is an expletive clitic, then the understood dative argument must in (2) correspond to a silent third person pronoun:

(5) PRON *ghe* dago un libro

Silent (third person) (clitic) pronouns are fairly common. Some French has one in sentences like:

(6) Je lui ai donné. ('I him have given' = 'I have given him it')

not to mention PRO and pro.

In another vein, the proposal in (5) is supported by Sardinian, to judge by an example given by Jones (1993, 220):

(7) Narrabìlis! ('tell *bi* to-them')

where *bi* is the Sardinian (expletive) clitic parallel to *ghe*, and *lis* is the overt (plural) dative clitic (with the accusative unpronounced, as in French (6)).

In conclusion to this section, then, *ghe* in (2)/(5) is not an instance of syncretism between *ghe* and third person pronouns. Nor is it an instance of suppletion in the usual sense of the term. Nor is there any sense in which *ghe* substitutes for a third person pronoun. Rather *ghe* is an 'extra' expletive pronominal clitic that is inherited from the existential substructure that (2)/(5) contains. The fact that the language faculty allows silent elements, and in particular silent pronouns, is what allows (2)/(5) (and (6)) to 'get away with' not having any overt third person pronoun for the relevant argument.

2.

A second instance in Romance that might at first glance look like suppletion has to do with the fact that Romance pronominal possessives don't show the expected third person possessive **l-*, but rather have the apparently suppletive *s-*. For example, Italian and Spanish have *su(o)* and French has *son*, but there is no possessive **lu(o)* and no possessive **lon*.

An intuition about suppletion that I think is widespread is that the unexpected/suppletive form occurs in the same position in the same syntactic structure that the expected form would have occurred in had it been possible. Put another way, the suppletive, idiosyncratic form is usually taken to simply substitute for the expected,

regular form. (A familiar way of making this substitution intuition precise is in terms of late insertion.)

The analysis of Romance pronominal possessives that I will now spell out denies, as did the earlier discussion of *ghe*, the validity of the intuition of substitution. In the possessive cases at hand, *s-* does not substitute for the expected but impossible *l-*. Rather, apparently suppletive *s-* appears in a structure/derivation that is (a bit) more complex than one might have anticipated with *l-*, had *l-* been possible; in addition, *s-* appears together with a silent counterpart of *l-*, again much as with the case of *ghe*.

(I use the term (apparent) suppletion in this talk for cases like these Romance possessives and like *ghe* above, as well as like the familiar *go/*goed/went* and *good/*gooder/better*. I set aside for the most part cases like *bring/*bringed/brought*, which may or (cf. Halle and Mohanan (1985)) may not have something significant in common with the others (see below).)

3.

Third person pronouns in (central - Italy, France, Spain) Romance usually have an *l*, e.g. Italian non-clitic *lui* ('him'), *lei* ('her'), *loro* ('them'), accusative clitic *lo* ('him/it'), *la* ('her/it'), *li* ('them(masc.))', *le* ('them(fem.))' and dative clitic *le* ('her') and (with a palatal variant of *l*) *gli* ('him/them').

Italian also shows an *l* in possessive 3pl. *loro*, as in:

(8) *il loro libro* ('the their book')

But the possessive 3sg. does not have an *l*:

(9) **il luo libro*

Instead we have, with an *s-*:

(10) *il suo libro* ('the his/her book')

In agreement with Cardinaletti (1998, sect. 2.2) and Manzini (2014), we can take possessive *loro* in (8) to be an oblique pronoun and the lack of agreement with *loro*:

(11) *la loro/*lora macchina* ('the their car')

to correlate with its status as an oblique pronoun.

Obviously, *suo* in (10), like 1sg. possessive *mio* and 2sg. possessive *tuo* has a different status from *loro*, as shown by the (feminine) gender agreement (with the noun) in:

(12) *la mia/tua/sua macchina* ('the my/your/his/her car')

This agreement resembles adjectival agreement (cf. Giusti (1993)) and determiner agreement. The following proposal then comes to mind, as a first step toward accounting for the impossibility of (9), which appears to hold across all of Romance:

(13) If a pronominal possessive is amenable to adjectival/determiner-type agreement, then it cannot contain *l-*.

