

The Problem of Strong Pronouns in French Possessive Constructions

▣ 0. Introduction

Standard French expresses possession using the preposition *de* (*du/des/d'*) (=of) followed by the Possessor.

- (1) Le chapeau de Gustave.
 The hat de Gustave.
 'Gustave's hat.'

Taken in a very broad sense, possession relationships can be aptly expressed by the same preposition *de*¹.

(2)	<i>Head N type</i>	<i>Complement type</i>	<i>Example</i>
a.	Flat N	Possessor	La maison de Paul. <i>The house de Paul.</i>
	Representational N		Les portraits du collectionneur Barnes. <i>The portraits of the collector Barnes.</i>
b.	Process Deverbal N	Agent	La venue de Paul. <i>The coming of Paul.</i>
c.	Property N	Theme	L'intelligence de Paul. <i>The intelligence of Paul.</i>
d.	Process Deverbal N	Theme	La construction de l'Opéra. <i>The construction of the Opera.</i>
e.	Relational N	Theme	L'ami de Paul. <i>The friend of Paul.</i>
f.	Psychological N	Experiencer	La passion du jeu des aristocrates. <i>The aristocrats' love of gambling.</i>
g.	Representational N	Agent	Le portrait de Corot. <i>The portrait of Corot.</i>
h.	Flat N	Agent	Le célèbre immeuble de Le Corbusier. <i>The famous building of Le Corbusier.</i>
i.	Representational N	Theme	Le portrait de cette jeune femme. <i>The portrait of this young woman.</i>

But there is one recalcitrant case:

- (3) *Un/L' ami de moi/toi /lui /elle/nous/vous /ils /elles.
 A/The friend *de* me/you-SG/him/her/us /you-PL/them-Masc./them-Fem.

¹ All the examples given under (2) are taken from Danièle Godard, 'Extraction out of DP in French'.

The pronouns *moi, toi, lui*, etc. in (3) are usually categorized as Strong Pronouns, to be distinguished from another kind of French pronouns, namely clitics. (3) combined with (2) suggests that a Strong Pronoun is not licit as the sister of the preposition *de*, while a lexical DP is.

In contrast to (3), (4) shows that French can resort to another preposition, namely *à* (*au/aux*) (=to) when the Possessor is a Strong Pronoun:

- (4) Un ami à moi/toi /lui /elle/nous/vous /ils /elles.
 A friend à me/you-SG/him/her/us /you-PL/them-Masc./them-Fem.
 'A friend of mine/yours/his/hers/ours/yours/theirs.'

- **My question** is thus: Why can't a Strong Pronoun be the sister of *de*?
- **Answer:** Case-marking of a Strong Pronoun obeys specific constraints. *A*-constructions differ from *de*-constructions.

▣ 1. Blame it on Genitive!

1.1 The contrast between (3) and (4) can be accounted for in terms of Case. It seems natural, although evidence is scarce in this respect (French does not have a rich casual morphology) to postulate that *de moi* is Genitive, while *à moi* is not. So (5) below instantiates an inherent case, with *de* being not a preposition but a case-marker:

- (5) La voiture de Paul.
 The car of Paul.
 'Paul's car.'

Following Chomsky (1986), let's assume that [-N] categories assign structural case (Accusative and Nominative), while [+N] categories (Nouns and Adjectives) assign Genitive Inherent Case. In light of this, the marker of Genitive is *of* in English, *de* in French and \emptyset in Irish:

- (6) Ilyfr Siôn. (Irish)
 Book John.
 'John's book.'

The idea that emerges then is that there is some restriction on the kind of DPs that can receive Genitive Case (an idea entertained in Milner (1978)²). In fact, the generalization is broader than this: (i) the Cases at issue are in fact Genitive *and* Dative, and (ii) the ban on Strong Pronouns holds also when the Strong Pronoun is complement of V:

- (7) **Milner's Generalization:** If the complement is a PP, it is realized as an *à/de* + pronoun sequence; if it is a Dative or Genitive NP, it is pronominalized as a clitic (the verbal clitic *lui*, or the possessive in NP).

² *De la Syntaxe à l'interprétation*, Le Seuil, Paris, 1978, cited by D. Godard.

(8) shows the restriction in NP:

- (8) a. Il y a un portrait de Corot/de lui dans cette collection. (PP)
There is a portrait *de* (=by) Corot/*de* him in this collection.
b. J'ai rencontré un ami de Paul/*de lui cet après-midi. (Genitive)
I have met a friend *de* Paul/ *de* him this afternoon.

