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1 Modularity and gaps

The set of possible combinations of preverbal clitics in French has apparently 'arbitrary' gaps, whose absence does not obviously follow from independent syntactic or interpretive principles like the Theta Criterion that restrict combinations of non-clitics as well. These gaps prove a powerful tool for investigating a foundational hypothesis about the architecture of language:

(1) MORPHOPHONOLOGY-FREE SYNTAX (MFS): Syntax is autonomous of morphophonology.

MORPHOPHONOLOGY is here a cover-term for the systems responsible for the form and arrangement of morphemes not due to syntax and interpretation. Its purview varies with the theory, but the allomorphy of the English past in distributed, let, ran, thought, went clearly belongs here, and even in an exuberant syntax, so does the morpheme-internal prosody-sensitive infixation in Dutch (-fuckin-)br(*-fuckin-)jóvnik (McCarthy 1982: 575). Under SYNTAX are included both syntax and aspects of interpretation dependent on it, such as theta and binding theory. MFS is a hypothesis about the MODULAR ARCHITECTURE of the cognitive system containing these domains: syntax is encapsulated from morphophonological information and the mechanisms that manipulate it. MFS seem to be as pervasively and systematically right as befits a fundamental architecture principle, whether or not it has exceptions that call for limited morphophonology-to-syntax communication. Syncretisms are a token: in French (2), nonstrong, nonnominative plural pronouns neutralize gender across paradigms, as for les, yet this fails to influence their gender for participle and pronoun agreement in the syntax, mises and elles.

(2) Les cuillères, je les ai mis-es là où elles/*/ils étaient.
The spoons / glasses, I put them where they were.

(Rezac 2009)

In the domain of gaps, MFS individuates two classes of gaps and two classes of mechanisms, syntactic and morphophonological ones, and predicts that syntactic mechanisms do not respond

---
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1 See Baerman (this volume), Zwicky (1992, 1996), Pullum and Zwicky (1988), Miller, Pullum, and Zwicky (1998), Halle and Marantz (1993), Embick (2000), Trommer (2002), Tseng (2005), Embick and Marantz (2008). MFS typically follows on realizationalist models of morphology, but also on early-insertion lexicalist ones to the extent there are principles to prevent syntax from accessing the morphophonology of the word node. It is explicitly absent in models where syntax and morphophonology are a single system, e.g. Bresnan (1998, 2001).
to morphophonological gaps even if they may do so to syntactic ones. The syntactic invisibility of arbitrary gaps has been emphasized by Trommer (2002) and Embick and Marantz (2008) in arguing against Bresnan's (2001) model of violable constraints unhampered by MFS, designed to allow the arbitrary *amn't gap of English license a unique syntactic structure as its 'REPAIR'.

The missing past participle of stride in English (Albright 2006) is a convenient illustration of their point: its absence licenses neither syntactic phenomena (do-support, *She has done stridden) nor interpretations (the past for the perfect *By now, she strode across the desert for many years) that are not available independently of the gap, say to glide. Only independently available paraphrase can be resorted to. Syntax does not seem to react to the INEFFABILITY of a syntactic structure due to an arbitrary gap in its realization.

The French clitic cluster is a rich source for the study of MFS. Some of its gaps share their underlying principles with morphophonological mechanisms affecting the cluster, viewable as repairs of gaps that would emerge otherwise. Others condition a syntactic repair, and so should prove to be syntactic if MFS is right, furnishing a base-line against which to compare morphophonological gaps, one not available for amn't and stride. In the comparison, MFS seems to emerge as the over-arching principle governing gap-syntax interactions, differentiating gaps similar on the surface yet profoundly different in kind and behavior.

Standard descriptions of French clitics propose the strictly ordered cluster in (3), filled by the clitics in (4), one per position, although we shall meet exceptions. The cluster needs a left-adjacent finite or infinitival verb as host. The cluster-verb units have been treated as forming an inflectional 'paradigm' (Lambrecht 1981, Miller 1992, Miller and Sag 1997, Bonami and Boyé 2006), parallel to the object-agreement inflection of languages like Basque (Heger 1966).

(3) Standard order: 1/2-3.DAT-3.ACC-GEN-LOC

(4) a. 1st/2nd person and se clitics: 1SG me, 2SG te, 1PL nous, 2PL vous, SE se
b. 3rd person accusative clitics: 3MSG le, 3FSG la, 3PL les
c. 3rd person dative clitics: 3SG lui, 3PL leur
d. Adverbial clitics: locative LOC y, genitive GEN en

An example of the cluster is lui en y in (5). The example also shows one set of clitics set aside here: the te me nous group of 'ethical' clitics, glossed ETH, invoking a nonargumental discourse participant as witness or affected entity (Leclère 1976). They mostly precede other clitics and do not interact with them for co-occurrence restrictions (Jouitteau and Rezac 2008).

(5) Je (te (me (nous))) lui en y ai mis deux.

---

2 Throughout, talk of 'repairing' of a gap is meant as neutral between two construals: responding to a gap as such, as by a constraint violation, and restating the conditions of a gap, which entails being able to state them.

3 Clitics are italicized. 1st/2nd person clitics make no case distinctions, but their case is recoverable by diagnostics like quantifier float, and is glossed (except for ethical clitics). The se clitic is glossed SE: it plays the role of a dative and accusative reflexive, an inchoative and a mediopassive formant, and an idiomatic part of some verbs.

4 The separation of adverbial clitics and the verb by certain adverbs is unavailable in the grammars studied here (Kayne 1975: 79 note 7, 430). Space allows only proclisis to be discussed. Enclisis is distinct in form and ordering, with intriguing gaps often attributed to a mysterious 'euphony' (de Kok 1985: 379-383, Morin 1979b: 309-311; Miller 1992: 175f.). Excluded are also gaps involving a single clitic only, such as *s‘a (Morin 1984, Abeillé and Godard 2002: 443f.). For more on the morphophonology of the cluster, see Morin (1979a), Miller (1992), Auger (1994).
I 2SG.ETH 1SG.ETH 1PL.ETH him.DAT GEN LOC have put two
I have put two of them (keys) there (in the bowl) for her.
(Jouitteau and Rezac 2008: 98; all the ethical datives are possible)

In the paradigm space defined by (3), many gaps exist, and some anomalous combinations that can be viewed as the repairs of other gaps. Two tools for investigating them are introduced first. Section 2 sorts out a set of gaps due to a syntactic principle, the Person Case Constraint, whose properties form a baseline against which other gaps are studied. Section 3 looks at the anomalous combinations, which betray the workings of an extra-syntactic system manipulating morphological features and imposing constraints on their combinations. It reappears in the irreparable morphophonological gaps studied thereafter, and the remaining sections turn to these, resumed in Table 1. All appear to occur in the morphophonology and share invisibility to syntax, as MFS holds, heterogeneous though they are in their causes: repetition problems, morphological garden paths, unorderable clusters, and those that are presently mysteries.5

Table 1: French clitic cluster gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster gap</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Gap type</th>
<th>Repair</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2/SE.ACC+3.DAT</td>
<td>me lui</td>
<td>syntax</td>
<td>syntactic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.DAT+3.ACC</td>
<td>la lui</td>
<td>partial repetition</td>
<td>allomorphy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*LOC+LOC, *GEN+GEN</td>
<td>en en</td>
<td>clitic repetition</td>
<td>allomorphy/--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.DAT+3.DAT</td>
<td>leur lui</td>
<td>partial repetition</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.DAT+3.DAT</td>
<td>lui y</td>
<td>garden path</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.ACC+LOC</td>
<td>l’y</td>
<td>garden path</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN+LOC</td>
<td>y en</td>
<td>clitic ordering</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro-predicate le+X</td>
<td>l’y ?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se+DAT</td>
<td>se lui</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The Person Case Constraint: A syntactic gap

Many of the logically possible combinations of clitics are missing for nonarbitrary syntactic reasons. Violations of the Theta Criterion, the Binding Theory, or the Case Filter belong here: there are no clusters of multiple accusative clitics to the extent a cliticization domain does not include multiple accusative arguments (cf. (40)c). More intricate is (6). The genitive clitic originates as the complement of the object le prix, which cannot itself cliticize as the 3SGM.ACC clitic le. A plausible explanation is that le cannot stand for le prix to the exclusion of its complement, nor for [le prix t_m] by the Lexical Integrity Principle (cf. Blanche-Benveniste 1975: 106f., Rooryck 1988: 383).