This way of understanding the impossibility of (9) (to be refined below) does not take (9) vs. (10) to be an instance of suppletion. (Suppletion was mentioned in this context by Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002, note 25), though just in passing.) Rather, it takes the impossibility of (9) to be a property of Romance languages that is in need of explanation, independently of the existence of (10). Conversely, the existence of (10), and in particular the fact that (10) shows an *s-* that looks like Romance reflexive *s-*, itself calls for explanation.

To think of (9) and (10) as being suppletive variants would fail to provide a handle on the question why it is in possessive contexts with agreement that *l-* is excluded and

gives way to *s-*, insofar as a suppletion relation could in principle be stated for any arbitrary instance of *l-*. From a suppletion perspective, there would also be the unanswered question why it is third person *l-* that is excluded in the agreeing contexts at issue, rather than, say, first person *m-* or second person *t-*. Nor would a suppletion approach tell us anything about why we find *s-* in (10), rather than some random consonant:

(14) *il buo/duo/guo libro

Thinking in terms of suppletion would put us in danger of thinking that none of these questions need to be asked.

4.

In pursuing a non-suppletion approach to (9) vs. (10), I will be in agreement with Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea (2011), who develop a non-suppletive account of (9) based (cf. their (12) and (43)) on a certain notion of inflectional phi-feature uniqueness that in part rests on the agreement seen in (12). When I return briefly below to the question of (9), I will, however, try to set out a different non-suppletive way of looking at (9) that does not directly involve agreement.

Let me begin, though, with (10), repeated here, from Italian:

(15) il suo libro ('the his/her book')

The *s-* seen in (15) recalls the *s-* found systematically in Romance third person reflexive clitics, as in the Italian example:

(16) Gianni si fotografa. ('J refl. photographs')

However, the *s-* of *suo* in (10)/(15) seems to be pronominal, rather than reflexive, to judge by:

(17) Ho letto il suo libro. ('I-have read the his/her book')

in which there is no local antecedent for *s-*.

Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea (2011, note 12) take the *s-* of (the Romanian counterpart of) (17) to be synchronically unrelated to the *s-* of (the Romanian counterpart of) (16). In line with the position I took in Kayne (2016a; 2016b) to the effect that the language faculty strongly disfavors homophones, and also for the more specific reasons given just below, I will argue, in contrast, that the *s-* of (16) and the *s-* of (17) can and must be unified.

5.

We can note immediately that the *s-* of (16) and the *s-* of (17) have certain significant properties in common. First, they are both gender-insensitive in Romance, in the sense that neither possessive *s-*, as in (17), nor reflexive *s-*, as in (16), ever require an antecedent of a specific gender.

Second, with respect to number, they have in common that neither ever favors a plural antecedent, and that both can be number neutral. Reflexive *s-* is usually, though not always, number neutral, in the sense that it usually allows its antecedent to be either singular or plural. Possessive *s-* is number neutral in that same sense in Catalan and Spanish. In French, Italian and Romanian, on the other hand, possessive *s-* requires a singular antecedent. In no language that I am aware of does possessive *s-* require a plural antecedent.

Although reflexive *s-* is usually number-neutral, with respect to the number of its antecedent, it occasionally favors a singular antecedent, as with Italian long-distance

non-clitic reflexives (as brought to my attention many years ago by Luigi Rizzi), with *sé* the reflexive in question:

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

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

What is never found with reflexive *s-*, any more than with possessive *s-*, is a case where it favors a plural antecedent.

Considerations of person yield a third point in common between possessive *s-* and reflexive *s-*, namely that both invariably favor a third-person antecedent. This appears to be true without exception for possessive *s-*, which as far as I know never allows a first or second person antecedent in Romance. In all the most widely-spoken Romance languages, this is equally true of reflexive *s-*, though there are Romance dialects in which reflexive *s-* can in addition have a non-third person antecedent. Yet Romance languages/dialects never have a reflexive *s-*, any more than they do a possessive *s-*, that would only allow a non-third person antecedent.