(9) shows the restriction in VP:

- (9) c. J'ai pensé à Paul /à lui. (PP)
I have thought *à* (=about) Paul /*à* him.
d. J'ai parlé à Paul /*à lui. (Dative)
I have talked *à* Paul /*à* him.
e. J'ai donné un livre à Paul/*j'ai donné un livre à lui. (Dative)
I gave a book to Paul / I have given a book *à* him.
f. ✓Je lui ai donné un livre. (Clitic) (Dative)
I to-him have given a book.

1.2 Economy

I assume that Milner's proposal is based on an economy principle: if Genitive or Dative can be realized on a clitic, then they have to be. As is, the proposal can probably explain the following contrasts.

- (10) a. *Un ami de lui.
A friend *de* him.
b. ✓Un sien ami. (archaic)
A his friend.
c. *L'ami de lui.
The friend *de* him.
d. ✓Son ami.
His friend.

Similarly in Italian (and in Spanish)³:

- (11) a. *Un/Il amico di me. (Italian)
A/The friend *de* me.
b. ✓Un/Il amico mio.
A/The friend mine.
c. ✓Un/Il mio amico.
A/The mine friend.
'A friend of mine/ My friend.'

Interestingly, *de* is perfectly licit before a Strong Pronoun in many cases, in particular if the idea expressed is not strictly possessive:

³ But the parallel cannot be pushed very far because *di* is licit before third person pronouns *lui* (3-SG-Masc.), *lei* (3-SG-Fem.), *loro* (3-PL).

- (12) a. Un livre de moi. (Origin, Author)
 A book *de* (=from or by) me.
- b. Une trace de moi.
 A trace *de* me.
- c. Une partie de moi. (Part/Whole)
 A part *de* (=out of) me.
- d. Un portrait de moi. (Theme)
 A portrait *de* me.
- But e. *Un livre de moi. (Alienable Possession)
 A book *de* me.
- f. ?Un cheveu de moi. (Inalienable Possession)
 A hair *de* me.
- g. *Une passion de moi. (Experiencer)
 A passion *de* me.

So **Milner's Generalization** would really apply to those Strong Pronouns to which Genitive Case is inherently assigned by Nouns. As a consequence, we predict that all licit *de*-constructions are in fact PPs. Of course, the **Generalization** by itself is little explanatory (its sole goal is a descriptive one).

1.3 À-Constructions

But then, one might wonder, why is (13) licit? *À lui* seems to be a clear case of dative, and here it is synonymous with *de lui*.

- (13) ✓Un ami à lui.
 A friend à him.

French has two prepositions in possessive constructions. *À* is used before lexical DPs (but judged colloquial), as well as before Strong Pronouns (then it is perfectly grammatical).

- (14) Le chapeau à Gustave. (colloquial)
 The hat à Gustave.
 'Gustave's hat.'
- (15) Un chapeau à moi. (perfectly grammatical)
 A hat à me.
 'A hat of mine.'

If **Milner's Generalization** (7) is right, then in (13) *à lui* is in fact a PP, not a Strong Pronoun with a case marker. This in turn suggests that the *de* constructions and the *à* constructions are not in fact parallel. In particular, the *à* constructions only serve to denote *possession* (that is, all the cases where *de* constructions are impossible with Strong Pronouns). I suggest that *à* constructions obey **Milner's Generalization** and that they are best conceived of as *reduced relatives*. In effect, French uses *à* in predicative constructions to express possession:

- (16) Le livre est à Pierre/ à moi⁴.
 The book is à Peter/à me.
 'The book is Peter's/mine.'

In the same fashion, we can assume that...

- (17) Un livre à moi.

...is in fact:

- (18) Un livre (qui est) à moi.
 A book (which is) à me.

In (16) *à moi* would then be a PP.

Another fact that points to the difference between *à* and *de* constructions is the type of Possessors: while *de* admits of all kinds of Possessors, *à* only admits of animate Possessors (and among animals, those that are considered as quasi-persons).