I GEN know the price

5 All gaps discussed here have been mentioned in the literature and discussed with various speakers, but detailed investigation focuses on the grammar of one consultant, M. Jouitteau (MJ), a middle-class speaker from Nantes with a register influenced by Cholet. For MJ, we may distinguish a school-taught literary level set aside here (no subject clitic doubling; weak subject nous ‘we; elle [ɛ] ‘she’), and spoken grammars ranging from ones at mid-distance from the literary level in familial and general informal settings (optional subject doubling, on ‘we, elle [ɛ] ‘she’) to more remote ones restricted to certain contexts among peers (obligatory subject doubling, on ‘we, elle [a], y-datives in section 5). Phenomena restricted to the last level are notated (MJ’), others (MJ). Cf. generally Lambrecht (1981).
I know the price of it.

Not all syntactic gaps are obvious, however. The \textit{ME-LUI} or PERSON CASE CONSTRAINT (PCC) in (7) defines a set of impossible combinations superficially similar to others like \textit{*lui y 3SG.DAT LOC} which will turn out to belong outside syntax. Indeed, the seminal studies of Perlmutter (1971) and Bonet (1991) view the PCC as a set of gaps in the morphophonology. Yet the PCC belongs to syntax, and it makes for a minimal contrast with morphophonological gaps.

\begin{equation}
\text{PERSON CASE CONSTRAINT (PCC): } *^{1}\text{st/2}\text{nd}/se \text{ accusative clitic} + \text{nonethical dative clitic.}
\end{equation}

Bonet's and subsequent work finds the PCC to recur across both Romance and otherwise typologically diverse clitic and agreement systems. This finding, the constraint's feature-based character, and its occasional independence of the morphological expression of these features, have lead much research to place the constraint into the syntax (Postal 1990, Ormazabal and Romero 1998, 2002, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Béjar and Rezac 2003, Bianchi 2006, Adger and Harbour 2007, Rezac 2008; cf. Albizú 1997). A remarkable property of the PCC confirms this move by the MFS: it licenses otherwise impossible syntactic structures. In French, unfocussed dative and accusative pronouns must be clitics rather than strong pronouns, (8)a, except when a clitic would incur the PCC, (8)b (Kayne 1975, Couquaux 1975, Postal 1990, Rezac 2009).

\begin{equation}
\text{a. } \text{Philippe } la \langle \text{leur} \rangle \text{ a présenté } \langle *\text{à eux } / \sqrt{\text{à EUX}} \rangle \text{ hier.} \\
P \text{ her.ACC them.DAT has introduced to them } / \text{to THEM yesterday}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{b. } \text{Philippe } te \langle *\text{leur} \rangle \text{ a présenté } \langle \text{à eux } / \text{à EUX} \rangle \text{ hier.} \\
P \text{ you.ACC them.DAT has introduced to them/to me yesterday}
\end{equation}

[Of course they know her/you \text{.} P \text{ has introduce her/you to them/THEM yesterday.}]

This clitic-strong pronoun alternation could in principle belong to the morphophonology. It resembles analytic-synthetic alternations that arguably occur there, such as \textit{quick-er \text{–} more rapid}, save that the distance between the clitic and the strong pronoun seems to great for a morphophonological mechanism to span (Ackema and Neeleman 2003). Bonet (1991) finds an elegant way to relate the clitic and strong pronouns of (8) outside syntax as different spell-outs of the same movement chain. The dative moves out from a VP-internal position, the clitic spells out the top copy if possible, and the strong pronoun spells out the bottom copy if the clitic is banned by the PCC as a morphophonological constraint (see also Bošković 2002).

However, it turns out that the clitic and the strong pronoun in (8) involve different syntactic structures, not different spell-outs of the same one (Rezac 2009). Dative clitics and strong pronouns differ syntactically in ways other than focus in French, and for all such purposes, the unfocussed strong pronoun of the PCC repair behaves as a strong pronoun rather than as a clitic. Bare floating quantifiers like \textit{tous }'all' are a case in point. Only the syntax underlying a dative clitic can license one, and the PCC repair with its unfocussed strong pronoun behaves as if there were no clitic: \textit{tous} can be added to (8)a to give \textit{Philippe la leur a tous présenté hier} 'Philippe introduced her to all of them yesterday', but not to (8)b. Binding theory and constraints on right dislocation can make the same point. Thus the PCC licenses an otherwise unavailable syntactic structure of the repair and is visible to syntax. This proves a key contrast with nonsyntactic gaps.
Visibility for syntax matches a different property of the PCC that furnishes another contrast: the PCC and its repair pay attention to syntactic primitives never differentiated by the morphophonology. For example, the repair only affects dative clitics that realize indirect objects, not those that correspond to possessors or benefactives (Kayne 1975, Couquaux 1975, Postal 1990, Rezac 2009). The realization of datives as clitics, and the morphophonological processes affecting clitic cluster in the next section, are blind to such distinctions. Morphophonological gaps are expected to be too. The actual situation is more nuanced, but not, it seems, so as to imperil this divide between syntax and morphophonology.

Such is the character of a gap that belongs to the syntactic component. MFS predicts that a morphophonological gap should avail itself of the mechanisms of the morphophonology solely, to be overcome or to remain as a gap. These gaps are introduced in the next section through a system that underlies and can repair some of them, leading into those that it cannot fix.

3 Morphophonological repairs: Opaque cliticization

Clitic cluster gaps due to the morphophonology should not have syntactic repairs, but they may have morphophonological ones. OPAQUE CLITICIZATION might be conceived of in these terms, where a clitic or ∅ appears in a way unexpected from their typical distribution. The phenomenon is of interest because it makes use of the same features and constraints that underlie some irreparable gaps, and because both it and these gaps are invisible to syntax, as MFS predicts.