The preceding points of similarity between possessive *s-* and reflexive *s-* have to do with properties of the antecedent of *s-*. Two additional significant points of similarity appear if we look at the form of *s-*. One is that neither possessive nor reflexive *s-* ever varies in form for gender. As noted, the antecedent of *s-* can be either masculine or feminine, but the form of *s-* never shows sensitivity to the grammatical gender of the antecedent; no Romance language or dialect has, say, a *se/sa* distinction whereby *se* would appear if the antecedent were masculine and *sa* if it were feminine. Secondly, neither possessive *s-* nor reflexive *s-* ever varies according to the number of its antecedent; no Romance language or dialect has, say, a *se/ses* distinction whereby *se* would appear if the antecedent were singular and *ses* if the antecedent were plural.

6.

The commonalities that we have just seen to hold in Romance between reflexive *s-* and possessive *s-* encourage us to try to find a way to bridge between them, despite Romance possessive *s-* not being reflexive. A key (non-Romance) language here is Norwegian, as discussed by Fiva (1984). Norwegian, like other Scandinavian languages and like Slavic languages, has a distinction between reflexive possessors (e.g. *sin*) and non-reflexive possessors (e.g. *hans* ('his')), as in the following examples from Strandskogen and Strandskogen (1989, 109):

(20) Henry tar sykkelen *sin*. ('H takes bicycle-the his(refl.)')

(21) Henry tar sykkelen *hans*. ('H takes bicycle-the his(non-refl.) = someone else's')

Of importance now is the fact that *sin* can occur, as Fiva (1984; 1987) discusses, within DPs such as *Per sin bil* ('Peter his(refl.) car'), which have the interpretation 'Peter's car', as in the Norwegian sentence:

(22) Vi liker Per *sin* bil. ('we like Peter his car' = 'we like Peter's car')

(Cf. the DP-internal possessive doubling found in colloquial German (cf. Durrell (2002, 44) and Sick (2006)); also French *son ami à lui* ('his friend to him') and *son ami, à Jean* (Kayne (1975, sect. 2.20).) In such cases, as Fiva (1987, 10) notes, *sin* does not look like a familiar possessive reflexive, insofar as it does not, in this kind of sentence, relate two separate arguments. (Whereas it does appear to relate two separate arguments in (20), namely the subject of 'take' and the possessor of 'the bicycle'.)

On the almost certainly valid assumption that *sin* in (22) is the same as *sin* in (20), we have a case in Norwegian in which something that seems to be a clear reflexive, as in (20), can also not be a reflexive (in the usual sense of the term), as in (22). The question, then, is how best to unify these seemingly disparate instances of *sin*.

In (22), the phrase containing *sin* also contains a DP possessor, *Per*. As an initial step toward unification, let me take there to be a DP possessor within the phrase containing *sin* in (20), too, as shown in the following (cf. Leu (2015, 132) on Swiss German.):

(23) Henry tar [sykkel-en DP(POSS) sin]

This silent possessor DP will have 'Henry' as antecedent (perhaps via movement of the phrase 'Henry' from within the object DP).

Returning to Romance, the proposal is now, following a suggestion by Thomas Leu (p.c.) that Romance possessive *s-*, in a way that now largely mimics (23), is invariably accompanied by a DP possessor. Thus (17), repeated here:

(24) Ho letto il suo libro. ('I-have read the his/her book')

is to be understood as in:

(25) ho letto il DP(POSS) suo libro

with the silent possessor DP in this case being, more specifically, a silent third person singular pronoun (capitals indicate silence):

(26) ho letto il LUI/LEI suo libro ('I-have read the HIM/HER suo book')

that can take an antecedent freely. (In (26), *s-* is linked to LUI/LEI, but otherwise takes no antecedent itself.)

7.

The non-reflexive possessive *s-* of (24)-(26) seems to be present in all of Romance, as well as in German and Dutch. But it appears not to be found in Scandinavian, nor in Slavic, nor in (classical) Latin. Conversely, the reflexive possessive *s-* of (20) and (23) is apparently found in all of Scandinavian and all of Slavic, as well as in Latin, but is not found in Romance or German or Dutch.

A familiar type of comparative syntax question arises. Can this distribution of reflexive vs. non-reflexive possessive *s-* within Romance, Germanic and Slavic be related to another property (or properties) of the languages in question? The answer may be yes, as follows:

(27) Reflexive possessive *s-* is possible only in languages lacking DPs of the form 'D N', where D is the definite article.