- | | | | |
|------|--|-------------------|------------------|
| (19) | ✓Le curé à mon cousin.
'The priest of my cousin.' | (person) | (Lexical DP) |
| (20) | ?La laisse au chien. (but ✓La laisse du chien)
'The leash of the dog.' | (pet animal) | " |
| (21) | *La portière à la voiture. (but ✓La portière de la voiture)
'The door of the car.' | (artefact) | " |
| (22) | *Le patron à la société. (but ✓Le patron de la société).
'The boss of the company.' | (abstract entity) | " |
| (23) | ✓Un ami à moi.
A friend à me. | (person) | (Strong Pronoun) |
| (24) | ?Une laisse à lui (about a dog).
A leash à him. | (pet animal) | (Strong Pronoun) |
| (25) | *Une portière à elle/ça (about a car).
A door à her/it. | (artefact) | " |
| (26) | *Un directeur à elle/ça (about a company).
A director à her/it. | (abstract entity) | " |

Attractive though the idea may be, it trips on this simple fact: the predicative construction in (16) is only possible with definite subjects, whereas the possessive *à* constructions have a broader distribution. Witness the (a-b) pairs below: parallelism breaks down for some of them:

⁴ This construction is reminiscent of Latin:

- (1) Ø Rosa est Petro. (Latin)
 A/The rose is Peter-DAT.
 'Peter has a/the rose.'

Notice that in Latin, the Possessee is definite or indefinite.

- (27) a. ✓Le livre à Pierre. (Lexical DP)
 The book à Peter.
 'A book of Peter's.'
 b. ✓Le livre est à Pierre. "
 The book is à Pierre.
 'The book belongs to Pierre.'
- (28) a. ✓Un livre à Pierre. (Lexical DP)
 A book à Peter.
 'A book of Peter's.'
 b. *Un livre est à Pierre. "
 A book is à Pierre.
 'A book belongs to Peter.'
- (29) a. *Le livre à moi. (Strong Pronoun)
 The book à me.
 'My book.'
 b. ✓Le livre est à moi. "
 The book is à me.
 'The book is mine.'
- (30) a. ✓Un livre à moi. (Strong Pronoun)
 A book à me.
 'A book of mine.'
 b. *Un livre est à moi. "
 A book is à me.
 'A book belongs to me.'

Even though we have some reason to think that *à* and *de* do not pattern alike, the simple hypothesis that we proposed to account for the difference is blatantly insufficient.

▣ 2. Proposal

2.1 Clitic Doubling

One defect of **Milner's Generalization** is that it is in a sense too narrow. Milner rightly points out that restrictions on Strong Pronouns hold with VPs as well as with NPs (see (8) and (9) above). But in fact, Dative and Genitive are not the only cases at issue. Focusing on VPs, besides Dative, Nominative and Accusative Strong Pronouns are illicit too (there is no evidence with regards to Genitive), unless a clitic is added:

- (31) a. *Jean a parlé à moi. (Dative)
 John has talked à me.
 'John has talked to me.'
 b. ✓Jean m' a parlé (à moi). (Clitic Doubling)
 John to-me has talked (to me).
 'John has talked to me.'

- (32) a. *Moi parle. (Nominative)
 Me talk.
 'I talk.'
- b. ✓(Moi,) je parle. (Clitic Doubling)
 Me I talk
 'I talk.'
- (33) a. *Jean voit moi. (Accusative)
 John sees me.
 'John sees me.'
- b. ✓Jean me voit (moi). (Clitic Doubling)
 John me sees me.
 'John sees me.'

Inserting a clitic rescues the sentence containing a Strong Pronoun which is not the complement of a preposition: this again is not taken into account by Milner. Drawing on facts involving Nominative and Accusative, Kayne (2000) argues against an economy-based account of these phenomena: for him, the rule is the following:

- (34) **Kayne's Rule:** Pronominal arguments that are structurally Case-marked in French must be doubled by a clitic.

We would thus hope to apply this **Rule** to our problem. I think this proposal offers a more promising perspective: it has a wider empirical coverage than Milner's, while retaining Case as a decisive factor. Of course, if we stick to the representation of the *de*-constructions we have assumed so far (Case on the Possessor is Inherent Genitive Case), **Kayne's Rule** has no bite whatsoever since the Possessor does not receive structural Case in them (and it is not clear whether a pronominal Possessor is the argument of an N). So there is a tension that we have to resolve: if we want to harness the benefits of the more general generalization (Kayne's), we need to revise the structure of *de*-constructions.

I will now draw on other theories by Kayne that shed some light on the case at hand.

2.2 Case-marking of Strong Pronouns

First, Kayne (1994) claims that *de*-constructions in French involve a DP which has CP-properties. Kayne hypothesizes the following structure for possessive *de*-constructions, with *de* as a prepositional complementizer, acting as a case-licenser of the Possessor.