A particularly common context for opaque combinations in Romance are 3.DAT + 3.ACC clitic clusters, in contrast to ones involving 1st/2nd person (Bonet 1991). Partial morphological feature repetition has been suggested as the source of their troubles, falling under the OBLIGATORY CONTOUR PRINCIPLE (Grimshaw 1997, Pescarini 2007, Nevins 2007). This problem extends beyond these clusters to irreparable combinations, such as 3.DAT + 3.DAT in the next section. For 3.DAT + 3.ACC combinations, there is presumably strong functional pressure against gaps, and we find instead a variety of adjustments by clitic substitution or deletion:

(9) 3.DAT + 3.ACC clitic clusters in Romance (French le/la/les + lui/leur)
   a. retained (standard French, Valencian)
   b. 3.ACC → ∅ (French varieties)
   c. 3.DAT → se reflexive (Spanish: 'spurious se')
   d. 3SG/PL.DAT → hi locative (Catalan, various Italian dialects)
   e. 3SG.DAT → ni genitive (Castrovalvi, South Italy)
   f. features redistributed across 3rd person and LOC positions (Barceloni Catalan)

These cluster transformations are not a matter of plain phonology because of Bonet's generalization in (10): they traffic in clitics and ∅, not in phonological features. Other work shows that the underlying ban on feature and clitic repetition is not phonological, for example Miller (1992), Pescarini (2007), Nevins (2007). Bonet's interpretation is that opaque cliticization occurs in a realizational component between syntax and phonology which operates over morphosyntactic features. The change of a 3SG.DAT to a locative for example consists of the impoverishment of [3SG OBL] to [OBL], where [3SG] are the phi-features 3SG.DAT shares with 3SG.ACC, and [OBL] is the feature that it shares with and that defines a locative.
Opaque output forms in clitic combinations always result in another clitic form, indicating a closed system. (Bonet 1995: 612)

Placing opaque cliticization outside syntax with Bonet matches its apparent properties, without necessarily prejudging how syntax-like the mechanisms of this component might be, as in Distributed Morphology (cf. note 14). The relationship between the transformed features and their context seems arbitrary from a syntactic standpoint, as underscored by the variation in (9). The transformations only seem to pay attention to the local word-like context, the clitic cluster, and not to the larger syntactic structure around. One reflex of this is that a dative clitic behaves the same whether it is an indirect object or a possessor, syntactic distinctions that do matter for the PCC. Finally, a morphophonological approach to Romance clitic cluster transformations makes the following key prediction by MFS:

(11) Syntax (including its interpretation) is not affected by opaque cliticization.

The prediction is significant, for opaque clitics do exist independently, engendering proposals where opaque cliticization is really the contextual use of the usual syntax of the opaque clitic: a locative replacing a dative really is a locative (Manzini and Savoia 2002). Yet Romance opaque cliticization appears to be inert for syntax, like the syncretism in (2). The Spanish spurious SE rule (9)c, shown in (12), is a good example. In the context of a 3.ACC clitic, the 3SG/PL.DAT le, les clitics surface as se, which is elsewhere a reflexive and impersonal subject clitic. Additionally, in some varieties the features of the clitic are realized by the form of the accusative. Neither phenomenon affects the syntax. This follows by MFS if they occur outside syntax, such as the morphological feature deletion and re-linking of Bonet (1995).

(12) El libro, a ellos sej lo/losj prestó?
the book to them who SE.DAT [les 3PL.DAT] 3SG/PL.ACC lent
Who lent the book to them?

The same syntactic inertness obtains of the other 3.DAT+3.ACC cluster transformations (Bonet 1991: 211 for (9)d). It holds also of clitic deletion, instantiated in French (13), and the addition of a spurious le in the same example.\(^6\) There is no theta-role deleted or added, and the phi-features of the deleted accusative clitic remain interpreted while those of the added one are not. More subtly, the deletion fails to affect binding possibilities and quantifier float, which we have seen PCC repair do. The deleted accusative clitic in (14) must remain disjoint from its local subject, and it continues to license a bare floating quantifier (Rezac 2009; cf. Zink 1997: 247).

\(^6\) For deletion, see Miller (1992: 172f.), Auger (1994: 82f.) who notes it to be obligatory, Bonami and Boyé (2006: 296); Grevisse-Goosse (1993: §1070.2); for dialects, e.g. Remacle (1952: 229), Svenson (1959: 56). Auger (1994: 83) and Bonami and Boyé (2006: 296) point out that the deletion cannot be object drop (of which it lacks at any rate the characteristic non-specific reading), since it is available with apporter 'bring' that cannot drop its object. Bonami and Boyé along with Miller (1992: 172) argue that it is not a plausible phonological process in French.

Spurious le does not seem to be mentioned in the literature, though it recalls Catalan reflexive splitting of Bonet (1991: 119-122), the doubling in donne-le/me-le 'give-it-me-it' of Bürgi (1998: 44) (MJ' refais-le/me/me/?nous-le 'redo-him/her-(for) me/us'), and the l-gemination in (œ)ll'avez-vous vu 'him.A have-you' of Morin (1979a: 26) (* for MJ). It affects all 3.DAT+3.ACC clusters, e.g. Elle la/les le lui a envoyé / fait envoyé 'She sent her/them to him, She had her/them sent to him'. It is not always limited to 3.DAT+3.ACC clusters, optionally affecting Elle me l'les a envoyé 'She send it/them to me' to give Elle me le l'/les a envoyé. Cf. note 13. It is not perceived as informal, seems common for Nantes speakers of MJ's generation but not that of their parents, nor have I found it elsewhere.
(13) Elle la lui → lui / le la lui / la le lui a envoyé.

She sent it (e.g. the table) to him.

(14) Elle les →∅ lui a tous déjà présenté.

She has already introduced all of them to her.

An extreme instance of repetition is the repetition of whole clitics, incurring the REPEATED MORPH CONSTRAINT (Menn and McWhinney 1984). Miller's (1992: 143-5) study of its repair by HAPLOLOGY in the case of French *en en* clitic clusters illustrates its syntactic inertness. In (15), the quantifier *deux* 'two' requires the genitive clitic *en* to represent its restrictor, and the left-dislocated *ce vin* must link to another *en* realizing the genitive argument of the verb. Independently, neither *en* is omissible. However, combining the two requirements results in a sole *en* clitic only, (15). It is possible to imagine what a genuinely syntactic reduction of two *en's* to a single one might yield, as in the parasitic gap in (16) where a single *en* links to two positions, (16). This is not the interpretation of (15). Syntax does not see the haplology.

(15) Ce vin, il en [＜en_i en_j] remplit [deux e_i].

This wine he GEN fills two

(16) Marie en_i a présenté [le frère e_i] à [la sœur e_j]

Marie introduced his_i brother to his_j sister.

(Haplography in the case of French *en en* clitic clusters is common. Opaque cliticization can occur elsewhere, as in GEN GEN n n > GEN LOC n i in Barceloní versus haplology in other Catalan varieties (Bonet 1991: 86-97, 112). Neither need be available. In that case, a repeated sequence sometimes survives: GEN GEN n n in Catalan varieties, REFL IMPERS si si in Conegliano Italian, 3PL.DAT 3PL.ACC els els in Valencian (Bonet 1995: 627f.; for *en en* retained in literary French, Rowlett 2007: 128 note 46). However, sometimes it does not, and then an irreparable gap in the clitic cluster emerges: combinations of impersonal and spurious *se* in Spanish (Perlmutter 1971: 33, Bonet 1991: 169) or multiple dative clitics in French (Miller 1992: 264f.; cf. the next section). These gaps arise in the domain where the Repeated Morph Constraint lives. Neeleman and van de Koot (2005) conclude it to lie outside syntax, given its language, construction, and morpheme specificity, and sensitivity to factors like adjacency. By MFS it follows that any repair should be syntactically invisible, as it is.