(28) Non-reflexive possessive *s-* is possible only in languages allowing DPs of the form 'D N', where D is the definite article.

Romance languages (and German and Dutch) have non-reflexive possessive *s-* and all clearly allow 'definite article + N', with the possible exception of Romanian, which normally has 'N+enclitic definite article'. But Romanian does have immediately pre-N *a*, which has been taken by some to contain a (pre-N) definite article (cf. the references cited by Giurgea (2014, notes 6 and 7) and by Giurgea himself (cf. his (37)) to sometimes licence a silent pre-N D. (It may also be relevant that Romanian, alone among Romance languages, as far as I know, has the property that, as stated by Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea (2013, 348) "The forms *său/sa/săi/sale* are mostly confined to the written register".) It thus may be possible to take (28) to hold without exception.

Scandinavian and Slavic and (classical) Latin all have reflexive possessive *s-*. Some of these languages have no obvious definite article at all; if so, they are immediately compatible with (27). (Note that, in the transition from Latin to Romance, *s-* in possessives did not, strictly speaking, change its status at all, if the present analysis is on the right track. Rather, the behavior of possessive *s-* changed because Romance languages developed prenominal definite articles.) Others have DPs in which a definite article is enclitic to N; such DPs are straightforwardly compatible with (27). (The fact that some have DPs of the form 'A+D N' is also compatible with (27).) Some Scandinavian languages have 'D A N', with a definite article preceding a prenominal adjective, which is allowed by (27), as long as 'D N' with a definite D is not allowed, which seems to generally be the case.

8.

If (27) and (28) are correct as stated, the next question is, why would they hold? Why would there be a correlation between reflexive vs. non-reflexive possessive *s-*, on the one hand, and the impossibility vs. possibility of 'D N', with D the definite article, on the other?

With (24)-(26) in mind, in which non-reflexive possessive *s-* is associated with a silent pronoun (probably originating in the Spec of *s-*) that itself takes the antecedent that *s-* only seems to directly take, we could interpret (28) as indicating that the silent pronoun in question needs to be licensed by a pre-N definite article, arguably via the Spec of D, as in:

(29) ...PRON D *s-*...

Such a licensing position for silent PRON would then not be available in a language with no definite article at all; nor would it be available in a language whose definite articles are always enclitic, if the phrase/head to which they (phonologically) encliticize occupies their Spec and thereby prevents it from hosting the silent possessor pronoun.

As for reflexive possessive *s-* and (27), it might be that *s-* can impose reflexivity on PRON only if, conversely, PRON does not move up to Spec,D. (The parameter(s) underlying raising vs. non-raising of this silent possessor pronoun remain to be determined.) Thus, just as (29) corresponds to non-reflexive *s-*, so does (30), from this perspective, correspond to reflexive *s-*:

(30) ...D PRON *s-*...

In a language that would have no visible definite article at all, D would not be present (or at least not be visible); in a language with only enclitic definite articles, there would be an X preceding D that would match whatever that definite article is enclitic on. In neither case would the silent possessor pronoun raise to Spec,D, in languages with reflexive possessive *s-*.

By the phrase 'impose reflexivity' in the preceding paragraph, I have in mind, among other languages, English, in the following way. Instead of thinking of, say, *himself* as taking a local antecedent, we should rather, following Helke (1973, 11), take the *him* contained within *himself* to take a local antecedent, with that locality (and c-command requirement) being imposed by *self*, in a way that needs to be better understood. (In addition, the presence of *self* allows the avoidance of a Condition B violation - cf. Kayne (2002); cf. also the recent Brown Bag talk by Ahn and Kalin.)

9.

If (30) is correct, then reflexive possessive *s-* in the languages that have it is associated with a silent pronoun in a way that is arguably strongly parallel to the way in which *self* is associated with an overt pronoun (e.g. *him*) in English. The question then arises as to whether reflexive elements are in general associated with a pronoun. Ordinary reflexive clitic sentences in Romance at first suggest not:

(31) Jean se photographie souvent. (French 'J refl. photographs often')

In such sentences there is a reflexive *se*, but no visible pronoun. Put another way, it would appear that sentences like (31) have one less element than the corresponding English sentence:

(32) John photographs himself often.