- (35) La [_{D/PP} voiture_j [_{de} [_{IP} Jean [_I⁰ [_e]_j...
 The car of John.
 'John's car.'

Now, in this configuration *de* is clearly a Case assigner, not a Case marker. In other words, *Jean* in (35) is structurally Case-marked (by a preposition). So we would expect that, when a Strong Pronoun replaces a lexical DP, Clitic Doubling would be required (insertion of a possessive pronoun)⁵. But inserting a clitic does not save the day.

⁵ This is so if *Jean* in (36) can be regarded as an argument, as **Kayne's Rule** requires: and in fact, it might well count as an argument of the silent Predicate below I⁰. If it is not, then **Kayne's Rule** does not elucidate our problem.

- (36) *Un/L' ami de moi.
 (37) *Un/Le mien ami de moi. (Doubling)
 A/The mine friend of me.
 (38) *Mon ami de moi. (Doubling)
 My friend of me.

So, what's wrong with *de*-constructions? It seems that we have traded an empirically accurate generalization (Milner's) for a more theoretical proposal, which does not elucidate our particular problem. I suggest that the Possessor in *de*-constructions does indeed receive structural Case but I modify substantially Kayne's proposal.

As a matter of fact, another way of seeing the restrictions on Strong Pronouns is to say that they don't want to be Case-marked in AgrOP and AgrSP, the positions in which arguments are normally Case-marked: the insertion of a clitic saturates the Predicate and hence ensures that the Strong Pronoun can only be the complement of a P. So we lay out the following rule:

- (39) **Rule of Case-marking:** Strong pronouns are never Case-marked in AgrOP nor in AgrSP⁶.

What happens in (36) is that the pronoun *moi* receives its case, not from the complementizer *de* but instead from AgrS, in violation of our **Rule** (39). Nothing can rescue the sentence, because there is no way a clitic can be placed in Spec,AgrSP instead of the Strong Pronoun (let's assume no Clitic can be placed on a silent Predicate, like the one we hypothesize below I⁰).

Now, how about *à*-constructions? We propose that they do not involve the same predicative structure as the one shown in (35). Following Den Dikken (2006), we suggest that the PP headed by the preposition is the sister of a silent 'Relator'.

- (40) [[_{RP} [_{Subject} POSSESSUM]]_{R'} RELATOR [_{PREDICATE=PP} P_{dativ} POSSESSOR]]]

Even though we have found evidence that the Relator is probably not BE (see above, when BE is realized, in (27) through (30)), and hence no intuitive overt counterpart can be provided, we find this proposal appealing. In the latter configuration, being the complement of the preposition *à*, a Strong Pronoun in a Possessive construction will never incur a violation of our **Rule of Case-marking**. No need to postulate a reduced relative, *à*-constructions involve a full-fledged maximal projection.

⁶ Another way to put it to say that they don't want to be arguments. Needless to say, something will have to be said about Strong Pronouns used as arguments of verbs in the Imperative. Second, if Nominative *moi* is not Case-marked in an Agreement projection (likewise for Accusative *moi*), where else is it Case-marked? This lack of account for the Case assignment of Nominative and Accusative Strong Pronouns might be a serious drawback of our proposal.

▣ 3. Outstanding Problems and Concluding Remarks

3.1 Definiteness Effect

Unfortunately, one problem is still pending. As the following sentence suffices to show, nothing is said in our proposal about the sensitivity of *à*-constructions to definiteness and relativization:

- | | | | |
|------|---|-----------------------|------------------|
| (41) | ✓Un ami à moi.
A friend <i>à</i> me. | (<i>indefinite</i>) | (Strong Pronoun) |
| (42) | *L' ami à moi.
The friend <i>à</i> me. | (<i>definite</i>) | (Strong Pronoun) |
| (43) | ✓L' ami à moi que tu aimes bien.
The friend <i>à</i> me that you like well.
<i>'The friend of mine that you like.'</i> ⁷ | (<i>relative</i>) | (Strong Pronoun) |

One way of dealing with these facts is to note the striking resemblance between NP-*à*-pronoun sequences (French) and NP-*of*-NP-'s sequences (English). Like the former, the latter are sensitive to animacy (maybe personhood), to definiteness and to relativization.