---


8 So also GEN GEN > SE GEN *se ne* in Italian (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2005: ex. 197), or > LOC GEN *ce ne* (Pescarini 2005); reflexive + impersonal SE *si si* in Italian > LOC/1PL SE *ci si* (Bonet 1995, Grimshaw 1997).
It is time now to turn to the irreparable gaps, first those due to the same causes as the ones in this section: partial repetition. Lacking morphophonological repairs, they permit a different test of their invisibility to syntax, because they would yet cannot be fixed by the PCC repair.

4 Double dative clusters

It is possible in French to create clusters with multiple dative clitics, typically by combining the arguments of distinct predicates through CLITIC CLIMBING. A variety of such clusters are unacceptable.9 Contexts that require clitic climbing yet run into a ban on multiple datives are simply ineffable. Not only are the clitics impossible, but the PCC repair that realize one of the datives as an unfocussed pronoun is not available either (Kayne 1975: 172ff., 290ff., 296ff., Couquaux 1975: 53, 71 note 11, Postal 1981: 308-314, 1983: 412, 1984: 122, Rezac 2009).

The simplest scenario is raising. French mostly permits raising only out of adjectival small clauses, and some adjectives take a dative complement, such as reconnaissant (à) 'grateful to'. If the dative is an unfocussed pronoun, it must be a clitic, and the raising verb is its only host. The raising verb may itself have a dative experiencer clitic. The resulting double dative combination is tolerated by many but not all if 1/2.DAT+3.DAT (me lui), homophonous with the 1/2.ACC+3.DAT clusters banned by the PCC; by none if it gives 3.DAT+3.DAT; and with a great deal of variation for 1/2.DAT+2/1.DAT. Unacceptable clusters are not amenable to the PCC repair, substituting an unfocussed strong pronoun for one of the datives:

(17) Paul me ⟨*leur⟩ semble reconnaissant ⟨?*à eux⟩
Paul me.DAT them.DAT seems grateful to them
Paul seems to me to be grateful to them.


Causatives of ditransitives (and unergatives + dative) are more complex. In the relevant causative construction, the verb is an infinitive embedded under faire 'do', the subject/causee of the (di)transitive is dative, and clitic climbing is obligatory. If the dative causee-subject and the dative indirect object of the ditransitive are both unfocussed pronouns, both must cliticize, and they find themselves in the same cluster. The details of permissible clusters are mostly as with raising, except that some speakers who permit 1/2.DAT+3.DAT for raising permit them in causatives only if an accusative clitic intervenes, 1/2.DAT+3.ACC+3.DAT, while others permit them as such. Impossible clusters cannot be ameliorated by the PCC repair, as in (19). To express such sentences, alternative causative structures with no clitic climbing are used.10

(18) a. Elle me les lui a fait envoyer(, les chocolats, à maman.)
b. *Elle leur les lui a fait envoyer(, les chocolats, à maman.)
c. Elle *leur??me she me/them.DAT them.ACC her.DAT has made send the chocolates to mom
She has made me send them (the chocolates) to her (mom).


(19) Paul va *lui faire porter les livres aux étudiants TOUT DE SUITE.  
Paul will him.DAT them.DAT make carry the books to them / the students immediately  
[Eric forgot to bring the books to Paul's students! What will they do now?]  
Paul will make him carry the books to them / to the students immediately.


In these structures, datives come together from distinct predicates. Double datives can also occur with a single predicate to some extent, by adding a benefactive clitic to a verb that takes an indirect object (Rouveret and Vergnaud 1980: 169-171). For some speakers, the indirect object can then also cliticize, and curiously, 3.DAT+3.DAT clusters may then become available, in direct contrast to multipredicate structures. Even in these double dative clusters however, repetition of the same dative morpheme is strictly impossible, a gap again invisible to the PCC repair.¹¹

(20) (Barbara,j)

a. On te lui a chanté sa chanson à Pauline,
   One you.ETH him.DAT has sung her song to Pauline
   We sang her song to Pauline for him, you see.

b. On te leur/*lui lui a chanté sa chanson.
   One you.ETH them/him.DAT her.DAT
   We sang her song to her for them/*him, you see.

c. On te lui a chanté sa chanson à elle.
   One you.ETH him.DAT has sung her song to her
   *We sang her song to her for him, you see.

(MJ)

For all these double dative clusters, the unacceptable dative combinations cannot undergo the PCC repair, and the underlying syntactic structure is ineffable. That matches the mechanical character of these gaps. From the perspective of syntax, the distinctions between good and bad dative clusters appear arbitrary and hard to refer to without ad-hoc devices: other selection and movement, for example, do not do so. On the other hand, the Obligatory Contour Principle over features from the preceding section seems to capture well the scale 1/2.DAT+3.ACC+3.DAT > 1/2.DAT+3.DAT > 3.DAT+3.DAT. If the gaps belong outside syntax, then the syntactic PCC repair is correctly unavailable by MFS.

An intriguing caveat comes from differences among raising, causatives, and benefactives in the types of double dative clusters tolerated. For many speakers like MJ, raising (17) but not causative (18) tolerate me lui; moreover, monopredicate and not multipredicate structures tolerate leur lui. To differentiate these, dative types might have to be featurally differentiated in the morphophonology, but this is unappealing insofar as dative realization and opaque cliticization treat all homogeneous. More satisfying would be to rely on independent principles, thinking notably of the pragmatic account of Tasmowski (1985) for various causative restrictions.

¹¹ The possibility to cumulate datives is far from general: contrast Kayne (1975: 172 note 122) for a possessor and Postal (1990: 131 ex. 61) for a benefactive. In sentences like (20), one of the clitics must bind se, it seems.
including *me lui -- me lui. For the raising-causative difference, we might depart from the observation that clitics signal a highly accessible discourse antecedent for a following gap (Ariel 1990, Delfitto 2002). This facilitates linking discourse referents to gaps, but also incurs processing complexity with an increase in the number of clitics (Lepschy and Lepschy 1988: 212). Causatives of ditransitives have three gaps at the point where the clitic cluster is met, raising structures have two, and speaker intuitions about their judgments suggest a correlated difficulty with their resolution. Causativizing an unergative, which yields only two gaps as in (21), seems to eliminate the ban on 1/2.DAT+3.DAT clusters of (18). Another story along these lines would have to be told for 3+3 clusters, starting perhaps from the optionality of one of the datives in monopredicate in contrast to multipredicate structures.

(21) Ca nous lui a fait apparaître fatiguée, *(à) nous
That us.DAT her.DAT has made appear / seem tired to us
That made her seem tired to us. (= Nous on a cru qu'elle était fatiguée.)

The alternative is to state these restrictions on clusters and their invisibility to PCC repairs in the syntax and to restrict the PCC repair to the PCC by syntactic means in a model with corresponding means, as in Postal (1990) deploying the power of Arc Pair Grammar.

5 Dative-Locative interactions

The gaps in this and the following sections are perhaps the most widely-noted ones in French: clusters containing the adverbial clitics. Incompatibilities between the locative clitic and datives are discussed in this section, and locative-genitive interactions in the next. Unlike the foregoing gaps where a high degree of consensus exists among French varieties close to the standard, these ones are subject to a great deal of variation along multiple parameters. They are little understood, and the following discussion has two unequal components: good evidence that the gaps are outside syntax and not visible for syntactic repair, and tentative suggestions about their causes. For the gaps of this section, the problem seems to come from interference in the morphological parse between features shared by datives and locatives.