Consider now the following (dative) reflexive sentence in French (which looks like (31), except for the extra direct object):

(33) Jean se lave les mains. ('J refl.(dat.) washes the hands' = 'J washes his hands')

Corresponding to (33), we would have, in the first person singular:

(34) Je me lave les mains. ('I me wash the hands')

Here, instead of reflexive *se*, we have what looks like pronominal *me*, with the challenge of understanding why this pronominal *me* doesn't trigger a Condition B violation.

The picture changes, though, if we jump from French to Bellinzone (a Romance language/dialect spoken in the Ticino part of Switzerland, to the north of Milan), which has, for (34), the following, as discussed by Cattaneo (2009, 163):

(35) Mi a ma sa lavi i man. ('me I me refl. wash the hands')

The *mi* here is a non-clitic pronoun that is not relevant to the issue at hand; nor is the *a*, which is a subject clitic of a sort discussed by Poletto (2000, chap. 2). What is important is that where (33) has just *se* and (34) just *me*, (35) has two object clitics, *ma* and *sa*. (This is also possible in Bellinzone in the second person plural, with *va sa*.)

The natural proposal is that Bellinzone here is reflecting UG more transparently than French is. Consequently all Romance languages/dialects should be taken to have, in sentences comparable to (31) and to (33)-(35), not one object clitic, but two. Both (31) and (33) are now to be understood to be as in:

(36) ...PRON se...

with PRON a silent non-reflexive pronominal object clitic, while (34) is to be understood as in:

(37) ...me SE...

with SE a silent reflexive object clitic. Parameters of one sort or another will regulate what is silent when, and in what language.

A generalization of this proposal would be:

(38) All reflexive elements of the *s*-type or the *self*-type must be accompanied by a (silent or pronounced) pronoun that mediates the taking of an antecedent, in all languages.

This may be paired with:

(39) Apparent Condition B violations of the sort seen in (34) always indicate the presence of a silent reflexive element (of the *s*-type or the *self*-type), in all languages, with the silent reflexive in such cases 'protecting' the pronoun from a possible Condition B violation.

The examples in (31), (33) and (34) come from Standard French. But there is a variety of French brought to my attention by Sophie Moracchini (p.c.) that allows certain sentences that recall the Bellinzone example (35). One such sentence is:

(40) Jean, cette voiture, il se la lui est offerte lui-même. ('J, this car, he refl. it him(dat.) is offered him-same' = 'J, this car, he bought it for himself himself')

Like the Bellinzone example, (40) seems to have an extra object clitic. (The intensifying 'reflexive' *lui-même* facilitates acceptability, but is not otherwise relevant.) Standard French would have just reflexive *se* here, along with the accusative clitic *la*, whose antecedent is 'this car'. But standard French would not have the 'extra' (dative) clitic *lui*, which from the present perspective is 'doubling' reflexive *se* (unsurprisingly, given (38)); put another way, *lui* in this example is to *se* as *him* in English is to *self*.

It should be emphasized that the present proposal takes all instances of *s-*, whether reflexive or non-reflexive, to be the same element *s-*, accompanied in all cases by an 'extra' pronoun. It is this pronoun that is the locus of the difference in behavior between reflexive *s-* and non-reflexive *s-*. *S-* imposes locality constraints on that pronoun only when, as in (30), that pronoun has not raised to Spec,D. (By extension, we would expect the pronominal subpart of English reflexives not to have raised to Spec,D - cf. again the Ahn & Kalin talk.)

The non-reflexive instances of *s-* that have so far been discussed have all been instances of possessive *s-* in Romance (with allusions to German and Dutch). The relevant structure was given in (26) and is repeated in essence here (with PRON a silent pronoun), taking into account the proposal illustrated earlier in (29):

(41) ho letto PRON il suo libro ('I-have read PRON the his/her book')

This represents an Italian sentence corresponding to English *I have read his/her book*.

In conclusion to this set of sections, then, *s-* in (41) is not in a suppletive relation with *I-*. PRON is a silent counterpart of *I-* that *s-* cooccurs with in the manner of *self*, both reflexive *self* and the non-reflexive *self* of *If he himself had joined us,...*

11.