- | | | | |
|---------|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| (44) a. | *Une page à lui/ça (book). | (<i>French</i>) | (Inanimate) |
| b. | *A page of its (book). | (<i>English</i>) | (Inanimate) |
| (45) a. | *L'ami à moi. | (<i>French</i>) | (Definite Possessee) |
| b. | *The friend of mine. | (<i>English</i>) | (Definite Possessee) |
| (46) a. | ✓L'ami à moi que tu as rencontré.
The friend <i>à</i> me that you have met. | (<i>French</i>) | (Relative) |
| b. | ✓The friend of mine that you met. | (<i>English</i>) | (Relative) |

To some extent French *de*+Strong Pronoun patterns with English *of*+bare pronoun, while French *à*+Strong Pronoun patterns with English *of*+pronoun+'s (with indefinite Possessee).

- | | | | |
|---------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| (47) a. | *Un ami de moi. | (<i>French</i>) | (<i>de</i>) |
| b. | *A friend of me. | (<i>English</i>) | (<i>of</i> +bare pronoun) |
| a'. | ✓Un ami à moi. | (<i>French</i>) | (<i>à</i>) |
| b'. | ✓A friend of mine. | (<i>English</i>) | (<i>of</i> +pronoun+'s) |

From the observation that *the (two) pictures of John's* is ungrammatical, while *the (two) pictures of John's that you lent me* is grammatical, Kayne (1994) develops the idea that *the* does not admit of a DP sister, and hypothesizes that *(two) pictures of John's* is a DP headed by *of*. So, given the definiteness effect that occurs in (42) (and given its repair in (43)), why not apply the proposal that Kayne offers for *of*-NP-'s sequences (English) to *à*-NP sequences (French)? In other words, why not treat *à*-constructions along the following lines?

- | | | |
|------|---|-----------|
| (48) | [_{D/PP} POSSESSUM] _j [<i>à</i> [_{IP} POSSESSOR [_I ⁰ [e] _j ...]] | (French) |
| (49) | [_{D/PP} POSSESSUM] _j [<i>of</i> [_{IP} POSSESSOR [_I ₀ 's [e] _j ...]] | (English) |

⁷ By contrast, (i) Relativization does not alleviate the problem caused by a definite article before a *de*-construction and (ii) Clitic Doubling is impossible in *de*-constructions.

3.2 Doubts

Here are some reasons why one should take this solution with a grain of salt:

- (i) If the Possessor-denoting DP is in Spec,IP, it receives structural Case (be it from *à* or from AgrS, as I propose). Assume first that it receives Case in AgrSP: then Clitic Doubling should be *necessary* to rescue the sentence when the Possessor-denoting DP is a Strong Pronoun (following our **Rule of Case-marking**). But there is nothing to rescue, the outcome is grammatical when the Possessee is indefinite (the outcome is bad when the Possessee is definite, due to the alleged incompatibility of *le* and a DP). In fairness, Clitic Doubling is possible, though, but not necessary (but recall, impossible with *de*-constructions):

- (50) Mon ami (à moi). (Clitic Doubling)
 My friend à me.
 'My friend.'

Second, assume that the Strong Pronoun receives its Case from the D/P *à* (in line with the original Kaynian proposal). **Kayne's Rule** predicts that Clitic Doubling should be necessary to salvage the derivation if the Strong Pronoun is an *argument*: being in Spec,IP in (48), it is natural to think that it is an *argument* (not of the Possessee, but of the silent Predicate under I⁰), so some action should be taken, contrary to the facts (the outcome is grammatical when the Possessee is indefinite). Now we are in for more trouble.

- (ii) If the problem in *L'ami à moi* is that *ami à moi* is a DP (headed by *à*), and *le*, as its English counterpart *the*, loathes DP complements, how can we account for the following (when the Possessor is denoted by a Lexical DP)?

- (51) L'ami à Paul. (colloquial) (French) (Lexical DP)
 (52) *The friend of Paul's. (English) "

This is the one case in which *à*-NP sequences and *of*-NP-'s sequences part ways. Is it to say that *ami à Paul* is not a DP, since (51) is well-formed? Do we need then to posit a special structure for *à*-constructions involving Lexical DPs (while retaining the structure in (48) for Strong Pronouns)? Besides, why don't we get any definiteness effect with *de*-constructions?