Let us begin with a highly specific gap affecting only 3SG.DAT LOC lui y, as in m'/leur/*lui y parler 'speak to me/*him there' (Miller and Monachesi 2003: 3.4; Couquaux 1975: 50, Blanche-Benveniste 1975: 77f., 85, Morin 1981: 99 note 6, Herslnd 1988: 60f., 320f., de Kok 1985: 368, Grevisse-Goosse 2008: 682.3°). The gap does not license the PCC repair. In (22)a, a strong pronoun for an unfocussed dative is bad whether or not cliticizing the dative runs into the lui y gap. Modifying the example to create a PCC context makes the strong pronoun fine in (22)b. Simply omitting y distorts the meaning in the same way as omitting 'there' in English.

(22) a. C'est parce que le nid protège ses petits/son petit, que
l'oiseau (leur/?*lui) y donne à manger (*à eux/*à lui).
the bird them/him.DAT LOC gives to eat to them/to him

12 The example, which seems robust, violates the generalization that dative clitics come in the order of gaps, perhaps a factor: Kayne (1975: 290), Rouveret and Vergnaud (1980: 177), Postal (1981: 319 note 30, 1984: 135, 152), Tasmowski (1985). One should like to relate the fact that the lower dative clitic may be coreferential with the matrix subject in causative but not raising or monoclusal structures, presumably due to the intervening causee, but here unergatives pattern with (di)transitives (Morin 1978: 359; cf. Postal 1983: 401, Kayne 2000: 23, 118).
It's because the nest protects its young (one) that the bird feeds them/*him there.

b. C’est parce que son petit, a faim que
the bird us.ACC him.DAT gives to eat to him
It's because his youngling is hungry that the bird gives us (worms) to him to eat.

The gap might be attributed to the phonological hiatus in the lui y sequence, [(l)ɲii] (Grevisse-Goosse op. cit., Littré 1872-7 op.cit.). Probably, phonology does play a role. For MJ, the gap disappears when the subject is clitic-doubled at the colloquial level as in (23), which results in the pronunciation [ji] and resolves the hiatus (thus also on 'one/we' lui y [ji], je T lui y [ʒi], etc.). The gap is also absent when the genitive clitic disrupts the lui y sequence, lui en y in (5), and when the order of the two clitics is reversed as some speakers permit, (24) (cf. Zink 1997: 232 note 79). A phonological gap irreparable by the syntactic PCC repair fits well with MFS.

(23) l'oiseau *(i) lui y a donné à manger. (∅ lui y [(l)ɲii] ~ i lui y [ji])
the bird *(he) him.DAT LOC has given to eat
(=22)a (MJ)

(24) Marie l’ y lui soumettra demain.
Marie him.ACC LOC him.DAT submit tomorrow
Marie will submit it to him there tomorrow.
(=22)a (MJ)

Still, a hiatus is not all there is to the story. Such hiatus is either tolerated or repaired by deletion in situations involving a clitic and a nonclitic, as Miller (1992: 176f., 145), Auger (1994: 55f.) demonstrate. Locative y is fine when it follows the strong pronoun lui 'he', or when followed by i-initial verbs like illustrer 'illustrate', save for ir- 'will go' when y is simply deleted. The lui y problem is also attenuated or disappears despite the hiatus when both clitics are subcategorized, as in (25).

(25) Je (l)ui y *parle / √ferai penser. (je lui y [ʒi])
I him.DAT LOC speak will.make think
I will talk to him (*there), √I will make him think of that.
(MJ)

In looking for what renders hiatus problematic for lui y, the close Romance relationship between locative and 3.DAT clitics comes to mind. Morphologically, dative clitics often seem to contain the locative clitic as a component, indicated in Table 2 and example (26). The dative may be realized as a locative alone, or in conjunction with various expressions of its phi-features: some identical to accusative clitics or to their subcomponents like the plural z, some to dative clitics in related dialects, with these modes transitioning smoothly one to another (as in Rohlfs 1935: 124). Particularly striking is Barceloní, where the 3rd person and locative components of a dative can be separated by the genitive clitic n: 3PL.DAT lz-i, 3PL.DAT + GEN is lz-n-i [ɔlζɔni] (Bonet 1995: 641f.; cf. Ahlborn 1946: 59-61 for Occitan).

13 For MJ however, the l’ here is the spurious le of (13), also in (i) (there is no accusative DP clitic doubling).
(i) Marie *(l’) y lui/leur soumettra le dossier demain.
Marie him.ACC LOC him/them.DAT will.submit the dossier tomorrow (MJ)
    I them.DAT will.break the face
    I'll break their/his face.

    b. On leur z’y/lui (*z’y) raconte des histoires.
    one them/him.DAT tells stories
    We tell them/him stories.

(MJ')

Table 2: Dative-locative relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>3SG</th>
<th>3PL</th>
<th>Variety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOC (+ PL)</td>
<td>y (leur)</td>
<td>Québec: Auger 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC + LOC</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i-z / z-i, y-eu-(z-y), etc.</td>
<td>F; FP; Béarn: Rohlfs 1935: 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT + LOC</td>
<td>lui(-z)-y</td>
<td>FP; Catalan variety: Bonet 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l-i</td>
<td>lous-i</td>
<td>FP; Marais Vendéen: Svenson 1959: 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l-i</td>
<td>lèz-i</td>
<td>FP; Old French</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This recurrent relationship suggests that the locative clitic is somehow a component of the dative clitic (Ahlborn 1946: 59-61). Partly on this basis and partly from the opaque cliticization of datives as locatives, Bonet (1991, 1995) decomposes dative clitics into phi-features, which is the content of accusative clitics, plus the feature [OBL], which defines locatives: 3SG.DAT = [3SG OBL]. Among the realizations of this feature combinations are both forms like lui, and others like lui-z-y that appear to have multiple exponent of [OBL]. Both differ from the sequence lui y [3SG OBL] lui [OBL], only in the number and grouping of features. The lui y gap may then be thought to arise partly from a difficulty in differentiating [3SG OBL] from [3SG OBL] in the morphology or its parsing, as an instantiation of the mechanisms underlying the Obligatory Contour Principle effects (Walter 2007: 168-172). Recurrence of the same problem in the phonology as [(l)ɥii] exacerbates it. It is ameliorated or eliminated by realizing lui as [j] distinct from [i], fixing the phonology; by subcategorization for a dative and a locative argument, priming the expectation of two distinct elements; and if lui and y are separated by another clitic in lui en y or if they come in reverse order y lui (especially if the lui[3SG] > i LOC order means that [3SG OBL] lui has trouble being followed but not preceded by [OBL])y.14

14 The dative-locative relationship can be articulated in ways other than Bonet's feature composition of terminals without affecting the proposal to be made, notably through distinct LOC and DAT syntactic terminals as in Manzini and Savoia (2002), Kayne (2008). In this light Vaudois French is interesting. As (26)b indicates, y cannot be attached to lui; it does however surface attached to the sole auxiliary that permits clitic climbing if present, veux in (i). A syntactic approach lends itself to this. So must a morphophonological approach: in some Romance varieties where clitic climbing is clitic copying as in (ii), what gets spelled out at which copy can depend on prosodic properties of the infinitive, as Morin (1979b: 304f. note 5) points out, and that ought to belong to morphophonology.
The same logic should apply to leur y, save that the phonological factor is absent. Consonant with this is Morin’s (1981: 99 note 6) observation that it is also dispreferred (Herslund 1988: 60f.), although better than lui y ‘everything else being equal’. Its acceptability varies with context, from best to worst in (27). The first example involves a subcategorized y, the second unlike the others is at a distinctly literary level, the last has no redeeming qualities.