The non-reflexive possessive *s-* of (41) has now been seen to fit into a broad and rich syntax of *s-* (in Romance, Germanic and Slavic) that covers both reflexive and non-reflexive *s-* (with the latter being exemplified also in Spanish 'spurious' *se* - cf. Kayne (2018)) and that extends well beyond possessives.

In a similar vein, we should expect the prohibition against possessive *I-* that was discussed earlier to be related to aspects of syntax that again go well beyond possessives. The proposal in Kayne (2018), which part of this talk is drawn from, relates the restriction against possessive *I-* illustrated in Italian (9), repeated here:

(42) *il suo libro ('the his/her book')

to a restriction seen in English with definite articles in:

(43) How many Brooklyn loving linguists do you know?

(44) How many (*the) Bronx loving linguists do you know?

and to what I think is a parallel prohibition against third person pronouns in compounds:

(45) *Nixon would have liked to be able to disregard all those him-hating linguists.

12.

The two cases of potential suppletion so far discussed have both turned out to be cases in which the optimal analysis involves, instead of a substitution relation, the

presence of extra structure, combined with the presence of a silent pronoun. In addition, it should be noted, *ghe*, in the first case discussed, is not in any sense an allomorph of a dative pronoun. Nor, in the second case discussed, is *s-* in any sense an allomorph of *l-*. (The anti-homophony principle/heuristic that I've proposed also plays a key role in keeping the overall theory from being too powerful. In the cases at hand, all instances of *ghe* are the same, as are all instances of *s-*.)

13.

There are additional instances of apparent suppletion that arguably involve, not substitution, but extra structure and a silent element, in which the silent element is other than a pronoun.

Consider the case of *much* and *many* in relation to *more*. *Much* and *many* look like adjectives insofar as they are compatible with degree words like *too*, *so*, *as*, *how*, *enough* and *that/this*. Yet they lack a regular comparative form:

(46) Mary has written more/**manier* papers than John.

(47) You drink more/**mucher* coffee than I do.

in such a way that one might be tempted to take *more* to be suppletive/contextually allomorphic for both **manier* and **mucher*.

Yet *more* itself can 'modify' adjectives in a way that *much* (and *many*) cannot (cf. Jackendoff (1977)):

(48) This question is more important than that one.

(49) *This question is much important.

(*So* is arguably not adjectival in *This question is important; too much so for us to ignore it* - for relevant discussion, cf. Corver (1997).)

This suggests that taking *more* to be a substitute for **mucher* is less straightforward than it might have seemed. An alternative in the spirit of the preceding discussion of *ghe* and *s-* would instead look toward the syntax of *enough*, and in particular toward the fact that *enough* cooccurs with silent MUCH, as in:

(50) You've had enough coffee for today.

as argued for such sentences by Jackendoff (1977, 152), against the background of the impossible:

(51) *You've had enough much coffee for today.

(52) *You've had much enough coffee for today.

The analysis of *more* that now suggests itself is illustrated by:

(53) ... has written more MUCH/MANY papers than...

(54) this question is more MUCH important than...

in which *more* is a modifier of, rather than a substitute for, *much* (which is here silent). (Romanian seems to have *mai mult*, which looks like an overt instance of 'more+much'.)

14.

A fairly different (at first glance) kind of apparent suppletion is found in Romance languages with the verb corresponding to *go*, which typically has more than one root (with the distribution quite different from English *go/went*, to which I'll return shortly). Let's take French. The root for *go* is usually *all-*, as it is in the infinitive *aller*, past participle *allé*, gerund/present participle *allant*, imperfect *allais*, *allait*, *allions*, *alliez*, *allaient* and in the present tense indicative first and second person plural *allons*, *allez*.

Whereas in the present tense singular and third person plural, *all-* is absent and *v-* appears, e.g.:

(55) *je vais* ('I go')

Rather than having *all-* and *v-* competing with each other for the same 'spot', the preceding suggests that they cooccur, with (55) to be understood as:

(56) *je v+ALL-+ais*,

with *ALL-* a silent version of *all-*. In the same vein, *vous allez* ('you go') will be:

(57) *vous V-+all+ez*

with *V-* a silent version of *v-*.

The conditions that determine the choice of *all-* vs. *v-* will now be interpreted as conditions regulating the possible silence of one or the other of *all-* and *v-*.

