SQUIBS AND DISCUSSION

some heretofore elusive facts about the nature of phonological processes operating in natural languages.
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A PRONOMINALIZATION PARADOX IN FRENCH

Richard S. Kayne,
Université de Paris, Vincennes

Assume that the input to the transformational component of the grammar of French is a set of deep structures in which the NP's are indexed to indicate identity of reference. Assume further that there is a transformation called "Pronominalization", which, under certain configurational conditions, converts one of a pair of like-indexed NP's to a pronoun. It is this transformation which is to account for the distribution of anaphoric pronouns in surface structure. Within such a framework, the sentence:

(1) a. Jean, croit qu'il, est malin.
   'John thinks he's smart.'

would be derived via application of the Pronominalization transformation from a deep structure resembling:

(1) b. *Jean, croit que Jean, est malin.

We claim that this theory of pronominalization embodies a contradiction.

Consider the rule of Clitic Placement, which, since it applies only to pronouns:

(2) Paul connait Jean.
   'Paul knows John.'

(3) *Paul connait lui.

(4) Paul le connaît.
   'Paul knows him.'

(5) *Paul Jean connaît.

must be ordered after Pronominalization. For example, the sentence:

(6) La petite amie de Jean, le, déteste.
   'John's girlfriend hates him.'
is derived as follows:

(6) a. *La petite amie de Jean, déteste Jean,
     — Pronominalization —
(6) b. *La petite amie de Jean, déteste lui,
     — Clitic Placement —
(6) La petite amie de Jean, le, déteste.

If, on the other hand, Clitic Placement were ordered before Pronominalization, it would fail to apply in the case of (6a), which would then be converted to the ungrammatical (6b) by Pronominalization. Sentence (6) would not be derivable.

Thus, a grammar of French in which anaphoric pronouns are excluded from the base must contain a Pronominalization transformation ordered before the rule of Clitic Placement. Such a grammar makes the specific claim that Clitic Placement cannot change the coreference relations within a sentence. We now consider certain facts which are incompatible with this claim.

Sentences such as:

(7) J'ai monté la petite amie de Jean, contre lui,
    'I turned John's girlfriend against him.'

show that the Pronominalization transformation must be formulated so as to apply to the second of two coreferential NP's in the configuration: V-[NP de NP]-Prep-NP.

Therefore, given the deep structure corresponding to:

(8) *J'enleverai la petite amie de Jean, à Jean,

Pronominalization will apply to the second Jean, yielding:

(9) a. *J'enleverai la petite amie de Jean, à lui.

1 Although it is irrelevant to the present argument, Pronominalization could also apply from right to left in such structures, yielding sentences like:

On a rendu son livre à Jean,
'They gave John back his book.'

Sentence (9a) is ungrammatical because Clitic Placement is obligatory in such environments.

If examples are chosen in which Clitic Placement is not possible, the resulting sentences make much the same point as (7):

Je ne rendrai le livre de Jean, qu'à lui,
'I'll return John's book to him only.'

On a offert des photos de Jean à lui, et à sa femme.
'They gave pictures of John to him and to his wife.'

A passive sentence derived from a structure resembling that underlying (8) would be grammatical:

La petite amie de Jean, lui, a été enlevée par des bandits.
'John's girlfriend was stolen from him by bandits.'

Le livre de Jean, lui, a été rendu par Paul.
'John's book was given back to him by Paul.'
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(9a) will not undergo Clitic Placement,² yielding:

(9) b. *Je lui enlèverai la petite amie de Jean.
   'I'll steal John's girlfriend from him.'

which is grammatical, but only if lui and Jean are understood as noncoreferential, contrary to what is predicted by ordering Pronominalization before Clitic Placement. A contrast such as that between (7) and (9b) would typically lead us to conclude that the movement rule in question, here Clitic Placement, must be ordered before Pronominalization. But in this case such a conclusion would be in direct contradiction with the evidence presented with respect to (6).³

Similarly, parallel to (9b) we have:

*On en, a nommé le fondateur de l'organisation, président.
   'They named the founder of the organization its president.'
*On y, a incarcéré le directeur de la prison.
   'They incarcerated the director of the prison in it.'

but:

Le fondateur de l'organisation, en, a été nommé président.
   'The founder of the organization was named president of it.'
Le directeur de la prison, y, a été incarcéré.
   'The director of the prison was incarcerated in it.'

² The rule of Clitic Placement presupposed in the text must contain a variable, the need for which is most strongly suggested by examples of the following kind:

Jean nous a offert des cadeaux à tous.
   'John gave all of us presents.'
Jean les fera sans doute lire à sa petite amie.
   'John will probably have his girlfriend read them.'
Elle en a lu la première partie du premier chapitre.
   'She read the first part of the first chapter of it.'
On en a nommé Jean président.
   'They named John president of it.'

For more detailed discussion, see Kayne (forthcoming).