(27) a. Il leur y fera penser.
   he them.DAT LOC will.make think
   He will have them think of it.

b. Il leur y succèdera.
   he them.DAT LOC will.follow
   He will replace them at the position.

c. Max leur y parlera.
   Max them.DAT LOC will.speak
   Max will speak to them there.

(Morin 1981: 99 note 6)

There occur other problematic interactions between datives and locatives that fit this picture. McA’nulty (1971), discussed in de Kok (1985: 196), observes that in a sentence containing a dative argument gap, (28)a, a locative clitic is excluded, while the reverse is not true, (28)b. A similar effect obtains in (29), with further nuances: an adjunct locative clitic is impossible with a verb subcategorizing for a dative, donner ‘give’, better if the dative is optional, amener ‘bring’, and fine if there is a dative clitic. These patterns suggest that a verb looking for a dative argument seeks to interpret an [OBL] feature as belonging to the dative and pre-empts a locative parse for it, causing a morphological garden-path, unless already satisfied by a dative clitic.

(28) a. *C’est à lui/toi que j’y parle / j’y ai remis le livre.
   it’s to him/to you that I LOC speak / I LOC have returned the book
   He is / you are the one that I spoke to there / that I returned the book to there.

b. C’est là que je lui parle / je t’y ai remis le livre.
   it’s there that I him.DAT speak / I you.DAT have returned the book
   There’s where I spoke to him / where I returned the book to you.

(McA’nulty 1971: 63) (MJ)

   articles into the bar she GEN LOC has brought/given there three to Pierre
   Of articles, in the bar, she ?brought/*gave there three of them to Pierre.

b. Je vais leur y 〈en〉 envoyer un 〈de nos projets〉.

(MJ)

by modularity. Bonet’s copy spell-out proposal in section 2 has the means to make it so. The scope of morphology is unclear when it comes to features shared across copies or extended projections like auxiliary plus participle, letting opaque cliticization affect these.

(i) J’y veux le lui/leur prêter. (ii) La podes pourta-lo au lieit
   I LOC want it.ACC him/*them.DAT lend her you.can carry-her to.the bed
   I want to lend it to them. (Bürgi 1998: 53, cf. 99f.) You can put her to bed. (Piat 1911: §44)
I am going them. DAT LOC GEN send one of our projects
I'm going to send them one of them / of our projects there.

The same dative-over-locative garden-path may account for a gap observed by Heggie and Ordóñez (2005: 12f.): 3SG.ACC LOC l'y. L'y is fine in (30), where it is subcategorized and the verb does not take a dative argument, but quite strongly out in (31)b where y is an adjunct and the verb subcategorizes for a dative. The problem disappears when the dative argument is a clitic, giving le lui y, realized either as [la lui i] in a slow distinctive tempo or as [(l)qii] in a rapid one, not [(l)qii], to avoid the lui y gap. The gap does not occur with another choice of accusative: 3PL.ACC LOC les y is fine in (31)b. Repair by a strong pronoun is impossible, (32).15

(30) a. Il a mis le livre sur la table.  he has put the book on the table
He put the book on the table.

b. Il l'y a mis.  he it.ACC LOC has put
He put it there.

(MJ) (Heggie and Ordóñez 2005: 12f.)

(31) a. Il [l') y a donné le livre à Marie   he/(*)y has given the book to Marie
He gave the book/it to Marie/to her at the meeting/there.

b. Il l' [l') y a donné à Marie   it.ACC LOC has given *to Marie (au congrès)
he/(*)y has put *to her
He put it there.

(MJ) (Heggie and Ordóñez 2005: 12f.)

(c. Il le lui y a donné.  (le lui y = [la lui i], [(l)qii], *[[(l)qii]])
he/(*)y has given her
He gave the book/it to Marie/to her at the meeting/there.

(MJ) (cf. Heggie and Ordóñez 2005: 12f.)

(32) Maï voulait de nos hérissons / notre hérisson, 3SG.DAT [3SG OBL] and 3SG.ACC LOC [3SG] [OBL] are featurally identical, as they are morphologically in many Romance varieties. The hypothesis that would account for the foregoing paradigms is that the sequence 3SG, OBL tends to be parsed as [3SG OBL] rather than

15 The gap is stronger than the lui y gap, and holds at different levels of language. It is considerably attenuated for the verb présenter, perhaps because the location is more of an argument. A gap recalling this one is the exclusion of 3SG/PL.ACC GEN l'/les en in the presence of a dative argument, as in (i) (cf. Morin 1981: 101 note 10). However, the pattern is not the same: it is weaker than l'y, both l'en and les en are excluded about equally, and cliticizing the dative does not seem to help. If one wanted to pursue a parallel explanation nonetheless, there comes to mind the opaque cliticization of some Catalan varieties, 3SG.ACC GEN > LOC l'i (Bonet 1991: 86-97). (Some varieties of spoken French, but not MJ’s, generally exclude l'y/en and less so les y/en, beside good m'y/en: see Morin 1979a: 7f., 1981: 100 note 8, and Lepschy and Lepschy 1988: 212 for variability of ne lo in Italian.).

(i) Je l'/les en ramènerai (??à Maï), de Paris.

(ii) *Je le lui en ramènerai
*Je le lui en
him.DAT will.bring
he/(*)y has given him
He gave them/??him to Fañch (Maï’s friend) there.

(MJ) (Morin 1981: 101 note 10)
[3SG] [OBL] if there is a dative expected. The presence of a dative clitic impedes this garden-path, since it discharges the expectation of the dative argument. The effect seems abetted by the phonological similarity of *l'y [li] and 3SG.DAT *lui [(l)ɥi], and disappears for 3PL LOC *les y. The reasons for the contrast are not fully clear, relating perhaps to the unmarkedness of SG vs. PL and the absence of number specification for LOC, perhaps to the greater prevalence of 3.DAT – 3S.ACC + LOC parallelisms for 3SG than for 3PL in Romance, including Old French.

The garden-path character of dative-locative gaps is suggested by their pattern of degradation and amelioration in function of factors such as hiatus and subcategorization. The hypothesis needs much further exploration. In the literature, morphological garden-paths of this sort have already been occasionally invoked to explain arbitrary gaps. Noyer (1992: 164-6) proposes one for a state of affairs in Mam illustrated in (33), under his analysis. There is a unique suffixal position of exponence, underlined, expressing the features of the agent preferentially and of the patient otherwise. In (33), the agent *he* controls the suffix ∅ expressing its [-I, -you] features. Because the position is unique, ∅ also pre-empts an expression of the patient's features for the two translations: a suffix a for [+I, -you] for us (excl.), and ∅ for [+I, +you] of us (incl.). The morphology should therefore be ambiguous between the two. However, the reading with the patient as us (incl.) is strongly preferred. Noyer posits that the reading with us (excl.) is excluded as a garden path in parsing the morphology, which assumes that a form ending in ∅ does not 'hide' the a that would express the features of the patient if not pre-empted by the agent. On the preferred reading, the suffix ∅ is surface-true to the features of the agent and patient alike.

(33) ... qo ... t- tzeeq'an- ∅ 
[+I-sg] [elsewhere] hit [(aI) ayou]
he hit us (incl.), */?he it us (excl.)