That French allows a 'piece' of its 'go' to be silent is reinforced by the future and conditional, which in French are normally built on the infinitive, e.g. we have infinitive *parler* ('to-speak') and future *vous parlerez* ('you will-speak'). But the future tense of 'go', with infinitive *aller*, is not **vous allerez*, but rather:

(58) *vous irez*

in which form it is 99% certain that there is no pronounced root at all. The *-r-* of *irez* is the usual infinitival *-r-*, and the *i-* is almost certainly either the expletive/locative clitic *y*, or else (as Chris Collins has suggested to me) the theme vowel *-i-*, so that (58) should be thought of as:

(59) *vous V+ALL+i+r+ez*

15.

In Kayne (2016c), I argued that *went* in English is a form of *wend* parallel to *bent/bend*, *sent/send*, *lent/lend*, *spent/spend* and that the exclusion of **goed* is not specific to *go*, but part of a more general fact about English that can be stated as follows:

(60) English light verbs are incompatible with the theme vowel *-e-* in the past tense/participle.

This covers:

(61) **beed*, **haved*, **doed*, **goed*, **comed*, **taked*, **bringed*, **putted*, **getted*, **gived*, **maked*, **letted*, **sayed*, **canned*, **willed*, **shalled*, **mayed*, **musted*

In that paper, I didn't propose an account of (60). A possibility that now comes to mind, from the perspective of Hale and Keyser (1993; 2002), is to say that this *-e-* can only appear if accompanied by an incorporated noun, and that light verbs (by definition) have no incorporated noun. (Whether this means that this *-e-* is a D or a P or a V is not clear.)

Although *went* and **goed* were in that paper not taken to be in competition, there was nonetheless a feel of 'equivalence' about them; in addition the analysis made no crucial use of silent elements. Thinking of van Riemsdijk (2002) and especially of Collins (2007, 26) having taken on *the way home* to be as in :

(62) the way GO home

with a silent GO, an analysis of *They went home* would be:

(63) they went GO home

with this GO akin to a serial verb, as Chris has in fact suggested.

16.

An obvious extension of this would reinterpret Binnick's (1971) idiom-based argument on *bring* and *come* being very closely related as leading to:

(64) that's what brought it COME to mind
with the two verbs closely related in a serial-verb-like way.

17.

In a recent seminar where I was arguing that *better* isn't really a suppletive comparative of *good*, or at least that that was far from the whole story, Chris suggested that *better* might cooccur with GOOD. A way to execute that idea would be as in:

(65) this idea is better GOOD than that one
with this then to some extent akin to:

(66) This idea is that good.

18. Conclusion.

In a number of cases, then, suppletion (or suppletive or contextual allomorphy) can be seen to involve, not competition between two forms for a given position, but instead two structures that differ (a bit) in size and that also differ in that one contains a silent element lacking in the other. If so, then the substitution intuition that underlies much work on suppletion and contextual allomorphy must be wrong, in at least some non-negligible set of cases.

If so, we have the usual question of why an intuition that seemed natural would turn out not to match the workings of the language faculty.

This question recalls the fact that substitution was actually a part of syntactic theory in the 1960s. A position vacated by postposing of the agent could subsequently be filled by preposing of the object. *There*-insertion sentences could be derived by moving the subject out of subject position and then replacing it with expletive *there*.

Substitution is not, on the other hand, a viable option in bare phrase structure. In particular, it would violate the Extension Condition. So it may be the Extension Condition that forces the language faculty away from a substitution approach to suppletion and non-phonological allomorphy, whether substitution is characterized in terms of late insertion or in some other way.

References:

- Binnick, R.I. (1971) *Bring and Come*," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 2, 260-265.
- Cardinaletti, A. (1998) "On The Deficient/Strong Opposition in Possessive Systems," in A. Alexiadou and Ch. Wilder (eds.) *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam 17-53.
- Cattaneo, A. (2009) *It Is All About Clitics: The Case of a Northern Italian Dialect Like Bellinzonese*, Doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Chomsky, N. (1957) *Syntactic Structures*, Mouton, The Hague.
- Collins, C. (2007) "Home Sweet Home," *NYU Working Papers in Linguistics* 1, 1-34.
- Corver, N. (1997) "*Much*-Support as a Last Resort," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28, 119-164.
- Déchaïne, R.-M. and M. Wiltschko (2002) "Decomposing Pronouns," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 33, 409-442.
- Dékány, E. (2018) "The position of case markers relative to possessive agreement. Variation within Hungarian," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 36, 365-400.

- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. and I. Giurgea (2011) "Pronominal Possessors and Feature Uniqueness," *Language*, 87, 126-157.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. and I. Giurgea (2013) "Pronominal Possessors," in C. Dobrovie-Sorin and I. Giurgea (eds.) *A Reference Grammar of Romanian, Volume I, The Noun Phrase*, 347-354.
- Durrell, M. (2002) *Hammer's German Grammar and Usage. Fourth Edition*, McGraw-Hill, Chicago.
- Fiva, T. (1984) "NP-Internal Chains in Norwegian," *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 8, 25-47.
- Fiva, T. (1987) *Possessor Chains in Norwegian*, Novus Forlag, Oslo.
- Giurgea, I. (2014) "Romanian AI and the Syntax of Case Heads," *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, 16, 69-98.
- Giusti, G. (1993) *La sintassi dei determinanti*, Unipress, Padova.
- Hale, K. and S.J. Keyser (1993) "On Argument Structure and the Lexical Expression of Syntactic Relations," in K. Hale and S.J. Keyser (eds.) *The View from Building 20. Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 53-109.
- Hale, K. and S.J. Keyser (2002) *Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Halle, M. and K.P. Mohanan (1985) "Segmental Phonology of Modern English," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 16, 57-116.
- Helke, M. (1973) "On Reflexives in English," *Linguistics* 106, 5-23.
- Jackendoff, R. (1977) *X-bar Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Jones, M. A. (1993) *Sardinian Syntax*, Routledge, London.
- Katz, J.J. and P.M. Postal (1964) *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kayne, R.S. (1975) *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- 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. (2004) "Here and There" in C. Leclère, E. Laporte, M. Piot & M. Silberztein (eds.) *Syntax, Lexis & Lexicon-Grammar. Papers in Honour of Maurice Gross*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 253-273 (reprinted in Kayne (2005)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2005) *Movement and Silence*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (2008) "Expletives, Datives, and the Tension between Morphology and Syntax" in T. Biberauer (ed.) *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 175-217 (reprinted in Kayne (2010b)).
- Kayne, R.S. (2010b) *Comparisons and Contrasts*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Kayne, R.S. (2016a) "The Unicity of *There* and the Definiteness Effect", lingbuzz/002858 (to appear in E. Gonçalves (ed.) *Existential Constructions in Focus*, Federal University of Bahia Press, Salvador, Bahia, Brazil).
- Kayne, R.S. (2016b) "Some Thoughts on *One* and *Two* and Other Numerals", lingbuzz/002991 (to appear in "Linguistic Variation: Structure and Interpretation – A Festschrift in Honour of M. Rita Manzini in occasion of her 60th birthday", Mouton De Gruyter).

- Kayne, R.S. (2016c) "What is Suppletive Allomorphy? On *went* and on **goed* in English", *lingbuzz*/003241.
- Kayne, R.S. (2018) "Toward an Understanding of Apparent Suppletion in Romance Pronominal Possessives," *Probus*, 30, 251-276.
- Leu, T. (2015) *The Architecture of Determiners*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Manzini, M.R. (2014) "Grammatical categories: Strong and weak pronouns in Romance," *Lingua*, 150, 171-201.
- Moro, A. (1997) *The raising of predicates. Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Poletto, C. (2000) *The Higher Functional Field in the Northern Italian Dialects*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Riemsdijk, H. van (2002) "The Unbearable Lightness of Going. The Projection Parameter as a Pure Parameter Governing the Distribution of Elliptic Motion Verbs in Germanic", *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 5, 143-196.
- Sick, B. (2006) *Der Dativ ist dem Genitiv sein Tod*, Kiepenheuer & Witsch, Köln.
- Strandskogen, A.-B. and R. Strandskogen (1989) *Norwegian. An Essential Grammar*, Routledge, London.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1983) "The Possessor that Ran Away from Home," *The Linguistic Review*, 3, 89-102.