- (53) ✓L'ami de Paul. (Lexical DP)

Well, maybe *ami de Paul* is not a DP:

—Either *de* is a Case-marker: then we fall back on **Milner's Generalization** in order to rule out *ami de moi*; but the **Generalization** was too narrow and not explanatory;

—Or *de* is a P and *ami de Paul* is a small clause PP: when the Possessor-denoting DP is a Strong Pronoun, it will be structurally Case-marked by the P *de*. Then if it is an *argument*, **Kayne's Generalization** predicts Clitic Doubling should kick in, but it does not (witness (37) and (38)); if it's not an *argument*, **Kayne's**

Generalization simply does not help to explain the ungrammaticality; and our **Rule of Case-Marking** predicts that there should be no problem because the Strong Pronoun receives its Case from a P, not in an Agreement projection, but there clearly is a problem with **Un/L'ami de moi*.

My sense is that we have the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle, and I am quite confident that a solution is at hand, but there is something wrong with my assumptions. At this point, I don't know what, but I suspect that a more accurate characterization of the ban on Strong Pronouns inside DPs as well as inside VPs is in order. In particular, I think I give too much weight to the Clitic Doubling phenomena. On the one hand Kayne claims that Clitic Doubling is a repair, and I am tempted to think that there is a lot to learn about the Strong Pronouns in general if we can identify the violation Clitic Doubling fixes. But on the other hand, Clitic Doubling is *not* the only repair for illicit Strong Pronouns in VPs. Clefting is another one⁸:

- (54) a. *Il parle à moi. (Dative)
 He talks à me.
 b. ✓C'est à moi qu' il parle. (Cleft)
 It is à me that he talks.

Coordination is another one, at least for Nominative Strong Pronouns⁹:

- (55) a. *Moi parle. (Nominative)
 Me talk-1SG.
 b. ✓Paul/Toi et moi parlons. (Coordination)
 Paul/You and me talk-1PL.

But Coordination doesn't alleviate a violation induced by a Strong Pronoun in a Possessive construction, *unless* the Strong Pronoun is coordinated with a Lexical DP and preceded by *à*:

- (56) a. *La voiture à moi et à toi a été réparée. (à)
 The car à me and à you has been fixed.
 b. *La voiture de moi et de toi a été réparée. (de)
 The car de moi and de you has been fixed.
 c. ✓La voiture à Paul et à moi a été réparée. (colloquial) (à)
 The car à Paul and à me has been fixed.
 d. *La voiture de Paul et de moi a été réparée. (de)
 The car de Paul and de me has been fixed.

These facts cast doubt on the possibility of extrapolating from VPs to Possessives: the fact that the repairs of violation in the former don't seem to apply to violations in the latter suggests that the phenomena may be different. What is quite clear though, is that all the facts I have gathered (sensitivity to human vs non human Possessor, definiteness effect, repair by relativization) conspire to show that *à*-constructions differ from *de*-constructions.

⁸ To the best of my knowledge, Clefting licenses all Strong Pronouns, irrespective of Case.

⁹ Dative and Nominative Strong Pronouns do not improve much under Coordination.

Summary

Data

(57)	Un ami de Paul		(de)	(Lexical DP)
(58)	L'ami de Paul.		"	"
(59)	*Un ami de moi.		"	(Strong Pronoun)
(60)	*L'ami de moi.		"	"
(61)	Un ami à Paul.	(colloquial)	(à)	(Lexical DP)
(62)	L'ami à Paul.	(colloquial)	"	"
(63)	Un ami à moi.		"	(Strong Pronoun)
(64)	*L'ami à moi.		"	"
(65)	*L'ami de moi que tu aimes bien.	(Relativization)	(de)	"
(66)	L'ami à moi que tu aimes bien.	(Relativization)	(à)	"
(67)	Mon ami à moi.	(Clitic Doubling?)(à)		"

Proposal

- (68) **Rule of Case-marking:** Strong Pronouns are never Case-marked in AgrOP nor in AgrSP.
- (69) **de-constructions:** *Jean* is Case-marked in AgrSP.
La [D/PP voiture]_j [de [IP Jean [I⁰ [e]_j...]
- (70) **à-constructions:** the POSSESSOR is structurally Case-marked by *à*.
[[RP [Subject POSSESSUM][R' RELATOR [PREDICATE=PP P_{dative} POSSESSOR]]]

References

- Den Dikken, M. (2006), *Relators and Linkers: The Syntax of Predication, Predicate Inversion and Copulas*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Godard, D. (1992), 'Extraction out of NP in French', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, vol. **10**, Springer Netherlands.
- Kayne, R. S.
1994. ——— *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
2000. ——— 'A Note On Clitic Doubling in French', in *Parameters and Universals*, Oxford University Press.
- Milner, J.-C. (1978), *De la Syntaxe à l'interprétation*, Le Seuil, Paris.