In Noyer's proposal, the surface form is compatible with a featural make-up that leads the parser down one type of analysis, the more surface-true one, and blocks another. The Tamashek gap discussed by Baerman (this volume) might lend itself to such an approach as well. French locative/dative interactions differ slightly. A garden path is created by a parse that attaches an [OBL] feature to an expected dative gap in the McAnulty paradigm, combining further with an adjacent [3SG] to give [3SG OBL] (3SG.DAT) in the *l'y gap, while in the *lui y gap the local repetition of [OBL] in [3SG OBL]_lui [OBL]_y either also results in [3SG OBL] or plain confusion. However, these dative parses are not themselves legitimate in any of the above gap examples. It is important therefore to note that ungrammaticality generally does not prevent garden-paths. German (34) closely resembles Noyer's proposal. A genitive can be expressed by the preposition von or the suffix -s, but for nouns like *Paris* whose genitive is homophonous with the unsuffixed nominative for phonological reasons, the nominative parse beats out the genitive one despite its ungrammaticality (Bayer et al. 2001; cf. Di Sciullo 2000: 8). Similarly in English (35), there arises an irrecoverable parsing garden-path analyzing *DP_1 of DP_2's DP_3* as [1 of [2's 3]] rather than [[1 of 2]'s 3], despite any local disambiguation clues and ungrammaticality or nonsense of the outcome (Fodor and Inoue 1994: 441f., Green 1971).16

inhabitants of London/Paris inhabitant London's/*Paris'

---

16 Brought to my attention by D. Pesetsky, p.c.
(Bayer et al. 2001: 467)

(35)  a. a picture of *me's/*my/*mine recipient/frame
     the recipient/frame of a picture of me

  cf.  b. the person talking to me's purpose

(q.v. Zwicky 1995)

Morphological parsing problems thus seem to furnish one source of gaps in the clitic cluster. They are incurred by principles operating over the features manipulated by the opaque cliticizations of section 3 and partly identical to those seen there, the Obligatory Contour Principle. The next section turns to gaps also arising in the extra-syntactic systems that put morphological features to use, but this time in realization: to ordering problems.

6 Locative-Genitive combinations

LOC + GEN combinations are widely noted to be rare, save for two y en sequences that might have an idiomatic status: in the existential il y en a 'there is' lit. 'it) LOC GEN has', and s'y en SE LOC GEN (Blanche-Beveniste 1975: 77f., 137, 220ff., Morin 1981: 101, de Kok 1985: 385). Morin (1981) observes that the acceptability of other LOC + GEN combinations varies with subtle factors: its literary character induced by naît helps (36)a, whereas (36)b shows more arbitrary variation. He also points out that nothing is wrong with the phonology. In varieties that replace 3(SG).DAT by y, the resulting DAT GEN y en sequences are no more restricted than lui en (cf. Auger 1994: 105, 107).

(36)  a. Il naît à Paris plus de femmes qu'il n'y en meurt. (92%)
     it is.born at Paris more women than it LOC GEN dies
     There are born in Paris more women than die there.

  b. J'y en ai ajouté/planté deux. (54%/15%)
     I LOC GEN have added/planted two
     I added two of those to it / planted two of those there.

     (Morin 1981: 99 note 6, rate of acceptation out of 13 speakers of diverse localities)

Probing the GEN+LOC sequences a little further, we find a great variability of and uncertainty about ordering. Prescriptive works propose y en, but in the linguistic literature there are both cases of y en / *en y and attested en y, in otherwise apparently parallel examples (Morin 1979b: 300 note 3 vs. Lambrecht 1981: 32; cf. Rowlett 2007: 128 note 46). Consider the initial judgments on such sequences for one speaker, in (37), (38), and in (29) above. Grammaticality judgments are available and can be crisp, and completion scenarios lead to the spontaneous production of the two clitics, but the order varies greatly. Indeed, the judgments may reverse within a short time: (37)a is not good on both orders, but on one at a time, engendering an experience reported similar to the reversal of a bistable percept. At the same time, there are islands of stability where independent factors force a certain order: the cluster in (5), where the lui y gap forces lui en y, is a spontaneous production of unmitigated enduring goodness.

(37)  a. T'étais saoule, t'as rien vu! -- Je te jure, j'en y / y en ai vu trois.

17 With reflexive se, we should get the 1st/2nd person clitics as in Je m'y en vais or Je m'en y vais 'I am going away there'. The former is literary (Littré 1872-7, s.v. y1, de Kok 1985: 385), the latter condemned as a frequent vice by Molard (1803, s.v. aller, noted by M. Jouitteau p.c.), though neither now in use in varieties familiar to me.
I have seen three
You were drunk, you didn't see anything! – I swear, I SAW THREE OF THEM THERE.

b. Je t'y en / *t' en y verse (, de l'eau, dans le verre)
I pour you some in it?

(38) a. Il nous faudra faire quelque chose de la fenêtre, dans la cuisine, -- il y a deux rideaux de couleurs différentes. Je crois qu'
Il faut yj enj / ?enj yj ôter le jaune et garder le rouge.
We'll have to do something about the windows of the kitchen – there are two curtains of different colours. I think that we should remove the yellow one from it (the window) there (in the kitchen), and keep the red.

b. Les rideaux ne sont pas mal, sauf pour celui, de la fenêtre, dans la cuisine. Il faut l' en y en ôter au plus vite.
The curtains are not bad, except for the one of the window of the kitchen. We should remove it (the curtain) from it (the window) there (in the kitchen) as fast as possible.

Usually, these clusters are simply avoided. A common strategy is to omit one clitic. Là 'there' may complete (39), but a contextually salient bowl or a pointing gesture will do as well.

(39) A: Ou est-ce que je mets la nourriture pour le lapin / les lapins? B: Tu vois ce bol-là?
A: Where do I put the food for the rabbit(s)? B: Do you see that bowl?
Tu peux lui/leur (*y) en mettre (là).
you can him/them put there
You can put some (GEN) in it (LOC) for them (DAT).

GEN+LOC combinations thus run into some problem that has speakers avoid them if possible and linearize them variably otherwise. The latter suggests that the grammar might be uncertain about the relative order of the two clitics. This proposal is related to the classical view that GEN and LOC share the same clitic cluster slot, but it permits the exceptions seen above. The Obligatory Contour Principle might be responsible, since many Romance varieties spell en out as en + y generally or contextually (e.g. Benincà and Poletto 2005: 233, cf. Zink 1997: 309f.); cf. Bonet's (1995) analysis of y as [OBL], en [OBL [GEN]]. Diachrony helped. The order of the clitics changed from en y to y en in the history of French (de Kok 1985: 366ff.). Subsequently, the combinations of the two clitics have been rare, save for the fixed il y en a and s'y en, and do not seem to have established a sufficiently robust ordering (compare Albright 2006 for the causes of *stridden). When independent principles like the *lui y gap establish the order, the problem disappears, and the GEN+LOC combination is fine.

7 Mystery gaps
The foregoing gaps in French clitic combinations seem amenable to explanations built on reasonable assumptions and with the potential to explain their properties in some detail. The last two gaps considered here are more elusive (cf. note 15 for another gap). They are not amenable to the PCC repair and lack an obvious syntactic reason, but a nonsyntactic one is also not evident.