³ The "transformational" theory of pronominalization would be salvageable here if otherwise well-motivated means of excluding sentence (gb) could be shown to exist (although one might still be suspicious of an analysis which did not rule out sentences (gb), (10), and (11) by the same mechanism). For example, it might seem that the "crossover principle" (v. Postal 1968) would be applicable to (g). This principle, however, must apparently make reference to the notion of "pronominal virgin" (v. the formulation of Cross-Over VI, 164) and would therefore in effect be inapplicable to rules which follow Pronominalization. But Clitic Placement is just such a rule; consequently, the "crossover principle" is not relevant to the derivation of sentence (gb).

We note, in addition, that the class of examples considered by Postal typically exhibits the same paradigm with pairs of pronouns as with combinations of pronoun and full NP:

*I talked about John to himself.
*I talked about him to himself.
*Who, did you introduce the girl John likes to?
*Who, did you introduce the girl he, likes to?
On the other hand, in a theory in which indices indicating coreferentiality are assigned to pronouns generated in the base, and in which Pronominalization is a rule which filters out, perhaps cyclically, certain configurations of anaphoric pronouns, sentence (6) provides no evidence as to the relative ordering of Pronominalization and Clitic Placement. The evidence from sentences (7) and (9b) would again require that Pronominalization be ordered after Clitic Placement, this time without contradiction.

The kind of case being discussed in the text provides a striking contrast:

(9b) *Je lui enlèverai la petite amie de Jean.
     Je lui enlèverai sa petite amie.
     'I'll steal John's/his girlfriend from him.'

Similarly:

* On lui, a offert une photo de Jean.
     On lui, a offert une photo de lui.
     'They gave him a picture of John/him.'
* Je lui, a offert le livre dont Jean, m'a parlé.
     Je lui, a offert le livre dont il, m'a parlé.
     'I gave him the book John/he told me about.'

The examples discussed by Postal have recently been reexamined from a rather different point of view by Jackendoff (1969), none of whose proposals are extendable to the facts at hand. (Jackendoff, moreover, argues specifically for an interpretive theory of Pronominalization). Sentence (9b) thus remains a contradiction for the "transformationalist" position.

* This would be equally true given the analysis of pronominalization proposed by Jackendoff (1969). The crucial point is simply having pronouns generated in the base.

We note that it would not be incompatible with the facts discussed in the text to maintain the existence of a transformation deriving pronouns from full NP's, if this rule were supplemented by some kind of output condition designed to rule out sentence (9b). Since such an output condition would essentially duplicate the usual conditions on backwards Pronominalization, in particular, those needed to rule out sentences (10) and (11), it would render unnecessary, and undesirable, similar conditions on the Pronominalization transformation itself.

In fact, this suggests that an analysis with base-generated anaphoric pronouns could be replaced by one in which all pronouns are introduced by a transformation which must meet only the requirement that it apply before any other transformation making specific reference to pronouns (e.g. Clitic Placement). The configurational constraints on anaphoric pronouns could then be accounted for entirely by output conditions.

This latter analysis would, however, permit the existence of some transformation Tj ordered before the introduction of pronouns into trees by the now conditionless Pronominalization transformation. No such Tj is formulable if pronouns are present in the base. Insofar as no Tj can be demonstrated to exist, the more restrictive "pronouns in the base" hypothesis must be considered preferable. One might also wonder whether the output conditions in question would not, in light of the base-generation of nonanaphoric pronouns, make a Pronominalization transformation entirely superfluous.

We argue elsewhere (Kayne, forthcoming) in favor of the principle of the transformational cycle, and at the same time that
The Pronominalization rule would exclude (9b), but not (7), exactly as it would exclude:

\[
\begin{align*}
(10) & \quad *Marie l'\text{enlèvera à la petite amie de John.} \\
& \quad 'Mary will steal him from John's girlfriend.' \\
(11) & \quad *I l'\text{a enlevé l'enfant à la petite amie de John.} \\
& \quad 'He stole the child from John's girlfriend.'
\end{align*}
\]

We conclude that linguistic theory must be constrained so as to disallow, at least for French,\(^6\) the selection of a grammar in which the distribution of anaphoric pronouns is determined by a rule converting full NP's to pronouns.

### References


---

Clitic Placement is not a cyclic rule. The ordering in the text therefore implies either that Pronominalization is not cyclic in French or that Clitic Placement is last cyclic rather than postcyclic.

\(^6\) That the same is true of English has been argued by Bach (1970), Bresnan (1970), Dougherty (1969), and Jackendoff (1969).

---

**I THINK, YOU THINK, HE THINK**

*John Kimball, University of California at Santa Cruz*  
*Judith Aissen, Harvard University*

Verbs in English are marked in the third person singular with an /s/ suffix. There is a dialect of English, however, in which the occurrence of this suffix is optional in certain environments. In this dialect both (1a, b) are acceptable.

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad a. \quad \text{Mark knows the people who Clark thinks are in the garden.} \\
& \quad b. \quad \text{Mark knows the people who Clark think are in the garden.}
\end{align*}
\]

Our hypothesis (to be spelled out below) is that the main verb of the relative clause exhibits the plural (zero) morphology under the influence of the plural head of the