The first gap is the failure of the neuter clitic to combine with others. French has a pro-predicate clitic le, homophonous with 3SGM.ACC, where some other Romance varieties like Barceloní use a dedicated neuter clitic. The French pro-predicate le cannot combine at all with the adverbial clitics, (40)a (more impossible than (30)b), though it is better with datives, (40)b (Kayne 1975: 299 note 27, Heggie and Ordóñez 2005: 12f.). In Barceloní, combinations of the neuter clitic with others also give rise to gaps or to opaque cliticizations (Bonet 1991: 19, 95, 151f.; 122-4; 86ff.). This recalls the difficulties of note 15 that l’y, l’en occasionally experience independently, but is not reducible to them. The neuter clitic might interact with adverbial ones because like them it is not pro-nominal, and indeed in other Romance varieties the pro-predicate clitic may rather be locative or genitive (Ronjat 1937: §511 for Occitan en, Zink 1997: 302 for Middle French y; cf. Walloon below).

(40) a. Jean l’ (*y) est (à Paris). (l’ = connu, président)
   Jean it.ACC LOC is at Paris known, president
   Jean is one (president) at Paris/*there, Jean is such (known) at Paris/*there.

b. ?Dévouée, elle me l’ est depuis longtemps
   devoted, she me.DAT it.ACC is since a.long.time.ago
   Devoted, she has been to me for a long time.

   (Kayne 1975: 299 note 27) (MJ)

c. je ne veux pas qu’elle soit malade, encore moins qu’elle se la fasse
   that se.ACC her.ACC makes
   I do not wish her to be ill, still less that she makes herself such (ill).

   (de Kok 1985: 384) (*MJ, with la or le)

Instead of an invariant pro-predicate le, older and dialectal French deploy the full array of 3.ACC clitics to reflect the phi-features of the replaced predicate, such as la in (40)c (Posner 1997: 397, Grevisse-Goosse 2008: §673b). The accusative-neuter similarity thus goes farther, though not, as far as I know, to give 1st/2nd person pro-predicates. De Kok (1985: 384f.) observes that in literary usage, pro-predicate clitics rarely combine with accusative clitics to give sequences like (40)c. He notes that attested clusters are all homophonous with ones existing independently, so while (40)c stands beside se SE.DAT + le/la 3SG.ACC, there is no le/la because there is no double-accusative le/la. That too might suggest that the difficulties of combining neuter clitics with others relate to realizing the result. In (40)c the pro-predicate clitic is of the agreeing type; in other examples gathered by De Kok it is not. However, none are remotely acceptable in the French discussed here (MJ; Blanche-Benveniste 1975: 140f., Jones 1996: 303; in Gleize Walloon of Remacle 1952: 256, the 3.ACC pro-predicate clitic changes to LOC if combined with a true 3.ACC).18

The second gap is consists of the mediopassive se + dative clitic. As a reflexive internal argument, se participates in the PCC and its repair. It also serves to form MEDIOPASSIVES, where

18 Accusative clitic climbing is impossible across an accusative when fine otherwise, suggesting a Case problem (Solà 2002: 241f., cf. Rivas 1977; see Tasimowskij 1985: 314, 362 note 7, Postal 1990: 196 note 69 for exceptional French varieties immune to this, perhaps relatable to (13)). For MJ, the neuter clitic might run into this ban.
the external argument is interpreted as an impersonal agent and the direct object if any is promoted to nominative case and agreement (Fellbaum and Zribi-Hertz 1989, Dobrovie-Sorin 2005). Mediopassive *se cannot combine with a dative clitic, although it can combine both with dative arguments and with the locative and genitive clitics. For the resulting gaps, the PCC repair is not available, as observed by Blanche-Benveniste (1975: 214-9), Kayne (1975: 398), Postal (1990: 167ff.).

(41) Bien sûr qu'Azenor aime danser,
mais ça ne *se dit pas (à ses parents / à elle), c'est tout.
but that NEG SE her.DAT says not to her parents / to her that's all
Of course Azenor likes to dance, but one does not say that to her parents / *to her.

(MJ)

Although superficially identical to a subset of the PCC in French, there is reason to think the mediopassive *se clusters are unrelated to it. Some older French varieties seem to permit it without permitting other PCC combinations (de Kok 1985: 384), and so do Occitan varieties (Ronjat 1937: §792, §798). In Spanish, the reflexive accusative *se is not subject to the PCC as it is in French, but mediopassive *se + dative clitic is still excluded, (42) (with n).19 By contrast, NOMINATIVE *se is fine, (42) (without n); absent in French, this *se differs in keeping direct object as an accusative and not promoting it to an agreeing nominative.

(42) Se les vende(*-n) libros a los chicos.
SE them.DAT sell.3SG(-3PL) books to the boys
One sells books to the boys. (Mendikoetxea 1992: 319).

It is unclear what underlies this gap. Mendikoetxea (1992: 319f.) proposes that mediopassive but not nominative *se forms an inseparable morphological unit with the verb, within a theory where the mediopassive *se is lower in the structure than the nominative *se and attaches to the verb as a passive-like suffix. That is untenable for French, where locative and genitive clitic may freely separate the mediopassive *se from the verb: modifying (41), we get Ça ne s’y est pas dit ‘One has not said that there’ (y LOC ‘there’). Spanish in turn renders difficult another sort of explanation. Since the PCC bleeds all other *se + dative clitic clusters in French, this remaining set might encounter difficulties in realization as in the last section, or even be learned as a gap (Boyé and Hofherr, Sims and Daland, this volume). But in Spanish *se + dative surface clusters are fine, as in the nominative *se version of (42) or with its reflexive *se unaffected by the PCC, yet the mediopassive *se + dative clitic combinations are still out.

8 Conclusion: Gaps in morphology and gaps in syntax

The gaps in the French clitic cluster fall into two groups. Syntactic gaps make up one, and the Person Case Constraint belongs among them, invoking syntactic information and licensing a syntactic repair, superficially similar to nonsyntactic gaps though it is. The other group is constituted by gaps invisible to syntax and dependent on morphophonological information and mechanisms, properties which reappear in opaque cliticization. MFS expects nonsyntactic

19 Mendikoetxea (1992: 319 note 8) notes some speaker variation, and indeed the ungrammatical (42) type seems not infrequent elsewhere, e.g. Fernández-Ordóñez (1999, ex. 157).
mechanisms and syntactic invisibility to correlate, and to a considerable extent that seems true, indicating some version of the modular architecture from which MFS derives.

The syntactic status of the PCC and the blindness of its repairs to other gaps may be valid cross-linguistically (Rezac 2008ab). For this, the least suitable architectures are ones where morphophonological gaps are visible to a syntax modeled through violable constraints, predicting their automatic repair by the emergence of otherwise ungrammatical syntactic structures (Bresnan 2001; see Poser 1992: 123-5 for related discussion). In more modular conceptions of the syntax-morphology relationship, there is a variety of ways to draw the necessary distinctions. One is to put the PCC squarely into the syntax, or at the syntax-morphology interface where syntax could see it but not the internals of external module(s), as much of the work cited in section 2 proposes. The notion of interface could be broadened to include parts of an extra-syntactic morphological component defined precisely by being visible to syntax, lending itself to the proposals of Albizu (1997) or Bonami and Boyé (2006: 304f.). Similarly, a gamut of approaches to morphophonological gaps is compatible with MFS, from ones wholly autonomous of syntax to the syntactic but post-spell-out realizational component of Distributed Morphology. In weighing these options, the key will prove a theory of the limitations of the PCC repair, and the existence and nature of other systematic differences between the two groups of gaps, some seen above: the (in)visibility of syntactic distinctions neutralized in the morphophonology (types of datives), and vice versa, the syntactic (non)arbitrariness of feature couplings in gaps (les/*l'y), and the role played by phonology (*lui/?leur y).
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